



**Meeting Notes - DRAFT**  
**AD HOC REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**COMMUNICATIONS AND COORDINATION**  
**(CAPCOM) STEERING COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Wednesday, June 22, 2005

**TIME:** 3:00 PM

**PLACE:** COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE, Meeting Rooms 4/5

**PARTICIPANTS:** George Ake, CapWIN  
James Austrich, DDOT  
John Contestabile, MDOT  
Soumya Dey, DDOT  
Rick Dye, MDOT/SHA  
Alvin Marquess, MDOT/SHA  
Amy Tang McElwain, VDOT  
Andrew Meese, COG/TPB  
Gerald Miller, COG/TPB  
Mark Miller, WMATA  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Richard Steeg, VDOT  
Phil Tarnoff, University of Maryland  
Michael Zezeski, MDOT/SHA

Several items were distributed to the group.

1. The draft scope of work drafted by Mr. Tarnoff for the proposed Volpe Center support, and draft revisions to the scope proposed by DDOT
2. A draft CapCom activities work plan prepared by Mr. Tarnoff
3. Draft slides related to the work plan that could be a basis for a presentation to the TPB at the July 20 work session
4. Copies of the letters from the TPB Chairman, MDOT, and VDOT responding to the letter on CapCom from TPB Citizens Advisory Committee Chairman Dennis Jaffe
5. A current Urban Area Security Initiative FY2005 funding summary
6. The draft Regional 511 Feasibility Study technical support document.

Continued...

District of Columbia  
Bowie  
College Park  
Frederick County  
Gaithersburg  
Greenbelt  
Montgomery County  
Prince George's County  
Rockville  
Takoma Park  
Alexandria  
Arlington County  
Fairfax  
Fairfax County  
Falls Church  
Loudoun County  
Manassas  
Manassas Park  
Prince William County

**Meeting Notes - DRAFT**  
**Ad Hoc Regional Transportation Coordination and**  
**Communications (CapCom) Steering Committee**

June 22, 2005

Page 2

Mr. Meese called attention to the draft 511 report, and asked that committee members provide any comments back to him by the end of June. The report was prepared by PBS&J under contract to VDOT, as an adjunct to their development of the Virginia statewide 511 system. The draft report anticipated that any regional 511 deployment would occur within the context of a CapCom program. There were policy questions that would have to be decided upon at some date, including how to allocate costs, and the level to which a system would pivot from the existing Virginia statewide 511 system versus being developed anew. A next and possibly final meeting of the 511 study steering committee was anticipated for August [later postponed].

Mr. Tarnoff presented a status report on the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) project, which is providing technical underpinnings to the CapCom effort. By October, RITIS is anticipated to be successfully receiving and integrating data feeds from the Maryland CHART system (which is also used by DDOT), as well as the VDOT transportation information system. Because of the data sources involved, Mr. Tarnoff stated that RITIS information for this phase would be limited to that for freeways.

Ms. Pourciau expressed concern about RITIS not including information about arterial streets and transit, and stated that would be non-responsive to the District's needs and to the Steering Committee's direction. She felt this was made clear at the April 21 meeting, and asked if there were minutes or a summary of the meeting. Mr. Meese noted that over the several months of evolution of these steering committee meetings, there had never been a request to TPB staff to provide meeting summaries. Ms. Pourciau requested, and the group agreed, to ask TPB staff to provide meeting summaries from now on.

Mr. Austrich noted that DDOT could and does enter information on arterial streets and on transit though its use of the CHART system. Mr. Tarnoff stated that any information that was in CHART could be in RITIS, including arterial information, but his previous statement was based upon his expectation that the amount of information about arterials available through CHART and VDOT would be much less than that for freeways. Mr. Tarnoff welcomed Mr. Austrich's statement that DDOT would enter transit information into CHART, since there was no other identified automated source for transit information in this phase. Ms. Pourciau emphasized that arterial information was critical to the District, and it still was of great concern to her that there had been any statements made about arterial information not being in RITIS.

Ms. Pourciau inquired about what information in RITIS would be fed back to the agencies. Mr. Tarnoff stated that the University of Maryland already had a Web page set up, and that information that was fused into the RITIS database would be available back to agencies on that Web site, reflecting whatever information is put into the system from the two integrated sources (CHART, VDOT). Mr. Dye noted that the CHART system was set up such that a variety of transportation systems information could be input into the system, and that CHART could make available in a Web format the appropriate types of that information (such as the location and general nature of an incident), while filtering information that would not need to be distributed (such as identities and arrival times to the scene for each individual response unit).

## **Meeting Notes - DRAFT**

### **Ad Hoc Regional Transportation Coordination and Communications (CapCom) Steering Committee**

June 22, 2005

Page 3

In response to the comments on information flow, Mr. Contestabile sketched a diagram showing information being fused from multiple sources into the RITIS database server, then its potential outputs to a Web site. The group discussed what information was available now versus the future, and the extent to which information could be fed back from the RITIS server to the agencies. Ms. Pourciau stated that such a diagram would be good to include in discussions on CapCom to policy representatives, and asked that a timeline be added. Mr. Tarnoff stated, and Mr. Zezeski and Mr. Dye concurred, that data feedback to agencies from RITIS would be desirable, but could not be put in place by October. Mr. Zezeski noted, based upon his experience developing CHART technical systems, that the funding provided to date for RITIS and CapCom was too limited to support all the functionalities that might be desired.

Ms. Pourciau inquired about the status of the CapCom white paper and work plan that were requested by the committee at the April 21 meeting. Mr. Tarnoff stated that the two-page document distributed to the TPB for its May 18 meeting, and the draft work plan distributed at this meeting today, were intended to be responsive to those requests. Ms. Pourciau disagreed, saying that the two-page summary lacked details she was expecting, particularly on information inputs and outputs, and relationships to programs such as RITIS and the RICCS. She also suggested that might now be better to have the CapCom work plan developed subsequent to the involvement of the Volpe Center. Mr. Zezeski stated that it had not been his expectation that the white paper would need to address such details, which would take much more time to work out.

Mr. Zezeski and Mr. Tarnoff stated that the University of Maryland would welcome the involvement of the Volpe Center. The University did not have any internal reason to push to do CapCom work; it was trying to provide the services requested, starting from the initial task order that had been given from Mr. Zezeski, and would abide accordingly if the committee was felt that any particular work was best accomplished by other parties. Mr. Zezeski and Mr. Contestabile stated that the University's and Mr. Tarnoff's nationally-recognized expertise were valuable, and recommended they remain involved.

Mr. Steeg expressed concerns about having just spent a significant amount of this meeting's time revisiting RITIS information-sharing details that he felt had been discussed and agreed to at earlier meetings. He felt it was critical to turn to look at how CapCom would move ahead conceptually. He and Mr. Zezeski expressed views that a regional transportation coordination program was needed, and felt they had their agencies' support to proceed with the prototype. Ms. Pourciau stated that DDOT could not commit to such a program until the details of that program were worked out, that she recommended the Volpe study be the vehicle to facilitate this, and that the transportation agencies would have to withstand any pressures applied at the July 20 work session for taking the extra time necessary for Volpe to complete its work. Ms. Pourciau noted that there are many within the District of Columbia who believe there is no problem to fix.

The group discussed the two versions of the draft scope of work for consultant support by the U.S. Department of Transportation Volpe Center, under its contractual arrangement with DDOT: the version included the version distributed by email by Mr. Tarnoff, and a version revised by

**Meeting Notes - DRAFT**  
**Ad Hoc Regional Transportation Coordination and**  
**Communications (CapCom) Steering Committee**

June 22, 2005

Page 4

DDOT staff. There were concerns expressed about the shortness of time allotted to Volpe in the DDOT revision of the work scope (three months versus the originally proposed six) to accomplish a great deal of work, although there was acknowledgment that external pressures to work quickly on CapCom advised against a longer work scope.

The group agreed that Volpe would be well-suited to work on a strategic-level plan for CapCom. However, there was a further discussion on the extent to which Volpe was suited, as proposed in the DDOT revision of the work scope, to address CapCom operations-level plans and procedures. With this uncertainty, it was suggested that Volpe staff themselves be asked to comment on the potential tasks their staff could address. Mr. Meese suggested that Mr. Dey make further revisions to the work scope to reflect today's discussions, and redistribute it to the entire ad hoc committee for review and comment before providing it to Volpe for their comments.

Mr. Contestabile and Mr. Zezeski, based upon the experience of setting up and operating the CHART system, urged that progress also proceed with hiring at least one first CapCom employee, a transportation operations manager, who could work with the committee and Volpe on operations-level issues. They felt a person directly involved in the work to be done was critical to successfully addressing operations planning and procedures development, over and above the expertise that could be provided by Volpe staff.

Mr. Contestabile also suggested, pursuant to concerns expressed by Ms. Pourciau, that the current RITIS phase also proceed with integrating transit information. Mr. Mark Miller agreed to work with the University of Maryland to address what information WMATA could provide.

Mr. Meese discussed the scheduled July 20 TPB work session, as well as the newly announced July 6 work session on CapCom and CapWIN hosted by the Chief Administrative Officers Committee and the states' Senior Policy Group. All ad hoc committee members would be invited to both sessions. It was suggested to add slides to the TPB presentation addressing RITIS and the concept of data fusion, since the importance of data fusion is not necessarily understood by policy makers or by detractors of the CapCom concept. Mr. Meese anticipated the TPB asking the region's transportation agencies on July 20 about their commitment levels, funding, and schedule for implementing the CapCom program.

In response to a question, Mr. Meese stated that the preliminary plan was to have TPB Transportation Planning Director Ron Kirby present the facts on CapCom at the July 6 CAO meeting, following an introduction from David Snyder on why TPB members think CapCom is important. Mr. Contestabile asked that transportation agency representatives be given a chance to add their comments after Mr. Kirby's comments, and for Mr. Kirby's draft presentation materials be circulated to the ad hoc committee in advance of July 6 for review and comment. In contrast to the TPB, which had already expressed support, the CAO-SPG audience needed to be informed about the potential benefits of CapCom. Scenario examples and the previously used with/without CapCom side-by-side comparison chart could help explain CapCom.