SunGuide Software
User's Group
Meeting Minutes

Date: April 12, 2018

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

Agenda:

Topic	Led By:
Item 1: 3974 Permission Issues	Derek Vollmer, CO
Item 2: 3986 Sending Messages to Non-Color and Color Sign via SAS	
Item 3: Executive Notifications	
Item 4: Truck Parking	

Attendees:

Mike Crawson, D1
Robbie Brown, D1
Justin Merritt, D1
Raymond Mikol (Ray), D1
Jason Summerfield, D2
Ryan Crist, D2
Jay Jay McFadden, D3
Aven Morgan, D3
Jacques Dupuy, D4
Alex Mirones, D6
Mark Laird, D6

Marlon Chin Shue, 595
Adrenamae Rolle, 595
Tucker Brown, SwRI
Derek Vollmer, CO
Jennifer Fortunas, CO
Mark Dunthorn, CO
Frances Ijeoma, CO
Karthik Devarakonda, CO
Jennifer Rich, CO

Discussion:

ITEM 1   3974 Permission Issues

This meeting is being recorded for the purpose of taking meeting minutes.

Ability to store presets give people the ability to configure cameras. I sent out an email so you would be aware that this topic would be discussed at this meeting. Does anyone have any additional permission refinements that you would like to talk about? Allison sent one in from District 4 about presets. To be able to store presets you would have to be able to modify cameras which gives you permission to configure the camera. We would want to break that one out. Tucker, can you refresh our memories of what was discussed at the last meeting?

Tucker: The examples listed on slide are things that multiple Districts have asked us to change. They are not large changes by any means. The email Derek sent earlier was looking for examples of where he is looking for something more granular. I know Jason mentioned clarifying what we need for a read only user and other than the District 4 email, those are the only examples we have seen so far. If anyone else has anything else they would like to see done, please let us know.

Derek: Does anyone have any more refined permissions you would like to see?

Derek: Hearing none, we will go with the examples we have and the one we received from District 4.

ITEM 2   3986 - Sending messages to non-color and color sign via SAS

This is something that District 6 wants to get into the 7.2 release of SunGuide and has to do with the Schedule Action Subsystem (SAS) and color and non-color signs. And the messages for those signs and only having one SAS item to work for all the different signs. The current situation is District 6 has schedules for DMS and there is scenario where there is a SAS scheduled for color DMS and it will have some non-color DMS included. The DMS message will have the color tags included with it. When the schedule activates, it sends a message with the color tags out to all the signs and the message will fail on the signs that do not support color.

Work around: They will set up two scheduled items, one for the color signs and one for non-color signs. This work around is tedious to manage when they will have sign replacements and have to move things around.

They would like something so they can send messages to color messages to color signs and some to non-color messages to non-color signs during the same scheduled item. We have a couple options.

Option 1:

You would have a graphic and color message that would be created for your scheduled item,

If you have messages that want on a sign, you would have to remove it before saving the scheduled item. SAS would know details about the sign (whether it supports graphics and color). If the sign supports graphics and color message will be sent as is. If the sign supports color but not graphics, it will remove the graphic tag and send just the color message. If the sign doesn't support color or graphics, it will remove both the graphic and color tags. From talking to SWRI we might be able to include getting the abbreviations from EM to account for sign differences.

Option 2:

Use a similar concept of predefined plans within SAS. For that we would need a new plan type. It would allow for similar functionality to know when you have predefined plans. You would save your predefined plans and then use that as your scheduled action.

Tucker: Right now, when you go to define a DMS item you put in a message and it applies to a set of signs. The concept of the plan here is that you would put in as many as you want and it would tailor the message to the individual sign. There is no reason to use abbreviations because all of that would be done up front. You can use graphic and color for the signs that support those options by generating a custom message per sign. To make that easier, it would give you all of the options and you would have a filter level. When I say there is a custom message per sign, you could still edit them as a group but you would still have a custom message per sign and change the message to whatever you want and it wouldn't affect the sign. Once you create that plan, it would be something that is usable by SAS instead of sending a DMS message you would send this predefined plan. Everything it needs is included in that plan already so all you do from a SAS standpoint is schedule it.

The biggest difference between option 1 and 2. Option 1 you put in a single message and SAS tries to make the determination of automatically pushing that to what is selected. Option 2 is more configuration because you are specifying the message per sign but gives the ability to send multiple messages to signs within a single scheduled item. It depends on how much you want to put into actually creating these or how much you want SAS to say "go and do this".

Derek: Does anyone have any comments on this?

Is the issue only with scheduled actions or are normal response plans effected by having color and non-color DMS?

Tucker: The only way we could recreate this in SAS, because if you try to do a multi-edit and do a bunch of signs, it will give you the lowest common denominator so if you selected 10 color signs and one non-color sign it will give you a non-color option even in the response plans. The same concept exists in SAS as well. But what happens is you can add signs to the SAS item after scheduling the message and it doesn't pre-validate. The issue that occurred is you have a message with color and graphics and then we had signs that didn't have color and graphics support. So, when SAS was activated it sent out messages that contained the color tag and it was sent to a sign that didn't support color messages. This is to address that and to make it more flexible to supporting multiple types of signs within a single scheduled item.

Marlon: Option 2, can you go back and reuse those plans?

Tucker: Yes, the concept is if you use SAS for cameras and have a list of actions for cameras, you can reuse those. You create the plan of something separate from the schedule items and within the schedule item, you just use it.

Marlon: It looks like the option would come down to the number of signs in each district and the types of signs between them.

Mark L.: I would move toward the pre-defined plan approach because the other one can have somethings come up as issues at one time while the operator is trying to put the messages up. I'd rather spend time during configuration so things go up smoothly. Alex, what do you say about this?

Alex M.: I think option 2 makes sense, it gives the SAS a little more functionality than it had. I like the ability for it to behave more like the response plan. It is much more preferable than to have to create multiple messages for different types of signs multiple times, which sounds like what option 1 is. I prefer Option 2 for that reason.

Marlon: I think option 2 is better.

District 1: I agree too, District 1 likes option 2.

Derek: District 1, District 4, I-595 and District 6 like option 2. Central Office also likes option 2. We will move forward with flushing out the option 2 so we are ready for the next CMB or if it should be sooner, we could have a voting poll go out before the next CMB meeting.

ITEM 3   Executive Notifications Concept of Operations

Derek: We had comments from District 2 and District 4 on the Executive Notifications Concept of Operations (ConOps). Within the executive notification triggers, one of the triggers is if we have a crash with more than five fatalities. In the ConOps, I believe we were going to keep it as something that was manually triggered. You would put in the executive notification type and manually trigger the notification. District 2 put in the comment can we add "greater than X Fatalities" to the injuries field. The trigger right now is five. Are people interested in having the greater than x injury fields and once selected it would trigger the executive notification?

Ryan: District 2 is interested, anything to help automate the process.

Alex M.: From an on the ground perspective, when we have a serious crash it involves multiple fatalities, it is so hard to get the additional detail of the number of fatalities. We are co-located with our dispatch on the second floor and even then, it is hard to get a confirmation on number of fatalities. I don't know if it's the best entry because we don't want to wait on someone to get a confirmation for five fatalities. Do we want something in-between that says multiple fatalities? I'm concerned that if we have greater than five fatalities or greater than X fatalities, that we are going to really get into trouble with the communications with dispatch. Do we want to have a grade below that and indicate those kinds of things, like two or three fatalities?

Derek: From the executive notification criteria, it says greater than five fatalities, but I know that Trey encourages the TMC to make the judgment calls on if it looks like it's a bad crash to just make the judgement call to send out the executive notification.

Alex M.: Say we have a double fatality, I tell my team to send it out because it will be a long-time closure and have a serious investigation. We send it out for a double fatality, but it might not fit the criteria for Central Office. I know we want to automate but I want to prevent having floods of calls coming in asking if we have confirmed the five fatalities. That is not the type of call dispatch likes to get. Want to stay away from "are we there yet" mindset.

Derek: I would be okay to have a "multiple fatality" option instead of a "greater than X fatality" option. Then the District can make the call based on how many that is.

Aven: Could we have a manual button that activates the Executive notification information and then it comes in prefilled with the known information? Manually clicking the box will activate the executive portion and moves it up to the next level for the notification process.

Derek: This would be more than for fatalities, it would be a way to manually generate an executive notification? Other than doing the comment type?

Aven: Correct.

Derek: The issue is that we wouldn't know if there were multiple fatalities. We just have the ability to say there is a fatality. I think it would still have to be something that was manually populated by whoever is inputting the executive notification. The comment that District 2 has here, where it is one of the injury types when you select multiple fatalities it would populate the description with multiple fatalities and it would automate that. Based on your selection of multiple fatalities injury type and a lot of the other stuff can be automated as well. With District 2's comment and District six's input it sounds like a good idea to have multiple fatalities injury type.

Ryan: Either way we are fine with the phrasing of it, we just want some level of automation. Major Gaston is wanting to get read only access for all co-located TMCs to the FHP CAD so they could see the number of fatalities on seen. Want more CAD access in TMC operations statewide so this level of automation would help.

Derek: I am okay with having the multiple fatalities injury type. The word multiple will have to be interpreted at the TMC.

Alex: Is there a way to have a drop down from Multiple so we could give a number? That way we can populate it with a number instead of waiting for it to hit a certain number.

Derek: I have heard it is too hard to get that information so I was okay with not entering that in. We are not the official agency that documents fatalities.

Derek: The next notification that we can't automatically trigger is the Smoke/Fog visibility event where there is a crash involved. We can't automate the smoke on the crash you would have to do it manually. District 2 has visibility sensors in the Paine's Prairie area so they might have the ability to automate if you know there is a visibility issue and a crash. The questions we have goes to more of the association. I will let Tucker ask the questions because he knowsmore than me.

Tucker: If we are auto triggering based on a crash the event type would be a crash. Now we are talking about having a visibility event associated with it. Should it trigger for the visibility event or for the crash and would that be a primary or a secondary?

Ryan: when the visibility sensor drops below a threshold it will automatically create the event for the operator to take control of. Once we validate that, the visibility would be the

primary and if you have a crash, you have the operator associate the secondary crash with primary being the visibility. We would want that to automatically trigger it.

Tucker: Are we triggering it based on the crash or the visibility event?

Ryan: It would be triggered based on the crash being secondary to the visibility.

Tucker: Which is the one we are sending out the executive notification for? The visibility or the crash?

Ryan: The crash is the one we are sending out but its association to visibility event would trigger the action.

Tucker: I think there is an option of a visibility event coming in and you associate it to an event. So potentially we could have a situation where we have a crash and the visibility is something that you associate the two together. Should that generate an executive notification?

Mark L.: Now you know the crash was due to the visibility which you might not have known if it was just a crash.

Tucker: I believe this is created as a visibility type of event. So, it wouldn't have to be created off of an alert. The primary and secondary would look at it as a secondary of a visibility event so we are going to send out an executive notification. Is that reasonable?

Ryan: Exactly.

Derek: Keep in mind for a lot of the Districts it is still a manual process for this because not everyone has visibility sensors deployed. It would be beneficial for a few Districts to automate it.

Mark L.: It sounds like if they created the visibility event second, then operations would have to know to associate the crash as the secondary, correct?

Ryan: Yes.

Derek: District 4 is interested in receiving all of the executive notifications statewide from other Districts. We were curious if anyone else was interested in seeing them from other Districts?

Mike Crawson: District 1 is interested.

Derek: I am also interested as to why another District would be interested in receiving the executive notifications from Districts that might not be adjacent to you.

Ryan: I don't want them real-time, but if there was a central warehouse where we could access, we would be interested.

Derek: We weren't planning on doing it that way, but we could potentially do that in the future.

Charles (District 7): I am interested in receiving it. But agree that a central repository would be a good idea.

Derek: We won't do this in this ConOps but we will bring it up to Trey and see what his thoughts are.

Charles: Maybe it could be like the FL511 alerts where I can sign up to get the alerts from certain places (neighboring Districts).

Derek: That is a good idea and something we could do through DIVAS.

ITEM 4   Truck Parking Needs

Derek: We have a few new truck parking needs. Some rest area configurations where there may be multiple rows for them to park on the way in and they have to make a decision to go down one row or the other. Once you go down one row you can't come back to the other row. and the trucker has to decide correctly because they can't re-enter. We need to have the ability to indicate within the rest area the parking availability per row.

SunGuide is configured on the interstate for the DMS so that once it goes below a threshold, it will post a zero on the sign that is on the interstate. Some people in Central Office were interested in posting "low" instead of "zero". Currently it is zero, so if you have a preference of posting "low" let me know. Hearing none, I think zero that is okay for the interstate.

Now you are inside the facility and you have a situation where there are a couple of rows. Are you still okay with seeing zero? Or would you like to see low? We also have an alert that gets sent when it gets below your threshold. So, you have your overall facility and have 50 spaces and you have your threshold set to five and whenever there is less than five spaces available it posts as zero on the interstate and you get an alert that is associated with going below the threshold. I am thinking you don't want to have the alerts pop up when you have these thresholds triggered for an individual row but it was something I wanted to ask the group. If you want more alerts when the row threshold is triggered, any opinions?

Ryan: District 2 is fine with just the facility.

Derek: Is everyone okay with just having the facility?

Jacques is okay with just the facility.

Derek: Only do alerts for the facility threshold.

This is a request from our freight people. They want to be able to keep track of the individual space turnover rate. They want to know how long truckers are parking. In order to do that, we would need to know the individual space information. Currently, SunGuide gets an availability number from the truck parking system and that is all we are using. We would need to make a change and do a truck parking driver that would be able to include getting all of the individual space information from the truck parking facility. We are going to try and do this so it is more of an awareness for the District. Anyone think they need to see space individual space availability?

Derek: we could go the zone level for this one but I think we should go down to the space level so we have the information for the freight people. I don't see the need to present for space availability.

We don't have the ability to be able to do this for all of the protocols but in the future we would like to be able to get some of the maintenance information from the system. So, this could potentially be, you have a bad detector, your battery health is bad in one of your detectors that we would try and retrieve from the system to present that information to someone at the TMC. I am not sure how we would present it and we could have the device ID but at least it would be a way to know something is going wrong through SunGuide. Is anyone interested in getting this information? It would be years down the road, you would be able to determine if you are having health issues of the system.

Marlon: Does the device itself alert you? I think some of them do.

Derek: I didn't know they did that. If they do that's fantastic and we don't need it.

Meeting adjourned around 3:01 PM

New Action Items:

Action:	Responsible Person: