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| --- | --- |
| Discussion: |  |

This meeting is being recorded for the purpose of taking meeting minutes. Two of these issues require the operational folks to give us their input. I understand from talking to the TSM&O engineers, we will have TMC folks in this meeting to give us their input. From that said, we will go over two issues that we discuss before so we can come to a consensus of how to move forward.

1. EM Intersection Performance Measures – Summary of District Responses

Mark: First we will talk about the EM Intersections. This was an item at the May 9th SSUG and there was a follow-up email sent out on May 13th with specific questions. We received feedback from at least five Districts so I think we have an idea of how to move forward. We have majority agreement from the Districts that we will be storing the “worst lane blockage” by approach. We understand the need for it to also be on a per movement basis but due to the time crunch and getting it into 7.2, we want to move forward with something that will work for now.

We are going to go with per approach to store “worst lane blockage”. We will be recording a separate blockage time per approach. The closed or fully closed approach will take priority over the percentage of lane blockage. We aren’t going to record the number of lanes blocked, we will be recording the percentage of lane blocked.

For PM reporting, we have reduced these to a single road. This is where we will need your input. The worst lane blockage for an entire event is going to look at the blockage as measured by the highest per-approach worst lane blockage. The first blockage time will be the first blockage time on any approach. Last blockage time will be the last blockage time and that might be for a different approach. If any approach was then closed then the location will be considered to have been closed. We need a way to reduce these to a single event. Does anyone have any thoughts?

Mark Laird: Will the percentage of lanes be the percentage of all available lanes regardless of movement?

Mark Dunthorn: Yes, we are not going to take movement into account at this time, just approach.

Mark Laird: So, if you have three through lanes and two turn lanes, and one of the turn lanes is blocked, that is a 20% blockage?

Mark Dunthorn: That is correct. Let me throw something else out there that might help you with your thinking. Right now, when we run a performance measures report, one of the most important criteria in determining which events are included in that report is the roadway. There is a flag that says, “this is a PM type roadway”. Would it be useful in this upcoming release which is more focused on operating an event, to exclude intersection events from reporting at this time? We could have a per-location flag that says include or do not include this intersection regardless if that intersection is on a PM roadway. Include routes of significance and performance measure but don’t include intersections.

Christine Shafik: Do you agree on the approach we are presenting here? Do you have any questions?

Mark Laird: One question comes up. If you have an intersection and two roadways with performance measures, and there is a blockage on an approach on one roadway. Is that intersection then iconsidered to have been blocked because of the approach blockage does that aaffect the performance measures of the other roadway? The ones for that intersection?

Mark Dunthorn: The performance measure data mostly comes from that view, the EM Perf Measure view. Each row in that view is an event. Regardless of which approach has the blockage, we will be considering that blockage to be assigned that row in EM Perf Measure view.

Mark Laird: So, the roadway in which the event is located in the one affected?

Mark Dunthorn: Well because it is an intersection both roadways are affected. I am not sure what you mean by affected?

Mark Laird: In terms of performance calculation, I was thinking if 'rethe approach to the intersection, not the approach leaving, is blocked the intersecting roadway is not actually going to be impacted. It is going to back up away from the intersection. How does the intersection get affected on the approaching side? You are coming into the intersection and there is a crash but the intersection is functional you can’t get into it from the one direction but for everyone else it is fine. Does that show up as an intersection effect or not?

Mark Dunthorn: Assuming you have four approaches and one has a blockage. We are going to record this as one with the approach that has the worst blockage. That is how blockage will be reported for this event.

Mark Laird: That is if the EM chosen for the event is the intersection?

Mark Dunthorn: Yes, that is what we are talking about.

Mark Laird: So, if it is on the approach and not actually in the intersection they probably won’t be choosing the EM location for the intersection.

Mark Dunthorn: Yes, it depends on how you define your EM location. But if you choose your event to be located at an intersection, then in terms of the blockage that is recorded for that it will be the worst approach. Once that blockage has been recorded, I am not sure how that impacts the performance measures.

What is looking for now is if you are comfortable with this approach that we have documented? If you are then we will move forward, if not maybe we should consider allowing EM locations or at least intersection locations to be excluded from PM reports.

Mark Laird: I like that because I don’t think we know enough yet.

Mark Dunthorn: I agree, I think we do that and start looking at data and how it all looks. Then revisit the algorithm. Are you comfortable with this method?

District: If we put this into effect and we don’t count it towards PM reporting, how will we know how it shows up on the PM reporting if it is not reporting?

Mark Dunthorn: We can still run reports, we can still look at the various metrics. All of the metrics are available on other reports and we could still run them.

Tucker: I want everyone to keep in mind here that the approach information is being stored, they are just excluded from the view for now. When you do run reports, you can run one with the flag and one without and can compare. What we are talking about is just how to view the data. We are not going to lose the data no matter what.

Mark Laird: Well this approach seems to be the consensus of the districts. And adding in the safety valve seems to make it okay to go ahead with.

Mark Dunthorn: I like that too.

1. SG-4791 Incident Clock Should Start when the Operator Clicks on “New Event”

Mark Dunthorn: This is another item we discussed at a previous SSUG and we did have a follow-up email. We want the operations folks to talk about this issue. The question is when should the clock start on events for the purpose of generating the metrics. Right now, there are two main methods. One example is if an operator sees a crash on a camera they right click on the map at that location and logs the crash and notes the agency contact and then they click create an event. Once they click create an event, that is when the event starts. You have an alert reported by IDS and the alert shows up in SunGuide. Then an operator sees the alert and right clicks to create a new event and the event actually started when it hit the operator map. There is a difference there and an inconsistency. We are trying to look for a consensus from the Districts. Is there a better approach than what was previously discussed at the SSUG?

Kyle Higgins: The intent is like you said and to make it mimic the IDS alert. When you right click on the map and click create or when you click create from the event list it starts the time. Event when the operator receives a call it would be the call receive time that the event would start which would be the same as an IDS alert.

Mark Dunthorn: You said the call received time. Where would we get that?

Kyle Higgins: If an operator takes a call, theoretically what they should be doing in SunGuide is the start time would be the time they hung up the phone and started putting the event in.

Mark Dunthorn: So, when they right clicked on the map, that would be the start time.

Jason Evans: Maybe I am not understanding this correctly, are we talking about the difference in the time it takes to click on a new event and then the 15 seconds it takes to fill out the event information and then click create an event? The 15 seconds doesn’t seem like much.

Kyle Higgins: Yes, it also captures the time law enforcement gets the call over to us. It could be a minute or two and is a relevant timestamp.

Mark Laird: It could be two events at one time and the operator can only do one at a time.

Kyle Higgins: It is just to mimic what is already recorded by IDS.

Mark Dunthorn: I think we understand the issue and there is a discrepancy. We do have a solution and we can capture that right click time and use that as the timestamp the event is created on. Today we would like to put it up for a vote, it is non-binding because we aren’t in the CMB but we want to know where each District stands.

Dee McTague: Is the right click time the same add new event time?

Mark Dunthorn: That is a good point. If you go to the event list and add a new event then yes it will be the same.

District One: Yes.

District Two: before we vote I have a question. Why can’t we just make that time configurable or editable?

Mark Dunthorn: I had thought of that. Tucker, what do you think? Is it feasible?

Tucker: It would be doable to put it there. Permission-based would limit the issues but also would they go back in and change the start time because it would alter their performance measure.

Mark Dunthorn: You are right, we already have the auditing mechanism so we might just want to stick with the original proposal which captures the start time of the event by right-clicking on the map or by clicking add a new event. Any adjustments will have to be made via the existing audit function.

District Two: I am fine with that.

District Three: Why wouldn’t you just add that to the data set? Put both times on there, when the event was added and when it was activated.

Mark Dunthorn: We could and maybe we should. But we still have to determine which one is used when we calculate the confirmation time.

District Three: I don’t think it makes that much of a difference. I am okay with it.

District Four: Yes.

District Five: Yes.

District 6: Yes.

District 7: We were just discussing this. We like the newly presented idea of both times. I had another idea if you start the event and there is a grace period of 2-3 minutes and it’s not held against anyone. It would level out all of the events.

Mark Laird: Maybe the two different times could eliminate the penalty to the operator and you could also know how FDOT handles an event once they know about it.

Dan Buidens: I think there is value to that. If you have an operator that is taking a long time to enter an event, you could monitor their performance.

Mark Dunthorn: I think there is a lot of value in recording both times. I am not sure about the grace period. That is something we will have to come back to. Maybe a new JIRA issue would be the best path forward. And for today, is everyone okay with using this as a starting point? Tucker, is it feasible to somehow record them both?

Tucker: I think it is just another timestamp to be recorded it wouldn’t be a big deal. The only question is how do we factor this into the performance measures. Do you use one sometimes and the other another time?

Mark Dunthorn: For today’s discussion, we are just talking about recording time stamps and the recording would remain the same. District Seven are you okay with storing them and moving on?

District Seven: Yes.

FTE: Yes.

CFX: Agrees with District Five’s opinion.

MDX: Yes.

Mark Laird: The way you restated it sounded like the new click to create an event is not going to become the starting time. Is that what you just said?

Mark Dunthorn: I apologize, I meant we are going with a new start time which will be when they initiate an even either by right-clicking on a map or by selecting create a new event.

Mark Laird: So that will be used for the performance measures and the one that we use to use for the performance measures will be stored but not used in the performance measures.

Christine: I am glad that we clarified everything and I am glad we got your input. When we move forward with enhancements, we want everyone on board.

1. SG-3875 Notify Manager Enhancements

Mark Dunthorn: This should look familiar, we spoke about this a while back. We want to get more consensus before moving forward. This issue contains multiple JIRA issues. We are going to talk about how notify manager is working today and the changes we are proposing.

One thing we are doing with notify manager today is that we are looking at thresholds for CPU and memory. These thresholds were determined over a decade ago. It was all 32 bit. Those thresholds are no longer relevant. We have updated those to 64-bit environments. Another discussion was to set those thresholds per application and should they be configurable? Does anyone have strong feelings either way? Should they be configurable per application or configurable at all?

Mark Laird: We have different servers and configurations. I would think different districts having configurable thresholds makes sense.

Mark Dunthorn: I agree. A lot of this will be dependent on resources being managed by a subsystem and it does vary significantly. I will go through all six and at the end, we can go over if it is a good enhancement overall.

John Hope: Both District Five and CFX have other software to monitor their servers and usage. They are fairly robust a lot better than what is built into SunGuide. So, this is not a benefit to CFX and District Five. I am not sure if there are districts doing the same thing. I would imagine they are using some other monitoring software.

Mark Dunthorn: That is an excellent point. We have that discussion before as well. Is anyone else using third-party monitoring tools? SolarWinds would be an example to manage not only the network infrastructure but also server performance, application performance, etc. Does anyone else have something third party outside of notify manager?

District One: Yes, we use other software.

District Four: We use other software.

District Six: So, do we.

Mark Dunthorn: Is this to manage servers? Or do you also monitor whether the services are up and if the thresholds are being crossed?

Mark Laird: Not sure.

John Hope: CFX is using on a per-service basis the memory usage and disc space. And a number of other items.

District One: That is the same for us. We even poll devices in the field.

Mark Dunthorn: I have D1, D4, D5, CFX, D6, does anyone else use an external third-party monitoring solution and is happy with that?

District Two is not for the servers.

Mark Dunthorn: Let’s proceed. It is good to hear you getting more monitoring down at the service level. We still have some Districts relying on notify manager. There is a value of enhancing the notify manager.

Process state could be useful if you track starts and stops. You would get a better picture of how services move around in a cluster. This is an email to a configurable list.

Level of Detail: what comes out of notify manager is not detailed at all. We are proposing to add detail from the status logger. The districts who are monitoring externally should already be getting that information.

Restarts: If you don’t use notify manager this won’t affect you. This is just to get it to work better. Currently, notify manager requires a restart when a new operator or email address is added. We want to not have it require a restart.

Data Archive: Are you capturing everything you need for data archive performance? I have seen roll ups not being performed correctly or taking too long. Latency for database rights. Are the Districts that use third-party tools getting the data archived in the way you need?

District one: I believe we are getting what we need but our opinion is that you can never get too much. If it is configurable to get the data we want it wouldn’t hurt. We are good either way.

Telemetry: We are looking for a health message that comes out of every SunGuide system to let us know it is good. It would tell us the SunGuide version, status of each subsystem, machine-readable format.

Notify Manager would be the easiest way to do this.

Mark Laird: Be sure it is configurable so it wouldn’t be in our test system.

Mark Dunthorn: Any questions or comments on the Notify Manager enhancements? Are any of the Districts interested in all or any of the enhancements?

District One: yes, District Two: Yes, District Six: need to talk to someone else before answering.

Christine Shafik: Would it be helpful if we sent the PPT a day or two ahead of the meeting so you could brainstorm with your team?

Districts: Absolutely.

Christine Shafik: We will do that so we can make decisions during the SSUG meeting.

District: it would be helpful to have a cliff notes version or a snapshot because sometimes it hard justifying my time to review an entire presentation. Like a question and brief descriptions should be enough.

Mark Dunthorn: That should be doable.

Mark Laird: Please send both.

1. SG-567 Status Logger Message Evaluation

Mark Dunthorn: This is more of a question to you, we won’t finalize right now. Some log messages have been identified as needing to be at a different log level. If you have ever spent time looking at log levels you will know. There are a few issues in JIRA that talk about this. When you start up some subsystems the account doesn’t have permission and the subsystem dies. They are all small things and we have a couple of them in the JIRA issue. If you have some you want to be fixed please add the information into the JIRA issue. That way we will be more effective. Log level identification issues that need to be dealt with, this is your chance. JIRA issue 567.

Christine Shafik: The next SSUG meeting is June 20th and the plan will be different, we will make it 2 hours and it will be a design review for 7.2. We will go over the enhancements. The plan is to start FAT testing in August. Please forward the meeting to anyone else that should attend.

If you have any enhancement requests, please reach out to us.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| New Action Items: |  |
| Action: | **Responsible Person:** |
| Send SSUG PPT a few days before the meeting | Christine |
| Create a snapshot prior to SSUG and send to Districts. | Christine/Mark |
| District forward the 6/20 SSUG mtg to anyone to attend the design review for 7.2. | Districts |
|  |  |