Overview

The Mobility as a Service (MaaS) Feasibility White Paper Advisory Group Meeting #3 was held on Wednesday, January 19, 2022, from 1:00PM to 3:00PM PST to give members an opportunity to discuss and prioritize key strategies, members were also given the opportunity to discuss the draft implementation guide.

Meeting Summary

1. Welcome & Purpose (Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Project Manager, SCAG)
   i. Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang provided welcoming remarks and thanked the members for attending the prior two meetings and for continuing to offer their perspectives and insights.
   ii. Priscilla reviewed the agenda and meeting format with the attendees.

2. Project Update (David DeRosa, Associate Vice President, AECOM)
   i. David DeRosa provided a project update, beginning with a recap of the second meeting held in October 2021, which covered key opportunities and challenges, and goals and objectives.
   ii. David reviewed the input and comments received during the second meeting in the recap, including input received and how the inputs were incorporated to refine identified opportunities and challenges, and goals and objectives.

3. Vendor Survey (Victor Xie, Transportation Planner, AECOM)
   i. Victor Xie introduced the vendor survey task conducted by the project team in the prior months, including the purpose and design of the survey and how the results will be included in the final recommendations of the white paper.
   ii. Victor provided an overview of the survey including the number of participating vendors, the timeline for administering the survey, and the availability of the final survey results.
   iii. Victor also provided a summary of the preliminary findings, as well as the questions asked, including those related to Governance, Finance, Institutional Practices, as well as Equity and Engagement.

4. Breakout Group Discussion (David DeRosa, Associate Vice President, AECOM)
   i. David DeRosa introduced the draft strategies for focused discussion in breakout groups. The strategies were related to the framework elements of:

   a. Equity and Public Engagement
   b. Data and Technology
   c. Governance
   d. Institutions
   e. Infrastructure
   f. Management and Operations
   g. Finance
   h. Performance Metrics

   ii. Two polls were introduced before the breakout room discussion; the results were shared with attendees, and they were given the opportunity to comment.
Poll #1 – Strategy Categories
Participants were asked to select the top strategy categories. The poll results below show respondents top choice from the option given.

1. Which strategy categories are the most pertinent and imperative for the SCAG region?
   Data Standards and Information Sharing Agreement Development 39%
   Public Engagement and Inclusive Solutions 31%
   Transit Infrastructure Expansion and Enhancement 15%
   Identify Dedicated Funding Sources 15%
   Form Dedicated MaaS Institution for Development and Implementation 0%
   Determine the Most Suitable Management Structure 0%
   Open-Loop Payment Adoption 0%

Poll #2 – Opportunities
Participants were asked to select their top implementation choice.

1. Which implementation item do you find the most useful and applicable to your agency?
   Checklist for Agencies 36%
   Performance Measurement for Agencies 36%
   Timeline / Schedule 28%

Meeting Comments
Seleta Reynolds: Question about data sharing agreements. Preference for statutory protections accompanying privacy principals and data protection principals before moving forward with a conversation about data sharing agreements.

5. Breakout Discussion Groups (Moderated by David DeRosa, Susan DeSantis, and Victor Xie)
   i. There was an opportunity for targeted discussion in two breakout rooms. Advisory Group Members were assigned to a breakout room with a moderator. Each breakout room had a facilitated discussion on the draft Strategies and draft Implementation Guide presented earlier in the meeting.
   ii. Advisory Group Member assignments to breakout groups reflected a diversity of thoughts and ideas, and organizations and agencies in each room. Breakout room discussion provided a space for an interactive and open forum in which members could exchange ideas and provide feedback.

6. Report Outs
   i. A representative of the breakout rooms provided a report out consisting of an overview of the discussion that took place.

7. Wrap-up and Next Steps (David DeRosa, Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang)
   i. David DeRosa shared next steps with the members including a tentative date for the final meeting of the Advisory group.
   ii. Priscilla thanked all for attending and participating in the discussions. She also highlighted next steps, the proposed final meeting date and final report publishing.
Breakout Discussion Highlights

Breakout Room #1 – Moderated by David DeRosa and Susan DeSantis

Implementation Guide
- Preference for an implementation guide for agencies that are interested in MaaS but are not looking for near-term implementation.
- Interest in including strategies on how to launch MaaS programs and projects, including funding sources and vendor agreements.
- Preference for a "consortium" instead of an "entity." Some public agencies do not believe they could support the forming of an "entity."
- Interest in including Councils of Governments (COGs) which could be a platform for pilot implementation because they’re a sub-regional collection of agencies that geographically cover people’s travel patterns.
- Interest in including comparable performance metrics and KPIs, including data standards.

Data Standards
- Concerns about data privacy and issues when it comes to building partnerships with private vendors and transit agencies.
  - Preference for Data Standards to be a priority for any Implementation Guide
  - Preference for policy change at the federal and state level to be able to implement data agreements with vendors and transit agencies, as well as between transit agencies.
  - OCTA provided a sample of a data sharing agreement with a private vendor. Preference for keeping some of the data private but still usable.
    - Interest in implementing a data agreement that moves from the rider to determine what data standards are needed.
- Concerns about the limited flexibility of an open-loop payment system to target specific user groups.

Open-loop Payment Systems
- Concerns about the cost to launch and implement a different system. LA Metro has built an infrastructure (TAP and mobile app). Abandoning the current system and building one with new technology would be cost prohibitive and could take up to 10 years to accomplish.
- Concerns about the time it can take an agency to implement or change to an open-loop payment system that includes reduced-fare programs.
- Interest in prioritizing governance and fare policy, concerns about taking away flexibility to target specific fare types to specific groups from policy makers with technology choices.

Equity and Public Engagement
- Interest in groups and communities that do not typically interact with transit agencies to increase public awareness of MaaS projects.
- Interest in collecting data in communities of need or targeted areas that are underrepresented.
Breakout Room #2 – Moderated by Victor Xie

Implementation Guide
- Preference for the study to provide some examples of implementation in other geographic areas in the US, more specifically in California.
  - Concerns about major geographical and demographic differences across the entire SCAG region, concerns around differences in priorities in different regions.
- Preference for a timeline and schedule as well as a step-by-step guide built into the framework of the Implementation Guide. Preference for SCAG to provide some leadership and outward pressure for policy change at the local level for implementation of MaaS projects.
- Questions regarding how to identify challenges by agency or by region, and where to best scope projects.
- Question about multiple providers to provide an all-inclusive mobility action, versus how to establish a framework that creates a standard across the region.
- There should be a distinction about the County of Los Angeles being in a much different position.
  - There are some similarities, outside of general transit, how people are moving around in the region, SOV, TNC are key elements. Each agency needs to figure out how they are going to be delivering service. Implementation of MaaS is what’s most debated

Funding Sources
- Preference for SCAG to lead not only policy discussion but to also lead a discussion on the requirements, such as data standards, as well as working with Caltrans to create some funding opportunities that are tied to these standards.
- Uncertainty about having State/PUC/regional requirements in place, tied to funding, which can be seen as a clean “hands-off” way to incentivize the private sector cooperation.
  - Provided an example in Ventura County with micro-mobility and TNCs and the deployment of a multi-operator fare payment system.
- Question about SCAG role as a facilitator or as a leader in regional MaaS implementation and funding streams.

Transit Infrastructure
- Recognizing that people want more transit and more service options. SBCTA and RCTC can work with transit agencies to make transit more efficient.
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