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Christine Shafik: Welcome to the SSUG meeting, we have a few items to discuss today. For the purpose of taking notes, we will be recording this meeting as usual. I just want to clarify that these are not bugs, they are enhancements. We are trying to release as many enhancements as possible. Please give us your input so we can make sure we develop what you request.

**Item 1: SG-3488 – DMS Priority in Response Plan changes all DMS Messages.**

Tucker Brown: The initial request was to add a way to change the priority without changing the message. We went to a SUGG and it the result was that we wanted both functionalities. Right now, when you right click the edit item, it brings up the standard DMS window which will allow you to change both the priority and the message, but it would apply to all signs. When you select either change message or change priority a new window will appear. This is the change message sign window, and you will notice it looks like the standard messaging window where you can modify the message. The alignments are new to 8.0 but essentially the entire message is capable of doing that. You will notice that normally there is a priority in the top left, that is not there this time so basically you can change everything but the priority. If you select change priority, there will be a dialog where your only option is to change the priority. Either option would be available. If you don’t want to use either of these, the option to use what we previously had is also available. This enhancement is just adding two additional options to what you could previously do. There were a couple of comments that came back on those. One was will it still allow auto merge to occur if the priority is lower than our travel time message? This effects the priority in the same way it did previously. So, these options only give you the ability to set the priority or message independently. It does not affect auto merging; it is the same behavior as it is now. The other is that it does effect all of the signs that are selected in the response plan. Any questions or comments?

John Hope: District Five likes the way it is laid out.

Kelly Kinney: Turnpike concurs.

Matt Mileto: District Seven concurs.

Ray Mikol: District One likes these plans.

Tucker Brown: It sounds like we have a good consensus on that one. Any other questions?

**Item 2: SG-4815 – Response Plans should use congestion tail if available.**

Tucker Brown: Right now, if you have a response plan and you wanted to use the location, it is going to use the primary location on the left to build what is on the right. That is the current behavior, and it would be used this way. We aren’t changing anything in the template, it will still reference the primary location in the template but if you set a congestion tail, instead of referencing the primary location it will reference the congestion tail location. In this case the initial location is MM 69, and the tail congestion is MM 63. The Response Plan will reference MM 63 which is part of that congestion tail. You will notice the distance calculation is different here and basing it on a different point. You are still using the same tags in the templates but instead of referencing the primary it will reference the secondary congestion tail. One of the comments we got back was would the congestion tail point move as the congestion builds from the initial point selection. It is still the same concept here and you have to update the point as you get more updated information. There is nothing that is automatic about tracking the congestion tail. It is still the exact same process there. Are there any other comments?

Carla Holmes: I have a question, if you have a response plan and you choose a congestion tail, can you also have other signs that reference the event, or does it change, or do you have to use congestion tail on the signs?

Tucker Brown: In this case since it is a single tag, it wouldn’t know which one you want to use so you have chosen. They would all now be referencing the congestion tail.

Carla Holmes: Even if you have signs within the limits of the congestion could you manually make that sign reference the event instead of the congestion?

Tucker Brown: That might be doable, the one thing about that is that you would have to make sure your sort orders are set up correctly.

Mark Laird: You would calculate that the distance is less than zero then its negative.

Tucker Brown: That is going to be interesting. I need to look at that closer. The distance only goes in one direction and will start at the primary location. There is not a good association with DMS, physical location, and event location. Let me go back and look at that.

Kelly Kinney: Does this only apply to congestion event type or every event type?

Tucker Brown: Right now, it was requested to apply to all event types there was no event type specified.

Kelly Kinney: So, if you had a closure and you had congestion associated with the closure, would the miles ahead then be updating to where the end of the congestion is? I am just trying to picture what the sign would say, would it be all lanes closed at let’s say it was a detour and there was congestion at the detour point. Would the sign be adjusting itself to the congestion tail?

Tucker Brown: The distance would change to the tail, yes. It would read all lanes blocked and x miles ahead which would potentially to the tail of the congestion, not to the actual closure.

Kelly Kinney: Okay, I think this template only makes sense for congestion event types. It is confusing for other event types like crashes.

Tucker Brown: It can be limited to that; I have no issues with that.

Alex Mirones: District Six concurs with the Turnpike.

Matt Mileto: So does District Seven.

Ray Mikol: District One agrees as well.

Tucker Brown: Should we make this to where you can set it to whatever event types you want as opposed to hard coding it to limit it to congestion?

David Roark: That is what I was going to ask, can it just be applied to whatever templates we add the tag to?

Tucker Brown: The thought right now is that we would be piggy backing the existing tag. I was trying to make this, so you don’t have to update anything in your tags to make this work. Potentially we could make it an independent tag that has this functionality then you could make it specific to event types. Then for congestion, you only use this tag otherwise it will use the default. Conceptually if you set it up to only work with congestion, that is what it will do. Does that work?

Kelly Kinney: That’s acceptable, if there is a separate tag that we can set up to use how we choose which would be congestion, that’s fine.

Tucker Brown: That would imply that on the initial install of this you would have the same behavior, but you can change the template to have this behavior.

Kelly Kinney: That’s acceptable for the Turnpike.

Ray Mikol: This would be beneficial for road work.

Tucker Brown: I think we have a scheduled road work and an emergency roadwork which are two different event types. You could have a tag that you can put into those and use it. But the default behavior for a closure would be the standard behavior we have now.

Mark Laird: So, if you made a new tag, it would be congestion tail and if you didn’t have congestion, it would just use location?

Tucker Brown: I think we were going to have a hybrid tag. Then we would have one that could use the congestion tail and if you don’t have a congestion tail it would use the primary. Any other questions?

Carla Holmes: Can you restate what the change will be?

Tucker Brown: The only real change is that instead of piggy backing the original tag, we would be creating a new tag with the same functionality I just described. The tag itself would take the primary location and use that unless there is a congestion tail set then they would use that. Anyone deploying this would have to use that tag and insert it into a message template in order to use it.

Carla Holmes: So, does this account for the question I asked about the proximity and it starting in the congestion limits or is that something you still have to look at?

Tucker Brown: That is something that still needs to be addressed. Out of curiosity, let’s talk about that real quick. Let’s say I do have a sign and it is inside the congestion area between the location and tail. Should that default back to using the primary location? What should be the behavior there?

Carla Holmes: I would think that would be a good solution to default back to the primary location for that sign.

Jason Evans: Usually for the ones between the head and tail, District Two would put congestion through where the primary event was.

Kelly Kinney: Instead of saying miles ahead you could say next so many miles if you are within that queue.

Tucker Brown: That is something I need to look at and get back to the group on. Any more questions on that one?

**Item 3: SG-3800 – Reporting of more accurate locations**

Tucker Brown: The idea here is for operators in the field would be able to set a more accurate latitude longitude location. As you populate the event and set an initial location, the latitude and longitude would be based on that initial location. The way to set a more accurate location is using the ribbon button on the top right where it says, “Set Location on Map”. If you hit that button you could go to a place on the map and automatically pick up that location and set them into this latitude and longitude. The way to do that is modifying the SPARR app and interface to set the latitude and longitude by clicking a button. This is a set operation so whatever the last position of doing this is and that is what would show up for the event. One question we had on this was if operators are allowed to type in manually the latitude and longitude values. When we talked about this at the SSUG we talked about ease of use and operator error of trying to type these in. Our initial thought was that these would be read only and if they didn’t want to set it, they would use the ribbon to set it. It would always show up correctly as to where they put it instead of having someone manually type it.

Mark Laird: I was thinking they would copy and paste from somewhere.

Tucker Brown: What other sources are they getting that data from?

Mark Laird: The FHP data? I don’t know. If you can grab the road ranger list, you could use SPARR.

Tucker Brown: The two things I heard there is that there is a case to manually set these…

Mark Laird: Maybe and just maybe using the road ranger location would get it done for us.

Tucker Brown: I will mention here that at the end of the event it will have two sets of coordinates. One will be the location, the lat and long does change the event where it is configured. This is storing the additional lat and long and you can reference either one with the reports. It is still going to be something you will see. Does anyone else want to weigh in on the manual type in?

 Kevin Mehaffy: How will this effect current reports? Will it loop them together or show up as a separate event.

Tucker Brown: Currently when you pull lat and long it will do it based on the location of the event. The only enhancement here is to store the lat and long. There was no mention of adding reporting to this. I think anyone who is reporting on this has their own custom reporting tools.

John Hope: Will there be any indication on the map where this latitude and longitude is?

Tucker Brown: Meaning, where is the event going to show up? Or an additional something that would point them to a specific spot?

John Hope: The latter. For example, if a road ranger uses a SPARR app to set a location, the operator would see numbers there but what do those numbers mean for the operator.

Tucker Brown: Is there something specific you want to see there? We have a way to highlight a specific position but that would only be like a blue circle around that. I don’t know how else that would show specifically.

John Hope: I could be a blue dot.

Tucker Brown: Should it always be visible or only if you select it?

John Hope: I would guess only if its set and it is different than the EM location.

Mike Crawson: With the Lat and Long, using the SPARR application, wouldn’t that just show up as the road rangers’ vehicle on the map?

Tucker Brown: Yes.

Mike Crawson: You could always just use that if you are using the SunGuide map to see where the road ranger is placed if the road ranger has the SPARR Application.

Tucker Brown: that would also mean that they could move, and it would show an inaccurate location. The other point is that if it is set differently than location of the event should the icon on the map be where the primary location is or the more accurate location?

John Hope: I would guess the more accurate location.

Jason Evans: That was my thought is that when you set the latitude and longitude it would move the event location to the new spot on the map. Is that not what this is for?

Tucker Brown: The actual request is to have a better latitude and longitude that you could run reports against and better aggregate stuff in an aftermath of an event. The map side of this is a secondary consideration.

Mark Laird: A benefit of showing it on the map is if you change it, it moves it to that location so you can confirm that what you changed it to is correct.

Tucker Brown: The only downside to that is you don’t know where the primary location is so is long as that is not a problem it is doable. In that case, having a point to show the primary vs the accurate location is always basically where the icon is. Is that acceptable?

John Hope: That is good to me.

Tucker Brown: One thing I thought of mentioning is how it would change if you changed a location. Let’s say I set the primary location, and I had a lat and long from that. Then I manually change it to a more accurate location and set it. Then I go back and modify the primary location and the way it is written is if you set coordinates manually and you change locations, the manually set locations are going to hold and won’t be changed. If you were to set a primary location and you didn’t set an accurate location, and then you moved locations it would follow. It will make a comparison to primary location and accurate location and if they are the same it when you change location the accurate location would change. If they are not the same and someone manually put them in, then it will not change. That behavior is consistent with how we do nearest camera as well.

Jason Evans: I am fine with that as long as we are verifying the new accurate locations. I am a little worried about the road rangers having the capability to set the location through SPARR. Would we be able to get a pop-up to the operator who owns the event that says the road ranger is trying to set a more accurate location and it asks for the operator’s approval?

Tucker Brown: You would like to approve anything done by the road ranger?

Jason Evans: Yes, incase they hit a button by accident or move it to the wrong location.

Tucker Brown: That wasn’t part of the original scope, but I can go back and look into that. Should the users be able to type in the lat and long?

Kelly Kinney: I don’t think that is a good idea.

Mike Crawson: I don’t see a benefit for doing that.

Jason Evans: Yea that isn’t a good idea.

Alex Mirones: That is a lot of numbers, District Six says no.

Kevin Mehaffy: I think that opens up the opportunity for error and scope creep.

Tucker Brown: Okay so we will leave those as read only fields. I picked up Marks’s point about being able to set a road rangers location. We are going to move the icons to the accurate location. Then the other request is to have an approval for when the lat and long is set by a road ranger, the operator would receive a pop-up. Should that only be to the event owner?

Jason Evans: Yes, but if you can do what Mark was suggesting and the operator be able to select the road ranger location then you can leave the road ranger out of it.

Tucker Brown: So, no SPARR app modification at all?

Jason Evans: Yes, if we can pull it from the operator map, we won’t have to do that which is better than giving capability to the road ranger.

Kelly Kinney: FTE and D5 have been talking about getting more accurate locations on where road ranger stops occur so we can publish to other applications like Waze. We wanted to bypass having to purchase additional devices by having an exact location set up in SunGuide. So, I like the idea of having a road ranger set their own location so we can use that data for third party applications.

Mark Laird: That would be completely different since you are trying to get the road ranger stops to show up as opposed to an event. Is that what you are saying?

Kelly Kinney: When the road ranger creates an event when they stop.

Mark Laird: So, it is the event itself you are trying to track.

Mike Crawson: The only problem I see with this is if an operator creates a location and there is a response plan going and the road ranger is asked to go block off an exit ramp and they update their latitude and longitude, and it changes the location of the event. That’s the biggest problem I see with this. I think if the event location doesn’t change and we obtain the road ranger location in addition to the event location, that is fine.

Kelly Kinney: Wouldn’t you be cloning the event and sending them to the new event with the updated location to block a ramp or start a detour?

Mike Crawson: Yes, but it may not happen right away. I think if a road ranger can change a location, I think there should be an approval process before instead of changing a location on an operator mid event.

Jason Evans: We will be doing polyline events soon which means you might not need to create another event to go block ramps if you update it to a polyline event.

Kelly Kinney: I think what we are looking to do should be another enhancement, but I do like the ability for a road ranger to go do that and if it has to have a secondary approval that is fine.

Tucker Brown: If there is an approval process, we want that sent to the event owner? And only them?

Jason Evans: If it went to anyone else, they would have to take over the event to update that, right?

Tucker Brown: We could actually allow that but generally we want the person that owns it make the changes.

Jason Evans: I would say owner.

District: Is it possible to make it like a geo-fence alert where any operator would be able to make it any location and they confirm it?

Tucker Brown: Potentially, in this case it is more event specific but showing in the alert box as opposed to a pop up?

District: Yes.

Tucker Brown: Anyone have thoughts on that?

Jason Evans: I am fine with that.

Carla Holmes: I have a question on them using the web manager instead of SPARR to set the location. Isn’t the SPARR application mobile so they might not be at the vehicle when setting the location so just using the vehicle to set the location on the map may not be accurate.

Dan Buidens: How would they know where they are if they are out of the truck?

Carla Holmes: I understood it was just a push of a button.

Dan Buidens: Oh okay, on the tablet.

Tucker Brown: Correct. This is mobile but some districts mount them to the truck, but do you know if they pick up the tablets and take them out of the truck to the event? It would be the truck location and not where they walked to.

Jason Evans: We need to make them aware that when they are setting that event location to set it while they are there instead of away from it. To go back to Kelly’s suggestion on the approval. Can you make a back end setting to auto approve if you wanted to?

Tucker Brown: So, no approval required?

Jason Evans: Yes, on the back end.

Kelly Kinney: Or even if it is in the IDS box on the right side of the event manager.

Tucker Brown: This would be a system level change for everyone like per installation?

Jason Evans: Yes.

**Item 4: SG-5156 – Timestamp logic pop-up warnings**

Tucker Brown: The criteria that we went with were things that potentially could be an error. One of the ways it could be applied is on the closure of an event, it will check all of them or on each save and verified. If it is done on each save, some of the criteria needs to change. We did pass these criteria out as part of the requirements. We didn’t get any additional criteria from anyone, but we did get things about the departure time should be less than or equal to an arrival time. On the requirements themselves it was actually less than so we can change that. More of the times being equal. I would like thoughts on if these should be checked on each save or on the closure. And I also want thoughts on what the criteria should be or if there is additional criteria. The intent here was to do one of two things: either have a single check box that says you would like to monitor the criteria and you would be able to turn it on or off on the installation level. Or each one of the criteria can be its own checkbox and if you didn’t like a specific criteria, you could uncheck it. If there are criteria you have disagreements on, then we should have the criteria be its own checkbox. Going back to the criteria slide I would like your thoughts on the closure or save and then on specific criteria.

Kevin Mehaffy: If it is on each save and you decided it was an error, but you wanted to do it anyway, would you have to ignore each of these boxes?

Tucker Brown: In a simple condition if you have an error condition, it would be checking the ones being set. It would only be checked when the initial save occurs.

Jason Evans: I like the first save operation like checking an event to see what time maintenance arrived if you put in the wrong time and the event is still open you could potentially give the wrong information to someone.

Kevin Mehaffy: It is also fresh in your mind.

Tucker Brown: If we go with the save route on per save, the criteria two would almost have to be a closure criterion. Maybe it is a hybrid so when you save you check certain ones and then when you close you check certain ones.

Jason Evans: That sounds good to me and I am good with all the criteria as well.

Carla Holmes: I think it would be good if we made the upon closure check have more alarm to it so they know they can’t change it after they close it. It needs to be more eye catching.

Tucker Brown: What do you think bout this? Most of them check on the save then at the end we check all of them so if you clicked through it once when you do the closure you would have to click through it again.

Mark Laird: That’s what I was thinking.

Carla Holmes: Yes. That is good.

Tucker Brown: This would be a system setting applied to all users.

**Item 5: Other Enhancements**

Tucker Brown: These three enhancements did not have direct design review mockups.

* SG-3336 – Automatically select associated event in alert handling dialog.
	+ Event would be selected from a drop down of open events. This will function in the same as it does now but will have automatically selected the event from the drop down if the alert was previously associated to an event.
	+ If you have not previously selected it, it would sort it by proximity to the alert. It would sort by which is closest. There was a comment on that saying that there was no way to tell if it was the closest or the previous event. I believe the text is red at the top which also has the event number. We could also do something else on the alert to make it more visible with an asterisk. Is that sufficient?
	+ John Hope: An asterisk, color coding or making it bold would work as long it is consistent.
	+ Tucker Brown: The other comment on that was is it possible to take a step further and have a pop up if the operator tries to apply an already associated FHP alert to an event that has already dropped off EM. The option right now is that you only get alerts that are still in EM and you wouldn’t be able to associate it with an event that has already been closed. It would not let you associate it with an already closed event. Closed events that are no longer in the map.
* SG-5170 – Ability to filter roadway in Waze Alert.
	+ This is a configuration item in Waze Reader that is running at the TERL. There are no operational changes to the districts needed for this issue. I did not get any comments on this section.
* SG-5376 – Add nearest camera information to C2C eventData.
	+ For the nearest camera, both the camera name and ID will be added to schema for the “eventData” type as well as the “publishEventReq” sent to 511 when publishing an event. The design was to make it an optional element that would appear in both the event data and the publishEventReq. If the camera was set it would provide the name of the camera and the camera ID. If it were not set at all it would basically it would be removed from that and would not show up in the xml. The comment received said it would be more useful to FL511 if the nearest camera was always reported. If the nearest camera is selected for an event the field would provide camera name and ID. If the nearest camera was not selected it would indicate that no camera was set for that event. Nearest camera is selected automatically as long as the event is within a certain distance from the camera. In most cases we would see this. It is possible to unset a nearest camera as well. For the people that would use this, do you have any issues with making it there if it is set and making an optional element missing if it is not set?
	+ John Hope: Having it missing would work as long as there is a clear indication.
	+ Tucker Brown: Okay that works. The other camera is that they would like to correct the associated camera if it is incorrect. This could happen when there are a lot of cameras in close proximity. There is the ability to set the camera to the correct one in the event. I don’t believe we expose it via Audit. Was that comment directed at updating a live event or a closed event?
	+ John Hope: When an event is closed it is not reporting from C2C.
	+ Tucker Brown: Correct, it goes to beyond the enhancement itself if it is applied to closed events. I just wanted to clarify what the comment was referencing. If that’s fine, then that was all the comments.

Christine Shafik: That was a great discussion. I appreciate all of the input we got ahead of this meeting and we sent out the hotfix 4 requirements which is due by the 10th and I am looking forward to getting input from you. Most likely I will have next SSUG on the 18th as the Design Review for Hotfix 4. Please send in your comments and copy Carla so she can consolidate them.

Carla Holmes: I think we discussed it being on the 24th and the SSUG on the 18th being a regular meeting.

Tucker Brown: Potentially, it might be the 24th before getting it out.

Christine Shafik: We will coordinate internally, and you will see the Design Review either on the 18th or the 24th. Thanks for attending.