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Christine Shafik: Good afternoon SSUG Team. Thank you for joining the meeting this afternoon. As you know, we’re going to discuss the Design Review for SunGuide 8.1 Hotfix 3. We are going to start with the Roll Call. This meeting is being recorded for the purpose of taking notes.

Following the Roll Call, Christine turned the meeting over to Tucker Brown to start the Design Review.

**Topic 1. SG-5865 - Improve EM DMS suggestions if message does not fit**

Tucker Brown: When you first get a message suggestion, you get it into the tab for the Suggestions screen, and there is no direct editing in this screen. So, it’s still going to show up blank, but it’s going to have text along with this – either above or somewhere in the box. It’s basically going to say, this DMS is still suggested, but the abbreviated message does not fit. So, you will still see it in here, but you’re not going to be able to do anything until you accept that DMS. Part of the reason is there is no sense in having the user fix it if they are not even going to accept that one. So, as soon as you press the Accept button, and you basically transition it from the Suggestions tab to the Current Plan tab, you’re going to be prompted with what looks like the Add Message dialog. But on the top of it, it’s going to have the original message, essentially indicating this is what is supposed to be there. And then below, originally it would appear blank, but then you can fill it in how you want to fill it in to make it fit.

There was an open question here – Do you want the original message without abbreviations, or maybe with the abbreviations that are Priority 0 which always get applied? Maybe that version. Or do we want it to be a fully abbreviated version that still may not fit exactly. And then have that in the bottom half to be able to fix it from there? So, that is an open question of how do we want to deal with what message gets sent back to the user? But essentially this is the dialog where you fix that, and then it will allow you to insert that into the message. You would be required to fix it in some way or another. Whatever you type into this, whatever you end up with as the message here, and you click OK on the bottom right, that’s the message that is going to go on the DMS in the Current Plan tab. You can then further edit it from there, but you wouldn’t end up with a blank, and you would have the option of knowing exactly what the message was supposed to be.

The other option here is that you’re already on the Current Plan tab and you hit something like Add DMS. That does a suggestion, as well. And if that suggestion again is too large to fit, when that sign comes back to be added to the current plan, you would get this exact same dialog to say, you asked this DMS to be added. It can’t fit. Please fix it and then we’ll add it to the actual plan. So, two ways you can get to this dialog. One from accepting suggestions and one from adding a DMS to a current response plan. In either case, it will give you the message and allow you to fix it.

So, open question - What do you think the top half where it says Original Message should be? Should it be the abbreviate version where all of it is abbreviated, or the original message?

Kelly Kinney: I would agree with including the approved abbreviations, not just the Priority 0, but all abbreviations. If it’s still not fitting with the approved abbreviations, that would be a good starting point rather than the operator just choosing what words they feel are appropriate to abbreviate.

Tucker Brown: Okay, so fully abbreviated message.

Oswald Gonzalez: I agree that it should have the abbreviations so the operator is aware of what the words are that are already abbreviated before proceeding.

Mark Laird: Once you make changes to this, can you check it from here to find out if it fits? The newly modified?

Tucker Brown: The bottom half here is going to be the size of the sign. So, as long as it’s not wrapping here, you should be fine.

Mark Laird: Okay, And if you go back to the plan and you try to activate it, and you didn’t make it fit, it will give you that same thing back again, right?

Tucker Brown: No. If you made it fit here, and assuming that – the only way it might not happen is if you have a sign that is not being font managed. And the font you have in SunGuide doesn’t match the one in the field. In that case, it might get rejected. And in that case we can’t do anything about it because SunGuide doesn’t know the actual sizing then. But in every other case here so long as the bottom half looks like you want it to, then that’s how it’s going to come out.

Mark Laird: Yes. We have had some WYSIWYG issues that didn’t quite exactly represent what it could hold. But I think most of them have been resolved now.

Tucker Brown: Yes. So long as the font is correct of the one that you’re sending out, the sizing of that should match the one on the sign. And if there is a case where it doesn’t, then that actually more of a DMS/font related issue than an issue with the response plan. Because there should not be a case where it affects the message. Especially if you are monitoring fonts and you send it out and the sign says No, it can’t fit. Somewhere in the logic of how we’re sizing that sign is incorrect then.

Mark Laird: Yes. Whatever it is, we still need something to go up. Even if it isn’t on that sign right now, and we can take it away or something. We need to get the event handled.

John Hope: Will this group together multiple signs that are having the same issue?

Tucker Brown: No, because of the potential for sizing. We’d have to go lowest common denominator on those. We could, but you’d end up with the lowest common denominator. The other option there too, is based on the device templates and how you have those set up, you might actually end up with different messaging based on the template per sign.

John Hope: So in other words, if you have five different signs that are having this issue, operators are going to have to correct this five different times?

Tucker Brown: Potentially, yes. Is that common? My understanding of this is that it is one or two signs per response plan, normally when this happens.

John Hope: It depends on what is going out. If this is a Silver Alert, you could possibly have a whole bunch of them.

Tucker Brown: So, what about the caveat that it could potentially be applied to signs. It definitely has to apply to signs with the same messaging. Or actually - do you want to make that, as well. We could group them all into one. But that means you get one message and one sizing. And it’s got to be the least common denominator or else it won’t fit on all of them.

John Hope: Could you group it based on the size of the sign and the font?

Tucker Brown: And message? Or so potentially you could have two fonts the same size and the same characteristics on the sign, but also they have different messaging.

John Hope: Gotcha. Yes, it would have to be the messaging, as well. It may not be worth it, but…

Tucker Brown: And that’s where this gets funny. If we can apply that it’s almost got to be the same size sign, with the same font, and the same message.

Cherie Phillips: Might there be a way to apply logic that if they were all the same sizes, that you could do an Apply to All the same size. That way if you ‘re approving this and there may be two different sizes that you would approve one for all of those size, and then move on to the next message, and approve whatever adjustments to that one. Is that a possibility?

Tucker Brown: The problem with this arbitrarily approving messages for a sign is without knowing what signs those are in advance, you can’t really tell which ones that would actually fit on. And in that case, you’d just be saying, Yes, apply it to this one. But based on font and size that may not be the accurate way to do it.

Cherie Phillips: So, if we have three different DMS sizes, and we apply a certain consistent font to all of those… Maybe a better question to all of the districts is – Do you guys have different fonts on different DMSs? Because if we’re all trying to be consistent with the font on each of the same size DMSs, then this may not be an issue and it would be okay to approve it. It’s only really if we have variations in our environment for the same size DMSs.

John Hope: District 5 definitely has multiple font throughout the system. Largely because we have different makes and models and sizes that were deployed during a variety of projects. There is inconsistency in District 5, not intentionally, but there is.

Jason Summerfield: Same with District 2.

Brent Poole: Same with CFX.

Dee McTague: And District 4.

Jason Summerfield: It’s probably going to be pretty common, especially as projects have been generational. So, every so many years you get new projects, new signs, and it’s the newest stuff hot off the market. Which can do more than your last generation signs. Sorry to make it complicated.

Tucker Brown: I’m not opposed to grouping them. That’s just the part that makes it complicated. I would say that if you do have signs of the same size font and message, we could automatically apply that same message to all the signs that have that configuration, then you would be less.

Mark Laird: That seems like it should handle a lot of the cases. It may only have to do a couple of edits to get all of them. Maybe three. That would help a lot.

John Hope: In any case, however, the mock-up that you have says, “The message does not fit on the selected sign.” Instead of saying “on the selected sign”, can we say, “on and then list out the one or multiple DMS names”, so the operator knows exactly which DMS you’re looking at?

Tucker Brown: Regardless of this we’d like to see the sign name here. And if it’s more than one, list all of the signs where this is going to apply.

John Hope: Even if it’s only one, listing the name of the sign would be preferred.

Tucker Brown: Right.

Cherie Phillips: What are the thoughts about providing more information surrounding the reasoning why it’s not fitting on the selected sign? So, if I’m trying to do something often times if I‘m trying to fill out a form, and there are only a certain amount of characters, and it tells me “You’ve exceeded it by 8 characters”, then I know what I’m working with, or how significant there is in the abbreviations that I may need to apply. How easy might that be to capture in this?

Tucker Brown: I’m not quite sure I understand. The message that you’re getting is the most abbreviated message the system knows of.

John Hope: Do you mind if I try to answer that? If you look at the mock-up that’s being shown, at the bottom half where it says New Message. To the left of the white text box there is a preview. And as you are typing in the white text box, the preview updates. And that will tell you what will actually fit on each line. So that as you are deleting or typing in new words, it will automatically update in the preview. So instead of actually telling you that it’s 8 characters too long, you can actually see it in the preview.

Tucker Brown: Okay. Thank you. I think I misunderstood that question.

John Hope: Does that make sense?

Cherie Phillips: Yes, I understand. Thank you.

Brent Poole: Quick question on this. Has there been any thought to changing the message to be able to send it out to multiple DMSs? For example, if this pops up because the message is too long to fit on a certain 3-line sign, but I’ve got 10 or 15 3-line signs selected, and it’s just one or two signs that are throwing this error, is there a way to adjust the message that’s put out to all the DMSs so it’s consistent across all of them?

Tucker Brown: Yes. Are you saying, you have 10 signs, and it doesn’t fit on two of them? And you want to change the messaging for all of them to be consistent so that those two will fit? Is that what you’re saying?

Brent Poole: Yes. So the message displayed that everyone sees is consistent across the entire roadway.

Tucker Brown: So, the remedies there are either add more abbreviations, or change the device template that all of them are using to generate, to possibly generate less text.

Brent Poole: Okay.

John Hope: Another thought, Brent. I would assume that after you click OK on this window, you would go to the window that you get where it lists out all the different DMS signs. You should be able to select all of them right there and edit a single message for everything that is selected.

Brent Poole: Yes, I’m thinking more along the lines of a one size fits all type of thing. So if we know that two signs out of the 10 that are selected are smaller for whatever reason, or have different fonts or some type of messaging constraints, that would be identified and it’s just one change to do it instead of multiple changes for multiple signs.

Tucker Brown: Okay, so the changes I have for that is the message at the top should be the most abbreviated form of that message that it could possibly be. The text at the bottom should indicate at least one sign or multiple signs depending on if they are grouped. And the groupings for these when you fix them should be based on sign size, font, and message sent out to those particular signs. And we would group by those, and if you apply it to one, you will apply to all those signs. Anything else I missed on that one?

John Hope: Yes, please also specify the names of the signs.

Tucker Brown: Correct. Anything else on that one?

**Topic 2. SG-6039 - Temporary "Allowed Word" option for authorized users**

Tucker Brown: So, this is your current DMS spelling conflict dialog. There are zero changes to this right now. One option here is that instead of saying Approve Selected Signs, or Approve All Messages. Essentially, that approval would change to a lifetime of the message approval. And so, you basically wouldn’t see anything different. That’s Option 1.

Option 2 is if you still want the option for approving it one time, and potentially approving it in the future, as well. Then we would have to add additional buttons. We suggest if you go that route to allow specifically for doing it once. So, you would still have the Approve Selected or Approve All, and that would do the lifetime. And then we would add buttons for doing it once.

So, really you have to choose between Option 1 or Option 2 . Do you still want the option of doing it just once? Or do we want to take that out and replace it entirely with approving for the lifetime of the message.

So, I need comments on Option 1 or Option 2.

District 7: The intent of when it was submitted was for it to be approved for the lifetime of the message, but I would let Operations take the lead on responding to that. I don’t see the point of just approving it once. But I don’t know.

Kelly Kinney: Turnpike would agree with the life of the message.

District 3: District 3 agrees.

John Hope: District 5 agrees with the life of the message.

District 1: Same for D1.

Brent Poole: Same for CFX.

Tucker Brown: Okay. I think I basically heard everyone say Option 1. The dialog will remain exactly as it is, and underneath it approve for the lifetime. We’re good on that one.

**Topic 3. SG-4968 - Wrong Way Detection Pop-Up Alerts**

Tucker Brown: There was one field that contained the Roadway, Direction, Longitude and Latitude, all crushed into one column. We’re breaking that apart into four different ones. And then adding the Location Description column, as well. By default we are going to hide the Latitude / Longitude ones, and you can bring those up with the Column Chooser if you actually want to see them. But those will be hidden by default and you will still see Roadway, Direction, and Location Description.

And then the other change we had to make is because we broke that apart, and now we have a Direction field. On the far right there was a field there called Direction, which was actually showing an arrow indicating which way the cars were supposed to be travelling. We had to rename that to “Direction of Travel” so it doesn’t conflict with the direction of the device itself. So, that’s not a new column, it’s just a rename of an existing column. Any questions or comments on those fields?

Kelly Kinney: Will the arrow still be there?

Tucker Brown: The arrow will still be there in that column.

Luis Hernandez: For that column where it says, “Direction of Travel”, could that be modified to say, “Correct Direction of Travel”. Because I think it could be a little bit confusing with the direction of the wrong-way driver.

Tucker Brown: Okay. “Correct Direction of Travel”?

Luis Hernandez: Yes, unless somebody has a better wording for that. Maybe “Correct Traffic Flow”, or whatever. Something to denote that’s the way the traffic is supposed to go, not necessarily where the driver is going.

Tucker Brown: So, if we go that route it starts to get kind of longer. Do you have any issues with putting “Correct Dir. of Travel”? Trying to shorten the column a little bit, because really we’re just going to have an arrow in it.

Luis Hernandez: I think that’s fine. And again, if anyone has a better suggestion…

Cherie Phillips: Would you mind going over some clarifications. So, we have “Direction” on the left hand side of the columns. And then we have one on the right? How is this different?

Tucker: “Direction” on the left is the direction and roadway associated with the wrong-way driving device itself. The “Direction of Travel” on the right is a configuration that you do that indicates the correct direction of travel. So, when you see the image, it has an arrow saying essentially this is where the car should be going. And it helps the operator identify the wrong-way driving vehicle. Essentially saying they are going in the wrong direction versus a false alarm where maybe it triggered on something else.

Cherie Phillips: Thank you.

Tucker Brown: Okay, so the only change we’re making from the slides here is instead of “Direction of Travel”, we’re going to call it “Correct Dir. of Travel”. And I think that was it.

**Topic 4. SG-5811 - Search Historical Reports by FHP CAD & Case#**

Tucker Brown: So, these will just be new filters added to the available set of filters that are possible. We are adding these to any report that already references the CAD# and Case#. The issue title here calls out FHP CAD# and Case#. We actually renamed those in one of the last releases to just CAD# and Case#. So we matched that wording and we’re that text field to the bottom of the report to allow you to type in those and get to a specific event in the system. They are optional fields just like basically all of the other fields. Any event that uses and displays the CAD# and Case# will have these added to them. Questions or comments on that one?

John Hope: Could these fields be case insensitive? Because occasionally there are letters.

Tucker Brown: Yes, we can make that happen.

District 7: Could this also be configured to instead of, or on top of searching for CAD# and Case# in that specific field in the event, could it search the chronology data, as well, to look for a specific comment that says Case#?

Tucker Brown: So, the intent here was to tie those to the specific field of the event. Is the implication here that they are putting it in the chronology and not updating the event?

District 7: Yes. So, sometimes when we attach CAD alerts to an event, that field will auto-populate. But more often than not the operators are actually putting in the Case # manually into the event comments sections.

Tucker Brown: So, essentially we’d be doing a stream search with the chronology on every event in the system. That could take a significantly long time to return. Especially since you’d be adding this to something like the event chronology that you’d be running. Is there any way to get Operations to just put it in the CAD# field when they have it?

District 7: Yes. We can work on that. But if we were to search for a CAD# and Case#, we’d usually be using a specific period, like a date and time, so it wouldn’t be like a crazy stretch of time to try to search for a couple of characters. But, yes, we can work on getting them to add that into the specific field.

Tucker Brown: So, I want to say, there was another enhancement… I don’t know the status of that one, as well. But there was a keyword search that we were going to put in for basically for the chronology. And potentially that would also work for that.

District 7: Yes. That would actually be perfect because that would take away searching for those specific fields in the event, and just do a keyword altogether. So, if you don’t want to search for a Case# and you want to search for a specific word, you could also do that. But I do understand what you’re saying about the time it could take to locate one word in all these events in the chronology.

Kelly Kinney: I think this enhancement; it may have been a separate one. But it also included having the Case# present in the header of the report. Has that already been addressed? Because it was only the CAD# that was populating in the header of the Event Chronology.

Tucker Brown: Case# and CAD# are now listed in the Event Chronology. It should be. I think it was the latest release. I have to go check that to be sure. But not on the release;. I’m fairly sure it’s there.

Kelly Kinney: Okay.

**Topic 5. SG-5782 - RISC Module Enhancements**

Tucker Brown: This next one has a couple of things for the RISC module. First, you see the button at the top. I believe it says “All Lanes Cleared” right now. The intent here is to disassociate that from lane clearance to essentially the end of the RISC, which is what that is meant to imply. So, we are going to rename it to RISC Complete so that Operations knows exactly when they’re supposed to click that button. One of the issues that was problematic there is that when the travel lanes were cleared people would click that button, but they still needed to arrive equipment and continue working the RISC. So, that button is intended to be, “We’re done with this RISC and we can move on”. So, we’re changing it to RISC Complete.

Also, we are adding to the Chronology whenever you have a contact. Whether that is a contractor or someone in the field that you’re verifying stuff with. Whenever one of those boxes pops up that says here is your contact, logging that to the Chronology. I believe it also lets you put comments in there, as well. And those would be added, if you put anything in those boxes. Essentially adding all of those to the chronology.

The other request is for an email to be sent out on the RISC activation. This is going to be an open question, as well - When do you want to see that email? It could be when someone starts the RISC, in which case we’d really only have the event ID, the location, and maybe the blockage. If we wait until a responding contractor actually accepts it, we’d be able to add the responding contractor and the accepted time, essentially when they start their clock. But I don’t think we addressed that in the SSUG or the CMB. So, as we were starting this we looked at the requirements and said we’re not sure when to send this one. So, open question of when that email should be sent. The intent is to have an email address in the Config file, and it would pick that up and send it to whoever you want on that email.

That’s the last one in that set, so I’ll open it up for questions on either the look of the first one with the chronology or the button, or the email question.

Luis Hernandez: With the email I would say to send it on the RISC vendor acceptance.

Tucker Brown: I did forget to mention that if you don’t want an email, you just wouldn’t configure an email address and nothing would be sent. So, that’s an optional thing,

Kelly Kinney: Turnpike would agree on acceptance that the email would be sent.

I do have some comments on the previous slide; I guess questions for discussion. I know we’ve gone round and round about the logistics of the term we would use here, RISC Complete. I just want to make sure it’s going to be used consistently among the districts. Because ultimately, I think timestamps for RISC events are going to be queried through this module for all districts. So, to give a scenario – We have a RISC event and the travel lanes are clear and the RISC is on the shoulder and they’re working on the clean-up for another several hours. Is this RISC Complete button intended to be when the travel lanes are clear and payment is made for clearing the lanes within 90 minutes? Or is it when the RISC is completely departing the scene and it’s completed on the shoulder?

Unknown: Kelly, I’m glad you brought this up. That’s where there needs to be almost some variation between all lanes cleared. Because in theory, you could activate a RISC with all lanes clear. And so that’s two different timestamps. A timestamp that the vendor made all lanes clear, and obviously there is the duration of the RISC.

Kelly Kinney: Yes. I think two fields might be needed. Like a RISC Clearance or Lane Clearance field that would not limit you to be able to arrive additional equipment once that button is selected. Because that was the major issue to begin with. Because once we hit All Lanes Cleared you couldn’t arrive additional equipment. Which in the example we just heard, it’s possible to have a RISC activation that’s not actually blocking travel lanes – a rolled over dump truck on the shoulder. So, one button that says RISC Clearance and one button that says RISC Departed Scene, or something like that.

Tucker Brown: So, one of the things we talked about in the SSUG that got brought up is people did not want a separate lane clearance option than the standard lane clearance in the event itself. Because then the operator would have to remember both to clear the lanes in the event and the ones in the RISC; and that those would be two separate timestamps.

Kelly Kinney: What if there is some reason the lanes can’t be opened, but RISC has done their job – if there is pavement damage, or guardrail damage sticking out in the lane so a roadway contractor now has to come out and fix it. Sometimes the lane clearance is a separate time than the RISC clearance is.

Mike from D7: We’ve had that issue, too. What we have done is we ended the RISC at the time the vendor is done doing what they can do, and then a secondary event is created – that would be for emergency roadwork in that example. The RISC at that point is done. Whatever vendor can pave the roadway, you have your asset maintenance person come out. I do agree there are two different times, we treat it as a secondary event from the RISC. You have your secondary roadwork event that is due to say, a gas tanker on fire that’s destroyed the interstate.

Unknown, D5: I would say the only problem with that is that the technically RISC duration is from the entire event. Just because the vendor left - at least according to District 5, I’m not sure how Turnpike looks at it – we look at it’s all one time. Even if the RISC vendors completely leave and the highway needs to be repaved, technically the highway being repaved is still part of that RISC event.

Dee McTague: District 4 agrees.

Unknown, D5: So, essentially how Kelly said - I think eventually Central Office will be pulling these times. So, by not correlating that we’ll have lot of... If there is not a timestamp inside this to show lanes complete versus the RISC event done, there’s going to be a lot of districts showing a lot of different times.

And sorry to be the bearer of bad news while everyone is thinking about that – Here in Central Florida, our troop command that oversees CFX and the Central Florida area, along with portions of Jacksonville and Tampa, have essentially done away with where the TIM Manager or somebody in the RTMC can exempt vehicles or equipment from being sent to the RISC event to eliminate costs on the person that created the RISC event. Because that was one of the biggest complaints – there is no way to document that.

And the other thing we have is based on the rotation, the TIM Manager or FDOT for District 5 can make an executive decision to bypass the rotation due to special circumstances, such as another RISC vendor would be closer. At the end of the day, the whole point it to clear the highway, so DOT can take an executive action and basically bypass the rotation. How the current RISC module is set up, there is no way to go off rotation due to special circumstance like that.

Tucker Brown: There is a way to back-end that, but I wouldn’t recommend it. It basically involves reconfiguring the ordering on the fly in the configuration. But I wouldn’t recommend that at all.

For those two, can you put those in? Based on the quick turn-around, I know we are not going to be able to get those two in. Can you add a new issue in for that?

John Hope: Yes, we will do that.

Tucker Brown: As far as the RISC Complete versus the lane clearance time, we can put another button up in that ribbon and basically keep the All Lanes Cleared button. The All Lanes Cleared button will do nothing but set a timestamp. It won’t keep you from adding new equipment or arriving or whatever you need to do there. The RISC Complete would be the one that would say we are done with this RISC and we are moving on. But if we just capture that extra timestamp, is that something we want to put in there? I know there was some hesitation by some districts at the SSUG.

Jason Evans: I think the bigger issue here is the different districts are using these milestones and different time ranges. And there is nothing in the statewide SOG that really defines RISC duration and the different times we’re talking about. So maybe these need to be defined more clearly in the statewide SOG so that we can be consistent across districts in how we are using these.

Unknown 3: According to the statewide TIM SOG, RISC duration is essentially from the time the crash occurs until the roadway is reopened. Kelly, correct me if I’m wrong, but that’s the new TIM SOG.

Unknown 4: Is it the start of the crash, or RISC activation?

Unknown 3: RISC duration is from the time the crash occurs until the roadway reopens.

Kelly Kinney: Quick other question – I know there was not a separate RISC Chronology Report. So, all of this information is going to go into the Event Chronology; there won’t be a separate report? Or will there be both happening?

Tucker Brown: Both.

Kelly Kinney: Okay. In the equipment tracking section – the timestamps that you’re putting for arrival and verified, is there a hidden field that is not being shown here for departed time? Are there any other fields we’re not seeing?

Tucker Brown: Yeah, I was questioning that. I was looking at that, too. AJ, is there a departed time on that equipment tracking? I was thinking there was off the top of my head.

AJ Skillern: No, there is no Departed timestamp.

Kelly Kinney: That may resolve some of our issues. Add a Departed timestamp in there, so we don’t need to know when RISC is leaving the scene. We can determine that from the departure times.

Tucker Brown: So, still going back to the button at the top. Do we need that timestamp or not? And obviously that threw another one into it - if we add a Departure timestamp, does that cover it?

Kelly Kinney: I would be okay with utilizing the button at the top as the official RISC clearance time - whenever we deem the vendor has done their job. As long as there is a way in the equipment tracking section to determine when they actually departed the scene.

Dee McTague: District 4 agrees.

Unknown: Yes, that would solve all the issues, as long as when you click RISC Complete you can still depart equipment.

Tucker Brown: So, RISC Complete means we are done with this and we no longer adding timestamps. Also, when you’re talking about departure time, is it per equipment piece or one timestamp for all equipment?

Kelly Kinney: Because the equipment is listed individually in Arrived, I would say individually for Departed.

Tucker Brown: Okay. Would they be required to be all departed before you can complete the RISC?

Kelly Kinney: No, I guess I have a different meaning for the RISC Complete button. I take that as the “official RISC Clearance Time” where you can still be working on the shoulder, but the RISC time is official.

Unknown: Yes, so essentially when you click RISC Complete, it should still allow you to depart equipment.

Tucker Brown: Is there any action that should close out a RISC entirely and say that we are no longer doing anything on this one?

Kelly Kinney: When the last vendor departs, when the last piece of equipment departs.

Tucker Brown: Okay. Basically, what I am hearing then is RISC Complete will track a timestamp that means that the RISC is done in terms of that is the timestamp that I captured. But we should be able to do equipment tracking beyond that. And add a Departed time for each piece of equipment.

Kelly Kinney: Turnpike agrees.

D5 agrees.

D2 agrees.

D4 agrees.

D3 is good with it.

CFX is good with it.

D1 is good with it.

D7 is good with it.

Tucker Brown: So, I think we are good on that one. We still need an answer on when an email should be sent.

D5 likes the accepted time.

D4 agrees.

CFX agrees with the accepted time.

D3 will go along.

(Tucker dropped off and had to rejoin.)

Mark Laird: I want to clarify one thing – Did we end up with two buttons? Or did we end up with one button that just captures a timestamp that says RISC Complete?

AJ Skillern: My understanding that I got out of the end there when Tucker summarized it is that we were tracking equipment departure times and that would cover what Kelly’s issues were with needing the All Lanes Cleared button. And so, we were going to track departure times of the RISC equipment, and we were going to leave the RISC Complete button.

Tucker Brown: Okay. Anything else on that one?

**Topic 6. SG-5561 - Give permitted users the ability to assign an active event to a user**

Tucker Brown: So, there will be a specific permission in order to actually be able to assign an event to another user that’s not you. If you don’t have that, you’ll still get the Lock icon and the Unlock icon, but we were going to change the wording to “Change Owner”. Change Owner could mean you’re getting it. Change Owner could mean you’re releasing it. If you have the specific permission, the bottom half, (you see in that bottom dialog), will essentially be a button that is split in half. And you can click the bottom half and then you get a list of users who are logged in the system. You’d be able to select one and then that particular user would be assigned that event.

When that user gets assigned, they’re going to get a pop-up to them that says, your user is assigned ownership, and then give them a hyperlink to that event if they want it. Otherwise they can just click OK and get rid of it. But it will tell that user that they have been assigned to that event so they will know.

Essentially the biggest change here is the Obtain Ownership/Release Ownership button. It’s changing the name of it. And if you have that specific permission, it will split in half and allow you to pick a user. Questions on that?

Mark Laird: All of our operators have to have the Obtain Ownership permission. And they wouldn’t have to go through the dialog to accept and be notified and all that. But only supervisors probably get the Change Owner permission to assign it to someone. So it seems like two very different behaviors that you wouldn’t want to replace one with the other.

Oswald Gonzalez: The supervisor is usually the one that assigns the event chronology to someone. So maybe changing it to “Assign Owner”? Instead of “Change Owner” so it matches the other dialog?

Tucker Brown: So, we started off with a different concept of a different button here that would allow you to do that. But, we’ve had numerous people say that that ribbon is growing way too large. And so we’re trying to figure out a way to make a consistent button that also allows people to do both things. So, in which case they’re really only Obtain Ownership / Release Ownership. And in the other case they may be able to change the owner or not. Is the biggest complaint the wording of it, or the actual combining it into one button?

Mark Laird: I thought they were different behaviors. If they only have permission for one, can you have the Obtain/Release?

Tucker Brown: Yes. Are you talking about the wording?

Mark Laird: Yes. Then you wouldn’t have to get a popup, because you took it yourself.

Tucker Brown: So, I think what you’re saying is, if you only have permission to obtain or release, you want the button to still say obtain and release. If you have the ability to assign, you’d essentially get the Lock icon, but have the second half say either Assign Owner or Change Owner?

Mark Laird: That’s what I’m thinking. We can have more of the Operations people jump in.

Oswald Gonzalez: I agree with that.

Tucker Brown: Anyone else want to weigh in on that one?

Jason Evans: District 2 likes that idea.

Tucker Brown: Okay. So, essentially the top half here, when they only have permission to obtain or release will have no change whatsoever. If they have permission to assign an owner, it will look different. It will have a Lock and a release icon whenever they want to obtain or release. But the bottom text, do you want that to say Assign Owner?

Oswald Gonzalez: Correct. If possible.

Tucker Brown: Okay.

Jason Evans: Let me ask you a question. When we originally put this in, I think we were talking about a supervisor taking over an event and then assigning it back to someone else. With the effect here, would the supervisor have to own the event to assign someone else to it?

Tucker Brown: No. Could they? Yes. Do they have to? No.

Jason Evans: Thank you.

Mark Laird: Just to confirm one thing. If it’s Retain Ownership / Release Ownership, there won’t then be a popup? Correct?

Tucker Brown: So, when you obtain ownership of an event from someone else, if they have the event open, you actually already get a popup saying someone else just took this event from you. That’s existing behavior.

Mark Laird: Yes, I mean the person taking it; who is now the recipient.

Tucker Brown: Yes. If you are changing the owner, you will get a popup to the new event owner. But otherwise it would stay the same behavior.

Mark Laird: Okay.

Tucker Brown: Okay. I think we’re good on that one.

**Topic 7. SG-5215 - SAS Missing Merge with Travel Time Option**

Tucker Brown: This one is pretty simple. The bottom right here, there was no way to auto-merge within the SAS messaging. That’s just being added. It will look the exact same as it was in the DMS Add Message dialog. It’ll just be in the exact same spot, so it should be a consistent look and feel. Any questions on that one?

**Topic 8. Other Enhancements**

Tucker Brown: The last four of these, they don’t have any actual GUI components. But just to let you know what’s in it and make sure you know.

**SG-6072** - Vehicle Alert dialog does not pop up when minimized. The Vehicle Alert dialog, which is your wrong-way driving and overheight dialog is going to take focus no matter what. If it’s minimized or behind another dialog, it currently didn’t. It will do that at all times now.

**SG-5282** - Change "Terminate Schedule" in SAS to also remove DMS from device queue. The "Terminate Schedule" in SAS or if you disable a scheduled item, either one of those. When you do that it’s going to run the final action for whatever that schedule action is. So, in DMS’s case, it will take those messages off the DMS queues. So, if you’re in the middle of a schedule, despite not ending the actual schedule, it’s still going to take them down. And that will be for schedules and schedule items.

**SG-6037** - Make SunGuide usernames case insensitive. All usernames will be made case insensitive whether they are SunGuide users or domain users. Everything is going to be case insensitive.

**SG-4760** - Not Auto-Merging Scheduled Messages. When you auto-merge something, right now it looks at the very next message on the queue and says, “Hey can I merge with that”? Instead of just looking at the next message, it’s going to look at everything in the queue, and essentially pick the highest one that is able to be merged. So, maybe you have Message 1 that says yeah, I can merge with something. Message 2 says no I can’t, and Message 3 does. It will actually merge Messages 1 and 3. And then when one of those goes away, it will break the messages apart again. Essentially it will look further down the queue to see if there is anything that’s possible to merge with your top message.

And I believe that’s everything. Any questions on those four?

**Announcements**

Christine Shafik Thank you, Tucker. That was good discussion. Thank you guys for your input.

We’d like to announce that we are currently testing Hotfix 2 at TERL. We found some bugs, so we are expecting another build next week that we will be testing, as well.

Any comments or questions?

We would also like to have your input for presentations for upcoming SSUGs. So, if you have anything you’d like to present, or have it as a priority, send it my way with your slides and we will schedule it in the next coming SSUGs. We appreciate your help and your input.

Thank you all, and have a good one!

The meeting was adjourned.