




# Strategic Plan Development for Transportation for the Nation (TFTN)

## Discussion Notes from Plenary Session

GIS-T Symposium  
April 2010




## TFTN panel discussion Notes from the audience

- **Lewis:** Feds shouldn't tell YOU what to do. We want to hear from you on how to do it right.
- All modes of transit eventually
- Routing, LRS, addressable → Common geometry
  - Private sector adds routing?
  - Census adds addressing?
- **Vaughn:** Nation trans data source with surface system attributes
- Feds: coordinate/reporting reqs; States: data authority for collection; Locals: acquires and aggregates; Private: support & technical services
- States should take an enterprise approach: GIS = ARRA; Traffic; Accidents
- HPMS can influence states via reporting requirements; would like to assist states, if possible



## TFTN panel discussion Notes from the audience

- **Fusaro:** Core features – NOT everything to everybody
- Aggregation from the bottom-up
- Planning begins with ensuring Federal agency road reqs are met; then moves on to cover broader “national” requirements
- State & Local: populate and maintain the roads
- Private sector: YES, but the “features” should be in the public domain – value add “linked” to public domain
- Other stakeholder: NGOs & academia
- **Widner:** NSGIC wants to see people get together in a coordinated fashion. “Coordinated approach”
- Leverage the VGI/crowdsourcing activities
- Attributes: begin with the bare minimum attributes – addresses
- We need to identify everyone’s “business needs”. Not about ownership, identify what people need.

## Audience Q’s

- Volunteered geo info, are there any “active plans” from panelists? **Steve:** reaching out to OSM. **Randy:** USGS had an external VGI conference, Census participated. Open questions “how do we control and incorporate”.
- Gene Parcher, USGS: How do envision the states owning the standards? 50 potential standards? **Ron:** Feds would help the states arrive at a common standard. Reporting requirements can drive that. **Steve:** it doesn’t work for the Feds to dictate, need input on what states should provide.
- Is basic routability part of the TFTN vision? **Steve:** we would *like* to see a complete, routable data set in the public domain. **Randy:** it would be difficult for the Feds to do it well. Especially the maintainability part. **Bruce/CSI’s followup question:** Distinction between “basic topology” (connectivity) vs. “fully routable” (turn restrictions)? **Ron:** Yes, we’re looking at basic topology. **Steve/Randy:** YES, basic topology.
- CO-DOT: Concerns about VGI. Concerned about losing authoritative source and trust. The crowd isn’t already right. **Dan:** what is the definition of “authoritative source”. Different needs – finding a restaurant, get close; sending an ambulance, no margin for error. Nebraska: agrees with Lou/Co. What’s true and trustworthy? **Randy:** trust, but verify. How do you verify is the big question. **Dan:** we can’t be asleep – these technologies are catching on and we can’t be left behind.

## Audience Q's

- Answer to VGI. There are editors from the public contributions. How soon is the data checked? A formal process for checking.
- KT Transportation: The public is willing to live with an imperfect world. We need to adapt to a faster turnover. Capture meta data on who collected the data. You can see trends on who provides quality.
- VA-DOT: What does routable mean? What does roadway mean? What does network mean? What about a higher level standard like an ISO process? More standardized definitions? Steve: no such effort underway. But the standards could be part of this process. Randy: first need to identify the core features and attributes, then we move to the standard. Dan: we are behind, other are leading the way. We need to set the lead.

## TFTN panel discussion #2 Notes from the audience

- **Lang:** What does it mean to me? Potentially more work without resources? Why can't we use something that's already been done? Why can't we partner the private sector and work deals with them?
- There's less duplication in state govt. than people thought
- Private sector: "data enhancers"
- Public: error reporters
- **CO** has statewide roads, we meet our HPMS requirements. HPMS is the starting point; build our LRS on top of that. Add bridges and accidents and addresses ON TOP of that.
- **Clarify – Transportation DATA for the Nation**
- **Skip:** TFTN is a consistent base map with common structure used across applications. **All parts of the country** – rurals have less quality in commercial products.
- Cross jurisdictional – city-to-city; state-to-state; US-Canada
- **Public-private partnership models are workable.** We will need to continue to charge for the special sauce. We have field geographers and do validation.
- Willing to work with you to put the "geometry into the public domain"

## TFTN panel discussion #2

### Notes from the audience

- **Melanie/VDOT:** Federal, state, local “collaborative”
- CL’s are the **basis** for LRS and routable
- **We need to think of multi-modal going forward**
- **Feds should coordinate the standards development by states**
- States should educate and support local govts.
- Other stakeholders, Mass Transit organizations
- In VA state provides good orthos to support local govts
- Keep the attributes simple
- Census population can help prioritize data collection.
- **Blackstone/ODOT:** Create it once, use it a bunch. **Uses of centerlines have expanded over the years.** Accidents, emergency response. It’s not just mileposts
- **Federal requirements = once/year; doesn’t work for local govt. need a more transactional model**
- Avoid a “top down” implementation
- **E911 can be a key ally**
- Other stakeholders US Postal Service

## Audience Q’s

- **Steve Lewis:** States, would you submit a “complete road network”? Should we change the requirement? **Melanie:** we have it, we would provide it, but it needs to be a requirement that create a business need. **Blackstone:** NO, the attributes are extensive and need to be defined first. “Roughness tests” are expensive. **Relax some attributes. Subsets, we could do it.**
- **GA-DOT:** Mandates get resources assigned to them. Can’t do something “for the good of the public”. How does TFTN work if there’s not strong internal state coordination? **Blackstone:** Be creative in finding the money. **Tie-in to safety.** Census spent \$24M on improvements in OH. Spending \$’s to locals is popular and politically workable. **VA: E911 and safety funds are key participants; homeland security funding.**
- **LA-DOT:** Emerging issue is to tie-in DHS and emergency managers.
- **LA-DOT:** Google is now using NON commercial data. But the data seems degraded. What is the definition of acceptably accurate? Emergency managers have accuracy needs. **Blackstone:** The commercial providers and Google are asking for our data. **Skip: New products LiDAR + panoramic cameras are being driven now.** 3 cities will be available this summer. New York, Chicago and LAX.
- **Steve Lewis:** Skip and Virginia, you have a partnership for HPMS? Is this a prototype for TFTN. **Skip:** Not identical products, but two parallel products that share geometry. **VDOT** doing daily updates. In MA, we did lots of QA that improved the geocode success >90%.