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**Florida Department of Transportation**

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Monday, January 27, 2020**

**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**GoTo Meeting**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Robbie Brown, D1Justin Merritt, D1Pete Vega, D2DeeDee Crews, D2Jason Summerfield, D2Jason Evans, D2Amy DiRusso, D3Mark Nallick, D3John McFadden, COTHossam AbdelAll, D4Dan Smith, D4Dee McTague, D4 | J Jeremy Dilmore, D5Shannon Watterson, D5Kyle Higgins, D5Eddie Grant, D5John Hope, D5/CFXMark Laird, D6Javier Rodriguez, D6Alex Mirones, D6Alejandro Motta, D6Mike Crawson, D7Dan Buidens, D7Eric Gordin, FTE | Kelly Kinney, FTEJermaine Da Silva, FTETony Albert, FTECherie Philips, FTEWang Lee, MDXBryan Homayouni, CFXChristine Shafik, COMark Dunthorn, CO HTNBJennifer Rich, CO HNTBShawn Kinney, COTucker Brown, SwRIAJ Skillern, SwRI |

**Purpose:** The purpose of this meeting is to review and vote on statewide issues and requirements, and review JIRA issues.

**Welcome:** Change Management Board (CMB) Chairman J. Hope opened the meeting.

**Call for Quorum and Review of Agenda:** A quorum was established for this CMB meeting. J. Hope reviewed the meeting agenda. J. Hope also mentioned that online voting would be used for this meeting. All of the items are numbered and because we are using the online voting, if you have only dialed in, please log into the WebEx if you are the voting member.

**Previous Meeting Recap and Action Item Review:** The following items are complete.

**Action Item Review**

* Dan Smith - Wrong Way Driving Wavetronix – Test using WavetronixHD data to detect and track WWD events.
	+ My understanding is that equipment has arrived and there is testing underway.
	+ Hossam AbdelAll – yes, we are in the process of setting up a trial run, it should be underway fairly soon.
* Complete - Christine Shafik – Send the RITSA/SITSA schedule slides.
* Complete – Christine Shafik – Send list of future CMB items for the Districts to prioritize
* Complete - Christine Shafik – Send email reminder to the Districts about responding to the pending JIRA tickets. Include the statistics of how many items are still pending.

**SunGuide Software Update**

Christine Shafik: Good afternoon, thank you for joining today. A lot has happened since we last met in September. A lot has happened since then. The first thing is the 7.2 release which was released on October 5th. Currently CFX and District One were the pioneers to deploy it. We have MDX and FTE scheduled next, we are looking forward to getting the rest scheduled as well. We also have a hotfix coming out, specifically for this portion for 7.2 which covers nine issues. We are expecting the build to be sent to the TERL today or tomorrow for testing. This hotfix will cover 7.1.1 and 7.1.2. Overall, it is fixing about 50 issues. Starting with the next set, we’ll only be providing hotfixes for the two most recent releases (7.1.2 and 7.2).

When we release 8.0, we will only be supporting 7.2 and 8.0 only. So, let’s all be on the latest version as possible. As you know, we have approved 16 issues to be approved in the next release which is 8.0. Overall, we have had 49 issues sent to CMB members for prioritization (1/10/20). We have finalized 19 of them to be discussed today. This morning the results of the prioritization was sent to the group.

As mentioned, we are going to cover 19 issues today. SwRI provided the cost estimates to us and we will be covering everything we can in the next release. It is not guaranteed but we are doing our best to have it covered and accommodate all of the needs.

Currently we are finalizing the RCA and RISC ConOps, we appreciate your input and are discussing further with the SSUG team. We are planning to have 8.0 release in October. Are there any questions?

John Hope: You mentioned we will be covering 19 items today but actually we are only covering 18 items; one was duplicated.

Christine Shafik: Yes, you are correct. Two items were combined and so we will be going over 18 enhancements. Thank you for pointing this out.

John Hope: Are there any other questions? Hearing none, we can jump into the first enhancement.

Mark Dunthorn: Sorry but this was a last-minute addition. The AVL/Road Ranger Map Display at SEOC but I am going to turn it over to Shawn to give some background. This was an application put up by FDOT’s Office of Information Technology with SunGuide data that they are collecting in real-time.

Shawn Kinney: When the Traffic Engineering and Operations team is out at the State EOC, if there is an evacuation, they will be facilitating the support to that operation. One of the things that enhances their ability to keep traffic moving is having the location and status of the service patrol type elements. Many of you are aware that the Office of Maintenance has developed the Emergency Roadside Assistance for that purpose. To assist in operation awareness at the SEOC by the TEO office we have begun working on implementing the automated vehicle locations in SunGuide that are being plotted on an ArcGIS map. This is for emergency use out at the State EOC for stages 1-3. This is not intended for general public use it is strictly to be used by Central Office and the Districts to coordinate service patrol assets. I appreciate everyone’s time and attention to make this happen. My goal is that this will be available for the upcoming hurricane season.

Mark Dunthorn: That is the why, and we will be sending out a “how to” document on configuring this in SunGuide to provide background. You can also reach out to SwRI and it should take less than 10 minutes. We have looked into potential performance issues and did not see anything significant. As Shawn said we would like to see this up and running by hurricane season but we would like to get all of the Districts configured by February so we can start testing. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to Central Office.

John Hope: Now we will discuss the first enhancement, 4681.

1. **SG-4681 Region Based Actions**

Tucker Brown: The first one on the list is talking about region-based actions. There are different situations where we have different entities we need to call or have different people we need to email depending on where the event is located. There are a few situations where this has come up and one example is with IDS alerts for users concentrating on a specific area. We want to be able to set up different mailing lists depending on where the event is located. It will also include the RISC and be able to have a responder list based on location. It will also give us an easier way to define device permissions. Having a way to define the regions and apply that in multiple places will be useful.

The way this would work is that a user can define a region on a map and draw it out on the map. Those regions would be able to be used in different parts of the systems. The portion that we are apply to as a voting item is to assign email addresses to a region. EM would automatically put those addresses in as the default for an event in that region. There are future possible uses for this and one is the RISC enhancement. You would assign users to a region or regions. The RISC is not part of this enhancement but is something we could easily do in the future.

The way we intend to do this is take the contact notification that TxDOT has where they already define the region. We would need to develop some configuration dialogs as theirs are not currently WPF. The EM will still maintain the list of agencies but then all of the agencies would be ported to the new contract notification. We would also update the AVL and IDS to the new agency contacts. The cost is for the whole port of the contact notification and the new configuration dialog. In the end the first thing we are going to apply is the defining of regions so they can be added to events. This opens up a lot of abilities to use regions in other parts of the system and that is why we are laying the groundwork for additional enhancements in the future.

Does anyone have any questions?

John Hope: When you say the users would define the regions, do you mean the system administrators will define the regions beforehand? Then the operators would go in and chose the region.

Tucker Brown: Yes, users being Administrators.

John Hope: So, there wouldn’t be any on the fly creations of regions?

Tucker Brown: No, it is all pre-configuration and use. All of the configurations would be done at the administrator level and then the operators would be able to use it.

Cherie Phillips: I see there is a $54k cost, how is it broken down?

Tucker Brown: Part of it is the port of the subsystem from Texas to Florida. Part of it is the configuration dialog that will allow you to configure regions, associate emails to those regions, the database structure that goes along with it. Then making it to where the events can pick up the emails from that region and associate them with the event.

Kelly Kinney: So you mention we still have agencies but the contacts will be regionalized, so in the event managers screen where we have responders on the right side, you would select and agency then there is a drop down with names, would that still exist there or would it change?

Tucker Brown: It will be the same concept there and you will still have contacts associated with the agency. This will just change where they are configured and will allow for a regional configuration with it. What you are talking about won’t change.

Bryan Homayouni: So, we have 17-18 items to vote on here and each of them have an associated cost, is there enough in the overall budget to cover them?

Christine Shafik: As I mentioned earlier, we are not guaranteeing that everything voted on today will be included in 8.0. As the budget permits, we will go on and prioritize them in the next release. If we run out of budget, then it will be pushed to the next hotfix or major release.

Bryan Homayouni: So, Christine, are you going to prioritize it from a Central Office standpoint?

Christine Shafik: Yes, unless we hear something else from the Districts before moving it forward. The priority list received from the Districts will help in the decision on prioritizing what goes into 8.0,

Dan Buidens: If we have 18 items, how do we as Districts let you know what enhancements we truly want before others? Some Districts might have different priority of needs, so how do we flush that out?

Christine Shafik: Remember we are having hotfixes prior to 8.0 so your priority might come before the release of 8.0. You can reach out to Central Office and we will brainstorm it and let us know your priority list. We are still in the brainstorm area here.

Dan Buidens: Okay, we like that approach.

John Hope: Are there any additional questions for this enhancement? Hearing none, let’s vote. Please make sure there is only one person voting per agency. We need 6 yeses to proceed.

**Cost: $54K**

**Schedule: 8.0**

**Vote: 12 approved and 2 did not approve. Item passes.** It looks like District One and Two there were multiple people who voted but it looks like this measure passes.

1. **SG-3444 Non-Standard DMS Messages for Color DMS Do Not Display Well on Map**

Tucker Brown: This item discusses using non-standard DMS messages for Color DMS and the display on the operator map. The anticipated format here is graphics on the left and text on the right. There is a way in the system how you can send in from a third party where you want the text and image and the system won’t reformat it. But when the status comes back SunGuide doesn’t understand how to interpret where those graphics are so what you end up with is something different than expected and looks like jibberish on the operator map. There are limitations to how MULTI is rendered in the OM regardless of the source. The idea here is to add functionality to the add message window which will allow you to do all kinds of text alignment and graphic positioning. This allows you to put the graphic anywhere on the sign, not just on the left. It gives you the ability to put multiple graphics and in multiple positions. This allows for a lot more options.

**Cost: $18k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Are there any questions?

Hossam AbdelAll: I am sorry, I missed the justification for this. Can you go over it really quickly?

Tucker Brown: There are Districts who are sending messages to signs with text on the left and graphics on the right. This will allow them to appear correctly in the operator map and by doing this enhancement we are also giving the operators the ability to put the graphic in other locations not just on the left.

John Hope: Are there any other questions about this enhancement? Hearing none, we will move to the vote.

Dan Buidens: We are using SunGuide to post messages, not the third-party software. When using SunGuide I can only put the text on the left and have a graphic on the right, does this application give me the freedom to display that message and I put the graphic wherever I want? And who is using this?

Tucker Brown: To answer the first, this will allow you to put the graphic anywhere on the sign. CFX is using the software and it allows them to post travel times.

Mark Laird: When you say the operators will be able to do this and that they will be able to use SunGuide, how will that work?

Tucker Brown: Yes, they will be able to do it in SunGuide and the editor will be changed to allow them to move graphics and text around on the sign.

Mark Laird: And resize graphics?

Tucker Brown: They won’t be able to resize the graphic, but they will be able to choose graphics that are pre-loaded. Is there anyone who doesn’t like that functionality and wants us to put a setting in there to keep it how it is? It doesn’t change the cost.

Mark Nallick: I think that would be a good safety measure for new operators.

Mark Laird: I think we might want to put it into templates to allow or not allow operators to modify.

John Hope: So, what you are saying, instead of modifying the window that is shown you would just allow it in the template configuration.

Tucker Brown: I was thinking more along the lines of a permission that would allow a user to that or not. If the user or the administrator had that permission, then they could do it. And the operators would be able to see it but not modify it. They would have to replace it and have limited options to be able to replace it.

Mark Laird: I don’t think we want adhoc placement of graphics on messages.

John Hope: Would a work around be an option in the DMS library that the operator couldn’t select?

Tucker Brown: We can address those questions in the general requirements phase.

Mark Laird: Having that permission probably works for what I was looking for. The administrators can turn it off for the operators until we get comfortable with it.

John Hope: Are there any other questions about this? Hearing none, we will vote. Please just have one vote per District.

**Vote: 11 approved, zero not approved. This enhancement has passed.**

1. **SG-4801 Partial Lane Blockage as a Lane Configuration**

Tucker Brown: This is about partial lane blockage as a lane configuration. The current lane status you can have is open, blocked, and unconfirmed. There was a request to add partial blockage as a type. At a configuration level, you can choose to disable this and keep the original lane status. If you do enable it, there are different places it would touch specifically the user interface, DMS, HAR, Reporting and 511. It would affect all of the descriptions going to those places. There isn’t a tone to it, but it just touches a lot of places.

**Cost: $15k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Javier Rodriguez: I know this has been discussed in the SSUG meetings and I have not been part of the conversations, but we need to be consistent throughout the state and it will impact reporting and other items. I don’t know why we need this; it is either blocked or open to traffic. If you have an incident you can give the public another route. I am not sure what this is trying to accomplish.

Dan Buidens: We have a lot of ramps where it is a single travel lane with shoulder on both sides. Sometimes there is a crash where the vehicles are blocking some of the shoulder and a little bit of the lane. There is still room to pass the disabled vehicles on the ramp. We don’t want to tell the public that the ramp is closed because technically it is not. So, we would want to use the partial closure to notify the public that part of it is blocked but you can still use the ramp.

Javier Rodriguez: If you have a crash, I’d imagine you would have responders in the same location, so I think from an operational perspective it is the wrong message to send to the public. If it is partially blocked, it is blocked.

Dan Buidens: In District Seven we have a connection between I-4 and I-75 and there is a single lane designated for the vehicles, but the shoulders are wider than the lane is. So, it allows for emergency vehicles to go there. We would only pull this tool out of the toolbox when the situation is there is a disabled vehicle and there is a road ranger behind them and there is ample room for the public to get by this event. We just want to warn the public of the activity on the ramp since there is still enough room for them to get by.

Pete Vega: I am going to have to agree with Javier on this one. I think this would be more confusing to the motorist than anything and there are other tools that you can use. If you are going to have activities impeding travel, then you need to call it blocked. If there is room to travel then you can say accident ahead, right shoulder blocked but I am going to agree with Javier it would be more confusing to include this.

Javier Rodriguez: Either the lane is blocked or not blocked. If a vehicle is partially blocking a lane then it is blocked. I understand the situation in D7, but we need to stay consistent statewide and handle your particular situation another way. This enhancement could lead to a lot of misuse.

Tucker Brown: At a software level, we are going to have to determine for DMS purposes and others if it constitutes blocking or not. It will affect performance measures reporting and is it considered blocked or not blocked.

John Hope: Are there any other comments or thoughts about it?

Dan Buidens: Saying the shoulder is blocked for the ramp lane isn’t exactly accurate. I thought there would be a lot of support on this enhancement.

John Hope: It sounds like from a few Districts that the terminology of partial blockage might not be the best option. May I suggest that we table this item and workshop it offline and bring it back to the CMB for another vote? Is everyone okay with that approach?

Bryan Homayouni: Can we do an interim vote, so we don’t have to wait until the next CMB?

John Hope: Yes. Dan, are you good with that?

Dan Buidens: Yes.

Jeremy Dilmore: Can we also ensure we are given the option to remove this capability at an administrator level? That way for folks that need it, it would be available but for others we can turn it off.

Tucker Brown: Yes.

John Hope: If everyone is okay, we should table it. Anyone against that? We will table it for now and then send out an online vote.

1. **SG: 4776 Ignore Out of Service Cameras when Finding Closest Camera to an Event**

Tucker Brown: This is when the system just finds the closest camera to an event. It doesn’t take into account any device status. So, the proposed solution is to disregard the “out of service” cameras and find the next closest camera.

**Cost: $1k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: One concern I see is a camera going into an error state until an operator attempts to move the camera. You are just proposing if it is manually set to out of service that it will skip it, not when it is in error state?

Tucker Brown: Yes.

John Hope: Are there any questions about this enhancement?

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this measure passes.**

1. **SG-1957 Incorrect “Last Updated” in Email Response Plan Items**

Tucker Brown: Right now, when you generate a response plan and the email gets generated with it, if you have the same response plan and you just switch out the response plan, you do not get an updated email to go along with that plan. So potentially you could activate an email that contains stale information.

The solution is to alert the operator if they activate the plan without regenerating the email item. It will look at the times of the response plan and the generation email time and will be able to recognize if it is an old item. The options are they can pass through the alert and still activate the response plan, or they can choose to cancel the activation so they can regenerate the email with the correct information.

**Cost: $2k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this measure passes.**

1. **SG-4635 Cloning Events and Injury Data Transferred**

Tucker Brown: Right now, when you clone an event the injuries section is carried over to the new event. It was requested to blank this out, so you don’t see it. We wanted to make sure this was good with everyone. Is there any other information that should be carried over to a cloned event? Can we safely exclude anything (such as injuries) that is not included here?

**Cost: $1k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: Are there any questions?

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this measure passes**

1. **SG-4682 Email Template for Response Plans**

Tucker Brown: There is currently a single template for email generation in response plans. This is not flexible for operational needs. The solution is similar for how you do response plans for DMS. You would get a default email response plan template and you could configure it for different event types. This gives you flexibility on how the email generates based on event types.

**Cost: $8k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Pete Vega: Does this replace the executive notification process?

Tucker Brown: This is specifically for the email response plan item. There is a secondary template specifically for the executive notifications.

John Hope: Hearing no more questions, let’s open up the voting.

**Vote: 10 approved, 0 not approved, 1 abstained – this item passes.**

1. **SG-1586 Additions to the Event Details Dialog**

Tucker Brown: Right now, we have an FHP incident number which comes from the FHP CAD, it has been identified that there is a second number that needs to be captured for the FHP Case #. There are two things, the FHP Incident # would be renamed to FHP CAD # and add an entirely new field for FHP Case #. We would also make it auditable.

**Cost: $3k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: I believe there are SunGuide standard reports that use incident number, will those reports be updated?

Tucker Brown: Yes, not a problem.

Jason Evans: Are we going to be able to do a search in the reports for FHP case #’s if this is approved?

Tucker Brown: Are you referring to the perimeter of the reports that will be able to search for a specific number?

Jason Evans: Yes, a specific number for that search box.

Tucker Brown: We did not bid that in to do a perimeter search, but it can be done.

John Hope: Would that be a significant change in the cost?

Tucker Brown: No, I think it would make the cost in the $3k-$4k range.

John Hope: Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, we will move onto the voting.

Mark Mathes: Are we voting for the searchable functionality as well?

John Hope: I would assume yes.

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this measure passes**

1. **SG-4949 Device Sequencing Loop Handling**

Tucker Brown: Right now if you are setting up the devices outside of DMS, it happens to be more specific for if you have a loop on the roadway or an arterial that meets an interstate in two places it is possible to get into a loop. If you are searching and go back far enough, you can potentially end up in front of the event or in the opposite direction. There are two enhancements we would like to propose:

* Once the search leaves a roadway, it can never return to that roadway
* Devices on the same roadway but in the opposite direction would be excluded

**Cost: $5k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Mark Laird: When you say opposite direction, is its cardinal opposite direction or any
other direction?

Tucker Brown: Most cases it would be cardinal opposite direction. So, would cardinal be okay?

Mark Laird: Yes.

Jason Summerfield: Are you trying to block cardinal directions on the same road or when it traverses to another roadway?

Tucker Brown: It would be same road. The one including directional is only on the same roadway.

John Hope: With that in mind, would it be possible that there is a loop on an adjacent roadway?

Tucker Brown: This would be if you leave the primary roadway and enter a secondary roadway and the secondary roadway somehow loops on itself, it would still be the same thing. Once you leave a roadway, you can’t go back into that roadway.

John Hope: Are there any other questions or comments? Hearing none, we will vote.

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this item passes**

1. **SG-5077 RPG DMS Suggested Priorities Based on Event Type**

Tucker Brown: Right now, the list of priorities is done, and they are done based on how far away the signs are from the events. This does not match up with the D5 priorities and might not match up with other priorities as well. So, the proposed enhancement is to allow configuring ranges for priorities. For example, a crash event in D5 will utilize priorities 1-10 based on distance from the event and event severity. While a scheduled road work event would utilize priorities 11-20.

You would have to set the default range for all other event types. If you don’t want to use this at all, it would be 1-255 and you would not specify any thing. This is really to allow the possibility. If you don’t want to use it, you can remain with the same thing you have right now.

**Cost: $6k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Mark Laird: Would the ranges be allowed to overlap?

Tucker Brown: I don’t think I have a problem with that, and it doesn’t change the concept. Does anyone else want to weigh in?

Mark Laird: We would lose the ability to check for overlaps because we wouldn’t exclude them.

Kevin Mehaffy: I just want to put out a word of caution, where you put out these things where you can turn them on or off, it makes us less consistent across the state.

Tucker Brown: I will say that the overlap does give you more flexibility so say I wanted crash and roadwork to always be 1-10, if I don’t run overlaps then I can only have one that is 1-10.

Mark Laird: So, could you have roadwork 1-10 and crashes going 8-18?

Tucker Brown: Yes, I think overlapping is a better idea but someone else should weigh in on that.

District: This isn’t a statewide priority for an event type is it?

Mark Dunthorn: I don’t think there is.

John Hope: This enhancement could be implemented, and the operational decisions can be made outside of this and we can configure the system to match that. Any other comments or questions?

**Vote: 10 approved, 1 not approved – this item passes.**

1. SG-1713 EM Window Title Bar

Tucker Brown: Right now, we have event number in the dialog title bar. The proposed enhancement is to add the event type and location would be available in the title bar.

**Cost: $1k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this item passes**

1. **SG-4966 Audit on Injuries**

Tucker Brown: There is no current way to audit the injury type. There are times when you need to update the fatality after the fact. The proposed enhancement would allow you to modify through an audit. There is no add or delete of that, only modification through an audit. The cost includes the change of the audit and reporting.

**Cost: $11k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

Jason Evans: If fatality or injury was not selected at all and the event gets closed out, we will not be able to add that?

Tucker Brown: There is no concept to add because if you didn’t put anything it would say no injury. It would only change no injury to fatality. That field doesn’t log timestamps, so we are not adding a record, we are just changing the value it was. Any other questions?

Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this item passes

1. **SG-3749 Events will be Highlighted that haven’t been updated in a configured amount of time**

Tucker Brown: Without looking at each event, it is difficult to tell how long it’s been since the event was last updated. The enhancement would be a configurable value that will set the amount of time an event should go without being updated. The event will be highlighted in the event list if it hasn’t been updated in the configured amount of time. Right now, the row color can be updated by users so we will have to figure out a way to distinguish that row from others. We will run the design by the Districts for approval. There will be a way to turn this off if you do not have this situation.

**Cost: $3k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: Is this applied to abandoned vehicles or something that is expected to be in the system a long time?

Tucker Brown: Now that you mention it, I think we discussed at the SSUG that it is configurable per event type.

John Hope: So, you would set the time range per event type?

Tucker Brown: Correct.

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this item passes**

1. **SG-4761 Allow DMS Graphics to be Defined in EM Template**

Tucker Brown: Currently, DMS graphics are applied in response plans if the following is true:

* DMS sign supports graphics
* Graphic is defined for the event type

There is no way to tell the software to exclude the graphic. The enhancement is to allow a template to define whether or not to allow a graphic to be added. Even if the template allows the graphics, previously conditions still must be true. Allows a default template to be set for all DMS (include or not). Allows a specific device template to override the functionality with a different template that may have a different setting to include (or not include) the graphic. This gives you more flexibility to put graphics on signs.

**Cost: $11K**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: It sounds like what has been accounted for is a DMS that supports graphics and ones that don’t. What I don’t see are different sized DMS or pixel densities.

Tucker Brown: When it goes to pick a graphic for a sign, it will look at the graphic for the event, which you can have multiple sizes of graphics defined for that event type. It will try to find the best one and if one doesn’t exist then it would not put one on the sign.

John Hope: What are the priorities of the graphics?

Tucker Brown: Size, the one that fits will go on the sign. This also gives you control over signs that support graphics where you might not want to put graphics up which you would do at the template level.

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this item passes.**

1. **SG-3949 Alert Operator when an Event is Created through the SPARR App**

Tucker Brown: When SPARR users create an event, it is silently added to the list of events in the UI. If not in communication, operators might miss actions they need to complete against those events. The proposed enhancement is to have a pop-up or other notification to users that a SPARR user created an event. We would implement a permission to receive these so administrators can configure who gets the notification.

**Cost: $3K**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: I recall from the SSUG that D5 was not interested in using this and you mentioned that there would be a configuration for administrators to control how this is done.

Tucker Brown: The bottom bullet covers that, if no one wants the alerts then no one has to see them.

**Vote: 9 approved, 0 not approved, 2 abstained – this item passes.**

1. **SG-3123 Alert Users when C2C Missing for TvT Generation**

Tucker Brown: When a link is deleted from C2C, there is no way for a remote district to know that link is no longer available. This is not designed to tell you when all of the data is gone, it is for a specific situation when data is no longer available.

The proposed enhancement here is if a link is not in the TvT status cache, check to see if there are other links available from the same network. If none are available, the data source is probably not available, and no notification should be sent. If there are links from that source available, send a notification to an email set in the config file and specify the link is no longer in the configuration. Resend at a configurable interval while the condition persists.

**Cost: $3k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: When you say the link is no longer available means it is not reported at all vs being reported as no data.

Tucker Brown: Correct. The issue here is that there is no way to notify another District that you are deleting things from your system without telling them.

**Vote: 11 approved, 0 not approved – this item passes.**

1. **SG-4948 Auto-Merge and Manual Merge with Travel Time are Inconsistent**

Tucker Brown: This is making the behavior between auto-merge and manual merge the same. When auto-merging, the software limits the phases to a maximum of 2 phases. When manually merging, there is no maximum number of phases and this can result in messages of 3 or 4 phases.

The proposed enhancement here is to allow the district to configure the maximum number of phases. Change manually and auto-merged messages to follow the maximum number of phases to be consistent with each other.

**Cost: $9k**

**Schedule: 8.0**

John Hope: If someone tries to manually merge something and it exceeds the threshold, what will happen? Will it exclude a sentence or error out?

Tucker Brown: Right now, when you auto-merge it will take out the second phase entirely and you are left with half the message. Because it is travel times, we usually don’t care. If you are trying to manually do that, the intent was to take off the second phase. We could change it to a warning and not allow them to do that, but the initial request was to make the two the same as the auto merge. Any other questions?

**Vote: 10 approved, 1 not approved – this item passes**

1. **SG-4870 For NTCIP Cameras, Set into Manual Mode Before Sending Manual Command**

Tucker Brown: Using NTCIP, if a camera is in automatic focus/iris mode and the user sends a command to change the focus/iris, the system does not send a command to change the camera to manual focus/iris mode. We found that some cameras will accept this, but some interpret this as a command to send the camera to a manual focus/iris mode. It then requires the user to click the focus/iris command again to start the focus/iris action.

The proposed enhancement is if the camera is in automatic mode, send a command to change the camera to manual mode before sending the requested focus/iris action.

**Cost: $3K**

**Schedule: 8.0**

**Vote: 9 approved, 1 not approved, 1 abstained – this item has passed.**

**Open Discussion:**

We have concluded all of the enhancement voting. Does anyone have any items to discuss with the group?

Mark Dunthorn: We did have one quick item we wanted to discuss – there is a SunGuide website that has the Districts and agencies using SunGuide. That information is out of date, we wanted to let everyone know to review that page and to send us any updated information and we will replace it. It is under the About tab, Menu and it is SunGuide Users. I will send out a link to the group.

**Review Action Items:**

* Enhancement 3 – SG 4801: Discuss this item further at a SSUG meeting and then proceed with an online vote.
* Mark Dunthorn to send out link to the SunGuide Users page for the Districts to review and send in updated information.
* Christine Shafik to send out the AVL data

Are there any other items to discuss? Hearing none, this concludes the meeting and I appreciate everyone help and thanks for a successful meeting.