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**Florida Department of Transportation**

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Tuesday, September 25, 2018**

**1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.**

**Rhyne Building, 308 Conference Room, Tallahassee, Florida**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bryan Homayouni, CFX  John Hope, CFX  Tucker Brown, SwRI  Mark Dunthorn, CO  Frances Ijeoma, CO  Karthik Devarakonda, CO  Jennifer Rich, CO  Derek Vollmer, CO  Chrissie Collins, CO  Justin Merritt, D1  Robbie Brown, D1  Vincent Lee, D1  Pete Vega, D2  Alex Valera, D2  Jason Summerfield, D2 | Craig Carnes, D2  Amy DiRusso, D3  Daniel Smith, D4  Dee Mctague, D4  Dong Chen, D4  Tushar Patel, D5  Clay Packard, D5  Josh Sibley, D5  Jeremy Dilmore, D5  Shannon Waterson, D5  Claudia Paskauskas, D5  Alex Mirones, D6  Javier Rodriguez, D6  Alejandro Motta, D6 | Mark Laird, D6  Rodney Carrero-Vila, D6  Dan Buidens, D7  Jared Roso, D7  Mike Crawson, D7  Cathy Mckenzie, D7  Susan Shaffer, D7  Eric Gordin, FTE  Ryan Brown, FTE  Kelly Kinney, FTE  Karla Smith, FTE |

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting is to review and vote on statewide issues and requirements, and review JIRA issues.

**Welcome:** Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman B. Homayouni opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

**Call for Quorum and Review of Agenda:** A quorum was established for this CMB meeting. B. Homayouni reviewed the meeting agenda there were eleven agenda items and seven are voting items.

**Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review:** We will review the action items from the previous meeting.

**Action Items:**

1. **RWIS Developmental Specification –** The item is on hold and we can circle back with Romona to discuss in detail since it was an effort lead by Chester. We will table it now and circle back on it as time progresses.
2. **Update the Travel Time Document –** This was through Mark Dunthorn. It is an item that is in progress. The document has been reviewed and we have identified where the conflict is. We are still reviewing the document and we should have it completed and distributed within the next several weeks.
3. **Add RWIS to SSUG Meetings –** This item is pending and needs more internal discussion.
4. **Keep Districts in the loop for the Architecture updates –** Funds have been programmed for FY18/19 and 19/20 for the scope is almost complete for the task.
5. **Look into adding 3986 and 4183 into the 7.2.0 release –** The 4183 will be discussed later in this meeting. The 3986 is pending and needs more internal discussion.
6. **Bridge closures and executive notification in SSUG meetings –** Modifications are being made for the D6 automated bridge closures. Executive notifications is a voting item at today’s meeting.
7. **Take the idea of adding images to the executive notifications to the SSUG meeting –** This was added to a SSUG meeting and a survey has been completed.
8. **Get a schedule for R-ICMS deployment –** The schedule has been sent and was sent to the group last week. Please contact Clay Packard if you have any questions or concerns with the schedule.
9. **Add Bluetooth (probe vehicle) specifications 660-2 updates to ITS Working Group Meeting –** This has not been discussed but we are editing the specifications and once the specification is updated, we will send it out for review.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**SunGuide Software Update – Frances Ijeoma**

**Truck Parking Updates -** We have a new configurable color DMS for Truck Parking. When it was released it was just the basic DMS color but now it can be configured to use the colors that you want. The truck parking icon can be published in FL511. Previously, you could publish the icon but did not have a way to choose which truck parking facility you wanted to publish but now you can choose which truck parking facility to publish.

**SunGuide 7.1.1. –** Has been released and the new enhancements are:

* Lane by Lane detector data which was JIRA ticket 3808 and it originated from District 5.
* Links on Map Option 1 – C2C Icon Configuration which was JIRA ticket 2736 and was from District 6.
* Traffic Signal Malfunction Event Type – New Event Types:
  + Traffic Signal Dark, Traffic Signal Flash, and Bridge up
* Roadway Type Flags came from District 2 because they wanted the arterial roadway option.
  + Limited Access, Arterial, and Express Lanes
* Bluetooth MAC Address matching which was JIRA issue 3984. They wanted to be able to have the Bluetooth read different MAC Addresses

**SunGuide 7.2 Update – Frances Ijeoma**

* 7.2 will be released early next year. The expected changes are listed below.
  + Audit Chronology - SunGuide software will enter audit records into the event chronology at the time the audit is performed. SunGuide will indicate what record was modified by referencing the record type and the timestamp of that record.
  + Link Display - SunGuide software will display an expanded view when hovering over multiple links that are stacked on top of each other.
  + Roadway Primary/Secondary – SunGuide software will support configuring a parent roadway in the Roadway Configuration window. When you configure a parent roadway, the roadway itself won’t be present in the selectable options. If an event is created on the secondary roadway, SunGuide software will report that event in FLATIS using the secondary roadway not the primary roadway.
  + Case Sensitivity in Object Names – SunGuide software will enforce case insensitive uniqueness for the name of the configuration items which are basically all of your devices.
  + Monitor and Regulate DMS Fonts – Adding font monitoring to SunGuide and you will be able to detect when a font has changed on a sign.
  + Planned Events – You will have the ability to have a new start and end time for planned events like marathons. The response plan in this case will need to be approved between the creation of the events and the start of the events.
  + ICMS Integration Change – Changes to SunGuide for the D5 ICMS project includes porting over TMDDv3 signal interface.
  + Executive Notification Automation - Derek specifically wanted me to talk about this change and hopes that it passes today.
  + Intersection EM Location – Derek also wants this item to pass today.
* There are too many SunGuide hotfixes to list here so please refer to the emails sent out and the readme files. Also, be sure to test any items that are listed as “deferred to the District” in the email.
* Mark Dunthorn added that the 7.1.2 release is coming out between 7.1.1 and 7.2 and there are six items in that release as well.
* **Bryan:** Right before the meeting we had a discussion about the schedule and we will be shifting the schedule on some of these items. When we get to the slides that show the cost and the schedule, please note that the schedule has changed and it is not reflected on the slide but will be discussed.

**Vehicle Position Data Across C2C Connection (VOTE): Mark Dunthorn**

This is about adding a new link to the data structure. The original need was for the Districts to see other Districts road rangers. The Traffic Incident Management (TIM) program wants to be able to see these at the State Emergency Operations Center (EOC). They want to have a read-only map that shows all locations statewide. The Districts will be able to see how the incidents are managed during the large scale EOC type of events.

There will be some minor changes to the operator map. Basically, around trying to see another Center-to-Center data type. There will also be a data type that is added to that stream. The data itself is already part of SunGuide. We are not adding data to SunGuide, we are just making the data available over the network. We are looking for the location and the availability status. At the SSUG meetings we mentioned the possibility of wanting more information like the home district of the Road Ranger and the vehicle type. We will work out this during the design phase.

* **Mark Laird:** I think one thing we will need is the timestamp since the position data can be stale sometimes.
* **Mark Dunthorn**: That is a very good point. The timestamp is always sent with every C2C update. The Traffic Engineering Research Laboratory (TERL) relies on the timestamp to know when the data gets stale. Are you asking if you should be able to see it on the map as well?
* **Mark Laird**: Yes, there is a reported timestamp not just when it was sent via C2C.
* **Mark Dunthorn**: We will get that as a note and put that in. I don’t see any problem with including that. Are there any other questions or comments?
  + **Estimate**: $11.5K
  + **Scheduled Release**: 7.2
  + **Vote**: District 1 (Robbie Brown): Yes, District 2 (Alex Varela): Yes, District 3 (Amy DiRusso): Yes, District 4 (Dong Chen): Yes, District 5 (Jeremy Dilmore): Yes, District 6 (Javier Rodriguez): Yes, District 7 (Dan Buidens): Yes, FTE (Eric Gordin): Yes, CO (via Mark Dunthorn): Yes, CFX (Bryan Homayouni): Yes, MDX : not present (no vote)
  + **Bryan**: The measure passes.

**Sending Messages to Non-Color and Color Signs via SAS (VOTE) – Tucker Brown, SwRI**

This item involves sending messages to color signs and non-color signs through SAS. Currently, SAS allows you to configure a single message (whether it is color or non-color or graphic or no graphic). It allows you to configure any single message. The problem with that is if you want to send a message to a set of color signs and non-color signs, you would have to create two separate schedule items to make that happen. One message to your color signs and a different message going to your non-color signs. There is another issue when you have color messages sent to non-color signs which will fail because they do not recognize the color-tag.

The enhancement here is to use the pre-defined planned concept with SAS. With the pre-defined plan, you would select a set of signs and you would choose a message for each individual sign that could include graphics or color. Each sign could have a different message. You get the ability to configure every message for every sign. There is also the concept of modifying all of them at the same time as well. Essentially, we would like to reuse the pre-defined plans that were created for EM locations, and it would allow you to use those pre-defined plans in SAS as a scheduled item. As you create these, you would tell it to use a pre-defined plan and when the SAS system activates that message, it is going to go through each of the signs and send that particular message to that particular sign. When the scheduled item is over, the same concept is that we are going to pull all of those messages back down.

* **Estimate: $11.5K**
* **Schedule Release: 7.2**
* **VOTE:** District One: Yes, District Two: Yes, District Three: Yes, District Four: Yes, District Five: Yes, District Six: Yes, District Seven: Yes, FTE: Yes, Central Office: Yes, CFX: Yes, MDX : not present (no vote)
* **Bryan**: The measure passes.

**Small-Effort JIRA Issues: 4015, 4187, 4301, and 4302 (VOTE) – Tucker Brown, SwRI**

There are four issues here and we will vote on them individually. They are labeled small effort but some of these are actually not small efforts.

* **Executive Notifications (4015) –** There was a ConOps circulated that lists all of the changes. Essentially right now there is an automatic email based on particular criteria. The email has a template and can be modified by TMC staff before it is sent out. The emails can be triggered manually for an event. Emails are also sent to the TMC operators on a configurable interval until the event is completed. The changes right now are not currently highlighted in the email.
  + **New Enhancement** – In the ConOps there are 8 different criteria for generating an executive notification. It will generate alerts based on all of that criteria. There will still be an option for manually generating one. Instead of the notification being sent out to a particular email, it will have a particular dialogue within SunGuide that allows the users to look at what would be sent. That way any corrections or modifications can be made. The formatting can be modified. If you are a user with the right level of permissions, you are able to send that out directly. When you click send it will generate and email to the list of people who would receive it. It will no longer be sent to a TMC operators email where they would have to forward it out to a bunch of people. That would be something they configure already and when they hit send it would go out. The initial generation of that email will be based on the template and you can modify all of that stuff after the fact anyway. If there is a regeneration of the executive notification, you are not going to have to continually make that same change. It will save the changes previously made. It will also add the new items associated with the executive notification. The changes that are being made in this system, the changes will be highlighted for updated notifications. There will be a way to have multiple events combined into one notification. The system will also allow you to go get snapshots (video on desktop) and attach them as part of the email. It is not required but is an option. It will directly pull the users contact information and it will attach it at the bottom. That way if someone needs to respond to the email, the contact information will be at the bottom.
  + **Estimate:** $66k
  + **Scheduled Release:** Initially slated for 8.0 but Derek asked to move it back to 7.2 release.
  + **Alex:** Our district has recently started adding KMZ files from Google Earth because we have a lot of rural locations. Is that still a possibility to add that KMZ file?
  + **Tucker:** Are you talking about as an attachment to it? Adding additional attachments?
  + **Alex:** Correct.
  + **Tucker:** That was not listed in the ConOps but that is something that can be done.
  + **Alex:** This has been something we have done the last few weeks, and helps with mile markers.
  + **Tucker:** If we were to have the ability to add an attachment, it would not just apply to those. It would apply to all of them.
  + **Bryan:** What would be the level of effort to include this in the enhancement?
  + **Tucker:** It is pretty minor and would not be a big deal.
  + **Bryan:**  Is there anyone on the line that has concerns regarding the request?
  + **Eric:**  I don’t have any opposition, but I was going to ask a similar question. For districts that may not use the video on desktop, is there an ability to attach a snapshot via an alternate method but this might take care of that.
  + **Tucker:** That goes back to the same thing, if we allow attachments that would be supported. It sounds like it is a need from multiple districts.
  + **Bryan:** It sounds like there aren’t any concerns and we should be able to include it in this enhancement to add attachments.
  + **Tucker:** Correct, it won’t be a problem.
  + **Jeremy:** Is this scheduled release 8.0 or 7.2?
  + **Bryan:**  It is 7.2. There are two changes for this task. The first is adding the attachments and the second is to update the schedule from 8.0 to 7.2. Let’s go ahead and start the vote.
  + **VOTE:** District One: Yes, District Two: Yes, District Three: Yes, District Four: Yes, District Five: Yes, District Six: Yes, District Seven: No, it is not needed, FTE: Yes, Central Office: Yes, CFX: Yes, MDX : not present (no vote).
  + **Bryan**: The measure passes.
* **Intersection Locations (4187) –** Adding intersection locations as part of SunGuide. The current behavior is that the location is based on a single point with a single roadway, direction and lane map. For intersections, some districts have been putting in multiple events because they have multiple roadways, multiple directions, etc. and are trying to post based on those factors. There is not a good equivalent in SunGuide for that. If you are putting in those multiple events you can have the performance metrics going off. If you do post those, FLATIS see that as multiple events not a single event effecting multiple roadway.
  + The enhancement is to have the ability to configure a location that has multiple approaches. Looking on the slide, you have the intersection and see the multiple approaches and they would all be defined as a single location. This can get complex and to help with that, we would be creating a tool that would take in a roadway that will allow you to configure locations along that roadway. It pulls out a lot of the information from shapefiles, so you can get all of the intersections and approaches and the user would run it and they would get a view of what is configured for them. The user would have a chance to modify them and then import them into the system. This tool can be used for additional roadways in the future. The system will have the ability to go in and modify the locations and gives the option of doing a bulk import.
  + Once you start using these, essentially the lane blockage area of the event would get a little bit larger and show you the picture of what the intersection will look like. You will have the same ability for all approaches for any set of lane blockages. You can change the lane blockage on any of the lanes. You can also add or remove lanes from any of those approaches. Then you would get a description based on the location. We will also have to take into account the response plan and post that on a DMS sign.
  + Additionally, reports are going to have to be modified. If you do a report on a particular roadway and an intersection may contain that roadway but it might also show up in a different roadway. The filters need to make sure that when we are looking for particular events on a roadway, it takes into account the multiple roadway and intersection location. A lot of reports for events are going to have to change. Potentially there will be new reports that want to just look at intersection locations. So, filtering out all of the single points, single roadway direction and location to just look at the intersection. That would allow you look at particular roadways and particular data for that roadway.
  + This is a very large change to the system. SunGuide was originally developed with the idea of only using single points, single direction, and single roadways. It touches a lot of the different pieces of the system. A lot goes into this especially at the reporting level.
  + **Estimate:** $130K
  + **Schedule Release:** 7.2 (updated release)
  + **Bryan:** This is what the ConOps was for that Derek sent out earlier this week, right? Did everyone have the chance to review the ConOps before the meeting?
  + **Robbie:** I think we just received it yesterday.
  + **Bryan:** If anyone didn’t get the document please let us know so we can send it back out. Are there any questions, comments, concerns regarding this voting item?
  + **Justin:** I know it was discussed in the past but what was the solution for roundabouts? They seem to be adding them like crazy around here. How would that be managed?
  + **Tucker:** I think at the current time they decided not to add in roundabouts. At the time we talked about them, I thought they would be few and far between. It did not seem that they would be widely used at that time.
  + **Justin:** Okay, no worries. I guess it is just our district that will be lucky.
  + **Jeremy:** I have a couple of questions. How will incidents between intersections be handled in SunGuide?
  + **Tucker:** Can you clarify what you mean by between intersections? Do you mean the space between the two intersections? Not at the intersection?
  + **Jeremy:** If we had a crash that was between these two new EM points that have all of these properties of an intersection, will we still have an option for before and after? Then would we have to designate which roadway it is on? Some of the definitions, the before and after becomes a little more complicated for me to understand how those definitions will now be used now that there is no directionality associated with a point.
  + **Tucker:** With the location concept, it is almost like you need a second location there. Not specifically tied to the intersection, but just to the point of talking about a single point, single roadway, and single direction I think is what you are referring to. You are right that the before and beyond as an intersection doesn’t have a directionality associated with it. I know that is not discussed in the ConOps for sure. Is there a way you would like to see that? Or would making a second point there that is a single point (like the current system) be sufficient for that?
  + **Jeremy:** If we go into creating additional points would we have the same problems that we had in the past? We would load up the EM locations and there were performance issues in SunGuide. Given the number of intersections we want to see represented, do you think we will have performance issues or do you think it will have performance issues?
  + **Tucker:** We have done testing in the current versions.
  + **Mark Dunthorn:** What we tested was at the TERL and majority of the locations were not enabled. The issue that we most recently tested was with the configuration scheme and it has been addressed. What I think Jeremy is talking about is when all of the locations are enabled for use. We have not tested that particular scenario.
  + **Tucker:** In reference to the larger loading issue, in the older version the map wouldn’t load. We have done a lot to help that issues and it is better for sure. You will still see larger load times on the initial login. They are now workable in the system. That being said, it is still an ongoing effort to make that even less of a burden. We are moving towards being able to support hundreds of thousands of locations. In reference to this specific instance, I think adding more here is fine if that meets the operational need because we will be fixing it anyway.
  + **Jeremy:** I appreciate it, thank you.
  + **Tucker:** There is bulk import tool that is for event locations. It is possible to put it in an excel format. Not a lot of people use it because it doesn’t allow shapefiles to pull all of the data and is a manual process. We could combine them into one. This would be for intersections and to get the roadway configured. Are there any other questions or comments?
  + **Bryan:** Does anyone have concerns or need more time to review this update? Hearing none, we can proceed with the vote.
    - The change to slide would be the scheduled release would be moved to the 7.2 release not the 8.0.
    - **VOTE:** District One: Yes, but we are still having a sidebar conversation. I think we have internal questions as to how it would work for us.
    - **Bryan:** Something to keep in mind since you just got the ConOps is to review that and provide questions and comments to Derek.
    - **District One:** Yes, that sounds good. We got it yesterday morning and have not had a chance to go through it thoroughly.
    - **Jeremy:** Before we go on with the vote, If we were to table this until next time are we looking at three months?
    - **Bryan:** The next formal CMB would be in about three months or so. We do have a process implemented where we could do an online vote and handle it in between. What specifically are you requesting? More time to review?
    - **Jeremy:** What I am hearing is that the ConOps was just sent out yesterday and might not have provided people with enough time to look at the document. I wasn’t sure if there was something that is schedule critical. I know there is only so much time available before it would miss the window to be included in 7.2. I’m assuming there is a reason why Derek made the note at the beginning of the meeting that he hoped this item passes. It would be helpful if we understood some of the back story and if we had enough time to fully digest all of it and make sure we know all of the information before making a determination on whether to spend $130k. Could Tucker talk to any schedule issues and does anyone have any back story as to why Derek wanted to see this one approved?
    - **Tucker:** I don’t have any information as to why the approval message were included in the slides at the beginning. As far as a schedule these weren’t on the original 7.2 slate so we are adding them in late which will push the 7.2 back. There is work to be done 7.2.1. that has not yet started so we can be doing those while people are trying to digest this one. If we delay it right now for a couple of weeks, that is fine. I prefer to not delay it for three months if we are to get it done. There is plenty of time in the schedule if people want to review the ConOps more and get back to us.
    - **Bryan:** What is plenty of time in the schedule?
    - **Tucker:** If all comments and questions were done in a month I don’t think it would be a problem.
    - **Bryan:** That being said, would you prefer more time? This isn’t an official vote here but would you like more time to review the ConOps?
      * Would you like a little more time before we vote?
      * **District One:** Yes, District Two: When would 7.2 would be released if it is pushed back? When are looking at the release?
      * **Tucker:** Adding the two new items today, intersections and executive notifications would push it back three months. So we are at least looking at quarter two of 2019.
      * **Bryan:** Is that regardless of whether we vote today or not?
      * **Tucker:** That is pending its approval. One of them did get approved, if it gets approved then it would push it back.
      * **Bryan:** The question is if we don’t vote today, and we vote in three weeks’ time, we do an informal vote and it passes does that change the schedule you just mentioned?
      * **Tucker:** It would be the same, we are working on 7.2 issues right now.
      * **Bryan:** Does that answer your question?
      * **Justin:** Yes, it does. It don’t see any downside to this enhancement at all. It is really if we can get it tailored on your end. We would have to review the ConOps.
      * **Bryan:** From that standpoint are you okay to vote today or do you want a more time to review?
      * **Justin:** We are good either way but if the majority wants to wait we are fine with that.
      * **Bryan:** If we have a few district’s that prefer to wait, let’s give them the opportunity to review. District Three what are your thoughts? Wait or no wait?
      * **Amy:** I prefer to wait to have more time to review. I haven’t sent it to my other folks yet.
      * **Bryan:** We have three out of four districts saying to give them more time. My thought is to go ahead and table it. Everybody review the ConOps and provide feedback to Derek and I will reach back out to everyone in two weeks to see if we are ready to proceed with the vote. Then we will issue an online vote for the item. You will get an email from John Hope and hopefully in a three-week time period we can have this item completely voted on. Does that sound okay Tucker?
      * We will hold off and create an action for all the Districts to review the ConOps and we will follow up with an online vote.
      * **Daniel:** We are having the diverging diamonds come to District 7. Construction has started on one of them and there is another one that will be let in the near future. I’m just wondering about diverging diamonds and if it is covered in the ConOps, I apologize I haven’t had a chance to read it yet.
      * **Tucker:** The diverging diamond is not specifically mentioned, if you want to add that to the comments on the ConOps we can add that.
      * **Daniel:** We will add that to our comments. Thank you.
      * **Derek:** What’s going on?
      * **Bryan:** We just finished discussing JIRA 4187 which is the intersections. There was a substantial amount of questions regarding the ConOps and the application. I understand that it was sent out earlier this week.
      * **Derek:** No, I sent it out in July with a two to three-week review cycle. I received comments back from District five and District two.
      * **Bryan:** So, the recent version sent out were based on the comments?
      * **Derek:** Yes, but there weren’t very many changes.
      * **Bryan:** What we are hearing from the Districts is that they would like more time to review and then we would move to an online vote in a one to two-week period instead of voting today on the item.
      * **Derek:** Right now, I have the document as view only, so I will need to change that and open it back up for comments.
      * **Bryan:** Yes, we have already had some comments like adding the diverging diamonds.
      * **Derek:** Just remember this enhancement is for your route of significance that should already be implemented. It will also help with the intersections that occur with the intersections.
      * **Bryan:** Another item that was discussed was the schedule and one of the things we are trying to be mindful of is to not impact the overall deployment schedule. Based on talking to Tucker it sounded like that if we move this forward in a timely fashion (next few weeks) that it would not impact the 7.2 release date schedule.
      * **Derek:** If people want to add comments I will give you until October 4th and then we can try to vote after that.
      * **Bryan:** Does anyone have any questions or concerns? Hearing none, we will move on. This item is tabled for a later vote.
      * **Derek:** I can’t promise I can stay on, I have testing to attend.
* **Event List Row Height (JIRA 4301) – Tucker Brown**

The previous version of SunGuide used multiple lines for each event in the event list. Since we removed those, and the event list has one event per line some people were losing the information from being cut off. The proposal will allow a user to select if they would like to use multiple lines per event in the event list. This will be a user setting not an installation setting. If they decide to have it be more than one, then each event would get two lines worth of screen space. If something in that column that wasn’t fitting it would wrap to the next row, it would show up. You’re not going to be able to see as many events on your screen but if you’re doing a horizontal monitor as opposed to a vertical, you may have more vertical space or horizontal space depending on how you configure it. It just gives you another option on how much information in the events you can see.

* + **Estimate:** $6k
  + **Schedule Release:** 7.2
    - **Bryan:** Anyone on the line have any questions, concerns for this item. Hearing none, we are going to move to the vote.
    - **VOTE:** District One: Yes, District Two: Yes, District Three: Yes, District Four: Yes, District Five: Yes, District Six: Yes, District Seven: Yes, Central Office: Yes (Mark), CFX: Yes, MDX : not present (no vote).
    - **Bryan**: The measure passes.
* **Permanent Status Filters (4302) – Tucker Brown**

The previous version of SunGuide had a fixed list of filters for devices (Active, Error, Failed, Out of Service). In the new version, we will have Excel style filtering so if you don’t have any items in that particular status you won’t be able to filter it. This allows you to go back to always have those four options regardless of the items and their status in their list.

* + **Estimate:** $3k
  + **Release Schedule:** 7.2
    - Bryan: Anyone on the line have any questions, concerns for this item. Hearing none, we are going to move to the vote.
    - **VOTE:** District One: Yes, District Two: Yes, District Three: Yes, District Four: Yes, District Five: Yes, District Six: Yes, District Seven: Yes, Central Office: Yes (Mark), CFX: Yes, MDX : not present (no vote).
    - **Bryan**: The measure passes.
* **TAPCO Blinklink Wrong Way Driving API – Tucker Brown**

This is for the wrong way driving devices, TAPCO has provided an API into the BlinkLink software (as opposed to connecting to the device directly). The request is to integrate with the BlinkLink interface for new alerts and respond to the software with the BlinkLink custom resolutions. The only difference that would affect the user is that there would be a new drop down (only for TAPCO alerts from the BlinkLink interface) that would force the user to select the resolution action, in addition to the actions that SunGuide should perform.

* + **Estimate:** $10k
  + **Schedule Release:** 7.1.2
    - **Bryan:** The schedule is different than what is on the slide. It will be worked into 7.1.2. Does anyone have any questions, comments or concerns on this item? Hearing none, we will vote and note that the release is 7.1.2.
    - **VOTE:** District One: Yes, District Two: Yes, District Three: Yes, District Four: Yes, District Five: Yes, District Six: Yes, District Seven: No, it is not applicable here, Central Office: Yes (Mark), CFX: Yes, MDX : not present (no vote).
    - **Bryan**: The measure passes.

.

**Wavetronix Modification for WWD Reporting/Archiving (possible VOTE) – Dan Smith**

**Bryan:** this is a possible voting item. The central office is focused on testing an application, the reason why it is listed as a possible vote is if other Districts are interested in testing this application as well, Central Office could roll it out on a statewide level.

**Dan:** We did some real-world testing on the road adjacent to the TMC. Wavetronix came down and set up some detectors to test for wrong way driving.

* **Test scenario A:** using the negative speeds to detect wrong way driving. It did work but we discovered that there were built in logic flaws where it doesn’t work in a real world. If there was a wrong way driver and then a regular driver the device would take both the negative speed and regular and average them together. We would also lose the data if the wrong way driver changed lanes. We decided it was not a good path.
* **Test scenario B:** was to use the wrong way detection bins which is what CFX has already done. We used a check and balance system where if we picked up a wrong way driver on the mainline, we wouldn’t want to create any event yet. We would want to see it triggered again. We didn’t have any false positives.

**Bryan:** What they are looking at doing is specifically using the devices that are available and already support these types of events. They are talking about applying it on a district level and pulling in this data to examine the directionality bins and the speed to see if we can effectively evaluate wrong way driving. The enhancement is at a district level with the purpose of testing and evaluating wrong way detection. Are there any questions from other districts or are you interested in testing it, let me know?

**Justin:** Would this give us the ability to pull raw detector data out of our database easier?

**Tucker:** Reports on wrong way driving specifically or just raw data?

**Justin:** If it makes it easier to pull the wrong way bins, you should be able to pull the normal routes as well, right?

**Tucker:** The Wavetronix have the classifications bins and then they report the speed volumes in numbers not exactly the bin form. The enhancement is about adding the directional bins and if we did that, yes, we would log the database and the dataset and have access to those at a reporting level.

**Bryan:** It wouldn’t impact your ability to pull raw data reporting for what you are capable of what you are doing. It is basically adding another column to what you can pull.

**Justin:** Will there be any enhancements on the map? Would the operator see it as well? Or would it be on the back end with an alert?

**Tucker:** We have not gotten to what that looks like in SunGuide. Essentially, this could be another wrong way driving protocol. If we do make it a protocol, you would have the ability to create a response and all the other items with it.

**Bryan:** To be clear, that would be the next step. We are not there yet. This is just the ability to add that bin.

**Tushar:** From the 512 module you were looking at does it pull the data or does it come directly from the HD Wavetronix?

**Dan:** This method would not require the use of a click module.

**Tushar:** So, the information is directly from Wavetronix then?

**Dan:** Yes.

**Tushar:** We can talk off line, I am trying to figure out how this information was handled and how to monitor it.

**Tucker:** The polling of the device shows all of that information.

**Dan:** Another thing we used this for was to track a wrong way driver on camera because we haven’t been able to find them. This system in theory could be used to track the drivers.

**Bryan:** Any questions or comments? Dan, follow up with us and give us feedback on the results after the enhancement rolls out. We would like to see the test results. I think this would be a quick hotfix.

**Tucker:** When we talked about this, it wasn’t going to be in a particular release.

**Bryan:** So, what is the timeline for that?

**Tucker:** I will have to leave that to Derek for when he approves it. It is not a long modification.

**Cloud-Based Solution with SunGuide – Chrissie Collins**

This is mainly to start the discussion on information security with ITS and SunGuide. Please refer to the slides for additional information.

**Bryan:** Thank you for sharing with the group and it is a significant item and we should start the discussion on if that is something we want to do as a state. Is there anyone on the line that would like to contribute to the conversation?

**Jeremy:** Chrissie brought up some great points. The hard part is trying to wrap our arms around it, each one of knows our individual district well but we may not understand the other districts. It almost seems like the most cost effective and efficient way to move forward is to be able to go out and look at the other districts and understand what is out there. It almost seems like it could be a role for the Tallahassee TGEC. Not to give more work to the Central Office but to gather the facts would be good.

**Bryan:** I think that is a sound suggestion/comment. Does anyone from the Central Office want to speak to that point?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Yes, I think that is a great idea. The Central Office can talk to SwRI and coordinate an effort and get with Derek to see if he will let us do that. If the districts are open to that, we would love to get an idea of what’s happening out there. We were thinking about talking about this at the SSUG. We have an open JIRA and it is really around notify manager and how that system notifies the local SunGuide. We would like that information to come back to the TERL so we know what is happening out there. Bottom line is that I like this idea and we will talk to Derek and see what we can do.

**Bryan:** We will make the action a little more general for you to discuss with Derek to see what we can do.

**Jeremy:** To add one thing to it, is that SunGuide handles a lot of the data but the system we work with does have some different elements and we want to make sure that it is known the other systems are part of our operating environment and the elements that are tied to SunGuide.

**Bryan:** If this is a task that Central Office is moving forward with, is there an opportunity for the Districts to see the framework of the scope before the task is executed?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Yes, absolutely. It does depend on working with the Districts, so I would like to get their input.

**Bryan:** Does anyone else have anything specific to this topic they would like to say?

**Pete:** I have been on a panel with ITS America and there was discussion on a cloud-based system. They used Amazon and when they needed the system most it failed them. So they decided to revert back to managing their own network. I think if we could do some additional research industry wide, that would be helpful.

**Bryan:** That’s a good point. It would be something we want sooner rather than later. Mark does that sound good?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Yes.

**Open Discussion – Bryan**

* The CMB Process Document has been updated and is posted on the website. I think we need to update it for the Central Office and add Mark as an alternate. Does anyone have any objection to that?
* Does anyone else have any open discussion items they would like to bring up?

**Review of Action Items – Bryan**

* Add the timestamps to the vehicle provision data enhancement for ticket 3470. This was part of an update that was voted through.
* Update for ticket 4105 – add the KMZ and other file types attachment to the event notification.
* Intersection Enhancement – Derek is going to open up the ConOps for comments. He will update the link that was sent out earlier. The Districts should make any comments by October 4th. John Hope will pull together an online vote and send it out to everyone.
* Wrong Way Driving Wavetronix – Dan will provide test results of using WavetronixHD data to detect and track WWD events back to the group after the enhancement is made.
* Tucker – Provide an updated release date for R7.1.2, R7.2, and R8.0. Send the updated schedule after the vote is completed for the intersections.
* Central Office – take next steps to determine the District needs for moving towards a cloud-based system and get research from the industry.

**Bryan:** Does anyone else have any comments or concerns before we conclude the meeting? Hearing none, thank you for participating in the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.