

*FDOT Change Management Board Meeting Notes  
 Friday, January 12, 2007 — 9:45 a.m. to 1:25 p.m.*

---

File Name:	<i>Florida Department of Transportation – Change Management Board Meeting Notes – Friday, January 12, 2007, 9:45 to 1:30 p.m.</i>	
File Location:	W:\ITS Program\ITS GC\060305 NEW ITS GC Contract\Assign 41 - CMB Meeting Support\070112 CMB Mtg Notes Final.doc	
Deliverable Number:		
Version Number:	2	
Created By:	Dave Hodges, PBS&J	January 12, 2007
Reviewed By:	David Chang, PBS&J	January 17, 2007
	Trey Tillander, FDOT	January 22, 2007
	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	January 26, 2007
Modified By:	Dave Hodges, PBS&J	January 22, 2007
	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	January 26, 2007
Completed By:	TJ Hapney, PBS&J	January 26, 2007

## **List of Acronyms**

AVL .....	Automatic Vehicle Location
CCTV.....	Closed-circuit Television
CMB .....	Change Management Board
COTS .....	Commercial Off-the-Shelf
DMS.....	Dynamic Message Sign
EM / PM .....	Event Manager / Performance Measure
FDOT.....	Florida Department of Transportation
FHP.....	Florida Highway Patrol
FY .....	Fiscal Year
GUI.....	Graphical User Interface
FHP.....	Florida Highway Patrol
HTML.....	Hyper Text Markup Language
ITS .....	Intelligent Transportation System
LPR.....	License Plate Reader
RFID.....	Radio Frequency Identification
SwRI.....	Southwest Research Institute
TEOO.....	Traffic Engineering and Operations Office
TERL .....	Traffic Engineering Research Laboratory
TMC.....	Transportation Management Center
TSS .....	Traffic Signal Systems
XML .....	Extensible Markup Language

**Florida Department of Transportation**  
**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Friday, January 12, 2007**  
**9:45 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.**

**FDOT District 5 Regional Transportation  
Management Center, Orlando  
and Teleconference Sites Statewide**

**Purpose:**

This meeting was held for the Board members to vote on various software requirements to be incorporated in SunGuide<sup>SM</sup> Release 3.0 and for briefings on the CCTV preset scheduling and GUI performance enhancements.<sup>1</sup>

**Attendees:**

Trey Tillander, ITS Section	Chris Birozak, District 1	Peter Vega, District 2
Kamal Munawar, District 2	Chad Williams, District 3	Steve Corbin, District 4
Dave Ashton, District 4	Dee McTague, District 4	Jeremy Dilmore, District 5
Mike Smith, District 5	Edward Grant, District 5	Jesus Martinez, District 6
Elizabeth McCrary, District 7	John Easterling, TPK	Steve Dellenback, SwRI
Robert Heller, SwRI	John Bonds, PBS&J	David Chang, PBS&J
Dave Hodges, PBS&J	Ron Meyer, PBS&J	Ashis Sanyal, PBS&J
James Barbosa, IBI Group	James Bitting, Lucent Group	Walt Townsend, Siemens ITS
Aaron Jackson, Transcore		

**Welcome and Introductions** – Board Chairman Steve Corbin opened the meeting and had everyone introduce themselves.

**Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review** – The Board heard a recap of the December 1, 2006, meeting by Steve Corbin and a review of the action items from that time, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> SunGuide is a service mark of the Florida Department of Transportation.

- 1) SunGuide users were to provide Trey Tillander with their comments on the *SunGuide Support Definition Response Times* document so that the mean time for software repairs can be tracked for the purpose of documenting response times. Trey had a teleconference with the Districts on December 20. The Districts agreed on the support and maintenance support scope from SwRI. There were some additional questions on the TERL-based developer and Trey followed up on these. SunGuide Software TERL on-site support will begin in July 2007.
- 2) For the FY 2008 SunGuide support maintenance scope and cost, Trey was to work with SwRI to find ways of reducing the cost of trips to Florida for on-site support. This cost was reduced by half.
- 3) Trey was to distribute SunGuide support and maintenance cost information to the CMB members so they can decide if the response level is what everyone wants. This was completed on December 5, 2006.
- 4) Trey was to contact Maj. Williams of the Florida Highway Patrol (FHP) regarding the cost of Microsoft MapPoint software. FHP was invited to the map workshop, but did not attend. Trey will follow up with FHP.
- 5) The CMB members were to provide comments on the mapping approaches white paper by December 8. Steve Corbin was sending everyone an e-mail survey on this. Steve sent the e-mail to the CMB on December 5, 2006.
- 6) The CMB was to schedule the SunGuide mapping proposal discussion in conjunction with the 511 workshop in January 2007. The map workshop was provided January 11-12.
- 7) SwRI was to provide a prototype map for the January workshop. This was deferred to the March workshop.
- 8) The CMB members were to provide review comments on SunGuide Release 3.X by December 20, 2006.
- 9) Language stating that the EM/PM module in Release 3.X will be fully compatible with SunGuide Release 2.2 was to be added to the engineering change order for the project.
- 10) The CMB members were to provide comments on the CCTV camera preset scheduling function as outlined in the presentation slides by SwRI by December 8, 2006.
- 11) SwRI was looking into the CCTV preset scheduling sequencing feature, based on a 24-hour clock.
- 12) SwRI was to research what happens when an operator manually schedules a device that already has a sequence and they conflict. Which operation would take priority? Action Items 10 – 12 were covered in the presentation.

**SunGuide Footprints Issues Review** – Robert Heller of SwRI presented a review of the SunGuide Footprints Issues Database status. Since the CMB’s last meeting there have been 11 new issues added to the database. A total of 15 have been opened and 89 have been closed. SwRI is trying to resolve them in the order that they are submitted by SunGuide users. Of the ones still open, many are awaiting additional information that is necessary in order to settle them, he said.

**SunGuide Software Release 2.2.2 CCTV Present Scheduling and GUI Performance Enhancements** – Trey Tillander explained that Board members had offered comments on the CCTV camera preset scheduling function, which was covered in a SwRI presentation at the December meeting. Trey said he had divided six or seven of the issues into three or four areas. He wanted to see how many requirements could be developed within the \$135,000 budget. The development effort is at \$60,000 right now, so the project is reaching its halfway point.

Steve Dellenback talked about the CCTV preset scheduling enhancement. He explained camera movements and the sequences for programmed schedule movements. The schedules are all independent. If one is made for I-95, it will run separately from the schedule for I-295, for example. SunGuide will have a new “CCTV Scheduler” which sends all the commands. When it is time for a change, the scheduler sends it to the camera control subsystem (not the GUI). Steve said the operator can develop a schedule for the cameras then group them together.

The Board discussed who should have authority to set camera schedules. Peter Vega said it may be better for a TMC administrator to decide schedules. Steve Dellenback noted that schedule setup is done in the SunGuide administrative editor and that SwRI needs clarification as to where setup should take place, whether it should remain in the administrative editor. There was further discussion about also having it in the operator GUI so the supervisor can delegate schedule preparation to an operator with instructions on what to set up. Steve asked whether the operator should be able to set schedules. If the answer is yes, then it needs to be in the operator GUI; the administrative editor is a given.

A vote was taken on this matter and Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, the Turnpike and Central Office all vote for the administrative editor. District 6 asked whether there are levels of privilege in assigning scheduling to an operator. District 6 ultimately voted for camera scheduling to be a TMC operator function.

In response to a comment, Steve Dellenback said the camera scheduler will be a separate GUI. Selecting cameras (Comment 9, Slide 18) also allows the ability to suspend a camera from the scheduled movement.

Discussion followed on adding the ability to lock chosen cameras to exclude them from a scheduled movement. Peter Vega further clarified that District 2 would like for an operator, under an administrator-configurable setting, to manually lock multiple cameras until they are released. Currently, SunGuide Software only allows one camera to be locked. Peter asked that this be added to the SunGuide requirements. SwRI suggested that this might be more

appropriately handled as a minor enhancement under SunGuide support. Trey asked if District 2 would enter this as a Footprints issue instead, and Peter agreed.

A single operator would be able to lock multiple cameras. During the discussion, Steve Dellenback asked for more instruction. Ron Meyer asked if there was to be an “exclude box” that an operator could check to exclude a camera. Steve responded that he thinks there was talk of that, but said he would look into it.

Steve Corbin talked about the inability to view cameras until each preset is run, individually. He asked about creating a “tour” of cameras. Steve Dellenback replied that SunGuide has the capability to do that. Ron noted that at Slide 15, there is a pull-down menu for a decoder choice.

Regarding Comments 10 and 11 (Slide 19) Steve Dellenback said the comments are being addressed the same way. If Districts want a conflict resolver across multiple schedules, then that requirement needs to be written out and submitted to SwRI. Ron asked if it can be done like the scheduler that is used for putting events on calendars (such as a green band in Lotus Notes that indicates no conflicts). Steve Dellenback said it is best for the scheduler to be relative time.

A question was asked whether there would be multiple schedules for the same segment of road. Steve Dellenback said he didn't think so. Peter gave an example about I-95 and I-10 in Jacksonville having different schedules.

Chris Birosak brought up the situation where a camera is locked and does not respond during “Schedule 1”. If, during “Schedule 2”, the camera is unlocked, which schedule does it respond to? Walt Townsend said the schedules run continuously and if a camera is locked, it ignores that command from the scheduler. Once the camera is unlocked, it will respond to the next schedule in the cycle. Ron noted that Slide 16 has a start time and an end time. Steve Dellenback said a schedule starts itself. The operator does not have to initiate a schedule, but he does have to manually suspend it if so desired.

An unlocked camera remains in position until the next schedule command comes in. It picks up with the next scheduled movement. It does not move to catch up with a scheduled sequence once a lock is released. Chris said he is not sure how big a problem this will be; District 1 is not running SunGuide Software at this time. Trey asked Chris if District 1 could accept the current requirements as is and Chris was okay with deferring to other Districts' operations with SunGuide Software at this time.

Regarding Action Items 11 and 12 from the December meeting, Trey Tillander said he wanted to make sure they were answered. Action Item 11 deals with CCTV movement based on a 24-hour clock.

Steve Dellenback briefed the CMB on the status of GUI performance enhancement. The intent is, when the user logs on to SunGuide, that the processing delay is lessened from the software having to parse numerous XML messages. Now the login will speed up because they are

reducing reliance on the Javascript rendering of the screen and all the information that goes with it. All HTML windows look the same. Steve said he expected this will be finished by the end of February. The old map can still run; i.e., both operator interfaces will function. The user can always go back to the old way if desired. The log-in will just be handled differently.

**SunGuide Software Release 3.0 Requirements Discussion and Voting** – John Bonds addressed the Board regarding the many new requirements being added to the software (Slide 27). He cautioned that there is a risk of the program “breaking”. One way to lessen the risk of software failure is to divide the enhancements into separate releases. For Road Rangers and incident management, for example, he said the FDOT could make that a stand-alone program that interacts with SunGuide, but is a separate item. He brought up this matter because he sees the growth curve getting steeper – the rate of requirements added is increasing as SunGuide matures.

John thanked everyone for the input being received on the requirements.

*AVL Subsystem* – Under this function, SunGuide would produce a list showing each vehicle’s location. Robert Heller explained that there’s a difference: the acquisition function gets the information, but the display function is what lists the vehicle time stamps in chronological order. He admitted he is splitting hairs, but there is a distinct difference between acquisition and display.

The cost for this subsystem is \$234,792. John continued presenting the requirements. Robert explained that any new vehicle with AVL capability that is added to the fleet needs to be included using the SunGuide AVL editor. Otherwise, it would not be reflected in the display for reporting purposes.

There was discussion about data retention. Robert asked whether the Districts really want to throw away old position data. SunGuide archives it all and does not delete anything until instructed to. Deleting old position data would be a change in philosophy. SwRI can do it, as described in Requirement AV009T1 (Slide 36). It was the decision of the Board to delete AV009T1.

Peter said the need for reports is an issue. Historical information is sometimes demanded. After a traffic crash in Jacksonville on Super Bowl weekend in 2005, he was called to testify in court about traffic conditions and Road Ranger status at the time of the collision.

A vote was taken on the AVL requirements and they were passed unanimously. District 6 asked about whether map icons will be configurable according to zones (i.e., their color based on a road the Road Ranger is on or assigned to). Robert said if he assigns different classes to the Road Rangers, then he could give a different color to each class. Therefore, if a Road Ranger moves to a different road, his color would remain the same. John cautioned everyone about getting too complicated with multiple icons and colors. There is a risk in doing that.

*EM Subsystem Requirements* – These requirements were detailed in Slides 38 to 45. John covered the various changes. Following, there was a brief discussion about e-mail being incorporated into the response plan.

The EM subsystem requirements will cost \$253,618. A vote was taken on them and they were passed unanimously.

*PM (Reporting) Requirements* – For the most part these were editing changes. The cost for implementing these requirements is \$131,300. District 6 asked about how to get the Road Ranger events. That is actually in Release 2.2.

Chris said he would like to add a note about accident investigation sites. There needs to be a way to add the time it takes for the trooper and cars to move from the accident site to the investigation site (this would be on I-75). Steve Corbin answered that this is something that can be tracked.

A vote was taken on these requirements and they passed unanimously.

Chad Williams asked about a reference to a final report by Cambridge Systematics and whether a date should be mentioned for it. After more discussion, it was agreed that John would rephrase the requirement to remove the “Cambridge Systematics” reference.

*Road Ranger Requirements* – The cost for this is \$131,020. There was a request for clarification from District 2 regarding Requirement TM006D and its XML interface with Road Ranger data. SwRI determined in discussion between developers to agree upon a relationship of “XML format” with “document” or “message” terms used in other requirements.

Ron Meyer asked if Requirement TM006D was referring to the interface between, for instance, the District 4 tablet and SunGuide. SwRI stated yes. Ron asked if there had been consideration of detailed requirements for this interface such as whether it is poll-response, push, if there are expected interval periods for reporting, etc. No definitive answer was given, but he expects these items will be components of design and implementation.

A question was posed about video switching for Web pages. If a user is collecting video using a third-party program, Steve Dellenback said SunGuide has no control over that.

*FDOT Change Management Board Meeting Notes*  
*Friday, January 12, 2007 — 9:45 a.m. to 1:25 p.m.*

---

Ron asked about the “dump truck” reference in Requirement EM001E and whether it is a vehicle type or refers to a kind of incident, such as a cargo spill. That prompted more discussion. John (or maybe it was Steve Corbin.) asked who made the list of events. [No audible response was heard back but someone thanked Ron for the question.]

Steve Corbin called the question and a vote was taken. The Road Ranger requirements passed unanimously.

*Video Incident Detection Requirements* – Steve Dellenback said this function is a subsystem as well as a driver, so the FDOT will need to develop both if future units are added. The cost is \$66,483. Ron asked why it isn't a traffic signal systems (TSS) function. Steve Dellenback and Trey replied that this was a design question that prompted much internal discussion. It is a requirement, however, not a function.

A vote was taken on the video incident detection requirements and they passed by a vote of 7-2. (District 2 and the Turnpike were opposed.)

Peter said there are other providers besides the Citilog. Peter said he voted no because when vendors come to him, he refers them to SwRI about getting their SunGuide drivers developed. Trey asked if it is actually two items – a vote on the subsystem and a separate vote on the drivers. Steve Dellenback said video network firm Cornet has paid SwRI for development of such items and SwRI will provide them to the FDOT to use. Legacy units were paid for, but not the new vendors. Elizabeth McCrary said the CMB should agree on what is meant by “legacy” system so there is no inconsistent application of the rule. Ron said there is an important distinction in that while some Districts approach SwRI about the use of certain products, Cornet approached SwRI directly so they could get a driver and then compete for business in Florida. Everyone agreed that was a key factor.

*SunGuide Event Viewer Subsystem* – Steve Corbin said District 4 uses the event viewer subsystem frequently to check the status of operations (e.g., Staff members who are at home and log on and do the same). He said it is a very useful application. The cost for this feature is \$49,951. A question was raised about creating a “smart event viewer” users category. Steve Dellenback said that can be done. A vote was taken and the addition of this subsystem passed by a vote of 8-1. The Turnpike was opposed.

There was an additional vote on the Administrative/Configuration Editing requirement (Requirement S035) at a cost of \$25,004. The item passed.

*Amber Alert Message Template for DMS* – Steve Corbin explained that there is a question about the future of Amber Alerts. This was the gist of a memo he received. Peter moved that this item be tabled. He said this is the first he has seen of this requirement and he believed it needed more discussion, especially before this amount of money (\$39,166) is spent. The motion to table passed.

Trey asked if District 4 could take the lead in drafting the Amber Alert requirements, and Steve Corbin said yes.

**SunGuide Software Release 3.1 Requirements Discussion** – The next segment of the CMB meeting was devoted to Release 3.1 matters.

*Travel Time Enhancements* – Steve Dellenback talked about documenting how travel times can be used in the current SunGuide implementation. Trey observed that there are at least two Districts interested in dynamic linking for this function. Steve said four links make up a travel time. If a link is missing data, then the system goes back to the previous link and interpolates what it would have been in order to provide the calculation. Historical data can also be incorporated to fill in missing data from missed links, the data based on the values historically typical for that link. Peter said it would be beneficial for District 2. There was discussion about keeping the links (detectors) up. Lightning, for example, can knock them out and that link would produce no information. Trey said there appears to be enough interest in this to proceed.

There was discussion of a comment (Slide 74) regarding how a lane reading could be ignored by the system. This is more difficult because the system, as currently functioning, is not designed to do this. This was in response to a comment from District 6.

*Tallahassee LPR and iFlorida Enhancements* – Trey talked about using legacy hardware that includes Automatic Vehicle Identification/Radio Frequency Identification (AVI/RFID) and LPR devices already installed. The Orlando-Orange County Expressway Authority has some, too. There are one LPR and two AVI legacy devices. In addition, Tallahassee has a project that would create a second LPR legacy vendor. Details on this will be out for everyone to review prior to the next CMB meeting.

Next, there was discussion of a teleconference to be held before the next CMB to go over the Amber Alert items that District 4 is creating.

The next CMB meeting was tentatively set for the first week of March. The date is to be determined.

After review of the following action items, the meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. CMB Slide 18, Comment 9: District 2 will enter this issue of supporting Group Camera into the Footprint Database.
2. AV009T1: After a configurable number of days, the oldest vehicle position data will be overwritten as new position reports are received. John Bonds will delete this requirement.
3. The Central Office will talk to Legal Office regarding the “required duration” for maintaining data in an archive.

4. CMB Slide 42, Requirement EM003R, the Board agreed to delete the wording “within the Performance Measures data fields only”. John will update the requirement.
5. CMB slide 44, Requirement EM002T: The EM tracking component shall automatically track the billable/non-billable and available/unavailable for dispatch status of a truck based on its current status. John will add a sub-requirement of it.
6. EM001R1: John will rephrase the requirement to remove the “Cambridge Systematics” reference.
7. TM006D: David Chang will update the ballot to reflect the change of adding “document”.
8. EM002G1: John will change the wording “verification time” to “notification time”.
9. EM017G and EM017G1: John will replace the wording “video switch” with “video switch subsystem”.
10. EM001E: John will delete the wording “additional event attributes (Hazmat, Fire, Rollover, Dump Truck, and Fatality)”.
11. District 4 will ask Citilog for the driver cost of the “Incident Vehicle Detection System”.
12. District 4 will refine the Amber Alerts requirements to be discussed at the next CMB meeting.