

9950100 TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL AND DEVICE MATERIALS
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Jeremy Dilmore
(386) 943-5360

Jeremy.Dilmore@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-17-21, Industry)

How does the requirement for Preemption and TSP apply to connected vehicle applications. Specifically the requirement for individual vehicle identification, 995-8.2.2. With the privacy provisions of OBUs rolling IDs doesn't this mean OBU and RSU are therefore not meeting this spec and cannot be used for EVP and TSP in Florida. Same question with range, 995-8.2.5, given that range testing just got started with the grants this past year. There is a specific vendor that has mentioned this in my District and it raises a potential for bid protests.

Response:

Currently for Preemption and TSP connected vehicle applications, please submit a traffic control device permit request.

The requirement for Preemption and TSP may be covered in the developmental specification, Dev681RSU, in the future. The Dev681RSU could reference ISO 19091:2019, which states that "Public transport vehicles, freight vehicles, and emergency vehicles are assumed to have consistent, non-changing IDs for the duration of all interactions described for pre-emption and priority as described herein. That is, the randomization present for light vehicles to maintain anonymity does not apply to this class of vehicle for these applications."

Deborah Ihsan
(954) 777-4387

Deborah.ihsan@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (12-22-21, Industry)

Please review the verbiage – shall not be between 5 and 30 flashes per second. Reasoning: when the section deals with Beacon flashing requirements, why mention about " shall not be"

Response:

In order to maintain consistency with the language in the FHWA Interim Approval 21 (https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interim_approval/ia21/index.htm), the verbiage "shall not be" was used.

Melvin Wilton
(815) 621-1048

mwilton@skybracket.com

Comments: (12-27,21, Industry)

9950100 Traffic Control Signal and Device Materials 995-7.5.1 Span wire Clamp Would it be possible to split and list the aluminum and stainless steel properties separately like was done for the Adjustable hanger in sections 995-7.5.3 & 995-7.5.4. As I recall the state wants the Span wire clamp manufactured from aluminum alloy 535 if aluminum is used. This change would make that clearer.

Response:

Separating aluminum and stainless steel span wire clamps into separate sub-articles would be done if we wanted to list aluminum vs stainless steel span wire clamp products separately on the APL. For the alloy, at this time, we just want the span wire clamps to meet minimum tensile and

yield strengths. We can investigate moving to aluminum alloy 535 in the future. No change at this time.
