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

1. SG 4559 Filter Alerts by User Group

**Mark Dunthorn:** We have a function similar to this for FHP CAD and Waze. FHP CAD alerts are filtered by county and roadway. You go into the XML and specify which alerts you want to see. Waze is very similar with roadways and counties again and we configure it at the Central Office but you can always tell us if you want to add or subtract from either of those lists.

We are proposing that the filtering by roadway and county would be assigned to user groups. If you wanted to have operators dedicated to one geographical area you could. One group of operators could be used for I-95 and Miami-Dade County and another group of operators could A 26 for example. This would allow you to divide up the ISDs alerts by user group. You would have the ability to configure users into these groups. The idea is that we are going to allow you to create user groups and you are going to assign filter sets to these groups. Does anyone have any thoughts?

**District:** Is it easy to switch them between areas? We might want them in one area one day and the next day have them in a different area.

**Mark Dunthorn:** That was one of my concerns and I think we are going to take this as a user need. We might want to move it out of config .XML. Tucker, you might have another thought.

**Tucker:** The thought behind this was that there is a region and here are the alerts in that region. Then you would assign that region to the user group. Think about how we have device permissions set up, you give the individual access to the devices. This would be for a specific region and specific set of alerts and you want to assign it to an individual and you want to assign it to a group. When the alerts come in, the person assigned to receive them would get them.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Then would the filter sets still be in .XML? Is that what you are saying? Because the device permissions are all done from the GUI, correct?

**Tucker:** The device permissions just say, “should this user receive alerts?” then there is one specific for wrong way driving. There are two different behaviors that could be discussed here.

1. Should we allow for better filtering for an individual user or user group to say, “I would like this group to receive FHP and Waze alerts.” Do we need more granularity for filters for users?
2. Or are we talking about distributing alerts by region? Do you want to see FHP alerts but in a specific region?

They are two different concepts. The additional permissions to give granularity to the alerts is fairly trivial. But when separating into different regions for certain groups it becomes a little more difficult but it can still be done. Do people need more of the granular alerts per user or are they looking for more of regional alerts for the user?

**Mike Crawson:** We would find this useful more for geographic because our operators go off of roadways. Another thought is maybe we could have an operator switch off in the event list. One day they work on I-75 and the next day they would on I-275.

**Tucker:** Who would assign the users location to work? Would it be the user or an administrator?

**Mike Crawson:** The user themselves should be able to pick that.

**Tucker:** What I was thinking is that someone would actually draw the geographic region. If we were to do that to roadways you would have to draw the roadway. But potentially what you just said was that you would like to see a roadway fall on X, Y, Z today and the user would be able to select those. Would that be more beneficial than a region that someone draws? Or should we do both?

**Mike Crawson:** The roadway would be more beneficial. But maybe having both would work because we are looking at going through arterials as well. We could draw a region for the corridors we manage here.

**Tucker:** So, you want the possibility of both?

**Mike Crawson:** Yes.

**Tucker:** Someone has to define that region, there could be a list where the user would select the roadways and region.

**Mark Laird:** You could combine the roadways within that region?

**Tucker:** Yes. If you do that, and say you want roadways and a region, anything along that roadway in the District would show up. If you want a specific section of the roadway you would need to draw that as its own region.

**Mike Crawson:** That sounds good to us.

**Tucker:** As a general concept, is this something you would use and want?

**Mark Laird:** We might do something with express lanes.

**Mark Dunthorn:** If you do express lanes you would want to select the roadway. If you draw it you won’t be able to differentiate.

**Mark Laird:** I think we would do both later on.

**Mark Dunthorn:** If we are drawing regions, it would be useful to save to them.

**Tucker:** Think of it as a geofence and you can use it. You would draw it and it would be added to the list at the system level. Does anyone have strong feelings about alerts in general or having the ability for users to receive alerts more granular? Receive alerts and receive wrong way driving alerts are two separate permissions, do we need to make permissions for every alert type?

**Mark Laird:** Are these filters going to give us different alert types to assign to the group? If so, I don’t think we need separate permissions for that.

**Tucker:** Right now, you have the ability to filter out certain ones from your own list. We can make that a user level setting. If we go that route, the concept of assigning them at a group level doesn’t make sense because they could change them on their own. Assigning it at a system level makes more sense.

**Mark Laird:** I think we need to think through this a little more.

**Tucker:** We might have to do profiles for each type of user and the settings are associated with the profile which is different than a user group.

**District:** I think ideally putting the user alerts to choose would be best. Then the operator can choose each day. Then a supervisor could get all of the alerts and not have to choose any filters.

**Mark Laird:** I think we need to put together some use cases.

**Mark Dunthorn:** I agree, I also think we have some good information here. If anyone wants to send in specific use cases that would be good too. We will table this for now unless anyone else has something they want to contribute at this time.

1. 4545 Multiselect IDS Alert for Dismissal

**Mark Dunthorn:** This is something we have seen at the TERL but I know of a number of Districts that are not 24/7 and you do have IDS running overnight you can collect a bunch of alerts that can be handled the next morning. Now you can only handle them one at a time even if it is dismissing them. It is a lot of clicks.

What we are proposing here is a way to handle multiple IDS alerts at one time. Most convenient would be to select all and apply the same handling to those. We want to make the process a lot simpler and allow the operator to handle more than one at a time. Any thoughts? Is this something someone else can use or benefit from?

**District:** My operator just said heck yea!

**Mark Dunthorn:** Any other questions or comments on that?

1. 4561 Add “Displayed on Map” Filter to Link Editor Window

**Mark Dunthorn:** Back in the day there was a way to filter the “shown on map” so you could see where the work needed to be done. That went away with 7.0. At this point we no longer have that filter. We are proposing to add that back into the link editor GUI. We have a few different options.

* Add a button in the ribbon
* Add a column in the table

But you need to let me know what you think. Would this be useful? Do people miss it?

**District:** Yes!

**Mark Dunthorn:** is there anything else we lost? This was the only item I noticed. Any other questions on this item?

**Mark Dunthorn:** Any other comments for today? Thank you all.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Get use cases for item 1. | Mark Dunthorn/Tucker |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |