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Christine Shafik: Welcome to the SSUG meeting, we have a few items to discuss today.

**Item 1: SG-5468: DMS Removal Request**

Tucker Brown: When attempting to delete a DMS, the user is required to manually remove references to a DMS before deleting. A list is provided but the list can be extensive. The is helpful because it lets you know that you might have things you are using it for those. But it is tedious to go to each of those and try to remove those from the sign. The proposed change would be to have the system automatically remove all of those references in all of the locations. Any comments?

Mark Laird: How does it behave as device linking?

Tucker Brown: Right now, you can delete just within the device linking only. It will just remove it and I believe it will break the link. That is one of the reasons for this pop-up is to make sure you think about it. One thing we are looking to do is to stitch that back together. The children of that DMS would be linked to the parent of that DMS. That could have weird implications as well so you would need to look at that and make sure you did it right.

Mark Laird: I think I lean toward not doing the device linking removals but to remove all the others.

Tucker Brown: That’s fine, I don’t think that would hurt anything. Device sequencing is the one it could be in and still delete. It would just remove it. The other are required.

Mark Laird: Yes, that could make the list shorter and more manageable.

Tucker Brown: How many people have run into this and is it a problem?

John Hope: District Five is a hard yes. This would be very helpful.

FTE, D4, D6 all agree.

Tucker Brown: Multiple Districts are in favor of this.

Cherie Philips: Would the proposed change be a secondary? So, you would get the original DMS configured conflict message where it points out all the places where there is a conflict? And then a subsequent process where you could go ahead and move those references?

Tucker Brown: It would probably be this exact same dialog but instead of an okay button it would one to automatically fix it for you.

Cherie Philips: If you wanted to cancel out of it, would you have that option as well?

Tucker Brown: Yes. Any other questions?

Mark Laird: What is the final implementation going to be?

Tucker Brown: What it sounded like was don’t do device linking and have the option of bringing this up and seeing the conflict still. Having the option to ignore and fix it yourself or having a button here to fix it for you.

Mark Laird: And if there was any device linking that remains, it would not remove the DMS and you could run it again and get just the list of links that needs to be fixed. Once you fix that then you can delete it and it will really go away.

Tucker Brown: When you say links are you referring to the device linking status?

Mark Larid: Yes.

Tucker Brown: Right now, it will let you delete a sign that is only in device linking. It will just remove it entirely. We could maybe expand it to what it is linked to, but it might be virtual nodes which wouldn’t make a lot of sense. It is more of if it is in your device sequencing you should go take a look at it.

Mark Laird: I would like to get this list down to that and then go fix those and have the list delete it and have it go away for real.

**Item 2: SG-3232: Associating FHP and TSS Alerts to Already Created Events**

Tucker Brown: When picking an event to associate an alarm to, the event list presented is difficult to find the correct event. There is an option to filter this list for “nearby events” and the definition of nearby is a predefined number of miles away. If you don’t have that checked it will put all events in the system. Right now, there is no sort filter. There are definitely some improvements that can be done for this dialog. Some of the items discussed in the issue were to have a numerical sort, distance sort or a grid layout for filtering. I think the most useful would be the grid layout so you can see all of them then doing a distance sort so whichever alert is closest to the event would show up at the top of the list.

John Hope: I think the grid layout would be very helpful as long as the various columns are all selectable. So when you select a certain column it would sort by that column.

Tucker Brown: Yes, if we go to a grid, it will be the same grid structure as for all the other dialogs. You would have filtering and sorting.

Mark Laird: Would distance be one of the columns?

Tucker Brown: We could do that.

Dan Buidens: Will it sort the at, before, and beyond as well?

Tucker Brown: These are only on active events, so it is not just event locations. You won’t have the at, before or beyond for a single event.

Mark Laird: I think you have proposed distance sorted will get the job done.

Kevin Mahaffey: Could you do it both ways as the grid layout and the default be the distance?

Tucker Brown: Yes, that is what I would propose is a grid layout with a default distance sort.

Kevin Mahaffy: Perfect!

Jason Evans: If you do change one of the columns, would it stick for that operator? Or would they have to do it each time?

Tucker Brown: It would be each time, currently we don’t save filtering criteria. Okay, sounds like we are good with that one.

**Item 3: SG-2997: Visibility/Smoke Weather Condition**

Tucker Brown: When this was originally put in, they wanted to add smoke in the weather section. It basically got shot down since smoke is not part of a weather condition. The intent is to allow others like FL511 know that this is a visibility event. This changes because of the way we are doing 8.0. 8.0 will have a list of attributes that you can add to an event. There is a statewide list, and you can hide them if you don’t need them. There will always be a full list there. We are proposing to add smoke to the list of attributes and proposing to send that list to FL511. Then FL511 can choose to display the information however they want to the public. This is another way to get smoke visibility events to FL511.

John Hope: Do you mean a checkbox in the event window?

Tucker Brown: 8.0 is going to have a list of attributes and each one of them can be added to the event. We moved almost all checkboxes into essentially a larger list. You can also add custom attributes so your District has other attributes, and you want to report on those, you can do that as well.

John Hope: So, if you are already adding the ability to add attributes, what is this enhancement proposing?

Tucker Brown: Adding it to the statewide list to make sure everyone has the same attributes and adding to attributes to the FL511.

Ray Mikol: The statewide attributes list, will it be separate from the current weather selection?

Tucker Brown: Weather and attributes will both be there. Attributes is independent of weather.

AJ Skillern: The attributes that Tucker is talking about are rollover, HAZMAT, fire, etc that are in the event details dialog.

**Item 4: Database-Specific Changes**

Tucker Brown: Right now, Districts have the ability to add custom indexes, constraints, and tables to the SunGuide database. Overtime we have seen slight variations in the SunGuide databases, they don’t hurt the running of the system. But during an upgrade process, custom changes can cause a failure in the upgrade scripts. These are normally worked through by running the scripts against a test database, prior to an upgrade.

What we would like to do is have the Districts’ database structure in sync. District would be asked to run a query to give the current state of the database. A report would be generated about differences between the Districts and a recommendation given on how to sync them. Once completed, future database changes would need to be reported to the Central Office to be included in the statewide structure.

I am wondering if anyone wants to give their opinion on that idea.

Mark Laird: Sounds like a good idea to me.

Dan Buidens: Some of the unique scripts that the Districts are using, would there be value in gathering those and distributing them across the state?

Tucker Brown: Yes, and some of that would depend on how they are using them. There are Districts with tables in their database that aren’t related to SunGuide operations. I am not sure what the Districts are using them for so I am not sure how I could accurately let other Districts know about them. It would require input from the Districts using the tables.

Dan Buidens: If the Districts send you these scripts and tables, you would be the middleman and you would have an inventory of them. So, when you push out the update, maybe you can tell your program to look for these things and pull them out.

Tucker Brown: Yes, that is mainly the idea here is to make sure we are aware of all of the differences between them. Being able to write one set of scripts and stating that it would work across the state is the goal.

Dan Buidens: I think it is a good idea.

Tucker Brown: That is all I had.

Christine Shafik: Does anyone else have any other comments or concerns?

Kevin Mahaffy: We are having an issue with 7.2 congestion when it crosses the county line. Is anyone else having issues with it? It is not recognizing we are in the next county.

AJ Skillern: I feel like that has been reported as a JIRA issue. I don’t recall the number off the top of my head. But it does sound like something we have already resolved but haven’t pushed out that hotfix yet. Let me see if I can get that JIRA issue and I will tag you as a watcher.

Kevin Mahaffy: Fantastic, thank you!

Christine Shafik: Anything else? We had a good meeting, thanks for the feedback. Please reach out to me with any questions or concerns. We will be starting the factory acceptance test next Monday followed by a few weeks of testing. We might cancel the next SSUG but will keep you posted.