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|  |  |
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| Agenda: |  |
| Topic | **Led By:** |
| 4949 Device Sequencing Loop Handling  4801 Partial Lane Blocking as a Lane Configuration  3949 Alert Operator when an event is created through the SPARR App  4680 Ability to save filters for the dialog in the user settings | Tucker Brown  Tucker Brown  Tucker Brown  Tucker Brown |

|  |  |
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| Robbie Brown, D1  Ray Mikol, D1  Tanesha Sibley, D2  Jason Evans, D2  Robert Briscoe, D3  Kevin Mehaffy, D3  Aven Morgan, D3  John McFadden, COT  Dee McTague, D4  Jacques Dupuy, D4  Clay Congdon, D4  Adrenamae Rolle, D4  Shannon Watterson, D5  Eddie Grant, D5 | John Hope, D5 - CFX  Mark Laird, D6  Alex Mirones, D6  Mike Crawson, D7  Matt Maletto, D7  Jared Roso, D7  Wang Lee, MDX  Tucker Brown, SwRI  Mark Dunthorn, CO  Jennifer Rich, CO  Frances Ijeoma, CO  Karthik Devarakonda, CO  Gregory Dudley, CO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Discussion: |  |

**Item 1: 4949 – Device Sequencing Loop Handling**

**Tucker Brown:** This happens when a loop occurs in the device linking file, you can end up on roadways in the opposite direction and picking up devices up stream which will make you chose the wrong DMS. I know District 2 has had this problem and I think District 7 has this issue as well. We did encounter this in another state and two things we did for them might be beneficial to SunGuide as well.

The first one is if you are searching it is trying to go upstream to look for certain devices and as it branches off into another roadway and then loops back into another direction. One of the rules here is if you are searching and an arterial goes to an interstate and then the system takes you back to the same arterial roadway as before, it will cut you off right there. The other possible change that could happen is that no matter what and you pick up a device on the same roadway but in the opposite direction you would automatically exclude it. A lot of those would already be excluded based on the first rule but if the possibility does come up and based on the linking file it would automatically exclude that. The reason where I add that as a possible change is because there may be cases where that is valid. I don’t know off the top of my head but those are two possible rules that we could put in that would help when we have a loop in a device linking file. I will open it up for discussion to see what you think of those.

**Tanesha Sibley:** We like these rules and would be open to testing but so far it seems like your solutions won’t help with our issue.

**John Hope:** The first item that you suggested would work. The second seems like it would run it through wrong way driving cases.

**Tucker Brown:** So wrong way driving picks up on radius searches not device linking searches. If it was a radius search it would exclude that. If it is a device that gets picked up on the opposite side, that could be a problem. Maybe the rule is if it is not a wrong way driving event then do this so that was a good thought.

**John Hope:** It might help if we can take an algorithm and apply it to different roadway scenarios to see if that algorithm will resolve the issue.

**Tucker Brown:** I know District 2 has this problem and I think District 7 but they would have to point me to where it is. Does anyone know if they have a look in their device linking?

**Mike Crawson:** We have four loops in our District.

**Tucker Brown:** Yes, so whatever solution we come up with will need to be for the problems we know we have. The wrong way driving is a consideration we might have to test to see how it reacts to it. If it works that would be fine but we might have to tweak some stuff based on directional in that case. Districts 7 and 2 I can reach out to and I know they can point me to examples does anyone else know if they have this situation?

**John Hope:** District 5 is unsure if we do have this situation. You might want to follow back up offline and see if anyone has this issue.

**Tucker Brown:** Any further comments on that one? Hearing none moving on.

**Item 2: 4801 Partial Lane Blockage as a Lane Configuration**

**Tucker Brown:** Right now, when you block lanes you have open, blocked, and unconfirmed and they are configurable at the District level. There has been a request to add a partial blockage type in addition to what is there now. We would make it configurable so it could be saved as a blockage. Doing this has implications on the lane blockage descriptions on the UI, DMS, HAR, reporting and 511. I wanted to get a feel for what people thought about using partial blockage and if they would use this enough to make the effort of going through each use case on how each system is using it worth it.

**District:** I think this would be useful for exits and maybe arterials but maybe not so much for interstates. I can’t think of a time I would want to put up a partial blockage on the interstate.

**Mike Crawson:** We proposed this because we have few single lane ramps that have rather wide shoulder where law enforcement will have people use the shoulder. We are having issues reporting to the public what is blocked. Right now, we are creating a ghost lane to tell people that the right lane is blocked on a single lane ramp. We figure for entry ramps or those one lane type of ramps the blockage at least for 511 tells the public what is blocked.

**Tucker Brown:** In that situation it is a ramp as well. Does anyone else want to comment on how they might use it.

**Alex Mirones:** We would not use this, I believe this is in the face of FHWA’s training or reference to the partial closures when there is lack of lateral bumper space, we should be taking a whole lane. I think this would encourage unsafe behavior so District Six would not be using this.

**Mark Laird:** In this case it would say the shoulder is open and the lane would be blocked not closed. Right?

**Tucker Brown:** Correct, if you declared that as a shoulder lane, yes.

**Mark Laird:** Does it work as all lanes block not closed on signs?

**Tucker Brown:** If you had a ramp lane, a travel lane and a right shoulder, if only one of them is blocked then you would say right shoulder blocked.

**Mark Laird:** What if the shoulder is open but the lanes are blocked?

**Tucker Brown:** I want to say that would be reported as a closure, all travel lanes blocked.

**Mark Laird:** All travel lanes blocked vs closed is the distinction isn’t it?

**Tucker Brown:** Yes. There is a distinction there.

**Mark Laird:** I don’t think we understand that distinction.

**Alex Mirones:** I would be cautious using this in the context of advanced traveler information. I would really discourage inviting people to come into a work zone. I would strongly lobby against it.

**John Hope:** District Five would use this. We do not see this as encouragement for bad behavior.

**Ray Mikol:** One-way District One would use this is for partially blocking a lane but not causing vehicles to go out of that lane. I don’t know how other Districts feel about that.

**District Seven:** If was to a degree of partially blocking a lane, we would just go ahead and block the lane. If the lane is partially blocked, we should block the whole lane. This is more for exit ramps where law enforcement or tow trucks are halfway blocking it and we want to move traffic to know where to go.

**Mark Laird:** Is this something you might want to restrict to using on ramps only for high speed kind of cases?

**District:** I think that is a great idea.

**Mark Laird:** That makes it more difficult for Tucker.

**Tucker Brown:** I am trying to figure out how we distinguish that. We could limit it to locations that contain a ramp lane. Is that sufficient? Or is there some other distinction there I am not thinking of?

**Mark Laird:** That is tough because you ramp and general lanes at the location.

**Tucker Brown:** You might have that main line next to the ramp lines and technically you could put partial blockage on the main line.

**Mark Laird:** I think lane type would have to be considered in order to do that.

**Tucker Brown:** Would it be too much of an imposition to make something as part of a location that flags that says you should allow partial lane blockage at this location? Excluded everywhere unless you want to list partial blockage for that location and can have a flag on the location. We can have an administrator configure those, that way it is limited to the exact locations you want.

**Mark Laird:** Only once you get down to the ramp would you allow it.

**Tucker Brown:** Yes, something like that.

**Mark Laird:** Maybe a location that has ramp only.

**Tucker Brown:** The pain would be that you have to configure all locations that potentially have that configuration and that may not be as fun.

**John Hope:** May I suggest not having the software leases and having it open to everything and have the operations in place to only use it in certain conditions.

**Tucker Brown:** That is doable, it certainly makes the implementation easier.

**Mark Laird:** Do you want to have operators make that decision?

**John Hope:** Operations.

**Mark Laird:** That is the configuration but if it is a procedure then you would have your operators do it. I wouldn’t do that.

**District:** I don’t like that either.

**Tucker Brown:** We did talk about it being a whole configurable setting, if you didn’t want to use partial lane blockage at all you could set it up to not allow it anywhere. Kind of like we do unconfirmed lane blockage.

**Mark Laird:** John, can you live with having the configuration to allow it or is that too much configuration?

**John Hope:** The word I am hearing from District Five is that they would use it according to their operational procedures.

**District Seven:** It wouldn’t be too hard to configure it now that we can visually see all the locations on the map. So, it is a lot easier to know exactly where those ramps are.

**District:** From the Districts that were against this how are dealing with a disabled vehicle on a ramp. Are they close to that ramp or how is it being entered?

**District:** If the vehicle is on the white line then it is going to require someone to take it out of there and wouldn’t necessarily be a lane blocked on that ramp.

**Alex Mirones:** I have to say, I think I am the only one thinking like this but in the face of national attention for traffic incident responders, safety and preventing secondary crashes, I really think this is inviting a dangerous situation. I think in the context of traveler information; this is inviting people to come into a work zone. I just want to make sure that is understood from our end. It may be different from an urban to a rural environment where you might have 50 miles for that exit ramp. Form an incident management standpoint, that is our stance.

**John Hope:** District Five is just responding to what law enforcement is doing. And law enforcement is the one making the decision.

**Mike Crawson:** With District Seven it is the same thing. We are trying to report what first responders are doing on the ramp, but we can’t report what’s going on. We don’t want to tell the public that a ramp is closed when it is not. We are just trying to find an accurate way to report.

**John Hope:** District Five agrees.

**Tucker Brown:** Okay, I think we have gotten a lot of discussion on that one and we can move on.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Before we move on, let me make sure I understand where we are landing. We are going to move forward, and I hear you Alex. We will be voting on this at the CMB. As far as the technical side goes, this will be configured as if it is supported or not, in that deployment and we will be configuring this function on a per location basis as a flag. Is that correct?

**Tucker Brown:** Yes.

**Item 3: Alert Operator when an event is created through the SPARR App**

**Tucker Brown:** The next item has to do with SPARR created events. When you create an event through the SPARR interface, not the SPARR Android Application, that event gets added to the event list and right now, the AVL subsystem owns it so no operator picks it up. If the person in the field is not in communication with the TMC, operators may need to do something against that event, and they could fail to do that because they don’t know it came in. There was a request to have a pop up or some sort of notification for when something comes out of that interface it creates an event. So, the operators are aware that something just happened. Because we know pop ups and notifications like that aren’t for every user, potentially we would implement some permission for users or administrators to get these alerts. It would be a notification saying the event got created and it would have a hyperlink to the event. You could click on it and take ownership and work the event from there. There would be no action from it, just a hyperlink to the event. Does anyone have any comments or thoughts?

**Tanesha Sibley:** We like this, instead of having the pop up we suggest having the event populate in the IDS alert section of the event list.

**Tucker Brown:** If it goes in there would you clear it from there?

**Jason Evans:** We would have it work the same way as the pop ups, so you create the event and it also gives you an IDS alert and you click on that you can work the event from there.

**Tucker Brown:** You wouldn’t want to create a new event out of it, your only action would be to take ownership and open or potentially acknowledge the alert.

**Jason Evans:** Right, that is it.

**Tucker Brown:** Okay, does anyone else have thoughts on this?

**John Hope:** District Five would not be using this.

**Tucker Brown:** Any more comments? Hearing none, we will move to the next one.

**Item 4: Ability to save filters for the dialog in the user settings**

**Tucker Brown:** The last one has to do with saving filters in user dialogs. Right now, the column position or if you change the width or dialog preferences are stored as user preferences. These are stored automatically without user action. Filters to the dialog are not stored. The enhancement that was requested was to request a filter to be saved. This would be done by the user manually selecting the filter to the dialog that would be reloaded when the dialog is loaded. Since that is a manual save, you would also need the ability to clear it. The reason we want it to be manual instead of automatic is because too often you just want to take a quick look at something without it being saved. The two questions I have are: do you think this would be usefully to the users in the ability to persist the filters and the second is do you have a comment on automatically saving those vs saving it manually?

**John Hope:** District Five is okay with this enhancement and is okay with the manual option.

**Mark Laird:** I agree that the manual saving is the way to go.

**Tanesha Sibley:** District Two agrees with the manual saving as well. Also, it would be nice to have an option to be able to clear the filters and return to default. But I just read the slide so never mind.

**Tucker Brown:** Yes, there are two ways to do that. One would be to put the clear explicitly and you could also probably clear the filter. Either by clicking at the bottom and it lists the filter that is there, or you can resave your filter which would save it to nothing.

**Tanesha Sibley:** Does the explicit clear return it back to default in a sense?

**Tucker Brown:** Correct. Any additional comments?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Thank you everyone for the great discussion today. Is there anything else someone wants to bring up before we end?

**John Hope:** Yes, District Five has an item to add a lane type to the collector and distributor ramps as well as cash lane type for toll plazas. Would any of this be beneficial to other districts?

**Tucker Brown:** Did you say cash as in money?

**John Hope:** Yes, as in for toll plazas. Right now, they have a location at toll plazas but there is no distinction between the open roads tolling and the cash lanes. We understand the Turnpike would be open to this. Are they on the line?

**Mark Laird:** The Turnpike did not announce so I am not sure anyone is on from there.

**John Hope:** As far as the ramp collector and distributor CD ramps, I would imagine all Districts would benefit from that. Any thoughts?

**District One:** We would be interested because we do have a collector and distributor ramp.

**John Hope:** We wanted to get initial feedback. We will submit a ticket and we can discuss at a later SSUG.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Thanks John. Does anyone else have something they want to bring up?

**Mike Crawson:** Do you have the event type pedestrian?

**Districts:** One, Two, Five, and Four have that event type.

**Mike Crawson:** I am wondering how we don’t. It says the event types are standardized and we can’t change it.

**Mark Dunthorn:** They are standardized, and it would be strange for you not to have it. Can you open a ticket for it and Tucker can look at it?

**Mike Crawson:** Will do.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Anything else someone wants to bring up? Hearing none, we will talk again in two weeks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Add ticket to JIRA for missing pedestrian event type | Mike Crawson |
| Add ticket for cash lane, collector, and distributor ramps lane type | John Hope |
|  |  |
|  |  |