



U.S. Department of Transportation
Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee

ITS Program Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
June 17, 2011

August 1, 2011

CONTENTS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. General.....	2
2. Meeting Attendance.....	2
3. Meeting Action Item.....	3
4. Meeting Agenda.....	3
5. Summary of Proceedings.....	4
a. Welcome and Opening Remarks	4
(1) Dr. Sussman.....	4
(2) Mr. Denaro.....	4
(3) Dr. Bertini	5
(4) Ms. Row.....	5
(5) Meeting Purpose / Agenda Review	6
b. Global Harmonization of Standards Subcommittee Report	6
c. Technology Strategy Subcommittee Report.....	8
d. Program Evaluation and Strategy Subcommittee Report	9
e. WIN Initiative for Transportation Roundtable Meeting.....	12
f. Further Engagement with Mr. Aneesh Chopra, White House Chief Technology Officer	13
g. State of Transportation Reauthorization Legislation.....	15
h. 18 th World Congress on ITS	15
i. Subcommittee Breakout Discussions	16
j. Adjourn.....	17
k. Post-meeting Committee Action.....	17

1. General

- a. A meeting of the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Program Advisory Committee (PAC) was held June 17, 2011, in the Oklahoma City conference room of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) conference center.
- b. These minutes provide a summary of the meeting proceedings. A copy of these minutes, the meeting transcript, and other meeting documents are available for public inspection and copying in the ITS PAC Website at <http://www.its.dot.gov/itspac/index.htm>.

2. Meeting Attendance

- a. Committee members present, in alphabetical order:

Mr. Steve Albert, Director, Western Transportation Institute

Mr. Scott Belcher; President and CEO, ITS America

Mr. Joseph Calabrese; Director, Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority

Ms. Robin Chase; Founder & CEO, Meadow Networks

Dr. Adam Drobot; Managing Director and Chief Technology Officer, 2M Companies

Mr. Robert Denaro; Vice President, NAVTEQ Corporation (ITS PAC Committee Vice Chairman)

Ms. Ann Flemer (via teleconference); Deputy Executive Director, Policy; Metropolitan Transportation Commission; Oakland, California

Dr. Genevieve Giuliano, Senior Associate Dean for Research and Technology, USC School of Policy, Planning, and Development

Mr. J. Peter Kissinger; President and CEO, AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety

Dr. Joseph Sussman; JR East Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Engineering Systems Division; Massachusetts Institute of Technology (ITS PAC Committee Chairman)

Dr. Peter Sweatman; Director, University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute

Mr. Gary Toth; Senior Director, Transportation Initiatives; Project for Public Spaces

Mr. Pravin Varaiya; Nortel Networks Distinguished Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences; University of California, Berkeley

Mr. James Vondale; Director, Automotive Safety Office, Sustainability, Environmental and Safety Engineering; Ford Motor Company

- b. Committee members absent, in alphabetical order:

Mr. Randell Iwasaki; Executive Director, Contra Costa Transportation Authority

Mr. Jack Lettiere; President, Jack Lettiere Consulting

Mr. Bryan Mistele; CEO, INRIX

Mr. Don Osterberg; Senior Vice President, Safety and Driver Training, Schneider National, Inc.

Mr. Kirk Steudle; Director, Michigan Department of Transportation

c. Others present, in alphabetical order:

Mr. Peter H. Appel; Administrator, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
Dr. Robert L. Bertini; Deputy Administrator, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
Mr. Stephen Glasscock; Program Coordinator, ITS Joint Program Office, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation (ITS PAC Designated Federal Official)
Mr. Jeffrey A. Lindley, Associate Administrator for Operations, Federal Highway Administration
Ms. Shelley Row, Director, ITS Joint Program Office, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation
Mr. Carlos R. Vélez, Jr.; Citizant, Inc.

3. Meeting Action Item

Updated subcommittee reports are due to Dr. Sussman and Mr. Denaro no later than Monday, August 1 (see bold type on page 17, paragraph 5.k.(1)).

4. Meeting Agenda

Following is the original meeting agenda. Due to time constraints, the Subcommittee Presentations (Reflecting Breakout Discussions) and the Plenary session were not conducted.

- a. Welcome and Opening Remarks
- b. Global Harmonization of Standards Subcommittee Report
- c. Technology Strategy Subcommittee Report
- d. Program Evaluation and Strategy Subcommittee Report
- e. Subcommittee Breakout Discussions
- f. Informal Reports on the Wireless Innovation (WIN) Initiative for Transportation Roundtable Meeting; Further Engagement with Mr. Aneesh Chopra, White House Chief Technology Officer; and the State of Transportation Reauthorization Legislation.
- g. Subcommittee Presentations (Reflecting Breakout Discussions)
- h. Plenary
- i. Adjourn

5. Summary of Proceedings

a. Welcome and Opening Remarks

(1) Dr. Sussman

- (a) Dr. Sussman welcomed participants, acknowledging that Ms. Row had returned from a year-long overseas sabbatical.
- (b) Dr. Sussman reminded committee members that the ITS PAC had submitted a memorandum to the ITS Joint Program Office (JPO) in August 2010 that identified several issues for committee consideration. Although this memorandum did not provide the ITS JPO substantive advice, it did help to “set up” the committee’s subsequent meetings.
- (c) The committee’s two meetings in January and March 2011 were conducted in a three-subcommittee structure to study the following topics for potential advice to the U.S. DOT:
 - Standards and Harmonization
 - Technology Strategy
 - Program Strategy and Evaluation
- (d) Dr. Sussman expressed his hope that the committee would be near agreement on most of the content of an advisory memorandum to the U.S. DOT at the conclusion of the present meeting.
- (e) Dr. Sussman invited Mr. Denaro to present his welcome remarks.

(2) Mr. Denaro

- (a) Mr. Denaro made the following major points:
 - The subcommittees’ areas of study could potentially cover a broad range of information; however, as was discussed in prior committee meetings, the committee’s advice must be focused to be effective.
 - Although the committee’s eventual advisory memorandum will reflect committee consensus, it likely will not “speak with one voice” due to the diversity of committee members’ backgrounds. However, this diversity of backgrounds and experience can serve to add value to the advice memorandum.
- (b) Dr. Sussman invited Dr. Bertini to present his welcome remarks.

(3) Dr. Bertini

- (a) Dr. Bertini stated that Peter Appel, RITA Administrator, could not attend the meeting due to business travel, but requested that Dr. Bertini express his appreciation to the ITS PAC for their continuing work.
- (b) Dr. Bertini emphasized that the ITS program has successfully moved forward in the past year with many challenges, but also with many opportunities.
- (c) He is very pleased with the ITS PAC's subcommittee structure, adding that this is a good way for a group with such a large charge to effectively focus its work.
- (d) Dr. Bertini reminded committee members that their membership terms expire on December 16, 2011, which is an incentive for the committee to "get a product out the door."
- (e) Dr. Bertini stated that he will be departing RITA on July 15. He will be returning to his position at Portland State University, and will be on sabbatical at the Delft University of Technology, Netherlands during the next year.
- (f) Dr. Bertini stated that during his tenure at RITA he championed the following two major issues.
 - Workforce development. All organizations should be concerned not only with "program" issues, but also with "people" issues. Current staff should be mentored to produce the next generation of excellent transportation leaders.
 - Cross-modalism. The ITS Management Council has been expanded to include all appropriate U.S. DOT modes (not including the Federal Aviation Administration and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation).
- (g) Dr. Bertini announced that Mr. Gregory Winfree, RITA Chief Counsel, will be the next RITA Deputy Administrator effective July 15, and summarized Mr. Winfree's professional background.
- (h) Dr. Sussman invited Ms. Row to present her welcome remarks.

(4) Ms. Row

- (a) Ms. Row expressed her pleasure to be working with the committee again, and stated that she was impressed with the quality of the reports the subcommittees had prepared for the meeting.
- (b) She thanked the committee for the work they have done, and stated that whether or not a particular topic of committee discussion is addressed in the committee's next advisory memorandum, it is nevertheless very helpful to the ITS JPO to hear the committee's viewpoints on all topics.

- (c) Ms. Row thanked Dr. Bertini for his leadership as Acting ITS JPO Director and Mr. Augustine and the rest of the ITS JPO staff for their work during the preceding year.

(5) Meeting Purpose/Agenda Review

- (a) Dr. Sussman reviewed the structure for the remainder of the meeting.

- The main objective of the plenary session would be to determine how to best reflect as many committee members' views as possible in the advisory memorandum without making the memorandum so "plain vanilla" that it would not be helpful to the U.S. DOT.
- The subcommittee reports would be oral presentations of previously submitted written reports, which are available in the ITS PAC Website at <http://www.its.dot.gov/itspac/index.htm>.

- (b) Dr. Sussman turned the meeting over to Mr. Vondale for the Global Harmonization of Standards Subcommittee report.

b. Global Harmonization of Standards Subcommittee Report

- (1) Mr. Vondale's report highlighted the following major points:

- (a) Globally harmonized standards are critical to the expeditious and efficient deployment of ITS technologies.
- (b) Quick action is needed to avoid the development of regionally-based standards that are inconsistent with standards developed in other regions. Significant work is rapidly moving forward on ITS standards development, so without quick and strong direction and leadership to encourage harmonization, these standards will not be fully harmonized.

- (c) Major obstacles to global harmonization of ITS standards include:

- Competition among standards organizations.
- European mandate M/453 that is driving short timing on standards development and is being used as an excuse by vehicle manufacturers and standards organizations not to harmonize.
- A lack of identified forums to develop harmonized standards.
- Lack of agreement among vehicle manufacturers on the scope and timing of harmonization needs.

- (2) Mr. Vondale stated that subcommittee members agreed that not all standards need to be harmonized, but that it is important to identify and prioritize critical standards.

- (3) Ms. Row presented a summary of major issues that have or will impact directly the global harmonization of standards.
- (a) In 2009, the European Union (EU) issued mandate M/453, which requires the EU's standard-setting organizations to develop a minimum set of ITS interoperability standards within a given time schedule. Consequently, the major European standards-setting organizations (ETSI and CEN) are rushing to meet the mandate. At the same time, the U.S. and the EU signed an agreement to cooperate on international standards harmonization. The agreement established working groups, including a Standards Working Group. The EU's cooperation pursuant to this agreement has been unsatisfactory, due primarily to the pressures of satisfying the M/453 mandate. Ms. Row discussed this issue with her EU counterpart at the June 6-9, 2011, ITS European Congress in France, highlighting that the EU Standards Working Group had not developed an effective standards harmonization plan. During the meeting, the Europeans agreed that they would reach agreement on a harmonization plan before a scheduled Standards Working Group end-of-June meeting in Vienna, and that at that meeting they would agree on a short list of connected vehicle standards that should be harmonized internationally. The goal is to develop the specifics of a plan to harmonize a core group of standards by a fall meeting in Germany and to demonstrate the plan at the 2012 World Congress.
 - (b) Ms. Row stated that the work the ITS PAC has done on standards harmonization has been a very useful resource in her efforts to emphasize to the EU the importance of global standards harmonization to the U.S. DOT.
 - (c) Global standards harmonization is one of the top priority items addressed in periodic ITS JPO reports to the Secretary, so this is an avenue that could be used to obtain high-level U.S. government support in reinforcing the U.S. position on the importance of the global harmonization of standards. However, this is an avenue that has to be used judiciously. The results of the meetings in Vienna and Germany will help determine whether the issue will need to be further "elevated" within the U.S. government.
- (4) Mr. Denaro recommended that the Global Harmonization of Standards Subcommittee consider how to "beef up" its report and recommendations to better emphasize the importance of this issue, thereby providing added support to ITS JPO efforts in this area.
- (5) Ms. Row agreed with Mr. Vondale's suggestion that the subcommittee should wait until after the June and July standards-related meetings in Europe to finalize its report and recommendations.
- (6) Dr. Sussman turned the meeting over to Dr. Sweatman for the Technology Strategy Subcommittee report.

c. Technology Strategy Subcommittee Report

- (1) Dr. Sweatman's report addressed two major topics: (1) the subcommittee's deliberations on a broad technology strategy to advance ITS program effectiveness, and (2) a potential agenda for a White House summit to promote ITS.
- (2) Dr. Sweatman addressed the following major points concerning an ITS technology strategy:
 - (a) A broad strategic view of ITS technology requires consideration of not only communications technology, but also computing, sensors, interfaces, function-specific applications, and software.
 - (b) A robust, long-lived architecture will be key to successful developer community engagement, which is critical to ensuring endorsement of the government's connected vehicle platform.
 - (c) There is debate concerning whether DSRC should be the sole choice for critical functions, or whether the newly emerging Long Term Evolution advanced architecture ("3.9G" cellular) may provide the low latency communications required, while also having much broader market adoption than DSRC and additional, useful features.
 - (d) Broad community endorsement of the government's connected vehicle initiative would be enhanced by an effective Federal Government role. Examples of areas where the government might be more effective than the private and public sectors are security, authentication, and managing development of potentially driver-distracting applications.
 - (e) Any effective ITS solution must include accommodation of aftermarket vehicle devices and smart phone applications to achieve high developer interest and user acceptance. The data generated by these technologies should be made available to vehicle owners so that solutions and applications can be tailored to their vehicles and driving habits.
 - (f) The technological path followed by auto manufacturers and suppliers, and automotive consumer behavior will greatly influence the direction and pace of ITS technology development. The government will continue to play a critical role in ensuring that new vehicle communications technologies have a cumulative effect on reducing crashes and serious injuries.
 - (g) There is no clear solution for bridging the gap between the Federal ITS research role and the State and local deployment roles.

- (3) Dr. Sweatman entertained several questions and summarized the subcommittee's draft recommendations in the following three categories:
 - (a) Accelerating private sector and innovator engagement.
 - (b) Accelerating State and local jurisdiction adoption of technologies that meet safety goals.
 - (c) Closing the gap between the Federal government research role and the State and local deployment role.
- (4) Dr. Sussman noted that the ITS JPO had not been addressed in the Technology Strategy Subcommittee's recommendations, but that the Federal government and RITA were mentioned. He stated that this raised the question about whether ITS PAC recommendations should be directed to the ITS JPO or a higher Federal level. Mr. Denaro commented that the ITS PAC charter is to advise the Secretary of Transportation through the ITS JPO. Ms. Row endorsed Mr. Denaro's comment, adding that it would be a disservice to the ITS PAC's recommendations if they were addressed only to the ITS JPO.
- (5) Dr. Sussman turned the meeting over to Ms. Flemer for the Program Evaluation and Strategy Subcommittee report.

d. Program Evaluation and Strategy Subcommittee Report

- (1) Ms. Flemer began her remarks by stating that the committee's preceding discussion of the appropriate organizational level for ITS PAC advice will impact on the Program Evaluation and Strategy Subcommittee's ongoing work since its focus to date has been primarily at the ITS JPO level versus the overall ITS Program level.
- (2) Ms. Flemer stated that the subcommittee's initial step was to identify the following three major ITS JPO functional objectives:
 - (a) Perform, manage, and advocate for ITS research and development.
 - (b) Create an environment in which ITS can advance as a critical and deployable element of a contemporary transportation system (with emphasis on deployable).
 - (c) Position ITS as a response to U.S. transportation system policy challenges.
- (3) The subcommittee then narrowed the focus of its work based on the following two caveats:
 - (a) The program evaluation strategy should reflect a program versus a project-level focus.

- (b) The resources necessary to effectively implement some ITS PAC recommendations, including funding and authority, may be well beyond what the ITS JPO will have available.
- (4) Ms. Flemer discussed six proposed recommendations to the ITS JPO, which are summarized below:
- (a) Provide an effective program to support system development, investment, and deployment by others (e.g., state and local entities) in addition to the national deployment objectives.
 - (b) Facilitate and accelerate institutional transformation (e.g., public-private partnerships, Federal/State interactions, interactions among the U.S. DOT modal administrations, communication of transferable lessons across geographic areas, etc.), where it is of fundamental value (or necessary) to achieve progress on deploying transportation technologies.
 - (c) Have a technology strategy that recognizes and leverages technology developments in other sectors (e.g., defense, telecom, etc.), recognizes the importance of global interoperability, and is based on an “open, agnostic” architecture.
 - (d) Develop and execute multi-modal ITS strategies as identified through an assessment of activities underway in each of the modal administrations. Engage the modal administrations and national modal associations (e.g., AASHTO, APTA, AMPO, etc.) in these strategies.
 - (e) Work toward an ITS program that contributes to a sustainable transportation system that supports economic development, environmental protection, and social equity. Propose the key metrics for each of these sustainability objectives and the data collection required as deployment occurs.
 - (f) Recommend program-level performance metrics, including metrics for the recommendations of the other two subcommittees, for review by the ITS PAC and implement them as an integral part of an ongoing independent evaluation to measure specific outcomes against expectations.
- (5) Following are the major points raised during the subsequent discussion:
- (a) Dr. Sussman commented that Ms. Flemer raised a good question about whether the ITS PAC recommendations should more explicit about their focus on the overall ITS program instead of on just the ITS JPO. Mr. Denaro recommended that the proper place to address this focus issue is the ITS PAC advisory memorandum’s program evaluation and strategy section.

- (b) Ms. Row stated that the subcommittee's recommendations, particularly the italicized portions in the subcommittee's written report, would be extremely difficult, time-consuming, and costly to implement, and that she is not sure what the desired outcomes are. Therefore, she requested additional discussion to better define those desired outcomes. Ms. Flemer agreed with Ms. Row's request, adding that the challenge is to determine whether the recommendations should be actionable at the ITS JPO level or the overall ITS program level.
- (c) Mr. Vondale stated that the subcommittee's understanding had been that the ITS PAC was advising the ITS JPO and not the broader ITS program. He added that broadening the subcommittee's recommendations beyond the ITS JPO would create many issues, so this topic should be further discussed. Ms. Row emphasized her earlier statement that if ITS PAC recommendations are directed only at the ITS JPO level, this would do a disservice to ITS work performed by, for example, FHWA, which works hard with State DOTs and local governments to deploy ITS. Ms. Row recommended that ITS PAC recommendations look more broadly at the Federal ITS program, and not at the ITS JPO role in the program.
- (d) Dr. Sussman recommended a detailed discussion of subcommittee recommendation #4 that recommends the ITS JPO provide the ITS PAC a budget breakdown by mode to determine whether sufficient resources are allocated to support meaningful multimodal strategies. If the concern is that the ITS program is heavily biased toward highway research, Dr. Sussman asked whether there is a way to allay that fear without putting the U.S. DOT modes through "an extraordinary fire drill" to develop budget breakdowns? Ms. Row responded that ITS funds previously were allocated by mode, but that this was counterproductive because the modes measured themselves based on budget allocations, which fragmented, rather than enhanced modal relationships. Therefore, more recently ITS program funds have been allocated on a functional, rather than a modal basis. Ms. Row asked if there are other ways the committee could evaluate ITS program multimodalism? Mr. Denaro recommended that the subcommittee consider redefining the metrics of this recommendation during the subcommittee breakout discussions.
- (e) Mr. Denaro noted that the meeting was behind schedule and suggested that discussions could continue during the lunch period, the subcommittee breakout sections, and the plenary session. The committee adjourned for lunch.
- (f) Dr. Sussman turned the meeting over to Mr. Denaro for the first of three lunch-time presentations, the first on the May 23, 2011, Wireless Innovation (WIN) Initiative for Transportation Roundtable meeting.

e. WIN Initiative for Transportation Roundtable Meeting

(1) The PowerPoint file that Mr. Denaro used to aid his presentation, "WIN for Transportation," is available in the Meeting Handouts section of the June 17, 2011 meeting section of the ITS PAC Website at <http://www.its.dot.gov/itspac/index.htm>. Following are key points of the presentation.

(a) The May 23, 2011, WIN for Transportation Roundtable meeting was sponsored by Mr. Aneesh Chopra, the White House Chief Technology Officer, to discuss the potential surface transportation opportunities of widespread wireless broadband.

(b) WIN for Transportation is part of President Obama's WIN initiative proposed legislation that would authorize \$3 billion to drive innovation, including \$100 million for transportation over a 5-year period.

(c) Proposed elements of the WIN for Transportation program are:

- Use "living laboratories" in a competitively-selected region or corridor where innovative wireless communication methods and applications can be safely evaluated in an operating environment. These living laboratories would leverage public and private investments.
- Create broadband wireless "fast lanes" for multi-modal transportation applications for real-time safety inspections, reporting, and nationwide access, including in underserved rural areas and at border crossings.
- Work with state inspection and public safety partners, along with other Federal agencies, to deploy rural wireless access points in areas of critical need for enhanced emergency communications.
- Require that all applications discourage distracted driving/operations and uncover advances that can work to reduce driver workload.

(d) A major focus of the program will be safety, with particular emphasis on rural applications.

(e) Invitees to the WIN for Transportation roundtable were asked to answer three questions on:

- Key communications challenges facing surface transportation.
- Lessons learned in successfully deploying wireless communications.
- Pitfalls which the government should be aware of in its efforts to collaborate on these matters.

The answers to these questions reflected three major areas of common interest:

- Policy needs versus technology.
- Interoperability of standards.
- Innovation of applications using V2X.

- (f) Mr. Denaro reviewed his company's responses to the meeting advance questions.
 - (g) Dr. Giuliano commented that \$100 million is insufficient considering what is needed to deploy ITS technologies. Ms. Row clarified that the \$100 million is not intended for deployment, but to provide seed money to incentivize innovation in surface transportation using wireless technology.
 - (h) There being no further discussion of the WIN for Transportation Roundtable meeting, Dr. Sussman turned the meeting over to Dr. Sweatman for his presentation on ITS PAC further engagement with Mr. Aneesh Chopra, White House Chief Technology Officer.
- f. Further Engagement with Mr. Aneesh Chopra, White House Chief Technology Officer
- (1) Dr. Sweatman stated that the proposed objective of a White House summit to be held in collaboration with Mr. Chopra is to accelerate ITS deployment in the U.S. for near term advances in highway safety, mobility, energy, and environmental performance.
 - (2) The subcommittee identified the following proposed summit goals:
 - (a) Evaluate and close the gap between government ITS research and the innovation efforts of private sector players (major industries and entrepreneurs).
 - (b) Leverage the best communication and other types of technologies from within and outside the transportation sector.
 - (c) Accelerate the deployment of beneficial ITS technologies by the public and private sectors across all modes.
 - (3) The subcommittee also identified the following desired summit outcomes:
 - (a) Identification of White House and U.S. DOT actions to accelerate ITS deployment.
 - (b) Ensuring that government ITS initiatives in technology R&D will encourage and facilitate innovation and ITS deployment by private industry, and will encompass technology developed by aftermarket suppliers as well as Original Equipment Manufacturers.
 - (c) Identification of barriers to deployment and ways that legislators may act to accelerate ITS deployment for safety, mobility, energy, and the environment.
 - (4) The subcommittee identified the following proposed summit discussion topics:

- (a) Alignment and synergy between government research and development and initiatives in the private automotive and telecommunications industries.
 - (b) Bridging Federal Government research and development activities to adoption and deployment by State and local agencies.
 - (c) Identifying barriers and potential solutions to accelerating deployment of ITS, V2X, and other key technologies to achieve target results earlier.
 - (d) Development of an open communication platform for vehicles (private, freight, and transit) that will attract entrepreneurs and lead to innovation for safety, mobility, energy, and the environment.
 - (e) Creation of a value chain for transportation data extending across all modes and addressing data ownership, security, and brokerage.
- (5) Dr. Sussman asked whether the intent is for ITS JPO/RITA to take the lead in planning the summit and making the contact with Mr. Chopra? Mr. Denaro responded that his recollection of previous committee discussions was that the ITS PAC would develop the plan for a fall 2011 meeting, and that the ITS JPO would make the contact with Mr. Chopra.
- (6) Concerning the desired summit outcome, Dr. Bertini stated that Mr. Chopra had expressed interest in determining what needed to be done to accelerate DSRC implementation.
- (7) Ms. Row offered the following points based on ITS JPO recent experience with the WIN for Transportation roundtable:
- (a) Selection of participants is key to success.
 - (b) The ITS PAC must be “crystal clear” on the desired summit outcome.
 - (c) “Pre-work” is essential to getting the participants and Mr. Chopra focused. For the WIN roundtable, Mr. Chopra read, understood, and assimilated all the meeting advance materials.
 - (d) Mr. Chopra will want to facilitate the summit.
 - (e) There should be no PowerPoint or other formal presentations – only conversation.
 - (f) The summit duration should be no more than two or three hours.

- (8) Mr. Denaro stated that, based on a two to three hour meeting duration, the committee should revise its plan for the meeting and focus on one main desired outcome that Mr. Chopra could uniquely influence. Dr. Sussman recommended that this singular desired outcome could be achieving U.S. government involvement in standards issues at more senior levels.
- (9) Other potential summit desired outcomes were addressed during the subsequent committee discussion. There was general agreement among those who are familiar with Mr. Chopra's working style that his strengths are in technology and in bringing people together to resolve issues that previously have proven difficult to resolve.
- (10) Ms. Row recommended that, to schedule the summit before December, the committee should agree on the desired outcome soon and within the next month. Dr. Sussman stated that Ms. Row's advice that the summit desired outcome must be "crisp" was exceptional advice.
- (11) Dr. Sussman asked if there was additional discussion on the White House summit. There being none, Dr. Sussman requested input on the state of transportation reauthorization.

g. State of Transportation Reauthorization Legislation

- (1) Dr. Bertini stated that the only significant change the President's proposed 2012 budget makes to the ITS program is the \$100 million WIN fund over a five-year period. He added that the Administration and the U.S. DOT proposals are available online.
- (2) Dr. Sussman stated that during the ITS PAC March meeting in Ypsilanti, Michigan, the comment was made that it was unlikely that transportation reauthorization legislation would be enacted prior to the 2012 Presidential election, and requested information on the likely schedule. Mr. Belcher summarized major factors that will impact the upcoming transportation reauthorization legislative process, and concluded that, considering all factors, including the major National debt ceiling debate, there is a little better than an even chance that legislation will be enacted in 2011.
- (3) Dr. Sussman agreed to Mr. Belcher's request to provide information on the October 16 – 20, 2011, World Congress on ITS in Orlando, Florida.

h. 18th World Congress on ITS

- (1) Mr. Belcher stated that the World Congress will include:
 - (a) A focus on the role of transportation on the economy.
 - (b) Approximately 10,000 participants from over 70 countries.

(c) “Big-name” speakers, including:

- Ray LaHood, Secretary of Transportation
- Bill Ford, Executive Chairman, Ford Motor Company
- Tom Stephens, Vice Chairman, General Motors
- Ben Verwaayen, CEO, Alcatel-Lucent
- Deborah Hersman, Chairman, NTSB
- Six or seven U.S. DOT modal administrators

(d) Participation by government transportation ministers from around the world.

(e) 250 technical sessions; and public and private sector, safety, and modal administrator plenary sessions.

(f) About 25 safety, mobility, sustainability, and pricing demonstrations.

(g) Over 250 exhibitors.

(h) A First Responders’ Day and Students’ Day, including free admission.

(i) An Investor Matching Day to link investment capital firms with entrepreneurs and other companies looking for money.

(2) Ms. Row stated that U.S. DOT plans to raise the profile of international standards harmonization at the World Congress by addressing the issue at one of the scheduled sessions and by requesting that Peter Appel and his EU counterpart address the issue in their scheduled remarks.

(3) Mr. Albert asked if the ITS PAC could hold its next meeting in conjunction with the World Congress. There was a brief discussion, without decision, of the options of holding an ITS PAC meeting on the Saturday or Sunday prior to the congress, or on the Friday following the congress.

(4) Dr. Sussman observed that the meeting had fallen behind the agenda schedule and closed the ITS World Congress discussion.

i. Subcommittee Breakout Discussions

(1) Dr. Sussman recommended two options for the balance of the meeting time: (1) hold subcommittee breakout meetings as scheduled, or (2) continue in plenary session to plan the finalization of the committee’s next advisory memorandum.

(2) Following a brief discussion of the two options, Dr. Sussman announced that the meeting would continue with subcommittee breakout sessions, and that the committee would return to plenary session if time permitted. Before dismissing the

subcommittees to their breakout sessions, Dr. Sussman emphasized that the following two points had been strongly made during the committee's deliberations:

- (a) Subcommittees need to "toughen up, sharpen up" their recommendations because, while they are good, they are "a little plain vanilla...."
- (b) ITS PAC recommendations should address the ITS program at the federal versus the ITS JPO level.

j. Adjourn

Time constraints did not permit the committee to return to plenary session. The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. without further action.

k. Post-meeting Committee Action

On June 26, Dr. Sussman transmitted an e-mail to ITS PAC members with the following major points (a copy of the e-mail, Subject: Moving Forward from June 17 Meeting, is available in the Meeting Documents Section of the June 17, 2011, meeting section of the ITS PAC Website at <http://www.its.dot.gov/itspac/index.htm>):

- (1) Updated subcommittee reports are due to Dr. Sussman and Mr. Denaro no later than Monday, August 1.**
- (2) ITS JPO staff members are available to participate in subcommittee discussions, provide briefings on specific topic areas, and help arrange conference calls and Webinars. To take advantage of their expertise, they should be contacted directly or through Shelley Row, John Augustine, or Valerie Briggs.
- (3) There likely will be an ITS PAC conference call in August to ensure committee consensus on the final recommendations before Dr. Sussman and Mr. Denaro draft the final advisory memorandum.
- (4) Subcommittee draft recommendations to date, while sensible for the most part, seemed somewhat bland and muted. More assertive statements from the ITS PAC would be more effective.

We hereby certify, to the best of our knowledge, that the foregoing minutes are accurate and complete.



Shelley Row, P.E., PTOE
Director, Intelligent Transportation
Systems Joint Program Office
Research and Innovative Technology
Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation



Joseph M. Sussman, Ph.D.
Committee Chairman
JR East Professor of Civil and Environmental
Engineering Systems
Department of Civil and Environmental
Engineering and Engineering Systems Division
Massachusetts Institute of Technology