

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Robert Russo [mailto:rrusso@safetran-traffic.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 2:19 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: Re: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee

Bob Russo

|

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Renfro, John (KYTC) [mailto:John.Renfro@ky.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 3:17 PM

To: Miller, Dave; rjohns8@houstontranstar.org; rrusso@safetran-traffic.com; minh_v_tran@dot.ca.gov; sevans@edittraffic.com; robert.rausch@transcore.com; rboaz@pillarinc.com; Peter.Ragsdale@ustraffic.net; phat.Vu@ustraffic.net; jrose@econolite.com; rroozitalab@mccaintraffic.com; Hudgins Jr, Mark; amao@eng.co.harris.tx.us; edward.fok@fhwa.dot.gov

Cc: Siva Narla

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

Dave and Siva,

Please be advised that I will be retiring from Kentucky State Government effective June 1, 2006. It has been my pleasure to have worked with you guys on the ATC Joint Committee and the Working Groups. Until then, please see my vote on the cabinet below. Please let me know if there is anything I can do for you guys. Thanks for everything.

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Hudgins Jr, Mark

Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 10:55 AM

To: Miller, Dave; 'rjohns8@houstontranstar.org'; 'rrusso@safetran-traffic.com'; 'minh_v_tran@dot.ca.gov'; 'John.Renfro@ky.gov'; 'sevans@editraffic.com'; 'robert.rausch@transcore.com'; 'rboaz@pillarinc.com'; 'Peter.Ragsdale@ustraffic.net'; 'phat.Vu@ustraffic.net'; 'jrose@econolite.com'; 'rroozitalab@mccaintraffic.com'; 'amao@eng.co.harris.tx.us'; 'edward.fok@fhwa.dot.gov'

Cc: 'Siva Narla'

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee

Best Regards,

Mark Hudgins Jr.
Mechanical Engineer
Siemens ITS
512-837-8349

4/22/2006

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

Attachments: Jonny Cash - Rawhide.mp3

From: Ralph W. Boaz [mailto:rboaz@pillarinc.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 11:13 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Cc: 'Siva Narla'

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

Dave:

Roll'n, roll'n, roll'n. That's a YES from here.

Ralph

Ralph W. Boaz
President
Pillar Consulting, Inc.
20031 Crestknoll Drive
Yorba Linda, CA 92886
714-779-2164 (Office/Fax)
714-803-0330 (Mobile)
rboaz@pillarinc.com
www.pillarinc.com

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Montgomery, Ken [mailto:Kenneth.Montgomery@dot.state.ga.us]

Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 9:19 AM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee

*Ken Montgomery
State Signal Engineer
Georgia Department Of Transportation
935 East Confederate Avenue, Building 5
Atlanta, Georgia 30316*

*Southern Linc 28101
Office Phone 404.624.7123
Office Fax 404.624.7116
Cell 404.694.6578*

kenneth.montgomery@dot.state.ga.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Minh V Tran [mailto:minh_v_tran@dot.ca.gov]

Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 11:42 AM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

Hi Dave,

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee

Thanks

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Ron Johnson [mailto:RJOHNS8@houstontranstar.org]

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 4:53 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: Re: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

Dave,

I vote to move the specification forward to the committee.

4/22/2006

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond by Friday, April 21

From: Mao, Andy (Engineering) [mailto:amao@eng.hctx.net]

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2006 2:34 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond by Friday, April 21

Dave,

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee.

Thanks,

andy

4/22/2006

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Rausch, Robert [mailto:robert.rausch@transcore.com]

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2006 6:25 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

[YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee](#)

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Scott Evans [mailto:sevens@editraffic.com]**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2006 5:47 PM**To:** Miller, Dave; rjohns8@houstontranstar.org; rrusso@safetran-traffic.com; minh_v_tran@dot.ca.gov; John.Renfro@ky.gov; robert.rausch@transcore.com; rboaz@pillarinc.com; Peter.Ragsdale@ustraffic.net; phat.Vu@ustraffic.net; jrose@econolite.com; rroozitalab@mccaintraffic.com; Hudgins Jr, Mark; amao@eng.co.harris.tx.us; edward.fok@fhwa.dot.gov**Cc:** 'Siva Narla'**Subject:** RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee contingent on the following changes:

1. The drawings 6-5-21EP and 6-5-21IP should **NOT** contain the insert box showing the Manual Flash, Stop Time, and Monitor Bypass circuits. The drawings should also **NOT** show the "jumper" connections numbered 1 thru 11.
 1. The option of running the ITS Cabinet without the Serial Bus #1 connection to the CMU has been debated in a previous working group meeting (June 13, 2005). The voted consensus of the WG was that this option can easily result in unsafe operation of the cabinet. Because of the strong desire of one agency to provide this option, it was voted to compromise by putting the material into an Annex, and clearly denote it as optional.
 2. The published notes from that meeting by Ralph Boaz are as follows: Drawing 6.5.21 (L) - Moving to the annex. Text to be generated and reviewed by WG to reflect change. Restore monitor bypass circuit and description to annex. (Johnson/Kinnard) " .
 3. My personal notes from the same meeting are as follows: "Drawing 6-5-21 added the relay system for running without serial bus #1 to the CMU. The WG decided to put the serial bus #1 defeat circuit in the annex. The monitor bypass circuit remains in the annex. The drawing 6-5-21 will be modified to remove these circuits from the drawing."
 4. This material did not end up in an appendix, and providing the "option" in the body of the Standard may lead to an interpretation that this Monitor Bypass and Serial Bus Defeat is an option that users should and can consider. The note that states "Not required for serial operation" seems to imply a non-serial option is available for users. I personally objected to this material being in the Standard even in an annex. I believe that this is actually a Procurement issue and should be treated as such by procuring agencies. A published Standard should not provide guidance that circumvents operation of the cabinet in a safe manner.
2. The drawing 6-5-43 should NOT contain any reference to the "Monitor Bypass" circuitry. Again, this was voted by the WG to be placed in an annex and was just that in published version 01.02.15. The Monitor Bypass signal lines were marked as "Annex B Reserved".
 1. It should be noted that the references to Annex B in the current v01.02.17a document incorrectly refer to the Compliance Statement. The "Annex B" reference is not correct.

In summary I believe that the changes made to 6-5-21 (EP & IP) and 6-5-43 were made in direct opposition to the voted consensus of the Working Group and furthermore result in changes that exceed the editorial nature of the revision from v01.02.15 to v01.02.17a. I recommend that the drawings 6-5-21EP and 6-5-21IP in the body of the Standard be revised such that the aforementioned "jumpers" and reference to the "optional" circuitry be totally removed from the drawings in the body of the Standard. The drawing 6-5-43 should be restored such that the reference to the "Monitor Bypass" is eliminated. Any incorrect reference to "Annex B" should be corrected to the proper annex.

I would also suggest that this would be a good time to finalize the document revision numbering scheme as was

noted in an action item in the Boaz minutes from the June 2005 meeting; "Document Revision identification (Cheeks / Kinnard)". The essence of this item was to use the same revision scheme as that applied to NTCIP documents. The published version of this new document would therefore not be "v01.02.17a" but most likely v01.03.00.

Just for the record, trying to review this document for correctness in PDF format and without change bars in 10 days is asking to much. This revision has been in the works since June of 2005 and forcing the final review to 10 days is not an efficient way to find and correct any problems. As such I have not been able to do a thorough review other than the critical items cited above.

Regards,

Scott Evans
VP of Engineering

Eberle Design Inc.
3819 East La Salle Street
Phoenix, AZ 85040
Tel 480-968-6407

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Reza Roozitalab [mailto:RRoozitalab@McCaintraffic.com]**Sent:** Friday, April 21, 2006 9:29 AM**To:** Miller, Dave; rjohns8@houstontranstar.org; rrusso@safetran-traffic.com; minh_v_tran@dot.ca.gov; John.Renfro@ky.gov; robert.rausch@transcore.com; rboaz@pillarinc.com; Peter.Ragsdale@ustraffic.net; phat.Vu@ustraffic.net; jrose@econolite.com; Hudgins Jr, Mark; amao@eng.co.harris.tx.us; edward.fok@fhwa.dot.gov; Scott Evans**Cc:** Siva Narla; Bill Brown**Subject:** RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee . However I like the following items to be addressed:

Drawing 4-11-7A – Power Supply

The front view shows “12 or 24 VDC” indicator. Does this mean that we have (2) externally mounted power supplies, (1) 12VDC and (1) 24VDC? If this is one unit with (2) supplies in it, then we should have (2) output indicators, (4) test points and (2) output fuses!

Power Distribution Assembly:

Is the name PDA5 IP/EP or PDA-ITS? Through out the document, it is being called differently examples : Section 2.2.1.3, 3.1.2, 6.1.2.1,.....

Exhibit 2-3 (page 6) shows a PDA 5EP having a compartment with access door and with (2) thumb screws on the sides. What is the access door for and why it is different from drawing 6-5-19A?

3.7.9.3 Power Distribution Assembly Tests

If the purpose of PDA testing is to test the power supplies, then the type of test recommended on 3.7.5 may not be suitable for power supplies. Caltrans TSCES recommends line and load regulation tests.

Drawing 6-5-13 - Input Termination Panel Housing 1

There is no reference to the above drawing in the document. The example cabinet configurations, page 136, does not mention this assembly. There is no information about how to wire this assembly to the input files.

Drawing 6-5-42

I believe the Fiber Opic Termination Panel should not be part of the standard as the agencies may have different type of communication systems or may prefer different style of panels.

Drawings A-1-1, A-1-2, A-1-3, A-1-4, A-3-1, A-3-2

I believe that these drawing s should not be included in the specifications. They are procurement specifications.

Regards,
Reza

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Jim Rose [mailto:jrose@econolite.com]

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2006 2:33 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

YES, I vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee

Jim Rose
Econolite

Miller, Dave

Subject: FW: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

From: Ragsdale, Peter - SFS [mailto:Peter.Ragsdale@ustraffic.net]

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2006 11:11 PM

To: Miller, Dave

Cc: Siva Narla; Schopp, Bruce; Schofield, Vicki

Subject: RE: WG email Ballot, Please Respond

Dave,

As discussed earlier today, **NO**, I do not vote to move ITS Cabinet Draft Standard v01.02.17a to the Joint Committee.

This negative vote is based on the following:

1. The changes were not implemented properly (as previously commented by Scott Evans)
2. The document does not include any ability to review changes (i.e. track changes was not used). This makes it very difficult to review documents of this size. WG and Ballot documents need to be released in Word format and preferably with track changes activated throughout the update process. We have the tools, let's use them. Releasing "clean" pdf files is extremely counter-productive to the standards development process.
3. There has been an improper amount of time provided to review this document, especially considering its size and the fact that the ATC v5.2a document was being balloted concurrently.
4. Although I volunteered to provide the change history section of the document, this "final" pdf is the first I have seen of the document and I cannot add this section.

Once all of the above issues are resolved, I would be willing to change the vote to YES.

Peter Ragsdale, P.Eng.
GM New Product Development
Quixote Traffic Corporation
Work: (562) 923-9600 x177
Fax: (562) 923-7555
Cell: (562) 774-5101
<mailto:pragsdale@quixotecorp.com>

* CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE *

The content of this e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and contains copyrighted and/or proprietary information of the sender. If you have received this communication in error, be aware that forwarding it, copying it, or in any way disclosing its content to any other person, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail immediately.

4/22/2006