

MINUTES
OF THE
IT EXECUTIVE STEERING COMMITTEE
OF THE
WOODS HOLE, MARTHA'S VINEYARD AND NANTUCKET STEAMSHIP AUTHORITY
VIRTUAL MEETING ONLY
April 2, 2026

Attendees:

- Peter Jeffrey (subcommittee member)
- John Cahill (subcommittee member)
- Rob Ranney (subcommittee member)
- Gordon Carr (subcommittee member)
- Alex Kryska
- Mark Amundsen
- Mark Rozum
- Stephen Colman
- Sean Driscoll
- Tom Innis
- Lizzy Freeman (minute-taker)

Video and Audio Recording of Today's Meeting:

- It was announced that the Steamship Authority was making an audio and video recording of the meeting.

Statement Regarding Remote Participation:

- It was announced that, pursuant to Section 20 of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, as amended, Rob Ranney and Gordon Carr are participating in the meeting remotely because their physical presence would be unreasonably difficult. All IT Steering Committee members participating in the meeting by Zoom videoconferencing app and all members will be clearly audible to each other.

1. Public Comment

- None
-

2. Minutes

- It was noted that the previous meeting discussion indicated the January 15, 2026 IT Executive Steering Committee minutes did not accurately reflect Mr. Cahill's involvement. It was clarified that Mr. Cahill was not physically present but was referred to during the discussion. A motion was approved by role call vote to rescind the amendment to the January 15, 2026 IT Executive Steering Committee minutes and approve the originally drafted minutes, meeting in public session.
 - It was voted upon a motion by role call vote to approve the motion to approve the February 27, 2026 IT Executive Steering Committee minutes, meeting in public session.
 - It was voted upon a motion by role call vote to approve the motion to approve the March 9, 2026 IT Executive Steering Committee minutes, meeting in public session.
-

3. Project Updates (Mark A)

- Mark A reported successful in-person meetings in Nantucket (Monday, shipper session and town hall) and Martha's Vineyard (Tuesday), with strong engagement and valuable stakeholder input
 - Board approval has been secured for Phase I policies
 - The team is continuing to work through solution design, with refinement and approval as key priorities
 - Beginning April 13, an E-Dea representative will be onsite at Palmer one week per month, along with vendor support
 - Several SSA team members traveled to Italy; in-person collaboration has been highly effective
 - Ongoing public engagement related to Phase II policies
 - Two workstreams are currently flagged as red: system configurations with E-Dea and preseason portal development with E-Dea
-

4. Project Timeline (Tom)

- Tom shared that E-Dea provided a draft timeline based on their standard implementation approach; as of March, E-Dea has proposed an R1 solution and a path to Go Live, with phased steps (e.g., 1.1, 1.2) tied to releases and testing
- The timeline has not yet been approved, as it reflects E-Dea's proposal and requires SSA review and potential changes; system configuration and integration is currently extended by two months compared to the original plan, with no buffer between configuration and R1 Go Live
- The team is evaluating how to update the timeline, including ensuring integrations are fully ready and tested, and incorporating additional time for training, deployment, and community engagement, especially outreach to island communities and senior centers
- Tom emphasized the importance of transparency, sharing the evolving timeline for feedback while working toward a firm Go Live date that, once set, should remain fixed; adjustments may be made across R1, R2, etc. to ensure readiness
- Peter asked whether delaying R1 Go Live would also push back the R2 cutoff date
- Tom explained that SSA's R1 rollout may need to occur in two phases (shippers first, then general public), including preseason processes; this could allow R1 and R2 to be closer together (approximately 30–60 days apart)
- Peter raised concerns about preseason and shipper scheduling, noting that a delay (e.g., 30–90 days) could conflict with current business rules and seasonal booking timelines, and questioned whether business rules may need to change
- Tom noted exploration of creative solutions, such as manually entering preseason data using the current process instead of relying on the new portal; highlighted the challenge of overlapping seasonal planning (summer and winter schedules)
- Peter asked when a final, approvable timeline will be ready and at what point delays to R1/R2 would trigger additional costs or change orders under the E-Dea contract
- Tom responded that the priority is ensuring system readiness before rollout; implications of timeline changes (including vendor contracts and SOWs) still need to be assessed, with a goal to finalize the timeline in the next few weeks
- Peter confirmed expectation of greater certainty by the next meeting; Tom agreed
- John questioned whether the April–September (5-month) configuration and integration period leaves too much in E-Dea's hands

- Tom clarified that the process is shared between E-Dea and SSA, involving iterative releases and testing cycles
 - John suggested pushing E-Dea to shorten the timeline and exploring ways to accelerate internal decision-making (e.g., rapid turnaround, reduced dependency on meetings)
 - Alex noted ongoing discussions (with Mark A) about speeding up internal responses to support faster progress
 - John emphasized addressing internal bottlenecks while maintaining pressure on E-Dea to reduce timelines
 - Alex suggested a more iterative approach: implement current policies in the system first, then refine based on real data rather than delaying for extended policy discussions
 - John agreed with this approach and suggested communicating changes through releases with the public
 - Alex highlighted the value of improved data (e.g., no-shows) from the new system to inform future policy decisions
 - Peter supported maintaining current policies if they do not require additional customization from E-Dea
 - John asked whether SSA will re-engage E-Dea to revisit the timeline
 - Alex confirmed the need for internal alignment first; with E-Dea returning on the 13th, there will be an opportunity to review and potentially accelerate the timeline
 - Mark R emphasized identifying parallel paths and resolving blockers while ensuring vendor alignment
-

5. Policy Updates (Mark A)

Public feedback:

- Mark A shared that public feedback emphasizes keeping policies as aligned as possible with current rules
- Proposed update to change policy: \$10 fee for changes made less than two weeks out; first change could be free, with \$10 applied to subsequent changes

- Considering removal of fees for waitlist matching and standby tickets
- Identifying policy areas that cannot remain the same due to E-Dea system constraints
- Gift cards cannot support non-incremental pricing and must align with system requirements
- For the no-show policy, encouraging customers to notify SSA if they cannot make a trip; staff (Mashpee call center, agents, terminals) will assist with rebooking when possible (e.g., traffic delays)
- Coupon books involve terminology changes only, with ongoing work to define expiration dates

Shipper (commercial) feedback:

- Mark A shared that shipper feedback highlights frequent changes within 24–48 hours of travel, reinforcing the need to maintain flexible policies aligned with current practices
- SSA plans to maintain the existing cancellation policy, targeting either a strict 24-hour window or the current 9 AM day-before cutoff; feasibility will be confirmed with E-Dea
- The new system will not allow ticket pending, so proposed change fees are: 10% for changes within 48 hours and 5% for changes between 48 hours and two weeks, aiming to stay aligned with current policy
- High-demand routes (e.g., Nantucket summer bookings at full capacity) require clear policies, including how to handle downsizing reservations within the system
- Reservation transfers will only be allowed through approved SSA channels
- The current 110% smoothing practice will be reduced to 100%, reflecting capacity constraints
- Steel-treaded vehicles policy was raised (notably in Nantucket): these vehicles can damage vessels and must be transported via flatbed; enforcement will continue
- Gordon asked if there were any policies shippers did not push back on
- Mark A responded that shippers are providing feedback rather than resisting; they feel strongly about maintaining the cancellation policy and prefer to evaluate changes after year one of the new system

- Alex clarified that feedback on steel-treaded vehicles was exploratory rather than opposition to policy
 - Mark A outlined next steps, including establishing a recurring meeting schedule
 - Ongoing meetings will take place on the fourth Tuesday of each month from 10:00–11:00 AM
-

6. Project Budget (Mark R)

- Mark R presented budget components for the reservation system implementation, including implementation costs, change orders, contingencies, annual licenses, and hosting
 - Peter asked whether costs are coming from the operating or capital budget; Mark R clarified the reservation system is a SaaS cost and will be amortized over the life of the software agreement
 - Mark R noted that annual expense recognition will be mapped to timing of costs on the income statement, aligned with the expected November launch and software payment schedule
 - John asked whether the budget includes other vendors (e.g., Intrasystems, credit card processing); Mark R clarified it currently only includes the reservation system, with plans to separate and roll up other components later
 - John requested that vendor breakdowns be included for the next meeting
 - Integrations will be shown separately from the reservation system, with detailed tracking of budget, change orders, spend, contract status, and ownership
 - The team will also provide an annual cost analysis, with some costs treated as depreciation or amortization within operating expenses
 - For the next meeting, each subcategory will be presented on separate slides and then consolidated at the end for a full view
 - Peter requested that the complete package be distributed to committee members in advance of the meeting, with availability for offline review sessions if needed
 - He emphasized that this level of detail is necessary for oversight by the board, port council, and IT steering committee
-

7. Old/New Business

- None
-

8. Public Comment

- None
-

Motion to Adjourn:

- It was voted by roll call to approve the motion to adjourn of the IT Executive Steering Committee, meeting in public session.
-

Meeting Duration

1:02 pm – 1:50 pm

Documents Distributed:

- April 2, 2026, IT Executive Steering Committee Meeting - Presentation
-

Next Meeting:

- April 28, 2026 at 10:00 am – virtual only
-

Action Items:

Action Item	Owner	Due Date
Budget edits <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Break out reservation system budget into clear subcategories (implementation costs, change orders, contingencies, SaaS licensing, hosting)• Separate and clearly present integrations vs. reservation system costs• Include detailed breakdown in next meeting materials: budget, change orders, spend,	Mark R	Next meeting

<p>contract status, and ownership per component</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide annual cost analysis, including treatment of depreciation vs. operating expense (amortization) • Structure next meeting deck with each subcategory on separate slides, followed by a consolidated summary • Map implementation costs to timing of expense recognition on the income statement (aligned to expected November launch and payment schedule) • Confirm SaaS amortization treatment over the software agreement term • Work with project team to prepare integrated vendor/budget reporting structure for future roll-up across all systems (beyond just reservation system) 		
<p>Review expanded vendor scope requirements (confirm inclusion or exclusion of additional vendors such as Intrasystems and credit card processing in future reporting structure)</p>	<p>John</p>	<p>Next meeting</p>
<p>Distribute full budget package to committee members prior to next meeting</p>	<p>Gibbous (PMO)</p>	<p>Next meeting</p>
<p>Make available for optional offline review sessions with stakeholders (Board, Port Council, IT Steering Committee)</p>	<p>Internal Working Group</p>	<p>Next meeting</p>