Meeting Notes

Change Management Board

December 10, 2009 – 1:30 pm to 4:30 pm

January 19, 2010
Final - Version 1.0

Prepared for:
Florida Department of Transportation
Traffic Engineering and Operations Office
Intelligent Transportation Systems Section
650 Suwannee Street, M.S. 90
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0450
(850) 410-5600

List of Acronyms

C2C .... Center-to-Center
CAD .... Computer-Aided Dispatch
CMB .... Change Management Board
CO .... Central Office
ConOps .... Concept of Operations
DMS ....Dynamic Message Sign
FAT ....Factory Acceptance Test
FDOT ....Florida Department of Transportation
FHP .... Florida Highway Patrol
FTC ....Florida Transportation Commission
FTE .... Florida Turnpike Enterprise
FL-ATIS ....Florida Advanced Traveler Information System
GUI ....Graphical User Interface
ICD ....Interface Control Document
ITN ....Invitation to Negotiate
IVR ....Interactive Voice Response
ITS .... Intelligent Transportation Systems
IV&V .... Independent Verification and Validation
MDX ....Miami-Dade Expressway Authority
RTMC ....Regional Transportation Management Center
SAE ....Society of Automotive Engineers
SSUG .... SunGuide® Software Users Group
SwRI ....Southwest Research Institute
TERL ....Traffic Engineering Research Laboratory
TMC ....Transportation Management Center
WAN .... Wide Area Network
WGM ....Working Group Meeting

Attendees:

Chris Birosak, FDOT D1	Carlos Bonilla, FDOT D1	Pete Vega, FDOT D2
Kevin Jackson, FDOT D2	Derek Odom, FDOT D2	Mark Nallick, FDOT D3
Daniel Smith, FDOT D4	Michael Smith, FDOT D5	Jennifer Heller, FDOT D5
Manny Fontan, FDOT D6	Bill Wilshire, FDOT D7	Terry Hensley, FDOT D7
John Easterling, FTE	Eric Gordin, FTE	Gene Glotzbach, FDOT CO
Arun Krishnamurthy, FDOT CO	Trey Tillander, FDOT CO	Dee McTague, DMJM Harris
Mark Laird, DMJM Harris	Cathy McKenzie, Vanus	Paul Mannix, PBS&J
David Chang, PBS&J	Khue Ngo, PBS&J	Clay Packard, PBS&J
Charlie Creel, PBS&J	Marie Howell, PBS&J	Erik Gaarder, PBS&J
Steve Dellenback, SwRI	Robert Heller, SwRI	

Purpose: The purpose of this meeting was to review and vote for statewide issues and requirements, and review footprints issues.

Welcome and Call for Quorum: Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman Pete Vega opened the meeting at 9:30 A.M. A quorum was established. He briefly introduced the objectives of the meeting.

Action Items Recap:

- Mark Laird to finalize the "Right Click Menu" proposal and Arun Krishnamurthy to distribute to CMB members for review. – **Complete.**
- Central Office to initiate "Travel Time Reliability" report. – **In Progress.**
- SwRI to develop rules to handle with roadway changing direction issue in the SunGuide Enhancement: Congestion across County Lines. – **Complete.**
- Manuel Fontan to send two rules for handling roadway changing direction to SwRI (Robert Heller) and Central Office. – **Complete.**
- Central Office to initiate 10-minute teleconference with CMB members for voting on SunGuide Enhancement: Congestion across County Lines (FP 497). – **Complete.**
- SSUG (Clay Packard) to discuss on SunGuide Release Upgrade with FL-ATIS procedures issues and provide result to the next CMB meeting. – **In Progress.**

CMB Chairman Nomination – Pete Vega

Pete Vega asked everyone for nominations for the next CMB Chair. P. Vega stated that he will send out an email to everyone for nominations, please send nominations to Arun Krishnamurthy.

Bill Wilshire stated that Chester Chandler would be taking over as the voting member for District 7 upon his retirement.

SunGuide Enhancement: Cross County Line Congestion FR 497 – Robert Heller

Robert Heller began by reviewing the slides, Robert stated that there will be some fields opened up for the cross county lines to allow the user to modify the screen. He went on to show what the proposed screen will look like if this change is approved. There will be a checkbox in the admin editor screen that will have to be checked if you want to edit the county or roadway direction. P. Vega inquired if each District would have to enter other county information to use the cross county congestion feature and R. Heller responded yes; each head and tail are EM locations and this allows the user to add EM locations to select other county information for congestion. For example, if you want to configure congestion from Dade County extending to Broward County you would have to configure the Broward County EM locations. R. Heller went on to explain that there are a number of requirements to express what is trying to be done and there also had to be requirements written about congestion in general based on the old functionality to reflect the new functionality.

Manny Fontan inquired if these locations still have to be submitted to FL-ATIS in the IVR and Robert responded that yes will still need to be submitted to FL-ATIS.

Mark inquired about the sort values. The intent was originally the default value because the way sort values were setup the EM location closes the event that was upstream on the roadway, if you properly arrange the sort values through the District that should still be the same. P. Vega asked E. Gaarder since District 2 would have to develop reference points for District 5 is there anything that needs to be given to IBI. E. Gaarder responded yes that if this change goes into effect that there will have to be changes made to FL-ATIS; since we will be assigning an event to more than one county there will have to be a major re-work to FL-ATIS. Mark inquired if there were no change done to FL-ATIS; E. Gaarder responded that it would confuse the system and would not accept the information because it would be across two counties; you would still be able to get the information by roadway just not county.

Chris Birosak questioned the wording of the requirements. He went on to state that it does not make since for the congestions head and event location to be different. R. Heller stated that when the requirements were originally written it allowed the operator to change the county for the head but after discussion the head county was locked so this requirement was written when you could change the head county; the code was changed without updating the requirement, if you want the head county locked this requirement can be deleted. A. Krishnamurthy stated that CO thinks that the head should be locked but still have the option to change the county for the tail. District 7 stated that if the event is still occurring the head will stay the same as the event location but once the event starts to clear up the head will be chasing the tail. P. Vega stated that no many TMCs will change anything on this screen after the event is created unless they create a new event for congestion. District 7 stated that they keep the congestion in FL-ATIS but it is still associated with the original event. A. Krishnamurthy stated that once the congestion starts to clear the head is constantly moving making it hard to keep accurate.

C. Birosak stated that these requirements are not needed unless we have to make that change but we do not need to change the county at the head. R. Heller asked if Districts should be able to change the county for congestion head. P. Vega stated that he did not see a need for this and stated that this needed a vote.

Cross County Line Congestion – Lock Head Vote:

D1: Yes
D2: Yes
D3: Yes

D4: Yes
D5: No
D6: Yes
D7: No
FTE: No
CO: Yes

SunGuide Enhancement: Cross County Line Congestion FR 497 Vote:

D1: Yes
D2: Yes
D3: Yes
D4: Yes
D5: Yes
D6: Yes
D7: Yes
FTE: Yes
CO: Yes

SunGuide Enhancement: Incident Severity FP 1280 – Arun Krishnamurthy

Arun Krishnamurthy stated that this Footprint was discussed in the last CMB meeting. When you are currently on the EM page there is no way to pick the severity level. The GUI mock-up shows the capability to pick four severity levels. There was an email sent out to the Districts with the proposed severity criteria. The preference from the Districts seems to be option two. District 5 stated that they were concerned with having the option for the operator to change the severity level. R. Heller stated that SunGuide will make a recommendation to the operator and the operator will have to confirm the recommendation.

SunGuide Enhancement: Incident Severity FP 1280 – Option 2 Vote:

D1: Yes
D2: Yes
D3: Yes
D4: Yes
D5: Yes
D6: Yes
D7: Yes
FTE: Yes
CO: Yes

SunGuide Enhancement: Floodgate Multi-Set FP 1365 – Robert Heller

Steve Dellenback started by stating there are two floodgate enhancements and one has already been approved which allows you to store a recorded floodgate. The focus of this is to create one floodgate message and apply it to multiple slots. This will have no impact to the FL-ATIS system. S. Dellenback went on to show the proposed GUI and reviewed the slides. Mark Laird inquired if you could combine English and Spanish and S. Dellenback responded that it would have to be either all English or all Spanish.

SunGuide Enhancement: Floodgate Multi-Set FP 1365 – Vote:

D1: Yes
D2: Yes
D3: Yes
D4: Yes
D5: Yes
D6: Yes
D7: Yes
FTE: Yes
CO: Yes

SunGuide Enhancement: Right Click Menu – Mark Laird

Mark Liard reviewed the slides with the meeting attendees and showed some examples.

SunGuide Enhancement: Right Click Menu – Vote:

D1: Yes
D2: Yes
D3: Yes
D4: Yes
D5: Yes
D6: Yes
D7: Yes
FTE: Yes
CO: Yes

SunGuide Map Requirements – Robert Heller

Robert Heller started by stating that the map requirements were distributed and were reviewed in the design review meeting. R. Heller went on to review the slides which showed the enhancements of the maps. P. Vega inquired if the Districts would need to upgrade computers to use / view the new maps. R. Heller stated that SwRI has tested this out on current computers and it works fine. The only thing we are doing dynamically now is the placement of device. You are transmitting these tiles to the workstation and then figuring out where to display various devices; as long as the workstations are not more than a few years old there should not be a problem. This solution requires much less horsepower because a lot of the rendering was done on the fly and these are all pre-rendered. This is less CPU intensive as far as the run time.

Mark Nallick stated that this describes the map but questioned the requirements document, are all existing map requirements going to be void and this is all the new ones. R. Heller stated that the maps retains the colors, icons, etc. this is not stated in the new requirements. M. Nallick stated that he thought the requirements should state that these colors and icons were previously approved by FDOT. R. Heller stated that additional requirements were written for multiple tile renderings. This was done so FDOT could supply more than one rendering of the tiles and the operator can choose which of those pre-rendered sets they would like to use. A. Krishnamurthy stated that he has tasked PBS&J to pull all the old requirements and verify that it is okay to void all of the old requirements.

SunGuide Map Requirements (pending requirement changes) – Vote:

D1: Yes
D2: Yes
D3: Yes
D4: Yes
D5: Yes
D6: Yes
D7: Yes
FTE: Yes
CO: Yes

Response Plan requirements – Robert Heller

Arun Krishnamurthy stated that the Response Plan requirements is something that CO is looking into and SwRI has provided a cost estimate to complete the work but CO will not be able to fund the entire effort and is looking for help from the Districts. P. Vega asked if this would be something for the new SunGuide contract and A. Krishnamurthy stated that CO is considering that as an option.

Performance Measures – Clay Packard

A. Krishnamurthy started by stating that the Performance Measures have been sent to all Districts with request for comments. There were two sets of bugs found, one set in the calculation and the other set was editorial. The first set of errors included reports still using Road Ranger time stamps for last departure. This was corrected. Another change made was to not consider any negative value for open roads duration. P. Vega mentioned that there have been several instances when this value has been negative and should be considered in the analysis. It was decided to not make this change in the updated report. Also, the report was not using the event types that were agreed upon. Districts have reviewed their event types to be consistent with what was agreed upon.

RISC ConOps – Clay Packard / Charlie Creel

P. Vega inquired about the RISC watcher and asked if it manages the whole RISC program for District 6. A. Krishnamurthy stated that there is a presentation that will be held on December 15th and he will send the invite to the Districts. A. Krishnamurthy stated that it would be useful to have specific information in SunGuide so that you can access summaries and be able to track the program better, if this is approved it will potentially be added to SunGuide Release 5.0.

Charlie Creel gave a brief overview of the RISC program and stated that the department needs to be able to document all time stamps because of the bonus' that are given. C. Packard reviewed the RISC timeline, durations and showed the proposed GUI mockup. Terry Hensley in District 7 stated that RISC activation is actually when the contractor is notified; RISC happens between contractor notification and lanes cleared. There are some time labels that might be misleading. Also, the slide showed the time stamp for the last road ranger leaving and it should be the last responder. C. Creel stated that T. Hensley was correct and those changes would be made to the timeline. John Easterling stated that the Turnpike has some additional fields that they would like to have added since their contract is different than others. J. Easterling will email the timestamps that he would like to have added. C. Packard stated that there will need to be a

modification to the database and it is proposed to include a crystal report for the data that is stored. There will be a section with a summary and a section that is broken down further.

T. Hensley stated that the Turnpike has many more RISC than District 7 but wants everyone to think and make sure that we need to do this. This would be nice to have but in District 7 there haven't been any issues with their operators. He stated that he wasn't sure how many Districts will use this but it might not be worth spending the funds on this when we don't have any trouble reporting on this. J. Easterling stated that the Turnpike is currently using SunNav we are also using our own separate tracking program. P. Vega suggested the CO get something in writing to the Districts to see if this is worthwhile.

Turnpike SunGuide Enhancement Requests – John Easterling

Arun Krishnamurthy stated that the Turnpike had three requests for enhancements to SunGuide and would like for John Easterling to quickly review those with the group. The document was sent out to the District this morning so many may not have had time to review at this point.

John Easterling started by stating that the Turnpike will be losing some reporting functionality that is currently available in SunNav and not in SunGuide.

1.   Crash Types: Breakdown the crash type and have it in a reportable format. T. Hensley inquired if the Turnpike has the option to check multiple boxes. J. Easterling stated that the Turnpike has proposed a drop down menu and the default would go to property damage. T. Hensley stated that he thought this needed a little more thought and discussion but this could possibly be made as an optional field like others.

2.   Additional Fields: The Turnpike currently collects additional data that is not included in the FHP CAD feed. The Turnpike tries to get additional information such as the case number and Trooper ID for any accidents and this is used to help the Safety Office. J. Heller stated that District 5 also collects some additional data and this information is put into the comments field. J. Easterling stated that the Turnpike suggested the information be entered by the operator as an optional field.

3.   Email Alert Auto Population: This enhancement would build upon the email editor but the Turnpike would like to have it auto populate into the email. A. Krishnamurthy inquired if the Turnpike would want this information in the body of the email. J. Easterling stated that the information would go into the body of the email and there would also be changes to the "sensitive" text box. M. Fontan stated that in the ConOps for the Response Plan Generation an email editor was presented and it has some of the features that the Turnpike is describing except the RISC information.

J. Easterling stated that the Turnpike is responsible for getting certain information to certain people and they are just trying to get this as easy as possible. A. Krishnamurthy stated that CO is working on the Response Plan Generation and stated that these enhancements may be able to be included but may have to be done separately. Please review the information sent out by A. Krishnamurthy and send any comments by December 16th.

Action Items Review

1.   PBS&J to review current SunGuide map requirements and compare with SwRI's proposed new map requirements.
2.   SwRI to edit map requirements according to PBS&J findings.
3.   CO to modify the Performance Measure reports to change the Open Road duration criteria back to -15 min from 0 min.
4.   CO to coordinate with District 6 for RISC Watcher demonstration to all districts on Tuesday December 15[th.]
5.   Districts to send comments to Arun regarding to TPE's requests.