

7820102 ITS – VIDEO EQUIPMENT
COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

Richard B. Morrow, P.E.
District Traffic Operations Engineer
Florida Department of Transportation
District Five
386-943-5309

Comments:

The proposed changes to this specification significantly increases the wind load requirements. My question is, how much cost will this add to the assembly?

In D5 we have hundreds of cameras throughout the district (about half along I-95) and have never had a problem with wind. My concern is that this change could add significant unnecessary cost and make some new installations infeasible. If cameras are damaged during storm events it is far more likely for them to be damaged by lightning or storm blown debris, not direct wind.

Response:

The change is being made to align the wind load requirements to those that have been adopted in the FDOT Structures Manual. The CO ITS Section considers this change relatively minor when compared to the previous requirement of meeting 110 with 30% gust (143). While we concur that the likelihood of damage or direct failure as a result of wind is low, the requirement has helped ensure that the physical construction and ruggedness of cameras approved and reviewed by the Department has been appropriate their intended use. To date, we have received no indication from currently approved vendors that this slight increase will require product redesign, therefore we do not expect to see cost increases either. Should implementation of the new requirement prove problematic during the device approval process, the wind load requirement will be revisited at a later date.

*Ron Meyer, FDOT-ITS Section, TERL
850-410-5612
Ronald.meyer@dot.state.fl.us*

Comments:

Recommend that this section include a statement to clarify the requirement that devices described by these specifications be listed on the Approved Product List. While many already understand that this is the case, there have been a number of inquiries to our office on the topic of “is APL required for [insert device here]?”. While Section 780 does already cover the APL requirement, having it stated in the section for each device would be an improvement and would be similar to similar language in other sections of the State Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction that require APL or QPL listing.

Response:

Document modified accordingly.

7820102
782 Items