



**I-95 CORRIDOR  
COALITION**

*I-95 Corridor Coalition, CVO Program Track*

## **CVO Program Track Committee Meeting Minutes**

CVO Program Track Committee – Semi-Annual Meeting  
Days Hotel on the Harbor  
Providence, Rhode Island  
June 28 – 30, 1999

---

**Monday, June 28, 1999**

---

### **1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. – Advisory Group Meeting**

The Advisory Group took advantage of coordinating travel efforts and met prior to the full CVO PTC meeting. Due to the scheduling, a number of PTC members sat in on the meeting and participated in some of the decision points. The Advisory Group had last convened in May to discuss the first phase of Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT funding applications. The agenda for this meeting included reaching consensus on recommendations for the Year 7 Work Plan, Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT Funding applications. Comprehensive review materials were distributed to the Advisory Group members prior to the meeting allowing the group to address the decision points more directly.

The first topic discussed was the Year 7 Work Plan. Over the course of approval, the Work Plan had been reviewed by the Program Management Committee and the Steering Committee; both made modifications to the requested funding amount. The original request from the CVO PTC was for \$2.5 million; the reductions left us with \$616,700 to allocate among approved projects accordingly. The Advisory Group was considering recommended re-allocations to accommodate the final funding figure. The group reached easy consensus on the following allocation of funds:

- 1. Field Implementation Funding Incentive - \$500,000**
- 2. Senior Management Outreach (Os/OW Permit) - \$50,000**
- 3. Industry Outreach - \$50,000**
- 4. CVISN Deployment Workshops - \$16,700 (to be supplemented with \$64,000 from CWTA funds)**

The second topic of discussion was the Corridor Wide Technical Assistance applications. The advisory Group had previously agreed to a 45-day full turn around time for applications requesting this kind of funding. As the nature of these projects are “quick-fix” and “get over an obstacle” the group felt it was imperative to address these state needs as quickly as possible. In following the agreed upon process, the NEC team received initial applications, reviewed them for completion in addressing all criteria, made estimates of labor hours, labor costs and direct costs, and recommended support staff to complete the task. Once the NEC process was complete, these packages were distributed to the Subcommittee Co-Chairs and leadership for review. Each Subcommittee worked to provide recommendations on approval and funding to the full Advisory Group, who would in turn discuss the options. The NEC team compiled summaries and results of the Subcommittee findings and distributed this information to the full Advisory Group for further discussion. Discussions focused on the criteria used in reviewing projects which included hardware as well as the potential multi-state benefits of completing projects with this funding. The conclusion of the Advisory Group was as follows regarding approving and funding:

|                       |                                 |                 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Massachusetts:</b> | <b>Wireless Data Design -</b>   | <b>\$50,000</b> |
| <b>Connecticut:</b>   | <b>Website Development -</b>    | <b>\$10,000</b> |
|                       | <b>CVISN Proof of Concept -</b> | <b>\$50,000</b> |
| <b>New York:</b>      | <b>Van Deployment -</b>         | <b>\$20,000</b> |
| <b>Corridor Wide:</b> | <b>CVISN Workshops -</b>        | <b>\$64,000</b> |

The final discussion was about Additional FOT Funding applications. The same process as was used in the Corridor Wide Technical Assistance was used in receiving, reviewing and recommending projects for Additional FOT Funding. There were differing opinions on the criteria for receiving funding through this source. The topic of funding hardware, predominantly FOT 7, was discussed at length. There was a general feeling within the Coalition that the continuation of funding for hardware is not desirable nor is it an effective use of funds. The group discussed each state application and came to the following conclusion regarding approving and funding:

|                      |                 |                  |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <b>Connecticut:</b>  | <b>FOT 9 -</b>  | <b>\$175,000</b> |
| <b>Maryland:</b>     | <b>FOT 8 -</b>  | <b>\$40,000</b>  |
|                      | <b>FOT 10 -</b> | <b>\$50,000</b>  |
| <b>Rhode Island:</b> | <b>FOT 7 -</b>  | <b>\$75,000</b>  |
| <b>New York:</b>     | <b>FOT 7 -</b>  | <b>\$59,000</b>  |

### **3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. - Registration & Refreshments– Full CVO PTC**

Consultant support staffed the registration table located directly outside of the Bayview meeting room prior to the meeting start time. Participants were asked to verify their personal information as listed in the CVO PTC contact list and provide any updates to their contact information. A current CVO PTC contact list is available on the web site as well as in hard copy; please contact Shelley Feese at (703) 771-9815 if you would like a hard copy sent via US Mail.

### **4:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. – CVO PTC Meeting Formal Opening**

#### **Welcome & Introduction**

John Baniak, Executive Director for the I-95 Corridor Coalition, officially opened the Semi-Annual CVO Program Track Committee meeting. John Baniak has been involved with the I-95 Corridor Coalition for a number of years and has contributed greatly to the success and progress of the CVO Program Track. His appreciation for the efforts of the CVO PTC and the importance of our continued commitment was the focus of Mr. Baniak's opening. Mr. Baniak introduced Kevin Holland, CVO PTC Co-Chair.

#### **Meeting Goals & Objectives**

Kevin Holland, of American Trucking Associations, and Dan Smyser, of Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, are Co-Chairs of the CVO Program Track. Together in leadership, they have accomplished a great deal with the CVO Program Track. In Mr. Smyser's absence, Mr. Holland accepted the responsibility of leading the three-day agenda beginning with a discussion of the primary goals and objectives of the meeting.

The Co-Chairs and the Advisory Group have been working diligently since the December, 1998, meeting in Baltimore, Maryland. With the Year 7 Work Plan due on the heels of the implementation of the Year 6 Work Plan, regional meetings, project proposals and final work plans were developed and submitted in February. Allocations had been made by the Steering Committee and were to be discussed with the full PTC as part of the meeting format.

The CVO PTC continues to grow in both size and activity level. With the additional responsibility of Year 6 project implementation, and Year 7 projects starting shortly, the Co-Chairs felt it was important to structure a meeting which would provide an update on the complete Program Track as well as address the activities and progress of the Subcommittees.

The intended results of this semi-annual meeting were to reach a final group decision on the Year 7 Work Plan and associated funding amounts, the allocation of funds to Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT Funding applications. Kevin Holland stressed the importance of accomplishing these tasks within the framework of the three-day meeting as he reviewed the schedule.

Upon conclusion, Kevin Holland introduced Bill Stoeckert speaking as Chair of the I-95 Corridor Coalition's Steering Committee.

#### **4:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. - ITS/CVO and Corridor Perspective**

The I-95 Corridor Coalition and CVO Program Track are of national importance to industry, government, private sector, and enforcement. The activities of our Corridor and our Program Track have been observed and recognized. In order to continue on this successful path we used this meeting as an opportunity to focus on our Corridor states, their needs, and how our project activity can positively impact our region. The following speakers shared their perspective on how we are doing and insight as to how we may be able to improve on award-winning efforts here in the I-95 Corridor.

Bill Stoeckert, Chair of the I-95 Corridor Coalition Steering Committee, spoke to the full CVO PTC for the first time in this new position. Mr. Stoeckert was speaking for the first time to the CVO PTC as Chair of the Steering Committee. The opportunity gave the PTC a chance to meet our new Chair as well as hear his perspective on the activities of the Corridor Coalition as well as our specific Program Track. Mr. Stoeckert spoke to the group of their continued efforts and introduced the ITS America 1999 Award for Outstanding Achievement in Commercial Vehicle Operations which had been presented to the I-95 Corridor Coalition. Mr. Stoeckert provided the PTC with an overview of the Coalition's program and goals and related the activities and progress of the CVO Program Track. He also offered some financial figures and his perspective on these as he discussed the overall program. Copies of Mr. Stoeckert's presentation are available upon request through consultant support.

Steve Crane, Program Manager for the Office of Motor Carrier and Highway Safety, spoke to the PTC on behalf of FHWA. His Federal perspective provided the group with insight and understanding relating to the recent reorganization of FHWA as well as the reorganization's impact on the states. He also covered some issues related to legislation and earmarks so the group could better understand the process. Mr. Crane expressed his support on behalf of FHWA towards the CVISN activities, compliance and efforts of the pilot states. Mr. Crane's presentation concluded with an introduction to the Mineta Panel, the work done and the recommendations resulting. Reference materials related to Mr. Crane's presentation are available upon request through consultant support.

### **5:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Open Discussion**

Time was provided for questions and answers upon conclusion of all presentations.

### **6:00 p.m. - Close**

Kevin Holland formally closed the afternoon's activity and briefly recapped the following day's schedule.

### **6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. – Informal Reception**

An informal reception was sponsored by the I-95 Corridor Coalition, at the Gatehouse Restaurant on the Providence River, as an opportunity for our members to get together in a professional yet informal atmosphere. This gave those attending an opportunity to enjoy business and socialize while preparing for a full next day. Hors d'oeuvres and soft beverages were offered compliments of the Corridor Coalition; arrangements were made for a cash bar for alcohol, beer and wine.

---

## **Tuesday, June 29, 1999**

---

### **8:30 a.m. – Continental Breakfast**

Continental breakfast was served at 8:30 a.m. just outside of the Bayview Room compliments of the Corridor Coalition.

### **9:00 a.m. – Good Morning, Subcommittee Session Overview, Goals and Objectives**

Kevin Holland formally opened the meeting promptly at 9:00 a.m. He reviewed the day's agenda, goals and objectives of the Subcommittee meetings, and briefly ran through the Subcommittee agenda items. Kevin Holland reviewed the Year 7 Proposed Work Plan. As a result of the Steering Committee meeting, recommendations pertaining to the reallocation of funds for the Year 7 projects had been developed by the Advisory Group; these recommendations were presented for consideration by PTC members. Each Subcommittee would have the opportunity to discuss these recommendations in detail and develop their own proposal for the funding reallocation.

Prior to breaking out into Subcommittees, NEC consultant support representatives for each of the Year 6 projects were introduced to give the full PTC an update on their respective projects. Consultant support members gave updates of the Training

and CVISN Deployment Workshops, Oversize/Overweight Permitting Study, and Credentialing Study projects.

Time was provided at the end of each project summary for questions and answers. Each consultant representative was scheduled to attend their designated Subcommittee meeting, during which additional time was to be provided should questions/issues become too specific for the general session.

John Orban and his team of evaluators from Battelle presented the PTC with their evaluation goals and methodology, results from Roadside Safety Studies, an interim report on focus groups with CVO Safety Inspectors, and evaluation status and plans. Further attention was to be given to the evaluation effort in each of the Subcommittee meetings. Copies of Battelles' presentation are available upon request through consultant support.

### **10:45 a.m. – Break**

A fifteen-minute break was offered with complimentary assorted beverages outside of the general assembly room. Subcommittee meetings were to convene promptly at 11:00 a.m. The Credentialing and Carrier Operations Subcommittee meetings met in conference rooms “C” and “D”, respectively. The Safety Subcommittee remained in the Bayview room.

### **11:00 a.m. – 3 Concurrent Subcommittee Meetings**

|  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| <b>Carrier Operations Subcommittee</b> | Conference Room “C” |
| <b>Credentialing Subcommittee</b>      | Conference Room “D” |
| <b>Safety Subcommittee</b>             | Bayview Room        |

Three concurrent Subcommittee meetings were scheduled to last a majority of the day. This time was to allow each group to review and focus on their specific activities as well as each a decision on the Year 7 Work Plan projects and allocations, and allocations awarded for Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT Funding applications. While many agenda topics were consistent, each Subcommittee spent appropriate time on the following topics:

- □ Evaluation of FOTs,
- □ Update of Year 6 projects
- □ Project monitoring and reporting for Year 6 projects and FOTs
- □ Planning for Year 7 projects:
  - □ reallocation of funds,
  - □ prioritization of projects
  - □ contracting mechanisms
- □ Interoperability Report
- □ Meeting logistics and communications



CVO PTC members were open to attend any Subcommittee meeting they chose. Each Subcommittee was responsible for allocating proper time for each agenda item according to their individual needs. All were required to report-out on their decision points in the 3:00 p.m. general session. Copies of all Subcommittee presentations and handouts are available upon request through consultant support.

### **2:45 p.m. – Break**

A fifteen-minute break was offered compliments of the Corridor Coalition with assorted beverages outside of the general assembly room. The full PTC was scheduled to meet together in the Bayview Room at 3:00 p.m. for Subcommittee Report-Outs.

### **3:00 p.m. – Report Out: Break-Out Sessions**

Each break-out group's facilitator reported their group's results to the full PTC in the Bayview room. Report-outs included each Subcommittee's recommendations on the reallocation of Year 7 funds and projects as well as suggested approach to contracting mechanisms for these new projects. Upon completion of presenting results, the floor was opened for brief discussion with the understanding that final decisions were not to be reached until the final session, scheduled for Wednesday morning. The findings were reported in conjunction with the Subcommittee agendas and presented in the following order:

- □ Credentialing Subcommittee – Nick Owens
- □ Safety Subcommittee – Sgt. Vince Babich
- □ Carrier Operations – Marygrace Parker

### **Credentialing Subcommittee**

The issue of evaluation was considered by the Credentialing Subcommittee. The group felt that all four involved states should be included in the process. The evaluation is currently scheduled to end 12/99, but the Subcommittee felt that a one year extension would ensure that implementation efforts could be fairly evaluated.

The floor was opened up for additional questions regarding the Year 6 projects. No specific questions were raised and the discussion focused on the Credentialing Study. Each state was asked to name a point of contact who would consistently work with the Credentialing Study team during the duration of the project. A briefing was also provided on a meeting of the Credentialing Subcommittee in conjunction with the AAMVA meeting Region I in Harrisburg on July 23, 1999.

Jeff Secrist, of FHWA, has offered to facilitate a meeting between the IRS and the Corridor Coalition representatives to further the discussions pertaining to HVUT.

The question was raised concerning how CVISN states requiring paper verification (HVUT, insurance, etc.) handle the issue of electronic credentialing. Jeff Secrist also agreed to take the lead on this task and report his findings back to the Subcommittee.

The topics of Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT Funding were handled together. The Subcommittee was very concerned about the role of the Subcommittee in these related processes; many felt that the Advisory Group seemed to be making decisions. It was the recommendation of the Subcommittee that the processes be reviewed as well as the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Group, Subcommittee Co-Chairs, Subcommittees and leadership. Some members inquired about the process of becoming an Advisory Group member which led to PTC solicitation in the most recent leadership update to the CVO PTC.

The group agreed with the Year 7 Work Plan as proposed.

## **Safety Subcommittee**

John Orban and the Battelle team continued their evaluation presentation. This portion of the evaluation discussion covered requested information on inspectors, how they perform inspections, what technologies are used, perceptions of technologies, and the questionnaire on the SAFER DATA MAILBOX. Battelle's evaluation is scheduled to end on June 30, 1999, with intention of getting a draft report out no later than the end of August.

FOT Updates related to Safety projects FOT 7, 9, and 10, were given by attending state project managers. Eight presentations were given, one was provided in written format, and two were incomplete. These updates all included a brief overview of the project scope, current status of the budget, accomplishments, barriers encountered and lessons learned, next steps, and finally, suggestions for other states involved or interested in similar projects. All presentations were submitted to consultant support prior to the Providence meeting and were incorporated into Subcommittee handout materials. Copies are available upon request through consultant support.

There were no additional questions related to the Year 6 projects as the three presented are not being managed by the Safety Subcommittee.

Discussions about the Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT Funding applications led to a number of questions regarding the process used as well as the criteria. The issue of hardware was of particular concern to the Safety Subcommittee as it relates to the FOT 7 project and other safety related aspects. The group felt very strongly that the entire Subcommittee should be involved in the review process of future applications processed for Corridor Wide Technical

Assistance as well as for applications for Year 7 funding for Field Implementation Funding Incentives. The group did not agree with the Advisory Group recommendations for the Additional FOT Funding projects due to the perceived problems with the criteria and process. They agreed to have their concerns reported to the group in order to reach some resolve.

Consensus was reached regarding the funding strategy used in the recommended Year 7 Work Plan. Specific changes suggested included removing the Industry Outreach project and incorporating parts of this effort into an existing project and moving the designated \$50,000 to supplement the Field Implementation Funding Incentive.

### **Carrier Operations Subcommittee**

Steve Capecci, of the ATA Foundation, provided the Subcommittee with updates on the current status of FleetForward. FleetForward is currently in the middle of a 6-month demo period in which several carriers are using the system. Reported problems have included the reception of all of the traffic information from the IEN, and these issues are being addressed and resolved. Part of this resolution includes the effort to encourage participating agencies who enter information regarding congestion, accidents or construction, to be diligent in making sure the information is being provided to the IEN.

Evaluation of the FleetForward project was presented by Mike Williamson, of Cambridge Systematics. This presentation covered a summary of recent activities, overview of the strategic plan, review of goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness, discussion of individual test plans, allocation of evaluation resources, proposed evaluation schedule, and remaining evaluation activities. A copy of Mr. Williamson's presentation is available upon request through consultant support.

Year 6 project review discussions focused on the Regional Oversize/Overweight Permitting Study. The committee was slightly confused; Al Karoly brought clarification to the scope of the study. Following discussions, the group supported the study in the event that it was based on the idea of looking at the concept of educating senior management and advancing the idea of a Regional Oversize/Overweight permit among these senior representatives.

The Subcommittee supported the concepts of both Interoperability Resolutions and thought the crafting of letters should be the responsibility of leadership, if pursued. Referencing 99-1, the Subcommittee recommended that the CVO PTC pursue resolutions through discussions at the Steering Committee level. The Subcommittee felt that 99-2 was a good idea, but thought I95 should fund this type of effort before sending the resolution to FHWA.

The Subcommittee approved the recommended Year 7 Work Plan with the suggestion that Industry Outreach be made a high priority project thereby placing it above Senior Management Outreach. The feeling among participants was that it is important that the CVO PTC know what industry is looking for prior to planning for Year 8.

Procurement discussions focused on ensuring that the proper individuals were assigned to appropriate tasks, regardless of what contract mechanism was needed to do this. The Industry Outreach project was suggested to use the NEC procurement vehicle if the correct mix of people were included on the Outreach team. Sole Source was also a discussed option for Industry Outreach in the event the Subcommittee did not fully approve an NEC team. The Subcommittee suggested using the procurement method which would provide the best possible team staffing for every project – not necessarily limited to one method.

#### **4:30 p.m. – OPEN DISCUSSION**

The floor was opened to the PTC for brief discussion and clarification of Subcommittee Report-Outs. Concerns, suggestions, and full discussion were agreed to begin Wednesday morning allowing the group to take a break from it all after a full day's work.

#### **5:00 p.m. – CLOSE**

Kevin Holland formally closed the afternoon's activity and briefly reviewed the following day's schedule.

---

**Wednesday, June 30, 1999**

---

#### **8:30 a.m. – Continental Breakfast**

Continental breakfast was served at 8:30 a.m. just outside of the Bayview Room compliments of the Corridor Coalition.

#### **9:00 a.m. – Good Morning, Recap Report-Out, Discussion and Consensus**

Kevin Holland formally opened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. He reviewed the objective of the morning session - reaching consensus on the Year 7 Work Plan and awards for Corridor Wide Technical Assistance applications. In order to illicit discussion, an overview of the PTC history and process started the meeting presentation. Next, the Corridor Coalition spoke about funding and allocations, and finally a recap of report-out issues and Advisory Group recommendations were presented by

members of the Advisor Group. Upon completion of presenting issues and recommendations, the floor was open for full PTC discussion and final decisions.

The predominant issue was that of the criteria and the process used in evaluating both Corridor Wide Technical Assistance and Additional FOT Funding applications. Some members of the PTC had concerns with specific recommendations resulting from the process while others looked at the process itself. The application process for Additional FOT Funding has been closed, so the group was charged with reaching an agreement on the projects which had been submitted. The Corridor Wide Technical Assistance application process is ongoing so the group needed to reach decisions on the projects currently submitted as well as how to handle these applications going forward. A refined process would be applied to the Year 7 project of Field Implementation Funding Incentive. The group decided to form a Guidelines Review Committee who would work with leadership and consultant support to clarify the criteria and process used in evaluating applications. This work would be completed in mid-August, submitted to the Advisory Group for consideration, and then released to the full PTC by September 1, 1999.

The following tables summarize the final CVO PTC decisions related to the Year 7 Work Plan, Corridor Wide Technical Assistance projects and Additional FOT Funding projects.

#### **Year 7 Work Plan**

| <b>Priority</b> | <b>Project</b>                            | <b>Funding Amount</b>                                       |
|-----------------|---|---|
| #1              | Field Implementation Funding Incentive    | \$500,000   |
| #2              | Senior Management Outreach (OS/OW Permit) | \$50,000  |
| #3              | Industry Outreach                         | \$50,000  |
| #4              | CVISN Deployment Workshops                | \$16,700 (to be supplemented with \$64,000 from CWTA funds) |

#### **Corridor Wide Technical Assistance Projects**

| <b>State</b>  | <b>Project</b>         | <b>Funding Amount</b> |
|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Massachusetts | Wireless Data Design   | \$50,000              |
| Connecticut   | Web Site Development   | \$10,000              |
|               | CVISN Proof of Concept | \$50,000              |
| New York      | Van Deployment         | \$20,000              |
| Corridor-Wide | CVISN Workshops        | \$64,000              |

### Additional FOT Funding Projects

| State        | Project | Funding Amount |
|--------------|---------|----------------|
| Connecticut  | FOT 9   | \$175,000      |
| Maryland     | FOT 8   | \$40,000       |
|              | FOT 10  | \$50,000       |
|              | FOT 9   | \$10100        |
| Rhode Island | FOT 7   | \$75,000       |
| New York     | FOT 7   | \$59,000       |

#### 10:30 a.m. – Next Steps

Kevin Holland summarized the meeting results, and graciously thanked the full PTC for their attendance, participation, and support. Consultant support is responsible for following up with the Guidelines Review Group and refining the criteria and process for Advisory Group review. An Advisory Group meeting will be scheduled for late August, and the next semi-annual meeting of the CVO PTC is targeted for the Fall of 1999 to be held in the Philadelphia area.

#### 11:30 a.m. – Meeting Adjourns

The floor was opened for any comments, suggestions or questions. All issues were addressed and Kevin Holland formally closed the CVO PTC meeting.