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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agenda: |  |
| Topic | **Led By:** |
| Item 1: 5124 Publishing EM Event to FLATIS will appear on FL511 even if publish flag is falseItem 2: 3688 Suppress Multiple visibility alerts based on configurationItem 3: GPIO 7.2 Bridge ChangesItem 4: SunGuide Data Entry Style Guide | Tucker BrownTucker BrownTucker BrownGregory Dudley |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Attendees: |  |
| Justin Merritt, D1Ryan Brown, D1Jason Summerfield, D2Tanesha Sibley, D2Kevin Mehaffy, D3Jay Jay McFadden, CoTJacques Dupuy, D4Kyle Higgins, D5Eddie Grant, D5John Hope, D5-CFXShannon Watterson, D5Mark Laird, D6 | Alex Mirones, D6Dan Buidens, D7Jared Roso, D7Mike Crawson, D7Dan Buidens, D7Karla Smith, FTETucker Brown, SwRIChristine Shafik, COMark Dunthorn, COGregory Dudley, CO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Discussion: |  |

**Item 1: 5124 Publishing EM Event to FLATIS will Appear on FL511 Even if Publish Flag is False**

Tucker Brown: This issue has to deal with being able to send out the publish flag for an event as part of the response plan to FLATIS. The need to limit publication of certain locations (from the FLATIS side) has gone away. Essentially anything we have marked like that would still go out. It appears from our last discussion that there is still a need on the TMC side to limit what might go out at these locations. The proposed enhancement has two options: one we can completely remove the ability to publish to 511 when the publish flag is set to false. The other option is to not automatically suggest it to 511 and then warn the user if they attempt to publish the event. Option two will give you flexibility if you have to publish it. If you did run into this issue and you had you to publish, you can always go in and change the configuration in real time to publish. What are your thoughts? Do we need this and if so, which option do you prefer?

John Hope: In District Five they generally handle a decision on whether an event should be published to FL511 as an operational role. The operators are trained on when to publish events to 511. That being said, making the configuration perimeter isn’t needed from our perspective.

Tucker Brown: The perimeter is already there; it would be whether we use the publish flag or not. In that case are you more in favor of saying leave it up to operations and don’t make any changes?

John Hope: That would be fine with us.

Aven Morgan: Would this be configurable as it is now only through the event location?

Tucker Brown: Correct, the publish flag is for each location.

Jason Summerfield: I know right now if the publish flag is turned off then it automatically populates, a big red message pops up stating it will not be published to FLATIS. So are we suggesting to have an override button there?

Tucker Brown: I want to say the text has something along the lines of this event wouldn’t show up on FLATIS. The system right now allows you to still publish that. When I say it publishes, it would show up on FL511 as well. They don’t have the restriction anymore and are not honoring that flag as a non-publishable location anymore. Is there a need to not publish locations from a TMC level?

Aven Morgan: The second option would work well for us. Have it restricted but should the need arise we can publish it.

Jason Summerfield: I am assuming the other option is to move it to another location that does have the location set.

Tucker Brown: If you are using the first option where you are not publishing at all, you can still change the configuration, or you can move it to a different location.

Mark Dunthorn: Jason, what was it you said about a message stating it will not be published to FLATIS?

Jason Summerfield: Whenever you generate a response plan, it automatically puts in a FLATIS item for you. If the location is set to not publish, there is a red message in the FLATIS item box that says “This event will not be published to FLATIS” basically because of the location already. Unfortunately, as we know it is published and the flag is ignored. So, the answer now is that you have to go through and remove that item. So, the question is if you restrict it completely or keep the red message there and have a button that overrides it, so it does publish.

Tucker Brown: That is correct.

Mark Dunthorn: Well we will have to do something cause the message is misleading as it stands so it is not an option to do nothing.

Jason Summerfield: Unfortunately, I don’t have anyone here operationally that could answer the question of the leaving it there and overriding it or just changing the location.

Christine Shafik: Do you prefer to circle back on this after you speak with your operational team?

Mark Dunthorn: This is your issue right, Jason?

Jason Summerfield: I think they just told operations to make sure they remove the event from the event list. But it is another step for someone to pay attention to and it is misleading. I will get someone from operations to answer that.

Christine Shafik: Let’s confirm with the operations side and bring this back at the next SSUG.

**Item 2: 3688 – Suppress Multiple Visibility Alerts Based on Configuration**

Tucker Brown: The issue here is with visibility alerts. The issue here is when fog rolls in and you have a bunch of RWIS together, when the first one hits it will trigger a visibility alert on the RWIS. Then when the front moves across, every one of the RWIS will be triggered and then you get a ton of alerts for the same fog event.

The enhancement will be similar to the traffic alerts so when the queue starts to build you don’t get alert after alert. If you get a visibility alert, you will have a radius for how far an alert should apply. When an alert triggers a single station, the same type of alert would not trigger for any stations in the configured radius until the original condition has returned to a normal condition. Essentially it will be suppressing all of the alerts that are part of a single event and it would be similar to what we do now with traffic alerting. Does anyone have any questions or comments?

Jason Summerfield: I like it, but I think that is because I submitted the ticket.

John Hope: District 5 is for this.

Karla Smith: I think this would be helpful for Turnpike.

Tucker Brown: Okay it sounds like most of the group is okay with this.

**Item 3: 5149 GPIO 7.2 Bridge Changes**

Tucker Brown: This is for the bridge enhancements in GPIO. There are a couple of issues that have been identified here in order to make this more effective. The issue is that the roadway and the direction is set to the device group level instead of the device level. So, there are multiple spots that need to be monitored. The enhancement would be to add the roadway and direction to the device level as well, so it appears in both places and has more flexibility for the end user of the data. Configuration and status values for the device group and the device will be included in the C2C feed.

The second issue is that there are a few ways to handle the GPIO elements. One of them is the manual status so you can change the status wherever you want to do it. So in this case it might be bridge closed vs bridge open. Those might be manual statuses because the triggering criteria might be high wind or something along those lines. The other way to do it to read it directly from an XML feed and then automatically change the status. There are a few issues that could come up such as comm failure or incorrect data in the feed could cause an incorrect status to be sent to FLATIS.

The proposed enhancement is to allow the explicit override value being reported which you would have to manually override and change the value. Because we are allowing that override there are two scenarios that have to come up. We will continue to poll and show the polled value.

* If comm is restored, the value will update, and device will return to active state but the user would still need to disable the override.
* If a bad value, once the correct value is known to be in the feed, the user can disable the override and go back to the poll value.

Mark Laird: In the case where comm is restored, how will we be informed that it is back so we can away this override?

Tucker Brown: We had a discussion about this yesterday, and we brought up the question of should it be manual or automatic action? We do know that the device would be in an error or failed state and could return to active. I wrote this as a manual change, but we can actually programmatically recognize that it came back to active from the failed or error state. The only issue with the automatic override is that we don’t know what value is there and if it is correct. If you think it is a low probability of being wrong then we can make it more automatic.

Mark Laird: The automatic is going to be normally the thing we want.

Tucker Brown: If that is not a big concern then we can make it automatic. If there is still a bad value, you can override it manually and change it back to the value from the feed directly.

Mark Laird: If it is bad, we can override it and take it out of service.

Tucker Brown: So you prefer the automatic on the device comm and manual for the bad value issue? And the concept of having to manually override is needed correct?

Mark Laird: Correct. When a bridge is up and we lose comms, people are looking for detours but the bridge is down and open and they don’t even know it.

Tucker Brown: Is anyone else using bridges at this moment?

John Hope: District 5 has one bridge, but they do not monitor through SunGuide.

Tucker Brown: Is it possible that one system goes live to monitor it through SunGuide.

John Hope: No because it is owned by the Port Authority. So they wouldn’t unless that changes.

Mark Laird: Do you know when we will get this?

Tucker Brown: This will be released in a hotfix in the near future, but well before 8.0.

Mark Laird: 8.0 is in October so do you have a better timeline?

Tucker Brown: Here in a month or two. Would 511 be ready to accept those values?

Mark Laird: They said they would be and whenever SunGuide has it they would have it.

Mark Dunthorn: Yes, that is what they said. We are coordinating it at the same time, and I think 511 will have it ready.

Tucker Brown: Then we should make this a priority and get it out ASAP.

Mark Laird: How will we get the alert and what type of alert will come?

Mark Dunthorn: That has not been determined but we can get James on the phone to discuss.

Mark Laird: We can’t upgrade to 7.2 until we get the alerts in FLATIS because that is the only way we can get the information out to people.

Mark Dunthorn: I will take this as my action item to schedule a meeting with James to walk through it and make sure we are all on the same page.

**Item 4: SunGuide Data Entry Style Guide**

Greg Dudley: This is an item where we need representation from each of the Districts. Global-5 is working on creating a style guide so there is a consistent nomenclature on how we identify devices and input items into the system. We want to have a District representative so we can work them on this effort. Please have your District send in the representatives name and contact information to Mike Wacht (MikeWacht@Global-5.com) or John May (JohnMay@Global-5.com) and copy Christine Shafik (Christine.Shafik@dot.state.fl.us). Please send the contact information by February 28th. That way they can work with you directly to ensure all Districts have a voice.

Christine Shafik: Actually, lets shoot for the 18th instead of the 28th. I don’t think you need two weeks for a contact name.

Jason Summerfield: Can you send out an official request to the TSM&O managers so they actually approve of us doing something like that.

Christine Shafik: Yes, I will send it out today or tomorrow. Any other comments or concerns from the District side?

John Hope: There was one item that we were voting on at the CMB and it was tabled, the partial lane blockage. We were going to re-bring this up, how are we proceeding with that issue?

Christine Shafik: We had a meeting with District 7 where we discussed it further, we need to streamline the process statewide and had another meeting at Central Office. We agreed that it is an ITS Working Group issue and should be brought up there. The next ITS Working Group is March 10th and this is where it will be brought up.

Dan Buidens: Do we have the blanket travel approval to go to the working group?

Christine Shafik: Good question, let me check with the team and get back to you. Are there any other concerns or comments? Hearing none, I hope you have a great afternoon and weekend.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Check with Operations Staff on which option would be better for 5124 Publishing EM Event to FLATIS will Appear on FL511 Even if Publish Flag is False | Jason Summerfield |
| Make getting 5149 GPIO 7.2 Bridge Changes a priority and get it out ASAP | Tucker Brown |
| Get a meeting with James, Tucker, Mark about bridge alerts  | Mark Dunthorn |
| Districts submit contact information for a representative to work with Global-5 to work on the standardization for all naming in SunGuide. Due February 18th.  | Districts |
| Send out official request for District Representatives. Send it by 2/14 | Christine Shafik |
| Add partial lane blockage to ITS Working Group  | Jennifer Langford  |