



**I-95 CORRIDOR
COALITION**

**MEETING MINUTES
CVO Program Track Committee**

November 13 – 14,, 2000
Crystal City, Virginia

AGENDA (November 13, 2000):

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review
2. Review of CVO PTC Status and Activity (2/00 – 11/00)
3. Participation and Roles
4. Procurement Issues
5. Break
6. Project Status
7. Oversight and Monitoring
8. Accountability and Reporting
9. Review Day-2 Agenda/Close Day-1

AGENDA (November 14, 2000):

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review
2. Year 9 Work Plan Overview
3. Review Executive Board Guidance
4. Review Work Plan Submission Schedule
5. Review Match Credit Requirements
6. Break
7. Review Year 9 Project Submissions
8. Review Current Unused CVO PTC Funds
9. Discuss Previous Work Plan Submissions
10. Decide Next Steps in Work Plan Development
11. Close CVO PTC Semi-Annual Meeting

Monday, November 13, 2000 (1:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.)

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Marygrace Parker, I-95 Corridor Coalition staff, opened the semi-annual meeting in support of the CVO PTC. Opening remarks included appreciation for the participants in both the CVO PTC meeting and ITS-CVO Deployment Forum held in conjunction. The emphasis of the CVO PTC semi-annual meeting was introduced as a need to gather constructive feedback and ideas, from

the volunteer participants, for successful future growth with the possibility of restructuring the way the CVO PTC approaches its activity. Revitalization of the CVO PTC, Advisory Group and Subcommittee participation was also introduced as an emphasis for the two-day meeting with a strong desire to elect additional leadership to assist in the many on-going projects within the CVO PTC. Agendas for both the CVO PTC meeting and Eastern States ITS-CVO Deployment Forum were reviewed with the group as many participants were attending all sessions. Introductory remarks included appreciation, on behalf of the I-95 Corridor Coalition, to meet in conjunction with FMCSA in promotion of the value and importance of the CVISN program. Due to the schedule of many other professional meetings and seminars throughout November, the CVO PTC and Forum agendas had been best-tailored to address as many potential conflicts with specific session topics and interest groups in order to not exclude any participants; the Coalition expressed concern and acknowledgement toward any group who may have experienced scheduling conflicts with the 4-day meeting.

Review of CVO PTC Status and Activity (2/00 – 11/00)

Prior to reviewing the recent CVO PTC activities, Marygrace Parker gave a brief history and overview of the PTC for the benefit of participants from outside of the Coalition states. The review went back approximately four years when ATIS-related ideas first grew into the recognition of CVO and other ITS initiatives as pertinent. The CVO PTC developed through the identified need to bring multiple agencies and organizations to the table and best address the myriad of issues related to the CVO industry. The group has grown quickly, accomplished a lot and has benefited from a generous amount of funding for CVO-related projects.

The Advisory Group, a smaller representation of the full PTC, was formed to help address issues and reach consensus through smaller, more frequent meetings. The Advisory Group took a very comprehensive look at the CVO PTC program in Philadelphia (2/00). In order to best determine the status of this large, growing program, the Advisory Group and the Coalition staff chose to focus their attentions on accountability, reporting, project status, and long-term planning. As a result of taking such a comprehensive inventory of the overall CVO program, the full PTC supported concentrating on current projects and unused funding and submit a minimal request for Year 8 funding. This action allowed for the continued pursuit of proven, successful activities (training for Corridor states, Fleet Forward II, IFTA web based filing) without compromising momentum, while not diminishing the level of focus on completing currently funded activities. The Year 8 Work Plan was submitted and approved in March, 2000. The I-95 Steering Committee supported the CVO PTC's focus on accountability and reporting during a July, 2000, meeting. The Advisory Group reconvened in August, 2000, to specifically address project status and organizational structure. A number of staffing changes within participating state agencies have left vacancies within the CVO PTC leadership structure. The focus of the semi-annual meeting was clearly stated to reinvigorate and redirect the volunteer-base of the program as well as determine what the Coalition staff and leadership can do to assist the volunteers in successfully pursuing projects and work plans.

Participation and Roles

In order to determine how best to redirect the volunteer base, Marygrace reviewed with the group the specific changes in leadership positions and participation since the last semi-annual meeting. Discussion points covered the decrease in full PTC attendance, the State Contact program initiated in late 1999, Committee and Subcommittee Co-Chair vacancies, and the Advisory

Group. Solicitation for interest in leadership positions had been distributed to the full PTC resulting in no responses. In light of the number of positions currently open and the potential vacancies related to term-year options, the Coalition asked the group to seriously consider participating at the leadership level. Coalition staff would welcome the opportunity to talk off-line to anyone interested.

Participants were asked to offer ideas on how to increase participation at both the membership and leadership levels. Leadership addressed possible issues which may have proved to be deterrents such as meeting locations and dates as well as frequency of meetings. The group agreed that meeting locations and dates have not been prohibitive for this committee. Members offered that there is a degree of difficulty in getting approval and having time to participate in the many meetings held within and outside of the PTC which relate to their roles and interests. Increasingly, members are finding redundancies within the meetings and greater difficulty in then justifying travel/leave with their supervisors. Discussions continued to cover the pros and cons of “piggy-backing” meetings with other events such as Subcommittee meetings in conjunction with CVSA or AAMVA meetings. Pros included the advantage of having key people present and increased travel cost efficiencies; cons included the length of meetings as members are forced to extend into the evenings in order to not disrupt existing agendas. Leadership agreed to look closely at the calendar of events scheduled throughout the year in consideration of reasonable scheduling efficiencies.

The group was asked to offer ideas on how to best manage and monitor current projects as well as develop a Year 9 Work Plan in lieu of the current organizational structure and vacancies. The idea of Task Forces was introduced as an alternative to Subcommittees with the intent of allowing specific focus on topics/projects and avoiding the conflicts experienced by members involved in projects housed within separate Subcommittees. Participants had mixed perceptions of this approach offering the possibility of discontinuities as projects completed and the task force disbanded. Support of the Subcommittee structure was also recognized for the need to keep expertise focused on certain project areas. The need to allow members to participate in the areas which relate to their interests and expertise was supported by the group in order to make efficient use of volunteer time. Consideration was given to varying Subcommittee participation based on multi-jurisdictional projects and employing a task force, of sorts, who would focus on a project under the supervision of the Subcommittee. No conclusion was reached, at this time, pertaining to the operational direction of the PTC.

Coalition staff asked the group to share whether they felt “supported” in their efforts within the PTC activities. While the group felt supported in their efforts, there was agreement that projects, in general, are not multi-jurisdictional and therefore do not benefit other member states to the fullest. Related to this sentiment, the group related the funding of single-jurisdictional efforts as a potential reason for decreased participation as those who have not received funding do not participate and feel they will not benefit from attending. The group expressed an interest in pursuing projects with more regional emphasis. Leadership acknowledged the need to develop a formal strategy which fits the vision of the group.

A regional benefit recognized by the group was that of the Training effort. Members expressed an interest in assisting remaining and smaller states in completing their training through adaptation of materials used to better reflect the changes since the Pilot and Prototype states were involved. Members expressed the need to be able to take something back from these meetings in the form of information exchange, relationship building, or project sharing. The Coalition staff reminded the group to take advantage of the Coalition Connection web site (www.I95coalition.org)

to post information, pose questions, share technologies and lessons learned through varying project approaches.

Procurement Issues

Dan Smyser, CVO PTC Chair, addressed the group and reiterated the need for increased participation and asked for assistance in leadership. Mr. Smyser offered to discuss any options for redirecting the organizational structure in order to better meet participants' needs in terms of time commitment, travel, etc., and would also welcome the opportunity to talk off-line with any members.

Dan Smyser reviewed the importance of understanding the procurement options as it relates to current projects as well as in developing the Year 9 Work Plan. There have been questions and concerns regarding the rules and regulations pertaining to procuring work and projects through the Corridor Coalition and leadership wanted to have an open discussion with the group to assist in clarifying the vehicles and options as well as any misconceptions. The current vehicle for procurement is through the PB Team and the state of Connecticut by simply adding work orders; if the PB Team does not offer the capabilities needed to best complete the work necessary, a new procurement mechanism may be sought. In order to utilize a different procurement vehicle, any state within the Corridor must be willing to act as a procurement state. Under this scenario, the procurement details must comply with the rules of that state. While it would take some procedural time to get a new procurement in place, if the states feel the need to pursue it, it can and will be done.

Leadership stressed the importance of remaining accountable for all projects as we go forward and consider the need to position, and champion, projects properly in order to determine whether an additional procurement vehicle is necessary in the planning phases. Discussions included the inability to procure directly through agencies such as NPTC and ATA which are dictated by the legalities of the procurement and not meant as a deterrent for these members to submit project ideas or participate in PTC activities. The Advisory Group had suggested, In August, 2000, the formation of a Funding Task Force to help address these issues on behalf of the members and the Coalition. Clarifications were made regarding the submission of project ideas and championing work cautioning that upon approval, the work may not necessarily be directed to whomever submitted after following Federal parameters and guidelines. Coalition staff is available to answer any questions and assist in pursuing viable procurement options.

Project Status

A chronological review of all CVO PTC projects was summarized for the group in order to give the participants a comprehensive idea of where the program stands in terms of funding and activities. This exercise would prove most important as the group is asked to approach the development of the Year 9 Work Plan.

A majority of Year 5 projects are nearing the formal completion phase; the process to formally close a project was reviewed. Upon completion of a project, each project manager must make certain that all invoices have cleared and then provide Marygrace Parker, Coalition Staff, with a request to close the project. Some Year 5 projects have submitted approved Changes in Scope and are pursuing newly stated objectives and timelines for completion. In particular, FOT 8 – Electronic Credentialing, has been a very difficult project for all participating states. This project

proved a much greater task than originally anticipated by states in Year 5 resulting in necessary reductions in scope and more realistic perceptions of available funding. Another lesson learned through the Year 5 projects related to the procurement vehicle utilized in FOT 10 – Safety Management involving three states and other member agencies and universities. Leadership stressed the importance of applying the lessons learned from different projects as we approach program planning activities.

Dan Smyser was CVO Co-Chair representing the Year 6 Work Plan to the Executive Board and he offered some insight to the difficulty in asking for a “pot of money” as in Additional FOT Funding and Corridor Wide Technical Assistance funding projects. While these projects were approved and funded, they proved damaging to the program and the participating states. Additional FOT Funding has recently been released to the states who were awarded project approval and these project managers have been asked to review project timelines, staffing plans, etc., to ensure they will be reflective of the delay in start-up. The Corridor Wide Technical Assistance (CWTA) funds have proved instrumental in benefiting states as they complete the CVISN Workshops through the CVISN State Advisor roles. Some funds remain in this project and leadership advised the group that some of the smaller states have expressed an interest in securing some of these funds in pursuit of training. The group supported this in theory and leadership also urged any ideas which are multi-jurisdictional to be recommended for these funds. Participants suggested that CVISN project managers from states which have completed the work shops share their lessons learned, and even participate in the training of the smaller states, for the benefit of information exchange and coordinating CVISN teams in such a large learning curve environment. FMCSA also offered the idea of utilizing the Peer to Peer Program to assist in the CVISN related activities which may be difficult for the states. Leadership strongly reinforced the support of the Federal programs and/or the use of CWTA funds in promoting the success of the training and deployment efforts. Other Year 6 projects are reaching completion such as the IRP Study and the OS/OW Permitting Study while the Credentialing Study has been cancelled and is under review by the committee.

Year 7 projects include the combined Outreach efforts designed to get higher-level support for the permitting efforts as well as increase overall industry participation. Due to the current leadership vacancies, this is one effort which is currently under the management of the full Advisory Group versus a specific Subcommittee. Scopes of Work are being reviewed for this combined effort and work has been allocated through the PB Team. Training efforts continue within the Corridor with a current emphasis on the smaller states and their specific needs. These states have been recently contacted and training activities, modified in approach and material content with the help of PTC members, JHU/APL and FMCSA, may begin as early as Spring, 2001. As details are determined, the PTC will be informed in order to coordinate activities as well as offer other states the option to send new staff to the trainings held. Space may be limited in these training sessions but leadership will work with interested states in getting new staff trained.

The Year 8 Work Plan, as stated earlier in the meeting, was a very focused and modest submission on the part of the CVO PTC in an effort to concentrate on current activities as well as utilize un-used funds within the CVO Program Track rather than ask for additional funds. The Training effort received additional funds to supplement remaining Year 6 money and ATIS for CVO (FleetForward II) was also awarded funding from the Year 8 allocations. An additional effort supported by the CVO PTC, the IFTA project for web-based filing of tax returns, was funded from the existing Year 7 funds for Field Implementation Funding Incentives. While the IFTA project was approved at the same time as the Year 8 Work Plan was developed, leadership wanted to clarify the source of funds as Year 7.

Dan Smyser closed the meeting, Day 1, activities upon completion of project review and program status to date. Mr. Smyser asked the group to consider the topics covered through the day's agenda as they would be approaching the Year 9 Work Plan on Day 2 and would need to focus on some important decisions.

In closing, Ed Logsdon of Kentucky, offered the CVO PTC and the I-95 Corridor Coalition great praise and support of their efforts through cooperative efforts and dedication. Mr. Logsdon reminded the group of its importance and urged participants to not be discouraged by the inevitable stumbling blocks through pioneering changes and improvements in this important industry.

Tuesday, November 14, 2000 (9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Dan Smyser welcomed the participants to the morning session and reviewed the day's agenda with a preview of the afternoon Eastern States ITS-CVO Deployment Forum beginning at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Smyser recapped the prior day's activity and asked the group to reiterate some of the decision and discussion points regarding organizational structure, leadership positions, and consideration of developing the Year 9 Work Plan. With no suggestions for how to approach these issues, Dan suggested to the membership continuing to utilize the Advisory Group for all decision making points. Membership agreed and leadership agreed to coordinate an Advisory Group meeting during which the issue of organizational structure and leadership positions would be specifically addressed.

Oversight and Monitoring

In completion of the prior day's agenda, the group looked at the issues of Oversight and Monitoring of projects in light of the current organizational structure. Dan Smyser expressed the need to find, at least, an interim approach to these tasks in order to avoid potential problems as well as complete a sensible Year 9 Work Plan for submission in February, 2001. Two issues addressed were funding and staffing changes as both have impacted the way certain projects have progressed. As stated earlier, the Advisory Group had recommended the establishment of a Funding Task Force to look at scenarios involving procurement, delays in funding, and possible methods of streamlining processes. Project delays have resulted in missed opportunities, lost momentum as well as critical staff turn-over within the life cycle of project timelines. Scenarios of staff turnover include Subcommittee Co-Chairs and project champions who have left their state/agency positions prior to the completion of certain projects; leadership stressed the importance of being prepared to handle changes in key staff seamlessly so as not to interrupt project activity. The Advisory Group will be addressing these issues at the next meeting.

Accountability and Reporting

Accountability and reporting have been primary themes of the CVO PTC since the last semi-annual meeting. Accountability has been increased in consultant services, project contacts, and in the CVO PTC overall program as seen through compliance with Changes in Scope for projects and better reporting compliance. At the Philadelphia, 2000 meeting, the Quarterly Reporting process had just been initiated by the Corridor Coalition. The process and the actual reporting form have been modified after each cycle to make reporting as easy and accurate as possible for project contacts. The form is now e-mailed to project contacts in two files which allows each contact to review what he/she submitted last quarter and easily complete the new form and e-mail it back to PB. The CVO PTC has improved greatly in reporting compliance and should soon have a number of projects formally closed from this process. Any project contact who is having difficulty closing a project from the Quarterly Reporting cycle should contact Marygrace Parker, Coalition staff, for assistance.

Year 9 Work Plan Overview

Dan Smyser reviewed some of the important guidelines and issues for the group to keep in mind as they discussed the development of the Year 9 Work Plan. The Executive Board was scheduled to meet later the same week as the CVO PTC meeting so there was no new guidance issued but the Executive Board had instructed program tracks to utilize the Year 8 guidance in the interim. The schedule for submission requires each program track to submit their work plan by February 1, 2001, with appropriate match credit requirements met. While the total of available funding is not known, it is estimated at approximately \$3 million for all program tracks; the Executive Board strongly recommended that each program track look back to their Year 8 Work Plans and consider any partially funded or tabled projects when developing their Year 9 submissions.

The group reviewed past submissions, work plan focus, and total funding for program Years 5, 6, 7, and 8. The focus of the Year 5 Work Plan (\$3,876,160) was to secure “seed” money for the member states to undertake projects in the categories of Safety, Electronic Credentialing and Electronic Screening. The Year 6 Work Plan (\$1,850,000) supplemented the “seeded” projects and defined studies to assist the Corridor in pursuit of specific issues. The Year 7 Work Plan (\$616,700) concentrated on implementation-based projects and outreach efforts. Finally, the Year 8 Work Plan (\$175,000) followed the PTC’s dedication to current project success and utilizing existing funds while continuing the training effort.

Review Executive Board Guidance

The guidance issued for the Year 8 Work Plan was to be considered in this planning cycle as well. In order to approach the planning discussions properly, Dan Smyser led the group through a review of the guidance including:

- Focus on CVO PTC Goals and Objectives
- Plan for longer term
- Consider intermodal needs, information exchange, education, and training needs
- Identify partnering opportunities with other program tracks, associations, and organizations

- Assess performance

Project ideas should also consider:

- Consistency with TEA-21 goals
- Identification of components to integrate/deploy
- Consistency with National Architecture
- Identification of applicable ITS standards
- Service as testing site
- Inclusion of agreement to evaluate benefits/costs either nationally or independently
- Consideration of match requirements
- Inclusion of a long-term, agreed upon O&M plan

Members pointed out the particular importance of coordinating their CVO and state Intermodal activities. Leadership both supported and urged this specific recognition within the CVO community.

Review Work Plan Submission Schedule

The following schedule represents the development, submission and approval timeline for the Year 9 Work Plan. Dan Smyser reviewed the dates and stressed the urgency in addressing the work plan.

- October 1, 2000** – solicitation for project ideas distributed to CVO PTC through the e-mail distribution list due back November 3, 2000
- February 1, 2001** – Year 9 Work Plan proposals due from each Program Track Committee
- March, 2001** – Steering Committee Meeting, review Year 9 Work Plans submitted by each track, approve recommendations to the Executive Board
- May, 2001** – Executive Board Meeting, adoption of Year 9 Program
- June 1, 2001** – Work Plan letter to FHWA

Leadership suggested the group develop project ideas and priorities by mid-December for full development of project plans for review in mid-January, allowing for incorporation of comments in time for the February 1, 2001 due date.

Review Match Credit Requirements

Prior to discussing specific project ideas, leadership reviewed the match credit requirements for different types of projects. Coalition staff urged to group to not be discouraged by match requirements as they may already be eligible for the match. Projects are categorized as either integration/deployment projects, or general support activities which typically take the form of training, studies, or administrative activities. As many of the projects of interest to the group are deployment related, this match credit category was explained first. This project category requires a 50%/50% match but 20% of the 50% match can take the form of cash, equipment or personnel (as long as these items are not double billed) and the remaining 30% of the 50% match may come from other Federally funded ITS projects. The Coalition staff is available to any member to discuss project ideas and possible approaches to meeting match credit requirements.

Review Year 9 Project Submissions

No project ideas had been submitted in response to the solicitation distributed in October, 2000. Leadership expressed concern for how the group would like to approach the development and submission process. Leadership stressed the importance of the committee's role in the directing the efforts of the program.

Review Current Unused CVO PTC Funds

Dan Smyser asked the group to consider the unused funds available to the CVO PTC through the Corridor Wide Technical Assistance funds. The total available (not including the possible debits per recently received applications) is \$150,000. Leadership reminded the group of the importance of showing legitimate need/use of any unallocated funds as the group applies for additional program monies. The group remained in support of utilizing the CWTA funds to assist the smaller states in completing training successfully. Agreement remains that the CWTA funds would not be unallocated beyond the next couple of months.

Review of Previous Work Plan Submissions

The group was asked if there were any project ideas to be verbally presented for open discussion. The first idea offered to the group pertained to Diesel Emissions Testing. This testing is handled differently throughout the Corridor states. The idea proposed involved connecting ASPEN and SAFER to the Diesel Emissions Inspection with the idea of a multi-jurisdictional approach in mind. Dan Smyer asked the members if there was interest in this project. Five states (MD, NJ, NY, MA, and CT) offered support and interest in participating. Ideas related to this project included the collection of data, where data would be entered (ASPEN – new version), use and purpose of sharing data/information, and possible organizations which may be able to assist in approaching these topics (CVSA, February, 2001 meeting). The group agreed to pursue this project idea with the expressed intent of having a solid conceptual idea by mid-January, 2001.

Leadership asked the group whether they felt the Training effort may need to be continued. The Coalition, FMCSA and the full PTC all feel that the Training efforts have been successful and have achieved very positive results. While the Year 8 approach to Training for Smaller States addresses the adaptation of materials and work shops, leadership suggested we poll further to determine whether this effort may continue into Year 9. Currently, NH, VT, ME and DE have expressed interest in the Training courses with the approach approved in the Year 8 Work Plan.

Through work on the OS/OW project and coordination with NASTO, there is a possibility that NASTO may approach the Corridor Coalition for assistance in supporting efforts related to impediments and institutional issues. NASTO has been relatively unsupported to date and may need assistance in how to move the issues forward formally. Marygrace Parker will follow-up with NASTO.

Member states who did not receive earmarks for CVISN related activities through the last appropriations bill inquired about the possibility of trying to get funding through the program track, possibly through the Work Plan vehicle. Leadership understood the nature of the request but determined it unlikely to be a vehicle for any single state; a regionalized CVISN effort was supported as a more likely submission to receive approval and funding. Members all agreed that

the importance of keeping momentum through deployments is critical especially in states just completing the CVISN Design Work Shops. The group agreed that this approach will require a very specific inventory of “where we are” as well as next steps involved in assisting the Corridor states in CVISN deployment.

The idea of Electronic Screening through a web based enrollment for any jurisdiction was offered. There was expressed interest among the group to look into the benefits and impact on the region as a whole. The project idea will be further developed.

Participants inquired about Federal progress with Optical Readers. While the topic could not be addressed at the moment, FMCSA and the Coalition staff will follow-up and distribute some information to the group through the web site and e-mail list.

Transponder Administration was discussed briefly among participants involved with Electronic Screening. It was agreed that the topic was more complex than may be perceived and if the idea were to include tolls and screening, a very serious dialogue was necessary. Scenarios involving a seed-money approach to a low-cost/high-impact project, CWTA funds were suggested. Leadership suggested utilizing the Coalition web site to establish these dialogues with the membership.

In closing project discussions, members suggested a possible “inventory of projects/activities” of what each state is pursuing and actively involved in to get a better idea of possible multi-jurisdictional projects; this could also promote information exchange between states.

Leadership and consultant support will follow-up with CVO PTC members in development of project ideas as well as scheduling the next Advisory Group meeting.
