

**MINUTES**  
**MAG ITS STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE**  
**REGIONAL ITS STAKEHOLDERS GROUP MEETING NO. 10**

**August 16, 2000**  
**10:30 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**MAG Office Building**  
**302 North 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue**  
**Phoenix, Arizona**

ATTENDANCE

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Sarath Joshua, MAG, Project Manager  | Alan Sanderson, City of Mesa               |
| Jim Book, City of Glendale, Chairman | Paul Casertano, Pima Assoc. of Governments |
| Tim Wolfe, ADOT                      | John Taylor, Pima Assoc. of Government     |
| Brian Latte, City of Chandler        | Scott Nodes, City of Peoria                |
| Bill Vachon, FHWA                    | Mike Frisbie, City of Phoenix              |
| Bruce Ward, Town of Gilbert          | Jim Decker, City of Tempe                  |
| Charles Hydeman, City of Goodyear    | Don Dey, TransCore                         |
| Dale Thompson, MCDOT                 |  |

PROJECT TEAM

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Pierre Pretorius, Kimley-Horn and Associates | Tom Fowler, Kimley-Horn and Associates |
|--|--|

MINUTES

1. Project Introduction and Welcome  
Chairman Jim Book called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM.
2. Approval of RISG Meeting No. 9 Minutes  
Chairman Jim Book asked if there were any comments or corrections to the RISG Meeting No. 9 minutes. There were no comments or corrections and the minutes were approved.
3. Progress Report
  - 3.1 Task 9, Operational and Implementation Strategies  
The final version of Technical Memorandum No. 6A was distributed to the RISG at the meeting.
  - 3.2 Task 10, ITS Implementation Plan  
The final version of Technical Memorandum No. 6B was distributed to the RISG at the meeting.
  - 3.3 Task 11, Develop ITS Telecommunications Plan  
The final version of Technical Memorandum No. 7 was distributed to the RISG at the meeting.
  - 3.4 Task 14, Develop Final Report  
The Draft Final Report was distributed to the RISG and an overview presentation was provided. There were several items listed on the agenda for discussion that needed resolution in the Final Report. These items are described below:
    - 3.4.1 Role of LTAP in the Professional Capacity Building (PCB) Program  
The PCB section in the Final Report recommends that MAG champion the implementation of a PCB Program in the MAG region. Tim Wolfe asked whether a full-

time staff person was required at MAG to champion this effort. Pierre responded that the report language is unclear on this point, but the intent was to provide \$250,000 for PCB in the MAG region over a five-year timeframe. The \$250,000 was not intended to fund a full-time staff person at MAG and it is not anticipated that the PCB champion role of MAG would require a full-time employee.

Dale Thompson said that he would like the PCB Program to emphasize a greater need to identify roles and responsibilities for universities. The MAG Committee agreed that more effort should be made to involve the universities in Arizona in PCB. Paul Casertano discussed the University of Arizona's role in ITS in Tucson, and he thought that the University of Arizona would be very interested in assisting with PCB. Sarath Joshua noted that in order to include universities, funding must be provided. This could be done through project evaluation, in which the universities could have a major role. Bruce Ward noted that the Arizona State University Design Build Program was a model of a university getting involved in PCB.

Bill Vachon asked if the existing LTAP and FHWA structure for training could be modified to suit the ITS needs. Tom Fowler responded that the PCB Plan recommended that LTAP and FHWA still be used to coordinate and develop classes. However, the regional champion was identified as someone that serves an active role in the ITS community, identifies deficiencies in training and skills, and works with LTAP and FHWA to bring the appropriate training to the region.

The role professional societies, such as ITS America, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Women's Transportation Seminar, and American Society of Civil Engineers was discussed. It was agreed that these groups should also have a role in PCB.

The RISG recommended that the following elements be included in the PCB section of the final report:

- Use LTAP and FHWA for scheduling, promoting and developing ITS courses;
- Universities should be encouraged to take a more active role in PCB;
- MAG should support and coordinate PCB efforts in the region but should not fund a full time position; and
- Professional societies should take a more active role in PCB.

#### 3.4.2 Proposed Evaluation Funding of 5 Percent

Tim Wolfe and Alan Sanderson stated that they felt many of the ITS Projects in the TIP (FMS, TMCs, SMART Corridors) have already been evaluated and that more evaluation was not needed on these types of projects. Brian Latte stated that he felt continued evaluation was necessary to prove the benefits of ITS. He felt each positive evaluation of ITS technologies in Chandler has proved extremely helpful when asking for new funding for additional projects.

Sarath stated that there were still many things that we do not know the full benefit of, such as the placement of detection on SMART Corridors. He suggested that perhaps we need to expand evaluation to "testing and evaluation." There was discussion that there could be some overlap with ADOT's research program, however there was also opportunity to coordinate these programs.

The RISG recommended that following elements be included in the Evaluation section of the final report:

- Identify a need to find evaluation funds;
- Suggest a funding level for evaluation;
- Recommend that matching funds be provided from local agencies, however do not require that five percent of project's budget be reserved for evaluation;
- Universities should be used for evaluation whenever possible; and
- Coordination of the MAG evaluation program with PAG and the ADOT research program should be encouraged.

#### 3.4.3 Proposed Future Institutional Framework

The RISG decided that there was not enough time and representation at the meeting to discuss the proposed future institutional framework. A special meeting to discuss the future institutional framework was considered, however it was decided that the best representation for the RISG would be at the September 20, 2000 MAG ITS Committee Meeting. Therefore, it was decided that this item would be further discussed at that time. Sarath Joshua would look into the possibility of providing Kimley-Horn with a change order to attend this additional meeting. Kimley-Horn emphasized the need to resolve this issue prior to October, when the final report will be presented to the MAG Transportation Review Committee, Management Committee, and Regional Council.

**Comments on the Draft Final Report are due back to Sarath Joshua no later than Wednesday, August 30, 2000.**

#### 4. Next Meeting

The next RISG meeting will take place on **Wednesday, September 20, 2000** at the regularly schedule MAG ITS Committee Meeting. The topic will be to resolve the proposed future institutional framework.

#### 5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.