Meeting Notes

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

And

Regional ITS Architecture Work Session

CHAIRS: Hon. David Snyder, City of Falls Church
and Lora Byala, WMATA

DATE: Tuesday, March 8, 2005

TIME: 1:30 p.m.

PLACE: COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE, Meeting Room 1

Attendance:

Pete Buckley, Montgomery County Transit Ride-On
Lora Byala, WMATA
Charles A. Clarke, Edwards and Kelcey
John Contestabile, MDOT
Pete Costello, PBS&J
Cina Dabestani, VDOT
Soumya Dey, DDOT
Deepak Gopalakrishna, Battelle
David L. Hall, Prince George's County DPW
Kamal Hamud, DDOT
Doug Hansen, Fairfax County DOT
William Haynes, City of Alexandria
Al Himes, Alexandria Transit
Steve Kimble, PB Farradyne
Michael Kinney, Montgomery County DPWT
Jana Lynott, NVTC
J.F. Peter Meenehan, WMATA
Mark Miller, WMATA
Frank Mirack, FHWA
Phil Tarnoff, University of Maryland
Alex Verzosa, City of Fairfax

COG Staff Attendance:

Andrew Austin
Michael Farrell
Andrew Meese
Jim Yin

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Byala chaired the meeting. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the previous MOITS meeting were distributed. This meeting was to be followed by a work session on ITS Architecture.

2. **Update on 511 Traveler Information Activities**

The contractor team for the feasibility study for 511 for the National Capital Region is PBS&J, represented at this meeting by Pete Costello. This study is an adjunct to a statewide 511 implementation contract sponsored by VDOT. The 511 steering committee has provided technical advice to the consultant, and has created a conceptual design draft report, and an implementation draft report. The committee held a conference call on February 17th to review the draft implementation plan. Just prior to this meeting the ad hoc CapCom steering committee also discussed the reports.

Regarding the question facing the region on whether to develop a stand-alone version for the capital region or to extend the VDOT statewide system to the rest of the region, the ad hoc CapCom steering committee recommended moving in the direction of an independent system associated with CapCom and the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) currently housed at the University of Maryland Center for Advanced Transportation Technology, instead of extending the VDOT system. Though extending the VDOT system might have resulted in an earlier date for service to begin, there were a number of technical, budgetary, and sustainability advantages to the separate CapCom-based 511. The region still can learn lessons from VDOT and take advantage of systems Virginia has developed where feasible. It was noted that for a regional CapCom-associated 511, this was a conceptual agreement, but funding has not yet been found.

Mr. Costello described the status of VDOT's 511 state-wide system feasibility study. A draft of the study was to be finalized soon. Landline 511 has been launched in Virginia on February 15, 2005, except with Verizon, which is still being negotiated. Cost is the sticking point. In response to a question from Mr. Hansen, it was anticipated that there would be ways to transfer from a regional 511 call to Virginia's statewide 511 call, or to select a geographic area of interest from a menu during the call.

3.   **Update on FY 2005 Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Funding**

To apply for UASI funding, applicants prepared two-page concept paper by a January 28, 2005 deadline. MOITS reviewed the draft concept papers at a January 25 special work session. MOITS recommendations were then forwarded to an inter-functional UASI review panel, meeting on February 3 and 4 to provide recommendations on all the functional areas' concept papers to the COG Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) Committee. Three transportation projects were kept on the list at the interfunctional meeting, and those applicants were invited to develop detailed applications by a March 1 deadline. The three transportation project applications submitted were: CapCom, submitted by the University of Maryland; a study of relocation of rail in the Washington region being submitted by DDOT and the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC); and fiber-optic components of the larger proposal to create a full WMATA back-up control center.

The March 11 meeting of the CAO Homeland Security Executive Committee was the next milestone, again looking at all proposed projects to make recommendations to their full CAO Committee meeting on March 22. Mr. Snyder was to be in attendance to represent RESF-1 (Transportation) on March 11.

The amount of UASI funding available for the regional (CAO) process to consider was $42 million, revised downward from $55 million, with the balance reserved for consideration by state-level representatives of the Senior Policy Group (SPG). The funding total available was anticipated to go back up if and when monies set aside for public safety overtime during major incidents go unused (if no incidents occur in the fiscal year). All the discussions and submitted projects, including those not funded in the current round, will inform a future strategic plan for homeland security for the National Capital Region. Applications will go to the States and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and funding was anticipated to be awarded in April.

Mr. Contestabile complimented the CapCom proposal, noting that it was difficult for transportation to compete with the attention given to fire, emergency management, and police proposals for UASI funding. There also had been concerns voiced during CAO discussions about CapCom being associated with Capital Wireless Integrated Network (CapWIN), since some public safety stakeholders had expressed concerns about past and future expenditures on CapWIN.

The transportation sector should try to keep its priority list of projects updated, in case more funding becomes available. Ms. Lynott noted that CapCom is difficult to explain, and suggested that someone put together a one-page white paper understandable to laypersons, explaining CapCom and the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) and how all the pieces come together; Mr. Tarnoff agreed to put something together. Mr. Contestabile predicted that each ESF will coalesce around a set of tools or platform, such as FRED (Facilities Resource Emergency Database) for the medical world. The different platforms should be able to exchange information. We need to describe better how the platforms will communicate. We need to link the existing communications with emerging systems. The emergency operations centers are developing a private fiber network, to reduce communications reliance on the public

phone lines. Mr. Meese also noted that there were a range of possible items for UASI funding, in planning, training, exercise, and equipment categories, eligible for consideration for a future emergency transportation needs list.

4.   **Update on Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Coordination During Incidents**

A definitive discussion on governance within the CapCom steering committee had not yet occurred, so the update to TPB on March 16 was likely to be brief.   Mr. Contestabile recommended informing the TPB on the proposed organizational structure and the status of the UASI funding requests. Mr. Tarnoff sketched the CapCom organizational structure which was to be presented to the TPB, with a combination of policy committees, technical committees, and staffing. There was an overall steering committee provisionally called the "Mid-Atlantic Communications Interoperability Partnership" (MACIP). It would be advised by a CapCom steering committee centered on transportation issues, and a CapWIN steering committee centered on public safety issues, along with necessary cross-functional discussions and technical committee and staffing support.

Mr. Contestabile suggested, in response to concerns about CapWIN, that to end CapWIN would mean having to do all the organizational work again from scratch to put together something of a regional nature within the law enforcement or transportation worlds, and thus it would be better to keep CapWIN but enhance it rather than restart. Mr. Tarnoff noted that $20 million has been invested developing CapWIN, and that the interoperability committee was not pushing for the abolition of CapWIN; CapWIN should be improved, not abolished.

5.   **Other MOITS Business and**
6.   **Convening of the Regional ITS Architecture Work Session**

There was no other business. Staff recommended participants stay for the work session.

7.   **Review of the Overall Structure of the Regional ITS Architecture Development**

Mr. Meese gave a presentation on the federal requirements for a regional ITS architecture, and the current status for each requirement. Copies were distributed. Nine main points of federal compliance for completing a regional ITS architecture were:

1.   A description of the region
2.   Identification of stakeholders
3.   Operational concepts of the functions of agencies involved
4.   Agreements on how activities and systems work together
5.   Functional requirements of the systems addressed in the architecture
6.   Interface requirements among systems addressed in the architecture

7. Standards available for systems integration
8. Sequence of ITS projects that may support systems integration
9. Maintenance (of the Architecture).

Drafts of all sections would be available for review on COG's Web site by April 1 [later changed to April 6]. Most sections were already drafted, except the standards, sequencing, and maintenance sections. After the other elements are drafted, a list of projects and their possible sequencing was to be developed, a small list focused on regional systems integration projects. It was anticipated that maintenance of the architecture would be accommodated within the TPB Unified Planning Work Program on an ongoing basis, and a committee convened through the MOITS to advise the update process. Timing of the updates was thought to be quarterly for minor technical updates, annually for full technical updates, and once every three years for a full revision for presentation to the TPB.

This version of the Regional ITS Architecture would be descriptive of what existing or is planned in the region, and would not at this time push for system changes. Revisions to the architecture could be considered during future updates and discussions. For the current development period, changes to the draft architecture will be posted on a set schedule, probably at the beginning of each month until completion. [The next draft update was posted on the COG Web site on April 6.] Each version will be known by its posting date.

TPB staff had met with WMATA and VDOT staff regarding the relationships of the draft Regional ITS Architecture with their agencies' enterprise architectures, and were planning to do the same with DDOT and MDOT, with MOITS meetings and other special architecture work sessions as opportunities for feedback from other regional stakeholders. In response to a question from Mr. Haynes, Mr. Meese noted that the architecture discussions recently were between TPB staff and the specialist architecture staffs and consultants of DDOT, MDOT, VDOT, and WMATA, that the MOITS meetings and other special work sessions were opportunities for discussions with local jurisdictions and other stakeholders, but staff was also willing to meet with any other agency such as the City of Alexandria regarding their architecture upon request. Mr. Contestabile requested that staff give a presentation on the Regional ITS Architecture to the homeland security-related National Capital Region Executive Interoperability Committee (NEIC), an at appropriate time.

8. **Outlook to the Next Meeting, Other Business, and Adjournment**

This group was to reconvene on April 12, 2005.