

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Inventory
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Functional Requirements and Interface Definition Report (Chapter 3)**

When you have completed your comments please email this form to Tom Petrosino at tmp@iteris.com.

Reviewer Name Chalap Sadam			Representing City of Montclair	Phone # (714) 992-2990	Email address chalap@albertgrover.com
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
1	3.2	11-12	<p>Comment specifically refers to local City and County Roadside Equipment and Signal Systems: As pointed out at the workshop on May 7, 2003, I believe many agencies are receptive to using ITS elements and conforming to any national/regional standards. However, requiring elements such as vehicle signal priority, signal pre-emption and transmission of traffic information to other jurisdictions etc., via the Regional ITS Architecture, may not be appropriate. It should be evaluated on a case-by-case based on need, the project scope and availability of funds.</p> <p>Further, the Regional ITS architecture should be structured more as a goal oriented process and encourage stakeholders to design ITS elements that can be integrated with other ITS elements. Perhaps the use of “shall” statements could put agencies in a bind when all elements do not necessarily apply in each case.</p>		1

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
1	3.2	3	It would be nice to have a listing of all the stakeholders and systems in the front of this section (a sort of table of contents to all the detailed listings that follow)		1

*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Inventory
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Functional Requirements and Interface Definition Report (Chapter 3)**

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:	Disposition of Comment*:	
2	3.2	3	We need to choose a word other than “shall.” Shall implies that whenever such a system is implemented that it must contain the listed elements. In reality, a cost analysis and phasing will be involved, which may mean that only a portion of these capabilities are provided. Some capabilities may be provided at a later date, and some may never be provided, because the cost does not warrant it. A system should not be found inconsistent just because it does not include all the listed capabilities. Consider “should” or “list of potential capabilities” or something like that. “Shall” will be appropriate for bid specifications, but not for defining requirements at the architecture level. Need to maintain flexibility. Each “shall” has a cost implication.	1 – The term “Shall” meets the intent of the Regional ITS Architecture Rule and, primarily for that reason, has been maintained in the revised document. Another stakeholder also made a similar observation regarding the term “Shall.” Wording was added to the “lead-in” paragraph that helps “soften” the impact of the term Shall in the following material. Also, in response to stakeholder comments, some specific “shall statements” were “softened” for, in particular, the Local Cities and Counties” stakeholder(s).	
3	3.2	3	Regarding systems not under the control of Inland Empire agencies (e.g. DMV), we should characterize their capabilities as ones with which Inland Empire agencies may have to interface. “Shall” is definitely not appropriate here.	1	
4	3.2	3	Under CHP CAD system – instead of saying “provide safe and efficient routes” say something like “enhance safety and efficiency of routes.” In next bullet, the system itself won’t develop and execute emergency response plans, maybe better said “enable the development and management of emergency response plans.” Same thing with next bullet. “ The system doesn’t do the managing, it enables management, as I understand it.	1	
5	3.2	4	D8 Maintenance and Construction – same thing – the system doesn’t manage, it enables the management of, unless you are talking about a super-sophisticated, automated system of some kind, and I don’t think that will happen.	1	
6	3.2	4	Caltrans D8 Signal Ops – I don’t think that detecting and verifying incidents through the signal system would be an appropriate or achievable function on arterials. Cameras may possibly be used to verify, but not sure if that capability is included in this set of functions.	1	
7	3.2	5	D8 Signal Ops Roadside Equipment – some of these functions seem redundant with those listed under signal ops	4 – The functions shown are reciprocal and complementary	

*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Inventory
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Functional Requirements and Interface Definition Report (Chapter 3)**

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:	Disposition of Comment*:	
8	3.2	5	D8 TMC – Incident verification is a very appropriate function, but I would question whether incident detection is worth pursuing as a TMC function. Almost all the incidents these days are detected through cell phone/911, and I don't think we should spend any effort on trying to implement incident detection algorithms. They don't work all that well.	4 – There is an understanding that Caltrans is pursuing this capability as a TMC ATMS functionality, not just for the District 8 TMC but as part of a “standardization” of software and ATMS capabilities for all of the Southern California Caltrans District TMCs (Districts 7, 8, 11 and 12).	
9	3.2	7	It seems like the City TMCs, roadside equipment, etc. are pretty much the same for all the City TMCs. If they are the same, the document might be easier to understand and digest if there is a generic set of requirements for these types of systems, with the understanding that cities would need to implement all or some appropriate subset of these functionalities for their own system.	1	
10	3.2	10	It seems a bit strange that we would have shall statements for what the General Public uses. Our systems must recognize the capabilities the general public has to receive and provide information, but we have no control over it.	1	
11	3.2	11	As far as receiving vehicle priority requests, we need to specify that these would be only along designated routes. In addition, some cities may not implement such systems, so we need to make sure that systems they procure have the flexibility not to include those features.	4 – Some signal priority systems are centrally directed and have the ability to provide priority at “any” or “almost any” intersection on the signal system; as opposed to signal priority systems where the approaching vehicle only interacts with a specific intersection where specialized equipment has been installed. As written, the requirement is broad enough to allow any type of signal priority system to be implemented, at any location, as appropriate.	

*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Inventory
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Functional Requirements and Interface Definition Report (Chapter 3)**

Reviewer Name Steve Smith			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909-889-8611 ext. 134	Email address ssmith@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:	Disposition of Comment*:	
14	3.2	14	The functional requirements for the fixed route transit systems seem to be identical also. Could these be consolidated into a single generic set of requirements from which the agencies choose when they proceed to implementation? Some of the issues of compatible fare media will be very important, and it might be nice to highlight some things that the transit agencies should really be thinking about as they proceed with implementation of ITS. Its hard to pick out what they should be particularly paying attention to when there is such a long list of “shalls.” Hopefully the report will have some sections addressing what important things each agency should remember as they proceed down the path to implementing ITS. In other words, what would you tell Omnitrans, RTA, Sunline, and Metrolink (among others) if you had them all gathered in a room to talk about their future ITS initiatives.	4 – The functional requirements for RTA, SunLine and Omnitrans were developed based on specific input received from those stakeholders. The functional requirements will not be combined in the revised report because these stakeholders have been individually identified in the Inventory and in the Turbo Architecture database. Because it is an issue larger than the Inland Empire, the issue of universal fare media will be handled in a “Regional Perspectives” section of the final report.	
15	3.2	16	Commercial vehicles would be similar to the general public, in that we don’t control them, but we need to recognize what they have and what they will have in the future. And only certain portions of the fleet will have these features.	1	
16	3.2	17	Should be Riverside County Transportation Commission	1	
17	3.2	23	What the media does must be recognized, but we have no control over their systems.	1	
18	3.3	24	I am hoping that we will get specific information on how to use the architecture within the local context. It would be nice to have a section that more specifically discusses how to use each part of the architecture at the local level: the functional requirements, interconnect diagrams, etc. This is a weakness of the national architecture documents, in that it is hard to figure out how you actually use them (once you have them) at the local level. As suggested at the workshop, it will be imperative to illustrate the use of the architecture, and how consistency with the architecture is determined, by applying it to some sample projects.	3 – A section will be included in the Final Report to address this issue. It has also been a topic of discussion at a recent Project Workshop and will be discussed again at the Final Project Workshop.	

*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Inventory
Stakeholder Comment Form
Draft Functional Requirements and Interface Definition Report (Chapter 3)**

Reviewer Name Jerry Rivera			Representing RCTC	Phone # (909) 787-7141	Email address jrivera@rctc.org
Comment #: 1	Section: Chap. 3	Page: 17 & 18	Comment: Stakeholder: Riverside County Transportation Commission (four consecutive times)		Disposition of Comment*: 1

Reviewer Name			Representing	Phone #	Email address
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment: <i>Other verbal comments were received at Project Workshops at which this Report was discussed, via fax and in other conversations with project stakeholders. Those comments will be incorporated into the revised Report.</i>		Disposition of Comment*:

*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)