

Status of ITS (AVL) Project

Michael Abegg
Transit Planning Manager
Minnesota Valley Transit Authority
August 29, 2012



AVL History

- Metro Transit deployed Transitmaster many years ago, now a legacy system – Council has invested significant dollars in Upgrade
- "Regional AVL" system simply a deployment of the Metro Transit system to non-Metro Transit providers
- No study of best option for those other operators
- Only MVRTA made a stand to say that the region could do better

MVTA AVL Deployment

- Based on review of 2011 technologies and capabilities plus MVTA and regional operations needs
- RouteMatch system:
 - Cellular-based communications
 - Tablet operator unit
 - Hosted dispatch
- Greater openness and flexibility, simpler operations for MVTA and Schmitt's

Phase I Project

- \$630,465 including hosted dispatch and on-board system for 118 buses (complete)
- Web site interface and basic public portal (soft-launch imminent)
- Data interface to Metro Transit
- Cubic fare collection interface
- Cedar costs: \$193,500
- Basic System costs: \$436,965

Phase II Project (2012

Implementation)

- \$1,005,382 including on-board system, AVVAS, APCs for 7 Cedar Station-to-Station vehicles
- AVVAS (Automated Visual and Voice Announcement System) and APCs (Automated Passenger Counters) for 40 other Cedar Transitway vehicles
- APCs for 12 basic system buses
- Platform Signage (2 park & rides)
- Back office system enhancements
- Cedar costs: \$849,056
- Basic System costs: \$156,326

Phase III Project (2013 Implementation)

- \$420,699 for on-board systems for Rosemount & I-35W CMAQ projects
- APCs - 19 additional "basic system" buses
- Platform Signage (5 park & rides)
- Back office upgrades
- I-35W costs: \$195,428
- Rosemount costs: \$55,921
- Basic System costs: \$169,350

Total All Three Phases

- \$2,056,546 divided as
 - Cedar \$1,042,556
 - I-35W \$195,428
 - Rosemount \$55,921
 - Basic System \$762,641
- Substantially more than original project but includes additional functions not originally included
- Concern: No Met Council comment on program other than debate about which agency would install platform signs in Cedar corridor

Funding - Cedar

- \$14,979 leftover on-bus funds from Cedar Grove buses
- \$450,000 transferred to Met Council in today's action
- Unfunded amount: \$1,027,577
- DCRRA has indicated a willingness to fund additional Cedar elements – dollar amount?

Funding - Basic System

- \$600,000 NTD Formula Funds converted to non-Federal funds
- Unfunded amount: \$162,641
- Concern: unfunded amount, plus likely need to fund Cedar and Rosemount elements with additional Basic System money

I-35W and Rosemount (CMAQ)

- I-35W fully funded
- Rosemount Unfunded amount: \$55,921
(CMAQ project did not specifically include funds for platform signage or vehicle ITS)
- Concern: if funds can not be located within Rosemount CMAQ project, need to come from Basic System funding



Time is of the Essence

- Multiple needs for immediate action
 - Cedar Startup
 - Full Regional Compatibility and regional equity
 - Cedar TSP Costing and equipment acquisition
 - MVTA CMAQ project launches in 2013

Project Delays - Funding

- Council authorization of Basic System Phase II funding – no process in place to approve program and proceed
- Council and DCRRA approval and authorization of Cedar funding after removal of existing CMAQ funds

Project Delays – Non-Funding

- Delays from vendors
 - RouteMatch: provision of Cubic interface
 - Trapeze: provision of documentation for RouteMatch interface
- Council comment and input on overall program
- Council motivation on compatibility project
 - MVRTA staff has provided feedback in a very timely manner and has been flexible while Council staff have been slow, inflexible, and unavailable