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| Robbie Brown, D1Justin Merritt, D1Raymond Mikol (Ray), D1Jason Summerfield, D2Tanesha Sibley, D2Ryan Crist, D2Christopher Johns, D2Alex Varela, D2Aven Morgan, D3John McFadden, COTAquiles Alfaro (Jose), D4Jacques Dupuy, D4Dee McTague, D4Marlon ChinShue, D4 (595)Adrenamae Rolle, D4 (595) | John Hope, D5 (CFX)Mark Laird, D6Alex Mirones, D6Jared Roso, D7Charles Keasler, D7Vinny Corazza, D7Cathie McKenzie, D7(SunGuide)Daniel Buidens, D7(SunGuide)Wang Lee, MDXTucker Brown, SwRIChrissie Collins, OITDerek Vollmer, COMark Dunthorn, COFrances Ijeoma, COAylen Guevara, CO |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Discussion: |  |

1. 3747 – RPG to Remove Error and Out of Service Signs

We are going to talk about two enhancements request that came in from District 4. I am going to turn it over to Tucker to explain the details. As you recall the title was to remove error and out of signs from the response plan 3747 – RPG to Remove error and Out of Service signs.

**Tucker:** The issue was when we start to do a response plan, the sign that are currently in Error or Out of Service (OOS), people were removing those. They are not actually included in the response plan and that is taking additional time, so it is keeping them from activating them quickly. The goal is to activate the response plan faster and after the fact when people are reviewing the chronology are they able to see that if these signs were an Error or OOS that is in the chronology We tried to use these but we couldn’t because of whatever the problem was. We talked about a lot of different things, but I have a list of proposal of what we can do and list pros and cons of each. Essentially, we talked about leaving the error and out of service in the response plan, so that we know the operator tried to include them. When you do that it allows to be activated and EM is going to see them as a normal time, instead of sending a message, it will send the Error one, but not the OOS one. It will put them in the queue, but it will post them as if they became active. Additionally, if you were to terminate that, to come off of that message queue, and you are not worry about message been stuck on time and it will behave as a normal response time. The difference here is that in the chronology entrees normally there is two entrees for every time it goes out. One is hacked DMS – which means I tried to post them as part of the response time. And the next one is in the posted- which would imply that yes, it actually went in the time it was displayed to the public. Within the DMS ones you could say: this is out of service or Error and it would include it as part of that message text; or it will be helpful if we can put it in a whole different line in the message; or we could include something like this is Error or OOS and this might post if the time it becomes active status. We could do it as a new chronology type or we could add the text to the existing DMS Entrée. Either one of these would be fine. The questions left in the air for everyone here operationally are:

1. Leaving them in the response plan either Error or OOS with the option to activate does it accomplish the goal of been able to activate quickly? Or do you continue to take them out?
2. Through chronology entre what would be the most helpful in terms of indicating that these signs will Error or OOS and that is why it didn’t post a message to the public.

**Tucker:** I will open these for discussion.

**Derek:** I would like to point out that John Hope, I know he is not here but I will represent him. I know in the last meeting he did want to keep those DMSs in the response plan. He was a very big advocate of that. In that respect, I would like to keep them in the response plan knowing that the message won’t actually post to the sign because is in an Error or OOS state, they will go on the queue, when you terminate your response plan they will go off the queue and you won’t have to worry later on posting if they became active, having a stale message posted in you sign.

**Ryan:** District 2 agrees with John on that as well. All that chronology tends to trickle into different places to where people don’t fully understand what they are looking at; to be able to have that in a document, especially if someone from the TMC is not there to represent or to talk on behave of the event chronology. We would like that as well. We agree with John.

**Aven:** District 3 as well.

**Derek:** I guess for District 4 having the new chronology type or the text, that would help you with your QA process, that way you can look at your chronology and see which signs were on that state; at least to make that quicker.

**Dee:** Yes, it would.

**Derek:** Tucker the only thing we need to look at is whether we make a new chronology type or indicate something in text in the existing entre.

**Tucker:** Yes, add it to the existing entre that way in the DMS we can put it in as a new type. Essentially there are two types: one says DMS and the other one DMS posted, when they actually get posted. If they do a new type, essentially what you’ll see is DMS entre indicating you attempted to post it or you attempted this. The new entre would probably qualify as DMS Error or something like that, where it would indicate that, that particular sign is prompting an Error or OOS. You can actually end up with three entrees, if the sign was acting in an Error state, and you ended up trying to post it and went in the queue and the sign actually went active and posted a message; you’ll then get a DMS posted after that. That is one thing you should note if it goes as a new chronology type, if we do it as part of the existing DMS entre it would just say: DMS Error, it would talk about posting and if it error or out of service, there will come additional texts that would say: how ever the sign was and the error. The questions I think on those is how are people posting the event chronology? If it is programmatically, I think it would be easier to have a new event type. If it is someone looking at it and then indicating the chronology type, it’s probably just as easy to do in a DMS entre.

**Derek:** Does anyone has any preferences?

**Aven:** Yes, for our QC and TMC it would probably be better if we have a separate chronology type

**Derek:** Does anyone else has an opinion on the chronology type vs the text entre? So far, District 6 would like to see some new chronology type.

**John:** Yes, it would be easier to run a report against it or do queries with a new chronology type.

**Derek:** There are two votes for a new type. Does anyone oppose to having a new chronology type? I think we can just go to a new chronology type. We will bring this to the next CMB meeting and propose it with having a new chronology type. Does anyone have any concerns on this one? I know we are not going to vote on this, but if anyone has concern that they want to bring up as what we bring to the CMB we will make sure that we make notes of the concerns at the CMB No concerns.

1. FP 3751 – Allow a Cloned ‘Disable Vehicle’ Event Type to be Created as an ‘Abandoned Vehicle’ Event Type

The original was to basically, when you clone a disable vehicle to automatically turn it into an abandoned vehicle event type. After some discussions, we were going to genericize it a little bit and after further discussions internally we have some additional concepts that we would like to bring up to the group. I am going to pass this to Tucker.

**Tucker:** We actually picked three different proposals here and talked about different complexity on how they could do this, what we are really trying to accomplish here is maybe to set our self-up for the future; keep that in mind as we go through. The goal of this is essentially right now to change an event type when you clone an event. We can do that in a multiple way:

1. If we are looking for just some automatic event type converters, we can actually do that at the config file level where we just justify action and we can say if it is this event type and I clone it, I want to go to this event type. You can put in any existing event type and change it to any other existing event type. The good thing about this is you have zero operator interaction as soon as you clone it, it would actually just keep it. The down side of this is, you couldn’t as effectively overwrite this is in real time. If your cloning an event in one way in the config file, it is going to change it; that does not mean that after the fact you couldn’t go back and switch it once the event is created. It would just require kind of what you are doing now, the event is created and you switch it to something else. Theoretically you have an operational situation, where you already know that you want this automatic converter, so maybe that actually works for you.
2. This proposal will not involve any thing in the config file. Whenever you hit clone, you would get a pop up dialog immediately that would ask you: if you want to change the event type? It would default to the existing event type that you are already on and then if you want to change to something else you are allowed to do that. The good thing about this is that in real time you can select exactly what you want. The down side to this if you are looking for a quick way, you still going to have additional mouse to click on to actually get to that current event. Potentially you are going to have to change an event type and potentially you have to save it and then you get an event type. It does allow more flexibility real time, but it is a little slow.
3. This proposal is kind of a mix of one and two, where you do have the automatic option, where you can go to config file and say: for this event type I always wanted to go to some other event type. Whenever you clone an event if it sees that, it will automatically going to happen and that’s how is going to create it. If you select any other event type that is not connected to the config file, is going to bring out this pop up dialog, like proposal two, and is going to ask you: do you actually want to change this? If not then, you just click okay and it would close with the same event type. The good side of this is if you know you are have these automatic transitions, then you can use that part. It would also allow people to change event in real time for things that are not connected to the config file. The down side of this is that is probably the most complex in terms of training, and configuration. It creates a very complex way to solve the initial problem, but it actually does do that and it gives you the most flexibility than any option.

For the proposal two and three which contains the pop up dialog, if we ever get into a scenario where we want something else; to tide the event type to come over, or to change up the event type, if you don’t want to change after the event type is created; proposal two and three are going to set up much better for that proposal one; just because they already have the pop up dialog where they ask the operator something. That is kind of a future consideration, based on the footprint there wasn’t a real need for that and honestly, I don’t know if there is a real need for that. This is just something to consider in general. All three of these kind of depend on how much do you know that you are going to do, before you get into that operation. If you know for sure that this is always going to be the scenario then, option one is the best, because it is quick, cheap, and easy to do. If you are unsure proposal two or three are a better fit. That is why we have different proposal, we are looking at the direction of what people think.

Derek: Thank you Tucker. Dee from D4, since this came from D4, out of curiosity do you have any preferences over which proposal we use? I know one would be the quickest for your cloning, initially was definitely one type to another type, and three would give everyone some flexibility, so just out of curiosity what D4 was thinking?

Dee: I don’t see a problem with either one or two; however, if we say two and three cons are going to be slower event creation for cloning event; how much slower is going to be to just select another event type? It gives us some flexibility if in fact it isn’t an abandoned vehicle.

Derek: That is true.

Tucker: In terms of folks cloning we are talking about two mouse clicks

Dee: Something like that I wouldn’t be too concern about the slowness there at all. No real strong feelings.

Derek: Anyone else leaning towards one event over the another? I know D2, you had some event type you clone and turn into something else; would you want one over two, two, or maybe both?

Ryan: If I remember correctly, I don’t think we were looking for automation, the thought or the idea of been able to select a new event type when you clone an event would be useful. Probably proposal two.

Derek: Proposal two gives us some flexibility and it is not so cumbersome. I also lean towards proposal two.

Aven: Not that this feature gets use as much especially for us, but if we had to choose of the three, proposal two gives the best flexibility.

Derek: Okay, thank you Aven. I think we have a strong lean towards proposal two. We will bring proposal two to the Change Management Board. Does anyone have any concerns?

Vinny: We have amendment comment. Charles: It seems for a lot of our secondary events, when we have to clone the main event, we would have to change the direction; for example, for vehicle fire or a bush fire that is affecting on both sides of the road; for example, northbound there is a bush fire and smoke blows to the southbound side. We have to clone that event and then we have to flip it around and switch direction and do everything else. How about something in that pop up for proposal two were we actually say to SunGuide yes give me visibility event but opposite direction (southbound of bush instead of northbound).

Derek: Tucker what do you think about that?

Tucker: That’s fine and that kind of what I was getting at with the options about been more flexible and adding additional features where two and three were better than one in terms of adding things like that. It’s not a big deal to do.

Derek: We’ll do proposal two and expose the ability to change the direction as well.

Tucker: Keep in mind that proposal two doesn’t have any form of knowing what they are trying to get to, which is what would allow you to change itself and default when the initial creation would pop up the initial event type and change direction that you currently have on the event that you are cloning. It would be covered on the operator to actually change whatever event direction they would like.

Derek/Mark: I think that is fine. It gives them that flexibility

Vinny: I want a second button: one clone button and another with clone reverse direction.

Derek: That gets tricky.

Tucker: That gets very specific in the implementation now that we are reversing the direction and also that you have multiple directions and it is not just a simple reverse, that there are more than two options, it is not going to know which one to pick. You are going to actually assigned all four different directions to a single roadway.

Jason: Basically, most likely, it would be a pop up (here is the event type) with a drop down where you can change it, and here is the location with drop down where you can change location, and hit save and a new one would just take those; not just directions but generally locations.

Tucker: Correct.

David: In the cloning event, is there any way to automate, putting some of the comments from the primary event into the cloned event.

Tucker: The problem with that is that you said the word ‘something’, determining which one would have to come over would be the most difficult part. When a new event is created we can add whatever we want to it as long as we know what is actually is to be added. When you say some of the comments to come over, how do we know which one are which?

David: Okay thank you.

Derek: Going back to District 7, are you okay with just being able to select the location and beeing able to change that location?

Dee: Cloning events basically stays the same, the thing is you are just changing the event type. Weren’t you all taking about secondary events, when you are taking about vehicles fire, that are also in the other side of the road, and If they are in the different direction? Aren’t you taking more of secondary events than clone events. I don’t know I’m a little confused.

Daniel: If we have vehicle fires and it is affecting both lanes, threatening both directions traffic, we have the primary event on one side and the other side could be secondary events. We get more of those than we get secondary events in the same direction. We get a crash in the median, then we get congestion in both sides of the roadway. If we get more of those than secondary events in the same direction, that’s why I was wondering. If I clone it, I’m going to have to change direction, location, and adding a pop up; although I do like proposal two, adding a pop up, and it just adds two or three steps to generating this event.

Dee: Our whole purpose to it was that it was the exact same event, it was just no longer a disable vehicle been left on the side of the road, I think we are making this more than it was originally intended to be.

Derek: I don’t want to say is District 2, maybe some other Districts too, crash events gets cleared but there is still congestion, if those get cloned and turned into a congestion event? I don’t know how it works? I know there is other types that get cloned and then turned into another event type, at that same location?

David: Yes, for District 2, the way that Dee is discussing it, will just do the disable vehicle and we’ll swap the same event to an abandoned vehicle, if it is left there. What we’ll use a lot of the cloning event for it sounds a lot like what Charles in District 4 uses it for. We’ll clone that event just to have that linkage of the primary to the secondary with the same vicinity for the most part; having 18 counties and all the miles of roadway, for District 2 is easier to do it that way, than just starting a new event and then linked it through the feature down in the event detail part of the EM.

Dee: We don’t do that because then you would lose the disabled vehicle count and it just becomes an abandoned vehicle, once you change the event type, that’s why we clone it to an abandoned vehicle.

Alex: In District 6, I’m not seen why we wouldn’t want proposal three if some Districts, like D4, has its specific use for the actual configuration automatic, while others may need some additional changes to be done. Wouldn’t proposal three has some benefits to all Districts?

Derek: The only downside to proposal three is that whatever you configure to be automatic will always do that action. If they ever decide that they have an abandoned vehicle or some other type that want to turn into a different event type; they wouldn’t have that flexibility. They would have to go and change their configuration to do it.

Alex: I thought that three gave you that pop up also. So, I’m going to have to select it when you can configure it, but you can still change it.

Derek: No, I don’t think that’s what three does.

Tucker: Originally it was done where you could do it automatic, but you could actually do it like that as well. Yes, we could do that.

Derek: So, that would be proposal four.

Tucker: Yes, that would be proposal four.

Derek: It would automatic change it for the pop up. I’ll be okay with that. I think we will bring proposal four to the CMB. Does anyone have any concerns? I’m not hearing any, then that’s what we would do.

**Update**

**Derek:** Just to give everyone an update on: we’ve been working on the footprint for District 2 about including intersections in SunGuide, as basically having intersections EM locations. For whenever a District starts actually look at crashes on their arterial roadways and intersections. Currently, District 2 may have to interrupt to four events for one just to try and capture one crash at an intersection. So, we are looking to have a new type EM location. If you look at it, it would kind of look like all different directions coming into one intersections and we would have all the lanes and turn lane associated with the intersection. Then, you would be able to block whichever one you need to block, that’s happening for that crash. Then we would send all that information to DIVAS, but on 511, it would basically say crash at intersection X and Y, expect delay. Hopefully what we would have going to the third-party data feed would be all of the various lane closures or blockages associated with the crash. From a configuration stand point, it would be a lot of configuration work. We reached out to our GIS office and they have a contract with a company called GIS Solutions, which is our provider for HERE data and HERE Map data. They kind of pointed us in the right direction to try to extract a lot of that information from the HERE Map data. Adam is still working on that, but so far it looks promising that we would may be able to pull where all of our signalized intersections and the roadway geometries leading up to those intersections; so that we can prepopulate those new EMs locations, whatever their configurations are. Then, someone can go in and make edits if edits need to be made prior to saving it. I just wanted to give you that update. Adam is working on it, I think we are going to look at one roadway in District 2, Phillips Highway (US 1). We are going to try to go and pull what we think is signalized intersections and the geometries for those intersection and provide that to District 2, for review just to see how accurate it is. Then, from that we’ll probably represent that topic at a future SSUG hopefully with the ability to automatically pre-populate a lot of those intersections in SunGuide. I think that would be great.

Mark has made some progress and I reviewed the automated executive notifications. We are going to try to send it out. Hopefully, I’ll have time to finish reviewing it with Mark and send it out by next week, for review. I think it is coming along well. Just want to point out that with this concept of operations we are trying to keep things at the high level of user needs state. It is harder than I thought, but we are trying to do that. After that, once we go into design, we’ll have more meetings with SwRI, to discuss any design decisions that needs to be made. I know one of them that’s going to have a lot of discussion is:

1. When you actually create the emails in the format of that dialog and merging information from multiple events into one executive notification email; that would have a lot of design topics to discuss.
2. Been able to create EM locations sort of on the fly, so when we have incidents with bridges, or buses that occur and where we don’t have coverage, we would be able to quickly create something to be able to post an executive notification and post something to the FL511. I know that kind of comes up with the hurricanes and there are roadways where we don’t typically cover but they want to have an event posted in the FL511; we have to create those locations. This would be a good feature to help with that as well.

We have started to look at tickets associated with the center-to-center connections. If you any, maybe we missed some, while we were looking them up. If you got any that you want to bring up, just send an email to me, Mark, or Tucker. Let us know what ticket number that is, so we can include in our discussions. We are trying to get the center-to-center connectivity more reliable. I don’t think I have anything else. Anyone wants to bring anything else.

**Charles:** District 7, the project manager and the consultant are here and want to ask the group whether anyone has any specialized custom crystal reports for SunGuide and what they might be?

**Mark Laird:** I know District 6 has a bunch of crystal reports that Joe Snyder had made. I don’t know the details of what they are, but we can make them available to anyone that want them. Alex can you provide me with more detail on those.

**Alex:** Not really.

**Mark Laird:** What I can do is I can capture a list of what we have and what we call them, to get an idea of what they are and provide a copy of the template. If anybody wants to look through them and see what they do.

**Robby:** District 1, we are probably interested in getting into more crystal reports. If we can be included in that.

**Mark Laird:** Maybe we can just send it to everybody.

**Derek:** Yes, we’ll just sent it out to the group. Does anyone else have an custom crystal reports?

**Aven:** We have one in Chipley, it is about 80 something pages and it is a monthly report. It really gives you a breakdown of everything. It is actually about two or three reports combined, it goes through events, events type, road ranger activity, device usage, up down times and things like that. It has a lot of useful information in it but it has a lot of pages

**Derek:** That’s a lot of pages.

**Aven:** . I don’t know how useful they would be to different districts. They have a lot more devices than we do.

**John:** This could actually work if we are modifying the queue existing report, a little more filtering. Specifically, the performance measures report.

**Derek:** John did you say we need to modify existing reports, to add more filtering?

**John:** Yes.

**Derek:** Has that been done?

**John:** It has not, it has not exceeded our needs.

**Derek:** I asked, did you all modified it to add more filter?

**John:** We are on the process of working on that. Yes, once completed I can share the modified template with you.

**Derek:** Yes, I will appreciate that. We can bring it up to the SSUG and see if we want to incorporate it into the standard SSUG, as a modification.

**Ryan:** Derek at the FL511 Working Group meeting, we talked about removing theFLATIS aspect from the response plan for the disabled vehicle and it turned into should DMS be removed and it seems we needed a wider discussion on a statewide level on that. Do you know when they plan to talk about that, it will eventually end up affecting SunGuide?

**Derek:** I already talked to Trey about that. He is not concerned about removing, or not posting abandoned or disabled vehicles to the Fl511. He is in the opinion that it will add clutter and potentially take away from more critical information.

**Ryan:** Will that be a topic coming up?

**Derek:** Yes, sir that will be a topic coming up; maybe not in this meeting, not initially at this meeting.

**Ryan:** I know is slightly off topic, but I figured I’ll bring it up since a lot of people in the room have to deal with that day-to-day. You know Pete will ask in an email or some type of document from Trey. Thank you, Derek.

**Derek:** Any one else has anything. No, thank you for participating.

Meeting adjourned around 3:20 PM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Bring RPG to Remove Error and Out of Service Signs to the next CMB meeting and propose it with having a new chronology type.  | Derek Vollmer |
| Bring proposal four- It would automatic change the configuration for the pop up, to the CMB. | Derek Vollmer |
| Email crystal reports to SSUG committee. | Mark Laird and Aven  |
| Modify existing reports, to add more filter once completed will share the modified template with Derek. | John McFadden |