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

1. SG 4776 Ignore Out of Service Cameras when Finding Closet Camera to an Event

Tucker: When you go to find the closest camera to an event, currently it takes you to the closest camera (geographically) to the event. There is a disregard camera that isis currently “Out of Service” when searching for the nearest camera. It would just be a quicker way to do this. This is not a big task and I wanted to open it up to see if anyone has any questions or comments on this.

Mark Dunthorn: Just for the sake of prioritizing, who would be interested in using this? We want to gauge the level of interest.

Mark Laird: District Six requested it so yes, we will be using it.

Aven Morgan: District Three would use it, this would be great.

Jacques Dupuy: I agree too.

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

Tucker: The next issue is allowing DMS graphics to be defined in an EM Template. Currently, if you go to put graphics into a response plan, it looks for two things:

1. Does the DMS support graphics?
2. Is there a graphic defined for the particular event type?

If those two things are true, it is going to try to put the image in there with the text. It will do its best to alter the text so both the text and graphics fit. If they don’t, the graphic will be forced out. The request is that there is no way to tell the software to exclude the graphic. The request was made to make that an option in the template feature.

You would be operating the EM templates to basically have a checkbox for the graphic. If you want the graphic, it will allow you to get the exact same behavior. It will also allow you to indicate that you do not want graphics and will use that as the default template. If we do that it would never attempt to put graphics on the sign. It would also allow you to specify per event type if you want to use a graphic. The templates are broken out by event types. It would give you a lot more flexibility on when graphics apply to response plans instead of always being there. Are there any questions?

Jason: So, this doesn’t allow you to determine what the graphic is?

Tucker: Right now, the graphic is tied to the event type. Are we looking to make it where you can use the template with any graphic?

Jason: Right now, it is tied to the roadway.

Tucker: I would think it is tied to the event type but either way it is to force you to use a particular one. The problem with that is it is a lot more specific and you would have to make a template per sign, per category which you can do but it is more work to configure.

Jason: So, the behavior right now as we see it, if graphics are enabled at all and if you create an RPG message it uses the roadway of the incident location. So, if you have a sign on I95 and you create an incident on I95 it will put a giant I95 shield on the sign which is redundant because they are already on I95. If you are not on I95 it would be useful but it would be an off-route template. I don’t believe there is an incident type defined set of graphics that we have been permitted to use.

Tucker: Are you more interested in a template that allows you to stick a specific graphics or do we want categories of graphics to use?

Jason: I think that was the initial idea to have a flag that says roadway graphic.

Tucker: So, you want to be able to choose the roadway graphic or event type graphic? And that is dependent on if there is a graphic defined.

Mark Laird: I do remember seeing event type graphics and producing messages that had them. We haven’t done it in a while. If you don’t have the graphics created, maybe we do the one route template and we have the graphics revert to the roadway graphics because it doesn’t have an event type. Is this possible?

Tucker: Yes, I was thinking of the ordering if it was event type then roadway or roadway then event type.

Mark Dunthorn: So, do we need further research in the discussion to flush this out?

Tucker: We are trying to make this more useful so what is the most useful option? Roadway graphic, event type graphic, or set a specific graphic? What are people trying to with Response Plans and how can we make it easier?

Jason: Right now, we don’t have a choice it is either roadway graphic or nothing. We are trying to find a way to toggle the roadway graphic on or off. On route, we don’t want it, off the route we do. But for the future would we want to change it? No one has a standardized set of approved incident graphics and the concern was having multiple pictures across the state for one type of incident. The flag could be done as long as we could assign a generic on route or off route. Right now, it is a roadway, not event type. The simple part is that if you can toggle on and off then it would be helpful and would cover our immediate use case.

Tucker: Are there any other comments on that? Do you agree with what he said?

Mark Laird: Yes.

Tucker: How many people are interested in using graphics on response plans?

Dee McTague: District Four is interested.

Jason: District Two is interested.

1. Update Camera Blocking Functionality to Not Require VS Subsystem SG-4727

Right now, if you want to use camera blocking, and you have a camera that has an embedded encoder or decoder you can’t use the camera blocking functionality until you set up a source. You can set up a dummy source to use the camera blocking functionality.

Are there a lot of you that still have external encoders/decoders?

Mark Dunthorn: If you need to go back and do some research please do and just let us know.

Aven: Our decoders are internal.

District 5: I believe we still have a few out there.

Tucker: We are looking to allow camera blocking to be applied to a camera and not just a source. And want to maintain a single dialog that has both the sources and the cameras with the ability to block cameras. If that is something that people like we can go that route. It sounds like the video switching is being used less. Does anyone have any issues with not setting up the dummy anymore? Does setting up the dummy annoy people or is it not a big deal?

District: I would say it is annoying because they show up on inventory reports.

District 5: I had a similar issue and couldn’t get rid of the old cameras.

Tucker: If anyone else agrees, you can email Central Office and let them know.

1. Email Template for Response Plans SG-4682

Right now, you have a single template that is going to generate emails for you. It is not really that flexible. We would like to make the email templates similar to what we have for DMS. We would have a default template and then an event type. It would be a better configuration of what the email template would like for different event types. Is the event type specific enough?

Mark Laird: Something that came up in discussion years ago was the first message when you create an event, do an update and close it. They were all potentially different. I don’t remember the details.

Tucker: The closure email we talked about before and people said they were okay with it. Is event type enough and people can handle the differences manually? Any thoughts on that?

Mark Laird: I would need to ask Alex before I can answer that. The other thing that was being discussed was the response plan ConOps stuff. The subject of the messages being configurable but I don’t remember the details.

Tucker: You wouldn’t have a single subject you would want to base it on the event parameters as well?

Mark Laird: I think there was something else that could be included but I am not sure what it was. It may have been in the updates, a change in severity, identify a fatality, HAZMAT. Maybe there are operations people on the line that could provide some insight on if it is needed or not?

Aven: What would be the overall benefit of having it more configurable than what is going through SunGuide now?

Tucker: Right now, you are getting a single template that is always putting out the same information. The new one would give you the ability to change the format and information shown based on the event type. Mostly formatting for what you want to send out.

District 5: We would want to have it configurable for sure.

District 4: We want it as well.

District 1: We want it too.

District 3: Us too.

Mark Laird: The two variables right now are if event type is enough of a characteristic to define the template you want to use. Or is there something different for new and update? Is there a need to have a template for the subject line as well? I just remember there was some mention of this in the RPG ConOps.

Tucker: I would have to go back and try to dig out the ConOps.

Mark Dunthorn: It was like ten years ago. Mark, you wrote it right?

Tucker: I might be able to dig that up and see if there is anything else. But it sounds like there is plenty of interest in this.

Mark Dunthorn: We did get some good feedback. If you need to go back to your operations folks please add any comments in JIRA. It is there for you to use and collaborate about these issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Look for old RPG ConOps | Tucker, Mark Laird |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |