

**MEETING MINUTES  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
NEW JERSEY TRANSIT  
NEWARK, NJ  
MAY 15, 1997**

**ATTENDEES:** See attached list

**AGENDA:** See attached

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Dennis Keck welcomed everyone, especially those in attendance for the first time: the Co-chairs of the CVO Working Group - David Lewis from Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles and Nick Owens from Maryland DOT; Gene Donaldson, the new ITS Coordinator for Delaware DOT; Jim Paral the new Director of traffic Operations for New Jersey DOT; John McQuaid from the National Private Truck Council and Bob Ramirez from FHWA-CT. Self introductions were made.

Mr. Keck discussed the goals for the day, which include: the prioritization of the proposed operational tests to select those that will be funded through the Year 5 Program, the discussion of potential long term financing options for the Coalition, discussion of the draft Strategic Plan so it can then be presented to the Executive Board, discussion of the next steps for the Intermodal Program based on the issues in the draft Intermodal Concept paper, discussion and possible approval of the merger of the Budget and Policy working group and the Public/Private Partnerships working group, discussion and possible approval of an addition to the Procedural Manual concerning "Mid Term Appointments to Fill Vacant Executive Leadership Positions," the discussion and possible approval on a policy on "Restrictions to Consultants Contracting on Projects," the approval of Al Karoly from New York State DOT as the new co-chair of the FRAT working group, and the discussion and possible approval of the reallocation of funds between two of the CVO operational tests.

**2. Introduction to Discussion on Operational Tests**

Before breaking up in three groups to prioritize the potential operational tests, Chris Cox wanted to discuss Item #6: the completion of the HAR Operational Test (FOT-2). She explained that in order to complete the operational test as it was originally planned, the project will need an additional \$318,154. The issue was discussed at the most recent Budget and Policy meeting, and they felt that the Steering Committee should decide whether to approve the additional funding under the context that any money used for FOT-2 would be at the expense of some other potential project. Ms. Cox stated that information explaining why the project cannot be completed within the initial budget was included in the background materials for this meeting. Those materials gave a summary of the cost required to complete the test as originally planned, a chronology of events to date, funding options, and the cost of additional consultant efforts. Doug Robertson, Program Manager for the NEC, stated that he has carefully reviewed the activities of the project and is satisfied that the NEC followed the directions of their TRC and were diligent in performing

the work. He explained that this is an operational test in which several things occurred affecting costs that were not anticipated and were beyond our control. For example, hardware prices went up, two procurements were required instead of one, and coordination with the agencies was more extensive and time consuming than expected. There are three agencies that would be affected if additional money is not approved for the project: Connecticut DOT, New Jersey DOT and New Jersey Turnpike. Bill Stoeckert from Connecticut DOT, indicated that his agency has planned to install three additional digital HAR stations based on the commitment from the Coalition to provide two others. ConnDOT's decision to procure the three digital HAR stations came after the Coalition asked his agency to be one of the test sites for the digital equipment. The issue was raised that if the additional money for the purchase of digital HAR stations is not provided, one of the main objectives of the operational test will be compromised. The main objectives of the test are the regional coordination of HAR messages and the performance of analog verses digital stations. One of the main reasons that additional money is needed for the project is because the current quote for digital equipment is more than double the quote that was given when the project budget was originally developed. FOT-2 Project Manager, KR Marshall, could not guarantee that the cost for the digital equipment was firm. He is using a quote given over a year ago from one of two vendors. However, he feels that the quote is probably high. Based on these facts, there was a lengthy discussion on whether the Steering Committee should put a cap in the amount of additional money that should be allocated to complete the project. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee decided to provide an additional \$318,154 for the completion of the project as originally planned. However, this was the maximum amount that would be allocated. Even if the cost of the digital equipment is higher than expected, the Steering Committee will not allocate any more than \$318,154 to complete the project. If the costs should increase, the scope would be decreased accordingly.

### 3. Discussion on New Operational Tests

Since the discussion on the completion of the HAR operational test took longer than expected, the group did not utilize breakout groups to discuss the other seven potential operational tests. Instead, Chris Cox led the group in a discussion of each of the potential operational tests. Comments on each are included as an attachment. After each potential test was discussed, the group decided that they wanted to rank them by giving everyone an opportunity to vote for their top three. Based on the votes, the following are the top three ranked operational tests (a summary of the voting is included in the attachments):

- #1 - CVO Operational Tests
- #2 - Expand ETTM effort to include DSRC applications
- #3 - Corridor-wide Internet based Intermodal Passenger Information System

It was pointed out that at a previous Executive Board meeting, CVO and ETTM were ranked as high priority items by the members, and the above ranking supports that position. The group was concerned about ranking CVO operational tests as #1 because they were unsure as to how the money should be utilized. Nick Owens, CVO working group co-chair, stated that at yesterday's CVO working group meeting, several projects were selected for funding but the amount of money requested was more than the allocated budgets for the CVO operational tests. Based on the letter of interest requirements and evaluations, the CVO working group chairs felt an additional \$325,00 was needed to restore funding to several programs that were reduced due to funding constraints. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee decided to allocate \$325,000 for CVO operational tests based on the feedback received from the CVO working group co-chairs. The #2 ranked test was amended to be a test of the dedicated short range communications (DSRC) standard, once it is finalized; the standard would not be finalized until sometime

in 1998. One of its goals would be to test multiple uses of the standard ie ETTM, CVO, etc. The internet based intermodal passenger information system was limited to the development of the functional requirements. Once the requirements are completed, the Steering Committee will make a decision as to whether to move ahead or not. All three of the top ranked operational tests will be funded through the Year 5 Program. The NEC will be responsible for the development of scopes for #2 and #3. The allocation of the appropriate amount of funding will be the responsibility of Coalition staff and Steering Committee leadership.

## **5. Lunch and Status Reports**

During lunch, Chris Cox and Mike Eadicicco gave an update on several items that each felt was important for the Steering Committee to be aware of. Below is a summary of the items that were discussed:

HOGs - The regional groups are working very well. The co-champions will be meeting soon to select a date, location and develop an agenda for their two day annual meeting. They plan to hold the meeting before the September 18th Steering Committee meeting.

IEN - To date 46 workstations have been installed. Discussions with Amtrak for the expansion of the IEN in the future to intermodal agencies have been successful.

Project #2 - This project is currently working closely with Project #11 for training requirements.

IEN License Agreement - The Coalition has received a request from SmartRoutes for an IEN workstation for use in their Washington, DC office for the Washington Metropolitan Area Traveler Information Service project funded by Virginia DOT. Virginia DOT has already submitted a letter of support for their request. An IEN license agreement has been drafted and will be distributed to the Budget and Policy group for their review. Once it is approved by them, it will be forwarded to the Steering Committee. A copy of the agreement is attached.

## **10. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for September 18th and will be hosted by Rhode Island DOT. More information will be distributed as it becomes available.

## **6. Long Term Financing**

Bill Stoeckert indicated that at the last Steering Committee meeting, a presentation was given on the results of Project #25: Long Term Financing. The group was asked to get feedback from their agency on the financing options that were presented. Since that time, the Executive Leadership asked for more information on SmartCards. A white paper was developed and was included in the background materials for the meeting. Mr. Stoeckert asked if anyone had any feedback from their agency, especially on the issue of equity contributions. The group indicated that it is difficult to get feedback since they did not know how much money would be required from their agency and what the money would be used for.

Bob Rupert from FHWA gave a brief update on the status of NEXTEA. A summary of the NEXTEA proposal submitted by the USDOT to Congress is included in the attachments.

## 7. Draft Strategic Plan

A color version of the draft Strategic Plan, which was included in the background materials for the meeting, was discussed. Chris Cox went around the room and asked each person to give their feedback on the document. A summary of the main comments received are listed below:

- Write for the intended audience(s),
- add the term ITS and/or technology into the first paragraph of the vision (define ITS if the term is used) - omit reference to transportation policy,
- the vision statement is too long,
- there is no mention of what the Coalition has already accomplished,
- #1 and #2 sound similar - the bullets under #2 should be action oriented - eliminate repetition,
- the format is good - like the small size, and
- clean up the partners list.

The draft plan will be revised based on the comments received and will be forwarded to the Executive Board for their approval.

## 9. Action Items

- a) A recommendation was made to merge the Budget and Policy and Public/Private Partnerships working groups. A new name and roles of the group has yet to be determined. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee approved the recommendation.
- b) A recommendation was made for an addition to the Procedural Manual concerning "Mid Term Appointments to Fill Vacant Executive Leadership Positions." Draft language was distributed to the group. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee approved the addition to the Procedural Manual as it was drafted.
- c) A draft policy on "Restrictions to Consultants Contracting on Projects" was presented for discussion/approval. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee approved the policy as it was drafted.
- d) The FRAT working group has recommended Al Karoly from New York State DOT as the new co-chair of the working group. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee approved the recommendation.
- e) Dennis Keck presented the conclusions from the CVO working group's deliberations on the proposals that were submitted to the Coalition as a result of the Coalition's letter of interest. A list of the states selected for each of the operational tests is attached. The selections made by the working group require reallocating the existing CVO operational test budgets that were previously allotted (not adding additional money, just reallocating existing budgets). **DECISION:** The Steering Committee approved the reallocation of the existing budgets.

## 8. Intermodal Program Concept

The Steering Committee received a draft Intermodal Concept paper in the background materials for the meeting. There were several issues identified that needed to be addressed by the Steering Committee. One issue was a decision on what action to take in regard to the operational test that was recommended by Project #12: Intermodal Outreach and Information Exchange. The test that Project #12 recommended was discussed earlier in the meeting under item #2 - New Operational Tests. It was potential operational test #2, a Corridor-wide Internet based Intermodal Passenger Information System. The Steering Committee already decided to fund the development of the functional requirements of the test under the operational test pool budget.

Another issue was whether the Coalition should sponsor an Intermodal forum to assist in the development of the Coalition's overall Intermodal Program. It was stated that Mike Onder from FHWA was planning an intermodal forum and the Coalition should work with him so as not to duplicate efforts. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee decided that the Coalition should sponsor an intermodal forum. The NEC will draft an RFP to hire a consultant with intermodal experience to coordinate the event.

The final issue concerned Project #13: Passenger Freight Database. Chris Cox explained that this project is funded, but it does not seem to have any context in the overall goals and objectives of the Coalition, and lacked agency champions. Ms. Cox discussed the issue of reprogramming the funds and the intermodal forum with Delaware Secretary, Anne Canby, who initially proposed the project several years ago. **DECISION:** The Steering Committee decided to hold back enough of the \$350,000 to fund the Intermodal Forum. The remainder of the money should be held for the overall Intermodal Program until the conclusion of the forum. At that time, the Coalition should have direction on where it would be best to use the money.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM.

### Attachments

- Agenda
- Attendance sheet
- Comments on potential operational tests
- Summary of operational test top three voting
- IEN License Agreement
- Summary of NEXTEA, handout from Bob Rupert
- CVO Working Group Final Operational Test Recommendations

**CVO Working Group  
Operational Test Recommendations**

| <b>FOT-7: Roadside Safety</b>                      |              |                    | <u><b>Original Budget</b></u> |              |
|--|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| <u><b>Change</b></u>                               |              |                    |                               |              |
| Connecticut DMV                                    |              | \$145,000          |                               |              |
| Maryland DOT                                       | \$150,000    |                    |                               |              |
| Massachusetts State Police                         |              | \$220,000          |                               |              |
| New York DOT                                       |              | \$160,250          |                               |              |
| Pennsylvania DOT                                   |              | \$145,000          |                               |              |
| Rhode Island State Police                          |              | \$221,000          |                               |              |
|  | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$1,041,250</b> | <b>\$1,500,000</b>            |              |
| <b>(458,750)</b>                                   |              |                    |                               |              |
| <br><b>FOT-8: Electronic Registration</b>          |              |                    |                               |              |
| Delaware DOT                                       |              | \$190,000          |                               |              |
| Massachusetts Motor Vehicles                       |              | \$456,000          |                               |              |
| New Jersey DOT                                     |              | \$240,000          |                               |              |
| New York DOT                                       |              | \$532,750          |                               |              |
| Pennsylvania                                       |              | \$190,000          |                               |              |
|  | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$1,608,750</b> | <b>\$1,150,000</b>            |              |
| <b>+458,750</b>                                    |              |                    |                               |              |
| <br><b>FOT-9: Electronic Clearance</b>             |              |                    |                               |              |
| Delaware DOT                                       |              | \$150,000          |                               |              |
| Virginia DOT                                       |              | \$150,000          |                               |              |
|  | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$300,000</b>   | <b>\$300,000</b>              | <b>- 0 -</b> |
| <br><b>FOT-10: Safety Management</b>               |              |                    |                               |              |
| Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New York<br>(all DOT's) |              | \$200,000          |                               |              |
| Maine DOT  |              | \$100,000          |                               |              |
|  | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$300,000</b>   | <b>\$300,000</b>              | <b>- 0 -</b> |

