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

**Item 1: 4936 – Add Roadway Filter to Monthly Performance Measures Report**

**Tucker Brown:**  The first change is for reports and to add a roadway filter to the performance measures report. Currently, when running the report, we need to know the date and the county. The request only mentions the monthly reports but while we are making the change, we would update the weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annual reports as an optional parameter. The default would be to include all roadways and run as it does now. Are there any issues or comments on that?

**Kevin Mehaffy:** Would it be possible to select multiple counties as well?

**Tucker Brown:** That should be doable but it does change some of the stuff we do for reporting right now. That is a larger change and I don’t know that parameters allow selecting multiple counties so there would be changes to that.

**John Hope:** District Five is in favor of that.

**Tucker Brown:** Multiple roads or just counties?

**Mark Laird:** I think both.

**Christine Shafik:** So, I heard Districts Three and Five, are there any other districts that are interested?

**Jason Summerfield:** District Two is interested.

**Jacques Dupuy:** District Four.

**Robbie Brown:** District One is interested as well.

**Item 2: 2364 – Log username of user that changes device status**

**Tucker Brown:**  Right now we do run device status changes and we can run reports but we cannot determine the user who changes it or possibly the system is not logged into the database to record these changes. So, when you run the report, you don’t know who made the change. The request is to add a user name to the database and log the user or the subsystem that makes the status change. Say you have a camera and you want to pan it and the driver came back with an error, so the sub-system would put that into an error state. The most helpful thing you would get out of this is if a user changes something to out of service or changes something from out of service to active. You would be able to see and filter on that if you were able to make changes to the device status. Are there any questions?

Would you use this or is it a low priority?

**Jason Summerfield:** I get asked a lot if something is in or out of service so it would be useful.

**Chrissie Collins:**  From a security perspective it would be a good feature to have.

**Jay Williams:** District Five is in favor of this as well.

**Tucker Brown:** It seems like we have agreement from a lot of districts. Does anyone have any proposed changes to this?

**Jason Summerfield:** If a detector is going in and out, is there any method of suppressing any repeated log messages?

**Tucker:** Like as far as a status log?

**Jason Summerfield:** Yes, I can see detectors going in and out multiple times and it would be logging it multiple times. I am just wondering how much signal will be in that kind of noise. You are right; the sub-system will be doing most of the statuses.

**Mark Laird:** Tucker, you said these were already being run and we are just adding the user to them?

**Tucker Brown:** That is correct.

**Mark Laird:** So, there are no new log messages being generated?

**Tucker Brown:** Correct. I think we have what we need on that one. We can move on.

**John Hope:** Before we move on, the first enhancement (Item 1), District Five had an additional discussion and they are in favor of multiple selecting roadways.

**Tucker Brown:** Roadways and counties for multiple selections?

**John Hope:** Yes, please.

**Item 3: 4948 – Auto-Merge and Manual Merge with Travel Time are Inconsistent**

**Tucker Brown:** Right now, when you auto-merge a message there is a limitation in the software where it will do a maximum of two phases. If you have a single event message up, then you have a two-phase travel time, it will essentially hack off half of your travel time and you will only get one of the two phases. It still tracks that the travel time is two phases, if it goes down, it puts it back together as two phases. Really, all it does is when it gets merged it knocks it down to two phases. There is a different behavior when you manually merge, there is no maximum number of phases. If a two-phase event message is merged with a two-phase travel time message, it will be a four-phased message. MUTCD says that you shouldn’t do three but it is not a software limitation.

The proposed change would be that manually merging messages are to follow a maximum of two phases, like auto-merge. Essentially it would allow a maximum number of phases (two). So, if you had a single-phase event message and wanted to merge it with two-phase travel time, you would get the same auto-merge process and it would sort it down to a two-phase message instead of a three-phase.

Are people manually merging those? Are you having issues merging one phase into two phases? Should we cap it at a maximum of two phases (always) or should the maximum number of phases be configurable?

**John Hope:** The concept of hard coding gives us pause because the operational procedure may change. Currently, we are stuck to only a few phases but that may change in the future. The configuration parameter may help. The main intent of this was to have something that would split up the travel time. Currently, the operational procedures say they can’t have more than two phases if we have a two-phase travel time. If you have an incident event, you can’t use the travel time at all if they are trying to manually merge.

**Tucker Brown:** I am not hearing a lot of responses on this, but let me ask a different question. If you were to make it where merging allows this possibility, are people doing merges manually and would this cause them problems? I am trying to gauge people’s tolerance for how we change this.

**Mark Laird:**  I think it is unclear to what would happen if this changed and you had a two-phased travel time. Does it mean you can’t do the merge?

**Tucker Brown:** The idea here is the first message on the top of the queue, if you set a maximum of two phases, it would have to be a single phase. If it is two phases it would do absolutely nothing. Whatever is on top of the queue must have one phase. The next thing on the queue that it has to merge with if it has more than one phase, whatever is after phase one would just get hacked off and it would merge the first phase of the second message with the primary message. There is no way in travel time to set which one goes first.

**Shannon Watterson:** A useful situation for us would be if you had your travel time and a silver alert is activated and now we have a silver alert message posted and then we have a crash occur. I would want to send a one-page message with my lane blockage crash information and I want to manually merge it with the travel time so I then have my crash message and one of the travel times and have my silver alert message remain at the bottom of the queue.

**Tucker Brown:** I guess I should have asked this question first, does anyone know for sure that they are using manual merging consistently? If you are not then it wouldn’t affect you anyway.

**Jason Summerfield:** I think we are because we have problems with merging in the past and we never turned it back on.

District One is manually merging signs. We do not merge incidents with travel times. It would be two different incident messages.

**Tucker Brown:** Do you ever go to three phases?

**District One:** No, just two.

**District Four:** There is never more than two.

**Tucker Brown:** Is District Four manual merge too?

**District Four:** Yes, we do from time to time.

**Tucker Brown:** It sounds like there is a number of people who are manually merging and it sounds like no one is going over two phases anyway. If we made it configurable we could do whatever you want. It should affect your manually merging as it stands today. If nobody has an issue with that then I think we can move forward with it and how you merge today and give additional features.

**Item 4: 4527 – Operators requesting to have data sort feature added**

**Tucker Brown:** The title is slightly misleading on this issue, I pulled it directly from the issue title. The actual issue here is when you are running multiple organizations from the single physical installation, the example being Chipley and Pensacola. There is a need to split reporting to isolate the individual centers. This is done by setting the organization parameter of the event so it can filter in the reports but this is a manual process and could lead to errors. Currently, if you want to do this there is a way we do this with certain districts and we create multiple organizations and when you get into the event process, you have to manually set which organizations you want. One would come up by default and if you want a different one than the default then you would have to manually go set that one up. That works as long as everyone knows of the process in place if they don’t then we could get errors or not have events counted.

One solution is that we can add an organization field to the user, and default the event to the organization assigned to the user. The other way to do it is organizations could be defined geographically and default to the organization that the event’s latitude and longitude correspond to. I think with either one of these options there could be ups and downs. I am throwing it out to the group to find out how to use these.

**Jacques Dupuy:** We have three different ones here and it is not always the same operator doing the same. When you add the field to the user, do they have to change it every time they manage something different?

**Tucker Brown:** They would have to manually reset it which would lead to the original problem. That one doesn’t work. My question is does the geographical boundary work?

**Jacques Dupuy:** Yes.

**Tucker Brown:** So, they are distinctively different areas that they are monitoring?

**Jacques Dupuy:** Yes.

**Tucker Brown:** Here is the problem I get into on that one, if you can geographically make a boundary of one county then you can make a boundary for another county but the organization does all three. How do you define that boundary over the top of the other ones and how would you get the event set to that organization? I can see that if you have overlapping geographical boundaries how that could be a problem. Are they different counties than the two you listed before Palm Beach and Broward?

**Jacques Dupuy:** Yes, so after Palm Beach and Broward then there are three more. And those three are connected into one.

**Tucker Brown:** So, they are distinctively different and you don’t have geographical overlaps?

**Jacques Dupuy:** That is correct.

**Tucker Brown:** So that is one group and geographically it works for them. District Three, would one of these work for you?

**David Roark:** The first one would be the only one that would work and cover the nights and weekend issues. It would cover the same place geographically as the satellite TMC so the geographic part wouldn’t work for us. If the group decided to go with the first option, there is another alternative. You could set up different logins for those individuals.

**Tucker Brown:** Yes, you can do that but if you have to run user-level reports for a single user, you would have to combine all three of those. Does anyone else have this type of problem?

**Jay Williams:** I think we could utilize this functionality more so tied to the user than geographically. We have a situation where we have two separate contracts that cover various roadways in our districts. So, them having the ability to run reports for each individual contractor would be beneficial and there is some geographic overlap.

**Mark Laird:** Can the report page have this organization selection default to the user’s organization?

**Tucker Brown:** When the reports are run, it basically has a whole list of the organizations and yes, it could default to one on the users’ end. I think if you are running at that level the person running the reports, get them at all levels. I think the bigger issue here is getting the right data in the database. I think in the end people are going to run reports on the organization.

**Ray Mikol:** Is there any way to add this to the SunGuide login screen? So, the user can log in and choose which site they are working at and the login screen would take them there?

**Tucker Brown:** I see where you are going with that and I would hate to put it on the login screen because it wouldn’t fit everyone’s needs. I could see doing something like when you login you are able to set particular sites for that session and change their own. If they had the ability to do this without reconfiguring users, would that work? Is setting it after the login acceptable or will people forget to do it?

**Jacques Dupuy:** For us in District Four, after the login would be okay.

**Ray Mikol:** After login should be fine.

**Tucker Brown:** It sounds like if they are able to reset their organization at any point without having the user-level configuration permissions and they would set them themselves. Does that work for everyone?

**Jacques Dupuy:** Sounds good to me.

**Mark Laird:** Will that require auditing in case they forget to change it?

**Tucker Brown:** Yes, I am debating whether we have to set the organization field as an audit field right now but you should be able to audit the organization.

**Christine Shafik:** Thank you, Tucker. I do appreciate the conversation and all of the feedback on the items. Please keep the conversation going as to how we prioritize enhancements.

**John Hope:** Before we adjourn I have a question. District Five wants to integrate some cameras from local agencies but they have password protection on their cameras. I think we have discussed this in the past and didn’t know if there is a ticket or some enhancement that encompasses this.

**Christine Shafik:** I am not aware of any ticket. Tucker are you aware of one?

**Tucker Brown:** The one discussed was that OnVIF required a user name and password. We talked about password protecting a particular field when you type it in it shows bullets instead of the actual text. Are the cameras you are implementing NTCIP with password protection?

**John Hope**: Yes, I believe so.

**Tucker Brown:** There are two things in the field. Yes, they can be password protected and still have their community and rewrite names be different than the user names and passwords. However, I believe Bosch requires that they be the same. In that case, you would essentially be putting plain text in the password. So, there is password protection on the community name field as well.

**John Hope:** Is this something we need an enhancement for?

**Tucker Brown:** There would need to be something done to change the software for password protection.

**John Hope:** Okay, I will submit a ticket then.

**Christine Shafik:** That was a good conversation. If there is nothing else, that will conclude the meeting.
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