

Clarus ICC Meeting #2: Zoomerang Survey Results

Question	Response Summary
1. On a scale of 1 to 5, did the meeting satisfy your expectations?	1 (not satisfied) = 0 2 (somewhat satisfied) = 1 3 (satisfied) = 11 4 (very satisfied) = 15 5 (extremely satisfied) = 4
2. On a scale of 1 to 5, were the presentations clear and meaningful?	1 (not clear) = 0 2 (somewhat clear) = 1 3 (clear) = 8 4 (very clear) = 18 5 (extremely clear) = 3
3. On a scale of 1 to 5, were you satisfied with amount of discussion on technical issues?	1 (not satisfied) = 1 2 (somewhat satisfied) = 4 3 (satisfied) = 12 4 (very satisfied) = 11 5 (extremely satisfied) = 3
4. On a scale of 1 to 5, were you satisfied with the amount of discussion on institutional issues?	1 (not satisfied) = 0 2 (somewhat satisfied) = 6 3 (satisfied) = 15 4 (very satisfied) = 6 5 (extremely satisfied) = 2
5. On a scale of 1 to 5, do you have a positive outlook toward the next ICC meeting?	1 (not positive) = 0 2 (somewhat positive) = 0 3 (positive) = 8 4 (very positive) = 16 5 (extremely positive) = 7

Questions 1 through 5, Conclusion Summary

Overall, participants were very satisfied with meeting, finding it a positive and substantive experience.

Questions 6 through 8 (see pp. 2-5), Conclusion Summary

In general, participants were pleased with project updates and use of break-out sessions; however, a few participants felt that there was redundancy in the information/topics for these sessions. In addition, it was noted that assignments to groups was not satisfactory and some groups needed more focus. Overall, participants found the leadership of each group knowledgeable and satisfactory. Some participants noted that some graphs and charts were difficult to follow (identified specifically in raw data), and some sought more information on specific topics (identified specifically in raw data). Finally, while lunch was appreciated, morning refreshments are requested for the next meeting, as well.

General Conclusion: Overall, participants found the meeting substantive and effective, providing a good overview of the initiative, its progress, and challenges to come.

The following write-in responses to Questions 6 through 8 have not been edited or revised, and appear in the manner and order that they appear in the raw data.

6. Regarding the meeting, please provide input in the space below on what you thought was effective that you would like to see again.

- Updates on status
- The break-out sessions were good except that they tended to go over some of the same material that occurred at an earlier session. Lots of material discussed which is good but some focusing at the next Meeting would be better.
- Having a variety of stakeholders.
- I'm most interested in the relationships of FHWA/NOAA and the state, local and other agencies and institutions who need to work together to make Clarus a success. Those relationships will lead to a body of information and what that will look like and how it will be available is the important outcome, in my thinking.
- small groups were effective at letting all brings their issues and thoughts forward
- The discussion was the best part of the meeting.
- The Wednesday morning session very valuable in setting the stage. The breakout group reporting helped understand each disciplines problems and institutional and cultural issues.
- Communications Planning among the many agencies, Clarus Matrix, and Sensor Devices.
- Overview/update/status by Pisano and Pol. Breakout sessions are probably best way to gather input, however these became repetitive with special interest concerns. Strong leaders who are not defensive are needed lead the breakout sessions. Osborne and Pisano did a good job.
- Good discussion between weather experts and DOT's.
- I think that it is great that the FHWA is making such an effort to get stakeholders involved early in the process. That is much appreciated and should result in a better and more accepted final product.
- The breakout sessions were great!
- I thought the initial discussions on overall concepts were productive. There wre lare institutional issues that needed to be raised w/respect to NOAA/CLARUS and I think they were aired out well.
- space for breakout out sessions was convenient to the main meeting room
- It was good to have non-governmental transportation representatives participate. Organizers did a good job keeping schedule on track.
- The presentations and updates on related topics was very interesting (example: NOAA's presentations on Surface Weather and ISOS and subsequent discussions on Clarus ownership seemingly transformed Clarus and put it in a different light.) The breakouts also were a good idea although they all seemed to go down the same road.
- The facilitated breakout groups were very professionally handled. I'm not sure that this format will be appropriate for future meetings, but it worked well in the context of refining the concept of operations.
- The breakout group sessions and hand-outs or slide presentations all worked extremely well...much better than having to slog through the CLARUS Con-Ops text page by page! Also, providing lunches each day was helpful to keeping to a time schedule.
- The breakouts were a good way to involve all of the members in the decision making process, but sometimes the discussions tended to drift toward minutia instead of staying on track with deciding the 'big picture'. Minutia should be reserved for later meetings.
- Breakout sessions covering use cases was a good format. I would like to see this again. I would also like to see some type of "walkthrough" of the entire process from data collection to processing to application. This should be interactive so the participants could "stop" the process and discuss it.
- I received a good overview of what the CLARUS program is hoping to accomplish.
- The presentations were very effective in getting everyone "up-to-speed" on the Clarus Initiative.
- The presentations and the updates were great. I really liked the break out session concept.
- The overall structure of the meetings was effective; the way in which presenters set the stage for the discussions and brought people up to speed who had not been involved in meeting 1.
- I enjoyed most of the updates of projects (e.g., VII) at the start of the meeting, then breaking out into discussions. I thought this was effective.

The following write-in responses to Questions 6 through 8 have not been edited or revised, and appear in the manner and order that they appear in the raw data.

7. Regarding the meeting, please provide input in the space below on what you thought was ineffective that you would NOT like to see again.

- I thought the format for the breakouts was repetitive. Using the same questions over and over yielded the same responses in each session in some cases. Assigning people to breakouts was a bad idea. I was assigned to Rails even though I knew nothing about it, when I could have been in a session in which I have expertise. I think the Time-Critical Weather Information section needs much more discussion by state DOTs.
- Don't need long presentations with unreadable chart slides.
- I have to admit that, not being a highly technical and data oriented person, the discussion on those aspects left me without too much understanding or interest. I recognize that they are important. Those highly technical areas of data languages and protocols just don't interest me as much as an end user.
- The pure system engineering approach centered on use cases did not work. No matter how much tutorial was presented, it just was not how more of the people thought. A different set of pictures/graphs are needed to show the proposed highlevel information transactions
- The requirements diagram...it really does a poor job of identification of feedback systems.
- There was nothing I would class as "ineffective". Everything had some meaning, some more than others.
- N/A
- I have mixed emotions about the charts used. One definite problem with the charts is that they did not all conform to the original chart. It was confusing when Actor names and/or lines changed from chart to chart.
- Too repetitive. During the breakout sessions we spent a great deal of time looking at diagrams that were essentially the same. The follow-up questions were answered during the first breakout and re-stated throughout. More thought might be put into the structure, although again, the fact that these meetings are being held is important in itself.
- Too little information on the overall picture for people to always effectively discuss the pieces of the use cases.
- While I understand that use case diagrams are useful to engineers, they are not useful for non-engineers who are trying to examine a problem. Much of the discussion ended up being around what the meaning of various stick figures were.
- The presentation on various standards was beyond what most people needed, although it was certainly worthwhile for some of the attendees.
- nothing stands out. Very well run meeting.
- Some of the breakout session discussions deviated from the particular transportation mode topic.
- We didn't need a Railroad oriented breakout. It seemed to just be a vehicle for the railroad guys to just complaint, vent and lecture on topics unrelated to Clarus. Their culture of railroads being singularly the most important piece in the transportation puzzle was obvious, as was their seemingly traditional inability to compromise.
- Please don't pre-assign folks to a specific break-out group...let each decide which break-out function to attend, based on their interest and/or entity they represented.
- I would like to see a different selection method for the breakouts. I was fortunate in that my hand written name tag did not have a breakout assignment on it, but I did here a few participants grumble a bit. Some way to adjust our assignments at future breakouts would be helpful.
- Weather presentations should be better integrated into the overall program. They were interesting but somewhat removed from the goals and objectives of the meeting.
- Use case diagrams and their merit as a graphical illustration became the focus of much of the discussion rather than the actual collection and exchange of weather related information. Suggest having the facilitators provide specific scenario details at each step (i.e., data is collected from an RWIS, transmitted to a TMC and relayed, via radio to a maintenance vehicles) to keep audience focused on topic instead of graphic. Too difficult for "novice" audience to imagine the types of collection methods, dissemination destinations, etc. without something tangible that they can relate to.

The following write-in responses to Questions 6 through 8 have not been edited or revised, and appear in the manner and order that they appear in the raw data.

QUESTION #7 CONTINUED

Regarding the meeting, please provide input in the space below on what you thought was ineffective that you would NOT like to see again.

- The breakout sessions were great and necessary, however, the discussions sometimes went way off target. Discussions about tracking animal migrations and influenza with Clarus made it hard for people to focus on the real goal of Clarus.
- I felt that some people were there on personal agendas and that they kept the group pulled back listening to their own concerns and questions. I would like to
- I would prefer to see a NOAA update that stated what they were doing and not an overview of their organizational structure and budget process. We lost a lot of time in some of the breakout sessions with discussions of pros/cons of the case scenario diagrams. I think it needs to be stated up front that this is the METHOD that is being used and let's make the best of it regardless of whether we would or wouldn't use that method. The facilitator needs to focus the conversation on matters that aid Clarus.

The following write-in responses to Questions 6 through 8 have not been edited or revised, and appear in the manner and order that they appear in the raw data.

8. Please provide any suggestions in the space below on what you would like to see at the next Clarus ICC Meeting.

- I have expertise. I think the Time-Critical Weather Information section needs much more discussion by state DOTs.
- More focus on institutional issues. The technical will work itself out. The inter-agency stuff will take a while longer and really needs more dialogue. Perhaps some policy level people from stakeholder agencies need to be present and involved in the fray.
- Hopefully the next meeting will begin to provide information on the progress being made (or barriers to progress) in collecting and processing the data. I also found the VII work to be very interesting and hope it can link to and support the work being done in Clarus.
- I would like to see a refreshed on the CLARUS mission statement and vision before the system is designed. As the concept of operation should flow from these, it is not always clear who and what is being served. This also could help focus the group on what they should be looking at and not just the edge cases
- Regional differences discussed...Florida does not need icing treatments, other states do not deal with zero visibility in heavy rain...or hurricane evacuations...and gale winds on bridges.
- Need well developed scenarios to show what Clarus can provide.
- Funding Opportunities; Demonstration Projects that can be used in conjunction; and Implementation Plan (Immediate, Short, and Long Range Successes)
- I still have the feeling that major decisions have been made and the ICC provides minor, if any, function (other than trying to get buy in). Perhaps a summary of changes effected as a result of ICC input would be beneficial. This wouldn't have to part of the meeting, it could be distributed prior to the meeting if time is needed.
- At that time, the system development will have begun and the questions that arise in this process should drive the content of the next meeting.
- More discussion on the candidate options toward the road to operations.
- More or longer breakout sessions with an overview of the entire picture prior to the sessions.
- Smaller groups being asked specific questions -- what do they see people doing with the data? what are their time/quality criteria? Much like we did during the STWDSR exercise.
- Continue to move forward with initiative. Include more initiatives to promote Clarus with federal and state governments AND with those who can provide funding.
- Accommodations were excellent. Please offer coffee if possible in the morning.
- Morning coffee
- A recap of meeting #2 given at the beginning of the meeting, continue with the break-out group discussion idea, yet still gather everyone all together at the beginning and the end of each day, stay with a 2-day event, as one day would not be enough time to really "get results". For future meetings, please provide coffee, tea, juice, etc. in the mornings!!
- Right now Clarus is searching for direction and scope. As time goes and the focus becomes clear, make sure we do not lose that focus. Many of the members will want to steer the project in a certain direction to fit their needs (nothing wrong with that) but as a group we need to make sure this does not result in too mammoth of a project through expansion, or too selective of a project by focusing on too narrow of a scope.
- More information on GIS/GT Issues so that everyone has a better understanding of the location intelligence that we need to deal with weather issues
- It's good to brainstorm, but I think the next Clarus meeting needs to start drawing lines between what Clarus will and won't do. That's the only way we can really move forward and tackle this project.
- I would like to see a presentation on how the weather service is currently pulling surface information from a states system and how they use it and how they would expect Clarus to perform.
- Focus on very specific questions with shorter break-out sessions. Breakout discussions were a little to abstract in order to formulate concrete recommendations and directions. Ultimate outcomes were unclear to me. Not entirely sure what was accomplished.
- Coffee! ;-)