

# V2I Deployment Coalition

## Deployment Initiatives Technical Working Group (TWG 1)

### February 25, 2016 Webinar

### Notes and Summary of Discussions

---

#### Welcome / Overview of Webinar Logistics

Bill Legg welcomed the attendees. A list of those in attendance is provided at the end of these notes. This list may not be comprehensive, as attendees may have joined late and were not identified on the webinar. Please contact Dean Deeter at [deeter@acconsultants.org](mailto:deeter@acconsultants.org) to be added to the list.

#### Recap of the V2I Applications Survey Results

Bill Legg reminded members that the results of the V2I Applications Survey were presented during the last webinar. Bill led a discussion about what actions the TWG members would like to take to advance the survey results. Reza Karimvand suggested that the TWG members discuss the summary document during the in-person meeting and discuss any additional planned actions. Joe Averkamp suggested that the TWG offer to present the survey results at the ITS America Annual Meeting in June. Joe offered that he will be there and would be happy to present the results (*Update: a submittal has been sent to ITS America suggesting Joe Averkamp present the survey results*). Another suggestion was to propose to present the survey results at the AASHTO Annual Meeting. Finally, a member asked if the survey responses identifying the most beneficial V2I Applications mapped to the Applications planned for deployment at the Pilot Sites. An action was taken to outreach to the pilot sites to ask for their input on how their planned applications map to the selected applications in the survey.

#### Issue #13: Infrastructure Processes as V2I Obstacles

Bill introduced the next topic of discussion for the day – Issue #12 Infrastructure Processes as V2I Obstacles. He explained that this was an issue added by TWG 1 during the Pittsburgh meeting. Question 8 on the survey was intended to support this issue. Members of TWG 1 helped to craft Question 8 so that it invited responders to share any obstacles they felt they would face when deploying V2I applications (including such things as MUTCD restrictions or environmental reviews). As shared in the meeting, none of the responses to Question 8 identified these examples as obstacles. Rather, the obstacles identified by survey responders were similar to other obstacles expressed regarding V2I (e.g. security concerns, lack of backhaul, etc.). Roger Wentz added that he believes there are still some MUTCD related issues (even though none of the survey responders included them). He made the point that as messages are sent to the vehicle and displayed to the travelers, it would be nice if the displays in the vehicle were consistent with those on roadside signs (including Dynamic Message Signs), but the signs are restricted by the MUTCD and the in-vehicle displays are not. He believes this is a topic to be discussed and resolved.

Hideki Hada added that he believes the responses to Question 8 should be submitted to USDOT as formal input to the Deployment Guidelines. *(Update: The Question 8 responses were shared with TWG 4 (who are coordinating responses to the Deployment Guidelines), and they committed to including them with their next submitted input on the Guidelines).*

## Issue #14 Federal V2I Policy Statement

Bill led a discussion regarding Issue #14 – The Need for a Federal V2I Policy Statement. As background, during the June meeting in Pittsburgh, TWG 1 members decided to add a new issue to the set of issues addressed by the V2I DC that related to the need for a Federal policy statement regarding V2I. The text of the Issue, as added to the coalition issues, is as follows:

*“The recent NHTSA resolution regarding vehicle-to-vehicle communications has helped the V2V industry. Similar strong encouragement from a federal agency to give infrastructure owners and operators a push to deploy V2I would also help V2I. It is recognized that a rulemaking is likely not possible, but perhaps another strong encouragement from a federal agency (e.g. something similar to an “Every Day Counts” EDC model) could be released. **The V2I industry needs a strong message from a federal agency encouraging V2I deployment.**”*

In January, core members from TWG 1 and TWG 4 met by phone to discuss this issue and an approach for TWG 1 and TWG 4 collaborating on the issue. The idea is that the TWGs would collaborate, and any request to USDOT could come from TWG 4 as part of their input to V2I Guidance. Bill shared the latest draft text expected to be included in the Guidance. After some discussion, the TWG members agreed to wait for the Guidance to be released before further discussion. Reza Karimvand commented that ‘policy’ considerations should continue to be included.

## Next Webinar Topics

Bill reminded members that the next webinar will be March 24, 2016 from 2:00 – 3:00 PM Eastern. Bill showed a high level summary of the planned discussion topics for TWG 1 at the April in-person meeting. During the March meeting, Bill will lead a discussion to finalize an agenda that all TWG members agree will be most productive.

## TWG 1 February 25, 2016 Webinar Participants

- Bill Legg, Chair
- Joe Averkamp
- John Conrad
- Oliver Brandl
- Hideki Hada
- Joey Yang
- Mohammed Hadi
- Reza Karimvand
- Jonathan Riehl
- Leisa Moniz
- Jack Hall
- Jim Peters
- Kyle Conner
- Dean Deeter
- Roger Wentz