

MVTA & Regional AVL Projects



MVTA Board

June 24, 2009

Where We've Been

- Long Council delays (several years)
- MVRTA AVL needs for UPA and to meet public information expectations
- Research found Nextel-based alternatives, both proprietary and open-source
- Council (finally) moved forward with extension of Metro Transit deployment of Transitmaster system to entire region

Where We Are



- Council has option to include MVTA in Transitmaster deployment
- Transitmaster as it would be deployed by the Council currently does not meet MVTA's well, at a high cost
- N/OSS (Nextel/Open Source Software) solution *IS* viable
- Nextel-based commercial packages *NOT* viable

Option 0: Transitmaster Unconditionally



- Risk: Low
- Cost to MVTA: Lowest
- Cost to Region: High
- Benefit to MVTA: Low-Moderate
- Benefit to Region: Moderate
- Staff Time Commitment: Lowest
- Certainty: Highest

Option A: Transitmaster With Reasonable Conditions

- Risk: Low-Moderate
- Cost to MVTA: Low
- Cost to Region: High
- Benefit to MVTA: Moderate
- Benefit to Region: Moderate-High
- Staff Time Commitment: Moderate
- Certainty: Low?

Option B: N/OSS Deployment



- Risk: High
- Cost to MVTA: High
- Cost to Region: Lowest
- Benefit to MVTA: Highest
- Benefit to Region: Moderate-High
- Staff Time Commitment: High
- Certainty: Moderate?

Timeline



- Council option with Continental expires July 23
- Council has requested a response by July 2 to meet their meeting schedules
- If progress is being made, possible to extend one or both of these timelines?