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: All traffic controllers are required to be APL items. The installation/construction and material requirements for 600 series items (Section 603-695) are more "intertwined" than for roadway or structures. For clarity, it was decided to include both installation and material language in Div II.
No changes made.

****

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 processer 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 agenciies 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: The intent of the revision is to require all new installations to use controllers listed on the APL that meet the high resolution data logging requirement. The intent was not to make this a requirement for all controllers that are purchased for replacement in existing systems, etc. The specification above has been revised to clarify this. The APL can be noted to indicate which controllers meet the high resolution data requirement.

The research so far has only included testing the controllers to ensure they can log data locally and then transmit the data via FTP (or similar protocols). The central system, so far, has not had a major role in the research and testing or in the use of the high resolution data. FDOT installed its own version of UDOT server and application, so the data can be pulled from any controller in the state via FTP, once proper configuration is done and communication channels are enabled.

****

Katie King
386-943-5333
Katie.King@dot.state.fl.us

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: The requirement captured above is for NTCIP compliance, but the comment appears to be in regards to high resolution data logging. In response to the comment, see response above to Fred Heery's comment.

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: See response above to Fred Heery's comment.

****