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This meeting is being recorded for the purpose of taking meeting minutes.

1. TSS Probe Fusion Functionality

**Tucker Brown:** The first item has to do with probe fusion questions. The situation is you have a vehicle that passes detector A and it goes and does something else for some period of time then passes detector A again and then passes detector B. The real issue is the stop and having two tags that came from A and one from B and how to match them together. Looking at this, the actual matches that will be made between the first time you pass A and the first time you pass B and chronologically matching those. It is difficult because there are two tags on A. There is a concept of throwing out duplicates but it is usually a configurable window when you first read a tag and only lasts for the time it is configured. From that window, you can select which tag you want and what the minimum timeframe is. Theway to get rid of that duplicate tag is only if they are read consecutively and in a small window. The other way is that there is an actual tag variety that once the tag gets so old it will be thrown out of the system. However, typically it is one hour so if its 30 or 45 minutes it wouldn’t get thrown out.

The other factors to consider are that they would probably not be factored into the speed reading. But there are configurable parameters that dictate the maximum speed change per cycle and throw out these type of outlier matches from the average algorithm. If the outliers start to persist (like a sudden slowdown), they are taken into account for the average. The question that came up in the issue itself is are other Districts seeing this in the data sets where it throws off your speed reading? We could gather data from districts with a large amount of tag data to see how often this situation occurs. It is probably more common on arterials. Some options that were thrown out are the minimum speed parameter. Does anyone know if this happens to them? I am hoping for an open discussion.

District: I think this is something that is hard to answer. I think this isn’t something that would be seen often. They would probably only see this via travel times.

Tucker: Does anyone think it might be happening to them and would they be willing to yes, please examine our database to see if it occurs. We need to determine if it is a large problem we are seeing or not.

District: We have this on the arterial as well.

Tucker: The Pinellas County one? We can take a look at that. Does anyone have any other thoughts on possible situations we would need to look into? Hearing none we will move on.

1. Link Roadway Selection SG-4485

Tucker: This has to do with links and configuration of roadways. Scrolling through the list when doing link configurations, if you deselect X it will remove the roadway from the configuration and cause issues on FLATIS. If we are able to remove that configuration it is probably not a good thing.

The desired change would be to remove the deselection X on the roadway. It would turn into a drop down so you would have to know you are deleting it. When creating the link it automatically populated the roadway for that link from the detector.

John: I can’t think of a way you wouldn’t want to associate the roadway.

Jason: Back in the day, I looked in our database and we had a lot of detector links that don’t have roadways. They were all ramps because we didn’t know what to associate it with. It had to do with SunGuide used to draw things. So if I can add a roadway and not break things, that is good.

Tucker: The one issue that could pop up is if it is a required field and they set it to say this must be done, the first time you get that change and you go into the link configuration window if you have links that don’t have roadways already, it will give you a validation error. I don’t see an issue implementing it here. Is anyone opposed to it at all?

1. Severity for an Event SG-4654

Tucker: This was a different issue that came up for the severity of an event. Recently there was an issue that came in that when you create a response plan and you look at the default distance at the top, theoretically, you should get three options there severe, moderate, and minor. The config file looks to base those on the percentage of lanes blocked for severe, moderate, and minor. Right now, the severity is based on lane blockage duration not percent lane blocked. The reason I am bringing this up at the SSUG is because we have two implementations of what it means to change the severity of the event. I am not sure what people want and what would be better for this. We need to determine what severity means in the system and implement it consistently. I think historically we have used it both ways but I can’t go back and look at what we use to do.

Mark Laird: It looks like the greater severity should win.

Tucker: We could potentially do both and base it on the higher. That’s an option that I can do. Based on everyone’s understanding, is anyone basing decisions on severity with something other than response plans? Does anyone have thoughts on making it mixed and choosing the higher of the two?

Dee: It makes sense.

Tucker: This particular one since it is part of a footprint we checked already it will probably go out as a hotfix. If the mixed one is okay, that’s what we will go with unless someone objects. Hearing none, we will move on.

1. Planned Events

Tucker: The last item is planned events. In the SSUG notes, there was talk of a need of “End Time” when entering in planned events. Do you think we need an end time? If we do need an end time, what should it do?

It could possibly look like a notification that says it ends here with no actions. In the notes, it was mentioned that this would not be used for construction events and would be used for other events. I think a closure time would be more useful for construction events.

One option is to notify the operator to look at it.

The other option is that you would have an associated action with it. Like close out the event.

Does anyone have thoughts on an end time in general? If so, what do you want it to do?

Mark Laird: I am not sure if it is really needed but if so, a notification would be what I want to see.

Tucker: Just a notification letting you know that it is supposed to end at a certain time?

Mark Laird: yes, if it has been there a long time they might have forgotten. Operators will know because they will be pulling out MOT or other things associated with the event. I am not sure if notifications are needed.

Dee: Notifications certainly wouldn’t hurt.

Tucker: If a notification came up would it be pop up that alerts them and they just click okay, or do you want to see something else?

Wang: I think the notification will be fine.

Mark Laird: Do you think we are going to use it though?

Tucker: The question is, do you actually need it?

Wang: I thought when you finish the event and close it, that it adds the end time to it?

Tucker: That is correct.

Wang: Then I don’t see an end time needed. If there is a Road Ranger and they are finished then they stamp the end time that would be the end time. I am not sure the notification would be beneficial.

Mark Laird: This is something different than you tell it when you create the event.

Tucker: It would be more of a reminder of when you want it to end. You would still have to go into the event and close out everything. It would just serve as a reminder to that. If operators know when events would end anyway, they wouldn’t need this. For long running events, they might want a reminder.

District: It could be for an operator that’s construction related, they should be aware of it but it might be helpful to have that alert.

Aven: Is this alert going to show up in the IDS box or something like that?

Tucker: No, it would be more of pop that reminds them.

Aven: So who gets that pop-up? Every user that is logged in?

Tucker: One requirement is that it would be people who would handle planned events and then they would be who gets it. But if none of them are logged in, no one would get it.

Mark Dunthorn: Well if the event is open the owner would get it, right?

Tucker: Yes, we could do it for the specific owner.

Mark Laird: What about shift changes?

Tanesha: I think it should be for all users that are logged in at the time.

Tucker: All logged in users and keep the end time and have no action based on it. Send a notification when the event is about to end that reminds them then it goes away.

Mark Laird: The end time is still optional, right?

Tucker: Yes, they can leave it blank. The other one has to do with planned events. It was previously discussed that when looking at the event list, one section would be planned events. There was a comment that talked about differentiating between types of planned events.

* Events that have been scheduled by are not close to occurring and no one has given approval
* Events that are close to occurring but no one has given approval
* Events that have been approved but have not yet occurred

There are three possible categories these events could be in. Do we need to differentiate those in the event list or could we just have a parameter on the event list? How do you want to see the planned events in the event list?

The easiest way would be to put them in a planned category and we would have a parameter of what type of event it is. If no one has strong feelings we could do that then if we need to change it we could do an enhancement.

Mark Laird: Would they be in chronological order by starting time?

Tucker: One list and the sorting would be controlled how you want to sort it. The columns would be the same for all the events and you can sort it how you want. If they are sorted by ID they would be chronological but that is not true for planned events. There will be a field for start time that could be put into the event list.

Mark Laird: I think we need to think about it and play with the list. The more columns you add the more cluttered it gets.

Mark Dunthorn: For the purpose of the requirements, are we good with having the start time as an optional field. We are trying to get this in 7.2.

Mark Laird: We normally have data in the list and we could take that out and put start time there and it wouldn’t clutter the list and we could sort by that and get the same effect. The start time is the scheduled start time for planned events.

Tucker: Yes.

Mark Laird: If you start the planned event early or late, does that change?

Tucker: Yes.

Mark Dunthorn: Start time is a new field in the database and won’t have an effect on current reporting, right?

Tucker: That is correct. If you set pre-set blockages, we have to make sure it is the start of the event, not the time you set the blockage. There are some gaps we need to make sure we cover. We will go with one section for now for all planned events and will have a field to sort for start time. As it rolls out we can discuss changes.

Mark Dunthorn: We got some good discussion. Thank you. Does anyone have any other issues you want to bring up?

Tucker: Oracle?

Mark Dunthorn: We wanted to ask if any Districts have a SunGuide system test or operational that is backed by Oracle at this time? If you do, please let us know. The question is if we need to support Oracle going forward. We do not see a need to develop scripts going forward. We could always bring it back if we need to but now it is just a discussion point.

Hearing none.

Bryan: Just want to remind everyone about the CMB meeting next Tuesday. We will be electing a new chairman so if you have any recommendations, please bring them to the CMB.

Mark: We are restricting CFX, CO and District Six to not be eligible for the chairman position since they have done it recently in the past.

|  |  |
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