



Appendix Q: Steering Committee Meetings

CONTENTS

Meeting #1	December 4, 2003	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #2	January 22, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #3	February 26, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #4	April 1, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #5	May 6, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting #6	July 7, 2004	Agenda and Meeting Minutes
Meeting	July 7, 2004	Meeting Minutes from Joint RVMPO Committees Meeting

Agenda- Kick-Off Meeting

Time, Date: 9 a.m., Thursday, December 4

Location: RVTD Conference Room, 3200 Crater Lake Avenue, Medford

Conference Call-In Number: (541) 608-2421

Contact: Vicki Guarino, RVCOG- (541) 664-6676 ext. 241

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions (5 min) Alex Georgevitch
Approve minutes; public comment
 2. Project Introduction (15 min)..... Galen McGill
 3. Project Overview (20 min).....Jim Peters
 - A. Scope of Work
 - B. Project Schedule
 4. Stakeholder Consensus (15 min).....Jim Peters
 - A. Key Stakeholders (main contact and back-up)
 - B. Expanded Stakeholders
 5. Information Needed by DKS (10 min).....Jim Peters

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic signal locations and controller details • Traffic signal systems (twisted pair, fiber, radio, WAN, etc.) • Hardware and software system platforms • Leased lines, phone drops • System detectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITS devices (CCTV cameras, dynamic message signs, etc.) • Communications infrastructure • Bus priority equipment • Transit infrastructure • Existing and future (2023) traffic volumes, V/C, and LOS for 10 project corridors
--	---
 6. List of Documents to Review (up to 6) (10 min)Jim Peters
 7. Project Expectations (20 min)Jim Peters
 8. Mission, Goals, and Objectives (30 min).....Jim Peters
 9. Next Steps (10 min).....Jim Peters
 10. Other..... Alex Georgevitch



Meeting Minutes Project Kick-Off Meeting December 4, 2003, RVTD Conference Room

Attendees: Sue D’Agnese, Shirley Roberts, Galen McGill, Larry McKinley, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Jerry Barnes, Medford; Dan Moore, Julie Rodwell, Chris Olivier, Vicki Guarino, RVCOG; Scott Chancey, RVTD; Jeff Proulx, OSP; Hau Hagedorn, Castle Rock Consultants; Nathaniel Price, FHWA; Millie Tirapelle, Arlen Hatlestad, S. Ore. Regional 911; Peter Coffey, Renee Hurtado, Jim Peters, DKS Associates.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of MinutesAlex Georgevitch

After meeting participants introduced themselves, Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order. Minutes from the May 15, 2003, meeting were approved as presented.

2. Project Introduction Galen McGill

Galen gave a brief overview of ITS, saying a plan is required by April 2005 for the region to qualify for Federal Highway Administration funds. The plan addresses traffic management devices such as signals. Each agency has its own systems and the idea of ITS is to have them work together. Much of that compatibility already is happening in the Medford area. This project will be directed by two groups: a steering committee of representatives of agencies that are key to the project’s success, and an expanded stakeholder group which includes smaller communities, agencies and others interested in the plan.

3. Project Overview..... Jim Peters

Jim presented an outline of the project with PowerPoint, listing key project participants and the scope of work. The plan will include a needs assessment, which will be based largely on information from key local agencies. The work will follow a top-down, bottom-up approach. Top- down approach will involve applying the ITS architecture format to local projects and needs; the bottom-up approach will involve gathering the local information and framing it within the architecture. The project and deployment will have a 20-year horizon so it can be visionary.

A project schedule was distributed. Renee Hurtado said the task of identifying existing conditions will be done through the inventory and interviews. The plan will build on existing conditions and needs. A questionnaire will be sent to the expanded stakeholder group.

The group reviewed the corridors covered in the statement of work and agreed that the list seemed adequate. Jim said the area probably could be expanded if necessary as work proceeds. The ITS plan will assure that necessary agencies work in coordination and that ways are found to share information, such as road conditions for travelers. It will focus on ways to improve



transportation for the general public rather than for a particular segment, such as the trucking industry. The regional architecture will show connections and a circuitry for information. It also will identify the agency responsible for carrying out specific aspects of the plan.

The group discussed potential benefits for agencies. Jim said the value of the plan will depend on agency input, so that projects address identified needs. Galen said local expertise is key to the usefulness of the plan. The plan won't necessarily solve all problems, but it should identify important problems.

The steering committee agreed to meet monthly, with meetings timed around the release of a draft document, which will be reviewed at the meeting. Millie Tirapelle said the SORC center has a larger conference room that may be more comfortable. She would check on its availability.

Jim said that an open house session in February, coordinated by RVCOG, would focus on information from the expanded-stakeholder group. Vicki Guarino said the open house will present the project's findings to date to the public and stakeholders who haven't been actively participating in the work. Additional, useful information for the ITS plan may be obtained at this event. Galen was concerned that the project not rely on the open house to gather necessary information from key sources. It was agreed that key sources would be contacted separately, perhaps in a smaller, daytime meeting on the same day as the open house, where information could be obtained in a more guided fashion.

Project information also would be presented to the RVMPO TAC, PAC and Policy Committee.

4. Stakeholder Consensus..... Jim Peters

Jim presented the draft lists of key stakeholders and expanded stakeholders. The committee decided to include smaller jurisdictions such as Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Phoenix, and Talent as expanded stakeholders. They will be included in project notifications and their representatives can decide how active they will be. Dan Moore asked about private sector participation, groups such as AAA and Oregon Truckers. Arlen Hatlestad suggested that fiber optic companies be included. Others suggested that the news media be included in light of their participation in issuing emergency warnings. Captain Rodriguez (OSP) or Dave Abbott (Jackson County Sheriff's Office) may have a contact list for media technical personnel that would be appropriate to include as expanded stakeholders. The California-Oregon Advanced Transportation Systems (COATS) should be reviewed for appropriate information. Alex noted that Medford has a project to create a fiber optic link to OSP. There was brief discussion of the recent activation of the Amber Alert system after a toddler was kidnapped, and a passing motorist alerted by the system was instrumental in the recovery. The committee agreed that the military would not be directly involved in RVITS. The private industry representatives (trucking, fiber optic companies, cell phone companies) would be invited to the open house.

Key stakeholders for RVITS were identified as Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Jackson County, RVCOG, RVTD, ODOT and FHWA.



5. Information Needed by DKS Jim Peters

Jim presented a brief list (on agenda) of information needs, but said he will email a more detailed list. Most of the information would come in the interviews. Julie Rodwell said she would like to have all traffic count data and data collection in RVMPO projects be integrated.

6. List of Documents to Review..... Jim Peters

Jim presented a list of documents that will be reviewed as part of the existing conditions chapter. The committee agreed to add COATS and ODOT’s Economic and Bridge Options Report. Julie said she will coordinate the list with DKS because there may be other reports that should be included.

7. Project Expectations Jim Peters

Participants listed expectations as follows:

Alex Georgevitch: Identifying software to share information from traffic cameras and other sources, and creating data bases that can be shared, such as accident data.

Dan Moore: The RVMPO needs to meet federal requirements by deadline. He hopes the plan will alleviate congestion, be integrated with emergency management providers, improve safety and incident response, provide real-time traveler information, and provide opportunities for public-private partnerships.

Sue D’Agnese: ODOT traffic management is undertaking projects, but information about projects needs to be better communicated, and duplication avoided.

Jeff Proulx: Oregon State Police wants to do whatever possible to reduce accidents on State and County roadways and to keep the roads clear.

Scott Chancey: RVTD wants to further efforts for transit signal prioritization.

Galen McGill: wants the plan to be well-coordinated so that it is effective, identifies agencies’ current projects and needs, and establishes long-term relationships. He also wants to see automated data sharing.

Shirley Roberts: said her role is to support the project, and agreed with others’ comments.

Julie Rodwell: wants to see public understanding the plan, and integrate the plan with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Larry McKinley: said it is important that various agencies’ systems be integrated, secure communications interfaces be set up, and resources to be shared.

Arlen Hatlestad: wants to address ways to integrate the Internet with ITS for information dissemination and for secure access by public agencies. Galen noted that raw data is posted on ODOT’s ftp site, but many people do not know about it.



Millie Tirapelle: said the challenge is to integrate users and communicate information about resources, such as ODOT's highway cameras. She hopes the project brings some cohesion to agencies and better information sharing despite limited funds. Alex noted that a communications network for emergency-services vehicles is expanding beyond Medford. Central Point has a wireless network linking patrol cars to city hall, and is linking patrol cars to cameras in the field.

Nathaniel Price: noted the importance of fiber links, but among smaller agencies the facilities and resources will differ widely. He wants to make sure the RVITS plan is something that is used and updated. It should identify areas of integration, and ways to incorporate ITS features into construction projects. Federal funds have been set aside for building ITS projects.

Jerry Barnes: said the public often is critical of the way transportation funds are spent, but this project presents an opportunity to show efforts toward efficiency, coordination and effective use of public money.

8. Mission, Goals, and Objectives..... Jim Peters

Jim led the committee in a roundtable discussion, recording suggestions with PowerPoint. He said he would compile comments into draft mission statement, goals and objectives and distribute the draft by email to meeting participants. Goals include safety, efficiency, security, improved real-time information, increased public awareness, system integration. Jim said the goals will be used near the end of the study for project scoring.

9. Next MeetingAlex Georgevitch

The group agreed that a meeting room with a larger table would be more comfortable. Millie Tirapelle said she would check on the availability of the SORC conference room. Jim noted that tentative meeting dates are listed on the project schedule and asked meeting participants to mark these on their calendars and check for future conflicts. Meetings will be Thursdays, 9 -11 a.m. The next meeting will be at 9 a.m. Jan. 22, 2004, tentatively at Southern Oregon Regional Communications conference room, 4th floor of the Jackson County Courthouse, 10 S. Oakdale Ave., Medford. (Note: Use the Facility Maintenance and Handicap Entrance at the back of the building to get to SORC's office.)

10. OtherAlex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch adjourned the meeting at 10:50 a.m.



Agenda- Steering Committee Meeting #2

Time, Date: 9 a.m., Thursday, January 22, 2004

Location: SORC Boardroom, 4th Floor, Jackson County Courthouse, 10 South Oakdale Avenue, Medford

Conference Call-In Number: Call contact number below by Jan. 21 to arrange this service.

Contact: Dan Moore, RVCOG - (541) 664-6676 ext. 217

-
1. Call to Order/Introductions Alex Georgevitch
 2. Review/Approve Minutes Alex Georgevitch
 3. Public Comment Alex Georgevitch
 4. Mission, Goals, and Objectives (15 min).....Jim Peters
Background: The working group in the last meeting discussed draft goals.
Action Requested: Finalize project mission, goals, and objectives.
 5. Project Update (10 min)Jim Peters
A. Existing Conditions (15 min)
B. Interview Results/Status (30 min)
 6. Expanded Stakeholder Meeting (15 min).....Jim Peters
A. Finalize Expanded Stakeholder List
B. Discuss Meeting Format
C. Finalize Meeting Location
 7. Next Steps (10 min).....Jim Peters
 8. Other Business..... Alex Georgevitch
 9. Next Meeting: February 26, 2004 Alex Georgevitch
 10. Adjourn



Meeting Minutes Steering Committee Meeting #2 January 22, 2004, SORC Conference Room

Attendees: Sue D’Agnese, Galen McGill, Larry McKinley, ODOT; Alex Georgevitch, Medford; Dan Moore, Chris Olivier, Kathy Helmer, RVCOG; Mathew Barnes, RVTD; Nathaniel (“Nate”) Price, FHWA; Arlen Hatlestad, Southern Oregon Regional Communications; Jim Wear, Phoenix.

Teleconferencers: Peter Coffey, Renee Hurtado, Jim Peters, DKS Associates.

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Approval of MinutesAlex Georgevitch

Alex Georgevitch called the meeting to order at 9:08 AM. The minutes of the Dec.4. 2003, meeting were approved as presented. Jim Peters apologized for DKS staff not attending the meeting in person; their plane had been returned due to fog. In the future, they will drive to Medford.

2. Public Comment.....Alex Georgevitch

There was no public comment.

3. Mission, Goals, and Objectives..... Jim Peters

Jim led the group in reviewing the drafted mission, goals and objectives, as per the handout. The group agreed that the mission statement was good as is.

Regarding Goal 2, Alex inquired about the applicability of the phrase “for non-motorized modes” in the second objective. The group agreed that the objective should be changed to “for all modes.”

Dan asked if the objective of meeting federal requirements needed to be added to the list. Nate replied that complying was enough; it did not have to be listed.

Regarding the first objective under Goal 5, Alex asked why “building consensus among the Steering Committee members” was included, since it was part of the current process. Galen said that the sheet was lacking the objective of developing long-term partnerships to carry forward the coordination. The group agreed that the fourth objective should be changed to read “Continue to coordinate and integrate projects with other agencies.”

Dan asked if there was going to be an ongoing need for an ITS Committee, and if so, what activities would it undertake over time. A budget for continued committee coordination would



need to be developed. Galen noted that there would be a wide array of potential activities. The committee might become an MPO subcommittee that proposes regional projects or defines project pieces. Nate noted that there is a requirement to update the plan over time. The plan is to present an implementation plan; there will be a discussion of how to continue in the future. The group suggested that there would likely be two regular meetings each year and maybe a couple of special meetings regarding special projects. Jim noted that the group needed to consider managing the whole communications infrastructure. This group would develop intergovernmental agreements and memoranda of understanding.

4. Project Update..... Jim Peters

Jim asked for people's comments on the draft Chapter 1 regarding Current & Future Transportation Conditions. He noted that comments are needed by 1/30/04. Some of the maps have yet to be finished.

Regarding the table on page 1-3, the group discussed how best to refer to the various interchanges and agreed that the I-5 exit numbers should be used for consistency. There are local names for the interchanges, but it is best to use the exit numbers.

The OSP office on Hwy 99 needs to be added to Figure 1-2.

In response to a question by Alex, Galen said that the maps will be in color and everyone to receive the report will receive a disc with color.

Jim noted that Figures 1-3 and 1-4 on congestion were not yet done; DKS is waiting for the information from the smaller towns.

Alex said that some traffic signals might be counted twice since Medford maintains some that are not owned by the City. Larry and Sue felt confident that they had not been doubled counted; some of the new signals are actually missing. Jim asked that the people responsible for each item review them for accuracy.

Alex asked that the RTP Policy about removing unwarranted signals be included somewhere in the report. This is an effort to improve efficiency. Jim said he would add it to section 1.13.5.

Regarding the crash data, Chris reported that he has 3 data sets in different formats. RVCOG has mapped some of the corridors; the state has mapped some. Medford has lots of data, but has not mapped it. This report calls for "high collision locations" and will require some data refinement. Jim suggested that Chris could use the SPIS calculations and just use each agency's format, rather than trying to put them all into the same format. Jim said that they just wanted the top accident locations. What is still needed is information from the other jurisdictions. Jim said that he, Renee and Chris would talk and organize to gather the data. Jim will contact Eric Niemeyer for county data. Alex will send Medford's data to DKS.

Alex mentioned that Figures 1-3 and 1-4 are a problem for him since the volume-to-capacity ratios are based on raw numbers from the travel demand model. Jim asked him to look at it as a starting point. Alex said he has v/c ratios for the intersections from a Citywide Synchro model and will give it to Jim to use for Figures 1-3 and 1-4.



The Oregon Highway model and the new MPO model are due out by the end of the fiscal year. The group agreed that they will go with the best information available now. If the model were done by June, then that information may be incorporated as appropriate.

The group discussed information that is still needed, which includes: the I-5 Alternate Route Plan, the I-5 Viaduct Alternate Route Plan, the Commuter Rail Feasibility Study ,the Traffic Management Plan for the new amphitheater, and a ranked list of County issues. Sue said she would get both I-5 alternate route plans from Bob Sechler and talk with John Vial regarding a traffic management plan for the new amphitheater. Jim will ask about whether a Jackson Co. Homeland Security Plan exists and if it is generally available. Dan will get the Commuter Rail study. Sue mentioned that Parametrix put together a list of ranked County issues and she will look into obtaining a copy of this documentation.

5. Expanded Stakeholder Meeting Jim Peters

Jim asked the group for their recommendations regarding public involvement aspects. Jim said he planned to have three events on February 26th: a meeting for other interested agencies, a Steering Committee meeting, and a public Open House. Dan said it would be a benefit to invite the public into the process at this time; he was particularly interested in inviting the MPO PAC, TAC and Policy Committee. Alex did not think that public input would be so helpful at the front end of this project since public turnout is virtually nonexistent for planning projects; he felt it would be better to wait until more work was accomplished and there was something for the public to review.

Ultimately, the group agreed that a meeting would be held from 9:30 AM to 11:30 AM, on Feb.26 for the “expanded stakeholder” group of other interested agencies and targeted members of the public, including such groups as the MPO PAC and TAC. Lunch will be brought in for the Steering Committee and that group will meet from Noon to 2 PM.

Regarding the expanded stakeholder list, Alex wanted Bill Hoke’s name to be added. Dan suggested that TRADCO be added, as well as the local Freight Advisory Committee. RVCOG will put together a mailing list and send out a DKS brochure on ITS along with an agenda for the Feb.26th morning meeting. DKS will prepare handouts for the meeting. Alex suggested that each agency or group send a representative, such as their Chair, rather than inviting several people from each group.

The meeting format will be: a starting presentation, followed by participants visiting a variety of stations manned by staff. Jim will work with RVCOG to determine a venue.

Jim shared some of what had been heard in stakeholder interviews. They heard a good deal about accidents on the I-5 viaduct, as well as closings of the Interstate due to the Siskiyou Pass closures in recent snowfalls. They heard many positive comments about work that had already been accomplished, such as the common dispatch of ODOT and OSP and the sharing of a CAD system by CCOM and SORC.

6. Next Steps Jim Peters

1/30/04 Comments are due on the Future & Current Transportation Conditions



2/12/04 Draft Needs Assessment Chapter will be ready for review
2/26/04 The Expanded Stakeholder and Steering Committee Meetings will be held
The next Steering Committee Meeting will focus on architecture, as well as the concept of operations.

7. Adjournment**Alex Georgevitch**

Alex adjourned the meeting at 10:50 AM.



Castle Rock Consultants