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

1. Unpublish an Event

Tucker: Currently when you complete an event, you will terminate the response plan which will take down the event from FL511 and it will take it down from the DMS. The problem with that is we told FLATIS that we no longer want that event on FLATIS, there is nothing that actually sends them an update that says, “everything is clear and we are taking this down”. I believe there are some Districts that will activate a new response plan with just the FLATIS item and possibly an email. Are there any Districts that do something else at the end of events?

There was an issue that has been brought up, as part of an effort in District 6, there is a bridge pre-emption event. When a draw bridge goes up we automatically read that the draw bridge is going up. We create an event and publish a response plan that identifies which part is closed completely. When the draw bridge comes down we terminate the response plan. The problem with that is that FLATIS is sending out an email that the event is over but the last known status is “all lanes are closed”. If we don’t republish something saying, “all lanes are open” then the FLATIS’ last status is: here is last set of lane blockages received.

The request is for an enhancement to re-publish when all of the lanes are open and then terminate the response plan before closing the event. This is for bridge pre-emption and is automatic. However, we thought about how this would be beneficial to all events, not just bridge pre-emption.

There are a few options we can do:

* When closing an event which had an active response plan containing a 511 item, send a publish with the lanes open status, and send a terminate to remove it officially from FLATIS.
	+ The risk is if they get published but not terminated. It would be an error state, that something went wrong in the command chain.
* The alternate method is to provide a quick method (like a ribbon button) to activate a response plan with only the 511-item using the currently available information. Then you could do the termination manually.

These are just two items I thought up that might work for this. I wanted to bring up the topic of how people would want to handle it on other events. These two do not cover a method with an SG generated email. It is possible that is could do that. Does anyone have an opinion? Also, what would you like to see at the end of an event closure? What would make it easier for you?

Mark Laird: I think one outcome of this is that we have discovered that anytime we close an event if the last blockage wasn’t clear, it could be an issue. My understanding is that you have to remove all blockages before you can close the event in SunGuide. Is that right?

Tucker: Yes, but you don’t have to republish after you do that. When you terminate, it just pulls everything down and doesn’t tell them that they are back open. The problem is that no one else knows it is back open.

Mark Laird: In all cases the lanes will be cleared. We could have SunGuide do what it is going to do for bridges or we can tell FLATIS “we never allow blockages to exist when the events are closed so we want you to always show them as cleared if we say the event is closed”.

Tucker: FLATIS doesn’t know a concept of closed vs not, people are just getting a republished event. You can say that when we terminate a response plan, that means the event is closed. But if there are cases when you terminate the response plans but the lanes are not yet cleared, that might be an issue.

Mark Laird: Okay, so it is better to handle in SunGuide.

Tucker: I am open to suggestions on either side. I just want to fix the problem.

Mark Laird: It seems to me, if we can make it work for the bridge case then it would make sense to make it always happen. That way the message with people’s routes will always show it as cleared when it clears the event. Do we ever take a FLATIS response plan out before we clear the lanes? Does anyone know?

District One: Usually, we do it in FLATIS when we want to close a response plan. We remove FLATIS and then we close the response plan. That is the procedure down here in District 1.

Mark Laird: But you don’t remove it before you clear the blocking, right?

District One: Correct.

Mark Laird: I am just thinking if we are to automate this, something that could go wrong is that if it is automatic we wouldn’t be able to remove it before we take the blockage out.

Tucker: It would be if you ever publish a FL511 item during the course of this event, then it would do this. The other kicker on that is that there are very few cases that generally allow automatic publishing of events or automatic terminating. Usually, there is some kind of manual action going on and I am not opposed to doing that and it is not a technical hurdle. I just wanted to bring it up.

Mark Dunthorn: Is there any other situation when we close an event?

Tucker: Bridge pre-emption would be the first one. And I think it was already scheduled to proceed. There are some things that close out events but never publishing and unpublishing to FL511.

Mark Dunthorn: The bridge pre-emption would be the first but are we getting close to a consensus that we want to go with option one?

Tucker: I guess let me ask a different question, other than the bridge pre-emption, I think what is happening is that FLATIS is sending out an email to tell everyone that this event is over. Does anyone else have that problem for non- bridge pre-emption events?

Mark Laird: It would only happen if you took it out of the response plan and activated it before you cleared the blockage.

Tucker: Yes, you have to publish a final FL511 that says: “no lanes blocked” before you close the event.

Mark Laird: That is true. If you didn’t publish after you clear and close it then you would leave it that way and FLATIS would then send a cleared message saying the blockage is still there.

Tucker: Is that an operational procedure or do you always publish a 511 item after you clear the blockage?

Mark Laird: I think if there is a FLATIS item in the response plan, it is going to get reactivated with blockage cleared, but I am not certain.

Tucker: So, if you clear the blockage, you wouldn’t be activating the DMS sign to say all lanes cleared. You would be taking it down. My thinking is that you would terminate which would not republish it.

Mark Laird: That could be but you want to send an email message out saying it’s cleared.

Tucker: That is what I am saying, I am not sure if everyone does that or not. If you are already doing that then it wouldn’t affect you anyway because you are probably already publishing something to FL511 saying all lanes cleared.

Mark Laird: That is likely. That might even result in redundant messages to subscribers.

Tucker: In this case yes, it probably would.

Mark Laird: That is probably not a good thing either.

Kevin: Is anyone doing that? I think most people are adding the event and then canceling the response plan.

Tucker: If everyone is okay with their Standard Operating Procedure and it isn’t effecting anyone, then do we even want to make the change at all? If we do it for bridge pre-emption that is fine because it is happening automatically. In the standard case of an event is there anyone who feels strongly that this would help them operationally? Are there complaints on this?

Aven: Is it possible to tie it into the event type itself? Can it be automated based on the event type?

Tucker: For bridge pre-emption, we will put it in automatically. The events that are automatically created by the system and closed by the system that is up for debate. But if no one is having this problem or getting complaints on it then I don’t think we should put something in to help fix a problem that doesn’t exist.

District Comment: I think the silence from operations is letting you know that they don’t think it is a problem.

Tucker: In that case, we will just do it for bridges.

1. JIRA Cleanup

Tucker: We switched to JIRA earlier this year. We have been trying to fix a lot of issues and clean up older issues that are sitting around. We would like to get with each of the Districts and create a report that shows all of the issues that are currently open including enhancements. We would like to sit down with you and go through a list of pending items and get feedback on what enhancements are still useful and needed. This is a heads up that we will be contacting each of the Districts.

1. SunGuide Wiki/Help

Tucker: Requests have come in the past for some general help for SunGuide. Frequently, we get questions along the lines of “How do I configure this device?” or “What does this device ID mean?”. Some of this information is located in the software user manuals but that is not a widely read document. We were trying to consider ways for which we could make the help more useful but also make it to where it is more of a compilation of District issues that could be posted as well as help that we create. I am open to suggestions but we had a couple of ideas here.

* Add a section to the website that would help with specific pages. The reason for the website as opposed to District SunGuide is you can add, remove or modify them dynamically. If we put them in the SunGuide installation, it would be hard to push it out to everyone.
* Add links in the SunGuide dialogue that links to the website with the help information.

We would need to know if an external website would be accessible by the operators or if it would have to stay in SunGuide. Another potential issue is with proprietor protocols. An example would be if we show a page that shows vendor maps of software or list part of a protocol. We probably couldn’t post that publicly. We talked about having a website with a password protective page but the access password would be the same across all Districts and all users. Any other suggestions?

District Comment: A lot of the information listed seemed to be more along the lines of administrative or background information not like your everyday operator use dialogue.

Tucker: This is intended to be both. We do get a lot of administrative questions. The TERL sets up these devices long before people get them so they could line up a technical document gives good instructions.

Mark Laird: I like the onsite installation and I think a lot of the updates will be release dependent.

Jason: I think for like you said individual dialogue updates will be released dependent of the software update. So, the operator SunGuide pop up help wouldn’t change until the next software update. More operator sensitive stuff should be on the server and more administrative could be hosted on the password protected website.

Tucker: That sounds like a good idea.

District Comment: I think the administrative information should be hosted on a Central Office server so there is only one source. And they can add to it based on the testing that they do.

Tucker: How much access would an administrative person have to FDOT SharePoint?

District Comment: I am not sure. I know years ago Central Office tried to put together almost like a blog but it wasn’t maintained.

District Comment: Was it SunGuide.com?

Tucker: Maybe someone could look around the website and see if it is out there.

Mark Dunthorn: Th website uses JuneBug which does have a blog component. It could be out there and we just don’t know about it.

District Comment: The key is to make it maintained.

Mark Dunthorn: The reason this is coming up now is because Frances and Karthik have put together some Truck Parking How To’s. We created it from information from the TERL and some from District 5. I think if we can come up with a system that we all have the ability to contribute to then we could benefit from it in the long run. It sounds like you are okay with it and could help us keep it up to date. The TERL will take the lead on the stuff that comes through the TERL and out together documentation on that. A place to store it would be great. Any other comments?

Jason: I agree, as long as it stays updated.

Mark Dunthorn: Does anyone have any other items they want to bring up before we close?

Bryan: To clarify on the first item, is there a need for further discussion? Do we need to bring this up at the CMB?

Mark Dunthorn: What I am hearing is that we are going to move forward with the bridge pre-emption but I don’t think we need to take it further since no one from operations had any comment.

Bryan: So, we don’t need to vote on this at the September CMB?

Mark Dunthorn: Correct, I think we have handled what we needed to here.

Mark Laird: Is that going to be in 7.2?

Tucker: Yes, but do you need it faster?

Mark Laird: It would be helpful to get it faster.

Tucker: I estimated 7.2 to be the first quarter of next year which is a long time to wait for bridge pre-emption.

Mark Dunthorn: Any other comments for today? Thank you all.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| None. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |