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Christine Shafik: Let’s start with the roll call. This meeting is being recorded for the sake of taking notes.

Alright, we have a full house now and we can start. I will turn it over to Tucker or AJ (SwRI) to start the first issue.

Greg Dudley: Well, Christine, the first issue Kelly Kinney was going to present.

Christine Shafik: Kelley, you are going to start this time. The floor is yours, Kelley.

**Item 1: 5267 – “Thru Lanes” Lane Type**

Kelley Kinney: A couple of SSUG meetings ago, we were talking about the addition of the “thru lane” lane type in SunGuide. Thru lanes are kind of unique to the Turnpike, describing them similar to express lanes but without the dynamic pricing and without the delineation but they are defined as thru lanes.

So, you guys are probably familiar with the SunGuide lane types screen and all the currently available lane types and we kind of added what we envision to be the thru lane just represented by a TL. It would be identical to general purpose lanes or the regular travel lanes with the exception of the name of the lane and then how it displays in the 511 and the email. So, we are not asking for any changes to the behavior of the DMS sign generation.

So, although there are toll amount DMS (or what we call “TADMS”) and lane static DMS (or “LSDMS”) associated with these thru lanes, like the sign you see in the picture now with the single line sign underneath the side sign. We are not asking for those to be a part of the response plan. Anytime a thru lane, which they are on the left side of the roadway so we get the left lane essentially, anytime a thru lane is blocked, the response essentially should be the same as a typical left lane blocked, so it wouldn’t indicate thru lane; it would just say “left lane blocked”. This kind of special circumstance is when the ramp to the thru lane is blocked. We created an EM location that just says “ramp to thru lanes”, so the response might already generate correctly for that, so there wouldn’t be any additional accommodations needed for that special scenario when the ramp to the thru lane is closed.

And then, the response plan 511 and email, I literally just mimicked the way that an EL express lane blockage is displayed in the 511 and email. They would essentially be the same. We are just asking that instead of it saying express lanes that it say thru lanes. And as for any specialty recording when you are running an event chronology or an event list and you have that ability to select the worst lane blockage dropdown, we would just ask that the thru lane type be added into that dropdown list. I think that’s the last of it.

Christine Shafik: Alright. Thank you, Kelley. The floor is open for discussion.

John Hope: District 5 is fine with this.

Christine Shafik: Thanks, John.

John Hope: Good job, Kelley.

Kelley Kinney: I am glad we were able to clarify. I know there were a lot of questions the last time and we went back to the table with it.

Christine Shafik: Any word from anybody here or any comments, concerns? Looks like everybody is on bored. I guess you did a good job, Kelley.

Kelley Kinney: Thank you.

Christine Shafik: Alright, so, we got to move to the next time. That was quick. I wasn’t expecting it to be that quick. Perfect. Next item on the agenda.

**Item 2: 3336 – Automatically select associated event in alert handling dialog**

Tucker Brown: This one should be fairly quick as well. It’s talking about automatically collecting associated events as part of the alert dialog.

So, specifically when handling FHP alerts or anything where you can associate an event already. Right now, it will tell you the fact that there is an event that is previously done with it, whether it was created, whether it was you, just something which associate that passed alert with that event. It could be a direct association or recreation of it, something along those lines. But if you do have an event association, what happens is the dropdown and it shows you, here are all the events within a configurable radius, pick one and then it will move on. The way this is happening is previously associated an event to it, automatically select that one; if I go to associate, so that all I have to do is essentially click a button they associate that’s already there and I don’t have to go searching for it. So, it’s really just a short cut way to, I know that I have already handled this in the past, I know that it is associated with this pick; use that option right away and it would also allow me to change it by need too. So, if you are not that known that that would be it, but it just keeps your operators from having to re-select it every time you want to associate that FHP alert with it. Not a huge change, but I think it will at least maybe save you a little bit of time. I will open that one up for discussion.

Ray Mikol: District 1 likes this idea, Tucker. I think it will fit probably with time.

Kevin Mehaffy: District 3, echos as well. We like it.

Derrick Odom: District 2 agrees.

John Hope: District 5 likes this.

Tucker Brown: Okay. Sounds like there is no more comment on that. Sounds like there is broad approval for it. Moving right along. This may be a pretty quick meeting.

**Item 3: 5251 – Wrong Way Device – Incorrect images displayed in SunGuide with Alert**

Tucker Brown: Alright. This goes back to a topic that we discussed, I believe, two SSUGs ago and it has to do with wrong-way driving and how alerts should come into the system and how they should be displayed with the alert.

So, in the previous when we talked about, the issue here is right now, the paradigm is that only one alert per wrong-way driving device kind of gets to it at one time. So, if an alert comes in and five seconds later you get an alert, that would automatically get resolved. If an alert comes in and you do nothing with it and two hours later, you get another one, same deal, as long as there is an existing active alert, you will never get another one. The other problem that we are running into there is the images that are coming in actually overwrite the previous one and even if you don’t get that new alert, the images are still overwritten, which is functionality that’s not desired for sure. But along with fixing that, we thought we would look at other behaviors here.

At the last meeting, we kind of just threw up a couple of options and we kind of ended at a hybrid approach but what I wanted to do is go back to this and confirm that this is a behavior that everybody can live with and that everybody was capable of using and we don’t have any issues with it. But essentially, I believe, what we came up with is we want to allow multiple active alerts at the same time on the same device and that those alerts would be presented to the user. The images themselves will not overwrite the older images but they will not be stored in a way that we would continue to write images forever and that they would actually be stored on this. The way in which this would be done is Alert 1 comes in that, let’s say, lets you write images one through ten and if they are still active alerts and another alert comes in, we would write images eleven through twenty and associate those with that alert and then if you were to clear both of those, the next alert that comes in would write images one through ten again. So, we are not going to overwrite images for an active alert, but we will overwrite images. That does help us out with not storing these long term, so you are not having to be able to maintain these for years and years, stuff like that. So, we get around some of the pitfalls of that, but we still make sure that images are associated to a specific alert and then the operator shouldn’t be able to see them independently of each other. We did talk about essentially a configurable amount of time where we might suppress the alert and I was going to go back to that and kind of open that for discussion as well. The thought here is if you do have a wrong-way driving event, let’s say, caused by some type of emergency vehicle and they progress down the ramp and that triggers an alert and then very shortly after that, we have another emergency vehicle just trailing it produce that same alert. If we don’t have anything in place to suppress alerts, you would essentially get two different alerts on this. If we do, we could suppress the second one, if the trigger is inside that configurable threshold, so you would be able to set it up whether it’s sixty seconds, whether it’s five minutes, whatever you want to set that on. We would essentially just automatically acknowledge the alert. I think we would still want to create it and store it; you would just not get it on the map that the operator is actually seeing. We would just create it and then automatically resolve it and then automatically solve it if we are sitting at like Blinklink or something, we would resolve it within as well. That would sync up your reporting. If you got reporting on something like Blinklink and they said they generated 20 alerts, we should see that exact same 20 alerts in the SunGuide system as well. That’s basically where we are going with that. Does anybody have any comments on the general behavior or specifically on whether or not we should include a threshold where we kind of suppress the duplicate or alerts that occur within a very short amount of time of each other; comments on that? And then just any other comments on the overall.

John Hope: District 5 doesn’t like this last bullet. Their policy is they would want an operator to make that decision whether or not the multiple alerts are actually associated with the same event. They do not want an automated feature.

Kelley Kinney: Turnpike agrees. Yeah, we would not want to suppress the alerts.

Tucker Brown: Yeah, we can do that. If nobody wants that, we can leave it out entirely. If there are people that want it, we can always set that down. We could include it but then we could set it to zero and then you would be able to basically get all the alerts without any of the suppressed alerts. I thought I would throw that out there as a possibility. Nobody needs it honestly; it’s less work to do.

Ray Mikol: I think, Tucker, that District 1 would vote not to suppress either. You know, just on the off chance that there may be a real wrong-way driver. We don’t want to take that chance.

Tucker Brown: That’s fine.

Christine Shafik: How about to ask if anybody is interested since all the comments are against it? Anybody interested in this?

Kelly Kinney: When you say interest in this, are you talking specifically about the suppressed?

Christine Shafik: Yes. Hey Tucker, it doesn’t seem like anybody is interested in the suppressed one.

Tucker Brown: That’s fine. I thought I would throw it out there. So, we will leave that part off. Does anybody have any comments on the behavior beyond that configurable amount where we are suppressing alerts but essentially getting multiple alerts, having your operator essentially see every alert that is generated? We are not storing the images long-term, so I don’t think anybody has an issue with that, but if you do, just let us know. But any other general comments on the enhancement? Other than that, I believe we just got before that we had a lot of comments with a lot of districts. So, I think there is a lot of support for moving this forward for sure. Just want to make sure we are getting the right functionality.

John Hope: Everything else aside from the suppression sounds great.

Tucker Brown: Alright. Sounds like that one had good support and sounds like everybody was in favor of that as well. I believe that was the last one. This was a very short meeting for us.

Christine Shafik: That is impressive, guys. We tried to avoid the incident that happened before that we were running out of time. I am trying to limit the amount of requests, so we can have our time on each topic. It seems like we picked three good-to-go ones this time or you guys are all on-board with all of them without any discussion apparently. It’s a moving target so we cannot predict how it’s going to happen, but I am glad we have a short meeting today, so you guys can have more time to finish your daily emails and stuff. If you have any further questions or comments or concerns about any of the issues we discussed today, feel free to reach out to me with an email and let me know and we can go from there. But other than that, I heard that on the items we discussed today. Anything else from the team here? Alright, guys, have a great day and talk to you next time.