Model Task Force Survey: Advanced Model Priorities

presented to
Model Task Force

presented by
Steve Ruegg, Parsons Brinckerhoff

December 1, 2010

Purpose of Survey

- Assess Needs and Capabilities of MTF Members
- Identify “Gap” Between Needs and Capabilities
- Identify major issues that future models need to address
- Inform future direction of FSUTMS development, short and long term
Survey Design
Classification Questions

- Affiliation
- Metro Size
- Voting/Non-Voting Members

Survey Design
Major Issues

- Major Issue Categories
  - Land Use Planning
  - Pricing
  - Vehicle Demand
  - Transit
  - Non-Motorized
  - Demographic
  - Air Quality
  - Special Markets
  - Analyses
Survey Respondent Characteristics

- 62 Responses -- About 1/3 of those notified
- 23 Voting Members, 39 non-voting. 37%/63% -- roughly representative of MTF members and friends
- 55% Consultants, 40% Govt, 5% Academic & Other
- 53% Large Metro Areas, 47% small or medium

Highest Needs
Percent rated need “HIGH”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>MTF Voters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transit Ridership Projections</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land Use Forecasting</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FTA New Starts Forecasting</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pollutants</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gasses</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MOVES Input Data</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Freight &amp; Commodities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mixed Use/TOD</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evacuation Planning</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lowest Capabilities
Percent rated Capability “Low” or “None”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>MTF Voters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bike Route Planning</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Occupational Change</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hourly Traffic Projections</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ITS Responses</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flexible Work Hours</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peak Spreading</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Changes to Traffic Operations</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering Needs and Capabilities

- Useful to note where we have the greatest needs and lowest capabilities

- Methodology:
  - Assign a numeric value to responses
    - 0 = none or no response
    - 1 = Low
    - 2 = Medium
    - 3 = High
  - Calculate average response for questions
  - Plot Needs vs. Capabilities
Voting vs. Non-Voting (public vs. private)

- Voting Members (Public Agencies) tend to score needs higher for AQ, Transit, Land Use and New Starts
- Capabilities generally not scored very differently, except for Non-motorized, where Voting members indicated less capability
- Overall, Not too dissimilar

Conclusions

Needs and Capabilities

- Highest Needs
  - Transit
  - Land Use
  - Air Quality
  - Freight & Commodities

- Lowest Capabilities
  - Traveler Behavior – Related
  - Special Events & Visitors
Needs vs. Capabilities – Considered Jointly
High Need and Low Capabilities

- MOVES
- New Starts
- Toll Roads
- Transit Forecasting
- Land Use
- Air Quality