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**Florida Department of Transportation**

**CHANGE MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING NOTES**

**Thursday, January 28, 2021**

**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Microsoft Teams Meeting**

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Robbie Brown, D1  Justin Merritt, D1  Luis Hernandez, D1  Ray Mikol, D1  Pete Vega, D2  Jason Evans, D2  Jason Summerfield, D2  Craig Carnes, D2  Deedee Crews, D2  Amy DiRusso, D3  William Reynolds, D3  Jason Small, D3  Kevin Mahaffey, D3  Robert Briscoe, D3  Alexandra Lopez, D4  Hossam AbdelAll, D4  Dee McTague, D4  Tushar Patel, D5 | Jeremy Dilmore, D5  Eddie Grant, D5  Jay Williams, D5  Kyle Higgins, D5  John Hope, D5/CFX  Mark Laird, D6  Alejandro Motta, D6  Alex Mirones, D6  Javier Rodriguez, D6  Mike Crawson, D7  Dan Buidens, D7  Matt Mileto, D7  Romona Burke, D7  Eric Gordin, FTE  Karla Smith, FTE  Cherie Phillips, FTE  Michael Kerpen, FTE  Tony Abid, FTE | Kelly Kinney, FTE  Brent Poole, CFX  Bryan Homayouni, CFX  Wang Lee, MDX  Christine Shafik, CO  Alex Brum, CO HNTB  Mark Dunthorn, CO HNTB  Greg Dudley, CO HNTB  Jennifer Langford, CO HNTB  Juan Abreut, CO HNTB  Karthik Devarakonda, CO HNTB  Derek Vollmer, CO  Tucker Brown, SwRI  AJ 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 Jay Williams opened the meeting.

**Call for Quorum and Review of Agenda:** A quorum was established for this CMB meeting. Jay Williams reviewed the meeting agenda.The agenda should have links to all of the voting items.

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

**Action Item Review**

* **Central Office:** Records retention – CO to determine legal requirements to comply with the Florida Statutes. Christine Shafik:We got with the Central Office folks and it doesn’t seem that we have any requirements for the retention. If the team here feels that we need something, we can come up with something for our area and we can make it official with the legal team.

Jay Williams:So, is the suggestion that we agree as a group on a statewide policy?

Christine Shafik: I am open to ideas but for now there is nothing in place.

Eric Gordin: By any chance is this related to the email correspondence I had with Derek Vollmer about what the retention should be for SELS?

Christine Shafik: It is not related but it could be in the future.

Eric Gordin: I had brought Derek together with some of our tolls group to discuss how we are trying to handle tolls data as well. We have a meeting scheduled for next week and I can follow up with you on what we find out from our tolls group.

Christine Shafik: Derek brought that to my attention, and we are communicating on it. Thank you for bringing it to the conversation here.

Jay Williams: Are there any additional comments on any of these subjects? Hearing none, I will turn it over to Christine to give an update on the SunGuide Software.

* **Central Office:** There were a few items from the last meeting that we will be voting on today.

Questions regarding RITIS interface enhancement:

* + Does RITIS support compression?
  + Determine bandwidth requirements.
  + What does recovery look like?
  + How will administrators enable/disable sending updates/recovery?

**SunGuide® Software Update**

Christine Shafik: The last update for 7.2 was Hotfix 4 which was released on 1/11/2021 and we had over 40 issues or enhancements on it. 7.2 is currently deployed in all Districts. 8.0 is the latest release which was released 12/17/2020. Here is the plan we are thinking of we would like all districts to install 8.0 as soon as possible. We want everyone to be on 8.0 prior to hurricane season and you can utilize RCA very well. We are planning to put enhancements and hotfixes in 8.0. We will not be duplicating the work for previous SunGuide versions. If you are in 8.0 you will get the latest and greatest. We can work with the districts one-on-one in installing 8.0 if you need assistance, please just let me know.

John Hope: SwRI was working on the upgrade scripts for 8.0 to make it more efficient. Do you have an update to that?

Tucker Brown: So, the plan right now is that it will have to be done in stages. Stage 1 will be the absolute necessary things to get the system up and running. For the D2 database it was taking around 20 hours, it is now down to 2.5 hours. It will be a shorter time to do that. After that happens there are a number of scripts that need to be run, the indexes need to be rebuilt on the tables. The way we are having to do this is by splitting the data that was there into a different table, redo the indexes and then push it all back together in the end. It will be 4 stages and stages 2, 3, and 4 will be ran after your system is up and running. Stage 1 we have those in place and should be sending them to TERL today for their tests. We are currently working on 2, 3, and 4.

Christine Shafik: As you all know last week, we released Hotfix 1 for 8.0 which covers all 7.2 issues and some release issues from 8.0. One district asked if it was worth doing hotfix 4 for 7.2 prior to moving to 8.0. The recommendation was it is better to move forward to 8.0 and there are no issues with skipping hotfix 4. All of the issues that are covered in hotfix 4 are included in 8.0. Any questions?

Christine Shafik: We are going to cover the SunGuide Polylines ConOps at the end of the presentation so we will come back to this.

Jay Williams: Now we will get started with the voting items, the link should be active in the agenda for each voting item.

**Enhancement 1: SG-3338 Allow floodgates to be scheduled through SAS.**

Tucker Brown: This is about floodgates and putting something in SAS that allows you to schedule them. All floodgates are manually entered at the time that you need them. The proposed enhancement is to allow users to schedule floodgates to post to 511. Start time would post the floodgate and end time would pull the floodgate down from 511.

Cost: $13k

Release: Next version

Jay Williams: Are there any questions for this item? If not, please vote.

Vote: This item passes. We will move to the next item.

**Enhancement 2: SG-5278 Blank Out Signs Integration**

Tucker Brown: This item was brought up at a previous meeting. General purpose of blank out signs (BOS) are to redirect traffic during planned or unplanned traffic events. These would be part of the response plan functionality. You would have status on these to know what is active at any given time, you can utilize them in pre-defined plans and just generic response plans. Another part of this enhancement is warnings for over height vehicles approaching bridges. Adding that functionality to the system as a whole and these are actual devices that would be doing this. There is a future enhancement that might be investigated at the PAS or FOX system that could provide that information as well but what we are voting on today is to integrate a specific device that will give specific alerts. Then there is parking availability type of signage as well that is directing traffic into parking facilities.

The changes for SunGuide are just the communication with the BOS and OHVD devices. Configuration of those plans which we will also change up beacons a little bit. Right now, when you activate a beacon, we are talking to a device that might have one, two or four relays. We are going to split that so if you have a device that has four relays you can control each relay individually. It is a slight change in how it is run, if you are using beacons then you should have the same functionality you had before, but it will be expanded to use more of each beacon’s relays. The beacons and BOS will be integrated into the response plans. There is a large cost to this since these are completely new concepts to this system.

Cost: $113k

Eric Gordin: One question on the over height. Is it an over height detection system that would be integrated with SunGuide or is it just the ability to post a message on the over height sign indication?

Tucker Brown: It is an over height system; it would be a specific device that we would be able to give alerts to and its ability to detect that.

Jay Williams: If there are no more questions, please vote.

Vote: Item two passes. We will move to item 3.

**Enhancement 3: SG-5359 Wrong Way Driver Alert**

Tucker Brown: This is just the change in how the WWD alert looks. Previously if you were looking at this window the grid on the left would stretch all the way across. The image would be tied to the specific row of the grid. It was small and hard for people to see. The proposed change is to have images displayed when the row is selected allowing for a larger view. Thumbnails of images will be available below the image. This splits it in half and the image will be on the right. It will still go through the images like a slide show. The behavior here is if you had multiple alerts at the same time you wouldn’t be able to see all of their images, but the image would be specific to whatever row was selected on the left.

Cost: $8k

Any questions?

Kelly Kinney: I just want to mention how helpful this will be. The operators do struggle with the size of the image and being able to what the first image of the series and what’s the last so this will be very beneficial.

Jay Williams: If there are no more questions or comments, please vote.

Vote: This item passes.

**Enhancement 4: SG-5156 Timestamp Logic Pop-Up Warnings**

Tucker Brown: This is for timestamp warnings for operators. When you are managing an event on the far-right side there are responder times. It is possible to get those into a state where they might not make sense which could impact performance measures or other reports that are being run. The enhancement here is to notify the users of timestamps that might not make sense. An example would be if the arrival time is before the departure time. Or just the departure time is given not the arrival time. We are making these optional as well so you can disable them if you don’t want to see them. Any questions?

Cost: $6k

Jay Williams: Everyone can vote on this item.

Vote: This item passes.

**Enhancement 5: SG-3336 Automatically select associated event in alert handling dialog.**

Tucker Brown: Right now, when you handle an FHP alert, the user is still required to pick the associated event, even if previously associated. If there is an event ID already known, it will auto select that one and it gives you a faster way to select the associated event. Any questions?

Cost: $2k

Jay Williams: Okay, everyone can vote on this enhancement.

**Enhancement 6: SG-3925 Add assigned Beat to Road Ranger information in Event Reports.**

Tucker Brown: Right now, vehicle is reported but not the beat the Road Ranger was assigned to when the event occurred. The user can currently choose the responding agency but can’t filter that by Beat or specific vehicle. When running reports and you want to look at a specific beat regardless of vehicle that is something that is not there. There are two things here, one is adding beat information to event reports and the other is add the beat/road ranger information to EM sort filters. This cost includes adding the filters and the Central Office controlled report pool. Any questions?

Cost: $12k

Jason Evans: How do you plan on showing the beat within the chronology? Say you have truck 217 would you report it as 217? Or would you have parenthesis next to it that has the beat number?

Tucker Brown: Normally the beat is associated with the log in so there is only one per vehicle. So right now, in the chronology report, I believe the vehicle is in the top half of the report. So, we would see the vehicle and it would be a dash with the beat or have a colon and have the beat. When we do the design review, we will mock it up. It should be either its own item or tagged in as part of the vehicle.

Jason Evans: Yes, I was looking down in the chronology where it will have an arrival and list each line items for that truck.

Tucker Brown: So when the arrival occurs you want to know the vehicle and the beat?

Jason Evans: I am most interested in knowing the beat. Would that be possible to list the truck number and the beat in the chronology?

Tucker Brown: That is doable, but it would be separate from this because we will be adding it to the report specifically and adding it as a report filter. Where you are requesting it is where that line item would be written. I don’t think it would be a huge change, but it wouldn’t be covered as part of these changes.

Jason Evans: Okay, thank you.

Jay Williams: Any other questions? Hearing none everyone please vote on this item. That item passes.

**Enhancement 7: SG-5410 Question about new Executive Notification**

Tucker Brown: We have a couple of things to go through here. Currently this is what happens: the operator who owns the event is the only one to be notified when an Executive Notification needs to be handled. UI enforces consistency in format of the email and allows attachments and if users don’t have permission to send the email, authorization from a user with permission can be granted. The concerns about how this operates are the alert is only visible to the event owner (operators). Operators do not send EN so management through SunGuide may require unnecessary event ownership changes. The proposed change to fix it is instead of just sending it to the operator, executive notifications will broadcast to all users with permissions to edit which widens distribution. It will have a configurable option to exclude the event owner for distribution. This was because the event owner never handles the EN. The other problem that people were getting into was that the prompt was being missed or ignored which could result in no EN being sent. The proposed solution is to introduce an option to “dismiss as false alarm” that will reset all timers so the next EN criteria that is met will be just like the first. This solution is for when operators didn’t mean to make it an EN.

Cost: $8k

Mark Laird: When you said it would reset to the initial state, what if it was an executive notification that came in? Does it reset to the previous state or all the way back to a new version?

Tucker Brown: Once you are in Executive Notification it sends them out on a periodic timer. If there was a second criteria that might generate that, it won’t immediately give you that one. It will wait until it thinks you need the next executive notification. There should not be a scenario where people dismiss it in a case that you do want an executive notification. If that were to happen by accident, the reset trigger would get it back on track.

Mark Laird: So, if you do reset it in a real EN case, you would have to manually retrigger it. Is that correct?

Tucker Brown: Manual or anything that would have triggered it in the first place. So, if you had a crash where you checked more than 10 vehicles, then you resave it and the system sees you don’t have an EN.

Mark Larid: Then fatalities should trigger another one, but you did it in error and you want to get back on the original schedule.

Tucker Brown: Right.

Jay Williams: Any other questions? Hearing none, please vote. This item passes.

**Enhancement 8: SG-4758 RWIS Alerts need the alert type and value added.**

Tucker Brown: Right now when you get an RWIS alert it has an alert type. It also gives you the station but doesn’t tell you what triggered it. To get an RWIS alert you must have set up a type (wind, temperature, etc.) and threshold. The request is to add the criteria onto the alarm so the operator can see the station and the reason the alarm was set off.

Cost: $2k

Jay Williams: Hearing no questions, please vote. This item passes.

**Enhancement 9: SG-5170 Ability to filter roadway in Waze Alert.**

Tucker Brown: The Waze process allows you to whitelist roadways where they would like to see alerts generated. The system does not allow districts to pick which roadway where they do not want to see alerts generated. The proposed enhancement is to allow a blacklist of roadways so certain roadways can be filtered out. Districts would get to choose between a whitelist or a blacklist but not both. They essentially would cancel each other out. It would just be adding the ability to do a blacklist. Any questions?

Cost: $7k

Jay Williams: Hearing no questions, please vote. This item passes.

**Enhancement 10: SG-3143 Status Logger Filters**

Tucker Brown: This is dealing with the status logger window. If you have delt with status logger you are familiar with the filter window in the status log viewer items too small or hard to read, lacking “none” and additional options. The proposed enhancement is to resize the selection box for the process names, add an additional filter option for “none” and add the ability to handle AND or OR queries. Majority of the cost estimate is for the queries, but the rest is for resizing and adjusting the look of it. Any questions?

Cost: $13k

Jay Williams: Hearing no questions, please vote. This item passes.

Jay Williams: Before we go to enhancement 11, Christine had an update on it based on the ConOps comments.

Christine Shafik: Yes, Tucker is going to present the enhancement first then will go through the ConOps comments.

**Enhancement 11: SG-4209 Use polyline instead of a single point for road closures**

Tucker Brown: We sent out a ConOps for review. Trying to achieve multiple goals as part of this effort. We want to give operations the ability to put in events that contain multiple EM locations and track as part of one event. Get events to show in the Waze feed and Waze requires a start and end point for all events. Get events to show in the Waze closure feed as well. The proposed changes are as an operator creates an event, there will be an option to turn the event into a polyline event if it is a full road closure. The operator would set the start and end of the closure. The software would pick up and automatically select all locations between the start and end point. The operator would be allowed to view the list of midpoints and deselect locations as they might not need to publish. The operator publishes message to 511 with full list of affected locations. We did have a tool as part of 8.0 that is being delivered that helps with the sort order and looking at a roadway and being able to put them in the right order along the roadway. Waze won’t accept single point events. So, for single point events, we have already asked the 511 team to create a second point within 50m in the direction of the event. If an event has multiple EM locations, we will ask he 511 team to provide a list of points between the start point and end point. This may move SunGuide generating the points based on those discussions, but this would all be automated with no operator input.

We did get comments on the polylines – I will go over those now. We did get comments on lane closure vs single lane blockage. Right now, this enhancement is intended for full lane closures not for single lane blockage. The reason for that is it could potentially involve doing lane blockage for every single location. The scope of this would increase if we were doing lane blockage per selected location. We are limiting it to just lane closures. As soon as we have the database structure and schema available, we will release them way before the actual release date. So, if there are custom reports that use the schema you can start updating them. I think those were the major comments.

Mark Laird: If you have an intersection closure that will affect multiple approaches, and multiple roadways, we also have a case with express lane closures that can cause an event to migrate to a different roadway. Would this be for a single roadway only?

Tucker Brown: Single roadway only, you can include a location that would be an intersection location which would report that all of the approaches are closed for that single location. But you can’t go upstream from those. If there are multiple roadways with closures, they would still be handled as independent events.

Mark Laird: What about the recovery process as you have one of these events and you start opening lanes how does that affect the way that Waze behaves?

Tucker Brown: There are a couple of ways that can be handled like if they are opening up internally, and the head or tail is shrinking you can move the head or tail of the polyline event to accommodate that. If things start to open in the middle, I anticipate you shortening the end of one to shift that event and make another event for the other closure. So, you would divide it up. We are not going to track discontinuous closures along the same roadway.

Mark Laird: So, if we start to open lanes at the original event location the ramps would stay closed and if we wanted to change something upstream, we will split it into different events. Is that correct?

Tucker Brown: If it would result in non-continuous closure, yes.

Mark Laird: If you start opening the original lanes of traffic and keeping the upstream ramps closed, it doesn’t affect them in anyway? They stay closed.

Tucker Brown: That is correct.

Jason Evans: What if we have cleared all the lanes closed but still have a few lanes blocked in the original event? Do we switch it back from a polyline to a normal event?

Tucker Brown: Correct. Think of it like the congestion side where you can set a head and tail and once it clears it goes back to the point.

Cost: $40k

Jay Williams: Any other questions on this one? We are ready to proceed with the vote. This item passes.

**Enhancement 12: SG-3429 Reliable DAR to RITIS Interface Using a Message Queueing Product**

Tucker Brown: The last one here has to do with the DAR interface and sending data to RITIS. Right now, we get files from SunGuide and package them into a zip file and send them to an FTP. They will pick them up from there and ingest them into RITIS. They would like to replace that with a new interface that is a rest API that fits their environment. They would be sent in real-time to their interface and ingest them as they come in. They are developing tools that deal with real-time data so they would like to receive the real time data. Essentially, they will set up end points per district and per data type. One for detector inventory, one for detector data. This service will accept XML data in current SunGuide XML schema format. Data will be queued by the service to be processed by RITIS loaders that will read from the service queues. There will no longer be any zip files, they will all be XML. For backlogs (RITIS or network downtime) raw files would be written to disk, after some amount of downtime, files would be zipped. Zip files could potentially be uploaded to FTP site or pushed to RITIS in another way if defined in the new interface. Email for not being able to upload is available now and would still be available. This would be for when the data gets too old and they just need to ingest it. Compression would be implemented for updated files. The districts could pause sending to RITIS and save to archive to the local disk.

Cost: $28k

Any questions?

Jeremy Dilmore: I think I asked this before but is there any rate limiting in case there is too big of a pull?

Tucker Brown: Not so much limiting but we can do that if you want to. Was that the question related to bandwidth?

Jeremy Dilmore: Yes.

Tucker Brown: Mark do you have the testing done on this that we can show?

Mark Dunthorn: We did some tests on that and what is shown is that the existing system is using a couple of megabits per second. If we go to the new mechanism we would probably see when the detectors get pulled, we would be seeing a peak utilization of about the same or a little bit less. I think the peak for the current system is 12 megabit per second. We can send these numbers out after the meeting, so you have it. What we would see in the new system is a couple megabit per second for 20 seconds or something like that. Tucker is that something we could configure to have a max megabit per second? How would we do that?

Tucker Brown: There is a way to do that. What we don’t want to do is blitz them and create a bottleneck. There will be thought into how to limit that. That will limit how fast you can catch up which might also drive the other perimeter of time if you want to upload it manually. There is probably some give and take between those numbers.

Jeremy Dilmore: When you look at fields is there the potential for them to look at the other data and bring that in which historically, they might not have? Specifically, I am worried about them trying to get the TMVD data that we are starting to get, and I am worried about the size of that data when we do updates.

Tucker Brown: That process right now doesn’t get any of that data, but you are right they could potentially subscribe to it. There are two ways to handle it; do they need all the data or can cut some off of it and how fast and often do they need it? I think when we start bringing in those data sources, we start looking at it and decide on a decision of when and what to send them.

Jeremy Dilmore: I am worried about a request coming in and bogging down the system. The idea that they potentially have the ability to subscribe to it causes me concern.

Tucker Brown: Their ability right now is only what we expose to them, so their only ability right now are events and TSS. Any discussion about giving the TMVD data would still require modifications to DAR to be able to send it. So, we should continue to look at what they should have access to.

Jeremy Dilmore: So, it is not a risk right now and we can move forward and cross that bridge when we get to it.

Tucker Brown: Correct.

John Hope: This is a push into their system, correct?

Tucker Brown: That is correct.

John Hope: Since it is a push, we have more control over what we push.

Tucker Brown: Yes, that is correct.

Mike Kerpen: Is RITIS still feeding HERE? Do you know that?

Tucker Brown: I do not know the answer to that.

Mike Kerpen: The reason I am asking is because a lot of the connected vehicles are using applications that are based on HERE and RITIS. So, it might be a benefit to include out information in their solution.

Tucker Brown: They are getting the traffic data as it is right now. This wouldn’t be modifying anything that we are giving them it is just the manor in which we give it to them.

Mark Dunthorn: They are already doing that.

Jason Summerfield: Since you will be working with them to define the communications or protocols, you will have an idea of what is required if we have someone else in the future that wants to do something like this? You will have enough information to guide them on the set up?

Tucker Brown: Yes, that is correct.

Mark Dunthorn: Christine just pointed out that if there are additional questions for RITIS we would be happy to set up a meeting to discuss any questions you have with them.

Jay Williams: Any other questions on this item? Hearing no more questions, please vote. This item passes. Now we have a non-voting item from the Central Office.

**SG-5300 Access to district SunGuide from the Central Office**

Mark Dunthorn: We have talked about this in the past. We are maintaining a number of dashboards and reporting for various offices. We have a need for the SunGuide data. We are sending ad hoc requests right now and we greatly appreciate your response. One of our main user needs here is automation so we don’t have to bother you with requests. We get an annual database backup and sometimes we will ask for one in January. That is great and useful for us the only issue is that it is not updated data. It is not current. The last mechanism is the C2C data and is driving the dashboards. We need more complete data for a lot of these requests. Some of the options we have talked about are DAR and for the districts to run a separate instance of DAR. We have looked at the API that RITIS runs and we could implement that. We acknowledge the impact on the District. RCA is another option and is out there with 8.0. There would be no change in SunGuide, the impact for RCA would be comparable to a remote operator, just subscribe and read traffic data from the district, there would be no editing permission. The last option would be C2C which would allow network access from TERL. SunGuide would need to update the C2C schema with more detail and update the C2C provider. It would have a lot more detail, it would also impact the districts sending that detail to us. Central Office is happy with any of these options, we have the infrastructure to get this data, we just need to enhance it. Scheduling wise SunGuide already supports DAR and RCA, the previous voting item will change some things, but we could probably support. If we do RCA, the districts will need to update to 8.0. Early second quarter for each of these but C2C would take a little longer since it requires SunGuide changes. Are any of the three mechanisms preferred?

Mark Laird: One concern I have is if CO can run reports, we run into limits of how many reports can be ran at once.

Mark Dunthorn: There is another JIRA ticket for running reports from a remote district. The RCA option is to subscribe updates to events and TSS we would not be running reports that way. This is a very limited access. Simply EM and RCA.

John Hope: We are in favor of the DAR option so we can set it up and not worry about it or user management and it is more resilient to network changes on our end.

Jason Summerfield: That is a good point since DAR has a lost connection mechanism built in. If there is downtime you will get the data.

Mark Dunthorn: D5 is DAR, D2 DAR is an okay way to way to proceed, CFX we are going with the DAR option, D6 DAR has advantages, D3 supports DAR, D7 prefers DAR, FTE is leaning towards DAR, D1 is having the same conversation and doesn’t know much about the other options so we are okay with DAR. I think we have clear direction here and we will move towards DAR.

**Open Discussion:**

Jay Williams: Now we are into the Open Discussion part of the meeting. I want to open the floor for anyone to bring up any items to the group.

Christine Shafik: As you know this CMB is the cut off for the coming up release. We have a long list of enhancements that have been approved. Due to limitations of resources, we need to make a priority list. We have been successful with getting your priorities and implementing them in that order. I will send the updated lists with all approved enhancements and you tell me your top 25 and we will make it happen this year. There is a quick turnaround so please send it back by Tuesday.

Jay Williams: Does anyone have anything? I have something, we are getting to the end of my term as chairperson. Per the CMB policy, this is the meeting to request nominations for the next CMB chairperson. Does anyone have any nominations? Or you can send an email to me for a nomination. In our next meeting, we will vote on the new chairperson.

Pete Vega: Jay you have done an awesome job! I nominate Amy DiRusso.

Amy DiRusso: I nominate Pete Vega.

Pete Vega: There is rule that past chairperson can’t be a chairperson again.

Jeremy Dilmore: Do we know who has been a chair before?

Christine Shafik: We can let you know.

Eric Gordin: I have been a chairperson which makes me unqualified.

Christine Shafik: Jay we can get together the list of previous chairmen and send out to the group, so we know who is eligible.

Eric Gordin: The CMB chair will have a lot of support from Central Office and SwRI.

Jay Williams: Okay, we will include an item that everyone will vote on in the next meeting. Thanks for the submission. Are there any other open discussion items? Hearing none, we will review the action items.

**Action Items:**

Jay Williams: There were discussion topics for road ranger beat information, there were additional requests related to that and you want to move forward with those separate enhancements, please submit that through the SSUG process and enter in a JIRA ticket.

That was the only action item I heard. Thank you for your participation and we will reach out to schedule the next CMB shortly.