

1.1 Summary of Information from FHWA Division Offices

FHWA representatives in 16 states and the District of Columbia responded to a request for information from FHWA Headquarters. A summary of the current status of each state's activities in respect of CMS messaging is provided in Table 1.

CMS Messaging Application	Status	Number (out of 16 Respondents)
Travel time information	States regularly using CMS for travel time messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AZ, KY, OH, OR, TX, WI 	5
	States planning, willing, and/or capable of using CMS for travel time messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, MS, NY, TN, UT, VA, WA, WY 	8
	States not known to be involved with CMS travel time messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DC, HI, WV 	3
Emergency or security warnings	States known to have used CMS for Homeland Security messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AZ, NY, VA, WA 	4
	States planning, willing, and/or capable of using CMS for Homeland Security messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DC 	1
	States not known to be involved with CMS Homeland Security messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, HI, KY, MS, OH, OR*, TN, TX*, UT, WV*, WI, WY 	12
AMBER Alerts	States known to have used CMS for AMBER messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA, NY, OR, TX, UT, VA, WA 	6
	States planning, willing, and/or capable of using CMS for AMBER messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AZ, CO, KY, MS, OH, TN, WV, WI, WY 	9
	States not known to be involved with CMS AMBER messaging: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DC, HI 	2

Table 1. CMS Messaging Status

Source: responses from FHWA Division Offices.

Note: States indicated (*) have used, or are prepared to use, CMS for non-homeland security emergencies.

1.2 Summary of Information from Interviews with State DOTs

Based on the responses from the FHWA Division Offices, and established CMS messaging applications in other states, ten states were selected for further research to explore operational experiences in greater detail. The selected states and the primary

messaging applications of interest are indicated by check marks in Table 2. (Note: the absence of a check mark against an application does not indicate that a state does not participate in that application.)

	Travel Times	Homeland Security	AMBER Alert
Arizona	✓		
California			✓
Florida			✓
Georgia	✓		
Maryland		✓	✓
New York		✓	✓
Oregon	✓		✓
Texas	✓		✓
Virginia		✓	✓
Wisconsin	✓		

Table 2. States Selected for Further Research

In addition to the states selected from the 16 respondents, Washington and Illinois were added to the list, and appropriate stakeholders were contacted and subsequently interviewed.

2 Literature Review

As indicated earlier, the first task in documenting this report included a literature review of documents, reports, web sites, and other pertinent information related to changeable message signs and their applicability for travel times, amber alerts, and homeland security messages. The review focused on literature that was published from 1996 to 2003. To summarize briefly, information that was collected and was deemed relevant to this report, included:

- Various memoranda and reports that were published by the federal highway administration and state agencies on changeable message signs use, guidelines, operations, and deployment.
- Amber Alert policies and plans that have been established by state agencies that display these messages.
- Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) operations, guidelines, and message development guides.
- Policies and plans by state agencies that included a combination of Amber Alert and the use of HAR for messages.
- Miscellaneous articles and reports on assessments of CMS technology, surveys, manuals, etc.