

## New Jersey Comment Resolution Database

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
1	6/16/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	MP ATMS21-1 (So)	In the title, change "South Jersey Turnpike Authority" to "South Jersey Transportation Authority"	7/1/2004	The title has been changed to "South Jersey Transportation Authority"
2	6/16/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	SJTA/ACESP TOC (St)	Please break this ITS element into it's component TOC and SP ITS elements, and make sure the interface between them is exposed and documented. This is so that if the TOC function is relocated, the interface to the SP patrolling the ACE is shown.	7/2/2004	Renamed Emergency Management subsystem functions to ACESP Dispatch (Stakeholder is NJSP), renamed Traffic Management subsystem functions to SJTA TOC, and renamed Maintenance and Construction subsystem to SJTA TOC - Maintenance functions to SJTA TOC - Maintenance (St).
3	6/17/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	MP ATMS07-01 (No)	Please delete this market package as per stakeholder consensus at the 6-17-04 workshop.	7/1/2004	This customized market package diagram has been deleted. However, please be aware another, but different, customized market package may be renamed "ATMS07-01 (No) in the August 10, 2004 update of the ITS architectures.
4	6/19/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	sj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	MP ATMS08-03 (So)	The emergency management element "DRPA Police (No)" should be renamed "DRPA Police (So)". I'm sending this comment for Karl Ziemer.	7/29/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
5	6/19/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	sj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	The following comment is being sent for Karl Zeimer. ALL ITS elements for the "DRPA - Delaware River Port Authority", need to be identified as "(So)".	7/1/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
6	6/21/2004	Steven Burke	DRPA	SBurke@drpa.org	(856) 968-2092	NJ - MP APTS4-2a (No)	<p>With regards to DRPA/PATCO, For APTS 4 - Transit Passenger and Fare Payment, the DRPA/PATCO Fare Management System is labelled as "(No-So)". This does not seem appropriate, since PATCO is wholly contained within the DVRPC region. I think we should be categorized as either DVRPC (if there is such a designation) or just southern.</p> <p>There are two inconsistencies with the flow-chart. First, if PATH is considered "north", then we should be considered "south", since both transit agencies are similar in most respects, except location within the state. Second, I dont understand the difference between the "(St)" statewide designation and the "(No-So)" north-south designation.</p>	7/1/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
7	6/21/2004	Steven Burke	DRPA	SBurke@drpa.org	(856) 968-2092	NJ - MP APTS7-1 (No)	For APTS 7 - Multimodal Coordination, the DRPA/PATCO Operations Center is labelled as "(No-So)". This does not seem appropriate, since PATCO is wholly contained within the DVRPC region. I think we should be categorized as either DVRPC (if there is such a designation) or just southern.	7/1/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
8	6/24/2004	Trevor Harris	ConSysTec	trevor.harris@consystec.com	(703) 598-9968	CVO-01	Add website subscription to ISPs, such as Smartguide, smart traveler, or smartroute		
9	6/24/2004	Trevor Harris	ConSysTec	trevor.harris@consystec.com	(703) 598-9968	CVO-07	Missing roadside safety. See page 3-9 of the CVISN documents		
10	6/24/2004	Trevor Harris	ConSysTec	trevor.harris@consystec.com	(703) 598-9968		NJMVC as an ISP?		
11	6/21/2004	Steven Burke	DRPA	SBurke@drpa.org	(856) 968-2092	NJ - MP EM01-1 (St)	For EM01 - Emergency Response Coordination, the DRPA/PATCO Police Dispatch is labelled as "(No-So)". This does not seem appropriate, since PATCO is wholly contained within the DVRPC region. I think we should be categorized as either DVRPC (if there is such a designation) or just southern. Also, I dont understand the difference between the "(St)" statewide designation and the "(No-So)" north-south designation.	7/1/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
12	6/21/2004	Steven Burke	DRPA	SBurke@drpa.org	(856) 968-2092	NJ - MP EM08-2 (St)	For EM08 - Disaster Response and Reentry, the DRPA/PATCO Operations Center is labelled as "(No-So)". This does not seem appropriate, since PATCO is wholly contained within the DVRPC region. I think we should be categorized as either DVRPC (if there is such a designation) or just southern. It also seems that either the PANYNJ PATH Operations Center should be here also, or both PATCO and PATH should not be on the statewide flowchart. Also, I dont understand the difference between the "(St)" statewide designation and the "(No-So)" north-south designation.	7/1/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
13	6/21/2004	Steven Burke	DRPA	SBurke@drpa.org	(856) 968-2092	NJ - MP MC04-6 (No)	For MC04 - Weather Information Processing and Distribution, the DRPA/PATCO Operations Center is labelled as "(No-So)". This does not seem appropriate, since PATCO is wholly contained within the DVRPC region. I think we should be categorized as either DVRPC (if there is such a designation) or just southern.	7/1/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
14	6/21/2004	Arnold Mercer	NJTA	Mercer@turnpike.state.nj.us		NJ -Icnx E-ZPass CSCs (St) and NJTA Parkway Division Toll Collection System (St)	The NJTA and NJTA Parkway Div. Toll Collections Systems interface with only one CSC: the CSC operated by ACS in Newark. The various E-ZPass CSC's are interfaced for reconciliation purposes.	7/2/2004	The correction has been made to the ITS element name (E-ZPass CSC). Flows have been added between the E-ZPass CSC and the E-ZPass Reconciliation Network.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
15	6/22/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ -Architecture Flows	We need a definition for the architecture flow: road conditions observations_ud which shows up in APTS2.  I hope that the definition includes probe surveillance information derived in the APTS1 MPs.	7/1/2004	A definition has been added to road conditions observations_ud to be: Roadway conditions reported by transit bus drivers.
17	6/22/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS10-1 (St)	At the Statewide Electronic Payment workshop, there was a consensus for 1). A Universal Payment Instrument that would have the benefits of EZ-Pass (value in infrastructure), and Smartcard (value on card) for transit. (Note that MarkIV's patent expires soon); Include an EZ-Pass tag that has an interface to a SmartCard. In this way a single smart card can be used for tolls, parking, transit and other purchases 2). Include the EZ Commerce Business Center. This is a CSC for other financial transactions (e.g. fast food purchases). 3). Note that NJ Transit parking may use EZ Pass. 4). Enforcement using license plate OCR and DMV interface to bill offenders.	7/2/2004	Added data flows between the Toll Collection subsystems to a Universal Smart Card ITS element. Also added the proposed E-ZPass Commerce Business Center as a Toll Administration subsystem.
18	6/22/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS16-1 (No)	We need to analyze all the ATMS 16 diagrams to see if we can harmonize, specifically if PATCO and NJTransit can use an EZPass Tag with a smart card for parking payment.	8/6/2004	The market package, ATMS16-1 (St), has been added to reflect the electronic payment operations available to parking facilities (public and private) in New Jersey).
19	6/22/2004	Roger P. Sager	DRJTBC	rpsager@drjtbc.org		NJ -Region Home	have the following corrections to the flow charts. They all revolve around the fact that DRJTBC does not have a police force. We have a contract with Pa. & NJ State Police organizations to provide service to us. In reviewing the charts the following need to be changed: ATMS08 For NJ DOT NORTH; ATMS08 for DRJTBC; MC04 Weather; EM01 Emer. Response. All those charts identify a DRJTBC Police.	7/1/2004	The elements DRJTBC Police has been removed from the architecture. A market package, ATMS08-05 (No) and EM02-6 (No) has been edited/added to reflect that DRJTBC communicates with NJSP and Pennsylvania State Police for incident management.
20	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS16-1a (So)	Split diagram for Park Services and other public parking facilities. Also, SJTA intends to have parking facilities in Atlantic City that will have their own DMS or CMS field equipment to guide travelers to available parking in Atlantic City. This field equipment will be tied directly to the parking management facilities.	8/6/2004	Private parking facilities have been separated from public (agency) operated parking facilities. Separate market packages have been created for NJDEP State Parks, National Park Service, NJ Transit and SJTA operated parking facilities. Also, added information flows between the TOC and ITS Field Equipment (for DMS).
21	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS16-3a (So)	Rename to be parking lots and not just park and ride lots. May need to add another element to the Parking Management box: e.g. Facility Operator Systems OR change the name and definition of "Public and Private Park and Ride Systems" to be more than park and ride lots.	8/5/2004	Renamed element to generic Parking Facility Operators. Changed the definition to be, "Parking Facility Operators systems, both public and private. Includes park and ride lot operators."

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
22	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP AD1-06 (St)	SJTA/ACESP TOC (St) should be decomposed to the "SJTA TOC" and the "ACESP Dispatch" which should be allocated to the EM entity in this diagram.	7/2/2004	The decomposition has been made and is reflected in the August 10, 2004 update of the ITS architectures.
23	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP APTS5-14 (So)	Title should be "SJTA Transportation Services Division Security"	7/1/2004	The title of this market package has been renamed "SJTA Transportation Services Division Security". Also, the market package has been renamed APTS5-06 (So).
24	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS01-1b (So)	This diagram should be renamed "Atlantic City Area JOC Network Surveillance" Also, Add a new ATMS01: "SJTA TOC" connecting to "SJTA ITS Field Equipment South" AND "NJDOT Field Equipment South".	7/2/2004	This diagram has been renamed "Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center" for consistency with other MP titles. The market package diagram has also renamed ATMS01-2 (So). ATMS01-3 (So) has been added with SJTA TOC connecting to NJDOT South ITS Field Equipment and SJTA ITS Field Equipment.
25	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS04-6 (So)	Add to the lower Roadway subsystem "NJDOT South ITS Field Equipment" (to connect to the "Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center"). In the upper diagram, all flows EXIST.	7/1/2004	The ITS Element, NJDOT South ITS Field Equipment" has been added to this market package, ATMS04-6 (So), to connect with the Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center. In addition, all flows between SJTA TOC and SJTA ITS Field Equipment in this market package has been changed to Exist.
26	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS08-03 (So)	Make sure to add the new ACESP element (from splitting the existing element) to the EM entity box.	7/2/2004	The new ACESP (Atlantic City Expressway - State Police (Dispatch)) has been assigned to the Emergency Management entity. It has also been mapped to the Enforcement Agency terminator.
27	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS18-4 (So)	The new "SJTA TOC" needs to have the "So" suffix.	7/2/2004	The suffix for all ITS elements have been removed to minimize confusion. Only the customized market package diagrams have been assigned to either the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture.
28	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS18-4 (So)	Remove the Atlantic City TOC elements (the bottom pair), since they will not make lanes reversible using ITS lane controls. Rename the title to remove Atlantic City.	7/1/2004	Removed Atlantic City TOC and ITS Field Equipment elements from the market package, and renamed the title to South Jersey Transportation Authority.
29	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS21-1 (So)	Enforcement Agency should be the new ACE SP element. Flows to the SJTA TOC (So) EXIST.	7/2/2004	Changed the Enforcement agency to be ACESP Dispatch. Appropriate flows between ACESP and SJTA TOC have been changed to existing.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
30	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP MC04-7 (So)	SJTA TOC receives RWIS information from their own sensors. They need an MCO3 MP for this. They also get NJDOT RWIS information from a technical (not public) website supported by NJDOT, which is provisioned from NJDOT Maintenance. Also, they buy weather information from specialty weather companies (add the appropriate Terminator).	8/10/2004	MC03-4 (So) market package (Road Weather Data Collection) has been added for SJTA. This market package shows SJTA TOC - Maintenance receiving RWIS information from a Weather Service Provider and from its own (SJTA) ITS Field Equipment. In the 9/13/04 update of the ITS Architecture, SJTA was added to MC04-2 (St) to show SJTA receiving RWIS information from NJDOT TECC.
31	6/23/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP MC06-9 (So)	The weather service terminator should be supplying weather information to the SJTA TOC Maintenance and Construction subsystem (NOT the traffic management subsystem).	7/1/2004	The weather service terminator has been changed to supply weather information to the SJTA TOC - Maintenance element. Please note that this market package diagram has been renamed to be MC06-8 (So).
32	6/23/2004	Arnold Mercer	NJTA	Mercer@turnpike.s tate.nj.us		NJ -NJTA Parkway Division ITS Field Equipment (St)	I do not believe that this field equipment would ever have all of the interfaces shown. I believe that they would only interface within the Authority (and with Transcom), as is shown for the NJTA Field Equipment.	8/6/2004	The interfaces indicate with which elements does the Parkway ITS Field Equipment communicate with. The NJTA Parkway Division TOC controls and monitors the ITS Field Equipment, NJTA Parkway Division Maintenance monitors the ITS Field Equipment for roadway pavement conditions (weather information), and at the workshops, there was an indication that in the future, certain Parkway Division ITS Field Equipment might be controlled from the Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center. Also, please let us know if an interface is needed with TRANSCOM, and if so, please detail what that interface (or information) entails.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
33	6/23/2004	Arnold Mercer	NJTA	mercero@turnpike.s tate.nj.us		NJ -NJTA Parkway Division Maintenance (St)	don't understand why Maintenance would ever have these numerous interfaces to outside organizations, and if they would, why aren't the NJTA Parkway and NJTA Turnpike divisions consistent? For example, the Parkway interfaces with NJT Bus Operations, but the Turnpike does not.	8/6/2004	Many of the interfaces to other transportation agencies are for coordination of maintenance resources. This coordination may be necessary if other agencies has a resource (e.g., an extra loader or salt truck) that may be needed, or to coordinate maintenance activities near or on one of the Parkway ramps (e.g., to coordinate with a municipality to clear an incident on or near one of the Parkway ramps). The interfaces with outside organizations between NJTA and NJTA-Parkway Division Maintenance Divisions, should be more similar in the August 10, 2004 update. Differences may be a result that the Parkway Division deals more with SJTPO counties/municipalities (Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, and Salem counties) in Southern Jersey, while the Turnpike deals more with DVRPC counties/municipalities (Burlington, Mercer, Camden, and Gloucester counties).
34	6/29/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s (201) 797-9036 tate.nj.us		NJ - MP AD1-19 (No)	Since this is Central NJ RWIS Database, in the upper right box the North New Jersey County TOC's should be replaced with Central New Jersey County TOC's and North New Jersey Municipal TOC's should be replaced with Central New Jersey Municipal TOC's	7/1/2004	Replied - Pchan. - The Central NJ RWIS Database is "owned" and maintained by the NJDOT TOC Central. North New Jersey County TOCs and North New Jersey Municipal TOCs represents those TOCs in the NJTPA region, while South New Jersey County TOCs and South New Jersey Municipal TOCs represents those TOCs in the South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization; thus there is no Central New Jersey County or Municipal TOCs in any NJ architectures. The future NJDOT TOC Central, as we understand it, includes only those counties and municipalities in the NJTPA region. If there is any understanding on our part, please let us know. Otherwise, no changes will be made at this time.  8/6 - Follow-up. The RWIS database is now owned by MPOs.
35	6/29/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s (201) 797-9036 tate.nj.us		NJ - MP APTS2-12 (No)	The list of service providers may also include the 511 system with Web Page.	7/1/2004	The ITS Element, NJDOT 511 System, has been added to this and other similar market packages. Please note that with the August 10, 2004 posting of the NJ architecture, this market package diagram has been renamed APTS2-05 (No), NJTPA Region - County/Municipal Transit Operators System.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
36	6/29/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP APTS2-12 (No)	The list of Information Service providers should include NJDOT WebSite (St)	11/22/2004	The ITS Element, NJDOT 511 System, has been added to this and other similar market packages. Please note that with the September 13, 2004 posting of the NJ architecture, this market package diagram has been renamed APTS2-05 (No).
37	6/29/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP ATMS07-02 (So)	In the list of Traffic Management entities: North New Jersey County TOC's should be replaced with South New Jersey County TOC's. North New Jersey Municipal TOC's should be replaced with South New Jersey Municipal TOC's.	7/1/2004	Replied - Pchan - This market package represents Municipal TOCs in the South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization (SJTPA) region (South New Jersey Municipal TOCs) coordinating with other Traffic Operations Centers. North New Jersey County TOCs and North New Jersey Municipal TOCs are included to represent traffic coordination for those South New Jersey Municipal TOCs bordering the counties and municipalities on the NJTPA region, i.e., traffic coordination across the border between the NJTPA and SJTPO regions.
38	6/29/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP ATMS07-05 (No)	Under other Traffic Management the New Jersey State Police should be also included.	7/1/2004	This market package is intended for traffic operations centers to share information and control to implement a regional control strategy. Although the NJ State Police does contribute to traffic control from a manpower perspective, it is unlikely that NJ State Police operates any "ITS field equipment". Thus, we believe that NJ State Police should not be included in the Other Traffic Management for traffic coordination purpose. However, if desired, we can probably provide NJ State Police with a traffic information data flow so they can manage traffic flow in the field
39	6/29/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP ATMS07-06 (No-So)	Under Other Traffic Management, the New Jersey State Police should be also included.	7/1/2004	This market package is intended for traffic operations centers to share information and control to implement a regional control strategy. Although the NJ State Police does contribute to traffic control from a manpower perspective, it is unlikely that NJ State Police operates any "ITS field equipment". Thus, we believe that NJ State Police should not be included in the Other Traffic Management for traffic coordination purpose. However, if desired, we can probably provide NJ State Police with a traffic information data flow so they can manage traffic flow in the field

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
40	6/24/2004	RSJ	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP APTS7-2a2 (No)	Re-title. Should be "North New Jersey Municipal/County Transit Systems (No)".	7/1/2004	This market package has been replaced by market package APTS7-1 (No), NJTPA Region Transit Coordination Network. This new market package reflects a creation of a transit communications network between the transit operators in the NJTPA Region, allowing for the coordination of transit service, and the sharing of transit-related information between the participating transit agencies, including Municipal and County Transit systems.
41	6/30/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP ATMS07-06 (No-So)	NJ State Police should be included in the Other Traffic Management box.	7/1/2004	Replied - Pchan - This market package is intended for traffic operations centers to share information and control to implement a regional control strategy. Although the NJ State Police does contribute to traffic control from a manpower perspective, it is unlikely that NJ State Police operates any "ITS field equipment". Thus, we believe that NJ State Police should not be included in the Other Traffic Management for traffic coordination purpose. However, if desired, we can probably provide NJ State Police with a traffic information data flow so they can manage traffic flow in the field
42	6/30/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP ATMS08-03 (So)	DRPA Police (No) is not necessary for Incident Management in South New Jersey	7/1/2004	DRPA Bridge Police has been removed from this market package. As an additional note, because DRPA is entirely within the DVRPC region, DRPA Bridges Police has been removed from the NJTPA and SJTPO regional architectures, and appears only the Statewide ITS Architecture.
43	6/30/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP EM08-1 (St)	Should also include agencies from New York and Pennsylvania.	7/1/2004	Replied - Pchan - Please let us know which agencies from the following list should be included:
44	6/30/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP MC07-2 (No)	Since this is for Maintenance of Northern Region, the South New Jersey Municipal TOC's and South New Jersey County TOC's should be taken out from the left box.	7/1/2004	Fixed - Pchan. Removed South New Jersey County TOCs (So) and South New Jersey Municipal PWD Operations (So) from Traffic Management subsystem.
45	6/30/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	NJ - MP MC07-2 (No)	Since this is for the Northern Region the South New Jersey County PWD Operations and the South New Jersey Municipal PWD Operations should be removed from the right side box.	7/1/2004	We have removed South New Jersey County PWD Operations (So) and South New Jersey Municipal PWD Operations (So) from Maintenance and Construction Management subsystem.



No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
46	6/30/2004	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	KAUFSCHEIDER@sjta.com		NJ -SJTA/ACESP TOC (St)	I am not sure that the TOC would have direct interfaces with so many entities. This may be left over from before we separated the TOC from the State Police.	8/6/2004	I believe you are correct. The "SJTA/ACESP TOC" ITS element has been split into two elements, "SJTA TOC" and "ACESP Dispatch" in the August 10, 2004 update of the ITS architectures. This should decrease the number of direct interfaces with SJTA TOC.
47	7/1/2004	Bill Ragozine	Cross County Connection TMA	ragozine@transportationchoices.com	(856) 596-8228	NJ - MP APTS8-02 (So)	What is the DVRPC connection to this market package? It is linked via market packages by stakeholder.	8/6/2004	Fixed - There was an error in the building of the website.
48	7/1/2004	Bill Raogzine	Cross County Connection TMA	ragozine@transportationchoices.com	(856) 596-8228	NJ - Market Packages by Stakeholder	There is no information for Cross County Connection TMA yet on the market packages by stakeholder.	8/6/2004	There is a generic Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) stakeholder, which includes Cross County Connection TMAs. Rather than list each New Jersey TMA separately, the generic stakeholder was created. This streamlines the regional ITS architecture(s) and provides consistent interfaces/data flows for all the TMAs with other ITS elements/systems.
49	7/4/2004	Dhanesh Motiani	NJDOT	dhanseh.motiani@dot.state.nj.us	(201) 797-7314	NJ - MP AD1-19 (No)	I would like to attempt to clear some confusion. I have attached an excel sheet to show how the NJ counties are broken down for different purposes. This is what causes the problem/confusion. Also, TOC's do not maintain the RWIS. Now, as far as MP AD1-19 goes, Mercer would be the only county that would belong to Central region and not belong to NJTPO or "NO" for the sake of our architecture. What I would suggest is that maybe it should say, "No and DV" for the Central Jersey RWIS Database and add Mercer country and Mercer county municipalities to the Traffic Management box on the right.	8/6/2004	Fixed - Pchan. Regional RWIS databases are now own by MPOs.
50	7/4/2004	Dhanesh Motiani	NJDOT	dhanseh.motiani@dot.state.nj.us	(201) 797-7314	NJ - MP ATMS07-02 (So)	This was meant for say, Atlantic county when it wants to coordinate with Ocean county which falls under NJTPA. However, if that is correct, what about Atlantic county coordinating with Burlington county? I think you should add DVRPC counties TOCs. Also, South Jersey county TOC's are already shown at the bottom of the list on the right hand side.	8/6/2004	Connections have been added, where appropriate, to DRVPC Region Counties/Municipalities TOCs where appropriate.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
51	7/4/2004	Dhanesh Motiani	NJDOT	dhanseh.motiani@dot.state.nj.us	(201) 797-7314	NJ - MP ATMS07-05 (No)	The question is two fold. First, the link "traffic information coordination" , does it mean "controlling ITS field equipment" ? I was under the impression that it means also to control cameras from a central location. Secondly, if you would consider operating the cameras as "controlling ITS field equipment" then, yes the State Police and also the Bergen County Police should be added. I am not saying we should add them no matter what. All I am saying is that if the term "traffic information coordination" means to have control of cameras, then Tibi is right and we should consider them on the list. We already have the SP and BCPD watching our feeds, they do not have the control and I know they have asked to in past.	11/22/2004	Added flows for NJSP to receive traffic images and control CCTV cameras through NJDOT TOC North in ATMS01-01 (St).
52	7/4/2004	Dhanesh Motiani	NJDOT	dhanseh.motiani@dot.state.nj.us	(201) 797-7314	NJ - MP EM08-1 (St)	I agree with Tibi, this MP shows that NJ is self sufficient. It depicts that we will ask interagency help but not from out of state. I think we need input from Art Egan on this issue. Also, I didnt see the STIC on this and other MPs?	11/22/2004	Added EM8-03 (St) market package diagram.
53	7/15/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - Inventory by Entity	Review all ITS element names to make sure that the name begins with an indication of the ITS element stakeholder.	8/6/2004	Completed. All ITS elements have been reviewed.
54	7/15/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - Inventory by Stakeholder	Need to add archive coordination between the NJ MPOs, including DVRPC but also the NYMTC MPO Archive and the NYSDOT archive (for the non-MPO counties that border New Jersey in the North), the DRJTBC, and the Delaware MPO that Jim Kemp will tell us about.	8/6/2004	The archive coordination between the different MPOs data archives has been added and can be found in AD3-5 (St). Archive coordination includes NJTPA, SJTPO, DVRPC, NYMTC, and WILMAPCO.
55	7/15/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ -Other Facility (Toll) Commercial Vehicle Check (St)	This element needs a description that will shed some light on the stakeholder (pretty vague right now). The two MPs are correspondingly unclear as to who is really effected by this MP.	8/6/2004	This ITS element definition has been updated to read, "Represents the roadway devices used for commercial vehicle checks of toll facility operators in the region. These devices may perform such functions such as automated vehicle identification, credential checking, roadside safety inspections, and weigh-in-motion sensors. Toll facility operators in the region may include BCBC, DRBA, DRJTBC, NJTA, NJTA-GSP, PANYNJ, PTC, and SJTA."
56	7/15/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder; FW: Wilmington MPO	Attached is a link to the Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO)	8/6/2004	This link was provided to support archive coordination between the MPOs. The archive coordination between the different MPOs data archives has been added and can be found in AD3-5 (St). Archive coordination includes NJTPA, SJTPO, DVRPC, NYMTC, and WILMAMPO.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
57	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP EM08-2 (St)	Need to include PANYNJ transit resources in the Transit Management box. (Need to confirm with PANYNJ that this is okay - to not explicitly go through TRANSCOM.)	8/6/2004	PANJNJ requested that all coordination between its elements and other agency elements be through TRANSCOM.
58	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP EM04-1 (St)	Add separate EM4's for SJTA (and NJTA as per already noted in the diagram).	7/29/2004	The following market packages exist for Roadway Service:  EM04-1 (St) - NJDOT ESP Vehicles EM04-2 (St) - NJTA Courtesy Patrol Vehicles EM04-3 (St) - SJTA Emergency Service Patrol Vehicles
59	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP ATMS08-12 (St)	TRANSCOM is currently sending event plans to the NJTA Turnpike TOC (through the TRANSCOM RA).	8/6/2004	The data flow, event plans, from TRANSCOM to NJTA Turnpike TOC, has been changed from planned to existing. Note: this market package diagram has been renamed to ATMS08-02 (St).
60	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP ATMS08-04a (So)	We need a similar diagram for the North Jersey TMCs (to be able to coordinate resource requests for maintenance resources).	8/6/2004	Changes made to ATMS08 market packages so market packages are focused around each TMC with flows to the appropriate maintenance organizations and emergency management agencies. Also, market packages added to ATMS08 focused on flows and coordination between maintenance and construction agencies.
61	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP EM09-1 (St)	Change lower right comment to say "Private Freight and Rail will be notified by the TECC, and the STIC will notify the TECC."	8/6/2004	Change to the comment has been made.
62	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP EM08-2 (St)	This diagram might be removed, because the required connections are in other diagrams, as follows: The OEM (in the middle, with the Transportation Commissioner), DOES develop requirements for Transit resources, but executes through the STIC. Thus the STIC connects to the OEM, AND connects to the Transit Agencies.	8/6/2004	OPEN. This market package diagram has been changed based on other comments. Required connections can be found in EM08-1 (St), EM08-2 (St), and EM01-5 (St). However, still need to verify some flows.
63	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		nj - MP EM06-1a (No)	The Amber Alert message needs to also go to transit properties so that the message might be published to the message signs at stations and on vehicles.	8/6/2004	Alert flows have been added to, and from Transit Management Centers in the EM-06, Wide Area Alert, market packages.
64	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com (914) 248-8466		NJ -Market Packages	Need to add a new EM5 MP to monitor bridge/tunnel high value infrastructure. Today: PANYNJ; Future: NJDOT; NJTA; other operating agencies (including transit) Project is: "Critical Infrastructure Systems"	8/6/2004	EM-05 market packages (Transportation Infrastructure Protection) have been added for NJDOT, NJ Transit, South Jersey Transportation Authority, NJTA, NJTA-GSP, and PANYNJ.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
65	7/20/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ -Market Packages	Include a new combination CVO01 and CVO12 MP for detecting hijacked or AWOL HAZMAT commercial vehicles.	8/6/2004	CVO12-1 (St), CVO12-1 (No), and CVO12-1 (So) market packages has been added to support this transportation service.
66	7/30/2004	Mark Smith	NJDOT, TOC South	mark.smith@dot.st ate.nj.us	(856) 486-6610	NJ - MP ATMS20	An addition MP is needed for NJDOT, which has draw bridges. The TM ITS entities that should be monitoring/controlling the facilities can be any of the following: NJDOT TOC North, South or Central, and NJDOT Maintenance.	7/30/2004	Added market package diagrams ATMS20-1 (St), ATMS20-1a (St), and ATMS20-1b (St) for drawbridge management by each of the NJDOT TOCs.
67	7/30/2004	Mark Smith	NJDOT - TOC South	mark.smith@dot.st ate.nj.us	(856) 486-6610	NJ - MP ATMS20	Cape May county also has draw bridges - thus update the title to include Cape May.	7/30/2004	Regarding Cape May county drawbridges, a market package diagram, ATMS20-1 (So) has been added for SJTPO Counties Drawbridge equipment. The diagram includes a note that it includes Cape May county.
68	7/30/2004	Mark Smith	NJDOT - TOC South	mark.smith@dot.st ate.nj.us	(856) 486-6610	NJ - MP AD1-17 (So)	For South Jersey RWIS Database, the NJDOT RECC and NJDOT Maintenance are sources of roadway weather data. Same for North Jersey RWIS Database.	8/6/2004	Fixed - Pchan. Added flow from NJDOT Maintenance and NJDOT RECC (South and Central). See AD3-2 (So).
69	7/30/2004	Mark Smith	NJDOT - TOC South	mark.smith@dot.st ate.nj.us	(856) 486-6610	NJ - MP MC04-3b (No)	Add additional MP for TOC South. One exists for NJDOT TOC North & Central.	8/6/2004	Fixed - Pchan. Added market packages MC04-1 (So) and MC04-2 (So).
70	8/5/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT - TOC North	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	nj - MP ATIS2-1c (So)	In the left box we should call: NJDOT 511 System instead of: NJDOT New Jersey 511 System	8/6/2004	Fixed - PChan.
71	8/4/2004	Tom Rafferty	New Jersey State Police	rafferty.tom@gw.nj sp.org	(609) 538-6077	nj - MP EM08-3 (No)	For something that will just affect the north region area, I'm not sure you need to show the State EOC on this slide since we have the connection of the county OEMs to State OEM shown in other slides. State OEM will be advised by the counties but unless the incident is a very large one that the counties need assistance, State OEM won't be coordinating the response.	8/6/2004	We have removed the State EOC from this slide.
72	8/4/2004	Tom Rafferty	New Jersey State Police	rafferty.tom@gw.nj sp.org	(609) 538-6077	nj - MP EM09-1 (St)	I forget where we said the other states' EOCs will be added to this diagram. Can you please advise?	8/6/2004	Connections between NJ OEM and Other States OEMs can be found EM09-1 (St).
73	8/5/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJDOT - TOC North	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 797-9036	nj - MP ATMS18-1 (No)	PANYNJ is the agency operating the reversible lane on I-495 section approaching Lincoln Tunnel from the New Jersey side. Not NJDOT, as per notation.	8/6/2004	The regional ITS architecture now has a market package diagram ATMS18-1 (No), and ATMS18-2 (No), for NJDOT North and PANYNJ Tunnels/Bridges. The note has been removed.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
74	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -DVRPC Transit Operators Systems (DV)	Does this element duplicate other transit operators like SEPTA, who are listed separately?	8/10/2004	The ITS Element, DVRPC Transit Operators Systems, is a generic element to represent all transit operators within the Delaware Valley Regional ITS Architecture. Sometimes, specific transit operators and/or elements within the region will be mentioned because there may be a unique connection with another stakeholder element in the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture. For example, New Jersey Transit - River Line Light Rail Transit System, has its own elements because of its relationship to New Jersey Transit overall in the Statewide ITS Architecture, although it operates only within the DVRPC region. SEPTA was a stakeholder that was specifically mentioned at one of our workshops, but does not currently have any ITS elements in the NJTPA/SJTPO or Statewide architectures. It is being kept as a placeholder for the draft architecture, but if no ITS elements appear, it will be removed from the final architectures.
75	6/23/2004	rsj	ConSysTec	rsj@consystec.com	(914) 248-8466	NJ - MP ATMS07-02 (So)	<p>SJTA TOC needs to exchange "traffic information coordination" with:</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_428.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_428.htm</a>&gt;Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_682.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_682.htm</a>&gt;Atlantic City TOC (So)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_140.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_140.htm</a>&gt;I-95 CC Information Exchange Network (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_429.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_429.htm</a>&gt;NJDOT TOC South (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_421.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_421.htm</a>&gt;NJTA Parkway Division TOC (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_36.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_36.htm</a>&gt;NJTA Turnpike TOC (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_616.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_616.htm</a>&gt;Probe Data Processor (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_582.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_582.htm</a>&gt;RIMIS IEN (St)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_522.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_522.htm</a>&gt;South New Jersey County TOCs (So)</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_146.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_146.htm</a>&gt;South New Jersey Municipal TOCs (So)</p> <p>The only interface above that currently exists is:</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_429.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/web/el/el_429.htm</a>&gt;NJDOT TOC South (St)</p>	8/10/2004	Market package ATMS07-6 (St), Regional Traffic Control, has been added and reflects the comments below.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
76	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -RIMIS IEN (St)	Does the connection with "Other States Public Safety Department" include PA or DE? If so, this link is acceptable, if not, take it out of RIMIS. Also, there is no definition for this entity ("Other States Public Safety Department"), which made it unclear.	8/23/2004	A definition for "Other States Public Safety Department" was added in the August 10, 2004 post of the website. However, the definition will be further modified to, "Represents public safety departments and agencies from other states. This includes Delaware, New York State, and Pennsylvania."
77	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS5-08a (So)	Mercer County TMA is not included for Transit Security, but should be. Maybe make a transit security market package for just TMA's, which would include both.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, Mercer County TMA is not part of the NJTPA or SJTPO architecture, but would be part of the DVRPC architecture and perhaps the Statewide architecture. That said, APTS5-05 (No) is meant to show the connections for NJTPA Region TMAs, and APTS5-03 (So) show the connections for SJTPO TMAs.
78	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS7-1a (No-So)	RIMIS should not be a part of this market package.	9/10/2004	RIMIS IEN has been removed from this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004). Please note that this market package has been renumbered and will be APTS7-4 (So).
79	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS7-2 (So)	Take RIMIS out of this market package.	9/10/2004	This market package has been melded into a SJTPO Region Transit Coordination Network (APTS7-2 (So)). RIMIS IEN has been removed from this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004).
80	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS7-2b (So)	Either add a market package for Greater Mercer TMA, or group them together, and this market package would just be called TMA's.	9/10/2004	For the purposes of the SJTPO regional ITS architecture, a (future) SJTPO Region Transit Coordination Network has been created to facilitate transit service information and coordination between all the transit providers operating within the SJTPO region (See APTS7-2 (So)). At the Statewide level, a (future) Statewide Transit Coordination Network has been created to facilitate transit service information and coordination between the 3 MPO regions (see APTS7-2 (St)). Coordination between the Cross Connection TMA and the Greater Mercer TMA is implied through these networks.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
81	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS7-2f (No)	RIMIS should be eliminated from this market package.	9/10/2004	RIMIS IEN has been removed from this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004).
82	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS7-2g (No)	RIMIS should be eliminated from this market package.	9/10/2004	RIMIS IEN has been removed from this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004).
83	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS7-1b (So)	Take the following entities out of this market package. They will not interface with RIMIS: Cape May Seashore Lines, DRBA Cape May Lewes Ferry System, Private Demand Response Operators Central Systems, Private Ferry Operators Systems. Add Greater Mercer TMA to this market package.	9/15/2004	These interfaces have been removed. As for interfaces that you suggested adding, only a connection with the Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center was added, since all the other elements and the RIMIS IEN are within the DVRPC Region, the interfaces between these elements should be reflected in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture.
84	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -RIMIS IEN (St)	RIMIS will not interface with the following entities: Cape May Seashore Lines, DRPA Bridge Police, DRBA Cape May Lewes Ferry System, Private Demand Response Operators Central Systems, Private Ferry Operators Systems, National Airline Information Centers, National Airline Operations, NJDEP State Parks, NJT LRT Hudson Bergen Ops Center, NJT LRT Newark City Subway Ops Center, NPS Park Mgmt Center, Public and Private Park and Ride Systems, Regional Airline Ops South NJ Co. PWD Operations (So), South NJ Co. TOCs (So), South NJ Municipal PWD Ops (So), South NJ Municipal TOCs (So), South NJ Municipal/Co Transit Systems (So), South NJ Public Safety Dispatch (So). RIMIS will be interfacing with the following entities, and need to be added: Greater Mercer TMA, Atlantic City Area Joint Operations Center, DRPA TMC, DVRPC County 911 Centers, South NJ Co. PWD Operations (DVRPC Counties), South NJ Co. TOCs (DVRPC Counties), South NJ Municipal PWD Ops (DVRPC Counties), South NJ Municipal TOCs (DVRPC Counties), South NJ Municipal/Co Transit Systems (DVRPC Counties), South NJ Public Safety Dispatch (DVRPC Counties). (Note: The South Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.)	9/15/2004	These interfaces have been removed. Since Greater Mercer TMA and the RIMIS IEN are within the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture, the interfaces between these elements should be reflected in that architecture.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
85	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS2-11 (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
86	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS3-3 (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
87	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP APTS3-6 (So)	Either add a market package for Greater Mercer TMA, or group them together, and this market package would just be called TMA's.	9/10/2004	Greater Mercer TMA would be in the DVRPC regional ITS architecture. We do have Cross Connection TMA market packages in the SJTPO regional ITS architecture and NJTPA TMAs in the NJTPA regional ITS architecture.
88	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP ATMS06-08a (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
89	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP ATMS06-10 (So)	Add RIMIS as an ISP for this market package.	9/10/2004	RIMIS IEN has been added to this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004). Please note that this market package has been renumbered and will be ATMS06-06 (So).



<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
90	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP ATMS06-12 (No-So)	RIMIS should not be included in this market package.	9/10/2004	RIMIS IEN has been removed from this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004). Please note that this market package has been renumbered and will be ATMS06-03 (St).
91	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP ATMS07-02 (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
92	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP ATMS07-04 (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
93	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP ATMS07-11 (No)	Please note that DRJTBC is not just in the north region, but is included in the DVRPC region as well. Also, PennDOT District 6 is in the DVRPC region, and not north.	9/15/2004	The interfaces between PennDOT District 6 and NJ DOT North have been removed.
94	8/10/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	nj - MP ATMS16-1b2 (No-So)	RIMIS should not be included in this market package.	9/10/2004	RIMIS IEN has been removed from this market package, and the change will be reflected in the next posting of the website (expected September 13, 2004). Please note that this market package has been renumbered and will be ATMS16-3 (St).

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
95	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP MC06-1c (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
96	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP MC06-1d (So)	South New Jersey municipalities in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the municipalities (except Atlantic City) in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	OPEN - Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
97	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP MC06-1e (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.
98	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	nj - MP MC06-1f (So)	South New Jersey counties in the DVRPC region (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, Mercer) will be the only ones to interface with RIMIS, not the counties in SJTPO.	9/9/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, the Statewide, NJTPA Regional, and SJTPO Regional ITS architectures have been rechecked so that only DVRPC region counties (Camden, Burlington, Gloucester, and Mercer) interface with RIMIS.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
99	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -PennDOT Statewide TOC (No-So)	DVRPC Regional Arch will show PennDOT Statewide TOC speaking to RIMIS. We do not envision speaking to NJTA Parkway Division. Note: Context Diagram and List of Interface do not correspond.	9/20/2004	The context diagram for the PennDOT Statewide TOC element now reflects all of the interfaces listed. The connection to NJTA Parkway Division has also been removed.
100	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -PennDOT District 6 TCC (No)	PennDOT District 6 TOC is not a north agency. They are located in DVRPC region. They are covered within our DVRPC Regional Arch. In the NJDOT Architecture, we feel that PennDOT 6-0 should interface to: RIMIS, NJDOT South TOC, NJDOT STIC, TRANSCOM, Burlington County Bridge Commission, DRJTBC. Besides these agencies, other agencies within your inventory that PennDOT 6-0 interfaces with are: DelDOT, DRPA TMC, DRBA, Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, PennDOT Central TOC, PennDOT District 4, PennDOT District 5, SEPTA	11/22/2004	Added connections with NJ DOT South TOC, NJDOT STOC, and TRANSCOM. Connections with DRJTBC already exists.
101	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -PTC Operations Center (No-So)	Context Diagram and List of Interface do not correspond. PTC is located in the DVRPC Region. PTC should also interface with: NJDOT TOC South, RIMIS. PTC probably will not speak to SJTS/ACESP, NJDOT North, NJ OEM	9/15/2004	The PTC now interfaces with the NJDOT STIC, and the other interfaces have been removed, as suggested. No connection with the RIMIS IEN was made since that would probably belong in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture.
102	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -Burlington County Bridge Commission Facility (DV)	Note: Context Diagram and List of Interface do not correspond. How does the Bridge Facility differ from the Burlington County Bridge Commission Police. Besides the Police officers patrolling, we believe that they are located at the same desk. Burlington County Bridge Commission is entirely in the DVRPC Region. They will should interface with RIMIS, NJDOT TOC South, PennDOT District 6-0, DRPA. They will not interface with NJDOT TOC North, NJT Bus Operations North (St).	9/15/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, since Burlington County Bridge Commission, DRPA, PennDOT District 6-0 and RIMIS are entirely within the DVRPC region, these interfaces should exist only in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture.
103	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -Burlington County Bridge Commission Maintenance (DV)	South New Jersey counties/municipalities in the DVRPC region ( Burlington.) will be the only ones to interface with Burlington Co. Bridge Commission, not the counties in SJTPO. Should not speak to NJTA Parkway Division TOC (St), NJTA Turnpike TOC (St), SJTA/ACESP TOC (St).	9/15/2004	Starting with the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, the concept of North/Northern New Jersey and South/Southern New Jersey has been renamed to clearly indicate that generic elements are meant to be the NJTPA region or SJTPO region. Based on that, since Burlington County Bridge Commission and DVRPC counties/municipalities are both within the DVRPC region, these interfaces should exist only in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
104	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -Burlington County Bridge Commission Police (DV)	Add Burlington County 911 Dispatch Center & Municipal Police	9/9/2004	An element called "DVRPC Public Safety Dispatch" has been created, and the definition is "Represents the public safety dispatch centers for counties and municipalities in the DVRPC region".
105	8/10/2004	Chris King	DVRPC	cking@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2849	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	No element for SEPTA. Should include SEPTA Operations Center.	8/23/2004	The ITS Element, DVRPC Transit Operators Systems, is a generic element to represent all transit operators within the Delaware Valley Regional ITS Architecture. Sometimes, specific transit operators and/or elements within the region will be mentioned because there may be a unique connection with another stakeholder element in the NJTPA, SJTPO, or Statewide ITS Architecture. For example, New Jersey Transit - River Line Light Rail Transit System, has its own elements because of its relationship to New Jersey Transit overall in the Statewide ITS Architecture, although it operates only within the DVRPC region. SEPTA was a stakeholder that was specifically mentioned at one of our workshops, but does not currently have any ITS elements in the NJTPA/SJTPO or Statewide architectures. It is being kept as a placeholder for the draft architecture, but if no ITS elements appear, it will be removed from the final architectures.
106	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Stakeholders	Web site lists "Driver" ("generic driver") as a stakeholder, but not "traveler" or "pedestrian", both of which we're specifically trying to serve in the New Jersey ITS architecture.	8/23/2004	The stakeholder Driver has been removed. The element, Driver, has been renamed to be "Traveler" and is an element of the stakeholder, Private Traveler.
107	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Stakeholders	Oops, found one of them. "Private Travelers" should be renamed simply "Travelers". (By definition, they're all private.)	8/23/2004	The stakeholder "Private Travelers" has been renamed "Travelers". Its elements have been renamed to be "Traveler", "Travelers Vehicles", and "Travelers Personal Computing Devices".
108	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Stakeholders	Need to either add a specific stakeholder "NY Waterway", or add a generic stakeholder "Private Multimodal Provider". They operate both bus and ferry service, and we'd like to help them tie the two together as well as possible.	8/23/2004	With the August 10, 2004 posting of the website, an element was added under the stakeholder, "Private Ferry Operators", "Private Ferry Operators Landside Shuttle". Its definition is, "represents the shuttle vehicles operated by the private ferry operators.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
109	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Stakeholders	You've listed "NJT" and "New Jersey Transit Police" as separate stakeholders. Shouldn't they be combined?	8/23/2004	The Turbo architecture database has been updated and the stakeholders for NJ TRANSIT now include:  NJ TRANSIT Bus NJ TRANSIT Corporate NJ TRANSIT Customer Service NJ TRANSIT Paratransit NJ TRANSIT Police NJ TRANSIT Rail  This was done to delineate the separate operating entities operating under the NJ TRANSIT umbrella.
110	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Stakeholders	Please change "NJT" to "NJ TRANSIT"	8/23/2004	The Turbo architecture database has been updated and the stakeholders for NJ TRANSIT now include:  NJ TRANSIT Bus NJ TRANSIT Corporate NJ TRANSIT Customer Service NJ TRANSIT Paratransit NJ TRANSIT Police NJ TRANSIT Rail  This was done to delineate the separate operating entities operating under the NJ TRANSIT umbrella.
111	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	Please add entity to NJ Transit Police (or to NJT, if police are combined as requested) - "NJT Police handheld radios"	9/20/2004	The New Jersey ITS Architectures are intended to map data flows, and not voice communications. Our understanding here is that NJT Police handheld radios are voice communications only.
112	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	Please add following entities to NJT: NJT Passenger Information Server, NJT Transit Alert System, NJT In-Vehicle Passenger Information Systems, NJT Vehicle Operator Data Terminals, NJT Vehicle Health Monitoring Systems, NJT Vehicle Event Recording Systems, NJT Vehicle Security Systems, NJT Vehicle Location Systems, NJT Rail Traffic Control System, NJT AccessLink Vehicles, NJT Contract Carrier Vehicles, NJT Contract Carrier Vehicle Administration, NJT Contract Carrier Dispatch, NJT Light Rail Transit Vehicle Administration, NJT Emergency Command Center, NJT Vehicle Base Systems	11/22/2004	Elements that have connections with other elements have been added to the architecture. Those elements that have no connections have been removed from the architecture.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
113	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	Please create a "Statewide Fare Reciprocity Administrator" stakeholder, and reassign the Statewide Fare Reciprocity Network entity from NJT to this new stakeholder.	9/9/2004	This stakeholder has been added, and the definition is, "Person or agency responsible for coordinating a network between transit agencies operating in the State of New Jersey, for sharing transit information and for coordinating transit service and resources."
114	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	The entity "NJT Security and Surveillance" does not (and will not) exist as a separate entity. In the context where I found it used, it would be appropriate to replace it with "NJT Emergency Command Center". Alternatively the interfaces currently shown to it could be mapped instead to specific bus operations, rail operations and police entities.	9/9/2004	The element has been deleted and the interfaces have been mapped either to the appropriate transit dispatch element (bus, rail, paratransit), and/or NJ TRANSIT Police Dispatch/Command Center.
115	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	Please add "Regulatory Agencies" (e.g. FRA, FCC, FTA, FAA, ICC) as an additional distinct stakeholder group.	9/9/2004	A stakeholder called "Regulatory Agencies" has been created, and the definition is "May include FHWA, FRA, FTA, FCC, FAA, ICC, etc... Agencies that issue regulations and require reporting from other stakeholders, including transportation agencies, transit agencies, and private companies."
116	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Entity	Please add "FTA National Transit Database" as an element under the "Archived Data Management Subsystem" entity for the "Regulatory Agency" stakeholder.	9/9/2004	This element has been added, and the definition is, "Federal Transit Administration National Transit Database containing transit-related statistics, such as passenger ridership data and transit resources."
117	8/10/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Entity	Please add "FRA Rail Safety Database" as an element under the "Archived Data Management Subsystem" entity for the "Regulatory Agency" stakeholder.	9/9/2004	This element has been added, and the definition is "Federal Railroad Administration Rail Safety Database, collecting and storing safety-related statistics."
118	8/11/2004	Patrick Chan	ConSysTec	patrick.chan@consystec.com	(718) 767-5120	NJ - MP ATIS5-1 (So)	Correct the Market Package name. It is NOT ATIS5-1 (So), but should be ATIS9-1 (St).	8/23/2004	Change has been made.
119	8/11/2004	Patrick Chan	ConSysTec	patrick.chan@consystec.com	(718) 767-5120	NJ - MP CVO4-5 (St)	Rename MP name from CVO4-5 (St) to CVO04-5 (St).	8/23/2004	Change has been made.
120	9/3/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	NJ -DVRPC Region Public Safety Dispatch	The context diagram for this element does not show all of the interfaces listed.	9/20/2004	The context diagram for the DVRPC Region Public Safety Dispatch element now reflects all of the interfaces listed.
121	9/3/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	NJ -DVRPC Region Counties/Municipal TOCs	The context diagram for this element does not show all of the interfaces listed. NJTPA and TOC Central and North are not shown.	9/20/2004	The context diagram for the DVRPC Region Counties/Municipal TOCs element now reflects all of the interfaces listed.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
122	9/3/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	NJ -DVRPC Region Counties/Municipalities PWD Operations	The context diagram for this element does not show all of the interfaces listed. Only SJTPO is shown.	9/20/2004	The context diagram for the DVRPC Region Counties/Municipal PWD Operations element now reflects all of the interfaces listed.
123	9/3/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	NJ -DVRPC ITS Data Archive	The context diagram for this element does not show all of the interfaces listed.	9/15/2004	The context diagram for this element now reflects all of the interfaces.
124	9/3/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	NJ -RIMIS Archived Data Management System	The context diagram for this element does not show all of the interfaces listed.	9/15/2004	The context diagram for the RIMIS IEN element now reflects all of the interfaces listed.
125	9/3/2004	Laurie Matkowski	DVRPC	lmatkowski@dvrpc.org	(215) 238-2853	NJ -Stakeholders	Serving the Greater Philadelphia-Camden-Trenton area for almost 40 years, DVRPC works to foster regional cooperation in a nine-county, two-state area. City, county and state representatives work together to address key issues, including transportation, land use, environmental protection, information sharing and economic development.	9/7/2004	The change has been made. Also, I added a sentence at the end, "The DVRPC is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the area."
126	8/27/2004	Bill Ragozine	Transportation Choices	ragozine@transportationchoices.com	(856) 596-8228	NJ -Market Packages by Stakeholder	Back during many of the discussions, it was indicated that not all TMAs were equal in the level of involvement, so the involvement of the TMAs was to be determined based on your series of meetings. The indications I provided were both specific to our TMA, and sometimes general for all TMAs. Also, since I was the only TMA in the southern region, I was assuming we would have an indicator. That is not necessary if it is understood that it is not necessary generic for ALL TMAs.	9/9/2004	Specific elements for the Cross County Connection TMA (Cross County Connection TMA Systems, Kiosks, Traveler Information Systems, and Fare Management Systems) were created to differentiate your TMA's needs and interfaces from other TMAs. The stakeholder was kept as TMA to demonstrate consistency between the goals and purpose of all the TMAs across New Jersey. Nonetheless, as requested, a Cross County Connection TMA stakeholder will be created.
127	9/21/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ -Inventory by Stakeholder	More and more, Police handheld radios contain GPS receivers and have at least an "officer down" data messaging capability.	11/22/2004	Added an element named, "NJ Transit Handheld Radios"
128	11/15/2004	Patrick Chan	Consystec	patrick.chan@consystec.com	(718) 767-5120	NJTPA Regional Inventory by Stakeholder	This is a note to correct the stakeholder for NJTPA Municipalities TOCs. The stakeholder is currently SJTPO Counties.	11/22/2004	The stakeholder assignment has been corrected in the database.
129	11/15/2004	Patrick Chan	ConSysTec	patrick.chan@consystec.com	(718) 767-5120	NJTPA Regional Inventory by Stakeholder	This is a note to change NJDOT STIC to NJDOT STOC (Statewide Traffic Operations Center).	11/22/2004	The element name has been corrected in the database.
130	11/15/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJ DOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.state.nj.us	(201) 523-1661	NJ Statewide - - MP EM01-1 (St)	NJDOT STIC was renamed to NJDOT STOC	11/22/2004	The element name has been corrected in the database.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
131	11/15/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJ DOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 523-1661	NJ Statewide - - MP MC08-1 (St)	NYSDOT Region 11 is closest to New Jersey. It covers the five boroughs of New York City. It should be listed to interface with NJDOT STOC for Traffic Management, instead of the currently listed NYSDOT Region 8 which covers Westchester, Rockland and five other counties located to the north, but does not include New York City.	11/22/2004	The NYSDOT Region 11 TMC is part of the NYC Joint TMC. Connections will be added to the NJDOT STOC.
132	11/15/2004	Tiberiu Tajts	NJ DOT	Tiberiu.Tajts@dot.s tate.nj.us	(201) 523-1661	NJ Statewide - - MP EM01-3 (St)	NYSDOT Region 11 is closest to New Jersey. It covers the five boroughs of New York City. It should be listed to interface with NJDOT STOC for Traffic Management, instead of the currently listed NYSDOT Region 8 which covers Westchester, Rockland and five other counties located to the north, but does not include New York City.	11/22/2004	The NYSDOT Region 11 TMC is part of the NYC Joint TMC. Connections will be added to the NJDOT STOC.



No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
133	8/16/2004	Sing Wong	City of Newark, Traffic	WongS@ci.newark .nj.us		Update of Website Documentation and Stakeholder Comment Review Period	<p>I have searched through the latest ITS EDP architecture presented for comment and found that the City of Newark is NOT listed as one of its stakeholders. I found Atlantic City and Newark Penn Station included in the list but not Newark.</p> <p>I recently attended the ITS EDP seminar that was presented at the NJIT Newark campus, and was able to describe Newark's plan for a traffic operations center, centralized control of 200 signalized intersections, and a fiber optics communications system. In the area of interagency interfaces, I mentioned the need to show interfaces to: NJ TRANSIT for Newark Elizabeth Light Rail and traffic control and incident management; NJ DOT Region North for Route 21, 22, US 280, Doremus Avenue incident management and traffic control; ESSEX COUNTY for Central Avenue, Bloomfield Avenue, and South Orange Avenue interagency traffic signal coordination; PORT AUTHORITY NY/NJ PORTWAY for Doremus Avenue incident management and traffic control; and TRANSCOM for a regional traveler information gateway. The traffic control center has been designed and will be in construction in the near term. The fiber optic system for first 80 of the 200 signalized intersections is under construction, the remaining 120 (UTCS) signalized intersections is a mid term project. The NJ Transit Light rail system is under construction. The ESSEX COUNTY Central Avenue Arterial Project has been funded and will enter the design phase. The Doremus Avenue CCTV and counting station has been constructed and will be linked to NJ DOT and NEWARK.</p> <p>As a result, one of the NJ DOT Region North representatives indicated that Newark should be individually identified as a stakeholder. However my search of your latest ITS EDP shows that there has been no change to reflect such a decision. Please respond by indicating how Newark will be included in the NJ Statewide/Regional ITS architecture.</p>	11/15/2004	<p>You are correct, the City of Newark is no longer listed as a stakeholder. Our initial versions of the architectures did have the City of Newark (and a few other cities and counties) as separate stakeholders but after several discussions with stakeholders, a decision was made that unless a municipality or county ITS element had a unique project with unique interfaces with other stakeholder ITS elements, all municipality and county ITS elements would be represented by generic stakeholder ITS elements. In the case of the City of Newark, that generic stakeholder is called "NJTPA Municipalities". The use of a generic stakeholder has several distinct advantages.</p> <p>First, it leads to uniform interfaces with the same agencies. For example, from the standpoint of NJDOT, all interfaces (information exchanges) with municipalities should be the same, that is, NJDOT's traffic management systems should not need a different (type) of connection for information exchange with each city or town or county. There should be one common interface for all cities and counties. Similarly, the same would be true for the City of Newark, you don't want to provide (or receive) your traffic information differently for each city, town, county, or private entity with which you may exchange information. TRANSCOM is an excellent example, it receives and disseminates its information in a consistent, uniform manner to/from all agencies. Atlantic City is a special case: it was called out separately as a stakeholder because of its role in the planned Atlantic City Joint Operations Center. This Joint Operations Center will be operated by the South Jersey Transportation Authority, NJTA/Garden State Parkway and the City of Atlantic City. Newark Pennsylvania Station was called out separately as a stakeholder because it is a major transit hub jointly operated and owned by multiple distinct stakeholders: Amtrak, New Jersey Transit Bus, New Jersey Transit Rail, and PANYNJ PATH.</p> <p>Second, it makes the size of the architecture(s) more manageable. Already, the NJ and NJTPA ITS architectures are a relatively large size, with over 160 stakeholders, over 440 ITS elements, and 470 market package diagrams. Counting each major city</p>

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
									<p>and/or county as a separate stakeholder, including the stakeholder elements, could significantly increase the size of the architecture(s).</p> <p>Finally, the configuration management of each of these architecturally identical interfaces is dramatically simplified if they can be correctly represented with one ITS stakeholder.</p> <p>2. We believe each of the ITS projects you described in your email that are currently planned by the City of Newark are represented by a market package diagram. Each of these market package diagrams can be found on the New Jersey website at <a href="http://www.consystem.com/newjersey/default.htm">www.consystem.com/newjersey/default.htm</a>. (Username/password is njitSWG/njitSWG). To follow along with the analysis below, click on "NJTPA Region", then "Market Package by Functional Area" on the left.</p> <p>a. Newark's plan for a traffic operations center, centralized control of 200 signalized intersections - Click on ATMS03 - Surface Street Control. The first market package diagram represents NJTPA Municipalities Traffic Operations Centers interfacing with NJTPA Municipalities ITS Field Equipment. The interfaces show control of the ITS Field Equipment by the TOCs, and the ITS Field Equipment providing its status back to the TOC. It also shows future control of the traffic sensors connected to the ITS Field Equipment, and the return of sensor data back to the TOC. The definition of NJTPA Municipalities ITS Field Equipment is "Field equipment operated and maintained by municipalities in the NJTPA region, including traffic signals, dynamic message signs, highway advisory radio, ramp meters, CCTV, and portable equipment".</p> <p>b. Newark's plan for a fiber optics communications system - regional ITS architectures do not directly define or discuss the communications systems required to facilitate these interfaces.</p> <p>c. Interfaces to NJ TRANSIT for Newark Elizabeth Light Rail and traffic control and incident management - From ATMS03, or any other market package diagram, click on All Market Packages, and select ATMS13 - Standard Railroad Crossing. The first market package</p>

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
									<p>diagram shows, at the top right-hand side of the diagram, interfaces between NJTPA Municipalities ITS Field Equipment, which includes traffic signals, and the NJT Rail Grade Crossing Protection equipment. On the top left-hand side of the diagram, interfaces between NJTPA Municipalities TOCs and Rail Operations elements, including NJT LRT Newark City Subway Operations Centers, provides the traffic control and incident management coordination.</p> <p>d. Interfaces to NJDOT Region North...incident management and traffic control - Select ATMS07 - Regional Traffic Control. The first market package diagram on the right shows the sharing of traffic information between NJDOT TOC North and other traffic management elements, including NJTPA Municipalities TOCs. The definition of the traffic information coordination flow is: "Traffic information exchanged between TMC's. Normally would include incidents, congestion data, traffic data, signal timing plans, and real-time signal control information."</p> <p>e. Interfaces to Essex County...traffic signal coordination - Select ATMS07 - Regional Traffic Control, then on the top right-hand corner, select the left-arrow to move back one market package diagram to ((ATMS07-04 (No)). This market package diagram shows the sharing of traffic information between NJTPA Municipalities TOCs and other traffic management elements, including NJTPA Counties TOCs. Again, the definition of the traffic information coordination flow is: "Traffic information exchanged between TMC's. Normally would include incidents, congestion data, traffic data, signal timing plans, and real-time signal control information."</p> <p>f. Interfaces to PANYNJ PORTWAY - This interface is not directly shown. However, we have strong guidance from PANYNJ that there will be no direct interfaces between PANYNJ and other agencies, except through TRANSCOM. Thus all communications and coordination with PANYNJ is conducted/routed through TRANSCOM. If you need a direct interface with PANYNJ, we would need to discuss this further with PANYNJ to gain their approval.</p> <p>g. Interfaces to TRANSCOM for a</p>

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
									regional traveler information gateway - Select ATMS07 - Regional Traffic Control, then on the top right-hand corner, select the left-arrow to move back one market package diagram to ((ATMS07-04 (No)). This market package diagram shows the sharing of traffic information between NJTPA Municipalities TOCs and other traffic management elements, including TRANSCOM. Again, the definition of the traffic information coordination flow is: "Traffic information exchanged between TMC's. Normally would include incidents, congestion data, traffic data, signal timing plans, and real-time signal control information." There are other interfaces to TRANSCOM as well, in other market package diagrams, including ATMS06 - Traffic Information Dissemination, MC06 - Winter Maintenance, MC07 - Roadway Maintenance and Construction, and MC08 - Workzone Management,
134	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 9, top paragraph -- DROP REFERENCE THAT DVRPC ARCHITECTURE IS NONCOMPLIANT WITH RULE 940. While we are aware we need to update our architecture, we can not do so until the RIMIS, NJ and PA architectures are completed. Stating that our architecture is non compliant can potentially endanger funding ITS projects in the region. I do not think you want to be responsible for that. The text should be reworded to say DVRPC plans to update their architecture to be consistent with New Jersey and Pennsylvania architectures in the near future.	11/22/2004	The text will be reworded in the Final Report to say DVRPC plans to update their architecture to be consistent with New Jersey and Pennsylvania architectures in the near future.
135	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 10, Section 1.2.1 -- Drop reference that DVRPC architecture will be updated, it was mentioned on the previous page. In parenthesis add that DVRPC's architecture covers Philadelphia and four adjacent counties in Pennsylvania in addition to four counties in New Jersey.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report.
136	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 19, Table 1-5 -- Under NJDOT TOC Regional Traffic Control and Coordination add RIMIS to the systems each TOC will coordinate with.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
145	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 19-20, Table 1-5 -- Because these are the most significant projects, they should be mapped to one of the market packages identified in Section 7.4. For example, NJDOT TOC Regional Traffic Control and Coordination should refer readers to ATMS07 on pages 88-90. This way people can see what the proposed project entails.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report.
146	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 20, last item Table 1-5 -- We thought NJDOT is implementing a statewide 511 system. Is a separate 511 being implemented in South Jersey or is it mislabeled and this item represents the statewide system?	11/22/2004	The 511 is a Statewide system. However, we will investigate this further to confirm that it belongs solely in the Statewide ITS Architecture only.
147	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Pages 23 and 29 -- These pages refer to NJITAC. There is no identification to what NJITAC stands for or the role of the committee in guiding ITS development.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report.
148	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 35, Geographic Scope -- According to the text the central region in New Jersey is covered by DVRPC. While factually true when viewed on Figure 3-1, from common usage DVRPC is actually in South Jersey. Jersey residents consider Mercer, Middlesex and Monmouth counties as Central Jersey. Technically there are two MPOs in South Jersey - DVRPC and SJTPO. You should tie your reference to north central and south to Figure 3-1.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report.
149	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Pages 63-133 -- The following general comments apply to the market packages in the statewide architecture: 1) There should be a legend on each diagram indicating dotted lines are planned flows and solid lines are existing flows, 2) There needs to be a differentiation between which subsystems currently exist and which are proposed, and 3) If a market package is included on the list of regional significant projects should be denoted on the diagram.	11/22/2004	Each market package diagrams will contain a legend indicating the different flows. Market packages that are regionally significant will be noted as such also. However, it is difficult to differentiate existing and planned subsystems in the diagram, however, there are tables in the appendices that indicate that information.
150	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 64, APTS2 -- Add RIMIS (traffic management system) to Fixed Route NJ Transit Rail Operations market package. Two rail lines, the Atlantic City Line and the River Line pass through our region and will interface with local TOCs.	11/22/2004	The market package diagram will be updated to reflect the addition of RIMIS IEN.
151	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 70, APTS5 -- Add RIMIS (ISP) to Transit Security Rail Operations market package. Two rail lines, the Atlantic City Line and the River Line pass through our region.	11/22/2004	The market package diagram will be updated to reflect the addition of RIMIS IEN.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
152	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 80, ATIS2 -- If this market package is exclusively for NJDOT then RIMIS should be removed. But if its a way for NJDOT to distribute traveler information to the public and media then TRANSCOM should be added to the market package (in addition to RIMIS).	11/22/2004	Because it is not envisioned that RIMIS IEN will provide data to NJDOT Kiosks, RIMIS IEN was removed from this market package diagram.
153	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 93 MC04 -- Weather information should also be sent to TRANSCOM and RIMIS so they can distribute it to other agencies.	11/22/2004	The collection and distribution of weather information with TRANSCOM is in the NJTPA Regional ITS Architecture. It is assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that the distribution of weather information via the RIMIS IEN would be in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture.
154	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 132, EM07 -- Because RIMIS has no direct security role, security agencies will not provide threat information to it. RIMIS should therefore be removed from the market package.	11/22/2004	RIMIS IEN will be removed from these market package diagrams.
155	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 150, TIP discussion -- When you searched the TIP for ITS projects did you only identify projects that were exclusively ITS, or did you also identify larger scale projects which have small ITS components? For example if NJDOT programmed a new highway, and VMS and CCTV is incidental to the project (and ITS may not be in the project's TIP description), did you identify the highway as an ITS project?	11/24/2004	In the example mentioned in the comment, a new highway project for a particular route would not have been identified as an ITS Project, unless a stakeholder informed the project team that ITS components (e.g., DMS, CCTV) are associated with a TIP. The purpose of the stakeholder workshops were to receive feedback on the TIPs to guide the project team with planned ITS solutions.
156	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 152, TIP Discussion -- In many instances a TIP project will only implement a small portion of a market package. In that case do you denote which portion of the market package is being implemented (agencies and or architecture flows)?	11/24/2004	The projects only indicate which market packages would be involved to deploy a particular project, as described in Appendix 11.A. The comment was made is more towards a design implementation concern. When a project is to be implemented, then stakeholders should convene to determine the specific details for deploying a project (e.g., how many phases will be required for this project or which components of market packages are allocated to a particular phase?). Appendix 11.A should be used as more of a guideline as to which agencies/systems and interfaces should be considered during the design phase of project implementation.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
157	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 152, Section 11.3 -- A major problem with this discussion and Figure 11-1 is that it describes how the process would work in an ideal world. Unfortunately many ITS projects are only implemented because they are part of a larger construction project; or if a market package is implemented, its done in a incremental manner (e.g., one agency or interconnect at a time). The discussion should address these issues.	11/24/2004	The bullet for Project List Management will be updated to address the comment. Suggested text - Although project lists may reflect a single project, projects are typically broken into multiple phases and are implemented in an incremental manner. For example, many ITS projects are partially deployed through mainstreaming with larger constructions projects. A project's scope might involve interfacing with ten agencies and funding constraints may require agencies to be interconnected one at a time. In this situation, a project might be implemented in five years, if two agencies are being brought on-line per year. The key message is projects will be implemented in an incremental manner, therefore the list manager should keep accurate records of the incremental process.
158	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 162, Using the Architecture Recommendations -- As described in the last two comments, ITS projects tend to get constructed incrementally, either as part of larger projects or one agency at a time. There should be recommendations on how to treat these situations.	11/24/2004	The reader should refer to the project sequencing report for this information and not necessarily the integration strategy document. However, the recommendation section of the integration strategy document has been updated based on the comment.
159	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 169-170, Importance of ITS Standards -- There is no context of why ITS standards are being promulgated (i.e., to promote interoperability), why they should be used (i.e., to follow federal regulations), or even that consideration should be given to their maturity.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report
160	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 9, top paragraph -- Identify that DVRPC is the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report
161	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 11-12 -- Table 1-1 and the accompanying text is somewhat confusing. The text talks about attending functional workshops, the table title implies the number of workshops attended, but the table shows how many people from a particular agency participated in the architecture stakeholder meetings. You may want to clarify the table title or accompanying text. Another column should be added to the table showing the number of workshops attended by each agencies. This would give credit to agencies who actively participated in the architecture development; at the same time if an agency later complains about some facet of the architecture, it can be pointed out to them they had an opportunity to be a more active participant.	11/22/2004	The text will be updated in the Final Report

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
162	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 14, Table 1-2 -- The number of elements mapped to each subsystem is listed in the table. It would be nice to know how many of each subsystem currently exists, and how many are proposed. The table gives the impression that we have a more extensive ITS system that actually exists.	11/22/2004	The table will be separated to indicate existing and planned elements in the Final Report.
163	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 36 - Is Maryland covered by SJTPO's Architecture? It is not included in the Statewide or DVRPC architectures.	11/22/2004	The reference to Maryland will be removed from the Final Reports.
164	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 38, last paragraph -- When the appendix is referenced, it should be noted that its contained in a separate document.		
165	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Pages 39-41, Tables 4-1 to 4-3 -- There are two conflicting table numbers, one at the top of the table (left over from some other document) and at the bottom of the table (the correct table number).	11/22/2004	The formatting and numbering of all the tables will be corrected, including those in the appendices, for the Final Report.
166	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Pages 47 and 52, Figures 5-1 and 6-2 -- There are no major national and state parks in the New Jersey portion of the DVRPC region that would necessitate the need to implement a parking management program. Therefore we previously asked the interconnect with RIMIS, as shown in both figures, be removed.	11/22/2004	Our apologies, we accidentally used an old market package diagram as an example. You are correct, the updated market package diagram has the RIMIS IEN removed. We will update the figure with an updated market package diagram.
167	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 105, AD1 -- DVRPC is listed among the agencies needing institutional agreements, but is not show on the diagram. We should be removed from the list.	11/22/2004	The correction will be made.
168	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 135, Section 8.3 -- There is no context why Figure 8-1 should be followed. The text should state that federal regulations require all ITS projects using federal funds must undergo a systems engineering analysis as described in Figure 8-1.	11/24/2004	Section 8.3 will be updated to state, "Federal regulations requires all ITS projects using federal funds must undergo a system engineering analysis. Figure 8-1 is a display of the process for a systems engineering analysis." This section will also mention that functional requirements can support the high-level requirements definition in the project implementation process.



No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
169	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Page 140, Figure 9-1 -- DRJTBC is a bi-state agency that also crosses the jurisdiction of two MPOs. Both PennDOT and DVRPC Counties TOCs should be added to the diagram.	11/22/2004	The example interconnect diagram was derived from a turbo database with all 3 ITS architectures developed under this project, which included the Statewide and NJTPA Regional ITS Architecture. As a result, certain elements appeared that do not belong in the Statewide ITS Architecture, such as NJTPA Municipal TOCs. Connections with DVRPC Counties TOCs should appear in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture. Coordination with PennDOT should appear in a Pennsylvania ITS Architecture.
170	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Table formats are inconsistent throughout the document, three examples are on Page 12 (Table 1-1), Page 14 (Table 1-2), Page 44 (no table number).	11/22/2004	With the exception of Table 1-1, some of the formatting did not translate properly when we created the .pdf format of the Final Report (Draft). All the tables will be formatted properly and double-checked the figures for the Final Report.
171	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Dates are formatted differently, see Page 26 (8 April 2005) and Page 27 (August 19, 2004).	11/22/2004	A check will be made for date formatting consistency in the Final Report.
172	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	A glossary is needed, there are too many acronyms.	11/22/2004	A Glossary will be added to the Final Report.
173	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	A couple of market diagrams contain notes (e.g., CVO03 Page 114). Since the architecture process is nearly completed, these issues should have been resolved by now and the notes removed.	11/22/2004	Some notes are intended to be left in the market package diagrams for clarifications. For notes that require follow up, we will contact the appropriate stakeholders to resolve the issues before the Final Report.
174	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	Print Issues When we printed the report a number of tables and diagrams experienced print problems: information was missing from text boxes, labels were misaligned, etc. We are not sure if it is a print problem at DVRPC's end or whether the tables and diagrams need to be reformatted. Below is a list of tables and figures where we experienced problems: Figure 1-2 Figure 2-1 Figure 2-2 Table 2-3 Tables 6-1 to 6-7 Page 74, APTS5 Vehicle Security Monitoring -- Text intrudes into title.	11/22/2004	It appears some of the figures did not convert properly when we created the .pdf format of the Final Report (Draft). We will double-check the figures for the Final Report.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
175	11/19/2004	Stan Platt	DVRPC	splatt@dvrpc.org		Statewide Final Report	STOC vs. STIC: You should be consistent if its a STOC or STIC: STOC - Table 1-5, STIC - MC08 (pages 1 and 2), ATMS08 (pages 116 and 117), EM01 (pages 123 and 124), EM05 (page 126), EM07 (pages 132 and 133), Figure 9-1, Figure 9-2	11/22/2004	The element name has been corrected in the Turbo database. We received the instructions to change the element name from NJDOT STIC to NJDOT STOC after some of the text was already written and some tables were already created. The Final Report will be updated for consistency.

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
177	11/9/2004	Karl Ziemer	DRPA	KZiemer@drpa.com			<p>I have reviewed the 3 architectures from a DRPA perspective. My only comments are concerning the Interfaces listed for each of our elements. It appears that the NJDOT STIC is used everywhere. Perhaps when that planned element is operational that will be true. However, I believe that there will be more local interfaces with say NJDOT South and other NJ transportation partners. There is also some confusion with the way Interfaces are listed.</p> <p>For example: In the NJTPA arch. for DRPA TMC, it has an Interface with NJDOT TOC Central. Why isn't the STIC used here? Or NJDOT TOC South for that matter.</p> <p>And for DRPA PATCO Ops Center. Why is the Interface TRANSCOM? But for SJTPO, the PATCO Interface is SJTA. Doesn't make sense to me. Where does NJTransit fit into all of this with PATCO?</p>	12/2/2004	<p>With regards to your comments, you're correct, there has been some confusion on which architecture does an interface belong in. In general, if it's purely a local/regional concern, the interfaces belong in a regional ITS architecture (i.e., NJTPA or SJTPO). If it's a statewide concern, the interfaces belong in a statewide ITS architecture. Unfortunately, a stakeholder may need to look at all the architectures to see their connections. That's why on the New Jersey homepage (<a href="http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/default.htm">http://www.consystec.com/newjersey/default.htm</a>), stakeholders have the option of viewing the Integrated All Regions View (Master Copy), which shows interfaces for all 3 architectures.</p> <p>In the examples you mentioned for DRPA TMC, interfaces with NJDOT TOC Central appears in both NJTPA and SJTPO regional ITS architectures, interfaces with NJDOT TOC South appears only in the SJTPO regional ITS architecture, and interfaces with NJDOT STIC only appears in the Statewide ITS Architecture.</p> <p>If you believe there are still errors with the interfaces, please let us know asap. There is still a small window of opportunity to correct the interfaces.</p> <p>For example, if you believe that DRPA TMC needs to interface with other TMCs, please let us know which TMC (Note: some may belong in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture). Same with DRPA PATCO Operations Center. Should an interface with TRANSCOM be considered? SJTA? TRANSCOM is considered a NJTPA element and thus would not appear anywhere else, that's why that interface appears here in the NJTPA Regional ITS Architecture. I believe PATCO operates entirely within the DVRPC region, and that's why there is no interface with NJ TRANSIT (considered a statewide element), we've assumed that it would belong in the DVRPC Regional ITS Architecture since all the interfaces with NJ TRANSIT would be on a regional basis, as opposed to a statewide basis.</p>

No.	Submitted	Submitted By	Agency	E-Mail	Telephone	Webpage	Comment	Resolved	Resolution
178	11/22/2004	Tim Herlihy	NJDOT	Tim.Herlihy@dot.state.nj.us	(609) 530-2549	Statewide -Project Documents	Pg 22 of the Report still has the same "V" that was discussed at one of the meetings. Your Comment Resolution site isn't opening so I don't know why this wasn't changed as discussed. See e-mail below. Also, was the Implementation finalized? I see the web site shows the Project Cost Document is dated 11/15, but the Report & Appendices are still 11/1.	12/2/2004	<p>Page 22 of the Report was the Introduction chapter of the Final Report. The "V" was intended to show a generic version of the systems engineering process for implementing projects. The actual discussion of the process, including the more detailed process currently used by NJDOT, can be found on pages 163 to 165. However, the text in the Introduction chapter will be revised to make this distinction in the Final Draft of the Report, which will be on the website by December 7.</p> <p>The current versions of the reports, appendices, and project cost documents on the website are all Drafts. A Final Draft for the Report and Appendices (the Project Costs will be moved into the Appendices) will be on website by December 7. After a final, short comment period (probably 10 days to 2 weeks), the Final version of the Report will be posted on the website.</p>
179	12/1/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861		It's been brought to my attention that according to the final report SJTPO has on their website, NJ TRANSIT is was not a participant in the SJTPO public transit workshop. (We're not shown as attending any workshops whatsoever.) But I was there. Can you fix the mistake?	12/8/2004	The error has been corrected.
180	12/27/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ (St) - - MP APTS5-02 (St)	AccessLink dispatch does not monitor secure area sensor data.	2/4/2005	Deleted the flow secure area sensor data between NJT Access Link and Newark Penn Station Information Displays, NJT Corporate Customer info Display systems, and NJT Facility Security Equipment.
181	12/27/2004	Jim Kemp	NJ TRANSIT	JKemp@njtransit.com	(973) 491-7861	NJ (St) - - MP APTS5-01 (St)	NJT buses do not talk to NJT rail operations, trains do. The slide also apparently needs to be duplicated for Bus Operations (where buses do communicate with the bus control center.	2/4/2005	Corrected NJT Bus Vehicles to NJT Rail Trains
182	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP MC08-2 (St)	OK to change SJTA Transportation Services Division to SJTA TOC (it's also OK to leave it if you are already finished)	2/4/2005	No change.
183	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP MC08-1 (St)	OK to remove the word "Maintenance" SJTA should be just SJTA - TOC (its also OK if you are already dfinished and don't want to change it)	2/4/2005	No change.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Submitted By</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>E-Mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Webpage</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolved</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
184	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP EM01-2 (St)	OK to Show SJTA TOC instead of Transportation Services Division (OK to leave if you are already finished)	2/4/2005	No change.
185	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP EM01-3 (St)	OK as is	2/4/2005	No change.
186	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP EM08-1 (St)	This is fine the way it is	2/4/2005	No change.
187	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP EM08-2 (St)	Need to leave ACESP n the right, but the reference on the left should be changes to SJTA TOC (or can be left if its too late)	2/4/2005	No change.
188	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP EM09-2 (St)	OK as is	2/4/2005	No change.
189	1/19/2005	Kathleen Aufschneider	SJTA	kaufschneider@sjta.com		NJ (St) - - MP EM09-3 (St)	OK to change to SJTA TOC from Transportation Services Division	2/4/2005	No change.