

**Twin Cities Shared Mobility Collaborative
Data Sharing Subcommittee**

Meeting #2

September 13, 2018, 11:00 to Noon

Center for Transportation Studies
Transportation and Safety Building University of MN
511 Washington Avenue SE, Suite 200

Notes:

1. Introductions and check-in – Opening thoughts roundtable

Attendees

- Gina Baas
- John Levin
- Adam Mehl
- Alireza Khani
- Andrew Owen
- Aaron Bartling (MVTA)
- Ben Timerson
- Heidi Corcoran
- Steve Elkins
- Greg Lindsey (phone)
- Paul Morris (phone)
- Kevin Karner (phone)
- Deb Barber (phone)

2. Review of committee purpose of tasks

Gina reviewed the four key tasks of the committee (from the first meeting)

- Build a matrix of use cases and data sets to understand the scope of the data sharing opportunities and challenges
- Collect a set of existing data sharing policies and regulations.
- Develop language for model ordinances and contracts between public entities and private/non-profit operators
- Explore options to foster data sharing, such as creation of a trusted data collaborative

3. Introduction to Slack

[This was moved to the end of the agenda and we ran out of time.]
John will send out an invitation to all the Committee members.

4. *Committee member updates*

Several new members were added to the committee since the last meeting.

- MnDOT: Brian Kary, Garrett Schreiner, Ben Timerson, Michael Iacono, Angela Boardman
- U of M: Andrew Owen, Alireza Khani, Saif Benjafaar, Greg Lindsey
- Providers: Paul Schroeder (HOURCAR), Eric Kocaja (Lime), Amy Walstein (representing Bird), Eric Wong (Uber), Carla Jacobs (Uber), Joel Carlson (representing Uber)

John also plans to reach out to several data “consumers”, including Google, Apple and Transit to see if they would be willing to be involved in future discussions.

Comments from new members:

Andrew: What researchers are really looking for is a place to go for data without having to request it each time. This is hugely valuable to explore new ideas and encourage students to try new projects.

Greg: National funding agencies, e.g., NSF, say that data used for analysis must be archived and made available. A stronger structure is needed for sharing data to meet these requirements. This will increase our competitiveness for grants.

Ben: MnDOT did a pilot earlier with Streetlight for access to travel time and O/D data. Users don't get the data itself, but can make queries to analyze the data. MnDOT issued an RFP and are in the process of awarding a contract to Streetlight to continue with them. MnDOT, Met Council, FHWA will have access to the data. Others, MPOs, cities, counties, etc., can buy in.

Streetlight data is historical data. Most recent data is at least one week old. Brian Kary from MnDOT RTMC is looking into how to get up to the minute data.

Another potential data source is the NMPRDS (National Performance Management Research Data Set) travel time data.

Heidi Corcoran has switched roles but will continue to take part on the committee. She is a Research Project Specialist in the State and Local Policy Program at the U of M.

5. *Shared Mobility Collaborative updates*

John provided update on SMC and the other four committees (TDM, Public Private Partnerships, Job Access, Mobility Hubs).

There is also an equity committee that is forming. Chairs are Katie Rodriguez and Bill Dooley. It will meet for the first time on September 18th.

Next quarterly meeting of the whole Collaborative will be the week of November 13-16. There are plans for committee reports, a panel on legislative issues, and a happy hour.

There is ongoing discussion of potential research and other work by SUMC as well as by the U of M.

6. *Existing regulation of data sharing*

a. *Review of items submitted*

b. *Brainstorming on additional items*

Gina provided a document with information from Minneapolis, Metro Transit, and a report from the Texas Transportation Institute.

Discussion items

- Add information about the Minnesota Data Practices Act
- Ask Saint Paul staff (Russ Stark) if there are ordinances or other documents from Saint Paul with regard to their work with Lime and Bird
- Should also check with the suburbs that have worked with Lime if there are data sharing elements in their agreements or ordinance
- Talk to Geoff Maas on input from existing GIS data sharing work
- We should also track what rules/etc. are not there
 - For example, Minneapolis has nothing for data sharing from Uber and Lyft
 - This will guide info on what is needed to be able to share data
- Regulation at the city level can be too granular.
 - Maybe we need county or state regulation instead
 - But this must be balanced with concern over state preemption that does not allow for/require enough data sharing.
- Dakota County – comments from Heidi
 - Working on special needs transportation coordination issues

- Data sharing is a big part of the need, esp. for travel planning
- There are regional councils forming state wide
- Mobility management need access to data from all the different services
- Group has hit roadblocks immediately
- Joe Morneau can provide updates on the data issues
Maybe ask Joe to come to our meeting to talk about their work
- In general, we should try to stay connected to human services work
- Aaron Bartling (MVTA) is also involved with Dakota County work

7. *Review of draft Use Cases and Data Sources document*

John reviewed the document that lays out the elements for a future matrix.

- Andrew commented that It's good that the document is mode neutral
 - It can be challenging to think that way
 - Makes us think about how all the modes are more the same
 - Helps us think about new tech as just new modes (in existing framework)
 - Helps us think about existing systems in new ways
- Steve comment that transportation is a derived demand
It's not really about the ride in the vehicle, it's getting from point A to B
- Suggestion to add a dimension for whether the trip is "operated" by the traveler (e.g., bike share, car share, etc.) or by someone else (transit, ride hailing, etc.)
- Another potential source of data is to capture the information that is shared from travelers during travel training sessions. These are one on one session that generate useful information on travel demand and challenges. It could be used to inform system and service planning.
- We did not have much time for comments. All are encouraged to share their ideas for edits the scope of the different use cases for data, the different sources of data, the different characteristics of data, and the different issues and opportunities with data that should be included in the matrix.

8. *Brainstorming for Trusted Data Clearinghouse workshop*

Reviewed a document from Washington. Also briefly discussed other examples included SharedStreet.io and MetroGIS.

Andrew suggested the Transportation Secure Data Center as a potential model. They work with survey data that might have PII and provide a mechanism to safely access and use the data.

Streetlight is another example of a model of sharing access to data with sharing the data itself.

Many of the transportation providers are national. It may be easier for them (or for others working with them) to share and access their data at a national scale as opposed to having different solutions city by city.

SUMC is working on state by state examples. It was noted that the work in Washington state was driven in part by the state's open data laws.

EZ Pass in the tolling industry is another example of interoperability in transportation.

9. Check-out / Closing thoughts roundtable