



**I-95 CORRIDOR
COALITION**

I-95 Corridor Coalition, CVO Program Track

Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

To: Advisory Group Members
From: Kevin Holland and Dan Smyser
Date: Monday, January 25, 1999
Re: Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

Meeting

Date: Wednesday, January 20, 1999

Attending: Kevin Holland, Al Karoly, Joe Foster, Norm Schneider, Jeff Secrist, Rich Bates, Charlie Katz, Vince Babich, Rudy Supina, Tricia Faust, Marygrace Parker, Steve Keppler, Chris Hill, Nick Owens, and Shelley Feese.

Location: Parsons Brinkerhoff Offices, New York

Time: 10:30 a.m. thru 3:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 2. Year 6 Projects – Next Steps
 3. Lunch
 4. Year 7 Work Plan
 5. ITS/CVO Policy Subcommittee
 6. Close and Summary
-

The purpose of this Advisory Group Meeting was to review information developed by the consultant support based on the outcome of the full PTC meeting in Baltimore, MD. Review materials included Year 6 Projects' Scopes of Work, criteria and application process for applying for additional FOT funding, and Year 7 proposed project descriptions.

The meeting was structured, yet informal, to allow for the open exchange of ideas and concerns. The above agenda was used to guide the presentations and discussions. Handouts were given to all participants including the presentation materials.

INTRODUCTIONS

Co-Chairs, Kevin Holland and Dan Smyser, started the meeting with welcome and initiated self-introductions in round table style for the benefit of new participants.

AGENDA REVIEW

Kevin Holland reviewed the day's schedule and stressed the importance of deciding upon the next steps for initiating project activity.

YEAR 6 WORK PLAN – NEXT STEPS

Draft review material was distributed prior to the Advisory Group meeting for the following Year 6 activities based on decisions made in Baltimore, MD:

- ITS/CVO Training and CVISN Project Design Workshops
- Technical Assistance to CVISN Project Design Workshops
- Regional Oversize/Overweight Permitting Study
- Electronic Credentialing Architecture Study

Draft material was not included on the following Year 6 activity:

- Corridor Wide Technical Assistance

Consultant support presented the developed scopes of work. Kevin Holland and Dan Smyser led the group through discussions on each project; results of each discussion are as follows:

ITS/CVO Training and CVISN Project Design Workshops & Technical Assistance to CVISN Project Design Workshops

The scope of work for training and the workshops was developed by Castle Rock Consultants. This project will provide training and workshops for I-95 Corridor Coalition states that wish to participate in CVISN deployment. The training and workshops will be sponsored by the Coalition, in conjunction with the Federal highway Administration. Training is to be conducted throughout 1999 to help prepare the states for the CVISN workshops starting in late 1999.

Delivery anticipates up to 10 ITS/CVO training courses, and 3 CVISN Project Design workshops in November, 1999, February, 2000, and May, 2000. States wishing to participate in the workshops must attend the second and third training courses; the Technical training Team will work with the states to ensure that personnel involved in the workshops will also participate in the training courses.

The scope of work for the technical assistance to CVISN workshops was developed by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. This idea to provide additional support to the workshops in the form of pre- and post-state visits was developed during the full PTC meeting in Baltimore. FHWA had provided "pilot state advisors" for technical support to the model deployment states, but is not likely able to fund the next round of CVISN states.

This project was not funded as part of the Year 6 Work Plan, but is being proposed for funding consideration through the Corridor Wide Technical Assistance project. The original scope suggests both pre- and post-state visits to all participating states for assistance in completing pre-

work and homework assignments in preparation for the workshops. The CVO Program Track suggested this be modified to reflect a demand driven model.

Group discussions focused on the timeframe of implementing the training and the possible use of Technical Assistance funds for the additional support functions. The Co-Chairs would like to initiate this project and suggest proposing the idea to the states and see what the response is. Concern for funding this additional support from the Technical Assistance Project is based on the currently unstructured approach to allocating the \$500,000 approved for this project (i.e. – does this fit the criteria, will there be enough funding to allocate \$100,000 to this additional support?).

The Advisory Group supports the development of a full proposal based on the submitted scope of work. The states will be presented with the proposed approach, and their reactions will help determine the final decision on the additional support functions.

Regional Oversize/Overweight Permitting Study

This scope of work has been developed by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. This proposal is for a feasibility analysis of a regional electronic oversize/overweight permit system in the I-95 corridor. Its four tasks are designed to support and augment the ongoing efforts of the NOOPA team developing a regional compact to make regional permit feasible. Functional and institutional requirements are to be explored in setting the stage for system design fulfilling the needs of industry and states.

The Advisory Group expressed concern over the current presentation and the intention to develop one system based on common denominators in current practice. The point was raised that some of the current practices need to be re-engineered and the focus should be what the carriers are looking for and the systems currently in place.

The group agreed the study should be redirected toward needs assessment, develop alternative business models and then gain consensus on the opportunities.

Electronic Credentialing Architecture Study

This scope of work has been developed by SAIC. This study intends to determine the corridor's definition of electronic credentialing, and provide guidance to the CVISN states for implementation. The study will address regional and multi-jurisdictional issues of benefits to the motor carrier credentialing programs, benefits to motor carrier safety enforcement programs, benefits to motor carriers, and the need for interoperability related to electronic credentialing.

Discussions pertaining to this project and the scope of work involved the understanding of the existing CVISN architecture definition, and the credentialing studies completed by other organizations/institutions. While the CVISN architecture is defined, the solution to credentialing complexity within the corridor, for all states, has not been clearly identified. The group agreed to rename the approved project to more clearly identify its intended purpose. The project will now be identified as the Regional Credentialing Study. The group also agreed that the study must clearly define what the intended outcome/product is to be, and can not be a duplication in effort already produced by other sources.

The current scope of work will be modified and developed into a fully detailed proposal, without interim review and approval. The proposal will include the investigation of existing resources to avoid duplication and will fill informational gaps existing in current studies.

Corridor Wide Technical Assistance

A formal scope of work was not prepared for this project. A task force discussion took place via conference call on Tuesday, January 19, 1999, to identify some key issues to be reviewed by the Advisory Group. These issues included:

- Capping the maximum amount of funding for each project
- Determining the length of time a project may span
- Capping per state
- Development of application, review, and approval procedures
- Imposition of project control
- Requirement of state match requirements

The Co-Chairs would like this project to be a “quick hit” project which could provide effective assistance to existing projects without delay in order to see project results. Participants offered a number of scenarios which may be faced by the Advisory Group in the approval process which made it apparent to all that some definition must be given to the use of these funds.

It was agreed that a straw-man would be developed by consultant support in order to define some rules and limitations. Approximately one to two pages in length, a request submission should be quick, timely and provide tangible results which do not include hardware procurement. Limitations include \$100,000 maximum per state, \$50,000 maximum per project, and can not exceed 12 months in length.

Application for Additional FOT Funding

The application process and review criteria proposed were developed from the original FOT selection criteria and the material developed by the Advisory Group over the past 8 months. The intention is to develop a clear, guided process for the states to use in application for additional funding which can be reviewed quickly and consistently by the Advisory Group. At the same time, clarity and quality must be expressed by the states in requesting funds to continue FOTs.

The proposed application and review process is as follows:

- Initiate application process to interested states
- Define requirements which must be included in each state’s “letter of interest”
- Define review process and timeline
- Define review criteria to be used by Advisory Group
- Define approval and awards process and timeline
- Define reporting structure required

The proposed material was approved and slightly modified to clarify the intended use of the funds to be allocated as well as the timeline. Concern was raised about states who have not completed an approved business plan, as criteria requires submission for funding to compliment the state business plan as it relates to CVO. The group decided that explicit buy-in from upper management is the important factor; a letter of endorsement will be required from the state’s I-95 Corridor Coalition Executive Board member.

The following timeline will be adhered to:

- Initial package out to the states clearly defining the process – March 1, 1999
- State submissions due back to Advisory Group – May 1, 1999
- Subcommittee review complete – June 15, 1999
- Advisory Group review complete – July 15, 1999

The CVO Program Track intends to fund as many projects as possible, but there is limited funding available. The initial package will express this scenario and stress the need for prioritization based on completion and deliverables in hopes of eliminating applications for excessive funding by any one state. In addition, it was decided that there will not be an imposed funding cap, the number of projects a state is involved in will be considered, and states will not be expected to provide monetary matches. The application process for additional FOT funding will be discussed in depth at the regional meetings as well.

Industry Market Research

This scope of work has been developed by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. This proposal has been designed to provide a clear and comprehensive assessment of motor carrier needs and perceptions to support current and future I-95 Corridor ITS/CVO programs. This effort will update and augment previous analyses with new and relevant information.

The need for a current market analyses exists as the most recent survey is 4 – 5 years old. In order to most appropriately direct project activity to match industry needs, the Program Track needs to be aware of current market environment.

This project was not approved for funding in the Year 6 Work Plan, but was a priority of the CVO PTC. For this reason, the Advisory Group is proposing this project be funded from the un-allocated funds being held by the Corridor Coalition. It was agreed that a letter would be drafted and submitted to John Baniak expressing the project importance as well as the proposed funding mechanism.

Subcommittee Terms of Service

Subcommittee co-chair vacancies were formally filled during the full PTC meeting in Baltimore. It was also determined in Baltimore during the Organizational Structure Break-Out Session that terms of service would be established for Subcommittee co-chairs. These terms of service would be minimum terms, with option for renewal, and would be staggered to allow retention of experience in each Subcommittee.

Subcommittee terms of service are established as follows:

Safety Subcommittee

Norm Schneider – 1 year
Vince Babich – 2 years

Credentialing Subcommittee

Cheryl Roe – 1 year
Bonnie Rutledge – 2 years

Carrier Operations Subcommittee

Marygrace Parker – 1 year
Dave Barry – 1 year

Year 7 Work Plan