Meeting Notes

Change Management Board

January 27, 2015 – 1:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Version 1.0 - FINAL

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

CCTV .... Closed-Circuit Television

CFX .... Central Florida Expressway Authority

CMB .... Change Management Board

CO .... Central Office

ConOps .... Concept of Operations

CoT .... City of Tallahassee

DMS .... Dynamic Message Sign

EMS .... Event Management Subsystem

FAT .... Factory Acceptance Test

FDOT .... Florida Department of Transportation

FHP .... Florida Highway Patrol

FL-ATIS or 511 .... Florida's Advanced Traveler Information System

FP .... Footprint

FTE .... Florida's Turnpike Enterprise

GUI .... Graphical User Interface

ID .... Identification

IDS .... Incident Detection Subsystem

IE .... Internet Explorer

IP .... Internet Protocol

IPv6 .... Internet Protocol version 6

ITS .... Intelligent Transportation Systems

IV&V .... Independent Verification and Validation

MDX .... Miami-Dade Expressway Authority

NTCIP .... National Transportation Communications for ITS Protocol

PTZ .... Pan-Tilt-Zoom

RITIS .... Regional Integrated Transportation Information System

RFP .... Request for Proposal

RR .... Road Ranger

RTMC...Regional Transportation Management Center

RWIS... Road Weather Information Subsystem

SAA... Software Administration Application

SAS.. Scheduled Actions Subsystem

SOG ....Standard Operating Guidelines

SSUG...SunGuide® Software Users Group

SwRI ....Southwest Research Institute®

SR ....State Road

TAPCO...Traffic & Parking Control Co., Inc.®

TERL.. Traffic Engineering Research Laboratory

TMC .... Transportation Management Center

TSS..Transportation Sensor Subsystem

UMD... University of Maryland

VAS.. Video Aggregation System

VPP... Vehicle Probe Project

WAN.. Wide Area Network

WPF .... Windows Presentation Foundation

WWD..Wrong-Way Driving

<div align="center">

Florida Department of Transportation
CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES
Tuesday, January 27, 2015
1:30 to 4:30 P.M
Springhill Building, TERL Conference Room, Tallahassee, Florida

</div>

Attendees:

Russell Allen, CO	Sandra Lenis, D2	Joe Snyder, D6/AECOM
Clay Packard, CO/Atkins	Ryan Crist, D2/Metric	Rodney Carrero-Vila, D6
Derek Vollmer, CO	Craig Carnes, D2/Metric	Terry Hensley, D7
Kelli Moser, CO/Atkins	Pete Vega, D2	Dave Howell, D7/HNTB
Brian Ritchson, CO/Atkins	Jason Summerfield, D2/Metric	Matthew Mileto, D7/Lucent
Randy Pierce, CO	Lee Smith, D3	Cathie McKenzie, D7
Frank Deasy, CO/Schneider	Kenny Shiver, D3	Charles Keasler, D7/HNTB
Jo Ann Oerter, CO/Atkins	Stephen Corbin, D3	Greg Reynolds, D7
John Glowczewski, CO/Schneider	Dong Chen, D4	Eric Gordin, FTE
David Heupel, CO/Schneider	Dee McTague, D4/AECOM	John Easterling, FTE
Chris Birosak, D1	Dan Smith, D4	Wayne Bryan, D3/CoT
Scott Robbins, D1/HNTB	Jim Stroz, D5	Wang Lee, MDX
Robbie Brown, D1	Shannon Watterson, D5	John Hope, CFX/Atkins
Vincent Lee, D1/Lucent	Javier Rodriguez, D6	Tucker Brown, CO/SwRI
Josh Reichert, D2	Mark Laird, D6/AECOM	Joe Cooper, CO/OIS

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

Welcome and Charter Review: CMB Chairman D. Vollmer opened the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

Call for Quorum and Review of Agenda: A quorum was established. D. Vollmer briefly reviewed the meeting agenda.

Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review

1. **FTE to prepare white paper to document their efforts and findings on WWD and send out draft by next CMB. (Open Action Item / Modified)**
2. **CO to create a scope and cost estimate for discontinuous lane blockage item and provide more information. (Closed Action Item)**
3. **CO to look into getting C2C connection data into RITIS. (Open Action Item / Modified)**
4. **CO to reach out to Districts for appointments to the Technical Review Committee to review DMS displays and SunGuide software capabilities. (Closed Action Item)**
5. **CO to follow-up on Google Traffic data possibilities. (Open Action Item)**
6. **CO to send updated RITIS enhancement schedule to everyone when received from UMD. (Closed Action Item)**
7. **CO to investigate D2 proposal regarding Alert Auto-Dismiss only dismissing upstream events. (Closed Action Item)**

AGENDA ITEMS

ITS Telecommunications Update
J. Glowczewski and D. Heupel presented slides on the ITS WAN update. The FTE Tolls Middleware Application status has not changed. We are looking to migrate District 4 in the near future. We are working on a fiber re-route project in southeast Florida that would accommodate that. We are waiting on that to be accomplished prior to moving on. The FTE Tolls connection being upgraded to a Layer 3 connection is all part of that same project. The D5 to Turkey Lake redundancy project has had progress on the design work, fiber allocations as well as the sites affected by that. We are looking at the microwave network as well as the fiber backbone as affected sites. We are looking to upgrade those pieces of equipment as soon as we can get the design finalized and put it out for bid. Phase I of the FL-ATIS & VAS migration project has been completed. Phase II is in motion. The delay in Phase II was bandwidth access into the cyber center located in Tampa which has been resolved by the service provider. The circuit from the cyber center to the District 5 TMC will be upgraded fairly soon. Once that is completed, we will be rescheduling Phase II of the VAS & FL-ATIS upgrade project. The CoT Fiber Ring RFP will be closed next week. The contract will be executed shortly thereafter. The RTMC Pompano location was migrated for the FL-ATIS and are still waiting on access from FTE and testing beyond their router interface. Once we finalize these other projects, we will start looking at the multicast for each of the Districts. CO ITS has developed a new IP addressing schema to reallocate the IP address assignments for all the Districts. The plan reclaims over 9 million unusable addresses because IP address space could not be logically subnetted due to the way the prior assignments were made. Most of the Districts will see no real change to their allocation other than the fact they will gain additional address space. The largest impacts are going to affect District 5, District 6 and FTE. We are in the process of re-doing the static route plan to facilitate this. Once we have that completed, information will come out by Randy Pierce to submit this new IP addressing scheme for FDOT. The main driver of this is the next generation ITS network that is going out statewide that we are working on. Fiber in the north part of the state is going to be connected to the fiber in south Florida. There will be a multi-year project where FDOT's microwave system undergoes an upgrade to support Ethernet and IP traffic. The main reason for re-allocating the IP addresses so we can engineer the new network around what is existing today without causing issues. The multicast IP allocations will be augmented for every District. You are going to get double the number of multicast IP address space that you have today. D. Heupel asked if there were any questions. T. Hensley in D7 asked if it required any changes in those IPs that have already been assigned and are in use. D. Heupel responded that the allocation for District 7 would be unaffected. C. Birosak in D1 asked if their allocation unaffected as well. D. Heupel responded that there was equipment in 192.168 class C subnets will need to be migrated to D1's 10 class A network allocation. J. Glowczewski noted that when the document was ready to be distributed, an outline of the affected networks subnets will be attached. J. Summerfield in D2 asked if there was any investigation or potential allocation plans for an IPv6 address space as well. D. Heupel responded it was in the planning stages but we are nowhere near an implementation plan. J. Glowczewski noted that backbone we are putting in as well as the existing backbone is IPv6 capable. M. Laird from D6 asked about the migration of their system.   D. Heupel responded District 6 is contingent on District 5 completing their allocation because currently District 6 allocations are logically dividable IP subnets that are interwoven with each other. District 5 is

currently working on re-addressing their ITS infrastructure according to the new plan and once that is in place, D6 can begin with their migration. It is critical for D6 to migrate their IP allocations from 172.16 network space into 10 class A network address space for CO as we deploy the next generation networks statewide. We would use the 172.16 class B network space solely for management of the new network. We will be working closely with personnel in D6 to facilitate the migrations. We understand this will take time but we need to set feasible deadlines. M. Laird from D6 asked when the plan was expected to be in place. D. Heupel responded the plan was in place now but the goal is to get it distributed to all the Districts by the next CMB. D5 is already working on migrating their network into their IP allocation. J. Glowczewski noted that the timeframe seems to be the concern. When the information is being distributed, we will meet with D6 to review what needs to be done and have them assess the time they will need. As you move out of the 172 network range, we will be able to review what network ranges we can move into. M. Laird from D6 asked to know as soon as possible since there are many things that are changing right now and it would help to plan the other things D6 is doing. J. Glowczewski responded they have already spoken with Juan Lopez and given him a series of his potential 10 ranges and he is currently working within those ranges right now. L. Smith in District 3 asked about the Tallahassee Fiber Ring and wanted to know when the connection to CoT would be ready. R. Pierce responded the contract will be put in play by the end of February.

SunGuide® Software Update
D. Vollmer presented slides on the status of SunGuide software release 6.0 upgrades. Most Districts have upgraded to 6.0. District 6 and MDX are still on SunGuide software release 5.1.1. District 6 is preparing to transition to SunGuide software release 6.0. D. Vollmer asked M. Laird in D6 when they were expected to transition. M. Laird in D6 responded April was the expected transition date. D. Vollmer continued presenting the slides. In the previous CMB meeting we mentioned we were hoping to release 6.1 by the end of 2014. After completing the FAT and the IV&V, we found bugs that we want resolved before we release 6.1. We are working with SwRI® to discuss the bugs we found and update the software to get another version to test. We do expect to release 6.1 in the first quarter of 2015. We don't want a repeat of the last release so we were very thorough with our testing resulting in finding a lot more bugs that we want to get resolved. We sent out an email to all of the ITS engineers on documentation of the changes impacting other systems. Some of them are additional tags in the C2C feed and how permissions are going to work now in 6.1 via the SAA. Please share that document with anyone who might be connected to the SunGuide software system in your Districts so they can verify if it will impact them or not. We have most of the representatives for the technical committee. We will send out a meeting invite by the end of this week. The first kickoff meeting for the technical committee will cover the current ConOps we have for color DMS and the capabilities that SunGuide software has. It will also cover future needs we are anticipating for color DMS on expressways, capabilities that are possible within the NTCIP standards and font support and what level of font support we may want. Sometimes the sign's default font may be set to something that is not anticipated when you put a message on the sign. Possibly having the ability of reading that and change it, if need be, from SunGuide software would be nice rather than having to go through a proprietary software from the manufacturer (some won't allow changes without certain level of permissions.) We would welcome any other items that people might want to discuss related to DMS messaging. The TERL contacted us a few weeks ago

regarding an issue with the auto focus button currently in the Video on Desktop within SunGuide software. We have an old version of NTCIP 1205 that had a definition for auto focus and then an amended version of NTCIP 1205 that clarified the definition for auto focus. It appears that there is an inconstancy in how manufacturers are implementing that object for turning the auto focus on and off. There are two bytes in this object and some manufacturers don't use the second byte and some do use the second byte to turn the auto focus on and off. SunGuide software doesn't use the second byte currently so we wanted to pose this question "Does anyone use the auto focus button in Video on Desktop to turn the auto focus on?" This feature wasn't available in the previous camera dialog; it was added to address an issue with one of the camera manufacturers when you tried to manually focus it didn't necessarily revert back to auto focus so this allowed you to manually set the auto focus for that camera. A lot of the other manufacturers have a mechanism to PTZ and it will go back to auto focus. We will send out an email to follow up on this so you can talk with your technical staff. D. Vollmer asked if there were any questions. We have Pete's Signals in SunGuide software ConOps coming up. We have a meeting with District 2 to go over comments that came up in the ConOps. Shortly after that meeting, we will circulate the ConOps for all the Districts to review and provide comments. Some of the previous enhancement priorities that we received we are looking into further. We will have more detailed discussions at the SSUG and are hoping to have voting items for the next CMB. Previously at a CMB meeting, we discussed moving the map out of IE. We were going to review some items and come back to the CMB. Since then, we realized migrating the map and all GUIs out of IE and into the WPF had been approved at a previous CMB meeting. We are going to work on getting a master schedule together with SwRI on how we plan on migrating all of these GUIs out of IE into WPF. We have had a few Districts contact us about IE updates somewhat breaking their SunGuide software systems. A lot of this is associated with the map so we would like to move the map out of IE first. As soon as we get more information on the schedule and the cost I will send that out to everyone but we plan to move forward with this in the next release. D. Vollmer asked if there were any questions. E. Gordin in FTE asked if there was a release and timeframe for the RWIS upgrade. D. Vollmer responded it would be in release 6.1 so it will come out this quarter. We are testing that at the TERL right now.

RITIS Update
D. Vollmer presented slides on the RITIS update. We sent out the RITIS enhancement schedule. The HERE data is now available in RITIS on the real-time map and the tools in the VPP suite now called Florida Analytics where you can analyze the HERE data. The HERE data is not yet incorporated into the archive. We need to get with HERE for them to provide UMD the data to incorporate into the system. You can tell if you have access to the HERE data by going to the map and looking under the Probe Speed Data layer and check the HERE Speed Data box. We don't currently receive INRIX Speed Data so you don't need to check that box. From the Data Archive tab you can access Florida Analytics and the various tools available. D. Vollmer reviewed the slides for the Florida Analytics in RITIS. The following issues in RITIS have been resolved:
- Event Query Tool Missing Roadways – Resolved
  - Additional Roadways were added to the Event Query Tool Drop Down
- Inactive Detectors on Traffic Map – Resolved
  - Detectors on Traffic Map are now showing as active.
- Road Gaps in Vehicle Probe Project Suite – Resolved

- o Multiple selected roadways no longer have gaps.
- Incorrect Road Prefix in Data Archive – Resolved
  - o Road prefix FL-XXX was being used but has been changed to SR-XXX.

UMD is still working on the ID fix. UMD was supposed to roll something out last Friday but encountered some issues but they sent CO a link to see the progress they made combining the detector IDs from SunGuide software release 5.1.1 and 6.0 into one detector. We have seen significant decrease in the number of detectors on the map but they still have problems and we are working with them on that to get it resolved. It will probably be another three weeks before anything would go live on their production system. It is constantly changing on the link they sent us so if it gets to a good enough state, we will send that link out to some of the Districts who were having major problems with the IDs (District 7.) If you have issues with the RITIS system, send the issues with detailed information to: Derek.Vollmer@dot.state.fl.us, Clay.Packard@dot.state.fl.us, and Kelli.Moser@dot.state.fl.us. D. Vollmer asked if there were any questions on the update. T. Hensley in D7 asked about the relationship with RITIS and if the turnover issue had been resolved since they were using students causing us to have to start over with getting our issues resolved. D. Vollmer responded that the people currently working on our issues aren't students but are permanent staff so that isn't the problem. However, there seems to be only one person working on our issues which is likely the real problem. P. Vega in D2 asked if Cambridge was going to contact the Districts for the data or use RITIS for the annual report. D. Vollmer responded they are looking into using RITIS. P. Vega voiced his concern over the inaccuracy of HERE data and wants to make sure it wasn't being used. D. Vollmer responded that they were using the detector data but were looking into analyzing the HERE data as well. P. Vega wants to ensure they aren't being just annually on data that isn't accurate. D. Vollmer responded that he will relay that information on to Cambridge.

Detector Naming Convention
C. Packard presented slides on the Detector Naming Convention. We are all familiar with the FL-ATIS style guide and that has served our motorist well since we have standardized naming convention. As we have had users come to the RITIS website and look for detectors, we have noticed by not having a style guide in place detector names and link names, it has been difficult for people to find detectors and reference detectors that they need. We would like to standardize the detector and detection zone names to help users find detectors and zones on SunGuide software and RITIS map. This will benefit the following: operations, researchers and performance measures analysts. This would also allow us to use the name efficiently by indicating technology type and location. The proposed approach for this was developed by John Hope who was instrumental in creating the FL-ATIS naming convention. The details of the naming approach, rules and examples are all included in the slides. All of this will be documented and reviewed before implementing. D. Smith in D4 interjected they had looked into this over the past several months due to the additional detectors being added to the express lanes. It is considerably more complicated than it initially seems for detector names not lane names. It is valuable to have a compass direction in the name. The reason for that is we use the direction the detector is facing not the direction of traffic. For instance, on I-95 with detectors on both sides of the road, if we name the detectors from the inside out that can change by 180 degrees if you don't have the side of the road the detector is on properly placed. The detector by default is going to name the closest lane to the detector lane one and go outwards from there. The lane name is also more complicated than we thought. We are

looking at the concept of an index lane. Lane 3 may be a completely different lane name in another area. We are looking at two are three different approaches since it is so complicated. C. Packard thanked him for his input and suggested Dan meet with him, John Hope and anyone else who is interested to talk through all of the possibilities. C. Packard suggested we get feedback from everyone before they meet. C. Packard finished presenting slides and asked if there were any other questions.

Waze Phase 2

D. Vollmer mentioned there is a draft Waze Phase 2 ConOps that will be sent out by the end of the week. C. Packard presented slides on the Waze Phase 2. We are hoping to automate as much as possible in Phase 2 to reduce the operator actions. Reporting has been added to include Waze alerts in IDS Alert reports. Waze is considered a secondary source since it may not be as reliable as a primary notification source. Waze data will be downloaded by a centralized Waze interface server that will look similar to FHP CAD interface server. Data will be distributed to each TMC via ITS WAN. Any change to the Waze data feed can be handled by a modification to the interface server and the updated software only needs to be deployed in one location. Filtering can be handled from a central location. This will reduce the complexity of installing and configuring the software at each TMC. The Waze Phase 2 IDS automates Waze incident processing including generating Waze alerts and facilitates the creation and management of SunGuide software events. Operators will handle new Waze alert just like an FHP CAD alert. The Waze Phase 2 SOG and quick reference guide for managing Waze events will be drafted soon. T. Hensley in D7 asked if they needed to do something to enable District 7 access to Polk County Waze events since they aren't currently receiving them. D. Vollmer responded they will look into it and asked for contacts in D7. T. Hensley in D7 responded they could contact Dave Howell or Charles Keasler. D. Vollmer asked if there were any other questions.

Wrong Way Driving

C. Packard presented slides on Wrong Way Driving. WWD objectives are to expediently alert motorists and responders of WWD detection, facilitate TMC WWD incident management operations and enable WWD detection and incident management analysis. Wavetronix Click!512 will be the first supported device but from a ConOps standpoint we are not limited to any particular device. The Wavetronix Click!512 is currently supported through a SunGuide software hotfix that was previously released. The device listens to the radar and forwards only WWD vehicle detections from SmartSensor to SunGuide software. Click!512 is configured as a separate device in IDS with its own IDS driver. This does not interfere with TSS operations of the SmartSensorHD it is just another output we can tap into. D. Vollmer interjected that everything mentioned was included in the hotfix and the rest of the items have not been released yet and is included in the Phase 2 ConOps. C. Packard continued presenting the slides. You will be able to configure the WWD device to an associate set of cameras and a preset on those cameras to PTZ and find the wrong way driver. WWD will have a new event type in the EMS. Operators will interact with the system after WWD detection with the following:

- Notify law enforcement of the potential incident.
- Verify the WWD incident with CCTV cameras if possible.
- Take ownership of the event and continue to look and listen for information.
- If the system is configured not to automatically post a response plan, post a response plan to warn upstream motorists of the potential WWD incident ahead.
- Coordinate with response agencies.
- Open the response plan and make adjustments if necessary.
- Terminate the response plan and close the WWD event when WWD incident is over or cannot be verified after some time.
- If a crash ensues, the operator will create a new, secondary event at the new location. The secondary relationship will help identify the crash event as a result of WWD detection event.

SunGuide will automatically do the following when WWD is detected:

- Generate an alert using the existing IDS
- Create an event using the WWD event type indicating the location at which the WWD detection device is located
- Generate a response plan for the event (each device will be configurable as to which response plan items are generated for the event)
- Provide immediate alert to operators
- Log the WWD information in the database and produce a SunGuide report of WWD detections and WWD events for future analysis

D. Vollmer noted that he has some things to add before going into any questions and thanked everyone who provided comments to the ConOps. We made revisions based on some of the comments that were received. We will finalize our changes after we get with those who made comments. We will send out the revised ConOps for review. We added a future section to the document which included ramp metering as a future possibility. There were multiple comments on the camera lock item so we added some language that an operator with permissions can override that lock that is made by the subsystem. The lock prevents SAS from moving the camera off to some other area but instead focus on detecting the wrong way driver. District 5 had a good comment about looking into standardizing a communication protocol for these new devices. As more new devices are added, we will look into a standardized communication protocol when incorporating them into SunGuide software. It doesn't look like there is anything in the NTCIP spec we could piggy back on so we will have to develop something ourselves. There was a comment about using a secondary source before automating a response but due to the timeliness and sensitivity of these detections and the incidents themselves we will not wait for a secondary source to send out the notifications. In yesterday's DTOE meeting, Mark Wilson made a comment about this but I will follow up with him on that. It seems that the decision was made at a higher level but I wanted to verify. T. Hensley from D7 confirmed that Brian Blanchard had already made that statement. D. Vollmer appreciated the confirmation and continued addressing the comments on the ConOps. Clay mentioned earlier about the Click!512 but instead of specifying the technology in the ConOps District 7 suggested we make it more generic so we made that change to the document. This will allow us to include other devices in the SunGuide software without having to change the ConOps. We will keep a secondary list of devices. District 7 also commented on external calls coming in (from FHP or a motorist) and the motorist isn't sure of their location or which direction they are really traveling in that you would want to post notifications in both directions of travel on a roadway. We modified

the ConOps to allow for clicking on the map and generate a WWD event that would notify both directions of travel on the roadway with a configurable DMS radius (for example 10 miles.) District 7 is using the TAPCO® device which has three contact closures and when all three go off, that signals there is a WWD detection. They are using that contact closure to communicate with the safety barrier subsystem to generate alerts in their SunGuide software. The TAPCO devices with their camera can capture images and send those back to the TMC as well. Images from these devices are of concern since those images would need to be kept for three years and would be subject to public records requests. FTE is using the TAPCO devices on one of their pilot projects as well. D. Vollmer asked what the thoughts were from the Districts on these images. T. Hensley in D7 clarified they were not sending the images back to the TMC. They have an internal camera that is strictly used internally to the device to confirm WWD. It does allow those images to be saved on a chip in the camera that would have to be retrieved but we don't get any of those images. We are opposed to getting the images for the reasons you already stated. We didn't make the decision until after we discussed it with FHP. FHP said if they are notified of WWD, they don't need the additional information of the color and make of the car since they will stop any wrong way drivers they see. Additionally, FHP stated a picture for prosecution purposes is of no value since it is not a criminal charge, it's a civil charge and FHP has to personally witness it before they can charge them. D. Vollmer asked T. Hensley in D7 if they were using the BlinkLink™ software to communicate with the device. T. Hensley in D7 responded they don't need the BlinkLink software since they use the safety barrier in SunGuide software. T. Hensley suggested renaming the safety barrier in SunGuide software since they are using it for the purpose of WWD in case someone wants to us it for WWD and for safety barrier alerts. Additionally, false positives aren't the best term to use. We prefer to call them unconfirmed. This can happen when someone comes up the ramp the wrong way, our flashing lights go off, they realize they are going the wrong direction and turn around before we can get a camera on them. We only show it as false positive if it is a hardware malfunction. This is important to note for evaluation of the product. The product could be working fine so we don't want to it to appear there is a problem with the product in those cases. D. Vollmer agreed. J. Easterling from FTE commented on the images. FTE finds value in these images. The images aren't clear enough to read a license plate so prosecution isn't the reason for wanting them. From the perspective of the radar and false positives, they are useful. We have 15 of these devices up over the past three months and we have been getting false positives associated with the TAPCO radar. There are false positives that occur from things like shadows, maintenance vehicles and mowers on the shoulder and other instances. The images are useful in confirming these are false positives. I'm just putting that out there for consideration. D. Vollmer thanked J. Easterling for his comments. T. Hensley in D7 noted that J. Easterling's comments are accurate. The difference is District 7 has installed single focus cameras on those ramps since they can detect WWD as a backup system. We will have a live streaming image but it isn't something we will have to save and record. We are working with the TAPCO engineers now because we found some problems like John mentioned and other problems in our "canyons." In interchanges where there is a sound wall on one side and a berm on the other, it creates a man made canyon which messes up the radar echo. In those places, we are going to have to put in loops and we are working with the engineers to have the loops set off the detector instead of the radar. This is all part of the experimentation process. J. Easterling with FTE agreed. D. Vollmer agreed that further discussion is probably needed. M. Laird from D6 asked if the detector are equipped with this are they typically detectors on a ramp.

Are other detectors going to be configured with this typically so you keep updating the camera selection? T. Hensley in D7 responded that all they did was replace detectors that needed to be replaced anyway with the Wavetronix and then the Click!512 device on them. By doing that we have installed 12 and 5 more are included in a construction project that is almost done and we'll have done half of I-275. It doesn't take a lot of them to cover. The detectors also help us with the problem of the U-turns on the interstate since the devices on the ramps don't assist with that. M. Laird in D6 had another question but the audio was muffled. D. Vollmer asked him to submit it as a comment to the ConOps. D. Vollmer asked if there were any other questions related to the WWD slides presented. L. Smith in D3 asked how many WWD systems were deployed now (he knew of D7, FTE and D3.) T. Hensley in D7 responded that District 7 has a Temple WWD deployed too. D. Vollmer responded that Tallahassee has a Unipart Dorman deployment and CFX has some Wavetronix and TAPCO devices. So D3, D7, FTE, CoT and CFX have deployments. T. Hensley in D7 mentioned that they put out a bid and awarded to both companies, TAPCO came in $3,000-4,000 cheaper than Temple and it's an open contract if anyone needs to use it. L. Smith in D3 asked if the devices were all included in SunGuide software. D. Vollmer responded they were working on including the ones being used now (TAPCO) in SunGuide software and the Wavetronix was included in a previous hotfix. Please let CO know what devices you are looking into so they can get them incorporated into SunGuide software.

Break (10 Minutes)

Discontinuous Lane Blockage (vote)
D. Vollmer presented slides on Discontinuous Lane Blockage, which is a voting item. This item was originally brought up by D4 and D6. It deals with the scenario where we have an incident and move a vehicle off to the side of the road so we open the actual travel lane blockage (during peak travel time) then later on you close the travel lane back down so a tow truck can come and remove that vehicle. To start, we pulled a couple of items from the current Open Roads Policy. A couple things to note you can leave damaged vehicles or cargo remain on the shoulder adjacent to the travel lanes for removal at a later time. Also, roads must be cleared within 90 minutes of the arrival of the first responding officer (starts the clock). This goal is made with the understanding that more complex scenarios may require additional time for complete clearance. We discussed this with Paul Clark with the Traffic Incident Management section and as far as the measurement for the 90 minutes, he is ok with saying it is the time the first responding officer arrives until you get all the travel lanes cleared. So if you move something off to the side, that would count as travel lanes cleared and the clock would stop. It is split into multiple segments. There are separate lane blockage durations and that is what is meant when we say it is split into multiple segments. Currently, the behavior in SunGuide software is the lane blockage is calculated from the first time stamp when the RR arrives and goes until that second time stamp when it is cleared for the second time (reference slide 59 diagram.) What we are proposing is for the clock to start when the RR arrives on the scene and when all travel lanes are cleared the first time (vehicle is moved off to the side.) So the second closure wouldn't be include in the open road closure calculation but it would be included in the overall event duration. T. Hensley in D7 commented that not all Districts have RRs. D. Vollmer said RR or other first responder and thanked Terry for the clarification. The truncation calculation approach would compute this example as 25 minutes and 2 hours in how the system is currently set up.

Severity will remain unchanged in definition but will use the new lane blockage duration. D. Vollmer asked if there were any comments or questions before the vote. L. Smith in D3 asked if the intent was to clear all lanes and later do the rest of the recovery. D. Vollmer confirmed it was the intent. L. Smith in D3 asked if the shoulders had to be cleared too or not. D. Vollmer responded that to meet the intent of the suggested revision only the travel lanes need to be clear since the traveling public is not impeded. D. Vollmer confirmed there were no additional questions. This was followed by voting.

Voting results: D1-yes; D2-yes; D3-yes; D4-yes; D5-yes; D6-yes; D7-yes; FTE-yes; MDX-yes. The item passed.

Statewide ITS Architecture Update
D. Vollmer presented slides on the Statewide ITS Architecture Update. District 1 and 7 ITS Architecture updates were completed 01/09/2015. As we go through subsequent architecture updates and find revisions need to be made, they will be made at the end of all of the updates. Remaining Districts ITS Architecture updates will be completed by 12/31/2015. District 5 and Turnpike Workshops scheduled for 02/17-18/2015. They are conducting their interviews and should be done by the end of next week so they can prepare a draft to present at the workshops. Statewide, Districts 2 and 3 updates begin 04/15/2015 and end 06/23/2015. Districts 4 and 6 updates begin 07/09/2015 and end 10/28/2015. C. Carnes from D2 asked why the Statewide update was happening in the middle of the rest of the regional updates. D. Vollmer responded the Statewide architecture will be updated accordingly when the regional architectures are completed. Additionally, it was to accommodate travel restrictions. Part of the process will be to incorporate the all the regional changes into the Statewide at the very end. The ITS Architecture deliverables include Turbo architecture files (V7.0), customized service packages in Visio file, ITS Architecture Summary document and hyperlinked web site of architecture. D. Vollmer showed the revised District 1 and District 7 architecture web pages. D. Vollmer asked if there were any questions about the update.

Auto-Dismiss Already Detected Alerts Modification (FP 2845) (vote)
C. Packard presented slides on the Footprint 2845 Auto-Dismiss Already Detected Alerts, which is a voting item. This is a modification of the item that was approved at the last CMB meeting to focus on dismissing upstream alerts only and treat downstream alerts as potential new events. This will minimize the number of alerts the operator has to deal with by automatically dismissing the upstream alerts as congestion grows. District 2 suggested that downstream alerts should not be dismissed since it is likely they are unrelated to the upstream alerts. All the previous meeting slides were modified to focus on the upstream only. The software will automatically dismiss a TSS alert and associate it to an existing event when there exists another TSS alert from the same link or upstream link associated to an active event.
Design Details:
- There shall be no new configuration for this modification (i.e. you don't have to configure all your links to tell which ones are upstream.)
    - However, you do need to have correctly configured links, and we will look into a display option in the map editor mode to easily point out configuration issues on the map so you can easily find and correct them.

- Link A will be considered upstream if Link A's ending node is the same node or within 0.1 miles of Link B's starting node.

There was no change in cost from the last vote $28,500 and it would be included after Release 6.1. C. Birosak in D1 asked if there was an alert and another crash occurred upstream what would happen when the first event was closed since all the other alerts were dismissed. C. Packard responded you would get a new alert because the first event was closed then all subsequent alerts would be dismissed. T. Brown with SwRI interjected there was a catch to that because of the recovery threshold. It won't regenerate an alert until it has passed the recovery threshold. B. Ritchson from CO suggested to have auto dismissed alerts not follow the recovery threshold. T. Brown with SwRI said the worry would be what scenarios could happen because the alerts associated with the event that was closed could re-trigger so you may get a lot of different alerts. B. Ritchson from CO agreed. D. Vollmer suggested this be discussed further at the SSUG meeting. This item was tabled and voting did not occur.

Voting results: Tabled.

TSS Link Editor Removal of Non-TSS Links (FP 2391) (vote)
T. Brown presented slides on the TSS Link Editor Removal of Non-TSS Links which is a voting item. Previous Incident Management system (used in releases before 2.2.2) required a link be drawn on the map for an event to be placed. To support events on non-TSS-instrumented roadways, non-TSS links were introduced. Additionally provided more detail to a map which lacked many current features. The current use of non-TSS links show lane level detail for non-instrumented roadways are marginally useful. Additionally, "ghost" links left over when TSS links are deleted from the system have a negative effect. Recommendation for non-TSS Links:
- Remove support for non-TSS links from SunGuide
- All drawn links MUST be backed by a TSS link
- When a TSS link is deleted, its link geometry (the drawn link) will also be deleted
- Users CANNOT configure and display links without first creating a TSS link

This would clean up the system significantly. Current basemaps where shown without non-TSS links. D. Vollmer asked if there were any questions. C. Birosak in D1 said they are not using detectors on US-41 but have EM locations and he was unsure if they were using non-TSS links or not. T. Brown with SwRI responded that if you are only reporting events from those locations then non-TSS links are not needed for that function. We don't know of anyone using them for any particular purpose. C. Birosak in D1 said ok. L. Smith in D3 asked Tucker to confirm you don't need non-TSS links to report floodgates. T. Brown with SwRI confirmed that was correct. There were no other questions. This was followed by voting.

Voting results: D1-yes; D2-yes; D3-yes; D4-yes; D5-yes; D6-yes; D7-yes; FTE-yes; MDX-yes. The item passed.

Open Discussion
D. Vollmer opened the floor for open discussion.

Review Action Items

- **ITS WAN to send IP Allocation Plan to all the Districts by the next CMB meeting.**

- **CO to send out technical committee meeting invite by 01/30/2015. – Completed**
- **CO to send email to Districts to follow up regarding auto focus button question by 01/30/2015. – Completed**
- **CO to verify with Cambridge that HERE data won't be used for the annual report.**
- **CO to collect comments from the Districts on the naming of detectors by 01/30/2015. – Completed**
- **CO to send out draft Waze Phase 2 ConOps by 01/30/2015. – Completed**
- **CO to look into enabling District 7 access to Polk County Waze events. – Completed**
- **CO to distribute the SunGuide software GUI update schedule once they are received.**
- **CO to bring the Upstream Auto-Dismiss Already Detected Alerts to the SSUG Meeting. – Completed**

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.