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

**Item 1: 4771 – Report diagnostics from TPS devices**

**Tucker Brown:** There are a few issues to discuss today. The first is something we have talked about in the past. This issue has to deal with getting the truck parking status to and from the actual field device. What we gather are the counts and if we can pull the feed and if we can’t then we pick up the error status. Based on the type of provider (vendor) they might provide another status. For instance, the devices themselves and their locations within the parking spots or the ability to re-sync the sensor. Several of the vendors open up things like this and there has been a request to push that information so we actually see the information on the operator map. What we would like to do is to look at all of the feeds that we have now and consolidate some of the common fields. What we might end up with is a common set but also if you click on an individual set you might see that is specific to that type of devices and the associated status.

Would it be useful to put this in the map? Is there something missing from this that is not listed?

Another question would be how many people are dealing with truck parking devices and having the vendor map talk to them?

**Dan Buidens:** We are in District Seven. I am curious, would this be an overlay on the map that shows the pucks at the rest stop in their spatial orientation? Or is it something that is pulled from a list?

**Tucker Brown:** It depends on how in-depth you want to go. Right now, they present them to us in a list but I would like to see them oriented spatially. In order for us to show them spatially from the feed, we would have to draw a custom screen. I could see putting it in a separate dialog instead of on the map somewhere. Or the alternative is a larger list that shows all of the pucks and their status.

**Dan Buidens:** That is the way we have seen it, it has been presented that if we have three sensors we could name them however want within the stall. We have seen similar stuff presented from the vendor who installed everything down here. So, it sounds good.

**John Hope:** Currently there isn’t a concept of individual pucks in SunGuide, it is really at the zone level which could incorporate a ton of pucks. Does this imply that additional configuration would be needed?

**Tucker Brown:** No, the status we are getting here is the device actively reporting stuff or did the device go down.

**John Hope:** Just to clarify, is there anything additional that we would need to do?

**Tucker Brown:** District Seven might have a different interpretation and if they do I need to know that.

**Dan Buidens:** No, I was just curious if the gateway would then be represented on the sign and the map. I am just thinking if the gateway goes down and all the pucks go down and if there was an icon to show that, it would be discernable.

**Tucker Brown:** The facility itself has a status, and someone will have to make the decision on what constitutes an error on the facility. Obviously, if the gateway goes down, that is an obvious one. But if several pucks go down we need to have a way to check the status on it. I don’t know if you want to make the entire facility an error state because one of the pucks went down. You probably want a way to draw attention to the fact that one of the pucks went down. You could do it through an email or through an indication in the facility status that you need to go check something.

**John Hope:** Is there the ability to set the puck out of service?

**Tucker Brown:** Do we know if that is supported in the interfaces? If it is then sure.

**Mark Dunthorn:** I do not believe it is. That is basically a read-only interface to the puck status.

**John Hope:** I don’t see how that has to do with the interface. It really only has to do with SunGuide ignoring the puck.

**Tucker Brown:** So, what you mean by that is to not change the facility status based on the puck and the concept of out of service would only be on the SunGuide side.

**John Hope:** Yes.

**Tucker Brown:** That could be doable. That would rely on a lot of manual changes because it would be solely based on what the operator believes. Conceptually it can be down.

**John Hope:** Once there is a problem identified with the puck then it could be days or weeks before that puck is serviced.

**Mark Dunthorn:** That is a good point. Right now, the mechanism for dealing with bad pucks is to use that offset. We have seen some strange things happen with that offset so this might be a better approach to that.

**Dan Buidens:** Would this be a phase one rollout for the status of devices and would phase two be an actual aerial map of the rest stop with the pucks laid out spatially, with the colors showing their status?

**Tucker Brown:** If we have the latitude and longitudes and they are accurate we could do that. The point of this meeting is to determine if we want to phase it out or do it all together.

**Dan Buidens:** Now that everyone has heard the concept of the map, should we discuss it at the face-to-face next week?

**Christine Shafik:** The face-to-face meeting is the ITS working group and there are no SSUG items on the agenda. I can check if that is a possibility but if not, it can be brought up in the CMB in September.

**Dan Buidens:** If we can’t get it on the agenda then we can discuss at the CMB.

**Christine Shafik:** I will see what I can do.

**Jason Summerfield:** The depth of the information is based on the type of puck or controller that you are using for it to report to SunGuide right?

**Tucker Brown:** Correct.

**Jason Summerfield:** So, we have stuff going in that we haven’t seen since we are rolling ours out now. So, I can’t tell you one way or another.

**Tucker Brown:** It is one of the supported vendors, right?

**Jason Summerfield:** Yes.

**Mark Dunthorn:** In 7.1.2 we added the recording of space level ability. Do you think the Districts have a need to store that data at a sensor level? Or would this just be for real-time operations? If I don’t hear anyone say they have this need then we will just report on it and not store it.

**Dan Buidens:** District Seven wants it in SunGuide.

**Christine Shafik:** If there are no more comments then we need the LOE.

**Tucker Brown:** Do you want the full sensor to read out at each location?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Maybe you can give us a breakdown with and without it.

**Christine Shafik:** Any additional questions or comments on this? We will discuss at the CMB.

**Item 2: 1533 Allow audit of Road Ranger procedural errors**

**Tucker Brown:** Right now, you can’t audit procedural errors for Road Rangers. The proposed enhancement is that you can change the vehicle selected and audit the errors. Is there a need to add or delete the errors that are there? Does anyone have any questions?

**Jason Summerfield:** We need the ability to add and delete. I think the biggest thing is when someone adds something accidentally and it needs to be removed.

**Tucker Brown:** Add and delete shouldn’t be that difficult, we can do it.

**Item 3: 1584/1586 – Additions to the Event Details Dialog**

**Tucker Brown:** The next is for two issues. They both have to deal with the event details and event dialog. One of the options is a checkbox to indicate if this is a rollover event. The proposal is to turn it into a combo box with more options. We can go one of two ways with this, we can list it as a single item or we can have it as a list and you can check multiple boxes.

**Dan Buidens:** Would this list be editable?

**Tucker Brown:** Not District by District. We would probably make it editable at the database level. I say that because of performance measures. We could also give everyone a list and then they can edit it how they want. From a technical side, it doesn’t matter but I think it matters for performance measures.

**John Hope:** When you say combo box does that imply only one of the boxes can be selected?

**Tucker Brown:** We could go either way. Only one can be selected or we can open it up to a larger list and be able to check what applies. I think more people would be on board with checking multiple.

**Mark Laird:** It would be rare but I think it would happen.

**Kevin Mehaffy:** I like this.

**Tucker Brown:** Does anyone have any opinions on one master list or having individual District lists?

**Jason Summerfield:** Will others be a flag or a box to type in something.

**Tucker Brown:** It is intended to be just a flag. A freeform field makes it a little more complicated which is probably doable.

**Jason Summerfield:** Why are we adding this if we are not updating the reports to make it searchable?

**Tucker Brown:** We can and it can be included. We sometimes like to do the enhancement then identify the reports but we can identify them now.

**Christine Shafik:** The reporting is very useful. It is just going to be hard if we decide it will be an editable list the reporting will not be consistent. We recommend that the list not be editable.

**Kevin Mehaffy:** Didn’t you originally say we could have both? If there is something in your area to monitor that you can add that.

**Tucker Brown:** We can go that route but the question is how to do report against those items. When you start adding your own, that is when reporting starts getting complicated.

**Mark Dunthorn:** This list on the slide doesn’t have to be the final list. If there are more we can add to it.

**Tucker Brown:** You can add more to the list, they would just be columns in the database. The question is should the Districts be allowed to do it individually? From a reporting side, I would discourage that.

**Christine Shafik:** I second that.

**Dan Buidens:** I suggest it gets rolled out statewide. Each district has unique features and we would hide those until they applied. Statewide is the best approach.

**Tucker Brown:** This is just a suggested list, if you have more please send it to Central Office.

**Dan Buidens:** Yes, this is what we want and if you push it statewide then eventually we will have some of the items on the list.

**Jay Williams:** We are in favor of rolling it out statewide. Maybe Christine can email out the list and survey the Districts to get the final list together. We have something we would like to add like jackknife semi.

**Christine Shafik:** That is a good idea. I will send out an email calling for any proposed items to this list and we can go from there.

**Jason Summerfield:** When you send it out can you explain that we are not replacing rollover, we are just adding more features that you can flag.

**Christine Shafik:** Thank you, will do.

**Tucker Brown:** Right now, you have boxes for rollover, HAZMAT, WWD is coming, etc. we are trying to add the flag to them. Would anyone be in favor of adding those items to this list or should they still be their own checkbox? The new items would have no automatic functionality associated with them. They would just be flagged unless someone wants that.

Does anyone have a problem having them in a larger checklist or do you want to leave them separate?

**Jay Williams:** We are in favor of the combined approach.

**Dan Buidens:** District 7 is okay with that.

**Jason Summerfield:** I would take the critical items and leave them at the top of the list.

**Tucker Brown:** So, you would want a sort order on these?

**Dan Buidens:** Yes.

**Tucker Brown:** You would probably have the sort order on the user interface so you could change them on the fly.

**Jason Summerfield:** I still have the others like HAZMAT or fire that have a special function, I would keep those above the rest of the tiles. Clicking those have a different effect and they are so critical they should be checked first. I would keep them at the top of the list.

**Tucker Brown:** That is not a problem.

**Kevin Mehaffy:** If we were to put this out to the Districts and we get a large number of topics, what do we do with that?

**Tucker Brown:** That is why we would do the sort order. So, you change the order of list according to your District.

**Aven Morgan:** Is there a way to disable ones your District doesn’t want?

**Tucker Brown:** We can make them not shown to the user but are still in the database. We will do the sort/order and the disable and they would be things you could change on the fly.

**Mark Laird:** The existing items like HAZMAT, rollover, etc. When we have reports, are we still able to select those items?

**Tucker Brown:** When this change is made, the reports that use those fields would need to be modified because the database would be modified with it.

**Mark Laird:** I think we will need that to happen at the same time.

**Tucker Brown:** Agreed. Once we start bringing the items that have reports tied to them we need to update them at the same time.

**Ray Mikol:** I know in previous SSUG meetings we have talked about flagging infrastructure damage; would this be part of that?

**Tucker Brown:** I think this would be part of that. Anything we are proposing to add is just a checkbox. For guardrail damage, there might have been an extra request for a textbox or text field we could type into to link the comments.

The next is currently the only field for FHP is the FHP incident number. It gets prefilled when you associate the event with the FHP alert. There is a proposed enhancement to both track the incident number and the case number as different fields. The proposal is to rename the incident number to FHP CAD number which would be at the UI number and have another field for the case number. The issue noted that normally you might not know the case number but if it is auditable it can be added. If you don’t use the case number it is not a big deal and it can be hidden able in the event details configuration.

**Jay Williams:** Would those two fields be independent of each other?

**Tucker Brown:** Yes.

**Jay Williams:** If we wanted to integrate other CAD systems in the future would the FHP CAD capture those?

**Tucker Brown:** I think if we got to another CAD system we would need to make the decision at that point. Offhand I would separate them so they don’t overwrite the information if they have the same fields.

**Jay Williams:** Okay, that works.

**Jason Summerfield:** I think this is closer than it seems. We have talked to Jacksonville Sheriff’s Office (JSO) to add their information in as well as FHP.

**Tucker Brown:** Would we end up with JSO case number and FHP case number and JSO incident number and FHP incident number?

**Jason Summerfield:** It depends on how they are working together. I think for the most part it is FHP CAD numbers but there are JSO case numbers where there is infrastructure damage. Normally we put the information in comments so it is not in a separate field.

**Tucker Brown:** If we are talking multiple case numbers then we might need to turn the field into something like the contact where you select the agency then put the associated case number. For now, it thinks we are okay. Any other comments?

**Christine Shafik:** Thank you for the discussion today. Just a follow-up, the first item we will wait on the LOE from SWRI and we will bring it to the CMB next month. There was no interest in the second item but the third item I will send out an email for additional items to be added to the list. The fourth item we will consider. Are there any other comments? Hearing none, thank you for attending.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Send email the checkbox list for the event dialog box for rollover to the districts for proposed items. | Christine Shafik |
| Tucker to send an LOE with breakdown for the TPAS report diagnostics including map view and puck status | Tucker Brown |
|  |  |
|  |  |