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OPENING

(1:10 p.m.)

MS. ROW: We’ll go ahead and get started, and hopefully we’ve gotten everyone hooked up or on their way.

First of all -- first of all, let me say welcome. We appreciate you all being here. We appreciate you serving on the advisory committee. We appreciate all of our guests being here, participating with us. So, welcome and thank you for your time and your willingness to serve on the advisory committee.

I’m Shelley Row. I’m the Director of the ITS Joint Program Office. I am your designated federal official. That’s a very official title that we have to have as part of our FACA guidelines that you’ll be hearing more about.

We are going to do some introductions in just a minute, but the first introduction that I would like to make to you all is the RITA Administrator, Mr. Paul Brubaker.

MR. BRUBAKER: Hello.

MS. ROW: We’re very happy that Paul is with us now. And, Paul, would you like to say a few words?

MR. BRUBAKER: Yeah, I’m just delighted to be here, and I’m new to the job here. I’ve got a total of six and a half weeks under my belt here. And, you know, I’m learning all kinds of new things. I thought I knew a little something about the ITS Program, but it turns out I didn’t know much compared to what I thought I knew when I got on board.
A couple of things I’d like to suggest, but I think it will wait until I -- I’m going to brief the slide on RITA as we go forward, and then I’ll just say a couple of things about, you know, my thinking relative to ITS going forward.

MS. ROW: Okay. Thanks, Paul.

MR. BRUBAKER: Thanks.

MS. ROW: And Paul is being very modest. He walked in the door having done a lot of research and knew a lot about the program, has a very strong technology background, and he’s had us at a run ever since.

(Laughter.)

MS. ROW: And we’re picking up speed.

So, why don’t we take a moment and introduce everyone so we know who’s here, and we’re going to introduce everyone that’s here in the room as well as everyone that’s on the phone. And particularly for those in the room, if you would particularly note if you are actually on the committee. I think we’ve just got a couple of you, and the rest I think are guests.

So, you’ve already heard from me. I’m Shelley Row.

MR. BRUBAKER: Paul Brubaker.

MR. MISTELE: Bryan Mistele, President and CEO of Inrix, which provides traffic information, and I’m on the committee.

MR. AVERKAMP: I am Joe Averkamp. I’m on the
committee. I am the designated telecommunications rep.

MR. BUTTON: I’m Ken Button, George Mason University.

I’m on the committee.

MR. MONNIERE: Good afternoon. My name is Robert Monniere. I’m an attorney with the Research and Innovative Technologies Administration.

MR. HINCH: I’m John Hinch. I’m with the National Traffic Highway Safety Administration, in the Research Office.

MR. RESENDES: Ray Resendes, also with NTHSA.

MS. ROW: Jack?

MR. WELLS: I’m Jack Wells, Chief Economist in the Office of Transportation Policy.

MR. ITZKOFF: I’m Don Itzkoff with O’Connor & Hannan.

MR. WILLIAMS: I’m Kyle Williams. I’m in advanced technology and product marketing at Robert Bosch.

MR. SCHUMAN: I’m Rick Schuman. I’m with Inrix.

MR. WELBES: I’m Matt Welbes, Federal Transit Administration, Acting Associate Administrator for Research.

MR. HYNES: Ron Hynes with the FTA’s Research Office.

MR. BAYLES: Steve Bayles, in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

MR. BELCHER: Scott Belcher, ITS America.

MS. ROW: Thank you very much. And Scott is the new incoming president of ITS America.
And on the phone, would you gentlemen please introduce yourselves as well?

MR. INGLISH: John Inglisch, with Utah Transit Authority.

MR. MORGAN: Granger Morgan. I’m head of the Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University.

MR. FOXX: Alfred Foxx, Director of Transportation for Baltimore City, Maryland.

MS. FLEMER: Ann Flemer, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, San Francisco Bay Area.

MR. WORTHINGTON: John Worthington, President of Transcore.

MR. ALBERT: Steve Albert, Western Transportation Institute, Montana State University.

MR. IWASAKI: Randy Iwasaki, Caltrans.

MR. LUND: Adrian Lund with the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

MR. DENARO: Bob Denaro with NAVTEQ Corporation.

MR. SUGIMOTO: Tomiji Sugimoto, Honda R&D America.

MS. ROW: Is there anyone else on the phone?

And I believe Joe Sussman is going to be joining us a little bit late.

I have to acknowledge the extraordinary lengths that
many of you have gone to, to participate in this.

Adrian, I understand that you are in Brazil.

MR. LUND: That is correct.

MS. ROW: Well, thank you for working so hard to participate in the call. We do appreciate it.

We do have this -- the presentation materials available through WebEx. That’s particularly important to those of you who are on the phone and are connected through the Internet. Charlie Velez is working with us through Citizant and has been helping us get all this set up and arranged.

Charlie, do you want to say a quick word to the people on the phone about how they can type in questions for us to consider during the course of the meeting?

MR. VELEZ: Sure. First, for participation on WebEx, it’s highly recommended that you close any other applications you may have on your computer, and if you’re not in a private area or if you’re in your office, it’s also highly recommended that you get as much privacy as possible to avoid any interruptions. You, hopefully, on your screen, will see what’s called the “presentation pod,” which has the introductory slide for the presentation today, a PowerPoint slide. And to the left of that are two pods: the upper pod, called the “participant/attendee pod,” which includes the names of all of those who have logged in; and below that is what’s called the
"chat pod." This is the pod that we can use to communicate.

At different points during the meeting, if you would like to ask a question or when Shelley requests questions, simply in the cell, at the bottom of the pod, type in your question and then, below that, you’ll see a drop-down, because right now it says “everyone.” If you click on that, there’s a drop-down list where you can select to whom you would like to ask that -- of whom you would like to ask that question. If you have a question of Shelley, go ahead and use my name, Carlos Velez, and then we’ll know that that question is for Shelley. Then once you select the individual, then go back up to the right of the cell and click on that little arrow to send the message. The message will be received here with your name preceding the question.

Are there any questions on that procedure?

MR. FOXX. Yes. This is Al Foxx. There’s two Carlos Velez on the status list. One is 2, and the other has no number.

MR. VELEZ: Use the one without the number.

MR. FOXX: Okay. Thanks.

MR. VELEZ: Right.

MS. ROW: So, you all are good to go with that, okay?

MR. FOXX: Good to go.

MS. ROW: Great. We are going to be watching what you
type in there so we make sure that we have a good opportunity to
address any questions that you have.

We will be pausing through the different sections of
the agenda so that we can get any questions that you have out on
the table. So -- okay.

Let me just quickly review where we are with the --
going to the Meeting Purpose slide. Keep going. There we are.

This meeting today is just our introductory meeting.
Primarily, what we’re going to do is to walk you through some of
the basics of what it means to be part of a Federal advisory
committee, to be a member of this particular committee, a little
bit about the charter, what your role is going to be, and then a
little bit of background about the current program and then some
final words to set us up for a future -- for our next
discussions.

What we are expecting to do -- and you will see this
in the materials later on -- is we are expecting to use you all
and your knowledge and your experience to help us with a
strategic planning effort that we’re going to be embarking on.
This isn’t a big, huge one; it’s going to be --

We’re getting some feedback on phone. If you guys
could make sure you have your mute button on.

But we are expecting to do a strategic planning
process. We’ll talk a little bit about that. It’s going to be
pretty targeted, focused, not long and drawn-out, and you’ll see what we’re talking about, about that. But that will be kind of the thrust of where we’re going today.

So, again, introductory meeting. The next meeting will be much more of a substantial conversation. Okay?

Okay. Let’s take a look at the agenda. It looks like a lot of stuff. Again, most of it is just introductory material.

**ETHICS AND FACA BRIEFING**

So, let’s go ahead and move on to the first part, which is the ethics and the FACA briefing. And I do want to acknowledge, Bob Monniere is part of our legal staff at RITA. For those of you on the phone, he has an incapacitated arm.

So, Bob, thank you very much for going to extra effort to be here today.

MR. MONNIERE: Not a problem. Good afternoon. I’ll be giving a very small presentation on the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the ethics, basically, issues that have come up in the past and that members should be aware of. And then we’ll talk briefly about the GSA regulations which cover all Federal advisory committees. People should be aware that GSA is the Federal agency that has oversight responsibility for all Federal advisory committees, and they have issued actual regulations.

So, most of the time, when a question comes up as to
process and procedure, the place to find that is in the GSA regulation. Being a lawyer, I always like to give cites so that those who would like to, that would like to look that up on their own, can. The cite for the GSA regulation is 41 C.F.R. -- which stands for Code of Federal Regulations -- parts 101-6 and 102-3.

MS. ROW: Excuse me, Bob. I might just share with the group that, in your read-ahead materials, that citation is actually in Section D.

MR. MONNIERE: Thank you, Shelley. Once again, you’ve thought of things that I did not.

We can go to the first FACA slide. As most of you know, advisory committees are a way that the Federal government formally seeks advice, input from persons outside the Federal government. They play an important role and have for many years, and the one thing that people should be aware of is (phone beep) -- is that this is an open process we’ll go through later. Under -- only under most extreme circumstances would a meeting be closed to the public. By and large, this is a public process. Minutes are kept of the meetings. Those minutes are available upon request. And so, people should be aware of that.

Next slide, please.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act was passed by Congress in 1972. And, as I said, it was Congress -- it was
their effort in an attempt to have an orderly procedure for
gathering input and assistance from members of the public. In
addition, what we refer to as the SAFETEA-LU legislation
actually created this particular advisory committee, and I
believe the legislative language has been provided to committee
members. You will see where Congress was very specific
concerning the membership of the committee and, basically,
representatives from certain aspects. And, in addition, that
was the intent of Congress, that the Federal government should
be available to have independent and balanced views presented to
it.

As of 2005, there are approximately 960 Federal
advisory committees with approximately 62,000 members. So, as
you can see, there is a large number of committees and a large
number of members carrying on the process of giving input to the
Federal government on a variety of issues.

One of the things that the GSA regulations provide is
that the agency is responsible to ensure the avoidance of a
conflict of interest. And, as I said, GSA has published Federal
regulations concerning this subject. I’ll take a moment to just
quickly talk about conflicts of interest. We have had advisory
committees in the past, and certain areas have come up before.
One area that I would like to highlight to all the members is
the area of contracts. In the past, we have had committee
members that have expressed interest in entering into a contractual relationship with the agency. That, in almost all cases, would be viewed as a conflict of interest. Members of the committee are here to provide independent and balanced advice, not to be involved in a contractual relationship with the agency.

In addition, from time to time, the issue of personnel actions have come up, and in addition, input from committee members on particular personnel issues, for the lack of a better word. Again, that’s an area that, while certainly general advice to the agency is appropriate and proper, specific advice considering a specific individual would certainly be stretching the boundaries.

In addition, as I’ve mentioned a number of times this afternoon, there are GSA regulations involving the process and procedures, a number of policies, and I think just to keep in mind they’re important as the committee goes about its business. One is that the agency is required to publish a Federal Register notice at least 15 calendar days prior to every meeting. So, you will see a notice published in the Federal Register that will outline the time, place, purpose of the meeting, a summarized agenda, and those types of items. And, again, that must be published at least 15 days prior to the actual meeting.

In addition, I spoke briefly about the public nature
of these meetings. An advisory committee meeting can be closed
to the public. There are a number of legal hurdles that need to
be attained. First, there needs to be prior approval for any
closed portion of the meeting. In addition, the agency must
seek the General Counsel review prior to the meeting itself, and
the General Counsel must approve closing the meeting. In
addition, there has to be a formal determination by the head of
the agency that it is in the best interests of the government
and the committee to have a closed or portion of the meeting
closed. And, basically, that is a determination of public
access.

So, as the members can see, there is a number of sort
of hoops, if you will, that one has to go through prior to a
meeting or a portion of the meeting being closed to the public.
I raise this issue because it has come up from time to time,
where, based on perhaps the sensitivity of a particular issue,
certain committees have wanted to go into executive session, and
as I said, you cannot simply take a vote of the committee
members and execute an executive session. That would be in
violation of the GSA regulations.

So, my advice at the outset is that, for any reason,
if committee members feel that a portion of the upcoming meeting
should be closed to the public, then you need to contact Shelley
in giving her as much advance time as possible.
And all committee members should be aware that, as I said, meeting minutes are kept. They’re open to the public. They’re provided upon request. There is no need for an individual to submit a FOIA request. They are, by and large, open to the public.

As Shelley mentioned before, she is the designated Federal official, and, in fact, she should be your liaison if you have questions. Let me, in fact, give you my telephone number: It is 202-366-5498. And, again, Robert, the last name is spelled M-O-N-N-I-E-R-E. If you have any questions whatsoever concerning the GSA regulations, other FACA questions, I will be happy to answer those or do my best to find out the answers for you.

Are there any questions from the committee? I know I’ve gone rather quickly, but we will have other opportunities to discuss these issues.

MR. MORGAN: This is Granger Morgan. It’s not an issue for me, since I have no research contracts with the Department of Transportation. I chair, however, the EPA’s Science Advisory Board, which, of course, is another very old and long-standing FACA committee, and in that case, at least, so long as one declares it and takes oneself out of any particular matters, having research support from EPA does not bar one from being a member of that committee.
MR. MONNIERE: Well, if we take, for example, a hypothetical where we had a committee member receiving, at the time of appointment, funds from the agency, we would obviously need the committee member to make us aware of that, and we would go by a case-by-case basis. Obviously, if issues concerning that particular -- and we'll just say for the sake of discussion -- grant funds were going to a particular project, part of the arrangement that possibly would have to be set up is that that member would be recused from any interaction on those particular, either project or projects. But, obviously, the agency would want to be notified of each member's relationship that has either an indirect or direct connection to the agency.

Did that answer the question?

MS. ROW: Are there other questions?

I also neglected to mention earlier that this meeting is being recorded. So, we have a court reporter here with us today so that we will have a record of all the discussions and minutes. I also should tell you that we are preparing a place on the ITS Web site within RITA, where all the materials pertaining to this advisory committee will be housed. So, this presentation, for example, the minutes, any information about the advisory committee will be available publicly on that Web site.

Any other questions for Bob?
Okay. Great. Well, let’s move on and talk about the charter. One of the things that is required by FACA is that we establish a charter. That charter was provided to you. It is in Tab F in the read-ahead materials. And I also -- I neglected to mention that we have a few copies of the read-ahead materials. So, if any of the guests here or -- we can get a copy. Thank you, Andy.

So, I’m going to briefly walk you through the key elements of that charter, just to know that it’s there. It’s been filed. It’s real and all that. I would also tell you, in your packet under Tab E, just for your reference, we have provided you with a copy of the ITS Section of SAFETEA-LU. Now, we inadvertently only gave you part of it. That wasn’t intentional. We will make sure that you have the full thing.

But the part in it that talks specifically about the advisory committee is on page 4. It’s under letter H. So, you can see exactly what it was that SAFETEA-LU said about this advisory committee. It’s -- they were very specific in membership, and it also talks about the roles. And that has now been embedded in the charter.

Okay. So, let’s move on, Charlie.

As is mentioned, the role of the advisory committee is advisory. We take that information to the DOT, so you’re
providing official input into the DOT as advice. We are
required to -- well, let me just say the input from this
advisory committee will be fed into at least two different,
distinct places: One is through the Surface Transportation
Research and Technology Development Strategic Plan, that is led
out of RITA. So, we will be feeding that into that process as
well as into the ITS Program Plan, which we will talk more about
in a few minutes.

The legislation specifies that, at least annually,
that you all are to review our program, review the funding for
that program, to determine if we are doing appropriate
activities that are likely to advance ITS, that are likely to
result in deployment or identify the barriers to deployment, and
that we have identified the appropriate role for the government.

I think you will find that we are very cognizant and
interested in a very robust role for the private sector. So, we
are very clear on being explicit in what role the government can
serve to facilitate that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MS. ROW: And we’re getting some feedback on the phone
again. If you guys could check your mute buttons, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MS. ROW: Okay, we’re getting some conversation on the
phone. Okay, thank you, I think.
The information that comes from the advisory committee is provided to Congress through a report in February. Now, we have been -- we’re doing that report all this time, while we’ve been trying to get you all set up, and the reports have said we’ve been trying to get you all set up. So, this time we expect to have a more substantive report, although we will not have had much opportunity to meet. So, we intend to report on what we have heard from you to date and how we are intending to move forward. And so, that we will be putting together for the report that’s due in February.

Ultimately, we expect that report to include your recommendations, how we have assimilated your recommendations, and any reasons that we would have not taken your recommendations. So, at some point down the line, when we’re at that point, that’s what we will have in the report. Okay?

Next slide, Charlie.

The charter also contains the duration. It is two years from the date of filing, of the effective date of the charter. That was in February of ’06. So, do that math. It expires this February. We do expect to go through the process to renew it so you actually will have a chance to continue to meet, but we will have to go through that process.

You all report to the Secretary of Transportation through the ITS Joint Program Office.
The legislation was very specific on the membership.

I won’t go through all of that. We are capped out at 20 members. They were very clear on the types of members that we should have and specified public and private sector, urban and rural, that type of diversity. We took it even further and tried to make sure that we have a very broad cross section of all the stakeholders in the ITS industry.

So, you will see that we -- we are very pleased with the members of the advisory committee. We have automotive manufacturers; we have telecommunication providers; we have information service providers; we have State DOTs, local governments, transit, academic representation. So, we really do have a broad cross section, I think, that’s going to serve us well.

We do need to have a quorum, 10 people, to take official action. So, we have tried to poll you all for meeting dates to ensure that we have a quorum. And that’s why we’re doing that, is to try to make sure we’ve met the quorum.

Bob’s already talked about the meeting being open to the public. We are hoping to have three per year in person and supplementing that with teleconferences such as this, once we kind of get moving and everyone has a chance to meet each other.

We do look forward to you all providing very active input. So, it’s not a, you know, come together and not be taken
seriously. That’s not it at all. We are very interested in making this a working meeting.

We will be appointing a chair ultimately and a vice chair in subsequent meetings. We will work with the chair and the vice chair to establish the agendas. We don’t yet have a chair. We’ll be working to appoint that -- those two people before our next meeting.

And I think those are the high points of the charter.

Bob, is there anything I’ve missed?

MR. MONNIERE: No, I think that covers it.

MS. ROW: Okay. Are there any questions from anyone on the committee? Any questions, Charlie, from the phone folks?

MR. VELEZ: No.

MS. ROW: Okay. Committee members? Anyone in the room -- questions?

Okay. Well, we’re going to proceed on.

ITS PROGRAM PLAN

I wanted to take this opportunity to share a little bit with you about the ITS Program Plan. That is also required of us in the legislation. In fact, under Tab E, where you find the legislation, the very first thing in the legislation is about the program plan.

What you will see in there is that we are required to produce or update this plan every two years. We will,
subsequent to this meeting, mail you a copy of the current
program plan. It’s still relatively new, even though it was
published in ’06. I think it came out in ’07, actually, once we
get through the publications cycle.

The really key thing here is that it’s due to be
updated this year, in ’08. So, we have to provide an update to
Congress by the fall of ’08. That means that we have to have
the text done by about June. We view that to be a nice synergy
with this committee. So, we want to use your input as we frame
that program plan and articulate our vision for the future. At
this point, we are expecting to have two parts to the program
plan: One is basically an update of the current program plan,
the current state of play of the program, but then an explicit
section that talks about what is the future vision for the
program, where do we want to go, what are the big things that we
feel like need to be done and are the big winners for this
program going into the future. So, that’s why I bring your
attention to that program plan.

Those dates also drive some of our activity. So,
we’re going to be pushing pretty hard. Because of the review
and the publications cycles, we’re going to have to have words
on paper pretty set by early summer. Okay?

Okay. I think I’ve talked about that -- any questions
about the program plan?
Okay. All right. Okay, Charlie, let’s move on.

RITA AND ITS JPO

And we’re going to give you a little bit of background about how we’re organized internally. Many of you know and knew us when we were at Federal Highway Administration. We’ve recently completed a move into the Research and Innovative Technology Administration. We’ve been welcomed into that administration and are getting ourselves -- making our new home in RITA, and we have been made to feel very welcome there.

I was going to ask Paul to talk a little bit about his visions for RITA.

MR. BRUBAKER: Sure, and I’m not going to brief this slide. I think that if you go -- I’ve got a slide up here, the next slide, don’t I?

MS. ROW: Yes.

MR. BRUBAKER: Okay, I’m not going to brief you on it or read it to you. Basically, you can take a look at that, except for the fact I want to highlight the fact that our charter, our remit under the Mineta Act, is a very -- is focused very closely on ensuring the efficient and effective investment in research and technology across the department, across the modes.

It’s a responsibility we take very seriously. There are some things right now, from an organizational perspective,
from a process perspective and a governance perspective, that are lacking, that we’re working very hard to rectify. I chair something called the RD&T Planning Council, which is probably not the best name for it, but it is what it is under our charter. And really what that is, it’s more or less the pinnacle of the governance process for the RD&T investment across the department, and it serves a coordination role, not a control role. And stay tuned on that, because we’re in the process right now of developing process around that, and developing what I would call a robust governance process.

There are a number of activities that are in the RITA portfolio, one of which is the Volpe lab in Cambridge, Massachusetts, which many of you are familiar with. The other is, of course, the ITS Program. All the RD&T activity within RITA -- that includes the University Transportation Centers. There are 60 of those around the country, and we manage those on behalf of the department. We are actually going to be applying that RD&T Planning Council process around the UTCs to begin with, as well as some of the other investments in the RITA portfolio, including the ITS investments. So, you know, we’re excited about that, and we take our statutory responsibilities pretty seriously. We also take a look at the ITS statutory responsibilities; we take those very seriously too.

And I would recommend that everybody, when you get the
complete version of the SAFETEA-LU language around the ITS Program, that you take a detailed read of those -- of that criteria that’s laid out there, because that should, in essence, guide a lot of your recommendations. You need that as backdrop because it’s the context by which we want you to make your recommendations. You know, you’ve got -- there’s some language in the charter that will guide your recommendations, but also I think it’s really critical that you look particularly at the scope language in the legislation and the goals and purposes section in the underlying legislation that governs ITS. I would highly recommend that you take a detailed read of that, if you would.

And, you know, with that, we’re delighted to have ITS as part of the portfolio in RITA, you know, and we’re working pretty closely together to make sure that it’s achieving the goals that were laid out in SAFETEA-LU. So, thanks.

MS. ROW: Thanks, Paul.

Charlie, why don’t you go on to the ITS slide.

As Paul said, we are an office within RITA. We wanted to at least show you this slide and just tell you a little bit about the office organization. There are several caveats here. What you see on the slide, and as in the presentation materials, is the current organizational structure for the office. It’s a very flat structure right now. I will tell you that’s what it
is now. It is subject to change. The office is going through a
lot of change. I’m new. Paul’s new. The program is at a point
of where we need to think afresh about it. So, those changes I
would expect to be reflected in the way we organize our staff,
but I’m not doing that just yet. So, this is what it is
currently, but stay tuned.

There are 17 people on our staff. So, it’s a
relatively small staff. They are very highly skilled, highly
graded people in their technical areas. We have several
vacancies, and we’re about to fill all but one of them. So, I’m
very happy about that.

We have a budget of 110 million per year per SAFETEA-
LU, and that’s the program of work that we will be talking about
in more detail at a subsequent meeting. And we’ll talk a little
bit more about the contents of the program, but that’s just more
about the structure. Any questions about that or about our role
with RITA? Anything that you’d like to ask Paul regarding RITA
or our role in it?

You all are so easy. (Laughter.)

**ITS MANAGEMENT COUNCIL AND ITS STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP**

Okay, Charlie, let’s move on to talk about the
Management Council and the Strategic Planning Group. Again, we
feel like that you all need to understand some of our internal
structures and the way we conduct the business of the program.
First, the Management Council. The Management Council functions like our board of directors. It is comprised of most of the modal administrators in the department, particularly those representing the surface modes. They meet periodically. They provide strategic guidance to the program. Paul chairs the Management Council, and they are the ones that we go to, for example, when we added a Congestion Initiative into our portfolio of work. They were the ones who structured the program around the nine major initiatives that we’ll talk about later. So, they provide very important input, and, again, at the modal administration level. Questions about that?

Okay. The other group that we work with routinely is the ITS Strategic Planning Group. Many of those folks are here today. This is the peer-level group of associate administrators across the modes that are involved in the ITS Program. They provide a very critical link and collaboration point for the ITS Program with the modes who are our partners in carrying out many of our programs. We meet periodically. They provide more detailed programmatic input, more specific input into the budgeting process, and provide specific guidance to us on the direction of the program. So, we work with those people fairly frequently and communicate on a routine basis in the conduct of the program.

So, those are the two main internal bodies that we use
as a mechanism to ensure that we are coordinating and
collaborating across the modes. Okay? Any questions on that
part?

MR. AVERKAMP: I have a question, Shelley. With
respect to the Strategic Planning Group, what is the key
deliverable that comes out of that body and what’s the
timetable?

MS. ROW: We meet as we -- as is needed, and it
depends on the nature of what we’re doing at the time. They
provided us, for example, specific input on how to restructure
the program when we brought the Congestion Initiative on board.
So, for example, we had two Strategic Planning Group meetings to
look at how to go about the process of realigning the budget to
accommodate a new initiative. They provided specific input on
how to structure that program, what pieces of the program can be
streamlined, which ones stay, which ones go, from their
perspective. That’s what we used them for most recently. We
don’t have another meeting set up right now. I’m expecting to
arrange one in the near term to talk more about some of the
program management issues that we’re going to grapple with.

Other questions on that?

Okay. All right. Charlie, let’s move on and talk a
little bit about the program itself. Go ahead and move forward.
OVERVIEW OF CURRENT ITS PROGRAM

I’m going to give you a bird’s-eye view of the program. There’s much more material. I’m happy to answer questions about any specific program area that you’re interested in. We’ve provided to you some high-level background material under Tab G. There’s much more available. There’s a lot on the Web site, but we just gave you a little taste of it in your packets. Okay? So, I’m going to give you a very high-level view, again, and we can talk more if you wish.

In very general terms, I think it’s constructive to think of the program as having two main parts, and as you read the legislation, there are a lot of words in the legislation, but when you boil it down to a couple of big chunks, the big chunks are a research program and a technology transfer program.

And there’s a lot of words in the legislation about both pieces of that, but at the end of the day, those are kind of the two big imperatives of the program.

So, we move on to the research part. Most recently, and it’s still several years ago, the program underwent a change and a rethinking of how to make best use of the program to make best use of the Federal research dollars for research.

It was restructured around nine major initiatives. Those major initiatives were focused on high-risk, high-value, high-leverage research. In many cases, it required partnering
across a broad range of stakeholders that would have been
difficult for anybody else to pull together or there was some
attribute of the research that would have been very difficult
for anyone other than the Federal government to be able to
bridge across it.

There was a lot of discussion with the Management
Council on the identification of those nine initiatives. They
are what you see summarized in your packet. We still have those
initiatives. They are all at different stages of development
and completion. Many of them, probably, I think, six of them,
are scheduled to complete in about the ’09 time frame. And that
lines up, again, with about the reauthorization time frame. So,
it’s yet another one of those milestones that tells us now is a
good time to be thinking about, well, then what’s next, and how
should we focus the program in the future.

All of them were geared around achieving the
departmental goals: safety, mobility, productivity. Okay?

I talked about the partnerships -- all of them have very
robust partnerships. What we have found is that a lot of times
a good Federal role is in bringing those stakeholders together
because it’s very difficult to do in our fragmented
transportation environment. So, all of them have a wide range
of partners. They all include some level of private sector
involvement in different aspects of the programs, and then a lot
of State and local government involvement.

This year, the Congestion Initiative was added to our portfolio, so we have 10 major initiatives now. And let’s go to the next slide, Charlie.

This is one of the common ways you will see us frame them and organize them, and these are around the departmental goals. Many of them, however, cut across the goal areas, so it’s not a neat, tidy little box. As most of you recognize, something that’s good for safety is probably also good for mobility; something good for mobility is probably good for productivity. So, there’s a lot of synergy between them, but this is the common way that we framed it. You will note that we have at least one that we explicitly identify as having a cross-cutting function, and that’s the Vehicle Infrastructure Integration Program.

And let’s talk a little bit about the Congestion Initiative.

MR. MISTELE: Is there a description in here? Of the Congestion Initiative?

MR. ROW: Yes, there is. It’s a very brief description, and, again, there is much more that is available --

MR. BRUBAKER: It’s on Intelligent Transportation --

Operational Testing Program to Mitigate Congestion.

MS. ROW: Yes. It’s a code. (Laughter.) And I did
not come to brief you on each of those initiatives. I’m more
than happy, though, to answer any questions that you have on
them. We can do that today, or I’m happy to do it off-line,
whatever you prefer.

I did want to take a minute, though, to talk about the
Congestive Initiative. It is our new one. It’s gotten a lot of
visibility. It is obviously a key focus for the department and
for our Secretary. We are pleased to be a part of it. As many
of you know, the administration, to its great credit, looked all
across the department to find available funding, combined it
all, and it totaled over a billion dollars that was to be made
available to urban partners for the Congestion Initiative.

The ITS Program is part of that. We provide 100
million over three years: 20 million in ’07, 40 in ’08, and 40
in ’09. That does make it our largest funded initiative in the
program.

The ITS funds, while they are specifically defined for
each of the urban partners in general, they all go toward
supporting the technology components for operational tests at
the urban partners’ sites. It’s a little different for each
site, and we can provide you with descriptions of that detail if
you wish.

MR. SUSSMAN: Shelley, excuse me. This is Joe
Sussman. I finally landed, and I have -- I’m joining your call.
MS. ROW: Wonderful, Joe. Welcome.

MR. SUSSMAN: Sorry to be a bit tardy, but you can’t control the airplanes nowadays.

(Laughter.)

MS. ROW: We’ve all been there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nobody from FAA in here, is there?

(Laughter.)

MS. ROW: And, Joe, hopefully you can get linked in or just participate on the phone. Your preference. So --

MR. SUSSMAN: Yeah, I think we’ll be just on the phone, given the circumstances.

MS. ROW: Okay. The other point I wanted to make about the Congestion Initiative is not only are we spending 95 million of the 100 million focused on the technology components; we have allocated 5 of the 100 million for evaluation and some oversight. The vast majority of that will go toward evaluation.

Obviously, this is a very big initiative, and it’s a big initiative to the country. We’re hopeful that these sites will lay the groundwork for other cities being aggressive in the way they deal with congestion, particularly with the pricing part of the program, of which technology is an underpinning.

So, it’s important that we evaluate how well this works. Does the thesis hold? So, we have allocated specific
funding for evaluation. We are in the process right now of figuring out how to do that evaluation. It will clearly be done in partnership with the urban partners. Many of them have engaged University Transportation Centers as a part of their partnership locally. So, we expect to be working with them on data collection, and we’re looking at some kind of an umbrella approach so that we can gather information across the sites for an assessment. That’s still in formulation, and we’re still thinking that through. So, more to come on that.

The urban partner sites you see listed there -- Miami, Minneapolis, New York City, Seattle, San Francisco -- a small point: San Diego is not technically an urban partner, although we are going to be spending some money there doing some operational testing of an innovative -- actually an innovative transit technology in San Diego, that we’re very excited about.

Okay, so that’s the Congestion Initiative in a very small nutshell. Questions on the Congestion Initiative before I move on, or the ITS research program before I move on to the technology transfer piece?

MR. AVERKAMP:  I have a question for you.

MS. ROW:  Sure, Joe.

MR. AVERKAMP:  Joe Averkamp. What’s the timetable for assessing the implementation of these programs? You have funding, I see, spread out through ’09. Is there a report due
in 2010 or --

MS. ROW: The -- each of the urban partners has their own agreement --

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MS. ROW: -- in place, and they are -- one of the criteria for selecting them is that they be prepared to be operational very quickly. So, we’re looking for them to be operational in the ’09 time frame. In terms of evaluation, however, what we’re expecting there is to work at the beginning to understand what is it that we want to evaluate, what are the test plans, what are the data collection that we need to collect. Then, they will go through a phase where they will become operational. And then, we expect to have a phase, heavy again in the evaluation arena, where we get that data and have assimilation and some conclusions from it. I’m guessing that will be in the 2010 time frame. We don’t know for sure because it depends on how the implementations go.

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MS. ROW: Are there questions on the screen?

MR. VELEZ: Yes. It’s probably a good point to correct what I said earlier. I see the -- in chat pod, that I’m identified as Carlos Velez 2. So, questions to Shelley should go to Carlos Velez 2, and not to Carlos Velez. Mr. Morgan has a question, but I believe -- on the screen anyway, it looks to be
incomplete. Here. "Will the committee have any organized
opportunities to visit any of the demonstration sites to better
understand the current" -- what should follow "current," Mr.
Morgan?

MR. MORGAN: Well, if you’re talking about Granger
Morgan, that’s not from me, so somehow your software is
identifying somebody else as me.

MS. ROW: Oh.

MR. VELEZ: My goodness.

MS. ROW: Okay, who asked that question?

Anyone? It’s a good question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have John Worthington.

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I actually have it on my screen too
as John Worthington.

MS. ROW: John, did you ask that question?

Okay, whoever asked the question, I hadn’t thought
about that. If you all are interested in that, then we could
work with the sites to see if we could arrange something.

MR. VELEZ: Here we go.

MS. ROW: Oh, here we are. It -- was there another
question, Charlie, on there?

MR. VELEZ: "State of the" -- “current state of the
play in terms of technology, options, and visibility.”

MS. ROW: Okay. Well, again, if you all are
interested in something along that line, we can look into that.

Okay? Other questions?

MR. BUTTON: I’m just curious --

MS. ROW: Yeah, Ken.

MR. BUTTON: In terms of evaluation, are we simply evaluating the technology or the impact of the technology?

Because it seems to me a sort of one-year time frame of sticking something in place and expecting to understand its implications is, to put it mildly, rather naïve.

MS. ROW: It’s a very good question. The answer is that we want to evaluate the impact of the pricing, the tolling -- the Four Ts: tolling, transit, telecommuting, and technology. So, we’re trying to evaluate the impact of the whole package on congestion. Having said that, the funding is coming from the ITS Program. So, we’re very careful to make sure that we do include the technology role in achieving that.

MR. BUTTON: That’s a -- well, it isn’t very clear. I mean how much can you tell within one year --

MS. ROW: Yes, that’s --

MR. BUTTON: -- is my question.

MR. BUBAKER: Depends. I mean, the reality in terms of judging a long-term impact on a program -- you’re spot on. I mean it takes a long time to -- and you need sustained deployment of the evaluation effort over time to be able to spot
the impact of -- depends on the type of program, though. If
it’s a congestion mitigation program like, for example,
congestion pricing, you can acquire baseline data and then, you
know, that’s a pretty quick evaluation cycle. You know,
deploying some innovative technology throughout a system where
you don’t have necessarily baseline data, it’s much harder, as
you know. So, that’s going to depend, but this is the
challenge for the 5 million bucks.

MS. ROW: Yeah, and I think it goes without saying,
we’re looking at ways to leverage that 5 million dollars because
it’s very difficult to accomplish what we want to accomplish in
a program this size with that amount of money. So, we do expect
to be partnering with the urban partner sites and the other
partners they’ve brought in. Very good question, Ken.

MR. ALBERT: Shelley, this is Steve Albert. Can I ask
a question?

MS. ROW: Yes, Steve.

MR. ALBERT: Do you see one of the roles of the
committee as being able to look back in terms of provide some
historical context in terms of what’s gone right and what’s gone
wrong with the ITS Program so that we can improve it in the
future, or do you see a role predominantly of this committee
being able to just review what you’ve done in your plan, your
upcoming plan?
MS. ROW: I think that’s a -- I would be -- I would welcome the committee’s thoughts on what’s gone well and what hasn’t gone well in areas that we could improve on. At this juncture, again, we’re looking to you all to help us think strategically about the big opportunities in the future, kind of the big rocks, if you’re familiar with that analogy. So, Steve, I think some of what you mentioned there could be very illuminating as we think about how to best use the resources that we have.

MR. ALBERT: I think, from my perspective, I’d like to see it as an agenda topic and just -- almost a roundtable discussion of what people’s perceptions of how it could be improved so, in the future, we don’t make -- go down that same road of maybe making a mistake or leaving out a certain user group.

MS. ROW: Okay, Steve, in fact we’re going to talk a little bit about what we are thinking about for the next meeting. I’m going to add that to the list, and we can revisit it when we get to that part of the discussion.

Any other questions, comments?

MR. VELEZ: Shelley, Mr. Greer Woodruff just joined the Web conference.

MS. ROW: I think he’s been on. Oh, okay.

MR. WOODRUFF: I am on, Shelley.
Great. Okay. I’m going to talk a little bit about the technology transfer part of the program. We take this part of the program very seriously because it’s well and good to do research, but unless you can transfer it into something useful, we haven’t fulfilled our mission. Currently, the technology transfer portion of the program has some major components.

We do think a lot about how to distribute the information that we create: Research reports, documentation, anything that’s coming out of the programs and the research. We do focus a lot on what are the deliverables, how do we get them out, who’s the target audience, what’s the best way to distribute them? All of them are available electronically through our electronic documents library. That’s not to say that there’s not a lot of ways that we can do that better. It is a substantial challenge to get information to a community as large as ours.

We have a professional capacity building program. We have developed training materials; we’ve developed training courses; we’ve worked with others to develop training materials. We hear continually, in the surface transportation community, about the need for trained professionals and the lack of those kinds of skills in the current workforce. So, we hear a lot about those needs. Again, we have this part of the program. I
think there’s a lot that we can do to enhance it, to leverage it more, to partner more, to accomplish more in the community in terms of developing trained professionals.

Architecture and standards -- this is a section that is specifically called out in our legislation, and we are directed to support the national architecture and the developed standards. We’ve been doing that for quite a long time. We do have a National Architecture. Version 6.0 was just released in the summer. We have an extensive Standards Program. We’ve developed, I think, close to a hundred standards, at this point, that are published, and there’s still a handful of them -- I think about a dozen -- that are still in the development process. So, we are moving into a new role in the Standards Program.

The other thing that you will note in our legislation is that we were required to have an expert -- I think it was called an expert panel -- assess the Standards Program. It was run through the National Academy. We have received that report. And, again, I’m happy to share that with you. The highlights of that report are that the Standards Program is coming to a new era. We have developed a lot of standards; now we’re moving into more of a maintenance mode and more of a deployment mode. How do we use those standards in deployment? And what that report said to us is that you need to rethink how you structure
that program, how you engage your stakeholder community in that program, and think anew about how to go forward. You’re not in a massive new development of standards program.

So, again, that’s another data point that we bring to this committee to say now’s a good time to think about our direction for the future. And we are, again, taking that standards report very seriously and want to implement that.

Benefits, costs, lessons learned, and deployment statistics. Also in the legislation, we are required to maintain an information clearinghouse. This work on benefits, costs, lessons learned, and deployment statistics is maintained in an online clearinghouse, and that is a lot of work that goes into that. That’s the place that we go to capture information from deployments, from research, from some of the ITS earmarks that have been done in the past. We capture that material. We mine it and put it on that searchable Web site so people can easily find, again, benefits, costs, lessons learned.

We also, for a number of years now, have been doing -- gathering deployment statistics. We do a survey I think it’s every other year now, maybe every three years. I’ve forgotten.

Every other year?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MS. ROW: Okay, this is the year, where we go out to the community, several hundred people at the State and local
government level, to say what do you have in terms of this long list of ITS stuff? We gather it up and, again, we publish it. It’s all searchable. It’s searchable by type of technology, by State, by -- I think it’s by city, so you can get a pretty good sense of what is out there based on that deployment statistics database. It is the only thing like it in the community that we’re aware of. So, that’s fulfilling some of that information clearinghouse role.

I have asked our staff to think about the technology transfer portion of the program. We will ask you also for some of your input. These programs have operated sort of independently of each other. Not completely. There’s some overlap. But they’ve kind of little niches in the program. We believe that there’s a lot of synergy to be gained from synching them up together and thinking about it more holistically to support that technology transfer role that we have. So, the staff are currently looking at that and trying, again, to take kind of a fresh view of what it means to do technology transfer and how to do it most effectively, leveraging all of the players that are in the community: universities, private sector, public sector, associations -- all of those folks. Again, we will welcome your input on that portion of the program as well.

So, let me pause there. Questions, comments on the technology transfer portion of the program?
Okay. Going once, going twice...

STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Okay, let’s move on to -- I called this strategic
direction. This is kind of setting the stage for our next round
of discussion, and I’ve alluded to some of this already. So,
bear with me a little while I zoom up to the high level and kind
of give you a big frame for our discussion. Let’s go ahead and
go to the next --

MR. SUSSMAN: Shelley, this is Joe Sussman again.

MS. ROW: Yes, Joe.

MR. SUSSMAN: Just on the phone, is there something I
can be following here? I’m -- I have your package, but it
sounds as though you’re referring to other material.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We don’t have this
presentation.

MS. ROW: Yeah, we don’t have the presentation. We
didn’t e-mail that out. You will -- Joe, this doesn’t help you
now; you will get it later. (Laughter.)

MR. SUSSMAN: I’m -- I’m actually online. If you can
send me the presentation, I could follow it along.

MS. ROW: Does someone have an ability to do that?

Can you guys? Okay. Joe Sussman --

MS. WEINSHALL: Hi. This Iris Weinshall. I’m just
joining.
MR. VELEZ: Right.

MS. ROW: Hi, Iris.

MS. WEINSHALL: Hi. Is this Shelley?

MS. ROW: Yes, it is. Welcome.

MS. WEINSHALL: Hi, Shelley. How are you?

MS. ROW: I’m good. And, Iris, for your information, we’re at the part of the program called “Strategic Direction.” Are you, Iris, on the WebEx?

MS. WEINSHALL: Yeah, I have the -- I have the visual, but I can’t see you. I have it up.

MS. ROW: Okay. No, that’s all you’re going to get.

(Laughter.)

MS. WEINSHALL: That’s fine.

MS. ROW: Okay, and, Joe, one of the folks has just gone to send you the presentation material by e-mail.

MR. SUSSMAN: Okay. You’ve got my e-mail address, of course.

MS. ROW: Yes, we do.

MR. SUSSMAN: Okay. Let me know when it’s on the way.

MS. ROW: Okay. I think it’s on its way here in a couple minutes.

MR. SUSSMAN: Okay. Sounds great.

MS. ROW: A few minutes.

MR. SUSSMAN: Thank you.
MS. ROW: All right. Let’s talk a little bit again -- we’re going zoom up to the high level. As I have alluded to, it appears to us that the time is right to take a fresh look at the program, at the direction of the program, and set ourselves up to look at really what are the big things that we ought to be accomplishing through a Federal research and technology transfer program.

Let’s go to the next slide.

The conundrum -- and I think this will be familiar to many of you. The conundrum is that today in transportation we are experiencing a lot of stress. There’s a lot of congestion. While safety statistics, depending on how you measure them, they tend to be a little bit better, any way you slice it there are too many fatalities on the roadway, and we’re kind of at a plateau. If you look at the statistics, they’re pretty flat. We’re in need of something to really give us some momentum to take that to a new level.

Productivity -- as congestion gets worse, and there’s an issue with how does that affect our national productivity? At the same time -- let’s go to the next slide -- the other side that we’re experiencing in the public sector is a real stress with funding. The way that we have traditionally dealt with some of those problems in transportation is through public investment in transportation systems, through the Federal
aid program and through substantial State and local funding. In fact, if you look at the numbers, State and local funding is more than the Federal funding.

But we have relied very heavily on those public sector resources to address those transportation problems, and yet we’re in a time period where those financial resources are more and more stretched thin. They are stressed. The trust fund is running out of money, and we’re seeing that there’s just not enough funding to address the magnitude of the needs. One of the losers in that mix is technology. Let’s go to the next slide.

Through our deployment tracking database, we just picked two variables to look at. So, this is just a snapshot. The one on the left is the number of miles of urban freeways -- so it’s urban and it’s freeways -- that have real-time information, and this was as of our last survey. You will see the trend is that it’s grown over 10 years. That’s a 10-year time snapshot. But if you just -- this is not statistical, by the way. We just drew a line that kind of matched the bars. But it’s roughly in the 20-30 time frame that you would see something along full deployment under a model, of a traditional model of putting in sensors, putting in all that stuff.

The other diagram is of transit AVL. Similar kind of trend, moving in the right direction, but it’s moving very
slowly. It’s moving very slowly. And part of that, I would
just say, is what we hear from the State and local government,
it’s not for lack of want, but there is a very difficult sell on
technology when they’re experiencing such stress in their
transportation environments. The analogy that I use is, if you
have a house that has a roof leak and you only have enough money
to fix the roof or buy a new laptop, which one are you going to
do? And most people would choose fixing the roof. So, they’re
in a real stressed situation.

Now, at the same time that is going on -- let’s go to
the next slide -- we’re experiencing an information explosion.
We have telecommunication services we’ve never had before. We
have the growing impact of cell phones and PDAs and BlackBerries
and Trios and all of that stuff. We have connectivity that
we’ve never had before. We have technology applications that
we’ve not had before, several of them in the room and on this
committee. We have opportunities that the technology gives us
that we’ve not had available to us before.

So, one of the questions that we ask to you all at a
very high level -- go to the next slide -- no, yes. Information
technology has been driven by the market. There’s a very big
market, open access to the Internet, industry standards -- all
of that has enabled this technology explosion. So, the question
that we put forward -- now the next slide; go ahead and bring it
all up -- how do we take the excitement, the energy, the
creativity of what’s going on in technology, together with the
Federal Research and Technology Transfer Program, to address
those problems that we have in transportation, of congestion,
safety, and productivity?

At the highest level, that’s the framework that we put
forth to this committee to help us think it through. Now we’ll
have to go, obviously, to a few layers below that. But I ask
you to begin to think about that as setting the stage for our
discussion the next time.

And, Charlie, let’s go to the next slide.

So, again, there are several vectors that appear to be
coming together. We have you all. It’s been a long journey to
get this advisory committee established. So, now we have you
all here to work with us. We have a program plan that’s due
this year. We have many of the major initiatives ending in
2009. We have a reauthorization that’s coming up in 2009. One
of the things that’s not on here is we have imperative from the
standards panel saying we need to rethink the Standards Program
as well. So, we look at that and say, a perfect opportunity for
us to think together along with all of our modal partners
through the Management Council and our Strategic Planning Group
on what is the strategy. How do we want to position this
program? What are the big things that this program is uniquely
situated to accomplish and how do we organize ourselves to do
that? Okay?

So, not that we’ve given you a big job. But that’s
sort of how we see some of the synergies coming together.

And, Charlie, let’s go to the next slide.

So, again, we will be engaging you and want to engage
you at several levels: First of all, I really look forward to
your strategic thinking in this area. At the same time, we will
be engaging you at a lower level within the program to get your
input as well. We look to you to be entry points into your own
communities. We have a very broad group on this committee. You
collectively represent almost an entire picture of the
waterfront of the ITS community. So, we’re going to ask you to
engage with others in your respective communities to talk to
them, get their input, bring that back to the committee.

And then, we do intend to link this to the ITS Program
Plan. That drives our schedule for that part of our work. So,
we will be pushing pretty hard and fast. Expect that there will
be a lot of work we’ll be doing at the staff level, working with
the modes behind the scenes between your meetings, so that we
can make maximum use of your time and your intellectual
thinking.

GENERAL DISCUSSION, NEXT STEPS

That sets the stage for what we are currently thinking
about our November meeting, and then we will open that up for
discussion here as well. Our current thought is to use your
expertise, because you do represent such diversity in the
community, to literally bring your knowledge into the group.
So, what we’re thinking of doing is to have each one of you --
in your various sectors, and in some sectors there is a couple
of you representing one area; I think we have a couple of State
DOT folks; we have a couple of auto industry representations --
for you to come to the group the next time and share, from your
industry’s perspective, what is the current state of play and
what are the market trends that you’re seeing that are relevant
to the work that we could or should be doing in this program, to
talk about what are the implications of those trends to this
program? What are the opportunities unique to this program that
we could take advantage of?
And, Steve Albert, back to your point, what are the
things that have worked well and what are the things that
haven’t worked so well in the past of the program that could
influence what we do in the future?
Now let me stop there because that’s a lot. That’s
our current thought about how to go into our next meeting. It
is a day and a half, the way we’ve scheduled it so far, so we
will have time to have interactive discussion and engagement and
dialogue. What are your thoughts, reaction? Any comments?
MR. SUGIMOTO: Shelley, this is Tommy Sugimoto speaking. Do we have to prepare some presentation for the November meeting?

MS. ROW: Well, I’m glad you asked that. (Laughter.) Depending on what you all thought today, that’s exactly what we were thinking of asking you to do. Now, before anyone panics, we were going to go back and think about what we heard today and then come back to you with some suggestions. I’m not looking for, you know, PowerPoint presentations and lengthy things, but more materials, talking points, bullet points of what you would put forward that you think is relevant to the committee. It wouldn’t necessarily even need to be a formal presentation, but to have your thoughts together to share with the group.

MR. SUGIMOTO: All right. Thank you.

MS. ROW: Tommy, does that make you feel more comfortable.

MR. SUGIMOTO: Yes. Thank you.

MS. ROW: What do you all think?

MR. SUSSMAN: Shelley, this is Joe Sussman. I think - - I think it would be helpful, not only for you but for the rest of us on the committee, to kind of get some station identification, if you will, from everybody on the advisory committee, just get an idea of where everyone is coming from.
So, I support the idea.

MS. ROW: Okay. Thank you, Joe.

MR. AVERKAMP: This is Joe Averkamp. I think it’s a good idea. What we need to do is do a situational assessment, an environmental scan of each of our respective industries, distill it to something that is comprehensive to -- comprehensible to a broader audience. And then we can all get the lay of the land with respect to each other’s, I don’t know, industries. So, I think it’s a -- I think it’s the right approach and a good start.

MS. ROW: Are there other comments, thoughts?

MR. WOODRUFF: Shelley, this is Greer Woodruff, and I think it would be a good idea, and it would be helpful if maybe we could have an outline, maybe some strategic questions that we could ponder --

MS. ROW: Okay. That’s a good idea.

MR. WOODRUFF: -- and discuss with other people within our industry to kind of help fill in the blanks and help us prepare to come with that type of information.

MR. AVERKAMP: And to that point -- this is Joe again -- Shelley, does it make sense -- and I know we’re a general discussion, and not of next steps -- but does it make sense to and is it acceptable to form a smaller planning committee for that November meeting so that we can address exactly those kind
of issues? I don’t know if we need to assemble the 20 of us
again, but 3 or 4 people that will actually work on crafting an
agenda, crafting an outline for the presentations --

MS. ROW: Here’s the conundrum -- and I will have to
go back and talk to Bob Monniere -- our meetings are public.

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MS. ROW: And they have to be advertised 15 days in
advance in the Federal Register.

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MS. ROW: So, it’s not clear to me -- actually, I know
it says that we can establish subcommittees. I need to find out
if we have to publish the subcommittees 15 days in advance --

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MS. ROW: -- and provide public access. That --

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or working groups.

MS. ROW: Yes. We can establish working groups. I
just don’t know if they’re subject then to the publication in
the Federal Register.

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MS. ROW: The only issue there, obviously, is the lead
time to get it through the Federal Register process.

MR. AVERKAMP: And then, does it have to be public as
well? So --
MS. ROW: Yeah.

MR. AVERKAMP: So, four people convene on the conference call to plan the agenda for the November meeting, does that have to be published?

MS. ROW: I’ll check that, but I think so.

MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

MR. ALBERT: Shelley, this is Steve Albert again.

MS. ROW: Yes, Steve.

MR. ALBERT: I think it would be helpful even if the individuals on the teleconference here could have -- could prepare a one-pager that would answer maybe three or four big-picture questions. I know, with our national rural ITS conference coming up in a few weeks, there’s a great opportunity to be able to pose those questions to all 50 States and see what they perceive on the rural front, and I’m sure everyone else could do that, and then we could transmit them back to you or your designee to put almost into a booklet that we would all be able to read in advance.

MR. BRUBAKER: Can I say something?

MS. ROW: Absolutely, Paul. Yes.

MR. BRUBAKER: This is Paul Brubaker, the RITA Administrator. I’ve got -- there was a reason why I was sort of requesting, strongly urging everybody at the beginning to read the legislation, and we’ve got to get a complete version of it
to you so that you can see it. But, you know, big-picture questions -- and I’m sure everybody, depending on where they sit, will have a different point of view -- but, you know, fundamentally, there’s a -- the legislation defines the scope of the national ITS Program to specify the goals, objectives, milestones for the research and deployment of ITS. And it further goes on to say that, you know -- it talks about the goals and objectives, but, you know, where you sit, you’re going to have different goals and objectives.

And I would strongly suggest that you be thinking about some specific outcomes you believe that your industry or your organization or just stuff you’re generally aware of can actually achieve over the next, you know, five/six-year time horizon, and let that really drive kind of the recommendations that you make. And I would strongly urge you to be as bold as possible and outside the lanes of the existing program as much as possible, you know, and just -- here’s your opportunity to really be bold and make a mark.

And I’m a little worried, you know, that -- I don’t necessarily want us to be, you know, sort of pitting the past against the present because we might wind up forsaking the future here, if we’re not careful. So, I don’t -- I hope that we don’t spend a whole lot of time looking in the context of what currently is, as opposed to what can be. So, I would urge
you to take that tack, and if you’re looking at those broad
questions, I would strongly urge that you go to that national
ITS Program Plan that’s in the legislation and look to that for
guidance because there’s some really good guidance in there that
can help you bound your thinking. And the good new is it’s not
very bounded. It’s pretty broad. I mean you can bring whatever
you want to at the table, and frankly I think you’re expected
to, based on the way the legislation was written.

So, I’m really looking forward to the recommendations.

And keep in mind that, you know, you’re working for the
Secretary and you’re making recommendations to the Secretary,
and this is something that she’s very much interested in. I
don’t know if you guys are aware of this or not, but the Texas
Transportation Institute last week came out with a report
talking about the future of congestion, just one problem that
Shelley was citing, and her number one comment out of the gate
was about technology and how technology had to be part of the
lynch pin; it’s not just about building new capacity, although
that’s an issue. You know, when you look at the demographic
data over time, we’ve got a real opportunity here to get on
track, but technology’s going to be a key element of this. And
she is real concerned with the issue of deployment, of ITS
solutions, and how do we speed deployment, which is the big “D”
word that is in this statute. So, let’s be thinking about that.
I think -- you know, again, I hesitate to bring up the past, you know, but the reality is, I think, the next five-year period really needs to be focused on how do we speed deployment of these technology solutions to help us address the system performance requirements of our current transportation environment? So, I’ll just give you that. You guys can tell I’m pretty passionate about this, so --

MS. ROW: Yeah.

(Laughter.)

MR. BRUBAKER: But at any rate, that’s where I’m coming from on this.

MS. ROW: Thanks, Paul.

And you can see why we’re glad to have Paul at the program. And that is a very good point. As you think about the deployment, I think it is important to be bold and think about how we can do things differently than we’ve maybe done in the past. It’s not clear to me that the old model works at the -- it’s kind of we’re going at this snail-mail pace in an environment that is looking at downloading, you know, video, streaming video. So, that’s great. Let’s be bold. So, I’m --

go ahead, Bryan.

MR. MISTELE: To just point out, it would be great if you could put together the half-dozen or so --

MS. ROW: Questions?
MR. MISTELE: -- big questions or areas --

MS. ROW: Okay.

MR. MISTELE: -- that you would like us to think about, and then whether it would be a one-pager or a couple of slides each, we could sort of give you, you know, off-the-cuff perspective, and I think that would be good to sort of go around the room and get a good, like you said, environmental scan on where everyone’s at --

MS. ROW: Okay.

MR. MISTELE: -- what your thoughts are.

MS. ROW: Hm-mm. Okay. We will do that. We’ll put together some questions. We’ll get them out to you as soon as possible, and I’ll look at how to get them back and collate it so that you have something to react to.

Are there other comments, thoughts, suggestions?

MR. IWASAKI: Shelley, this is Randy Iwasaki. I have a comment on a comment that you made earlier, and I assume you were talking off a presentation. You were talking about the difference between buying that roof and buying ITS, I guess, and the point that I wanted to make at that time was the problem, a lot of times, that we have is that existing procurement laws -- and this goes to deployment -- and so one of those things on that presentation and whatever you were talking from, you should also add the procurement piece as well, that things have to
change in order to expedite the procurement or deployment of ITS strategies.

MS. ROW: That’s good. And Randy is with Caltrans.

Thank you, Randy.

MR. IWASAKI: You’re welcome.

MR. BRUBAKER: Hey, Randy, can you be a little more specific in terms of is it -- is it something with the acquisition requirements, the funding, the matching, you know, is it -- I’m just -- I kind of know. I want to draw you out a little bit on that, the whole issue relative to procurement.

MR. IWASAKI: Sure. There’s a couple of issues. One, in our State, the resource agencies or the control agencies still view ITS as IT, and so it’s buying computers and hooking them together and, therefore, the CIO takes a look at that, and they’re not skilled in the deployment of ITS. They’re skilled in buying servers, buying computers, and they just don’t sometimes comprehend the system aspects of putting servers together to manage traffic.

And so, in our State, one of the problems is that they still look at signal interconnect as being in the purview of the CIO, and then the State CIO doesn’t understand the processes that we put into place. And so, that creates a slow-down process, if you will, of having to write reports justifying the purchase of these basic technologies.
The other piece is, if we’re going to streamline or expedite the introduction of some ITS strategies of the future, we’re going to have to really look hard at getting the private sector involved and making them public-private partnerships or at least developing business models that allow for advertising or things like that so that the private sector can get their capital investment back in other ways than selling data and things like that.

MR. BRUBAKER: Got it.

MS. ROW: I’m glad you brought that up, Randy. Good. Ken, did you have a comment?

MR. BUTTON: A couple of comments. It seems to me the whole issue about implementation, which seems to be what’s concerned about here, it all has to do with institutions. I mean we’ve just heard there and then. It’s an institutional issue, not a technical issue. We’ve got all the technology in the world to solve these problems. I remember a few years ago, as adviser to the House of Commons’ Transport Committee in the U.K. --

MR. SUSSMAN: I can -- this is Joe. I can barely hear --

MR. BUTTON: I’m sorry. It’s my English accent, perhaps. I was just saying that I think implementation is an institutional issue. We just heard that, really, from Randy.
It’s not a technology issue. And I was just reflecting back some years ago when I was adviser to the House of Commons’ Transport Committee and we were looking into charging for motorway use with congestion tolls on motorways. And we had a plethora of engineering companies along, professors of technology. They said, we’ve all got the technology; what we’ve got to do is somehow get the institutions --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could someone repeat the comment?

MR. SUSSMAN: Yeah, I can hear nothing at this point.

MS. ROW: Now --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don’t think that’s working.

MS. ROW: Yeah. Come join us over here, Ken.

MR. BRUBAKER: You need to speak into that. Sorry about that.

MR. BUTTON: I shall start my diatribe --

(Laughter.)

MS. ROW: It’s a very good point, though. So, we do need to get it.

MR. BUTTON: I was simply saying that, if we’re interested really in implementation, that’s all about institutions. If you -- we heard Randy’s comments about California. That’s not about technology; that’s about legal frameworks, institutional structures, with all the market, with
all the public sector command and control. And I was reflecting simply on something I was involved in some years ago when I was adviser to the House of Commons’ Transport Committee in the U.K. We’re talking here of 15, 20 years ago. We had a plethora of specialists, private sector specialists in information technology, data collection, tolling, and so on. They said we can put together any package you want for collecting revenue from motorists, charging by the minute, the mile, the day, the week, the year. The problem is you haven’t got the institutions to do it. And it comes down to institutions. Another example, I flew back from Europe last night -- most cities in Europe, as soon as you reach them, as soon as you hit the outskirts, you see signs telling you exactly where the parking places are, in real time, how many parking places. In this country, it’s about 20 percent of the morning rush hour’s wasted in congestion with people looking for somewhere to park. The fact is you can do that in Europe because you’ve got unitary authorities which allow them to measure and monitor and record the existing parking places and display them to the traveling public. The people in the industry could have done this 25, 30 years ago, I’m sure. You simply don’t do it in this country.

So, I’m just wondering where all this fits in about we know we’re going to hear a lot about all the technology out there and we’re going to hear a lot about the, you know, what
can be done technically, but the real problem is, you know, the
technology may be 15, 20 years in advance of its implementation.
I’m just wondering where that fits into the entire debate.

MR. BRUBAKER: I --

MS. ROW: Go ahead.

MR. BRUBAKER: I think that’s exactly right, and it’s
one of the reasons why, you know, we need to really take a
little different tack to how we look at this. And that’s a key
element. I mean one of the projects -- or one of the things
that we’re looking at is what’s kind of stalling the deployment
of, you know, hydrogen-fueled vehicles, and it’s standards and
codes, and it’s institutional stuff, not the technology,
although the technology’s not to the point now where it’s large-
rate production.

But it’s a similar point. I mean the technology
exists, and these aren’t technical issues. They’re
institutional issues; they’re cultural issues. And those things
really need to be on the table as part of this program.

MR. WORTHINGTON: I would argue that hydrogen vehicles
are not at all like the example you just heard. The reason that
they are not attractive is that they’re just too damned
expensive; whereas, the parking example is a very
straightforward issue where there -- where he’s right. It’s
basically got to do with organizational and institutional
issues. I don’t think that’s the binding constraint on
hydrogen, but let’s not get off onto that tangent.

MR. BRUBAKER: Yeah, but the point is that there are –
- once the technology’s a little more mature and there’s large-
rate production, that it will be a standards and codes issue
that will affect -- and an institutional issue -- that will
affect deployment.

MS. ROW: If I might just suggest, as you all are
thinking about what you’ll bring to the table next time, keep in
mind: The program has been structured around technical
applications. There is no reason that it can’t be structured
around policy research. Okay? So, that is on the table. We
have an opportunity here to think about this in a whole new way
and to look at research on public-private partnerships. How do
we do more to leverage the use of the energy and innovation in
the private sector?

One of the things that I like to talk about in
presentations is, you know, the public sector would love to be
able to keep up with the technology, but it moves so fast, it’s
extremely difficult to do that in a typical public construct.
Are there some different constructs that allow us to take
advantage of the innovation, but still get the public good out
of it?

MR. AVERKAMP: Well, I think -- it’s Ken’s point --
maybe part of what we talk about in November maybe goes beyond
our particular industry view and focuses on barriers to
adoption. I mean we could also focus on -- and what I just
heard was institutional barriers to adoption as a big
(inaudible).

MS. ROSS: Okay.

MR. AVERKAMP: And there are others.

MS. ROSS: We can put a question in the mix that gets
to some of that.

MR. AVERKAMP: In fact, I think what you’re pointing
out is that it’s potentially the mismatch between the pace of
the transportation deployment and the pace of technology
because, I mean, the wireless industry is going to be on its
fourth-generation network before we’ve really assimilated first-
and second-generation technology --

MS. ROW: Right.

MR. AVERKAMP: -- so --

MS. ROW: Right. Right. Some of you have seen my
slide that I use, where you’ve got, you know, streaming video on
cell phones and transportation has punch cards.

MR. AVERKAMP: Yeah.

MS. ROSS: The other point that I wanted to make --
Randy, I’m going to use Caltrans, if you don’t mind. Caltrans
went through -- or the State of California went through a “Go
California” initiative fairly recently, and they, as one of the
things that came out that is a pyramid where they’ve looked at
the things that they need to do to keep California moving. The
thing that I think is interesting about that pyramid is at the
very base of it. Randy, can you articulate what the
very bottom of the pyramid is, now that I’ve put you on spot?
MR. IWASAKI: Yes, system monitoring and evaluation.
MS. ROW: It’s gathering the information on the
network, being able to monitor the system, and the technology
enables that to happen. And, right now, it’s a big, not a
completely missing piece, but it is certainly not as robust as
what it could be, given the technology that we have today. So,
I put that on the table as well as just the lack of information
that we have on the network today to manage, operate the
transportation network. How do we fill that gap?
Other comments, thoughts?
Okay. So, where I think we’ve ended up is that we’re
going to prepare some questions to get at some of the strategic
issues. We’re going to send those out to you. We will ask you
to think personally about them, to engage others in your
industry, and to come prepared to talk about it at our November
meeting. We may ask you to try to send some of that information
in, if you can, in advance, so we can maybe assimilate it, look
for some common trends, and package it together so it would be
easier for us to digest.

Now, is there something that I’m missing? Is there anything else that -- that you all said that I didn’t capture?

And I have some points here about some of the nature of the specific questions. Okay.

MR. WELBES: Shelley?

MS. ROW: Yes.

MR. WELBES: Just to facilitate communication with the group, I don’t if you know this, but at the time you were describing the Federal advisory committee process earlier, while you’ve been talking, in fact our regulation, it does have a provision where two or more members, any two or more of you, between official meetings that are announced in the Federal Register and go (inaudible), people can talk, people can convene, in preparation. You can conduct research, analyze facts, prepare for meetings. So, if people need to communicate to keep this process moving, please don’t be inhibited by the, you know, structure that you’ve heard.

MS. ROW: Thank you. For those of you on the phone, did you all hear what Matt said?

MR. SUSSMAN: Not very well, no.

MS. ROW: Okay. What he was saying is that he’s been looking at the FACA regulation while we’ve been having this discussion, and there’s a provision that allows two or more, you
said?

MR. WELBES: Yeah.

MS. ROW: So, we can probably have a small group meet to keep this discussion going. So, there could be a small group that could assemble to frame the agenda.

MR. WELBES: It allows for preparatory work for meetings.

MS. ROW: Preparatory work for meetings. Okay.

MR. WELBES: Sure.

MS. ROW: So, that’ll be good. We will take advantage of that.

Thank you, Matt.

And that is Matt Welbes from FTA. Let me just finish up here, just on some of the next steps logistically. We are focused on our next meeting being on November 26th, starting at 1:00 p.m. That is the Monday after Thanksgiving. Sorry. It’s the Monday after Thanksgiving. It is here, starting at 1 o’clock. So, hopefully, that will give those of you who are traveling time to get here on Monday morning without impacting your Thanksgiving holiday.

It will go through the next day, 8:00 to 4:00 on the second day, on Tuesday. It will be in the DOT building, is what we’re expecting right now.

Again, we will have read-ahead materials. We will
send you travel information on how to make your travel arrangements, hotel information -- all that kind of stuff. Now, let’s see.

MR. ALBERT: Is there any flexibility on that schedule?

MS. ROSS: Well, we --

MR. ALBERT: In terms of the date? I know, coming from Montana, it’s pretty difficult for me to get there without impacting the Thanksgiving holiday.

MS. ROSS: Well, I tell you what we did -- and we surveyed everybody to get a sense of what dates were available. That was the one that had the most participation, and so that’s why we picked that one.

We -- you know, we know that we’re not going to be able to get everyone, and we could maybe set up a conference call. We expect that meeting to be highly interactive, so it wasn’t clear to me how it helpful it would be to have a conference call arrangement.

So, Steve, in direct answer to your question, yes, we believe that to be the date at this time.

MR. ALBERT: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. ROSS: Are there any other comments from anyone else in the room? Anybody?
Okay. Any other comments from anyone on the committee?

Okay. I can’t promise that we’re going to end early all the time, but we are this time. (Laughter.)

CLOSING

Let me again thank you all for your time, for all the extraordinary efforts you all have gone to, to participate by phone or in person. We really do look forward, sincerely, to having you provide input into the program and help us frame the program.

Thank you very much.

MR. VELEZ: Shelley, could I just confirm, we have a record of those of you who have participated by Web conference, but by telephone, my understanding is Bob Denaro and Joe Sussman are the only two now participating by phone. Am I correct?

MS. WEINSHALL: No. Iris Weinshall is on the phone.

MR. WORTHINGTON: John Worthington’s on the phone.

MS. ROSS: I think we had you guys because you’re on WebEx.

MS. WEINSHALL: Oh, okay.

MS. ROSS: Yeah. And that reminds me: We need a record of everyone who’s here. Do we have -- did everyone sign the sign-up sheet?

Everyone signed the -- okay. All right. Okay, then,
with that, we are adjourned. Thank you again.

MR. SUSSMAN: Thank you, Shelley.

MS. ROSS: Thanks, Joe.

(Whereupon, at 2:46 p.m., the meeting concluded.)