

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

Meeting Notes

MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (MOITS) POLICY TASK FORCE AND MOITS TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, September 13, 2011

TIME: 12:30 PM

PLACE: COG, First Floor, Meeting Room 1

CHAIRS: Hon. David Snyder, City of Falls Church, Chair, Policy Task Force
Sean Kennedy, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority,
Chair, Technical Committee

Attendance:

Shahid Abbas, Arlington County
Bala Akundi, Baltimore Metropolitan Council (via phone)
Ed Daniel, Montgomery County Police Department
Egua Igbinosun, MSHA
Ndanaan Jallow, WMATA
Sean Kennedy, WMATA
Curt McCullough, City of Fairfax (via phone)
Amy Tang McElwain, VDOT
Mark Miller, WMATA
Frank Mirack, FHWA DC Division
Tom Scherer, Arlington County DES
Amit Sidhaye, Arlington County
Eileen Singleton, Baltimore Metropolitan Council (via phone)
Ed Stylc, Baltimore Metropolitan Council (via phone)
Dwight Wright, Telvent Inc.

COG Staff Attendance:

Michael Farrell
Karin Foster
Andrew Meese
Erin Morrow
Patrick Powell
Wenjing Pu
Huijing Qiang
Eric Randall
Daivamani Sivasailam

MOITS Policy Task Force and Technical Subcommittee

Notes from the September 13, 2011 Joint Meeting

Page 2 of 5

Actions:

1. Welcome and Review of Notes from the July 12, 2011 MOITS Joint Meeting

Participants introduced themselves. Notes from the July MOITS meeting were approved.

2. Coordination Updates

a. Regional Emergency Support Function #1 – Emergency Transportation Committee Activities

Mr. Powell briefly introduced the agenda items to be discussed at the following Monday's RESF-1 committee meeting, including the Virtual Joint Information Center and the Baltimore Grand Prix event. Early in September, the UASI 2011 projects plan was submitted and the senior group leaders started discussions about the UASI 2012 projects.

In response to Mr. Mirack's question regarding RESF-1's response to the August 23 earthquake, Mr. Powell reported that the Chief Administrative Officers of all counties had a conference call about the situation but there were no calls to individuals to initiate any responses. Mr. Meese added that the MATOC operators did send out periodic, special messages after the earthquake about the traffic conditions. Mr. Kennedy asked if there was any feedback about the RESF-1's and MATOC's responses to the earthquake. Mr. Powell and Mr. Meese replied that they were not directly informed by any of the feedback, but the topic would possibly be discussed by the next IMR (Incident Management and Response) Steering Committee meeting.

b. COG Steering Committee for Incident Management and Response Activities

Mr. Meese reported that the Committee had its 3rd meeting on August 4th. Some updates since the meeting include:

- 1) There were more detailed discussions on the Virtual Joint Information Center for emergencies, and this would be discussed at length at the Friday's (September 16) IMR meeting. This information center is to be run by Fairfax County on behalf of this region.
- 2) On August 4th, The Committee received the preliminary draft of the report regarding the COG's IMR initiative. The report, scheduled to be revised at the September 28 meeting and finalized in late October, was still in its early draft form with many comments and suggestions.

c. Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program Activities

Mr. Meese reported that the MATOC Steering Committee also looked into the January 26 snow/ice event and tried to enhance and improve incident responses from the transportation aspect. The Center for Advanced Transportation Technology (CATT), which provides services to the MATOC program, was charged by the committee to develop ideas and recommendations on enhanced

MOITS Policy Task Force and Technical Subcommittee

Notes from the September 13, 2011 Joint Meeting

Page 3 of 5

incident responses. One of the main topic areas of this effort was the regional coordination of transportation mobilization for severe weather events.

Mr. Meese also mentioned that the MATOC program was in the process of technologically enhancing the messaging function. Mr. Powell commented that the RICCS messaging by MATOC was successful, expanding from DC to the whole region.

3. Status Report on the *Multimodal Coordination for Bus Priority Hot Spots Project*

Mr. Kennedy first briefly introduced the background of this project and then updated the participants with that Parsons Brinkerhoff was selected as the consultant to conduct the project after a multi-jurisdictional review of the proposals.

In response to Mr. Miller's question, Mr. Kennedy replied that the November 2009 AVL bus speed data were one of the data sources to identify the bus hot spots. Mr. Pu added that the general traffic speed data on many arterials in the region became available for year 2010 after COG's recent procurement of data from INRIX, Inc. and this data could be potentially used to identify traffic bottlenecks, which in turn would provide valuable information for bus hot spots.

In response to Mr. Sivasailam's question regarding the scope of this project. Mr. Kennedy replied that the project would first identify the locations (hot spots) and then come up with some recommendations. The exact extent about the hot spots improvement specifics would be determined later, at about the 10-15% concept level.

Mr. Kennedy clarified at the end that the project was not confined to find a transit solution for bus hot spots. Any solutions that could improve bus operations at hot spots were in consideration.

4. Update on the National Capital Regional Congestion Report (Draft) – A Congestion Management Process (CMP) "Dashboard"

Mr. Pu updated the participants on the status of NCR Congestion Report with a presentation. The major changes from the last report (July meeting) included that the value of time was changed from \$16/hour to \$18.49/hour based on the TPB travel forecasting model and the most recent regional household survey, and the comparative presentation of the number and duration of RITIS-recorded incidents. Mr. Pu then introduced some technical details about the report, including the data source and coverage, Traffic Message Channel (TMC) segment and traffic detector matching, delay calculation, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) comparison to the TPB model outputs, and the derivation of the value of time used in the report. At the end, Mr. Pu made the participants aware of that the recent procurement of INRIX data has a much more comprehensive coverage in our region (especially on arterials) compared with the data obtained from the I-95 Corridor Coalition Vehicle Probe Project.

Mr. Kennedy and several other participants suggested that the title of the number and duration of incident should be revised to "Number and *Average* Duration of RITIS-Recorded Incidents". In response to Mr. Sivasailam's question regarding the "work zone" incident, Mr. Pu clarified that

MOITS Policy Task Force and Technical Subcommittee

Notes from the September 13, 2011 Joint Meeting

Page 4 of 5

those are not incidents occurred at work zones but the work zone events themselves. This led to a recommendation to replace the “incident” by “event”. The work zone event could be either scheduled or non-scheduled (emergent) work activities.

In response to a question regarding the reason of using monthly average delay and cost on the top page of the report, Mr. Pu and Mr. Meese mentioned that different reporting periods such as quarterly or daily average had been tried and the monthly average was thought to make the most sense to travelers’ experience; this monthly average was also consistent with the reporting period on page 2-5 of the report. In response to a question from the staff of the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) regarding the procurement cost of the INRIX data, Mr. Meese and Mr. Pu replied that the INRIX Inc. pricing of data was based on regional population, not roadway mileage. Another question came from the BMC was whether the INRIX data would replace the Skycomp aerial photography survey or the floating car arterial travel time studies. Mr. Meese replied that staff of the TPB’s Traffic Monitoring Program was investigating a variety of data sources and technologies to enhance and improve the traffic monitoring efforts in the National Capital Region. The understanding was that a single source would not be able to provide the perfect data – different methods and data often complement each other to provide a comprehensive view of the actual traffic conditions.

5. Transportation Operations Considerations in COG/TPB Climate Change Planning

Ms. Morrow made a presentation titled “Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Transportation in the Metropolitan Washington Region”. Transportation accounts for about 30% of total Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, thus it is worth investigating the strategies from the transportation sector that could reduce GHG. The goals of GHG reduction were recommended by COG’s Climate Change regional committee in November 2008: to reduce GHG emissions to 2005 levels by 2012, 20 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, and 80 percent below 2005 levels by 2050. There are three major areas affecting transportation GHG emissions: (1) the composition of the fleet, (2) the fuel we put in the fleet, and (3) how we use the fleet. Strategies from the three areas can be considered toward GHG reduction. Ms. Morrow summarized several strategies and their cost-effectiveness. For example, the MATOC program could reduce CO₂ 124,000 tons by 2030.

In response to a participant’s question regarding the chart shown on page 7 of the presentation, Ms. Morrow explained that although the share of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by heavy duty vehicles would keep almost unchanged from 2010 to 2030, the share of the CO₂ emissions from these vehicles would rise significantly, because other vehicles in the fleet would become cleaner in the future. The key word here is “share”, not the absolute total amount.

6. Preview of Re-examination of TPB Travel Monitoring Activities

Mr. Sivasailam presented an overview of the ongoing effort of re-examining the TPB Travel Monitoring Activities. As the technology of data collection and delivery had evolved so rapidly in the past several years, it was necessary to re-examine all of the traditional and emerging data sources to enhance and improve the travel monitoring activities under UPWP budget constraints. This effort was carried out by TPB staff and the findings would be summarized in a white paper, whose

MOITS Policy Task Force and Technical Subcommittee

Notes from the September 13, 2011 Joint Meeting

Page 5 of 5

recommendations for future travel monitoring activities would be reflected in FY 2013 UPWP budget.

7. Jurisdictional Roundtable

Ms. McElwain reported that the Variable Message Signs (VMS) on I-66 now provided travel time information, which is based on INRIX data and other sources.

Mr. Igbinosun made the participants aware of that the 2012 ITS America meeting would come back to our region and to be held at the Gaylord National Hotel and Convention Center at National Harbor.

8. Other Business

None.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned around 2:00 PM.