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

**Item 1: 3029 – Predefined Plans do not Populate Dynamic Vehicle Information**

**Tucker Brown:** Currently when you set up a predefined plan there is no way to use event tags to dynamically populate information from the event. The proposed enhancement is to allow the users to put in those tags. It would look like you are defining a suggested message template. When the predefined plan is loaded into an event, at that point the tag you said would be there would be the same thing as auto-suggesting the message and would replace whatever the message said. If you didn’t have anything available for that field, for instance, if you put a congestion tag in that field and you did not have congestion on the event, it would essentially remove the tag and blank out whatever was there. For priority, we could populate this dynamically or you can set the priority statically as well. Right now, if you suggest a message the priority is defined by how far away the event is from the sign. This enhancement would be to more dynamically be able to produce predefined plans. Are there any comments or suggestions? Would anyone really like this?

**District:** Would this be for predefined plans for silver alerts?

**Tucker:** No, they would still be controlled through suggested messaging. I don’t have a specific use case in mind but if you wanted to put something together more dynamic which was listed in the JIRA issues. This just depends on how people will use it or if they even need to use it. If you are okay with the way predefined messages are done right now, it is possible we don’t need to do this one.

**David:** I have tried to set this up before for vehicle alerts so the operators could go in and select whether it is a primary or secondary and it would fill in all the fields we needed without having to select the DMS group. It would all be filled in for them and that is the only thing I could think of where this would benefit.

**Tucker:** For suggested messages for Silver Alerts and AMBER Alerts there is the ability to pull that in already. If that is what you are looking for, I can help you configure that.

**David:** We get that, it is just when there is a DMS group you have to set the priority and the timer. If we had a predefined plan we could select the messages with the proper priority, timer, and vehicle information. It would cut down on the steps for the operator.

**Tucker:** Does anyone else have any use cases for it? Hearing none, we will move on.

**Item 2: 4794 – Hide the password in “TSS Detector Configuration” Dialog Box**

**Tucker:** Right now, when you type in an OnVIF URL, it would require a user name and password. The password is not a protected field so anyone could have access to the configuration. The enhancement is for anywhere there is a password field to put it as a bulleted number or bulleted string as opposed to the actual password. This would mean that you don’t have the ability to see the passwords of the other users. There is something called radius where you go into the user name or user management and as you type that in it is a bulleted string or if you go into AVL and go into driver that has a password it would do the same thing. Is anyone opposed to that?

**Item 3: 3512 – Clear all lane blockage on closure**

**Tucker:** Right now, when closing an event, the user is forced to manually unblock the lanes prior to closing the event. If you don’t have a lane blockage but you have a response plan, the response plan is automatically terminated, the proposed enhancement would have the lane blockage automatically cleared when the event is closed. It would not prompt the user. A few questions – do you want this, should it warn the user, and are there any performance measure implications with allowing an automatic closure to take place?

I don’t see a huge impact on the actual closure time itself, there might be a slight improvement.

**Alex:** This is something that we would not be interested in. In fact, this would a bit of a pain. We do have some performance measures in reference to notification and any closing/reopening of a lane requires us to notify certain agencies and this enhancement would increase the probability that we don’t do that. I don’t want this to be done.

**Karla:** Same for Turnpike, we would not be interested.

**Dee:** Same for District Four.

**Robbie:** Same for District One.

**John Hope:** If we don’t do this enhancement is there a way to not have it close in the queue?

Is there a way to not have it disappear if it is closed and has an active response plan? That the operator could notice so they could go back and blank signs or clear response plans?

**Tucker:** The response plan is automatically terminated right now so you shouldn’t have active signs. It should take everything down.

**John:** Is there anything remaining to be done in the event that would still stay in the list? Is that something that everyone else would be against?

**Tucker:** Right now, it doesn’t allow you to close the event if you still have things like this. It just warns you. After you manually go through it, you can close the event. You should not be able to close the event if there are remaining action items (lane blockages, response plans, etc.) within the event. As of right now, I don’t think there is a condition like that but it does hang around for an hour so if something does happen you can always bring it back up and reopen it. It sounds like there is a unanimous no for this enhancement.

**Mark D.:** In summary, we will move forward with the first and second enhancements and not do the third. We are in the middle of IV&V for 7.2 we will hopefully get that out shortly. Thank you for your participation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |