



## Vehicle Probe Project Committee Conference Call July 17, 2008 Minutes

Participants – see attached

### Agenda

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
1   Introductions and purpose for the meeting	Bill Stoeckert
2   Contractual Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Data Use Agreement Status</li><li>• New Jersey Coverage Expansion Status</li></ul>	Bill Stoeckert
3   Web Site and Data Feed <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monitoring Site Walkthrough, Issues and Roadmap</li><li>• Data Feed Status and Issues</li></ul>	Rick Schuman/ Jeff Summerson
4   Data Validation Issues	Phil Tarnoff
5   Agency Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Data Use activities and plan</li><li>• Agency feedback since July 1 launch</li><li>• Expansion Plans</li></ul>	All
6   Review of Action Items from this call	Karen Jehanian
7   Next Meeting	Karen Jehanian

### Welcome and Introductions

Bill Stoeckert opened the conference call at 10:00 a.m. by welcoming everyone and thanking those participating. The following is a summary of the discussion. The slide presentation and all Vehicle Probe (VP) Project information is available at: <http://www.i95coalition.org/vehicle-probe.html> (scroll to the topic area of your choice.)

### Contractual Issues

Bill Stoeckert reported on the status of the Data Use Agreements (DUA) for the various agencies:

1. Virginia's DUA has been signed with some minor issues to be resolved.
2. North Carolina's DUA is in process.
3. Pennsylvania has sent the documentation to its legal department for review.
4. All other states involved (New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland) have signed DUAs.

New Jersey's expansion Memo of Understanding (MOU) is very near completion. Bill stated that the I-95 Corridor Coalition is very excited and thanks INRIX for including the New Jersey expansion on the monitoring site since July 1<sup>st</sup>. In response to a question, Karen stated that the University of Maryland MOU was used as the contracting mechanism for the expansion.



*Action:*

Agencies without a signed DUA should review and forward it to their respective legal departments. These agencies should provide their legal department contact information to Kathy Frankle at [kfrankle@umd.edu](mailto:kfrankle@umd.edu).

**Web Site and Data Feed**

Rick Schuman explained that the monitoring site was successfully turned on July 1, 2008 and thanked everyone for their efforts. Currently 2800 center line miles are covered by this project and the resultant speed information is shown on the monitoring site. This includes 1500 Core Freeway miles, approximately 870 Core Arterial miles, and approximately 425 additional miles in New Jersey.

Rick Schuman introduced Jeff Summerson as the technical person in charge of the monitoring site for INRIX and the contact for website support. Jeff stated that once a participating agency has a signed DUA, it is able to sign up to view the monitoring site. Jeff walked the group through the steps to do so and explained that access should be granted within a day and an email confirmation notice will be sent. He explained that the monitoring site is best used with Internet Explorer 7. Internet Explorer 6 may be used but not all the features are available and transmission speeds will be slower. Fire Fox may also be used but the archive functions and pop up bubbles do not work well, if at all. Some members of the committee have explored the monitoring site and a conversation ensued regarding suggested changes. Jeff and Rick demonstrated several features on the monitoring site to the committee. Members provided comments which were noted by the project team and will be included in the comment review effort. Jeff Summerson is the contact to receive additional comments regarding the monitoring site. They should be sent to him at [i95Support@inrix.com](mailto:i95Support@inrix.com) by August 15, 2008. He will review all comments and conduct a meeting with the project team and INRIX to identify and prioritize improvements. The results and open issues will be presented to the committee.

INRIX demonstrated how archive data could be requested on the monitoring site. Once an agency has a signed DUA, they may request data from July 1, 2008 to present. Rick stated that the contract currently calls for three years of archived data to be maintained. When it gets closer to the end date, this issue may be revisited. Jeff noted that although requests for archive data may be made in local time, archive results are returned in Universal Time (GMT). Several members requested that the results be shown in the time requested. It was noted that providing data in GMT is a standard practice and that once the DOT's integrators are made aware of the format they will prepare a small conversion application to meet the internal needs of their respective agency.

Regarding Data Feed, INRIX stated that they are currently working with New Jersey and Virginia on API access for data integrators. It was noted that integrators should develop off of [devzone.inrix.com](http://devzone.inrix.com). Lastly, Jeff Summerson also noted that the monitoring site needs Java, Java Script and cookies turned on to function.

*Action:*

Agency contacts should review the monitoring site (version 1) and provide comments to Jeff Summerson at [i95Support@inrix.com](mailto:i95Support@inrix.com) by August 15, 2008.

**Data Validation Issues**



Phil Tarnoff explained that the data validation effort began on July 16, 2008 and is currently underway using the floating car method and blue tooth sensors. He explained there are three phases and each one will focus on a different geographic area to conduct the validation. Each phase basically represents one month. During that month 80 miles will be covered/validated in the selected region. A total of 240 miles in the six core states will be included.

Phase 1 – Maryland and Northern Virginia

Phase 2 – New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware

Phase 3 – Remainder of Virginia, North Carolina

Bob Winick, Motion Maps, has been hired to conduct the floating car validation effort. This is proposed to be a limited effort and used as a comparison and verification along with the blue tooth testing. Phil stated that blue tooth method is accurate and relatively inexpensive. He explained that 5% of vehicles travel with a blue tooth device. The presentation showed that as a vehicle with blue tooth passes blue tooth receivers on the side of the road, at a set distance apart, a signal (similar to an IP address) is sent out from the blue tooth device and received at each location. The speed is calculated based on the distance and the elapsed time. He showed pictures of the blue tooth device and a typical placement. The device is typically placed for a 24 hour period and then downloaded to a PC. He reminded the agencies that local police should be notified when these devices are placed. Phil also noted that using blue tooth offers greater privacy than using cell phone signals, as blue tooth addresses are not attached to personal information readily accessible.

Phil showed graphs illustrating data from both methods. The data for each method provided similar results however; the blue tooth method offers a more significant sample size as compared to the floating car method. Phil noted that blue tooth is significantly lower in cost as compared to drive testing, 0.3 to 1.5 cents/data point compared to \$3/data point, respectively.

Ali Haghani, lead for the validation effort, reported that Maryland and Virginia have been contacted, coordination has occurred and the blue tooth validation process is ready to begin. Pennsylvania is working through legal issues regarding the placement of blue tooth receivers and may not be able to use them.

Data quality specifications were discussed, in particular data lag (previously known as data latency) which was explained as the delay between when an event occurs and when it is reported on the site. Phil asked for consensus in using the term data lag to label this period of time. A discussion ensued regarding how to address the calculation of data accuracy and whether data lag should or should not be considered. Ali Haghani stated that this issue is still being studied.

*Action:*

The validation team will discuss and resolve the issue of how to calculate data accuracy.



### **Agency Updates**

Each member agency present was requested to give a status update related to their use of the VP data and/or expansion plans.

**Virginia** – Waiting for Attorney General's office to determine whether to go through UMD or INRIX directly. Will be checking out integration issues and will report back.

**New York** – there are currently no new issues. Nathan has sent list of comments regarding monitoring site to Jeff Summerson at INRIX.

**New Jersey** – As NJDOT was not able to participate in the call, Rick Schuman gave a brief update based to the email sent by Tim Herlihy. NJDOT is very close to being contracted with INRIX through UMD. They have noted that ramp data is not available on the site. Rick explained it will be at least a year before TMC codes for ramps are available for exploration within the project. Other issues raised, including data point locations will be addressed directly with NJDOT.

**Maryland** – no new issues.

**Pennsylvania** –They are continuing to work through the DUA process.

### **Review of Actions Items**

1. Agency contacts should review the monitoring site (version 1) and provide comments to Jeff Summerson at [i95Support@inrix.com](mailto:i95Support@inrix.com) by August 15, 2008.
2. The validation team will discuss and resolve the issue of how to calculate data accuracy.
3. Agencies without a signed DUA should review and forward it to their respective legal departments. These agencies should provide their legal department contact information to Kathy Frankle at [kfrankle@umd.edu](mailto:kfrankle@umd.edu).

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is tentatively planned for August 13, 2008, but this date will be finalized after the committee members are contacted to determine their availability.

Any questions in the meantime should be directed to:

- Bill Stoeckert at 774.207.0367 or [wstoeckert@yahoo.com](mailto:wstoeckert@yahoo.com)
- Stan Young at 301.403.4593 or [seyoung@umd.edu](mailto:seyoung@umd.edu)
- Rick Schuman at 407.298.4346 or [rick@inrix.com](mailto:rick@inrix.com)
- Jeff Summerson at [i95Support@inrix.com](mailto:i95Support@inrix.com) for questions or comments regarding the monitoring site
- **DUA issues and project expansion issues should be directed to Kathy Frankle at [kfrankle@umd.edu](mailto:kfrankle@umd.edu)**

Mr. Stoeckert thanked the Committee members for their input.

The conference call was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

**POST MEETING NOTE: The next meeting has been scheduled for Monday, August 25, 2008 at 10 AM.**



**Minutes  
Vehicle Probe Project Committee  
Webcast/Conference Call  
July 17, 2008**

**PARTICIPANTS**

<b>I-95 Corridor Coalition:</b>
Bill Stoeckert

<b>Vehicle Probe Committee Webcast Attendees:</b>	
Scott Cowherd	Virginia DOT
Nathan Erlbaum	NYS DOT
Glenn McLaughlin	MDOT/CHART
Bob Pento/Larz Kegerreis/ Steve Howrylack/Regis Ryan	PennDOT
Ben McKeever	FHWA
Phil Tarnoff/ Ali Haghani	University of Maryland
Rick Schuman/ Jeff Summerson/Pete Costello	INRIX
Todd Kell	PBS&J

<b>Consultant Support Staff:</b>
Karen Jehanian/Joanna Reagle, KMJ Consulting, Inc.