Meeting Notes

Change Management Board

February 22, 2012 – 1:30 pm to 4:30 pm

March 12, 2012
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

AVL ....Automated Vehicle Location
C2C .... Center-to-Center
CAD .... Computer-Aided Dispatch
CMB.. Change Management Board
CO .... Central Office
ConOps.. Concept of Operations
DMS..Dynamic Message Sign
EOC.. Emergency Operations Center
FDOT..Florida Department of Transportation
FHP .... Florida Highway Patrol
FIU.. Florida International University
FTE..Florida Turnpike Enterprise
GUI .... Graphical User Interface
ITS .... Intelligent Transportation Systems
MSP.. Modified Special Provision
ONVIF.. Open Network Video Interface Forum
OOCEA..Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority
PSIA ....Physical Security Interoperability Association
RCA ....Remote Control Application
RPG.. Response Plan Generation
SSUG .... SunGuide Software Users Group
SwRI..Southwest Research Institute
TERL .... Traffic Engineering Research Lab
TMC..Transportation Management Center
TxDOT .... Texas Department of Transportation
VAS ....Video Aggregation System
WAN .... Wide Area Network

Florida Department of Transportation
CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, February 22, 2012
1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M
Rhyne Building, Room 330 Tallahassee, Florida

Attendees:

Elizabeth Birriel, CO	Gene Glotzbach, CO	Arun Krishnamurthy, CO
Randy Pierce, CO	Trey Tillander, CO	Chris Birosak, D1
Carlos Bonilla, D1	Pete Vega, D2	Cliff Johnson, D3
Dong Chen, D4	Nathan Ruckert, D5	Mike Smith, D5
Alejandro Motta, D6	Javier Rodriguez, D6	Ramona Burke, D7
Terry Hensley, D7	John Easterling, FTE	LA Griffin, OOCEA
Mark Laird, AECOM	Dee McTague, AECOM	David Chang, Atkins
John Hope, Atkins	Ron Meyer, Atkins	Jo Ann Oerter, Atkins
Clay Packard, Atkins	Marie Tucker, Atkins	Dave Howell, HNTB
Brian Ritchson, MCG	Tucker Brown, SwRI	Robert Heller, SwRI
Mari Bacon, Telvent	Frank Deasy, Telvent	Ryan Crist, TotalTraffic
Penny Kamish, TotalTraffic	Jason Summerfield, TotalTraffic	

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

Welcome and Call for Quorum: Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman Javier Rodriguez opened the meeting at 1:30 P.M. A quorum was established. He briefly introduced the objectives of the meeting.

Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review

- Southwest Research Institute (SwRI) to provide information and cost estimate for Open Network Video Interface Forum (ONVIF). **– Information provided in current meeting.**

- SwRI to present Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Remote Command Application (RCA) application at next CMB meeting. **– Information provided in current meeting.**

- Users to provide feedback to SQL Storage Guidelines. **– No feedback received.**

- SwRI to add entire download of current report templates on SunGuide Web site. **– Complete.**

Agenda Items

ITS WAN Update

Frank Deasy provided an update on the current status of each District being connected to the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Wide Area Network (WAN). He continued to state that Florida Highway Patrol (FHP) Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) is now connected to the WAN

from the data center in Tampa to the Orlando Transportation Management Center (TMC) and Districts that are connected to the WAN should be able to see the connection (Districts 2, 4, 5 and 6). All Districts should re-address now to enable Statewide Multi-casting. The Video Aggregation System (VAS) will have dedicated circuits and those are now being replaced with the ITS WAN where fiber connections are available. Chris Birosak asked the status of the connection with District 1 and District 4 on Alligator Alley and F. Deasy stated that he would look into that further. Pete Vega stated that District 2 is currently trying to connect to the City of Gainesville and asked what the monthly cost for the District 6 to Traffic Engineering Research Lab (TERL) connection was; F. Deasy stated that this a $4,000 per month charge.

SSUG Update

Jason Summerfield stated that the SunGuide Software Users Group (SSUG) went through the current list of event type flags and came up with some suggestions instead of the generic terms which are often changed anyways and can be time consuming. He then reviewed the table with the proposed suggestions. J. Rodriguez asked if all the Districts were represented at the SSUG meeting and J. Summerfield stated yes all Districts were represented except District 3 and this is our recommendations. J. Rodriguez suggested that all Districts check with their operations people to make sure this is ok and a cost estimate from SwRI will be needed. Terry Hensley stated that Interagency Coordination will not fit on all Dynamic Message Sign (DMS). Dee McTague stated that this is used for record keeping only in SunGuide and would not be displayed on a DMS. T. Hensley stated the other event type flag would also be a question. J. Summerfield stated that this was discussed and how often it is used and operators change it anyways since it is a catch all. District 5 asked the purpose for changing the abandoned vehicle flag and J. Summerfield stated that the SSUG did not want to give the public the wrong impression and it will remain as abandoned vehicle in SunGuide. Tucker Brown stated that SwRI could create a different event type for silver, leo and amber and then create a template for each. Mark Laird stated that he has done an update to the Response Plan Generation (RPG) Concept of Operations (ConOps) and it will be circulated for review and one item in there is to update this as well. T. Brown stated that changing the names will be trivial but adding event types and creating templates for them will be a little more detailed. J. Rodriguez stated that each District should communicate this to their operation folks to verify the changes and then receive a cost estimate from SwRI.

ONVIF Support

Robert Heller reviewed the ONVIF slides in detail. Arun Krishnamurthy stated that basically what R. Heller is struggling with is there is not much discussion about the decoders. R. Heller stated that the alternative is Physical Security Interoperability Association (PSIA) and it has about eight companies listed but I think the Department has made a good decision going with ONVIF as they have more companies. Ron Meyer stated that the manufacturers are leaning towards the ONVIF protocol; they currently advertise and claim that they are ONVIF compliant but the TERL has not seen any of these first hand. The question was asked how important are stand-alone decoders to the system. P. Vega stated that the only issue for District 2 is the media because they decode their feeds and ship it broadband.

R. Meyer stated that some language was added in the specifications with an "or" statement encouraging the manufacturers to adopt the ONVIF standard because the Department sees it going that way, we are where we need to be right now and moving that direction. There will be a

period for a little while where things we have taken for granted like mpeg2 will not be so easy with all the differences. J. Rodriguez asked if the plan was to keep monitoring and then move forward at a later date. R. Heller stated that this was to alert the CMB that if SwRI built a driver to talk to cameras there are a lot of ONVIF cameras available but would have to abandon the stand alone decoders to get ONVIF compliant ones. J. Rodriguez asked if it would be possible for R. Meyer to lead a small teleconference with some technical folks and have an update on this at the next meeting. R. Meyer stated that he will work with Clay Packard on the next steps for this issue. A. Krishnamurthy stated that we do have a cost estimate for ONVIF for the encoding portion and if the CMB is ok with it we can have SwRI work on the encoder part of the implementation and then have the SSUG work out the decoder portion. A. Krishnamurthy will forward the requirements and cost estimate to the CMB members.

Bulk Update AVL RR

T. Brown reviewed the problem and discussed four possible solutions. M. Laird stated that one other factor is when you have a large number of active vehicles you can get multiple updates coming in one after another and you have the same problem with the Graphical User Interface (GUI). T. Brown stated that there has to be a way to fix it within the GUI and SwRI is still looking at options for what can be done to the map. M. Laird stated that the real advantage of putting these together is getting usable data faster. Neena Soans asked if this pertained to Road Ranger status and T. Brown responded that this was just for Automated Vehicle Location (AVL). J. Rodriguez suggested bringing this up at the next SSUG meeting and coming back with a recommendation to the CMB.

Remote Command Application

T. Brown stated that this is informational and a Whitepaper was distributed recently with a detailed description and then reviewed the slides. M. Laird asked if we were transitioning to RCA could you continue to have Center-to-Center (C2C) with another District and T. Brown stated that was correct. John Hope stated so we could have C2C and RCA at the same time and T. Brown stated yes you can run them both as they are independent of each other. J. Hope then asked how much effort it would take to implement this in SunGuide and T. Brown stated that a cost estimate was not prepared for this item but it will be a lot of work. J. Rodriguez stated that the best next step would be a cost estimate to make a decision. T. Brown stated that one of the things that was discussed is a better and more stable communication between each Districts and would need to find out how many folks would be interested in this product. M. Laird stated that District 6 primary focus is stability and the connection of C2C. A. Krishnamurthy stated that this presentation was to gage the interest of each District, it is not meant to replace C2C; when it comes to sending information to 511 or connecting to Inrix data that would be the same. RCA is to connect to another SunGuide system and easily manage that system and would like to see how many Districts would be interested. T. Hensley stated that he thought that was the main purpose of C2C. T. Brown stated that C2C does have some control of devices but C2C does not offer full control and the other option is to expand C2C for full control. C. Birosak made the comment that a ConOps should be developed detailing what should be done in case one of the TMCs needs to be evacuated (e.g. hurricane approaching) or has to relinquish control to another TMC. The ConOps should identify what is needed and perhaps a tool such as RCA may meet those needs (develop the ConOps to identify what is needed, then develop the tools to support the ConOps). J. Rodriguez polled the Districts to see how many were interested.

District 1: Yes, would like to see a ConOps developed
District 2: Yes, would help us monitor District 3
District 3: Yes
District 4: Yes, would like to see a ConOps
District 5: Yes, would like to see a ConOps
District 6: No immediate need but would like to see a ConOps to see how it works
District 7: Yes, would like to see a ConOps
Florida Turnpike Enterprise (FTE): No immediate nee but would like to see a ConOps
Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority (OOCEA): C2C was one of the key factors for OOCEA to move to SunGuide and now District 5 has to login to two different systems, we could use this today.

A. Krishnamurthy stated that he liked the idea of producing a ConOps to see how this product will get used. He continued to state that the concept is clear in my mind and I think about what if there was a hurricane and we need to control another TMC, but I am not clear what the ConOps should be about. C. Birosak stated that we need to know up front how do we want to proceed on doing that if there was a hurricane and would District 1 turn over all control to District 4 or District 7 and if we turn it over then what do we do. T. Brown stated that RCA does require that both SunGuide systems are running. A. Krishnamurthy stated that what C. Birosak explained does make sense but that is more of an operational issue and the Districts should have an emergency plan in place. T. Hensley stated that if our system is not working and we cannot go anywhere to make it work; we do have plan through emergency management to move but the software issue puts a big question mark on the whole thing. J. Rodriguez stated that District 6 has a plan as well but it does not concern any other Districts; perhaps we should look at upgrading C2C instead of RCA. I do see this being implemented more for Districts who do not have 24-hour coverage at their TMC.

Sensys: Interstate Detection System

Trey Tillander stated that Sensys offers a interstate detection system which is the hockey puck detectors and they are wirelessly communicating to a pole on the side of the road. These are not widely used in Florida but CO has recently had some contact from the vendor and they would like to sell these for freeway use, but we currently only have them approved as stop bar detectors. A major concern is that it is an intrusive device like a loop. CO would like to ask all of the District who would be interested in using this device for ITS, the vendor has offered to develop a driver for SunGuide. J. Rodriguez stated that District 6 has these on the I-95 project and they have been down for over 180 days and they cannot get them back working; they were used to disseminate loops and are telling us that it is a bad batch of devices.

District 1: No, would not want to use them because of maintenance, they are currently being used on arterials in Collier County
District 2: No, have questioned the battery life and the cost is too high
District 3: No plans to deploy but they work great on stop bar application
District 4: No plans to use on interstate
District 5: No
District 6: No
District 7: No
FTE: No
OOCEA: No

Arterial Dynamic Trailblazer Projects

T. Tillander stated that the TERL has been doing a lot of work with color DMS and wanted to get an updated from all the Districts on these types of projects. T. Tillander then reviewed the list of known District projects and asked if there were any others that CO needed to be aware of. OOCEA stated that they have just completed the implementation of a project with color DMS. T. Hensley stated that District 7 has one about to start construction that has color DMS and two or three other that will be starting within a year that have color DMS. T. Tillander asked T. Hensley for the project that is about to start construction do you know what type of sign they will be using and T. Hensley stated that he is not sure what type but they were looking to see what District 5 used. John Easterling stated that FTE has a concept report to actually reuse some of the color DMS that they have on the toll plazas onto arterial approaches but it is just a concept at this point with no funding. T. Hensley stated that the cross town connector has color DMS on it as well but they are a couple years out from any installation, it is under construction but it is 32 miles and has a lot of ramps to build first.

T. Tillander stated that he wanted to give an update on the specification as it will be implemented July 2012. For all projects prior to July 2012 please use a Modified Special Provision (MSP) and copy the upcoming specification. District 2 has done this successfully with their project. Also two front access color signs will be approved soon and two walk-in signs are available now on the APL.

T. Tillander stated that he has been working with the City of Ocala on a project that had a budget struggle, the need for smaller electronic signs ended up with a temporary permit for a sign that would not meet the current specification but would meet the project needs. This will be a good test to see how the signs hold up and asked if anyone else was looking to use these types of signs for arterial use for a cheaper solution. T. Hensley stated that District 7 might be interested, there are arterial DMS' at every interchange and this would help save money. T. Tillander stated that if you are referring to a normal traveler information sign you probably still want to stick with the normal DMS specification; these would not be your normal DMS and would be ground mounted usually trying to solve a unique problem. He continued to state that CO is trying to see how much research should be done for a cheaper solution but will continue with a temporary permit and look at the project later to see how the signs hold up. C. Birosak stated that District 1 has had some local agencies express interest in what T. Tillander was describing but there is currently not funding so it would be a few years out. T. Tillander recommended letting them know that there is an active temporary permit with the City of Ocala but will probably want to wait a year to evaluate the project.

Top Priority SunGuide Item by District

A. Krishnamurthy gave an update on some prior top priority items. District 1 requested an update on when the safety barrier alert would be available and A. Krishnamurthy stated that it will be part of the next minor release. District 6 also submitted 11 high priority items, some are currently being worked on, some have been resolved, some are waiting on the next minor release and some are pending District 6 response.

T. Hensley stated that District 7 is having an issue with floodgates and Windows 7, this is not an urgent problem but when you create a floodgate through C2C all of the operator's windows crash and this can be very time consuming. There is already a footprint on this problem. A. Krishnamurthy asked the other Districts if they were experiencing this problem and there was no response.

OOCEA stated that they are still having issues with C2C and has also sent a list of issues to CO. A. Krishnamurthy stated that CO is actively working on the C2C issues that all Districts are having. A. Krishnamurthy informed everyone that Central Office (CO) is holding weekly teleconferences to discuss issues with C2C.

C. Birosak stated that footprint 722 has to do with entering a right turn lane or left turn lane into SunGuide and currently you cannot do this accurately.

P. Vega stated that the weather information system deployment is almost complete and is curious on the status of the associated SunGuide modification that Florida International University (FIU) is working on. A. Krishnamurthy stated that not much progress has been made on this but a meeting is setup with Dr. Hadi this week. P. Vega stated that District 2 is looking at possibly installing fog sensors and might include it with this project. FHP is working with the Districts on the web Emergency Operations Center (EOC) application and during our meetings it was asked how do we interface this with SunGuide and make it work. A. Krishnamurthy asked if District 2 knew when FHP will be complete and P. Vega did not have an exact time frame but will keep CO posted on the progress.

J. Easterling stated that FTE is working with SwRI on a footprint and they are enabling us with a hotfix to use a long name on alerts which is configurable and this should be complete within a few weeks. FTE is also trying to get the ability to get special characters in the email alerts; this is a high priority for FTE because they use the editable feature of the email to give additional information to FTE management.

Action Item Review

1. A. Krishnamurthy to send T. Hensley the SQL Storage Guidelines document.

2. Districts to review Footprint 1744 suggestions and provide comments for finalization.

3. SwRI to provide cost estimate / description for making separate templates for Amber, Silver and Leo alerts.

4. SSUG to discuss ONVIF and requirements for video decoding.

5. A. Krishnamurthy to send ONVIF requirements and cost estimate to Districts.

6. SSUG to discuss bulk update AVL-RR solutions.