



# Transit and Rail Committee Meeting Notes

April 23, 2010

## Attendees

- Vidya Mysore (FDOT CO)
- Terry Corkery (FDOT CO)
- Frank Tabatabaee (FDOT CO)
- Shi-Chiang Li (FDOT D4)
- Danny Lamb (FDOT D7)
- Krishnan Viswanathan (Cambridge Systematics)

## Statewide Vs. Regional Models

Methodology & concepts that we can pursue for intercity passenger forecasting.

Larry kicked off the discussion by asking what methodology and concepts should be pursued for intercity passenger forecasting. The consideration were whether to use the statewide model or cobble together the regional models.

The discussion revolved around the pros and cons of each approach. The statewide model, in its current incarnation does not have transit or rail and is an highway only model. The issue with cobbling together regional models is the running time involved in getting results.

The discussion then focused on whether to create a hybrid with using the regional models to model access and egress to stations and the statewide model for travel between regions. The appeal of using such an approach was that it ensured consistency in the results while at the same time making sure that access to and egress from stations are properly accounted.

The discussion then moved towards getting an understanding of what markets were served by intercity rail. Dave Powers mentioned that the current Tampa to Orlando model looked at two distinct markets – Residents, segmented into business, non-business, and commuters and Visitors, segmented into business and non-business. The question was raised as to the type of model used in the current Tampa to Orlando forecasting and Dave Powers indicated that it was a diversion model which was built using a series of origin-destination (OD) and stated preference (SP) surveys.

There was consensus within the group that there was a need to take competing modes into consideration and it is necessary to look at air travel between the various corridors to get a better understanding for the market for intercity rail.

The general direction proceeding forward among the group was to develop an initial trip table from the statewide model, then import detailed zone structure from the regional models to account for access/egress and connectivity issues and then run the regional models.

This bought up the issue of data needs to develop such a model.

## Data Needs for Intercity Passenger Forecasting



# Transit and Rail Committee Meeting Notes

April 23, 2010

The success of any approach adopted by the committee was dependent on the data that is available. Given that there is a paucity of long distance travel data, the need for primary data collection reflecting travel in the corridors was brought up. One of the considerations was to look at the air travel market within the corridors, but the concern here is that while data on boardings at airports are available, data on air travel between cities is not easily available.

Another consideration was to look at the Turnpike data and see if there can be any use of the same for developing intercity trip tables.

FHWA is considering the development of a nationwide regional OD matrix but the timeframe and scope of the effort is uncertain at this time since the RFP to develop the matrix has just been released.

## **Action Items**

Given the general discussion, it was felt that it might be best to proceed with a multiple phase approach. The first scope of work will deal with the data needs, whether to rely on secondary data sources or do primary data collection and the model platforms to develop a model that is useful at the systemwide, corridor, and regional level. The second phase will be develop an actual model based on the recommendations from phase one.

The Transit and Rail Committee chair in consultation with FDOT CO Systems Planning and Public Transport Offices will lead the development of the scopes of work. The goal is to try and present the scope during the May Model Task Force Meeting.