



**I-95 CORRIDOR  
COALITION**

*I-95 Corridor Coalition, CVO Program Group*

## **CVO Program Leadership Meeting**

---

Date: Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Attending: Kevin Holland, Dan Smyser, Dennis Keck, John Baniak, Jeff Gaber, Al Karoly, Mike Eadicicco, Nick Owens, Bob Pritchard, Tricia Faust, Ron Smalley, Chris Hill, Cheryl Roe, Richard Easley, Shelley Feese, Lew Frese

Location: Brandywine Suites Hotel, Wilmington, Delaware

Time: 9:00 a.m. thru 5:00 p.m.

---

### Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
  2. Obtain consensus understanding on the I-95 Corridor Coalition's reorganization
  3. Identify issues, solutions and actions that need to be addressed to move FOT's ahead
  4. Develop strategy, as applicable and desirable, for positioning I-95 Corridor Coalition states to receive future CVISN funding
  5. Obtain consensus on proposed CVO Program Track reorganization
  6. Strategy for increasing industry participation and outreach
  7. Funding strategies
  8. Close
- 

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the current status and plans for the future of the CVO Program Track. The above agenda was distributed prior to the meeting and was used as a basis for guiding discussion. A meeting facilitator, Lew Frese, was in attendance to assist the group in staying with the agenda items as well as mediating the discussions of sensitive topics.

### INTRODUCTIONS

The group, led by Lew Frese, performed a self-introduction exercise briefly stating their names and affiliations to the CVO Program Track.

### CVO OVERVIEW

Copies of the agenda, 2 pages from the business plan, committee bullets and an organization structure piece were given to all attending. Jeff Gaber took the group through a general review of the history of the CVO Program Track through its "re-organization" to being one of 8 total program tracks. He also provided a brief listing of the other program tracks and an explanation of how this "re-organization" allows for Program Track Committee input, agency representation and consultant support.

### GENERAL CVO TOPICS

Dennis Keck brought to the group's attention the need to recognize the different interests represented within the CVO Track and the need to remain aware of the interests in the approach to all CVO activities.

Mike Eadicicco addressed the topic of CVO PTC membership, which has continued to increase and stands at approximately 190 members. The need to manage this large a group while still representing the issues and ideas is

an on-going challenge. It is agreed that overall, the Working Group Meetings are not effective and that a plan needs to include how they can be made more productive.

Kevin Holland addresses the concern that TRC's may need to "pull back" and complete what they have undertaken in order to, eventually implement national programs. Additionally, it was noted that the FOT's are getting strained with their efforts.

Tricia Faust suggests a committee to help with the efforts and get information to the states and carriers. She points out the need for TRC's to be more coordinated within the corridor and the FOT's with each other. Perhaps a committee could also assist with the posed membership issue.

The topic of moving a piece of work or idea through the process led to scattered discussion – interjections of "what our jobs are", "what our task is", "how do we do it?", "how do we build consensus?"

### CONCENSUS ON PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

The topics above lent themselves to the fact that the group needed to come to an agreement as to what was to be accomplished during the meetings. With the help of the facilitator, a plan of approach was discussed and agreed upon.

First, the facilitator helped the group to identify "our role" as based on the open discussion.

### OUR ROLE

- Build consensus
- Engage them in dealing with their diverse needs
- Facilitate their process
- Play to their strengths
- Deal with the diversity of different missions of each constituent group
- Get the projects done

Second, the facilitator identified categories into which these roles fit.

### CATEGORIES

- Process
- Action
- Representation
- Strategic thinking (added with John Baniak's comment that leadership needs to look forward to develop a mission)

Third, the facilitator had each member of the group write down clear ideas of "what we will walk away with from this meeting". Each member contributed his/her ideas to the following list:

### GOALS

- Desired outcome: show/create value for \$ spent
- What is the program and what do we want to accomplish
- Short, medium and long term issues to focus on
- Clear understanding of roles and responsibilities of leadership, staff and consultants, TRC chairs and the CVO Steering Committee
- Assign responsibilities for implementation
- Plan to develop a workable and effective organizational structure and
- Plan of action we can all agree on
- Understand how to deal with universal issues and how leadership will handle these appropriately
- How are we going to get there
- Clear well defined action plan
- What are mechanisms we use to develop annual work plan and what is management structure to support it?
- Protocol for implementing issues/activities as understood by everybody
- How to define a mechanism for communicating information to other coalitions

Forth, the facilitator had the group identify the items which require action; they are as follows:

**ACTION ITEMS**

- I. Reassess the Current FOT's
  - Redefine goals and objectives
  - Examine present status
  - Consistency with national architecture
  - Opportunities for joint development
  
- II. Establish Organizational Structure
  - Address policy/program/legislative issues
  - Coordinate FOT's
  - Promote knowledge/information exchange
  - Promote/pursue regional agreements
  
- III. Identify Funding Opportunities and Sources
  
- IV. Bring non-participating states into I-95
  
- V. Complete State and Regional Business Plans

Fifth, the facilitator broke the group into 3 breakout groups to develop their interpretations of the “Why, Who and How” the above mentioned action items, or “What” items. Each breakout group had a spokesperson who reported to the group and the facilitator assisted in reducing the 3 group’s approaches into the following format for discussion and consensus on Thursday, April 23, 1998.

<b>“WHAT” – RE-ASSESS CURRENT FOT's</b>		
<b>HOW</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>Group #1</b>		
Determine status	TRC Chairs w/ support of support/evaluation consultant	August 1, 1998
Assess progress vs original plan	“”	“”
Redefine as necessary	“”	“”
<b>Group #2</b>		
Identify funding sources and opportunities	TRC's	June 1, 1998
Create a baseline template	“”	June 1, 1998
Identify areas of improvement from template	“”	End of June, 1998
Redefine goals and objectives	“”	“”
Identify joint development opportunities	“”	“”
<b>Group #3</b>		
Complete FOT's		
Create accountability	Leadership	60 days
Provide technical support to TRC's	Consultants	30 days
Determine where are FOT's	“”	“”
Advisory Committee to provide evaluation	Leadership	60 days
Advance the Federal evaluation	“”	“”

<b>“WHAT” – BRING NON-PARTICIPATING STATES INTO I-95</b>		
<b>HOW</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>Group #2</b>		
Identify key contacts	CC staff & consultants	July, 1998
Outreach & information sharing	“”	“”
<b>Group #3</b>		
Supply non-participating states with information	CC staff	On-going
<b>“WHAT” – COMPLETE STATE &amp; REGIONAL BUSINESS PLANS</b>		
<b>HOW</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>Group #2</b>		
State business plan	States w/ support from M.S. champions	September, 1998
Regional business plan	“”	September, 1998
Develop draft	“”	July, 1998
Circulate for comment	“”	August, 1998
Review comment	“”	
Finalize for Workgroup “buy-in”	“”	September, 1998
<b>Group #3</b>		
Regional coordination plan		End of June, 1998
<b>Group #1</b>		
Complete Regional Coordination Plan	Consultants	June, 1998
Draft outline to workgroup	“”	“”
Regional meetings to get buy-off	“”	“”
<b>“WHAT” – ESTABLISH ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE</b>		
<b>HOW</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>Group #2</b>		
Re-assess our current organization	Co-chairs, TRC chairs, consultants and PTC	September, 1998
Revise/redefine as necessary	“”	“”
<b>Group #3</b>		
Define skill/knowledge set of technical, policy/planning, enforcement, etc.	Coalition Leadership and staff	mid May, 1998
Establish evaluation criteria to recruitment process & term limits (i.e. – formal solicitation, merit based evaluation, submit recommendations to Steering Committee)	“”	“”
Appoint Program Track Committee Leaders & Co-chairs	Steering Committee	June 1, 1998
New Leadership Meeting Transition Plan	Existing plus new Leadership	June 15, 1998
Identify Sub-Committees to support PTC (these replace TRCs’ roles & responsibilities)	PTC Leadership & Coalition Staff	To Be Determined

<b>“WHAT” – ESTABLISH ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE</b>		
<b>HOW</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<i>continued</i>		
Solicit applications for and appoint Steering Committee chairs	PTC Leadership & Co-chairs	“”
<b>Group # 1</b>		
Leadership remains	Kevin Holland & Dan Smyser	Now
Advisory Board is formed	Leadership, TRC chairs, co-chairs and other appointees	“”
Sub-Committees	Chaired by TRC’s	“”
Workgroup		“”
<b>“WHAT” IDENTIFY FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES &amp; SOURCES</b>		
<b>HOW</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHEN</b>
<b>Group #1, #2, &amp; #3</b>		
State	Consultant	September, 1998
Federal		
Private		

End day one.

Date: Thursday, April 23, 1998

Attending: Kevin Holland, Dan Smyser, Jeff Gaber, Al Karoly, Nick Owens, Chris Hill, Richard Easley, Shelley Feese, Lew Frese

Location: Brandywine Suites Hotel, Wilmington, Delaware

Time: 9:00 a.m. thru 12:00 p.m.

#### Agenda

1. Recap of April 22<sup>nd</sup> discussions
2. Obtain general consensus on Consultant Team work plan
3. Close

The size of the group was greatly reduced on the second day of meetings. The table generated from the prior day’s meeting represents the input of the full group. The purpose of this meeting was to come to a consensus regarding the current status and future direction of the CVO Program Track.

Discussions began about the five action items, or “Whats”, from the day prior:

- I. Reassess the Current FOT’s
  - Redefine goals and objectives
  - Examine present status
  - Consistency with national architecture
  - Opportunities for joint development
- II. Establish Organizational Structure
  - Address policy/program/legislative issues
  - Coordinate FOT’s
  - Promote knowledge/information exchange
  - Promote/pursue regional agreements
- III. Identify Funding Opportunities and Sources
- IV. Bring non-participating states into I-95
- V. Complete State and Regional Business Plans

The group agreed that the approaches defined by each breakout group in accomplishing the five defined actions were not excessively different, less the timelines in some cases. The group agreed there is only one year remaining for the FOT’s and with the next CVO PTC meeting in the fall, time is a primary concern.

The most difficult agreement to reach was that of specific actions regarding the organizational structure, particularly that of the Advisory Committee and the process of generating consensus from the PTC as well as the TRC chairs. The facilitator sketched out the groups’ perceived Advantages and Disadvantages of utilizing the Group #3 approach to this issue. (*see table above*)

#### ADVANTAGES

- Build consensus from member agencies up
- Can develop buy-in
- Sellable to Steering Committee
- Commitment, participation and representation all increase
- Participatory

#### DISADVANTAGES

- Supports inertia currently experienced
- Participatory
- Time consuming/labor intensive
- Complicates things
- Could make it hard to complete the FOT evaluations

Consensus represents the following Action List:

#### ACTION LIST

- I. Establish the Interim Organizational Structure which will act while the Group #3 approach develops
  - Establish an Interim Advisory Committee to work with leadership as we move ahead to specifically
    - help review the current structure of the CVO Program track and recommend changes
    - determine what skill mix is required in the leadership group to provide proper representation
    - critique the current TRC structure, and
    - evaluate the effectiveness of subcommittees to expand on the TRC’s current functions

II. Finish FOT's

- Perform a current status update and complete a report by the end of May
- Determine changes which may have been necessary in the original scope of work
- Re-establish benchmarks pertaining to the FOT's as to what is feasible to accomplish

III. Industry Market Assessment Survey and Forum

- Conduct a market assessment survey of the I-95 industry to gauge needs and concerns pertaining to ITS/CVO
- Increase the level of industry participation
- Develop a one-day industry forum including state trucking association, owner/operator, and motor coach representatives

IV. Regional Coordination Plan

- Complete Regional Plan according to outline determined in Boston
- Obtain PTC input through regional forums held between May and June

V. I-95 CVO Program Track work Plan

- Develop Annual Work Plan with proposed budget for next fiscal year
- Obtain PTC input through regional forums held between May and June

VI. Fall CVO Program Track Meeting

- Finalize Regional Coordination Plan and 1999 Annual Workplan

VII. Re-do the Timeline

Chris Hill presented the following timeline of tasks for comment by the group. Everyone agreed that these were not only the tasks which needed to be completed, but the aggressive schedule would be effective. Details of the tasks will be developed by Nick Owens, Chris Hill and support staff over the next 2 weeks for submission and approval.

5/1/98	6/1/98	7/1/98	8/1/98	9/1/98	10/1/98
Co-Chair Letter	Draft Regional Plan	Advisory Committee Meeting		Complete Plan Out	CVO Program Track Meeting
FOT Review	FOT Assessment			Advisory Committee Meeting	CVISN Workshop
Scope Market Research	Develop Support Materials - FOT's	Regional Meetings Scheduled			Best Practices Panel
	Regional Meeting Planning				Plan Ratification
	Market Research				
	STA Forum		<b>FINALIZED PLAN</b>		