



One-Call/ One-Click Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes

Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Monday September 27, 2021

1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Attendees: Aaron Morrow, Alex O Reilly, Amy Biggs, Belina Van, Brock Howell, Dan Walker, Deborah Witmer, Dorene Cornwell, Jason Campos, Jeff Abrams, Jennifer Cao, Jon Morrison Winters, Julio Perez, Karia Wong, Kelly Hosea, Kevin Chambers, Mark Smutny, Megumi Tanaka, Mike Dee, Mike Rimoin, Pran Wahi, Riley Patterson, Susan Carter,

Staff Support: Sara Sisco and Staci Sahoo

*in addition to these notes the chat has been saved from this meeting

Phase One: Progress Report

Meeting began at 1:00 PM with attendee introductions.

To begin, Staci reviewed the current progress and information of Phase One of the One-Call/One-Click project. She highlighted that she has been in conversations with several agencies who have related projects on the horizon. Her intention is to coordinate with these projects when available with a deep focus on ensuring that work is not being duplicated or left out.

These related projects can be thought of broadly in two categories. For data standards, creation and data maintenance: Trillium, Washington State Department of Transportation, and ITS4US are engaged in this work. Hopelink is engaged in their projects and integration with One-Call/One-Click is top of mind. Hopelink is also a deployment site for the ITS4US Plan, Book and Pay project which will provide further resources and support for One-Call/One-Click. Details will be finalized soon.

The second bucket of related projects has to do with regional agencies who are developing customer facing products: Sound Transit, King County Metro, and Community Transit.

Meeting attendees mentioned they are excited by the prospect of several related projects. Noted concern that these projects need to be reviewed by diverse stakeholder groups. As these projects progress the Advisory Committee may want to receive more information as to their design, structure and goals.

Staci then reviewed the continued efforts of this project to engage with diverse stakeholder groups. Recent engagement includes presentations at regional coalitions: Regional Alliance for Resilient and Equitable Transportation (RARET), Snotrac, South King County Mobility Coalition, and the Indian American Community Services Youth Advisory Group.

Planned engagement events include King County Hospitals, Washington State Tribal Transit, King County Transit Advisory Committee, and continued stakeholder interviews.

Staci notes that this project is the product of several years work, which has collected extensive engagement throughout. we have spent many years working on this project. With that in mind she asked attendees if other groups seem to be missing from our radar.



One-Call/ One-Click Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes

Meeting attendees mention a desire for further engagement with youth end-users, particularly schools. Puget Sound Educational Services District is mentioned as a stakeholder. Community colleges are another. Sound Cities, Shoreline Community Response Team

Staci then reviewed a summary of what these engagement presentation and interviews have highlighted. See slide 11 for full list.

Attendees highlight and second the desire for acknowledging “near misses” in the system. Trips that a rider was almost able to complete, on the cusp of eligibility for, etc. Dorene highlights that “near miss” should also include when a rider cannot complete the trip because of payment barriers.

Amy mentions that this tool should be able to collect data that identifies “transit deserts”

Deborah mentions support for including youth as a user base. She also highlights the usability of this system for someone who is new to the area, resource discovery. Dorene mentions that this user could also be someone who has not used a service in a long time and needs to become familiar with any changes to the service since their last use.

Deborah mentions that this system will need to be nimble in an emergency, temporary changes to transportation systems.

Pran raises concern over data privacy, what kind of information will the system collect. May need to create prioritization structure for that information as well. Required questions versus optional data.

Staci responds by mentioning that this concern is a continued one. One way forward for this committee is to create taskforces to focus on specific concerns. The system needs to collect a certain amount of eligibility information, but where the bounds are a larger conversation. Attendees reiterate the need for trust and transparency surrounding data use and privacy.

Related to this concern is the desire for this tool to be useful for transportation programs. Mark mentions that certain data is crucial for operational needs and grant reporting. Perhaps the system needs to communicate with funders or be aligned with their requirements.

Karia asks how are we going to prioritize all the important points that have been mentioned.

Related to data collection and participation Staci reviews the timeline of surveying regional transportation programs.

Transportation Provider Survey will be going out in late October or early November. Will not be redoing the Puget Sound Regional Council Specialized Transportation survey from this year but will be building off it.

The goals of the questions asked center: willingness to participate in One-Call/One-Click, feedback on the platform, and contact information for engaging in the work.

Staci shared sample question about participation. Review slide 13 for full details.

Attendees provide feedback on the clarity of survey language. Urging simplicity, concise and accessible language. People will need to know what we are talking about, and confident in their understanding.



One-Call/ One-Click Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Survey needs to be clear on what it is asking of transportation programs. Attendees are concerned that lack of clarity will lead organizations to not respond or reject based off of an assumption of capacity issues rather than a genuine disinterest in the program.

Attendees suggest adding context through an introduction paragraph. One that uses generic definitions and terms. Perhaps a review of existing similar services such as the Pennsylvania One-call/One-Click system.

Review Current User Needs and Priorities:

The meeting moves to review of current user needs as we understand them and a conversation around linking these needs to one another and to prioritization and phasing.

Kevin begins by reviewing the Specialized Transportation Life Cycle. A One-Call/One-Click system assists in resource discovery, comparison of viable options, application and eligibility determination, and request of service. Not included in a One-Call/One-Click system is the actual provision of transportation service.

The goal of the Hopelink One-Call One-Click system is the simplification of this process from the perspective of the rider (end-user). There are lots of little niche services, each with their own details, we want to make it easy to understand and use.

Dorene mentions the use case of an infrequent users. Or someone who is attending/ planning special event and wants to make sure there are options to reach that destination for all attendees.

Kevin mentions that this is related to how we think about completeness of the tool and the simplicity of its interface. Staci mentions that we have also heard about the need to be accessible for group trips.

Jeff mentions that a solid first step is the identification of data elements for which we have access and then building the interface from there. Going backwards can be difficult.

In response Kevin mentions the data standards that are developing related to this work. Feeds that are specific to flexible route services, on demand services, eligibilities, and so on. This is a growing field and related to the work of Mobility as a Service (MAAS)

Jeff also mentions the need to identify the responsibilities of participating organizations. Alex asks how these responsibilities can be determined and shared so as not to be burdensome to the smaller providers.

She raises concern of smaller services, perhaps some of them will be reluctant to join due to potential increase in traffic that they are unable to accommodate. Jeff raises concern of a value add.

This is a central concern of the project. We will be evaluating the best ways to support smaller agencies and there will be experts available to assist.

The meeting moves to a conversation of user needs in the category of supported mobility independence. See slide 17 for full details.

Kevin raises a question for attendees to consider: the connections between these needs and the impact they have in terms of project priorities and investments. We need to be able to group certain needs, prioritize them and then make funding decisions accordingly.



One-Call/ One-Click Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes

Of the needs listed on the slide, which are the most important, which will have the largest impact on usability, and which are associated with phase one top priority

Deborah mentions that this is an interesting question. In her mind, mid-trip assistance has more of an individual implication. Infrastructure has more of an all-user impact. These functionalities also have related maintenance questions – especially during emergency events. For example, what happens when the buses have been re routed.

Mike R. asks whether availability of mid trip assistance is an aspect of infrastructure. Sustainability of system would allow for that.

Dorene echoing Deborah’s point about blue sky vs snow, asks how much you expect people to be on the app or web page. What is the accessibility of these rider alerts? What is the value of in person support?

Brock sees many of these as the same. Need to have ability to call a person in real time for support.

The meeting concludes rapidly. The conversation of user needs and function priority will continue in the coming months. Attendees are invited to reach out to the Hopelink One-Call/One-Click support staff if they would like to follow up or set aside time for deeper discussion.

Next Meeting: Monday October 25, 2021 1 PM to 3 PM

Location: Zoom

Advisory Committee Contact:

Bebhinn Gilbert, King County Mobility Coalition Program Supervisor

BGilbert@hopelink.org

(425)-943-6731

Staci Sahoo, Director, Hopelink Mobility Management

sshahoo@hopelink.org

(425) 943-6751

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

This material can be made available in an alternate format by emailing the Mobility Management Team at mobility@hopelink.org or by calling (425) 943-6760.

Title VI Notice to Public

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Hopelink is committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of its transit services on the basis of race, color, or national origin, as protected by Title VI in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1.B If you believe you have been subjected to discrimination under Title VI, you may file a complaint with Hopelink’s Title VI Coordinator. For additional information regarding Title VI complaint procedures and/or information regarding



One-Call/ One-Click Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

our non-discrimination obligations, please contact Hopelink's Title VI Coordinator at (425) 869-6000 or TitleVI@hopelink.org.