

Bi-State Regional ITS Architecture - Architecture Comments

November 4, 2005

No.	Comment	Source	Date	Completed	Comments/Rationale	Disposition
1	Should we have an MCO3 for AHTD? I was a little surprised to see one for ODOT and not AHTD, was it meant to be AHTD instead?	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	When we discussed the possibility for Road Weather Collection there were no plans in the region for it. Now, having said that, there were no plans for ODOT to do this either (within the region) however there was mention of collecting weather and road weather information from Tulsa. So, we added this MP in for that reason.	No market package for AHTD
2	Should we have an MC04 for AHTD? We do for ODOT.	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	Same comment as #1 above.	No market package for AHTD
3	Is the school zone flasher pager system really already existing in Fort Smith?	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders in review workshop.	Existing - no change needed to inventory element or MP diagrams.
4	AHTD District (Maintenance) Headquarters, maybe we should just call this AHTD District Maintenance	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	The stakeholders just wanted to call it "AHTD District Headquarters" but I thought this was too general because it made no reference to the element having to do with maintenance and construction operations for AHTD. So, I added "(Maintenance)" to make that clarification.	AHTD Headquarters - name change per comment #29. This element includes maintenance and construction. Changed definition to reflect the stakeholder input.
5	ATMS06 – Greenwood TOC 2 of 2, add County Sheriff Dispatch	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Done
6	EM06 – AR Amber Alert 2 of 2, the comment box here is confusing, reword to indicate that ASP can put Amber Alert messages on the signs, but that at all other times AHTD will use the signs for traffic information dissemination	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Done
7	EM06 – AR Amber Alert 2 of 2, why is there a hazmat flow in this Amber Alert market package? Shouldn't it be alert notification and alert status as in 1 of 2?	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Changed flows to be more representative of the market package and region.
8	EM06 - OK Amber Alert 2 of 2, why is there a hazmat flow in this Amber Alert market package? Shouldn't it be alert notification and alert status as in 1 of 2?	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Changed flows to be more representative of the market package and region.

No.	Comment	Source	Date	Completed	Comments/Rationale	Disposition
9	MC06 – AHTD Information Dissemination, should we add the other EMs to this? i.e. Ft Smith PD, etc	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	No. The thought here is that the regional emergency management providers would coordinate with the regional maintenance department, and the local emergency management providers would coordinate with the local maintenance department. Therefore, Fort Smith PD (for example) would appear in the diagram with the Fort Smith Maintenance. However, when discussed, no local maintenance departments were interested in Winter Maintenance, only AHTD and ODOT.	No changes required.
10	MC09 ODOT Maintenance Operation	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Deleted Traffic Management
11	MC10 Ft Smith Maintenance Operation	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Deleted Traffic - updated diagram for aesthetics.
12	MC10 Van Buren Maint. Operation	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Deleted Traffic - updated diagram for aesthetics.
13	MC10 Greenwood Maint. Operation	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Deleted Traffic - updated diagram for aesthetics.
14	MC10 Municipal Maint. Operation	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Deleted Traffic - updated diagram for aesthetics.
15	MC10 County Maint. Operation	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Deleted Traffic - updated diagram for aesthetics.
16	MC10 Activity Coordination AHTD 2 of 2	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Shown correctly, no change.
17	MC10 Activity Coordination ODOT 2 of 2	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Review Comment Box in Market Package diagram.	Shown correctly, no change.
18	ATIS5 – I think that at the deployment plan meeting when we were ranking that people felt that this was appropriate to acknowledge	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Add in real time.	Changed to Advertising & Promotion websites.
19	APTS5 ISD, did we ask about the special forces or is this holdover from another region	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	This was a holdover from another region. It will be deleted.	Element deleted.
20	Do we have KiaBois Transit in here at the appropriate level? Don't have a transit traveler information market package for them	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	TBD	We can add this MP if you would like. We don't know much about KiBois Transit, other than it exists in the region (there wasn't a stakeholder at the meeting).	Amy Lewis to research and determine level of representation for KiaBois.
21	CVO10 – Rail Cars, don't remember HAZMAT and rail cars coming up in discussions	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	It didn't, however this is a good MP provided there are railroads in the region (which, there are) and that these railroads are transporting/carrying HAZMAT materials (which they probably are at some point).	Per stakeholder discussion, keep MP in architecture.
22	AD1 AHTD Statewide Crash Records, this needs to be ASP	Julia	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Does this comment mean we need to add this diagram for ASP, and have it as existing, and keep this diagram for AHTS and have it as planned?	This MP will be included in the Statewide ITS Architecture - it will also be included here for reference once changed to ASP

No.	Comment	Source	Date	Completed	Comments/Rationale	Disposition
23	ATIS2 – Oklahoma 511 – wasn't OK 511 existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	None	Change element to existing - status of flows in MP diagram are <u>unknown</u> .
24	APTS2 – Fort Smith Transit Operations – should the website flows really be existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	Per stakeholder comments, flows are existing. No change was made.
25	ATMS13 – Fort Smith TOC – are the HRI status flows really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	Changed to planned in MP diagram.
26	From inventory table- is the Van Buren TOC really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Changed element status to planned.
27	From inventory table – is the Regional Smart Card really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Changed element status to planned.
28	From inventory table – is the AHTD statewide TMC really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	This was discussed - it was determined that it is not currently existing, but by the time the Fort Smith Regional ITS Architecture is completed, it should be.	Changed element status to planned.
29	Change AHTD District CCTV to AHTD CCTV	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	In the same manner, should be adjust all other AHTD names so as not to use “district” in the naming convention	Changed all names - removed "district" from all AHTD elements. Changed element to "CCTV Cameras".
30	From inventory table – are AHTD CCTV really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	Changed element status to planned.
31	From inventory table – are AHTD District Field Equipment really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	Changed element status to planned, and added that portable DMS are <u>existing to definition</u> .
32	From inventory table – are AHTD District Field Sensors really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	Changed element status to planned.
33	From inventory table – is the AHTD Equipment Repair Facility really existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	Existing - located in Fort Smith at the AHTD headquarters. Element <u>changed to existing</u> .
34	Is the definition right for AHTD Maintenance and Construction Vehicles? It mentions on-board equipment rather than vehicles, if it is correct, should it be existing?	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	Discuss with stakeholders.	The vehicles are existing, but the ITS components onboard the vehicles are planned. Therefore element status has been changed to <u>planned</u> .
35	Change AHTD Planning Division to AHTD Planning and Research Division	Gary Dalporto	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Element name changed.

No.	Comment	Source	Date	Completed	Comments/Rationale	Disposition
36	Add the Corp of Engineers to the architecture, Infrastructure Security? Incident Management?	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	We can do this, although we try not to add stakeholders with no elements to the regional architecture. It is important to note that this is a regional transportation architecture, not a communications architecture. If the Corps has cameras for bridge security, or a emergency management center for floods, or if there is a lock system, or flood monitoring, etc... we could add them	Add corps of engineers and coast guard for incident management and emergency coordination for waterways. Added to ATMS08, EM01, EM05, EM06, EM10, and CVO10 where appropriate. Didn't add their own field equipment due to this being a "roadway" transportation system, not waterways
37	Fort Smith Departments – this is a random stakeholder and descriptions, did we really use this stakeholder? If so we need to work on clarifying the description	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	11/4/2005	The only element that is owned by this stakeholder is the "Fort Smith Website". First, does this even exist? Second, who maintains it? They should be the stakeholder. This may double at the MPO website or the Fort Smith Advertising....website. This probably needs to be clarified	Changed "Fort Smith Website" stakeholder to Fort Smith. Advertising and Promotion Commission. Removed the stakeholder Fort Smith Departments from the architecture.
38	APTS5 – Fort Smith Transit Operations, add cameras at transit facilities for surveillance	Amy Lewis	10/6/2005	10/6/2005	None	Added security monitoring field equipment to APTS5-1 and all appropriate flows
39	HPMS Archive data may need to be moved to the statewide level, unless there are certain criteria where it is operated/controlled here.	Trevor Harris	10/20/2005	11/4/2005	Recommend deleting HPMS from the regional architecture and rely on the statewide architecture to represent the data collection for MPMS.	MP diagram deleted. HPMS to be included in the Arkansas Statewide ITS Architecture plan.
40	Should the Bi-State MPO have its own archive data system?	Trevor Harris	10/20/2005	10/20/2005	May want to consider the Bi-State MPO Data Warehouse (AD2-1) - medium term.	Added AD2-3 for the Bi-State MPO
41						
42						