

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEETING NOTES

JOINT MEETING MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (MOITS) POLICY AND TECHNICAL TASK FORCES

DATE: Tuesday, January 17, 2006

TIME: 12:30 P.M.

PLACE: COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE
Third Floor, Board Room

CHAIRS: Honorable David Snyder, City of Falls Church, and
Lora Byala, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

ATTENDANCE:

Brien Benson, George Mason University
Betsy Berry, National Organization on Disability
Lora Byala, WMATA
Raul Catangui, GeoDecisions
John Contestabile, Maryland Department of Transportation
Soumya Dey, District Department of Transportation
Joseph Geckle, Maryland State Highway/MDOT
Dan Godwin, Trafficland
Matt Greenwald, WMATA
Doug Hansen, Fairfax County DOT
Al Himes, Alexandria Transit
Thomas Jacobs, University of Maryland/CATT
Natalie Jones-Best, District Department of Transportation
Bill Knost, Trafficland
Darrin McKenna, Wilbur Smith Associates
Peter Meenehan, WMATA
Mark Miller, WMATA
Frank Mirack, FHWA
Michael Pack, University of Maryland, CATT
Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, Maryland State Highway/MDOT
Richard Steeg, Virginia Department of Transportation
Alfie Steele, Montgomery County Ride On
Amy Tang McElwain, Virginia Department of Transportation
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax

Continued...

COG Staff Attendance:

Andrew Austin
Mike Farrell
Andrew Meese
Gerald Miller
Jim Yin

1. Welcome and Introductions

The participants introduced themselves. The meeting had been rescheduled from January 10, 2006 due to a schedule conflict. Lora Byala chaired the meeting.

2. Update on the Regional Transportation Coordination Program (“CapCom”)

Work was progressing to determine the structure of the system. All materials for that report were at a final draft stage. COG staff was preparing a list of desired qualifications for a program manager. A steering committee for “CapCom” was to review the RFQ. The RFQ was expected to be released before the February 2006 TPB meeting.

The Volpe Center has been tasked to create a work plan for the portion of the project funded by UASI grants. The work plan was to address the integration of regional transportation operations coordination, the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS), and potential “511” traveler information services for the Washington region.

When a final draft version of the report on “CapCom” was ready, it was to be made available for review by member jurisdictions and agencies.

3. Update on Reestablishment of the Regional Emergency Support Function (RESF) – 1 – Transportation Committee for the Urban Area Security Initiative Strategic Governance Structure

The RESF-1 committee is being reestablished as a separate entity from the MOITS Task Forces. MOITS will continue to act as RESF-1 until a new staff person has been hired and the new committee convened. It was anticipated to have the new staff person on board at COG soon. The new position will be under the public safety section of COG’s Department of Human Services, Planning and Public Safety (HSPPS), headed by Calvin Smith. Close coordination between Andrew Meese and the new staff person will assist with the transition.

Natalie Jones-Best will chair the new RESF-1 committee. Ms. Jones-Best will work with Mr. Meese and the new staff person to identify stakeholders for the new committee and to determine its structure, co-chairs and participation from other jurisdictions.

There should be clear definitions of what each group’s responsibilities are. MOITS was expected to return to focusing on addressing technology, and day-to-day regional transportation

operational coordination issues. RESF-1 was anticipated to address planning for the role of transportation as a support function to emergency management agencies' coordination of response to declared emergencies or other major regional incidents. There will be some intergroup interaction and coordination as necessary, however. It was noted that "CapCom" will remain under the purview of MOITS, as it relates primarily to technology and day-to-day operations.

The chairs and staff persons for both MOITS and RESF-1 should regularly attend each other's meetings.

4. Update on the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Target Capabilities Review and Subgrant Proposal Process for FY 2006 Funds

In mid-December, the Department of Homeland Security put forth a new set of requirements for the UASI Funding application process. Under these requirements, UASI proposals were required to demonstrate how they address a set of 14 nationally and regionally identified target capabilities. The funds should be applied to projects that bridge gaps that are not being met. A series of workshops with UASI stakeholders had been held in the previous week to identify such issues and gaps. There were still some unanswered questions on the exact requirements administrative process for FY 2006, but clarifications were expected soon.

Similar to previous years, Concept Papers were to be completed. For FY2006, a new five-question Initiative Plan addendum needed to be filled out with each Concept Paper to address the capability gaps that have been identified. Proposals were to be reviewed by the DC Office of the State Administrative Agent for Homeland Security (Steve Kral) to ensure that each one matches up with a capability gap and properly fits within the administrative structure.

The total level of funding expected to be provided to the Washington region was unknown, unlike previous years when the Department of Homeland Security had pre-identified a regional level. Historically, the Washington region has received about 10% of the national total of UASI funding due to the region's high risk and density of targets. Proposals should identify the minimum amount of funding required to implement the project. Grand funding is very competitive and many proposals will not be funded.

The participants discussed the Concept Papers in hand at this meeting, including submissions from VDOT, WMATA, and the District of Columbia. [Concept Papers from other agencies, including the City of Alexandria, MDOT/State Highway Administration, and Montgomery County Ride-On were submitted and reviewed at later special meetings.]

The proposals should be reviewed to see if separate local projects can be aggregated into larger regional applications.

Betsy Berry of the National Organization on Disability and Dan Godwin of Trafficland discussed whether they should submit project proposals independently or through RESF-1 as a sponsor. Both groups were welcomed to develop concept papers to be included in the RESF 1 –

Transportation discussions, but it was noted that the nature of their concepts might be better suited to submission through RESF 5 – Emergency Management. In response to a question, it was noted that there was precedent for private sector involvement in UASI, such as hospitals' involvement in the Public Health RESF.

Today's discussions were to be followed up with at least two conference calls, the first on January 19. The calls would discuss proposals and potentially develop a prioritization.

Agencies should review each other's submissions and discuss if possible redundancies can be eliminated. At least the title and outline of RESF 1 – Transportation Concept Papers were to be submitted to COG staff by noon on January 19 for inclusion in the conference call.