



**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: Thursday, November 5, 1998  
Re: Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

---

**Meeting**

**Date:** Thursday, October 29, 1998

**Attending:** Kevin Holland, Al Karoly, Mike Eadiccico, Ray Walker, Joe Foster, Norm Schneider, Jeff Loftus, Pam Rice, John Kaliski, Dave McBath, Dennis McGee, Charlie Katz, Chris Hill, Nick Owens, and Shelley Feese.

**Location:** Parsons Brinkerhoff Offices, New York

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

---

**Agenda**

1. Welcome and Introductions
  2. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes (9/10/98)
  3. Review Delaware FOT De-obligation Scenario
  4. ITS/CVO Training & CVISN Project Design Workshop: Proposed Work Plan
  5. Lunch
  6. 3 Concurrent Break-Out Groups
  7. Report Out – 3 Break-Out Groups
  8. Review and Approval of December's Full PTC Meeting
  9. Close and Summary
- 

The purpose of this Advisory Group Meeting was to finalize information developed by the Advisory Group over the past 4 months. Decisions regarding the organizational structure of the PTC, additional funding for FOTs, and Year 6 work plan funding and contracting processes are to be used in developing review and presentation material for the full PTC membership. The consensus of the Advisory Group is to be the first step in reaching consensus within the full PTC during the December meeting.

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-Chair, Kevin Holland started the meeting with welcome and continued praise and thanks to the Advisory Group members for all they have helped to accomplish in the recent months. Self-introductions were conducted in round table style.

## **AGENDA REVIEW**

Kevin Holland reviewed the day's schedule and stressed the importance of adhering to the tight timeline in accomplishing the full agenda. The need to reach consensus on the agenda items was critical to proper preparation for the full PTC meeting in December.

## **REVIEW and APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (9/10/98)**

Meeting minutes from the Thursday, September 10, 1998, Advisory Group meeting were distributed via US Mail with other review material, prior to this meeting. Present Advisory Group members approved of the minutes and offered no additional comments.

## **REVIEW DELAWARE FOT DE-OBLIGATION SCENARIO**

Nick Owens gave a report regarding Delaware's interest in discontinuing their participation in FOTs 8 and 9. Delaware's current state direction may result in contradicting systems development, should the current FOTs be completed. In the interest of not spending more of the originally obligated funds, Delaware initiated conversations with the CVO Program Track leadership, I-95 Corridor Coalition staff, and members of the FHWA, to determine the best course of action. All parties were in support of Delaware's request and determined the funds should remain obligated until the time a new obligation was agreed upon; It was also agreed that the Advisory Group should determine the best use of the funds to be de-obligated (\$235,000).

Discussions ensued to establish the best choices to be considered. The approximate dollar value was discussed as it pertains to Delaware's possible desire to purchase 2 additional laptops to be used for roadside screening. It was agreed upon that if Delaware had originally been approved for these purchases, they would be permitted to use part of the obligated funds. This issue is to be discussed with Delaware individually.

For the sake of keeping to the agenda, discussions were urged forward to decide a use for the de-obligated funds. Two prevalent ideas included obligating the full dollar amount to continuing current FOTs, and using partial obligated funds for additional projects not allocated funding during the Year 6 awards with the remainder going toward completion of the FOTs. As \$500,000 was already awarded for the completion of the FOTs, it was agreed to recommend the latter option in written communication to John Baniak of the I-95 Corridor Coalition.

## **ITS/CVO TRAINING & CVISN PROJECT DESIGN WORKSHOP: PROPOSED WORK PLAN**

Jeff Loftus, of the FHWA, presented a proposed work plan to plan and facilitate both ITS/CVO Training courses and CVISN Project Design Workshops. As training will no longer be funded through the FHWA after December 31, 1998, it was the intention of Mr. Loftus to get consensus agreement from the Advisory Group to include this work proposal in the awarded \$250,000 for this specific Year 6 project. The proposed work plan included deployment strategy, technical training course descriptions, differences between the training courses and CVISN Workshops, approach to scheduling, identification of delivery team, and budget breakdown. Discussions included specifics regarding course content, maximum number of course deliverables, and trainer resources. No objections were raised throughout these discussions and the group consensus was in support of the work plan. Detailed discussions regarding the contracting mechanism would occur during the break-out group work.

### **3 CONCURRENT BREAK-OUT GROUPS and RESULTS**

Over the past four months, the Advisory Group has been progressively working toward the resolution of very important issues in order to successfully develop and implement a Year 6 Work Plan and continue existing projects within the CVO PTC. Upon reaching consensus on the organizational structure of the PTC and associated roles and responsibilities, additional FOT funding process, and Year 6 Work Plan funding and contracting process, materials will be developed for the full PTC to review prior to the December meeting. It is the intention of the Advisory Group to achieve consensus within the full PTC on the issues presented in December. The following information reflects the results of the 3 concurrent break-out groups.

#### **Organizational Structure of the PTC**

Pam Rice, Al Karoly, and Norm Schneider – Shelley Feese, facilitator

This break-out group was responsible for reviewing the proposed organizational structure of the PTC and associated roles and responsibilities. With slight modification, the organizational chart was approved. The decision was made to remove the individual names from the Advisory Group, add Noreen Hazelton as Contract Manager for the I-95 Corridor Coalition staff, and to consistently represent the member groups of the full PTC. Detailed roles and responsibilities were distributed for prior meeting review. Editorial comments were noted for changes to be made prior to distribution of the full PTC. Discussions in this break-out group focused on the identification, and process for filling, of vacancies within the organizational structure. Vacancies have been identified within the chair positions of Subcommittees. The group agreed to define a process allowing for the most efficient way to fill these voids while retaining the proper approval process. The proposed process includes the written solicitation of the full PTC for interest coupled with suggestions from existing chairs. Based on personal qualifications and the needs of the Advisory Group, the Advisory Group will vote and assign interested volunteers to the appropriate Subcommittee. It was suggested during report out that the volunteers for these positions have the expressed support from their superiors to help ensure commitment once elected. Terms-of-service was also discussed during the break-out session. It was agreed that terms should be set for the benefit of volunteers, but term limits would not be imposed allowing chairs to accept additional terms. Introduction of staggering terms is important in keeping skilled, experienced individuals in participation at all times. Two years is the suggested term for new chairs, with the existing chair retaining the right to retire at the end of the first year to start the

staggered cycle. In the event two existing chairs are remaining active in a Subcommittee, term will be determined by seniority or mutual agreement.

### **Additional FOT Funding Process**

Dennis McGee, Dave McBath, Mike Eadiccico, Joe Foster – Chris Hill, facilitator

This break-out group was formed to look specifically at the issue of providing additional funding to the FOTs. The group first reviewed the proposed criteria developed for state eligibility consideration. The most critical criteria were determined to be:

- Proven ability to deliver through commitment of particular technical skills, human and financial resources
- Demonstration of progress on existing FOT project(s) through management and oversight

For states interested in applying for additional funding, project proposals will be required. These state proposals are expected to provide a thorough project description accompanied by a fully developed management and technical proposal, and implementation plan. Implementation plans must include indicated milestones, detailed timelines, and outlined steps leading to a determined end date.

Once proposals are received, the Subcommittees will check to ensure they meet the basic criteria, and then prioritize the proposals within a subject area. The Advisory Group will be responsible for prioritizing all proposals, ultimately. Within the Advisory Group, there will be subject-specific experts assigned to assessing proposals, and bringing their findings back to the full group for prioritization and funding allocations. The subject-specific experts will have the option of returning proposals to states for further clarification within a defined turn around time, if necessary.

Funding will not be capped per state, but it is the suggestion of the group to limit the number of projects per state. It is the intention of the group to make the allocation as equitable as possible among the Corridor states rather than selecting as many interested states as possible. Specific decisions will be facilitated by the Subcommittees, such as the decision to urge states to work together if they have similar proposals, or granting the project to a state which may not have a current project.

Once projects are underway, the management and oversight of the projects is to be determined by the Subcommittee in which it is housed. The Subcommittee will be responsible for bringing reports and recommendations to the Advisory Group. The Advisory Group is, in turn, responsible for allowing the project to continue on course, or requiring additional explanation and possible change in procedure. The Subcommittees will each receive written monthly reports from project managers, and will be responsible for compiling these into quarterly reports for the Advisory Group meetings. To ensure the quality of these reports is consistent with the Federal quarterly reports, it is proposed that a staff person is assigned to this task. The magnitude of the report structure will be fully explained to differentiate from past reporting practices.

Finally, the group suggests that the Advisory Group be empowered with the authority to suspend funding in extreme circumstances.

## **Year 6 Work Plan Funding and Contracting Process**

John Kaliski, Jeff Loftus, Ray Walker, Charlie Katz – Nick Owens, facilitator

This break-out group was charged with addressing the contracting process and funding for each of the approved Year 6 projects plus the Truck Rest Stop Information Study. Once agreement could be reached as to how these projects could be contracted, work could begin on the specific work assignments and responsibilities. The first discussion involved whether Year 6 projects should procure contractors through an RFP process, or use the NEC contractors. The issues regarding the use of the NEC include limitations to the choice of contractors, and the considered perception that states may feel they are limited in their choice. The recommendation of the group is to suggest the NEC option, but to allow states retention of the final decision. Advantages to using the NEC were clearly identified and include:

- NEC won the existing contract in open competition
- Utilizing the NEC could expedite the process
- The NEC contracting pool offers a wide range of resources
- Participating state personnel will be less burdened in the absence of contract competition

NEC will support the Regional Oversize/Overweight permit effort with NOOPA, the Regional Credentialing Architecture Study, CVO Technical Assistance effort, and the ITS/CVO Training and CVISN Workshops. Additional third parties may be identified and contracted on a case by case basis. The IRP Fee Module Feasibility Study requires a different approach. IRP is the likely entity to sponsor this work, however, FHWA and the I-95 Corridor Coalition must determine a means of transferring funds to IRP while retaining project involvement. Three possible scenarios include:

- Utilizing an open funding mechanism with FHWA (adding the work and money to it)
- Work through an existing contract between IRP, Inc. and an I-95 Corridor Coalition state
- Allow IRP, Inc. to lead the work and NEC would perform the contract work through funding with a state

Regardless of chosen scenario, the focus of the study will remain on the IRP fee calculation for the I-95 Corridor Coalition states.

The recommended project initiation process for major projects includes five steps. These steps are:

- Subcommittees identify 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to assist in the process, write the Statement of Work (SOW) with the support of NEC, submit the SOW to the Advisory Group for approval
- NEC develops detailed proposal inclusive of work plan, detailed budget, staffing, schedule
- Subcommittee reviews NEC proposal and addresses outstanding issues
- Subcommittee submits proposal to Advisory Group for final approval
- Subcommittee monitors the project (each Subcommittee develops its own monitoring process; FHWA IPAS contract may be used for evaluation)

The process used for initiating the Technical Assistance projects will differ as will the nature and scope of the projects themselves. A three-step process was suggested which includes:

- State submits a request to the Advisory Group
- Advisory Group requests NEC define deliverables, cost, develop schedule (NEC submits to state as well as Advisory Group)
- Advisory Group determines whether funding will be approved under this project

The Advisory Group is to establish guidelines with the help of the full PTC in December, to be used in determining whether funding is granted. In the event state projects are too small to require the above listed process, a group comprised of Jeff Loftus, Jeff Secrist, Al Karoly, Joe Foster, Cheryl Roe and Rudy Supina, will work with Nick Owens to examine the provision of effective assistance on a small scale. It was consensus within the discussion group that these projects must be small in scale due to the limited funding for technical assistance. The idea of establishing use limits was introduced and will be considered.

### **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DECEMBER'S FULL PTC MEETING**

Nick Owens presented the detailed agenda proposed for December 15, 16, and 17<sup>th</sup>. The agenda and format (1/2 day, full day, 1/2 day) was well received. Concern was raised regarding the presentation of the Subcommittee workshop breakdown for the afternoon of the 16<sup>th</sup>. The presentation represented a much larger emphasis on the evaluation of the FOTs than was intended. The agenda will be modified to reflect the intention of the Subcommittees.

Consultant support expressed the need to be in contact with the Subcommittee chairs regarding their intended agendas for the December meeting. Present chairs agreed and conference calls will be conducted to collect this information, or schedule meetings if the Subcommittee chair prefers.

Request was made to add an additional speaker, John Steinhoff, to the agenda. Consultant support will make necessary adjustments.

### **CLOSE AND SUMMARY**

Kevin Holland closed the meeting as scheduled expressing gratitude for the achieved results with such an aggressive itinerary. The information will be used to prepare the full PTC meeting materials. Meeting minutes to be distributed to all Advisory Group members and invited parties.