

Alaska Iways Architecture Update

Project Team Call

February 18, 2015, 1:00 – 2:00

NOTES

Conference Call: (877) 829-8910, Access Code 6621697105#

1. Introductions

Participants: Val Rader, Jeremy Arnold, Aaron Jongenelen, Rick Feller, Jack Stickel, Lisa Idell-Sassi, Vivian Underwood, Erin Ehlinger, Les Jacobson, Jill Sullivan

2. Project Status

Les Jacobson provided a brief overview of the status of the project:

- The stakeholder list was drafted and submitted to Lisa. She provided her comments and the list will be updated accordingly.
- The recommendations for the general structure of the architecture and documentation was drafted in the form of a memo and submitted.

3. Stakeholder List

Les Jacobson provided a high-level overview of the agencies included in the stakeholder list.

Val suggested adding David Epstein.

Jack mentioned adding avalanche forecasters

Jill mentioned the difficulty with the multimodal connection program area. Same with traveler safety and infrastructure security. We will look to change the areas included in the architecture and how service packages are combined. The interviews will help with this process.

4. Interviews

Interviews will be by groups and will accommodate both experienced ITS folks and those new to ITS. The interviews with people new to ITS and the architecture will include more of an educational component to inform them about the architecture and what its purpose is. 12 interview sessions will be included. Some will include people involved with both the Anchorage and Iways architectures. We will provide interview guides with example questions to go out in advance of the interviews. We hope to get started scheduling the interviews this month and they will be complete in March.

5. Architecture Review and Recommendations

Les went over the general recommendations that are included in the draft recommendations memo.

- The Goal is to simplify the architectures and make it easier to use.

- The Maintenance Process Technical Memo is still valid. It may need to be appended to reflect needed revisions. The maintenance process will be finalized near the end of the project. We also recommend that we reduce the number of reasons to update/revise the architecture, if possible. There are too many reasons that could be covered by a single reason. This will help make in clarity.
- The steps needed to update the architecture do not need changing, but they should be tailored to the final structure of the architecture.
- The biggest effort will be updating the architecture itself. We recommend that service packages be tailored and combined to reflect what users of the architecture will be looking for. For example, there are 11 public transportation related service packages in the National ITS Architecture. This makes sense for the National Architecture so people can select the service packages that are relevant to their area. However, a public transportation user will find the architecture easier to use if there is one depiction of public transportation in the architecture. We intend to tailor and combine service packages to provide a single view in each of the major service areas. We also recommend that a single diagram be produced for each service area. We recommend an approach similar to the new structure of the Anchorage architecture.
- The most visible change will be in the documentation. We recommend collapsing the existing architecture documents into a single document. The document will not include the very detailed representation of the physical architecture. That really is not needed when that detail is available in the Turbo Architecture database. (The Anchorage architecture document is a good example.)
- We recommend adding information on overall structure of the architecture and instructions on how to modify the Turbo architecture files. One possible way to accomplish this is by developing an architecture use and maintenance guide.
- We also recommend that we add a discussion on updating the website (when and what might be the best things to include in the website) and what to archive when.

There was an overall discussion of the usefulness of some of the existing documents and how to streamline them. Overall, the existing documents are too long when taken as a whole and some are very difficult to get a handle on and understand. The new documents have to be more understandable and easier for someone to use.

6. Wrap Up and Adjourn