

**MEETING MINUTES  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
PENNSYLVANIA DOT  
PHILADELPHIA, PA  
OCTOBER 11, 1995**

**ATTENDEES:** See attached list

**AGENDA:** See attached

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Steve Kuciemba and Dennis Keck welcomed the group and thanked Harvey Knauer from Pennsylvania DOT and Don Shanis from Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission for hosting the meeting. Self introductions were made.

**2. Status Reports**

Morey Rothenberg gave a brief update on the status of funding. To date, the House and Senate still have not reached an agreement on ITS funding. As soon as something is known, the Steering Committee will be notified.

Chris Cox went over the procurement status of the new projects (#15, 16, 19 and 25). She indicated that the review process is currently underway and a selection should be made on each of the projects in the next three to four weeks.

Al Karoly discussed the recent RFI the Coalition distributed to gather information on developing a site on the World Wide Web (Internet). Responses were due on October 6th and Chris Cox received 35 of them. Once the responses are reviewed, Coalition staff will summarize for the Steering Committee and propose next steps.

Mike Eadicicco distributed stickers that were designed for agencies to use in their operations centers. The stickers remind operations personnel to call TRANSCOM if they have a regional incident. He encouraged the group to bring them back to their agencies for their operations personnel. Mr. Eadicicco indicated that reporting regional incidents to TRANSCOM was even more important now that the formal agreement with TRANSCOM is complete.

Steve Kuciemba discussed actions developed at the recent Outreach Task Force meeting (refer to the Outreach Task Force minutes that were distributed in meeting briefing package). He indicated that the task force would be hosting regional meetings for the public affairs officers to coordinate an outreach effort over the Thanksgiving Weekend. Mr. Kuciemba asked the group to encourage their PAO's to participate. He also indicated that the task force had developed a survey to garner feedback on the Travelers Alert Map that contains major construction activity in the corridor from September through December 1995. The survey was distributed at the beginning of the meeting and he asked if everyone could complete it and turn it in before going to lunch.

Chris Cox indicated that there was also a communications survey that was distributed earlier. The purpose of the survey is to gather feedback from the Steering Committee on how the staff can best communicate with them in order to receive necessary feedback. She encouraged everyone to complete the survey and turn it in by lunch.

Dennis Keck stated that the issue of agency travel restrictions has recently become more of a problem than normal. He asked if everyone could complete the travel restrictions survey and turn it in by lunch.

Chris Cox asked the group to take five or ten minutes to complete the three surveys. After that she would discuss the procedures for the breakout groups. Copies of all three surveys are attached for anyone who was not at the meeting or did not complete them on the 11th.

### **3. Breakout Groups on Operational Tests**

Before the Steering Committee split up into their smaller breakout groups, Chris Cox explained that the list of Operational Tests was developed by the TRC's, Working Groups, and Coalition staff. Each group was assigned the task of rating each Op Test as either High, Medium or Low and to keep track of comments as to why the group gave an Op Test a particular rating.

After lunch, the Steering Committee reconvened and summarized the activities of the breakout groups. The top rated Op Tests from all three groups were Group 1 (OT 3, 6, 9, 13), Group 2 (OT 6, 7, 8, 10, 13) and Group 3 (OT 3, 6, 7, 9, 10). Steve Kuciemba led the group in a discussion of all Op Tests that were rated High from the three groups. Specific notes from the individual groups and the entire Steering Committee as a whole are attached.

Comments and ratings will be brought to the Executive Board leadership for discussion and will be presented in whole or part (summary form) to the entire Executive Board for discussion and approval of the final Op Test approach, given the available funds.

### **4. Action Items**

- a) TRANSCOM agreement - Dennis Keck indicated that as soon as all parties sign the agreement, he will send a copy of the final agreement to the Steering Committee. It will be important that committee members inform their operations personnel that a formal agreement is in place and encourage them to call in regional incidents. This issue will also be brought up at the Executive Board meeting.
- b) Public/Private Partnerships - Charlie McManus, co-chair of the working group, indicated that his working group is endorsing Operational Test #3. The group does not think the Coalition should combine OT 3 and OT 6. He indicated that his working group feels that OT 3 should go first. OT 3 has the most opportunity for public private partnerships. Dennis Keck stated that the recommendation has been recognized and will be part of the presentation to the Executive Board.

- c) Budget and Policy - Dennis Lebo, co-chair of the working group, presented a draft of the Business Plan and Project Development/Procurement Process flow charts. He explained that neither of the two charts show anything new, they just show what the Coalition has already been doing. Steve Clinger asked if key milestones (in terms of months) could be added to the chart. Jon McDade indicated that the match credits have to be approved before the Coalition can send out RFP's. Dennis Lebo stated that both of those items will be addressed. With those minor changes, the group agreed that the flow charts were an accurate representation of the processes. Next, Dennis Lebo discussed the issue of distribution of deliverables (see attached). Steve Kuciemba asked about the issue of having an Executive Summary from every project that goes with each project deliverable. He indicated if the Executive Summary is available, then we can send that out first. Dennis Lebo stated that issue will be discussed at the next Budget and Policy meeting. Otherwise, the group approved the project deliverable distribution policy. Chris Cox also went over some important Coalition decision making processes that were discussed at the September 14th Budget and Policy Meeting. She indicated that these processes are not new, Budget and Policy is just putting in writing what has been happening already. She went over charts A & B, membership guidelines and staffing decisions (see attached). These are not Coalition by-laws, but they are operating procedures. These will next be presented to the Executive Board.

## **5. Upcoming Meetings**

- a) Executive Board meeting - The next Executive Board meeting is being held on Thursday, November 2nd at the World Trade Center in New York City. It is being hosted by the Port Authority of NY & NJ. Steve Kuciemba asked the group to encourage their bosses to attend the meeting. Briefing packages will be sent out before the meeting and the Steering Committee will also receive a copy of it.
- b) Next two Steering Committee meetings - New York City DOT and Maryland SHA volunteered to host the next two meetings. Steve Kuciemba indicated that the next Steering Committee will be held in either late January or early February. He will check with his agency and also New York City DOT to see which site will host the next meeting.

## **6. Other**

Jon McDade from FHWA is currently working on a Federal Highway plan that will affect some of the actions recommended by the Budget and Policy Working Group. He also indicated that the Office of Inspector General (OIG) received a complaint on the amount of work and how the work was given to the NEC. He indicated that he does not think there will be a problem with this complaint, but the Coalition needs to be aware of the issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.

## Attachments

- Attendance Sheet
- Agenda
- Travelers Alert Map Survey
- Communications Survey
- Travel Restrictions Survey
- Notes from Op Test Breakout Groups
- Charts/Overheads from Budget & Policy Actions

Steering Committee Members - The Executive Board Members did not receive any of the attachments for these minutes. They were informed to contact you if they would like to see them.

## SUMMARY OF NOTES FROM BREAKOUT GROUPS

<u>Op Test</u>	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>
OT 3 - TIS	H (1)	M/H	H
OT 4 - RSIS	M	M -	L
OT 5 - Surveillance	L	L +	M
OT 6 - CVO-ATIS	H (2)	H	H**
OT 7 - CVO-Safety	M	H -	H
OT 8 - CVO Clearance	M	H	L
OT 9 - AVI/ETTM CVO	H (4)	L/M	H
OT 10 - Open-ended ITS	L	H -	H
OT 11 - Air Trav. Info	M	L +	L
OT 12 - Mayday	L	L	L
OT 13 - Comm. Protocol	H (3)	H	M/L

### NOTES:

Descriptions of the Op Tests were given to each Steering Committee member in their briefing package that was sent out prior to the October 11th meeting. Please refer to that package if you want descriptions.

The Steering Committee was divided into three groups for discussion purposes. Each group was asked to assign a High, Medium or Low rating to each Op Test. The actual ratings given by each group are listed above.

## **SPECIFIC NOTES FROM GROUPS**

### **OT 3**

- Separate data collection from info dissemination in OT 3 & 6 (no duplication with IEN) (1)
- Combine with OT 6 (1)
- Project 12 needs to progress before test (2)
- Several private sector possibilities (2)
- Related to IDA (3)
- Need for continuation and expansion (3)
- Keep breadth (3)
- NOI important (3)
- Timing is right re. current members programs (3)
- Gives "Champions" an opportunity (3)
- Logical showcase for a priority corridor (3)
- Relates to Coalition objectives (3)
- Relates to OT 11 (3)

### **OT 4**

- Similar to TRANSCOM, Smart Route function (2)
- Relationship to Project 16 (RTICs)? (3)
- Focus not clear (3)
- Relationship to IEN? (3)
- Note possible ETTM connection (3)
- Eliminate? (3)

### **OT 5**

- Call it "detection technology" (3)
- Needs more definition (3)

### **OT 6**

- Separate data collection from info dissemination in OT 3 & 6 (no duplication with IEN) (1)
- Combine with OT 3 (1)
- Need to partner (2)
- More willing important component of travel - needs management
- Wait and see re OT 3 response (NOI) & CVO IDA (3)
- Depending on above, proceed with mods (3)

### **OT 7**

- Reword - tie closer into state activities (1)
- Regional CVO group (Eastern States) focusing on safety - should combine efforts (3)
- Blend with OT 9? (3)

### **OT 8**

- How many Coalition states will this really effect? (1)
- Problem not widespread (repeats I-75) (3)

## **SPECIFIC NOTES FROM GROUPS, con't**

### **OT 9**

- Could be an IDA - quick (1)
- No room for info at present time (2)
- Need next generation tag relationship to #15 (2)
- Await results of Project 15 (ETTM) & other transmit type projects (3)
- Combine OT 7/OT 9 (3)

### **OT 10**

- Can be done separately - not as a funded Op Test this year (1)
- Put out a solicitation for future Op Tests (1)
- Disclosure issue, solicits private sector (2)
- Could be valuable: over-the-horizon (3)
- Need some focus (3)

### **OT 11**

- Combine with OT 3 (1)
- Project #6 (2)
- Make element of OT 3? or wait to see OT 3 response (a subsequent step) (3)
- Wait for Project 6 & 12 results (3)

### **OT 12**

- Project 19 not started (2)
- Wait for Project 19 results (3)

### **OT 13**

- Timely (2)
- Continues Project 9 with VMS focus (3)
- Focus not clear (3)

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON TOP RATED OP TESTS (entire group)**

### **OT 3**

- Project 12 results will shape scope
- H, H, M/H Ratings
- Parts of 11 could go into OT 3
- Met timelines criteria
- Meets Coalition objectives

### **OT 6**

- Relationship to OT 3 Proposals
- Combine OT 3 & OT 6?
- Could be initial Task of OT 3
- CVO IDA results needed to help verify/alter scope
- H, H, H Ratings

### **OT 7**

- Scope could be tied closer to state activities
- In-Line with NE States study Phase II
- Could include OT 9
- Possible combine OT 7 & OT 9 and revise scope to better reflect ongoing activities

### **OT 8**

- H, M, L Rating
- Northeast is best testbed
- Will enough States benefit?
- For States that do not have site, have readers
- An additional check on the truckers
- Set up OT 7 to accomplish parts of 8 at a later phase (safety, credentials, OT 9) three parts
- Combine OT 7-8-9 into a multi-phase project

### **OT 9**

- Could be a subset of OT 7
- H, H, M/L Ratings
- Questions on timeliness - primary reason for folding into 7
- Project 15 could impact
- Could this bring together I-75 and IAG

### **OT 10**

- Low rating based on time/process
- Been done in other places
- Did not know how to award - disclosure
- Good idea, but no money next year
- Need more definition/structure/definition
- If money not set aside, the quality/quantity of responses could suffer
- Most agencies lack research efforts - this would satisfy
- Could lose money if not obligated quickly
- RFI response would be barometer

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON TOP RATED OP TESTS (entire group), con't**

### **OT 13**

- Someone else doing it?
- If we don't do it, someone else will
- Opportunity for I-95 CC to support National Program
- Finishes Project 9
- Will be major benefactor