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**Florida Department of Transportation**

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Tuesday, April 28, 2020**

**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**GoTo Meeting**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mark Mathes, D1  Robbie Brown, D1  Justin Merritt, D1  Pete Vega, D2  DeeDee Crews, D2  Alex Varela, D2  Jason Summerfield, D2  Tanesha Sibley, D2  Amy DiRusso, D3  Mark Nallick, D3  John McFadden, COT  Hossam AbdelAll, D4  Dee McTague, D4  Jeremy Dilmore, D5 | Jay Williams, D5  Shannon Watterson, D5  Kyle Higgins, D5  Eddie Grant, D5  John Hope, D5/CFX  Mark Laird, D6  Javier Rodriguez, D6  Alejandro Motta, D6  Romona Burke, D7  Margaret Kubilins, D7  Mike Crawson, D7  Jared Roso, D7  Dan Buidens, D7  Eric Gordin, FTE | Kelly Kinney, FTE  Jermaine Da Silva, FTE  Wang Lee, MDX  Bryan Homayouni, CFX  Christine Shafik, CO  Derek Vollmer, CO  Mark Dunthorn, CO HNTB  Jennifer Langford, CO HNTB  Karthik Devarakonda, CO HNTB  Alex Brum, CO HNTB  Gregory Dudley, CO HNTB  Shawn Kinney, CO  Tucker Brown, SwRI  AJ Skillern, SwRI |

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting is to review and vote on statewide issues and requirements, and review JIRA issues.

**Welcome:** Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman Jay Williams opened the meeting.

**Call for Quorum and Review of Agenda:** A quorum was established for this CMB meeting. Jay Williams reviewed the meeting agenda.

**Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review:** The following items are complete.

**Action Item Review**

* Dan Smith - Wrong Way Driving Wavetronix – Test using WavetronixHD data to detect and track WWD events.
  + My understanding is that District Four has scheduled WWD test runs at the TERL. The test dates have not been determined yet.
  + Derek Vollmer – the runs have been completed here; we are just waiting on Jacques to go back to the office to look at the data.
* Complete - Christine Shafik – Enhancement 3 – SG 4801: Discuss this item further at a SSUG meeting and then proceed with an online vote. It was discussed at the ITS Working Group.
* Compete - Mark Dunthorn to send out link to the SunGuide Users page for the Districts to review and send in updated information.
* Complete - Christine Shafik to send out the AVL data.

**SunGuide Software Update**

Christine Shafik: Good afternoon. We are going through a lot of enhancements and approved all the enhancements from the last CMB. We had the 7.2 release back October 5th and it is currently deployed in CFX, MDX, D1 and D5. We already released (2/26/20) a hotfix which addressed nine issues so far. The third hotfix for 7.1.2 was released 3/9/20. The next release will be 8.0 and it should cover 33 issues that have been approved. It will include some of the issues from today which are RISC and RCA ConOps, time zones, TPAS alerts, if approved today. We are in the development process now and we are going through the test cases and requirements. We want to thank the districts that have offered to help with the process. We are hoping the 8.0 release happens in November but with COVID-19, it might be delaying the release process. We will be voting on 15 items today and they will be added to a future release.

**SG-4771 TPS Report Diagnostics from TPS Devices**

Greg Dudley: Attempted to give an update but the audio was not functioning properly. Christine Shafik gave the update. There are three vendors that support TPAS and the IPSens is currently supporting the new features. Sensys and CivicSmart are not but it is just and FYI. So that is the status of the enhancement and our vendors.

Pete Vega: CivicSmart is getting a good chunk of the market share, so do you want us to reach out to them to get this taken care of?

Christine Shafik: We tried reaching out to them to tell them that this is happening. Our team did not have much luck.

Pete Vega: Mark, do you recall us working with CivicSmart and giving them enough time to work with SunGuide? I can go over the contract documents.

Mark Dunthorn: So, we did talk to CivicSmart and they did understand the need, but we don’t have a way to make them make changes on their side. All we could do was lay out what we needed and what they would need to do to provide the information for SunGuide to make use of it.

Christine Shafik: I think we still have some efforts in the Central Office and let me find out where it is before releasing information on this.

Pete Vega: The only other thing we can do is suspend them from the IPL until they work with us.

Derek Vollmer: Not without a Dev Spec change. I know Marie is looking into purchase order for D5 traffic control software and she is investigating that route to see if we could fund the changes.

**New CMB Voting Procedure**

Jay Williams: Next we will get into the new voting procedure. In the meeting invite there is an attachment that contains a link to each voting item so as we go through the presentation you can click on that link to vote. We are asking for the representative from each agency to click the link, select their agency and then click vote. I think you can also add comments if you want to. You will need to click done to cast your vote. It is straight forward but wanted to make everyone aware. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Dan Buidens: How many people have the permission to vote?

Jay Williams: I think anyone could do it, but we are asking for the District to coordinate and have one person submit the vote for that District.

Alex Varela: There are 20 voting links but 21 items in the presentation which will throw off everything when we are trying to vote.

Pete Vega: If you go to the invite – there is an item that is split for two votes. It should level out.

Alex Varela: The first link says RISK enhancement not TPAS enhancement. Maybe we do the first enhancement vote verbally and then use the links for the remaining items.

1. **Enhancement 1: SG-5236 TPAS Enhancement**

Tucker Brown: There became a need to track the length of time a single spot occupied/unoccupied in a truck parking facility. The proposed enhancement is to have an email configuration in the config file and have the maximum length of consecutive time a space should be occupied or unoccupied and then send an email to the configured address when a space occupancy value exceeds the threshold. It won’t alert the operators specifically, just the email that is configured.

**Cost: $4.5k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Jay Williams: Any questions about this before we proceed with a verbal vote.

Vote: D1: yes, D2: no, D3: yes, D4: yes, D5: yes, D6: yes, D7: yes, FTE: yes, MDX: yes, CFX: yes, CO: yes. This item passes.

1. **Enhancement 2: SG-3465 RISC Enhancement**

This item corresponds with the first link in the meeting invite for voting.

Tucker Brown: There was a full RISC ConOps sent out for District review. The proposed solution is to implement a system to dispatch contractors, track on scene and departure times, equipment, and history of RISC activations.

Cost: $106k

Schedule: 8.0

Tucker Brown: Are there any specific questions related to the ConOps or how this would be implemented?

District: Is there an option to pick by County instead of roadway? Or could that be added? I know different districts do this differently.

Tucker Brown: There should be an option for that, and it wouldn’t be problem. There will be a list of vendors and multiple contracts can be supported. A rotation list will be part of this enhancement.

Pete Vega: What about if we had a vendor who was suspended for a particular timeframe. Would they still show up?

Tucker Brown: That wouldn’t be an issue to skip vendors although I don’t recall that being in the ConOps. We should have the requirements completed in the next week or two and I believe those will be cycled to the Districts to review. If there are things that you don’t see in the requirements, then provide that as feedback and they can be included.

Hossam Abdelall: When was this sent out? I haven’t received it.

Pete Vega: It was sent in November, I just forwarded it to you.

Hossam Abdelall: Thank you. In the future please send it to me, Alexandra Lopez and Daniel Smith.

Online Voting Results: The item passes. All districts voted yes.

1. **Enhancement 3: Remote Command Application (RCA) Enhancement**

Tucker Brown: The idea behind this is currently through center-to-center (C2C) you get control and status of devices, but it is limited. The idea here is the RCA links the two systems together which integrates to different SunGuide installations. We are going to be able to put this into the dialogue you have DMS and CCTV, you would use the same control. The device dialogs will allow users to see status and execute commands on local and remote from a single dialog. It will be permissions based. The user who sends the command from the RCA will be logged so you know who sent the message. This was part of a larger ConOps that was sent probably around the same time as the other.

Cost: $112k

Schedule: 8.0

The system we are incorporating is the backend part, making the GUI aware that there are other statuses from devices and being able to route those to the appropriate places. Most of the work will be done to the user interface, the back end is mainly done from TxDOT.

Mark Nallick: We run a clustered enterprise environment and we have back up servers located in field offices. So C2C within our District, we don’t need because the servers are synced or clustered. Is there an advantage for District Three to have this? Or is it more of a tool to have D2 connected to D3?

Tucker Brown: If you had two versions running, like City of Tallahassee running side by side with District Three. If you had two distinct installations you would be sharing that information through C2C for CCTV, DMS and TTS. The control for that is extremely limited. The other option right now would be to launch two completely different maps. This would make it to where you would only have to launch one map and have all of the information there. You would have full access to the message cues, priorities, etc. The feedback you get back from this would be way more reliable than from C2C. The sole point of this enhancement is to link two full installations together. So, the clustered environment you speak of would be a single installation distributed across multiple nodes. If you incorporate the City of Tallahassee into the nodes, then you can still look at information through C2C but for those there is a good chance I will have to open two maps, one for D3 and one for City of Tallahassee. If it is all one installation, then you wouldn’t have any advantages.

Pete Vega: With this feature could we operate D3 or D5 devices?

Tucker Brown: Yes, you would be linking the two installations together.

Pete Vega: Would it require permissions before accessing the other District?

Tucker Brown: Both sides would have to configure the system to communicate to each other and essentially the RCA module on each side would have to establish that connection. The District you are trying to control would have to make you a username and password. Once you have that then the system would make calls to the other system. The District that created the username and password still have control over what the user is able to control.

Pete Vega: Will there be a ConOps distributed on this?

Tucker Brown: There already was.

Mark Nallick: How do you determine what operator is manipulating my cameras? If you have a generic userID, how do you audit who was doing what in my system?

Tucker Brown: Right now, the user gets logged and for DMS that is the user with the message. We talked at the SSUG that the permissions would be controlled by that one RCA is using but we would insert the username of the person doing the changes. So, you would be able to track who specifically did it.

Jeremy Dilmore: There will be unique credentials on the examples you gave on the system. There would need to be traceability to the individual of what permissions they have been granted.

Tucker Brown: That sounds correct.

Jeremy Dilmore: Mark, the usernames are maintained in the record set of who has what permission.

Mark Nallick: Okay, I just wanted to make sure there is an audit trail.

Pete Vega: I think this might be one we talk to Christine and get her guidance.

John Hope: The use that is set up in one district to allow another district to gain control I believe can be used in conjunction with the ability to specify which devices you can or can’t control. For example, if you want to have D2 control D3 devices then you can specify exactly which devices you want D2 control.

Tucker Brown: That is correct, you can set restrictions per device.

Pete Vega: Christine, from past hurricane experiences, would it be wise to have each district tied into another district? And I am assuming you can turn this on and off.

Christine Shafik: I believe there will have to be an MOU from the districts on how it is going to work, and we will provide the enhancement and coordinate the communication if needed. I believe the main purpose is what you just stated.

Tucker Brown: From a technical perspective that would be supported.

Jay Williams: Any other questions about this item? Hearing none we will proceed with the vote. Note that this will be the link for enhancement two in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 4: SG-2640 Time Zone**

Tucker Brown: The issue here are the timestamps in the database are not stored as UTC or with time zone information. Calculations can be incorrect due to daylight savings or management from 2 different time zones (D3). The idea here is to store and pass all timestamps as offsets to UTC. Requires report modifications, database view modifications and retesting of all subsystems.

Cost: $70k

Release: 8.0

John Hope: You mention the reports will be modified; will they be modified to report in local time?

Tucker Brown: Yes, the intent is to make this seamless for the user and would report in whatever time zone they are in. It would take into account the timezones in the timestamps.

John Hope: How would the TSS swap files be recorded?

Tucker Brown: Those currently have the timestamp information with them and the time zone.

Jay Williams: Any other questions on this item?

**Vote: This item passes. All district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 5: SG-5182 WAZE and Railroad Crossing**

Tucker Brown: Currently there is not railroad crossings in the system. Long Island Railroad implemented their crossings into Waze and significantly reduced incidents at the crossings. The way we could get that information to Waze is by putting the crossing in SunGuide and passing it through the C2C to FL511 and Waze. The GPIO model that was implemented in 7.2 was one of the features we talked about adding originally. This will allow you to configure a railroad and set a manual status. Waze is just looking to know if there is a railroad crossing there. That is the first part of the voting item we are talking about.

The second part of the voting item is at the SSUG meeting that D2 might be able to get a device that would gather the information if there is a train there. So, the second part of this would be to add a device driver to a particular device and be able to report automatic status based on the device report and it would pass through the system to FL511. The other side of this is that you would be able to use the GPIO functionality to post to DMS signs. Once you get an automatic status you can tie that directly to a DMS sign.

There are two costs here: one just adding railroads to the system and the other is adding the driver status.

Cost: $17k

New Driver Cost: $12k

Schedule: Future Release

Jay Williams: We don’t have this broken up into two separate voting items, we only have one link. We will merge this voting item to do a comprehensive total of both the railroad and the new driver and vote on that. Is that okay with the group?

All districts are okay with combining the vote.

Mark Mathes: District One would like to use a preemption for the system.

Pete Vega: What District did this concept originate?

Tucker Brown: District Four.

Pete Vega: We are looking at places where we preemption. Another method is that Wavetronix has an off-shoot company out west that can count cars or trailers at any speed. And a third option we are looking at is for LIDAR because the market is bringing the prices down. The solution we are doing is following the MH Corbin device and following for all communication types to go to SunGuide.

Tucker Brown: When you say follow all of them to an MH Corbin did you mean all three types, so it is in a single interface? Or SunGuide to go directly to each of those device types?

Pete Vega: Correct. We want an end device that can do as much as possible.

Tucker Brown: District One, how are you getting your preemption information? In D5 we are accessing the traffic signal vendor directly. Is there a mechanism that you would be able to see for us to access that preemption value?

Mark Mathes: Through Econolite and Syntrax we essentially have the intelligent rail bypass system and it would be nice to be able to automatically feed in the train status.

Tucker Brown: Okay, that is the same type of integration that Jeremy is talking about so that would work well. Good idea.

Use the link for enhancement 4 and it will be the combination of both items.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 6: SG-5065 Add Support for Authentication via Active Directory (AD)**

Tucker Brown: All authentication is done within the SunGuide application via username and password. North Texas Tollway Authority is running a version of Lonestar (TxDOT) and have already integrated standard AD integration so integration efforts would be minimal. We are adding support for active directory logins as well as standalone logins. It is an easier way to track users. You can also disable the AD if you want to still use the standalone logins.

Cost: $13k

Schedule: Future Release

Mark Nallick: Are we leaning towards single sign ins for the Operator workstations? Is that what we are trying to do?

Tucker Brown: Not exactly for this, it will still require you to use your username and password. Instead of having it stored locally in the SunGuide database it would go through password management in Active Directory instead.

Chrissie Collins: With activating active directory with this in a future release would it be possible to consider for controlling the permission would it work with RCA that you spoke about earlier?

Tucker Brown: Are you implying the active directory group gets permissions?

Chrissie Collins: Yes.

Tucker Brown: I don’t know if we considered tying the permissions to the group specifically. Permissions would still be tied to some user. The concept is still for a single user going into the other installation to make a request. I am not positive how that would work with groups, I would have to look into that specifically. If we could make that work, it would be nice.

Mark Laird: You mentioned the extension to single sign on, is that a big deal?

Tucker Brown: I don’t think it would be huge. I would have to check on that.

Mark Laird: It would be nice to be an option.

Tucker Brown: Is anyone against single sign on? It is probably something we could support both ways.

Mark Nallick: We are in favor of single sign on.

Chrissie Collins: It is more complicated so we would probably have to have a smaller group figure it out.

Jay Williams: What if you have people who need access outside of the DOT network?

Tucker Brown: we would still support the single user login like we do now, and it wouldn’t get tracked to active directory. You can also use a combination of these, you don’t have to use one or the other.

Jay Williams: If there are no other questions, lets vote. This is the first link for number 5 the one that says new driver was for enhancement 4. This is just the first link for enhancement 5.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 7: SG – 4985 Ability to Configure Response Plan Search Radius by Event Type**

Tucker Brown: There is a single set of search distance values for an event to search for response plan items. The proposed enhancement is to allow for administrators to configure a set of value per event type. If no event specific values are set, go back to the original default values. It would give you more configuration options and if you configure nothing on these event types, it will default back to the values you have now.

Cost: $11k

Schedule: Future Release

Jay Williams: Please use link for enhancement 6.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes**.

1. **Enhancement 8: SG-4760 Not Auto-Merging Scheduled Messages**

Tucker Brown: When a message is top priority on the queue and the sign is set to auto-merge, it will only attempt to merge the next message on the queue. It will not continue down the queue looking for additional messages that could potentially be merged.

The proposed enhancement here is if auto-merge is set, allow the sign to look at the full message queue for messages that can be merged and attempt to merge the one with the next highest priority.

It won’t reorder any messages on the queue, it just looks down the queue for merging options.

Cost: $2k

Schedule: Future release

Jay Williams: Vote will be using link for enhancement 7 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 9: SG-4781 Request Update of Integrated VLC Libraries**

Tucker Brown: SunGuide currently targets an older version of VLC. The enhancement is to update to use the newest version of VLC. Some potential benefits are some newer devices are having issues with older versions of VLC. Lower frame rate videos have less issues with newer versions and it is stable. It also allows for a user to specify that they want to use the version of VLC that comes with the package as opposed to the with the installer. This can be by user preference.

Cost: $3k

Schedule: Future Release

Vote: Use the enhancement 8 link in the meeting invite.

Mark Nallick: I do have one question. Do you maintain a license agreement for the third-party applications you are embedding in SunGuide?

Tucker Brown: There are only a few applications that require licenses and we do maintain those. Per the use code with no license to it. Most of it is open source. The version description library contains all documentation of what is included in it.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 10: SG-4680 Ability to Save Filters for the Dialog in the User Settings.**

Tucker Brown: Currently, column positions and width as well as dialog position are stored as user preferences. These are stored automatically without user action. Filters to the dialog are not stored.

The proposed enhancement is to create the ability for a user to manually select to save a filter to the dialog that would be reloaded when the dialog is loaded. You would need the ability to clear the setting as well. The idea here is to allow the users to save it how they want and then be able to load it again.

Cost: $8k

Schedule: Future Release

Jay Williams: We will move onto the vote. It is listed as Enhancement 9 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. All districts voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 11: SG-5086 TPS Facilities Start “Out of Service”**

Tucker Brown: The current issue is on a restart or creation, TPS facilities are always set to Out of Service. This was put in as a feature in the 1st implementation of TPS so users would be required to verify the number of spaces before putting the facility into an Active state. This was most likely meant for passage detection (as opposed to presence detection).

The proposed enhancement is for presence detection only, allow the facilities to behave as other devices and persist their state through a restart. We are basically updating how a status for the facility works.

Cost: $2k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 10 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 12: SG-3769 Allow sharing of created Video on Desktop (VOD) tours and layouts**

Tucker Brown: Right now, if you create layouts and tours, they are user specific and can’t be shared among other users in the system (not global). We want to allow users to save global layouts and tours so they could be sharable. The other is to allow users to export and import layouts and tours.

Cost: $6k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 11 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 13: SG-3745 Allow the Organization to be Selected within the “Add New Event” Dialog**

Tucker Brown: Some Districts have multiple organizations managing events. When creating an event, the managing organization is automatically selected by EM and may have to be manually corrected by an operator. The proposed enhancement here is in the event box you have the event type, status, agency, contacts and location. This proposal is to add new event to that dialog. It would default to what it would normally default to. The new option would default to selecting an organization in the same way EM does now.

Cost: $1k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Mark Laird: You mentioned the ability to associate the management organization with a user, is that correct?

Tucker Brown: Yes, that would require adding something to the user itself to associate the information. I was thinking that would be separate from this particular item. This is just a quick way to get organization tied to it. It is not a huge change from this one and it wouldn’t impact the cost much, so it is possible, and I split them.

Mark Laird: Okay, I just wanted to make sure it was mentioned. I did see that as a separate item.

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 12 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 14: SG-2493 Icon Enhancement for Arterial DMS**

Tucker Brown: DMS currently has a number of DMS categories (toll rate, toll status, truck parking, etc.) and icons for the map that you can turn on and off in the map. This enhancement has evolved into custom display filters. That allow users to create and save filters for specific sets of icons. We would need to define interaction between the icon configuration and the display filters. This would let you see a specific set of icons on the map and remove everything else.

Cost: $24k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Eric Gordin: Would this apply to each SunGuide instance where it applies to all of your operators? Or is it configurable per operator.

Tucker Brown: It is at a system level so it would apply to all operators. I don’t think we are set on either one, just depends on what people need.

Eric Gordin: So, each TMC can configure it how they want?

Tucker Brown: Correct. So, it would be per installation per District. The way it is described here is at the District level not the operator level.

John Hope: District Five would not want this at a user level.

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote for this enhancement to be at the global level not at the user level and it is listed as enhancement 13 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 15: SG-3962 Add Open CCTV from Event List and Event Details Feature**

Tucker Brown: Nearest camera and preset can be set in an event but there isn’t a way to jump to the camera. This would add a button to the event details dialog. And if you clicked on the event list it would have the nearest camera streaming.

Cost: $2k

Schedule: Future Release

Bryan Homayouni: This is a low cost and low effort enhancement. It looks like all of the low effort and low costs enhancements have been moved to the future release. Can we see if we can fit any of them into 8.0?

Tucker Brown: The schedule we put together has about 35 enhancements – they all vary. The schedule puts the release in November. It depends on how quickly people complete tasks that there might be potential to add some smaller enhancements, but my major concern is to hit the schedule we have so far. We do not want to be delayed with the release.

Bryan Homayouni: If we able to add a few more, please let districts chime in to prioritize. If it can’t happen no big deal.

Jay Williams: We will have Christine poll the Districts to see what enhancements could be pushed to 8.0 if any and let them decide based on the schedule impacts.

Christine Shafik: Yes, that would work. As Tucker mentioned it is a large release and we do not want to be delayed. By next CMB we will have a better understanding of where we are at. I will send out a spreadsheet and the districts can prioritize accordingly.

Any additional questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 14 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 16: SG-1533 Allow Audit of Road Ranger Procedural Errors**

Tucker Brown: Procedural errors for Road Rangers are not currently auditable. The enhancement would change that to make these auditable for both closed and open events. You would also be able to change the vehicle as well as the error.

Cost: $ 15

Schedule: Future Release

Hossam Abdelall: Can you walk through an operational scenario of how this would work?

Tucker Brown: There were multiple vehicles that were dispatched to an event and someone put in the error and tag a particular vehicle and say they didn’t do some procedural thing they were supposed to do. The event then closes, and an hour passes, and it leaves the map. There is a report run and it shows the vehicle that did something wrong associated with the event number. Then if you go back and someone talks to them and the Road Ranger states it wasn’t them but someone else. There is no way to go back in and reset the event to include the correct vehicle. This enhancement would give the opportunity to do that.

Any additional questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 15 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 17: SG-4965 Add support for mileage tracking in SPARR interface**

Tucker Brown: Miles travelled is tracked by the road ranger AVL driver but not by the SPARR driver. It was requested that we should be able to send that to the SPARR driver and log it in the database. The option here is when you log in, you would have the option to send the mileage in along with it at the start or the end of the shift. Because these would be optional if you have an existing SPARR interface it wouldn’t require anything. There used to be reports based on mileage, but they aren’t useful since no one is logging that data anymore, but they would work once you started logging that data.

Cost: $3k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 16 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Eight districts voted yes, one voted no, and 2 selected no preference.**

1. **Enhancement 18: SG-3688 Suppress multiple visibility alerts based on configuration**

Tucker Brown: When a visibility alert is triggered all other detectors in the same area could potentially produce alerts, most likely for the same visibility event.

The proposed enhancement here allows for administrators to configure a radius for how far an alert should apply. When an alert trigger for a single station, the type of alert would not trigger for any stations in the configured radius until the original condition has returned to a normal condition. In order to get back on that the original detector would need to get back into its normal state, recover completely then the new alert would go through. If you are using RWIS and you get multiple alerts, it should help you not receive so many.

Cost: $6k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 17 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 19: SG-4891 Unable to PTZ Cameras after CCTV subsystem restart**

Tucker Brown: Restarting the NTCIP CCTV driver with too many in service cameras will cause the driver to stop working. This can also be randomly triggered by reaching a threshold of too many in service cameras while the driver is already running. The problem appears to be Java requesting threads on a Windows platform.

The proposed enhancement is to migrate the driver from using Java to C#. The number of hours to rewrite is about the same as it would be to investigate a solution. Any solution would be temporary and could resurface if enough cameras are added. Also, Java is becoming a paid/licensed platform and we are looking to migrate to C#. The two problems (threading issue and Java dependency) would be handled through this issue.

Cost: $10k

Schedule: Future Release

Any questions?

Chrissie Collins: Would there be issues using the two different platforms? I am assuming there are other items written in Java as well.

Tucker Brown: This would be one of a couple steps that need to be taken. There is some ramp metering stuff in Java and DMS is in Java. Essentially trying to get everything off of Java would be helpful since it is a paid platform. The biggest challenge getting off of Java is DMS. TxDOT is currently underway rewriting their entire C#, that was one thing that was recognized that they didn’t want to be dependent on Java especially for the paid platform. When Florida does that, there are some fonts from 7.2 that would need to be included. But Texas will do a significant portion of the rewrite before FDOT even has to touch it.

John Hope: Would it be better for FDOT to wait until TxDOT completes their version?

Tucker Brown: Yes.

John Hope: On that note is there a potential problem with DMS like we face with CCTV?

Tucker Brown: Potentially yes. CCTV has issues because of the number of shared devices. The way it is threaded is an issue, there are three threads and that is what the problem is. I don’t anticipate it to be problem in DMS as soon as it is in CCTV.

Any additional questions?

Jay Williams: Hearing none, proceed with the vote and it is listed as enhancement 18 in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Every district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 20: SG-4936 Add roadway filter to monthly performance measures report**

Tucker Brown: This is fairly simple, just adding a filter to the performance measures report. The current issue is when running the monthly performance measures report, the only parameters are date and county. The proposed enhancement is to add a roadway filter to the weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual reports as an optional parameter to the existing reports. The default would be to include all roadways and run as it does now.

Cost: $4k

Schedule: Future Release

Pete Vega: When you say roadway, could we parse that roadway? Like in Jacksonville there is river that splits I-95. Could we pick certain limits of the roadway and do north of the river or south of the river?

Tucker Brown: Yes, you can but it would require additional filtering to tell us where to stop. Part of the enhancement we are doing for 8.0 is across county lines which could be a problem depending on how the sort order is set up. Is that something we would like to get into this as well?

Pete Vega: I think it would be useful in the future and different districts have cross corridors. It would be helpful in the future.

Tucker Brown: Being able to set specific points on the roadway being able to run from this point to this point?

Pete Vega: Correct.

Tucker Brown: That could work. Crossing county boundaries acts a little funny but we are fixing that in 8.0.

John Hope: Not to make things more complicated but D5 would like to be able to select multiple roadways.

Tucker Brown: We would have to find a way to multi select and send that. It gets more complicated to get the report to interpret multiple roadways. It is possible and we can add that.

Jay Williams: Christine, procedurally how can we move forward with this item? Can we incorporate some of the discussion for the additional built in filtering characteristics?

Christine Shafik: I would like to ask the rest of the Districts if we should go this route or not.

Jay Williams: Do any other districts see benefit in this?

Mark Mathes: Yes, I support parsing of a roadway.

Mark Laird: It would be helpful in District Six as well.

Dan Buidens: I agree with this in District Seven also.

Hossam Abdelall: I agree as well that parsing the roadway would be helpful.

Mark Nallick: We could use it for 231 and I-10.

Jay Williams: Christine, are you okay with us voting on the item to parse a roadway?

Christine Shafik: I am okay with that, but the cost might be slightly different.

Mark Laird: Is that for multiple roadways also?

Tucker Brown: Yes, we can do that, but I would need to go back and re-work the cost.

Jay Williams: Can we still move forward with the vote without having the cost change? Or should we table it?

Christine Shafik: Would it be a slight difference or a large jump?

Tucker Brown: The bigger one is the multiple roadways because I am not sure that reporting handles that right now. But with that being said, it will probably be less than $10k total.

Christine Shafik: I think we can go with the vote on this basis of not exceeding $10k and see if the team is okay with that.

Jay Williams: Lets move forward with the vote that this enhancement that is listed as 19 with the caveats that we discussed.

**Vote: This item passes. Each district voted yes.**

1. **Enhancement 21: SG-3214 Inactive EM Location Not Available in Report Filters**

Tucker Brown: This actually goes back to the original design of EM. Most devices do not have the ability to “cease use” the device (delete the device without deleting the reference in the system). Some of that is handled in data archive and are stored but not all. As far as EM it does cease use for some of them but not all. Once you actually delete a location it is cease use but no longer is running against reports because it is not in the active system. We are taking this in phases in how to get all of the devices and locations.

* Phase 1: AVL and the rest of EM – voting on today
  + Modify reporting to allow reporting on cease use EM objects
* Phase 2: Core Devices (CCTV, DMS, TSS) – **not a voting item today**
  + Modify reporting to allow reporting on cease use devices
* Phase 3: All other device types – **not a voting item today**

Phase one is what the voting item is for.

Cost: $83k

Schedule: Future Release

Jay Williams: Will we have to come back and vote on the other phases?

Christine Shafik: Since we only have the cost estimate for phase one let’s vote on phase 1.

Tucker Brown: I would say no because the phases are decoupled, and you would have the changes available to you. So, they are three separate items.

Jay Williams: So, we will table phases 2 and 3 for future meetings. Any additional questions? Hearing none, we will proceed with the vote, use the enhancement 20 link in the meeting invite.

**Vote: This item passes. Nine districts voted yes, 1 no, and 1 no preference.**

**Open Discussion:**

Bryan Homayouni: There is one question I wanted to ask; we had a SPARR enhancement earlier. At CFX we are having challenges with the Road Rangers using the SPARR app. We are having issues in the region of the accuracy of the location being reported. Which is being seen as unreliable. Are other Districts having that same challenge with location accuracy through the SPARR app?

Kelly Kinney: I can get you in touch with some of our trouble shooting helpdesk guys because one of the major issues we found was that the phone was put in some sort of power saving mode which was not storing the location properly. We resolved that and now we have a pretty fair degree of accuracy with it.

Bryan Homayouni: That would be great.

Hossam Abdelall: I have a question on the RISC enhancement. Is there an ability today to clearly attribute the event to where a responder would go? Can there be a specific field that denotes a RISC event?

Tucker Brown: There is not a specific field as of today but that is part of the enhancement. I think Districts have done comments to denote that information.

Dee McTague: In District Four we do use the comment to denote RISC events. We have a comment type RISC so there is no looking for specific words in the field.

Hossam Abdelall: Okay, I will get with you to discuss.

Bryan Homayouni: Is it possible to get the latest RISC and RCA ConOps sent out again to make sure we are aware of the latest version?

Christine Shafik: We sure can. I will ask Mark Dunthorn to do this after the meeting.

**Review Action Items:**

* Central Office to resend out the RISC and RCA ConOps
* Central Office is going to coordinate a survey to the Districts in terms of priorities from the voting items from this meeting to include in future releases or possibly 8.0
* Central Office to discuss the RCA enhancement at the next ITS Working Group which would be coordination in advance of hurricane season and giving Districts access to each other’s systems.

Jay Williams: Thank you for joining and being patient and working with us on the voting items. We will schedule the August meeting soon.