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Christine Shafik: Welcome to the SSUG meeting for the purpose of taking notes this meeting will be recorded. We are going to start with a roll call. We have a busy schedule for this meeting, so I am going to turn it over to Tucker to start with the first JIRA issue.

**Item 1: SG-4989: Alternative Travel Time Messages**

Tucker Brown: This has to do with the priority for travel time. Right now, if the travel time has two destinations and one is unavailable, the unavailable one is removed, the message is displayed. If both are unavailable, SunGuide will go to the next template. Here is an example template for A, B, C, D destinations: A and B, B and C, C and D, and D. If A is bad only B will be displayed, if B is bad only A is displayed, if A and B are bad then only C is displayed, if A, B, and C are bad then only D is displayed. The request to change it is if any of the destinations on a single message are bad, then the whole template would fail and drop down to the next one. I have the same set of destination and configuration but a different logic. If A is bad, B and C would be displayed, if A and/or B is bad then C and D would be displayed, if A, B, C are bad, D would only be displayed. If you still wanted the old behavior after doing this enhancement you could still make that happen. You can still set the templates up in a way that reflects the current behavior.

If you have any questions on that let me know. I think this would be a best bet, because you can still get the current behavior but improve how the messages are configured. If you do like the current behavior and we do this, you might have to reconfigure some of your priorities.

Dan Buidens: Is this enhancement only available on 8.0?

Tucker Brown: Is it available on 7.2 we put it in before 8.0. You can have an unlimited number of destinations on your signs. I just chose four. That feature is currently in the system. You will see it when setting up travel times in DMS there is a priority field and you set up multiple templates for a single DMS with different priorities.

Dan Buidens: What is an event occurs or you want to enter a PSA. Can you couple that with travel time?

Tucker Brown: So, you can, the travel time get a priority of whatever is in the config file as what the priority of travel time should be. If the travel time has a lower priority and it has to be the next thing on the priority. It can’t have something between them. And your messaging has to be one phase or else it won’t combine those together. A feature called auto-merge does it, if you have it enabled and the other things done it will work.

Dan Buidens: Thanks, and I like and support the enhancement.

Christine Shafik: are there any other districts who support this idea or enhancement?

Luis Hernandez: District One supports.

Richard Hemming: District Three supports it.

Christine Shafik: Are there any concerns about this enhancement?

John Hope: No concerns.

**Item 2: SG-5112: Reporting times for a cancelled responder**

Tucker Brown: A question came in on the views of reporting. The current state is when a responder is dispatched and then cancelled, the “FIRST\_DSPHVEH\_DISPATCHED\_DATE” is from the first time they were dispatched. SunGuide is storing the first time notified, disregarding the subsequent cancellation. There are two possibilities:

* Dispatch was correct but someone else got there before and RR was cancelled.
* Dispatch was in error and RR was cancelled.

How should this be interpreted? This will have reporting implications on the first dispatched date. My question is has anyone ran into this and how would you interpret this situation?

Luis Hernandez: I would say that if the dispatch was correct, and we are measuring the operator’s performance of dispatching that road ranger to an event, then we would want that dispatch to be the one that is reflected regardless of what happens afterwards.

Shannon Watterson: We agree.

Jason Summerfield: Our operations folks aren’t here right now but I think that is one of the things we should track. If you dispatch someone and the car is gone before they get there, the operator still dispatched them.

Tucker Brown: What I am hearing so far is that we rather interpret the initial one, not the subsequent one where they did arrive?

Dan Buidens: When FHP dispatches from CAD and it says from CAD, is that what we are talking about? Or are we specifically talking about road rangers?

Tucker Brown: It could be any of those, the one we are talking about here is the road rangers. What happens here is that road rangers have agencies and when you dispatch them the agencies that they are associated to gets a dispatch time. The one you are talking about would put a similar timestamp if that one came before this, but this is specifically catered to road rangers.

Richard Hemming: How would this effect reporting for the road rangers?

Tucker Brown: If we are talking about road rangers it is dispatch to arrival time and those you can usually take the cancellation into consideration. It would depend on the report and they usually look at the criteria there. This is more geared towards an agency being notified to do something and puts that timestamp in.

Jason Summerfield: The first case is process but the operator did dispatch so that should be the dispatch time. The second one, where the dispatch was an error, and they were cancelled sounds like it should be handled with an audit later.

Tucker Brown: I don’t know how those are handled. I don’t know if they are audited out or just left as cancelled.

Jason Summerfield: That is the only thing I can think of to differentiate now. Unless there is a difference in cancelled and cancelled error or something like that.

Tucker Brown: If we need to tell the difference between those two situations, we will need to add something because this doesn’t tell us that right now. So far, we have heard three opinions that the dispatch time is the dispatch time and that is how we are going to handle it. Does anyone want to make a case for the other? Alright, hearing none we will move on.

**Item 3: SG-5122: Blank at end of IP address causes failure.**

Tucker Brown: The current state when you enter an IP address, any characters including whitespace are allowed in the IP address field, there is no validation on that field. The issue that came up was that there was whitespace on the end of an IP address and that saved which caused issues and couldn’t read it. We can’t limit to IP addresses so it could also be hostname.

The enhancement is to trim off any whitespace but allow all other characters due to their potential use in hostnames. I don’t see a huge problem with this and the best we can do is trim off the whitespace.

David Roark: Would it be worth looking into expanding that into other areas of SunGuide? We have this same issue with DMS messaging if there is space at the end of the message it causes it to fail.

Tucker Brown: So, trimming at the end of the message in a DMS response plan?

David Roark: Right, and I have seen it in other areas as well if you have a space at the end of the screen, then it causes an error.

Tucker Brown: I am not opposed to that.

Christine Shafik: Is there a way to identify the areas? We should list them and update the JIRA. Do any other districts support this idea?

Jason Summerfield: Are you going to trim the field itself when someone goes to save if there is whitespace?

Tucker Brown: Yes.

Mark Laird: Are you going to trim left, and right?

Tucker Brown: Yes.

John Hope: You are talking about all devices and all addresses? Any field that you can have a hostname or IP.

Tucker Brown: Yes.

Richard Hemming: District Three has no issue with this request.

**Item 4: SG-5660: RISC Module: Once you click “All Lanes Cleared”, you can’t arrive any other equipment.**

Tucker Brown: This has to do with the 8.0 version of the RISC module. The current state it was assumed in the requirements that all vehicles would be onsite before the lanes were cleared. Clearing the lanes is an indication the RISC has concluded. The enhancement here would allow equipment timestamps to be modified after the “All Lanes Cleared” has been set. What is the “closure” criteria for a RISC event? There needs to be some way to know that RISC has been completed and maybe that is an operator marking RISC as completed. It would hang around the event until the event is done. Do we need closure criteria for the RISC event? Let me know if you have questions on this. I know a lot of you have not had the chance to use this yet in 8.0.

Alex Mirones: We are not currently using this, but it absolutely makes sense, and I would be in support of it. I would be cautious about giving an hour timestamp to close the event.

Tucker Brown: It is when the event leaves the system as well. So, the RISC is tied to the event and you work that. Once the event closes it hangs around for what I believe is an hour in the closure state. At that point it gets removed from the map for no future edits. Is that okay?

Alex Mirones: That makes sense.

Tucker Brown: Any other comments?

Dan Buidens: Why do these need to be modified in the first place?

Tucker Brown: This is when the equipment is requested and when it arrives on scene, they are both logged.

Dan Buidens: Then when all lanes are cleared you want to be able to manipulate those times?

Tucker Brown: Yes, that was the request. Even though the lanes are cleared, the equipment might not be there yet.

Dan Buidens: Okay, I am with you.

Luis Hernandez: In those cases, if additional equipment was requested and the lanes were cleared but the equipment came on site, is there a button or a timestamp to indicate when that additional equipment was requested?

Tucker Brown: Currently no and that is what this is trying to get you to be able to do.

Karla Smith: We support the idea of being able to put those times in.

Luis Hernandez: District One is not using this yet but supports this and making it more realistic to what is happening on scene.

Christine Shafik: Any other thoughts?

Mike Crawson: We agree with District One.

Shannon Watterson: District Five agrees.

Richard Hemming: District Three as well.

**Item 5: SG-5706: Add timestamp in SunGuide incident when Executive Notification Emails are sent.**

Tucker Brown: Right now, in the chronology, the executive notifications are logged into the event when the notification is generated, but nothing is logged when the notification is sent. The enhancement is to add a chronology entry when the executive notification is sent. That is a better way to track it.

Karla Smith: The Turnpike likes it.

Ray Mikol: If this were to be added into the EM window, it would send a timestamp to every executive notification including updates, correct?

Tucker Brown: Correct. Right now, you get notifications when the executive notification gets generated. Anytime you send out an update it would add a timestamp.

Ray Mikol: District One requested this, so we obviously support it.

Richard Hemming: District Three supports it as well.

Mike Crawson: District Seven as well.

Tucker Brown: Anyone else on that one?

Those were all of the issues.

**Announcements:**

Tucker Brown: Hotfix 3 was released last week. If you have not deployed 8.0 yet and you are, please bring the system all the way to this hotfix as part of the upgrade. It contains several bug fixes as well. If you need help setting these up, please let us know.

Release 8.0 Hotfix 4 was sent to the TERL yesterday to start testing. This is almost all enhancements. We do not have an official release date yet but should be the next few weeks.

The next SSUG meeting is 4/29/2021 and will be the Design Review for 8.1. As you can see, we broke up the enhancements for this year into multiple hotfixes and releases. This is the last design review for this release cycle. We will get the slides to you to review prior to the meeting probably late next week.

The other reminder we have is as you bring 8.0 online there is a new C2C data type called telemetryData. This data type will provide Central Office with visibility into which SunGuide components are deployed in each district, as well as current release information. Please reach out if you run into any problems configuring your production SunGuide or C2C infrastructure to support this data. As you come online with 8.0 just remember that.

John Hope: Do you know which collector is interested in it?

Tucker Brown: The one at the TERL.

John Hope: There is more than one at the TERL.

Mark Dunthorn: There is one collector and a separate extractor for each district. So, it is the collector that gets everything except traffic data. I can send you the IP address.

John Hope: Okay, I just want to make sure it is in the right place.

Tucker Brown: I think that was it so I will turn it back over to Central Office.

Christine Shafik: Hotfix 3 does all the fixes for all the issues we found from deploying 8.0 in a couple of districts. Please be sure to do this prior to hurricane season. Please keep me posted on the expected deployment date. Send me an email or put it on my calendar, I need to coordinate it statewide with SwRI and RITIS. Any questions regarding 8.0?

Mark Laird: The recent issues we found in 8.0 are not in hotfix 3, correct?

Tucker Brown: Correct. Hotfix 3 was current until 2 weeks ago, anything after that are not included. There are still D6 outstanding issues that are not in hotfix 3.

Mark Laird: My biggest concern is EM out of sync and having to restart it all the time. It is painful.

Christine Shafik: Where are you on the EM issue?

Tucker Brown: I would have to look at it specifically. How often are you restarting it?

Mark Laird: I am not sure; we are at the point to where they try to do it as quickly as possible. We are trying to get a chance to capture more data, but it is more than once a day.

Tucker Brown: Can they call us before they do that?

Mark Laird: We have asked them to do that and sent a reminder to not do it. Hopefully we will get more information for you soon.

Margaret Treiber: Is it a significantly larger database? We have had to significantly increase out disc space and it looks like it was 50% bigger after the update. Is that consistent with what you have been seeing?

Tucker Brown: Yes, it is larger and the reason for that is instead of storing timestamps for what they are every single time, they now contain time zone information as well. There are a few changes, and more data was added. The sizing issue on the upgrade is the transaction log will grow as well but once it is done you can shrink it back down to its normal size. Yes, the overall database size will increase after the run.

Christine Shafik: Mark Laird will you shed some light on OTM?

Mark Laird: OTM 4.6 is required if you are using OTM. It hasn’t had any issues since we upgraded to 8.0. It primarily deals with the time date format and the event attributes.

Christine Shafik: Any other questions?

Dan Buidens: Can we go back to the dispatching entry question? I wanted to try to understand what the enhancement is. Can you tell me what the enhancement will do?

Tucker Brown: In this case it didn’t sound like anyone wanted to change the behavior. The enhancement here would have been to distinguish the fact of which was an error, and which was correct or interpret the dispatch field different. But what it sounded like was that everyone wanted to leave it as is so this will be closed out.

Dan Buidens: Okay, if there is not universal buy in to make a change then it is not worth talking about.

Christine Shafik: Any other questions, concerns, or comments? As Tucker mentioned earlier our next meeting is a Design Review so please have your operations people attend. We appreciate all of your input today.