

## DOCUMENT CONTROL PANEL

File Name:	090403 CMB Mtg Notes 090213_V1 Final.doc	
File Location:	Z:\C8I75\Assign 41 - CMB Meeting Support\090213 CMB Mtg Notes\090403 CMB Mtg Notes 090213_V1 Final.doc	
Deliverable Number:		
Version Number:	1	
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
Created By:	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	2/13/09
Reviewed By:	David Chang, PBS&J	2/18/09
	Trey Tillander, FDOT-CO	2/20/09
	Pete Vega, FDOT	
Modified By:	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	2/17/09
	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	2/18/09
	Marie Howell, PBS&J	2/20/09
	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	4/3/09
Completed By:	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	4/3/09

## List of Acronyms

CAD	Computer-Aided Dispatch
CMB	Change Management Board
CO	Central Office
ConOps	Concept of Operations
DMS	Dynamic Message Sign
FDLE	Florida Department of Law Enforcement
FDOT	Florida Department of Transportation
FHP	Florida Highway Patrol
GUI	Graphical User Interface
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
MDX	Miami-Dade Expressway Authority
OIS	Office of Information Systems
RPG	Response Plan Generator
RTMC	Regional Transportation Management Center
SITSA	Statewide ITS Architecture
SOV	Speed Occupancy Volume
SSUG	SunGuide Software Users Group
SUM	SunGuide Users Manual
SwRI	Southwest Research Institute
TERL	Traffic Engineering Research Laboratory
TIM	Traffic Incident Management
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TSS	Traffic Sensor Subsystem
TvT	Travel Time

**Florida Department of Transportation**  
**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Friday, February 13, 2009**  
**8:30 A.M. to 11:42 A.M.**

**Rhyne Building, Room 330**  
**Tallahassee, Florida**

**Purpose:**

The purpose of this meeting was to review and vote for SunGuide™ Software issues and requirements, and review footprints issues.

**Attendees:**

Gene Glotzbach, FDOT-CO	Trey Tillander, FDOT-CO	Chris Birozak, FDOT D1
Carlos Bonilla, FDOT D1	Derek Odom, SmartRoute	Jason Summerfield, Smartroute
Pete Vega, FDOT D2	Chad Williams, FDOT D3	Mark Nallick, FDOT D3
Steve Corbin, FDOT D4	Dave Ashton, IBI-D4	Jose Grullion, FDOT D6
Terry Hensley, FDOT D7	Bill Wilshire, FDOT D7	James Bitting, Lucent D7
Vincent Lee, Lucent-D7	Eric Gordon, FDOT FTE	John Easterling, FDOT FTE
Mark Tucker, SwRI	David Chang, PBS&J	TJ Hapney, PBS&J
Clay Packard, PBS&J	John Hope, PBS&J	Erik Gaarder, PBS&J
Robert Heller, SwRI	Mark Laird, AECOM	

**Welcome and Call for Quorum**

Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman Pete Vega opened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. A quorum was established. He briefly introduced the objectives of the meeting then recapped the previous meeting's action items.

**Action Items Recap**

- Slide 27, SwRI will complete the efforts regarding Footprints 101 and 503 and would propose a solution at the next CMB meeting. Complete.
- Slide 28, Ocala/Marion County ITS Architecture: District 5 will provide detail of the update regarding the Ocala/Marion County ITS Architecture to Trey Tillander who will present the update at the next CMB meeting. No change.
- Slide 34, Footprint 222: SwRI will provide ROM for updating the naming convention drop-down display to Trey Tillander.
- Slide 34, Footprint 222: Jennifer Heller will coordinate with the SSUG regarding the naming convention.

- Slide 35, SunGuide Installation Documentation: SwRI will provide LOE/ROM to Trey Tillander for a Generic Installation Guideline and for a Web-based FAQ separately. This will be followed up at the next CMB meeting.
- J. Hope will change the FHP CAD ConOps back to have incident verification for District. SwRI will review if any new requirements are needed. Complete. Action not needed.
- J. Hope will check the requirement CA005A1 XML comment field and add “lane blockage” to the requirement language. This item will be covered in the ConOps.

### **SunGuide Software Footprints Issues Review**

Robert Heller from Southwest Research Institute (SwRI) reviewed Footprints issues' status and totals. He reported that currently there were no active issues with “critical failure” priority. Additionally, he stated that there were two open issues with “critical failure” priority and that the status of those items is “FDOT addressing” and “awaiting release”. Meeting participants were directed to slides 17 – 36 for current Footprints issues' status.

#### **Issue No. 491 – RPG uses roadway long name instead of short name**

Footprint Issue No. 491 was discussed by the CMB members. R. Heller stated that the Footprints issue was between two different releases and that the Response Plan Generator (RPG) changed from using “roadway short name” to “roadway long name”. District 4 submitted an issue for the change in the usage. R. Heller stated that SwRI was ready to go back to the short name, but other Districts weighed in and wanted the long name. This issue is pending clarification from the FDOT regarding which naming convention will be used. Trey Tillander addressed the issue and stated that there were several RPG issues that needed FDOT approval and were subject to approval of the Concept of Operations (ConOps). Trey added that the issues would be resolved in Release 4.3.

#### **Issue No. 101 – Detectors reporting 0-0-0 for both no vehicles (empty roadway), and stopped vehicles (congestion)**

Footprints Issue No. 101 was reported by District 4 due to detectors reporting 0-0-0 for speed occupancy volume (SOV). Values for speed were being utilized for travel time (TvT) being posted on signs. The Traffic Engineering Research Laboratory (TERL) participated in determining which detectors were reporting. The issue rose again when reported by District 2 as Footprint 503. R. Heller developed a TvT Questionnaire. The Districts' responses to the questionnaire were augmented with information that SwRI gained through research and development.

Q. If a detector is not responding to polls, should TvT “guess” at the speed value for that non – reporting detector?

A. Yes.

R. Heller added that SwRI determined not to use historical data, but instead would use current data with linear interpolation. In the vast majority of the cases, the linear interpolation provided the best estimate for a speed that was non-reporting. He added that he was surprised by the result as he had expected a quadratic to provide the best response, but in the end linear interpolation provided the best speed estimate.

Q. How many adjacent non-reporting segments (detectors) are allowed before TvT computation is abandoned?

A. This should be configurable and depends on the local topology. If detectors are densely packed, an algorithm is more tolerant of non-reporting detectors. This item should be configurable by TvT length.

Q. What should TvT software do if traffic is stopped?

A1. Continue to calculate TvT using speeds

A2. ATIS applications: Cap the computed time by configurable value set per TvT link.

A3. ODS – Store computed values.

T. Tillander inquired as to how it was determined if traffic was stopped or not present from different technologies and whether those differences were being resolved.

R. Heller responded that there were differences, clues in the protocols, which show when those conditions exist. Additionally, Loops, the firmware that was built for the FDOT to put in cabinets for ramp meters, had different criteria for rejection of volume and occupancy which resulted in two different paths through the firmware. Many of the issues were resolved working with District 6 and he stated that SwRI was making progress in being able to determine when traffic was stopped.

Enhancing the SunGuide driver to be compatible with the different types of devices was mentioned by T. Tillander. R. Heller added that Lynn Randolph from SwRI sits on the Traffic Sensor Subsystem (TSS) Committee and that there was at least one vendor trying to meet the 1209 standard. He continued by saying that the standard is so all encompassing of technology that those vendors trying to comply were finding it difficult and that there were some major hoops to jump through in order to structure a management information base (MIB) properly.

T. Tillander stated that SunGuide accommodated these technologies now, but asked about existing devices. R. Heller discussed EIS’ visit and stated that EIS was interested

in when FDOT / TxDOT would adopt the 1209 hardware and that they would like the FDOT to upgrade to the G4 detector protocol and expressed a willingness to pay for that upgrade. EIS is willing to fund the upgrade to G4 as FORTRAN funded the upgrade to VisioPaD. Trey responded that it was something the FDOT would be interested in discussing and that he had a similar conversation with Wavetronics a couple of years ago, but that it had not progressed. SwRI will provide the Scope, Requirements and ROM to Trey regarding EIS' new device.

Q. If no traffic is present.

A. ATIS - Calculate TvT based on free flow speeds. ODS – Store value based on free flow speed.

Q. LPR / AVI reader failure to match tag reads.

A. Report no valid data (in all traffic conditions).

Q. ODS Data Rollups: How should missing data be stored?

A. Roll data up and indicate percentage of missing data (data present?). R. Heller asked what percentage of data is present in the rollup is what you actually want to know.

Q. C2C TSS data:

A. Missing data: no data sent

A. Fast data: configurable caps

A. Slow data: send speed

A. No traffic: no data sent

For the next step, SwRI proposed the following solutions:

-Evaluate current compliance; and,

-Provide to the FDOT effort to meet these recommendations.

### **Description Character Limitation / Standard Naming Convention – Issue No. 222**

R. Heller reviewed the text of Footprints Issue No. 222, which can be found on Slide 45 of the presentation. This issue deals with the 30 character limit on link descriptions and names. Changes to this limit affect the Database, the Admin Editor and the graphical user interface (GUI).

### **SunGuide Software in Windows 2008 Environment (Chang)**

David Chang began by stating that Lee Co. plans to use Windows 2008. R. Heller added that in 2008 there are some subtle changes to how the server is accessed and that the majority of the effort would be testing to find those subtleties and make sure we do not break something by transferring to this. District 7 stated that they were interested

and would be using a test system with Windows 2008. P. Vega reminded that group that it was something that needed to be thought about because the FDOT would be ready for an upgrade in the next two years.

J. Bitting asked about Oracle 11 and whether there were any plans to test it. R. Heller responded that some things would have to be changed and that there were some differences in how the columns / rows were returned from the database and the need to fix those as various subsystems were opened up. Mr. Heller continued by saying that the upgrade was really an issue of extensive testing to make sure there were no surprises.

T. Tillander stated that the FDOT Office of Information Services (OIS) was further behind than Traffic Operations with regard to licensing. J. Bitting stated that it was not necessarily something to be done right now. R. Heller said that if looking into licensing, the CMB might want to look into Oracle RAC rather than using Failsafe. He continued by stating that if they were going to open up a licensing issue, this was an additional issue to investigate. D. Chang added that none of the Districts had the RAC license, but that in the future it could possibly be the standard license and the group would need to check with OIS. R. Heller stated that Oracle changed its licensing often. T. Hensley interjected that District 7 had requested RAC and was turned down. P. Vega inquired as to who had turned District 7 down. T. Hensley responded that District 7 was told that RAC was not recommended by CO OIS. J. Bitting added that District 7 was requested to remove RAC from their license. P. Vega added that if the Districts were to go through Trey Tillander and ask for RAC as part of the standardization, OIS might agree. This issue is to be checked into by the Districts with their personnel and brought up for a vote at the next CMB meeting.

D. Chang asked if there were any recommendations about the Windows 2008 environment. Pete Vega responded that the group needed to look at it and have a Plan B to have it implemented by July 13, 2010 when mainstream support from Microsoft ends; however, extended maintenance would still be available if purchased from Microsoft. R. Heller added that there were several issues such as whether to use Windows 2008 and how long to continue with Windows XP. Steve Corbin inquired about when SVG was going to stop being supported. R. Heller stated that it would be January 2010. S. Corbin replied that it was a systematic problem to continue to hope that SVG would be supported again. Adobe SVG map support ended January 1, 2009 because everyone but Internet Explorer is building in SVG. P. Vega asked if R. Heller had begun working on a recommendation. R. Heller stated that SwRI had been sporadically working on a map issue paper. Trey Tillander responded that the revised white paper was due to him on December 15, 2008. R. Heller stated that he would find out about

status SwRI is to provide “Map Technology Whitepaper” to Trey and present it at the next CMB meeting.

## **SunGuide Software Release 4.2**

### **1. FHP CAD Operator Interaction Requirements (Hope)**

J. Hope went over how the FHP CAD interface works and reviewed slides 50 - 67. With regard to Slide 50, T. Hensley asked about the push out by District and if it would be an option for Districts to see neighboring counties. J. Hope responded that each of the reports could be sent out and that it would depend on filtering configurations.

S. Corbin asked if the event location would be set automatically from FHP CAD data. J. Hope responded that it would as long as SunGuide can determine where that FHP CAD data is. Mr. Corbin inquired about the translation table and about how cryptic information from FHP was going to be translated into SunGuide. J. Hope pointed out that every FHP event has a lat / lon setting as well as a road name, direction of travel and cross street and that there might be a couple of other items; however, there was some uncertainty about how accurate that information might be and that it would be the configuration within the FHP data collector software that would make the filtration step more accurate because that was where the configuration was located.

S. Corbin stated that he did not believe it would be a problem to have the correct roadway filtered into the EM, but raised a concern regarding the association with a direction and a cross street which he stated could be problematic. He also asked what would happen if there was not a translation for some reason. T. Hensley added that he thought the naming configuration would make it even less likely that the FHP description would match SunGuide. J. Hope agreed that there would likely be some discrepancies at times.

Trey inquired as to what was being referred to with regard to matching. J. Hope explained that there was a location that FHP operators would be entering, but that those locations would not match with the EM location. Mr. Tillander stated that he thought new events were matched from the closest lat / lon. J. Hope responded that the system needed to find the direction of travel and that it would have to select the closest EM location to populate the field.

Trey stated that SunGuide was not matching any FHP names to any SunGuide names descriptive text. J. Hope stated that the system would just need to try to figure out which EM locations should be selected. J. Bitting interjected that he was not aware that FHP had lat / lon on their events. Trey responded that FHP events included lat / lon.



Steve Corbin pointed out that a concern was that SunGuide would be getting data from an external source that is not knowledgeable of the EM locations in SunGuide. Additionally, Mr. Corbin inquired about who would be accepting the data that was pre-filled by the FHP event and how much work would be associated with the transfer of data from FHP CAD.

Mark Tucker from SwRI stated that SunGuide matches the closest EM location to the lat / lon data from data that was entered with the FHP event. S. Corbin inquired about the type of association software that was being used to relate it to the X, Y coordinates. Mr. Tucker stated that the list of EM locations searched based on distance from the FHP lat / lon. S. Corbin further inquired about where the X, Y locations come from with FHP and pointed out that one of the biggest TMC problems is operator workload and that the FHP CAD events may cause increased workload. Additionally, he added that he was concerned about the accuracy of the FHP data.

Discussion took place regarding entry of the lat / lon into SunGuide by FHP where it would be matched to the nearest EM location. The group also discussed the delay between when an event occurred and when it would be entered into SunGuide by the FHP CAD system. Terry Hensley pointed out that in District 7 it generally takes 30 minutes to get to incident from FHP. J. Hope replied that as soon as an FHP CAD operator enters an event it should come to SunGuide and that the lat / lon is always sent. P. Vega pointed out that the system was about 30 percent automated and required some operator interactions. Discussion took place about whether a report could be created to determine how often the FHP CAD system gives faulty information. Currently, there is no way to determine and track the FHP accuracy rate, but there is the possibility of tagging the events to track in the future.

T. Tillander stated that SunGuide cannot make the FHP data accurate. The system only makes it easier to get event data into SunGuide. The quality of the data is dependent on those who enter it and some FHP regions do a better job than others. SunGuide is not able to change that.

Extra Feature - Poll of Districts:

D1 – Yes

D2 – Yes

D3 – Yes

D6 – Yes

D7 – Yes - unconfirmed

TPE – yes - unconfirmed

D4 – yes - unconfirmed

ACTION ITEM: Robert and Tucker to look into item and get back with T Tillander

S. Corbin suggested that an offline discussion could take place about operators' ability to influence the status of an event. For example, if the operator chooses CCTV it should automatically go to that for event status; however, when a Road Ranger in District 7 puts an event in SunGuide it should automatically make it active. Mr. Tillander added that it was his preference for notifiers to be consistent across all the TMCs. S. Corbin will send an email to CMB members to determine what each notifier should be. P. Vega responded that if the FDOT had this option, he would rather see it able to be configured by each administrator since some areas may have better Road Rangers or equipment than others.

T. Tillander asked R. Heller look into both by notifier by TMC as part of Release 4.2. He also stated that he knew that the schedule needs to be postponed due to enhancements being voted on during the meeting today. He added that he thought they were all good enhancements. Schedule impact from FHP and FL-ATIS should be completed by Release 4.2 with FHP being the biggest of the schedule drivers. Release 4.2 is due the second week in March. P. Vega suggested that some of the enhancements be pushed to an upgrade in the summer.

J. Hope continued with the slide presentation and discussed rules for editing existing events and handling of events.

Slide 60 – No requirement changes.

Slide 61 – One requirement change – CA008: SwRI requested that this be more specific and referenced document *Data Elements for CAD 511*.

Slide 62 – No requirement changes.

Slide 63 - Changes to CA005A2.

Slide 64 – New Requirement CA005A3 and CA005A4.

Slide 65 – 66 - No Changes.

Slide 67 – Lists of tasks that have been done or are in process of being completed.

S. Corbin asked where the requirements were that had initially been described in the earlier slides with regard to CA005A3. J. Hope responded that CA005A3 is the slide and asked for questions. Mr. Corbin inquired how an operator would be notified of a change to an event they did not own. Mr. Hope responded a pop-up box of some type was being considered. R. Heller asked how the CMB would like the alert to work since the alert mechanism was still undefined at the time of the meeting. SunGuide User's Group input was suggested and the item will be discussed with M. Fontan with regards to CA005A3 and CA005A4.

### ***FHP CAD Interface***

#### ***Vote:***

D1 – Yes  
D2 – Yes  
D3 – Yes  
D4 – Yes  
D5 – Absent  
D6 – Yes  
D7 - Yes  
TPE – Yes  
MDX – Absent  
CO - Yes

Discussion regarding a possible four to five week delay took place. Districts 1, 3, 4 and 6 did not object to the delay. Terry Hensley stated that District 7 was waiting on the Road Ranger capabilities and the delay would be a problem. Trey suggested a decision be deferred until the end of the meeting as all the items being voted on for the day would result in the four to five week delay.

## **2. FL-ATIS Publish to Public Admin Editor Requirements (Gaarder)**

FL-ATIS Publish to Public Admin Editor VOTE (Slides 70 – 72 show mockups)

Discussion took place regarding links for SunGuide not being compatible with Google maps and how that would affect the ability to display travel time (TvT). P. Vega asked if the TvT could be published without publishing the TSS. Mark Laird stated the links on the map could be suppressed, but still allow the retrieval of TvT from the drop-down. R. Heller stated that if the TSS data was not published then TvT would not be on the site. Erik Gaarder interjected that the issue of not showing up on the Web site is for IBI to fix. He added that it was an issue, but he did not think that resolving it by deleting the information is the solution. He continued that he would rather force IBI to get it right and pointed out that if TSS started being deleted that a lot of other issue might arise. Carlos

asked about using “XX” in front of the name if the additional information was not desired. E. Gaarder confirmed that using the “XX” still worked; however he thought this enhancement was a better fix. Further conversation took place regarding providing a box to click on for publishing to the Web site and about a simpler interface for CCTV, DMS and TvT links.

### ***FL-ATIS Publish to Public Admin Editor Requirements***

#### ***Vote:***

D1 – Yes  
D2 – Yes  
D3 – Yes  
D4 – Yes  
D5 – Absent  
D6 – Yes  
D7 - Yes  
TPE – Yes  
MDX – Absent  
CO - Yes

### ***SunGuide Software R 4.2 FL-ATIS Floodgate Monitoring***

E. Gaarder called for any questions regarding Release 4.2 FL-ATIS Floodgate Monitoring. P. Vega asked if the Floodgate Monitoring feature would still be coming out with Release 4.2. Trey Tillander replied that it was, but that he had been emailing people during the break and thought there was another option to accommodate the Districts’ needs. He suggested the possibility of splitting the District 7 Road Ranger enhancement out of the bigger release to keep it on schedule without impacting the District 7 enhancement. He added that this option would be dependent on District 7’s ability to host a FAT for their Road Ranger enhancement since there was not enough money in the budget for a separate FAT in San Antonio for such a small release.

M. Laird asked if floodgate monitoring could be delivered as a hotfix. R. Heller responded that it would require a database update and that a hotfix was problematic. He added that if the CMB wanted the floodgate monitoring early that there would have to be discussion about how to accomplish that and pointed out that it touches a lot of other items and there would have to be a determination of how to do it cleanly.

Gene Glotzbach responded to M. Laird’s question by stating that FL-ATIS currently had a schedule launch for the end of February, but that it would probably be delayed, which had not been completely determined yet. G. Glotzbach stated that he would send an email regarding an issue that came up during the IV&V which will push the launch back some. He added that he would like to give the Districts a couple of weeks to do that, as well as other issues that will delay the launch a little bit.

**Floodgate Monitoring Vote - Cost - \$5642**

**Vote:**

D1 – Yes  
D2 – Yes  
D3 – Yes  
D4 – Yes  
D5 – Absent  
D6 – Yes  
D7 - Yes  
TPE – Yes  
MDX – Absent  
CO - Yes

**Will proceed with update for Floodgate Monitoring**

**SunGuide Software Release 4.3 (Mark Laird)**

Mark Laird discussed Manny Fontan's work on the RPG ConOps. In summary, he stated that Manny was looking to combine mainline and ramp blockages, on ramp blockages, and shoulder blockage. He stated that the next version could be expected in a couple of months for the ConOps and that comments should be sent to Manny. However, he did add that major changes could be an issue due to the amount of review over the last year. He added that mainline blockages were handled by an auto response generator, but that ramp blockage is manual and suggested auto generation for mainline and adjacent ramps. No one had questions for Mr. Laird

**Discussion of Ramp Blockage Terminology** – Mr. Laird called for comments. None were given.

**On Ramp Messaging** – Suggest do not produce on-ramp DMS message. Comments were asked for, but none were given.

**Shoulder Blockages** (See Slide 86) – With the “move over” law in effect and in consideration of safety for emergency responders, the first issue is terminology to refer to the blockages. Terms like gore are not recognized by the public. A suggestion was made to ask SunGuide to recognize that there are ramp lanes and ramp shoulders and have it use ramp template for that case instead of using the mainline template. Beyond the gore area, could be a ramp shoulder on the left, which was more challenging to diagram. Such items are the things that are being considered to be addressed.

P. Vega inquired as to if the former DTOE had reviewed this and asked Bill Wilshire if he had any comments. Mr. Wilshire responded that he did not know if the diagrams shown would make sense to people or not. He added that it looked like the DMS messages were using a lot of exit numbers and noted that people were not used to

using exit numbers. He added that the operator would need some option to override the message. P. Vega said he would have his DTOE look at the section and give some comments by the end of the month.

### **Vehicle Alerts (See Slide 88)**

Slide 88 shows the first version of the suggested template for vehicle alerts. Mr. Laird mentioned that there had been some reduction in the text to fit on smaller signs. The vehicle year and type could be entered by operators. Alternatives to handle variants were discussed, including returning to three event types and providing a choice of vehicle alert variants. The variant information could be stored for selection of the appropriate template. Mr. Laird stated that if anyone had a preference or suggestions about how to handle the alerts that he would like to have them. He also asked if there was any support for given approaches or alternatives. Trey Tillander was asked how he felt about going back to three event types. Trey noted that the vote to use one alert type had been split at the time and added that the Districts that voted against three alert types in favor of one alert type probably would have some stronger input. P. Vega interjected that Derek thought it might be easier for SwRI to have three alert types instead of the one. He added that with the more Silver alerts the Districts received it seemed easier to have three alert types.

### ***Poll for preference regarding three event types***

D1 – 3 event types

D2 – 3 event types

D3 – Chad has made comments about silver alerts and would agree with 3 types

D4 – Prefers three event types District 4 also noted that the message template currently being used for silver alerts was getting negative comments regarding the first line of second phase which is the model and tag. Before we get to deploying this, we need to look at the template.

Mark Laird directed the meeting members to Slide 89, which was from the information E Birriel provided and noted that that version was where the information did not fit on one sign. S. Corbin added that Example 1 was causing a lot of problems because people were not associating the make / model because they are in different phases and that tag was not on the same line. G. Glotzbach suggested discussion with E. Birriel regarding the complaints from the public. P. Vega suggested seeing if the message could be made easier for the public to digest. John Easterling commented that he preferred Example 3 for the silver alerts. Both P. Vega and J. Easterling have received complaints that the messages are too wordy.

T. Tillander suggested that the upcoming Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Working Group Meeting (WGM) videoconference in April might be a good time to discuss the issue. P. Vega suggested that the CMB members send all comments to M. Fontan to be assimilated and presented at the WGM for finalization and pointed out that the concerns needed to be addressed. Mr. Vega added that the messages were causing problems with drivers hitting their brakes to try to get all the information from the alerts.

### **RPG Configuration**

Discussion regarding RPG configuration took place and it was stated that once it was entered, virtually some of it was very difficult to fix and that the group should probably try to get a configuration guide about RPG. It was suggested that some of this would be good for SwRI to do, but that it was not clear. The current recommendation is that this information needs to be compiled.

### **RPG Performance**

Discussion took place regarding issues with saving EM data and it was stated that each EM save needed to happen in no more than one second; no more than two seconds for response plan generation (seeing up to 10 minutes to get the initial proposal); and, no more than 2 seconds to activate the plan (does not mean message is up on the sign, but that the plan has been put into operation). Any thoughts on issues, whether items meet goals, etc.?

R. Heller stated that if the CMB was going to add performance measures of this type, then how the measures would be tested should also be defined. He continued by saying that when you go to test the performance measures you get an argument about how to set up the test if the developer does not know how the system is going to be stressed when the item is being developed. M. Laird added that input was need from SwRI to accomplish this performance and R. Heller noted that SwRI was currently investigating poor response plan generation in District 6 where some problems and limitations in the EM were found and were being investigated. R. Heller added that SwRI was working actively with District 6 to determine what the problem was. He also asked that if other Districts were using the RPG that SwRI would like to have input on whether the problem was found by other Districts or just by District 6.

M. Laird asked if anyone else was getting horribly long waits for RPG generation. S. Corbin replied that District 4 had not had any problems and that it was only a couple of seconds. S Corbin informed R. Heller that he should contact Dave Ashton about how District 4 was using the RPG.

P. Vega added that when District 2 first began using the system there was a significant delay because it was querying a HAR which District 2 did not have, but that it was because of the initial setup of the system and was now fixed. S. Corbin asked if it was maybe a system loading problem. M. Laird said they were looking at problems and had turned the test servers over to SwRI where it behaves in the same manner and added that he thought it was something specific to the deployment. P. Vega suggested that District 6 and SwRI look into the situation and provide an update about the findings.

### **Response Plans ConOps (Laird)**

#### **Schedule Issue Discussion:**

Discussion took place regarding scheduling. Trey Tillander suggested another option to keep the RR enhancement on schedule. He stated that the District 1 and District 7 AVL / RR enhancement could remain on schedule and the bigger release for FHP CAD with other additions would be delayed by about five weeks and have a FAT in San Antonio, if the RR / AVL FAT could be hosted in District 7. Trey stated that he would have to talk with T. Hensley regarding this solution, but that it sounded like an option that might work. Based on the votes, everyone wants the enhancements voted on during the meeting, but District 7 is being impacted by delay. T. Hensley stated that District 7 had some issues, but that District 4 had some interest and he did not want to cut them out. S. Corbin interjected that most of District 4's issues had been fixed and for District 7 to go ahead with what it needed. Mr. Hensley said he could work on this with Trey to get the RR/AVL schedule to work. T. Tillander stated that the FAT in San Antonio would be rescheduled and another FAT would be scheduled based on what was worked out with District 7.

R. Heller brought up that SwRI had a replacement in training for the person that had unsuccessfully been placed in Miami previously. He added that Mark Dunthorn would be in District 6 a week from Monday and would start providing support directly to District 6 as soon as SwRI gained more confidence in his abilities and he would be taking on more. He added that Mr. Dunthorn was basically working out very well for SwRI. Mr. Dunthorn would be located in Miami and would be participating with and making runs to other Districts to reduce travel costs. D. Chang also announced that Clay Packard had joined the PBS&J team.

### **Closing and Action Item Review (Vega)**

Trey announced that he would continue to work with the CMB for now, until his replacement is chosen. However, Trey pointed out that since he was essentially doing two jobs that inquiries should be copied D. Chang and Clay Packard for additional



assistance. He also directed that if an answer was not received from him to call David or Clay.

P. Vega discussed the performance measures that the Districts had been using and reporting to E. Birriel. He added that the performance measures were becoming more important to the Districts and that he would like the group to address what changes are needed in those reporting systems. He encouraged everyone to start using the performance measures.

### **Action Items Recap**

- 1) Slide 28, Ocala/Marion County ITS Architecture: District 5 will provide detail of the update regarding the Ocala/Marion County ITS Architecture to Trey Tillander who will present the update at the next CMB meeting. No change.
- 2) Slide 34, Footprint 222: SwRI will provide ROM for updating the naming convention drop-down display to Trey Tillander.
- 3) Slide 34, Footprint 222: Jennifer Heller will coordinate with the SSUG regarding the naming convention.
- 4) Slide 35, SunGuide Installation Documentation: SwRI will provide LOE/ROM to Trey Tillander for a Generic Installation Guideline and for a Web-based FAQ separately. Did not do due to questions that need to be discussed with CO.
- 5) J. Hope will check the requirement CA005A1 XML comment field and add “lane blockage” to the requirement language. This item will be covered in the ConOps.
- 6) SwRI will provide Scope, Requirements and ROM to Trey regarding EIS new device.
- 7) Pete Vega will coordinate the Oracle RAC license and Win. 2008 Environment issues in the future.
- 8) SwRI to provide “Map Technology Whitepaper” to Trey and present in next CMB;
- 9) District to provide review comments of FHP event notifier and send comments to David Chang by COB 2/20/09. Complete (?)
- 10) Pete will discuss w/ Eddie Grant and cc David Ashton, Roger Strain regarding the FHP requirements of CA005A3, CA005A4 for SSUG input. Eddy Grant will present/address the issue at the upcoming SunGuide User Group meeting
- 11) Pete will discuss alert types with E. Birriel regarding the Silver Alert and present in next ITS WGM. This will be coordinated through M. Fontan.
- 12) Trey Tillander and Terry Hensley will work out the schedule and location for the Release 4.2 RR / AVL FAT.

Meeting adjourned at 11:42 a.m.