

6710000 TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS
INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

DJ Conner
813-759-1559
djc@highwaysafetydevices.com

Comments: (7-11-16)

If the Department deems it necessary for SR-671-2 to be a requirement for all controllers make it a requirement for all manufacturers to be on the APL in the first place. If this is the attempt to ensure that then this language is Division III material related, not Division II construction related. If necessary create a new Division III section to encompass the APL requirements for controllers, and clean up the Division II 671 section in the process. The Division II specs as a whole are already overwhelmed with Division III requirements and this just continues that trend.

Response:

Fred Heery
850-410-5606
fred.heery@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (7-28-16)

I want to raise some concerns with this as proposed. This requirement should not be difficult for Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) controllers, but TS2's and 2070's may be difficult as those older controllers may not have the processor or storage capacity. Anyone making an "ATC" should expect to be required to collect the Purdue Data at some point. As the local governments update their controllers and communications to Ethernet and faster comm. rates this issue should go away. If they have the older controllers, but new 1 gig Ethernet switches, then the data should be passed to central without bogging the system and the other controllers on the channel won't see the data. This is important when the comms get passed through more than one network switch. Some of the local traffic signal maintaining agencies may have some issue with this. The ones that are using old controllers and centralized software. It might be better to "grandfather" this in through the APL process. And, any new ATMS with Central and Field cabinet controller upgrades as a complete system should require this functionality. There likely needs to be some testing of backward compatibility with the common central systems in use in the state. Naztec/Econolite/TranSuite and SCATS, etc. As the basic input/output scheme may have been revised to accommodate this feature and the application software from the common systems used in Florida may have some issue with the revised BIOS and the controller vendors internal functions (Clock, Comms, Data Storage). There may be no issue at all but, testing is King in this regard and it is not known if the Section 671 requirements were vetted against any form of backwards compatibility testing.

Response:

Katie King
386-943-5333

Comments: (8-4-16)

1. Is there a way to reword this? Not all NEMA TS2 or 2070 have the processing power to handle the High Resolution Logging?

→ All NEMA TS2, Model 2070 and ATC controllers must provide functionality that meets or exceeds operational characteristics, including NTCIP support, as described in NEMA TS-2-2003.¶

Response:

2. Is this part of the previous paragraph? Using only "Controller" appears to imply every traffic controller.

→ All NEMA TS2, Model 2070 and ATC controllers must provide functionality that meets or exceeds operational characteristics, including NTCIP support, as described in NEMA TS-2-2003.¶
→ Controllers must implement all mandatory requirements listed in supplemental requirement SR-671-2-1.1-01, Supplemental Traffic Controller High Resolution Data Logging Requirements, as published on the Department's State Traffic Engineering and Operations Office website at the time of Contract letting.¶

Response:
