

## FootPrints Based Test Cases – FAT3

<b>Issue Number</b>	157		
<b>Issue Title</b>	Lat & Long for SunGuide in Admin Editor		
<b>Description</b>	When using the Admin Editor, one may choose to add a cross street by first selecting the TSS tab, then the roadway tab, then selecting the edit roadway button, and finally selecting the add cross cross street button. However, when one is to add a cross street this option does not allow for one to enter in the cross street GPS coordinates.		
<b>Resolution</b>	This page is being replaced with a new EM screen in SunGuide Release 3.0.		
	<b>Test Steps</b>	<b>Result</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>F</b>
	In Admin Editor, select Event Management   Location Configuration  Locations. Filter down to a roadway and direction. Select a reference point. Verify that a location can be configured with a latitude and longitude.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11 / 29 AM  
 Troy Tillander  
 Alberto Hernandez

<b>Issue Number</b>	240		
<b>Issue Title</b>	D6 Log of support activities		
<b>Description</b>	Various		
<b>Resolution</b>	No specific tests to perform		
	<b>Test Steps</b>	<b>Result</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>F</b>
	No tests identified	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Issue Number</b>	259		
<b>Issue Title</b>	Response Plans not Terminating		
<b>Description</b>	At 5:27 this morning the operators noticed that response plans would not terminate and messages were left on the signs by the SunGuide system. Digging into Status Logger we found that some of the "removeMsgReq" messages at and after 5:27AM had an empty MsgId tag. Also note that at 5AM we modified device templates (deleted in favor of the defaults) for three signs: 95SB31, 595WB10, and 595EB05. These signs were identified specifically by operators for not dropping response plan messages upon plan termination.		
<b>Resolution</b>	No specific tests to perform		
	<b>Test Steps</b>	<b>Result</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>F</b>
	Not testable as this was written against version 2.x "incident management" which has been completely replaced by "Event Management" in 3.x (completely different code base).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Try at TERL

<b>Issue Number</b>	260	
<b>Issue Title</b>	Queue behavior with unapproved words and response plans	
<b>Description</b>	<p>Case 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Response plan A is on DMS with top priority (say, 1).</li> <li>2. Response plan B for another incident is placed on same DMS with lower priority. (say 2) This message has an unapproved word.</li> <li>3. Response plan A is moved to higher priority (5) to allow second message to display on sign.</li> <li>4. Queue shows proper ordering, but no change occurs on sign. Resending queue or reordering messages by priority has no effect.</li> <li>5. Blank sign, resend second response plan. Unapproved word dialog appears, and message B can be confirmed/denied.</li> </ol> <p>Case 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Response plan A w/unapproved word is on sign, priority 2.</li> <li>2. Response plan B w/unapproved word is put in queue, priority 2.</li> <li>3. Response plan A is moved to priority 5. Unapproved word dialog appears FOR RESPONSE PLAN A MESSAGE. Can allow/disallow.</li> <li>4. If allowed, queue shifts, but message A still remains on DMS.</li> </ol> <p>It appears that a response plan with an unapproved word (whether intentionally or not) will interrupt the proper functioning of the queue (and what is sent to the sign). Especially in Case 1, where no dialog appears whatsoever to indicate that there is an unapproved word unless there are no other (response plan) messages in queue. Even more telling is in Case 2, where even though message B should be going out to the sign, the dialog that appears contains the original message A.</p> <p>Did not try to recreate with non-Response Plan messages in queue; may have same effect.</p>	
<b>Resolution</b>	Behavior sent at D4 – EM 3.0 a new interface.	
	<b>Test Steps</b>	<b>Result</b> <b>P</b> <b>F</b>
	Not testable as this was written against version 2.x “incident management” which has been completely replaced by “Event Management” in 3.x (completely different code base).	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Issue Number</b>	301		
<b>Issue Title</b>	Cannot Edit DMS Sequence		
<b>Description</b>	When editing a DMS Sequence the main window opens. However when a Sequence Item is selected neither the "Edit Item" nor "Remove Item" buttons are highlighted like it would make sense to, and the error message noted is given.		
<b>Resolution</b>	There was a JavaScript error that was fixed by Roger Strain. Upon applying the fix, the issue was resolved. This will be distributed globally as a part of Release 3.		
<b>Test Steps</b>		<b>Result</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>F</b>
Select a sequence to edit. Verify that items can be edited and removed.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11/29 AM  
 Tracy Tillander  
 Melissa Ann

<b>Issue Number</b>	323	
<b>Issue Title</b>	Incident Management fails to flush hour old closed events from cache	
<b>Description</b>	The event manager from the operator map shows closed events over and hour old. After these closed events grows and grows, the operators report the system running slow in regards to incidents and events. Restarting EM alleviates the problem by flushing the events. We will look into why these events are not cleared on their own as they should be.	
<b>Resolution</b>	SwRI has been monitoring this periodically and it seems that there is always one stale (closed for over an hour) event which alone does not cause a significant impact to the system. If this doesn't cause any further significant performance issues, we will wait and see if this is still an issue after Release three, where IM will be migrated over to EM.	
	<b>Test Steps</b>	<b>Result</b> <b>P</b> <b>F</b>
	Not testable as this was written against version 2.x "incident management" which has been completely replaced by "Event Management" in 3.x (completely different code base).	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>



Defer to  
TERL

<b>Issue Number</b>	337 and 355	
<b>Issue Title</b>	337 – Video Wall Subsystem Exited 355 – Video Wall Subsystem has exited	
<b>Description</b>	<p>337: Operators reported they were unable to Video Switch to the Barco Wall. During investigation Julio noticed the Video Wall Subsystem was in an “exited” state. Shortly after receiving the call SwRI began troubleshooting the issue and noticed it was a problem which has been addressed and included in release 3.0. The fix was to stop the Barco Driver, make sure both VW Subsystem and Barco Driver were stopped, then start the VW Subsystem before the Barco Driver. Once this was performed everything was operational in District 6.</p> <p>355: Rcvd a call from Scott Hayden at 11am regarding Video Wall Subsystem. Scott stated the Operators called and reported Video Wall was not operational. Scott notice the VWS was in an exited stated, verified this in EHV. Attempted to restart VWS, but it went back to exited state.</p>	
<b>Resolution</b>	Fix was included in 2.2.2 patch 2.	
<b>Test Steps</b>		<b>Result</b>
		<b>P</b> <b>F</b>
With both VW subsystem and Barco Driver stopped, start the Barco Driver, then the VW subsystem.		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Verify that video switches to the wall can be performed.		

<b>Issue Number</b>	338		
<b>Issue Title</b>	Video Wall does not connect if user logs out		
<b>Description</b>	If we log into SunGuide there will not be an option for VW, but if we are already logged into SunGuide and then restart (Barco Driver, VW Subsystem) then it connects on the map and everything works. If it is working and then you close or log out of the map and go back in it will not connect and you will need to restart the two services.		
<b>Resolution</b>	There were a couple of updates since the pre-FAT deployment that had to be pushed out in order to fix this. Users can now login to SunGuide and they will automatically be logged into the VideoWallSystem without having to restart VideoWallSystem.		
<b>Test Steps</b>		<b>Result</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>F</b>
Log into the Operator Map.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Verify the user logged into Video Wall.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11/29 AM  
 Troy Tillander  
 M. H.



<b>Issue Number</b>	340		
<b>Issue Title</b>	Travel Times are not correct on Signs		
<b>Description</b>	We have travel times on signs that show an example (4 miles / 3 minutes) and that would be around 80 miles an hour. I have checked all the links and they are set for 65MPH. If we do the formula to find out the travel time we get 3.69 minutes for that 4 mile segment at a speed of 65MPH. Can we find out how SunGuide uses the information to calculate the travel time? How it rounds or if it rounds? An example of a sign that is showing these incorrect travel times is I-4 East of SR 532 WB.		
<b>Resolution</b>	Per discussion with FDOT the "algorithm" has been modified to always take the CEILING of a computation (as opposed to a ROUND or TRUNC) – the algorithm was truncating.		
	<b>Test Steps</b>	<b>Result</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>F</b>
	View the travel time page of the <a href="http://www.fl511.com">www.fl511.com</a> web site to verify that travel times appear correctly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11/29 AM

Troy Fullender  
 [Signature]