

MEETING NOTES

AD HOC METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS COORDINATION (MATOC) PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, March 13, 2007

TIME: 2:30 PM

PLACE: COG, First Floor, Meeting Room 1

ATTENDANCE:

Joe Langley, VDOT
Yanlin Li, DDOT
Andrew Meese, COG/TPB
Mark Miller, WMATA
Michael Pack, University of Maryland
Richard Steeg, VDOT
Michael Zezeski, MSHA

ACTIONS:

1. Welcome

2. Review of Action Items from the February 20, 2007 Meeting

The status of action items were as follows.

1. *Provide information on the status of Maryland's signatures on the agreement package* – Mr. Contestabile had sent an email stating that MDOT had determined that they would have to sign the new agreement Version 7.0, and that the previous Secretary's signature on Version 6.2 would not be sufficient for this purpose. In the email Mr. Contestabile stated that this process may take "weeks".
2. *Obtain COG/TPB signatures on the agreement package* – COG/TPB signatures were still in process, though these were not critical until Maryland had signed.
3. *Hold the dates, confirm, or find alternate dates for upcoming meetings: March 13 immediately after MOITS for an ad hoc Steering Committee meeting, and March 21 at 11:00 AM immediately prior to the TPB meeting for the first official MATOC Steering Committee meeting to transact formal business* – Though the March 13 meeting date was kept, the group decided to

Ad Hoc MATOC Steering Committee

Notes from the March 13, 2007 Meeting

Page 2 of 6

cancel the proposed March 21 first official meeting, to be rescheduled on a date to be determined. The uncertainty in how long it would take to obtain the Maryland signatures meant that a new date could not be scheduled. Also, the March 21 TPB meeting agenda was completely full, and it would be difficult to schedule a review of this item at that time.

4. *Share a MATOC budget spreadsheet for error checking, review and comment, following from the discussion of how the budget in the RFQ should reflect what is in the funding agreement – Mr. Meese emailed this on February 21. Some committee members noted they had not had a chance to review it, and asked that it be re-sent. Mr. Steeg stated he had reviewed it and concurred with the mathematics of the budget assumptions, though the Committee may want to reexamine whether the assumptions should be changed.*
5. *Make changes to the draft RFQ identified during the February 20 meeting, circulate the new draft RFQ for a very short review, and then send it as previously agreed to Virginia FHWA representatives in advance of issuance – Staff made the changes to the RFQ requested on February 20, and brought the document back for Steering Committee review at today's meeting. Sending it to the FHWA would have to await Maryland's signatures and a good idea of when the RFQ was to be issued.*
6. *Determine whether there is an FHWA time limit for MATOC grant expenditures to begin – Mr. Langley stated he was not aware of any problems of this nature.*
7. *Provide comments on the draft RITIS Concept of Operations to Michael Pack as soon as possible – Certain agencies were still to provide comments.*
8. *Provide comments or edits on the draft RITIS PowerPoint presentation reviewed at the February 20 meeting to Michael Pack as soon as possible – It was determined that comments were not needed on this draft (see discussion below).*
9. *Provide names to Andrew Meese for nominations to the proposed MATOC Technical and Operations Subcommittees – Certain agencies had provided these names. Mr. Pack noted that the draft RITIS Program Management Plan, distributed at today's meeting, had his suggested list of contacts for a systems subcommittee.*
10. *Discuss the coordination of the proposed MATOC operators subcommittee with the proposed RESF-1 operations subcommittee at the next RESF-1 meeting – This was not discussed at the March 7 RESF-1 meeting, and was proposed instead to be discussed among the RESF-1 Chair and Vice Chairs on one of their future regularly held chairs' conference call.*

Ad Hoc MATOC Steering Committee

Notes from the March 13, 2007 Meeting

Page 3 of 6

11. *Explore scheduling of a TPB Work Session immediately prior to the April 18 TPB meeting (or another future date) to discuss MATOC in depth, including Michael Pack's RITIS presentation* – It was confirmed that a RITIS/MATOC TPB Work Session should be planned, but would probably not happen until at least May due to the signature and RFQ delays, as well as there already having been scheduled a TPB Work Session on April 18 on the topic of Value Pricing.
12. *Notify TPB member Timothy Lovain on the proposed MATOC TPB work session as an opportunity to discuss the questions raised in his February 12 email* – Mr. Meese discussed this with Mr. Lovain immediately prior to the TPB meeting on February 21, and had received a favorable response. Mr. Lovain also mentioned this proposal in his remarks during that day's TPB meeting.

3. Status of Funding Agreement and Signatures Package Approvals

The status of the signature packages was as follows:

- DDOT: The package had now been signed by all necessary parties. Mr. Li provided a copy to Mr. Meese.
- MDOT: It had been determined that the package would need to undergo review under the new MDOT administration, and that this process may take "weeks". The committee discussed whether there were ways to help speed this process, by communications from senior officials from other MATOC Agencies. Mr. Zezeski stated he would take a look into this.
- VDOT: Signatures were complete in January.
- WMATA: Signatures were complete in February.
- COG/TPB: Signatures were still in process.

Mr. Langley asked that all signature pages be provided to him so he could compile the master set. Mr. Langley also distributed a sample letter for an annual funding authorization of a multi-state program. The sample letter was from the Clean Air Partners Program, which was a multi-state-funding construct similar to MATOC. He asked that members be aware of this and that DDOT and MDOT should be prepared to issue such letters. He was to draft a similar letter for MATOC and provide it to all Steering Committee members for review and comment.

Ad Hoc MATOC Steering Committee

Notes from the March 13, 2007 Meeting

Page 4 of 6

4. Update on COG Contracting Issues, Budget, and Re-Advertisement

Mr. Meese distributed copies of proposed COG Board of Directors Resolution R28-07, "Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Accept Funding and Provide Administrative Support for the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program". This was proposed for action under the "consent agenda" of the COG Board of Directors meeting the following day, March 14, 2007. This action was needed by the COG Board of Directors in order for COG from a corporate standpoint to receive new funds such as the MATOC SAFETEA-LU grant and to enter into contracts under it such as hiring the proposed consultant team. All information in the resolution was based on and consistent with the funding agreement package.

The decision remained in effect that COG will not re-issue the RFQ until all signatures are in place on the funding agreement.

Mr. Meese distributed a budget assumptions spreadsheet for preparing the draft RFQ, which he had emailed on February 21. Mr. Steeg stated he had reviewed this and agreed with the mathematics. However, he and the group discussed whether to change proposed budget timing based on the delay that had already taken place.

The federal grant is spread over five separate federal fiscal years. The first year, FY2006, was already past, and it was now most of the way through FY2007. The group discussed whether to assume all FY2006 and FY2007 funding to be added to FY2008 for one big year (\$1.1 million), with the smaller amounts remaining unchanged for FY2009 and FY2010 (\$370,000 each year), or to redistribute the funding more evenly over FY2008, 2009, and 2010. Also, the group discussed what should be assumed in the RFQ for expenditures during the remainder of COG FY2007 until June 30, 2007.

The group agreed for the purposes of the RFQ to state that the approximate \$1.1 million would be available from notice to proceed through June 30, 2008, subject to continuing funding agreements starting July 1, 2007, with 2009 and 2010 remaining at approximately \$370,000 each. Carrying over unused funding to 2009 and 2010 could be reexamined at a later date.

5. Status of Preparation for Actions at the First Formal Meeting of the MATOC Steering Committee

Given the uncertain time frame of the funding agreement signatures, planning for the formal meeting was not discussed. The committee did discuss the need for getting started with the technical and/or operations subcommittees. Many potential participants had been identified. In response to a question for Mr. Pack, it was determined not to invite local government participants to the subcommittees at this time, limiting them to the Steering Committee member agencies for this initial phase. The Steering Committee scheduled a joint meeting with the proposed operators group on Thursday, April 19, 2007, 12:00 Noon at the University of Maryland Center for Advanced Transportation Technology in

Ad Hoc MATOC Steering Committee

Notes from the March 13, 2007 Meeting

Page 5 of 6

College Park. Steering Committee members were to work individually to assign their key people to come to this meeting. Mr. Meese was to draft an agenda for the joint meeting for review by the Steering Committee on April 10. Steering Committee members suggested the following topics:

- a. MATOC overview and status – people, process, and technology
- b. Review of high-level Volpe recommendations
- c. RITIS overview
- d. Guidance documents and next steps.

The Steering Committee also discussed the issue of both MATOC and RESF-1 proposing operators subcommittees. It was noted that MATOC will include only the states and WMATA, whereas the RESF-1 will include local governments also. This was proposed to be discussed on a future RESF-1 Chairs conference call. Mr. Miller suggested the operators group talk on a regular basis about what had gone well or not well during recent major incidents, and about how information coming in was being validated.

6. RITIS Update

Mr. Pack distributed a draft Program Management Plan document for the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) for the review and comment of Steering Committee members. He was to follow up soon with a slightly update version by email.

It was determined that Steering Committee members did not have to review the proposed RITIS PowerPoint presentation provided by Mr. Pack at the February 20 meeting, since a number of key issues were in flux at this time. A new draft presentation would be provided when appropriate.

7. Preparation for MATOC Program Update for the March 21 Transportation Planning Board Meeting

Mr. Meese was to write a memorandum giving the latest status. The TPB Steering Committee had not scheduled a briefing this month on this month's TPB meeting agenda. The TPB already had a full agenda, and such a briefing had not been requested by the TPB at the February meeting.

8. Discussion of Next Steps

Action items from the March 13 MATOC Steering Committee meeting were as follows.

1. Explore what senior level communications could take place in regards to expediting Maryland's signing of the funding agreement. (Steeg, Zezeski)

Ad Hoc MATOC Steering Committee

Notes from the March 13, 2007 Meeting

Page 6 of 6

2. COG will finalize the RFQ and await agreement signatures and can be ready to issue quickly when all signatures are in place. (Meese)
3. Get any additional appointments necessary to MATOC Steering Committee and subcommittee. (All) Compile and send out list for confirmation. (Meese)
4. Schedule a joint MATOC Steering Committee/operators group meeting on April 19, 2007, at 12:00 noon at the CATT lab. Send the notification to the Steering Committee members for them to forward the info to their appropriate personnel. (Meese, Pack)
5. Develop a draft agenda for the April 19 meeting and review at the April 10 Steering Committee meeting. (Meese)
 - a. MATOC overview and status – people, process, and technology
 - b. Review of high-level Volpe recommendations
 - c. RITIS overview
 - d. Guidance documents and next steps
6. Provide an electronic version of the draft RITIS Program Management Plan by email to Steering Committee members. (Meese, Pack)
7. Provide comments to Michael Pack on the draft Program Management Plan by March 27; also comments on the February draft RITIS Concept of Operations as soon as possible if you have not already done so. (All)
8. Compose and circulate a MATOC funding draft authorization letter similar to the sample letter distributed today, for comments and for potential use by other funding agencies. (Langley)
9. Place materials from the March 13 meeting on the MATOC portion of the COG Web site. (Meese)