

Micro-Transit Advisory Committee
June 12, 2020

Present:

Jamie Smith, GMT
Christopher Damiani, GMT,
Jon Moore, GMT
Elizabeth Parker, Sustainable Montpelier Coalition
Peter Kelman, Montpelier Senior Activities Center
Dan Groberg, Montpelier Alive,
Laura Brooke, Sustainable Montpelier Coalition
Dan Jones, Sustainable Montpelier Coalition
Peter Johnke, Vermont Center for Independent Living
Dan Currier, VTrans
Dona Bate, Montpelier City Council
Stephen Falbel, Steadman Hill Consulting
Ross MacDonald, VTrans
Nick Foss, GMT
Bonnie Waninger, Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission
Zoe Cartwright VOC Rehab Vermont
Jim Alvarez, Central Vermont Medical Center
Paul Zabriskie, Capstone Community Action
Cara Robacheck, VEEP
Charlie Maitland, National Life Group
Conor Casey, Montpelier City Council

1:00 PM: Open Meeting- Jamie Smith opened the meeting

1:01 PM: Adjustments to the Agenda- No adjustments to the agenda

1:02 PM: Public Comment- Dan Jones is delighted to see this moving forward and thanked to GMT to help push this along. SMC is excited to help make this the most publicly embraced system possible.

1:05 PM: Introduction to GMT

Jon Moore thanked everyone for participating and emphasized that community engagement is key to success with this project. Jon introduced himself, Jamie Smith(Director of Planning & Marketing), Chris Damiani (Transit Planner), and Stephen Falbel who provides consulting services to GMT on this project and other GMT and statewide projects. Jon reiterated that there will need to be GMT board approval required. He also stated that the advisory council will be a part

of the policy development and SMC will assist in taking the lead on marketing and outreach in Montpelier. Finally Jon stated that GMT sees this advisory council as a key partner towards the staff recommendations to the GMT board. GMT wants to maximize its investment in Montpelier and hope that we can use this model for other service areas.

Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

1:10 PM: Where we are now

Jamie Smith presented the Draft Project Timeline and highlighted the required actions that are needed by the GMT board. The advisory group will reconvene in August to discuss implementation and outreach of the project.

Dan Jones stated that he is glad that the advisory council is involved in the timeline. Jamie added that there will definitely be more opportunities beyond what was displayed for the advisory council to provide recommendations. There were a couple comments around who will be getting the RFP, the timeline, and potential customizations options from the vendors. Jon stated that GMT will make sure that all the potential bidders are informed and that the timeline matches what is typical of GMT's RFP process. Jamie added that the customizations that are listed in the RFP are listed so that everyone is informed of the vendors technical capabilities to adapt to a variety of scenarios and can meet the policy decisions that will be made along the process.

Donna Bate included that there has been a lot of research done on this topic and the vendors have come and done demonstrations in the past

Bonnie asked what the role of the advisory committee has been and if it is the same or different from previous microtransit working groups?

Jon said that GMT sees the advisory committee as the local formation of the policies in Montpelier and that GMT staff would be comfortable proposing that to the GMT board. The advisory committee will also be critical to the public engagement pieces towards a successful outcome of the project.

Dan Jones added that the larger the community input in helping set the policies and promoting within the community will lead to better buy in from the community. Laura asked how does the Advisory Council be part of it after the Jan 1 implementation date. Jamie emphasized that community engagement from the committee will not stop after implementation. Jon added that quality

assurance doesn't stop at implementation as well, the advisory council will help monitor key performance indicators along the way.

1:30 PM: Microtransit Draft RFP Review and Conversation

Stephen Falbel provided a brief history of the initial microtransit RFI back in 2018 to where we are now with the RFP. The process over the past two years has informed a lot of what is in the RFP. The purpose of the RFP is specifically to give proposers the information needed to develop a proposal to help the group decide which one is awarded the contract.

Bonnie asked what is the expectation of the proposer in relation ship to the advisory committee vs GMT role. Stephen stated that the selection committee will make the decision and GMT will act as the filter of all the stakeholders and communicate with the proposer.

Stephen provided background on the introduction and the table on pg.1 which gives a picture of the service in the area, service hours, and cost and to give a sense of scale. He added that Montpelier is probably one of the smallest areas that potential proposers have worked in so far.

Dan Jones asked about the service design section and whether the vendor is the one who would determine the service area? Stephen stated that this section is there to provide some potential scenarios based on previous discussion and to ask the vendors opinion which service would be more successful for microtransit. Jon added that the RFP is not the policy setting document but we want it to be as flexible as possible so that once the policies are developed it is broad enough to serve the purpose.

Peter Jonke asked what are the metrics for productivity? Stephen provided that It is typical boardings per unit measured. Dona stated that she appreciates the RFP's flexibility to respond to the needs of the community.

Dan Jones asked if the technology system is scalable. Stephen said that it is not a vendor question, its a GMT question regarding available drivers and equipment.

Stephen provided an overview of the fare structure and policy as well as the unreserved trips section. Cara stated that she likes that kind of structure and asked if there could be a section in the RFP about what is the backup system if

the technology goes down? Stephen replied that we could add questions such as What the is the percent downtime?

Peter Johnke asked if the RFP could ask about the vendors ability to send alerts to passengers? Stephen said that could be added to the RFP.

Peter Kelman asked if the tech support should be quicker than 24 hours. Peter Jonhke provided language suggestions to the tech support requirement.

Peter Kelman also asked if the companies know enough about Central Vermont to be able to support marketing? Dan Jones added that it is helpful to have their best practices from other places they have worked such as materials on how to use the app but locally the outreach will be helpful to SMC in communicating to various populations. Stephen added that the goal is to try and find the company that can cast the widest net possible. The RFP does not commit GMT to buying the marketing plans.

Dan Jones asked if the RFP could include a section asking vendors to include what the cost of utilizing their call center would be vs. the GMT call center. Jon stated that this project is a great opportunity for GMT to build its brand image in Central Vermont but GMT can look into including that ask in the RFP.

Dan Groberg asked if there is a possibility to include information as it relates to having regularly scheduled rides in the microtransit software for commuters? Stephen said he could include that in the RFP.

1:55 PM: Next Meeting Date

Jamie thanked everyone for their feedback and will incorporate the parts that we can. The RFP will go out early next week. She will send out a doodle for the next meeting date in late August. Dan Jones asked if GMT could provide a brief report after the RFP window has closed to give an update to the advisory council. Jamie stated she will plan to have an update after all submissions have been received.

2:00 PM: Adjourn