

ECONOLITE APPEAL OF THE ATC CONTROLLER STANDARD

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

From: Gary Duncan [mailto:gduncan@econolite.com]

Sent: Friday, February 13, 2004 9:30 PM

To: James Cheeks

Cc: srow@ite.org; David St. Amant; Mike Doyle; Jeff Spinazze

Subject: RE: ITE Announces "NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT" Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) Standards "ATC Controller Standard Revision 5.0"

James -

I spoke with Shelly Row yesterday at the ITS Strategic Plan meeting in San Diego regarding ITE's Intent to Adopt position on the ATC Controller

Standard. She encouraged me comment directly to ITE regarding Econolite's concern about this standard even though, as a NEMA member company, we can make our comments through the NEMA standard approval process. When I returned to the office today I found that the period for submitting an appeal to ITE expired today. As such, there is insufficient time for me to submit a written comment or appeal to ITE per the requirements outlined in the Notice of Intent to Adopt that you emailed on January 12th. However, I would at least like to raise some

of the key issues that we feel ITE should consider in determining if this version of the ATC Standard should be adopted.

1. The proposed standard was predominately developed from the perspective of 170/2070 users. No major NEMA only user was represented on the ATC Joint Committee nor were they drawn into the Working Group. The NEMA standards (TS1 & TS2) represent around 65-70% of the North American traffic controller market place, yet these users did not have a direct involvement in the development of this standard. In many cases, the needs of NEMA users have been ignored, even when comments have been provided (such as regarding controller height and connector pin outs/interfaces).

2. The process used to expedite the development of this standard, in our opinion, compromised the consensus based approach to developing a standard. A contractor team, as apposed to a consensus based working group drove the development of the standard and in addition dispostioned comments. This is in contrast to how contractors have been used to expedite NTCIP standards were the contractor worked at the direction of the working group. To make matters worse, the contractor chosen by ITE for this work appears to have had a strong interest in structuring the standard around a design approach the favors product already developed by a vendor that was part of the contractor team. Resolution of some of

the comments submitted by other vendors appears to support this.

3. A number of technical comments have been made by a various vendors during the development of this standard. We feel that a number of these comments had a sound technical base and could affect the viability of the standard. Yet, these comments were rejected by the contractor developing the standard. In some cases, the technical comment clearly pointed out flaws in the wording or design of the standard that would lead to interoperability or interchangeability problems between vendors trying to supply controllers or modules developed to this standard.

4. We feel that the current version of the standard does not provide a controller design that can accomplish one of the key goals of the standard, i.e provide a hardware base that allows software to be interchanged between controllers supplied by different vendors. The lack of an ATC API Standard makes the ATC Controller Standard incapable of accomplishing this goal. As such, we cannot see how the ATC Controller standard can be adopted until there is a clear design approach for the ATC API. Without the ATC API or the addition of further design details (such as selection of a common OS, driver definition, etc.) in the ATC Controller Standard there is little chance that software written for the ATC Controller will be able to run on controller hardware supplied from multiple vendors without the software being ported to the hardware requirements of each vendor's ATC Controller. This means that an agency investing in software may be able to only use the software purchase with one particular controller vendor. This problem is exactly what the ATC Controller Standard was supposed to solve.

5. The standard as written does a good job of targeting high end controller requirements. However, many users will not have a use for many of the features, such has the large number of communications ports included in the hardware requirements. The standard provides vendors little flexibility in providing optional implementations or "lite" versions of the ATC Controller that reduce end user cost by providing only those features that are truly needed by the end user.

6. It was our understanding that the ATC family of standards are a set of joint standards between ITE, AASHTO and NEMA. As such, we understood that each of the SDO's were to approve the standards before the standards can be considered as fully adopted. This does not agree with the Notice of Intent to Adopt statement published by ITE (see email message below). The ITE Notice of Intent to Adopt statement seems to imply that ITE will proceed with publication of the ATC Controller standard without any regard to the standards approval process of the other two SDO's that have participated in the development of this standard. We question if this is in keeping with the terms of the MOU agreement between ITE, AASHTO and NEMA.

There are other technical comments that we can raise regarding the ATC Controller Standard. However, I am not sure that it is appropriate for me to raise these in this email considering the fact that I have missed

my opportunity to officially submit an appeal to ITE during the time frame outlined in the Notice of Intent to Adopt. As such, we will submit these technical detailed comments during the NEMA voting process on this standard.

I would be happy to discuss these issues with you further if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gary Duncan
Senior Vice President & Chief Technology Officer
Econolite Control Products, Inc.
Voice: 714.630.3700
Fax: 714.630.6349
Mobile: 714.473.7653

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

From: James Cheeks [mailto:jcheeks@ite.org]
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2004 8:45 PM
To: 'George Fares'; 'Gerry Tumbali'; 'Gilleran, Brian <FRA>'; 'Glen Havinoviski'
Subject: FW: ITE Announces "NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT" Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) Standards "ATC Controller Standard Revision 5.0"

> Notice of Intent to Adopt
>
> Institute of Transportation Engineers ITS Standard
>
> Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) Standards: "ATC Controller
> Standard Revision 5.0,"
>
> The final draft version of the Advanced Transportation Controller
> Standards: ATC Controller Standard Revision 5.0, has been approved by
the
> joint ITE, AASHTO and NEMA Committee on the ATC. The Institute of
> Transportation Engineers intends to adopt this standard as of
February
13,
> 2004 assuming no final appeals are received. Please check the ITE
website
> (www.ite.org) for a notice after February 13, 2004 as to whether this
> version has been adopted by ITE. When adopted this standard will be
> jointly published by ITE, NEMA and AASHTO.
>
> This document was developed to be a Joint AASHTO / ITE / NEMA
Standards
> Publication, part of the ATC family of standards. The purpose of
this
> document is to define a standard that will provide a sufficient
framework
> within which manufacturers can provide innovative solutions to user
needs.
> The end result, however, must be a controller that works within
existing

> and proposed networks, so the standard provides details on the requisite
> electronic and user interfaces for compliant designs. The recommended
> standard tries to provide context for this effort by indicating the
> limitations of earlier standards, several of which are now in effect,
and
> describes how the proposed standard avoids these limitations.
Subsequent
> sections define design requirements for compliance with this
standard.
>
> The Advanced Transportation Controller (ATC) is being developed to
provide
> an open architecture hardware and software platform for a wide
variety
of
> ITS applications. In this context, the words "open architecture"
mean
> that the system will include both public and private sector
developers,
> and have modular software cooperatively running on standardized and
shared
> modular hardware platforms. This will provide cost-effective ITS
> functionality for a wide variety of applications. To accomplish this
goal
> the system needs to provide the maximum flexibility for many
different
> system configurations and installations.
> .
> The general concept and model for the ATC is the PC Computer.
However,
> the ATC will be a field-hardened, general-purpose computer for
embedded
> applications, which with the appropriate software and hardware
modules,
> could be asked to perform many different duties.
>
> Effective Date of the Standard:
>
> The effective date of this action to adopt as an ITE standard is
February
> 13, 2004 close of business, unless an appeal is received.
>
> How to View the Draft Standard:
>
> Between now and February 13, 2004 the final draft version of the
standards
> and the Standards Development Report on the ITE Website www.ite.org
> <<http://www.ite.org>> in the standards area
>
> If no appeals are filed, the ITE International Board of Direction
will
> ballot the standard and it will be available for purchase from ITE.
>
> How to File an Appeal:
>

> If you wish to appeal the adoption by Advanced Transportation
Controller
> Standards: ATC Controller Standard Revision 5.0, submit a written
appeal
> to ITE Headquarters (1099 14th St. NW Suite 300 West, Washington,
D.C.
> 20005, Attn: James Cheeks) by the close of business on February 13,
2004.
> The written appeal shall state the nature of the objection(s)
including
> any adverse effects, the step(s) of the ITE procedures or the
section(s)
> of the standard that are at issue, and the specific remedial
action(s)
> that would satisfy the appellant's concerns. Any previous efforts to
> resolve the objection(s) and the outcome of each shall also be noted.
>
> If an Appeal is Received by ITE:
>
> ITE Headquarters will work with the ATC joint committee chair to
develop a
> response. Within 30 days after receipt of the appeal, ITE
Headquarters
> shall respond in writing to the appellant, specifically addressing
each
> allegation of fact in the appeal to the extent possible.
>
> If an appeal is not able to be resolved informally in a manner
consistent
> with the ITE procedures, ITE Headquarters shall initiate the process
for
> the appointment of an Appeals Panel and will schedule a hearing.
>
> If the timeframe for the above actions will extend beyond February
13,
> 2004, another notice shall be provided announcing a delay in the
> anticipated date of adoption by ITE.
>
>
> James M. Cheeks, Jr.
> Standard Development Manager
> Institute of Transportation Engineers
> 1099 14th. St. NW, Suite 300 West
> Washington, DC 20005
> Ph. 202-289-0222 ext. 131
> Fx. 202-289-7722
> email: jcheeks@ite.org
> Web: www.ite.org
>
>
> James M. Cheeks, Jr.
> Standard Development Manager
> Institute of Transportation Engineers
> 1099 14th. St. NW, Suite 300 West
> Washington, DC 20005
> Ph. 202-289-0222 ext. 131
> Fx. 202-289-7722

> email: jcheeks@ite.org
> Web: www.ite.org
>