



Appendix Q: Steering Committee Meetings

CONTENTS

Meeting #1	December 4, 2003	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #2	January 22, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #3	February 26, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #4	April 1, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #5	May 6, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #6	July 7, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting	July 7, 2004	Meeting Minutes from Joint RVMPO Committees Meeting

Agenda- Kick-Off Meeting

Time, Date: 9 a.m., Thursday, December 4

Location: RVTD Conference Room, 3200 Crater Lake Avenue, Medford

Conference Call-In Number: (541) 608-2421

Contact: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG- (541) 664-6676 ext. 241

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions (5 min) Alex Georgevitch
Approve minutes; public comment
 2. Project Introduction (15 min)..... Galen McGill
 3. Project Overview (20 min).....Jim Peters
 - A. Scope of Work
 - B. Project Schedule
 4. Stakeholder Consensus (15 min).....Jim Peters
 - A. Key Stakeholders (main contact and back-up)
 - B. Expanded Stakeholders
 5. Information Needed by DKS (10 min).....Jim Peters

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic signal locations and controller details • Traffic signal systems (twisted pair, fiber, radio, WAN, etc.) • Hardware and software system platforms • Leased lines, phone drops • System detectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITS devices (CCTV cameras, dynamic message signs, etc.) • Communications infrastructure • Bus priority equipment • Transit infrastructure • Existing and future (2023) traffic volumes, V/C, and LOS for 10 project corridors
--	---
 6. List of Documents to Review (up to 6) (10 min)Jim Peters
 7. Project Expectations (20 min)Jim Peters
 8. Mission, Goals, and Objectives (30 min).....Jim Peters
 9. Next Steps (10 min).....Jim Peters
 10. Other..... Alex Georgevitch



Meeting Minutes

Project Kick-Off Meeting

December 4, 2003, RVTD Conference Room

Attendees: Sue D’Agnese, Shirley Roberts, Galen McGill, Larry McKinley, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Jerry Barnes, Medford; Dan Moore, Julie Rodwell, Chris Olivier, Vicki Guarino, RVCOG; Scott Chancey, RVTD; Jeff Proulx, OSP; Hau Hagedorn, Castle Rock Consultants; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Millie Tirapelle, Arlen Hatlestad, S. Ore. Regional 911; Peter Coffey, Renee Hurtado, Jim Peters, DKS Associates.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of MinutesAlex Georgevitch

After meeting participants introduced themselves, Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order. Minutes from the May 15, 2003, meeting were approved as presented.

2. Project Introduction Galen McGill

Galen gave a brief overview of ITS, saying a plan is required by April 2005 for the region to qualify for Federal Highway Administration funds. The plan addresses traffic management devices such as signals. Each agency has its own systems and the idea of ITS is to have them work together. Much of that compatibility already is happening in the Medford area. This project will be directed by two groups: a steering committee of representatives of agencies that are key to the project’s success, and an expanded stakeholder group which includes smaller communities, agencies and others interested in the plan.

3. Project Overview..... Jim Peters

Jim presented an outline of the project with PowerPoint, listing key project participants and the scope of work. The plan will include a needs assessment, which will be based largely on information from key local agencies. The work will follow a top-down, bottom-up approach. Top- down approach will involve applying the ITS architecture format to local projects and needs; the bottom-up approach will involve gathering the local information and framing it within the architecture. The project and deployment will have a 20-year horizon so it can be visionary.

A project schedule was distributed. Renee Hurtado said the task of identifying existing conditions will be done through the inventory and interviews. The plan will build on existing conditions and needs. A questionnaire will be sent to the expanded stakeholder group.

The group reviewed the corridors covered in the statement of work and agreed that the list seemed adequate. Jim said the area probably could be expanded if necessary as work proceeds. The ITS plan will assure that necessary agencies work in coordination and that ways are found to share information, such as road conditions for travelers. It will focus on ways to improve



transportation for the general public rather than for a particular segment, such as the trucking industry. The regional architecture will show connections and a circuitry for information. It also will identify the agency responsible for carrying out specific aspects of the plan.

The group discussed potential benefits for agencies. Jim said the value of the plan will depend on agency input, so that projects address identified needs. Galen said local expertise is key to the usefulness of the plan. The plan won't necessarily solve all problems, but it should identify important problems.

The steering committee agreed to meet monthly, with meetings timed around the release of a draft document, which will be reviewed at the meeting. Millie Tirapelle said the SORC center has a larger conference room that may be more comfortable. She would check on its availability.

Jim said that an open house session in February, coordinated by RVCOG, would focus on information from the expanded-stakeholder group. Vicki Guarino said the open house will present the project's findings to date to the public and stakeholders who haven't been actively participating in the work. Additional, useful information for the ITS plan may be obtained at this event. Galen was concerned that the project not rely on the open house to gather necessary information from key sources. It was agreed that key sources would be contacted separately, perhaps in a smaller, daytime meeting on the same day as the open house, where information could be obtained in a more guided fashion.

Project information also would be presented to the RVMPO TAC, PAC and Policy Committee.

4. Stakeholder Consensus..... Jim Peters

Jim presented the draft lists of key stakeholders and expanded stakeholders. The committee decided to include smaller jurisdictions such as Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Phoenix, and Talent as expanded stakeholders. They will be included in project notifications and their representatives can decide how active they will be. Dan Moore asked about private sector participation, groups such as AAA and Oregon Truckers. Arlen Hatlestad suggested that fiber optic companies be included. Others suggested that the news media be included in light of their participation in issuing emergency warnings. Captain Rodriguez (OSP) or Dave Abbott (Jackson County Sheriff's Office) may have a contact list for media technical personnel that would be appropriate to include as expanded stakeholders. The California-Oregon Advanced Transportation Systems (COATS) should be reviewed for appropriate information. Alex noted that Medford has a project to create a fiber optic link to OSP. There was brief discussion of the recent activation of the Amber Alert system after a toddler was kidnapped, and a passing motorist alerted by the system was instrumental in the recovery. The committee agreed that the military would not be directly involved in RVITS. The private industry representatives (trucking, fiber optic companies, cell phone companies) would be invited to the open house.

Key stakeholders for RVITS were identified as Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Jackson County, RVCOG, RVTD, ODOT and FHWA.



5. Information Needed by DKS Jim Peters

Jim presented a brief list (on agenda) of information needs, but said he will email a more detailed list. Most of the information would come in the interviews. Julie Rodwell said she would like to have all traffic count data and data collection in RVMPO projects be integrated.

6. List of Documents to Review..... Jim Peters

Jim presented a list of documents that will be reviewed as part of the existing conditions chapter. The committee agreed to add COATS and ODOT’s Economic and Bridge Options Report. Julie said she will coordinate the list with DKS because there may be other reports that should be included.

7. Project Expectations Jim Peters

Participants listed expectations as follows:

Alex Georgevitch: Identifying software to share information from traffic cameras and other sources, and creating data bases that can be shared, such as accident data.

Dan Moore: The RVMPO needs to meet federal requirements by deadline. He hopes the plan will alleviate congestion, be integrated with emergency management providers, improve safety and incident response, provide real-time traveler information, and provide opportunities for public-private partnerships.

Sue D’Agnese: ODOT traffic management is undertaking projects, but information about projects needs to be better communicated, and duplication avoided.

Jeff Proulx: Oregon State Police wants to do whatever possible to reduce accidents on State and County roadways and to keep the roads clear.

Scott Chancey: RVTD wants to further efforts for transit signal prioritization.

Galen McGill: wants the plan to be well-coordinated so that it is effective, identifies agencies’ current projects and needs, and establishes long-term relationships. He also wants to see automated data sharing.

Shirley Roberts: said her role is to support the project, and agreed with others’ comments.

Julie Rodwell: wants to see public understanding the plan, and integrate the plan with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Larry McKinley: said it is important that various agencies’ systems be integrated, secure communications interfaces be set up, and resources to be shared.

Arlen Hatlestad: wants to address ways to integrate the Internet with ITS for information dissemination and for secure access by public agencies. Galen noted that raw data is posted on ODOT’s ftp site, but many people do not know about it.



Millie Tirapelle: said the challenge is to integrate users and communicate information about resources, such as ODOT's highway cameras. She hopes the project brings some cohesion to agencies and better information sharing despite limited funds. Alex noted that a communications network for emergency-services vehicles is expanding beyond Medford. Central Point has a wireless network linking patrol cars to city hall, and is linking patrol cars to cameras in the field.

Nathaniel Price: noted the importance of fiber links, but among smaller agencies the facilities and resources will differ widely. He wants to make sure the RVITS plan is something that is used and updated. It should identify areas of integration, and ways to incorporate ITS features into construction projects. Federal funds have been set aside for building ITS projects.

Jerry Barnes: said the public often is critical of the way transportation funds are spent, but this project presents an opportunity to show efforts toward efficiency, coordination and effective use of public money.

8. Mission, Goals, and Objectives..... Jim Peters

Jim led the committee in a roundtable discussion, recording suggestions with PowerPoint. He said he would compile comments into draft mission statement, goals and objectives and distribute the draft by email to meeting participants. Goals include safety, efficiency, security, improved real-time information, increased public awareness, system integration. Jim said the goals will be used near the end of the study for project scoring.

9. Next MeetingAlex Georgevitch

The group agreed that a meeting room with a larger table would be more comfortable. Millie Tirapelle said she would check on the availability of the SORC conference room. Jim noted that tentative meeting dates are listed on the project schedule and asked meeting participants to mark these on their calendars and check for future conflicts. Meetings will be Thursdays, 9 -11 a.m. The next meeting will be at 9 a.m. Jan. 22, 2004, tentatively at Southern Oregon Regional Communications conference room, 4th floor of the Jackson County Courthouse, 10 S. Oakdale Ave., Medford. (Note: Use the Facility Maintenance and Handicap Entrance at the back of the building to get to SORC's office.)

10. OtherAlex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch adjourned the meeting at 10:50 a.m.



Agenda- Steering Committee Meeting #2

Time, Date: 9 a.m., Thursday, January 22, 2004

Location: SORC Boardroom, 4th Floor, Jackson County Courthouse, 10 South Oakdale Avenue, Medford

Conference Call-In Number: Call contact number below by Jan. 21 to arrange this service.

Contact: Dan Moore, RVCOG - (541) 664-6676 ext. 217

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions Alex Georgevitch
 2. Review/Approve Minutes Alex Georgevitch
 3. Public Comment Alex Georgevitch
 4. Mission, Goals, and Objectives (15 min).....Jim Peters
Background: The working group in the last meeting discussed draft goals.
Action Requested: Finalize project mission, goals, and objectives.
 5. Project Update (10 min)Jim Peters
A. Existing Conditions (15 min)
B. Interview Results/Status (30 min)
 6. Expanded Stakeholder Meeting (15 min).....Jim Peters
A. Finalize Expanded Stakeholder List
B. Discuss Meeting Format
C. Finalize Meeting Location
 7. Next Steps (10 min).....Jim Peters
 8. Other Business..... Alex Georgevitch
 9. Next Meeting: February 26, 2004 Alex Georgevitch
 10. Adjourn



Meeting Minutes

Steering Committee Meeting #2

January 22, 2004, SORC Conference Room

Attendees: Sue D’Agnese, Galen McGill, Larry McKinley, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Medford; Dan Moore, Chris Olivier, Kathy Helmer, RVCOG; Mathew Barnes, RVTD; Nathaniel (“Nate”) Price, FHWA; Arlen Hatlestad, Southern Oregon Regional Communications; Jim Wear, Phoenix.

Teleconferencers: Peter Coffey, Renee Hurtado, Jim Peters, DKS Associates.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of MinutesAlex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order at 9:08 AM. The minutes of the Dec.4. 2003, meeting were approved as presented. Jim Peters apologized for DKS staff not attending the meeting in person; their plane had been returned due to fog. In the future, they will drive to Medford.

2. Public Comment.....Alex Georgevitch

There was no public comment.

3. Mission, Goals, and Objectives..... Jim Peters

Jim led the group in reviewing the drafted mission, goals and objectives, as per the handout. The group agreed that the mission statement was good as is.

Regarding Goal 2, Alex inquired about the applicability of the phrase “for non-motorized modes” in the second objective. The group agreed that the objective should be changed to “for all modes.”

Dan asked if the objective of meeting federal requirements needed to be added to the list. Nate replied that complying was enough; it did not have to be listed.

Regarding the first objective under Goal 5, Alex asked why “building consensus among the Steering Committee members” was included, since it was part of the current process. Galen said that the sheet was lacking the objective of developing long-term partnerships to carry forward the coordination. The group agreed that the fourth objective should be changed to read “Continue to coordinate and integrate projects with other agencies.”

Dan asked if there was going to be an ongoing need for an ITS Committee, and if so, what activities would it undertake over time. A budget for continued committee coordination would



need to be developed. Galen noted that there would be a wide array of potential activities. The committee might become an MPO subcommittee that proposes regional projects or defines project pieces. Nate noted that there is a requirement to update the plan over time. The plan is to present an implementation plan; there will be a discussion of how to continue in the future. The group suggested that there would likely be two regular meetings each year and maybe a couple of special meetings regarding special projects. Jim noted that the group needed to consider managing the whole communications infrastructure. This group would develop intergovernmental agreements and memoranda of understanding.

4. Project Update..... Jim Peters

Jim asked for people’s comments on the draft Chapter 1 regarding Current & Future Transportation Conditions. He noted that comments are needed by 1/30/04. Some of the maps have yet to be finished.

Regarding the table on page 1-3, the group discussed how best to refer to the various interchanges and agreed that the I-5 exit numbers should be used for consistency. There are local names for the interchanges, but it is best to use the exit numbers.

The OSP office on Hwy 99 needs to be added to Figure 1-2.

In response to a question by Alex, Galen said that the maps will be in color and everyone to receive the report will receive a disc with color.

Jim noted that Figures 1-3 and 1-4 on congestion were not yet done; DKS is waiting for the information from the smaller towns.

Alex said that some traffic signals might be counted twice since Medford maintains some that are not owned by the City. Larry and Sue felt confident that they had not been doubled counted; some of the new signals are actually missing. Jim asked that the people responsible for each item review them for accuracy.

Alex asked that the RTP Policy about removing unwarranted signals be included somewhere in the report. This is an effort to improve efficiency. Jim said he would add it to section 1.13.5.

Regarding the crash data, Chris reported that he has 3 data sets in different formats. RVCOG has mapped some of the corridors; the state has mapped some. Medford has lots of data, but has not mapped it. This report calls for “high collision locations” and will require some data refinement. Jim suggested that Chris could use the SPIS calculations and just use each agency’s format, rather than trying to put them all into the same format. Jim said that they just wanted the top accident locations. What is still needed is information from the other jurisdictions. Jim said that he, Renee and Chris would talk and organize to gather the data. Jim will contact Eric Niemeyer for county data. Alex will send Medford’s data to DKS.

Alex mentioned that Figures 1-3 and 1-4 are a problem for him since the volume-to-capacity ratios are based on raw numbers from the travel demand model. Jim asked him to look at it as a starting point. Alex said he has v/c ratios for the intersections from a Citywide Synchro model and will give it to Jim to use for Figures 1-3 and 1-4.



The Oregon Highway model and the new MPO model are due out by the end of the fiscal year. The group agreed that they will go with the best information available now. If the model were done by June, then that information may be incorporated as appropriate.

The group discussed information that is still needed, which includes: the I-5 Alternate Route Plan, the I-5 Viaduct Alternate Route Plan, the Commuter Rail Feasibility Study, the Traffic Management Plan for the new amphitheater, and a ranked list of County issues. Sue said she would get both I-5 alternate route plans from Bob Sechler and talk with John Vial regarding a traffic management plan for the new amphitheater. Jim will ask about whether a Jackson Co. Homeland Security Plan exists and if it is generally available. Dan will get the Commuter Rail study. Sue mentioned that Parametrix put together a list of ranked County issues and she will look into obtaining a copy of this documentation.

5. Expanded Stakeholder Meeting Jim Peters

Jim asked the group for their recommendations regarding public involvement aspects. Jim said he planned to have three events on February 26th: a meeting for other interested agencies, a Steering Committee meeting, and a public Open House. Dan said it would be a benefit to invite the public into the process at this time; he was particularly interested in inviting the MPO PAC, TAC and Policy Committee. Alex did not think that public input would be so helpful at the front end of this project since public turnout is virtually nonexistent for planning projects; he felt it would be better to wait until more work was accomplished and there was something for the public to review.

Ultimately, the group agreed that a meeting would be held from 9:30 AM to 11:30 AM, on Feb.26 for the “expanded stakeholder” group of other interested agencies and targeted members of the public, including such groups as the MPO PAC and TAC. Lunch will be brought in for the Steering Committee and that group will meet from Noon to 2 PM.

Regarding the expanded stakeholder list, Alex wanted Bill Hoke’s name to be added. Dan suggested that TRADCO be added, as well as the local Freight Advisory Committee. RVCOG will put together a mailing list and send out a DKS brochure on ITS along with an agenda for the Feb.26th morning meeting. DKS will prepare handouts for the meeting. Alex suggested that each agency or group send a representative, such as their Chair, rather than inviting several people from each group.

The meeting format will be: a starting presentation, followed by participants visiting a variety of stations manned by staff. Jim will work with RVCOG to determine a venue.

Jim shared some of what had been heard in stakeholder interviews. They heard a good deal about accidents on the I-5 viaduct, as well as closings of the Interstate due to the Siskiyou Pass closures in recent snowfalls. They heard many positive comments about work that had already been accomplished, such as the common dispatch of ODOT and OSP and the sharing of a CAD system by CCOM and SORC.

6. Next Steps Jim Peters

1/30/04 Comments are due on the Future & Current Transportation Conditions



2/12/04 Draft Needs Assessment Chapter will be ready for review
2/26/04 The Expanded Stakeholder and Steering Committee Meetings will be held
The next Steering Committee Meeting will focus on architecture, as well as the concept of operations.

7. Adjournment**Alex Georgevitch**

Alex adjourned the meeting at 10:50 AM.



Castle Rock Consultants

Agenda- Steering Committee Meeting #3

Time, Date: 12 p.m., Thursday, February 26, 2004

Location: Smullin Center Room 109-111, Rogue Valley Medical Center Campus,
2650 Siskiyou Blvd, Medford

Contact: Julie Rodwell, RVCOG - (541) 664-6676 ext. 214

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions Alex Georgevitch
 2. Review/Approve Minutes Alex Georgevitch
Draft minutes from January 22, 2004 meeting attached.
 3. Public Comment Alex Georgevitch
 4. Federal ITS Requirements (10 min).....Jim Peters
 5. National ITS Overview Staff
 - A. Why are We Creating an Architecture? (Nathaniel Price – 10 min)
 - B. ITS Terminology (DKS – 5 min)
 - C. Turbo Architecture (DKS – 5 min)
 6. Rogue Valley Regional ITS Architecture (45 min)Jim Peters
 - A. Physical Architecture
 - B. User Services
 - C. Market Packages
 - D. How Will the Region Maintain the Architecture?
 7. Introduction to Concept of Operations (30 min).....Hau Hagedorn
 8. Next Steps (5 min).....Jim Peters
 9. Other Business..... Alex Georgevitch
 10. Next Meeting: April 1, 2004 Alex Georgevitch
 11. Adjourn

Meeting Minutes

Steering Committee Meeting #3

February 26, 2004, Smullin Center

Attendees: Sue D’Agnese, Galen McGill, Shirley Roberts, Larry McKinley, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Medford; Julie Rodwell, Chris Olivier, Vicki Guarino, RVCOG; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Eric Niemeyer, Jackson County, Peter Coffey, Jim Peters, DKS; Toshi Forrest, Hau Hagedorn, Castle Rock Consultants.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of MinutesAlex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order at 11:45 a.m. He suggested that if anyone had changes to make to the minutes they should call RVCOG.

2. Public Comment.....Alex Georgevitch

There was no public comment.

3. Federal ITS Requirements..... Jim Peters

Jim said the agenda would be changed so that Nathaniel Price could talk about the federal requirements and reasons for creating the ITS architecture.

Nathaniel made a PowerPoint presentation (slides handout) reviewing the reasons and history of the ITS Architecture. He said the ITS architecture is not a design but a plan that shows what the community wants the transportation system to do. It is a way of reducing costs by making the transportation system function more effectively. It also fosters cooperation among federal, state and local agencies and other interests, such as emergency responders. The architecture will become an element of other local plans, and incorporated into transportation plans. Federal regulations require that the regional architecture for the RVMPO be in place by April 8, 2005, so that projects in the RVMPO can continue to qualify for federal funds.

Alex Georgevitch asked whether the requirement could interfere with anticipated start of construction of the South Medford Interchange, which is expected to go to bid later in 2005. Nathaniel and Galen McGill said the region should have its ITS architecture completed well before April 2005, so there shouldn’t be any problem. (Additional comments attached at the end of this document as a memo.)

4. Rogue Valley Regional ITS Architecture Jim Peters

Jim reviewed work accomplished to date, including identification of key and expanded stakeholders, interviews and surveys, and the compilation of the results, which are included in the systems inventory. He distributed a handout containing the Draft Regional ITS Architecture

elements, which included the physical architecture, the Turbo Architecture inventory report, the user services, and the market packages.

Jim described the Draft Rogue Valley High-Level Physical Architecture Figure. The working group provided the following comments:

- Add the City of Medford under Web Based Transit & Traveler Information.
- Add the City of Phoenix under Traffic Signals.
- Add the City of Medford under Weather Stations.
- Add the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) as a Center.

Jim asked working group members to review the inventory for completeness. Members noted that Phoenix Traffic Signals, Mercy Flights and perhaps NOAA should be added to the inventory. NOAA would like to be able to distribute their information at rest areas. It was also noted that the name “Jackson County Public Works” should be replaced with “Jackson County Roads, Parks, and Planning”. Members would like the inventory to include field devices instead of the higher level “roadside devices”.

Jim described the market packages and their functions. He also described Turbo Architecture, the software that will be used to build and maintain the RVITS Regional ITS Architecture. Once the inventory is finished, the working group will verify that the draft selected market packages are appropriate to the area and best serve the RVITS needs. Market package descriptions also are on the web, as noted in the handout.

He led the group in an item-by-item review of draft Rogue Valley Market Packages by key stakeholders. Members noted planned and existing programs and services that match available packages listed in the draft, and discussed how packages fit existing and potential needs.

The working group discussed setting up a data warehouse, and agreed that RVCOG might be the most appropriate agency for the function.

Public transportation packages were skipped because RVTD representatives were absent.

Nathaniel and others said the options for assessing market packages, existing or planned, were too limited. There should be more ways to express the extent to which packages are applicable. Some packages could become useful in the future, and would be added to the architecture at the time they become useful, not now. The working group agreed that surface street and freeway controls need to be coordinated.

Some working group members said Ashland may have ITS needs relating to weather (freezing conditions at higher elevations) and traffic controls for special events.

DKS will incorporate the group’s comments on the draft market packages table and issue an updated table as part of the Draft Regional ITS Architecture chapter in late March.



5. Introduction to Concept of Operations..... Hau Hagedorn

Hau made a PowerPoint presentation on ITS operations. She said consultants will meet separately with stakeholders to gather additional information and then will draft an outline showing coordination among agencies. Roles for agencies will be defined, and the flow of data will be diagrammed. Information about agency roles will be gathered from stakeholders.

She showed a sample diagram, using information from SORC. The slide illustrated working relationships with other agencies, and ITS features. As ITS features are added to the system the diagram will be amended to reflect the change. Hau said she will talk to each stakeholder about their roles, and then discuss his findings at the next working group meeting. Hau explained the function of the diagram, identifying the kind of information, where it is generated, and where it goes.

6. Next Steps Jim Peters

The next working group meeting will be 9:30-11:30 a.m., April 1, at the SORC conference room in the Jackson County courthouse, Medford.



DATE: March 9, 2004
TO: RVITS Steering Committee
FROM: Nathaniel Price, FHWA
SUBJECT: ITS Architecture Conformity Overview

To follow up on the phone conversation last week: Attached is a short overview of the ITS Architecture conformance Final Rule and how it would apply to the South Medford Interchange. The first couple of pages is the overview and then at the end is how it would apply in Medford. As the process of just how projects should be implemented and how we will oversee this process is still being developed in our Office, this is subject to change for future projects. Please let me know if you have any comments or questions.

Conformance with the Final Rule for ITS Architecture and Standards

The requirements for conformance with ITS Architecture and Standards are found in 23 CFR Part 940. The main sections of Part 940 address the Policy (940.5), Applicability (940.7), Regional ITS Architecture (940.9), Project Implementation (940.11) and Project Administration (940.13). The two elements to focus on for conformance are Part 940.9 addressing the development of a regional ITS architecture and Part 940.11 addressing implementation of ITS projects.

Overview of 23 CFR Part 940

Part 940.5 – Policy:

This section states that ITS projects shall conform to the National ITS Architecture and standards. Conformance with the National ITS Architecture is interpreted to mean the use of the National ITS Architecture to develop a regional ITS architecture, and the subsequent adherence of all ITS projects to that regional ITS architecture. Development of the regional ITS architecture should be consistent with the transportation planning process for Statewide and Metropolitan Planning.

Part 940.7 – Applicability:

All ITS projects that are funded in whole or in part with the highway trust fund, including those on the National Highway System (NHS) and on non-NHS routes, are subject to these provisions.

An ITS project is defined as any project that in whole or in part funds the acquisition of technologies or systems of technologies that provide or significantly contribute to the provision of one or more ITS user services as defined in the National ITS Architecture.

Part 940.9 – Regional ITS Architecture:

This section states that a Regional ITS architecture shall be developed to guide the development of ITS projects and programs and be consistent with ITS strategies and projects contained in applicable transportation plans. The regional ITS architecture shall include the following:

- Description of the region;
- Identification of participating agencies and other stakeholders;
- An operational concept that identifies the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies and stakeholders in the operation and implementation of the systems included in the regional ITS architecture;
- Any agreements (existing or new) required for operations, including at a minimum those affecting ITS project interoperability, utilization of ITS standards, and the operation of ITS projects identified in the regional ITS architecture;
- System functional requirements;
- Interface requirements and information exchanges with planned and existing systems and subsystems;
- Identification of ITS standards supporting regional and national interoperability; and
- The sequence of projects required for implementation.

This section also states that the agencies and other stakeholders participating in the development of the regional ITS architecture shall develop and implement procedures for maintaining it, as needs evolve within the region.

Part 940.11 – Project Implementation:

This section looks at how ITS projects are developed and implemented in a region. It states that all ITS projects funded with highway trust funds shall be based on a systems engineering analysis. The analysis should be on a scale commensurate with the project scope. The systems engineering analysis shall include:

- Identification of portions of the regional ITS architecture being implemented;
- Identification of participating agencies roles and responsibilities;
- Requirements definitions;
- Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements;
- Procurement options;
- Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures; and
- Procedures and resources necessary for operations and management of the system.

It also states that the final design of all ITS projects funded with highway trust funds shall accommodate the interface requirements and information exchanges as specified in the regional ITS architecture. If the final design of the ITS project is inconsistent with the regional ITS architecture, then the regional ITS architecture shall be updated as provided in the process defined in Part 940.9(f) to reflect the changes.

Part 940.13 – Project Administration:

This section simply states that prior to the authorization of highway trust funds for construction or implementation of ITS projects, compliance with Part 940.11 shall be demonstrated.

Conformity in Medford

The “Regional ITS Operations and Implementation Plan for the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Area” that is being developed for RVITS by DKS will satisfy most if not all of Part 940.9

Regional ITS Architecture. One piece that may or may not be addressed in complete detail is the maintenance of the regional ITS architecture.

Following the completion of the regional ITS architecture, all ITS projects in the region must be implemented following the requirements stated in Part 940.11. While this does apply to all ITS projects in a region, the intent of the Final Rule is to foster integration of the development of regional ITS systems. This includes incorporating ITS elements into the region's transportation planning and programming process, promoting increased stakeholder participation, and identification of potential integration activities among agencies. This will have the most impact on major ITS projects. A major ITS project means any project that implements part of a regional ITS initiative that is multijurisdictional, multi-modal, or otherwise affects regional integration of ITS systems. All major ITS projects should be developed and implemented based on the requirements identified in 23 CFR Part 940. Other projects will be addressed on a case by case basis, until a more formal process for addressing the implementation and administration of ITS projects can be developed within our office. With this in mind, I would like to work with ODOT and local agencies within Oregon to develop this process.

For the specific project that was questioned, the South Medford Interchange project, the ITS elements that were mentioned are a CCTV camera and some new signals. In this case, the need for a formal systems engineering process does not seem to apply. However, I would still like to see some documentation addressing the following items:

- Portions of the regional ITS Architecture being implemented;
- Identification of the participating agencies roles and responsibilities (this can most likely come from the Operational Concept developed as part of the ITS Plan). This should also include procedures and resources for operation and maintenance of the field devices;
- Functional requirements of the devices. For this particular project, it will not be much more than a paragraph indicating what you will require the devices to do, i.e. PTZ Camera, etc.; and
- ITS Standards that you expect to implement. In this case, I don't suspect there will be any.

I don't expect this documentation should be much more than a couple of pages. Most of it should be able to be drawn directly from the regional ITS architecture. Again, the analysis should be on a scale commensurate with the scope of the project. In this case, the ITS portion of the project is relatively minor compared to the entire construction project. Basically, I want to ensure that the intent of the Final Rule is met without overburdening the process. I am willing to discuss these documentation requirements with you further if this proves necessary.

If you have any further questions regarding 23 CFR Part 940 please feel free to give me a call at 503.587.4709 or send me an e-mail at Nathaniel.price@fhwa.dot.gov. I would also be willing to go over this in more detail at our next RVITS meeting if that is necessary. In addition, I am collecting information from other States on how they are handling the administration of ITS projects. I will be using this information along with input from ODOT and local agencies to develop the process that will be used here in Oregon.

Agenda- Steering Committee Meeting #4

Time, Date: 9:00 a.m., Thursday, April 1, 2004

Location: SORC Boardroom, 4th Floor, Jackson County Courthouse, 10 South Oakdale Avenue, Medford

Conference Call-In Number: Call contact number below by March 30 to arrange this service.

Contact: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG - (541) 664-6676 ext. 241

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions Alex Georgevitch
 2. Review/Approve Minutes Alex Georgevitch
 3. Public Comment Alex Georgevitch
 4. Workshop Debrief (10 min) Jim Peters
Discussion of February 26th Expanded Stakeholder Workshop.
 5. Concept of Operations (60 min).....Hau Hagedorn
 6. RVITS Architecture (10 min) Jim Peters
 7. Goals and Objectives (35 min).....Jim Peters
Discussion of Project Scoring System
 8. Next Steps (5 min).....Jim Peters
 9. Other Business..... Alex Georgevitch
 10. Next Meeting: May 6, 2004 Alex Georgevitch
 11. Adjourn

Meeting Minutes
Steering Committee Meeting #4
April 1, 2004, SORC Conference Room

Attendees: Galen McGill, Shirley Roberts, Larry McKinley, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Jerry Barnes, Medford; Julie Rodwell, Chris Olivier, Vicki Guarino, RVCOG; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Jim Peters, Renee Hurtado, DKS; Toshi Forrest, Hau Hagedorn, Castle Rock Consultants; Ron Norris, Medford Police, Mike Curry, Jackson County emergency manager; Millie Tirapelle, Arlen Hatlestad, SORC 911; Scott Chancey, RVTD; Eric Niemeyer, Jackson County.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of Minutes Alex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. He suggested that if anyone has changes to make to the minutes they should call RVCOG.

2. Public Comment..... Alex Georgevitch

There was no public comment.

3. Workshop Debrief..... Jim Peters

Jim led a debriefing of the February 26 workshop. Committee members said many good comments were received and there was a good turnout. The committee agreed that the next workshop should be held in a larger room. Suggested locations for the next workshop included the Jackson County Auditorium on Table Rock Road and the Girl Scout facility in Medford.

4. Concept of Operations..... Hau Hagedorn

Hau distributed hard copies of the Draft Chapter 4: Concept of Operations, and reviewed the document. (Electronic copies were distributed in advance of the meeting.) She described how it was developed with the information from stakeholders. The database shows everything that was included, identifying the various agencies, their interactions and the flows of information among them. Relationships among the agencies are identified and roles and responsibilities are categorized. Some chapter elements were confirmed among working group members during the meeting, but the rest of the chapter still needs reviewed by Committee members. The document lists basic ITS functions for participating agencies. Jim Peters said the flow diagrams provide a structure that can be used to develop other plans and agreements in the future.

The committee discussed Figure 4-3: Incident Management Flow Diagram and a sample scenario, closure of the southbound I-5 viaduct, depicted in a map handout. The scenario included activation of message signs and traffic signal timing. It was noted that only ODOT has authority to close I-5. Closure decisions for a particular roadway are made by whatever agency

has jurisdiction of that roadway. The flow diagram is used to chart incident management and the information flows (data, video, control, request, status) between agencies, equipment, and vehicles. In general, information flows to and from roadside devices or vehicles will be between the device or vehicle and the owning/operating agency's center. Information flows between agencies will happen on a center-to-center level.

Summary of Edits to Figure 4-3:

- Change ODOT TMOC to ODOT TOC.
- Change CCOM to RVCCOM.
- Include "Other Cities" to the description of the Emergency Responders and Emergency Response Vehicles that interact with SORC. SORC dispatches for 9 cities and 28 agencies, but each one does not need to be listed separately.
- Add a planned video information flow from Emergency Response Vehicles to SORC and RVCCOM.
- Add Mercy Flights' Dispatch Center. Data and status information are currently exchanged between Mercy Flights and SORC and between Mercy Flights and RVCCOM. The two-way exchange of video information between Mercy Flights and SORC and RVCCOM is planned for the future.
- Add Jackson County Roads, Parks, and Planning Roadside Equipment and the appropriate flows.
- Add a planned two-way information flow (control, data, status, request, video) between ODOT TOC and Medford Roadside Equipment. The City of Medford will likely pursue an agreement for ODOT to implement pre-programmed signal timing after hours.
- Add a planned video information flow from Medford to SORC and RVCCOM.
- Add a planned video information flow from RVTD Coaches to RVTD.
- Add a planned video information flow from RVTD to SORC and RVCCOM.

Side note: SORC is in the process of deploying a countywide microwave system.

Table 4-8: Incident Management Roles and Responsibility Matrix defines roles and responsibilities for agencies in the areas of design, construction/implementation, operational planning, operations, and maintenance. Consultants asked agency representatives to review roles and responsibilities and notify them of any changes needed. There was discussion about 911 agencies possibly needing the capability to control variable message signs in the future. Larry also noted that ODOT operates highway advisory radio (HAR), not OSP.

Traveler information (Figure 4-2 and Table 4-6) and centralized data storage (Figure 4-6 and Table 4-14) were discussed. Julie Rodwell noted a growing amount of traffic data collected by the MPO. Warehousing data could be a role for RVCOG. Alex noted Jackson County has a lot of GIS data and the warehouse needs to be accessible and maintained so that it's useful. Medford is putting all of its traffic data on GIS. Galen McGill said he wasn't sure that traffic count data should be part of an ITS warehouse—it should be for ITS data, but details can be worked out later. The issue now is whether the group wants to have a warehouse. Also, Jim said it could be a virtual warehouse in which every member keeps their own data. Alex pointed out the need for an incident database. Galen said it may be desirable to have a central archive to provide analysis



and get information back to agencies. Julie said that even if each agency is responsible for its own information, there should be a lead agency assuming overall responsibility. Jim said such details can be worked out later during the actual project development of a data warehouse. Jim also mentioned that a separate project for standardization of data formats may be a project to include in the deployment plan.

Figure 4-2: Traveler Information Flow Diagram was discussed. Regarding construction information, Alex noted that Medford posts static info on the web and eventually the city would like to post its video images to ODOT's TripCheck website. Galen noted that the TripCheck website is available for the Rogue Valley to post information to and already has a link to the metropolitan area. The public is already largely aware of the TripCheck website. Diagram will be changed to eliminate an RVCOG Central Website and to show TripCheck as the regional traveler information website. Jackson County also posts static construction information on their website.

Jim pointed out that when Steering Committee members review the Draft Concept of Operations chapter, they do not need to review the chapter in its entirety but should closely review the information flows and roles and responsibilities associated with their agency.

5. RVITS Architecture..... Jim Peters

Jim distributed the draft Transit Architecture market packages, and said they are groupings of ITS equipment that provide particular transit related services. The market package selection is based on needs heard from stakeholders. Scott Chancey said much of what is noted is being done now, but in some cases is done by hand rather than an automated system. Some of the information is for RVTD's own use, but some would be useful to passengers and other agencies. Real Time Ridesharing is selected as planned under the traveler information market packages.

It also was noted that there is a new upgrade of the Turbo Architecture software (Version 3.0) expected out soon, so it will be used to update the regional architecture inventory and to create the regional architecture flow table.

6. Project Scoring..... Jim Peters

Jim distributed the draft matrix for evaluation of proposed Rogue Valley ITS plan projects. He noted that it lists the goals and objectives agreed upon during the January 22nd Meeting. Weighted goals and objectives will be used by RVCOG for project scoring. Each project will be assigned a score based on how well it meets each objective under each of the five project goals. The Committee agreed on the weighted goal scores included in the matrix, but changed Goal 2 to 25 points and Goal 3 to 20 points. It was noted that Committee members should contact DKS if they have any comments on the scores assigned to the goals and objectives.

7. Next Steps Jim Peters

The next meeting will be 9 a.m., May 6; Arlen Hatlestad said he would check on the availability of the SORC conference room.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.



Agenda- Steering Committee Meeting #5

Time, Date: 9:00 a.m., Thursday, May 6, 2004

Location: SORC Boardroom, 4th Floor, Jackson County Courthouse, 10 South Oakdale Avenue, Medford

Conference Call-In Number: Call contact number below by March 30 to arrange this service.

Contact: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG - (541) 664-6676 ext. 241 or Julie Rodwell ext. 214

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions Alex Georgevitch
 2. Review/Approve Minutes Alex Georgevitch
Draft minutes from April 1, 2004 Steering Committee Meeting
 3. Public Comment..... Alex Georgevitch
 4. Deployment Plan (90 min) Jim Peters & Renee Hurtado
Review of Project List
Discussion of Project Scoring (Dan Moore)
Proposed ITS Equipment Map
 5. Communication Plan (20 min) Jim Peters & Rich Shinn
 6. Deployment Plan Workshop (10 min).....Jim Peters
Finalize Location, Time and Format
 7. Next Steps (5 min).....Jim Peters
 8. Other Business..... Alex Georgevitch
 9. Next Meeting: June 3, 2004 Alex Georgevitch
 10. Adjourn

Meeting Minutes
Steering Committee Meeting #5
May 6, 2004, SORC Conference Room

Attendees: Galen McGill, Shirley Roberts, Larry McKinley, Sue D’Agnese, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Jerry Barnes, Medford; Julie Rodwell, Chris Olivier, Vicki Guarino, RVCOG; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Jim Peters, Rich Shinn, Renee Hurtado, DKS; Arlen Hatlestad, SORC 911; Eric Niemeyer, Jackson County.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of MinutesAlex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. By consensus, the committee approved the minutes of April 1.

2. Public Comment.....Alex Georgevitch

There was no public comment.

3. Deployment Plan Jim Peters

Jim reviewed the agenda and noted handouts: ITS deployment plan draft map, proposed deployment projects (Table 6-1), and draft evaluation chart. The deployment plan lists some 40-50 projects so the group at this meeting would hit only the highlights. He asked group members on their own to review all listed projects and let him know of anything that should be changed, removed or added within two weeks. He began an item by item review of the deployment plan.

Travel & Traffic Management Projects

RV-TM-01: Integration between ODOT Region 3 TOC and Local Transportation Operations Systems: Represents the functional requirements of the TOC, not necessarily a building and maybe no more than installing monitors or viewing camera images/system operations on personal computers at individual agencies.

#RV-TM-16: Central Signal System: The Central signal system is a placeholder project for Jackson County and ODOT traffic signals. Jackson County has only 9 signals, so they may not need this. System gives constant access to signals from a remote location. An additional project “Advance Traffic Management Software,” will be added to the project list and consists of software to interface with the central signal system. Galen said it would be part of an incident management system in specific situations, planned and unplanned. Alex said it would be useful for special events that cause traffic delays. Eric suggested a project to assure that all agencies have signal-control software that is compatible. Currently ODOT and Jackson County use Wapiti software and the City of Medford uses BI-Trans software. Signal software integration will be included as part of the Central Signal System project.

Figure 6-1: ITS Deployment for 2004 – 2024: Map identifies camera projects. Consultants need to know of additional needs not identified. Alex asked about connecting to ODOT’s viaduct sensors; Galen said that is possible now via the Internet. Medford will send locations of its planned cameras.

Automatic de-icing: ODOT and City of Medford to be removed; Medford would still like weather sensors on McAndrews Road to identify icing hazards on steep areas.

Eric asked whether an ITS project would have to be done in conjunction with other work at a site if the ITS project is listed in the plan. Galen said the ITS project would not be required, however if the project is not needed then it shouldn’t be listed in the deployment plan. There also was discussion about doing ITS projects not in the plan. The plan reflects today’s problems. Nathaniel said that if the project is simple, there would not be a problem. Galen said if the project is significant, the plan can be updated to assure that the project fits within the RVITS system.

Jerry mentioned that the City of Medford is planning to deploy red-light running enforcement cameras at approximately 7 additional locations. He will provide DKS with the new locations.

Weigh-in-motion projects on Hwy 62 and Hwy 140 were among several pulled from COATS that allow trucks to bypass weigh stations. The group decided to remove these from the map and project list since they do not fit with regional needs. Eric will check with the County Weighmaster to see if there are any County weigh station-related needs.

Julie asked about the plan update cycle. Galen said it would be done as needed; there is no mandatory review. Julie said an update should be tied to the RTP update cycle. Jim mentioned that the last project Steering Committee Meeting will focus on maintenance of the RVITS Plan.

#RV-TM-04 & 05 Automated traffic recording systems reflect need for traffic data information for corridor management, incident detection, and planning purposes. Medford is installing these devices to help identify growth impacts, around Stewart and Columbus for instance. Alex also noted that Medford has a weather station at its Columbus Ave. service center. He also noted the need for ice sensors north of the airport, useful when the airport is seeding clouds. He said he would check on the planned southwest Medford camera sites. Potential camera sites include Stewart/Columbus, Stewart/Kings Hwy, and Garfield/Kings Hwy.

#RV-TM-17: Expand/Upgrade HAR: ODOT noted that the existing HAR transmitter near Ashland will be replaced this summer, and perhaps a second transmitter may be added for better coverage. Julie suggested more signs to notify motorists of stations. Also need signs at Phoenix to notify motorists of Siskiyou Pass storm closure to give people more time to respond. Signs in White City are needed as warning for storms to the east (dynamic message signs and signs for weather/road conditions radio). Plan dates are soft, and meant to indicate priority.

Eric noted that ODOT, the County and private interests are attempting to coordinate development of the rest area for passenger vehicles only on Valley View, opposite Eagle Mill



Road, in Talent and this would be a good location for an information kiosk. A public rest area may also be added at the North Ashland Interchange. Sue mentioned that there has been some talk of adding a truck rest stop as part of the POE Weigh Station in Ashland because ODOT owns quite a bit of land adjacent to the weigh station.

#RV-TM-24: Lake of the Woods Highway Mayday System: pulled from COATS, but will be removed from the plan because most people have cell phones.

Several projects address regional incident management focusing on the I-5/Hwy. 99 corridor, and include aspects such as cameras, message signs, system detection, and signal timing coordination – all tools necessary to manage and divert traffic around an I-5 closure. Regarding incident response vehicles, Galen said such vehicles aren't seen as having a great direct benefit to the agency but would have a great benefit to the public by quickly redirecting traffic. Alex said that vehicles will eventually be needed in the future because the Medford area already is experiencing mile-long delays in some instances. Sue said such a project would have to be regional in scope and include efforts from multiple jurisdictions and should have a low priority.

#RV-TM-17 through RV-TM-21 are traveler information projects. #RV-TM-21 is a web page for the Siskiyou Pass showing conditions and listing temperatures along a profile view of the pass. Renee said she would provide a link to a similar existing site to show how it would work. [The University of Washington developed a traveler information website for I-90 through the Snoqualmie Pass: www.atmos.washington.edu/maciver/roadview/i90] It could also link to CALTRANS for information south of the summit.

#RV-TM-28: Real-Time Train Location Information: provides train location information to motorists. This project will be removed because train traffic is insufficient to support such a project.

Emergency Management Projects

Emergency management projects focus on getting traffic information to emergency responders, dynamic route information.

#RV-EM-04: Provide Real-Time Traffic Information to Mobile Data Terminals: Will provide real-time information to emergency vehicles.

#RV-EM-05: Emergency Vehicle Fleet Management System: Will be part of the mesh system so it has a higher priority because it is happening soon.

#RV-EM-06: Ambulance-Hospital Information System: also will move up in priority. It provides video from ambulance to the regional hospitals.

#RV-EM-07: Critical Infrastructure Monitoring System: sites will have to be identified. If no sites have been identified, this will be removed from plan. ODOT will check to see if anything has been identified as critical in the Rogue Valley.



#RV-EM-08: Flood Warning System: provides flood warning, but Galen said it is practical only in situations of commonly occurring floods.

All Projects

For all projects, Galen asked that the lead agency be listed to make the plan easier to use. There could be more than one agency.

Project Evaluation Matrix

Dan Moore from RVCOG scored the projects based on the project’s goals and objectives. This process is to be used as a starting point for assigning priority. For example, Jim said RVTB projects came out lower in priority in the table, but will be assigned varying levels of high, medium, and low priority based on RVTB’s plans. Julie said some steps need to be taken to get buses out quickly from the bus barn. Traffic causes long delays. Alex said the signal prioritization on Hwy. 62 has high priority because it is part of the agreement for the North Medford interchange project. Jim said AVL has uses beyond signal priority. He said the higher priorities seem to be going to the data collection and storage projects. The priority list has limited value in the ultimate phasing of the plan. Renee said it is one of the factors in assigning ultimate priority.

4. Communication Plan Jim Peters & Rich Shinn

Rich noted the region already has considerable facilities in place – Medford’s fiber ring, Ashland’s fiber network, and Jackson County’s planned conduit along Table Rock Road. It offers many opportunities including an Ashland-White City trunk line and a network that could run off the Medford and Ashland fiber systems as well as the trunk line. Jim noted that the ring around Medford connects many key stakeholders. The result is that ITS projects can be very cost effective. Rich provided several system options, especially Ethernet, which gets more efficient as more users join. Specific recommendations were listed on slides. The Draft Communication Plan chapter will be submitted to the group soon for review.

5. Workshops Jim Peters

Working group agreed that two workshops will be held on June 3 at the Medford public library. Session No.1: 2-4 p.m.; RVCOG will invite people on the expanded stakeholder list. This workshop will follow the same format as the User Needs Workshop, with a brief presentation at the beginning followed by breakout poster sessions around the room. Session No. 2: 5-7 p.m., with formal presentation by DKS at 6 p.m., for the general public. RVCOG will use mail list from other transportation projects, advertising and press releases to invite people to second session.

6. Next Steps Jim Peters

Comment period for all draft documents will continue for two weeks.

7. Next Meeting Jim Peters

The next meeting will be held after the open house sessions.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.



Agenda- Steering Committee Meeting #6

Time, Date: 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 7, 2004

Location: Jackson County Elections Office, 1101 W Main St, Medford

Contact: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG - (541) 664-6676 ext. 241

1. Call to Order/Introductions Julie Rodwell
2. Review/Approve Minutes Julie Rodwell
Draft minutes from May 6 Steering Committee Meeting and June 3 Workshops
3. Public Comment..... Julie Rodwell
4. Comments on ITS Chapters (5 min)..... Jim Peters
5. Next Steps for Implementation Plan (10 min)..... Jim Peters
6. Funding Plan Summary (10 min)..... Julie Rodwell
7. Draft Executive Summary (15 min)..... Jim Peters
8. Recommendation for Plan Continuation (60 min) Jim Peters
 - A. Architecture Maintenance
 - B. Incorporate ITS Plan into RTP
 - C. Project Requirements
 - D. Ongoing Steering Committee Meetings
9. Other Business..... Julie Rodwell
10. Adjourn



Meeting Minutes Steering Committee Meeting #6 July 7, 2004, Jackson County Elections Office

Attendees: Galen McGill, ODOT; Julie Rodwell, Chris Olivier, Vicki Guarino, Dan Moore, RVCOG; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Jim Peters, Renee Hurtado, DKS; Eric Niemeyer, Jackson County; Jim Wear, Phoenix; Scott Chancey, RVTD.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of Minutes Julie Rodwell
Julie Rodwell called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

2. Public Comment..... Julie Rodwell
There was no public comment.

3. Comments on ITS Chapters..... Jim Peters
Jim asked for additional comments on the chapters. He asked that all comments on the plan be made by July 16.

4. Next Steps of Implementation Plan..... Jim Peters
Jim noted that the high priority projects are listed in the 0-5 year plan. Julie said it is important to note that funding has not been identified for any of the projects, so they couldn't be considered as Tier 1 projects or the equivalent. Dan Moore asked whether ODOT would have additional ITS money, noting that the state is contributing funds to a joint Medford-ODOT fiber optic project. Galen McGill said ODOT has some money for ITS and has obtained grants. Also some bills in Congress allocate funds for ITS. Nathaniel Price said CMAQ and STP funds can be used for ITS, but the group noted that several projects should be bundled together because CMAQ projects smaller than about \$200,000 are not feasible. Galen said ODOT's ITS projects are funded through operations funding in the STIP so it would be up to local ODOT staff to advocate for ITS projects. Although this funding may be applied to ITS projects, it also includes funding for operations of traffic signals, lighting, and so forth. Dan noted that the next CMAQ round won't be until the 06-09 STIP, however there will be surplus funds available from the recent funding round.

Jim said DKS will be adding a supplement to the project list, which currently shows the agency/agencies responsible for each project, that includes a breakdown of the funding share by agency for each of the 5-Year Plan projects.

Cost estimates and funding were discussed. Scott Chancey questioned the cost for the automated vehicle locator emergency management project, noted RVTD's estimated cost of \$400,000 vs.



\$1.75 million in the plan. Galen said the cost estimate for the two-way 911 communications project also seems high compared to experience with a similar project in Portland. Total cost for the first 5 year projects is estimated at \$9.6 million. Galen said the total likely is more than this region would be able to receive, and perhaps the plan should be based on what is reasonable. Julie said an alternative would be to present all of the identified projects as a wish list. It also was noted that the trend federally seems to increase ITS allocations. Galen said some ITS projects would qualify for Homeland Security funds—specifically systems integration, cameras and incident management projects—and those grants do not require local match. Jim said some projects in the 5-year plan could be moved back to longer term, reducing the 5-year cost. Scott said that if a project is needed, it should be in the plan, regardless of funding outlook. Dan said all of the projects should be incorporated into the RTP. Jim said the region needs to be plugged into the Homeland Security Program funding pipeline because applications seem to have short filing deadlines.

5. Funding Plan Summary Julie Rodwell

Julie said she was working on a revised draft funding chapter that will include information about homeland security funds. Also, transportation act reauthorization funding is unknown but could heavily impact ITS. Also, the new draft will include potential CMAQ and STP funds. Julie, Eric and Galen said the point where the 5-year plan is pared down to what is fundable is when it is incorporated into the RTP. Dan said the RVMPO also will need to work with ODOT on funding. Scott noted that transit capital funds typically are used for bus purchase, but could be used for ITS. RVTD applies for earmarks every five years. Jim said the most immediate potential funding source is Homeland Security.

6. Draft Executive Summary..... Jim Peters

A draft executive summary was distributed via e-mail last week. Galen asked about the source for estimates of maintenance and operations costs, which seem high. Oregon costs have been less than 2 percent of the capital outlay. Jim said costs listed in the plan come from generic, national sources plus ODOT data provided by Ed Anderson during the Eugene-Springfield ITS Plan development. Galen will give DKS cost data from other Oregon projects to revise estimates in the RVITS plan.

7. Recommendations for Plan Continuation Jim Peters

Jim led a discussion of next steps after the plan is completed. To implement the plan the RVMPO will incorporate it into the RTP, which is being updated by April 2005. Additionally, the working group agreed that the RVMPO will be the lead agency for RVITS, and tentatively set working group meetings for late fall and winter. RVMPO responsibilities will include managing the working group, tracking plan implementation, identifying plan updates, coordinating funding applications, incorporating RVITS projects into the RTP Tier 1 and 2 project lists, continuing public outreach, and maintaining the Turbo architecture. DKS will provide the plan to the RVMPO; Nathaniel Price will provide the newest Turbo software and notice of training dates. Galen McGill said ODOT could maintain the architecture, but he had no problem with RVMPO doing the maintenance. ODOT will be responsible for making sure that changes the RVMPO makes to the RVITS architecture are reflected in the statewide architecture that is maintained by ODOT. Updates can be done periodically, as projects are completed, or annually or for RTP updates. ODOT and the RVMPO would be involved in the updates.



The group also discussed distribution of plan reports. Jim Wear asked about a presentation to the Phoenix City Council and the group agreed that the Executive Summary could be used for the presentation. Galen said each city should receive a copy of the executive summary plus a CD containing the final report and other key project documents.

8. Other Business..... Jim Peters

Eric Niemeyer asked that the meeting notes of May 6, 2004, regarding the deployment plan be changed to reflect that he was discussing development of a rest area on Valley View at North Ashland interchange only, not the rest area in Talent. Galen clarified that ODOT will be installing a phone at the Suncrest rest area in Talent that provides travelers with access to 511.

As the meeting adjourned, there also was discussion of printing and distributing the plan. Both DKS and RVCOG have tasks in their work scopes. Dan Moore said RVMPO funding for this project ended June 30, so Jim agreed that DKS will prepare copies per DKS work scope as follows: 10 copies full report; 25 copies executive summary; 30 or more CDs of full report. Distribution will be: full report, executive summary and CD to core stakeholders, Galen and John Vial; executive summary and CD to expanded stakeholders.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.



Meeting Minutes

RVMPO Joint Committees Meeting

July 7, 2004, Jackson County Elections Office

Attendees: Galen McGill, Dan Dorrell, ODOT; Julie Rodwell, Vicki Guarino, Dan Moore, RVCOG; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Jim Peters, Renee Hurtado, DKS; Eric Niemeyer, Kelly Madding, Jay Harland, Jackson County; Denis Murray, Angela Harding, Phoenix; Mark Gallagher, Medford; Tom Humphrey, Central Point; Glen Anderson, John Graves, Al Willstatter, Winter Salsa, Jim Ros, Mark Earnest, Ed Danehy, RVMPO PAC; Otto Caster, Mike Quilty, Sue Kupillas, Kay Harrison, RVMPO Policy Committee; Bunny Lincoln, Eagle Point.

Lunch meeting to introduce and review RVITS project began at 12:20. Jim Peters made a presentation, describing ITS, and the kinds of communications and automated systems that can be used to improve safety and reduce traffic congestion. RVITS equipment can streamline operations, reducing response times and costs.

Having an ITS plan approved is required for the area to receive federal funding for projects that include ITS. Jim described the high-priority projects identified in the RVITS projects. A project on the Siskiyou Pass is outside the RVMPO but was considered to be important to RVMPO members. The project would improve traveler information. Al Willstatter suggested that this work be coordinated with California officials.

Glen Anderson suggested that traffic signal detectors be set to respond to light-weight scooters and bicycles. Denis Murray said lights are needed to illuminate freeway interchanges; Jim said that would not be part of ITS because it is not communications or electronics based. Glen asked about pedestrian projects. Bunny Lincoln noted that a traveler information kiosk at Eagle Point's information center project on Hwy. 62 be included in the RVITS plan and the working group discussed having the city coordinate with ODOT. Mike Quilty asked about funding and the group discussed possible sources including Homeland Security and CMAQ, and the need to develop new sources. Mark Earnest asked about the South Medford Interchange, and Jim said that project includes cameras and traffic detectors/counters. Jay Harland suggested marketing RVITS information, possibly to have advertising/ sponsorship support. Mark Earnest asked about updates; Jim said the RVMPO will be responsible for updating the plan.