MEETING NOTES

JOINT MEETING

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD (TPB)
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)
POLICY TASK FORCE**

CHAIR:	Honorable David Snyder, City of Falls Church

and

TPB ITS TECHNICAL TASK FORCE

CHAIR:	Alex Verzosa, City of Falls Church
VICE CHAIRS:	John Frankenhoff, D.C. Department of Public Works Donald McCanless, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, Maryland State Highway
DATE:	Friday, January 26, 2001
TIME:	12:30 PM
PLACE:	COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE First Floor, Rooms 4/5

ATTENDANCE:

Armen Abrahamian, P.G. County DPW&T, aabrahamian@pg.co.md.us
Brien Benson, George Mason University, bbenson@gmu.edu
Wayne Berman, FHWA, wayne.berman@fhwa.dot.gov
Randy Carroll, Maryland Department of Environment, rcarroll@mde.state.md.us
Tony Clarke, Edwards & Kelcey, cclarke@ekmail.com
John Collura, Virginia Tech, collura@vt.edu
Soumya Dey, TransCore, soumya.dey@transcore.com
Kathleen Donodeo, WMATA, kdonodeo@wmata.com
Tom Farley, VDOT, tffarley@vdot.state.va.us
Harold Foster, M-NCPPC/PG County Planning Department, hfoster@mncppc.state.md.us
John Frankenhoff, DCDPW/DOT, jfrankenhoff@dpw.dcgov.org
Craig Franklin, Trichord, caf@trichord-inc.com
Marisa Greshko, Orbital Sciences, TMS, greshko.marisa@oscsystems.com
Kamal Hamud, DCDPW/DOT, khamud@wam.umd.edu
Doug Hansen, Fairfax County DOT, doug.hansen@co.fairfax.va.us

Dawn Hardesty, ITS America, dhardesty@itsa.org
Mike Harris, PB Farradyne, harrism@pbworld.com
Fatimah Hasan, MDOT, fhasan@mdot.state.md.us
Breck Jeffers, FHWA-MD, breck.jeffers@fhwa.dot.gov
Tom Jennings, FHWA-VA, tom.jennings@fhwa.dot.gov
Steve Lockwood, Parsons Brinckerhoff, lockwoods@pbworld.com
Sanjeev Malhotra, Loudoun County, smalhotr@co.loudoun.va.us
Honorable John Mason, City of Fairfax and Chairman, TPB
Don McCanless, WMATA, dmccanless@wmata.com
Glenn McLaughlin, MDSHA/CHART, gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us
Frank Mirack, FHWA, francis.mirack@fhwa.dot.gov
Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, MDSHA, jpoint-du-jour@sha.state.md.us
Will Raine, WMATA, wraine@wmata.com
Jim Robinson, VDOT-ITS, robinson_jr@vdot.state.va.us
Kajaz Safarian, DCDPW/DOT, doc10e@aol.net
Sharmila Samarasinghe, NVTC, sharmila@nvtdc.org
Eileen Singleton, Baltimore Metropolitan Council, esingleton@baltometro.org
Mishadoni Smith, FHWA
Myron Smith, Dulles Area Transportation Assoc. msmith@data-trans.org
Honorable David Snyder, City of Falls Church, dsnyder@aiadc.org
Amy Tang, VDOT NOVA ITS, amytang@vdot.state.va.us
Phil Tarnoff, University of Maryland, tarnoff@eng.umd.edu
Dusan Teodorovic, Virginia Tech, duteodor@vt.edu
Kenneth Todd, National Conference on Bicycling and Walking
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax DPW, averzosa@ci.fairfax.va.us
Ron Welke, MNCPPC Montgomery County, welke@mncppc.state.md.us
Bob Winick, Motion Maps, LLC, rmwinick@motionmaps.com
Emil Wolanin, Montgomery County DPWT, ewolanin@dpwt.com

COG Staff:
Malaika Abernathy, mabernathy@mwcog.org
Andrew Austin, aaustin@mwcog.org
Ron Kirby, rkirby@mwocog.org
Andrew Meese, ameese@mwcog.org
Jerry Miller, gmiller@mwcog.org
C.P. Zilliacus, zill@mwcog.org

ACTIONS:
Business of the ITS Policy Task Force
1. Review of Notes from the November 20, 2000 Meeting
Chair David Snyder called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm. No changes to the November 20, 2000 meeting notes were made.

Business of the Joint Meeting

2. Outlook from the TPB Chairman

TPB Chairman John Mason identified three priority areas to focus on during his tenure as this year's TPB chairman in 2001. The following priorities stem from the TPB Vision document:

- **Identification of *regional* transportation priority projects-** Mr. Mason envisions the TPB specifically identifying transportation projects of regional magnitude (i.e. rehabilitation of existing regional projects) to focus on this year.
- **Identification of *regional* funding mechanism(s)-** Mr. Mason hopes to achieve an agreement between the three states to individually develop some sort of funding mechanism, which in turn, would contribute to a regional source of funds for regional projects identified under the first priority.
- **Development of a *regional* management and operations approach that addresses our tri-state Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)-** Mr. Mason suggested the MPO assume a role which supports our unique tri-state region in addressing and mainstreaming management and operations within the traditional metropolitan planning process. He noted, however, that this was not to suggest that MPOs would directly engage in management and operations.

Mr. Mason identified three supporting factors for the aforementioned regional priorities:

- Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)- According to planning factor number six of TEA-21, MPOs shall promote efficient systems management and operations within the planning process. This means that efforts to begin the ball rolling in this direction should be started.
- Section 5206 E of TEA-21- This section requires that all ITS projects funded with Highway Trust funds must be in conformance with the National ITS Architecture and applicable standards.
- The third factor was the reality of this region's transportation system- Mr. Mason said that the notion of having sufficient space or funding for the construction of new facilities to resolve our current transportation crisis is absurd. This region must focus on maximizing the efficiency and capacity of our existing infrastructure through the use of technology.

Mr. Mason was aware of the recent moratorium placed on all regulations issued within the last sixty days by FHWA, nevertheless, he stated that it is imperative for this region to address management and operations and compliance with the National ITS Architecture in addressing our current transportation dilemmas.

As Chair of the TPB, Mr. Mason stated three expectations to be addressed this year by the ITS Policy and Technical Task Forces:

1. Mr. Mason charged Mr. Snyder with the task of reporting for the February 2001 TPB meeting, the progress of the ITS Policy Task Force in addressing management and operations of transportation systems in relation to ITS.
2. To change the name of the ITS Policy Task Force to reflect the relationship of management and operations with ITS, to the Management and Operations Policy Task Force. This task derives from the notion that ITS should be an implement which assists in achieving better operations, but ought not to be seen as an end in itself.
3. In reference to reporting the progress of this unique region, the establishment of performance measures would help identify and measure standards.

In response to a question from Emil Wolanin, Mr. Mason stated that this objective is definitely a challenge for this MPO, since traditionally MPOs have a capital and not a management and operations perspective. Mr. Mason urged the region's technical officials to prove to policy makers that management and operations/ITS is an important aspect of our systems and should be addressed.

Mr. Mason presented Mr. Wolanin with a certificate of achievement for his two-year leadership of the ITS Technical Task Force.

3. Perspectives on Metropolitan Management, Operations, and ITS
Steve Lockwood presented to the group a variety of issues relating to management and operations and ITS from an MPO perspective. Mr. Lockwood is the vice-chair and consultant to the National Dialogue on Transportation Operations (NDTO) and chair of the ITS America Institutions Committee.

The NDTO is a partnership generated by FHWA and other participating agencies to address ways to maximize existing transportation infrastructure through effective management and operation incentives.

Mr. Lockwood discussed issues that many MPOs are faced with, such as the lack of resources, and varied capabilities among jurisdictions and agencies. In addressing these and a number of other issues, the NDTO focuses on a variety of key components, which are highlighted below:
- Improve performance by building stakeholder consensus around the regional vision.
- Define the logic of operations- How decision makers look at alternative investments in relation to near-term benefits.
- Fix institutional barriers- Identify the relationship between all the players involved.
- Get the resources needed and benchmarks to support- Tracking and monitoring progress is key to obtaining additional resources.
- Develop needed technologies.

Mr. Lockwood identified a two-pronged approach that could assist our members in addressing the issues of this region:

- Maintaining the momentum of ITS- Based on the current situation of our transportation dilemmas, as a region, we should focus our attention on:
    - Maintaining jurisdictional commitments to deliverables and document our accomplished ITS projects.
    - Build on accomplishments and fund the next stages; and
    - Make sure progresses in these areas are ongoing.

- Begin to establish a shared priority on establishing a policy and programmatic framework by:
    - **Agree on the priority for operations**- Identify policy priorities to focus on operations from the vision and communicate that commitment to board/policy officials. Make commitment to resource operational priorities. Integrate non-traditional stakeholders within the operational focus.
    - **Focus on performance**- Identify measurable performance indicators at an integrated regional level and make into a policy priority. This could support resource allocations. Provide benchmarks to trace progress.
    - **Define and provide adequate resources**- Establish a consistent multi-year budget for operations, which is more reliable than just earmark resources. This region has attempted to identify an unfunded opportunities list, which is a great starting point. Important areas of concern include identifying the appropriate amount of investment needed operational improvements.
    - **Improve Technical capacity**- Increase the retention level of quality employees by participating in training and incentives programs. Streamline procurement systems to expedite implementation.
    - **Identify new coordination roles**- Begin by forming metropolitan operational partnerships. Identify the appropriate functions which could be dealt with in a centralized fashion such as performance tracking, establishing common regional protocols, and creating an incident management clearinghouse function, are a couple of examples to begin with.

In conclusion, Mr. Lockwood stated that this region should strive to be a world-class showcase in operation implementation.

4. Discussion: Management, Operations, and ITS
Based on Mr. Lockwood's presentation, Mr. Snyder opened the floor for discussion.

In response to a question from James Robinson, Mr. Lockwood concurred that a region should develop performance standards based on individual needs basis as opposed to a national perspective on appropriate measures.

In response to a question from Ron Kirby addressing the issue of how policy officials could support funding for management and operations so as not to compete with other projects, Mr. Lockwood said that MPOs should focus on developing further dialogue on the benefits of

supporting management and operations. He believes that since this is a quite different time than Transportation System Management (TSM) efforts of the 1970s and 1980s, our policy makers are very aware and eager to begin the dialogue on finding alternative options in maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of our current infrastructure. He referenced the transportation annual report for the City of San Jose, California, which uses performance indicators from a customer-service perspective, to support and obtain additional resources.

Kathleen Donodeo commented that all though it is evident that this region needs to change its approach, capital improvements are still necessary and are not obsolete; that line needs to be defined.

Mr. Mason suggested that the TPB adopt an initial set of performance measures from a regional perspective. This would be a great start in showing the public the amount of progress being made.

In response to a question from Craig Franklin, Mr. Lockwood stated it is not evident if there would be new regulations in federal funding in reference to the new direction to operations and management. One change of notice includes the introduction of a new unit to the FHWA, called Operations. Mr. Lockwood also noted that FHWA is willing to introduce new dialogue and visibility to operations in reference to considering new federal regulations.

Phil Tarnoff suggested getting the public's opinion on the performance of the region's transportation system. He identified the North Carolina situation as a good model, which made operational changes in response to customer feedback surveys. Mr. Mason suggested that due to the nature of our profession, it is necessary to first educate the public on certain transportation operations such as signal timing, in order to receive meaningful feedback from the public. Doug Hansen noted an upcoming effort of the Traffic Signals and Operations Subcommittee, which would allow customers to give transportation officials around the region feedback via the Internet.

Mr. Snyder stated that it is necessary to maintain the momentum and mainstream current ITS projects with management and operations. He identified the following projects and expected milestones/deliverables that could possibly be reported on for the next TPB meeting:

- **Signal Preemption –**
    - *Current Progress*- George Mason University and Virginia Tech have been conducting a study to examine the use of signal preemption and other priority strategies along signalized intersections in the DC Area. Two draft technical reports had been completed, Technical Report one discussed stakeholder requirements for Traffic Signal Preemption and Priority and Technical Report two identified technologies, past deployments and system requirements for traffic signal preemption and priority. Technical Report three on modeling transit signal priority along Columbia Pike in Arlington was underway.

- o *Milestone/Deliverable-* Final versions of Technical reports one and two were expected by the end of March. Initial simulation results from Technical Report three were being presented on February 9, 2001. As far as actual implementation, VDOT was moving ahead with procurement, DC had recently hired a contractor and Arlington County has issued an RFP. All of the previously mentioned systems were expected to be operational within six months to a year.

- **ITS Regional Architecture-**
  - o *Current Progress-* A consultant team, Computer Sciences Corporation and PB Farradyne, were engaged starting August 2000 to develop an architecture, in conformance with the National ITS Architecture, to advance the status of electronic exchange of regional ITS information in the metropolitan Washington area. This effort was working in conjunction with the Northern Virginia and Maryland statewide ITS Architecture and TPB ITS Strategic Plan developments.
  - o *Milestone/Deliverable-* A final version of the ITS Regional Architecture was expected in 2002. A draft strawman for technical review was expected at the end of March. The ITS Strategic plan was expected to be complete by the end of June 2001. A draft version some components of the plan was to be presented at the February 23, 2001 ITS Technical Task Force meeting. The NOVA ITS Architecture and the MD Architecture were both ongoing.

- **CapWIN-**
  - o *Current Progress-* The Capital Wireless Integrated Network (CapWIN) had established an executive committee to oversee all aspects of development and operation of project. Present efforts to acquire the first communications switch for the project were ongoing.
  - o *Milestone/Deliverable-* The final version of the RFP was expected to be released from the University of Maryland for procurement by the end of February. A Concept of Operations draft was to be completed by University of Virginia within the next couple of months.

- **WMATA Smart Card-**
  - o *Current Progress-* A $10 million dollar program to design and implement an electronic payment clearinghouse had been developed; partial funding had been identified to date through federal earmark and WMATA funds. WMATA was planning to issue an RFP for a consultant to develop a clearinghouse. This RFP was in the process of being circulating among local jurisdictional staffs for comment before issue. A contract to outfit all buses by late 2002 with smart card-compatible fareboxes is expected.
  - o *Deliverable/Milestone-* The jurisdictional comment period for the RFP for the clearinghouse was to end on February 19, 2001, and the RFP issued shortly thereafter.

A related proposal was the SMART ACCESS project, a demonstration project that would coordinate electronic toll collection, parking and transit. The region was awaiting an announcement by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of the winner of a competitive grant for which the region had applied regarding Smart Access. Mr. Snyder requested that a letter be drafted to be sent to the FTA requesting release of the name of the winner of the competition. Mr. Kirby also suggested identifying alternative funding resources irrespective of the results of the FTA award.

Mr. Farley stated that highlights of these and other ITS projects in the region should be showcased in the TPB Newsletter. Mr. Kirby suggested that these projects should be presented to the TPB and Chairman Mason for the February meeting.

- **ITS As A Data Resources Study-**
  - *Current Progress-* TransCore are the consultants tasked with duty of conducting a feasibility study and developing an implementation plan for using existing and planned ITS equipment as a resource for transportation system data usage.
  - *Deliverable/Milestone-* Phase one of the study has been completed and a preliminary concept of design was also completed. An extension of the contract was being explored to create a detailed end system design. Project completion would be at the end of March without an expansion, end of June if an expansion were granted.

- **Partners In Motion-**
  - *Current Progress-* This public-private partnership was nearing the final stage in the project. The Web Site was operational at the end of October 2000. The PUSH Technology Demonstration was launched in August of 2000.
  - *Deliverables/Milestones-* A meeting on an update of the entire operation was scheduled for January 31, 2001. Further information would be presented to the February 23, 2001 ITS Technical Task Force meeting.

- **511**
  - *Current Progress-* A national meeting was held regarding this issue. The region is moving very cautiously due to the nature of this subject. A report to the committee would be presented once a milestone is accomplished.

Mr. Snyder stated that these and any additional focus areas would be discussed in relation to the projects current progress and milestone accomplishments for each ITS Policy Task Force meeting.

Mr. Snyder opened discussion on a memorandum from Mr. Meese discussing management, operations, and ITS as it relates to the ITS Policy Task Force. Mr. Meese prefaced this discussion by informing the group that this memo reflects recommendations on next steps and is should only be viewed as a strawman to inform the discussion.

- **Name Change**- The memo states that Mr. Mason suggested that the name of the ITS Policy Task Force be changed to the "Management and Operations Policy Task Force" to reflect an updated focus. Mr. Snyder concurred with this suggestion and thought ITS should not be lost. The new name was suggested to be the "Management and Operations ITS Policy Task Force". In response to a comment from Mr. Meese, Mr. Snyder suggested that COG staff should consider the status of the group as a task force versus becoming a regular subcommittee, considering there is no sunset date for the current ITS Policy Task Force.

- **Ad hoc Performance Measures Group-** The memo states that a dialog on performance measures should be considered when understanding management and operations of the regions transportation system. Mr. Kirby suggested looking beyond planning data and using additional types of technology to help develop measurable performance indicators. Mr. Wolanin recommended that an ad hoc group be created to identify a series of performance measures that are associated with specific projects. These performance measures will be presented to the TPB in February. The group would address issues relating to improving the results of measurements in relation to the new context of management and operations.

  Mr. Farley suggested that this group should advise the agencies beforehand on the objective of identifying these types of performance measures and invite them into the dialogue before the TPB meeting. Additional suggestions supported involving the Public Safety officials if need be.

  Mr. Robinson questioned if this type of effort would even be feasible since this gives the region an opportunity to be geographic-specific. Mr. Snyder commented that the objective of this process is to measure performance and the efficiency of systems and should not negatively identify jurisdictions specifically.

  The meeting of this ad hoc group was scheduled for Monday February 5, 2001, at 11:00 am at COG.

5. Review of Draft FY2002 Unified Work Program Task for Management, Operations, and ITS
Mr. Snyder suggested that any comments on this item should be forwarded to Mr. Meese.

6. Other Business of the Joint Meeting
There was no other business. Mr. Snyder adjourned the joint portion of the meeting at 3:45pm.

7. End of Joint Portion of the Meeting and Coffee Break

Business of the ITS Technical Task Force

8. Review of Notes from the December 15, 2000 ITS Technical Task Force Meeting
Chair, Alex Verzosa suggested that the minutes of the December 15, 2000 meeting should be tabled until the next meeting date.

9. Reports from Groups/Focus Areas

Professional Capacity Building Subcommittee: Mr. Meese reported on the efforts of the Professional Capacity Building subcommittee. The committee identified three specific areas of concern:

- University Courses: The four courses developed by the four universities were scheduled to be offered in Spring 2001 through the Virginia T^2 Center and the Maryland T^2 Center. Also, a signal timing course at the University of Maryland would be offered on April 24 and 25, 2001.
- Vendor Courses: The working group had sought potential vendor-provided courses on specific needs identified by the region's transportation professionals. The first priority for this type of class was training in the Synchro software for traffic signal optimization; this had been scheduled for March 28 and 29, 2001 [note: subsequent to the meeting, the schedule was changed to March 29 and 30]. FHWA grant funds were helping fund this additional training. The committee had begun to explore having a vendor course on "What Transportation/ITS Professionals Need to Know about Databases".

The next meeting date of the Professional Capacity Building Working Group was scheduled for February 28, 2001 in Room 3 of COG.

10. Other Business
There was no other business. Mr. Verzosa adjourned the meeting at 4:15 pm.