# VER. 2.5 TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL DEVELOPMENT

Status Report

Ron Milone Contractor to COG/TPB staff

TPB Travel Forecasting Subcommittee May 17, 2019



## Ver. 2.5 Model: History

- Envisioned to replace the existing Ver. 2.3 Model
- Model was initially delivered at the end of FY 2017
- Includes added features to the currently adopted
   Ver. 2.3 trip-based model:
  - Updated transit network path-building software
  - Refined non-motorized mode treatment
  - Simplified transit choice set in mode choice model
  - Enhanced transit and highway assignment



### Goals for Ver. 2.5 Model adoption

- 1. Familiarity & comfort with model application
- 2. Superior performance relative to Ver. 2.3
- 3. Acceptable sensitivity test findings
  A fairly rigorous validation/testing list has been prepared
- 4. Reasonable running time Ideally, an "overnight" timeframe
- Documentation
   PT-based network documentation is needed
   User's guide, validation report



## Recent staff development activity (during past 2 months)

Most recent model reference: Ver. 2.5.13A

- Jurisdictional person-trip P/A adjustments modified in trip generation step
- Staff discovered/rectified a disconnect between highway-assigned speeds and transit network building
- 3. Further analysis of Ver. 2.5 mode choice results
  - Jurisdiction-level comparisons
    - ➤ Modal trip tables: 2014 estimated vs. 2007/08 observed (HTS)
    - ➤ Modal trip tables: 2014 estimated vs. 2045 estimated



## Recap of the Ver. 2.5 Model development

Recurring themes reported to the TFS over the past 21 months:

- Model running times are excessively long
  - ► 1.8 x Ver. 2.3 running times
- Highway performance metrics of Ver 2.5 are comparable to those of Ver. 2.3
- Transit boardings are <u>underestimated in total</u>
  - ➤ Metrorail slightly over-estimated
  - ➤ Non-Metrorail boardings are <u>substantially</u> underestimated



#### Conclusion

- Ver 2.5 Model development not yet completed
- Immediate path forward:
  - Reformulate transit targets used in the Mode Choice validation
  - Calibrate MC model to reformulated targets
  - Transit assignment performance should be analyzed in conjunction with the MC model calibration



## Conclusions, continued

- Ver 2.5 Model development not yet completed
- Staff acknowledges more work is needed beyond performance:
  - Sensitivity testing
  - Ver. 2.5-compliant toll setting procedures
  - Streamlining application to reduce running time
  - Documentation
- Staff acknowledges the imminent Gen-3 model development effort will compete for staff resources during FY 2020



#### **Ron Milone**

Contractor to COG/TPB staff (202) 962-3283 rmilone@mwcog.org

#### mwcog.org/TPB

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments 777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20002

