

7860000 INDUSTRY REVIEW COMMENTS

Gordon Johnson

COMMENT:

Bob, I am concerned about the warranty language in this spec. 786-11. Our industry continues to be forced into extended warranty requirements that not only exceed our ability to forecast but also exceed the limits of available performance bonds. This requirement (and it's response criteria) effectively requires contractors to stock costly replacement parts for these unique job specs. Determining warranty problems versus other failure causes in this new technology will be difficult and in the end this will be the burden of the contractor. This spec.(which effectively makes the contract both a construction and a maintenance agreement) will both drive up costs and limit competitive bidding.

RESPONSE:

Tim Grimm

COMMENT:

The proposed changes to the ITS item are straight forward. My only concern would be for the lineal foot measurement for electric service wire. As you recall the DASH jobs (and every Interstate DMS project on which I've worked) wind up running very long service drops. Although we could keep close track of the quantity with relative ease; the size (gauge) of the wire will vary by distance and load. Using different wire sizes, at different costs, will certainly be a concern to the contractor, in particular on a unit price job. We should consider parsing out the blanket category of electric wire as service wire #6 AWG; service wire #4 AWG; etc. We could also make electric service wire a Lump Sum item

RESPONSE:

Allen W. Schrupf, PE

COMMENT:

Proposed Specification Revision of 7860000 Intelligent Transportation Systems – Vehicle Detection and Data Collection (REV 6-1-06) Comments

- 1) For 786-3 Detection Accuracy section, suggest additional language (clarity) on an individual (each) lane basis or all lanes for minimum accuracy levels. It may be

misconstrued that only the first lane has to meet the accuracy levels since some vendor products' accuracy decreases lane by lane in a multi-lane configuration. A graph of the occupancy rate accuracy might be a more effective way of testing the devices.

The two subsection titles on page 7, subsection 786-3.3.3 Equation 3 and on page 9, subsection 786-3.4.5 Equation 8, should both read "Total Roadway Segment Accuracy Expressed in Percentage" rather than "Early Morning Roadway Segment Accuracy Expressed in Percentage", as each formula includes accuracy percentages for all time periods, not just "Early Morning".

- 2) For 786-4 Installation, currently Section 785-3 is Guaranty Provision. Reference of "field cabinet meets requirements of Section 785-3" is incorrect. However, reviewer expects that Section 785 will be revised.
- 3) For 786-4 Installation, suggest inclusion of reference to Section 785 for poles in addition to Section 641 and Section 649 (or remove Section 641 and Section 649 reference since it is include in Section 785).
- 4) Equipment cannot be rejected, repaired and resubmitted a number of times. The concern is that equipment that has failed might be repaired enough for short term testing, but not last the intended time in service. Consider adding language to limit repaired devices being resubmitted
- 5) Devices should be capable of rebooting themselves from a remote location on command location.

RESPONSE:
