

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:

Format fixed.

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?

Response:

No change. The Districts were asked this question and have up to 2-28-20 to respond.

Is anyone still purchasing analog?

Response:

No change. No analog cameras listed on the APL.

996-2.2.2- Is anyone using Standard definition with PTZ cameras?

Response:

No change. The Districts may be polled in the future about SD cameras.

Should this be standard definition static cameras?

Response:

No change. The fixed cameras can also be HD.

996-2.2.9.4 – Can we make the standard 100/1000 instead of 10/100?

Response:

No change at this time. This will be discussed at an ITS group meeting.

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.

Response: The word “All” will be removed. Network devices are those defined under 996-3.

996-3.2.1 Paragraph 3 – Layer 2+ isn’t a real designation in the OSI model can we remove the +?

Response: No Change at this time.

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.

Response: No change. The network devices covered in this specification are those in the field, not the RTMC.

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.

Response: No change. The majority of MFES are used at the edge where 120 VAC is common.

996-3.3 – Can we add RADUIS requirements to this section?

Response: No change. No device servers appear to support RADIUS.

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?

Response: No change. The 304 or 316 performs better in corrosive environments.

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).

Response: No change. The listed items describe both IP and analog cameras. If the analog cameras are removed from the SSRBC, then the analog requirements will be removed.

996-2.2.1 - Suggest fixed cameras be exempt from masking/privacy zone requirements.

Response: No change. Some of the features for the fixed cameras will be discussed in an ITS working group meeting.

Some fixed cameras supports a camera title greater than 18 characters but does not support masking/privacy zones.

Response: No change. The current specification states a “minimum of 18 characters per line”, thus, more than 18 characters is allowed.

996-2.2.2 - Does the 18x motorized optical zoom conflict with requirement number 7 above it about (min 10X)?

Response: No Change. There is a difference between the digital zoom and the motorized optical zoom.

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.

Response: No change. Some of the features for the fixed cameras will be discussed in an ITS working group meeting.

996-2.2.7 - First sentence can this requirement be removed? Some small verification cameras are black.

Response: No change. Some of the features for the fixed cameras will be discussed in an ITS working group meeting.

996-2.2.7 - Can the Sunshield be an optional requirement to allow for cameras designed to operate without one?

Response: No change. Camera housings shall include a sunshield to reduce the solar heating of the camera; however, we feel D5 may have needs not covered by this subarticle. This will be discussed in an ITS working group meeting.
