

February 16, 2005

Update on Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Communications and Coordination During Incidents

Prepared for the Transportation Planning Board

Presented by

Philip Tarnoff, Director

University of Maryland

Center for Advanced Transportation Technology

February 16, 2005

Background

- Existing situation reviewed and concluded that:
 - Incident response is the priority of existing organizations
 - No one is in charge of coordinating regional operations
 - Planning for regional coordination is a spare-time job
- CapCom organization proposed
 - Operations – collaboration, communication, information sharing, facilitation
 - Planning – operational procedures, databases, training
- Three phase plan unanimously approved at 1/19/05
TPB meeting
 - Preparation – Staffing and planning
 - Prototyping – Two shift “trial” operation
 - Operation – Three shift full operation

Operations Example

Step	What Happens Now	If CapCom Existed
Discovery	First responders	First responders
TD as regional incident	Uncertain	CapCom/First Responders
Facilitate regional coordination	Lead Agency (varies-often unclear)	CapCom initiates (e.g. conference call)
Ongoing communications	Ad hoc	Scheduled – CapCom ensures it occurs
Information dissemination	Ad hoc – stovepiped agency by agency	CapCom in coordination with agencies
Tracking regional impacts	Ad hoc	CapCom
Closeout	Lead agency	Lead agency with CapCom assistance
Lessons learned	Ad hoc	CapCom initiates, facilitates & documents

Information Dissemination

- CapCom Mission – To ensure that transportation status information related to the impact of regional incidents is disseminated to the public and among transportation agencies
- CapCom Information Dissemination Scope
 - Responsible for describing transportation system status rather than incident details
 - Rely on automation to the greatest possible degree (especially the Internet)
 - Do not include public information officer (PIO) activities (i.e. CapCom representatives will not brief the media)

A Review of Funding Needs

Phase	Capital Cost	Operations Cost	Total Cost
Preparation (4 mo)	\$125K	\$220K	\$345K
Prototyping (5 mo)	\$840K	\$500K	\$1.34 M
Full Operation (12 mo)	\$1.9 M	\$1.3 M	\$3.2 M
Total	\$2.9 M	\$2.0 M	\$4.9 M

Funding Sources

Funding Source	Process	Requirements for Local Match	Status
UASI (Homeland Security)	Proposal submission and selection	No match required	Approved for submission by screening committee 2/4/2005
Congressional earmark	Congressional action requested by the region	Match using local funding	Under consideration by Congress
Transportation Federal Aid	Agreement of three DOTs	Match using local funding	To be explored
TPB Member Contributions	TPB Agreement	Not applicable	To be explored

Governance

- Under exploration by stakeholders
- Need balance between transportation and public safety requirements
- Need to establish an organization whose sole responsibility is regional coordination
- Emphasis on multi-agency coordination
- George Mason University, stakeholders exploring CapCom organizational options, building on the existing CapWIN governance structure

Where Do We Go From Here?

- TPB
 - Support of Congressional Earmark
 - Active support of UASI proposal with CAOs
- University of Maryland, departments of transportation, TPB staffs:
 - Prepare and submit UASI proposal
 - Continue efforts to define governance structure
 - Continue to explore other funding options

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
February 16, 2005**

Members and Alternates Present

Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria
Ron Spalding, MDOT
Kael Anderson, NCPC
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning
David Moss, Montgomery County DPWT
Art Smith, Loudoun County
Damon Harvey, DDOT
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Cicero Salles, Prince George's County
Susan Hinton, NPS
Lora Byala, WMATA
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
Hilda Barg, Prince William County
Wally Covington, Prince William County
Bruce Reeder, Frederick County
Skip Coburn, DC Council
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Rick Canizales, Prince William County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Board of Supervisors sometime after the Draft Environmental Impact Statement has been released and a public hearing has been held on it, which is not scheduled to occur until the middle or end of March. He said that from a financial point of view, the agency understood that information is needed and hoped it would be available before March 16.

Chairman Mendelson asked if it was correct that the presentation to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors would take place after the TPB's vote on March 16.

Mr. Van Dop said that was the way it is scheduled right now. He said the FHWA and the National Park Service have a preferred alternative and a draft EIS. He said that comments at the public hearing and the comments from the Boards of both Fairfax and Prince William counties and VDOT would provide information that might change the alternative.

Ms. Hudgins said the timing for this project raises some concerns. She said she hoped that before March 16, some answers could be provided regarding the project, particularly related to funding.

Mr. Van Dop said his agency appreciated these issues. He said this ultimately came down to a question of timing: A record of decision could not be issued until the project had been included in the regional conformity analysis.

Chairman Mendelson said the item before the TPB was simply a presentation of the document. He said that when the Board is asked next month to vote on the document, it would have the authority to delete the project if the majority so voted.

Mr. Kirby asked that every TPB member review the projects that were listed to ensure the information provided was accurate.

13. Update on Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Communications and Coordination During Incidents

Mr. Snyder introduced Phil Tarnoff from the University of Maryland to make the presentation.

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Tarnoff briefed the Board on the development of an organization to coordinate transportation information during major incidents. He said an organization named CapCom has been proposed to provide this coordination. He said that CapCom, as currently proposed, will be initiated in a three-phase program: Preparation, Prototyping and Operation. He described these phases. He emphasized that CapCom would make sure that transportation information gets out to the public, to the media, and to transportation and public safety officials who need to know it.

Mr. Tarnoff said that full operation of CapCom has been estimated at \$4.9 million per year. He said that four potential sources of funding have been identified: 1) Homeland Security funding under the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI), 2) Congressionally earmarked funding, 3) traditional transportation federal aid funding, and 4) contributions by the jurisdictions. Regarding the UASI funding request, he said that the proposal had passed the initial screening and would be submitted to COG's Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) committee for review. For Congressional earmarks, he said some encouraging meetings had taken place with Congressional staff. He said that TPB Chairman Mendelson would be asked to send a letter of endorsement to the region's Congressional delegation regarding this request. He said a final recommendation was being developed regarding the governance of CapCom.

Mr. Snyder moved approval of the draft letter that would be sent by Chairman Mendelson to the Congressional delegation and the COG Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) Committee in support of funding for CapCom.

Chairman Mendelson said that this was the first time he had seen the letter, so he asked for the opportunity for editing. He asked that he be authorized to send a letter to the Congressional delegation and CAOs in support of the funding.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Chairman Mendelson noted that emergency preparedness was one of the issues that he had asked to be highlighted in the Solicitation Document. He asked Mr. Kirby how that was being handled.

Mr. Kirby said staff would report back on how well the project was being funded. He said there were strong indications that the project would be funded and moving forward.

Chairman Mendelson asked what information regarding the CLRP would be before the TPB in March.

Mr. Kirby said all the significant projects would be provided for the Board to approve for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis. He said that as the year goes on, staff will receive all the projects for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), including the ones that are not sensitive to the air quality.

Chairman Mendelson asked if his understanding was correct that the CapCom proposal was conformity neutral and therefore it did not need to meet the March deadline.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

14. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for 2005

