

# **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

## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** MOITS Technical Subcommittee

**FROM:** Karin Foster

**DATE:** June 3, 2008

**SUBJECT:** Summary of Results of the MOITS Participants' Survey

### **Background**

This memorandum summarizes the results of a survey of Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Technical Subcommittee participants. The survey was developed and conducted in March and April 2008 to gauge Subcommittee members' interests on various MOITS-related topics, and to try to energize the Subcommittee by ensuring that topic areas of focus are of the most interest to participants. The survey was distributed to approximately one hundred people who are on the MOITS contact list; twenty-four individuals responded to the survey, the majority coming from the public sector.

### **Survey Structure**

There were four Questions to the survey:

- Question A: Which of the following ways of sharing information and conducting committee business most interest you?
- Question B: Which of the following topic areas would you like the MOITS Technical Subcommittee to spend its time and focus on?
- Question C: What is your level of interest in MOITS reviewing potential projects and formulating regional recommendations on projects?
- Question D: If MOITS were to formulate recommendations on projects, what would be your three highest priorities?

A print out of the survey instrument is attached to this memorandum for reference.

### **Results – Overview of Questions and Responses**

**Twenty-four surveys were completed and returned.**

- Eighteen from public sector individuals
- Four from private sector individuals
- Two from individuals in academia

## **MOITS Technical Subcommittee**

June 3, 2008

Page 2 of 7

**The survey had four Sections/Questions, A, B, C, and D.**

**For questions A, B, and C we asked responders to indicate their level of interest on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the highest. Question D asked responders to select from a drop-down menu.**

**For tabulating Ranks for Questions A and B, each topic was totaled on the following point system:**

- 3 points for rank 8, 9, and 10;
- 2 points for rank 4, 5, 6, and 7; and
- 1 point for rank 1, 2, and 3

The total for each topic was sorted from highest to lowest to produce the top ranking preference tables.

**Results for Question C** are the mean of the 1-10 scores indicated by the respondents.

**Results for Question D were tabulated in a similar fashion to Questions A and B:**

- 3 points for a top priority ranking
- 2 points for a second priority ranking
- 1 point for a third priority ranking.

The total for each topic was sorted from highest to lowest to produce the top ranking preference tables.

**Responses are characterized as having “Strong Appeal,” “Moderate Appeal,” and “Low Appeal” according to the scores received.**

- **Strong Appeal:** significant numbers of responses among the 8 thru 10 ranks.
- **Moderate Appeal:** significant numbers of responses among the 4 thru 7 ranks.
- **Low Appeal:** significant numbers of responses among the 1 thru 3 ranks.

### **Question-by-Question Results**

**Question A. Which of the following ways of sharing information and conducting committee business most interest you?**

Respondents were reluctant to mark a low appeal (1-3) rank and most responses were focused around the middle of the spectrum in Question A.

Among the six meeting type questions, the meeting formats with the strongest appeal were: Regularly Scheduled Face-to-Face Meetings at COG and Face-to-Face Meetings Held at Various Locations Enabling Site Visits to Facilities of Interest. These two formats were by far more popular than the other formats.

## MOITS Technical Subcommittee

June 3, 2008

Page 3 of 7

Formats for conducting committee business that received moderate appeal were: Face-to-Face Meetings Held at Various Locations Enabling Site Visits to Facilities of Interest; Conference Calls, Webcasts, and Internet Forum, Blog, or Listserv.

Low appeal was shown for: Conference Calls and an Internet Forum, Blog, or Listserv.

Few respondents had comments for Question A. The theme of the couple comments made was that face-to-face meetings with time for networking before and after the meetings were most preferable.

**Question A Summary Table of Results**

| Number | Topic                             | Score | Rank |
|--------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|
| 1      | Regular face-to-face at COG       | 64    | 1    |
| 2      | Face-to-face at various locations | 63    | 2    |
| 4      | Webcasts                          | 51    | 3    |
| 3      | Conference Calls                  | 49    | 4    |
| 5      | Internet forum, blog, or listserv | 42    | 5    |
| 6      | Other                             | 0     | 0    |

### **Question B. Which of the following topic areas would you like the MOITS Technical Subcommittee to spend its time and focus on?**

Respondent answers for Question B did not show many strong leanings for a topic area. Again, in many cases responses focused toward the middle of the spectrum, particularly ranks 6, 7, and 8 with their answers.

The topic areas that had strong appeal included: ITS Technologies, Traffic Management, Emergency Transportation/Evacuation, Traveler Information/511, Traffic Signal Systems, Value Pricing, CMP, Vehicle Technologies, CapWIN, RITIS, Automated Enforcement, Corridor Studies, Public-Private Partnerships, Performance Measures, Transit/Traffic Operations and Communications Integration, and Traveler Information at Exits from Transit Stations to Guide Drivers.

Topic areas with moderate appeal included ITS Architecture, Systems Engineering, Traffic Signal Systems, Bus Priority/BRT, Congestion Management Process (CMP), Vehicle Technologies, Automated Enforcement, Weigh-in-Motion, Public Private Partnerships, and Traveler Information at Exits from Transit Stations to Guide Drivers.

Of the twenty topics presented, none fall into the “Low Appeal” category as defined above.

## MOITS Technical Subcommittee

June 3, 2008

Page 4 of 7

When sorting the projects by total score under a point system with 1 point for Low Appeal, 2 points for Moderate Appeal, and 3 points for High Appeal, the topic areas fall into the following ranks based on their tallied scores.

**Question B Summary Table of Results**

| <b>Number</b> | <b>Topic</b>   | <b>Score</b> | <b>Rank</b> |
|---------------|--|--------------|-------------|
| 3             | Traffic Management   | 66           | 1           |
| 2             | ITS Technologies   | 65           | 2           |
| 8             | Bus Priority/BRT   | 64           | 3           |
| 19            | Transit/Traffic Operations and Communications Integration            | 63           | 4           |
| 7             | Traffic Signal Systems   | 61           | 5           |
| 18            | Performance Measures   | 61           | 5           |
| 5             | Traveler Information/511   | 60           | 6           |
| 4             | Emergency Transportation/Evacuation                                  | 59           | 7           |
| 13            | RITIS  | 59           | 7           |
| 16            | Corridor Studies   | 58           | 8           |
| 10            | Congestion management Process (CMP)                                  | 57           | 9           |
| 20            | Traveler Information at Exits from Transit Stations to Guide Drivers | 56           | 10          |
| 11            | Vehicle Technologies   | 54           | 11          |
| 12            | CapWIN   | 54           | 11          |
| 14            | Automated Enforcement  | 53           | 12          |
| 6             | Systems Engineering  | 52           | 13          |
| 17            | Public Private Partnerships  | 52           | 13          |
| 9             | Value Pricing  | 49           | 14          |
| 1             | ITS Architecture   | 45           | 15          |
| 15            | Weigh-in-Motion  | 44           | 16          |

## MOITS Technical Subcommittee

June 3, 2008

Page 5 of 7

### Question C. What is your level of interest in MOITS reviewing potential projects and formulating regional recommendations on projects?

Most responses fell on rank 6, 7, 9 or 10, indicating moderate to positive interest in MOITS reviewing potential projects and formulating regional recommendations on projects. The average score was **7.09**.

### Question D. If MOITS were to formulate recommendations on projects, what would be your three highest priorities?

Question D presented respondents with three drop-down menus. These menus sought to understand survey participants topic priorities if they were to formulate recommendations on projects. For each priority, there was the same range of topics. Respondents' answers covered the gamut of topics for all priorities.

After a sort of the Priorities under a point system with 3 points for Priority 1, 2 points for Priority 2, and 1 point for Priority 3, the following topics came up as the top 5 Priority topics for the MOITS Committee. See the following table below for details.

**Question D Summary Table of Results**

| Priority Topics   | Priority<br>1 x 3<br>Points | Priority<br>2 x 2 | Priority<br>3 x 1 | Total<br>Score | Rank |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|------|
| ITS Architecture  | 5                           | 3                 | 0                 | 21             | 1    |
| Transit/Traffic Operations and<br>Communications Integration            | 4                           | 4                 | 1                 | 21             | 1    |
| Traffic Management  | 4                           | 4                 | 0                 | 20             | 2    |
| Traveler Information/511  | 3                           | 3                 | 3                 | 18             | 3    |
| RITIS   | 1                           | 3                 | 3                 | 12             | 4    |
| CMP   | 3                           | 1                 | 0                 | 11             | 5    |
| ITS Technologies  | 2                           | 0                 | 3                 | 9              | 6    |
| Performance Measures  | 1                           | 2                 | 1                 | 8              | 7    |
| Emergency<br>Transportation/Evacuation                                  | 0                           | 2                 | 3                 | 7              | 8    |
| Bus Priority  | 1                           | 1                 | 1                 | 6              | 9    |
| Corridor Studies  | 0                           | 0                 | 3                 | 3              | 10   |
| Traffic Signal Systems  | 0                           | 1                 | 0                 | 2              | 11   |
| Systems Engineering   | 0                           | 0                 | 1                 | 1              | 12   |
| Value Pricing   | 0                           | 0                 | 1                 | 1              | 12   |
| CapWIN  | 0                           | 0                 | 1                 | 1              | 12   |
| Automated Enforcement   | 0                           | 0                 | 1                 | 1              | 12   |
| Public Private Partnerships   | 0                           | 0                 | 1                 | 1              | 12   |
| Vehicle Technologies  | 0                           | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 13   |
| Weigh-in-Motion   | 0                           | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 13   |
| Traveler Information at Exits from<br>Transit Stations to Guide Drivers | 0                           | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 13   |

## **MOITS Technical Subcommittee**

June 3, 2008

Page 6 of 7

### **Review of Additional Comments Received**

**Few respondents wrote in comments. The following comments were received for consideration:**

- RITIS and CapWIN are tools that support operations and evacuation initiatives.
- MOITS could set goals for the region that individual agencies could try to implement (e.g. speed info for all arterial routes every half mile, signal coordination across all borders, cameras every 1,000 ft, patrol response on all arterials within X minutes, reduce TTI congestion, results for the region by X percent, by 20XX, etc).
- Arrange meetings at various locations and include more agencies and pertinent groups. Select common projects and work toward common goals as many of these meetings get staggered into multiple issues without focusing much on specific issues. More subcommittees.
- MOITS provides a needed forum to meet regularly to discuss and address regional M&O and ITS issues. MOITS allows for coordination. Continue month-to-month face-to-face meetings instead of conference calls, etc. Could be quarterly meetings if alternate methods (e.g. conference calls, webcasts, etc.) employed during off months.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Results of the survey indicate a general preference by MOITS participants to continue with focuses on longtime core MOITS topic areas, and continuing the meeting formats that MOITS has been using.**

**Face-to-face meetings held at COG are familiar and provide opportunities for additional networking. Site visits also seem to be of interest. TPB staff will take a cautious approach to newer communications methods like Webcasts and blogs since participants did not express a strong interest in them.**

**Topic areas of focus should continue to be those that have been at the core of MOITS, such as ITS technology, traffic management, traffic/transit coordination and communication, and traveler information. Other or newer topics with moderate or strong interest include bus rapid transit, performance measures, and emergency transportation/evacuation. Specialized topics falling outside the sphere of the day-to-day operations of most MOITS participants seemed to be of less interest, such as value pricing, systems engineering, automated enforcement, and weigh-in-motion.**

**MOITS should consider regional recommendations of integrative activities, such as communications, management, and traveler information. ITS architecture was marked as important for regional recommendations though low on participant interest; the new strategic**

**MOITS Technical Subcommittee**

June 3, 2008

Page 7 of 7

**planning effort may be a means of helping the important architecture have broader understanding and appeal.**

**Overall, the MOITS Technical Subcommittee may be advised to focus on topics pertinent to integrating operations regionally and intermodally, and improving communications, based upon good ITS architecture and associated strategic planning.**