Draft Chapters 4 (Project Sequencing), 5 (Agency Agreements) and 6 (ITS Architecture Maintenance)

When you have completed your comments please email this form to Tom Petrosino at tmp@iteris.com.

Reviewer Name			Representing	Phone #	Email address
Michelle Kirkhoff			SANBAG	909.884.8276	mkirkhoff@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	**Section:**	**Page:**	**Comment:**		**Disposition of Comment*:**
1		8	Call Answering Center and FSP, under the Status column – these contracts already exist		1
2		8	Smart Call Box – MOU – I can tell you for certain, there is no MOU between Caltrans and SANBAG for the receipt of our data, there probably should be		1
3	6.2	11	2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, change to: First, to assist in the traditional planning processes that occurs with the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs), such as the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) and the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), the MPO which is Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), or by local originations to define ….” This is all to clarify that SANBAG and RCTC are not MPOs but CTCs		1
4	6.2.1	12	When we refer to the TIP, suggest we refer to the Regional TIP or RTIP, as that is what we have input and control over. So in the 2nd bullet on this page, refer to it and say that “… which is a short term plan that updated annual. Projects must be included in the RTIP and RTP in order to be eligible for federal funding.” Further down, the 2nd paragraph below this, again, refer to the RTIP.		1
5	6.3.1.	15	Typo, says “SANDAG” and it should be SANBAG		1
6	6.3.3	16	Concerned about saying these documents “should” become appendices to the RTP and so on, could we say instead “could” or “may” – as our agencies have no control over what is attached to the RTP		1
7	6.4.2	18	There are references to an IE Metro Area LRTP; we don’t have anything, we only provide input into the RTP		1
8	6.4.3	18	After 2nd paragraph, may just say that we may want to consider the timing issues with RTP and RTIP approvals, prior to making any changes to our architecture plan; SCAG has very defined input periods, and so what we gather/amend, may be dependent on their timing/schedule		1

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Chapters 4 (Project Sequencing), 5 (Agency Agreements) and 6 (ITS Architecture Maintenance)

Reviewer Name Michelle Kirkhoff			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909.884.8276	Email address mkirkhoff@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
9	IE3	A-1	suggest taking SCAG out of participating agency in the IE dynamic ridesharing system, they would have no input/funding, and could be considered an other		1
10	IE5	A-2	Instead of calling the TMC "Ultimate" can we instead call it "Permanent" as that's how we now refer to it; and also include "Development and construction of a fully …" Also, as participating agencies, unfortunately include SANBAG and RCTC, as we are funding this monster		1
11	IE6	A-2	Shouldn't the State be a participating agency?		1
12	IE11	A-3	Shouldn't others as appropriate, as SANBAG and RCTC may be involved on the peripheral		1
13	IE16	A-4	Add SANBAG and RCTC to participating agencies		1
14	IE17	A-4	Add SANBAG and RCTC to participating agencies		1
15	IE24/IE 25/Riv8/SB5	A-5 & A-6 & B-2 & C-2	TANN is not an agency, it's a program, instead, put The Partnership		1
16	App D	D-2	Instead of the MPO, shouldn't it be the CTCs? As we do all this stuff for our counties, not SCAG		1
			Agency agreements that have been developed in the region: • Caltrans agreement with MetroLink for fiber use • Caltrans agreement with Corona for fiber use and exchange of video • SANBAG agreement with CHP for dispatching • Upcoming 3-way MOU for FSP between SANBAG, CHP, and Caltrans; also for RCTC, CHP, and Caltrans.		1

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

Draft Chapters 4 (Project Sequencing), 5 (Agency Agreements) and 6 (ITS Architecture Maintenance)

Reviewer Name			Representing	Phone #	Email address
Frank Cechini			FHWA	(916) 498-5005	frank.cechini@fhwa.dot.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
1			On agreements, can you add a column entitled "Barriers/Issues" that will allow the stakeholders to record possible issues in the way of final agreement? This gives them something to possibly start working on early in the project development process.		1 – A generic, or typical, set of "Barriers/Issues" has been added to the text, rather than a new column added to the table. If added without a comprehensive review of the affected stakeholders – which time did not allow – the added column would have been left largely blank.
2	6.2.1		The graphic in Figure 6.2.1-1, Reg Arch in Planning Process does not do much for me. Attached is one I created as a takeoff from (another project). It may not drive the point you're trying to make though.		2 – Ideally, the Systems Engineering process would have been introduced to the Stakeholder group in the development of this architecture, even though it is more applicable to <u>Project</u> Architecture development than <u>Regional</u> Architecture development. However, time did not allow that subject to be introduced in a sensible manner; so the recommended graphic was not inserted into the Final Report.
3	6.3.1		What is the thinking behind having the three planning agencies and Caltrans OPERATIONS as the team vs. all planning (includes Caltrans District system planning) vs. representative agency operations staffs vs. a mix of local/state ops plus planning agencies??? worthy of discussion??		1 – Traffic Operations at Caltrans is typically the lead for ITS planning and implementation. Caltrans' Transportation Planning was added to the text along with the qualifier "as appropriate."
4	6.3.2		You speak to version DOCUMENT control, but what about traceability between a need to MP to ops_con to reqm't to project. In other words, configuration management should be addressed starting NOW to accomodate traceability and ease of item modification at a later date. Food for thought. This could maybe be addressed in Section 6-4.		2 – Configuration Management is more of a project implementation issue than a Regional Architecture issue.
5			Ramifications of resource time and $$ needed to sustain this effort year-in and -out is disturbing to a lot of folks with completed architectures. I sure wish I had a handle on annual costs for this activity. Do we have any experience nationally that can help?		2 – There is very little (if any) data available on a national basis to estimate the cost of maintaining a regional architecture. A general rule of thumb for the software industry to budget annual maintenance and upkeep of custom developed software is approximately 10% to 15% of the initial software development cost. We think this model may be suitable for estimating the maintenance cost of a Regional ITS Architecture.
6	6.3.3		This is good!		2

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Chapters 4 (Project Sequencing), 5 (Agency Agreements) and 6 (ITS Architecture Maintenance)

Reviewer Name			Representing	Phone #	Email address	
Michael McCoy			RTA	(909) 565-5164	insert your email address here	
Comment #:	**Section:**	**Page:**	**Comment:**		**Disposition of Comment*:**	
1		3	The process for stratifying projects is agreeable to RTA.		2	
2		6	The chart of hierarchy of agreement types is handy. It shows deep understanding of Agreements process and a warning that detailed negotiations will be necessary to conclude these arrangements.		2	
3		8	RTA is aware of the challenges relative to the agreement and other administrative Requirements for the Transit Signal Priority.		2	
4		8	As to Transit Fare Management, the key is identifying its champion to get the ball rolling. We don't think the MPO, SCAG, for example, is prepared to take this on anytime soon. We'd tend to rely on RCTC and sister agencies for leadership in that area.		2	
5		16, 17	The Architectural Maintenance Plan has a military or aerospace industry feel to it.		2	
6		17	The examples are appreciated, especially the one about "Small Municipal Transit" providers.		2	
7		20	RTA is Riverside Transit Agency, not Authority.		1	
8	Appendix B		The references to RTA activities and projects are generally accurate.		2	
9	Appendix D		The sample MOUs provide a good starting point.		2	
10	Appendix D		Same as above for the sample Interagency Agreement for a JPA, in the event such an entity would be necessary in a particular situation. However, to avoid proliferation of JPAs, perhaps existing transit agencies would be better served by a sample Agreement between an existing and viable JPA and other agencies to administer certain ITS projects.		4 – We have no applicable sample agreements to insert into the report at this time.	

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address **ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov**
Comment #:	**Section:**	**Page:**	**Comment:**		**Disposition of Comment*:**
1	4.4	3	Perhaps add a comment at the end of the section stating that projects may be added to the list as they are identified by appropriate stakeholders and reference Section 6.4.1 on changes.		1

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address **ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov**
Comment #:	**Section:**	**Page:**	**Comment:**		**Disposition of Comment*:**

2	6.2.2	14	Use of the Regional Architecture (Section 6.2) needs greater specificity. Even if FHWA is not yet prepared to give further guidance on how to demonstrate project conformance with the architecture, locals should be able to understand specifically how to reference the I.E. Regional Architecture Document to help them ensure interoperability. I am mostly concerned about the design section (6.2.2), as this is where local engineers will need the most help. Several examples (ranging from simple to more complex) would be extremely helpful, and it seems that Section 6.2.2 would be the place to do it. I don't know what the answers are, but it might go something like this:
			
			For implementation of a transit vehicle tracking system (or whatever examples you choose), use the architecture in the following way:
			1. Find the following related Architecture Flow Diagram(s) in Appendix __:
			    • ___
			    • ___
			2. Check for XYZ on these flow diagrams and decide which interfaces and flows the current project must accommodate
			3. Contact the A, B, and C stakeholders referenced in the flow diagram(s) and coordinate the following:
			4. Determine whether MOU is required for the purpose of ___
			5. Consider the following aspects of the architecture for inclusion in the RFP/specs for the project
			6. Provide the following documentation
			
			Without something like this (and it doesn't have to be long), it will be very difficult for all the participants to figure out, on a practical level, how to actually use the IE architecture. Otherwise, it is still very abstract to the potential user. This is separate and apart from the issue of determining project conformance.
					1

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated   2=general statement   3=to be addressed by future task   4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address **ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov**
Comment #:	**Section:**	**Page:**	**Comment:**		**Disposition of Comment*:**
3	6.4.1	17	In Changes for Project Addition/Deletion, it is unclear why it states that aspects of the regional ITS architecture associated with the project have to be added, deleted, or modified. If it is a new type of project that was not anticipated in the original architecture, perhaps things would be added. It is hard to envision why we would delete things from the architecture based on an individual project, since the architecture doesn't force you to implement anything. It is just a framework, and that framework should stay in place in the event a project is implemented at some time in the future.		2 – Deletions from a Regional ITS Architecture are likely rare. However, it is possible that elements or systems or stakeholders could be deleted and that possibility should be recognized. It could be construed as inaccurate to continue to show items in an ITS Architecture that are no longer a part of any stakeholders existing operation or planned implementations.
4	App. A	A-3	I would tend to give the Regional Universal Transit Fare Card System a higher priority, but others may disagree.		2
5	General		The Federal rule and policy on Regional ITS Architectures indicates that the regional architecture must include the identification of ITS standards supporting regional and national interoperability. I didn't see that in there, but I may have missed it.		3 – Standards are addressed in the Final Report.
6	General		The Federal guidelines also suggest that a regional ITS architecture developed by local agencies and other stakeholders would call for the modification of legacy systems over time to support desired integration. Is there anything you can say about this subject? Is there any implication on existing systems?		4 – Existing/legacy systems are included in the standards requirements for interoperability and will be addressed as the stakeholders agree upon standards in the region. The applicable standards will be agreed upon in the implementation, maintenance and update of the Regional Architecture.

Reviewer Name Various			Representing Various stakeholders	Phone # N/A	Email address N/A
Comment #:	**Section:**	**Page:**	**Comment:**		**Disposition of Comment*:**
			Various other comments were received informally in the course of telephone conversations with various project stakeholders. Other, more formal comments were also received via fax from a few stakeholders. These comments are being incorporated into the various chapters as appropriate.		1

L:\programs\J99-0495 - Inland Empire Reg ITS Arch\doc\Chap 4 - 5 - 6 document\comments and disposition\disposition of comments - Chap 4-5-6 (v3).doc

*Comment Disposition Key
1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)