

9960000 INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DEVICE MATERIALS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

No Name

Comments: (12-12-19, Industry)

996-2.3, 996-3.3, 996-3.4, 996-3.5 - The lines are not indented properly and currently are aligned as a Article vs a Subarticle.

Response:

Katie King
(386) 943-5333
katie.king@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-19-19, Industry)

Comments D5 TSMO: 996-2.2.1 – Can we deprecate analog cameras and make everything IP based? Is anyone still purchasing analog? 996-2.2.2- Is anyone using Standard definition with PTZ cameras? Should this be standard definition static cameras? 996-2.2.9.4 – Can we make the standard 100/1000 instead of 10/100? 996-3.1 – We have concerns that about the all network devices shall be listed on the Department’s APL statement. We think it is a goal to work toward but don’t think we are ready for this yet. Many of the more powerful routing core switches do not have standards established in the specifications. 996-3.2.1 Paragraph 3 – Layer 2+ isn’t a real designation in the OSI model can we remove the +? 996-3.2.5 - There is a lot of information missing if this is trying to cover all the deployments of Layer 3 within an ITS network. This generally seems applicable to edge solutions but not to aggregation and core switches. Significantly higher minimum of transmission speed, multicast table size, and other factors would need to be considered for these more powerful switches. 996-3.2.7 – There are concerns with the 120 VAC shall statement. We may require DC power based on project specific variables. For example, all of the towers are DC when collocating with those sites. 996-3.3 – Can we add RADUIS requirements to this section?

Response:

Katie King
(386) 943-5333
katie.king@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (1-6-20, Industry)

Comments FDOT D5: 996-2.1 last sentence: Screws securing certain fixed cameras to factory supplied mounting bracket are not stainless (appear to be zinc plated screws). Can this requirement be revised? 996-2.2.1 - Compliance with items 3&4 is difficult to ascertain, even with APL cameras. The legacy requirements in 3-6 were likely originally based on old analog camera datasheets. Recommend that they be removed in favor of reliance on the functional requirement stated in #2 alone (which should be sufficient). 996-2.2.1 - Suggest fixed cameras be exempt from masking/privacy zone requirements. Some fixed cameras supports a camera title greater than 18 characters but does not support masking/privacy zones. 996-2.2.2 - Does the 18x motorized optical zoom conflict with requirement number 7 above it about (min 10X)? 996-2.2.2 - Last sentence can the varifocal requirement be removed? It is not necessary for some of our fixed camera for verification uses and adds cost. 996-2.2.7 - First sentence can this requirement

be removed? Some small verification cameras are black. 996-2.2.7 - Can the Sunshield be an optional requirement to allow for cameras designed to operate without one?

Response:
