

## Overall Comments about the INFOstructure (from introductions)

- The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet sees the INFOstructure as a tool to enhance emergency response
- A lot of the INFOstructure is already provided for by the national ITS architecture, but
  - Focus needs to be on rapid deployment of something that will provide solutions
- We don't really know how well the "system" is performing.
- Need to incorporate the perspectives of mid-level stakeholders. Some people will use the data to enhance safety and security, others will use it to make money (and that's OK)
- Of the states that responded, 33 said that they have ITS programs but only 13 states use that data for planning purposes. ITS data needs to be a normal data source for planners
  - User perspectives
    - Data is poor quality, or
    - Data is hard to obtain
- In Japan, need to update from loop/pulse data, which is only good for traffic volume but is not sufficient for traveler information systems and expanded applications.
- Preconceptions have changed:
  - Caltrans isn't necessarily as backward as previously thought (actually, way ahead of everybody else)
  - Security is a key element
  - People are beginning to get a "win-win" notion about sharing data
  - "Unintended consequences" are that people are beginning to realize the myriad ways they can use the data.
- Adoption is a key issue and is related to prejudices that may or may not be based on reality.
- Sharing data across borders (Canada, Mexico) is key, and different government departments (customs, immigration) may want to go different ways.
- Are potential users/agencies of advanced data ready to accept it?
- In Germany, a lot of these types of programs come from the car companies, not the government (so he wants to learn about how it's done in the U.S.). Particularly need an INFOstructure for a new application to reduce roadway fatalities (would use DSRC).