

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION
RE: UPDATING AUTOMATIC VEHICLE
IDENTIFICATION SPECIFICATION
Wednesday, July 8, 2015, 10:00 AM
at
Caltrans District 4 Headquarters
First Floor Auditorium, Room G-900
Oakland, CA 94612

Reported by:
KACY PARKER BARAJAS, RMR, CSR No. 10915
Certified Realtime Reporter
Job No. 41916LR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PANEL MEMBERS:

David Harris, Caltrans
Steve Harris, Caltrans
Joe Rouse, Caltrans

ATTENDEES:

Scott Koblentz, SANDAG
Rick Nelson, TXDOT
Frank Barbagallo, Jacobs
Stephen Lockhart, Star Systems International
Doug Williams, 3M
John Lester, 3M
Eric Redman, Neology
Lynn Valdivia, BATA
Ron Puccinelli, Port of Oakland
Mike O'Brien, Port of Oakland
Lester Patilla, Port of Oakland
Steve Weiss, TTI
Patrick Vu, TTI
Tom Sheehy, Greenberg Traurig
Victor Wong, BATA
Michael W. Melkonians, Caltrans
Jennifer Mennucci, GGBHTD
Murali Ramanujam, Santa Clara VTA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Wednesday, July 8, 2015, 10:00 AM

--oOo--

MR. HARRIS: Good morning everybody. My name is David Harris. I'm an attorney with Caltrans. We are here for what we call prenotice discussions on a regulatory action that the department is contemplating.

I will get into the nuts and bolts of that in just a moment, but first of all I wanted to do a quick mea culpa. I am solely, personally responsible for this particular venue and this particular format, and I will be the first to admit/acknowledge that it is not completely conducive to exactly what we want to do which is to have a more informal, free-willing conversation. But when I was planning this back in the spring, honestly I didn't know if we would have five people or 150, and I didn't want to have a room that was overflowing with people. So hopefully, you know, perhaps at some point the acoustics work out, our reporter, Kacy, is able to hear, we can ditch the mic and have a little more of a casual conversation. But again I apologize for the somewhat stilted, formal process that we're engaged in here today, but hopefully that won't hinder us too much in terms of being able to have a free-willing, informal

1 conversation.

2 I'd like to say again my name is David Harris.
3 I'm an attorney at Caltrans. I can also confess that
4 I am the person in this room most unfettered by any
5 knowledge of the subject matter about what we're to
6 discuss today. So I wanted to introduce the two
7 gentlemen to my left up here on the stage who are in
8 fact the subject matter experts who are going to be
9 doing most of the talking. Steve Hancock is to my
10 immediate left and then Joe Rouse to my further left
11 down at the end. Again, they are the subject matter
12 experts, and they are going to be doing most of the
13 talking today. In fact, I believe one of the
14 measures of success of this event will be how few
15 words I say after about 10:15 this morning. So
16 hopefully that will bear out that I will say very
17 little after 10:15.

18 Before we dive into exactly why we're here, I
19 want to take care of a couple housekeeping matters.
20 There is a sign-in sheet up front. There's also one
21 down here. There are name tags so that we can
22 identify ourselves to the reporter. I'll talk about
23 that in just a minute. Basically we want to get your
24 contact information so we could follow up with you.
25 Again, this is just the beginning of the process in

1 which the department's now embarking on this
2 regulatory track and being able to talk to you and
3 get in contact with you will be great.

4 Obviously you're giving that information
5 completely voluntarily. I'll give you the disclaimer
6 we're not going to sell it to anybody. We're not
7 going to share it with anybody. It's solely for the
8 purpose of being able to contact you if we need to
9 talk to you about these regulations. So if you
10 could, please sign in and wear a name tag so that we
11 can know who you are.

12 There are restrooms if you go out to the main
13 hallway and make a right, go down a little ways.
14 There are men's and women's rooms right there. There
15 is also a coffee cart just to the right there. I
16 think they're open till 3:00. I notice there is a
17 sign here that says no food or drink in the
18 auditorium, but if you don't spill, I won't tell
19 that. But that comment's not been endorsed by the
20 facility folks here.

21 In any event, those are the basic logistics. I
22 also want to talk a little about the schedule. We
23 have this room until 4:00. If we need it until then,
24 we'll be here that long. Candidly, we'll just play
25 it by ear in terms of, you know, if we are, for

1 example, to item 8 by noon, I may get a sense in the
2 room we may just want to just plow ahead and finish
3 up. I know that there are people from out of town
4 probably with travel plans and things like that, but
5 we will be here no later than 4:00. But if we need
6 to be here until then, we can stay until that amount
7 of time. And obviously we can take breaks. I'll
8 talk about that in a second here.

9 Actually, I'll talk about that right now. Down
10 at the far end of the stage here is Kacy Barajas who
11 is our realtime reporter. I want to thank Kacy very
12 much for coming in from Sacramento to help us with
13 this because what we're doing here is we're very
14 interested in what you have to say. Kacy will be
15 creating a transcript so that we can have it for our
16 records as we go through so that we can know
17 hopefully who said what. And so candidly, the
18 schedule's going to be determined by Kacy's needs.
19 Because obviously the rest of us can sit back while
20 somebody else is talking, but while anyone's talking,
21 Kacy is working. So I'm going to be sensitive to
22 that. So Kacy, please just give me a high sign or
23 something if you need a break or something like that.
24 We'll take a break every 90 minutes or so just to
25 give everybody a chance to stretch a little bit.

1 Obviously because we are trying to create a
2 transcript, we can take turns. Kacy's very good at
3 what she does, but she can only take down one person
4 at a time. We'll try to keep things again free
5 flowing, but hopefully we can all be heard and talk
6 to each other like that.

7 Again, you know, if you can ID yourself before
8 you speak, and again I'm going to say that and
9 immediately recognize that's not how the world works.
10 You have something to say. It's a very stilted,
11 artificial way to have to say your name and who you
12 represent every time. But if you can, to the extent
13 you can, at least the first couple times, I think
14 that would be very helpful so we can know who said
15 what and how to follow up on it.

16 Now we are here to listen, and so candidly that
17 is an introduction to tamping down some expectations.
18 They're not going to be any major decisions made here
19 today. This is just the beginning of the process.
20 In fact, you know, you may hear me say things like,
21 "Well, that's a very interesting comment. Thank you
22 for bringing that up." "Go with that thought," that
23 sort of thing. Basically the dynamic that we're
24 looking for is more information to come from here to
25 up here. We obviously want to share what we had

1 gained with regard to where the department is in the
2 process, but again the purpose of these kinds of
3 discussions is to hear from everybody.

4 And again one of the things we're trying to do
5 honestly is to determine the best way to communicate
6 with you and to get your subject matter expertise to
7 help to make sure, first of all, that we're covering
8 all the issues that need to be covered and also that,
9 you know, you tell us how the best way for us to
10 continue this process.

11 You know, I don't view this is just a
12 free-for-all brainstorming, but I think initially
13 that is what we're doing. We're just making sure
14 that we've captured all the issues, and then
15 obviously we determine how we go through them.

16 Okay. So let's dive right into what we're
17 doing. The department issued a notice of what are
18 called prenotice workshops, and I'll get to the
19 prenotice part of this in just a second. But we are
20 having this one here today in Oakland, and then we
21 will be having one in Fontana on July 22nd. That's
22 two weeks from today. A similar format, although
23 candidly given what we learn here today, we may
24 change things up a little bit in terms of bulk
25 procedure and substance depending on the issues that

1 are inspired here today. I will tell you that I
2 believe we have a facility that will be more
3 conducive for this size of an audience and hopefully
4 to a more free-flowing conversation.

5 But at this point what the department is doing,
6 and this is where I get to the prenotice part of
7 this, is the department is contemplating a change to
8 Title 21 which is a title of the California Code of
9 Regulations regarding what is known as automated
10 vehicle identification. Again, all of you I think
11 understand those technical aspects far better than I
12 do, but the prenotice part of this is that the
13 department has not gone forward with a formal notice
14 that it's doing it. So we are in what's been called
15 the prenotice stage. I'll go through the calendar
16 and the process. Again, we can show you where that
17 is as well.

18 Just a couple of terms to get out there to make
19 sure that we're all on the same page. Again, I
20 apologize if this is, you know, too "School House
21 Rock" elementary stuff, but I always believe it's
22 best to start at the beginning, and hopefully that
23 way we'll all be on the same page. You'll hear the
24 acronym APA. That stands for the Administrative
25 Procedures Act which is the act in California that

1 governs how agencies like Caltrans promulgate
2 regulations that are required or allowed by statute.
3 So when you hear "APA," that's the process that we're
4 engaged in.

5 You'll also here OAL which stand for the Office
6 of Administrative Law which is the agency in
7 California that oversees and ultimately approves or
8 disapproves regulatory packages from agencies like
9 Caltrans.

10 At this point I would like to turn to the
11 handout. The handout looks a little like this. It's
12 got the agenda on the front of it. You will see on
13 the second page there is a calendar, and again this
14 is a proposed calendar. And this is because I am a
15 lawyer, I'm going to start with a disclaimer.
16 Obviously this is a very ambitious, tentative
17 schedule and none of this is etched in stone, and
18 obviously there may be things that are unforeseen
19 that come up that change it. But given our most
20 ambitious goals here, people like Joe and Steve have
21 been working on this for a long time, so they're
22 obviously very anxious to get this going. But this
23 is basically our best-case scenario of what we'd like
24 to do in terms of the process.

25 You'll see at the top that May 2015 to August

1 2015, it talks about public outreach including the
2 prenoticed workshops which is what we're doing here
3 to solicit public input on the regulations.

4 You'll then see that our goal is to submit our
5 notice; therefore, that's why this is the prenotice
6 period of the proposed sets to the Office of
7 Administrative Law for the publication in the Notice
8 Register. And that's an important date because that
9 sets the clock where the department basically has one
10 year to finish up with the regulatory process from
11 the time it submits that notice to the OAL.

12 Then we are aiming for an early September
13 publication in the Notice Register which is again a
14 formal document maintained by OAL, and that begins
15 what's called the 45-day comment period which is the
16 formal period where all members of public and
17 stakeholders can come in and make comments on the
18 actual text that we're proposing to put into the Code
19 of Regulations.

20 Assuming our schedule, that would put our -- the
21 end of our 45-day public comment period in late
22 October, October 22nd on this calendar, after which
23 time there will immediately be a formal public
24 hearing to take comments on the proposed regulation.

25 After that, assuming there are no major changes,

1 we would either then send the package to OAL, or if
2 there are some minor changes, we might go out with
3 another 15-day comment period. And if the changes
4 are substantial, then we would have to go to another
5 45 days.

6 But again, assuming that we didn't have major
7 changes, it's our expectation that we would have
8 these filed with OAL with the regulations by
9 February 15th. They then have 30 working days or six
10 weeks to approve them. We're hoping for an early
11 approval, but in any event, on this calendar that
12 will get us to about April 1st is when these
13 regulations would go into effect. Again, that's the
14 ambitious schedule that we're on right now.

15 If you go to the next document that says "OAL
16 Review" on it, this again is kind of a -- excuse
17 me -- I skipped one, I apologize. The next one is
18 called "The Rule Making Process," and this is
19 basically a pictorial representation of the
20 regulatory process. I stole this from our folks at
21 OAL. And if you look at it along the top there
22 you'll see the state capitol, and then there's a
23 nondescript looking state building where it says
24 "State Agency." Next to that it says "Preliminary
25 Activities." That's the stage we're in now. That

1 includes again this prenoticed workshop here. You
2 will then see, as we talked about on the previous
3 calendar, you have the "Notice of Proposed
4 Rulemaking" which includes the text of the
5 regulations, what's called the initial statement of
6 reasons that justifies why we're doing this, and then
7 you have the publication of those with OAL in their
8 Notice Registry which again starts the 45-day comment
9 period leading to the public hearings and ultimately
10 to the submission of the package formally to OAL for
11 its approval. So that's a representation of how the
12 process works.

13 If you then go to the next page, which is titled
14 OAL Review at the top, that's another -- that
15 basically sets out the standards. These are, you
16 know, the words that you will hear and certainly that
17 I will hear from the Office of Administrative Law.
18 Authority reference means we have to have a statute
19 that gives us the authority and the reference to
20 promulgate the particular regulations. Those
21 regulations have to be consistent with other
22 applicable law. They have to be clear. They have to
23 not duplicate other laws, and they also have to be
24 necessary. Again, you can see that's just another
25 pictorial representation of the review that OAL will

1 eventually go through. And again, we can go through
2 these in a somewhat greater detail as we go through.

3 Now so the next document in the handout is from
4 the Streets and Highways Code. These are in fact the
5 two major sections of the Streets and Highways Code
6 that talks about AVI, and they basically set the
7 parameters and -- for which the department will be
8 working to make sure that we are in compliance with
9 the statute. These are basically the four corners in
10 which the department has to operate to make sure that
11 we are being consistent with what the statute allows
12 us to do.

13 Because Caltrans obviously is the administrative
14 agency, basically we only have the powers that are
15 enumerated to us, and so we can only do what this
16 Streets and Highways -- what, excuse me, these
17 Streets and Highway Code sections permit us to do. I
18 won't go through that. We will hopefully get into a
19 little more detail on that as we go through, but
20 that's just a reference for what we're looking at.

21 And then the final thing in the handout is a set
22 of useful links. Again this is basically just a
23 start. I have the URL for the Office of
24 Administrative Law. They do have a lot of very good
25 things in there. They have a really good 25-page how

1 to participate in the rule-making process document
2 there. In fact, that's where I got a couple of these
3 charts that I was talking about a few minutes ago.
4 It gives a very good perimeter on how this works. So
5 that's a good resource.

6 I've also included a link to the statutes. So
7 the statutes we just talked about, you can find them
8 there.

9 I've also included a link to the code of
10 regulations, and again we're talking specifically
11 about Title 21, Chapter 16, starting at Section 1700.
12 And those are obviously things we'll be talking about
13 quite a bit. Also included the Caltrans web site,
14 and then I'm sure Steve is very happy to see that
15 I've included his phone number as well as the e-mail
16 for the Title 21 changes. That is a dedicated e-mail
17 where you can send things.

18 I will say, particularly those of you from the
19 private sector, I just want to let you know that is a
20 public web site, that the comments will be
21 potentially subject to public disclosure. They may
22 either end up in the rule-making file at some point,
23 or they may, you know, be the subject of a California
24 Public Records Act request. As you all know, the
25 department is subject to disclosure of all documents

1 in its possession unless there is a statutory basis
2 for exception. And generally over the last ten years
3 there's been a very strong move in the courts in this
4 state towards more disclosure, not less. So that's
5 just something to keep in mind. It's a public
6 process. Again, we're not going to unnecessarily
7 share things with people, but we need you to know
8 that there is a potential that these comments that
9 you make may be publicly available at some point. So
10 I just wanted to make sure that we were clear on
11 that.

12 And with that, we went a couple minutes over
13 what I wanted to do. We're going to dive right in.
14 I'm going to turn it over to Steve and Joe to give a
15 little bit of a background on what they've been
16 doing, and then we will dive right in to the heart of
17 the agenda.

18 Steve, you want to go first.

19 MR. HANCOCK: Sure. Basically what we've been
20 doing is looking at the transition, learning a lot
21 about the administrative law process, looking at
22 various options to transition to what are the options
23 out in the market, talking with the CTOC agencies,
24 working with them to get -- to see what they want.
25 They have requested Caltrans transition to ISO 18063,

1 commonly referred to as 6C technology, sticker
2 technology.

3 So we're embarking in that process at -- this
4 process at the request of the CTOC agencies, and in
5 that we will be meeting with -- we're starting with
6 these meetings. We will have other meetings
7 discussing the regulation with various entities. So
8 we developed language, as David described earlier,
9 for the schedule. I believe our first date is what,
10 September 5th or early September -- yeah,
11 September 5th, that we'll do the publication and the
12 notice and the commencement of the 45-day comment
13 period. Obviously I would have to have it in to
14 David well before then, so he on the legal side can
15 go through the regulation, the proposed text, and
16 make comments, make sure that I'm covering things
17 appropriately, and such.

18 So that's kind of where we're at, what we're
19 doing to date. Joe, do you have anything you'd like
20 to add?

21 MR. ROUSE: Yeah. I'd like to just kind of take
22 a step back here and give you a little bit more
23 background as to why we are here today. If you look
24 in the statutes that are included in the handout
25 here, you'll see there's a date 1990 at the bottom of

1 them. So way back in 1990 when the legislature first
2 mandated that the state adopt -- Caltrans adopt, I
3 should say, in cooperation with the toll operators
4 adopt a system that allowed for interoperability
5 between toll facilities around the state, and that
6 was also an open standard. The current Title 21
7 specifications that are again found in Title 21 Code
8 of California Regulations were designed in compliance
9 with that state law. Those functional specifications
10 that we've been using now were adopted in 1992. So
11 we're using technology that's way over 20 years old.
12 I'm sorry that I'm preaching to the choir here, but I
13 think it's just good just to have this on the record.

14 I first started getting involved in tolling back
15 in 2007. At that time that was when some of the
16 California Toll Operators Committee agency, CTOC, so
17 some of the CTOC agencies were beginning to make
18 rumblings about wanting to change the specifications
19 in Title 21. The initial interest was being able to
20 write to the tag over time, particularly with the
21 advent of express lanes in different areas around the
22 state, and that's primarily my area of responsibility
23 is express lane operations. With the adding of
24 express lanes across the state, there was a lot of
25 interest in further updating the specifications in

1 technology to be able to allow for occupancy
2 declaration, vehicle occupancy declaration, and those
3 types of things, and we were fortunate that we were
4 able to work within the existing specifications to
5 allow for switchable tags. Switchable tags have been
6 used in California now for about five years, I
7 believe, maybe a little less. And there's going to
8 be a pretty much greater use of them in the coming
9 years particularly here in the Bay Area.

10 And so we were able to do that, but we're still
11 working with 12-plus-year-old technology, and so CTOC
12 agencies have long been feeling that it's time to
13 move on to something else. And so we've had a lot of
14 very intense discussions with the CTOC agencies over
15 the last several months, and that has led us to this
16 point that we are at today. And again the intent
17 here is to just hear from you all what your thoughts
18 are on this, and we do have a series of questions
19 that have been provided to all of you in advance.
20 Hopefully a few of you have had an opportunity to
21 review and respond to some of these questions, and we
22 look forward to getting that feedback from you.

23 And Steve is really going to be carrying most of
24 the water on this one in writing the regulation and
25 trying to work with David to get everything moving

1 forward.

2 I'm here to provide moral support, I guess you
3 could say, but also I'm the primary Caltrans
4 representative on the California Toll Operators
5 Committee, and I'm the one that was formally asked to
6 move this forward. Actually my boss was asked to
7 formally move this forward, but Caltrans is
8 responsible, you know, under the state law for taking
9 care of this process, and so we're taking the lead on
10 this. But we can't do it alone. And we need your
11 input, and we need your feedback. So let's move on.
12 Let's get this thing going here.

13 MR. HARRIS: All right. So that brings us to
14 Roman numeral III on the agenda which is entitled
15 "Are there any alternatives to transition to 6C?"
16 And that's a very open-ended question. But as part
17 of that, you know, and again no requirement here, but
18 if you just want to tell us who you are and your
19 perspective. Again, this is your meeting. We want
20 to hear from you, but that's the initial question.
21 I'll tee it up that way because I want to make sure
22 that everyone knows the department's not wedded to
23 any particular course of action. That's why we're
24 having these hearings. We want to be transparent,
25 listen to people who deal with this thing every day

1 and get as many good ideas as we can.

2 So in any event, let me just throw it open with
3 that, whoever wants to get started, again hopefully
4 everyone can hear and be heard. So again I don't
5 want there to be a presumption that the department's
6 wedded to a particular course of action. So are
7 there any alternatives other than a transition to 6C?
8 Anybody have any thoughts on that particular issue?

9 MR. BARBAGALLO: My name is Frank Barbagallo.
10 I'm with Jacobs. So have you considered not
11 necessarily fully transitioning but allowing both
12 technologies to coexist?

13 MR. HARRIS: Steve? Joe?

14 MR. HANCOCK: We have -- we have looked at
15 transitioning at a certain point in time whatever --
16 whatever protocol is selected, there would be a
17 transition where we would be operating two protocols.
18 Now I wouldn't want to think we would want to do that
19 for an indefinite period of time. But yeah, we've
20 looked at -- we would be looking at operating two
21 protocols at the same time for a period of time in
22 the transition as this moves forward just to give
23 agencies time to capitalize on their investment and
24 such.

25 MR. HARRIS: Again, no concrete definitive

1 decision has been made, but I will contemplate there
2 will probably likely be transitional language in the
3 regulations calling for a sunset date of a particular
4 technology if we're going to transition from
5 something, but I think we do contemplate that there
6 will clearly be a time period where there will have
7 to be a transition and that it can't go from turning
8 one off to turning another one on immediately. There
9 will have to be some transition period. But we are
10 definitely cognizant of that and looking into that.

11 MR. HANCOCK: There's a gentleman over here.

12 MR. SHEEHY: Thanks, Steve. Tom Sheehy with
13 Greenberg Traurig. Good morning, gentlemen. Thank
14 you. So if you go to 6C and you assume there's going
15 to be -- I mean, there's going to be a dual protocol
16 but that we might transition everything to 6C, then
17 that then assumes all of the existing Title 21 tags
18 would be ultimately phased out. You would have to
19 issue all new tags with the new 6C technology; is
20 that right?

21 MR. HANCOCK: Over time I would imagine what
22 would happen is, yeah, we would put a sunset date on
23 the existing Title 21 what I'll call for discussion
24 here, Legacy protocols, since we're talking. It will
25 still technically be -- whatever protocol we select

1 we'll still be under Title 21. As David was
2 indicating. It would be in the regulations. But
3 yeah, I would imagine that the -- that we will put a
4 sunset date on the Legacy protocol so at a certain
5 point in time the Legacy protocol would not be used.

6 MR. SHEEHY: Now my understanding is that there
7 is a national protocol being worked on. I'm not sure
8 how this process is going to dovetail with that, but
9 if we're required to conform with the national
10 protocol, could you then find yourself in a situation
11 where you had three protocols, the Legacy, the 6C,
12 and assuming that the national protocol isn't
13 identical to what you had adopted already quite
14 possibly, that you then have three protocols that you
15 would be dealing with, how would that work from an
16 infrastructure standpoint?

17 MR. HANCOCK: Well, on a national level, yeah,
18 there is a national interoperability effort going
19 forward, as you indicated. Time frame, we'll have to
20 see how that works out. Just depending on the timing
21 of it, there possibly could be a time where we
22 would -- could have to consider supporting three
23 protocols. It really -- a lot of that depends on how
24 the national effort goes forward, how it's
25 implemented, the time frame and such. At this point

1 it's really kind of hard to say what time frame that
2 is going to be.

3 MR. BARBAGALLO: So Frank Barbagallo, Jacobs
4 again. I hear time frame in a lot of this
5 discussion. What have you guys thought in terms of a
6 time frame for sunset?

7 MR. HANCOCK: That's something -- go ahead.

8 MR. ROUSE: I would just point out that that is
9 a topic of discussion under item 5. So, you know,
10 just to kind of stay on -- keep us on track here,
11 we'll get to that if we could just bear that in mind.

12 MR. BARBAGALLO: Okay.

13 MR. HANCOCK: Okay. Any other questions,
14 comments about alternatives to 6C, item 3 here, from
15 anyone?

16 MR. BARBAGALLO: Have you guys considered what
17 the trucking industry impact might be with their --

18 MR. HANCOCK: That's the purpose of these
19 hearings is to get industry -- public industry input
20 on impacts and how -- you know, how it will affect
21 the various industries. I know the port authority is
22 here and in other meetings will be airport
23 authorities and such, so that's the purpose of these
24 prediscussions.

25 MR. BARBAGALLO: Have they opined yet on their

1 views?

2 MR. HANCOCK: I personally have not received
3 anything on their views at this point. That's why we
4 have done a lot of outreach in various areas and
5 publicized meetings.

6 MR. HARRIS: Okay. Any other specific comments
7 on number 3? And I think this is a good idea that
8 we're delving into the nuts and bolts of this. And
9 so as we move on, I think we'll hopefully be able to
10 flesh out, you know, some of the things. As you
11 note, there is a discussion item here on time tables.
12 So why don't we move on to the next one. We just
13 talked about Roman numeral IV. "What are the
14 benefits of the transition to 6C?" Well, maybe put
15 it another way, is it inevitable we have to go that
16 direction?

17 And then "What are the drawbacks?" We've
18 already touched on some of the drawbacks. We talked
19 a little bit about if there is in fact a national
20 standard at some point, are we going to be in
21 conflict with that. Candidly, that's an ongoing
22 issue that we face in a lot of different areas, not
23 just at Caltrans but at other state agencies of not
24 knowing when, if ever, a particular national standard
25 might be implemented that would affect what we're

1 doing here. So we are going forward cognizant of the
2 fact that that's a possibility, but to be quite
3 candid with regard to our friends in the federal
4 government, we can't wait until they do that. We're
5 going to move ahead and hopefully be nimble and
6 adaptive enough to be able to deal with anything that
7 may come down the line on a national level.

8 So are there any thoughts on just generally
9 benefits of 6C or drawbacks that you see other than
10 the ones that we talked about? Candidly, at this
11 point, I think you could -- actually, why don't we
12 bring the item 5 in here about time tables. I think
13 it's a good time to talk about that because obviously
14 that is a major issue of how long is it going to take
15 to do these various transitions in terms of
16 infrastructure and things like that, people clearing
17 their inventories of Legacy devices and things like
18 that and getting their manufacturing up to be able to
19 meet whatever new protocol there is. Why don't we
20 talk about that. Are there any specific thoughts on
21 that, on how long you think it will take to make a
22 transition?

23 MR. BARBAGALLO: Well, we know that tags have a
24 minimum of a five-year life, and some live as long as
25 ten. And so it depends. I mean, that's -- that's

1 quite a long sunset, right, if you think about the
2 far out 10-year life of the tag. Unless you go about
3 doing a very expensive, very labor intensive recall
4 process where you're exchanging one device for
5 another, if you want them to atrit naturally, it's
6 going to be quite a long time.

7 MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

8 MR. LOCKHART: Stephen Lockhart, Star Systems
9 International. I don't know why you would
10 necessarily want to put a date on it. I mean, it
11 could be as long as it needs to be. Like the
12 technology allows for that transition period to be a
13 very long time, if necessary. I don't think
14 they're -- unless there's some commercial reason or
15 some other reason being driven by the toll agencies,
16 technically, from a technical perspective there's no
17 reason to rush it.

18 MR. BARBAGALLO: That was why I wanted to find
19 out what the thought was behind just adding another
20 protocol, just add 6C. And you have Title 21 or
21 whatever we're going to call Legacy system, and you
22 have 6C. And as long as both are usable and you
23 achieve interoperability, I mean, it's kind of a
24 modern world. You can achieve it through image-based
25 transactions. I think you've satisfied the intent of

1 the law.

2 MR. HANCOCK: So what I'm hearing from you,
3 Frank, you're indicating you don't see the need for a
4 sunset date?

5 MR. BARBAGALLO: Yeah. I think that it's sort
6 of a natural phenomenon. As agencies figure out for
7 themselves what is the most economical and
8 cost-effective mechanism to use across their system
9 and within their base, they will transition or not
10 transition as they deem necessary, as long as those
11 that want to transition to 6C can.

12 MR. NELSON: Rick Nelson with TXDOT. I'm
13 interested if in fact you go to a 6C, are you at that
14 time also going to offer interoperability to the
15 states? Is that part of the plan or one of the
16 benefits?

17 MR. HANCOCK: Well, that's outside of actually
18 the statutes. The statutes actually talk about the
19 transponder and reader. The interaction between
20 agencies and how the state agencies would be, to my
21 knowledge, up to the individual toll operators to
22 make agreements with out-of-state entities. Yes?

23 MR. PUCCINELLI: Ron Puccinelli, Port of
24 Oakland. This is not strictly a timing question, but
25 we're not necessarily a toll authority, but we do use

1 the automatic vehicle identification for trucks and
2 parking and other kinds of monitoring of vehicles.
3 How do you anticipate those of us who use AVI for
4 nontoll activities will be affected by this? Will we
5 be forced to transition? Will we be orphaned off on
6 our own. How does that play?

7 MR. HANCOCK: For nontolling entities we can
8 handle it in a separate situation. We can separate
9 that out in regulation as far as if there was a
10 transition time, just for sake of discussion here,
11 there was a different transition time that you needed
12 versus a toll agency needs, yeah, I think we could --
13 I think it's a good possibility that we can cover
14 that in the regulation language on addressing that
15 situation.

16 MR. HARRIS: Okay. So if I could just try to
17 wrap this up a little bit. Again, given my neolithic
18 status, I'm probably the perfect audience for this.
19 If I can understand it, then probably anybody can.
20 Seems like there's at least some sense that perhaps
21 we could either not have a sunset date or have a more
22 flexible one. Again, you know, as long as we can
23 comply with the legal aspects of the statute which
24 would require that vehicle owners not be required to
25 purchase or install more than one system, that there

1 may be some interest in the flexibility of
2 maintaining the Legacy system for a longer period of
3 time rather than less. Is that a reasonable
4 characterization of the sense of what people are
5 thinking with regard to that? And again, we're not
6 making any, you know, set-in-stone decisions today,
7 but it seems like that there is some if not unanimity
8 at least a consensus around that particular approach.
9 Would that be correct.

10 MR. BARBAGALLO: Well, from my perspective I
11 just worry about a regulation that causes some agency
12 to have to do something when they're not economically
13 prepared to do that. So they have a fiscal plan, and
14 they've got a certain amount of tax they're buying
15 every year. There's a certain amount of growth.
16 There's a certain amount of replacement. And to
17 allow things to happen organically rather than by
18 force of law, I think is better for agency
19 autonomy.

20 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I think this is, you know,
21 really a good conversation, to be candid with you,
22 and I'm going to make a statement a little bit
23 against the interest of Caltrans, but I think we all
24 know that the political climate in this state
25 currently is very much against overly burdensome

1 regulations. I think this is a very good discussion
2 to have in terms of, you know, what do we need to do
3 in terms of promulgating new regulations, shall we do
4 so, that make sure that we don't put too much of a
5 burden, that we don't put agencies under a clock that
6 they can't meet.

7 So that's really been one of the things we're
8 trying to do here is to find out how long is it going
9 to take people to make the transition, and, you know,
10 we want to obviously do that. Obviously we have to
11 do that in compliance with the underlying statute,
12 but I think there's obviously room to do that, and
13 that's what we're trying to figure out exactly, as a
14 practical matter, how long will these things take and
15 how long would a -- you know, a dual system or how
16 long will the Legacy system have to be allowed to
17 survive.

18 MR. HANCOCK: So Frank, just to clarify and
19 there's a -- Tom had a question up there. So what
20 you're saying is either, and correct me if I'm wrong
21 if I'm misstating this, is either putting long -- a
22 pretty long lead time as far as transitioning out or
23 not specifying a time at all and just support two
24 protocols? Which way would you prefer on that?

25 MR. BARBAGALLO: From the technology

1 perspective, I'd like the latter, adding a new
2 protocol and supporting both because you're going to
3 do that in a de facto mode anyway.

4 MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

5 MR. BARBAGALLO: So why -- I don't understand
6 the need to completely disallow the technology if
7 the, you know, an agency seems to believe that works
8 for them.

9 MR. HANCOCK: Okay. Tom?

10 MR. SHEEHY: Yeah. So question to Mr. Harris,
11 does the underlying statute require interoperability
12 statewide?

13 MR. HARRIS: No. It requires that a vehicle
14 owner have to purchase or install one system.

15 MR. HANCOCK: It's one device.

16 MR. SHEEHY: Is that another way of saying that
17 in essence everything has to be interoperable?

18 MR. HARRIS: I don't know if I would -- I think
19 that they're basically the same thing. I'm not sure
20 that they're synonyms exactly for one another.

21 MR. SHEEHY: Well, I'm not trying to parse it.
22 I'm just trying to understand just practically
23 speaking. I guess -- I mean, I'm not a technical
24 expert like the two gentlemen. It seems like if the
25 streets and highway code require interoperability,

1 which I think it does, unless you tell me it
2 doesn't.

3 MR. HARRIS: No. I think that's right.

4 MR. SHEEHY: All right.

5 MR. HARRIS: Yes. Somebody needs to be able to
6 use one device.

7 MR. SHEEHY: I wasn't sure exactly that's what
8 the code calls for. I would certainly have to read
9 it more carefully, but I think that's an important
10 issue in the legislature in terms of
11 interoperability. What I'm sort of getting at is
12 when you get to this whole issue of sunset date, if
13 there were two different protocols out there, does
14 that then mean that, as this other gentleman
15 mentioned, maybe particular agency in Northern
16 California that has a certain fiscal situation, it
17 bases relative to the tags and the population of the
18 tags and the timing might be for changing them out,
19 will that indirectly have to drive decisions that
20 have to be made maybe for a Southern California
21 agency that has a different set of -- different mix
22 of variables in its fiscal and economic picture, are
23 those two going to ultimately have to sync up because
24 the statute calls for interoperability. So that if I
25 live in Oakland and I have a tag that works in the

1 Bay Area and then I drive down to Los Angeles, my tag
2 will operate on I-10 or another private or public
3 facility down there, you know, that would read
4 tags.

5 MR. HARRIS: You raise a good point. Candidly,
6 I don't know the answer to this, but I think
7 obviously the scenario you are positing is quite
8 possibly what you have, for example, an agency in
9 Northern California that decides that it only wants
10 to have one protocol, and yet you have others or
11 another one in Southern California that says it's
12 more economically and technologically easier for it
13 to have more than one, you know, how do you reconcile
14 that? How does everybody stay on the same page? How
15 do we meet the statute in terms of having a vehicle
16 only have to have one device. So there clearly has
17 to be -- in that sense, interoperability, there has
18 to be consensus and agreement among the various
19 tolling agencies as to what devices will work.

20 MR. HANCOCK: So Tom, just to clarify, you're
21 saying, hey, if one agency has protocol A, another
22 agency has protocol B, how would that work as far as
23 interoperability?

24 MR. SHEEHY: Well, presumably both agencies
25 would have A and B unless one of them just made a

1 decision to do a complete recall which I think one
2 gentleman commented would be, you know, labor
3 intensive and costly, but I suppose that could be
4 done. So it seems like that there will be a mix of
5 protocols for some period of time.

6 MR. HANCOCK: Uh-huh.

7 MR. SHEEHY: But those -- that really gets back
8 to the question which is an agency's transition
9 plan -- one agency's transition plan may fit the
10 criteria for the predominant usage of that agency,
11 but it may not fit another agency's plan. And again,
12 the statute calls for a statewide interoperability.
13 How will that work? Because agency A may say -- or
14 agency number 1 may say we want to be completely on
15 the new protocol by a time certain, and agency number
16 2 may be in some other geographic location. They
17 say, well, that doesn't work for us. So then how do
18 you reconcile that? Then if I'm a Californian who's
19 a user of the system and I just want to have the one
20 tag, how would that -- I'm just raising the question.
21 These are issues that have to be --

22 MR. HANCOCK: Sure.

23 MR. SHEEHY: -- thought about carefully because
24 different agencies will face different, seems to me,
25 fiscal and economic incentives.

1 MR. HANCOCK: Well, how you would handle part of
2 what you're saying if you have the tag A, tag B,
3 different protocols, would be a multiprotocol reader
4 where you could read both of them and that would be
5 how the agency could operate two simultaneous
6 protocols in the transition period, whatever length
7 that transition period is or, you know, if it was
8 decided it would be indefinite or whatever, that's --
9 I would see that would be --

10 MR. SHEEHY: That assumes installation of new
11 readers that would be multiprotocol.

12 MR. HANCOCK: Correct. If they already do not
13 have them. A lot of agencies I believe already have
14 multiprotocol readers that would be -- would have
15 that capability of reading two different protocols.

16 MR. HANCOCK: Frank.

17 MR. BARBAGALLO: I was just going to say that
18 the cost on the agency for this program is for those
19 agencies with a single protocol reader, they need to
20 get new readers in order to play, and then they need
21 to get new tags if you were to eliminate one, so that
22 it gets pretty hefty in that process. So spreading
23 that out so things happen again more organically for
24 the agencies I think makes it more realistic in terms
25 of their ability to comply.

1 MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

2 MR. BARBAGALLO: I'm sorry. One last point
3 about achieving interoperability. Most agencies,
4 there's very few and they're express lanes basically
5 that don't have photo enforcement, so most agencies
6 have the ability and within CTOC's arrangements for
7 interoperability to exchange license plate files and
8 license plate information, and so that's a fall back
9 for achieving interoperability while people are
10 getting dual readers, for example.

11 MR. HANCOCK: Okay. My understanding is there's
12 just a couple agencies that do not have dual readers
13 throughout the state.

14 MR. BARBAGALLO: That's right.

15 MR. LOCKHART: Steve Lockhart. I'm a big fan of
16 the organic adoption of the new protocol and for a
17 lengthy time horizon but I would be a little
18 concerned about an indefinite time horizon simply
19 because I figure a situation at some point in the
20 future, maybe it's 15 years in the future, everyone
21 switches to 6C, yet there's a regulation out there
22 that says that you still have to support this other
23 protocol that is not being used, and that leads to
24 higher costs on the equipment. Because the 6C-only
25 reader is going to be significantly more expensive

1 than a 6C and Title 21 multiprotocol reader.

2 So I would just be concerned that you have a
3 regulation that says you have to support this, but
4 there's no one really using it. So I don't know if
5 there's some language that could be incorporated to
6 help -- help that sort of situation at some point in
7 the future.

8 MR. ROUSE: I want to clarify what I just heard.
9 You said that a 6C-only reader would be more
10 expensive than a dual protocol?

11 MR. LOCKHART: Other way around. Sorry. I may
12 have misspoke. So a 6C-only reader would be less
13 costly than a multiprotocol product.

14 MR. HANCOCK: Okay. Yes, gentleman --

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Doug Williams with 3M. Couple
16 things, number 1, we submitted a pretty succinct
17 questionnaire. I want to make sure you guys have it.

18 MR. HANCOCK: We do.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: You received that. The second
20 thing is when it comes to my understanding of how
21 things work especially in California, and I manage
22 the 3M from a sales perspective, it's only business
23 for the southwest. That would include TXDOT, E470
24 WSDOT, the whole nine yards. Agencies -- we have
25 found, agencies in California especially have been

1 wanting to get some direction from an organization
2 such as this and say whether or not it will be
3 feasible for them to go to 6C. I have personally
4 experienced a lot of support for 6C. Everybody's
5 just kind of waiting. They're waiting for a couple
6 things. They're waiting for the IBBTA
7 interoperability committee to decide when that's
8 going to occur. They're looking somewhere around
9 2016 for that to happen. I'm not sure that will
10 happen or not. It's debatable whether everybody will
11 come together.

12 Second thing is different agencies also have, as
13 I believe Tom said, they have different requirements
14 for exactly what they need. You know, you take a
15 look at the L.A. Metro who's worried about how
16 they're going to have a switchable tag, the T21
17 switchable tag for I-10 or the 10 freeway. You're
18 also looking at companies like sbX that have
19 responsibility just for standard T21, whatever. But
20 there's different T21 formats. Consequently, I think
21 you're going to see different 6C formats, switchable,
22 nonswitchable. The cool thing, when we get to what's
23 the benefit, the benefit is a huge cost savings to
24 the public, and instead of paying \$30 for an
25 old-fashioned T21, they're going to procure a 6C

1 sticker tag for maybe 5 bucks, and that's a huge
2 benefit to the public.

3 Now it's going to offset the fact that there's
4 going to be more toll roads, more opportunities to
5 use those, okay, but down the line the benefit is,
6 wow, okay. It's going to be a much less expensive
7 solution as well as them moving into switchables may
8 cost a little bit more, of course, whether it's going
9 to be a switchable for an on/off or switchable 1, 2,
10 3. In any event, I see that as being a huge
11 opportunity in fact for the public to be able to not
12 have to spend as much money for a tag and to have it
13 interoperable.

14 3M manufacturers, of course, an interoperable
15 reader that's -- excuse me, a multiprotocol reader to
16 read all of them. It can read them all. It's a
17 matter of flipping some switches. So the beauty to
18 us of course is some readers would have to be changed
19 out. But at the same time -- selfishly speaking.
20 But at the same time, the public ultimately will have
21 something that perhaps you could drive through from
22 Washington down to California, it will be read. Go
23 from Colorado into California, it will be able to be
24 read.

25 So I just see the benefit of a multiprotocol

1 reader, the multiprotocol system, and if it is 6C for
2 the western United States, ultimately each individual
3 agency will determine what's best for them, but they
4 want the option of and the endorsement of a 6C
5 protocol.

6 MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

7 MR. BARBAGALLO: So one of the issues with 6C,
8 at least as I understand it, is that it's a sticker
9 tag, and most of the customer databases that I've
10 seen, vehicles change pretty frequently, once every
11 sometimes two years, two and a half years, sometimes
12 even less than that. And so as vehicles change, you
13 would have to address how the cost impact of a
14 sticker tag is going to be dealt with when your now
15 normal tag, living as I said five to ten years, how
16 that factors over that five- to ten-year life of that
17 normal tag.

18 MR. HANCOCK: Well, I would say on that there's
19 various form factors that are available and 6C, as
20 the gentleman mentioned, also in Title 21 currently
21 there's a couple factors. So that would be -- part
22 of that would be up to the individual tolling agency
23 and what form factors they would like to offer to
24 their customers.

25 MR. BARBAGALLO: So are those form factors still

1 \$5?

2 MR. HANCOCK: It would just depend on what form
3 factor that you're choosing what the -- you know,
4 what the price would be. That would be up to the
5 tolling agency to decide what form factors. We
6 currently don't cover in the existing regulation any
7 form factors, and there's two form factors. It's up
8 to the agency to decide what form factors they need
9 and what they want to offer to their customer. I
10 would imagine going to 6C or any other protocol would
11 be the same situation where they would have to make
12 the decisions on what form factors they would like to
13 offer the customers.

14 MR. KOBLENTZ: Scott Koblentz with SANDAG.
15 Looking at this cost-benefit analysis transition just
16 from a tag perspective, we've done a significant
17 cost-benefit analysis. It's a lifetime away. Even
18 if you have a two-and-a-half-year turnover on sticker
19 tags, if that's the only form that you're going with,
20 when you look at the delta between the sticker tag
21 and the Title 21 tag and even at a five-year life of
22 a standard Title 21 tag, I mean, it's simple math at
23 any scale.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I'm sorry. I missed your opening.
25 You led with your conclusion, and I didn't hear it.

1 You said what?

2 MR. KOBLENTZ: I'm sorry. So in terms of the
3 cost-benefit analysis of the transition between a 6C
4 tag in any form and a Title 21 tag, even if it has a
5 two-and-a-half-year life based on the turnover of the
6 vehicle.

7 MR. SHEEHY: Even if what has a turnover life?

8 MR. KOBLENTZ: He mentioned that sometimes the
9 sticker tag lives with that vehicle and that vehicle
10 then gets turned over after every two and a half
11 years.

12 MR. SHEEHY: Okay.

13 MR. KOBLENTZ: But even at that delta between
14 tags, the Title 21 tags, as it stands today, and a 6C
15 sticker tag or even a 6C case tag which is available
16 and implemented in some areas, there's -- it's black
17 and white. There's no comparison between the two in
18 terms of the cost to the agency.

19 MR. REDMAN: If I could comment. Eric Redman,
20 Neology. One of the advantages of 6C that hasn't
21 been mentioned is typically there is no battery
22 associated with the 6C tag. That has a savings, you
23 know, environmentally. There's a cost savings.
24 There's also a maintenance savings. You know, the
25 current technology, the customer has to figure out,

1 hey, the tag's not working anymore. Maybe they get a
2 letter from the agency or something. They have to
3 turn it back in, figure out if it's still good or
4 not.

5 And then there's a disposal issue. Some of the
6 newer tags now have the symbol on there don't throw
7 away in normal trash. So all those issues are
8 avoidable with the 6C technology.

9 The other advantage is actually with that loss
10 of a battery, loss of a circuit board. You could put
11 it in a credit card format. You can put it in a hard
12 case. You can put it in a sticker tag. So there's a
13 host of different options. The options actually
14 increase dramatically with technology.

15 MR. KOBLENTZ: Scott Koblentz, SANDAG. Even if
16 the vehicle does turn over and that sticker tag is on
17 there, it's still an agency advantage of having an
18 identifying object on that vehicle. So if you sell
19 the vehicle to me, I'm not a registered user. I'm
20 not a violator. I have a bad account. I can track
21 that. I can still try and somehow recoup and
22 identify that vehicle. And it's not from a privacy
23 concern and all the other things that will be
24 discussed at some point today, I'm assuming, but it's
25 just allowing us to identify what that vehicle is.

1 We have a large violation issue in San Diego, and so
2 part of that issue is we do not require transponders
3 for carpoolers. And as time goes on 10, 15, 20
4 years, even if sticker tags are the preferred method,
5 even with those turnovers, it still allows us to try
6 and recoup some of that.

7 MR. NELSON: Rick Nelson with TXDOT. In a
8 previous life I was with Florida's turnpike. I was
9 director of toll operations there from 2008 to 2012.
10 Why that's relevant is 2008 is when we went to
11 sticker tags from hard case tags. Overwhelmingly,
12 the customers chose the sticker tag over the hard
13 case tag. I mean, they saw the benefits and costs
14 that they would get on a sticker tag. This wasn't a
15 6C, it was a 6B sticker tag. But the difference in
16 the delta on that, them turning over vehicles, that
17 was one of the things that we were concerned about.
18 We absolutely didn't see that an issue from the
19 customer.

20 The other side I'll tell you is the portable
21 tags, the hard case tags that can move vehicle to
22 vehicle caused a lot of additional costs because
23 people would buy one transponder and associate
24 multiple vehicles with it. We ended up I-tolling
25 them or doing a video toll, only charging them a

1 nonvideo toll rate for it. It's a significant back
2 office cost because of that. So I believe there is
3 some benefit to the agencies to have a sticker
4 because it's on the vehicle. It's associated with
5 that vehicle, and you won't have to be video plating
6 all of those and then charging them for a lower rate
7 if that's your business rule.

8 MR. HARRIS: Now you said that the preference
9 was clearly for the sticker, and you said that was
10 because of cost. Were there any other factors you
11 think that led to that preference?

12 MR. NELSON: All I can say is 90 percent of the
13 customers chose to continue to buy a sticker tag and
14 go away from the hard case that they could move
15 vehicle to vehicle. It was a very, very small amount
16 that still wanted a portable tag.

17 MR. BARBAGALLO: So there's a customer service
18 advantage to a sticker tag that is -- we haven't even
19 touched on here, and that is that you as an agency
20 can modify your business rules so that enrollment in
21 your program is really simple. You get a tag. You
22 stick it on the vehicle. When it goes through the
23 first time, you identify the license plate, find the
24 registered owner, create an account for them, offer
25 them an opportunity to become a prepaid customer. It

1 really is very, very simple. And if you can get tags
2 cheaply like they did in Vancouver, those tags can be
3 disseminated at events virtually for free without
4 requiring people to buy them. \$5 is a lot, I just
5 want to say that. For a sticker tag, that's a lot.
6 It's not a little.

7 MR. HANCOCK: So even if you mail them out,
8 you're going to be paying a lot less for mailing
9 versus the hard cases.

10 MR. BARBAGALLO: That's right. Or have events
11 where you just hand them out. And you gain
12 population in your FasTrak database easily and
13 cheaply. There's -- this has been proven in
14 Vancouver. It's a very extreme customer service
15 advantage. So yes, there's advantages to sticker
16 tags. The disadvantage of course in the migration
17 from Title 21's Legacy to 6C and the cost associated
18 with that.

19 MR. NELSON: One other comment, I've seen bids
20 or seen actual purchases of 6C's at 80 cents to a
21 \$1.05. Removable tags, 6C, probably \$5 range.

22 MR. SHEEHY: I'm sorry. I missed that. You
23 said you've seen bids on 6C tags as low as 80 cents,
24 and what was the second part?

25 MR. NELSON: I've seen bids in agencies buy 6C

1 for 80 cents. I've seen them buy them for a \$1.05
2 load on top of a small quantity. I've seen the
3 portables where they were in the \$5 range. The \$5 is
4 a very high number for 6C.

5 MR. HANCOCK: What are the agencies -- toll
6 agencies paying for Title 21 tags these days?

7 MR. KOBLENTZ: Switchable or standard or both.

8 MR. HANCOCK: Both.

9 MR. KOBLENTZ: Currently range from standard \$11
10 to we've had quotes up to \$18 for standard tags. For
11 switchable tags, the last one we purchased for around
12 \$14, \$14.50, and that price ranges from \$14 up to the
13 \$19 to \$20 range.

14 MR. HANCOCK: So you're looking at a substantial
15 difference in cost for the 6C.

16 MR. KOBLENTZ: Huge delta. It's a scale, we had
17 conversations.

18 MR. HANCOCK: Frank.

19 MR. BARBAGALLO: Yeah. I was going to add on to
20 the price of a Title 21 Legacy tag varies also
21 depending on whether or not you warranty it. Don't
22 warranty it. There's all kinds of --

23 MR. KOBLENTZ: Right. There is a bunch of
24 variables. You'll get apples of apples. There's a
25 large delta in the base price.

1 MR. HANCOCK: So you're talking well over \$10,
2 in that delta?

3 MR. KOBLENTZ: Could be, yes.

4 MR. ROUSE: I would just note it is likely that
5 there will still be a pretty strong market for a hard
6 case tag here in California. Just based on my
7 understanding of the form factors for 6C tags, a
8 switchable 6C tag would probably have to be a hard
9 case tag, and there are some agencies such as L.A.
10 Metro that deal almost exclusively in switchable
11 tags. So there would still be -- there would still
12 be a market share for that, but it does sound like
13 there would still be a reduced cost because of the 6C
14 technology, as I understand it. Am I understanding
15 that correctly?

16 MR. NELSON: In the place that I've seen them
17 used was in Utah where they could turn them on and
18 off, not necessarily set them for different numbers
19 of people in the vehicle. I'm not sure how you're
20 saying switchable. There's the one you can turn on
21 and off or put multiple --

22 MR. ROUSE: That would be multiple position.

23 MR. HANCOCK: Multiple three position is what
24 the current Title 21 switchable tag is, single
25 occupancy HOV2, HOV2 plus.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: You've got tags very similar.
2 Basically it pulls down and will either show red or
3 it would show not. And basically because it's so
4 visible, it gives the state trooper the ability to
5 determine whether or not that person has gone through
6 a reader-only system and has tried to say, yes, I
7 have more people in my vehicle or I don't and be told
8 either way. So that's a tag that's interesting to
9 look at.

10 MR. SHEEHY: That's a two-position operation
11 reader?

12 MR. WILLIAMS: It's either one, on or off, toll
13 or no toll.

14 MR. SHEEHY: Okay. So it doesn't distinguish
15 between HOV2 and HOV3?

16 MR. WILLIAMS: No that's pretty much L.A.
17 Metro.

18 MR. SHEEHY: So with a sticker tag on 6C doesn't
19 have a box, it's a -- you could have a two-position
20 scenario where it shows it's either on or off; is
21 that right?

22 MR. WILLIAMS: I think Eric can speak better on
23 this. Even on 6C you're going to need a box for a
24 switchable, yeah.

25 MR. SHEEHY: Otherwise, if you have a sticker

1 you're just on all the time.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Plain tag.

3 MR. REDMAN: There are some agencies that will
4 attempt to still use a sticker and have the
5 selectability be an app or on an online method for
6 the customer. As we can all imagine --

7 MR. SHEEHY: Then you're combining RFID with
8 cellular?

9 MR. REDMAN: No. You're not managing your tag.
10 You're managing your account with a -- you know,
11 online that requires the public to do a little bit
12 more than just throwing a switch. That can be
13 problematic.

14 MR. BARBAGALLO: In L.A. that would be difficult
15 because they use beacons to identify for the CHP on
16 whether or not -- what the position is.

17 MR. SHEEHY: How does the beacon process work in
18 L.A.?

19 MR. BARBAGALLO: So what happens, it lights up.
20 There's a beacon that lights up above the lane, and
21 it will indicate whether or not they're traveling
22 with the transponder in a mode appropriate for HOV.

23 MR. SHEEHY: Does the beacon recognize whether you're
24 HOV2 or HOV3? Or is it just simply on/off?

25 MR. KOBLENTZ: Currently, no, it doesn't.

1 MR. SHEEHY: Does it go red or green depending
2 on whether the tag is on or off so the CHP can see?

3 MR. KOBLENTZ: The colors can vary. The colors
4 can be configured HOV2, HOV3. You can have
5 multicolors in the beacon. The enforcement is a
6 whole nother conversation. It's still utilizing
7 those beacon lights. With CHP, it's a very difficult
8 thing for them to identify and triangulate regardless
9 of the position with multiple vehicles going under
10 the beacon which vehicle is which color and then how
11 to enforce thereof.

12 MR. SHEEHY: The officer I guess then has to do
13 several things. He or she has to see what the color
14 of the light is, has to determine which car it
15 applies to, and then he has to get a visual on the
16 car I assume to see is there two or three or just one
17 person in it, right?

18 MR. KOBLENTZ: Yeah.

19 MR. SHEEHY: All of that has got to happen
20 simultaneously.

21 MR. KOBLENTZ: You can't pull them over at 60,
22 70 miles an hour. It's a difficult scenario for them
23 to do.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I mean, it sort of raises a
25 question if you get into a multitag protocol

1 situation, is your efficiency going to go down, is
2 that going to create revenue issues.

3 MR. KOBLENTZ: Our efficiency can't go down any
4 further.

5 MR. SHEEHY: You're already at the bottom. Good
6 to know.

7 MR. HARRIS: This is a very obviously light
8 discussion. I think we should probably take a break.
9 We can wrap this up after we take a break. Let's
10 take about ten minutes. That clock is a little fast,
11 but let's try to come back when that clock says
12 11:25. Thanks.

13 (Break taken.)

14 MR. HARRIS: All right. Everybody thank you
15 very much. I apologize for breaking up the
16 conversations. I know that's actually one of the
17 major benefits of gathering like this is to be able
18 to network with people from different places. So
19 hopefully there will be a little more opportunity as
20 well. In terms of scheduling, we're going on a
21 pretty good clip here. My proposal is that we
22 continue on for about another hour, see where we are.
23 If it seems like we're going to be here longer, then
24 we'll break for lunch. Otherwise, we may just go
25 ahead with a short break and then continue.

1 Hopefully that will be okay. Please let me know
2 if there's any particular feeling one way or another.
3 I thought we would go for another hour or so, see
4 where we are. Kind of take an informal poll as a
5 group as to how we're going to proceed heading into
6 the afternoon. I did not want to close off the
7 entire conversation that we were in the middle of
8 before the break. So if there are any other
9 comments, specifically in regard to time tables, I
10 mean, obviously one of my major take aways from this
11 morning's discussion is that obviously the department
12 needs to make sure that it's communicating and
13 coordinating with people as to what kind of a
14 transition from the Legacy program to any new
15 protocol needs to be, and I think that conversation
16 has been very helpful to us. One comment was made
17 you may not want an indefinite, but I think we need
18 to obviously be flexible to understand the different
19 needs of the different agencies.

20 Are there any other comments to wrap up the
21 issues regarding time tables at this time? Anybody.

22 Why don't we move on then to the next part of
23 the agenda. That puts me at Roman numeral VI, and
24 I'm going to be candid with you, these next few items
25 honestly are where the department is looking for your

1 input because should we go forward with any
2 regulatory package, these are the questions that the
3 department's going to be asked by the Office of
4 Administrative Law again to make sure that our --
5 that our regulations do what they're supposed to do
6 and that they're not overly burdensome on, first of
7 all, the agencies that have to abide by them, but
8 there is again obviously a very strong moving in the
9 state to make sure that we don't do anything in terms
10 of collateral damage to the economic vitality of the
11 state.

12 So the first issue is potential economic
13 impacts. That's obviously a very broad concept. The
14 next one has to do with the potential impacts on the
15 ability of California businesses to compete. That's
16 obviously again a major focus of not just the
17 legislature but the governor and the state. So why
18 don't we take those kind of together. What potential
19 impacts do we see from an economic standpoint of
20 transition to 6C. We talked to some of them in terms
21 of the consumer benefit which seems to be potentially
22 quite strong. Any other comments on that issue?

23 Yes, down here in front.

24 MR. LOCKHART: Steve Lockhart, Star Systems. I
25 just have a procedural question. I also want to

1 mention something about the survey or the
2 questionnaire that we sent back in advance. I had
3 done that as well. Do we need to -- if we've listed
4 a bunch of things, like I listed a whole laundry list
5 of technical benefits of 6C. Do we not have to
6 rehash that? Can I leave it in the questionnaire
7 that I submitted or do we need to --

8 MR. HARRIS: If you feel you need to highlight
9 anything, that's fine.

10 MR. LOCKHART: I don't. I just wondered if we
11 submitted them in the questionnaire, is that on the
12 record?

13 MR. HARRIS: Yeah. I mean, obviously that will
14 allow us to follow up and appreciate that very much,
15 the completing the questionnaire. Again anyone else
16 who has that questionnaire, if you haven't completed
17 it, again obviously do that at any time and obviously
18 you can do it to -- as little or as much as you want,
19 but any of that information will be helpful.

20 And again I want to make clear though this is,
21 you know, not the end of the process. We are at the
22 beginning. There will clearly obviously be a formal
23 comment period as we go forward should we indeed
24 decide to promulgate regulations. But thanks very
25 much for the questionnaires. So yes, we'll take any

1 comments written or oral.

2 MR. HANCOCK: Question in the back here.

3 MR. HARRIS: Question in the back there?

4 MR. WILLIAMS: Doug Williams, 3M. Just a quick
5 question. Do we have any type of information you can
6 share with us as to what the different tolling
7 agencies and authorities would like? Do they want
8 6C? Do they want to move forward with a variation of
9 that? Any information from them other than what I've
10 already indicated.

11 MR. HANCOCK: They have indicated to us -- can
12 you hear me fine?

13 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, absolutely.

14 MR. HANCOCK: Usually people say I have a loud
15 voice so they don't have a problem. So just want to
16 make sure. They have communicated to Caltrans, CTOC
17 agencies have written a letter to Caltrans asking us
18 to -- indicating that they want us to change the
19 regulations to go to 6C. So yeah, they have made
20 that request.

21 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. And have they been
22 specific as to what type of 6C technology they're
23 looking for in the form factor as we discussed
24 earlier? Are they looking for switchables? Are they
25 looking for on/off, toll/no toll?

1 MR. ROUSE: No. Just strictly adopting the 6C
2 protocol. Again as mentioned earlier, the form
3 factors are really an agency individual choice. If
4 you look at the regs as specified, you know, in
5 Title 21, it is strictly just the communication
6 protocol between the tag and the reader. Nothing
7 more.

8 MR. HANCOCK: Yeah. We do not specify currently
9 any form factors, and I would imagine with any
10 protocols that we move forward with for the
11 regulation that we would not specify in the
12 regulation what form factors. We would leave that
13 up, as it currently is, to the agencies in terms of
14 procuring what their needs are to the specific
15 agencies.

16 MR. ROUSE: There is also some supplemental
17 information that we have posted on our web page
18 related to the distribution of the bits -- correct me
19 if I'm wrong; you're the technical guy -- as to how
20 the bits are assigned and the number of IDs that are
21 assigned to each agency. So that's a separate thing
22 that is not included in the regulation itself. The
23 regulations strictly deals with the communication
24 between the tag and the reader, but there's other
25 supplemental guidance, and that's how we're able to

1 make the distinction for the switchable tag is on
2 that separate document that lists out the bits that
3 are going to be used and things like that. He knows
4 that more than I do.

5 MR. WILLIAMS: From a Caltrans perspective, is
6 there any use of tags in a TTI type of environment,
7 time travel indicator, where like in Colorado, okay,
8 they'll -- CDOT will use different types of readers.
9 They'll use a reader simply to pick up but not to
10 toll, to pick up different, you know, sticker tags,
11 if you will, so that they can kind of tell how fast
12 I-70 is going and they can tell, you know, how fast
13 I-25 is going south of town. Time travel indicators
14 utilize those sticker tags. CDOT has said to me they
15 would like to get every car in Colorado to have the
16 tags so they could measure such things. Is there any
17 appetite to that within Caltrans?

18 MR. ROUSE: For a number of years here in the
19 Bay Area the FasTrak tags were being used for
20 travel -- the FasTrak readers were being used to
21 track travel times. There are some concerns with
22 that, as it relates to privacy. I can tell you the
23 data is encrypted, so there was no personal
24 information transmitted as part of that, but there
25 have -- there have been some concerns raised along

1 the way about them being used for that purpose.
2 However, my understanding and the folks from NTC who
3 are here can correct me if I'm wrong, my
4 understanding is that those tags are not being used
5 for travel time information anymore. Instead they
6 are collecting from INRIX. I'm getting nods from the
7 audience, so --

8 MR. SHEEHY: What's INRIX?

9 MR. ROUSE: INRIX is a private firm that
10 collects travel time data, freeway performance data
11 and sells it to various entities.

12 MR. BARBAGALLO: You know, one of the issues
13 that existed in the Title 21 Legacy world was how new
14 vendors were able to come on, get tested, get
15 verified so that they could also sell the tags, and
16 there was a lot of fuzziness around that process for
17 new vendors to get certified, if you will.

18 MR. HANCOCK: Yeah. New vendors to be able to
19 produce and sell.

20 MR. BARBAGALLO: Yes. So that goes sort of to
21 this economic impact. The more vendors that are
22 available to produce the item, whether they be local
23 California vendors or vendors outside of the state of
24 California, will help reduce some of those costs so
25 that they do get to that 80 cent level or below.

1 MR. HANCOCK: Yeah. As far as new vendors
2 coming online, we've been requested to have a
3 certification process, testing and certification
4 process, as a part of going to the new protocol. So
5 that would pave the way for new vendors to get into
6 the market in California so that where we do not
7 currently have that process, as you indicated Frank,
8 in the Legacy Title 21 protocol. So yeah, that's
9 something that we would -- we had been requested and
10 we would look at addressing in the new regulation.

11 MR. HARRIS: Any other comments on the potential
12 economic impact of a -- yes.

13 MR. NELSON: Rick Nelson with TXDOT. One of the
14 reasons I'm here and I'm looking at this, Texas is on
15 the train route between Mexico and Canada, some of
16 the bridges that California -- some of the bridge
17 crossings we're dealing with now have 6C. And
18 Canada, same way, some of those bridges have 6C. So
19 we're trying to improve what would be our train
20 route, what would be the best thing -- I guess this
21 is partly a statement, partly a question too. Are
22 you looking at also, I heard your port guy was here,
23 port security, freight security, other things to do
24 with economic development for the state and trade
25 within the state as being part of what you're trying

1 to accomplish?

2 MR. HANCOCK: We haven't been requested by
3 nontolling entities as far as changing the protocols.
4 It's come from the tolling agencies themselves.
5 There are others that use Title 21, but as we
6 indicated before, we could address any timing of
7 transition or a sunseting differently for the
8 nontolling agencies versus the tolling agencies.

9 MR. BARBAGALLO: In Vancouver when they entered
10 into discussion, Vancouver is an example where Golden
11 Ears has Title 21, Legacy technology, Port Mann has
12 6C technology sticker tags. So that's an example of
13 a region where they do have both protocols in
14 existence and use them both. But there was a big
15 discussion when the decision was made for Port Mann
16 to go with 6C with regard to goods and the trucking
17 industries' use of their protocol for that purpose,
18 and so these multiprotocol readers that 3M was
19 discussing were very important and critical to how
20 they would achieve that interoperability, if you
21 will, between in essence three different devices.

22 So you might want to consider something about a
23 time line for moving to multiprotocol readers for
24 those few locations that don't have it and how is the
25 state going to provide that funding. Is there going

1 to be assistance in that for the local agencies, how
2 are they going to accomplish that.

3 MR. HANCOCK: Okay. Any other questions on the
4 potential economic impacts?

5 MR. HARRIS: Okay. Let's move on to the next
6 one. Again, we've already touched on this a little
7 bit. I think obviously this is a major issue for the
8 tolling agencies and others in terms of the fiscal
9 impacts on state and local government, and I think
10 that's obviously where we're going to loop back
11 around to the transition period and how long any
12 Legacy system is going to stick around, so
13 particularly from the tolling agencies, but at any
14 rate, obviously what is the sense of how this
15 transition is going to impact the tolling agencies in
16 terms of their making a transition to a new protocol?

17 MR. SHEEHY: This is a question to the
18 collective wisdom of the group. It seems like I'm
19 putting on my Department of Finance hat here since
20 you're on the state and local government fiscal. It
21 looks like the vast majority of the fiscal impact
22 would be a local government impact and not state.
23 Doesn't look like there's going to be much of a
24 Caltrans -- Caltrans is not going to be involved in
25 switching out tags or reading hardware or anything

1 else. So it looks like it's really a local
2 government fiscal issue. Am I missing something?

3 MR. ROUSE: No. That's correct. Caltrans does
4 not operate -- does not operate any electronic toll
5 collection systems. Not at this time. We may in the
6 near future.

7 MR. HARRIS: Anybody have anything to add with
8 regard to potential fiscal impacts to particularly
9 local governments, particularly the agencies that
10 would be using this technology and that would be
11 involved in, you know, any transfer or any transition
12 from the current Title 21 to a new protocol, whether
13 it be 6C or something else? Any --

14 MS. VALDIVIA: So there's at least an answer to
15 this question from one agency's perspective, Lynn
16 Valdivia from Bay Area Toll Authority. There will be
17 some costs associated with modifying our systems to
18 accept the protocols, but we're looking forward to
19 the lower cost tags, costs of that. So we're not
20 particularly concerned about a large fiscal impact.

21 MR. HARRIS: How long do you think it will take
22 to transition?

23 MS. VALDIVIA: 18 months to two years, in that
24 range.

25 MR. HANCOCK: So long term, will you be saving

1 money transitioning to 6C, or will it cost you money
2 overall?

3 MS. VALDIVIA: I have not done an analysis of
4 that.

5 MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

6 MS. VALDIVIA: But we are thinking that it will
7 save us money, but I haven't done any kind of
8 analysis on it.

9 MR. LOCKHART: Steve Lockhart. Actually, this
10 is just a question to Lynn. You said up to two-year
11 length of time for your administrative changes. What
12 do you see as your biggest administrative challenge
13 for a switch, just kind of out of curiosity. Do you
14 have something that comes to mind as your largest
15 administrative challenge?

16 MS. VALDIVIA: We have different contractors
17 that will need to make software changes, so
18 coordinate that with our partners within the region
19 that will make the changes. We operate the regional
20 customer service center, so coordinating all of that.
21 And then there will be customer education, different
22 form factors out there most likely. So we'll need to
23 get -- make sure that customers understand all of
24 this. So I don't see major hurdles in there.

25 MR. LOCKHART: So this is sort of a process that

1 needs to be shepherded through?

2 MS. VALDIVIA: Yep.

3 MR. LOCKHART: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. HARRIS: Any other comments on the fiscal
5 impacts on state and local governments? Okay. We'll
6 have a catchall at the end. Basically we're down to
7 number 9 on the list here, issues regarding
8 individual privacy, I'll take that as something that
9 I have an interest in obviously because any time you
10 start tracking people's movements, certain segments
11 get skittish about big brother, whether that be
12 government big brother or corporate big brother
13 knowing where they're traveling. So I think that's
14 obviously an issue that will have to be answered
15 probably not so much by the -- with regard to folks
16 in this room but the public at large. The people are
17 always interested in the advance of technology and
18 what it says about that. Does anybody have any
19 particular thoughts on issues of individual privacy.

20 MR. SHEEHY: So I don't have any new to add
21 today, but I have a question to the collective wisdom
22 in the room. Would the transition to a 6C protocol
23 as is contemplated here create any new privacy
24 issues? I think many of the existing privacy issues
25 that exist with RFID and Title 21 have been well

1 talked about, documented, understood, debated and
2 agencies debated in the legislature. I think that
3 that -- and would back up things like LPR and so on
4 and so forth, I think those privacy issues are pretty
5 well mapped out, maybe not fully decided. Does the
6 transition to this protocol that's being anticipated
7 bring any new privacy issues to mind?

8 MR. HARRIS: You framed the issue very well,
9 obviously far more eloquently than I did. That's
10 really my concern does the advance of technology
11 create new privacy issues beyond what already exists
12 with everything else that already occurs. I think
13 that's the main issue is will there be any
14 significant concern or backlash from the public at
15 large as to will the issue of system allow certain
16 people, whether it be government or corporate
17 entities, private entities, to track my movements in
18 a more detailed way than they currently can, and is
19 there any sense of what the answer to that question
20 might be? Is the margin of technology going to make
21 it even more?

22 MR. LOCKHART: Sorry, Steve Lockhart. Yeah. I
23 can't think of how 6C would be any different in terms
24 of privacy than Title 21 and any existing challenges
25 that you might have with Title 21.

1 MR. HARRIS: Obviously that's what we're hoping
2 for, but I just want to make sure we are capturing.
3 Yeah, back here.

4 MR. PUCCINELLI: Ron Puccinelli, Port of Oakland
5 again. The only thing I can think of off the top of
6 my head that might be interesting because it's an ISO
7 standard, it could potentially open up for more
8 unintended sharing. If I'm from the Bay Area and I
9 go up to, I don't know, Canada or Mexico or whatever,
10 they could without my knowledge gather my information
11 because it's an international standard.

12 MR. BARBAGALLO: I don't think they can. The
13 information -- your information isn't resident on the
14 tag. Your information is resident in the back
15 office.

16 MR. PUCCINELLI: Correct. They could still
17 track my tag movement.

18 MR. BARBAGALLO: As they could by taking a
19 picture of your license plate.

20 MR. HANCOCK: That could currently occur with
21 the existing Title 21 too. If someone purchased the
22 reader, put it out, they could read that transponder.
23 It would not provide any personal information as
24 Frank indicated.

25 MR. ROUSE: That's how they were being used for

1 travel times.

2 MR. HANCOCK: Yeah, exactly. That's how they
3 were being used for travel times. Same issue. It
4 wouldn't be any different with 6C versus Title 21.

5 MR. LOCKHART: Steve Lockhart. The only
6 exception to that is maybe 6C readers are going to be
7 much more ubiquitous and widely available to the
8 public perhaps than a Title 21 read would be. Like I
9 can go -- anyone can go buy a 6C handheld reader very
10 easily. I'm not sure you can do that with a Title 21
11 reader as easily. So, you know, there's more 6C
12 readers available, but you can read somebody's
13 license plate or whatever. Again, there's no
14 personal information or there should not be any
15 personal information stored on the transponder, but
16 just being able to track the movement, I think just
17 because of the nature of the availability of readers,
18 there would be more read points possibly.

19 MR. HARRIS: You spoke of a transition in
20 Florida -- your time in Florida. Was this ever
21 raised as a concern? Was there any great level of
22 concern that, you know, this new technology was going
23 to allow people to track movements even more than the
24 old technology? Was there any of that?

25 MR. NELSON: Same protocols. So we had C built

1 protocol on a hard case active tag. We went to a
2 plastic sticker tag. If they could read the hard
3 case, they could read the sticker tag. And you're
4 right there's just -- because this 6C is widely used
5 for EPC, electronic price control, there is a lot
6 more readers out there, but the information on it
7 really doesn't give them anything. I mean, like you
8 say it's like looking at the license plate number.
9 Yeah, you got that, and people get tracked by their
10 license plate number by automatic license plate
11 readers and other things electronically.

12 So, I mean, as technology advances there's not
13 really any way that you can prevent those thing from
14 happening no matter what protocol you decide to use.
15 That may be a good thing that there's actually more
16 because you may get more applications and other
17 things used that provide the public more services
18 than they get today.

19 MR. HARRIS: Any other comments on individual
20 privacy?

21 Okay. Very good. Well, that brings to what is
22 officially our last topic, but in terms of this, what
23 I'd really like to do, anything else that's on your
24 mind, please bring it up. But mostly what I'd like
25 to hear is we are having another workshop in Fontana

1 in a couple weeks. I'm hoping that some, if not all
2 of you, can attend that. Let us know as we're going
3 forward here exactly what information we need to get
4 to you, to get from you, the way that you want us to
5 communicate with you, so this is now truly the open
6 forum part of the workshop here.

7 So anything that's on your mind, please let us
8 know, any other issues that we have not covered or
9 you think need to be addressed in any more detail.
10 Anything at all?

11 MR. NELSON: I would just commend you for what
12 you're doing. I think it's a good process. I really
13 think it's a global issue for a state when you get to
14 a protocol. I commend you for doing that. I think
15 all states should look at that. It gets back and
16 forth between agencies. There needs to be some
17 global standard set because it affects the whole
18 state. I just compliment you on this process. I'm
19 kind of here to see what it is, to see what works and
20 what doesn't work for Texas.

21 MR. HARRIS: Thank you for joining us here.
22 It's been very enlightening, not just your experience
23 in Texas but in Florida as well. Any other comments?

24 MR. RAMANUJAM: I have a similar comment. My
25 name is Murali Ramanujam I'm from Santa Clara Valley

1 Transportation Authority. We do have an express
2 lanes project. We're coming online as an agency.
3 We're quite supportive of what's being undertaken to
4 move to the 6C protocol. See more flexibility and a
5 better way of undertaking this electronic toll.

6 MR. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you. Any other
7 comments?

8 MR. PATILLA: Lester Patilla, Port of Oakland
9 Aviation Division. I think it's a good thing if we
10 can have this at the airport facility because we're
11 using the AVI tags for -- RFID tags for our
12 commercial vehicles, limos, shuttles, possibly taxis,
13 things we have in our parking lot operation. So
14 we're not doing tolls. So they in the past -- they
15 have not been Title 21. So I think the new ones
16 probably will be or possibly, but we've had in the
17 past our older ones, I guess there was interference
18 when the FasTraks run, they run near the same
19 location. So that was an issue for us. But again if
20 airports can be called out, that would be great.

21 MR. HANCOCK: There is a gentleman in the middle
22 I believe that had his hand up.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Oh, me.

24 MR. HANCOCK: Yeah.

25 MR. WILLIAMS: Doug Williams. I just have to

1 reiterate that I appreciate the forum very much so.
2 We've been out talking 6C technology for a while. So
3 I much appreciate the fact we have the opportunity to
4 discuss it. I think it's a good day for California.
5 Native born in Southern California guy, UCLA grad.

6 I'm looking at this, and I'm thinking, you know,
7 this is open system. This is an open platform. This
8 gives us the opportunity for competition. This gives
9 you the opportunity for other people to come in, DVEs
10 to come in to participate in the process. This is
11 good when you're looking at the standard T21 tag just
12 for reading a toll that the public might pay \$30 for,
13 you will be able to sell that tag for, you know, up
14 to \$5. I mean, cost on that tag is very cheap, 80
15 cents, 90 cents.

16 But everybody has the opportunity to participate
17 in the process. They can jump on a road, if they
18 need to jump on a road. It's a great day. It's a
19 great day to take a look and say we're looking into
20 new technology. At the same time, we're going to
21 grandfather in those T21 people and switch this into
22 a process that says, okay, you're going to continue
23 to use your T21 tag until around maybe five years,
24 then we're going to move into something just -- first
25 of all it isn't obtrusive to have in the middle of

1 your windshield especially people in Southern
2 California and Silicon Valley drive very nice cars,
3 and they don't like front license pate let alone big
4 boxes in their windows. They have a little sticker
5 tag to participate in the process.

6 So I'm very pleased that you guys are doing
7 this, very pleased to be a part of the course from a
8 3M standpoint. We stand ready to help in any way we
9 can.

10 MR. SHEEHY: Vehicle Code requires front license
11 plates, don't they?

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

13 MR. SHEEHY: They may not like it when they take
14 them off and they get pulled over as a result.

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

16 MR. HARRIS: Any other comments, questions at
17 this point? I would like to thank everybody for
18 taking the time to come out because those who have
19 traveled great distances, I'm glad everyone was able
20 to make it. I'm glad nobody was flying United today
21 because otherwise you might not have made it.
22 Hopefully you didn't have to come across the
23 Bay Bridge which apparently was difficult at least in
24 one direction today.

25 I'll also make one more pitch, if you have the

1 questionnaire, to please, if you can, fill it out,
2 and those who have already done so, we thank you.

3 Again, we'll be doing this again in two weeks
4 from today in Fontana. We sent that information, and
5 we can get that to you as well. Again if you didn't
6 sign in, please do so so that we can make sure we can
7 contact you. Again there is a web -- or excuse me,
8 an e-mail address on that useful links page at the
9 end of the handout where you can contact us. So
10 again thanks very much. Have a safe trip.

11 MR. NELSON: One question, will there be a report
12 or something published from these meetings?

13 MR. SHEEHY: Or a list of who showed up.

14 MR. HARRIS: Obviously, Kacy is taking a
15 transcript here. We intend to make the transcript
16 available publicly on our web site so people can see
17 it. Obviously the entire record-making file will be
18 in many, many binders and will be available as well.
19 Yeah. We are going to make the record available as
20 well.

21 Anything else? Well, thanks very much
22 everybody. Have a great afternoon.

23 (The proceedings concluded at 12:00 p.m.)

24 --oOo--

25