ITS CABINET DESIGN TEAM TELECONFERENCE
MONDAY, 11/15/10, 03:00-05:00 PM ET

ATTENDEES | VOTING MEMBERS AND RECENT ATTENDEES NOT PRESENT
---|---
Craig Gardner, Intelight ITS * | Steve Alonge, Noblis
Ralph Boaz, Pillar Consulting * | 
Jim Rose, Econolite * | 
Scott Evans, EDI * | 
Reza Roozitalab, McCain | 
Joe Palsa, Clary | 
Brent Katauskas, Siemens | 
Robert Rausch, TransCore | 
James Kinnard, Adaptive Solutions | 
Leah Fuss, Econolite | 

[Action items are assigned using the form "[ACTION: LASTNAME]".]

GENERAL
- Ralph Boaz led introductions and provided meeting guidance.
- Proposed design documents from Craig Gardner were circulated prior to the meeting. Ralph to put these on the ITS Cabinet Working Group (WG) FTP site. [ACTION: BOAZ]
- Design goals gathered by Ralph from past meetings were circulated prior to the meeting.

DISCUSSION
- Discussed the designed goals. The list was amended slightly with the agreed upon goals as follows:
  1) Increase the overall value to the user.
  2) Need to make the solution compelling such as better diagnostics, monitoring LED field displays, public safety, energy efficiency, etc.
  3) Make sure new features that are added are attractive to the majority of users. At a minimum, do not make special features for the minority of users be required for the majority.
  4) Add diagnostics to help technicians with trouble shooting.
  5) Have a CMU display that is easily read by technicians.
  6) Simplify cabinet design from a technician's perspective.
  7) Minimize changes unless they are a barrier to the other goals. Examples:
     a) Increased density in the input rack will change how inputs are mapped in application software.
     b) Exchange of information between the CMU and the Controller may be changed to support new diagnostic features.
- Discussed design documents from Craig Gardner.
  - Craig proposed a back plane in the output assemblies that it is made of two parts (front and rear portions) with the Flash Transfer Relays (FTRs) on a rear assembly (possibly subassembly) made up of separate cards per load switch (see file 14_Pack_13[1].pdf). This way, if an FTR is blown, the entire assembly (subassembly) does not have to be changed.
  - It is also a solution that allows the front part of the assembly containing the load switches to be replaced and still keep the cabinet in flash.
  - It was argued that if the rear portion was bad that a technician would end up replacing the entire assembly or cabinet anyway.
  - Reza Roozitalab felt that the idea was overly complex.
  - Jim Rose thought it was good idea even if only to help trouble shoot in a lab.
DRAFT

- It was discussed that Loadswitch fuses should be 10 AMP but they were not suitable alone to protect the device from damage.
- It was discussed that service outlet fuses should be 10 AMP.
- Reza suggested that we ask 5-6 agencies outside of our group to get a broader assessment of the proposals. No action item assigned. This to be brought up again? [ACTION: BOAZ]
- There were other comments but no conclusions from the group as they wanted to review the rest of the material and meet again on Thursday. This needs to be announced and the all WG meeting cancelled. [ACTION: BOAZ]
- It was established that our overall goal of this group would be to come together and propose a design to the rest of the Working Group but if we did not have consensus within the design team that we would bring the specifics to the WG for voting.
- Ralph reminded the design team that we MUST PRODUCE A SCHEDULE FOR THE REMAINING WEEKS.
- The WG felt that this could not be done without agreement on the architecture. [ACTION: DESIGN TEAM]

NEXT MEETINGS/TELECONFERENCE
- Design Teleconference, Thursday, 3:00 PM ET, 11/18/10 to finish design discussion.