SunGuide Software
User's Group
Meeting Minutes

Date: December 7, 2017

Time: 2:30pm-3:30pm EDT

Agenda:

Topics	Led By:
Item 1: FP 3747 - RPG Plan to automatically remove signs that are not of service or in error.	Tucker Brown, SwRI Derek Vollmer, CO
Item 2: FP 3750 – Remove FLATIS from RPG when there are no lane blockage automatically.	Tucker Brown, SwRI Derek Vollmer, CO
Item 3: FP 3751 – Allow a cloned 'Disable vehicle' event type to be created as an 'Abandoned Vehicle' event type	Tucker Brown, SwRI Derek Vollmer, CO
Item 4: FP 3752 – Waze alerts to be acknowledged by any operator	Tucker Brown, SwRI Derek Vollmer, CO

Attendees:

Luis Ruiz, D1
Jason Summerfield, D2
Tanesha Sibley, D2
Christopher Jones, D2
John J. McFadden, COT
Dee McTague, D4
Jacques Dupuy, D4
Jose Alfaro, D4 (AMP)
Shayla Khalilahmadi, D4
Josh Sibley, D5
John Hope, D5 (CFX)
Mark Lucas, D5
Alex Mirones, D6

Mathew Mileto, D7
Cathie McKenzie, D7 (SunGuide)
Charles Keasler, D7
Vinny Corazza, D7
Mike Crawson, D7
Alexander Brum, D7
Brent Poole, CFX
Tucker Brown, SwRI
Derek Vollmer, CO
Mark Dunthorn, CO
Frances Ijeoma, CO
Aylen Guevara, CO

Discussion:

ITEM 1   FP 3747 – RPG Plan to automatically remove signs that are not of service or in error

Derek: We are going to have an open discussion. The first four topics were put in from District 4 about a year ago. We had an internal discussion about FP 3747- Response Plan Generator (RPG) to automatically remove signs that are not in service or in error:

- Currently SunGuide (SG) allows suggesting and adding signs in any state, if signs in Error/Failed/Out of Service state the message still get added to the queue but the chronology would never show it posted to the sign.

What District 4 is requesting that SunGuide could be enhanced to have a configurable setting where, if the sign is in an Error/Failed/Out of Service state, then those signs will not get automatically pulled into the suggested response plan. The way we would do this is:

- to have each of the response statuses as configurable options and you could select which state you want and those would not get pulled into the response plan.

- If they don't get pulled into the response plan, then they will not show up in any reports for that, in case anyone does any QA/QC reports in where signs get pull into their response plans.

- This is configurable so you can always turn it off if you don't want that to happen.

Does anyone have any comments on this, should we try to bring this forward as a small enhancement for the Change Management Board in the future? I open it up for comments and discussions.

John: This would lead to confusion. Usually when signs don't show up on the response plan, the first assumption is that it has not been configured properly. and the radius distance from the event location isn't wide enough or set properly. For signs to suddenly not to show up, especially if it has showed up in previous updates and then it failed at some point. I just imagine it would be confusing. Instead of not having anything show up on the sign maybe have it greyed out or some other effect where the message was never sent to the queue of that sign.

Mark: From the QA stand point do you look for signs that should have been included but for some reason didn't post because of some Error or Failed state? How do the Error/Failed states work with trying to figure out if people did things right?

Dee: For QA purposes if they don't show up in the event, then we will confirm that they were in Error/Failed state.

Mark: So that is checked, if it was supposed to be there then someone goes and looks to see if there was an error or failed state?

Dee: Correct.

Jacques: I think also that is why having the option of what you want to configure of which you want to leave and which you want to remove then you can decide to change them in the config. That way it can be customized so it does not cause confusion.

John: I understand that you can turn them off but if do have them enabled, operationally do you think there would be a moment of confusion? I am asking D4.

Jacques: The whole idea is also to step up the response time. We are just trying to speed up the process.

Derek: It sounds like you are just trying to get the response plan activated quicker and I guess right now they are removing the sign from the response plan before activated?

Jacques: Yes.

Derek: What about if they show greyed out and you knew that the greyed out signs wouldn't post anything to the queue or anything like that; but it will still pop up for people to see them. Would that be okay?

Dee and Jacques: Yes, that will be fine.

Alex D6: Would there be any kind of functionality that if it doesn't appear in the response plan because the sign has failed, that the system could generate a value or comment saying this sign was not posted due to been out of service?

Derek: In the chronology?

Alex: Yes, in the chronology a line says: "this sign was Failed"; that will not appear in the response plan and it would not require the operator to do anything else other than to activate the response plan with the radius. Since the sign was Failed, the sign will show up in the chronology as attempted but it was in Failed status. It will stay out of the response plan but it shows up in the line so there is some level of check. I could see our QA/QC process looking at this and says this was an available sign and was not used and if that comment was generated we would be able to see the Failed status.

Dee: Correct, if it is in the list instead of showing up with a message, it would just say: "Failed" and it is still on the list and it still shows up in the chronology and it would help with:

- Getting response out quickly because they don't have to manually remove signs.

- QA/QC process it is there for us to see.

Derek: The part that I need is that it will go into the chronology.

Tucker: If I heard everything correctly, what you are talking about before was that the signs would be suggested. And now you just mentioned that you must activate the plan. In that case, they would be part of the plan, they just wouldn't get a message and the message wouldn't be in the chronology but it didn't do anything because the sign was Error/Failed/Out of Service. Is that a more helpful message and is it acceptable for them to be in there with no message.

Dee: I believe that is what we said right, Alex.

Alex: Yes, we really want to emphasize the interface with the operator. If the radius includes that sign and it is out of service, it would not appear in the response plan because it is not available. There would not be a need to remove it. That would accelerate that process.

Tucker: That is what I can't do. Unless that is in the response plan when you say: "activate", it is not going to go in the chronology because otherwise it is a suggestion and if I leave it out entirely, there is no way for us to know that you meant to activate this but it wasn't in your response plan. Because you could have gotten as a suggestion and put it in the plan and then said: "no I don't want that" and remove it. How do I know the difference between that and it shouldn't have been there in the first place? The only time I can put something in the chronology is when you actually say: "this is what I want, activate". That been said I could allow out of service sign to be activated and it would not send any message and would say: "this is out of service" in the chronology. In that case they will see the chronology and see it is out of service and they would not have to do anything. You just know it was there.

Dee: The way I understand this is that it would solve both problems. Right now, the operators have to remove Failed signs in the plan then they are required to add a comment that says: "sign was removed because it was in Failed status". That way we know for QA/QC purposes. If they all show up in the response plan, the ones that are in Error will not delay the response plan going out because they are just going to be activated and the only thing that it is going to show in the chronology is that it was in Failed/Error status. Is that correct?

Tucker: All these will occur when activated, right!

Dee and Derek: Yes.

Tucker: Are you implying that they will or will not have to remove the Error/Failed? They will just activate them but the SunGuide software would not send anything or would you say this is Failed will not send anything.

Dee: That they don't have to remove it because this will slow them down.

Tucker: Okay. Also, The Error/Failed state technically does still have a queue and if I don't send a message to the queue and they were to magically turn back on again and become available during the course of that event; they will not post that message if I don't send it to the queue. Question: Do you want something in those queues or not?

Dee: My first instinct is to say not. We don't want rogue message in the queue because we have not use the sign and all of the sudden there is message in queue that is going to show two hours after an event has ended.

Tucker: It will still be removed if you terminate the response plan It will go in a queue and a termination will remove it from the queue.

Dee and Alex: I don't think I have any strong feelings either way.

Derek: What gets posted in the chronology for that then? Does it say that you posted a sign in the chronology? What would it say in that case?

Tucker: I would just show as DMS posted message but we could change that to DMS posted Error or indicated the actual description that the sign was an Error.

Derek: If we do add it to the queue I would like to note in the chronology that the sign was in the Error state when we first tried to post.

Tucker: Okay that would be fine. In order to expedite the response time we would activate with all of the states in there. Does that need to be configurable or does anybody have any strong comments or wouldn't want that?

Derek: I don't know. We have enough comments that we could present this later and send to everyone and we could always ask this later. Thank you everyone that was very good information.

We will move on to the next item:

ITEM 2   FP 3750 – Remove FLATIS from RPG when there are no lane blockage automatically

Derek: There are some situations that I feel need to be posted even though there is no lane blockage. Russell will still want it to be posted to 511, like congestion. There is no lane

blockage for congestion but he would like to see it posted to the 511. This is an alternative option, we would remove the disable vehicle items with no lane blockage automatically. This would be configurable of course. For an event like congestion, we would not automatically remove that one. We would let that one go through. Are there any other situations that you think we should post to 511 even though there won't be lane blockage, potentially fog or visibility type of situations? It comes down to the automatic removal. Is the big one that's a problem abandoned and disable vehicles?

Dee: I wish I could answer that. That is a question for my supervisor. Do you have anything Jacques?

Jacques: No that was from David. That was the discussion we had. We could have some kind of configuration and go from the District's needs.

Derek: I know District 2 mentioned there are some situations where you would like to post disable vehicles and abandoned vehicles to FL511. Is this only if they are severe enough to warrant posting, you don't post all of them?

Jason: Yes, we do. Ryan is not here right now but as far as I know we post for Disabled Vehicles on the shoulder.

Derek: You post for all of them? I know D3 Chipley posts for shoulder vehicles.

Dee: This is a non-discussion because this is District by District apparently. I don't feel very strongly on this one.

Derek: I talked to Russell about this and maybe is something he could bring up at FL511 Working Group meeting. I think he feels strongly about posting vehicles on the shoulder to 511. We can come back to this one after there is more discussion with the FL511 working group to see what they would like. I know we probably would get a lot of these vehicles stop on shoulder and you always have to remove that FL511 Response Plan item. It would probably help if we don't automatically put them in, but will table it until we get more consensus from FL511 Group.

Dee: I am okay with that.

ITEM 3   FP 3751 – Allow a cloned 'Disable Vehicle' event type to be created as an 'Abandoned Vehicle' event type

Derek: We can see what you are doing here, the disable vehicle turned into an abandoned vehicle and you just want an easy way to be able to convert that to an abandoned vehicle event type. To kind of genericize it a little bit, would it be acceptable to have whenever you

clone an event it might default to the existing event type but when you are in the cloning process you have the option to change it to another event type, before it gets created.

Jacques/Dee: That is a good idea.

Derek: District 2 I know you clone events as well. Do you clone and change event types frequently?

Jason: That would probably be a question for Ryan. I am not positive. He is not here right now.

Derek: Does anyone else? When you are cloning events do you change the event type?

John: I seem to recall a case when District 5 was doing this for a secondary event and the secondary event was a different event type. That was a while that they brought that up and I am not sure if they had a work around.

Derek: What do you do when you have crash and you clear the crash but still have congestion? Do you clone the crash event and convert it into a congestion event? Do you create a new congestion event? Do you change the event type from crash to congestion?

Dee: We never change the event type from crash to congestion or anything else because you then lose the original crash, so that will have to be clone.

Derek: So, it will be clone. There is an example where someone may have crash they clone it and turn it into a congestion.

Dee: Generally, we manage the congestion on the event until it clears, generally. But if we have to, we could clone it and turn it into a congestion event. Probably our most common one is a disable vehicle that people leave on the side of the road and it has to be clone into an abandoned vehicle. I believe it is our most common clone.

Jason: If this is one of those things where when you clone an event you could just clone it or there is an option to change an event type as you clone it, then that will fit with what we do as well. Most of the time there is a crash and we clone it into a congestion event.

Derek: Okay that works. I would like to move forward with this one as the ability during the clone process to change the event type. Does anyone have concerns with this one? So, we would go head and bring this forward to the future CMB meeting or as an interim vote. The next item WAZE Alerts is also from District 4.

ITEM 4   WAZE ALERTS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGE BY ANY OPERATOR

Derek: Currently what the SunGuide requires is that the events owner has to confirm the association of the Waze alert to any event by another operator. If another operator handles Waze alerts and associates it with an event that it is owned by you then, you have to actually confirm that or reject it. SunGuide could do this automatically without operator interaction. It could be done to where the other operator associates it with your event and there is no confirmation process, just automatically gets associate to your event. This would be similar to how VisioPad works in District 4. It automatically associates things to an event without having any operator interaction. Our question to everyone is, does anyone have any concerns with doing that, or are you okay with continuing to do it the way it is? We are open to discussion. Does anyone feel strongly either way?

John Hope: I like the idea.

Derek: I am okay with the idea.

Jason: The only thing I see as been a problem is if we have a new operator and starts associating alerts to events and does it incorrectly. Is there any safeguard against that? If I am an operator, I want things to be done correctly. I wouldn't want someone else randomly associating words to my event, without obtaining ownership first.

Derek: Do you want them to obtain ownership or you just confirmed it using the current mechanism?

Jason: I would like them to obtained ownership, just because if they are going to take over that event to make the association, I think that would keep it from getting confused with the other event.

Dee: The problem there is when they take ownership you could be in the middle of entering things in the event, and whoever saves last wins.

Jason: I think maybe having something where you could confirm that they could take ownership before it lets them do it.

Tucker: I think letting anyone associate an alert to an event, might not be the best idea. At least not without some type of confirmation from the original operator allowing it to happen.

Derek: Tucker, the way it currently works I thought the alert was handled by someone else and they can associate it to someone else's event. Did they take ownership? I thought they didn't take ownership to the event until something pops up for the event owner.

Tucker: There are multiple options that whomever owns the event could choose:

1. To disregard it completely

2. Allow them to make a change but the owner stay the same

3. Make the change and give ownership to the other person

Derek: Thank you. If the operator has the ability to allow them to make the change and you maintain ownership yourself, as one of the option. Is that good enough? Do you still want it automatic without the mechanism to confirm it? I am okay with the second option. Something pops up for the owner of the event and then they have the ability to allow that change or not, without that person taking ownership. Is that the most recent change Tucker, or this is with the older version of the software?

Tucker: Is this referring to the ability of what we are doing with Waze? I think it is 6.1 or 6.2.

Derek: Yes. Everyone should be on 6.2.

Tucker: I think it is 6.2.

Jason: Is not limited just to WAZE either, it could be any alert, right?

Tucker: The only two who currently do this are Waze and FHP. They are the only ones that have a specific area in the dialog that can update a field. It would get pre-fill and then inserts something in the chronology. They are the only two that truly associate with an event. The other ones don't go into an event nearly as much as these two do. Also, these are the ones that have updates, most of the other ones don't update as often. The FHP ones have updates that come in and could contain additional or corrected information. So, you do get an update and it may have something to do with the event after the initial alert. A lot of the other ones you do something with the initial and you don't care about the rest of them.

Derek: Dee for this one would it be okay to schedule a meeting with you and Jacques to go over our options.

Dee: Yes, that is fine. I would have to get with a Supervisor to see where this came from. Jacques is it okay.

Jacques: Yes

Dee: I will work on this. You may schedule a meeting, we might not have to have it.

Derek: Those were the four items we wanted to have discussion on today. District 7 was recently using new FLIR cameras. I am bringing this up so Vinny or Matt from District 7 could talk about this and how they got both stream into SunGuide for now.

Vinny: I'm the ITS Operations Manager from District 7. This morning we had a District Wide Fog event in the Tampa area, coincidently we just accepted the I-4 Fog Visibility Project from

District one, about a week ago. This morning I was checking up on the system and seeing how the Fog Project went on I-4. As part of that project we installed the FLIR D-Series Thermal Cameras. They both have thermal or infrared lenses and the color lenses. I'm an avid user of the SunGuide map. I found out that my map didn't have the thermal feed. You want to use the thermal camera in low visibility situations to see the road better. I asked the IT staff to look at a way of getting the thermal feed into the SunGuide software as well. I want to turn the work around that we found over to Mat and he'll described to you how we did this. I hope that by sharing this work around that we found, other Districts that have issues with dual feed cameras could get some use out of this.

Mat: We just created a representative camera with a slightly different name so, we could have the same network setting. Just want to avoid having two people using it at the same time. In the future, a SunGuide update will allow multiple streams to be selectable for the desktop video dialog. We set the new camera out of service so operators won't try to control the same camera at once. This is the work around until we have multiple stream selection in SunGuide.

Vinny: If anyone has any questions you can email us.

Derek: I am guessing you must set up one of them out of service because you can have a potential connection issues to those cameras. SunGuide will try to connect both at the same time. Does SunGuide even allows the same IP address and port?

Tucker: We initially thought it didn't, but Jared created one today and noticed that they can as long as the name is different. I assume you cannot create two entirely similar entries.

Derek: That is interesting I thought there will be a conflict for that. Good job guys. Vinny, I see your desktop video wall and camera selection here. Have you saved any layouts? I know you are looking at your I-4 cameras a lot.

Vinny: You mean like a save video wall.

Derek: Yes. Let me pull it on our test system. We go to the layout and change it and save. Then when you are on the operator map, you right click and go to cameras, now you have an option for desktop video layout and you just pull your layout up. All the cameras you had previously will come up. Will that be helpful for you Vinny?

Vinny: Yes, you just save the layouts for when you need it.

Derek: Yes. You can create tours and save them. I don't know what the default on this tour is, probably too fast but, you can change that. This box will switch between cameras. I don't know which ones over there work because it is a test environment. We did a lot of save layouts at the EOC when the hurricane happened. We create a bunch of layouts and had a bunch of cameras that we could easily access so we could see the conditions.

Vinny: That's a good idea, we are going to do that.

Derek: I don't have anything else for this meeting. If anyone wants to talk about anything before we go.

Josh, D5: I have a question on regard of what version of SunGuide 7.0 should the Districts install and is it available now?

Derek: You need to install version 7.0 and it is available. There may be some additional changes that come out on a new installer, some items from District 6 that were existing on previous version but not included on the current version and they want them to be included. Other than that, you want to install current version 7.0. Version 7.1 is still under test and it will not be release at least until January. It may be even later than that. Specially for Mr. Josh Sibley, who has a truck parking project coming up.

Tucker: There is a 7.0 installer on the FTP under statewide share/installer. That is the one you want to install and there will be a map update to the 6.1   coming up very shortly, I am expecting that today or tomorrow. It will contain the pictures that you want to put there as well. We actually have two districts who have install 7.0. We will probably not be putting out another new installer until everyone on a consistent version.

Josh: That's the version we did pull down and we had installed. I hear some different information about 7.1 and 7.1.2. I just want to make sure.

Tucker: When did you have 7.0 installed?

Josh: Let me check my emails, probably a couple of weeks ago.

Tucker: There was one posted on 11/17/17. That is the version you need to install. If you go to the 7.0 folder there are two versions there. One of them is marked do not use. You want to use the other one, the regular one.

Josh: This is 7.001993 release. If we installed with that version, what do we do?

Tucker: That's the old one. You just want to uninstall and reinstall. If you have already got the configuration all that stuff then uninstall and reinstall should be seamless.

Josh: Alright thank you.

Jacques: Tucker I have a question. I was looking at the footprint that Adam created when you were at D6. It covers features in 6.2 that aren't available in 7.0. Are the issues being address? Or is it something coming up on 7.1?

Tucker: Anything that is in footprints more recently, especially after the 17th, or issues that pop up on District 6, and also a couple that came out in the CMB a few weeks ago are considered in there as well. You want that hot fix put on your system.

Jacques: You said that will come out some time this week or early next week. Okay no problem, thank you.

Tucker: I will probably post it today or tomorrow. There is one thing I will say that is not mentioned in there. The headers on the event list are not currently colored like the old 6.2 version This will be voted on separately by the CMB members. Everything else you seen in the footprint will be addressed.

Derek: I would like to thank everyone for your contribution to this topic, we had some good discussions today. I will see you next time.

Meeting adjourned around 3:30 PM

New Action Items:	
Action:	**Responsible Person:**
FL511 Group Consensus: posting vehicles on the shoulder to 511, it would probably help if we don't automatically put them in.	Derek Vollmer/ Russell Allen
CMB topic: as the ability during the clone process to change the event type.	Derek Vollmer
Have a meeting with Dee and Jacques about WAZE Alert.	Derek Vollmer