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Christine Shafik: Welcome to the SSUG meeting, we have a few items to discuss today. For the purpose of taking notes, we will be recording this meeting as usual. I am going to turn it over to Tucker to go over the issues.

**Item 1: SG-4834: Add video for WWD Alerts.**

Tucker Brown: This is for adding video for the WWD alerts. The current behavior is that we support snapshots so when you get the alert in it will have a listing of the images and will roll through them. It is not live video it is just goes through a slideshow. Several of the vendors do support video but it is not currently part of the TERL APL process. The change here would be to have an option to add a playable video. The snapshots will still be there. The image and video area in the next release will be made larger in the alert dialog as part of 8.0 enhancements. Will have video in addition to the image that is provided and link those both to the operator. Basically, we want the video and image together in a single alert dialog. Any thoughts about having video or how the video would be more useful to the user? I think people will agree on the concept of the video and how we use it.

John Hope: You are going to add space for video and a slideshow, what happens if a vendor doesn’t support video? Would that real estate be used up?

Tucker Brown: You would want the snapshot to stay the same size whether it has video or not?

John Hope: No, what I am saying is do not use up real estate if the vendor doesn’t support it.

Tucker Brown: Correct, in the alert itself you would see a very large snapshot, or you would see a split screen for the snapshot and video.

John Hope: Perfect.

Kevin Mehaffy: Is there any risk that this will slow down the system? I know when dealing with wrong way drivers, speed and urgency is important.

Tucker Brown: The way the system is right now, is that the vendor can send an alert that contains the URLs to the images. So, if you time it out, the user gets the alert with no images immediately at the same time it is producing that, it will retrieve the images one at a time and will update the alert with the images. It will not delay the amount of time it takes for the user to get the alert; it just delays how the video will get to the system where the operator could access it depending on size but on fiber connections it should be a short amount of time anyway. It is less intensive than doing the live video at the bottom of the dialog. It would be software to coding on the machine itself in the case of the canned video it is playing from file location so it is not as CPU intensive as it would be if they were streaming cameras. This is the canned video of the WWD incident itself.

Cherie Phillips: If you are including the video, will you also include a slider at the bottom to be able to go back and visit something from earlier?

Tucker Brown: More like a player? Pause, resume, and timestamp?

Cherie Phillips: Yes.

Tucker Brown: Yes, that is fine.

Dan Buidens: Is there a stimulation that the application that is running this video needs to run constantly in the RTMC? And that it maintains a connection with servers at the home base?

Tucker Brown: The only one that is server based is the Blinklink stuff and all of the things that we retrieve are not a persistent connection. They are essentially an asynchronous alert, and we send a request to go get images and all of the devices at this point are not maintaining a consistent connection they are just sending an asynchronous alert. None of this relies on that. Once they say they have the image or the video, we bring it in and set that up to go to the server or folder location you prefer. So, when the operator goes to play it, they are playing something local to the TMC.

Dan Buidens: Okay. Thanks.

Tucker Brown: Is there anyone against video? I just want to make sure I throw that question out there.

Dan Buidens: Is there a reason why we shouldn’t be for it?

Tucker Brown: No, I think it is a good route to go but wanted to make sure everyone is good with it.

Dee McTague: Just curious but what about storage of the video? Do we have to maintain it?

Tucker Brown: So, this has come up with the next release in terms of images. Christine correct me if I am wrong. The current guidelines are that we will not be storing images or video so they would go away once the operator is finished using them. We are also going to delete those from the back end. Technical feasibility thing is something Central Office is looking into the policy but as of now we will be deleting them. When this enhancement actually comes around and we get into implementing it, it might be different. It would be good to bring this up when we discuss it at the CMB.

Cherie Phillips: Just a comment on what you said typically if we did have a wrong way driver, we would want to respond and get the event going as soon as possible. The vendor we have for wrong way detection captures 2 minutes of video and we don’t have camera systems on those ramps a lot of the time, so we are very dependent on the video from the vendor. If we are in a situation where we have to put in the DMS and get the response plans going would it prohibit us from accessing the video? I could see how that could cause some issues because we want the information from the video, but we also want to respond to the issue at hand. That is just some feedback on if you were to make the video unavailable as soon as you respond to the pop-up video.

Tucker Brown: I agree that is a perfectly valid use case for the video. So, the video and images would be connected to the alert itself, so when you handle the alert, it goes away from the map and the map no longer knows about that alert. I am debating on how the flow would work on letting them hang around because right now, the retention policy is that we need to get rid of them.

Cherie Phillips: Well, I think similarly how you store the WWD image alerts for the system, if you have it set up that way, it would over rite the previous video. Perhaps it might be possible to have a pop out video window so it could still be open while the operator maintains the event.

Tucker Brown: So, if we did pop out something like that, we would have the references to those. As soon as they close the alert it would only be accessible to them and the life of that dialog. There would have to be a point where we would go clean that up. We can’t over rite the files, that is what we are doing now, and it is causing issues. So, if you have stacking alerts, you can’t over rite the previous ones. We have to have unique file names on them and then at some point delete them. Right now, the triggering mechanism for that is when you handle the alert it gets rid of it. But what you are explaining is when that person closes the dialog. It might be harder to track but could be doable.

Cherie Phillips: Could you perhaps set it up so that if you were to have video integrated and you were to start an event it won’t close the pop-up window then it would be a manual thing.

Tucker Brown: Are there cases where you would need video where you did not create an event? Where I am going with that is some way to persist that image and video for the lifetime of the event and once the event is closed out it would delete them. The only problem with that is if you were to need them for handling alerts without creating an event.

Cherie Phillips: I don’t have a response for that either way. Perhaps other Districts will weigh in.

John Hope: Associating the images/video to an alert works for District Five because we create events for every single wrong way alert, including false alarms.

Mark Laird: In a strange case, you can always create one then void it.

Dan Buidens: In D7 we do a lot of after actions so trying to catalog all of the activations or alerts and throw them into different buckets so we have stats on them is the only thing I can think of to keep the videos.

Tucker Brown: Like I said there is no intent to store these long term so we need a way to know when to delete them. If you are going to do a lot of after-action wrap ups, the intent right now is that the video would not be available. All of the operator statistics would be available but not all of the video and images.

Dan Buidens: Do you know how long they retain in Blinklink?

Tucker Brown: I don’t, I haven’t delt with that personally.

Jermaine Da Silva: I believe it is kept for a month.

Tucker Brown: Do you know if it is server side on the cloud?

Cheri Phillips: The Blinklink website says that video recording is only available for 45 days.

Tucker Brown: Technically we can save video and images, but it is more of a retention issue.

Christine Shafik: I think we need to investigate further for the retainage subject here. Central Office and Turnpike are working on a process. I will check on the update for this and maybe we can give updates at the next CMB.

**Item 2: SG-4854: WWD Alarms – Camera Images Remain After Alarm and Event are Resolved.**

Tucker Brown: This one also deals with wrong way driving. When you have a WWD alert come in the cameras associated to the WWD device are automatically pulled up in the bottom half of the dialog. When the WWD alert is resolved, the cameras associated are not removed. If the alert dialog remains open, these would never be removed, without manually closing them. When you resolve the alert, the cameras stay in the bottom half of the dialog because the idea is that you are tracking something. Those cameras aren’t ever removed. So, you wouldn’t close out the dialog but the next time it came in you would have a new alert with different cameras. Some people are having those dialogs stay open, so the cameras are never removed. So, there are a stack of cameras every time there is a wrong way driver alert that comes in. You can manually close it, but you would have to know what cameras are associated with what alert. The potential change is whenever you close out an alert, whatever camera stream came in with that alert would be removed with it. The cameras would close only when the event is closed or when the alert dialog is closed. Any comments?

John Hope: Going back to the previous thing we talked about and retaining images or video. There has to be a way to view that. I would think these streams would also live in that window. As you resolve the previous issue, it might answer this question.

Tucker Brown: Essentially the alert dialog would close out entirely and then you would have the other viewer. If we do that, we will have that information available to everybody. So, we would be able to bring those up for multiple operators. If that is an acceptable change and how this works then yes, this rolls into that. Any other comments?

**Item 3: SG-4868: Associate Free Text Fields with Event Fields in Message Templates**

Tucker Brown: This has to do with message templates for response plans. The current behavior is if static text is added to a template to clarify an event tag, and the event tag is removed, the static text will remain. The issue is when you do that you end up with a partial sentence if the cross street wasn’t available. What you want is for all of it to be removed.

The potential change here is to add some type of mechanism (tags?) to “associate” a group of text. If any part of the text is not generated, remove the whole section. This would apply to both message template tags as well as the newer tags in predefined plans. I didn’t have specific examples from the issue, but this gives you more functionality with message templates. Does anyone have any comments?

Mark Laird: I think prepositions and articles and are the things that tie to the tags that would go away. I think using braces to enclose them with the other tag might be a simple notation. I think the begin and end is hard to interpret sometimes.

John Hope: I think it is a great idea and makes it more consistent with the travel time configuration. When you have a block of text that may or may not be reported when you have a block of text that is not available.

Tucker Brown: It isn’t just a line here; you could do it on a whole page.

John Hope: Good idea.

**Item 4: SG-5508: Make pre-planned events for Off ramp back up and congestion.**

Tucker Brown: These are just more suggestions for pre-planned events. Right now, there is a specific list of event types that are available to use when doing planned events. We limit the types of events you can plan. When we did that, we did not include off ramp backup and congestion as plannable events. There is a request to change that. We can add these unless someone disagrees, but the other question is are there any other planned event types that should be added?

Kevin Mehaffy: It might help if we knew what was in the planned list right now.

Jason Evans: Is there a reason why we wouldn’t make all of them plannable and obviously we wouldn’t use crash.

Tucker Brown: That was the reason was to keep people from doing that. It was supposed to be a filtered list so that people didn’t have to search through the entire event list. There is not a technical reason why we couldn’t make them all plannable.

Ray Mikol: It looks like we have roadwork scheduled, interagency coordination, PSA, special event, other, bridge work, and bridge closed.

Tucker Brown: Is anyone opposed to making them all plannable?

Kevin Mehaffy: I don’t love the idea that an operator can do a planned crash.

Christine Shafik: That is exactly how Central Office feels.

Jason Evans: Aren’t the planned events configurable so you can set them as a level of access?

Tucker Brown: It is not something that is configurable by administrators, it is at the database level. It is not difficult to change but yes, it is mostly configurable. I was referring to the event types themselves. The ability to do it is a permission.

Jason Evans: I would be okay with having all of them because the supervisors create them.

Tucker Brown: Any other comments?

Carla Holmes: To distinguish the crash congestion from congestion, should it be called recurring congestion? It could be confusing to have two different congestions in there.

Tucker Brown: the only event type we have right now is the congestion, we don’t have the recurring congestion or others. We could add other event types that would better describe them. But there is other work to figure out how to handle them with DMS plans. The act of adding them isn’t bad.

Carla Holmes: For planned congestion, you are putting recurring congestion in the same place so can this be called recurring congestion?

Tucker Brown: Not without adding a new event type.

Carla Holmes: I thought we were adding a new event type?

Tucker Brown: No these are existing being added to the planned event options. Okay, I guess we are good on that one.

**Next Steps:**

Tucker Brown: The Design Review Meeting for SG 8.0 HF 4 will be held on 3/24 from 3:00-4:30 pm. Revised SG 8.0 HF 4 Requirements have been sent out and we received some feedback. If you have not looked them over, please do so and send any comments to us. We should have slides out by Monday.

Christine Shafik: Thank you Tucker and thank you for your feedback. I just want to deliver some news that District 6 is now on 8.0! Good job D6. We are looking for the other districts to provide a deployment date for 8.0 to Central Office so we can coordinate deployment statewide.

Mark Laird: For those using OTM, there is a new version of OTM that goes with 8.0, it is version 4.6 which should be available by the end of next week.

Christine Shafik: Thank you all for your efforts and input today. Please send me an email with any comments or questions.

John Hope: What is the status of the upgrade spurts for 8.0?

Tucker Brown: Phase 1-5 are ready to go. The one thing that has been identified is that when running phase 2, the transaction log continues to grow. What we are thinking you can do is run consistent full back ups and if you do and the back logs are complete and the transaction log is truncated, it should just run through. What D5 is running into is that the full back up did not actually truncate the full transaction log. So, we are looking into why it didn’t truncate the transaction log. We are looking into slowing down how fast its doing those. As of now the script is runnable since all 5 phases are broken out. The rest of it is there, we just need to test it on your system to make sure it does what we want it to.

John Hope: What about phase 3, 4, and 5?

Tucker Brown: Those are available and ready to go.

John Hope: Where is it available?

Tucker Brown: Do you want it in the D5 folder or CFX folder?

John Hope: CFX is ready for 3, 4, and 5.

Tucker Brown: I will upload them to the D5 and CFX folders.

Christine Shafik: Any more questions? Hearing none, thank you for your time and talk to you next week.