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

1. SG-564, with 3214 and 2174 Cease Use Devices/EM Locations and Ability to Run Reports on Ceased Use Devices

Tucker: The first item contains a few issues together. Currently for most devices in the system, when they are deleted they are gone from the database table entirely. Essentially there is no way to recover them. Some of the configurations do get stored when they get changed in the data archive side. In general, most of your devices will go away. EM does what we call “cease use” some things. This means they do hang around but they show up as no longer in use. Actively the system doesn’t maintain them but stays in the database for reporting purposes. Once you do delete that, whether it be a device, or you physically go in and delete a location as opposed to cease use it. When you go to run a report against that, you can’t select the device or location to run a report on. Essentially it is just gone and it goes back to being able to do that type of stuff.

The proposed solution here is that all of the objects in the system would need to be persistent and would never leave the system unless someone deleted them from the database. They would be tagged as “cease use”. Which means that you no longer need them but would like them to stay in the database just in case or you want to report on them. Most devices don’t have this right now but we are talking about touching every single subsystem. From a UI standpoint, you won’t notice it. The naming in the system will probably stay as delete and it would remove it from the system but on the back end it would still be there and would only be flagged as “cease use”. As we do this, we will probably have to do it in stages so we can give you functionality as we move forward. The phases we came up and we can change the order if needed.

* Phase 1: AVL and EM – These are tightly coupled because of the responders ability to these in the event.
* Phase 2: Core devices (CCTV, DMS, and TSS) – make these be “cease use”
* Phase 3: Modify reporting - at that point, we would go into the reporting side to allow reporting on cease use devices and EM objects. Be able to run TSS reports on a device that is no longer in the system
* Phase 4: All other device types – we would make the other devices have the option of “cease use”.

That’s what we plan to do. Does anyone have comments on what we plan to do or the order of the phases?

Mark Laird: There was a comment last time that suggested when devices have been deleted when a reporting that there would be a checkbox that suppresses or includes “cease use” devices so that huge lists could be paired down some.

Tucker: That goes into how it looks for reporting for an older device. A possible problem that could arise there is that if you named the device “A” and you go and delete that device and then you name another device “A”. Then you would have two devices with the same name. In reporting, the back end has different database ID’s so the system recognizes them as two devices. When I click on the box for reporting, technically they show up with the same name. We need to come up with a way to differentiate them.

I think what Mark is talking about is to keep the reporting the same it is now and eventually give the option to report on items that are no longer in the system. At that point, the system would go gather what it needs to deliver that information. The reason for that is we would not want to hold all of the data because it will weigh down the memory of the system. I think once we get the ability to select it, then the report function would work the same way because it will work by pulling the ID in the database. I don’t see a lot of real modifications to the report template itself. It will be how to gather old locations and devices and will select them. Before we do phase 3 we would come back to the SSUG and show a sample of what we would be doing. We will get comments on it before we go full force.

John Hope: You mentioned there wouldn’t be much a change for the Operator with the map. Would it be possible to give administrators an option to view the devices that are flagged as cease use?

Tucker: So basically have them be able to recall all the devices and say “I would like to have this back”?

John Hope: Yes.

Tucker: That does add to the complexity of it and it is doable. There might be some catches in that like the duplicate naming. You would not be able to re-enable a device that has the same name as an existing one. Or you could but you have to fix the validation error. It could be possible.

John Hope: If you could just grey out the ones that are currently flagged.

Tucker: The intent here is to not have those devices currently in the system. You have to tell the system to recall those and give them back to you. We don’t want them around all the time other than these small occasions.

John Hope: Okay, that sounds good.

Tucker: Other than D6 and CFX, are there other Districts that want to get this done?

Jason: District Two would like it.

John: I don’t see it as critical but it would be helpful.

Tucker: Does anyone have comments on the ordering?

Mark Laird: The request I have is for EM locations first then devices are a complaint too. We have an ocean of devices. The EM location thing is more related to the reporting and it trying to pull point data but the point is no longer there.

1. SG-3749 Highlight events that have not been updated within certain time

Tucker: This item has to do with highlighting events that have not been updated within a certain time. Right now there is no visual indication that an event has not been updated in a certain amount of time. It could go for hours without anyone touching it and if the owner doesn’t, then no one knows. The problem is that right now we have a highlighting based on if you own the event and the road color can be changed in the user preferences. We are running out of ways to visually indicate this.

The solution that was proposed in the JIRA issue was that an admin can go in and set up a time for it to be updated (15, 20, or 30 minutes). It is a configurable threshold that can be a reminder if an event hasn’t been touched in that amount of time.

It could be the last updated time or the last response plan activation time or possibly either. When that exceeds the time interval that the admin sets, the event row will be flashing in the event list. Does anyone have any comments on those options?

Jason: I think this was originated here (D2). One key thing was to have the response plan activation because that was something we were keeping an eye on for hitting the published button or republish so FL511 shows the timestamp as recent.

Christine (internal comment): This is a duplicate for the District 4 ticket.

Tucker: Is that one more important or would you be okay with either, the last update time and last response plan activation? Do you care about the last update time?

Jason: I am thinking of in most cases making sure a long term event is updated every 15 or 30 minutes that Central Office wants to see for FL511. I am thinking a construction event that hasn’t been updated.

Tucker: There are possible events where this would not apply.

Jason: Possibly.

Tucker: It sounds like Jason was going to go ask a question. Does anyone else have any comments?

Dan Buidens: I think we could almost break it up by event type. One thing I am thinking of is what if we have an abandoned vehicle and we don’t want that going up every 15 minutes.

Tucker: So you want timing per event types?

Dan: Yes, so in District 7 we have operators check every 8 hours to make sure the abandoned vehicle is still there. We could use that in terms of an event type of the response plan generator maybe every half hour like we do for congestion.

Tucker: If we did an alert for the event type, it may cover Jason as well where he is looking for construction as well. It might not need to be updated as often. Essentially we would put a high number or we could have an option that does not have an alert for this event type.

Dan: That would be awesome.

Jason: Yes it is a good idea.

Alex Mirones: Would it be event type singular or event types plural?

Tucker: Per event type you would have a single number associated with that event type. Any other comments? Jason, were you able to ask someone your question?

Jason: No, everyone is scattered. I can ask and send the answer via email to you.

Tucker: When you left, there was a suggestion to have a time out per event type and you could set each event type differently. Possibly have construction set higher than your normal events.

Jason: Quite possibly. I know the biggest focus for this was to make sure things were being republished to FL511 at the appropriate intervals. I am trying to remember if it has developed from there.

Tucker: If you have certain timings that you have to update events, do they only apply to events that have response plans? Or it applies to all events in general? Are abandoned vehicles posted to FLATIS?

Dan: Abandoned vehicles are not.

District: Unless it is blocking, you could have an abandoned vehicle blocking.

Tucker: It will need to apply to all events and potentially last update time or last response plan activation. Anyone else wants to comment before we move on?

Aven: Just to be clear that section in the event list would flash?

Tucker: The row that the event is on in the event list would flash. There are section headers in the event list, is it not that. It is the actual row that has the event would flash. Is that good?

Aven: Yes, that is fine.

Tucker: If anyone has suggestions on how to show it better please let me know.

1. SG-4789 A “snooze” or “reset” button for Road Ranger stopped vehicle alert

Tucker: This is for Road Rangers and how to handle the alerts. Right now the AVL alerts don’t operate like the IDS alerts but have the same dialog. They will pop up and stay there until the condition generating them is removed. There was a request to make them easier to maintain and handle them.

Option 1: Allow the user to “snooze” the alert and remove it from the alert list. The alert should come back after a configurable amount of time if the condition is still present.

Option 2: Allows the user to “acknowledge” the alerts and not have it reappear.

The issue in question, we prefer option one but option two would be better than what have now. In either case, we would have to add logging and essentially the user that “snoozed” or “acknowledged” it would be logged in the database. So if you do have a problem with someone continuously snoozing or acknowledging events you can see who it is. Does anyone have any comments?

John Hope: This came from District Five and I know they were okay with either options.

Tucker: Any comments?

Mark Laird: It seems like snooze has a slight advantage if it is stopped for an accessive amount of time you could have it come back.

Ray Mikol: What is the difference between this and what is currently occurring?

Tucker: When an IDS alert pops up, you basically handle it and it goes away. An AVL will hang around until the condition clears. There is not a way to handle it, it is more like a notification that ends up in the alert list.

Ray: I prefer option one so if you snooze it, it will come back.

Tucker: It looks like option 1 (snooze) is favored (D5, D1, D6). If there isn’t any opposition then that is what we will go with.

1. SG-4790 Checkbox (or some other means) for Tracking Asset Damage (guardrail, etc.) Covers 1587 from FTE.

Tucker: Right now there is not a good way to track asset damage. Some Districts have set up a comment type and will put the damage in the event chronology and run specific reports. Similar to what we are adding for RISC and wrong way driving (WWD), we would add a checkbox to say “asset damage” that is stored as part of the event. It would allow you to run a report that will give you all of the asset damage. We would also add a text field so the user can put an ID to link to another tracking system.

There wasn’t an intent to put specific elements that were damaged or lost, this was more of yes there was asset damage. The text field is not required so if you didn’t have an ID you would just move on. Any comments?

Ray: What is the possibility of being able to audit this after the fact and adding the associated numbers in?

Tucker: Are you saying you have an external asset damage system and you want to tie that back to the event?

Ray: I think that may be helpful.

Tucker: Okay, we can add the ability to audit these. It will end up being a slightly larger enhancement to audit WWD, asset damage and all of the fields we’ve added a checkbox for. Any other comments?

1. SG-4791 Incident clock should start when the operator click on “new event”

Tucker: This has to do with performance measures and when an event starts. The proposed change in JIRA was instead of setting the event creation time to when the user fills out the information and chooses to create the event, start it the moment the user selects “create event” and starts to fill out the initial information.

This will impact performance measures timing and when the event actually starts. I will open this up for general discussion.

John Hope: One of the purposes behind this for District Five is that there are several operators that take a while to confirm the event location and it affected the statistics on the events.

Jason: I think we should run this by operations people.

Aven: I don’t think this is a positive change. It could have negative impacts and the issue sounds more like a training problem than a SunGuide problem.

Tucker: The people on this call may or may not know the performance measures impact of this. Central Office, do we want to do this similarly to how we did the one a few weeks ago for location performance measures?

Christine: Yes, sending an email and getting the operations folks opinion would be beneficial.

Alex: What you are looking at as an impact for operations is depending on what performance measure you have. Event confirmation or road ranger dispatch tempts you to verify it on camera or have someone arrive on the scene. The noose would be tightened for those metrics. As far as operationally there might have been a pre-prep time period, but to measure the time, I don’t see how this will improve the behavior.

John: When you say training are you suggesting that the unconfirmed location should be created first? Then have the operators confirm it? I don’t understand the steps that your District follows.

Ray: The detection of an incident, that detection starts the event process and you do what you can to dispatch Road Rangers and verify it on camera to make it an active event. That’s the clock that you are looking at operationally. If someone is trying to start that first window, then if you take the time to find it, your active time is longer. Is that what we are trying to insulate ourselves from? I don’t think we need to make the start time the creation time of opening the window.

John: I am not sure. It was explained to me that they were trying to get the initial start time stamp closer to the start of the actual event and removing that operator decision-making time.

Aven: Ultimately what they would end up doing would be in a negative way. In Chipley, we have a goal to have any notification that comes through within five minutes. It is an internal goal but we do use the unconfirmed option and always strive to improve that number.

Mark Laird: Is there a need to record the start of this dialog to active? As a separate number that hasn’t been tracked yet?

Aven: Doesn’t it do that already?

Tucker: Are you suggesting that we have the time stamps of when the dialog is opened to when they click creat event?

Mark: Yes, I am asking if that is needed instead of moving the start time.

Tucker: That is another option.

John: I think adding the additional timestamp would fulfill what District 5 was trying to do.

Christine: I do appreciate that we have operations folks attending the SSUG. Please encourage them to continue to join the meetings. For this issue, I will be sending out an email to get your final vote on this issue. When you get the operations folks input, please respond.

We managed to close 2/3 of the backlog and we are moving forward with the rest. We have issues to discuss for the next six months of the SSUG. We also have CMB items. We are moving forward with the enhancements. The hotfixes are underway and the testing schedule for 7.2 will be over the summer. Hopefully to be released in the fall.

If you have any enhancement requests, please reach out to us.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Email about 4791 for final vote after Districts talk to the operations folks. | Christine |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |