

MEETING NOTES

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) TECHNICAL TASK FORCE

CHAIR: Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax

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 Administration

DATE: Friday, March 23, 2001

TIME: 10:30 am

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

ATTENDANCE:

Armen Abrahamian, Prince George's County DPW, aabrahamian@co.pg.md.us
Howard Benn, Montgomery County/Transit Services, howard.benn@co.mo.md.us
Brien Benson, George Mason, bbenson@gmu.edu
Randall Carroll, Maryland Department of Environment, rcarroll@mde.state.md.us
John Collins, Traffic.com, jcollins@traffic.com
Harold Foster, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission-Prince George's County, hfooster@mncppc.state.md.us
John Frankenhoff, DC DOT, john.frankenhoff@dc.gov
Craig A. Franklin, Trichord Inc., caf@trichord-inc.com
Marisa Greshko, Orbital TMS, greshko.marisa@orbital.com
Dave Hall, Prince George's County DPW, dlhall@co.pg.md.us
Doug Ham, Capital Transit Consultant/PB Farradyne, hamd@ctcmetro.com
Kamal Hamud, DC DOT, khamud@wam.umd.edu
Fatimah Hasan, MDOT, fhasan@mdot.state.md.us
Thomas Jennings, FHWA-Virginia Division, tom.jennings@fhwa.dot.gov

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the March 23, 2001 Meeting**

Page 2

Donald McCanless, WMATA, dmcanless@wmata.com
Glenn McLaughlin, MDSHA/CHART, gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us
Frank Mirack, FHWA
Peter Moreland, DCDOT
Marcia Pincus, ITS America, mpincus@itsa.org
Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, MDSHA/Office of Traffic and Safety, jpoint-du-jour@sha.state.md.us
Sharmila Samarasinghe, NVTC, sharmila@nvtc.org
Vaishali P. Shah, Mitretek Systems, vshah@mitretek.org
Amy Tang, VDOT NOVA, amytang@vdot.state.va.us
Phil Tarnoff, University of Maryland, tarnoff@eng.umd.edu
Kenneth Todd, NCBW
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax DPW, averzosa@ci.fairfax.va.us
Xueqin Wang, Arlington County DPW, xwang@co.arlington.va.us
Ron Welke, M-NCPPC Montgomery County, welke@mncppc.state.md.us
Robert Winick, Motion Maps, LLC, rmwinick@motionmaps.com
Emil Wolanin, Montgomery County DPW, ewolanin@dpwt.com

COG Staff:

Malaika Abernathy, mabernathy@mwkog.org
Andrew Meese, ameese@mwkog.org
Gerald Miller, [gmiller@mwkog.org](mailto:gmillier@mwkog.org)
Joe Zelinka, Public Safety, jzelinka@mwkog.org
C.P. Zilliacus, zill@mwkog.org

ACTIONS:

1. Review of Notes from the February 23 Technical Task Force Meeting

Chair Alex Verzosa called the meeting to order at 10:45 am. No changes were made to the February 23 notes.

2. Presentation of Mitretek Study on Traveler Response to Advanced Traveler Information in Metropolitan Washington

Mr. Verzosa introduced Vaishali Shah of Mitretek to present the study on traveler response to Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS) in Metropolitan Washington.

The study compared and simulated the behavior of travelers that regularly use pre-trip ATIS (ATIS commuter) with the experiences of commuters that do not use traveler information prior to their commute (Habitual commuter). The study used archived data from the SmartRoute Systems to conduct a case study based on travel conditions in Washington DC between August 1, 1999 and October 1, 2000.

Ms. Shah highlighted the following findings of the study:

TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force Notes from the March 23, 2001 Meeting

Page 3

- Pre-trip ATIS yielded time management benefits, as opposed to travel time benefits; on a good day, ATIS users know to leave later, and on a bad day, they know to leave earlier or find an alternative route.
- The ATIS commuter would have improved travel time reliability and less wasted time.

The next steps that may be explored by Mitretek included:

- Examining findings in other cities;
- Applying a value of time for schedule delay;
- Applying regional trip demand patterns to outcome;
- Implementing alternative travel behavior profiles; and
- Developing other regional performance tracking measures using archived data.

In response to a question from Kenneth Todd, Ms. Shah stated that the study examined the benefits of the ATIS commuter and did not assess impacts on the overall transportation system.

In response to a question from Mr. Meese, Ms. Shah said that the SmartRoute Systems data could be accurate enough to use on a regional basis for variability, causality, or other types of analyses, though the Mitretek study and compiled database were not set up or programmed to do this.

Ms. Shah further explained, in response to a question from Mr. Franklin, that the reliability of both the habitual commuter and the ATIS commuter are quantified based on the assumption that the variability of travel time was greater than the average increase of travel time (2%), thus the habitual commuter was more likely to be late as a result of the variability of travel. Reliability, in this case, refers to the commuter and not the reliability of the network.

Ms. Shah confirmed that information on travel behavior would be addressed in the future. However, the following parameters were identified based on the Mitretek study results:

- ATIS commuters arrived on time to their destination, 19 out of 20 times.
- The savings threshold for route changes was 3 minutes and the threshold for travel time changes was 1-2 minutes.
- The value of saving time based on the length of the commute would also be addressed.

3. Report on the March 7, 2001 ITS Policy Task Force Meeting and March 21, 2001 Transportation Planning Board Meeting

Mr. Meese distributed a draft version of the March 7, 2000 ITS Policy Task Force meeting notes to the group. He also distributed and discussed a list of on-going activities as they relate to FY96-01 Federal Earmarks. This handout was distributed at the March 7 meeting, but was not discussed at length. The handout included an effort to update the group on the status of previous and current earmarks and Mr. Meese asked the group to submit all comments or updates to him.

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the March 23, 2001 Meeting**

Page 4

The actions of the March 21, 2001 TPB meeting as it relates to Action 1, were discussed in Agenda item 4.

4. Update on Expansion of Task Force Focus: Action 1 (Name Change and Mission Statement)

Mr. Meese stated that based on comments from this group and the ad hoc Management and Operations working group, the final name change and mission statements of the M&O/ITS Policy and Technical Task Force groups were officially approved by the TPB (meeting of March 21).

The names of the groups were as follows: TPB Management, Operations and ITS (M&O/ITS) Technical and Policy Task Forces.

Mr. Meese distributed a report from the FHWA regarding results of consumer surveys on improvement efforts in preserving and maintaining current transportation networks around the country. M&O/ITS Policy Chair David Snyder distributed this report during the March 21 TPB meeting, supporting the orientation to consumer satisfaction and management and operations of the transportation system.

5. Update on Expansion of Task Force Focus: Action 2 (Identifying M&O Opportunities)

Mr. Meese briefed the group on the status of the Action 2 item regarding potential near-term activities of regional context that would have an impact on management and operations of the region's transportation system. The following three M&O projects were discussed:

1. Traffic Signal Problem Reporting System- This project would establish a unified traffic signal problem reporting system for the region. The Traffic Signals and Optimization working group discussed the format of the system at the March 9 meeting. Mr. Meese stated that the M&O/ITS Policy group approved this project with the understanding that the format would not be redundant with existing telephone traveler information services. Chair Woody Hood, Doug Hansen and Mr. Meese were to meet on this on April 2 [later rescheduled to April 12].
2. M&O Prototype Arterial Corridor- Arterial corridors with interjurisdictional scopes would be selected. A few interagency meetings of responsible parties would examine the M&O of the corridors and identify any feasible, quick improvements (funding within existing sources). These meetings would invite a variety of regional stakeholders including, traffic, transit and public safety officials. This effort would expand upon currently existing on-going projects in the region.
3. Develop Summary of M&O in the Region- A stakeholders summit meeting would be held to showcase the numerous M&O and incident management activities going on in the region. The proceedings of the meeting would serve as a report that would inform the region's decision makers and planning professionals, for better consideration of M&O in regional transportation planning.

TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force Notes from the March 23, 2001 Meeting

Page 5

Mr. Meese attended the Maryland Regional Operations Coordination Committee meeting on March 15, and hoped to bring more information on projects discussed there to the M&O/ITS Task Forces.

6. Update on Expansion of Task Force Focus: Action 3 (Performance Measures)

The ad hoc M&O working group met on March 5 to further identify M&O performance measures. Staff will coordinate the M&O performance measures effort with the measures of effectiveness (MOEs) being discussed as part of the TPB's "mobility study" (scenario testing).

The M&O group should identify MOEs for Policy Goals 3 and 4, which addressed M&O and ITS issues, as input to the mobility study.

Mr. Meese also discussed the importance of identifying performance measures that are directly linked to an existing project in the region. He mentioned the new CHART report as a good example of this.

The next ad hoc M&O meeting was scheduled for April 2, 2001.

7. Update on ITS Strategic Plan

Mr. Meese and Craig Franklin updated the group on the progress of the ITS Strategic Plan. An outline of the plan was distributed. The outline was revised to reduce the length of the final report. The following comments were made by the group regarding the plan:

- Change the name- Jerry Miller advised the group to change the name of the ITS Strategic Plan to address the M&O focus of the federal planning regulations.
- Integration Strategy- Amy Tang suggested that the ITS Architecture effort should address the integration strategy and not the ITS Strategic Plan.
- Additional Component- Phil Tarnoff stated that current regional training initiatives in which the Professional Capacity Building working group had offered, should be addressed in the ITS Strategic Plan. Mr. Meese agreed and stated that training and other M&O activities which are unfunded could be addressed by Plan.
- Business Models- In response to a comment from Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, Mr. Franklin stated that examples of business models would be discussed in certain components of the ITS Strategic plan- namely, Electronic Payments and Regional Traveler Information.
- Inputs in the TIP or CLRP- In response to a question from James Gaston, Mr. Meese said that after the TPB approval of the ITS Strategic Plan, it would not be incorporated into the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) or the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). The plan would be a policy statement of the TPB.
- Reducing the length of the Plan- Mr. Tarnoff suggested a few ideas in reducing the length of the document.

A next draft of the ITS Strategic Plan would be distributed at the April 27 meeting.

8. Update on Regional ITS Inventory

TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force Notes from the March 23, 2001 Meeting

Page 6

Malaika Abernathy distributed an updated version of the Regional ITS Inventory. She briefed the group on the next steps to be taken in completing this effort. She urged the group to participate in this activity and submit all existing and planned (funded) ITS projects being implemented by agencies within the region to her by a deadline date of April 9, 2001. This document would be an appendix to the ITS Strategic Plan.

9. Reports from Groups/Focus Areas

ITS Regional Architecture

Glenn McLaughlin updated the group on the last meeting of February 28. At this meeting market packages and functions of the Architecture were discussed. He stated that all comments should be forwarded to him. The next meeting was scheduled for April 12.

Ms. Tang mentioned that the NOVA ITS draft Architecture was working in coordination with the Regional ITS Architecture effort. She stated that the draft architecture would be discussed at the April 6, meeting at VDOT.

511

In response to the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) designation of 511 as the national three digit number for traveler information services, a group of cellular providers had petitioned the FCC to exempt them from the requirement to complete 511 calls on their network. In support of 511 being the designated traveler information number, ITS America requested comments opposing the petition by the wireless cellular providers. The deadline to receive these comments was April 12.

Partners In Motion (PIM)

On March 19, a public sector partners meeting was held. Members discussed possible next steps to take in response to the expiration of the PIM contract in December 2002. Mr. Meese urged all public sector members to attend the next PIM meeting on April 9, to further discuss the concerns of the future of PIM in the region.

Electronic Payment Systems (EPS)

The members of this group have not met in a while. Mr. Meese, Mr. Verzosa and Sharmila Samarasinghe planned to meet on April 17, to discuss possible next steps for this working group.

FY 99/00 funding for the EPS was never allocated and the status of these funds needs to be determined.

CapWIN

The RFP for phase I of the CapWIN system was prepared for acquisition. Phase I system installation was planned for completion in July 2002. Pilot tests for the project would begin in April 2001.

Traffic Signals and Operations

**TPB Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the March 23, 2001 Meeting**

Page 7

Mr. Meese informed the group that COG's task order consultant, Mary Ann Mijares, was tasked to write a traffic signals white paper for the Metropolitan Washington region. The next meeting of this working group was scheduled for May 11.

Professional Capacity Building (PCB)

The following courses were being offered:

- *Implementing Transportation Projects: Facing Down the Policy and Institutional Issues-* April 5, 12, 19 at George Mason University
- *The Application of Advance Technologies in Public Transportation-* May 10, 17, 24.

For more information on these or other courses, please contact Carolyn Goodman at goodmancd@vdot.state.va.us.

The next PCB meeting was scheduled for March 30, 2001.

An upcoming course on what transportation officials need to know about databases was currently being developed. Additional funding was received by FHWA. The group was working on course description. This course was expected to be available in Fall 2001.

ITS As A Data Resource

The TransCore contract has been expanded to include a detailed design. TransCore had scheduled meetings with key agencies and stakeholders to further develop this detailed design.

10. Other Business

The ITS Virginia Conference was scheduled for May 2-3 in Charlottesville, Virginia.

Mr. Verzosa adjourned the meeting at 1:45 p.m.