SunGuide Software
User's Group Design Review
Meeting Minutes

Date: October 24, 2019

Time: 2:30 3:30 EST

Agenda:	
Topic	**Led By:**
4760 – Not Auto-Merging Scheduled Messages	Tucker Brown
2640 – Change to/from Daylight Saving Time Results in Incorrect Intervals and Sorting	Tucker Brown
1590 – Update USER Table to use CEASED_USE (or similar historical data)	Tucker Brown
4561 – Nearest Camera for SPARR Created Events	Tucker Brown

Attendees:

Robbie Brown, D1
Ray Mikol, D1
Justin Merritt, D1
Tanesha Sibley, D2
Jason Evans, D2
Aven Morgan, D3
Kevin Mehaffy, D3
John McFadden, COT
Dee McTague, D4
Jay Williams, D5
Shannon Watterson, D5
Eddie Grant, D5
Josh Sibley, D5

Sheryl Bradley, D5
John Hope, CFX
Mark Laird, D6
Jared Roso, D7
Wang Lee, MDX
Tucker Brown, SwRI
Christine Shafik, CO
Mark Dunthorn, CO
Jennifer Rich, CO
Alex Brum, CO
Frances Ijeoma, CO
Karthik Devarakonda, CO
Nelson Melendez, C0

Discussion:

Item 1: 1957 – Incorrect "Last Updated" in Email Response Plan Items

Tucker Brown: Right now, you generate a response plan, you set your email and then press activate. If you made updates to the event and went into the response plan and you add or remove a sign, that doesn't update the email item within the plan. The problem is you get an out of date timestamp or the most active up to date lane blockage.

There are two options we could do to fix this.

- Option 1 – After the operator, if they activate the plan without regenerating the email item
- Option 2 – Automatically update the information within the email (could be problematic due to dynamic operator text input)

Two questions here – are people actually experiencing this problem and need a solution and which option do you think would be best?

Mark Laird: Replacing the email message as you mentioned there is a real problem. Warning them seems to be useful. It is not just timestamped, it is blockages too, right?

Tucker Brown: Yes, the problem, in general, is that the email is not updated. The easiest way to identify that is based on the timestamp. Is it still a problem?

Mark Laird: As far as I know it is still a problem if you don't pay attention you will publish email messages with stale data.

Tucker Brown: So, it sounds like option 1 would have been better for you.

Dee McTague: District Four would like option 1 as well.

Item 2: 2510 – Indicate removed items in current response plan list prior to plan activation

Tucker Brown: The issue is when a response plan item is removed from a previously activated current plan, the current plan no longer reflects roadway conditions. The proposed enhancement is to indicate that the response plan item is set to be removed, but don't remove it from the current plan until the plan is reactivated. The other option would be to add a tab for a proposed plan. There are a few ways to address this but we are looking to see if people are having this issue.

Jason Evans: I like the idea of indicating what is being removed and having a quick way to just re-add that to the new plan. This would be a lot simpler than trying to look up what was done previously if we could just add items that are already in there.

Tucker Brown: I will say for once you hit activate, this would become the current plan. Then any changes you make would modify the current plan. If you have already activated it, I am not sure who could go back and do that but if you have not activated it then yes that is what we are planning.

Jason Evans: Yes, that is what I meant, before you activate it have it highlighted saying this is going to be removed and if you don't want it removed, you would be able to un-highlight it.

John Hope: District Five is in favor of highlighting as you just described it.

Mark Laird: Sounds good to me.

Kevin Mehaffy: District Three is in favor.

Tucker Brown: Sounds like we have wide approval for that one. Does anyone else have any questions?

Item 3: 3800 – Reporting of more accurate locations

Tucker Brown: Right now, the locations have a latitude and longitude that make sense operationally but are not necessarily accurate. As part of this, we might be able to go look at the location descriptions that will be published to FL511. The issue is that there are applications that need more accurate event locations and a more precise latitude and longitude as opposed to what we get in SunGuide. This has been a recurring issue in Central Office. The option here is to still use the event locations and to still do operations exactly as you do. But you would have the option of adding a more accurate latitude and longitude to it. The way you would get that is by having a place on the map just like we have for devices. It is optional to do that but if you do,

you would click on the map and give it a loose latitude and longitude that would be closer to the event location than what the actual event location is set up as. You could potentially pull road ranger information or SPARR and tag that in with the event. FHP provides a latitude and longitude with their information, it is unclear how accurate it is but it is a potential option and so is Waze. Several sources provide latitude and longitudes so we could get those from a lot of different sources. The other question I have for this is do you like this concept and will your operators use it is there enough time to actually set a more accurate latitude and longitude? Do you have cases where operations know the event is a half-mile down the road but they set the event location for whatever is the closest? My real question is do you think this would be used and is there enough time to set the accurate location?

Mark Laird: The issue for Central Office is that it would be inconsistent. You wouldn't be able to tell if/when the accurate location was loaded.

Tucker: I agree. Let me mention that these will be stored as an addition but you are correct you wouldn't know if they are dead on or just didn't do it.

Jason Evans: I like using the information from the SPARR app, and I could see where storing that information automatically would be helpful. As far as adding it in manually, the biggest issue we have right now is the difference between FHP latitudes and longitudes being slightly different than the SunGuide latitudes and longitudes and already having to go into the event and changing it from northbound to southbound. It is hard for them to go in and fix issues like that.

One other issue with having the Road Ranger using the lat/long is if you have them staged at the end of the queue or at the end of the event; it could cause confusion as well.

Jay Williams: Also, we don't necessarily dispatch Road Rangers to every event. To me, there is an issue of consistency wise of how much of this data we will be collecting.

Dee McTague: I know this is a big a want from our client especially for crashes at the safety office, I think we should come up with a way to do it. It will definitely be helpful because before, at and beyond is too vague. We can't accurately track, even if it means the operators have to go in and do the extra step to do it.

Mark Laird: It would have to be something on every event where we indicate if the EM location is good enough or they pick another one. Or they always have to pick an accurate event even if the location is the same.

Jason Evans: I think one issue too is that you don't always know where that EM location is. If the EM location could show up on the map and you selected the one that was most accurate, that would help. You could see where you need to add more EM locations and you would need to track them.

Tucker Brown: You are right that when you are adding the event you can't tell where they are but when you are configuring them, they both show up graphically and you can move them around to whatever location you want them at. There is a concept of doing them graphically, it just doesn't apply to the event creation.

Jason Evans: We know that. We were saying for the operator, we could choose between and add a lot more locations that they want to measure and track. The operator would get use from them if they could see them.

Tucker Brown: I have a general question, how accurately do operations know the location of an incident? And do they know it well enough to point it out on a map?

Dee McTague: If they are looking at CCTV cameras, they will get pretty close.

Tucker Brown: Is that the majority of events? Like 60%?

Dee McTague: We can see everything that is happening via CCTV, there is not a lot that we can't see.

Tucker Brown: So, you are 99-100% so most of the time your operators could pinpoint on the map where this thing actually is.

Mark Laird: Same for D6 except for the Keys.

Jay Williams: In some of our rural areas we might not be able to pinpoint as well as we could in urban areas. Depending on camera locations and roadway geometry, we could get close but it would vary.

Jason Evans: Yes, it is the same for District Two. We are getting close to 100% CCTV coverage for interstates but for the more rural areas especially our arterials we don't have complete coverage so for those events it would be more difficult.

Tucker Brown: So, I am going to summarize a few things I heard, most Districts for most events have the ability to locate the event and be able to point to it on the map. Operator input is an option. Other options we might consider would be SPARR or other Road Ranger applications but we would need to verify where they are and if that is what they want. The next question is how do we allow them to do it? Do they pick it or do we force them to verify? Something along the lines of if the location is accurate or if they set it somewhere else they have to check a box stating they have verified it. Do we need to confirm with the operator that it did happen or is that an optional step?

Mark Laird: This would be after they create the event that they could add this accurate location or does it have to be done during the creation?

Tucker Brown: My assumption is that it would be done after the event so they can start the event. The point at which they set this is irrelevant because it is not done for a timing purpose. I

don't want to mess with the time it takes to get an event posted. You could also do this via audit but I don't know if you would know where the location is well enough in order to do this.

Ray Mikol: I am a little confused on why EM locations wouldn't be as accurate as what we are looking for?

Dee McTague: For example, Commercial Blvd could be half a mile or more. It could be just before or after. Anything that falls before or after an exit ramp is considered the same location.

Ray Mikol: Okay, District One uses the exits and mile markers as well. It would be a lot of work to add all of the EM locations but it might solve the problem as well.

Dee McTague: That would be difficult because it would give us such a long list of locations.

Ray Mikol: You wouldn't be selecting from a list but from a map.

Mark Laird: What if we just added a mile marker to the event data?

Tucker Brown: It is there but as optional.

Mark Laird: What if we make people populate it?

Tucker Brown: And we are still only talking about every mile, right?

Mark Laird: Yes.

Tucker Brown: Let's say it is at a half-mile between and the mile marker is at the cross street, how accurate are they looking to get?

Mark Dunthorn: Certainly, less than half a mile, I couldn't say it is 100 feet but the issue I have heard raised is that we get artificial clusters of events at the same location every time. You can't see any distribution over the course of an interchange. Dee as far as your District's need, is it limited to event types like crashes for example? Do you need accurate locations for abandoned vehicles?

Dee McTague: It is more for crashes because it is more for safety. You have clusters of accidents that are always in the same place and it is because of the EM locations.

Mark Dunthorn: We are hearing the same thing and we need a solution. I am just not sure we have a solution yet. This might be one we have to take back and talk about it more internally.

Mark Laird: To what level of detail can the operators provide it?

Mark Dunthorn: Exactly.

Mark Laird: What do they use as their source?

Mark Dunthorn: I rather have a good technical solution that is also operationally feasible. We will have to work on this a little more.

Item 4: 4965 – Add support for mileage tracking in SPARR interface

Tucker Brown: Right now, the event locations are not accurate and operators are figuring them out by hand which means they are not in SunGuide. The interface itself does support this and there is a place to put the beginning and ending mileage. This is not a huge enhancement to make and we can make it optional. Would anyone use this or would want it?

John Hope: Would this also apply to the SPARR app itself?

Tucker Brown: We could but we will have to see what the group wants to do.

John Hope: This would benefit both the SPARR driver and the SPARR app.

Tucker Brown: I think D7 put this in there as part of their user client as well.

District 7: Yes, we would. Sorry.

Mark Dunthorn: I think we got the consensus and that was the last of the JIRA issues. Thank you, Tucker.

Item 5: General Support Issues

Mark Dunthorn: I have a few slides here on general support questions or issues that have come up.

- **New JIRA statuses** – We have implemented it and it has gone live. We have replaced the old, needs FDOT approval with five new statuses. The reason we did that was to better align with the process here at the Central Office. You can look at this workflow in JIRA. On every issue, there is a button you can click to show the workflow. Everything we talked about today is pending SSUG, now that we have discussed them the ones that were prioritized are going to move into pending CMB.
    - Today it is safe to say that the first, second, and last will all go to CMB. The third one was a good one but we don't have a great technical solution so we have to talk about it more. The larger issues will be voted at during the CMB, the smaller issues can sometimes get incorporated via support and some items won't be discussed at the CMB but will be voted on by another mechanism.
    - Sometimes there were issues waiting for District confirmation and would get stuck there waiting to be closed. We have implemented an auto transition that when a District comments on it when it goes to evaluation completed. From there it will be evaluated for if it needs to be closed or go back for review to fix the issue.
    - **John Hope:** What testing does the needs testing apply to? Is it IV&V, internal SwRI testing?
    - **Tucker Brown:** It is internal SwRI testing. It will verify that the changes work and from there it would transfer to the awaiting release which is at the TERL.

- o **John Hope:** Can we better describe what awaiting release means then? Does it always mean IV&V testing?
- o **Tucker Brown:** It means Central Office testing.
- o **Mark Dunthorn:** I wonder if that is something we should break out? That is something we can talk about.
- **SSUG Voting** – Today we had good feedback but there are instances I can think of when we did not get feedback. If we don't get a lot of feedback, feel free to get in there and vote for these items. We are always looking for feedback and this is just one more channel to provide that to us. In terms of prioritization, we typically do that on Monday.
- **Upgrade Early** – We have four separate releases we are supporting so please upgrade early after you have tested it and vetted it. We are not trying to rush you but the sooner the better because four releases is a lot for us to support. So that means that every time there is a hotfix we will be providing four versions of that hotfix. If possible please get that updated as soon as you can.

Mark Dunthorn: That is all that we have for today, any other questions or comments? Hearing none, thank you all and we will talk to you in a few weeks.

New Action Items:	
Action:	Responsible Person:
Follow up with the team on the impact of auto-merge for travel time if we were to move forward with item 1	Central Office Team