

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

+++++

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS PROGRAM
ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ITSPAC)

+++++

TELECONFERENCE

+++++

FRIDAY
NOVEMBER 13, 2015

+++++

1 The Advisory Committee met via teleconference at 1:00 p.m., Eastern Time, Sheryl Wilkerson,
2 Vice Chair, presiding.

3

4 MEMBERS PRESENT

5

6 SHERYL WILKERSON, Vice President, Federal Government Affairs, Michelin North America,
7 ITSPAC Vice Chair

8 STEVE ALBERT, Director, Western Transportation Institute, Montana State University

9 JOSEPH CALABRESE, Chief Executive Officer and General Manager Greater, Cleveland
10 Regional Transit Authority

11 JOHN CAPP, Director, Electric and Control Systems Research and Active Safety Strategic Lead,
12 General Motors Corporation

13 GINGER GOODIN, Director, Policy Research Center, Texas A&M Transportation Institute

14 DEBRA JOHNSON, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Long Beach Transit

15 J. PETER KISSINGER, President and Chief Executive Officer, AAA Foundation for Traffic
16 Safety

17 SCOTT MCCORMICK, President, Connected Vehicle Trade Association

18 JOE MCKINNEY, Executive Director, National Association of Development Organizations

19 TINA QUIGLEY, General Manager, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada

20 GEORGE T. WEBB, P.E., County Engineer, Palm Beach County, Florida

21

22

23 ALSO PRESENT

24

25 STEPHEN GLASSCOCK, ITS JPO

26 KEN LEONARD, ITS JPO

27 EGAN SMITH, ITS JPO

28 CARLOS VELEZ, Citizant

29

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

CONTENTS

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL 4

OPENING REMARKS 6

REFLECTIONS ON 2015 ADVICE MEMORANDUM..... 7

PLANNING FOR MARCH 2016 MEETING 10

DISCUSSION OF TOPICS FOR THE 2016 ADVICE MEMORANDUM 18

SUMMARY AND ADJOURN..... 23

1
2

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

3

1:01 p.m.

4 **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

5 MR. GLASSCOCK: I was just going to call the meeting to order, and I am just
6 going to do a real roll call real quick, just so the court reporter can get his record straight.

7 So, Steve Albert?

8 MEMBER ALBERT: Here.

9 MR. GLASSCOCK: Scott Belcher?

10 (No response.)

11 Roger Berg?

12 (No response.)

13 Joe Calabrese?

14 MEMBER CALABRESE: Here.

15 MR. GLASSCOCK: John Capp?

16 (No response.)

17 Bob Denaro?

18 (No response.)

19 Ginger Goodin?

20 MEMBER GOODIN: Here.

21 MR. GLASSCOCK: Debra Johnson?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. GLASSCOCK: Peter Kissinger?

1 MEMBER KISSINGER: Here.

2 MR. GLASSCOCK: Scott McCormick?

3 MEMBER McCORMICK: Here.

4 MR. GLASSCOCK: Joe McKinney?

5 (No response.)

6 Tina Quigley?

7 (No response.)

8 Raj Rajkumar?

9 BRIAN: He is not here, but Brian from Vegas is here listening at least.

10 MR. GLASSCOCK: Okay. And Bryan Schromsky is not here.

11 Susan Shaheen?

12 (No response.)

13 Kirk Steudle?

14 (No response.)

15 George Webb?

16 MEMBER WEBB: Here.

17 MR. GLASSCOCK: And Sheryl Wilkerson?

18 CHAIR WILKERSON: Yes, here.

19 MR. GLASSCOCK: All right.

20 MEMBER CAPP: This is John Capp. I just joined right now.

21 MR. GLASSCOCK: All right, Sheryl, I will hand it off to you.

1 **OPENING REMARKS**

2 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay, great. So, thanks, everyone, for being on the call.

3 We had agreed some time ago that we would have a follow-up or a meeting to touch
4 base sometime in November.

5 Also, I should mention that, if you are not speaking, if you could mute your phone?

6 We agreed the agenda would be as follows: to have -- did someone else join?

7 MR. SMITH: Hi. This is Egan.

8 MR. GLASSCOCK: Okay. I'm sorry, Sheryl, let me -- here at DOT, Ken
9 Leonard is here, Egan Smith, Charlie Velez, and the court reporter.

10 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay, great. Okay, did someone else join?

11 MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes, this is Debra Johnson.

12 CHAIR WILKERSON: Hi, Debra. Thank you so much.

13 MEMBER JOHNSON: Hi.

14 CHAIR WILKERSON: We are just getting started. We had the roll call. We
15 are just going over the brief agenda that we have today.

16 We are just going to reflect on the 2015 submission that we made in September.
17 We will discuss the March meeting, the 2016 report, and then, follow up on a few
18 comments that were discussed during the 2015 recommendations.

19 So, first of all, I would like to personally thank everyone for their contribution in
20 the submission that we provided to ITS JPO in September. I think it went pretty smoothly,
21 and I would love to get some comments or input from anyone as to how we can improve on
22 the process the next time or any other comments they might have about the process.

1 (No response.)

2 No comments? Okay.

3 **REFLECTIONS ON 2015 ADVICE MEMORANDUM**

4 So, we sent the report to Stephen Glasscock. Stephen, my understanding is that
5 the ITS JPO will submit a report to Congress sometime in early February of 2016.

6 MR. GLASSCOCK: Correct. It is just beginning the approval process. I give it
7 a 40-percent chance of being there by February 1. So, we will see.

8 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

9 MR. GLASSCOCK: We will do what we can to move it as fast as possible, but --

10 CHAIR WILKERSON: Well, thank you so much for your help.

11 MR. GLASSCOCK: No problem.

12 CHAIR WILKERSON: And, Stephen, if you can just confirm, the next steps for
13 us or the next key or important dates are June 2016. We have a third and final Advice
14 Memo that will be due to ITS JPO, and then, February 2017 they will be responsible for
15 submitting that to Congress. Is that correct?

16 MR. GLASSCOCK: That is correct.

17 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay, great.

18 Any other comments about the submission or any of the other dates that are
19 pending?

20 MEMBER McCORMICK: Well, the only thing that I would like to point out from
21 past history is that, if we are going to have a March meeting and we are going to have a few
22 submissions, then we probably need to have at least a short phone call prior to the June

1 submission to consent on it.

2 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. That is duly noted.

3 Anyone else have comments?

4 MEMBER CALABRESE: Hey, Steve, this is Joe Calabrese.

5 Anything happening with the reauthorization? Are both the House or Senate side
6 just going to in any way impact this group going forward on what our recommendations are
7 and work back, in fact, even a group going forward?

8 MR. GLASSCOCK: I am going to defer to Ken.

9 MR. LEONARD: There is a lot going on on the Hill right now. There is some
10 very specific language that has dramatic impacts on the ITS Joint Program Office.

11 Among other things, if you recall, the President's budget had two plus-ups in it.
12 One was just kind of to start growing the ITS JPO budget for inflation to take us from \$100
13 to about \$117 million. It is my understanding that is not in the proposal that Congress is
14 debating.

15 The other plus-up was a specific one for automation which would have given us an
16 additional \$50 million this year and a total of \$222 million over six years. That is not
17 being debated.

18 So, those budget differences alone are going to have a significant impact on our
19 program over the next several years. Add to that that there is in both versions of the bill
20 right now language that would require the ITS Joint Program Office to have a Deployment
21 Grant Program. It is hard to guess exactly how much, but in the neighborhood of \$30-35
22 million. That would dramatically change our program.

1 There are a couple of other bits and pieces in the legislation that have some impact,
2 but those are the main ones.

3 CHAIR WILKERSON: Thank you so much.

4 Are there any other comments?

5 MEMBER CALABRESE: Yes, Steve, this is Joe again.

6 If and when this is finalized, and when the picture is clearer than it is today, can you
7 get something out to us to let us really know what the final is, if there is a final, and the
8 impact on your budget and what you are going to be doing?

9 MR. GLASSCOCK: Definitely, we will do that.

10 MEMBER CALABRESE: Thank you.

11 MR. GLASSCOCK: In that legislation it still calls for an Advisory Committee.
12 So, this will go forward.

13 MEMBER CALABRESE: Thank you.

14 CHAIR WILKERSON: Great.

15 MR. LEONARD: Does it still call for the reports and everything?

16 MR. GLASSCOCK: Yes. Yes, it did. I think there was one version I saw, it
17 moved the report to May, I believe; I am not sure why.

18 On that, Sheryl, let me swing back real quick. You know, your term expires in
19 June.

20 CHAIR WILKERSON: Uh-hum.

21 MR. GLASSCOCK: So, because you gave us a fairly healthy and great Advice
22 Memo with the 17 recommendations, there is no obligation for you to have that many or a

1 certain amount when you submit your final Advice Memo. So, it could be as light or as
2 heavy as you feel the need.

3 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

4 MR. GLASSCOCK: Yes, you have like seven, eight months, six months to work
5 on it. I don't want anyone to feel like they have to come up with a certain amount of
6 recommendations. There is no requirement. So, it is up to you and what you feel best in
7 doing.

8 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Well, we will take that under counsel.

9 MR. LEONARD: Let me just add one other possible impact. There was some
10 discussion of requiring another report from us. We are not sure if it is going to fall to the
11 ITS JPO or someplace else in the Department. If we get a congressionally-mandated
12 report, we will probably, as we have in the past, turn to the Advisory Committee for input
13 on that report. So, just to close the loop on the previous question and give you one
14 additional thing to mull over. Once the legislation is final, we may share that tasking with
15 you for your input.

16 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

17 Any other questions for Ken or Stephen?

18 (No response.)

19 That was great, Joe.

20 **PLANNING FOR MARCH 2016 MEETING**

21 Okay. So, we will move to the next item. The next item was we have proposed a
22 March meeting. The agenda and ideas and purpose have not necessarily been set forth,

1 but we agree that it would be a good time to have a meeting.

2 Also, there were some recommendations among the members about possibly
3 holding this meeting on the West Coast. And so, I wanted to open the floor to anyone who
4 would like to talk about, one, having a March meeting and possible location or topics. We
5 do have some other topics we will talk about for the 2016 report that I noted in the email.
6 But I will raise those separately.

7 Is everyone okay with having a March meeting? Any comments? If we do have
8 it, should we continue to have it in Washington? Any other suggestions?

9 MEMBER McCORMICK: I am fine wherever you want to have it. Scott
10 McCormick.

11 The only thing I wanted to point out is that both on the first week of March and the
12 15th of March are two fairly important conferences. One of them is -- and both in
13 Detroit -- on the Cybersecurity Conference and the second one is on Connected Detroit.

14 So, my preference would be -- and it is entirely parochial -- but my preference
15 would be that, if we have this meeting in March, wherever it is, it is at the latter half of the
16 month.

17 CHAIR WILKERSON: Any other comments?

18 MEMBER ALBERT: The West Coast sounds fine to me.

19 MR. GLASSCOCK: Who was that that said that? I'm sorry.

20 MEMBER ALBERT: I'm sorry, I am Steve Albert.

21 MR. GLASSCOCK: Okay.

22 CHAIR WILKERSON: Does anyone have any other comment about other major

1 events taking place that month that we should take into consideration?

2 MR. LEONARD: And are there any major events that you would like to synch up
3 the next meeting with? I don't know if either of those two meetings in Detroit, if anyone is
4 traveling to that, but if a large number of people are traveling to an event, that might help
5 pick a location, too, not that I have got anything against the West Coast.

6 CHAIR WILKERSON: Uh-hum.

7 MEMBER CALABRESE: Yes, Sheryl, this is Joe.

8 There is a meeting that us transit folks will likely be at in Washington on the 14th,
9 15th, and 16th of March. That is our Annual Legislative Conference.

10 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. So, we have got the Cybersecurity, first of
11 March; the Connected Detroit, March 15th, and then, the Transit meeting, 14th, 15th, and
12 16th. Correct?

13 Any other potential dates of conflict?

14 MEMBER QUIGLEY: This is Tina Quigley from Las Vegas. I just wanted to let
15 you know I joined the call. I'm sorry I'm late.

16 LKERSON: Thank you, Tina. We are just going over comments for a possible
17 March meeting.

18 So, would it be best if we proposed a survey or Survey Monkey or Doodle for the
19 proposed date for a meeting to the group, rather than entertain that on the conference call?

20 MEMBER McCORMICK: It makes sense.

21 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Okay. And is there any concern? There was
22 tremendous interest, if I may, to have it somewhere else besides Washington. Is that still

1 the case or should we just go ahead and consider Washington?

2 MEMBER McCORMICK: Why don't you put that in the survey also?

3 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. And if someone dose propose to have it
4 somewhere else, it would be great if they can --

5 MEMBER QUIGLEY: I vote for Las Vegas and we will help host it.

6 MEMBER McCORMICK: I vote for Las Vegas, too.

7 MR. GLASSCOCK: This is Steve. I am looking at Ken. I don't really want to
8 talk to Washington Post reporters.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MEMBER McCORMICK: Well, we can do it in Henderson.

11 MR. GLASSCOCK: Yes, right.

12 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Perfect. We have some great facilities in Henderson.

13 CHAIR WILKERSON: Who is speaking?

14 MEMBER QUIGLEY: This is Tina Quigley from Henderson.

15 CHAIR WILKERSON: Oh, hi, Tina.

16 Okay. We can address that over -- unless there are some other comments, we can
17 work with Stephen to see if we can get some proposed dates and locations and things that
18 would be amenable to ITS JPO.

19 MEMBER McCORMICK: The other question I would have is, since they have
20 got that Transit event in D.C. the 14th, 15th, and 16th, is that the 17th in D.C. might be a
21 logical choice. We could find out how many people are already going to be there for that.

22 CHAIR WILKERSON: That's a good idea.

1 Are there any folks in town for that besides -- was that Joe?

2 MEMBER JOHNSON: This is Debra Johnson. I will be attending the APTA
3 Legislative Conference as well during that time.

4 CHAIR WILKERSON: Any others?

5 MEMBER QUIGLEY: This is Tina Quigley. I will be APTA Legislative as
6 well.

7 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. All right. So, that is three out of the -- okay.

8 I am sorry, go ahead.

9 MEMBER KISSINGER: Any interest in maybe Ann Arbor to have a view of M
10 City for those who haven't seen it?

11 MEMBER McCORMICK: Yes, I am not sure you want to go to Detroit in March
12 to see M City, I mean unless you want to see the snow plows operating on it.

13 I mean, I would be glad to help anybody go tour, if they want to come out here, but
14 March is not a good time to do it.

15 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Any other comments?

16 MEMBER McCORMICK: It is just a weather issue. What we would want to
17 have to do is for M City, now that Ford is beginning testing their autonomous vehicles, that
18 facility is closed for tours when the automakers are doing stuff on it. So, we would really
19 have to go contact M City and find out when they would have availability for people to see
20 it.

21 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Is that something worth exploring or is there
22 consensus on passing on it? Comments?

1 MEMBER McCORMICK: I will defer to John Capp's opinion.

2 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

3 MEMBER CAPP: I mean, anything in Ann Arbor would be convenient for me. I
4 think the M City facility is interesting as well as the whole MCC plan. It could be
5 advantageous for this team to be aware of things that are happening in the southeast
6 Michigan area with regard to connectivity. That probably is worth considering if folks
7 aren't familiar with what they are doing.

8 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Well, what we could do is --

9 MEMBER CAPP: But you may want to do it in April versus March. I certainly
10 think there is plenty of time, though, to plan with folks. I would certainly be happy to help
11 with that, too.

12 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

13 MEMBER CAPP: We could schedule the plant. I don't see that being a problem.

14 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Well, we can, certainly, when we do the poll, list
15 a couple of cities. We have M City. I think Las Vegas may be out, but if you will list it,
16 as well as Washington, D.C.

17 Can I ask a question? Are there any other events that are taking place, Stephen or
18 Ken, that you all will be attending in late March?

19 MR. LEONARD: I don't have the calendar.

20 MR. GLASSCOCK: Yes, I don't know of any off the top of my head.

21 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay, great. Okay. All right.

22 MEMBER BELCHER: Hi. This is Scott, just joining, Scott Belcher. I'm sorry I

1 am late.

2 CHAIR WILKERSON: Hi, Scott.

3 Scott, we have just -- sorry?

4 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Hi, Scott.

5 This is Tina Quigley from Las Vegas.

6 I was just remembering, there is a place in the Bay Area -- I think it is in Walnut
7 Creek or the Contra Costa area -- that is similar to M City. That was a former naval
8 weapons station where they are doing some testing as well.

9 MEMBER McCORMICK: Yes. Look at where Apple is doing some of their
10 testing. It might be a different naval station, but I thought it was Apple doing it there.

11 MEMBER BELCHER: That is Randy Iwasaki's test facility in Contra Costa.

12 MR. LEONARD: Yes, that was Scott Belcher.

13 But, yes, Randy Iwasaki, Contra Costa County, has a fairly impressive facility. It
14 is much larger than M City and maybe not quite as far along, but I think they have 30
15 partners. I think one of their key anchor partners is Honda. Is that right, Scott?

16 MEMBER BELCHER: Yes. I think they also have -- I think Mercedes is also a
17 partner.

18 MR. LEONARD: Right.

19 CHAIR WILKERSON: So, is that something folks would be willing to consider?
20 I am happy to add that to the list.

21 MEMBER McCORMICK: Yes.

22 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. All right. So, we were just going over potential

1 locations or venues for the March meeting. We have a couple of recommendations, and
2 we will send out a poll for a possible date and location.

3 MEMBER McCORMICK: Well, Scott Belcher just joined. Scott, do you know
4 if TIA had any events going on in D.C. or other places in the March timeframe?

5 CHAIR WILKERSON: That would potentially be a conflict or opportunity to
6 meet?

7 MEMBER BELCHER: No. We have, of relevance for this group, we have an
8 event on December 8th that we are hosting with the ITU ITS Committee on the role of
9 communications or telecommunications in transportation here at TIA.

10 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

11 MEMBER BELCHER: And it is really about 4G, 5G, and the future of
12 telecommunications.

13 And then, in June we have a meeting that will have an ITS component in it in
14 Dallas, but nothing in March.

15 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

16 MR. LEONARD: Scott, are you having your Cambridge meeting in March,
17 Cambridge, Maryland?

18 MEMBER BELCHER: No, we are doing that in D.C. this year.

19 MR. LEONARD: Okay.

20 MEMBER BELCHER: But that would be more of a political policy summit.
21 That would keep me unavailable, and March 7th and 8th are the days I would not be
22 available.

1 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. So, we are currently looking at the latter part of
2 March.

3 MEMBER BELCHER: Yes, that is good for me at this point.

4 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. So, we will move on and we will send out a poll
5 accordingly.

6 **DISCUSSION OF TOPICS FOR THE 2016 ADVICE** 7 **MEMORANDUM**

8 So, the next item on the topic is the 2016 report, which we discussed. The next
9 steps are for us to submit a final Advice Memo. As Stephen mentioned, it does not have to
10 be as detailed as the one that we sent, but it would be submitted sometime in June.

11 There were a number of topics for future discussion, which we can raise at the
12 March meeting, if everyone is amenable, or we can add to this list or we can subtract from
13 this list. I will just call off a couple of the topics that I had in my notes that were raised that
14 were not fully vetted or addressed in the current 2015 report.

15 The first was scenario planning. I know that was one that Scott McCormick was
16 working on, and whether there is an opportunity to follow up or discuss that?

17 We had talked about having a NHTSA update.

18 There were discussions about having greater discussion on automation, the traffic
19 safety culture. Let's see. How technology is accelerating in various institutions and
20 whether that needs to be clarified, vehicle hacking, taking an opportunity to review again
21 the strategic plan. That might also include the additional report, which I think Ken
22 mentioned we might be asked to review, in light of the pending legislation.

1 Review of former recommendations that were accepted by DOT and what the
2 status of those are, and whether we need to add anything to those.

3 We had talked about new industry trends, having a new industry trends or futurist
4 speaker.

5 And then, the last topic that I had was the human interface.

6 MEMBER McCORMICK: Do we have owners for each of those topic areas or
7 were those just -- I mean other than the scenario planning one?

8 CHAIR WILKERSON: I am sorry, I did not understand, Scott.

9 MEMBER McCORMICK: Did we have an owner, somebody that was going to
10 be the coordinator for calling together people to discuss that topic for each of those or were
11 those just, other than my scenario planning, were those just things that we threw out in the
12 pile?

13 CHAIR WILKERSON: Those were things that we threw out. There was some
14 consensus, but there was no final decision. These were just possible topics that we opted
15 not to include in the 2015.

16 MEMBER McCORMICK: Well, then, I guess I would like to make a suggestion.

17 CHAIR WILKERSON: Uh-hum.

18 MEMBER McCORMICK: If we could put that list out in the email --

19 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

20 MEMBER McCORMICK: -- and ask for somebody (a) to see if there is enough
21 interest in each of those topics and file that back to you. If we find out that we have four or
22 more people interested in a topic, or whatever number we choose, then we can have them

1 form their own little ad hoc committee to see if it is addressable.

2 CHAIR WILKERSON: I'm amenable to that.

3 Any other comments or thoughts or additions we should add to this list for
4 consideration?

5 (No response.)

6 I am giving you time to unmute your phones.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MEMBER McCORMICK: Well, I guess I have one thought. In terms of the
9 recommendations that we made from the last report --

10 CHAIR WILKERSON: Yes?

11 MEMBER McCORMICK: -- rather than having us determine where it is, I think
12 somebody like Ken Leonard or one of his people, whatever, could probably just give us a
13 status report on where we are on those. Would that work, Ken?

14 MR. GLASSCOCK: This is Stephen.

15 Yes.

16 MEMBER McCORMICK: Or Stephen?

17 MR. GLASSCOCK: Of the 17, we concurred on 16 and partially concurred on the
18 remaining one. We either have started the work that would be necessary or plan to start
19 the work that is going to be necessary to implement those recommendations.

20 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

21 MEMBER McCORMICK: I nominate Stephen to just give us a report on that.

22 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

1 MEMBER McCORMICK: Sorry, Stephen.

2 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay, that would be great.

3 MEMBER McCORMICK: Rather than defer to our Committee.

4 MR. GLASSCOCK: Sure.

5 MEMBER McCORMICK: Thank you.

6 MEMBER ALBERT: This is Steve Albert.

7 I wonder if we should have some theme for the meeting that we are going to have in
8 March that we could hang things on. You know, when I think back, a lot of things the
9 Committee has done, sometimes it gets down to the widget level. And I am wondering if
10 maybe we could have a theme that would be in general about how technology might be
11 changing everyday life, so to speak, and then, hang things on some theme like that. It
12 might give us a good understanding of not only who we might want to invite to a meeting,
13 but how we might want to focus a little bit of a meeting.

14 CHAIR WILKERSON: Well, some of these topics could certainly follow in that
15 topic that you just raised, such as automation and vehicle hacking, new trends, human
16 interface, those kinds of things.

17 So, do you have any thoughts?

18 MEMBER McCORMICK: We have a theme already which all of those things fall
19 under, and that is advancing safe, efficient transportation. So, I guess if we drift away
20 from that or drill down into it, we will end up focusing on certain areas rather than are we
21 helping and trying to help advance safe, efficient transportation. So, I guess that would be
22 my one caveat, is to be careful how you title your efforts, that it doesn't pigeonhole you.

1 MEMBER ALBERT: Understood. Okay.

2 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Yes, I want to keep seeing us focus on automation and
3 disruptive technologies.

4 CHAIR WILKERSON: Is that Tina?

5 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Yes. Yes, Tina, Las Vegas.

6 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

7 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Or Henderson, Tina from Henderson.

8 (Laughter.)

9 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Any other thoughts or comments?

10 (No response.)

11 There were two other comments. Raj is not on the call, but he raised two
12 comments that were not discussed. One had to do with having a clearinghouse collect and
13 maintain security incidents and their solutions.

14 And then, the other had to do with DSRC. Let's see. I am trying to read the
15 question. It had to do with DSRC, the coexistence of such uses by structured use of DSRC
16 safety messages. Well, I will have to look at it.

17 But there were two comments that we said that we would follow up. So, we can
18 certainly include those on the agenda as well.

19 MEMBER McCORMICK: Actually, I had one response to his first one, which
20 was that my feeling was that the affiliated testbed would be a natural repository for keeping
21 those records on incidences, if they ever occur, because one in the wild has not yet occurred
22 yet.

1 And that was the one comment I just wanted to throw out, is I don't know if we need
2 to create a separate bureaucracy just to handle the incidents when we already have a
3 repository for information that is collected from all over right now, that just says somebody
4 add a database, you know, somebody add a file to keep those incidences recorded and the
5 affiliated testbed, which would be important for all of the participants of the affiliated
6 testbed to know about because they are the ones working on it, as well as all the industries
7 that are involved in this space have signed up so that they get notifications of what is going
8 on. So, to me, it is like we already have a solution to that problem.

9 CHAIR WILKERSON: Uh-hum.

10 MEMBER McCORMICK: I did mention that to Walt Fehr when I saw him last,
11 and he was in full agreement with it.

12 CHAIR WILKERSON: Any other comments?

13 He is not here to fully vet this, so we can certainly keep it as a topic for possible
14 discussion.

15 The other had to do with mandated DSRC radios.

16 MEMBER McCORMICK: And I'm sorry, I don't remember what his point was
17 on that.

18 CHAIR WILKERSON: Yes, and I can send that around to everyone to consider
19 whether they want to continue to include that. Since he is not on the phone and able to
20 express his opinions on that, I will circulate it by email.

21 **SUMMARY AND ADJOURN**

22 I don't have any other topics to discuss. We said this would be a pretty quick call.

1 But it is a great time to open the floor to talk about things that are going on that relate to ITS
2 JPO and/or our mandate. So, the floor is open.

3 MEMBER CALABRESE: Yes, this is Joe Calabrese.

4 With the help, obviously, of DOT and FTA, we are just beginning with the
5 beginning phase of two demonstration grants to take place in Cleveland, hopefully, if
6 success, to be deployed throughout the public transit industry. And they are both very
7 much related to each other about pedestrian safety.

8 One is to alert a bus operator that a pedestrian may be stepping in the path of the
9 vehicle, give them in-advance warning.

10 The second one is to alert bus passengers waiting at a bus stop that a bus may be
11 approaching and may be entering their field.

12 So, they are very related. They are very location-specific. I am not sure what
13 exactly the ability is going to be to deploy them in a wide range, but we are thankful for
14 having these demonstrations in Cleveland. We will certainly keep everyone updated.
15 Maybe sometime down the road we could talk about the results.

16 CHAIR WILKERSON: Fantastic.

17 Any other updates or comments?

18 (No response.)

19 No? Everybody is waiting for the House and Senate to go to conference.

20 MR. LEONARD: Sheryl, this is Ken.

21 The Advisory Committee is aware of the Pilots Awards in September, right? I
22 know I missed the last meeting, but I just want to make sure --

1 CHAIR WILKERSON: Can you speak up a little? Go ahead.

2 MR. LEONARD: I just want to make sure that everybody is aware of the
3 Connected Vehicle Pilot Awards in September that we had made to New York City,
4 Tampa, and Wyoming.

5 CHAIR WILKERSON: Yes, yes.

6 Does anyone have any comments on that?

7 MEMBER BELCHER: I think a briefing on those would be a good topic for
8 March.

9 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. I think that is something kind of fun to share.

10 Oh, go ahead. Sorry. Was that Susan?

11 MEMBER QUIGLEY: No, this is Tina Quigley.

12 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Sorry, Tina.

13 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Also, we just want to share with you that at our CES, the
14 Consumer Electronics Show, here in Las Vegas next year or early next year, we are going
15 to be working with a company called Delphi to demonstrate autonomous vehicles and
16 features. We are going to be using our signals to communicate with the autonomous
17 vehicles and they will be doing a demonstration project. So, it will just be fun. It will be
18 fun to report on.

19 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. Any other comments?

20 (No response.)

21 Steve, do you have any comments for the Committee? Otherwise, we will follow
22 up on the items we had proposed about setting a date and location.

1 MR. GLASSCOCK: I don't. I will try to get that Doodle Poll out early next
2 week.

3 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay.

4 MR. GLASSCOCK: And we're good here, if you are.

5 CHAIR WILKERSON: Okay. So, if there are no other --

6 MEMBER McCORMICK: I wanted to --

7 CHAIR WILKERSON: Oh, go ahead.

8 MEMBER McCORMICK: This is Scott McCormick.

9 I wanted to add for the record that I wanted to commend Sheryl for admiral job of
10 stewardship on this Committee and chairing of it over the time we have been involved.
11 We really appreciate your leadership on this activity.

12 CHAIR WILKERSON: Thank you so much.

13 MEMBER CALABRESE: Yes, great job, Sheryl.

14 CHAIR WILKERSON: Thanks to all of you for being so diligent and prompt.

15 MEMBER QUIGLEY: Thank you.

16 CHAIR WILKERSON: Thank you.

17 Okay. Well, Stephen, you opened the meeting. So, I guess you need to adjourn
18 it.

19 MR. GLASSCOCK: Okay. Yes.

20 I would say the meeting is adjourned, and we will get the poll out and we will see
21 everyone, hopefully, in March.

22 (Whereupon, at 1:36 p.m., the teleconference was adjourned.)