



**Regional Transportation Technical Advisory Committee
MODELING SUBCOMMITTEE**

Friday, September 7, 2012 - 2:30 pm to 5:00 pm

Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization
100 West Cypress Creek Road, Suite 850
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33309

Agenda

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of the Minutes**
- III. Origin-Destination Data Capture**
 - Update on data needs – Rob Schiffer, Cambridge Systematics
 - Update on Request for Information – Paul Flavien and Jessica Josselyn
 - Discussion/Next Steps – ALL
- IV. Model Application Guidance Follow-up**
Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade MPO
- V. Status Report on SERPM 6.7**
Scott Seeburger, FDOT-District 4
- VI. Status Report on 2040 Regional LRTP Modeling**
Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade MPO
- VII. Future Meeting Schedule**
Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade MPO
- VIII. Other**
ALL
- IX. Adjournment**

June 1, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Regional Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (RTTAC)

Modeling Subcommittee

Date: June 1, 2012

Project #: 8055.003

To: Wilson Fernandez, RTTAC Modeling Subcommittee Chair

From: Rob Schiffer, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Jessica Josselyn, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

The following is a summary of the RTTAC Modeling Subcommittee meeting held on June 1, 2012. Meeting presentations should be provided separately via email and ftp.

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION

Friday, June 1, 2012 - 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM
FDOT District 4 Auditorium
3400 West Commercial Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309

MEETING ATTENDEES Present and Via Phone *(alphabetical order by agency/firm)*

1. David Schmitt, AECOM, david.schmitt@aecom.com
2. Paul Flavien, Broward MPO, pflavien@browardmpo.org
3. Buffy Sanders, Broward MPO, sandersb@browardmpo.org
4. Rob Schiffer, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., rschiffer@camsys.com
5. Srin Varanasi, Corradino Group, svaranasi@corradino.com
6. Shi-Chiang Li, FDOT D4, shi-chiang.li@dot.state.fl.us
7. Scott Seeburger, FDOT D4, scott.seeburger@dot.state.fl.us
8. Andrew Velasquez, FDOT/Turnpike D6, andrew.velasquez@dot.state.fl.us
9. Franco Saraceno, Gannett Fleming, fsaraceno@gfnet.com
10. Yongqiang Wu, Gannett Fleming, ywu@gfnet.com
11. Jess Josselyn, Kittelson Associates, Inc., jjosselyn@kittelson.com
12. Rohit Rai, Kittelson Associates, Inc., rrai@kittelson.com
13. Gavin Jones, Martin County MPO, gjones@martin.fl.us
14. Wilson Fernandez, Miami-Dade MPO, Wilson@miamidade.gov
15. Larry Foutz, Miami-Dade MPO, lfoutz@miamidade.gov *(via phone)*
16. Nellie Fernandez, Palm Beach MPO, nfernand@pbcgov.org
17. Paul Larsen, Palm Beach MPO, plarsen@pbcgov.org
18. Vinod Sandanasomy, Palm Beach MPO, vsandanasomy@pbcgov.org
19. Arlene Davis, Port Everglades, ardavis@broward.org
20. Neelam Fatima, St. Lucie MPO, FatimaN@stlucieco.gov
21. Steve Anderson, South Florida RTA, andersons@srfta.fl.gov
22. Joe Quinty, South Florida RTA, quintyj@srfta.fl.gov
23. Seyla Gonzales, Tindale Oliver Associates, sgonzales@tindaleoliver.com

24. Mike Brown, Transportation Planning Services, TPS.mike.brown@comcast.net

MEETING NOTES

Below is a summary of the key points discussed at the meeting. The comments have been organized by agenda topic. *Today's RTTAC-MS meeting included guests from MPOs to the north and a few attendees from the Southeast Florida Model Users Group meeting held earlier in the day.*

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

II. FEC Risk Analysis, Alternative Land Use Scenarios

Scott Seeburger provided an overview on how FDOT has been coming up with different land use scenarios to address uncertainties analysis for FTA as part of the FEC corridor planning.

Mike Brown then described the assumptions used in each alternative growth scenario. Baseline scenario was the existing 2035 land use forecast for the last round of LRTPs. The second alternative anticipated growth redistributed around proposed FEC transit station areas. Scenario 3 assumed a reduced growth scenario using different control totals while the final scenario included the reduced growth numbers in conjunction with redevelopment around proposed FEC stations. The Urban Land-use Allocation Model (ULAM) was used as a tool to generate alternative land use scenarios. A series of maps were then depicted to show the results of each scenario on land use distribution patterns.

Dave Schmitt then provided a summary of results from running SERPM 6.7 with the alternative land use scenarios in place. Transit ridership figures are lower in scenarios 2, 3, and 4 vs the baseline LRTP scenario. A series of feedback loops were added to SERPM 6.7 to achieve more realistic auto speeds. In addition to lowering transit ridership and mode splits, the alternative scenarios result in an overall increase in highway speeds.

After this presentation, subcommittee members asked a few clarification questions and entered into dialogue about the model results. Wilson Fernandez stated that these results are consistent with scenario testing done by the Miami-Dade MPO as part of their sustainability work order, although on the surface, it sounds counter-intuitive to the common expectation that increased land use densities would equal higher transit ridership. Shi-Chiang Li pointed out that it could be due to the increased number of internal and non-motorized trips as the model does not do a good job of capturing non-discretionary trips. Both highway and transit networks were identical for all of the 2035 scenarios so the outputs are the result of land use changes and impacts on accessibility and travel speed.

What are the next steps? An endorsement from the subcommittee of the analysis might be helpful in completing the uncertainties analysis for FTA. Another step is to analyze the impacts of the intensified development on the FEC corridor project. Joe Quinty expressed concern about the impacts on future Tri-Rail ridership which only grows marginally or in some cases, is lower in 2035 than recently documented daily ridership counts... and these scenarios don't even assume the FEC is in place. Four step models are not sensitive to development densities modifying travel behavior.

Action Item: Larry Foutz made a motion to accept this package of alternative land use scenarios with the understanding that the proper land use hubs included (*three Tri-Rail stations – Pompano, Cypress Creek and Sheridan Street – were missing from the map shown in the presentation*) will be confirmed and tests with the build conditions still remain to be completed.

III. Break

IV. Origin-Destination Data Capture

Paul Flavien provided some background on the request at the subcommittee's last meeting for MPOs to provide input on data needs. Rob Schiffer then briefly described information provided by each agency and provided an opportunity for those present to provide additional comments and clarification where necessary. A spreadsheet summary table of input received since the last subcommittee meeting was updated on the fly during today's meeting.

Neelim Fatima asked if there is any information on the cost of acquiring the AirSage data. Rob said the cost of acquiring the data would depend on the type of data. Larry said that good data on trip length is missing and hence it would be good if one could obtain data on trip length. Jess Josselyn asked if it is cheaper to order more data. Gavin Jones replied that the cost is determined by the geographic area and the level of aggregation (detail) required.

Shi-Chiang Li asked if there were other data sources available. Gavin Jones said that although AirSage data has limitations, there is no data source that is either better or cheaper than AirSage. Li said that although AirSage data can provide information regarding travel patterns, it cannot directly provide information regarding trip purpose.

Wilson asked if the group would be interested in putting together a Request for Information (RFI) to the industry to know what kind of travel information and data is available. Jess volunteered for the regional LRTP team to work with Paul Flavien on developing an RFI to get alternate vendors to respond to agency needs of importance in this regard.

Action Item: Prepare an RFI to the industry to know the kind of travel information and data that is available.

V. Model Application Guidance

Wilson provided background dialogue about SERPM 6.7 and concerns over the validity of the highway side of the model. Will SERPM 6.7 only be used for transit studies with SERPM 6.5 being used for highway projects? Commitment was already made to use v. 6.7 for the HUD Sustainability project.

Shi-Chiang Li provided additional background on the transit focus of SERPM 6.7. Li advocates that each highway project review available models and how these simulate travel patterns, then move forward with the model that addresses your study area and mode best.

Larry Foutz suggested that the Feds require that we use the officially adopted model and plan, which means that version 6.5 should be used by default... this led to a discussion by the subcommittee on whether v. 6.7 is ok to use, since it differs from the adopted plan/model.

Dave Schmidt said that they have been in similar situations but have never run into a problem. The reason FTA made that law is to ensure that model that are not up to the task are not used. Dave further clarified that v. 6.7 was not validated on the highway volume side but that FTA is comfortable with v. 6.7 for transit New Starts project forecasting. Interpolated 2010 socioeconomic data were used to validate v. 6.7.

Scott suggested that regardless of whether one is using SERPM 6.5 or 6.7, the consultant should look at validity of the model within the corridor/subarea of interest and make needed refinements and/or corrections.

Paul Flavien asked why the model base year was changed from 2005 to 2010. Dave responded that it was because the onboard surveys are more recent than 2005 and that substantial network changes (both highway and transit) were made after the year 2005.

Action Item: Bring a proposal to RTTAC for approval which says that SERPM 6.5 is the base model and use of any other model should be approved by the modeling subcommittee for project specific use.

VI. Future Meeting Schedule & Other Topics to Address

Wilson thinks it's a good idea for the RTTAC-MS to meet on the same afternoon of the next SEFUG meeting on September 7th. The discussion of items IV and V will be continued at that time.

VII. Adjournment