

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

February 7, 2001
MAG Saguaro Room, 2nd Floor
302 North First Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Alan Sanderson, Acting Chairman	* Ellis Perl, Surprise
Brian Latte, Chandler	Jim Decker, Tempe
Bruce Ward, Gilbert	Tim Wolfe, ADOT
Dale Thompson, Maricopa County	* Jim Matteson, Phoenix Aviation
*Jim Book, Glendale	Ron Amaya for Scott Nodes, Peoria
Bob Steele, Phoenix	Charles Hydeman, Goodyear
Bob Ciotti, RPTA	* Mary Kihl, ASU
*Terry Conner, DPS	* Alan Hansen, FHWA
Bruce Dressel, Scottsdale	

* Not present or represented by proxy

OTHERS PRESENT

Don Dey, TransCore	Amy Corathers, Scottsdale
Sarath Joshua, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Acting Chairman Alan Sanderson called meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Approval of January 17, 2001, Meeting Minutes

Bruce Ward moved and Tim Wolfe seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve minutes of the January 17, 2001 ITS Committee meeting.

3. Call to Audience

Chairman made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the ITS Committee. There was no comment from the audience.

4. Program Manager's Report

An error in Attachment Four was noted and a correct page was handed out to members.

ITS Strategic Plan Update: Sarath Joshua indicated that the Plan Update will be presented to Management Committee on Feb 14th and then to the Regional Council on Feb 28th. Kimley-Horn is ready to make these two presentations. The final report will be made available by mid-March.

Vision 21 Task Force and ITS: Governor's Vision 21 Task Force asked MAG for input from this region regarding ITS recommendations. They also asked the state, PAG and Tucson. At a recent meeting with John Carlson all these participants provided input. An email was sent out to committee members was to obtain updated numbers on traffic signals in their jurisdictions. A two-page handout containing information on traffic signals in the region and ITS needs was handled out. The recommendations shown on the second page came from the Strategic Plan.

Jim Decker questioned why a questionnaire was needed when a lot of information was gathered through the Strategic Plan. Sarath Joshua responded that it was his view that the information requested was not available in the Strategic Plan or the Technical Memorandums. He agreed to go back to the Plan and review. Tim Wolfe commented that he was not sure why Vision 21 Task Force was asking for near term or next 5 years' recommendations when all the resources available for near term implementation was from MAG, PAG or State Transportation Board. He stated that these agencies are already acting on near term plans that include these recommendations.

Tim Wolfe stated that Vision 21 plan was supposed to be for the period beyond 2007. Brian Latte commented that he was comfortable with the seven items listed as recommendations.

Alan Sanderson commenting on 10 AZTech workstations on the list stated that these recommendations should not get presented as if the workstations will solve all the traffic problems and no one will have to stop at a red light anymore. They will allow us to better manage traffic but it is still a vision. Perhaps the concept of operations can better address the entire coordination issue.

Jim Decker stated that a news article had quoted Vision 21 Task Force making negative comments on the status of signal coordination in the region. Sarath Joshua responded that both Tim Wolfe and himself have provided John Carlson with a lot of information on what is going on in this region.

Sarath Joshua stated that Vision 21 is planning to come up with a concept of super streets to be administered by another layer of government. He went on to ask the committee if he should make a statement from the committee at the Vision 21 Task Force's Resource Committee meeting on February 8, 2001. He stated that Mike Frisbie has already expressed concern about this concept. Tim Wolfe asked if this concept was the same as Roads of Regional Significance. Sarath Joshua responded that based on what he had read in the news, Vision 21 seems to be referring to ITS Smart Corridors as Roads of Regional Significance. Their concept seems to be pointing to a layer

of arterials between freeways and all other arterials that will be managed and operated by a new agency. Some members commented that the concept does not make any sense at all. Brian Latte asked if this was the same article on regional cooperation that referred to road widening and cooperation among. Dale Thompson stated that he was reluctant for the committee to ask Sarath Joshua to make a statement to the Vision 21 without knowing details. He indicated that Mike Frisbie was very concerned and even suggested that the committee hold a phone conference call to discuss this issue. Brian Latte stated that the news article that he saw was the problems in the MAG process in programming regional priorities rather than city priorities. He also stated that Mike Frisbie's concern may have come from the need to have 24-hour traffic management with perhaps ADOT or the County providing support during off-hours. Sarath stated that he will contact John Carlson to find out details and get back to members via email.

Freeway Service Patrol Project: Terry Connor has informed that they have five staff persons hired and three more in the process of hiring. During the month of December 400 motorists have been helped by the Service. It is proving to be a big success.

Regional Transportation Safety Forum: A hand out on this Forum was passed around. The Forum is planned to be held at the Annual ITE Conference. The purpose is to bring together transportation safety stakeholders to identify issues and needs related to safety and begin addressing them through the planning process. This activity is also supported by the most recent guidance given to MPOs by FHWA, where Safety Planning has been identified as the first emphasis area. At the national level an initiative on Safety Conscious Planning has been launched. MAG will start this activity in the region with this Forum. MAG management had suggested that the ITS Committee be briefed on this activity due to members of this committee being aware of safety issues better than any other MAG committee. This could lead to the formation of a stakeholder group. In response to a question if this effort is launched to fill a void, Sarath Joshua responded that MAG member agencies are doing a good addressing safety at the local level however it the MAG programming process safety is not addressed explicitly. Safety has not been incorporated into project selection. MAG is not alone in this area. Chuck Hydeman stated that the cities are already addressing safety needs.

Dale Thompson asked if this will lead to the committee becoming ITS and Safety committee. Sarath Joshua responded that it may not necessarily lead to an ITS Safety Committee. He added that his role at MAG was clearly to address both ITS and Safety. He added that at the national level ITS and Safety activities are coming together a lot and the committee should be aware of Safety issues. Brian Latte stated that City Transportation and Traffic engineers are already doing engaged in safety activities and many around the table are too.

5. Update on the ITS Integration Proposal

Sarath Joshua indicated that although he was unable to complete his undertaking of preparing a proposal by end of January. He asked for help from volunteers to wrap this up by middle of February. Bob Steele, Dale Thompson and Jim Decker volunteered to help. Dale Thompson asked if the proposal will be based on telecommunications. Sarath Joshua indicated that Integration funds will not allow us to purchase new field devices only equipment related to integration.

6. Programming of Additional Federal Funds

Four ITS projects were proposed in the MAG proposal for funding. All four projects came directly from the Strategic Plan Update. However, at the TRC meeting held on February 6, 2001, another list of priorities called Option #4 was generated by some members was proposed and was approved by TRC. There is one ITS project in the list worth \$250,000. Option #4 was presented by RPTA but it is not known who exactly produced this option. Jim Book was not at the TRC meeting. A committee member stated it looks like the message from TRC is that they do not care about the regional priorities. Many members expressed shock that light rail had taken such a big slice of CMAQ funds. Amy Corathers stated that Scottsdale still has the MIS to be completed. Sarath Joshua responded that some of the LRT funds may be programmed for FY 2006. Alan Sanderson requested that more information be provided to members.

7. Status Reports by Committee Members on ITS Activities

Chandler is finalizing technical specifications for new CCTV cameras. Brian Latte said that there is a House Bill on surveillance that may impact CCTV. Alan Sanderson said that language has been added to the bill to exempt public entities. Charles Hydeman reported that Goodyear is planning to implement CCTV and have begun trenching for fiber backbone. Their plan is to have the smart corridor implemented by 2006 and have it tied to the ADOT backbone at I-10. Bruce Ward reported that Gilbert was having problems dealing with ADOT local government section. Tim Wolfe reported that ADOT has a new contractor for Phase 4 of FMS. Also a new bid for FMS on I-10 and a landscape project will be delayed to put the conduit in. Jim Decker reported that work on the Tempe downtown traffic management system had run into a problem in that the bids had come in much higher than expected due to the general civil contractor being not conversant with ITS. Bruce Gilbert reported how Gilbert worked things out in their ATMS procurement. Ron Amaya of Peoria reported on a traffic signal and CCTV projects and the communication backbone. Alan Sanderson stated how Mesa was dealing with a number of issues with ICONs and was of the impression that the system was not quite developed to the point that they expected. Alan Sanderson also stated that a Mesa staff member is planning to launch an on-line ICONs user group.

8. Next meeting was announced as 10:00 AM on March 7, 2001.

9. The meeting was adjourned by Acting Chairman Sanderson at 11:25 AM