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Christine Shafik: Welcome to the SSUG meeting for the purpose of taking notes this meeting will be recorded. We are going to start with a roll call. We have a busy schedule for this meeting, so I am going to turn it over to Mark to start with the first JIRA issue.

**Item 1: SG-4524: Missing Roadway in Floodgate List**

Mark Dunthorn: So, this is something we have talked about in the past and is mainly an FYI. This JIRA issue is to add 395. We are taking this opportunity to firm up the process going forward. These bullets we have talked about at a previous SSUG. As always, we want to start the request for any update to a floodgate file with a JIRA issue. The Central Office will coordinate that in two directions: It has to get updated in the FL-ATIS database and in the file itself. When both of those happen, we will notify you and it will be up in the statewide shared like the hotfixes and new releases. There are no restarts required other than logging out and logging into the operator map. If there are changes or deletions to any existing locations, there may be a more complicated roll out involved. Those will be delt with on a case-by-case basis.

About 18 months ago we compared all of the district files and it seemed that most districts were using the last version of the file that was provided with a release. A couple Districts were very different, and they matched themselves and a few other districts had minor changes. Bottom line is we are going back to FL511 to ask them to do a comparison. We think the FL511 database matches the original. I would encourage all districts when the first file goes out to compare the file with that you use now. If all you see if 395 being added in a few places, you are probably good to go. If you do see a lot of differences, you will need to evaluate how you want to do that. Get with us if you have any questions. This will happen in the next month or four weeks. We will let you know when the file is ready. Are there any questions?

Dee McTague: I am curious about the IVR and how the floodgates play into that.

Mark Dunthorn: Is the IVR gone?

Dee McTague: Yes, I tested it this morning.

Mark Dunthorn: Tucker, what is left? That was the main complication there. What else uses this file? The website banners?

Tucker Brown: These are still pushing information to the website as location for floodgates in general. That is how we relay all of that information to FLATIS. If the reason for that file is for the IVR in terms of being able to vocalize that, there are probably easier ways to get that information to them to ask the system to do that. But right now, it is still needed to get them that information for floodgates in general.

Mark Dunthorn: I agree and the reason this file is so complicated is for the IVR. If all we want to do going forward is to update that banner, there are much better ways to do it. So, we should look at that question separately. We still want you all to update so we are all in sync. I think I will make it easier for you to accept these changes if there are differences in what you are using today. I think you should still go ahead and sync with the new file. Any other questions or comments?

**Item 2: SG-4968: Wrong Way Detection Pop-Up Alerts**

Tucker Brown: This deals with wrong way detection pop-up alerts. The request here is to change the location. What the window is currently showing is roadway, direction, and lat/long. I believe that FTE pointed out that this is not overly useful to them in terms of figuring out where this is. The proposed solution is to still include the roadway direction but also include the roadway description which may give a better idea of where it is. In addition to this, we can also include the name of the device reporting the WWD. It is just additional information to help the operator know where this is occurring. Are people in favor of this? Or do you not see any use for it?

John Hope: District Five likes it.

Mike Crawson: District Seven is in favor of this.

Jason Summerfield: I think District Two would like this.

Brent Poole: CFX likes it.

Richard Hemming: District Three is on board.

Luis Hernandez: District One is good with it.

Tucker Brown: Thank you. It sounds like that one is good to go.

**Item 3: SG-4999: “Set Responder” option for alarms should be removed.**

Tucker Brown: This came up when dealing with timestamps and alerts through IDS. One of the options you have when handling alerts is to set the responder arrival. As part of this if the alert contained the arrival in it, it would set it. What we found was that in reality the associate to event does the exact same thing. The other types (RWIS, weather) don’t report that and don’t have a timestamp responder that you could set anyway. We are duplicating the associated to event and the responder option. It was requested that we make it simpler and remove the set responder option for every alert does the same thing if the field is present. This just simplifies the number of options that users would have. Does anyone have feedback? Is anyone using that for something specific that we are not aware of?

John Hope: District Five never uses set responder.

Richard Hemming: District Three doesn’t use set responder either.

Jason Summerfield: District Two doesn’t use it.

Mike Crawson: District Seven doesn’t use it.

Alex Mirones: District Six ditto.

Dee McTague: District Four ditto.

Karla Smith: Same for Turnpike.

Tucker Brown: Okay so it sounds like no one was using that anyway. We can remove that, and you won’t be losing any functionality.

**Item 4: SG-5668: WWD Detection on Mainline using MVDS.**

Tucker Brown: This is part of a ConOps that was written and is part of this issue. The ConOps is attached to the issue and is attached to the meeting invite. Please review that. It goes back and is based on functionality we have in place. If you have a Wavetronix device on the mainline it has directional bends and can count cars going in a particular direction and can report that as part as the pole cycle. We did a small build with D4 where we took the directional bend and found vehicles traveling in the opposite direction, we put that in as part of the status updates. That allowed D4 to test how it might work and experiment with doing mainline detections with MVDS.

The idea here is we would be using instead of the ramp WWD detection we would be using the mainline MVDS to catch WWD. As part of the pole cycle, we read the fact that they are WWD and bring it to the attention of the operators. As part of that we should probably consider helping with false alarms, we might want to configure a number of consecutive detectors. They would need to be set up in a logical order, detector one has found a WWD then detector two triggers it as well then you know it is legit. In addition to that time constraints of how long it should take someone to get from one detector to the next. Once the alert is triggered, we want to get the same functionality of the ramp WWD for these detections. As the detections occur, flashing the links on the map. Consecutive detections should flash but suppress alerts. We would want the ability to disable WWD detection on some mainline MVDS as needed due to construction. That is the general idea of the enhancement, again, the ConOps goes into more detail on each of the things I just said and contains scenarios.

If you have additional comments on the ConOps you can put that into the issue as comments as well.

John Hope: District Five has a lot of comments and questions, should we send them in the document or discuss them today?

Christine Shafik: We can discuss them now.

John Hope: The timeliness of this data is critically important for WWD. Right now, the MVDS in D5 is set up for a 30-second polling. How does that play into detection with this implementation?

Tucker Brown: Not trying to step on District Fours toes but I can partially answer this so D4 correct me if I get something wrong. Yes, there will be a delay in the immediate detection of this. Up to 30-seconds may pass before you actually get this information. Maybe they pass one, maybe they pass two detectors so yes there is a timing constraint to this that is not going to give you the same quickness that you are going to get from a device specifically catered to finding WWD. Part of the consideration is that a lot of places already have these deployed on the roadway as existing infrastructure. We are trying to utilize this at a low cost to get additional insight. Some of these would be a primary way to do this if you are unable to put all the ramp detection in. You might get it late but it’s better than not getting it at all. This is supplementing the ramp detection. It might also be helpful for an after-event report and having proof of how far the driver got.

John Hope: These bends that are detecting the WWD, can they be requested more frequently than 30 seconds?

Tucker Brown: Potentially, the idea here is that we are polling them as part of the standard TSS cycle. I know you can request that but if you are doing a faster poll it might mess with your TSS detection in terms of how the device is bending stuff. If we go that route, we get more into a quick poll wrong way driving device.

John Hope: If we are moving towards using this as mainline detection, and we have ramp detection, can we have the ramp detection trigger the polling interval? In that logic since you are associating the detector order so the software should know which detectors should anticipate the vehicle. It wouldn’t have to poll all of the detectors, only the downstream.

Tucker Brown: Yes, if there is a way to do that without effecting the TSS data, I like it. My biggest concern is if we mess with the TSS polling it might mess up some of the report side. If we could figure out a way to do both then that is a good idea.

John Hope: With the quick poll you are only interested in the WWD data. Is that going to mess up the detector itself?

Tucker Brown: Not necessarily on the Wavetronix. I think they have a consistent poll cycle internally which you need to match in SunGuide. Some devices when you poll them it clears them out and starts it over and writes a new file. If it is that file, it would be an issue. I think Wavetronix will be okay.

John Hope: The idea of consecutive detectors. Most of the detectors in D5 are reading multiple directions of travel. We would have one detector detecting east bound and detecting west bound. With that in mind, everything that says within the ConOps consecutive detectors, we think you would be more interested in consecutive links.

Tucker Brown: Correct and that will funnel back to a detector that will have to be deployed. Yes, a logical way to go link to link but with the that we go back to the detector to poll it.

John Hope: Right, but the association happens at the link level not the detector level.

Tucker Brown: Correct.

John Hope: That also helps because we have several detectors detecting both mainlines and ramps as separate links.

Another question – you touched on new alarms in the slides that as new alarms come in, there would be an association back to the original alert. Is that going to be an automatic association or is that something an operator will have to click on each time?

Tucker Brown: That is not spelled out in the ConOps. In my mind, it looks like you have a ramp detection first and an event is created from that. Then you have a mainline that comes in and you have to associate that the event created from the ramp alert. From that point forward the consecutive linking detectors and links could automatically pull those into the event. The question is do they want to see those as individual alerts? Or do they want it to automatically associate and the links start flashing on the map?

John Hope: In District Five we want the latter. Another thing to keep in mind is that occasionally a detector will be offline/out of service so you might have an association so it needs to be smart enough to know if B is out of service it should know that C is next.

Tucker Brown: Is that only for out of service? Or is that applied to error and failed states as well?

John Hope: Error and failed as well.

Tucker Brown: Okay, that’s fine.

John Hope: Does a new icon get generated as a detector picks up the first location of the WWD? From the initial point that the detector picks up the WWD is a new icon created?

Tucker Brown: That wasn’t stated in the ConOps so it was assumed that the link would serve as the visual indication with the blinking. WWD devices ramp devices, if we had an alert for the MVDS it would likely be a red flashing background around the detector icon. To give you an idea of the area just for the alert. Once that is handled in some way the indication would be the flashing link.

John Hope: That sounds perfect. Instead of turning off the WWD detection for the entire site can it be done at the lane level?

Tucker Brown: I don’t know that we have access to… I think the directional bend covers the entire direction, so I think it is only the link. I don’t think it does lane level directional. And we don’t know which lane the vehicle was in when it was wrong way.

John Hope: I think that comment from detectors in construction zones if a lane is closed. If that’s the case the entire detector should be set out of service or at least the WWD feature would be set out of service.

Tucker Brown: The disabling I was referring to was only for the WWD part not the TSS detection. Which can be done on a per detector basis. I can look into it because I want to look to see what they provide (lane level or not). The intent now is to do it at the detector level.

Carla Holmes: The ConOps mentioned the ability for the nearest cameras to be associated with the mainline detection and for the cameras to be able to zoom in and out to see the affected area. Would that be part of this? How would tie into the enhancements?

Tucker Brown: The existing WWD allows for association of cameras. We would have to expand the concept to the MVDS. Then the same functionality would be associated with those so when it triggers, you would see that you already have that association. The ramp detector behavior will just be extended to the MVDS.

Carla Holmes: So, you would be adding cameras to what was already there?

Tucker Brown: There will be a configuration that allows you to associate cameras to the MVDS so when that triggers, you can bring up additional video.

John Hope: You also mentioned turning on and off the WWD detection from the MVDS on a per detector basis, does that imply we will get a new window with all detectors and status?

Tucker Brown: I am debating that question in my head because essentially detector itself already has a status asking if it is polling or not which is standard. It would continually be polling the directional bend as well as the regular TSS data and once it triggers it, there will be a visual indicator and it will probably flash and be associated with the event. It will flash until that event closes. The states are actively polling (TSS Ops status), blinking because of a WWD. Those are the ones I had in mind for the visual aspect. If we were to create a dialog it would be a duplication of the visual information. We can do that if people have a need for it. I am trying to figure out what you would get from having in a dialog rather than seeing it on the map.

John Hope: What we are getting at is getting a list of detectors that are on or off for the WWD detection.

Tucker Brown: Oh okay. At some point we are going to have a configuration window that will allow a configuration of cameras to MVDS. As part of that I saw it as a checkbox if detection is there or not. The way that is set up is you could have half doing WWD detection and the other half not and it could be solely by if you tell it to do it or not. If you get directional bends for both east bound and west bound, that would be possible to do it on the link basis.

John Hope: I think we are good.

Tucker Brown: If you have those comments in the ConOps, can you pass those along to Central Office?

Cherie Phillips: I have a few questions. I have observed WWD on our systems and their driving can be erratic which makes it challenging for our operators to be able to get ahead of the responsiveness. The ability to set up perimeters that are associated with these links such as DMS so being able to know or a way to have it configured on the back end to where the operator gets a pop up when a driver is close to the DMS, so the travelers know what is happening. As the WWD gets closer to the DMS it has a cascading effect. I know we might get a lot of false alerts with this so it might be good to have this come in as an actual alert. Did you mention if we have the ability for it to come in as an alert?

Tucker Brown: The first one for sure then the subsequent ones will be handled automatically. On the first thing you said, and it is picking up DMS and suggesting them to operators, right now, there is WWD template that can be used to populate a DMS. There are also concepts of activating the pre-defined plans but that is harder especially for a moving condition. Would the automatic suggestion for WWD be acceptable for operators?

Cherie Phillips: Karla do you want to weigh in on that? I will default to what everyone wants to do for that.

Mark Laird: I would worry about the latency issue again and the operator response time.

Tucker Brown: If we do what John talked about and up the interval to 5 seconds, it goes way down, and I would have more confidence in that. If we do something like that it would be finding DMS one mile or two miles downstream. You can adjust what you feel is a regional amount of distance in front.

Cherie Phillips: That would allow for different polling options for Districts with other hardware and allow for flexibility.

Tucker Brown: Anyone else on that? I would like to ask about general support for this. How many people would be interested in deploying it on their side?

Robbie Brown: District One would be interested.

John Hope: District 5 would use it.

Cherie Phillips: Turnpike would use it.

Richard Hemming: District Three would be interested.

Mike Crawson: District Seven agrees as well.

Tucker Brown: It sounds like there is a lot of support for this. Please comment on the ConOps or the issue. Thanks for your input.

Christine Shafik: Thanks for the good conversation. We have a few more minutes if anyone has any comments or questions.

Ray Mikol: We wanted to ask how the 8.0 rollout is progressing?

Tucker Brown: District Six was rolled out on March 16th, so it has been two weeks. They had a few issues we have delt with and we have pushed out fixes to them. So, it should cover the issues. That will cover everything except 2 or 3 intermittent issues that we don’t have a ton of information on. 8.0 Hotfix 3 should go out to TERL today for testing. They found some issues, but they have been fixed. If everything goes right, it should be out the door next week. At that point the scripts are good to go and the initial deployment has been done at one place. So, anyone wanting to upgrade after that is good to go. District Five and FTE are next up for the deployment.

Mark Laird: I think we need D5 to do that to fix the FHP issue?

Tucker Brown: No, Kyle pushed out a fix to the interface server and I believe AJ patched D6 this morning. You may be getting alerts right now. The interface server had to be compatible with 7.2 and 8.0 so we had to fix that. We also patched CFX this morning so you should be seeing alerts as well.

Mark Laird: On that topic, the testing of OTM 3.6 was completed and was put into production in D6 today and hope to get it available by end of day tomorrow so if you are planning to upgrade to 8.0 next week it will be ready.

Carla Holmes: So, is it correct to assume that no one should upgrade to 8.0 until Hotfix 3 is delivered?

Tucker Brown: Yes, I would recommend that if you are going to do an install from today forward that you use Hotfix 3.

Christine Shafik: Any other questions? Thank you for joining today and talk to you at the next SSUG.