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**Florida Department of Transportation**

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Tuesday, February 19, 2019**

**1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.**

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

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Robbie Brown, D1  Justin Merritt, D1  Luis Ruiz, D1  Alex Varela, D2  Edwardo Gomez, D2  DeeDee Crews, D2  Jason Evans, D2  Jason Summerfield, D2  Craig Carnes, D2  Pete Vega, D2  Amy DiRusso, D3  Kenny Shiver, D3  Russell Allen, D3 Atkins | Dee McTague, D4  Jonathan Overton, D4  Daniel Smith, D4  Jeremy Dilmore, D5  Shannon Watterson, D5  Jay Williams, D5  Eddie Grant, D5  John Hope, D5/CFX  Mark Laird, D6  Javier Rodriguez, D6  Yamilet Diaz, D6  Rodney Vila-Carrero, D6  Alex Mirones, D6 | Alejandro Motta, D6  Dan Buidens, D7  Matt Mileto, D7  Mike Crawson, D7  Ramona Burke, D7  Eric Gordin, FTE  Bryan Homayouni, CFX  Christine Shafik, CO  Derek Vollmer, CO  Clinton Smith, CO  Mark Dunthorn, CO  Frances Ijeoma, CO  Jennifer Rich, CO  Tucker Brown, 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 B. Homayouni opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

**Call for Quorum and Review of Agenda:** A quorum was established for this CMB meeting. B. Homayouni reviewed the meeting agenda the first voting item is for a new chairman of the CMB and the other four voting items were previously discussed at the SunGuide Software Users Group (SSUG) meetings.

**Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review:** We will review the action items from the previous meeting.

**Action Items:**

1. **Add timestamp to the vehicle provision data –** This was added as part of the enhancements and will be released in version 7.1.2.
2. **Update for ticket 4105 –** Add the KMZ and other file types attachment to the event notification. This is scheduled for version 7.2.
3. **Intersection Enhancement –** There was a good discussion about this at the last meeting in September and the Districts wanted a more thorough look at the Concept of Operations (ConOps). The review date was extended until October 4th. An online survey was sent to vote on the item and the vote was unanimous so it did pass. This will be part of the 7.2 release.
4. **Wrong Way Driving Wavetronix –** District Four is going to provide test results of using the WavetronixHD data to detect and track WWD events. District Four is still waiting on the hotfix so this will stay as an open action item.
5. **Provide a schedule for 7.1.2., 7.2 and 8.0 –** This will be discussed in the SunGuide Update
6. **Next steps for moving towards a cloud-based system** – The process is underway and meetings have been scheduled to discuss it. Central Office is starting an analysis over this issue and will keep the CMB updated as we move forward.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**SunGuide Software Update – Christine Shafik**

**Release 7.1.2**

* Testing was started back in December. All major issues were addressed this week. We are ready for the final IV&V and the target release date is early March.
* Enhancements:
  + One major enhancement is for connected vehicles. The 7.1.2. release will support the 2016 standards. There have been no significant changes to the high-level functionality.
    - We are still sending TAMs (now called TIMs) from SunGuide to connected vehicles via RSEs
    - Receiving BSMs from connected vehicles via RSEs for use by TSS in determining the aggregate speed
  + SunGuide currently reports on spaces available per facility and the new enhancement will allow SunGuide to report on number of spaces per row as shown in the picture. It will also allow SunGuide to report the availability of each space in the lot.
    - **Jeremy Dilmore**: The update to the parking management system, could you look into providing details on the GUI interface or the schema of what might be available from a C2C connection?
    - **Mark Dunthorn**: The Center-to-Center (C2C) schema was not updated. We are still providing total facility availability over C2C. I don’t think we are providing any zone or space information in C2C. All of that information is available in the database and we can provide you a quick look at schemas if want us to provide that early. We can also give you screenshots of the configuration. It is configured a little differently than the current system. We’ve introduced a concept of parking areas which is a way for us to organize the zones or rows with corresponding equipment meaning signs or cameras. We can provide screenshots.
    - **Jeremy**: Yes, that would be helpful along with anything that provides the database schema too.
  + AVL vehicles in C2C
  + Blinklink Wrong Way Driving interface we will elaborate later on in the presentation.
  + Toggle between multiple video streams in the Video on Desktop window
  + Configurable event type transitions for cloned events.
  + Display Coordinates vs. Actual Coordinates
  + Graphics-based DMS Message Report

**Release 7.2.0**

* We are currently working on the requirements and tentatively starting the factory acceptance test in June.
* Major Enhancements:
  + Monitor and Regulate DMS Fonts
  + Additional Automation for Executive Notifications
  + ICMS Integration
  + Links on Map
  + Audit Chronology
  + Case Sensitivity
  + Planned Events

For those of you who attended the SSUG meeting last Thursday, no District has a current need for Oracle support in SunGuide. Starting with the 7.2.0 release, SunGuide will no longer support Oracle.

As mentioned earlier the 7.1.2 release enhancement is the Blinklink. We are working with TAPCO now and one of their requirements is to have the connection between TAPCO and Blinklink to be secure.

* Districts can temporarily use a self-signed certificate (no cost)
* In the long run, Districts might need a commercial certificate. We have not received a definite answer yet. The enhancement is for all Districts but it is up to the District on whether they want to use it.
* **Bryan**: I was going to add to Christine’s discussion on the wrong way driving TAPCO Blinklink. We will definitely help you and work with you through that process, we are trying to get that system up and running as quickly as possible. If any of the Districts are using the TAPCO Blinklink, we are happy to be the guinea pig with getting it integrated and established.
* **Eric**: Could you explain a little bit about the commercial certificate and what the costs would be?
* **Christine**: The cost range is very wide but we are estimating a couple of hundred of dollars a year.
* **Eric:** Okay, so there isn’t much economic impact but that is something to keep in mind.
* **Bryan:** We have been trying to avoid it. It comes down to more of a policy concern than a financial. Right now they are showing a willingness to work with us and we will keep you posted.
* **Eric**: Will it be in 7.2.0?
* **Christine:** No, 7.1.2 which is coming out next month.

**Election of New CMB Chairman (Vote)**

The CMB process has the Chairman sit for two years, the CMB Chairman requests nominations and the CMB elects the Chairman by majority vote.

CMB Chairman duties compose of supporting the CMB from an organization standpoint and its mainly administrative duties (compose meeting agenda, moderate meetings, conduct voting). It is helpful to have a Co-Chairman to assist with the workload.

**Pete**: I was corresponding with Jeremy Dilmore and Jay Williams is who I would nominate from District Five. I think he would be a good choice.

**Bryan:** Does anyone else have any nominations or would anyone like to second that nomination?

**Jeremy:** I spoke to Jay prior to the meeting and he would be open and willing to take the position with John Hope as the Co-Chairman.

**Bryan:** From that standpoint, I second the nomination and Jay would be able to fulfill the role. Do we have any other nominations? Hearing none, we will go ahead and start the vote for Pete Vega’s nomination of Jay Williams.

**Vote for Jay Williams as new CMB Chairman:** District One: Yes, District Two: Yes, District Three: Yes, District Four: Yes, District Five: Yes, District Six: Yes, District Seven: Yes, FTE: Yes, MDX: N/A (not present), CO: Yes. We have a majority vote and it passes.

**SG-4577 Bridge Reporting/Notifications in FL511 (Vote)**

We talked about this at the SSUG meetings and are pushing forward with this enhancement. The current behavior of bridge pre-emption is that it is part of the EM module and it automatically creates an event when the bridge is raised and sends it to FL511. When the bridge is lowered it removed the event from FL511. The problem we are running into is that there is no way to subscribe to these alerts without creating a route that contains the bridge. The bridges are treated as individual locations and FL511 would have to read into each one. There is no way to have people subscribe to them via FL511 because we aren’t providing them enough data to do that.

The limitations are that it is only configured to Miami-Dade County. If we wanted to go statewide it would cause issues.

The concept we came up with is almost a generic feature subsystem. It could have items like bridges but it could also contain railroad crossings or items that have status. This would essentially contain items you don’t necessarily need to control but want to see the status. Think of items in the field that you would want a status for. These features would have an ID, name, location, can publish flag, last updated timestamp. You can create the types dynamically and can have configurable icons for each status type (or default for all status for a particular type). Underneath each type, you have statuses so you might have a bridge up or bridge down. Essentially you can get a list of statuses that would apply to that element. The information ties to a data feed to automatically update the status. If you go that route on a particular device it will probably have some integration for whatever that particular feed is. The other option is to not have a feed for that and to change the status manually.

The benefit for FL511 is that they get a generic location with a standard EM event location that way they can tie it better to their loading systems. This would also require changes on the FL511 side to allow users to subscribe to alerts at specific bridges.

**Cost:** 23k

**Schedule:** Next release after 7.2. (not versioned yet)

Any general questions?

**Mark Laird:** I assume the name that we assign will go to FL511? I want FL511 to use names that people would recognize.

**Tucker:** Yes, both the name and type will go to FL511.

**Jeremy:** So, this is not tied to the response plan generator for us to be able to trigger other events based on monitoring the status?

**Tucker:** There is no current plan for that, currently they would just be devices in the system. If we want to tie them into alerting from response plans that would be a future enhancement.

It wouldn’t be too difficult but we would need a driver and IDS (incident detection subsystem) to look at these generic features and then do something with them if we are going the alert route. The cost wouldn’t change much to get them implemented.

**Jeremy**: Did you look at trying to send traffic advisory messages? I didn’t know if looking at the bridge project in District 6

**Tucker**: Not that I am aware of.

**Jeremy**: We would be interested in being able to trigger DMS responses for bridge up or railroad arms down.

**Tucker**: Would you be interested in when the device status changes, automatically put something in the DMS queue then when it is done have it take it down? So, it is automatic?

**Jeremy:** Yes.

**Tucker**: That would not be a drastic change.

**District**: On the reporting end of it, you mentioned they would be tied to EM locations.

**Tucker**: I misspoke, I meant location in general. It should be generic locations.

**District**: So, we would be able to appropriately run reports on what each location is experiencing?

**Tucker:** yes, picture how you run reports on DMSs, that latitude and longitude is how you will run them.

**District**: Will the roadway be tied to it?

**Tucker:** Yes, the roadway, direction, are part of the general location so they would be tied to it.

**Rodney:** In the schedule you presented, you have the version after 7.2. We would like to request to see if we can get it out sooner. We have been working on trying to get this information out to the public since 2017. The District Six secretary has been leading this effort and we want to know if we can push this to 7.2?

**Tucker**: That request is for Central Office.

**Christine:** We will get on the phone with District Six and Tucker to discuss further needs.

**Bryan:** We will track that as an action to follow up on. Are there any other questions?

**Jeremy:** Are we taking a vote on this? Is that how we are proceeding?

**Bryan:** I think so, we have the change from Jeremy. Would that impact your cost at all?

**Tucker:** it would stay under $30k.

**Mark Laird:** If we rolled this into 7.2 would IDS be ready to take the data?

**Tucker:** I don’t know the answer to that specifically.

**Bryan:** From that standpoint, we would have to vote on it due to the timeline and then we could add an action to follow back up with the group based on the discussion with Central Office and District 6. We are voting on the item with Jeremy’s additional enhancement. Are there any concerns with proceeding on the vote?

**Mark Laird:** Do we have it well enough defined that getting it implemented at this time would not delay getting it implemented?

**Tucker**: Given the strict implementation of when status changes to this post I don’t think that would be problematic.

**Mark Laird:** Would it be configured as a message you set or a predefined plan?

**Tucker**: It looks like it would be tied to a sign so I would say a message plan and that would be the easiest implementation.

**Mark Laird:** So, it would be a single sign but different per direction?

**Tucker:** My thought was to have a list of instances and when it did one have it tied to a post option.

**Mark Laird**: You would have to do two signs because of each direction. So a fixed list of signs with one message?

**Tucker**: That would be fine,

**Mark**: Is that okay, Jeremy?

**Jeremy**: Yes, and this need is not immediate so don’t let it delay the release.

**Bryan**: Based on that information do you think this is better phased? Is this a single voting item?

**Tucker**: I would lump it all together.

**Bryan:** District Six are you comfortable with that?

**Mark Laird:** Yes.

**Javier:** Yes, I think if we could have it initially developed and then add on would be our preference here. What we have so far have been discussed in the SSUG meetings and various times so I think we should move forward.

**Bryan:** So if we vote on this as a single item, can you effectively get back with District Six and come up with a plan that addresses District Six’s needs to figure out the implementation side. Get them something they can use and then enhance it in the future.

**Christine**: I think we can vote on this item as is and then we will get back with the District and add this as an enhancement.

**Bryan:** Christine and Tucker, I am not quite sure if that is the same thing that Tucker said.

**Tucker:** She was saying to vote as is and then discuss the other enhancements later.

**Christine**: Correct.

**Bryan:** So there will be a follow-up voting item for additional enhancement. We are voting on it as is (from the original presentation). We have a cost and an anticipated release date and we will try to move it to the 7.2 release. Does anyone have any questions or concerns on the voting item?

**Cost:** 23k

**Schedule:** Next release after 7.2. (not versioned yet)

**VOTE:** District 1: yes, District 2: yes, District 3: yes, District 4: pass since I haven’t been in these detailed meetings, District 5: yes, District 6: yes, District 7: yes, FTE: yes, CFX: yes, CO: yes. MDX: N/A (not present),

Bryan: The item passes and we have an action item.

**Wrong Way Driving Crash Descriptor (Vote) – SG-4650**

**Tucker**: This is about adding descriptors to help with wrong-way driving (WWD) events. Right now, if you had a crash on a roadway and someone later comes back and says it was caused by a wrong-way driver you have two options: one to change the event type to a WWD event or two you can leave it as a crash and add a flag to the event.

The enhancement here would be to add a checkbox saying that this is a WWD event. If you make the event type WWD, the checkbox would automatically be filled in. For all other event types, you could manually flag it as a WWD event. When running report you can run it specifically for that flag and it would pick up all of the WWD events in the system.

If you manually create a WWD event, it will automatically activate a response plan for you. The problem with that is that if you want to create a WWD event but the driver turned around and you just want to track the event but don’t want a response plan activated, you would need to make the response plan activation optional. The intent of this enhancement is that you would get a pop up to give you the option of creating a plan but not create the response plan automatically.

**Cost: $4K**

**Release: After 7.2**

**Alex:** Is there going to be a way to search by the flag? Or do a search?

**Tucker:** The flag will be a characteristic of the event and will be in the database for sure. We will probably put this as a filter and we would need to do some work on the reporting side so you can filter and report by the flag.

**Bryan:** Any questions or concerns? Hearing none, let’s vote.

**VOTE:** District 1: yes, District 2: yes, District 3: yes, District 4: yes, District 5: yes, District 6: yes, District 7: yes, FTE: yes, CFX: yes, CO: yes. MDX: N/A (not present),

Bryan: This item passes.

**Permission Issues SG-3974**

We brought up in the SSUG meetings that permissions need more granularity. Most cases we needed someone to do one task but the permissions gave them access to multiple items not needed so we need permissions on a more granular level. Here is a list that we came up with.

* To activate a signal timing plan, you would also be able to manually activate a signal timing plan. The request was to split those out into two permissions, one to activate signal timing plan through response plan and one to manually activate a response plan that contains one. It would be through EM and response plan activation.
* Configuring camera pre-sets. Right now, you need add/modify/delete camera which would give you access to the full camera. In this case, they would just want you to do camera pre-sets so splitting that from the full camera configuration.
* The ability to change the Op Status on devices is tied to the add/modify/delete of that particular device. So, splitting out the device status without needing the full device configuration permission.
* Right now, there is a single permission for reports to configure and run.
* The other would be for travel times to disable/enable links permission instead of needing “configure travel time parameters”. Splitting out the ability to enable/disable instead of needing full configuration.

I believe that is a full list.

**Cost: $10K**

**Release: Next release after 7.2**

Does anyone have any questions? Hearing none we will proceed.

**VOTE:** District 1: yes, District 2: yes, District 3: yes, District 4: yes, District 5: yes, District 6: yes, District 7: yes, FTE: yes, CFX: yes, CO: yes. MDX: N/A (not present),

Bryan: This item passes.

**Bryan:** Is Derek online yet?

**Christine**: No, not yet. Can we push forward and come back to it?

**Bryan:** Yes, or we can move it to the SSUG. With that, we are onto the Open Discussion.

**Open Discussion – Bryan**

**Dan Buidens:** It seems when we are voting, everyone votes the same way. It seems if we could keep the votes a little hidden it might change how people vote. It might help with the votes being more honest, not sure if the new chairman wants to go that direction.

**Robbie:** We had that discussion on the side as well, maybe we just need to shift the order occasionally.

**Bryan:** I am not sure voting out of order would fix the issue. Without voting electronically you can’t cast it anonymously. It worked with online votes because the Districts didn’t see how each other voted. Ultimately, I think someone should see how each of the Districts vote.

**Dan Buidens:** In our town hall meetings we go through an exercise where we do trivia and they give us a device that has a remote and each person can vote anonymously and it shows the results on the screen.

**Luis Ruiz:** Through Office 365 there is a way to create forms so it would require an FDOT email to access the form and you can see who votes.

**Dee McTague:** Apparently you can create polls on GoTo Meeting.

**Bryan:** I would think that is something that Central Office would control.

**Christine:** We can talk about it and the idea of updating the CMB process.

**Bryan:** To speak to the point, we are trying to resolve a specific concern. Part of it goes back to the SSUG and to facilitate a discussion ahead of time. I think if you have concerns, there should be a discussion. The items we are voting on are changes to SunGuide that will help the functionality of the end users. I think the key is fostering healthier discussions before the vote. I think the anonymous vote won’t solve the problem.

**Mark Laird**: There have been a number of times when someone has brought up an issue, and it has resulted in redefining the item or delaying the vote since there was a concern. I think you should bring it up during discussion if you have concerns and feel free to vote against it.

**Eric**: I think in the past there has been a lot more debate about these requests because they were higher dollar items. Today they were relatively low-cost items and we did have more debate when they impacted everyone and the costs were higher.

**Bryan:** We will have to control the vote to make sure it is the proper representative voting. If someone has a concern and brings it to the forefront ahead of the vote, rather than it coming on the back end it gives us a chance to understand the reasoning or rationale behind the no vote.

**Mark Laird:** I think the issue with District One is that they always seem to be in the hot seat.

**Bryan:** We need to discuss this further. But historically, all of the voting items are bringing value to one or more Districts so we don’t have many no votes. We will mix up the voting order going forward. And we can look into electronic voting but the key to having good voting items is to have a detailed discussion.

**Christine:** We will look into it and circle back to the Districts.

**Adding Maintenance Info to Truck Parking - Derek**

**Derek**: Is anyone on from District Seven?

Dan Buidens and the RTMC floor manager Mike Crawson and lead IP technician Matt Meleto.

**Derek:** This came up from District Seven, Ron Chin and Ed Albritton. We discussed this previously and we discussed getting some of the maintenance information from the truck parking system and pull it into SunGuide. That way we could know what devices are failing. In District Seven, they were saying the system provided didn’t give them any maintenance information so they could not figure out where the failure is coming from. The device manufacturer is going to change its API to include the maintenance information. I just wanted to see if you were interested in pulling in that type of information.

**Dan:** It is beneficial to know if the device has failed or not, and have the ability to reboot a device. We don’t have the ability to do that since it would be through a vendor software. If I remember correctly, the vendor could supply that information but as a service that is at an additional fee. That was never the intent of how the devices would interact together.

**Derek:** It was not the intent to have to purchase an additional service to have that information.

We will have to go to a more granular level to get the information we need.

**Dan:** To further that, there might be 250 units in the rest area and they would be configured in some kind of 1, 2, 3 but where spatially is that in my 250 units? Also, how do I get my maintenance guys to go to the right unit? I wanted to bring the issue to light.

**Derek:** District Five are you having the same issues?

**Jeremy:** Yes, and we would like to have it integrated into our normal way of doing business.

**Derek:** How would you like it integrated since you are a MIMS user?

**Jeremy:** Being able to see something in SunGuide will allow our operator to post a ticket in MIMS. We would like to see it in SunGuide so there is not an additional application the users would have to open.

**Derek:** Is anyone on the line from District Four?

**Dee:** We just turned ours on so we haven’t seen any issues yet at the rest areas but we are having issues with the MVDS counting trucks inaccurately.

**Derek:** I think those are the projects where they are close to being active. I think we should bring this back and see if we can pull this information in. Thank you for the feedback.

**Bryan:** Were there any other open item discussions?

**Rodney**: One item we had pending on our list to bring up was the SunGuide device naming conventions. We worked on this in 2016. We have a lot of express lane projects coming to a close and we are using a D6 naming convention and I know there was a document that was going to go out to help. We want to know moving forward if that will happen.

**Derek:** There was a scope that was developed by Global-5 that was reviewed by Russell and I. I am not sure if Russell reviewed it before he left but I was okay with the scope and it was going to go under one of District Fives contracts to have it done.

**Russell:** We are trying to tie the different naming conventions together for ITSFM, 511 and SunGuide. The discrepancies we are seeing is when naming contains mile markers. Sometimes the discrepancies go up to ½ mile or more.

**Amy:** So, we had them go through all of our databases and make the naming conventions consistent.

**Russell:** I have spoken to Clint and I think the style guide will be updated by Global 5 in coordination with the ITSFM folks. I will get back with Clint tomorrow. There was a timeline provided to us so we can share that with the group.

**Derek:** Yes, I have no further comments on the scope. Clint will be able to provide the scope document.

**Bryan:** Who will be providing the notice to proceed on that?

**Derek:** I am not sure how that will work.

**Russell:** Derek and I narrowed down the scope and the plan was to give that scope by to District Five and work with Clint if additional funding is needed.

**Clint:** It sounds like we need to have a chat on this.

**Bryan:** Would you be okay with distributing the document to the Districts?

**Jeremy:** I don’t have the document, so I think it would be best to coordinate with Clint and we will be happy to execute it from our end.

**Bryan:** Very good. Are there any other items for discussion?

**Review of Action Items – Bryan**

* Existing action that carried over is for Dan Smith. Once they get the hotfix and get the testing started with Wavetronix and wrong way driving they will share it with the group. That will remain an open action item.
* Cloud-based solution – open action item and Christine will be the owner for this action.
* Update the CMB process document (voting member update and any changes on the voting process) – Jay Williams and Christine
* 4577 voting item – CO to coordinate with D6 on the schedule to see if it can be moved up and look into the follow-up enhancement from Jeremy (D5). Recommend doing an online vote to follow up.
* Truck Parking to be brought up at SSUG – Christine Shafik to follow up with SunGuide enhancement to figure out how to move forward.
* Device naming convention – Get the scope distributed to the group and give to District Five for processing – Clinton Smith
* Mark Dunthorn to send the concept of parking areas database schema and screenshots to Jeremy (D5).

**Bryan:** Does anyone else have any comments or concerns before we conclude the meeting? Hearing none, thank you for participating in the meeting.