

## **Materials TAG Minutes – Oct. 7, 2008**

### **Opening:**

Meeting called to order by TAG Chairman, Dave Bernard, who welcomed everyone to the meeting. Member roll call was taken.

#### **Members or proxies in attendance**

Mitchell Archer, Arkansas  
Sheri Meyerhoff - Proxy, Indiana  
Mark Higdon, Kentucky  
Beth Roberts, Louisiana  
Marty Foster, Michigan  
James A. Williams, III, Mississippi  
Denis Glascock, Missouri  
Lisa Durbin Proxy, Montana  
Melanie Douglass, New Brunswick  
David Bernard, NY  
David Conaway, OK  
Tim Lindberg Proxy, SC  
Stewart DeWitt, TX  
Michael Schillaci, New Jersey

☰ Note: Michael drove in from New Jersey this morning, and didn't get to the meeting until 10:45 am.

Jim Ferguson, Nebraska

☰ Note: Jim Ferguson attended for about five minutes to relay information on TMRs 8080 and 8081.

#### **Other Attendees: N/A**

- J.R. Connors, ITI, Louisiana
- Gus Wagner, Minnesota
- Joni Wissinger, Montana
- Steve Carter, Florida, Construction
- Sonya Dooley, ITI
- Sid Hodgson, ITI
- Jim Hanley, New York, Construction
- Janie Valdez, Colorado
- John Thomas, Oklahoma
- Brad Parks, ITI
- Cheryl Falcone, New York
- Norma Stephens, ITI, Alabama
- Kevin Martin, Iowa
- Kevin Fox, Michigan
- Jeremy Kampeter, Missouri
- Wilma Degraffenreid, Missouri
- Kevin Thornton, Arkansas
- Dean Grant, New York
- Diane Menz, ITI
- Jennifer Kihul, Mississippi
- Jeff Thorn, New York
- Russ Barron, ITI
- Tom De La Portilla, Texas
- Tony Bianchi, AASHTO
- David Debo, Texas
- Mike Meyerhoff, Missouri
- Jim Johnson, FL, TTF
- Pam Schmidt, Mississippi
- Celina Sumrall, Mississippi
- Cliff Farr, Michigan
- Todd Bergland, Minnesota
- Jon Wright, ITI
- Don Grayson, MS (Guest with Jim Ferguson for about five minutes)
- Tim Lindberg SC
- Gina Merseal, ITI
- Daryl Bushika, NY

## **Total Attendees = 50**

### **Mission Statement**

The mission statement was reviewed. Denis Glascock of Missouri made a motion to keep the mission statement as posted / copied below. Beth Roberts of Louisiana seconded the motion; motion carried.

Provide guidance, coordination, and oversight for the development, implementation, and maintenance of a modern comprehensive materials information management system within the framework of a total transportation information system

### **Short term goals:**

The short-term goals were reviewed. Mark Higdon of Kentucky made a motion to modify the short-term goals as posted / copied below. Marty Foster of Michigan seconded the motion; motion carried.

1. Prioritize known issues for correction and/or enhancement.
2. Continue to identify areas of concern.
3. Support materials management web development, by providing user business requirements to the Technical Review Teams.

### **Long term goals:**

The long-term goals were reviewed. Beth Roberts of Louisiana made a motion to modify the long-term goals as posted / copied below. James A. Williams, III of Mississippi seconded the motion; motion carried.

1. Review current and changing regulations and methods to insure that the AASHTO Trns•port products support the function necessary to comply with all regulations and evolving methods
2. Monitor the maintenance of the Materials management functions and pursue the resolution of problems identified by SiteManager users
3. Facilitate the implementation of the Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in web Trns•port.

### **Meeting minutes from 2007**

The minutes of the 2007 meeting were reviewed. Marty Foster of Michigan made a motion to approve minutes as posted. Melanie Douglass of New Brunswick seconded the motion; motion carried.

### **Election of officers**

2007 Coordinator Dave Bernard  
2007 Assistant Coordinator Mark Higdon

2008 Coordinator Dave Bernard  
2008 Assistant Coordinator Mark Higdon

### **Updates from past year**

See detailed notes in appendix A.

### **TMR Discussion**

See detailed notes in appendix A.

**TMRs -**

Deleted - 2189  
Deleted - 2200  
Deleted - 2225  
Deleted - 2226  
Deleted - 2227  
Deleted – 10270

**Ballot items:**

See detailed notes in appendix A.

**Items from Floor**

See detailed notes in appendix A.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Beth Roberts of Louisiana and seconded by Lisa Durbin of Montana.

## Materials TAG - Meeting Minutes Appendix A

---

**Date:** Tuesday, October 07, 2008  
**Time:** 8:00 am to 11:37 am Eastern  
**Location:** Saratoga Springs, New York

---

Materials TAG Minutes – Oct. 7, 2008 .....	1
1. Attendees.....	5
2. Topics .....	6
2.1 Welcome to Upstate New York .....	6
2.2 Introductions.....	6
2.3 Review MTAG Meetings for 2008 TUG .....	6
2.4 Roll Call – MTAG Members (member or proxy).....	7
2.5 Introductions, Others in Attendance.....	7
2.6 MTAG Business .....	8
2.6.1 Mission Statement .....	8
2.6.2 Short Range Goals .....	9
2.6.3 Long Range Goals .....	9
2.6.4 Review/Approve 2007 Minutes.....	10
2.6.5 Vote for Materials TAG Chair.....	10
2.7 Enhancement Discussion - 22 new TMR's for 2008.....	10
2.7.1 TMRs submitted by Maryland .....	10
2.7.2 TMRs submitted by Colorado .....	11
2.7.3 TMRs 8080 and 8081 .....	11
2.7.4 TMR 10240 .....	12
2.7.5 TMR 2200 .....	12
2.7.6 TMR's Captured in 2007 JAD Meeting Minutes .....	13
2.7.7 TMR 9968 .....	13
2.7.8 TMR 10068 .....	13
2.7.9 TMR 10086 .....	14
2.7.10 TMR 10087 .....	14
2.7.11 TMR 10222 .....	14
2.7.12 TMR 10224 .....	14
2.7.13 TMRs 10251, 10252, 10253, 10254, 10255.....	15
2.7.14 TMR 10109 .....	15
2.7.15 TMR 10241 .....	16
2.7.16 TMR 10243 .....	17
2.7.17 TMR 10245 .....	17
2.7.18 TMR 10246 .....	18
2.7.19 TMR 10247 .....	18
2.7.20 TMR 10248 .....	18
2.7.21 TMR 10269 .....	19
2.7.22 TMR 10270 .....	19
2.7.23 TMR 10376 .....	19
2.8 Items from the Floor .....	20
3. Review Action Items .....	22

## 1. Attendees

	Name	Agency	Email Address
1	Tony Bianchi	AASHTO	tbianchi@aaashto.org
2	Kevin Thornton	Arkansas SHTD	Kevin.Thornton@arkansashighway.com
3	Mitchell Archer	Arkansas SHTD	Mitchell.Archer@arkansashighways.com
4	Janie Valdez	Colorado DOT	Janie.Valdez@dot.state.co.us
5	Jim Johnson	Florida DOT	Jim.Johnson@dot.state.fl.us
6	Steve Carter	Florida DOT	steve.carter@dot.state.fl.us
7	Kevin Martin	Iowa DOT	Kevin.Martin@dot.iowa.gov
8	Sheri Meyerhoff	InDOT	smeyerhoff@indot.in.gov
9	Brad Parks	Info Tech, Inc.	Brad.Parks@infotechfl.com
10	Diane Menz	Info Tech, Inc.	Diane.Menz@infotechfl.com
11	Gina Merseal	Info Tech, Inc.	Gina.Merseal@infotechfl.com
12	J.R. Connors	Info Tech, Inc.	fconnors@infotechfl.com
13	Jon Wright	Info Tech, Inc.	Jon.Wright@infotechfl.com
14	Norma Stephens	Info Tech, Inc.	Norma.Stephens@infotechfl.com
15	Sid Hodgson	Info Tech, Inc.	Sid.Hodgson@infotechfl.com
16	Sonya Dooley	Info Tech, Inc.	Sonya.Dooley@infotechfl.com
17	Russ Barron	Info Tech, Inc.	Russ.Barron@infotechfl.com
18	Mark Higdon	KYTC	Mark.Higdon@ky.gov
19	Beth Roberts	Louisiana DOT	BethRoberts@dotd.la.gov
20	Celina Sumrall	Mississippi DOT	csumrall@mdot.state.ms.us
21	Don Grayson	Mississippi DOT	dgrayson@mdot.state.ms.us
22	James A. Williams, III	Mississippi DOT	jwilliams@mdot.state.ms.us
23	Jennifer Kihul	Mississippi DOT	jkiihul@mdot.state.ms.us
24	Pam Schmidt	Mississippi DOT	pschmidt@mdot.state.ms.us
25	Cliff Farr	Michigan DOT	farrc@michigan.gov
26	Kevin Fox	Michigan DOT	foxk@michigan.gov
27	Marty Foster	Michigan DOT	Fosterm@michigan.gov
28	Gus Wagner	MN/DOT	Gus.Wagner@dot.state.mn.us
29	Todd Bergland	MN/DOT	Todd.Bergland@dot.state.mn.us
30	Denis Glascock	MoDOT	Denis.Glascock@modot.mo.gov
31	Jeremy Kampeter	MoDOT	Jeremy.Kampeter@modot.mo.gov
32	Mike Meyerhoff	MoDOT	Michael.Meyerhoff@modot.mo.gov
33	Wilma Degraffenreid	MoDOT	Wilma.Degraffenreid@modot.mo.gov
34	Joni Wissinger	Montana DOT	fwissinger@mt.gov
35	Lisa Durbin	Montana DOT	ldurbin@mt.gov
36	Jim Ferguson	NDOR	Jim.Ferguson@nebraska.gov
37	Melanie Douglass	New Brunswick DOT	Melanie.douglass@gnb.ca
38	Michael Schillaci	NJDOT	Michael.schillaci@dot.state.nj.us
39	Cheryl Falcone	NYS DOT	cfalcone@dot.state.ny.us
40	Daryl Bushika	NYS DOT	dbushika@dot.state.ny.us

	Name	Agency	Email Address
41	David Bernard	NYS DOT	dbernard@dot.state.ny.us
42	Dean Grant	NYS DOT	dgrant@dot.state.ny.us
43	Jeff Thorn	NYS DOT	jthorn@dot.state.ny.us
44	Jim Hanley	NYS DOT	JHanley@dot.state.ny.us
45	David Conaway	OkDOT	dconaway@odot.org
46	John Thomas	OkDOT	jthomas@odot.org
47	Tim Lindberg	SCDOT	lindbergtw@scdot.org
48	David Debo	TxDOT	ddebo@dot.state.tx.us
49	Stewart DeWitt	TxDOT	ddewitt@dot.state.tx.us
50	Tom De La Portilla	TxDOT	tdelaport@dot.state.tx.us

## 2. Topics

---

### 2.1 Welcome to Upstate New York

8:00 am

- Good morning and welcome back.

### 2.2 Introductions

8:01 am

- Introductions were made.
- Dave Bernard (NY), Materials TAG Chairman
- Mark Higdon (KY), Materials TAG Assistant Chairman
- Tim Lindberg (SC), TTF, Materials TRT Coordinator
- Daryl Bushika (NY), SiteManager System Administrator
- Gina Merseal (IT), Materials TRT, meeting minutes
- Correction from yesterday, Jim Johnson and Tom Rothrock mentioned the LIMS enhancement from last year. One agency was left out of the credits. It is Louisiana. Dave made a public announcement that they were also involved in funding the LIMS enhancement project; Silent Partner.
- Dave had hand outs. There weren't enough for everyone. Dave wanted precedence of Materials TAG members to have handouts first. Dave passed out the handouts.

### 2.3 Review MTAG Meetings for 2008 TUG

8:05 am

- Dave went over the agenda for today and lunch tomorrow.
- The information is on the back of first page of the handout.
- The traditional Materials meeting is this morning's meeting (e.g. approving minutes, goals, mission statement, that sort of thing). Will do an election of Materials TAG Chairman. Will be going over that in about 15 minutes. Will go over TMR enhancements like we do.
- This morning after lunch there is a meeting that isn't on the official agenda here. Dave sent it out prior in an email. New York will go over the enhancement on LIMS in SiteManager Version 3.9. It is an agency only meeting. Things we will talk about are the concepts of LIMS enhancement software. Daryl and another System Administrator who is coming up later, Dan Fregoe will run that meeting for us. Talk about how to set up LIMS tables. Can talk to someone who has been doing this for 2 years now. Will get down to tables, screen, template development, and other topics. Will include lessons

- learned on building templates for LIMS. Try to model business process. Really pushed bounds of templates pretty good; to the extreme.
- There is one correction. Location will be in the Daily Double room and will start at 1:30 pm, not 1:00 and ends at 4:15.
  - Tomorrow morning is Round Table on agenda. Changed around a little bit.
  - Shows Materials has an hour, and TRT has an hour. Materials TRT will have 2 hours starting at 8:00. Will be a sign for whichever room we'll be in. Talk about new concepts for wTrns•port Materials. Their goal is to define requirements of new material. Kind of headed up by Tim Lindberg and his crew.
  - 10:15 to 11:00 is a Joint Construction and Materials session. Talked with Jeremy about it yesterday. Have some ideas of what we can talk about at that meeting.
  - Tim: External access and what to do to accommodate that.
  - Dave: Another thing in conjunction with Construction Division is to show enhancement processes for the field that involves materials and materials acceptances.
  - Lastly tomorrow morning 11 to 12 is open forum. Don't really have an agenda for that. In past, there were breakout sessions to kick around problems and ideas. It's mostly materials related. Hopefully Dave's not running out of things to say by then.

## 2.4 Roll Call – MTAG Members (member or proxy)

8:12 am

- Roll Call
  - Charlie Brown, Alabama (NO)
  - Mitchell Archer, Arkansas (YES)
  - John Giannini, Connecticut (NO)
  - Allen Hughes, Florida (NO)
  - Terry Callahan, Georgia (NO)
  - Sheri Meyerhoff - *Proxy*, Indiana (YES)
  - Mark Higdon, Kentucky (YES)
  - Beth Roberts, Louisiana (YES)
  - Marty Foster, Michigan (YES)
  - James A. Williams, III, Mississippi (YES)
  - Denis Glascock, Missouri (YES)
  - Lisa Durbin *Proxy*, Montana (YES)
  - Rhonda DeButts, Nebraska (NO)
    - ☰ Note: Jim Ferguson attended for about five minutes, but not as a voting proxy.
  - Melanie Douglass, New Brunswick (YES)
  - Michael Schillaci, New Jersey (YES)
    - ☰ Note: Michael drove in from New Jersey this morning, and didn't get to the meeting until 10:45 am.
  - David Bernard, NY (YES)
  - David Conaway, OK (YES)
  - Tim Lindberg *Proxy*, SC (YES)
  - Richard Weber, TN (NO)
  - Stewart DeWitt, TX (YES)
  - Bob Atchinson, Vermont (NO)
  - Joe Bouchey, Virginia (NO)
- Total Possible: 22
- Total Attended/Represented: 14

## 2.5 Introductions, Others in Attendance

8:16 am

Documented others in attendance for the record 36 at beginning of meeting and then it changed throughout the meeting.

- J.R. Connors, ITI, Louisiana
- Gus Wagner, Minnesota
- Joni Wissinger, Montana
- Steve Carter, Florida, Construction
- Sonya Dooley, ITI
- Sid Hodgson, ITI
- Jim Hanley, New York, Construction
- Janie Valdez, Colorado
- John Thomas, Oklahoma
- Brad Parks, ITI
- Cheryl Falcone, New York
- Norma Stephens, ITI, Alabama
- Kevin Martin, Iowa
- Kevin Fox, Michigan
- Jeremy Kampeter, Missouri
- Wilma Degraffenreid, Missouri
- Kevin Thornton, Arkansas
- Dean Grant, New York
- Diane Menz, ITI
- Jennifer Kiihul, Mississippi
- Jeff Thorn, New York
- Russ Barron, ITI
- Tom De La Portilla, Texas
- Tony Bianchi, AASHTO
- David Debo, Texas
- Mike Meyerhoff, Missouri
- Jim Johnson, FL, TTF
- Pam Schmidt, Mississippi
- Celina Sumrall, Mississippi
- Cliff Farr, Michigan
- Todd Bergland, Minnesota
- Jon Wright, ITI
- Don Grayson, MS (Guest with Jim Ferguson for about five minutes)
- Tim Lindberg SC
- Gina Merseal, ITI
- Daryl Bushika, NY

## 2.6 MTAG Business

8:20 am

- The Mission Statement, Short Range Goals, and Long Range Goals, 2007 Minutes, Election of TAG Chairman were displayed for review.

### 2.6.1 Mission Statement

8:20

- Current: Provide guidance, coordination, and oversight for the development, implementation, and maintenance of a modern comprehensive materials information management system within the framework of a total transportation information system.
- Discussion: No comments.
- Vote: Denis Glascock of Missouri made a motion to leave the mission statement as is. Beth Roberts of Louisiana seconded. All were favor.
- Final Decision: The mission statement will remain the same.

### 2.6.2 Short Range Goals

8:22

- Current
  1. Prioritize known issues for correction and/or enhancement
  2. Continue to identify areas of concern
  3. Define strategies and guidelines to implement an integrated laboratory information management system (LIMS) for SiteManager
- Discussion: #3 was added a couple of years ago. Point would be that we've kind of satisfied this goal. Recommend drop number three reference to LIMS. Anyone apposed? No. The other suggestion in this area came from Rhonda DeButts in an email. She suggested having a sentence that documents the fact that we are working on a TRT. Defining requirements for web development. Long range references, but short don't. Going to suggest language. Does anyone disagree that short term goals should not reference web developing in short term goals? No. Following are ideas and discussion.
  - Support materials management and web development, by providing user business requirements to the Materials Management Technical Review Team.
  - Developing user stories to document functionality.
  - Support materials management and web development, by providing user business requirements to the Materials Management Technical Review Team.
  - Sheri indicated to clarify a User Story. It's a business function.
  - Industry wide
  - Materials Functional Area TRT is the name of the TRT.
  - Connectivity to non agency people, where input by materials people would be broader or keep it to just materials.
  - She does have a point. There are cross functional aspects.
  - Change suggested to Agency Technical Review Teams.
  - Support materials management web development, by providing user business requirements to the Technical Review Teams.
- Vote: Mark Higdon of Kentucky made a motion to accept. Marty Foster of Michigan seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: The short range goals will be modified to reflect the following
  4. Prioritize known issues for correction and/or enhancement
  5. Continue to identify areas of concern
  6. Support materials management web development, by providing user business requirements to the Technical Review Teams.

### 2.6.3 Long Range Goals

8:30

- Current
  1. Provide oversight for the development of additional Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in SiteManager
  2. Review current and changing regulations and methods to insure that the AASHTO Trns•port products support the function necessary to comply with all regulations and evolving methods
  3. Monitor the maintenance of the Materials management functions and pursue the resolution of problems identified by SiteManager users
  4. Implement an integrated Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) in SiteManager
  5. Facilitate the implementation of the Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in web Trns•port.
- Discussion: LIMS doesn't need to be in long range goals anymore. Recommend to delete number 1. Oppose? Gus, want to modify SiteManager and wTrns•port?
  - Dave: Got that below. Know where you are going. Want to leave last one because it refers to wTrns•port. Anyone oppose getting rid of number 1? No.

- Delete 'Implement an integrated Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) in SiteManager'
- Any comment or discussion to adding others or additional changes? No
- Vote: Beth Roberts of Louisiana made a motion to accept. James A. Williams, III of Mississippi seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: The long range goals will be modified to reflect the following.
  1. Review current and changing regulations and methods to insure that the AASHTO Trns•port products support the function necessary to comply with all regulations and evolving methods
  2. Monitor the maintenance of the Materials management functions and pursue the resolution of problems identified by SiteManager users
  3. Facilitate the implementation of the Materials Management and Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) functionality in web Trns•port.

#### 2.6.4 Review/Approve 2007 Minutes

8:34 am

- Sent meeting minutes out from last meeting. Don't want to go through them again.
- Discussion: No discussion.
  - No modifications
- Vote: Marty Foster of Michigan made a motion to accept the minutes as they are. Melanie Douglass of New Brunswick seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: The meeting minutes from last year's Materials TAG will remain the same and have been accepted by the Materials TAG.

#### 2.6.5 Vote for Materials TAG Chair

8:36 am

- Dave sent an email out asking if anyone would like to perform chairperson. Received no emails back. Anyone interested assuming leadership of committee
  - What are the benefits?
  - Nomination from the floor of someone who would like to run the committee.
  - Beth Roberts of Louisiana nominated Dave Bernard of New York.
  - Any other nominations?
  - Is there a motion to accept Dave as continuing chairperson of committee?
  - Denis Glascock of Missouri moved that Dave Bernard be accepted by acclamation. James A. Williams, III of Mississippi seconded.
- Vote: A motion for Dave Bernard to be the new Materials TAG Coordinator by acclamation was made by Denis Glascock of Missouri. James A. Williams, III seconded. All were in favor.
- Final Decision: Dave Bernard will be the new Materials TAG Coordinator.

### 2.7 Enhancement Discussion - 22 new TMR's for 2008

8:38 am

- Have enhancement TMRS from this meeting. The point is that we get together, talk about enhancements, go home and vote on the enhancements. It sets the priorities for web development. This is a little different than it was with Client/Server. Have a spreadsheet to use that indicates the TMRs we'll be reviewing that were gathered from Cloverleaf.

#### 2.7.1 TMRs submitted by Maryland

- Description: 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2295, 2260 (Georgia)
- Discussion: There are 43 TMRs on Cloverleaf related to the Materials TAG. Of those 43 there are a number of old ones. Most submitted by Maryland. Dave couldn't get a hold of anyone to get rid of them. They are listed as 'Hold'. They are there, but cannot get a hold of them for voting on them.

- Decision: Will keep these on the ballot.

### 2.7.2 TMRs submitted by Colorado

- Description: 2189, 2200, 2225, 2226, and 2227
- Discussion
  - Colorado has some TMRs. Dave contacted Janie, and they agreed to obsolete them. These 6 should be out of there at this point.
    - 2189
    - 2200
    - 2225
    - 2226
    - 2227
- Decision: Will take these TMRs off the ballot if they are not already taken off.

### 2.7.3 TMRs 8080 and 8081

- Skipped to enhancements.
  - MS - James: Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) is leading the charge on that. We have an estimate from ITI to do this work. Not for sure funding wise where it is. NDOR is funding that enhancement.
  - Dave: Recommend staying away from these two TMRs that are related to NDOR funding these enhancements (8080 and 8081).
  - MS - James: TMR 8081 originally related to Contract Materials, we actually added verbiage to include Material Detail. That TMR expanded in original scope.
  - Dave: Anyone interested in taking a quick peak or accept the fact that agencies are taking care of these? Let's jump over to Cloverleaf to take a quick look.
    - Is there anyone who doesn't know about the Cloverleaf site who is here? No replies were made.
    - The minutes from last year are detailed. The TMR information is documented in the meeting minutes in 2007. There are 22 new TMRs.
- Description: 8081 Modify the window to allow display of all materials associated with an item.
- Discussion
  - It was Mississippi's, and Nebraska stepped in and paid for it. It was on the books since 2004 maybe. Is everyone good with this one? No comments were made.
- Description: 8080 Add a print button to the Sample Information Material Test Template Usage window.
- Discussion
  - MS - James: This TMR is primarily for printing. The intent of 8080 was to give an easy way to print the template information.
    - One: Blank templates for worksheets in lab.
    - Two: Field Lab report leaves a lot to be desired. The print functionality will be made to print Lab Report.
  - NY: Will make it more like a report?
  - MS: Yes
  - Dave: Will it be included in the next release of SM?
  - MS: Not for sure. Haven't talked to Rhonda in the last month.
  - Dave: Got enough money to pay for the enhancement?
  - MS: Not for sure.
  - Dave: If anyone has any money, then I'm sure Mississippi and Nebraska would welcome it.
    - 📄 Note: Jim Ferguson from NDOR came in during the discussion. Jim discussed TMRs 8080 and 8081. Would like to see them done, but need help getting them funded. Jim would be willing to forward that proposal to anyone if interested. Asked to say it again.

- Celina - MS: There are some really good changes. Would say they are worth looking at.
- Jim - NE: Need a little help. May be able to take on the cost of one TMR, but not both. Don't know what the policy is on sending the proposal to other agencies. Can give it to TAG Group. **AI** – Jim Ferguson will forward the proposal for 8080 and 8081 to Dave Bernard. **AI** – Dave Bernard will send the proposal for 8080 and 8081 TMR enhancements to the TAG members.
- Dave – NY: Will need to leave 8080 and 8081 on the ballot. Everyone understands the situation. NDOR has money, but not enough to cover both of them. If interested, contact NDOR directly.
- **Decision:** Will need to leave 8080 and 8081 on the ballot. Everyone understands the situation. NDOR has money, but not enough to cover both of them. If interested, contact NDOR directly

#### 2.7.4 TMR 10240

- **Description:** Changing Sample Date Removes Sample data - Sample window
- **Discussion**
  - NY recommend TMR 10240
  - Scenario: When you log a sample into SiteManager, and you change the sample date. If you fill in some of the data (e.g. Producer/Supplier) and then change sample date, it will erase some of what you entered, and then you have to put it in again. New York put the TMR in and said we didn't want it to do that. When you do modify the sample date, it checks to see the producer/supplier that can do that material, so New York wants to withdraw that one. Like it that way (the way it works now).
  - Sheri - IN: There is purpose to that functionality.
  - Denis - MO: Your 'aha' discovery on this was correct. It is built in for a variety of functionality. This was originally built this way because it was the simplest and less costly. Checking controls with out taking them out is a better way. Missouri has debated on how to improve this particular function. We're not necessarily advocating changing it. It is normal, but will blank things out that don't need to be blanked out. Check fields see if correct, if it is, leave, or blow out particular fields that aren't good.
  - NY: Users should be aware of the 'gotchas'.
    - If creating/copying samples from Monday to Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, then have to refill in information, it's extra work. Like Denis' idea.
    - Denis - MO: Modify or rewrite.
    - Dave - NY: Is that something you wouldn't mind doing for the group?
    - Action item identified that the gentleman from Missouri, Denis will resubmit a TMR. (*Modification to action item was made below.*) That wouldn't get it in this ballot. Enhancement for this ballot proposed by the Materials TAG today. Does ITI care?
    - Sonya - ITI: Either way will work. Changing the description is easy. Could do it either way.
    - Submitted by the TAG at that point.
  - **AI:** Daryl – NY: will modify TMR 10240
  - **AI:** Denis - MO: will write it up the description for the modified TMR 10240 for New York.
- **Decision:** Daryl – NY will modify TMR 10240. Denis - MO will write it up the description for the modified TMR 10240 for New York.

#### 2.7.5 TMR 2200

- Submitted by Missouri. Couldn't locate it. Didn't discuss it.

### 2.7.6 TMR's Captured in 2007 JAD Meeting Minutes

- Description: For the sake of time, recommend we not plow that earth again, and spend time on new stuff that came in on the ballot since St. Louis. Everyone was in agreement.
- Discussion
  - TMRs 2172, 2699, 3420, 6573, 6987, 7193, 9572, 9599, 9653, 9713, and 9849
- Decision: Keep these TMRs on the ballot.

### 2.7.7 TMR 9968

9:03 AM

- Description: 9968 Modify SM so that Lab Report meets AASHTO, ASTM and FHWA standards (Missouri)
- Discussion
  - NY: This looks very similar to TMR 8080.
  - MO: Modification is to specifically list AASHTO requirements. Not for sure if TMR 8080 does that. They seem to be similar.
  - NY: Idea is that AASHTO software should reflect AASHTO standards. One that comes to mind is Calibrated Equipment. Bring software more in line with standards of AASHTO (e.g. R-18). Remove it?
  - MO: Up to the TAG. Wrote it up for the TAG.
  - NY: Anyone in favor of removing this one? No replies.
- Decision: Keep this TMR on the ballot.

### 2.7.8 TMR 10068

- Description: 10068 Material test template character return values not saved in the results table (Montana)
- Discussion
  - Dave - NY: Will ask Diane Menz to speak about some of the details. George isn't here. Lisa?
  - Lisa - MT: Templates returning a pass/fail. Not numbered and use characters.
  - Joni - MT: Think there is a field in the table but you cannot save.
  - Daryl - NY: Even though defined as number, saved as text value. Database level defined as string, but cannot save string value. Recommend even save character fields, to check against spec character fields. Right now can only check ranges.
  - NY: SM or PB?
  - ITI: SM
  - Jeff - NY: In context of this it's related to one field, but really applies to the system. All kinds of data modeling.
  - Brad - ITI: Only applies to template area. If it is working in DWR Templates, it should work here.
  - Jeff - NY: Error check applied to templates when first written?
  - Brad - ITI: Not known when written, but when DWR Templates were developed we identified how. They are stored into a table, but there is a column in that table for each field on the window.
  - Dave - NY: Definitely sounds like a problem there. Good that it is documented as enhancement TMR. With LIMS in SiteManager, more agencies are going to try to use it. And now templates are more important than they were. It's needed to make backbone work. NY will probably keep this one to put points on it.
  - Joni - MT: Does it need to be expanded?
  - Daryl - NY: Yes, it needs to be expanded.
  - Dave - NY: Volunteers to amend this TMR?
  - Denis - MO: Recommend split two concepts. Haven't looked at code, but relatively easy fix. Denis described technical fix.
  - **AI**: Daryl - NY will create new TMR related to TMR 10068 to split two concepts.
  - Will leave 10068 alone.

- [Decision](#): Keep this TMR on the ballot.

#### 2.7.9 TMR 10086

- [Description](#): 10086 Automatically run ccalc process after contract sampling & testing modification (Oklahoma)
- [Discussion](#)
  - Dave - NY: Had trouble initially, when you save sample record, it didn't update. Had to run process to update count of completed samples. Still have to run process every time we update Sampling and Testing Requirements (S&TR). Would like to automatically have it done when you save S&TR.
  - Brad - ITI: When you change anything it should calculate it. Could validate it. It does work.
  - Will leave it on the ballot.
  - **AI**: Brad - ITI and JR - ITI will discuss TMR 10068 with Oklahoma and Missouri and will provide input to Dave by Thursday.
    - ☰ (from discussion on 10087) Sheri - IN: For the previous one, 10068 can it be researched before the ballot? Have it verified as to whether it is going to be on the ballot.
- [Decision](#): Will research and verify if it is going to be on the ballot by Thursday, October 9, 2008.

#### 2.7.10 TMR 10087

- [Description](#): 10087 SiteManager should automatically run smpl checklist rpt after generate materials (Oklahoma)
  - [Discussion](#): Sheri - IN: Was that supposed to be covered by Big 15 as well?
  - Sonya - ITI: Want ccalc to run after generating materials?
  - Dave - NY: Yes
  - Brad - ITI: It should do that, it doesn't.
  - Sheri - IN: Have a request by both of these. Can research be done before ballot?
  - Sonya - ITI: This one is an enhancement.
- [Decision](#): Keep this TMR on the ballot.

#### 2.7.11 TMR 10222

- [Description](#): 10222 SM LIMS Cannot add or remove multiple users on Maintain Lab Users (No Association on TMR was made)
- [Discussion](#)
  - Daryl - NY: The screen for associating user to LIMS. Pick lab on top, list on left assigned to tester, right indicates associations to lab. You can only add one at a time. Don't remember adding anything in on this one.
  - Dave - NY: It's a 'onesy' thing (ballot points). Would be better if multi-select thing. At a minimum it's documented for web development.
  - Daryl - NY: Should assign to whoever put it in.
  - Jeff - NY: Are there other areas in the application where it does this.
  - Dave - NY: There are others like the test area. Worse case scenario is that we'll assign it to NY.
  - This afternoon we'll spend more time looking at these windows unless we have more time this morning and want to play
- [Decision](#): Keep this TMR on the ballot.

#### 2.7.12 TMR 10224

- [Description](#): 10224 Test Template Computed Field returning String Value generates PowerBuilder error (New York)
- [Discussion](#)

- Daryl - NY: If you try to return a string, LIMS really doesn't like that and it terminates the application. Don't think NY submitted it either. Can take it though if nobody else claims it. If you try to save that value it will bomb and break.
- Joni - MT: You have to decode it.
- Daryl - NY: You don't receive a nice error; it just goes 'Oops I'm done'.
- Decision: Keep this TMR on the ballot.

### 2.7.13 TMRs 10251, 10252, 10253, 10254, 10255

- Description and Discussion:
  - 10251 SM LIMS - Add LIMS to Materials Management panel (Info Tech)
    - Diane ITI: Trying to replicate/integrate some of the GUI in LIMS into SiteManager Materials. That's what the five individual TMRs are looking at.
    - Sheri - IN: Level of detail is there another level of security in windows?
    - Daryl - NY: It didn't know about the LIMS windows, you had to go into Group Security in LIMS.
    - Dave C. - OK: Are you opting way to opt out of using LIMS?
    - Dave - NY: No
    - Diane - ITI: Just to launch them separately. Construction person may not use LIMS.
    - Denis - MO: Navigational icons for agency to set.
    - Dave - NY: Would envision this... When read TMRs. Kind of documenting for web development. Be surprised if did anything in Client/Server to be honest with you.
    - Dave - NY: Group of five?
    - Diane - ITI: Didn't write them, but could help interpret.
  - 10252 SM LIMS - Group Security for LIMS windows
    - Diane - ITI: In LIMS you get it for Update rights or you don't get it at all. That is the difference; SiteManager has it and LIMS doesn't.
  - 10253 SM LIMS - Integrate Destination Lab in Qualified Labs window
  - 10254 SM LIMS - Integrate Product User and Lab User in Materials User window
  - 10255 Add Lab User to Qualified Labs window
- **AI**: Diane - ITI will follow up with the author of 10255 and 10254 and see if 10255 is covered in 10254.
- Decision: Will keep the TMRs on the ballot; however, ITI will follow up with the author of 10255 and 10254 and see if 10255 is covered in 10254

~Break 9:40 to 9:55~

### 2.7.14 TMR 10109

- Description: 10109 Add Daily Source Record (DSR) functionality
- Discussion
  - Daryl - NY: Add functionality of DWR to contracts, but to material sources instead of contract. The source sent out the materials to the contract. An inspector was there to inspect, and this is what happened. In a plant, this is what happened and what needs to be tracked. Want DWR like functionality. Inspector goes to plant/source and tracks what he does, the components the facility uses, and the materials produced by that facility on a daily basis. Looking at a DWR type of function. Daryl gave a presentation on a DSR. Documented that something happened but no one was actually there.
  - Following is information from the presentation, but does not portray the slides.
    - DSR Material Produced
      - What contracts got this material and how much of it they got.

- New York lets water in mix, some don't. Maybe they need a water reducer yesterday, but today they don't. Record tweaks in mix. Maybe custom template.
- Inspection
  - Inspection history. Today we went there and did 90 day scale checks, safety checks, or whatever. Include grid to summarize what you've done. Include dates maybe. Can have a drop down for inspection type. Maybe a custom template off of it.
- Components
  - Where is he getting what he is using? Grid of Bottom Info Like P/S materials can have more than one active record of same material. Detail daily in Materials Produced tab.
  - If tie to plant, then every mix that plant produces uses that cement. Reduce records of tracking cement. Right now you have to change every mix that plant is producing.
- Sample
  - Link DSR to sample
  - Some kind of link to Sample Window.
  - Similar to DWR to Sample Window.
- Inventory
  - Man holes or whatever to be used. Contractor is not using them yet, but they are approved to be used on a state job.
- NY has ball park estimate to add to C/S. Been contacted by several agencies who have expressed interest. Looking for interest in helping fund it. Contact Bushika.
- Dave - OK: Mix designs are currently not at the plan level, they are at the Producer/Supplier level. You could select plant at Mix Design. Currently you cannot do that.
- Daryl - NY: That would get back to P/S and Plant functionality. Way done in NY, each Plant and P/S gets their own entry.
- Dave - OK: for Concrete and Asphalt our suppliers use same mix design at there different plants. It's pretty much the same.
- Daryl - NY: But if tracking different source, different mix design.
- Dave - OK: Always is.
- Dave B. - NY: Any other comment or discussion? This is probably the largest in scoping. Range is 30 service units (i.e. ball park for this one). New York could envision improvement in areas of plants. From identifying business process with plants. This TMR addresses what isn't included for business processes for plants. Any other comments before moving on to other ones? No comments were made.
- Decision: Keep this TMR on the ballot.

### 2.7.15 TMR 10241

- Description: 10241 SM LIMS - Maintain Test Queue enhanced for Sys Admins (New York)
- Discussion
  - Daryl - NY: There is a screen in LIMS that is a summary of what is in a lab. What is in testing right now? What's going on right now kind of screen. Customized screens to give editing that didn't have it before. Limited to Sys Admins. Don't really know where a sample went. You can force a sample to where it needs to go to get it unstuck.
  - Dave - NY: Adjust sample through its process via the GUI.
  - Sheri - IN: What's causing it to get lost?
  - Daryl - NY: Alternate workflow on specific test. If fails, then ignore workflow, so many records that sometimes forget one. Users expect it to be there and it isn't,

don't know where it went. Quick way to get a test to where it needs to go. Put in 20 instead of 50 from a typo.

- Sheri - IN: Place to document what you changed for auditing?
- Diane - NY: Remarks
- [Decision: Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

#### 2.7.16 TMR 10243

- [Description:](#) 10243 Remarks Icons on Sample Review and View-Only Sample Information Windows (New York)
- [Discussion](#)
  - Daryl – NY: Right now we have Sample Remarks. They are visible on several screens in LIMS. Other screens have remarks but at test level. There isn't a screen that will show both. Have to be done in report. Point is to have both sets of remarks available filtered by user. Got to be a way to have certain remarks hidden by user, and other way to have remarks viewable for all.
  - Sheri - IN: Driven by security?
  - Daryl - NY: Driven by code tables.
  - Sheri - IN: Driven by Group Security?
  - Daryl - NY: Don't think it's done in security, but code tables.
  - Diane - ITI: Code table for kinds of remarks. One is a subset of another one. Also included in on windows, that certain type of remarks will show up on a window and others won't. In a way it is kind of tied to security. But there is not specific security to say you can or cannot see a particular remark.
  - Dave - NY: To step it up a bit more and make it more secure.
  - Diane - NY: Explained issue further with example.
- [Decision: Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

#### 2.7.17 TMR 10245

- [Description:](#) 10245 View-Only Test Results window (New York)
- [Discussion](#)
  - Dave - NY: Test Results tab. View Only Sample Information window. System spits back information (e.g. log in SM). One area where you can pull it out. It's kind of a reporting thing in a way. Shows everything except actual test results. Users started using the window, but wanted to see actual test results. Have customized this window to allow that. Put in TMR to document it to permanently add feature to window. Users like it.
  - Daryl - NY: Like it because all reports are external application. Can do everything in LIMS but have to go outside LIMS. Tab level security also.
  - Dave C.: Test result data or test template?
  - Diane - ITI: Actual data in a grid view. Similar to other LIMS windows.
  - Dave - NY: Not template itself, but data in database.
  - Dave - OK: All the rows?
  - Daryl - NY: Yes, spitting that back in a grid. Without syntax to make it look pretty. Get's you in a problem when you are storing 1 and 2 for Pass Fail. Have to get users use to knowing what 1 and 2 means.
  - Dave C. - OK: Will we be able to pick which fields to show?
  - Daryl - NY: It brings back everything. Every row from every test on that sample.
  - Diane - ITI: Multiple rows that have invisible, you won't have blank rows.
  - Dave - NY: Can see information on window, won't have to go to external reporting tool to see data. Realize without working with the software it may seem tedious, hopefully when viewing the software this afternoon, it will make it easier.
- [Decision: Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

### 2.7.18 TMR 10246

- Description: 10246 All Runs of a Test Method Should Not Be Marked Not Reportable (New York)
- Discussion
  - Daryl - NY: Failed first one, performed second. Have option to make reportable. Point is to make sure user knows he is turning off all runs on test method and will not show up.
  - Dave - NY: Talking about having a message box there.
- Decision: [Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

### 2.7.19 TMR 10247

- Description: 10247 Allow Test or Sample remarks on Sample Review & change for Send back to Lab (New York)
- Discussion
  - Daryl - NY: Very similar to last discussion we had. Have issue that at time of Review Sample, most of our people that belong to projects, don't work in lab, work across town in engineering lab. They have final approval on Samples. When they were adding remarks, they were sample level remarks; users only saw test level remarks. They had to go to sample level remarks to view what they needed to do and why. Need to have access to both.
  - Dave - NY: Product Group is a group of Sample Review employees. Segregated people by material. Some units handle cement, binder, and other stuff.
- Decision: [Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

### 2.7.20 TMR 10248

- Description: 10248 Add LIMS chapter to SiteManager User Reference Manual (Info Tech)
- 10250 Allow multiple test selection for Send Test Back to Lab - Review Sample window (New York)
- Discussion
  - Daryl - NY: Send one test back to a lab at a time. Wrong on that one. Right now you can only send one back at a time, wait for it, then send back. Want to send multiple back. Could send test theoretically back to multiple labs at the same time.
  - Dave - NY: At the end of the workflow at a samples life, there was a feature that was put in during the middle of the workflow of performing the test. And want to do more testing. There is a feature that allows you to run five or more at a time. Want to point out that in this area we can only do one at a time, in other areas we can do more.
  - James - MS: If you add additional test failed, then run a new sample, still have failed test that show up on S&TR, how does that play into this? We have a process we run through for Check Sample - Void initial sample records, include new sample ID that becomes new Sample that counts toward S&TR.
  - Daryl - NY: Sample Status and Acceptance Method. Void wasn't taken out. Can void right there, compare original with check, and void one and the other would count.
  - James - MS: Sample record level, not test level.
  - Daryl - NY: Combined two concepts. This is running additional tests on the same sample. Not a separate sample.
  - Dave - NY: Will James from Mississippi attend this afternoon?
  - James - MS: Yes.
  - Dave - NY: Will be looking at this, this afternoon.
- Decision: [Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

### 2.7.21 TMR 10269

- Description: 10269 LIMS - Referential Integrity from T\_SMPL\_TST to LIMS\_SMPL\_TST2
- Discussion
  - Daryl – NY: Hiccup in network or database. User does something completely flaky and doesn't realize it. Sometimes records will end up in one table and not the other. Have no idea of what happened. Have queries set up in Access to show when there are rows in one and not the other. System fault. Cannot track why it is doing it.
  - Dave - NY: In 2.5 years it has occurred about 6 times. It may be a bug.
  - Diane - ITI: Don't know yet. Trying to get it identified. Want to put an RI in there to get a message saying hey you can't do this. It would at least let the user know to keep data in tact. Again not for sure if it is using network, Citrix, or what else.
  - Gus - MN: Capture it in the database or let user know when it is doing it?
  - Diane - ITI: Could expand to when saving sample record. Could include adding error messages. Don't think this one was covered to add error messages.
  - Jeff - NY: Transactions or something when someone goes to execute types of updates, then roll back to previous data. Think that type of technology exists.
  - Dave - NY: Best we do as System Administrator is read access to database to pier. Daryl builds diagnostic queries. Will run to perform check to see what is going on there. Over time, built up good tools.
  - Jeff - NY: That's a great idea to.
- Decision: [Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

### 2.7.22 TMR 10270

- Description 10270 Test Results Tab on View-Only Sample Information Window (New York)
- Discussion
  - Dave - NY: 10245 is the other TMR that somehow we did something. They talk about the same thing. Recommending that 10270 be withdrawn.
  - Denis: As agency submitting it, you don't have to request.
  - **AI**: Dave – NY will withdraw TMR 10270.
- Decision: [Withdraw this TMR from the ballot.](#)

### 2.7.23 TMR 10376

- Description: 10376 SM LIMS - Tab order not L to R on all windows (Info Tech)
- Discussion
  - Diane - ITI: Talked with person who wrote this up. The tab level on window is not the normal tab order.
  - Daryl - NY: Is that because of the moving the columns around?
  - Diane - ITI: Don't know if specific to columns.
  - Daryl - NY: Probably jumping around to original tab order.
  - Dave - NY: Windows built for new LIMS system has flexibility, so if there are columns in a grid you can shift them around. If I want to look at the 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> one, I can shift them around and over to see those first.
  - Jim: But then you can only sort on certain ones.
  - Daryl - NY: Are you talking about admin windows?
  - Jim - NY: Maybe yeah
  - Dave - NY: These don't apply to System Admin windows. If save money, saved on Sys Admin window. Can log onto another machine, and settings follow me as a user.
  - Diane - ITI: **AI**: Diane will speak to the author to get clarification to see if grids or in body of window on 10376.
- Decision: [Keep this TMR on the ballot.](#)

## 2.8 Items from the Floor

10:45 am

- Dave has a suggestion, but open it to the floor first to see
- The one area of concern that Dave has, being an agency that implemented C/S, and now being in the area of web development, basically a bit frustrated because license fees are being put into a pot of money (MSE Money). TTF has basically made decisions on how many is spent and most put to web development, and small amount to C/S like emergency fixes. We just had one of these. Goes to TTF they look at it. Still a way, but takes a fair amount of time to get through that process. Like to say to TTF don't forget about us in C/S. Would like to see some amount of money freed up for C/S. We'll be in the dark zone, the black zone for a few years. Lot of license money for web. Only enhanced, are agencies have to kick in NY, NJ, VA, MS, and NE trying to do it. It's slow and hard. Interested from this group is that something we should like to more formalize as a formal statement from Materials TAG, Resolution it's called, that it's more universal or if it's just me. Had my say. Does anyone else have comments?
- Sheri - IN: Playing devils advocate. If part of the money put toward enhancing C/S, it may take longer to get web developed.
- Dave - NY: That is the opposite side. It's frustrating to have to go to management because money is getting funneled to web. Can I get motion to Materials tag to make formal statement? On Wednesday there will be statements from TAG. Want to express to TTF.
- Gus - MN: If prior to solicitation what are we looking at in time frame to finish materials part of web, just using license fee on materials for web development.
  - Tim - SC: Wanted to echo Sheri's point to with funds directed toward construction, going to start being directed toward materials to. Want to put more emphasis on moving that forward. Question is if there is not solicitation, what time frame are we looking at?
  - Gus - MN: Yes
  - Tim - SC: Looking at phase 1 working with Michigan. 2 is construction and 3 is materials. It relies on good solicitation. If no solicitation it will take a lot longer.
    - Phase 1 – 2 years on that one.
- Sheri – IN: How functionality of material identified.
- James – MS: Been in production since 2005.
- Jeff – NY: Attend 2 years based upon dollar amount include din products. 2015 to 2017. Quite away out What is current projection from vendor from any point in time for Strategic Planning Session?
- Sheri - IN: Curious on TRT materials Hearing quite a few good things coming up. How much added functionality compared to what we have would be bigger scope?
- Daryl – NY: Thought close to being done.
- Sheri: You cannot estimate without scope.
- Tim: Concept to additional material scope this time. Administration.
- Dave – NY: Thinking new of existing 5 to 10% now. Some different of what we have now.
- Sheri – IN: Develop all before implement. Or all in package before getting rid of it.
- Dave: All there.
- John OK: concepts we are thinking about changing web based changes might be easier than what we are thinking about, we're hoping. Don't think we're suggestion monstrous changes. Conceptually big ideas.
- Sheri – IN: outside of code changes is general functionality the same?
- Daryl - NY: Most is the same.
- John - OK: It has to do what it does now s bare minimum.
- Sheri - IN: Over last two years, how much is general materials. Time and cost projected out is the same?

- Daryl - NY: Probably the same.
- Stewart: Just stretching ☺
- Dave - NY: Group enough support to push issue on Thursday? To adhere funds to C/S instead of web development.
- Jeff – NY: More accessible approach web, but depends on time.
- Dave – NY: Catch 22.
- AR: Have very little man power. No management support for C/S. We do need to maintain money for fixes and enhancement.
- Dave - NY: Other agencies, majority is suck it up and get to web.
- Mark – KY: Need to a bit more of C/S area. Funds to C/S at least a little bit.
- Dave – NY: Is mechanism for emergency fix when first time it goes to TTF. They decide if fund. Don't know enhancement.
- Denis – MO: Don't know if just for sure if for only bugs. If agency is trying to implement then they may be considerations. Not fair to say for emergency (e.g. Enhancement doc to LIMS. How many agencies will implement LIMS? Would be nice to have instructions. Is it an emergency? TTF might interpret as emergency, not optimistic to how fast and money obtained to get it done. Under the rosiest best conditions cannot see Materials management in condition to implement in less than three years. It is not rosy time now. Just bonded 3 million for bridges that are going to fall in. Going to give money to bridge. Look at how it went. TTF to divert funds. Can go from no upgrades, to not even a penny, to support on all platforms in the future. Even if done in 3 years, it will take another 1.5 years. Rosy is 5 years. Meantime I need C/S SiteManager. All eggs are in that basket. This is your opportunity to say to TTF.
- John – OK: Are you thinking percentage?
- Dave – NY: 10% or something like that. Above emergency fixes.
- Gus - MN: Strictly on materials?
- Dave - NY: Yes
- Gus – MN: If you put in there, 10 or Construction, 10 for materials. Set aside 10% to C/S. Let the TTF decide on importance similar in Construction yesterday.
- Jeremy – MO: Similar discussion on support. Realize several years down the road, but don't forget C/S.
- Dave - NY: Wouldn't have to be just materials.
- Janie – CO: As state getting ready to implement, and find something doesn't work, would hate to see that. Don't know what we're going to do.
- Dave - NY: That's the point on this. Have ½ on one and ½ on the other. Motion to vote on TAG members.
- Denis - MO: Can do straw pole.
- Dave - NY: Each TAG person or Proxy allowed to vote.
  - Agencies express to TTF not forget about C/S.
  - Support plus enhancement from MSE budget.
- James – MS: Favor of TTF looking case by case base. Critical to use community but 10% to enhancement not sure miss would be in favor.
- Denis – MO: Can give TTF guidance, but if they didn't think right thin to do.
- James – MS: Support and maintain C/S. Earmark scares me.
- Sheri – IN: If needed in five years. If convenience, different.
- Dave – NY: Ballot voting would show all that.
- Tim – SC: Estimates on what we can do.
- Denis – MO: Need to back off decision made a couple of years ago.
- Tim – SC: If that is direction this group wants to recommend, then submit it.
- Sheri – IN: How will it impact the big picture with funds and 10%?
- Denis – MO: Not asking to go back to old way with significant amount. But consideration if 20+ agencies are using software it cannot be all bad.
- Stewart – TX: Do client upgrades make web a moving target? Need to make sure web covers C/S development enhancement. At some time, need to move on. Current is bad

- model. If fix just limping along. A lot of areas because not working very well. It will make web part new difficult. New client migration to web much areas on much different. A lot won't transfer.
- Tim - SC: If enhancing existing function, that's still inside of the box. If outside, then those things added to web Trns•port log.
  - Shouldn't that be picked up by TRT and send to TTF?
  - Stewart - TX: Depends on new stuff. Old stuff wasn't working or new concept for new way. If you split that effort some working on C/S and some on TRT, then eventually have a problem. Eventually you want them put together. Why do them separately? Just sounds like you will be doubling your effort.
  - Dave – NY: Straw poll here to get since of numbers.
    - To express concern to TTF at minimum, voting process we do now has little meaning in C/S and would like to see some amount of money for CS enhancement realizing that some of us are still using C/S and will be a while before web.
    - Show of hands expressing to TTF.
      - Support: 7 with NY
      - Not in Favor: 2
      - Abstaining: All others (5)
        - 📄 FYI - Total Possible TAG Representatives: 22
        - 📄 FYI - Total Attended/Represented: 14
      - Motion to adjourn can of works, by Beth Roberts of Louisiana, second by Lisa Durbin of Montana.

~ 11:37 Meeting Adjourned~

### 3. Review Action Items

---

1. **Jim Ferguson of NE** will forward the proposal for 8080 and 8081 to Dave Bernard.
2. **Dave Bernard of NY** will send the proposal for 8080 and 8081 TMR enhancements to the TAG members.
3. **Daryl Bushika of NY** will modify TMR 10240.
4. **Denis Glascock of MO** will write it up the description for the modified TMR 10240 for New York.
5. **Daryl Bushika of NY** will create new TMR related to TMR 10068 to split two concepts.
6. **Brad Parks of ITI and JR Connors of ITI** will discuss TMR 10068 with Oklahoma and Missouri and will provide input to Dave by Thursday.
7. **Diane Menz of ITI** will follow up with the author of 10255 and 10254 and see if 10255 is covered in 10254.
8. **Dave Bernard of NY** will withdraw TMR 10270.
9. **Diane Menz of ITI** will speak to the author to get clarification to see if grids or in body of window on 10376.