



## MEETING NOTES

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

**CHAIRS:** Honorable David Snyder, City of Falls Church, and  
James Austrich, District Department of Transportation

**DATE:** Tuesday, May 4, 2004

**TIME:** 1:00 P.M.

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

**ATTENDANCE:**

James Austrich, DDOT  
Brien Benson, George Mason University  
Bee Buergler, TransCore  
Ron Burns, MDOT  
Tony Clarke, Edwards & Kelley  
John Contestabile, MDOT  
Scott Cowherd, VDOT  
Jim Curren, TransCore  
Soumya Dey, DMJM & Harris  
Kathy Franklin, Trichord, Inc.  
Doug Hansen, Fairfax County DOT  
Al Himes, Alexandria Transit  
Egua Igbinosun, MDOT/SHA/CHART  
Brian Jeffers, FHWA  
Jana Lynott, NVTC  
Alvin Marquess, MDOT/SHA  
Eric Marx, PRTC  
Amy T. McElwain, VDOT  
Peter Meenehan, WMATA  
Frank Mirack, FHWA  
Layla Peter, TCC-SMD  
Jean Yves Point-du-Jour, MDOT/SHA/OOTS  
Cynthia Porter Johnson, Fairfax County, DOT  
Jim Robinson, VDOT  
J.D. Schneeberger, P.B. Farradyne  
Susan Sharp, WMATA  
Hon. David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
Alfie Steele, Montgomery County Transit

*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*

**MOITS Policy & Technical Task Forces**  
**Notes from the May 4, 2004 Meeting**  
Page 2

ATTENDANCE (Continued)

COG Staff:  
Andrew Austin  
Ron Kirby  
Andrew Meese  
Gerald Miller

**1. Update on Recommendation for Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Communications and Coordination During Incidents**

Mr. Snyder reported on a set of recommended actions to improve regional transportation communications and coordination during incidents. The actions were recommended by a joint working group of transportation and emergency management personnel. The Transportation Planning Board (TPB) had been briefed on the recommendations and given a tentative endorsement. He said they would be presented to the Emergency Preparedness Council (EPC) at their meeting on May 6, 2004 and were expected to approve the recommendations before going back to the TPB one final time. The recommendations focused on working to enhance coordination with different government agencies but stopped short of establishing a new entity like TRANSCOM in New York City for the time being.

Andrew Meese distributed a set of slides that Mr. Snyder would be using during his May 6 presentation to the EPC. Feedback from prior MOITS Task Force meetings had suggested a number of activities towards the recommended actions, including duty rotations and procedural changes. As a result of several recent ad hoc meetings, working groups would be formed to address the issues of systems integration and operations tasks. The systems integration group would look at existing tools available such as the Capital Wireless Integrated Network (CapWIN) or Maryland's Emergency Management Mapping Application (EMMA). In addition this group would examine needs and gaps to further address these issues. The operations group would examine what improvements could be made in operations, procedures, and staffing. Mr. Meese acknowledged Alvin Marquess, Jim Austrich, and others for their interest in working with these groups.

A third issue was funding needs for expanded activities. Reauthorization of the federal transportation bill known as SAFETEA was approaching and referenced language in the proposed bill that could provide strong support for operations coordination activities. Certain existing ITS earmark funds might also be applied to one-time-only activities, but would not be available for ongoing activity funding.

Mr. Kirby asked the Task Force members if there was any objection to taking the recommended actions to the EPC and the TPB and asking for their final approval to move ahead. No objections were noted.

**MOITS Policy & Technical Task Forces**  
**Notes from the May 4, 2004 Meeting**  
Page 3

Mr. Meese asked if the timeline presented in the recommendations was reasonable. Mr. Kirby recommended some minor changes. He said that progress could be made quickly if a satisfactory package was presented.

Alfie Steele asked for a brief explanation on how the concept of duty rotation would work. Mr. Meese noted that this was currently a straw-man concept. He said that since there was no single person or agency that was presently responsible for monitoring systems and initiating a regional communication during an incident, that task might be assigned to one or more staff persons hosted at existing agency operations centers on a rotating basis.

Mr. Marquess said the intent was to build better coordination between dispatch centers. Mr. Kirby also identified the issue of linking with public safety agencies. He noted that TRANSCOM does this and has established an excellent relationship with local police departments. Mr. Austrich also suggested that transportation personnel that are on-site at an incident should promote this effort with their law enforcement counterparts to assist in fostering this relationship. Mr. Kirby noted that TRANSCOM was also able to coordinate lane closures and construction projects that impacted traffic. He suggested that the Washington region should consider a group that allowed for agencies to coordinate such projects.

Jana Lynott asked which organizations were expected to be on the rotation list. Mr. Meese said that no such list had been developed yet, but said it was likely to include all agencies that ran 24-hour operations centers.

John Contestabile sought clarification that the activities of public outreach and education were the responsibilities of the EPC and not the transportation community. Mr. Kirby stated that the transportation community should identify all activities that need to be done and work to accomplish those while continuing to provide input to the EPC on impacts and needs from other areas. Mr. Contestabile suggested the reorganization of some slides in the presentation to make it clearer which tasks were under the guidance of the TPB.

Mr. Meese returned to the topic of funding sources. He said that there were some advocates for seeking out funding from the DHS Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) process, while others wished to use other funding sources. He noted that a clear consensus had not been established yet. Mr. Contestabile suggested that the funding source issue need not be mutually exclusive. He said that if some broad-based initiatives involved emergency management agencies UASI funds could be considered, whereas if an effort was purely related to transportation, then dedicated transportation funding could be sought. Mr. Kirby said that there is a great deal of competition for UASI funds from incident responders, public health and emergency management agencies. He added that it would be very difficult to justify using these funds for transportation-oriented projects. Mr. Contestabile suggested that systems integration could be argued as a reasonable justification for consideration. Mr. Kirby referenced the CapWIN model and noted that if it is something that is a transportation need, then transportation funds should be applied. He said that the law enforcement and emergency management communities had significant needs already lined up. He concluded that there should be sufficient funds coming from the SAFETEA

**MOITS Policy & Technical Task Forces**  
**Notes from the May 4, 2004 Meeting**  
Page 4

bill and that the group's time would be better spent pursuing transportation funding mechanisms that might be more readily available.

Egua Igbinosun asked how the term "insufficient" on Slide 5 was defined and if any timeline or criteria were in place to evaluate that. Mr. Meese said there were no set timelines or criteria defined at present, but suggested that the threshold would be determined by a majority of stakeholders if the existing arrangement did not appear to be meeting expectations. Mr. Kirby commented that work needed to begin on this activity and should move ahead to accomplish as much as could be done within the existing arrangement. He said if an obstacle arises that prevents the region from meeting some objective then that may be the time to consider the creation of a new entity.

Mr. Austrich said it was also important to keep regional successes in mind. He cited the recent protests and march on the Mall that drew over one million people and caused relatively few transportation problems. He added that there will be ten or more operations centers in the region by 2010 and said that integration should still remain a key focus.

Mr. Meese agreed that there was room for improvement in communicating success stories. He said that he was not sure if a timeline could be defined at this point, but added that it may be possible to create benchmarks. Ron Burns suggested it might be a good idea to leave some ambiguity with regards to a timeline. Mr. Contestabile agreed with both points. He said that it is possible that the transportation community has become a victim of its own success. He said that because transportation has been so responsive, homeland security agencies are continually asking for assistance. Mr. Contestabile argued that some of the systems being discussed were overarching tools that should qualify for UASI funds. He suggested that perhaps transportation agencies could pay for the implementation of their own systems, but that law enforcement and emergency management agencies should fund their own installations.

Doug Hansen asked for clarification that there would be funding available to pay for agency personnel to carry out these new additional functions. Mr. Kirby said that was correct. He said there should be a list of duties, including surveillance that should be over and above each agency's everyday responsibilities.

Mr. Meese said he would revise the presentation slides with the given suggestions.

Mr. Kirby commented that the UASI funding and delivery structure were both very new. He said the process for prioritizing expenditures was still relatively mutable. He emphasized the need to make sure that transportation has input on how the money is spent. He gave an example that perhaps more should be being spent on public education. Mr. Meese said that the EPC was the strongest tool available to communicate those issues and noted that Mr. Snyder was our spokesperson there. Mr. Kirby added that we also had channels available through the Chief Administrative Officers Committee and the Senior Policy Group.

**MOITS Policy & Technical Task Forces**  
**Notes from the May 4, 2004 Meeting**  
Page 5

Mr. Meese briefed the group on upcoming exercises being conducted by DHS. He said they had set up a committee to organize a four-tiered exercise. Mr. Meese said they would need advice and interaction from the transportation community. He said that while the public safety community often takes actions that have traffic impacts, they are beginning to understand some of our needs from them. Mr. Contestabile said that these exercises are among the best ways to drive that issue home for those communities.

**2. Update on ITS Architecture Activities**

Mr. Meese said that COG was able to advertise a position for an ITS engineer. He said that a new staff person would allow COG to undertake a number of architecture activities. Mr. Meese encouraged agencies to publicize the position. He said that he hoped to reconvene the ITS Architecture Subcommittee and that a stakeholder workshop was tentatively scheduled for June 29 but noted that was subject to bringing a new person on staff.

**3. Update on Traveler Information and 511 Activities**

Mr. Meese acknowledged Scott Cowherd, Amy McElwain, and Jim Robinson for their work on the Regional 511 RFP. Mr. Cowherd described the recent activity undertaken by VDOT staff. He said that a steering committee had met to determine the required deliverables. He said that four bidders had responded to the RFP and that the review committee had met twice to evaluate those bids. Mr. Cowherd said that he was aiming to award the contract before May 31. Ms. McElwain stated that since the VDOT process was still underway, they were not at liberty to discuss many details. She did comment that it looked like there would be some interesting work on 511 in the Washington Region that would serve as another catalyst to address the issue of integration.

Mr. Robinson congratulated Mr. Cowherd for keeping the project on schedule to date. Ms. McElwain noted that VDOT had assembled a good review panel that included people with experience on implementing 511 in the Shenandoah Valley. Mr. Robinson added that the project would be on very quick schedule once the contractor was selected.

**4. Other Business**

Mr. Contestabile said he would be pleased to demonstrate the EMMA software at the next meeting. Mr. Meese suggested the next MOITS joint meeting, which previously had been rescheduled to Thursday, June 3, 2004, 1:00 PM.