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Christine Shafik: Thank you for joining us today, please note that this meeting is being recorded for the purpose of taking meeting minutes.

**Item 1: Email Title in Response Plan**

Tucker Brown: When you have a response plan item that is an email and you go into it and the subject isn’t generated; you could have a blank title which operators may miss when generating. We are intending to handle this as part of the 8.0 release any way. There is already an email template on the way which we will include the subject line, so it is always generated. Are there any special considerations to how this subject line is generated that we should know about when we are generating the email template? This was listed as a separate enhancement but will be included with 4682.

Does anyone have thoughts on this or what would need to be covered by standard templating?

John Hope: The question we have is since this is an enhancement, we are assuming that this was designed this way, to have a blank subject line. We were wondering why it was designed that way?

Tucker Brown: I think it was more along the lines of having so many options to put there, and there is no clear indication of what to put there for every scenario. Especially since there are multiple event types. So it was left up the Districts as to how they want to fill that in.

John Hope: So with this enhancement you are going to cover every possibility?

Tucker Brown: We are going to give a custom option, so people can prefill that but there would be a default template that would be used if the district didn’t prefill based on their event. You can set up event specific templates that you need.

District Three: Can we instead of having it default to a selected one, give us a warning that there is one selected? That way we don’t default to the wrong one or send out a blank one? It would be better if it worked like a regular email where it prompts you to fill out the subject line.

Tucker Brown: So are you saying you want to continue to want it blank? The intended 8.0 functionality is to give a template that allows you do that. In a base case, you could make the template have a blank subject line. The intention for 8.0 is to generate a subject.

District Three: but what is generates the wrong one? We were the ones who brough this up and if it functions like email, then if we leave the subject line blank, it won’t allow you to send it.

Tucker Brown: Based on the way 8.0 is set up, it will give an initial subject of something. It will be up to the operator to look at it and determine if that is what they want to use. They will be able to change it and if it is consistently wrong then they can modify the template to change it.

John Hope: Did I hear correctly that you can have a separate template per event type?

Tucker Brown: Initially on the base installation you will have one default template. But it will allow multiple templates to be set against each event type. If you choose to set that up you can but you aren’t required to.

It is the same concept that we have for DMS, so if you don’t set up any templates for a DMS sign it uses the base template. It can also go look up any other stuff to figure out what template to use. You can also set up custom ones for certain event types. That is the same concept we are going with here. Any other questions?

**Item 2: 5182 Waze and RR Crossing**

Tucker Brown: It was brought up that the Long Island Railroad has implemented something about them uploading their crossings into Waze and significantly reduced incidents at the crossing, up to 80% reduction.

As far as I am aware, it is not the status of a railroad crossing but that there is actually a crossing there. Waze warns the drivers that there is a crossing. Conceptually we were looking ot implement railroad crossings into the system. This would work the same way as bridges. At this time the request is not asking to link to any devices that would give any information on the status of a train coming. All that they are looking for here is where are the configurations for railroad crossings. The intent is to set those up in the system and pass them over to C2C to the FLATIS side then they could be sent out via the statewide feed which I believe Waze already gets. They then would be able to ingest that and display it in their app.

As a future consideration, if we got devices that were capable of detecting a train, we would implement the actual device later. The concept of a railroad and setting a railroad status would already be in the system. So this would publish the location and pass it out to Waze.

John Hope: How would this be different than just creating an EM location at a railroad crossing?

Tucker Brown: It wouldn’t be vastly different. You can put an attribute on an EM location and we could do it that way as well. That is one way this could be solved. The idea here is that long term we would get status on railroad crossings and then we would set up to do it. All we would have to do is integrate a device at some point. If we do want to solve this through EM and an attribute on the EM, then that is doable and for this case would serve the exact same purpose.

Mark Dunthorn: Do you know if the EM locations are exposed in the third-party data feed?

Tucker Brown: I do not know the answer to that, but they would already be creating a custom type to send to Waze saying these are the railroad crossings. FLATIS could get that data in and determine which are railroad crossings and could send it to Waze in whatever format they need it in. Either way we would have to make a modification. If they are not passing out EM locations then we would need to do a modification, if they are not passing them then they might have to put a new flag on the EM location.

Jason Summerfield: Since you brought this up, I am just going to state that devices reading railroad crossings might not be an “in the future” thing, it is more near future and I look forward to having that conversation soon.

Mark Laird: Quick question, do you know who it was that claimed this 80%? It doesn’t make any sense at all. First, more than 80% of people would have to be using Waze and they would have had to have the incident without it.

Kriss Whitaker-Lee: This could be an artifact of small sample size.

Tucker Brown: I am not going to disagree with that statement, this was just what was written in the ticket. In general, this enhancement goes towards what Jason was referring to with putting railroad information in SunGuide. This would be a first step of getting them in and getting them configured.

John Hope: I am trying to conceptualize what this will entail. Is this similar to adding device on the map and there be an icon on the map that indicates what is there. Is that what is being proposed?

Tucker Brown: Correct. The GPIO is a generic way to do devices that have more of an on/off type of stuff. Like with bridges, it is either up or down. The railroad case is there is a train there or not. It gives us a way to add custom statuses to the system, to change icons, and it is a more generic way to stick devices in the system without building their own subsystem.

John Hope: So this would be in addition to the GPIO?

Tucker Brown: Correct.

**Item 3: 5156 Timestamp Logic Pop-up Warnings**

Tucker Brown: This has to do with timestamps on the responders. In the responder dialog, there are cases where operators are allowed to manually enter non-logic timestamps. It doesn’t check what the operators input into the system. The request was to more strictly enforce the timestamps so the notify timestamp has to be before your arrive timestamp which has to be before your depart timestamp. The date cannot be future. There might be an issue with doing that for some Districts. If it is an issue, we can just do a warning or strictly enforce it.

Should it be strictly enforced or should we just warn people?

John Hope: District 5 is okay with checking between the arrive and depart and making sure those are followed sequentially. With the notify, they have a number of events where they don’t have a notify time. There are also times when the notify might happen before the event creation.

Tucker Brown: If no timestamp happened before the notify, I think that would be an acceptable case. Does District Five have an opinion on strictly enforcing or just warning people.

John Hope: Do not strictly enforce, just notify or warn.

Kevin Mahaffey: District Three agrees with that, just a warning is acceptable.

Tucker Brown: Does anyone else have any comments?

Mark Laird: I think you know how District Six feels.

Tucker Brown: Yes, that will mean that each time it will notify the operator and they will have to click through it.

Mark Laird: Yea, I might prefer for it to turn red instead of an actual pop up.

District Three: Is it possible to just have the warning when closing the event out that there are time conflicts?

Mark Laird: I don’t think they will know the times at that point. I want to catch them when they are wrong so they can fix it.

Tucker Brown: Good point.

Mark Laird: if it is going to be a pop up then we will just deal with it. A problem I could see is them just getting use to killing the pop up so that if they do get it wrong, they might not notice.

John Hope: What options would be in the warning?

Tucker Brown: The intent of the warning is to call out that x timestamp is greater than x timestamp and the operator clicks okay. I am open to other possibilities but I don’t think we want to make changes on this because there are many ways it could be interpreted.

John Hope: As far as the warning goes, could there be a few options where you could click okay or cancel. If you click cancel it will nullify the timestamp you just selected? Because there may be cases where you accidentally clicked the timestamp box.

Tucker Brown: What you said was interesting with the timestamp you just set. You also mentioned a scenario where you don’t know the notify timestamp and are setting the arrival timestamp later, we should know what time you just set and the system should allow the use to click okay and it be nullified itself.

Mark Laird: We would want to turn that off, we don’t want to null out information. It is hard enough dealing with the notifications.

District Three: They haven’t hit saved yet, could they just hit cancel changes?

Tucker Brown: There is a way to revert but it would revert everything.

John Hope: Considering the complexities involved, just having an okay option should be fine.

Item 4: TrafficVision Object Identification

Tucker Brown: FTE is looking at the TrafficVision object identification system and would like to integrate that into a supported back end server process. New Mexico has already done an integration but runs a Texas based ATMS with no IDS. We should still need integration with IDS. I believe the alerts are similar to VisioPad with images, I believe that part is done but I need to check. Is anyone else looking into this? Or is anyone interested in incorporating this?

Justin Merritt: We are currently in the process of getting an approval for a pilot project with this and adding 75 cameras with this on them. I mentioned it at the CMB meeting. During their demo they showed us the integration with SunGuide (not sure from where) but it popped up like an alert and have a 10 second video clip of what it is. The thing that I am not sure about is if we have to store that data from the video? They said there were settings where once you accept the event the video goes away. I would like that option if possible, I am not sure of the liability needs at the state level.

Tucker Brown: It depends on the access level, if we are sending it to a location to pick it up. I am going to have to let FDOT work out the video storage piece. From my standpoint we can get the video there as an alert and not store it in the SunGuide database. I will have to defer on FDOT on the retention laws.

Justin Merritt: I know our management was looking to get that information. We are looking forward to it and we think it will help our operators focus on the anomalies on the roadway. We are still a few months away from the pilot taking place.

Tucker Brown: For the pilot, you aren’t expecting a SunGuide integration are you?

Justin Merritt: Now that you mention it, if you can get it done by then. We would like it by the pilot but there will be two parts of it. One will be a blind test to see if the system finds more than what the operators are finding. Then we would have the fully integrated version in which we will have to use their software in conjunction with SunGuide.

Christine Shafik: What is the schedule on the pilot?

Justin Merritt: We are still waiting on the approval It has been set back, I am not sure where it is, I am just waiting on the go ahead. I am hoping two months to have it operational. All your doing is allowing the video to go out to the cloud server so there is no rack space issues.

Tucker Brown: I don’t have any specifics on New Mexico and rack space. I can ask and get back to the group. It would be nice to have some direct review from them and if I get it, I will let you know.

Justin Merritt: Other than the rack space was the product helpful?

District: They didn’t dislike the product, I think they just thought the cost was not worth it. But this has been a while. Their issues were the rack space and the recurring cost associated with it.

Tucker Brown: There is a tradeoff on using the bandwidth to send out the video to the cloud rather than storing it locally.

John Hope: District Five has a question about paying for the enhancement. Historically the vendor would have to pay for drivers to be integrated into SunGuide. Why in this case is FDOT proposing to pay for this?

Christine Shafik: I appreciate the question and have had some discussion with the team here and we have not settled on how it is going to go but please feel free to contact me for any additional discussion or questions you have.

John Hope: In general, District Five wouldn’t be pursuing this but would be interested in the enhancement itself and if it was brought up at a CMB to approve payment for it, they would likely decline it.

Tucker Brown: That was my last slide. Anything else?

Christine Shafik: Does anyone have any other concerns or comments?

Dee McTague: A question from management is when we are going to look at the topic of more accurate EM locations? I think it is JIRA ticket 3800. It was discussed at a SSUG in October.

Christine Shafik: Mark or Tucker, do you have the CMB list in front of you?

Mark Dunthorn: We discussed this on Monday. It is on our list to figure out the next steps. I have taken an action item to talk with someone from FHP and see they had any guidance on how to make this happen. We know we need to get this back on the SSUG agenda but we wanted to have something more concrete. We have not forgotten about it.

Dee McTague: Okay, thank you.

John Hope: District Five is putting together a paper on an enhancement on integrating SunGuide with blank out signs. I just wanted to ask if any other District would be interested or plan on using blank out signs and having them integrate with SunGuide. If so, I want to get some feedback from you.

Jason Summerfield: We don’t have any blank out signs but isn’t it equivalent to a beacon where it turns on and off?

John Hope: It is similar but a blank out sign would have two to three different states where it would display a couple different messages. It communicates and is activated by a relay. Is D2 planning on having any of these?

Jason Summerfield: No, but I was thinking of items similar in SunGuide this could be bounced off of.

Brent Poole: We might want to use it for our part time shoulder use in the future.

John Hope: Okay, I will reach out to you later.

Christine Shafik: If there is nothing else, please stay safe out there. We appreciate your ideas, thoughts and questions. Talk to you at the next meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Bring up JIRA 3800 back up at the SSUG. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |