



Transit Committee Meeting Notes

September 6, 2012

Start at 10:00am

Attendees:

Diana Fields, FDOT CO	Dan Macmurphy, Traf-O-Data
Scott Seeburger (Chair), FDOT D4	Steve Ruegg, PB
Sunil Saha	Ashutosh Kumar, AECOM
Jeanette Berk, Advanced Planning, Inc.	Terry Corkery, FDOT CO
Sandeep Puppala, PB	Neelam Fatima, St. Lucie County MPO
Sheldon Harrison, Cambridge Systematics	Sungryong Han, BCC
Diane Quigley, FDOT CO	Myung Sung, Gannett Fleming
Thomas Rossi, Cambridge Systematics	Jerry Graham, Traf-O-Data
Larry Foutz, Miami-Dade MPO	Gabriel Matthews, FDOT CO
Bob Crawley, FDOT D1	Bud Whitehaed
Kacia Monts, FDOT D5 Consultant	Michael Escalante, North Central Florida RPC
Li Jin, Kittleson	Xia Jin, FIU
Steve Polzin, USF/CUTR	Hoyt Davis, Gannett Fleming

1. INTRODUCTION

- a. Participant introductions.
- b. MTF meeting is scheduled for December 5-7, 2012 in Orlando.

2. TO DO ITEMS

- a. Scott will contact the committee chairs to coordinate activities and work initiatives.
- b. Diane sent out a Listserv invitation to transit properties to participate on the committee, is waiting for responses, and will let Scott know what the results are.
- c. Terry contacted Steve Polzin at CUTR to participate on the Committee. He is willing to participate, and was expected to on the call today. Diane indicated that Steve is presenting at the MTF related to the TBEST parcel-level improvements. (Steve did call in later to the teleconference).

3. COMMITTEE OBJECTIVES

- a. Scott introduced the draft Objectives and results of the survey of members pertaining to priorities for future Committee activities. The objectives were formulated based on the past objectives and polling of members for new ones. About ½ of the group responded to the survey with the results being displayed for discussion (see attachment).
- b. A number of Objectives were suggested for elimination including 1.2, 1.3, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 4.1, and 4.5. Most (not all) were rated fairly low from the survey. Scott asked for discussion of these objectives, particularly from those voting for elimination.

Objective 4.1 (Best On-Board Survey practice) -- Seven votes for elimination were received because a report was produced by PB and is on the FSUTMS Online website. All agreed on eliminating this objective.



Transit Committee Meeting Notes

September 6, 2012

Objective 1.2 & 3.3 (Data Driven Methodologies) – Dan questioned the relevancy of this as there has been recent similar training provided. Scott thought that this objective was forwarded by Dave Schmitt (not in attendance) and that it came out of the SAFETEA-LU Very Small Starts guidance that indicated that data driven approaches are permissible if not preferred to justify small projects. Ashutosh also indicated that MAP-21 is changing the analysis to require more short-term project justification, so data-driven methodologies will be very important. Larry indicated that the two data-driven objectives are relevant in light of MAP 21 and should be kept. Diane believes that data driven techniques will likely change, that we are just now at the early stages of defining the new processes that will be required by FTA, and agreed that the two objectives should be kept. Myung indicated that the phrasing of the objectives should clarify this relationship and how data can be used to inform project analyses.

Objectives 4.3 & 4.5 (Advanced Data Collection Techniques) – Jeanette asked and Dan agreed if this is the responsibility of the Data Committee? Larry stated that the Data Committee is not transit-focused, is likely not interested in transit data per se, and that the Transit committee may be justified in addressing data as it relates to transit.

Diana indicated that CO conducted a study and presented the results to the MTF last July on how to gather AVL and APC data to get useful transit travel times, speeds and delay data, and thought that objective 4.3 (transit speed, travel time, dwell time data) could be removed. The work did not include how to integrate this information into transit modeling or use it in network validation.

Scott believes that Dave Schmitt suggested Objective 4.3, and that Dave asserts that these data are very important to transit model development and that it can be prohibitively expensive to capture them. Ashutosh confirmed this. Diane indicated that her study was conducted with LYNX in Orlando and that they had operational AVL/APC systems in place. Scott indicated that good AVL/APC data is not universally available for various reasons and that it might be worthwhile to expand on Diane's work to include how to utilize these data in network development and calibration and to understand better the availability of these data and possible work-arounds for systems that do not have fully functioning systems.

Larry suggested rewording 4.3 to include how to maximize the data development and how to use it in re-coding networks. All agreed.

Jeanette suggested that Objective 4.5 should be kept and all agreed.

Objectives 2.4 (state preference surveys) and 2.5 (market segmentation) -- Dan suggested both objectives be eliminated as he believes these have already been wrapped up. Scott wondered what had been completed related to stated-preference (SP) surveys as he did not recall seeing anything on the FSUTMS Online website or in the past work of the Committee. Tom asserted that there are issues with SP and that it might be good to present the results to promote understanding. Larry stated he did not remember anyone in the MTF developing anything for this.



Transit Committee Meeting Notes

September 6, 2012

Scott confessed that these objectives were his suggestion since he has been involved in collecting data on current users, that transit agencies and MPOs want to understand how they can attract new riders and choice riders in particular, and that the only data for this is household surveys that typically under-report the transit side of things. Tom indicated that revealed-preference surveys are sometimes used in conjunction with SP surveys to build inferences, but that SP surveys are not sufficient on their own for model development.

It was agreed that these Objectives will be kept but need to be developed further for clarity.

Objective 1.3 (TCRP research applications) – Larry indicated that the Committee probably can't be a grant recipient and that agencies are more appropriate for initiating these applications. Diane thinks that the Objective is more correct if it pertains to submitting research ideas. This is another one of Scott's ideas stemming from the TCRP announcement in which there was not much time to submit ideas. He thinks that the Committee can likely provide good ideas and might want to be more prepared to submit next year. It was agreed retain this objective. Scott and Diane will look for last year's announcement and get it out so members to foster idea development.

Objective 3.1 (Transit Information Clearinghouse) – The discussion involved function, contents and organization, roles of the Committee and the Central Office, and how active should Clearinghouse be in keeping itself fed with information. Currently, CO (mainly Diana Fields) is responsible but the activity suggests that the Committee take a more active role in one form or another. Diane suggested that we break out the site to include research, data, and other categories that are relevant to transit. The objective is a Priority 2 for the members so should be kept. As this moves forward, a subcommittee should address the topics specified above. In the interim, any information, findings, studies, etc. that the members think are relevant to the FSUTMS Online library should be forwarded to Diana Fields.

Committee Priorities – The survey results were presented which included a priority ranking of the objectives that Scott suggested should guide the Committee's activities. His thoughts are that a small group be responsible for each of the higher priority items by developing an approach for pursuing the objective, developing a tentative schedule, and identifying necessary resources. Jeannette stated that the past has been for the CO to identify problems and develop initiatives then solicit involvement of the Committees. Scott questioned what the purpose of the objectives are then—are they to guide activities that Committee wants to pursue or do we take on solely an advisory function. Larry suggested that a small group should sit down and clarify and more fully develop the objectives. Steve Polzin suggested that a fuller description would help and that cross-referencing against current work would be helpful so we don't duplicate effort. Transit is changing – new markets, customized services to specialized markets. The challenge in modeling is how to show this in an aggregate approach. Myung noted that while the objectives are rank ordered, there is not much difference in the scores between the top priorities. Diane suggested that developing a one-page summary should be developed that identifies the issues and resources needed and then present them to Vidya.



Transit Committee Meeting Notes

September 6, 2012

Scott appreciated being recognized to lead in this, but he would like some volunteers to lead in the development of individual objectives of interest by coming up with an approach, possible schedule if relevant, and identification of resources that might be needed. Dan suggested that Scott query the members as to get initial thoughts on what they think each of the top objectives should address. This was agreed upon.

4. FUTURE PRESENTATIONS

Scott indicated that it has been expressed to him that there are various topics that members wanted presentations on, namely transit data libraries being developed in D4, D5, and D7; and the Advanced Transit Modeling work conducted by CO. Scott asked if the Committee wanted to have presentations as part of the quarterly Committee teleconferences or some other way. Larry indicated that it was tradition to have the first day of the Model Task Force meeting be set aside for committee meetings; but, this has not happened at the last two meetings and he believes that maybe this will likely not occur again in the foreseeable future.

The Committee agreed that presentations of interest solely to the Committee should be scheduled for the teleconferences and that topics of larger interest should be submitted for presentation at the Model Task Force meeting. The following topics were agreed upon as a start:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1) Transit Data Libraries (D4 and D5) | November Teleconference |
| 2) FSUTMS Transit Model Update (PB) | Teleconference early next year |
| 3) TBEST/Parcel-Level Enhancements (Polzin) | MTF Meeting in December |
| 4) Demographics synthesis (Polzin) | MTF Meeting in December |
| 4) Modeling the Future ((Polzin)) | Teleconference next year |
| 5) Google Transit Feeds (Quigley) | Teleconference next year |

5. ADJOURN

Next meeting will be held in early November with presentations from D4 and D5 on transit data libraries.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35



Transit Committee Meeting Notes

September 6, 2012

MEETING ACTION REGISTER				
Item	ACTION	ASSIGNED TO	TARGET DATE	NOTES/STATUS
1	Coordinate activities with MTF committee chairs	Seeburger	12/10/2012	Complete no later than MTF meeting in December
2	TCRP Call for research topics 2012 announcement	Seeburger, Quigley	10/3/2012	Send to members. See Objective 1.3 discussion above.
3	Listserv poll for transit agency participation	Quigley	10/31/2012	Send results to Seeburger
4	Clarify Objectives 1.2 & 3.3	Schmitt, Kumar, Seeburger	On-hold (See Item 7)	See Objectives 1.1 & 3.3 discussion above
5	Clarify Objectives 2.4 & 2.5	Rossi, Seeburger	On-hold (See Item 7)	See Objectives 2.4 & 2.5 discussion above
6	Clarify Objective 4.3	Foutz, Seeburger	On-hold (See Item 7)	See Objective 4.3 discussion above
7	Poll members on defining what the top priorities should include	Seeburger	10/3/2012	See Committee Priorities discussion above.
8	Organize transit data library presentation for November Committee webcast	Seeburger	10/3/2012	See Item 4 above
9	Schedule early November Committee webcast/meeting	Seeburger, Fields	10/3/2012	Include data libraries presentations
10	Information to MTF Transit Information Clearinghouse	Committee, Fields	On-going	See Objective 3.1 discussion above
DECISIONS				
1	High priority objectives need and will be further developed leading to a one page summary of approach to accomplishment, desired outcomes, issues, and resources			
2	Objective 4.1 eliminated (best survey practice paper)			
3	Early November for next committee meeting/teleconference. Presentations on D4 and D5 transit data libraries.			