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Christine Shafik: Thank you for joining us today in the SSUG meeting. We always hope that you and your family are safe. Today we have a couple of interesting issues that we need to discuss and have your input on. We are going to start with the roll call first. Just to let you know, as usual, this meeting is being recorded for the sake of taking notes.

Alright, I think we have a full house today. We can start the presentation. I know the first item is going to be presented by John Hope. So, the mic is with you, John.

**Item 1: Center to Center (C2C) Add nearest Camera Information**

John Hope: This is to incorporate the closest camera into center to center (C2C). The current situation is that SunGuide already has some functionality to auto-select the nearest camera. Of course, the operators can modify this within the event. The event information and the camera stream information are already recorded within C2C but there is currently nothing that really ties them together within the C2C data.

In 511, if you posted the list of events, there is a one or more camera images; you see on the bottom right hand corner there. But how that’s selected is an algorithm within the 511 system and one of the problems is that these images may or may not be aligned with what the operator selects within the SunGuide. And, of course, another problem is that if you have any other third party application that’s using data from C2C, they would also have to create their own algorithm, which again would have the same problem that it may or may not align with what’s configured within the SunGuide.

So, the request is pretty simple. It’s really just to add the closest camera that’s been selected by the operator or auto selected by SunGuide in C2C and there are two different channels. There is the C2C command channel which pushes event information and then there is the C2C status channel. That’s about it. Are there any questions?

Ray Mikol: Would this enhancement always ensure that the correct camera was displaying next to an active event 511?

John Hope: So, this would require two changes for that to occur. The first step is to make sure that the data is available within C2C, which is what this is proposing. And then after this is done, we would have to work with the 511 team for them to actually read that information and implement it however works best. And that actually more answers your question. So, once we get to that step, then we can figure out exactly how the website will display that information because right now, the 511 algorithms actually pick one or more cameras. So, there is actually an opportunity for them to select, like, four cameras, for example. So, with this enhancement, they might, maybe initially, highlight or point out one of those cameras and fill despite the other three, just in case or just only display the one that SunGuide is selecting. But we could more or less talk about that once the 511 system is ready to be modified.

Ray Mikol: Okay, great. Thank you, John.

John Hope: Sure.

Kevin Mehaffy: Would there be situations where the closest camera would not be the best or would not be the optimal camera, you know, maybe you are on a curve or something?

John Hope: Yeah, I mean, within the event details window in the SunGuide, there is an option to select no camera. I would assume that if that is selected, then this field within the C2C would be blank or null or something to that effect to indicate that nothing was selected.

Kevin Mehaffy: Thank you.

Brent Poole: What happens if the camera that’s selected just happens to be down at the given time?

John Hope: Well, like I said, the SunGuide auto-selects the camera but then after it auto-selects, the operator can change that to whatever camera they feel is the best one and they would know that if a camera is down.

Brent Poole: Okay. Thanks.

Mark Laird: There was a previous enhancement to have SunGuide choose a working camera, at least the ones not out-of-service.

John Hope: Yeah, thanks, Mark. You are right. Okay. Well, there doesn’t seem to be any objections to this, so I guess we can move on.

Christine Shafik: Just wanted to make sure. Are the Districts with the enhancement rather than asking the other way? Who’s with this enhancement? Who’s okay with it?

Ray Mikol: District 1 agrees with this enhancement.

Christine Shafik: Thank you, Ray.

Jason Summerfield: District 2 is okay with this enhancement.

Christine Shafik: Thank you, Jason.

Brent Poole: CFX is good with it.

Christine Shafik: Thank you, Brent.

Jacques Dupuy: District 4 as well.

Christine: Jack, thank you.

Mark Laird: District 6 is happy with it.

Christine Shafik: Very good, Mark. Thanks.

Greg Reynolds: District 3 is okay.

Christine Shafik: Very good. Thanks.

Mike Crawson and Jared Roso: District 7 is good.

Christine Shafik: Very good. Alright, sounds like it’s a go. Let’s move on to the next one. Thank you, John. I appreciate it. Tucker, the mic is with you.

**Item 2: 2570 – Allow comments to be added to closed events without reopening**

Tucker Brown: Next one is allowing comments to be added to closed events without reopening them. So, right now, you can add comments to events after they have been closed by audit and then also if you were on the event list and you closed it, you can actually reopen the event if it's still on the event list and then add the comments and then reclose it. There are probably scenarios in which you just really want to add a quick comment to the event and the process of opening the event, closing or, adding the comment and reclosing the event, for one, that will actually modify the timestamp of when the actual event closed, but not to mention that it takes several steps just to be able to do that. So, the proposed enhancement here is just to allow users to make comments to an event while it's closed and without having to reopen it and the catch here is it still has to be on the event list. Once it actually leaves the event list, your audit is the only way to actually do that, but this would be allowing you to do it before it leaves the event list and you would not have to actually open the event, make your comment and reclose; you can just add directly to it. Comments on that one?

John Hope: District 5 likes this idea.

Jason Summerfield: Sounds great.

Mike Crawson: District 7 likes this idea.

Dee McTague: District 4 does.

Unknown (Caller 04): District 1 does.

Greg Reynolds: District 3 supports.

Brent Poole: CFX is good with it.

Mark Laird: I think this would be fine. This is District 6.

Tucker Brown: Alright. Sounds like that one is good to go too.

Christine Shafik: Thank you. Appreciate all for the input.

**Item 3: 3488 – DMS priority in Response Plan changes all DMS sign messages**

Tucker Brown: This is all about DMS priorities and changing them as a group. So, the scenario here is when you go to multi-select a bunch of signs and really what you are looking to do is just change the priority of a particular message, if the signs don’t actually have the same message and this actually was part of response plan specifically. So you have a response plan and it has got may be five signs, may be all those messages are actually a little bit different from each other, if you select all five and you open them up, the message needs to be consistent on the five that you are editing. So not only are you changing the priority, but you are also changing the message that’s actually on those signs. The request for the enhancement here is basically provide an option that may not be part of this specific edit dialog but essentially a way to just say all I want to do is change the priority and so I can multi-select a bunch of signs, possibly down like a right click menu and say reset the priority and then give it a number and then you'd be able to select that and it would just change the priority without changing all the underlying messages for each sign. Again, this was in a response plan that this was occurring. Potentially, it could be in a modify of a bunch of different signs, possible message, something along those lines, but mostly I think in regard to response plan is where this was applying. Any thoughts or comments on that one?

Jason Summerfield: When we are looking at this, it actually came up the other way as well. Would it be possible to update a message on a bunch of signs without affecting their priorities?

Tucker Brown: So, you want to be able to modify the method without modifying the priorities?

Jason Summerfield: Right, so I was told that there have been a couple cases where they have a message and they send the priority list because the priorities have been set by distance or by whatever other means but they want to change the message on all the signs at once and it's not an individual thing; it's more than one sign. But in doing so, you would end up having to go with the same priority for both of it. I don't know exactly what specific case they had for that but that was when operations looked at this, they said, “That's awesome to be able to change its priority. Can we do the same thing, send the same message to multiple signs without adjusting the priority?”

Tucker Brown: Yeah, just as a comment on that is, on the thought of the priority is that we would be able to right click and possibly just change priority, make it do this. If we went with the scenario of just changing the message without changing the priority, do you have an idea of how you would like that to look or like how you get into that as opposed to just saying “Edit”? Maybe we could put another context menu that says something like “Change message without priority” or something along those lines to indicate that it’s something different but there has got to be a way to distinguish I'm editing and this message and priority and all of the stuff applying applies to all the signs versus I just want to change the priority of all these versus what you're talking about is just changing the message without changing priority. I need a way to distinguish those and on the top my head, I don't know if I have a great idea for that. I mean, a context menu would work; trying to think what else we could do there.

Jason Evans: My thought for that would be if you selected all the DMS and then add in your message. If you didn’t set the priority up top in the priority box, then it would leave the priority as the previous one. Does that make sense?

Tucker Brown: That would work in most cases. The one I am concerned about though is what if the priority that pops up is the one that you actually want. You would have to set it and then reset it back to make it stick.

Jason Evans: What do you mean if it’s the one that you want?

Tucker Brown: So, let's say I have five signs and they are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 in the priority and I really did want them to change the one but when I opened up the dialogue it just said 1. The other option would be something along the lines of maybe having it blank as you open it up for a multi-select and if you set it, then it automatically set it; if you don't we don't modify that, or having some kind of pop up in the edit dialog that you can click on a box or something that says “message only”, “priority only”, like different modes essentially that you could get into about what to actually set here.

Jason Evans: Yeah, like may be a radio button that just says “key priority” or something like that.

Tucker Brown: Yeah, some way to just tell it don't do particular parts of this or something like that. That is kind of what I was going around, just random ideas off the top of my head.

Jason Evans: Alright, yeah. That would work.

Tucker Brown: Okay. But essentially, just some way to section out whether it's message versus priority versus both.

Mike Crawson: Thinking about if we just had a check box that said “keep previous priorities” or “don't change priorities” you could change all the messages and leave 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 in the same place and then we can still roll out or right click where we keep the messages the same and change the priority if we want to do that as well. I think that will achieve what everybody wants.

Tucker Brown: Yeah, that’s an option.

John Hope: It sounds like what other people were talking about or possibly be resolved in this existing dialog box where they have like a check box or gray things out or whatever. I know Roger is kind of an expert of designing dialog. Can you maybe talk to him about it and come back with a solution?

Tucker Brown: Yeah, we can look at it.

John Hope: Okay, appreciate it, Tucker.

Tucker Brown: Alright, anybody else want to weigh in on that before we move on? I think the action item from that is essentially to come up, basically expand this into not just priority but maybe message only and then also present a mockup of what this might look like to be able to comment and then move this forward to CMB after that. So, we will bring this up at a future SSUG.

**Item 4: 5327 – Integrate TrafficVision video analytic alerts into SunGuide**

Tucker Brown: Another one here is talking about integrating TrafficVision video solution into SunGuide. So, I believe we have requests from both D1 and actually that should say FTE. I am not sure it’s D7; it may be. I don’t know for sure.

Christine Shafik: Yes, that’s correct. I think it's Turnpike and D1.

Tucker Brown: Yeah, I think I messed that up, but we at least have two districts that are asking about adding TrafficVision style alerts into SunGuide and there are a couple of ways to do this. So, they provide alerts for a variety of things. Wrong-way driver is one of them while other types of things like stop vehicle, debris on the roadway, I think there are some crash detection type stuff, but other types of alerts that kind of fit into other categories. The kicker on this is wrong-way driving alerts are handled very specifically in the system and they route to the wrong-way driver. They go to ITS and it makes it to where all the functionality is consistent. Potentially, if we wrote its own driver, we may be able to incorporate all that into one, but I want to make sure that for the wrong-way driving alerts, we still want the wrong-way driver functionality and then for the other types of alerts, it would be similar to something like the VisioPad alerts, so right now those come up and they have snapshots with them, you can create alerts, you can dismiss them, that kind of stuff. And those that apply to things like stop alerts, debris in roadway and vehicle crash type alerts but the wrong-way driver alerts would go into the wrong-way driving alert functionality where you can bring up cameras, that kind of stuff. So, we still need to separate how those actually work and so we may have to come up with an integration that works for them but I want to make sure that everybody is okay with the implementation of how that is; where the traffic vision alerts may show up at two different ways even though they are from the same video analytic solution and then if that doesn't work, if anybody wants to suggest something different about how this could be integrated, I am willing to listen to those as well. Yeah, this will be the first video analytics integration since Citilog and so, if there are different ways you would like to see the alert, I am interested in hearing those as well. I believe the snapshot is all we are planning to include. Right now, we don't even have video support in either wrong way driving or anything right now. That is something that potentially could be added but then again, we need to talk about how you actually want to see that, where it's stored. I mean that is some later on decisions, but if anybody has general thoughts on how they think they should be integrated, I would like to hear those.

Ray Mikol: I think having two separate alert types would be the preference, at least for District 1. I think for wrong-way driver, we really want to keep those separate and maintain their immediate importance.

Tucker Brown: Okay, so you like the idea even if it’s the same vendor seeing them in two different ways, it’s still okay.

Ray Mikol: Yes, if possible.

Tucker Brown: Yeah, okay. That’s good.

John Hope: District 5 agrees with that as well.

Mike Crawson: District 7 agrees as well.

Greg Reynolds: District 3 agrees.

Brent Poole: CFX agrees.

Dee McTague: District 4 agrees.

Tucker Brown: Okay, sounds like everybody is on the same page there. And that’s really what we need to know from them. I think that’s all I needed from a software integration standpoint. Yeah, I think that was the last one.

Christine Shafik: Yeah, sounds like we have another quick meeting today. Seems like we need to add more topics than expected. Last meeting, we were going through them that quick. Alright, any other comments or questions from the Districts?

Greg Reynolds: I got a question that Kevin just sent you a little bit ago. We are getting ready to complete integration on our TPAS project and I understand that the suggestion of TPAS mapping has already been presented to this team. I wanted to see if there is any progress made, any kind of position that this group has had or any movement within SunGuide or any other means of being able to map out the sensors throughout the projects?

Tucker Brown: Yes, that is part of the 8.0 enhancement. Yeah, that will track the individual sensors, CivicSmart or IPSense, I can’t remember which one.

Greg Reynolds: CivicSmart is the only one vendor.

Tucker Brown: Okay. There is only one vendor that actually supports the ability to even query that information so it will be a supported feature but only for, I believe, the CivicSmart ones. The other ones I do not believe actually report that but if it’s there, yes, you have the ability to query the sensor, figure out status from each one. You will be able to essentially import a snapshot of the actual truck parking facility and place the box essentially where they go. So, you will actually have a mappable area of what's good and what's bad.

Greg Reynolds: Will it just be a Passover with the cursor to the sensor? My little vision is red light, green light, you know; sensors active or not.

Tucker brown: I believe it would be both.

Greg Reynolds: How about for troubleshooting? The operators will need at one level, the maintainers will need it at another.

Tucker Brown: The system will report in real time the status of whatever that they're telling us, what the base station in the field is telling us what it is. There are fields that are also returned as part of that; they may not be common between vendors and will actually be able to report stuff for each sensor but that's not consistent between vendors, so I can't give you an exact list of fields. But there will be additional information there, things like battery life and other stuff like that.

Greg Reynolds: Okay and last question, what is your time frame for the version 8.0?

Tucker Brown: Official schedule has it releasing in late December but we're hoping well before that.

Greg Reynolds: Okay, thank you. That's all I have.

Karthik Devarakonda: Tucker, the vendor that supports the features is IPSense.

Tucker Brown: Okay. I couldn’t remember which one it was.

Jared Roso: I just had a question come for me and it was inquiring whether I know when we generate response plans, it's typically created over a distance radius from the incident, is that correct?

Tucker Brown: Say that again.

Jared Roso: So, when we create a response plan, that's typically based off a radius distance from the event based on severity.

Tucker Brown: Are you referring to how they pick up DMS?

Jared Roso: Yes.

Tucker Brown: So, it's not exactly a radius search. It uses the device linking to go upstream of there to a particular distance. There is a concept of radius search but normally it's the going upstream one part.

Jared Roso: Yes, right. So, I guess a few questions are does it have the ability when it's doing that to know if there is a DMS within that distance search and one of them is out and if so, do they present that to the operator when it's generated?

Tucker Brown: I believe out-of-service ones are excluded. The ones that are in repair would actually show up but there is an indication on the dialog that the device is in an error state

Jared Roso: Okay, and then his next question is if there is a device that is out or an error state, is it smart enough or could it be enhanced to add the next additional DMS to compensate for the one that’s down? So, go, the next hop back if the DMS somewhere in the chain is out.

Tucker Brown: So, right now, it wouldn't do that. It stops at that hard distance level.

Jared Roso: Okay.

Tucker Brown: If we did something like that, the problem is we don't know if the next distance is 200 feet or 200 miles, and depending on what that is, there might be a cap on where you actually want to do that. So, it's kind of one of those solutions that is doable programmatically. The question is how would you actually want that to work and would there be a cut-off distance and I mean there's also, depending on the severity of the event, it actually will go back different distances and so you're actually talking about thresholds per severity and how much further would be willing to go in this particular case. So, there is a lot that would go into that. It’s doable. The other way to actually do something like that is, let’s say, the default case it goes back 7-8 miles and you get those DMS and you see one that’s an error, you can manually say I want to go back 10 miles or 12 miles or whatever and pick up a new suggestion and that may return one or more signs but you may get nothing different because there's nothing in that range. So, you can basically manually trigger that suggestion to go further to try to pick up another DMS. That is more manual option that will be supported today but it is possible to do that programmatically as well but I think we want to give some thought into how we implement that and what kind of restrictions we place on what it means to go grab the next one.

Jared Roso: Okay, alright, I will pass that along and see if they want to do anything with it. Thank you.

Tucker Brown: Okay, sounds good.

John Hope: In regards to the release 8.0, Tucker, you mentioned that your schedule is to deliver it by the end of December but it might be delivered sooner but then the Central Office is going to do, I will assume, some testing. What is Central Office’s schedule?

Tucker Brown: Sorry, but I didn't do that fully. So, the SwRI delivery to Central Office is expected mid-October and that late December is a full release to the Districts.

John Hope: Okay, I understand.

Christine Shafik: Yes, we are going to do the FAST, John. Then we are going to do IVMV, as usual. So, what Tucker mentioned the date is to be released statewide.

John Hope: Okay, thank you.

Christine Shafik: Any more comments or questions? Good discussion here. Alright, we can give you back few minutes of your life, guys. Until we talk again next SSUG, please send me any questions or concerns you have or any issues you think your District needed to be discussed earlier, we can prioritize it in our list as well. Unless you guys have any other questions, I will say have a good day.
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