

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2007

The Committee convened at 1:00 p.m. in Conference Room 7 of the U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C., Ms. Shelly Row presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SHELLEY ROW, Committee Designated Federal Official

PAUL R. BRUBAKER

ADRIAN LUND

KENNETH J. BUTTON

IRIS WEINSHALL

JOSEPH M. SUSSMAN

STEVE ALBERT

M. GRANGER MORGAN

THOMAS C. LAMBERT

RANDELL H. IWASAKI

TOMIJI SUGIMOTO

ALFRED FOXX

ROBERT PETER DENARO

JOHN M. INGLISH

RONALD GREER WOODRUFF

ANN FLEMER

BRYAN P. MISTELE

JOHN WORTHINGTON

JOSEPH AVERKAMP

PROCEEDINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
4	Opening.....	4
5	Ethics and FACA Briefing.....	11
6	ITS Program Advisory Committee (ITSPAC) Charter.....	18
7	ITS Program Plan.....	22
8	Research and Innovative Technology Administration (RITA), and	
9	ITS Joint Program Office (ITS JPO).....	24
10	ITS Management Council and ITS Strategic Planning Group.....	27
11	Overview of Current ITS Program.....	30
12	Strategic Direction.....	45
13	General Discussion/Next Steps.....	51
14	Public Comments.....	71
15	Closing.....	72

Formatted

1 **OPENING** (1:10 p.m.)

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

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

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

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

16 MR. BRUBAKER: Hello.

17 MS. ROW: We're very happy that Paul is with us now.

18 And, Paul, would you like to say a few words?

19 MR. BRUBAKER: Yeah, I'm just delighted to be here,  
20 and I'm new to the job here. I've got a total of six and a half  
21 weeks under my belt here. And, you know, I'm learning all kinds  
22 of new things. I thought I knew a little something about the  
23 ITS Program, but it turns out I didn't know much compared to  
24 what I thought I knew when I got on board.

1           A couple of things I'd like to suggest, but I think it  
2 will wait until I -- I'm going to brief the slide on RITA as we  
3 go forward, and then I'll just say a couple of things about, you  
4 know, my thinking relative to ITS going forward.

5           MS. ROW:   Okay.  Thanks, Paul.

6           MR. BRUBAKER:  Thanks.

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

11           (Laughter.)

12           MS. ROW:  And we're picking up speed.

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

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

20           MR. BRUBAKER:  Paul Brubaker.

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

24           MR. AVERKAMP:  I am Joe Averkamp.  I'm on the

1 committee. I am the designated telecommunications rep.

2 MR. BUTTON: I'm Ken Button, George Mason University.  
3 I'm on the committee.

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

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

9 MR. RESENDES: Ray Resendes, also with NTHSA.

10 MS. ROW: Jack?

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

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

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

16 MR. SCHUMAN: I'm Rick Schuman. I'm with Inrix.

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

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

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

22 MR. BELCHER: Scott Belcher, ITS America.

23 MS. ROW: Thank you very much. And Scott is the new  
24 incoming president of ITS America.

1           And on the phone, would you gentlemen please introduce  
2 yourselves as well?

3           MR. ENGLISH: John English, with Utah Transit  
4 Authority.

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

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

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

12          MR. WORTHINGTON: John Worthington, President of  
13 Transcore.

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

16          MR. IWASAKI: Randy Iwasaki, Caltrans.

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

19          MR. DENARO: Bob Denaro with NAVTEQ Corporation.

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

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

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

24           I have to acknowledge the extraordinary lengths that

1 many of you have gone to, to participate in this.

2           Adrian, I understand that you are in Brazil.

3           MR. LUND: That is correct.

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

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

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

14           MR. VELEZ: Sure. First, for participation on WebEx,  
15 it's highly recommended that you close any other applications  
16 you may have on your computer, and if you're not in a private  
17 area or if you're in your office, it's also highly recommended  
18 that you get as much privacy as possible to avoid any  
19 interruptions. You, hopefully, on your screen, will see what's  
20 called the "presentation pod," which has the introductory slide  
21 for the presentation today, a PowerPoint slide. And to the left  
22 of that are two pods: the upper pod, called the  
23 "participant/attendee pod," which includes the names of all of  
24 those who have logged in; and below that is what's called the



1 "chat pod." This is the pod that we can use to communicate.

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

15           Are there any questions on that procedure?

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

19           MR. VELEZ: Use the one without the number.

20           MR. FOXX: Okay. Thanks.

21           MR. VELEZ: Right.

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

23           MR. FOXX: Good to go.

24           MS. ROW: Great. We are going to be watching what you

1 type in there so we make sure that we have a good opportunity to  
2 address any questions that you have.

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

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

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

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

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

23 But we are expecting to do a strategic planning  
24 process. We'll talk a little bit about that. It's going to be

1 pretty targeted, focused, not long and drawn-out, and you'll see  
2 what we're talking about, about that. But that will be kind of  
3 the thrust of where we're going today.

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

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

9 **ETHICS AND FACIA BRIEFING**

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

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

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

24 So, most of the time, when a question comes up as to

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

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

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

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

22 Next slide, please.

23 The Federal Advisory Committee Act was passed by  
24 Congress in 1972. And, as I said, it was Congress -- it was

1 their effort in an attempt to have an orderly procedure for  
2 gathering input and assistance from members of the public. In  
3 addition, what we refer to as the SAFETEA-LU legislation  
4 actually created this particular advisory committee, and I  
5 believe the legislative language has been provided to committee  
6 members. You will see where Congress was very specific  
7 concerning the membership of the committee and, basically,  
8 representatives from certain aspects. And, in addition, that  
9 was the intent of Congress, that the Federal government should  
10 be available to have independent and balanced views presented to  
11 it.

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

17 One of the things that the GSA regulations provide is  
18 that the agency is responsible to ensure the avoidance of a  
19 conflict of interest. And, as I said, GSA has published Federal  
20 regulations concerning this subject. I'll take a moment to just  
21 quickly talk about conflicts of interest. We have had advisory  
22 committees in the past, and certain areas have come up before.  
23 One area that I would like to highlight to all the members is  
24 the area of contracts. In the past, we have had committee

1 members that have expressed interest in entering into a  
2 contractual relationship with the agency. That, in almost all  
3 cases, would be viewed as a conflict of interest. Members of  
4 the committee are here to provide independent and balanced  
5 advice, not to be involved in a contractual relationship with  
6 the agency.

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

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

24           In addition, I spoke briefly about the public nature

1 of these meetings. An advisory committee meeting can be closed  
2 to the public. There are a number of legal hurdles that need to  
3 be attained. First, there needs to be prior approval for any  
4 closed portion of the meeting. In addition, the agency must  
5 seek the General Counsel review prior to the meeting itself, and  
6 the General Counsel must approve closing the meeting. In  
7 addition, there has to be a formal determination by the head of  
8 the agency that it is in the best interests of the government  
9 and the committee to have a closed or portion of the meeting  
10 closed. And, basically, that is a determination of public  
11 access.

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

21           So, my advice at the outset is that, for any reason,  
22 if committee members feel that a portion of the upcoming meeting  
23 should be closed to the public, then you need to contact Shelley  
24 in giving her as much advance time as possible.

1           And all committee members should be aware that, as I  
2 said, meeting minutes are kept. They're open to the public.  
3 They're provided upon request. There is no need for an  
4 individual to submit a FOIA request. They are, by and large,  
5 open to the public.

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

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

17           MR. MORGAN: This is Granger Morgan. It's not an  
18 issue for me, since I have no research contracts with the  
19 Department of Transportation. I chair, however, the EPA's  
20 Science Advisory Board, which, of course, is another very old  
21 and long-standing FACA committee, and in that case, at least, so  
22 long as one declares it and takes oneself out of any particular  
23 matters, having research support from EPA does not bar one from  
24 being a member of that committee.



1           MR. MONNIERE: Well, if we take, for example, a  
2 hypothetical where we had a committee member receiving, at the  
3 time of appointment, funds from the agency, we would obviously  
4 need the committee member to make us aware of that, and we would  
5 go by a case-by-case basis. Obviously, if issues concerning  
6 that particular -- and we'll just say for the sake of discussion  
7 -- grant funds were going to a particular project, part of the  
8 arrangement that possibly would have to be set up is that that  
9 member would be recused from any interaction on those  
10 particular, either project or projects. But, obviously, the  
11 agency would want to be notified of each member's relationship  
12 that has either an indirect or direct connection to the agency.

13           Did that answer the question?

14           MS. ROW: Are there other questions?

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

24           Any other questions for Bob?

1 **ITS PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ITSPAC) CHARTER**

2           Okay. Great. Well, let's move on and talk about the  
3 charter. One of the things that is required by FACA is that we  
4 establish a charter. That charter was provided to you. It is  
5 in Tab F in the read-ahead materials. And I also -- I neglected  
6 to mention that we have a few copies of the read-ahead  
7 materials. So, if any of the guests here or -- we can get a  
8 copy. Thank you, Andy.

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

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

22           Okay. So, let's move on, Charlie.

23           As is mentioned, the role of the advisory committee is  
24 advisory. We take that information to the DOT, so you're

1 providing official input into the DOT as advice. We are  
2 required to -- well, let me just say the input from this  
3 advisory committee will be fed into at least two different,  
4 distinct places: One is through the Surface Transportation  
5 Research and Technology Development Strategic Plan, that is led  
6 out of RITA. So, we will be feeding that into that process as  
7 well as into the ITS Program Plan, which we will talk more about  
8 in a few minutes.

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

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

19           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible)

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

22           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible)

23           MS. ROW: Okay, we're getting some conversation on the  
24 phone. Okay, thank you, I think.

1           The information that comes from the advisory committee  
2 is provided to Congress through a report in February. Now, we  
3 have been -- we're doing that report all this time, while we've  
4 been trying to get you all set up, and the reports have said  
5 we've been trying to get you all set up. So, this time we  
6 expect to have a more substantive report, although we will not  
7 have had much opportunity to meet. So, we intend to report on  
8 what we have heard from you to date and how we are intending to  
9 move forward. And so, that we will be putting together for the  
10 report that's due in February.

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

16           Next slide, Charlie.

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

23           You all report to the Secretary of Transportation  
24 through the ITS Joint Program Office.

1           The legislation was very specific on the membership.  
2 I won't go through all of that. We are capped out at 20  
3 members. They were very clear on the types of members that we  
4 should have and specified public and private sector, urban and  
5 rural, that type of diversity. We took it even further and  
6 tried to make sure that we have a very broad cross section of  
7 all the stakeholders in the ITS industry.

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

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

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

23           We do look forward to you all providing very active  
24 input. So, it's not a, you know, come together and not be taken

1 seriously. That's not it at all. We are very interested in  
2 making this a working meeting.

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

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

9 Bob, is there anything I've missed?

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

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

13 MR. VELEZ: No.

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

16 Okay. Well, we're going to proceed on.

17 **ITS PROGRAM PLAN**

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

23 What you will see in there is that we are required to  
24 produce or update this plan every two years. We will,

1 subsequent to this meeting, mail you a copy of the current  
2 program plan. It's still relatively new, even though it was  
3 published in '06. I think it came out in '07, actually, once we  
4 get through the publications cycle.

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

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

23           Okay. I think I've talked about that -- any questions  
24 about the program plan?

1           Okay. All right. Okay, Charlie, let's move on.

2   **RITA AND ITS JPO**

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

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

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

15           MS. ROW: Yes.

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

23           It's a responsibility we take very seriously. There  
24 are some things right now, from an organizational perspective,



1 from a process perspective and a governance perspective, that  
2 are lacking, that we're working very hard to rectify. I chair  
3 something called the RD&T Planning Council, which is probably  
4 not the best name for it, but it is what it is under our  
5 charter. And really what that is, it's more or less the  
6 pinnacle of the governance process for the RD&T investment  
7 across the department, and it serves a coordination role, not a  
8 control role. And stay tuned on that, because we're in the  
9 process right now of developing process around that, and  
10 developing what I would call a robust governance process.

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

24           And I would recommend that everybody, when you get the

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

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

17           MS. ROW: Thanks, Paul.

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

19           As Paul said, we are an office within RITA. We wanted  
20 to at least show you this slide and just tell you a little bit  
21 about the office organization. There are several caveats here.  
22 What you see on the slide, and as in the presentation materials,  
23 is the current organizational structure for the office. It's a  
24 very flat structure right now. I will tell you that's what it

1 is now. It is subject to change. The office is going through a  
2 lot of change. I'm new. Paul's new. The program is at a point  
3 of where we need to think afresh about it. So, those changes I  
4 would expect to be reflected in the way we organize our staff,  
5 but I'm not doing that just yet. So, this is what it is  
6 currently, but stay tuned.

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

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

19           You all are so easy. (Laughter.)

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

21           Okay, Charlie, let's move on to talk about the  
22 Management Council and the Strategic Planning Group. Again, we  
23 feel like that you all need to understand some of our internal  
24 structures and the way we conduct the business of the program.

1           First, the Management Council. The Management Council  
2 functions like our board of directors. It is comprised of most  
3 of the modal administrators in the department, particularly  
4 those representing the surface modes. They meet periodically.  
5 They provide strategic guidance to the program. Paul chairs the  
6 Management Council, and they are the ones that we go to, for  
7 example, when we added a Congestion Initiative into our  
8 portfolio of work. They were the ones who structured the  
9 program around the nine major initiatives that we'll talk about  
10 later. So, they provide very important input, and, again, at  
11 the modal administration level. Questions about that?

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

24           So, those are the two main internal bodies that we use

1 as a mechanism to ensure that we are coordinating and  
2 collaborating across the modes. Okay? Any questions on that  
3 part?

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

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

21 Other questions on that?

22 Okay. All right. Charlie, let's move on and talk a  
23 little bit about the program itself. Go ahead and move forward.

24

1 **OVERVIEW OF CURRENT ITS PROGRAM**

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

10 In very general terms, I think it's constructive to  
11 think of the program as having two main parts, and as you read  
12 the legislation, there are a lot of words in the legislation,  
13 but when you boil it down to a couple of big chunks, the big  
14 chunks are a research program and a technology transfer program.  
15 And there's a lot of words in the legislation about both pieces  
16 of that, but at the end of the day, those are kind of the two  
17 big imperatives of the program.

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

22 It was restructured around nine major initiatives.  
23 Those major initiatives were focused on high-risk, high-value,  
24 high-leverage research. In many cases, it required partnering

1 across a broad range of stakeholders that would have been  
2 difficult for anybody else to pull together or there was some  
3 attribute of the research that would have been very difficult  
4 for anyone other than the Federal government to be able to  
5 bridge across it.

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

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

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

1 of State and local government involvement.

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

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

16           And let's talk a little bit about the Congestion  
17 Initiative.

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

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

22           MR. BRUBAKER: It's on Intelligent Transportation --  
23 Operational Testing Program to Mitigate Congestion.

24           MS. ROW: Yes. It's a code. (Laughter.) And I did



1 not come to brief you on each of those initiatives. I'm more  
2 than happy, though, to answer any questions that you have on  
3 them. We can do that today, or I'm happy to do it off-line,  
4 whatever you prefer.

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

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

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

23 MR. SUSSMAN: Shelley, excuse me. This is Joe  
24 Sussman. I finally landed, and I have -- I'm joining your call.

1 MS. ROW: Wonderful, Joe. Welcome.

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

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. ROW: We've all been there.

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

8 (Laughter.)

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

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

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

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

23 So, it's important that we evaluate how well this  
24 works. Does the thesis hold? So, we have allocated specific

1 funding for evaluation. We are in the process right now of  
2 figuring out how to do that evaluation. It will clearly be done  
3 in partnership with the urban partners. Many of them have  
4 engaged University Transportation Centers as a part of their  
5 partnership locally. So, we expect to be working with them on  
6 data collection, and we're looking at some kind of an umbrella  
7 approach so that we can gather information across the sites for  
8 an assessment. That's still in formulation, and we we're still  
9 thinking that through. So, more to come on that.

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

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

20           MR. AVERKAMP: I have a question for you.

21           MS. ROW: Sure, Joe.

22           MR. AVERKAMP: Joe Averkamp. What's the timetable for  
23 assessing the implementation of these programs? You have  
24 funding, I see, spread out through '09. Is there a report due

1 in 2010 or --

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

4 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

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

18 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

19 MS. ROW: Are there questions on the screen?

20 MR. VELEZ: Yes. It's probably a good point to  
21 correct what I said earlier. I see the -- in chat pod, that I'm  
22 identified as Carlos Velez 2. So, questions to Shelley should  
23 go to Carlos Velez 2, and not to Carlos Velez. Mr. Morgan has a  
24 question, but I believe -- on the screen anyway, it looks to be

1 incomplete. Here. "Will the committee have any organized  
2 opportunities to visit any of the demonstration sites to better  
3 understand the current" -- what should follow "current," Mr.  
4 Morgan?

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

8 MS. ROW: Oh.

9 MR. VELEZ: My goodness.

10 MS. ROW: Okay, who asked that question?

11 Anyone? It's a good question.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have John Worthington.

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

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

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

19 MR. VELEZ: Here we go.

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

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

24 MS. ROW: Okay. Well, again, if you all are

1 interested in something along that line, we can look into that.

2 Okay? Other questions?

3 MR. BUTTON: I'm just curious --

4 MS. ROW: Yeah, Ken.

5 MR. BUTTON: In terms of evaluation, are we simply

6 evaluating the technology or the impact of the technology?

7 Because it seems to me a sort of one-year time frame of sticking

8 something in place and expecting to understand its implications

9 is, to put it mildly, rather naïve.

10 MS. ROW: It's a very good question. The answer is

11 that we want to evaluate the impact of the pricing, the tolling

12 -- the Four Ts: tolling, transit, telecommuting, and technology.

13 So, we're trying to evaluate the impact of the whole package on

14 congestion. Having said that, the funding is coming from the

15 ITS Program. So, we're very careful to make sure that we do

16 include the technology role in achieving that.

17 MR. BUTTON: That's a -- well, it isn't very clear. I

18 mean how much can you tell within one year --

19 MS. ROW: Yes, that's --

20 MR. BUTTON: -- is my question.

21 MR. BUBAKER: Depends. I mean, the reality in terms

22 of judging a long-term impact on a program -- you're spot on. I

23 mean it takes a long time to -- and you need sustained

24 deployment of the evaluation effort over time to be able to spot

1 the impact of -- depends on the type of program, though. If  
2 it's a congestion mitigation program like, for example,  
3 congestion pricing, you can acquire baseline data and then, you  
4 know, that's a pretty quick evaluation cycle. You know,  
5 deploying some innovative technology throughout a system where  
6 you don't have necessarily baseline data, it's much harder, as  
7 you know. So, that's going to depend, but this is the  
8 challenge for the 5 million bucks.

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

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

17 MS. ROW: Yes, Steve.

18 MR. ALBERT: Do you see one of the roles of the  
19 committee as being able to look back in terms of provide some  
20 historical context in terms of what's gone right and what's gone  
21 wrong with the ITS Program so that we can improve it in the  
22 future, or do you see a role predominantly of this committee  
23 being able to just review what you've done in your plan, your  
24 upcoming plan?

1 MS. ROW: I think that's a -- I would be -- I would  
2 welcome the committee's thoughts on what's gone well and what  
3 hasn't gone well in areas that we could improve on. At this  
4 juncture, again, we're looking to you all to help us think  
5 strategically about the big opportunities in the future, kind of  
6 the big rocks, if you're familiar with that analogy. So, Steve,  
7 I think some of what you mentioned there could be very  
8 illuminating as we think about how to best use the resources  
9 that we have.

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

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

20 Any other questions, comments?

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

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

24 MR. WOODRUFF: I am on, Shelley.



1 MS. ROW: Great. Okay. I'm going to talk a little  
2 bit about the technology transfer part of the program. We take  
3 this part of the program very seriously because it's well and  
4 good to do research, but unless you can transfer it into  
5 something useful, we haven't fulfilled our mission. Currently,  
6 the technology transfer portion of the program has some major  
7 components.

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

18 We have a professional capacity building program. We  
19 have developed training materials; we've developed training  
20 courses; we've worked with others to develop training materials.  
21 We hear continually, in the surface transportation community,  
22 about the need for trained professionals and the lack of those  
23 kinds of skills in the current workforce. So, we hear a lot  
24 about those needs. Again, we have this part of the program. I

1 think there's a lot that we can do to enhance it, to leverage it  
2 more, to partner more, to accomplish more in the community in  
3 terms of developing trained professionals.

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

15           The other thing that you will note in our legislation  
16 is that we were required to have an expert -- I think it was  
17 called an expert panel -- assess the Standards Program. It was  
18 run through the National Academy. We have received that report.  
19 And, again, I'm happy to share that with you. The highlights of  
20 that report are that the Standards Program is coming to a new  
21 era. We have developed a lot of standards; now we're moving  
22 into more of a maintenance mode and more of a deployment mode.  
23 How do we use those standards in deployment? And what that  
24 report said to us is that you need to rethink how you structure

1 that program, how you engage your stakeholder community in that  
2 program, and think anew about how to go forward. You're not in  
3 a massive new development of standards program.

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

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

18           We also, for a number of years now, have been doing --  
19 gathering deployment statistics. We do a survey I think it's  
20 every other year now, maybe every three years. I've forgotten.  
21 Every other year?

22           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (inaudible)

23           MS. ROW: Okay, this is the year, where we go out to  
24 the community, several hundred people at the State and local

1 government level, to say what do you have in terms of this long  
2 list of ITS stuff? We gather it up and, again, we publish it.  
3 It's all searchable. It's searchable by type of technology, by  
4 State, by -- I think it's by city, so you can get a pretty good  
5 sense of what is out there based on that deployment statistics  
6 database. It is the only thing like it in the community that  
7 we're aware of. So, that's fulfilling some of that information  
8 clearinghouse role.

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

23 So, let me pause there. Questions, comments on the  
24 technology transfer portion of the program?

1           Okay.  Going once, going twice...

2   **STRATEGIC DIRECTION**

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

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

10          MS. ROW:  Yes, Joe.

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

14          UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:  We don't have this  
15 presentation.

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

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

21          MS. ROW:  Does someone have an ability to do that?  
22 Can you guys?  Okay.  Joe Sussman --

23          MS. WEINSHALL:  Hi.  This Iris Weinshall.  I'm just  
24 joining.

1 MR. VELEZ: Right.

2 MS. ROW: Hi, Iris.

3 MS. WEINSHALL: Hi. Is this Shelley?

4 MS. ROW: Yes, it is. Welcome.

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

6 MS. ROW: I'm good. And, Iris, for your information,

7 we're at the part of the program called "Strategic Direction."

8 Are you, Iris, on the WebEx?

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

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

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. WEINSHALL: That's fine.

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

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

18 MS. ROW: Yes, we do.

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

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

22 MR. SUSSMAN: Okay. Sounds great.

23 MS. ROW: A few minutes.

24 MR. SUSSMAN: Thank you.

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

8 Let's go to the next slide.

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

18 Productivity -- as congestion gets worse, and there's  
19 an issue with how does that affect our national productivity?

20 At the same time -- let's go to the next slide -- the  
21 other side that we're experiencing in the public sector is a  
22 real stress with funding. The way that we have traditionally  
23 dealt with some of those problems in transportation is through  
24 public investment in transportation systems, through the Federal

1 aid program and through substantial State and local funding. In  
2 fact, if you look at the numbers, State and local funding is  
3 more than the Federal funding.

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

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

23           The other diagram is of transit AVL. Similar kind of  
24 trend, moving in the right direction, but it's moving very



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

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

19 So, one of the questions that we ask to you all at a  
20 very high level -- go to the next slide -- no, yes. Information  
21 technology has been driven by the market. There's a very big  
22 market, open access to the Internet, industry standards -- all  
23 of that has enabled this technology explosion. So, the question  
24 that we put forward -- now the next slide; go ahead and bring it

1 all up -- how do we take the excitement, the energy, the  
2 creativity of what's going on in technology, together with the  
3 Federal Research and Technology Transfer Program, to address  
4 those problems that we have in transportation, of congestion,  
5 safety, and productivity?

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

11           And, Charlie, let's go to the next slide.

12           So, again, there are several vectors that appear to be  
13 coming together. We have you all. It's been a long journey to  
14 get this advisory committee established. So, now we have you  
15 all here to work with us. We have a program plan that's due  
16 this year. We have many of the major initiatives ending in  
17 2009. We have a reauthorization that's coming up in 2009. One  
18 of the things that's not on here is we have imperative from the  
19 standards panel saying we need to rethink the Standards Program  
20 as well. So, we look at that and say, a perfect opportunity for  
21 us to think together along with all of our modal partners  
22 through the Management Council and our Strategic Planning Group  
23 on what is the strategy. How do we want to position this  
24 program? What are the big things that this program is uniquely

1 situated to accomplish and how do we organize ourselves to do  
2 that? Okay?

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

5           And, Charlie, let's go to the next slide.

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

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

23 **GENERAL DISCUSSION, NEXT STEPS**

24           That sets the stage for what we are currently thinking

1 about our November meeting, and then we will open that up for  
2 discussion here as well. Our current thought is to use your  
3 expertise, because you do represent such diversity in the  
4 community, to literally bring your knowledge into the group.  
5 So, what we're thinking of doing is to have each one of you --  
6 in your various sectors, and in some sectors there is a couple  
7 of you representing one area; I think we have a couple of State  
8 DOT folks; we have a couple of auto industry representations --  
9 for you to come to the group the next time and share, from your  
10 industry's perspective, what is the current state of play and  
11 what are the market trends that you're seeing that are relevant  
12 to the work that we could or should be doing in this program, to  
13 talk about what are the implications of those trends to this  
14 program? What are the opportunities unique to this program that  
15 we could take advantage of?

16           And, Steve Albert, back to your point, what are the  
17 things that have worked well and what are the things that  
18 haven't worked so well in the past of the program that could  
19 influence what we do in the future?

20           Now let me stop there because that's a lot. That's  
21 our current thought about how to go into our next meeting. It  
22 is a day and a half, the way we've scheduled it so far, so we  
23 will have time to have interactive discussion and engagement and  
24 dialogue. What are your thoughts, reaction? Any comments?

1           MR. SUGIMOTO: Shelley, this is Tommy Sugimoto  
2 speaking. Do we have to prepare some presentation for the  
3 November meeting?

4           MS. ROW: Well, I'm glad you asked that. (Laughter.)

5           Depending on what you all thought today, that's  
6 exactly what we were thinking of asking you to do. Now, before  
7 anyone panics, we were going to go back and think about what we  
8 heard today and then come back to you with some suggestions.  
9 I'm not looking for, you know, PowerPoint presentations and  
10 lengthy things, but more materials, talking points, bullet  
11 points of what you would put forward that you think is relevant  
12 to the committee. It wouldn't necessarily even need to be a  
13 formal presentation, but to have your thoughts together to share  
14 with the group.

15          MR. SUGIMOTO: All right. Thank you.

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

18          MR. SUGIMOTO: Yes. Thank you.

19          MS. ROW: What do you all think?

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

1 So, I support the idea.

2 MS. ROW: Okay. Thank you, Joe.

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

11 MS. ROW: Are there other comments, thoughts?

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

16 MS. ROW: Okay. That's a good idea.

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

20 MR. AVERKAMP: And to that point -- this is Joe again  
21 -- Shelley, does it make sense -- and I know we're a general  
22 discussion, and not of next steps -- but does it make sense to  
23 and is it acceptable to form a smaller planning committee for  
24 that November meeting so that we can address exactly those kind

1 of issues? I don't know if we need to assemble the 20 of us  
2 again, but 3 or 4 people that will actually work on crafting an  
3 agenda, crafting an outline for the presentations --

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

6 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

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

9 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

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

13 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

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

15 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or working groups.

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

20 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

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

23 MR. AVERKAMP: And then, does it have to be public as  
24 well? So --

1 MS. ROW: Yeah.

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

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

6 MR. AVERKAMP: Okay.

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

8 MS. ROW: Yes, Steve.

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

19 MR. BRUBAKER: Can I say something?

20 MS. ROW: Absolutely, Paul. Yes.

21 MR. BRUBAKER: This is Paul Brubaker, the RITA  
22 Administrator. I've got -- there was a reason why I was sort of  
23 requesting, strongly urging everybody at the beginning to read  
24 the legislation, and we've got to get a complete version of it



1 to you so that you can see it. But, you know, big-picture  
2 questions -- and I'm sure everybody, depending on where they  
3 sit, will have a different point of view -- but, you know,  
4 fundamentally, there's a -- the legislation defines the scope of  
5 the national ITS Program to specify the goals, objectives,  
6 milestones for the research and deployment of ITS. And it  
7 further goes on to say that, you know -- it talks about the  
8 goals and objectives, but, you know, where you sit, you're going  
9 to have different goals and objectives.

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

19           And I'm a little worried, you know, that -- I don't  
20 necessarily want us to be, you know, sort of pitting the past  
21 against the present because we might wind up forsaking the  
22 future here, if we're not careful. So, I don't -- I hope that  
23 we don't spend a whole lot of time looking in the context of  
24 what currently is, as opposed to what can be. So, I would urge

1 you to take that tack, and if you're looking at those broad  
2 questions, I would strongly urge that you go to that national  
3 ITS Program Plan that's in the legislation and look to that for  
4 guidance because there's some really good guidance in there that  
5 can help you bound your thinking. And the good news is it's not  
6 very bounded. It's pretty broad. I mean you can bring whatever  
7 you want to at the table, and frankly I think you're expected  
8 to, based on the way the legislation was written.

9           So, I'm really looking forward to the recommendations.  
10 And keep in mind that, you know, you're working for the  
11 Secretary and you're making recommendations to the Secretary,  
12 and this is something that she's very much interested in. I  
13 don't know if you guys are aware of this or not, but the Texas  
14 Transportation Institute last week came out with a report  
15 talking about the future of congestion, just one problem that  
16 Shelley was citing, and her number one comment out of the gate  
17 was about technology and how technology had to be part of the  
18 lynch pin; it's not just about building new capacity, although  
19 that's an issue. You know, when you look at the demographic  
20 data over time, we've got a real opportunity here to get on  
21 track, but technology's going to be a key element of this. And  
22 she is real concerned with the issue of deployment, of ITS  
23 solutions, and how do we speed deployment, which is the big "D"  
24 word that is in this statute. So, let's be thinking about that.

1           I think -- you know, again, I hesitate to bring up the  
2 past, you know, but the reality is, I think, the next five-year  
3 period really needs to be focused on how do we speed deployment  
4 of these technology solutions to help us address the system  
5 performance requirements of our current transportation  
6 environment? So, I'll just give you that. You guys can tell  
7 I'm pretty passionate about this, so --

8           MS. ROW: Yeah.

9           (Laughter.)

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

12          MS. ROW: Thanks, Paul.

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

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

24          MS. ROW: Questions?

1 MR. MISTELE: -- big questions or areas --

2 MS. ROW: Okay.

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

9 MS. ROW: Okay.

10 MR. MISTELE: -- what your thoughts are.

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

15 Are there other comments, thoughts, suggestions?

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

1 change in order to expedite the procurement or deployment of ITS  
2 strategies.

3 MS. ROW: That's good. And Randy is with Caltrans.  
4 Thank you, Randy.

5 MR. IWASAKI: You're welcome.

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

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

19 And so, in our State, one of the problems is that they  
20 still look at signal interconnect as being in the purview of the  
21 CIO, and then the State CIO doesn't understand the processes  
22 that we put into place. And so, that creates a slow-down  
23 process, if you will, of having to write reports justifying the  
24 purchase of these basic technologies.

1           The other piece is, if we're going to streamline or  
2 expedite the introduction of some ITS strategies of the future,  
3 we're going to have to really look hard at getting the private  
4 sector involved and making them public-private partnerships or  
5 at least developing business models that allow for advertising  
6 or things like that so that the private sector can get their  
7 capital investment back in other ways than selling data and  
8 things like that.

9           MR. BRUBAKER: Got it.

10          MS. ROW: I'm glad you brought that up, Randy. Good.

11          Ken, did you have a comment?

12          MR. BUTTON: A couple of comments. It seems to me the  
13 whole issue about implementation, which seems to be what's  
14 concerned about here, it all has to do with institutions. I mean  
15 we've just heard there and then. It's an institutional issue,  
16 not a technical issue. We've got all the technology in the  
17 world to solve these problems. I remember a few years ago, as  
18 adviser to the House of Commons' Transport Committee in the U.K.  
19 --

20          MR. SUSSMAN: I can -- this is Joe. I can barely hear  
21 --

22          MR. BUTTON: I'm sorry. It's my English accent,  
23 perhaps. I was just saying that I think implementation is an  
24 institutional issue. We just heard that, really, from Randy.

1 It's not a technology issue. And I was just reflecting back  
2 some years ago when I was adviser to the House of Commons'  
3 Transport Committee and we were looking into charging for  
4 motorway use with congestion tolls on motorways. And we had a  
5 plethora of engineering companies along, professors of  
6 technology. They said, we've all got the technology; what we've  
7 got to do is somehow get the institutions --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could someone repeat the  
9 comment?

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

11 MS. ROW: Now --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think that's working.

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

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

16 MR. BUTTON: I shall start my diatribe --

17 (Laughter.)

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

20 MR. BUTTON: I was simply saying that, if we're  
21 interested really in implementation, that's all about  
22 institutions. If you -- we heard Randy's comments about  
23 California. That's not about technology; that's about legal  
24 frameworks, institutional structures, with all the market, with

1 all the public sector command and control. And I was reflecting  
2 simply on something I was involved in some years ago when I was  
3 adviser to the House of Commons' Transport Committee in the U.K.  
4 We're talking here of 15, 20 years ago. We had a plethora of  
5 specialists, private sector specialists in information  
6 technology, data collection, tolling, and so on. They said we  
7 can put together any package you want for collecting revenue  
8 from motorists, charging by the minute, the mile, the day, the  
9 week, the year. The problem is you haven't got the institutions  
10 to do it. And it comes down to institutions. Another  
11 example, I flew back from Europe last night -- most cities in  
12 Europe, as soon as you reach them, as soon as you hit the  
13 outskirts, you see signs telling you exactly where the parking  
14 places are, in real time, how many parking places. In this  
15 country, it's about 20 percent of the morning rush hour's wasted  
16 in congestion with people looking for somewhere to park. The  
17 fact is you can do that in Europe because you've got unitary  
18 authorities which allow them to measure and monitor and record  
19 the existing parking places and display them to the traveling  
20 public. The people in the industry could have done this 25, 30  
21 years ago, I'm sure. You simply don't do it in this country.

22 So, I'm just wondering where all this fits in about we  
23 know we're going to hear a lot about all the technology out  
24 there and we're going to hear a lot about the, you know, what



1 can be done technically, but the real problem is, you know, the  
2 technology may be 15, 20 years in advance of its implementation.  
3 I'm just wondering where that fits into the entire debate.

4 MR. BRUBAKER: I --

5 MS. ROW: Go ahead.

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

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

19 MR. WORTHINGTON: I would argue that hydrogen vehicles  
20 are not at all like the example you just heard. The reason that  
21 they are not attractive is that they're just too damned  
22 expensive; whereas, the parking example is a very  
23 straightforward issue where there -- where he's right. It's  
24 basically got to do with organizational and institutional

1 issues. I don't think that's the binding constraint on  
2 hydrogen, but let's not get off onto that tangent.

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

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

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

24 MR. AVERKAMP: Well, I think -- it's Ken's point --

1 maybe part of what we talk about in November maybe goes beyond  
2 our particular industry view and focuses on barriers to  
3 adoption. I mean we could also focus on -- and what I just  
4 heard was institutional barriers to adoption as a big  
5 (inaudible).

6 MS. ROSS: Okay.

7 MR. AVERKAMP: And there are others.

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

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

16 MS. ROW: Right.

17 MR. AVERKAMP: -- so --

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

21 MR. AVERKAMP: Yeah.

22 MS. ROSS: The other point that I wanted to make --  
23 Randy, I'm going to use Caltrans, if you don't mind. Caltrans  
24 went through -- or the State of California went through a "Go

1 California" initiative fairly recently, and they, as one of the  
2 things that came out that is a pyramid where they've looked at  
3 the things that they need to do to keep California moving. The  
4 thing that I think is interesting about that pyramid is at the  
5 very base of it. Randy, can you articulate what the  
6 very bottom of the pyramid is, now that I've put you on spot?

7 MR. IWASAKI: Yes, system monitoring and evaluation.

8 MS. ROW: It's gathering the information on the  
9 network, being able to monitor the system, and the technology  
10 enables that to happen. And, right now, it's a big, not a  
11 completely missing piece, but it is certainly not as robust as  
12 what it could be, given the technology that we have today. So,  
13 I put that on the table as well as just the lack of information  
14 that we have on the network today to manage, operate the  
15 transportation network. How do we fill that gap?

16 Other comments, thoughts?

17 Okay. So, where I think we've ended up is that we're  
18 going to prepare some questions to get at some of the strategic  
19 issues. We're going to send those out to you. We will ask you  
20 to think personally about them, to engage others in your  
21 industry, and to come prepared to talk about it at our November  
22 meeting. We may ask you to try to send some of that information  
23 in, if you can, in advance, so we can maybe assimilate it, look  
24 for some common trends, and package it together so it would be

1 easier for us to digest.

2 Now, is there something that I'm missing? Is there  
3 anything else that -- that you all said that I didn't capture?  
4 And I have some points here about some of the nature of the  
5 specific questions. Okay.

6 MR. WELBES: Shelley?

7 MS. ROW: Yes.

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

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

21 MR. SUSSMAN: Not very well, no.

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

1 said?

2 MR. WELBES: Yeah.

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

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

8 MS. ROW: Preparatory work for meetings. Okay.

9 MR. WELBES: Sure.

10 MS. ROW: So, that'll be good. We will take advantage  
11 of that.

12 Thank you, Matt.

13 And that is Matt Welbes from FTA. Let me just finish  
14 up here, just on some of the next steps logistically. We are  
15 focused on our next meeting being on November 26th, starting at  
16 1:00 p.m. That is the Monday after Thanksgiving. Sorry. It's  
17 the Monday after Thanksgiving. It is here, starting at 1  
18 o'clock. So, hopefully, that will give those of you who are  
19 traveling time to get here on Monday morning without impacting  
20 your Thanksgiving holiday.

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

24 Again, we will have read-ahead materials. We will

1 send you travel information on how to make your travel  
2 arrangements, hotel information -- all that kind of stuff. Now,  
3 let's see.

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

6 MS. ROSS: Well, we --

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

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

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

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

21 MR. ALBERT: Thank you.

22 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

23 MS. ROSS: Are there any other comments from anyone  
24 else in the room? Anybody?

1           Okay. Any other comments from anyone on the  
2 committee?

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

5 **CLOSING**

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

11           Thank you very much.

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

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

17           MR. WORTHINGTON: John Worthington's on the phone.

18           MS. ROSS: I think we had you guys because you're on  
19 WebEx.

20           MS. WEINSHALL: Oh, okay.

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

24           Everyone signed the -- okay. All right. Okay, then,



1 with that, we are adjourned. Thank you again.

2 MR. SUSSMAN: Thank you, Shelley.

3 MS. ROSS: Thanks, Joe.

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