SCAG Mobility as a Service Feasibility White Paper

Advisory Group Meeting #2
Meeting Summary

Overview

The Mobility as a Service (MaaS) Feasibility White Paper Advisory Group Meeting #2 was held on Tuesday, October 26, 2021, from 10:00AM to 12:00PM to give members an update of the Study since the first meeting in August, and obtain feedback on the challenges and opportunities, and goals and objectives for MaaS implementation within the SCAG region. Advisory Group members received an agenda prior to the meeting.

Meeting Summary

1. ### Welcome & Purpose (Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Project Manager, SCAG)
    i. Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, MaaS Project Manager, provided welcoming remarks and thanked the members for attending the first meeting and providing valuable insights on key questions during the kickoff meeting.
    ii. Priscilla reminded the members that the overall goal for the Feasibility White Paper is to identify and define what the building blocks and key policy issues are in the SCAG region. She noted that the goal of this second meeting is to understand the challenges and opportunities of implementing MaaS in our diverse and complex region and for members to provide guidance and set goals and objectives for MaaS implementation
    iii. Priscilla described the general structure of the meeting and gave an overview quick of the meeting agenda.
    iv. Priscilla provided general logistics for the meeting including instructions on how to utilize the chat box and "raise hand" feature within Zoom for questions and concerns during the meeting.

2. ### Project Update (David DeRosa, Associate Vice President, AECOM & Victor Xie, Transportation Planner, AECOM)
    i. David provided a recap of the kickoff August Advisory Group Meeting, which included the suggested edits to the MaaS definition, and an update to the framework element "Public Education and Acceptance" to "Equity and Engagement."
    ii. An updated definition of MaaS was introduced based on the feedback received during the kickoff meeting and advisory group members were encouraged to provide input on the updated definition
    iii. David and Victor also provided a summary of the feedback received on existing conditions and the key highlights of the overall feedback received within each framework category during the August meeting. Additionally, a summary of the one-on-one individual Advisory Group member interviews was provided by policy framework category.
    iv. During the presentation, two poll questions were introduced that focused on challenges and opportunities. A total of 9 participants responded to poll #1 and a total of 14 participants responded to poll #2. Below is a summary of the poll results.

Poll #1 – Challenges

1. **What would you consider to be the top equity challenge for a MaaS system?**

Access to, and knowledge of, mobile technology	**33%**
All of the above	**22%**
Quality of public transit	**22%**
Lack of transportation infrastructure in disadvantaged communities	**11%**
Cost of transportation	**11%**
Barriers to access in the banking system	**0%**
All of the above	**22%**

2. **What would you consider the top challenge to data sharing and cooperation between public and private service providers?**

Public and Private sector's differences on their view and approach to collection and storing data	**44%**
Lack of Federal and State policies regarding privacy and date sharing	**11%**
Lack of a roadmap of technology products to guide the procurement for the public sector	**11%**
All of the above	**33%**

Poll #2 – Opportunities

1. **MaaS pilot projects in the SCAG region are worth considering?**
   a. True **(100%)**
   b. False **(0%)**

2. **MaaS has the potential to synchronize the level of service across the SCAG region**.
   a. True **(79%)**
   b. False **(21%)**

3. **MaaS technology is an important tool for achieving equity in the SCAG region?**
   a. True **(79%)**
   b. False **(21%)**

   v. Following Poll #2, Victor provided added detail to the challenges within each framework category for MaaS implementation and provided the opportunities within each category for the group members to consider.

3. Breakout Discussion Groups (Moderated by David DeRosa, Susan DeSantis, and Victor Xie)

   i. There were three breakout rooms and Advisory Group Members were assigned a breakout room and a moderator. Each breakout room was also given two (2) topics for discussion and asked to select a representative from each group to report on the discussion following the breakout sessions. The two topics were:
   o Challenges and opportunities
   o Goals and objectives (details above)
   ii. To facilitate the discussion on the goals in the breakout rooms members were given a set of sample goals which included:

- Establish a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) to compare baseline data
- Pursue policies and strategies (e.g., transportation and land use) that facilitate the widespread implementation and adoption of more sustainable transportation modes
- Generate more revenue and/or funding sources to enhance transit
- Remove payment barriers for unbanked/underbanked population
- Facilitate greater regional collaboration and cooperation
- Identify pilot projects/locations that are inclusive to disadvantaged communities with community-based outreach programs

    iii. Each breakout room was designed to be interactive and capture critical insights on the topics. The key takeaways from each breakout room are discussed later in this meeting summary.

4. **Report Outs**
    i. A representative of the individual breakout rooms provided a report out which consisted of an overview of the conversation from each topic of discussion.

5. **Wrap-up and Next Steps (David DeRosa, Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang)**
    i. David thanked all attendees for meaningful discussion and highlighted next steps, including the proposed dates and focus areas for two upcoming meetings.
    ii. Priscilla thanked attendees and encouraged participation in the third Advisory Group Meeting in December before adjourning the meeting.

Zoom Chat Highlights

Anne Mayer: I am interested in understanding how congestion pricing revenues would be used for purposes other than mobility? Examples of those suggested uses?
- Anne also mentioned that toll corridor revenue can only be spent on improvements in or near its corridor.

Breakout Discussion Highlights
Breakout Room #1 – Moderated by David DeRosa

1. Challenges and Opportunities

Challenges:

- Preference for infrastructure guides (such as LADOT's Mobility Hubs Reader's Guide) that include bus stops and mobility hubs.
- Skepticism around limited success of mobility hubs in transit markets.
- Reluctance from the private sector when implementing amenities in mobility hubs, particularly in more rural areas.
- Preference for a more consistent level of service across the SCAG region to successfully implement a MaaS system.
- Lack of regulation creates a market where only technology vendors benefit.
- Preference for interoperability and coordination among vendors.
- Skepticism in a MaaS model that can reach the communities that would benefit the most.

Opportunities:

- MaaS can improve equity to the SCAG region if a model can integrate payment with social service partners
- Preference for using the 2028 Olympics as a testing ground for implementing MaaS models

2. Goals and Objectives

- A focus on Pilot Projects that include significant demand-side subsidies to make market-rate services more affordable.
- Any Pilot Project should identify a target population that is already being tracked by social services providers.
- Any Pilot Project should also include robust community engagement.
- Mode share can be changed in communities by including subsidies to incentivize single-occupant-vehicle drivers.

Breakout Room #2 – Moderated by Victor Xie

1. Challenges and Opportunities

Challenges:

- Can't focus on single revenue source such as federal grants or formulas.
- Serving ta broad range of community members which entails different generations.
- General competitiveness of MaaS alternatives. Scattered origins and destinations. Trip times are long.
- Integrate MaaS infrastructure into new work environment where more and more people choose to work from home.

Opportunities:

- Private funding should definitely be explored. Incentives or inducement measures to help the mode shift. State continues to be an active partner on this.
- Despite the disruptions the pandemic has caused on people's work-life balance, it helped some people break their old travel patterns and start to use more alternatives to SOV.

Goals and Objectives

- Add a metric to evaluate accessibility. Not sure about the specific KPI.
- Questions: How will this be integrated into the 2024 RTP? Note, this will be addressed at the next Advisory Group meeting.
- MaaS should be considered as a generational tool, all needs from all communities, age groups, and passengers should be included.
- Need for broader definition on "disadvantaged" population.
- On overall KPIs, LACI's Transportation Electrification Partnership in which Metro, Metrolink, City of LA, County of LA and many others are partners, has set a mode shift goal.
- On pilot projects, LA County is eager to do MaaS pilots in unincorporated areas.
- Also, on pilot projects, LACI has done two EV car sharing projects in DACs and has determined that doing mobility pilots with HACLA sites can be particularly effective as they have built in community ambassadors who can help perform outreach. Might be worth considering as a recommendation to work with affordable housing complexes on Maas pilots.

Breakout Room #3 – Moderated by Susan DeSantis

1. Challenges and Opportunities

   Challenges:

   - Skepticism around adopting new technologies and differences between operators.
   - Lack of regulation to standardize data sharing between governments and the private sector
   - Differences on ways data is captured, stored, and shared between agencies
   - Lack of sufficient and standardized payment infrastructure to be able to reach unbanked communities
   - Too large of a focus on unbanked communities can hinder cash-based technology

   Opportunities:

   - A well implemented MaaS model can help address greenhouse gas emissions and climate change
   - New regulation regarding data sharing agreements between agencies and private partners
   - Addressing the needs of unbanked communities by improving payment infrastructure and/or providing more access to payment systems.

2. Goals and Objectives

   - Mode shift should be a base indicator of single occupancy transit, but it should not be the only indicator.
   - Addressing and reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the SCAG region should be a goal of MaaS.

Meeting Attendance

Advisory Group Members/Alternates:

Hunter Owens, Research Data Manager, California Department of Transportation
Marven Norman, Policy Coordinator, Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
Mark Baza, Executive Director, Imperial County Transportation Commission
Michelle Kinman, Senior Director of Transportation, Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator
Manish Chaudhari, Senior Director of Special Projects, Los Angeles County Metropolitan
Transportation Authority
Mark Vallianatos, Executive Officer of Innovation, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
Kurt Brotcke, Director of Strategic Planning, Orange County Transportation Authority
Anne Mayer, Executive Director, Riverside County Transportation Commission
Lorelle Moe-Luna, Multimodal Services Director, Riverside County Transportation Commission
Beatris Megerdichian, Management Analyst, Riverside County Transportation Commission
Nancy Strickert, Transit Manager, San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Roderick Diaz, Director of Planning, Southern California Regional Rail Authority
Sam Morrissey, Executive Director, Urban Movement Labs
Juan Matute, Deputy Director, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Los Angeles
Martin Erickson, Director of Public Transit, Ventura County Transportation Commission

MaaS Feasibility White Paper Project Team

SCAG
Philip Law, Manager, Mobility Planning and Goods Movement Department
Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner
Stephen Fox, Senior Regional Planer

AECOM
David DeRosa, Associate Vice President, Technology Lead
Victor Xie, Transportation Planner

Arellano Associates
Susan DeSantis, Senior Project Manager
Benjamin Lopez, Senior Project Coordinator
Matt Evans, Project Coordinator