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Christine Shafik: Welcome to the SSUG meeting, we have a few items to discuss today.

**Item 1: SG-5561: Give permitted users ability to assign active event to a user.**

Jason Evans: Thank you for the opportunity to present this one again. This would give the ability to permitted users the ability to assign an active event to a user. When this original enhancement was presented, we got off topic going down the road of handing off events to other operators which was not the intention of this enhancement. The current behavior for this is when releasing an event, the event owner is blank (no ownership). This can lead to a failed reassigning of the event to an operator. The proposed change is when releasing an event, the user would be able to see the list of active users in the system and select a user to assign ownership of the event. This selected user would be notified by a pop up with a link to the event. Operators without permission would get the release event functionality only. Could other Districts see yourself using this change?

Mark Laird: Did this come up because there was a problem with someone getting ownership of the event after it was released?

Jason Evans: Just an example is we are working during rush hour and we have an operator that is working several events. The supervisor would take ownership of that event to arrive someone then release it with the intent that the operator would pick it back up. But they did not notice that, and the event didn’t get updated again for an extended period of time. Doing this would re-highlight that on the event list.

Luis Hernandez: District One would be interested in this as well.

Kevin Mehaffy: District Three would be interested as well.

Mike Crawson: District Seven would be interested in this as well.

Dee McTague: This is District Four; I like this idea for when people are answering phones and they create an event that belongs in someone else’s feed that they could release and reassign ownership.

Jason Evans: Thank you.

Christine Shafik: Thank you Jason. We appreciate the clarification on the enhancement and the District input as well. It looks like it went a different direction last SSUG, so I am glad we presented it again. If there are no questions regarding this one, we can move forward to the next one.

**Item 2: SG-5093: Change the Lane Mapping Icons**

Tucker Brown: So, there is a limited amount of icons that we currently have to show on the map. When you declare that lane type, it might show up as a travel lane or it may show up as a number of things. There is a limited number so if you have a collector distributor it shows up however you show it. So, on the left here you see the collector distributor showing up as an M. The proposed change here is to have lane types that have unique icons and potentially make those icons configurable so they could change them on the fly or add additional ones. As you can see in the example, you can configure the image to be more specific like the shoulder example on the right has right and left shoulder instead of just shoulder. Any questions on that one? Are other people having issues with that?

John Hope: We just want to be clear that this is only affecting the icons themselves? This isn’t changing lane types, correct?

Tucker Brown: That is correct. Yes.

John Hope: District Five is good with making this configurable but only per installation. So, if we change it, it will change it everywhere.

Tucker Brown: Yes, the configuration would be systemwide per installation.

Kevin Mehaffy: What changes would this make to the FL511 postings?

Tucker Brown: None. Anyone else want to discuss before we move on?

**Item 3: SG-5413: Executive Notification Email recipients populate on “CC” line rather than “To” line.**

Tucker Brown: When the Executive Notifications get sent out, everyone gets added to the CC list. It was pointed out that some users may have rules to move/trash these or ignore the email if on the CC list. It was requested that they actually get put on the To list. So, we modified the enhancement to so you would be able to declare what group should appear on the To, CC, and BCC lines. This is to give you more control over how these get sent out and who these get sent out to. These would be installation specific. So, you could change them and add users to the executive notification, and this is the default group that would appear and how they would show up. Are there questions or comments on that?

Luis Hernandez: This is one that we submitted we with this enhanced enhancement. I was wondering if there would be a temporary solution until this is implemented.

Tucker Brown: I don’t have anything short term right now, but they are all on the CC list. If we can approve something like that, we can move all of them to the To list. I guess that is a topic to bring up as well.

Greg Reynolds: What is the standard and schedule for reviewing the mailing list? Is this in your domain or someone else’s?

Tucker Brown: So, my domain is essentially who gets put on the email groups. As far as reviewing the list that is nothing, I have a comment on. I just make sure it is configured and those people show up on the email. Central Office or the District would have to decide who is on the list.

Greg Reynolds: Okay, thank you.

Tucker Brown: So, going back to District One’s question, everyone shows up on the CC list if we moved everyone to the To list, would that cause anyone heartburn?

Luis Hernandez: I don’t believe so.

John Hope: District Five is okay with that.

Jason Evans: District Two has no issue.

Alex Mirones: District Six is good.

Dee McTague: District Four is in.

Tucker Brown: So, if we move everyone on the To list, do you need the capability to put anyone on the CC or BCC list?

Kelly Kinney: Turnpike is fine with everyone in the To.

Dee McTague: That is something we will learn about who will have a problem with it after we start the To list.

Brent Poole: CFX is good with it.

Mike Crawson: District Seven is good with it.

Alex Mirones: Good for Six.

Jason Evans: If we do move everything over to the To list, would it be possible to have a line item on the Executive pop up itself when we send it for CC? So, we have our hard coded To list in the background and if we wanted to add additional, we could do a CC before sending it out? That might be a separate enhancement request.

Tucker Brown: I would need to go back and look at it. I am not thinking of all the fields on the dialog. AJ, all of the users go on the CC list for the Executive Notification. We are going to move them to the To list instead. Is it possible to set the CC list in the Executive Notification?

AJ Skillern: No, the Executive Notification window only allows you to set the list of recipient’s period. Whether that is an individual user or one that is part of a group. There is no way to distinguish if they are part of the CC or the To.

Tucker Brown: For a quick fix just go the To list, then we might have to revaluate once we do that and figure out if that is acceptable or if we need to move people to CC or BCC list.

Jason Evans: That works for us.

Luis Hernandez: The To column is good for now but we would still like to see the development of the enhancement. Like Dee said it is not a problem now, but we will find out quickly when it is.

Tucker Brown: What I heard on this was, is that we would like a quick fix to change it from CC to the To. Long term to configure the To, CC, and BCC list.

Dee McTague: I would say long term we wait to see if we will get any complaints.

Christine Shafik: We will hear if anyone has any complaints.

**Item 4: SG-5601: Addition of bike lanes to lane configuration options**

Tucker Brown: The requested change is to add bike lanes to lane configuration options in order to provide a more accurate representation of arterial roadway lane mappings. As the arterial management coverage areas increase, districts are starting to see more of these types of lanes which might need to be configured. This would affect FL511 since it would be a new lane type. There would be things that need to be addressed like how do you want the DMS messaging to read if you have a blocked bike lane and what if it is combined with shoulder blocked? So, there are things to address here as to how it might look and that might be during the design review or a working group meeting. So essentially, we are adding a new lane type which is bike lane and the reason for that is as arterial management covers more bike lanes are something that you are running into and might need to be accounted for. Is this something a lot of districts are seeing? How is it being accounted for?

John Hope: We talked about this in District Five, this seems to be a bit of a Pandora’s box. If we are including bike lanes, there are a ton of other items that would also need to be included (sidewalks, rail, bus). I think it would be worth a discussion instead of just going one step, where else would this multi-modal go?

Dan Buidens: In my opinion, having sidewalks and golfcart lanes is really outside of the edge of the pavement but this bike lane would be.

Kevin Mehaffy: I struggle a little with how you would message this and that it might be confused as a travel lane.

Jeremy Dilmore: When were talking here, our assumption of bike lane was something to do with FL511 and trying to communicate that there is an activity that is closing a bike lane. Similarly, you could have something where the sidewalk is blocked due to construction. So, we saw equivalency there and from our side, our more frequent thing we see is the report of a service being down.

Luis Hernandez: Just to weigh in, I think there is value in pushing this information to third parties like Google and Waze. I wouldn’t want to our DMS or FL511 to convey this, I don’t think people are coming to us for this type of information, but it could be good for a third party.

Dan Buidens: As we start to expand into arterials, the arterials have certain characteristics such as bike lanes. We just wanted to make sure that we were going to appropriately capture this scenario. It might be two different things that we are chasing down here but that is my two sense.

Alex Mirones: I echo what John mentioned, this is a Pandora’s box. I recall being on I Drive in Orlando and I was in a bus lane, not knowing where I was. I think it is a positive thing because we are going to have multiple types of lanes. Just be ready the avalanche of requests.

Dan Buidens: We thought the same thing, how are we going to represent roundabouts or on street parking? I agree it will be a large-scale thing for us to wrap our hands around. As we get into arterials, we thought this was an important element to include.

AJ Skillern: I have a question that could lead to a suggestion for this to be less of a Pandora’s box. Typically, a bike lane is not what would be considered a travel lane, neither is a sidewalk or rail lanes because you wouldn’t drive down it. As far as SunGuide is concerned, we group things into a classification, there is a travel lane, a turn lane, etc. Potentially we could create a new classification that is a non-travel lane. We create that one category and within it in SunGuide you can configure a bike lane type category or a rail lane type that fails into that category. Would something like that help with the Pandora’s box concern and make this easier for Districts and cover all of the different lane types that could be covered by this scenario?

Jeremy Dilmore: We hear what you are saying. The hard part from our perspective is that it is not articulated on where we are trying to go but the end objective instead of the enhancement would help us understand the context. That way we can make things fit together a little better. We saw this as a big step as a program level not just at the SunGuide level like what issues would be reported and what our responsibilities are.

John Hope: Are you proposing a ConOps development?

Jeremy Dilmore: I don’t think it needs to be super detailed but something that puts it into context.

John Hope: Are there any other thoughts from other Districts?

Mark Laird: It makes sense that if there are going to be other lanes like this then we should put together use cases for all of those to try to come up with a concept of how it all fits together. Whether AJ’s proposal solves it or not, it would be helpful.

Greg Reynolds: I would like to hear more discussion; I was having a hard time hearing John, but Dan’s thoughts were well taken. I cannot help but wonder the cost benefit as well as the audience. The third-party feed is something to be considered, to put a bike lane on a travel is that going to benefit us in any capacity. I am trying to go along with it, but I am struggling with the benefit.

Dan Buidens: It wasn’t so much to tell the world that the bike lane is closed, it was more to capture the cross section of the roads there. That’s where the arterials differ so much from the interstate, the interstates have two shoulders, through lanes and ramps. You start adding arterials and it is a different animal.

Mark Laird: As you get to connected vehicles you might start sending out that notification.

Dan Buidens: I wouldn’t say that is outside of the possibility, it is a possible outcome.

Greg Reynolds: That’s where my thoughts were going towards the connected vehicle application. I am thinking more in the terms of why not give it a try and see how it plays out.

Dan Buidens: I am in support of it, I don’t know if we want to bubble it up or think on it for arterial management.

John Hope: I think the point that Jeremy was trying to convey was that there needs to be a purpose behind the enhancement and the focus on use cases might heal that purpose. That’s why a golf cart pass was brought up because in the villages there is a high population of golf cart traffic. In that particular area it is a good thing to keep track of but in other areas of the state it is not. It is a question of what the purpose behind it and what goal is are you trying to achieve and to look at the use case examples.

Christine Shafik: I think starting with a ConOps is a good idea and we can add comments to it as needed. Is there anything else on this one?

Dan Buidens: Nothing more from me.

Christine Shafik: That was the last slide. Are there any other items to discuss?

John Hope: There was one item, we put in a request a couple of months ago regarding the operator one click. There has been a number of issues that District Five has had over the years, every time the operator map has been dated, the folks who maintain the workstations have to go to every workstation and do additional work to get the operator maps functioning for every uses. It comes down to when the operator map is installed the map is user specific. There are issues that arise for specifying the path for firewall related issues with bringing up the video streams. We have talked to several districts and they use roaming profiles as a workaround which resolves part of the issues but there are still some issues each time the operator map is updated. District Five does not use roaming profiles for a number of reasons some security related. It is an ongoing issue every time it is updated. The ticket is 5533. I didn’t know if any other district had any input on this or anything, they want to add to problems that they might have when the operator map is updated. Or if what I am saying is completely foreign. I was wondering if the districts can consult with your IT people to see if what they have to do to support this on a user by user basis.

There is another piece I left out, occasionally there are issues with the profile settings, and you have to clear it out to launch the map. All of this is related to the click once implementation. If we move toward a regular application installation a lot of the issues would be fixed. Or if we look at another way to deploy the click once.

Tucker Brown: The simplest method was that it goes to a media type installation where you install a client. The trade off with that is instead of people going machine to machine is the media is not going to automatically update like the click once does now. You’re going to have to go to machine to machine to do the install anyway. I don’t know if that is the right answer, but we will have to look into more solutions.

John Hope: the current problem is the operator map updates and someone logs in and then we have to log in as an administrator to accept the installation. If a different operator logs into that workstation, that process has to be done again. So, having the installation media that you are talking about would actually be an improvement because we would only have to do the installation once per workstation.

AJ Skillern: There are two things that would be important considerations. One is right now your problem is when there is a map update an administrator has to go around and accept the update for each user. There are two ways we could build a new installer, but neither is going to get rid of this problem. One of the benefits of using click once is that it installs the map to the user’s personal folder which does not require admin privileges. We could build a new installer that installs the map to the users folder but in a more deterministic location and it would fix your concern although you would still have to set up firewall rules for each users work station. The other way is we could build an installer that goes to the program files directory but that requires administrator privileges and every time the map updates it would require administrator privileges to update the map on the machine but only once because each user can use that shared application. Does District Five have any input on either of those?

John Hope: The second option would work much better. The first options main problem is that the steps you go through a user would do the installation but the firewall rules would have be set up for each one and the installation path is a random number and IT has to figure out what those numbers are and add them to every user for every workstation. Only doing it once per workstation is considerably less.

AJ Skillern: If we went with something that goes into the program files, Administrators would still have to go around and install the operator map client on every workstation every time the map gets updated still. It will just reduce the number of times they have to do that, but they will have to authorize the map client.

Tucker Brown: If we were to change the click once to a consistent folder path and they no longer had random characters and installed always to the same spot but between map to map it would install in the same location and the rules wouldn’t have to change per installation.

Mark Laird: That creates a problem with test machines. The different instances of SunGuide from the same workstation.

AJ Skillern: I think that would be doable so part of the deterministic path is at least right now with the click one stuff we have the concept by deployment name by default the installer sets that up by the workstation name. We could use that as part of the deterministic path so that you could have multiple map files installed and same with the program directory.

Mark Laird: That might actually be a little bit better. We have issues with having two browsers, we have to uninstall one before we can use the other.

John Hope: That sounds great, especially if you relate it to the installation name for that operator map configuration file.

Brent Poole: Just a quick thought, not sure if District 5 is using it but if they are using FCCM and SunGuide was rolled out as a client as MSI there is way you can submit the update package to FCCM and upload it to all the clients. That would eliminate an Administrator going around to each PC and separately installing it.

Jason Summerfield: You can do it with regular group policy if it is an MSI file so you would be using FCCM regular windows management.

John Hope: Brent that is true but there is still a firewall issue that would have to be accepted in order to view the video streams on desktop.

Brent Poole: Okay.

AJ Skillern: Couldn’t you deploy the firewall through group policy if you know the deterministic location of where the map is going to be?

Jason Summerfield: I believe you can, but you need be careful of the order, so you don’t overwrite anything.

John Hope: The group policy method is preferred but the issue goes back to the installation path differing based on what AJ was describing.

Jason Summerfield: One of the other things is moving to a separate client there needs to be version check when the client logs in to make sure it is still valid with the current version of SunGuide. That is one of the bonuses of the click once is that if we have someone who is not directly on the operations floor like a DOT person that doesn’t login on a regular basis but has a computer for it. When they log in, they get an update, so we don’t have to go around do everything there if we don’t have direct control of that version. Some sort of version checking would be ordeal so if you have an out of date system or if you could get a deployment still have a deployment package built in.

John Hope: Where do we go from here? Can SwRI look into this and the other discussions?

Tucker Brown: We can do that, we are back and forth, is there a specific one we want to look at? I just want to be clear on it.

John Hope: The objective is to do the least amount of work while updating the operator maps while still addressing the possible issues that Jason mentioned without having control of version checking while having multiple version of operator maps can still run on a work station. So, if you could come up with a solution based on those requirements that’s what I would want you to do.

Tucker Brown: Yes, we can look into it. What I think is going to come out of that is either a physical installation media or click once with a deterministic map path. I believe we can make those go along with the goals that you just talked about. We would need to get to that point to determine if it is true or not, but I believe it would be. At that point we need to figure out which direction to take this.

John Hope: Can we talk about this at the next SSUG based on the findings you have?

Tucker Brown: We won’t have the results at the next SSUG because there is an upcoming hotfix that is due, but it could be the one after that.

John Hope: I just meant a future SSUG. That sounds great.

Christine Shafik: Very good discussion. We have a few more minutes for any comments or questions. Hearing none, thank you for joining today and we had a great discussion today.