

Technical Support and Strategic Plan Development Services for NYSDOT Statewide ITS Program

Task 2A Workshop

Workshop Notes – September 23, 2005

A workshop was held at the NYSDOT Region 8 Hudson Valley Traffic Management Center in Hawthorne, New York on September 23, 2005. The purpose of the workshop was to review and gather feedback on a process to incorporate regional ITS architecture and ITS standards into NYSDOT's Project Development Process.

A copy of the attendance sheet are attached at the end of these minutes.

Introductions

After a brief overview of the workshop agenda, introductions were made. Each attendee was asked to introduce himself/herself and their role in ITS.

Exercise #1

Began the workshop with an exercise with an incident scenario to set the context. Split up into 3 groups, and each group was asked to write on a piece of paper whom they would contact and what information to convey.

Each group presented their results.

Overview – ITS Standards

Provided a short overview on ITS standards.

Overview – How to ITS Standards Fit into the NYSDOT Project Development Process

In NYSDOT Region 10, the IPP (Initial Project Proposal) comes first before the TIP (Transportation Improvement Plan) - if it needs federal funds, the project must be added to the TIP. Region 10 used to have a Long Range Plan (LRP), but since they don't use it any more, it goes directly to the IPP. Sometimes has a blockout – need to do the study first with the knowledge that something (some project) is going to happen, but not sure what - not enough information until the study is completed, but we know the project will happen in 2 years.

Without completing an IPP, there is no PIN (Project Identification Number). Projects get ranked and voted on by the TCC (Transportation Coordinating Committee), especially for CMAQ funding. For NYSDOT, the PIN gets assigned when the IPP is approved.

IPP is for the NYSDOT, but if you want federal funding, it may be approved by the NYSDOT, but not approved by the MPO. You still have to apply to the MPO for inclusion on the TIP. Sometimes, the MPO will accept the IPP as the application for inclusion on the TIP, or it may have its own application.

Noted that Rule 940 doesn't blatantly say that the TIP has to be consistent with the architecture.

The question was posed, Should the onus be on the MPOs or the engineers submitting the projects to check for consistency with the architecture?

Mike Shauer believes the PSEA (project systems engineering analysis) is part of the preliminary design.

Need to mention transit in the guideline.

Break

The sections on concept of operations and design phase IV needs to be streamlined. Region 8, 10 and 11 are level 3, full deployment. It's mostly cut and paste for these regions when completing IPPs. Prior to the Project Development Manual, was a 3 step for Region 10: the IPP, Scope Summary Memorandum, and Final Design Report.

The group agreed it would like to see a Qualified Products List (QPL) for ITS standards, or maybe a standards specification for NYSDOT. Create a checklist of ITS standards - they have one for environmental stuff. Maybe a good start anyway. State recommendation is buy off state-furnished equipment or contractor provided. Add design-build to the PDM.

Each region needs their ITS deployment plan, it is this deployment plan that ITS projects are derived from. Is there enough detail in the deployment plan to complete a detailed design report? Probably not – still need spacing and actual equipment location, as opposed to as approximate locations (reference). Note: The EDP is the ITS deployment plan. Still need to consider environmental conditions.

Interesting point – Detailed Design Reports are really for roadways which is reviewed by the Main Office. However, for ITS projects, no one currently in the Main Office is reviewing it. So what's the point?

The discussion focused on that the reports are several hundred pages, which are similar or exact from other reports, just redone. For INFORM, which has an existing system, and they have a specific ITS device involved. They know what they want, many of the PDM requirements should have a N/A checkbox, so they can skip.

Perhaps there should be two (2) project development processes – one full, detailed process for regions where ITS deployment is just beginning, and one streamlined process for regions where ITS deployment is mature.

The abnormal conditions does not belong in the detailed design report, but belongs in the Advanced Detail Plans (ADPs). The start of Design Phase 1 is the Preliminary Design Report. ADPs come out maybe 2-3 months before the PS&E – so if there's a problem...that's a major problem because it may be too late to change.

It was suggested that each Region define its PRL/PICS (Project Requirements List/Profile Implementation Conformance Statements) and then at some point have a harmonization effort to bring them (the Regions) together. Especially for Center-to-Field standards, less so for C2C (Center-to-Center). More standardization is possible for C2C

since you need to communicate across all centers and center-types of NYSDOT. This would be the document that all specs would “point to” from an ADP and MAYBE tailored for the PS&E.

Comments

The moderators solicited comments from the participants on the structure and content of the workshop.

Have separate sections or workshops for transportation planners and designers. The emphasis and interests are different.

It’s really the consultants that need to be trained, not the NYSDOT project managers. Maybe the consultants need to be certified.

Consider standardizing how to perform the PSEA for the state. Perhaps develop it so that the PSEA can be a checklist?

We believe that these notes are an accurate depiction of the discussions, agreements, and issues discussed at the meeting. If there are any additional comments, additions or clarifications needed, please contact or e-mail to Patrick Chan (718-767-5120, patrick.chan@consystec.com).

Workshop Attendees

Region 8 Hudson Valley Traffic Management Center
(Hawthorne)
Friday, September 23, 2005

Name	Phone	Work Location	email
Region 8			
Santana, George	914-742-6010	HVTMC	gsantana@dot.state.ny.us
Duval, Mike	914-742-6004	HVTMC	mduval@dot.state.ny.us
Cusack, Maggie	914-742-6014	HVTMC	mcusack@dot.state.ny.us
Vagnini, Giselle	914-742-6016	HVTMC	gvagnini@dot.state.ny.us
Shanahan, Jean	845-431-5768	Reg 8 - Planning MPO Unit	jshanahan@dot.state.ny.us
Gunsch, Jean	845-431-5725	Reg 8 - Planning MPO Unit	jgunsch@dot.state.ny.us
Debald, Mark	845-486-3600	PDCTC	mdebald@co.dutchess.ny.us
Wrafter, Eoin	845-486-3600	PDCTC	ewrafter@co.dutchess.ny.us
Coots, Daniel	845-431-7930	Mid-Hudson South Transp. Coordinating Committee	dcoots@dot.state.ny.us
Region 10			
Sosa, Emilio	631-952-6733	INFORM	esosa@dot.state.ny.us
German, Paula	631-952-6736	INFORM	pgerman@dot.state.ny.us
Varughese, Maya	631-952-6951	Reg 10 - Planning	
Region 11			
Lai, Fred	718-482-4745	Region 11 - Traffic	fred.lai@dot.state.ny.us
Amin, Raj	718-482-4734	Region 11 - Traffic	ramin@dot.state.ny.us
Mamone, Salvatore		NYMTC	smamone@dot.state.ny.us
Drits, David	718-482-6596	NYMTC	ddrits@dot.state.ny.us
Saunders, Truman	718-482-4737	Region 11	tsaunders@dot.state.ny.us
Chiao, Kuo-Ann	212-383-7212	NYMTC	kchiao@dot.state.ny.us
FHWA			
Mike Shauer	518-431-4125	FHWA	michael.shauer@fhwa.dot.gov
NYSDOT – MO			
Bassett, John	518-457-2384	MO - ITS	jbassett@dot.state.ny.us
Moderators			
Manny Insignares	212-687-7911	ConSysTec	manny.insignares@consystec.com
Patrick Chan	718-767-5120	ConSysTec	patrick.chan@consystec.com
Sheryl Nichols	585-797-2276	Siemens ITS	sheryl.nichols@itssiemens.com
Raman K. Patel		RKPatel & Associates	rkpatelassociates@msn.com