

Prohibited Communication with Miovision regarding Hwy 68 AI Adaptive Project

I was informed by Miovision recently that after 3 years of direct communication, Caltrans had instructed them to no longer communicate directly with Barry Jones and me regarding the operation of their system on the Hwy 68 project and that all future communications go directly to Ryan Caldera at Caltrans.

Ironically, it was Barry and I that initially connected Caltrans and TAMC with Miovision in December of 2023 in a 2 hour zoom call to introduce Caltrans to this new technology and facilitated subsequent communication by informing the Board and the Public of the potential that this technology offered to the Hwy 68 project.

Additionally, this communication formed the basis for me receiving the 2024 Transportation Excellence Award for introducing Miovision technology to the Board, who invested in a 5-year study for the corridor. Now, after years of direct communication with Miovision, Caltrans and TAMC staff by Barry and myself with no identified problems, Caltrans has suddenly prohibited it without any specific reason.

Since the installation of the AI Adaptive system early this year, Barry and I have been giving Miovision **direct feedback from observations on its operation in the field**, since we both live on the corridor and frequently drive it, plus we forward **input from neighbors and community input from the Nextdoor blog**. **We have also done hours of observation of traffic flow via Caltrans intersection cameras and WAZE traffic transit times of separate sections of the Hwy 68 corridor to try to optimize the Adaptive performance** so Miovision could make adjustments to do so.

So, what was the problem in having this direct communication with Miovision and why is it suddenly prohibited by Caltrans just as Caltrans and Miovision is scheduled to do actual measurements of the before and after performance of the Miovision system? **What is there to hide from the Public while this analysis is done to actually establish the “benchmark” of AI Adaptive performance** rather than the simulated performance that was **inaccurately portrayed** as “actual” in the June PowerPoint presentation to the Board?

If Caltrans and TAMC want to be truly transparent in the process, should they not encourage open communication between parties involved in the project rather than limiting it, especially at this critical time?

This was the response I got from Ryan Caldera, the Caltrans Project Manager for this project, in an email on 9/18 (Todd Muck received a copy) after asking Caltrans why they were prohibiting direct communication with Miovision.

Mr. Stump,

We directed Miovision to forward public correspondence about the Adaptive Traffic Signal Control Pilot Project to TAMC and Caltrans staff. This approach is most consistent with the contract between Miovision and TAMC so that TAMC Board stays up to date with important developments.

We are no longer able to provide direct responses to your inquiries about the Scenic State Route 68 Scenic Corridor Improvement Project or related efforts, including the Adaptive Traffic Signal Control Pilot Project.

So, what in the TAMC contract with Miovision states that involved members of the Public cannot communicate directly with a private company and is that legally defensible? Barry and I have no problem with giving our observations to Caltrans and TAMC staff which we have done so for years.

In addition to preventing communication with Miovision, why is Caltrans now halting all direct communication and responses between Caltrans and me which we have been doing for years, including discussion of safety issues with the too short left turn lane at Corral de Tierra, safety issues of 2 lane roundabouts including truck tracking, and the Portola merge analysis which is the real cause of the AM Peak commute back up.

Part of the “Key Responsibilities” of a Caltrans Project Manager is listed as:

“Stakeholder Communication: Serve as the liaison and coordinator with Caltrans Headquarters, local/regional agencies, external stakeholders, and the public”

So why is Ryan Caldera as Project Manager for this Hwy 68 project refusing to continue direct communication with involved members of the public and respond to them? Does the Board agree and condone that stance?

It makes no sense if the objective is to be totally transparent and to include all related information and perspectives to produce the best project. Does this promote transparency with the public who is ultimately paying for all of your project decisions as well as the salaries of Caltrans and TAMC staff?

I believe that Barry and I have always been respectful and informative, giving well researched information that may have been omitted, to TAMC, Caltrans and the Board. We have always been open to correction and contrary facts when presented but feel this new communication restriction inhibits dialogue and the exchange of information in a timely fashion and urge the Board to take action to correct it or inform us of any misinterpretation by us or problems created by years of previous communication methods.

Thank you,

Dwight Stump