

MEETING NOTES

**TPB INTELLIGENT
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS TECHNICAL TASK FORCE**

DATE: Friday, June 23, 2000

TIME: 10:30 A.M.

PLACE: COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE
First Floor, Room 4/5

CHAIR: Emil Wolanin, Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation

VICE CHAIRS: Wils DerMinassian, D.C. Department of Public Works
Donald McCanless, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax

ATTENDANCE:

Armen Abrahamian, P.G. Co. DPW&T, aabrahamian@co.pg.md.us
Howard Benn, Mont. Co. Transit Service, howard.benn@co.mo.md.us
Zia Burleigh, VDOT, burleigh_zm@vdot.state.va.us
John Collura, Virginia Tech, collura@vt.edu
Chris Deter, VDOT/TPD/Richmond, detmer_ce@vdot.state.va.us
Tom Farley, VDOT/NOVA, tffarley@vdot.state.va.us
Doug Ham, PB Farradyne, hamd@pbworld.com
Kamal Hamud, DCDPW/DOT, khamud@wam-umd.edu
Todd Kell, VDOT/Richmond, kell_wt@vdot.state.va.us
Mesfin Lakew, DCDPW/DOT, mlakew@dpw.dcgov.org
Don McCanless, WMATA, dmccanless@wmata.com
Craig Maxey, WMATA, cmaxey@wmata.com
Chris Merdon, Computer Sciences Corp., cmerdon@us.net
Glenn McLaughlin, MDSHA/CHART, gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us
Karen Cavallo Miller, Battelle/PIM, cavallok@battelle.org
Frank Mirack, FHWA

Continued...

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the June 23, 2000 Meeting
Page 2

Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, MDSHA/DOTS, jpoint-du-jour@sha.state.md.us
JR Robinson, VDOT/Richmond, robinson_jr@vdot.state.va.us
Kajaz Safarian, DCDPW/DOT, doc10e@aol.net
Kenneth Todd, Member of the Public
Bob Winick, Motion Maps, LLC, rmwinick@motionmaps.com
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax, DPW, averzosa@ci.fairfax.va.us

COG Staff:

Malaika Abernathy, mabernathy@mwcog.org
Andrew Meese, ameese@mwcog.org
Joe Zelinka, jzelinka@mwcog.org

ACTIONS:

1. Review of Notes from the May 19, 2000 Meeting

Vice Chair Don McCanless called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m. The meeting notes for the May 19, 2000 meeting were corrected to reflect that, on May 19, the April 28 notes were reviewed, as opposed to the March 24 notes.

2. Update on Partners In Motion

Todd Kell encouraged public agencies to participate in the PIM project. He stressed the need for these agencies to participate and provide input during the meetings. The vision of having a successful and operative partnership could only be achieved with the participation of the public agencies.

Karen Cavallo Miller updated the group on following four PIM projects:

- Web Based Interface- This project is an interface for data entry for SmarTraveler. The project was being tested and a pilot run was scheduled for the end of July.
- Transit- An update of Transit agencies Web pages on the SmarTraveler Web site would be completed. A meeting in July would be scheduled to review the Web pages and collect comments from the agencies.
- Custom Interfaces- Custom interfaces are interfaces that were built through existing public PIM agency systems. Work with VRE and VDOT are currently in progress. The VRE system would communicate delay and cancellation information via email and beepers for the I-65 and I-95 corridors. This information would go to the SmarTraveler database. The VDOT system was still under construction.
- Data Warehouse- Two operating and maintenance subcommittee meetings were held last month. The purpose of the meetings was to collect input on the data warehouse from the participating agencies. PIM staff worked on final recommendations for an online analysis-processing tool, which would be ready by mid-August. Other projects included processing a physical data model. The system would transfer data from the existing warehouse to a data mart.

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the June 23, 2000 Meeting
Page 3

- PUSH Technology- About 500 letters were sent to various employers. Currently 38 firms were to participate in the PUSH technology demonstration. The target launch date was August 15, 2000. Some incentives for agencies to participate include the following:
 - Level one alerts would be sent to participating agencies; these alerts have significant impact on travel within the region;
 - The messages would be sent via email, pager and/or broadcast fax;
 - Information desired by the agency can be corridor specific;
 - Service free of charge.

Tom Farley suggested that PIM should consider the credibility of the program by working with the participating agencies on important success factors such as revenue increases or improved services. He also stated that this group should consider these issues and communicate them to the policy makers.

3. Federal Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) for ITS and Planning

Andrew Meese distributed the handout excerpted from the May 25, 2000 federal register, which identified the new NPRM for state and metropolitan transportation planning. The following significant issues were discussed:

- ITS Integration Strategy- Regions are required to develop an ITS integration strategy and an ITS Regional Architecture. The integration strategy would identify how ITS federally funded projects would be regionally interoperable. The definition of 'region' is not proscribed, and the current COG Washington metropolitan area logically would be defined as a region. JR Robinson commented that other areas are defining themselves as regions, such as Northern Virginia and Maryland and creating individual ITS strategies and architectures. These regions extend beyond COG's defined regional jurisdiction and it is imperative that the ITS Technical Task Force specifically define the word 'region'. Mr. Meese suggested that the ITS Strategic Plan currently under development would serve as a version of the ITS integration strategy, which defines a region as inclusive of COG's 17 member jurisdictions in Washington DC, Maryland and Virginia. Mr. Meese stated that this effort would be sensitive to the other 'region wide' ITS plans and not reinvent the wheel but address issues that relate to interoperability only. The expected date of completion, December 2000, would remain the same.
- National Compliance- The ITS Regional Architecture effort would comply with the National ITS Architecture. Consultant of the ITS Regional Architecture was about to get underway.
- ITS Planning Regulations- The regulations state that in the metropolitan planning process, ITS projects need to be individually tracked for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Clarification would be needed on how and what projects should be tracked.
- Agreement for the Integration Strategy- The regulations identified a need to establish a formal agreement of all state Department of Transportation's and the Metropolitan Planning Organization. Clarification on the specification of the agreement needs to be established, particularly on whether there can be one master agreement, or if there needs to be agreement on case-by-case bases for individual projects.

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the June 23, 2000 Meeting
Page 4

Mr. Meese stated that he did not anticipate the TPB would not prepare official comments for FHWA regarding the NPRM, because of the short deadline, however he encouraged the member agencies to do so if necessary. Mr. Farley suggested a FHWA policy representative should be scheduled to give a presentation to the ITS Technical Task Force to further explain the regulations.

4. Update on Proposed ITS Deployment Game

Mr. Meese stated that the ITS Deployment game was scheduled for Thursday July 6, 2000 at 12:30 p.m. Approximately 10 spaces were still available. Lunch would be served.

5. Report on the ITS Policy Task Force May 31 Meeting

The ITS Policy Task Force held its meeting on May 31. The group was updated on the following items:

- The Virginia Tech/George Mason University study of traffic signal preemption and prioritization.
- Draft outline of the ITS Strategic Plan- The group accepted the outline. Mayor Snyder suggested that the plan should emphasize ITS's role in meeting air quality requirements and integration/interoperability issues.
- Technical Items- Mr. Meese updated the policy group on the ITS Technical Task Force's current technical activities.
- Conference Proceedings- A brief synopsis of the January 19 ITS Conference was discussed. The group was also given the opportunity to comment on the Conference proceedings Web site. Mr. Meese added that an official flyer introducing the Web page would be sent out in the following month. Mayor Snyder was very supportive of the ITS Conference Proceedings and suggested presenting it to the ITS VA Annual Conference, which was held on June 7-8, 2000. He stated that this model was a significant accomplishment for the region and should be publicized as much as possible.
- ITS Deployment Game- Mayor Snyder suggested that participation should primarily be at the Technical Task Force level and if the results are compelling then introduce the game to the Policy Task Force at a later date.

The next ITS Policy Task Force meeting was not yet scheduled.

6. Reports from the Working Groups/Subcommittees/Focus Areas

Traffic Signals and Operations: Zia Burleigh reported that the upcoming Traffic Signals and Operations meeting would be held on June 30, 2000. Agenda items included discussing the results from the Signal Optimization and Inventory surveys, implementing an operations white paper and promoting a signal operations awareness campaign.

ITS Training: Ms. Burleigh stated that the next meeting would be held on July 12, 2000 at Virginia Tech. A presentation at the next ITS Technical Task Force meeting on the available ITS courses

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the June 23, 2000 Meeting
Page 5

should be scheduled. The CITE brochure on on-line ITS Courses was distributed in the mailout.
Telecommunications Study: Glenn McLaughlin stated that a final report for the Telecom Study was underway. Comments from the previous subcommittee meeting were used in preparing the final report. The major comments suggested the report should decrease the assertiveness to implement telecommunications in the region. Focus should be made on creating a regional backbone between MDOT, VDOT and WMATA. He also stated that this effort would be postponed until either additional resources are determined to create the connectivity between the backbone or the Regional Architecture plan defines more efficient connections.

Regional ITS Architecture: Glenn McLaughlin reported that the subcommittee met on June 15. The group discussed the NPRM and agreed that there were no disheartening issues that would effect the efforts of the committee. The group discussed the feasibility of an ITS regional coordinator position. It was suggested that the duties of this position would be impossible for one person for a number of reasons, and that it was suggested that each of the "big four" agencies, VDOT, MDOT, DCDPW and WMATA, dedicate one person to participate in the regional coordination effort. Each agency should provide additional funding for the duties of this position. Mr. Robinson volunteered for the VDOT position. Mr. McLaughlin volunteered for the MDOT position. The additional positions would be identified at a later date. Mr. McLaughlin also stated that the ITS Regional Architecture contract was still underway. The next meeting was scheduled for July 27, 2000.

Electronic Payment Systems: An electronic version of the phase one report from the Volpe center had been distributed to the ITS Technical Task Force members via email in late May. Comments on the report should be sent to Sharmila Samarasinghe.

N-1-1: Mr. Robinson inquired about the FCC's approval of N-1-1 for general transportation information. He was concerned with how the region would react to this ruling, since various operation and service requirements were unclear. Frank Mirack stated that the George Mason white paper was still underway, however one of the paper's recommendation specify PIM as a key actor in identifying the feasibility of such a system for the region. Mr. Robinson was concerned about the on going cost of the service and who would be responsible for the bill. Mr. Farley suggested that the ITS Technical Task Force should identify technical issues of the system by consulting the policy officials in each of the jurisdictions and identify what their stand on the issue is. He stated that then as a regional body, this group could create a regional policy. Mr. Robinson stressed the need for George Mason to finish the white papers by the end of July, so the policy officials can make a decision on the issue.

ITS as a Data Resource: Jean Yves Point-du-Jour reported that on June 14, a conference call with Mr. Meese and the consultant team TransCore was held. The group discussed the following two issues:

- First Task of the survey distribution;
- Schedule of the project

The next steps for the study include finalizing the survey and discussing any arising issues during the next meeting.

5. Update on ITS Strategic Plan

Mr. Meese stated that he has not received any comments on the draft outline from the ITS Policy Task Force regarding the ITS Strategic Plan outline. COG staff was currently working on a preliminary draft of the plan.

6. Other Business

Kenneth Todd asked the following 3 questions for follow-up:

1. How does a driver know of the time savings and travel distance if, for example, his route through Wilson Boulevard is heavily congested and Columbia Pike is the alternate route?
2. How does the driver know if the total fuel consumption of air pollution would be less or more?
3. How does the driver know if the alternate route has become congested due to the detour traffic?