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

1. RISC in SunGuide

**Mark Dunthorn:** Before we start I would like to mention that JIRA SG 4578 approving DMS spellcheck via C2C. We are looking at it and will try to get that into the next SSUG meeting.

**Tucker Brown:** Today we are going to discuss RISC and the process of incorporating it in the system. There are several requests for implementing RISC in the system and some are as simple as a checkbox in the even­t that indicates it is a RISC event. With that option, a report could be ran to list all events that are RISC events. The other would be a full RISC tracking and reporting in SunGuide which would be sending out emails and notifications. In that regard, is everyone in favor of going to a full RISC tracking? There is a way to design this so both options happen or is everyone okay with the possibility of tracking it in SunGuide?

**Romona Burke**: District Seven likes the idea of the full RISC tracking and reporting.

**Ray Mikol:** District One likes the additional tracking as well about the check box, I think we entered that footprint in.

District three and four liked the idea.

District two also likes the idea.

**Tucker Brown:** It sounds like everyone thinks a full RISC tracking is a good idea. The rest of the presentation is a walk-through of how we are going to do it. There is an intention here to develop a ConOps and put it out there for review and comments.

We are looking to get feedback from you now, so we can include it in the initial ConOps but if you don’t have any feedback, then you can offer it when the ConOps goes out for review.

Since this is event-based, one of the ribbon buttons at the top can be RISC and it would open up a separate dialog that tracks RISC in a different dialog itself. If you tried to put all RISC details in the original form, it would make that form very long and the user would have to scroll through it. Having it as a window provides the information more immediately and you don’t have to scroll through to find the data. Once you bring it up, you would put in a requesting agency and a person at that agency. We would still use event agency and contact and we could potentially add a checkbox for the agency. The agency name could be a list or have some people who are preconfigured. The next option is to have a secondary list. You would also have the ability to select if you need additional resources. You can configure all of the things that you might need.

**Romona:** Is there one that just says extra equipment on it? Is that what you mean by additional resource?

**Tucker:** If they had to bring anything special to it then they will have to track an arrival time on it. This is where you would see that.

**Romona:** We call for extra equipment like Bob Cats, etc. those items we need a date stamp on. If they need a rollback or something we do not need to timestamp that as long as they are making their time, that is all that matters. We don’t have to time when the rollback shows up.

**Tucker:** Is that something you would like to list that you requested it but don’t need timestamps for? Is that what you are saying?

**Romona:** The only thing that needs the timestamp other than their rotator/heavy/ MOT trucks is the call for the extra equipment which includes the Bob Cat.

**Tucker:** Are those a set list across the state or is that something different per District?

**Romona:** That list is for everyone. We all use the same boilerplate contract. We just need the one that says the additional equipment that is being requested by contract. They have the same response as that and have to be there in 60 minutes. If we make a cancellation, they can still go to the bottom of the rotation list, right?

**Tucker:** When you cancel activation of RISC, the person being activated goes to the bottom of the list? That is something we can do.

**Jason Summerfield:** I am not sure that is how it happens everywhere so it might need to be configurable. The ConOps will probably have a lot of revisions. The idea would be to make the fields configurable and be able to respond to every nuance in each District.

**Tucker:** For reviewing the ConOps, I need every District to review it and get the operations people involved. As far as a configurable enhancement, this will be highly configurable because of the different operational parameters in each District.

**Mark Laird:** There can be zones of contractors. So, in one district you might have multiple sets of contractors for different zones.

**Tucker:** Is that a selectable thing? So, the operators select a zone or do we want to have it where you preconfigure the zones and it automatically knows which ones to start activating.

**Alex:** I think it is going to depend on the District. I think most districts have maybe one or two but there are some that I know have several different zones. We are going to probably need to have that be something similar to selecting your city and county per event. I think it should be configurable.

**Mark Laird:** So, you configure zones and the event location would identify the zone. Is there any ambiguity in that? Is there any case where operators would have to have control over it?

**Tucker:** Is there something near a border where someone might be able to do it but you could also get the other side to do it?

**District 5:** In District 5 we have 14 RISC vendors. The only thing I can see is if we can’t get a RISC vendor out to a certain zone then we would have to go to the next zone.

**Tucker:** But you still maintain the order but they would just be able to decline the work.

**District 5:** Correct, we might have to jump to the next zone if a contractor is unavailable for the event location.

**Mark Laird:** The order would be by each zone and the zone you pick the next one up goes to that zone.

**Tucker:** We could make that one where we configure it and it would automatically prefill one and then allow changes.

**Cheryl:** In District Five, we would like a way to override it and we have some we would like to activate it off the freeway.

**Tucker**: Okay.

**Mark Laird:** If we override it, we will probably need to put in a comment explaining why.

**Cheryl:** Yes.

**District 5:** Some applications when you have lists that are location-based, when you are on the borderline, that is when it can get really tricky especially when you need to tell the system to assign it to this contractor and this zone. When it is on the border we need to be able to tell the system we want the contractor for this zone regardless of how it is configured.

**Tucker:** That sounds good.

**Mark Laird:** How would the lists be organized and would it have the contractor and the zone assigned to them? Or do you pick another zone and then chose a contractor from that zone? Just give that some thought.

**Alex:** For us in District 6 we have one zone which is Miami-Dade County although we do two counties. I know other Districts have several counties and I want to make sure those districts are able to address multiple zone type scenarios.

**Ray Mikol:** District One has different response times for their RISC contractors depending on the different zone. If we are able to configure this would we be able to add that much detail in the configuration?

**Tucker:** So, the intent here is that it does capture how long it takes. Can we handle that from the reporting side and let it tell us if they made it or not? Is there something in the software that will need to verify if they made it or not?

**Mark Laird:** The RISC contractor would be chosen based on the response time to a certain area whichever location the RISC event occurred in.

**Tucker:** So it is not based on which total time it is based on which one is closest.

**Mark Laird:** Exactly.

**Tucker:** That is doable and we will have the event location, it might have to be a proximity thing, not time. Would that be acceptable?

**Mark Laird:** Yes.

**Tucker:** Let’s assume that you have selected a particular contractor or contract region and you have a list of contractors responding to this. You would get an email coming out saying you are activating a RISC. You will get something similar to the picture on the screen. It would show here is who you are supposed to be contacting for this particular RISC if they respond you can choose who to activate. If there is no response from them, I believe it would pop up after five minutes and say, “this person is still there”. At some point, it would go to the next one in the list and it would be an automatic feature. If the contractor is unable to make it there, you can classify them as unable to respond and move to the next contact.

**Mark Laird:** Should unable to respond have a comment added?

**Tucker:** If we need to that’s fine. Once someone actually says “yes I am going to do this” you get a list of items that they are supposed to be bringing and here are all of the arrival plans. For each one, you would check a box that says this person has arrived. When the contractor said they arrived and another one when they actually did arrive. There is also a checkbox stating what was used when on the scene and you can check that as well. There is a notice to proceed box as well and that would be checked as well. You can stop and restart the timer if needed. That way we can report on how long it actually took instead of just taking the start time and end time.

**Bryan Homayouni:** Is there a way to retroactively do that? If you found out a day later that they had to stop and start again.

**Tucker:** That is something we could put into the audit, yes. The last step here is verifying when the lane cleared out. There is one option in the RISC window itself and you can indicate all of the lanes are cleared. The other option is to use the timestamp when SunGuide clears the lane blockage as well. If you use the second option, you do not get an agency and contact with it.

**District:** If you are talking about the end criteria, I have notes from someone with a NO so it will probably be discussed in the ConOps.

**Tucker:** What does that mean?

**District:** Can the ending criteria be that the operator unblocks the lanes in the event? The answer here is no. That will be a discussion. What I think it is they may still have RISC people on sight even though the lanes are cleared they are still tracking the RISC equipment on site.

**Ramona:** If there was severe pavement damage the lanes will remain closed.

**Tucker**: So the end of RISC is not the end of the event itself?

**Ramona:** Correct.

**Tucker:** It sounds like there should be a secondary place that indicates the RISC part of the event is over.

**Mark Laird:** I think the RISC clearance time is dependent on lane blocking status.

**District:** One more item to add from an ATIS perspective is that three vehicles are required for RISC package arrival but RISC recovery can begin with one or two vehicles in some Districts. The RISC start time might not be the same as all three vehicles.

**Tucker:** Are there any cases where there is a requirement when all vehicles must be on site before RISC can start?

**Ramona**: No.

**Tucker:** Essentially what I heard is that the top half you can fill it out when you go and you can get NTP any time.

**Bryan:** They are two separate milestones to be tracked. One is the arrival of the equipment to arrive within sixty minutes. Then once NTP is initiated then they have ninety minutes to clear the roads. They almost need to be tracked separately.

**Josh Sibley:** Will there be a section to audit the arrival of the equipment as well?

**Tucker:** We will have to build a new audit system for all of RISC, so yes, that will be included. If there is a timestamp associated with it, then there would need to be an audit to go with it.

There are two ways to go about chronology as it pertains to RISC. One is you can have an independent chronology specifically for RISC. Or it could be included in the EM event chronology and have a specific comment type for what happens in RISC. You will have a full list of RISC items, you could have one that appears with the EM chronology or have one that a list filtered for only the RISC items. Does anyone have strong feelings on either one of those?

The other consideration here is to have more columns the time and chronology type would be similar but the operator and contract related details would have a comment that would go in the event chronology. Should we separate that out?

**Mark Laird:** We will probably have to look at that.

**Tucker:** My preference is to have a single chronology and have the EM with it. We could filter for RISC. If we need to put something together for RISC we can. We will add information in the ConOps and you can comment on it there. The timestamps would be auditable and you can tell what part of the timestamps have been audited. If you have anything you want to add please let me know.

**Shayla:** When we saw the previous demonstration of the District Six workflow if I remember correctly you put in the contact name and then click the timestamp box? It would make sense that you would do it the other way around and put in the timestamp first then put in the contact. The timestamp is measurable as opposed to the comment/contact information.

Is there a way to attach screenshots?

**Tucker:** Not at this time. The executive notification modification will allow adding screenshots so you will be able to do it by the time it comes. We will have to get into logistics of storing them.

This will be circulated as a ConOps so please review it and provide feedback.

**Ray Mikol:** If this is going to be a subset of the regular SunGuide incident, is this going to be too much for one operator to handle? I am seeing the possibility of having a lot of notifications to the operator.

**Tucker:** We can make it so that the RISC specific stuff does not have to be handled by a single operator but you run the risk of two operators working on the same thing and stepping on each other’s toes. That is a valid concern, I would take feedback from the Districts on this.

**District:** Would there be an opportunity for multiple operators taking ownership at different times? An example is there is a RISC event that is an hour long and that operator needs a bathroom break, maybe someone else can take ownership?

**Tucker:** Currently, you couldn’t work the event at the exact same time but you could change ownership.

**District:** There are also times when a second RISC is called because there are so many vehicles spread out. If it is something that would be difficult to send out a second RISC.

**Tucker:** If we do one, it is possible for more than one. We can do that. Now we are talking about two RISC events within one event, but is that too much for one operator?

**District:** Have one main event but multiple events that stem from it. Everything encompasses one event and isn’t the only way it can happen. It might be best to make this an independent function.

**Tucker:** Do we want this independent to the event itself and tie to the event? We can keep these isolated as RISC and we can put something in the event details that launches the dialog.

**District:** If there is an event and a secondary event occurs, the operator would clone it and another operator could handle the cloned event.

**Tucker:** If there are multiple events we can have multiple operators tied to the event.

Any other topics that need to be brought up? The ConOps will a little while before you will see it.

 **Bryan:** Which way are you going to approach it? We didn’t get clear clarification.

**Tucker:** I was going to discuss it with Central Office and they may have more information. We could also send out a poll to go with the majority.

**Mark Laird:** Is there a big difference in cost?

**Tucker:** There might be cost impacts if we do not do it within the event chronology. The rest is independent. There was a request to CO on the background on reports. There is a small write up on the reports that explains what is in the report. There is a request to make all reports have explanations and backgrounds. We will be doing it for all of the reports listed there but if there are some you want immediately, let CO know.
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