One-Call/One-Click Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Monday, December 6, 2021
1:00 PM to 3:00 PM

Attendees: name (organization); 12063562141; Alex O'Reilly (Community Member); Amy Biggs (Snoqualmie Valley Transportation); Belina Van (Volunteer Services of CCS); Bree Boyce (Hopelink Mobility - Coalitions); Brock Howell (SNOTRAC); Cliff Perry (Northshore Senior Center); Deborah Witmer (City of Seattle - RARET); Dorene Cornwell (Community Advocate); Jeff Abrams (Community Advocate); Jon Morrison Winters (Seattle/King County ADS); Julio Perez (Hopelink Mobility); Karia Wong (CISC); Kevin Chambers (Full Path); Mark Smutny (Sound Generations); Mike Dee (Lake Forest Park Citizens' Commission); Mike Rimoin (King County Metro); Pran Wahi (IACS); Sara Sisco (Hopelink Mobility); Susan Carter (Hopelink NEMT Brokerage); Suzanne Schreck (Sound Transit)

Staff Support: Bebhinn Gilbert and Staci Sahoo

Welcome and Introductions:
The meeting began at 1:00 PM with brief introductions and announcements. Bebhinn shared the welcome statement and norms of the group, highlighting that this group is invested in learning and improving. Anyone is welcome to raise learning opportunities and requests for accommodations. Bebhinn highlighted the Advisory Committee's compensation policy reminding attendees to use the reporting form to log their hours in order to receive compensation. Anyone with questions in encouraged to email Bebhinn.

She then reviews the goals for the meeting. 1) provide project update and status report; 2) discuss rider profiles in terms of design and functional priority and 3) provide brief review of public facing frequently asked questions.

Project Status and Updates
Staci Sahoo reviewed the project's recent decisions and progress updates. She reminded advisory committee members that their input informs decisions made by the Hopelink project team. She highlights the feedback received at the previous committee meetings; the desire to have a representative table and the high priority of coordination with regional projects and partners.

The latest updates for the project are highlighted in the meeting slides for this session. Data collection is well underway for the Snohomish and King County transportation programs. This is being completed in partnership with WSDOT and Trillium.

An important update includes the decision to delay launching an RFP for the Open Trip Planner portion of the One-Call/One-Click tool. This delay is a decision made in order to better align with Community Transit's timeline. Community Transit is underway in its testing and launch of an open trip planner which *could* be part of the One-Call/One-Click tool.

The project itself is not delayed. The project team is taking on a cascading plan, so while this one portion is paused others will move forward, like Rider Profiles.

Staci reviewed the timelines of each element in this project with the committee. Visualization of this can be found in the presentation slide deck for this meeting and a screen reader accessible version is available in the meeting emails.

Committee members provided feedback on this updated timeline, noting that this timeline looks aggressive and some of the phrasing is unclear. "Plan and Design" is a phrase which makes committee members think that they would have something visual, like a beta product to review. Committee members mentioned that we may need to add another phase of "early conversations" some reference to the MOU development and agreements that are necessary to any long term partnership. Kevin mentions that the timeline and when things will happen. It is useful to look at the timeline as a set of priorities.

Committee members requested documentation of regional projects, greater detail of the One-Call/One0Click work and other projects it may intersect with. Specific to the One-Call/One-Click work committee members requested language that

describes to an end-user or assistor what the platform will look like, how they access the tool, and what is required of them.

Discussion: Rider Profiles
The meeting then moved to an in-depth review of Rider Profiles with the goal of receiving guidance from the committee on Design priorities, user functionality.

Before small group discussion Kevin and Staci reviewed the concept of Rider Profiles and their role in the transportation system. Rider Profiles as described in the Principal Components: provides a single source of truth for riders' travel preferences, mobility factors, common destinations, and eligibility for services. Profiles would be available to riders and their authorized assistors. How is this system going to tailor itself to the unique needs of a rider? Using profiles! This database would be available to riders for them to see what the available services as well as viewable to multiple stakeholders to have a window into what a rider is eligible for.

The profile database could be a central tracking of intake processes, it could be a way to coordinate eligibility work flow across transportation providing agencies. Rider could save trips – common destinations, Deborah also mentions schedule recurring rides.

Benefits: central tracking of intake process can reduce barriers to initial access; central tracking of eligibility could make seeing options easier; and tracking common origins and destinations makes booking faster. Challenges/risks: transit isn't a sector that commonly manages profiles – people may avoid it due to privacy concerns, building trust, key benefits may require challenging institutional coordination. Kevin reviewed the state of profiles in the transportation sector (mostly in for-profit spaces) known coordination challenges, stakeholder groups.

Staci then reviewed the known User Needs we have heard from Advisory Committee members and throughout community engagement. Review the list in the meeting presentation materials.

The meeting moved to questions and small group discussion on what the priorities are for this committee as the project team begins designing. Initial questions from the committee were around integration with payment systems like paypal. If profiles end up being core to the architecture of the system – there are associated privacy concerns. The organizing entity (agency) will need to be abundantly clear to the end-user. If Hopelink owns the profiles that has a different level of oversite than ORCA which is also different than integration with cloud-based profiles like Google or Facebook.

Committee members reiterate the need to give people control over their information.

Small group
The remainder of the meeting was spent in small group discussion of the following two questions: 1) What are we missing from the Rider Profiles overview? 2) How might we design rider profiles to maximize benefits and reduce risks?. The responses we received from committee members are listed here in bullet point form.

- Benefit of inputting information to the profile has to be clear – people are willing to share information when they see the value add
- Group of favorites would helpful
- Clear on data we are collecting and its use.
- Technology comfort of end user – different comfort levels – support available for learning how to use the system – language accessibility
- Consider the user experience if it comes back when the resulting search comes back with zero.
- Human centered design – needs to think about simple user interface
- Work with new customers who are often coming to us in a minor crisis, wanting to feel independent, this interaction point is coming at a vulnerable time for folks. Therefore One-Call/One-Click (profiles) need to have a simple path to reaching a thoughtful person.
- Phone tree needs to be quick if not at all.
- Tension between funders and end user – one wants more information the other less.
- Deborah: shared database where edits can happen from multiple sources, we need to know when the change happened and who did it.
    - Highly detailed audit – only a certain segment of the staff can see
- OCOC is also a communication strategy -

- How to organize outcomes for multiple choices come back – how are they ranked?
- Making it easier on riders – stepped process – to connect people to answers
- Would suggest (it was implied already but...) that the system gives people the ability to set a default 2nd address. IN our system they can say my home address is 1234 Main St. and My work is at 3456 Alder Street. From that point on they only must call and say their name and that they need to be at work on a date/time.
- If providers are expected to feed into this system, there might be some missing data or loss of pertinent information. What are the specific needs of providers and how do we accommodate that in the system? (Amy Biggs)
- What happens if there is a system disconnect between what providers ask and what the system needs? (Amy Biggs)
- Need for autogenerated notifications
- What happens if the rider doesn't know the details of the end of the ride? (Dorene Cornwell)
- How do we connect them with the right information regarding start and end? (Dorene Cornwell)
- Should the rider be directed to call?
- How do you coordinate the different profiles that agencies require? (Alex O'Reilly)
- What partnership opportunities exist for the transportation providers? (Alex O'Reilly)
- Rider profile – basic info, enrollment info, common destination, special event destinations (Sara Sisco)
- Risk – provider not getting the right information can impact funding (Amy Biggs)
- Do we need to a two part sign up and how does that impact the call taker (Amy Biggs)
- Time is a risk for all agencies (Staci)
- Demographic enrollment information may also cause barriers
- Language barriers on the form (Sara)
- Should the system suggest more options based on regular routes (Dorene)

Review: Frequently Asked Questions
The review of Frequently Asked Questions was cut for time. This is a standing item on our agenda.

Next Meeting January 24, 2022
Location: Zoom

One-Call/One-Click Advisory Committee Staff Support:
Bebhinn Gilbert
King County Mobility Coalition Program Supervisor
bgilbert@hopelink.org
(425) 943-6752

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