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

1. SG-4635 Cloning Events and Injury Data Transferred

**Mark Dunthorn:** This is basically when we clone an event some information is getting transferred over to the new event that shouldn’t be there. Specially in this JIRA issue it is the injuries that is getting carried over. In 7.1.2 that we are testing at the TERL we do have a new function that was added for this release. We are going to allow some flexibility in the information that does get carried over when an event is closed. We do allow the event type to be carried over and changed automatically. The location is already carried over but we allow you to change it. Is there anything else that should be carried over that is not part of this screen? Does anyone have any thoughts?

**Mark Laird:** Probably vehicles involved.

**Mark Dunthorn:** What you are saying is that we can exclude vehicles involved if it was carried over?

**Mark Laird:** It seems like if it was as secondary it would be different vehicles.

**Mark Dunthorn:** That is what I was thinking but I can see the option of where you might have… (interrupted)

**Mark Laird:** Well in that case I would think you would extend the existing event in that case.

**Dee McTague:** That is not always true, often you clone a disabled vehicle to an abandoned vehicle.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Yes, that is the one I was looking for. Tucker, how is that handled right now?

**Tucker Brown:** I do not believe those are carried over right now.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Would it make sense to add vehicles in the cloned option section and let you carry them over or not?

**Mark Laird:** That is currently an option.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Oh great. In this option I have no involved vehicles in the original so it grayed out so we do have that option.

**Mark Laird:** What about injuries?

**Mark Dunthorn:** That was what drove this issue in the first place. They are being carried over.

**Tucker Brown:** The question should be when to carry them over and if people are using them when they are carried over. Do we need a specific option to carry them over?

**Dee McTague:** Not really, we don’t want to double count it with a crash.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Any other thoughts on this? We are going to exclude injuries for being carried over automatically. We won’t provide an option for it.

**Aven Morgan:** What about the responder times?

**Tucker Brown:** I don’t believe those will carry over. The question is do you want them carried over and if you do, do you want them carried over automatically? Or do you not want them carried over at all?

**Aven Morgan:** I think for us I see benefit of having the option to carry them over when necessary.

**Derek Vollmer:** Are you thinking of a situation where you clone something that is really close to an existing event?

**Aven Morgan:** Yes, you might have a secondary that occurs or a large piece of debris that causes multiple accidents or something like that and the responders are already on scene.

**Tucker Brown:** The only problem with that is you could have responders arriving before the new event technically starts.

**Kevin Mahaffey:** I don’t think it will work because you would have negative response times.

**Tucker Brown:** For now, we won’t carry it over.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Any other comments or suggestions here?

**John Hope:** Yes, the roadway configuration when you select a location the roadway configuration is actually configurable by the operator in case there is construction or the location is incorrect. When it is cloned is that still modifiable?

**Tucker Brown:** I will have to verify but I would say no. It will put it as a second location and default to that location. That might be one of the ones where we say always copy this over and not give the option.

**John Hope:** I think that would be preferred. I’m sure this doesn’t happen all of the time but when it does I think it would be disruptive.

**Mark Dunthorn:** What you are saying is that for this location here you are seeing the modified location after the event was created? I think I am missing something here.

**John Hope:** No, when you select a location the lane config should appear and that is what can be modified by the operator. It is that modified lane configuration that I am referring to.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Do you think it should or should not be carried over?

**John Hope:** I think it should be and give the operator time to correct it.

**Mark Dunthorn:** I agree, does anyone feel differently that it should not be carried over? Will it be a problem Tucker?

1. SG-4212 Offensive Waze Messages

**Mark Dunthorn:** We have discussed this off line earlier in the year, there was a poll sent out. We received mixed results on whether or not to keep this. When a Waze alert comes in, you see the normal IDS alert information. There is a description field and most of the time it is empty. When there is a description it is often generic. These descriptions are crowd sourced information and users can put whatever they want. Sometimes it makes it to the TMC and sometimes it does not. The question is should we drop the field entirely so it is not distracting? Anyone have any strong feelings about keeping it or dropping it?

**Dee McTague:** Either way is fine with District Four.

**Tucker Brown:** Often this field will also show up in chronology reports so that is something to consider.

**Mark Laird:** Is that a field that can be edited by operators?

**Mark Dunthorn:** No.

**Mark Laird:** Okay, it is good that this cannot be attributed to an operator.

**Mark Dunthorn:** Since there are no strong feelings about this, let’s move to the next item.

1. SG-4650 Wrong Way Driving Crash Descriptor

**Mark Dunthorn:** Crashes caused by a wrong way driver can be reported two ways:

* A wrong way driver event is cloned into a secondary crash event
* A crash event is determined after the fact to have been caused by a wrong way driver

We need to be able to track crashes that are a result of a wrong way driver. What has been proposed is a new type descriptor. We would be adding a new descriptor. Which would allow the operator to go into an existing crash event and check the wrong way driver box to make the association. If a wrong way driver event is cloned into a crash then it would do it automatically. Is there anything that I have missed?

**Bryan Homayouni:** Is it possible to change that? One of the things we’ve seen is that sometimes based on the information provided in the field there is a question as to whether if it is a wrong way driver. Sometimes it changes based on further investigation.

**Derek Vollmer:** We want that field to be auditable so yes, it could be changed.

1. .NET Version

**Tucker Brown:** Currently all of our servers are running on .NET 4.0 which is very old and have had a few updates since then. If you have a higher version there is not a problem it is just when you have a lower version. I am not aware of anyone using Server 2003 or XP. We are proposing to update the operator map and work station. There is a need to upgrade .NET version to take advantage of libraries for device integrations. Due to recent upgrades, we believe the new minimums are Server 2008R2 and Windows 7. Does anyone know for a fact if you are running something lower than that? If you do, send me an email so I can know. We want to make sure we get the minimums in. The proposed change will be at least .NET 4.6. I do not want to go less than .NET 4.6. If server 2008R2 SP1 and Windows 7 or 10 (if current) .NET 4.7.2 will work. If you have any work stations or servers that are not going to meet the 4.7.2 standard there is a link on the screen that will tell you the requirements. Please send me and Central Office an email if you have any issues or are working on an older version.

**Jacques Dupuy:** Server 2016 should be fine?

**Tucker Brown:** Yes, anything higher is fine. The system requirements link is on the slide.

**Mark Dunthorn:** I think everyone should go back and get with your IT folks to get your information on what server and workstation version you are on.

**Derek Vollmer:** Not everyone is on this call so it would be best for Central Office to send out an email to ask what version is being used. That way everyone knows what we are trying to do and we can compile the responses from the different users (Districts, MDX, CFX, etc.)

**Mark Dunthorn:** Does anyone have any other items to discuss? Not hearing any the meeting will end.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Central Office send out email about .NET compatibility | Christine Shafik / Derek Vollmer |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |