

MEETING NOTES

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD (TPB)
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, February 23, 2001

TIME: 10:30 am

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
Jeff Arch, PB Farradyne, arch@pbworld.com
Howard Benn, Montgomery County/Transit Services, howard.benn@co.mo.md.us
Randy Carroll, Maryland Department of Environment, rcarroll@mde.state.md.us
Tony Clarke, Edwards & Kelcey, cclarke@ekmail.com
Carol Davis, CSC, Citizen/Springfield Interchange Project, fern98@erols.com
Rick Davis, CSC, rdavis39@csc.com
Wil DerMinassian, DCDPW
Soumya Dey, TransCore, soumya.dey@transcore.com
Kathleen Donodeo, WMATA
John Frankenhoff, DCDPW/DOT, jfrankenhoff@dpw.dcgov.org
Craig Franklin, Trichord, caf@trichord-inc.com
James Gaston, GDI Traffic Mgmt & Transportation Systems, gastonjg1@aol.com
Doug Hansen, Fairfax County DOT, doug.hansen@co.fairfax.va.us
Fatimah Hasan, MDOT, fhasan@mdot.state.md.us
A.S. Hollingsworth, Garcia-Lopez & Ash-ITS, ahollingsworth@legiondesign.com
Egua Igbinosun, MDSHA/CHART, eigbinosun@sha.state.md.us

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the February 23, 2001 Meeting
Page 2

Tom Jacobs, UMD-CATT, tjacobs@wam.umd.edu
Glenn McLaughlin, MDSHA/CHART, gmclaughlin@sha.state.md.us
Chris Merdon, CSC, cmerdon@csc.com
Frank Mirack, FHWA
Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, MDSHA, jpoint-du-jour@sha.state.md.us
Will Raine, WMATA, wraine@wmata.com
Kajaz Safarian, DCDPW/DOT, doc10e@aol.com
Sharmila Samarasinghe, NVTC, sharmila@nvtdc.org
Amy Tang, VDOT NOVA ITS, amytang@vdot.state.va.us
Kenneth Todd, NCBW
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax DPW, averzosa@ci.fairfax.va.us
Xueqin Wang, Arlington County, xwang@co.arlington.va.us

COG Staff:

Malaika Abernathy, Department of Transportation, mabernathy@mwkog.org
Andrew Meese, Department of Transportation, ameese@mwkog.org
Jerry Miller, Department of Transportation, gmiller@mwkog.org
Joe Zelinka, Public Safety, jzelinka@mwkog.org
C.P. Ziliacus, Department of Transportation, zill@mwkog.org

ACTIONS:

1. Review of Notes from the December 15, 2000 Technical Task Force Meeting

Chair Alex Verzosa called the meeting to order at 10:45 am. The December 15, 2000 meeting notes had not been reviewed at the January 26 joint meeting due to time constraints, and therefore were being considered here. Also, staff had slightly revised the notes since the version distributed at the January 26 meeting. The December 15 notes were accepted as drafted.

2. Review of Notes from the January 26, 2001 ITS Policy and Technical Task Forces' Joint Meeting

No changes were made to the January 26, 2001 joint meeting notes.

3. Announcement of Mitretek Paper on Traveler Response to Advanced Traveler Information in Metropolitan Washington

Responding to several previous inquiries, Andrew Meese announced to the group that a presentation on a recent Mitretek paper, on Traveler Response to Advanced Traveler Information in the Washington region, was planned for the March 23 ITS Technical Task Force meeting. Vaishali Shah of Mitretek, who would give the presentation, had suggested waiting until March 23, because they will have additional data to present over and above what was presented at the January Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting. The electronic version of the January version of the paper was available upon request from Mr. Meese.

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the February 23, 2001 Meeting

Page 3

4. Update on Expansion of Focus to Management and Operations, and ITS

Mr. Meese informed the group of Policy Task Force Chair David Snyder's presentation to the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) on February 21, 2001. Mr. Snyder briefed the Board on the discussions held at the January 26 joint meeting on potential TPB activities regarding management and operations for the regional transportation system. Mr. Meese went over the following three Action Items slated to be undertaken in 2001:

ACTION 1: Name and Focus Expansion- The ITS Policy and Technical Task Forces would reflect the management and operations focus through a name change and mission statement revision. The new names would be the Management, Operations, and ITS Policy Task Force and the Management, Operations, and ITS Technical Task Force. The time frame was to have the revised names and mission statements approved by the TPB in March.

ACTION 2: Identify Regional Management and Operations Opportunities- The focus of this action would identify a few key potential actions that could take place in calendar year 2001 that would consider and advance management and operations in the metropolitan planning process. The time frame was to have a few opportunities identified and perhaps started by mid-2001.

ACTION 3: Develop Informative Regional Performance Measures- An ad hoc Management, Operations, and ITS group has been formed. This group would be responsible for developing performance measures to gauge the efficiency of the regions management and operations systems. The group met on February 5 and was to meet again on March 5, 2001 at 11 am.

Mr. Meese stated that the Actions 2 and 3 would be further discussed during the ad hoc management and operations meeting on March 5.

The group endorsed the name change to the Management, Operations and ITS Technical Task Force, forwarded for Policy Task Force and TPB approval.

Mr. Meese distributed a draft handout of the existing mission statement for the ITS Technical and Policy Task Forces. The handout included changes suggested by staff. These suggestions supported the management and operations focus. After discussion, the group decided to provide further comments regarding the mission statement to Mr. Meese subsequent to the meeting.

5. Update on ITS Strategic Plan

Mr. Meese distributed a draft version of the ITS Strategic Plan drafted by consultant Craig Franklin. Mr. Franklin asked for input and consensus from the group regarding the direction of the plan. With respect to the new context of management and operations for the region, Mr. Franklin distributed a draft handout of the ITS Strategic Plan and a handout, which contained issues/concerns that may relate to the development of the plan. The draft begins to fill in the detailed outline for the document that staff developed and the Task Force approved several months ago. The document mainly used placeholders and bullet points indicating the topics of content in each section. Mr. Franklin requested the group give input and consensus on the direction of the ITS Strategic Plan based on the distributed handouts. Comments and suggestions

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the February 23, 2001 Meeting

Page 4

would be discussed during the March 23, 2001 Task Force meeting. Deadline for comments are March 14. Mr. Meese stated that COG staff would work with Mr. Franklin on providing a more substantive document for future Task Force discussion. A final draft of the document was expected by June 30, 2001.

6. Update on Regional ITS Inventory

Malaika Abernathy discussed the Regional ITS inventory effort. Ms. Abernathy distributed a draft document of currently existing or future planned ITS projects within the Metropolitan Washington Region. The document would be beneficial in assisting regional transportation officials mainstream ITS projects with current management and operations efforts. The inventory was also expected to be coordinated with the ITS Strategic Plan and the ITS Regional Architecture. Ms. Abernathy obtained the updated inventory information through each agency input and direction. She urged all member agencies to participate in this effort and contribute the needed information to expedite the completion of this document. This document was expected to be completed in July 2001.

In response to a question from Amy Tang, Mr. Meese stated that the inventory would characterize projects, which exist presently, are planned and funded, are planned and partially funded, and, are planned and not funded. This format would allow policy officials to easily identify unfunded opportunities. This means future projects that are not currently in the TIP or any other federally approved document may be identified in the Inventory, contingent upon the approval of the operating agency.

Ms. Abernathy urged the group to send comments regarding updated ITS project information and comments and suggestions regarding the format of the inventory. The March 23 meeting will focus on any changes to the inventory.

7. Update on Regional ITS Architecture

Glenn McLaughlin gave the following status on completed tasks regarding the ITS Regional Architecture:

- Research from existing documents had been completed.
- Stakeholders from around the region have been identified and related information was being inputted into the Turbo Architecture software.
- Functions from the National Architecture had been identified and would be used in indicating data flows.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the Architecture team's present task was to seek input from this Task Force in validating the proposed market packages to help customize and draft a strawman architecture. Mr. McLaughlin urged the group to participate in this effort and invited everyone to attend the February 28, 2001 ITS Regional Architecture meeting. Jeff Arch, one of the consultants from the architecture, also gave the group a brief status of the process in customizing a draft strawman architecture.

8. Reports from Groups/Focus Areas

511: Chair Todd Kell is a member of the AASHTO 511 group, which met in January to discuss 511 issues as it relates to the Northeastern states. An AASHTO retreat had been scheduled for March. Also, Channel 9 news interviewed Mr. Kell regarding 511 issues. A petition would be submitted to the Virginia State Corporation Commission in two months. This petition would grant control of 511 for Virginia to VDOT.

VDOT has a one-year time line for implementing 511 within their region. A draft version was currently under internal review. The draft version does not address the metropolitan Washington region, because there will need to be more discussions on the future or advanced traveler information systems (ATIS) in the metropolitan Washington region first. A March 19 Partners In Motion meeting was to address 511 as it relates to public agencies, and was to continue the discussion of the future of ATIS in the region.

MDOT had held some internal meetings on 511. It was hoped that further reports on the Maryland and District of Columbia responses to 511 would be forthcoming to the Task Force in the future.

Partners In Motion (PIM): PIM held an all committees meeting in January on the status of PIM. One issue addressed during this meeting was that the contract with Battelle and SmartRoute Systems ends in December 2002. The current business model for PIM likely will not sustain the project after the 2002 contract expiration. Mr. Meese suggested all of the public agency participants should attend the March 19, 2001 PIM meeting to discuss the previously mentioned issues.

Mr. Franklin identified the need for this group to address the telematics issue as it relates to the current PIM system.

Electronic Payment Systems (EPS): WMATA had signed a contract for the purchase of electronic fare boxes for the Smart Trip media. The contract provided for the region's other transit providers to procure these fare boxes for their own vehicles, to prepare for interagency acceptance of Smart Trip. Issues that need to be addressed include the establishment of a regional clearinghouse, which would operationalize the system. The clearinghouse would be called a regional service center. There was a question on the status of the FY1999 funding for the EPS that was to be looked into for the next meeting.

CapWIN: The RFP was prepared for acquisition of the Phase I CapWIN system. 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: The traffic signals group received a presentation on February 9 from Virginia Tech, to discuss preliminary results of the computer simulation portion of the

TPB ITS Technical Task Force
Notes from the February 23, 2001 Meeting

Page 6

Signal Preemption Study. Technical reports 1 and 2, discussing stakeholder requirements, technologies, past deployments, and system requirements for traffic signal preemption and priority, were in draft form. The group was to meet next on March 9, to discuss the following items:

- Expansion of M&O considerations for traffic signals and operations.
- Feedback on the strawman proposal for M&O.
- Updates on signals, white paper, signals public outreach, and the signal problem reporting system.

Professional Capacity Building: Two new courses were being offered-

- Synchro Traffic Signal Software Course- March 29-30, 2001
- Signal Timing- April 24-25, 2001

Additional funding was to be provided by the FHWA to support the Synchro course.

Please contact Mr. Meese for further information on these courses.

An upcoming course on what transportation officials need to know about databases was currently being developed. The group was working on a course description. Such a course maybe be offered in Fall 2001. The Professional Capacity Building Working Group was to meet next on February 28.

9. **Other Business**

There was no other business. Mr. Verzosa adjourned the meeting at 12:45 pm.