



SunGuide Software User's Group Design Review Meeting Minutes



Date: January 2, 2020

Time: 2:30-3:30 EST

Agenda:	
Topic	Led By:
Item 1: 5086 TPS Facilities start "Out of Service"	Tucker Brown
Item 2: RPG DMS Suggested Priorities Based on Event Type	Tucker Brown
Item 3: Ability to Configure Response Plan Search Distance by Event Type	Tucker Brown
Item 4: Audit on Injuries	Tucker Brown

Attendees:

Robbie Brown, D1	Mark Laird, D6
Margaret Treiber, D1	Cherie Phillips, FTE
Justin Merritt, D1	Karla Smith, FTE
Tanesha Sibley, D2	Tucker Brown, SwRI
Kevin Mehaffy, D3	Christine Shafik, CO
Dee McTague, D4	Mark Dunthorn, CO
Jacques Dupuy, D4	Jennifer Rich, CO
Jay Williams, D5	Frances Ijeoma, CO
Kyle Higgins, D5	Karthik Devarakonda, CO
Eddie Grant, D5	Gregory Dudley, CO

Discussion:

Item 1: 5086 – TPS Facilities Start “Out of Service”

Tucker Brown: This is about TPS facilities starting “out of service”. The issue is when you restart or add a TPS device they are out of service. This was put in as a feature in the 1st implementation of TPS so users would be required to verify the number of spaces before putting the facility into an active status. This was most likely meant for passage detection (as opposed to presence detection). The proposed enhancement is just for the presence detection and allow the facilities to behave as other devices and go to Active on the 1st successful poll cycle. This would not apply to ones that are already out of service and were down when the system went down, those would continue to be out of service. It would only be the ones that were active or failed, you would be able to bring those back. Does anyone have any questions or comments on this? Hearing none, we will move on.

Item 2: 5077 RPG DMS Suggested Priorities Based on Event Type

Tucker Brown: This is a District Five issue and they have slightly different rules on how they are prioritizing messages on the DMS based on event type. Right now, the DMS looks at how far away that sign is from the event and sets the priority based on how far away it is.

The proposed enhancement is to configure a static range of priorities based on event types. For example, a crash event in D5 will utilize priorities 1-10 based on distance from the event and event severity. While a scheduled road work event would utilize priorities 11-20. It would also have a default range of priorities that would be used for all event types that are not specifically configured for a range of priorities. An example would be if you had a crash event in the 1-10 range and scheduled road work in the 11-20 range, the next range that would pick up would be 21-255. If you didn't want to use this at all and you like the way SunGuide is currently doing priorities, you could set the default range to 1-255 and not specify any event type ranges. It would be up to the District on how they want to use it and will allow for another option. Does anyone have any questions?

Tanesha Sibley: This is something that we would like to have.

Tucker Brown: As described or are there any changes you would like to see?

Tanesha Sibley: As described.

Justin Merritt: I also agree. This would be very helpful.

Tucker Brown: Does anyone else have any comments? Hearing none, we will move on.

Item 3: 4985 Ability to configure response plan search distance by event type

Tucker Brown: There is a single set of search distance values for an event to search for response plan items. It doesn't matter what event type it is, all of them would be the same. This would allow you to change the search distance and by that, I mean how far you go down looking for response items, DMS, HARs for anything like that. Those would change based on the event type. The enhancement here is as an administrator you can configure a set of values per event type. If you don't set specific values, then it will go back to the original default values which is what you have in the config file right now. So, if you didn't want to use this feature then you can keep the original behavior of what you have right now.

Kevin Mahaffy: Being in a rural deployment I think this would be helpful for sure.

Ray Mikol: I don't see any negatives to this being implemented.

Tucker Brown: Does anyone else have any comments on that one?

Jay Williams: District Five is in favor of this.

Tucker Brown: I want to say this was a District Two issue, so I think that is four Districts in favor.

Dee McTague: District Four also agrees.

Tucker Brown: It sounds like we have a lot in agreement. We will move to the next issue.

Item 4: 4966 Audit on Injuries

Tucker Brown: The last one is simple too, auditing on injury types. Right now, there is not a way to modify the injury type after the event. We have seen cases identify where after the fact or after the event is closed, there was a fatality and we must go back in and edit the event. This would be to allow for a modification of it which would show up as no injury, injury, fatality, no fatality. It essentially gives you the ability to change that field for an event. There shouldn't be a lot to this. I will note in 7.2 there is a lot more in the auditing of when you change something. The audit will record when the audit was made, what the old value was and the new value. Even when auditing these you will have a good trail of who audited, when, and what was changed.

Justin Merritt: I think this will be great and will help give us accurate fatality numbers. District One is on board.

Cherie Phillips: Turnpike is board.

Tanesha Sibley: District Two as well.

Tucker Brown: I think this was an MDX issue if I remember correctly.

Jay Williams: District Five is in favor.

Tucker Brown: It sounds like we have a lot of agreement on this one as well.

Kevin Mehaffy: If it helps, District Three is in favor too.

Tucker Brown: Okay, that was all I had for today.

Mark Dunthorn: Thank you Tucker. Does anyone else have anything to bring up?

Karla Smith: Are there any changes to come with floodgate messaging?

Tucker Brown: Not specifically, did you have something in mind?

Karla Smith: The operators heard that they would discontinue recording floodgates. I am not sure where they heard it.

Tucker Brown: I am not aware of that, but I will let Central Office comment on that.

Mark Dunthorn: Thanks Tucker. One more thing we wanted to mention is that we have a new set of tiles and they have been tested at the TERL and we should be able to get them out early next week. We do not have anything pending for floodgates, but we are looking to get that consolidated list over to the FL511 group. I am not sure if that will address the floodgate need.

Tucker Brown: Did you say floodgates were going away?

Karla Smith: The need to record might be going away?

Mark Dunthorn: I have heard both sides of that, I will have to check with the FL511 team and get the information to you. We are not aware of any changes at the moment. We will get a confirmation from the FL511 team.

Christine Shafik: I heard Jay Williams on the phone and wanted to check with him if he has a CMB date or not.

Jay Williams: I will catch up with you offline. I have been in and out and I am not sure if this is my last week in the office. I will circle up with you offline.

New Action Items:

Action:	Responsible Person:
Follow up with FL511 team on floodgates and the need to continue recording.	Mark Dunthorn