

# San Luis Obispo County MSAA TMCC Project – Advisory Committee Meeting

Tuesday, January 31, 2017 - RTA Conference Room

10:30 am – 12:00 pm (noon) PDT

Dial: (669) 224-3412; Password: 945-310-541#

---

Committee Chair: Mark Shaffer, Ride-On

## AGENDA

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Mark Shaffer

- a. Mark welcomed all committee members to the meeting.
- b. Jeannine Burlingame, City of Morro Bay; Rik Opstelten, FTA; Mallory Jenkins and Stephanie Hicks, SLOCOG; Mark Shaffer and Jason Portugal, Ride-On; Geoff Straw and Omar McPherson, RTA; Gamaliel “G” Anguiano, City of San Luis Obispo; Mark Codey and Bruce Plowman, CalTrans; Todd Allen, RouteMatch Software; and Patti Star, Community Health Centers (CHC).

### 2. MSAA Project Update

Mark Shaffer

- a. Mark provided an update on the MSAA project status.
- b. Provider Update. Mark referenced the Ride-On and RTA discussions with Regional Center.

### 3. TMCC Draft System Requirements

Todd Allen,  
RouteMatch

- a. Status Update.
- b. Initial Comments.
  - i. Todd presented an update of the current MSAA project status, activities since September 2016, preliminary system requirements development, and a high-level overview of the initial draft System Design deliverable.
  - ii. Committee questions/comments.
    1. DRT Provider Commitment to the TMCC. Geoff inquired when the committee will determine which DRT Providers are committed to supporting the TMCC. Geoff stated that it is important to get inter-local agreements signed between providers to illustrate this commitment. Mark stated this will occur in February/March.
    2. DRT Provider Inclusion in the TMCC. Fred encouraged the development of a process for other DRT Providers to be a part of the TMCC. Mark stated that he envisions a package of provider requirements being developed to address participation in the TMCC. Omar asked who will approve the requirements? Mark envisioned the TMCC committee members. Geoff suggested creating an organization that approves participation. Mark stated

this shall be addressed in the High-Level Design deliverable process.

3. Fred recommended the Ride-On and RTA Boards create a joint operating steering committee to oversee TMCC development.
4. Reporting. Geoff recommended the TMCC system output the reporting data necessary for the State Controller's report. Add requirement to Section 3 in the draft System Requirements. For the High-Level Design process, identify other DRT Provider reporting needs and seek opportunities for the TMCC to report this data. Jason encouraged the system to maintain fluidity for future reporting needs.
5. Constraint. Geoff recommended adding the important constraint that cost/benefits must be developed for the proposed TMCC system alternatives in the High-Level Design. Add to draft System Requirements Deliverable.

#### **4. SLOCOG "Know How to Go" Website**

- a. Stephanie and Mallory reviewed the new website enhancements.

Stephanie Hicks  
Mallory Jenkins,  
SLOCOG

#### **5. Upcoming MSAA Project Activities**

Mark Shaffer

- a. High-Level System Design.
  - i. Mark stated the next step in the project is developing the High-Level System Design.
  - ii. Committee discussion/comments.
    1. Mark stated the next steps will include working in subcommittee on DRT provider issues, technology capabilities today (not spending \$\$ on development), costs for the system, sustainability costs, funding opportunities that may be available, and other issues of importance to the project.
    2. Fred stated that how the end user pays for the DRT provider services is important to address. A multi-provider pass system is beneficial. Not having to re-invent a system is important. Omar encouraged the system to be capable of being tracked as well.
    3. Omar stated that database security for the system is important.
    4. Mark discussed the proposed fare management system and it being an opportunity for connectivity between DRT Providers and human service agencies (i.e. payment for sponsored trips).
    5. Mark stated the Project Management team will identify beneficial practices and share with the committee to assist the design process.
    6. Geoff stated that a Joint Powers Agreement could allow for a process to identify potential DRT Provider participation and TMCC funding.
    7. Mark stated that a written agreement with options is a potential method to address DRT Provider participation. He stated the committee should determine how this process will unfold.

8. Mark stated the TMCC's technology should be built to help all stakeholders.
9. Geoff stated the creation of the system's base criterion is important.
10. Geoff stated there is a difference between someone scheduling a ride and making a request. Mark and Geoff stated they both see the customer making requesting a trip through the TMCC.
11. Geoff stated the system should consider building a feature for trip sharing. Mark stated that he envisions the trip scheduling and "batching" being the DRT provider's responsibility.
12. Fred asked if RTA is mandated for an immediate trip booking response. Geoff and Omar stated that Runabout cannot deny a ride request and seek to meet the trip request in a one hour window per the Americans with Disabilities Act.
13. Public participation/feedback – Fred encouraged the committee to select Ride-On and RTA users in a forum to discuss the proposed TMCC in the High-Level Design process.

## **6. Questions and Comments**

Committee Members

- a. Jason recommended the Technology subcommittee discuss data capacity and how to collect the data at the next meeting. He also recommended the subcommittee identify what data is needed for the system.
- b. Mark stated that he, Omar, and Todd have been invited to present on the TMCC at this April's CalACT Conference.

## **7. Next Steps**

Mark Shaffer

- a. Draft System Requirements Deliverable.
  - i. Receive committee feedback and revise draft.
    1. Mark stated the Project Management Team look to receive committee comments and create a revised draft to send to FTA.
  - ii. Submit to FTA for review and comments.
- b. High-Level System Design Deliverable
  - i. Initial alternative development – subcommittee discussion.
  - ii. Subcommittee Meetings (dates to be determined).

## **8. Closing Remarks**

Committee Members

- a. Next Meeting – February: subcommittee meetings (all three). Mark to check committee members' schedules and confirm all three meeting dates and times.
- b. Mark to send the Word version of the draft System Requirements deliverable to all members for comment. Please share comments with Mark.