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

1. WWD Event Handling (4700)

**Mark Dunthorn:** Before we start I would like to remind everyone that we have the Change Management Board meeting coming up so if you have any agenda items, please get those to us.

**Tucker Brown:** There are a couple of ways to handle wrong-way driving. One is from the map directly and it will automatically activate a response plan, from another datatype and then change it to a WWD event type, create an event from an alert and then SunGuide automatically creates an event and it activates a response plan based on the incoming alert.

There are a few issues that people have brought up. One is what if you have a crash that later you found out was related to WWD but still maintain a crash event type? Do you keep the crash type or do you change it to a WWD event and lose the crash type? It would be any event type, not just crashes. The other problem is what happens if you have a WWD event that doesn’t require an automatic response plan. If you create the plan, you would automatically get a response plan and have to terminate it.

We have discussed having a checkbox similar to the fire, HAZMAT area where it is to flag the event as WWD related. If you set it as a WWD event you would have that checkbox, if you set it for any other event type in the system you would then click the box to track it. The change would be to not have an automatic response plan generate, it would be optional. Make a checkbox or a way to tell the system to activate the response plan when needed. We would like to wrap all of these changes into one. Does anyone have any issues with this? Does anyone have a preference on whether to automatically create it or not?

**Bryan Homayouni:** I think you want to make it default to not create it.

**Tucker:** So make it default to not automatically activating a response plan and then if you do want one you would check the box?

**Bryan:** Correct.

**Tucker:** The initial thought was to look for the fastest possible path for operators. If we change it to the no we lose a little work. If the operator forgets to check the box then it will create more work. Has anyone had any experience with using this?

**Dee MaTague:** We have used it several times. Getting used to it was hard. I guess they like it since no one has complained.

**Tucker:** The question is how fast do you want these on signs and what happens if the operator forgets to initiate the response plan?

**Dee:** Should we go with putting up the response plan since it is easy to terminate a response plan?

**Bryan:** Has there been a direction from CO to post messages and do a response plan? If so, I am not aware of it.

**Mark Dunthorn:** There is a WWD Standard Operating Guidelines in the works that will be shared with the Districts.

**Bryan:** But is there a directive at this time from Central Office to post the signs and response plans?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Is that the only deciding factor? I will mark it as an action item to get a clear answer.

**Bryan:** I think it is a primary from the District to follow the CO directive. There will be other WWD events that aren’t life-threatening. 9/10 times you will see those instances, 1/10 is when you would issue the response plan.

**Dee MaTague:** We actually use this frequently, FHP reports WWD – we activate the response plan which the signs say WWD proceed with caution, then the operators scan the roadway. If it is not confirmed then we just blank the response plan. These are for actual reported WWD.

**Bryan:** What is the input into the system creating this WWD event? If you are getting a call from LEO stating there is a WWD out there.

**Tucker:** Both cases would be manual input by operators, not a device that detected something. Does that change it at all?

**Bryan:** I think that directly changes it.

**Tucker:** We can leave the automatic response plan with the option of not having the automatic response plan checkbox.

**Jason:** I think we want the option to not generate the response.

**Tucker:** The option to not generate will be there but the automatic default is to have the response plan activate.

**District:** What if you create the event and a pop up makes them select if it will automatically generate a response plan or not?

**Tucker:** Does anyone see any issues with that?

**Dee:** No, there is no loss of time there.

**Tucker:** We will default to having a pop up that asks if you want a response plan or not.

1. Modify Comments through Audit (4679)

**Tucker:** Currently, you can add new comments but can’t edit them. The issue says operator comments but I think we should be able to edit all comments. Does anyone have issues with that or making comments editable after the fact? You would be able to audit it.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Will you be able to audit the timestamp from the comment? Or is it just content?

**Tucker:** The timestamp will be there as well.

**H. Walker:** Would this option allow the editor to edit and delete comments?

**Tucker:** There is a delete option right now, but I wouldn’t mind if it was add/modify/delete comments.

**Tanesha:** Currently, I don’t think we can delete comments but it seems like a great option.

**Aven:** In the delete comment option, will there be a placeholder that says the comment was deleted?

**Tucker:** It would tell you that it was audited but it wouldn’t show the comment that was deleted.

**Aven:** What about a strikethrough vs delete to make sure the work is done properly.

**Tucker:** We don’t have a way to do that right now. Right now, it is just lines of text. The audit will keep the entry in the audit table forever. It wouldn’t stay in the chronology but you would see it in the audit.

**Jason:** That might bring up another question about auditing. It might be worth doing to create a different report or a flag that shows everything with the audit information so you don’t have dig through the database. That way you can see what it was.

**Tucker:** I agree, essentially, it’s the same report that shows different information.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Jason go ahead and put in a JIRA ticket for that.

1. Remove County Boundaries from Reporting

Tucker: Currently when running reports on a roadway, you have to go down to County,

Roadway and Direction before selecting the two points. The problem is you can’t run it through multiple counties. The EM locations are not tied to each other. Also note, there is no current path for traversing EM locations along a roadway. This is currently done by giving all the locations defined for the county, roadway, and directions between the sort orders of the selected endpoints.

The easiest way is to reconfigure your EM locations along the roadway so that the sort orders are consecutive. Then the report can be re-written to capture all of the roadways.

The medium option is to go through the sort order and shapefiles to link them together. There is less configuration that has to be done. The downside is if there was an error you wouldn’t have access to see it and edit it.

Option three is the most expensive and long term. Change how event locations are stored in the system. It would be easier to traverse roadways, easier to configure initially. It will be hard to tie historical data to new locations, it is less flexible in the placement of locations and would be hard for third-party changes. If they rely on the event data they would have to change their paradigm as well.

Realistically, the better options are one and two which require more configuration on the user side. We could do both if you wanted to. Is it worth going through option two and does it get more into what people want to do with event locations?

**District:** Option two.

**Jason:** How often are the shapefiles updated? How do you deal with new roadways if there is no shapefile available for them?

**Tucker:** Does anyone know how long the shapefile lags in construction?

**Jason:** The tiles would be within a few months,

**Tucker:** We could update the tiles more often. The next update will be soon.

**Mark:** There was a JIRA issue to have them come out on a schedule.

**Jason:** I took our baseline event sort order and appended a number in the millions for the counties. You could also do that programmatically if you set a county sort order on the back end. Roadways along counties could be an issue too.

**Tucker:** That would be interesting.

**Jason:** You could look at the sort orders and append it in the database for getting one taken care of unless you have more than one million locations in one county. Number two is not a bad idea if the work has already started since it is more flexible for the future.

**Tucker:** Option two will help with polylines or figuring out items between two points. There are a lot of options that can happen if we do that option.

**Mark Dunthorn:** The polylines was something you were already working on, right?

**Tucker:** Yes, and we have discussed it at a previous SSUG. Option two is something that seems to be more useful for everyone. If you need something now, we can help you with option one for the short term.

**Mark Laird:** Is there an editing function?

**Tucker:** Yes, it could be something that looks like the device linking file and doesn’t regenerate. There will be an interesting overlap when merging changes. There is a possibility to build a tool.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Is there a directive from Central Office to post WWD messages and to activate response plans? | Mark Dunthorn |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |