

**MEETING MINUTES
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
AUGUST 27, 1998
PHILADELPHIA, PA
9:30 AM - 3:30 PM**

AGENDA: See attached

ATTENDEES: See attached list

1. Final Draft of the Procedural Guidelines

Chris Cox stated that since the last meeting, she made some changes to the document based on input from a few committee volunteers. The biggest change was the reorganization of the existing materials into a more logical order. She highlighted two items that were changed or added which included: 1) the description of the Program Management Committee on page I.6, and 2) the charts on pages II.2, II.4 and II.6. Ms. Cox indicated that the charts are a modified version of the ones that were in the original guidelines instead of the completely new ones that were in the last version. Typically, the guidelines solidify what has worked in the past and that is what these charts show. She emphasized that these guidelines are constantly evolving and they are not a restriction on how we operate now or in the future. It was noted that the match credit section could change based on additional information from FHWA regarding the funding from TEA 21.

ACTION:

- The group amended the affiliate membership description to add MPO's and other transportation planning organizations.

Any additional comments are due back to Ms. Cox by Friday, September 4th. The final draft will be presented to the Steering Committee for their adoption at their September 22nd meeting.

2. Review of Total Budget for Year 6

Dennis Lebo explained that for the remainder of the meeting, the group would be focusing on different activities all associated with the Coalition's Year 6 Program. It was noted that because the passage of

TEA 21 occurred so late in the federal fiscal year that the Year 6 Program is late and the development of the Year 7 and 8 Programs will begin immediately after Year 6 is finalized at the Executive Board meeting in October.

A memo was distributed (see attached) that outlined the available funding for the Year 6 Program. There was a lengthy discussion about the rationale for the additional three months of funding for Coalition staff and the support consultant.

ACTIONS:

- The group agreed with John Baniak's recommendation that it is best to have the staff and support consultant funded on a calendar year basis rather than the federal fiscal year. The group suggested that when the memo is sent to the Steering Committee that section #3 should be better explained.
- The group suggested that the \$600,000 that is currently set aside for the intermodal program should be shown on the Year 6 Program chart so that everyone is aware that the funding is available.

3. Year 6 Program Management Committee Projects

Dennis Lebo explained that the projects that Jeff Gaber is going to present are potential projects for the Year 6 Program that the Program Management Committee is responsible for managing. Jeff Gaber from the NEC presented several projects including: training, clearinghouse, and outreach.

ACTIONS:

- The group indicated that the training, outreach and clearinghouse project descriptions should be better defined for the Steering Committee meeting.
- The following allocations were decided: training \$200,000 for the University of Maryland ITS Education and Training; outreach \$400,000; and clearinghouse \$125,000 for the design/prototype.
- Consider need for and cost of any security for the Clearinghouse.
- It was stated that anything that can be funded through the current NEC contract should not appear in the Year 6 Program.
- The group recommended starting a new Public Education and Outreach Task Force through the Steering Committee. The task force would report to the Program Management Committee but developed using a larger audience. *Since the meeting, the Core Team recommended several task forces including: outreach, training, standards, and IEN.*

4. Funding Allocation for Draft Year 6 Program

During this part of the meeting, Dennis Lebo explained that the goal is to assign a preliminary funding allocation to each Program Track Committee. It was noted that the prioritized projects from the Program Track Committees are included in Attachment A from the materials that were distributed prior to the meeting. Each Program Track Committee that was present at the meeting was asked to discuss the projects that their committee submitted and why they were important. Based on all the discussions, the attached allocations were assigned to each program track.

ACTIONS:

- Decide which program tracks have responsibility for the Coalition's older projects that are still on-going, such as the IEN and the HAR operational test.
- Create a budget line item for "Unallocated Funding" that can be accessed through Program Management Committee by Program Track Committees that have projects that are "ready to go." Draft criteria for what "ready to go" means, should be developed and presented to the Steering Committee for their approval.
- The Electronic Payment Services committee needs a scope for their project by the Steering Committee meeting.
- The Incident Management committee needs to better define their prioritized projects for the Steering Committee meeting.
- All the Program Track Committees need to reprioritize their projects based on the preliminary allocation they received during this meeting, and review the projects that were submitted by the agencies for possible submission to the Steering Committee.

5. Next Meeting

The exact date of the next meeting was not set but will occur in November or early December. The focus of the meeting will be on developing structure on how the Program Management Committee plans to manage the Agency Support, Coalition Support and Emerging Issues program tracks and to begin the process to develop the Year 7 & 8 Programs.

Attachments

- Agenda
- Meeting Attendance
- Draft Funding Allocation Chart