

7810301 ITS – MOTORIST INFORMATION SYSTEMS
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

David O'Hagan
State Roadway Design Engineer
850-414-4283

Comment: (Internal Review)

781-3.1.2, 3rd paragraph: Why are we making these specifications? Is it known that this will support the sign for the AASHTO & Structures Manual -specified design criteria? The supplier should simply provide a Z shape necessary to accommodate the specified design criteria.

Response:

The Z bars given in the Specifications are a minimum. In the APL application, the fabricator must provide calculations substantiating that the bracing provided is adequate for the design.

Mark Nallick
D3 ITS LAN Administrator
Florida Department of Transportation
District Three Traffic Operations
1074 East Highway 90, P.O. Box 607
Chipley, Florida 32428
Office 850.415.9445
FAX 850.415.9273
mark.nallick@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

Good afternoon. I realize the documents referenced below are being distributed for industry review and comment however I hope you will consider my informal comments below for your consideration in the final versions.

Have a safe and happy New Year...

Most manufactures offer a GUI (graphical user interface) for local (serial connection) management of field devices. Would a requirement to provide a 32 bit GUI in lieu of a simple command line or 8/16 DOS type menu be of any benefit to (field) technicians? For remote management SunGuide would of course provide the GUI to TMC operators.

Document “Proposed Specification: 7810301 ITS Motorist Information Systems”

Section 781-4.2.9 Power System;

This section appears to contains a possible grammar error (fragmented sentence) in the last sentence as indicated in the image below.

~~the following sections can be operated locally and remotely.~~

781-4.2.109 Power System Distribution: *Provide a solar or AC power system as shown in the plans. Both solar and AC powered sites must be provided with* Provide a power distribution system, *for both solar and AC powered sites, that includes* with automatic battery charging circuitry. *Ensure that battery chargers must* to prevent overcharging and *provide* with the capability *a means* of low-voltage battery disconnection and isolation.

Provide external AC power supply module with backup batteries as shown in the plans. Ensure that *AC powered systems* the power supply module *utilize* is a nominal 120 volts of alternating current (V_{AC}) *nominal input voltage*. Ensure that the *HAR* power supply module operates *from 89-135VAC with a frequency* at 50 of to 60 +/-3 Hz and a maximum of 150 watts. Provide batteries that can continuously operate the HAR system at full power for a minimum period of three days without an external power source. *Ensure that loss of AC power to the system does not* the system has an automatic charging unit and automatic power changeover with no interruption to *HAR transmissions.*

Response: It is difficult to see in the markup copy, but the verb “interrupt” is still in the sentence. No change necessary.

Section “781-5.2.3 ESS, Item 1, data description B;

In the description of the surface data should the statement “percent of ice” be replaced with “presence of ice” as indicated in the image below?

781-5.2.3 ESS: Install an ESS having the sensors necessary to collect, store, and transmit the following data:

1. Roadway data, including:
 - A) Temperature
 - ~~B) Subsurface temperature~~
 - ~~C) Surface~~ Precipitation data that includes precipitation type, percent of ice, and precipitation depth/amount.
2. Atmospheric data, including:
 - A) Temperature
 - B) Relative humidity
 - C) Barometric pressure
 - D) Precipitation data that includes type and intensity
 - E) Visibility as affected by fog, smoke, or a combination thereof
 - F) Wind data, including direction and average speed
 - G) Solar radiation (optional)
3. Subsoil data (*optional*), including:
 - A) Temperature
 - B) Moisture (~~optional~~)
4. High water data

Response: Document modified for clarification.

Section 781-5.2.4 Communications;
The acronym “RPU” does not appear to be defined within this document (Plain Language Initiative).

781-5.2.4 Communications: Use an RPU capable of transmitting all collected data to the transportation management center (TMC) using the National Transportation Communications for ITS Protocol (NTCIP) over any of the following media, as detailed in the plans:

1. Microwave communications, specifically, Florida’s statewide Motorist Aid System (MAS) microwave communication infrastructure.
2. Ethernet communications over single-mode fiber optic cable that transfers data at a minimum rate of 10 megabits per second (Mbps).
3. Twisted-pair copper wire capable of transferring data at a rate of up to 128 kilobits per second (kbps).
4. Cellular mobile telephone service with data transmission rates of up to 56 kbps.

Ensure that all communications, including those between sensors and the RPU, are nonproprietary and compatible with the Department’s SunGuide^{®SM} Software System.

In certain cases, provide peer-to-peer wireless communication between RPUs at a maximum distance of 5 miles. Ensure that the RPU is capable of, or adaptable to, providing this type of communication.

Response: The document only contains sections that were modified. RPU is defined earlier (upon its first use) in section 781-5.2 Materials. No change necessary.

Eddy Scott
FDOT District 2
Specifications / Design Review
Quality Assurance Manager
386.961.7831
eddy.scott@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

Difficult to review as there are duplicate portions.

- Compare sections 781-3.1.3.3 & 781-3.2.3.2
- Compare sections 781-3.1.3.4 & 781-3.2.3.3
- Compare sections 781-3.1.8 & 781-3.2.8
- Compare sections 781-3.1.10 & 781-4.2.110

Response: There are subtle differences in the sections for the different sign types that justify the duplication of some text.

781-3.1.1 Last paragraph – Suggest combining sentences and adding “and“ between the two.

Response: The current language is sufficient.

781-3.1.10 Control Cabinet Specifications – Suggest removing “Specifications” from the title.

Consider replacing the entire spec as the changes appear extensive although

Response: Document modified to remove “Specifications” from control cabinet section titles (781-3.1.10 and 781-3.2.10).

Chris Sweitzer
386-961-7418
chris.sweitzer@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-11-10)

The legibility distance range in the (proposed) last paragraph of 781-3.1.1 differs from the one listed in 781-3.1.4 (3rd paragraph).

Response: The minimum value in 781-3.1.4 has been changed to 100.

James T. Barfield, P.E.
District 3 Secretary

Comments:

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 7, 2010

TO: Duane F. Brautigam, P.E., State Specifications Engineer, MS 75

FROM: James T. Barfield, P.E., District Secretary

COPIES: See Distribution List

SUBJECT: Proposed Specification Change: 7810301

=====

We have retrieved the referenced document from the [State Specifications Office's Industry Review intranet website](#). Pursuant to request, we have reviewed the document, entitled “ITS-Motorist Information Systems” and offer the following comments for your consideration.

Confirm with the State Structures Office that the referenced horizontal aluminum Z members are indeed satisfactory for use. These were rejected as a satisfactory mounting method on a recent D3 project, and the Central Structure Office commissioned a study to evaluate the use of the

horizontal Z members statewide. It is understood that the findings of the study did not support the continued use of the horizontal Z member in this application.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me, at (850) 415-9200.

Jennifer Williams

*Office of the District Secretary
Florida Department of Transportation
Office (850) 415-9592
Fax (850) 415-9761
jennifer.williams@dot.state.fl.us*

Response: The State Structures Office has reviewed and provided input on the draft language concerning the use of horizontal Z members in this specification. The 4"x3"x5/16" minimum requirements were incorporated in the requirements following consultation with the State Structures Office.

The material specified in the draft is stronger (larger dimensions, thickness, etc.) than what has been provided on past DMS. These members are directly connected to the internal framing of the sign and have been demonstrated to meet loading requirements, etc. Some manufacturers were able to provide calculations in the past that supported the use of smaller material in various configurations, but the Department has a desire to apply a more standard approach and reduce the variability of proposed manufacturer designs.

The issue with the use of Z on the project in D3 (assuming the project you are referencing is the DMS installation in Tallahassee), involved the use of a Z member as an intermediate member between vertical attachments in order to resolve mounting conflicts between the sign and truss structure. At that time, it was determined that the use of that particular Z, in that particular manner, was not adequate. That experience has been taken into consideration.

Trevor Slight
Daktronics, Inc.
(P) 605-692-0200 X57308
Trevor.slight@daktronics.com

Comments:

Daktronics has reviewed the proposed specification changes by the Florida Department of Transportation, and we have put together the following list of suggestions.

1. Section 781-3.1.2 Sign Housing (paragraph 3) has an addition to state minimum specific dimension of 4"x3"x5/16" for the structural aluminum Z members on the rear of the sign housing. Could you please state the reasoning behind having this specific dimension listed in the specifications? Our suggestion

is to remove both the dimensions of the Z bracket and their location. Instead, we would suggest requiring P.E. AASHTO calculations to ensure the design meets the intent of the specifications.

Response: The minimum structural requirements were coordinated with the State Structures Office based on a number of prior issues, investigations, and studies. The Department felt that it was important to at least state these minimum requirements. P.E. Calculations are required to demonstrate compliance with AASHTO and FDOT requirements as a condition of DMS approval and listing on the APL. These calculations are reviewed by the Department during the APL evaluation process.

2. Section 781-3.1.3.4 Optical, Electrical, and Mechanical Specifications for Display Modules. Paragraph 5 has a requirement removed that called for the easy removal from the display module PCB without tools. We wanted to clarify that this requirement was for individual LEDs to be removed from the PCB board without tools, and this is why it was removed from the specification.

Response: Yes, it is not practical or desired to replace individual LED's on a display module.

3. Section 781-3.3 TMC Communication Specifications for all DMS (Table 1 – Range Deviances for Objects) has had the required number of brightness levels changed from 255 to 16. Why has this specification been reduced to 16 levels of light? This is not consistent with a number of other state specifications and industry standard practice. The 16 level requirement was used years ago, and has since been phased out or changed to a minimum of 200 levels.

Response: The requirement for 16 levels is a minimum. The specification also states that, "...the sign's brightness changes smoothly, with no perceivable brightness change between adjacent levels." This means the manufacturer will need to interpolate data from the brightness values to an appropriate number of levels to produce a smooth transition between levels. Daktronics DMS currently on the APL support this functionality.

4. Section 781-3.3 TMS Communication Specifications for all DMS. Under Table 2-NTCIP 1203 Standard Software Tags, a requirement has been added to ensure the controller's internal time clock can be configured to synchronize to a time server using the Network Time Protocol (NTP). It also states that the NTP synchronization frequency must be configurable and permit polling intervals from once per minute to once per week in 1-minute increments. Does this requirement need to support DNS, Static IP, or both? Please clarify.

Response: Document modified to clarify need for DNS and Static IP support.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments regarding changes to the 781 Specifications. We appreciate that you value our input on these items, and we are happy to work with the Florida DOT in any way we can to help with the process. Please let me know if any of the above items require further clarification.

Response: Thank you. Your comments are appreciated.
