

Research Report KTC-15-12/SPR12-444-1F DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13023/KTC.RR.2015.12

Analysis of Historical Travel Time Data

Our Mission

We provide services to the transportation community through research, *technology transfer and education. We create and participate in partnerships to promote safe and effective transportation systems.*

© 2015 University of Kentucky, Kentucky Transportation Center Information may not be used, reproduced, or republished without our written consent.

> **Kentucky Transportation Center** 176 Oliver H. Raymond Building Lexington, KY 40506-0281 (859) 257-4513 *fax* (859) 257-1815

> > **www.ktc.uky.edu**

Research Report KTC-15-12/SPR12-444-1F

ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL TRAVEL TIME DATA

By

Mei Chen Department of Civil Engineering

Xu Zhang Department of Civil Engineering

Eric Green Kentucky Transportation Center College of Engineering University of Kentucky Lexington, Kentucky

in cooperation with Transportation Cabinet Commonwealth of Kentucky

and

Federal Highway Administration U.S. Department of Transportation

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the University of Kentucky, the Kentucky Transportation Center, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the United States Department of Transportation, or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The inclusion of manufacturer names or trade names is for identification purposes and should not be considered an endorsement.

September 2015

15. Supplementary Notes

Prepared in cooperation with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet

16. Abstract

Travel speed is a critical piece of information for many applications. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) states that calculating travel speeds illuminates the performance of the nation's highway system. New technologies make the collection of speed data more straightforward than ever. Private vendors collect and sell this data, and KTC purchased speed data for 2010-2013 from NAVTEQ (now HERE). The main objectives of the research were to:

- Evaluate private sector speed data and its use in generating travel time based performance measures
- Create a mechanism to integrate this speed data with networks maintained by KYTC and Kentucky Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to facilitate congestion management and travel model improvement
- Generate performance measures, including travel time index, planning time index, buffer index, annual hours of delay, and percentage travel under congested conditions

This study assessed private sector speed data, its potential as a robust data source, and its limitations. Evaluation of the data indicated that link-referenced ATP data offered the best value for a wide range of applications. It offered details on speed distribution and provided critical insights into the dynamics of congestion and the variability of travel times. Among the three types of data, the link-referenced ATP data should be the first choice when future purchases of private sector speed data are made. These data provided critical support to develop the performance measures required by MAP-21. These data need to be linked with traffic volumes to generate the full range of performance measures. Data remain sparse for roads with lower functional classifications, especially collectors and local streets. When sample size is a concern, the research team recommends that data from other sources (such as Bluetooth, radar, and others) be used to supplement the private sector speed data. A range of congestion and reliability performance measures have been generated from these data and were provided to KYTC and MPO stakeholders in the form of geodatabases. Other applications can benefit from these data, including: the calibration and validation of simulation models, travel demand models, and air quality analyses.

List of Tables

List of Figures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Travel speed is a critical piece of information for many applications. It is a measure that is often used to calculate the performance of the nation's highway networks. In 2011, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), in collaboration with the Kentucky Transportation Center (KTC) at University of Kentucky, purchased speed data for 2010 and 2011 from NAVTEQ (now HERE). In 2013, speed data for the year 2012 were acquired from the same vendor. The specific data items included:

- 2010 Analytical Traffic Pattern (ATP)
- 2010 Traffic Pattern (TP)
- 2011 Link-Referenced ATP
- 2012 Link-Referenced ATP

The main objectives of this research were to:

- Evaluate the private sector speed data with regard to its use in generating travel time based performance measures
- Create a mechanism to integrate this speed data with networks maintained by KYTC and Kentucky Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to facilitate congestion management and travel model improvement
- Generate performance measures including travel time index, planning time index, buffer index, annual hours of delay, and percentage travel under congested conditions

Evaluation of the data indicated that link-referenced ATP data offered the best value for a wide range of applications. It can be used to generate performance measures on many Kentucky roadways, including many minor arterial and collectors that are not typically included in the TMC network. Link-referenced ATP had finer spatial resolution, which allowed for the identification of bottlenecks on longer corridors. The calibration and validation of travel demand models and simulation models may also benefit from the data because they reflected measured and unedited speeds across different times of day. Among the three types of data evaluated, the link-referenced ATP data should be the first choice when future purchases of private sector speed data are made.

The analyses performed as part of this study demonstrated the robustness of the link-reference ATP data, and these findings will support KYTC's and MPOs' needs for performance tracking. Since probe vehicle data were not available on all segments for all time intervals, private sector speed data remained sparse on many roadways, especially low volume rural roads. Nevertheless, probe vehicle sample size and coverage has improved over recent years.

For segments with adequate sample coverage, performance measures were generally reliable. When sample size is a concern, the research team suggests that data from other sources (such as Bluetooth, radar, and others) supplement private sector speed data. A range of congestion and reliability performance measures were generated from these data after they had been conflated with the KYTC's highway inventory network. Results were sent to KYTC and MPO stakeholders in the form of geodatabases. Other applications can benefit from these

data, including: the calibration and validation of simulation models, travel demand models, and air quality analyses.

CHAPTER 1 BACKGROUND

Travel speed is a critical piece of information for many applications, such as congestion management, air quality conformity analysis, and travel demand model calibration and validation. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) states that travel speed is a necessary input when calculating measures that evaluate the nation's highway performance. Traditional speed data collection methods such as floating cars require significant effort and resources to achieve desirable accuracy. With the advances in GPS and communication technologies, speed data have become increasingly available through private data vendors.

In 2011, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), in collaboration with the Kentucky Transportation Center (KTC) at the University of Kentucky, purchased speed data for 2010 and 2011 from NAVTEQ (now HERE). In 2013, KTC acquired speed data for 2012 from the same vendor. The data obtained included:

- 2010 Analytical Traffic Pattern (ATP)
- 2010 Traffic Pattern
- 2011 Link-Referenced ATP
- 2012 Link-Referenced ATP

The main objectives of the research were to:

- Evaluate the private sector speed data and its use in generating travel time based performance measures
- Create a mechanism to integrate this speed data with networks maintained by KYTC and Kentucky Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to facilitate congestion management and travel model improvement
- Generate performance measures including travel time index, planning time index, buffer index, annual hours of delay, and percentage travel under congested conditions

The comprehensive research was divided into several major projects, which were funded through different sources. Planning Study 20 (PL-20) funded the tasks of purchase, quality control, and network conflation with KYTC's roadway system. SPR12-444 and PL-24 funded the data analyses and the generation of performance measures. This report documents the research carried out under SPR12-444 and PL-24.

1.1 2010 Network and Data

The 2010 ATP data is Traffic Message Channel (TMC)-based, which means that the probe data was only available on the TMC network. TMC protocol was developed decades ago to deliver travel information to motorists via conventional FM radio broadcasts. The TMC network largely coincides with the National Highway System (NHS). As a result, the TMC-based speed data have very limited coverage. Figure 1-1 shows the TMC-based network for the 2010 ATP data.

Figure 1-1 2010 TMC-based network

The 2010 ATP data were reported at 15-minute intervals and aggregated by day of the week and by month. When a highway segment on the TMC-network did not have sufficient probe vehicle coverage, the vendor used other information such as historical data and/or data on similar roadways in the area to estimate average speeds. The algorithm to estimate these data is proprietary and not available to the research team. Therefore, the application of these data on generating performance measures is limited.

1.2 2011 Network and Data

The 2011 link-referenced ATP data were attached to the links of the massive NAVTEQ street network. The speeds were reported at 5-minute intervals and grouped by day of the week and by month. Speeds were not reported on a link for the periods when probe data were not available. In addition to the average speeds, probe speed sample size and speed standard deviation were also reported for each link and for each time interval.

Examination of the 2011 link-referenced ATP data showed that many lower functionally classified roads (mostly in NAVTEQ functional class 5, which roughly corresponds to FHWA's local roads classification) had very small sample sizes. When performance measures for 2011 were generated, those roads were excluded. Figure 1-2 shows the 2011 link-referenced ATP data coverage on NAVTEQ roadways (classes 1–4). The high resolution of the 2011 link-referenced ATP data allowed for performance analysis to be conducted on every link and at 5-minute intervals. For the purpose of maintaining consistency with the 2010 measures, it was decided that measures would be generated for 15-minute intervals.

Figure 1-2 2011 Link-referenced network

MAP-21 also requires that performance measures be generated for all roads in the National Highway System (NHS). The NHS roads for which speed data were available for 2011 are shown in Figure 1-3.

Figure 1-3 2011 National highway system network

The 2011 NAVTEQ network was conflated with KYTC's Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) network. One drawback of this practice is that many attributes in the HPMS network have been aggregated from multiple links, and therefore, using the HPMS network sacrificed granularity. At the advice of the advisory panel, this approach will not be used in the future conflation amid changes to the data management process at KYTC.

1.3 2012 Network and Data

The 2012 data have the same format as the 2011 ATP data. Noticeable differences included the addition of new roads and changes in roadway segmentation. Both of these changes resulted in added links and therefore an increased number of link IDs.

Network conflation was performed using the NAVTEQ street network and KYTC's HIS network extract of traffic flow (TF), speed limit (SL), type of operation (OP), and functional classification (FS). These asset types were chosen because they contained information needed for performance calculations after the conflation was completed. Conflation involved spatially joining the two networks to link their attributes together. But since the definition of travel direction differed between the NAVTEQ network and the HIS network, complications arose. Further, for divided highway segments, NAVTEQ's network may use two lines, one for each travel direction, to represent that segment, whereas there may be a single line in the HIS network. A manual check was necessary to identify mismatches and to align the direction of travel between the two systems.

Through discussions with KYTC, it was concluded that the following steps would be the most advantageous to link the performance measures generated by this study to KYTC's Transportation Enterprise Database (TED):

- Perform spatial join between the NAVTEQ and HIS layers to assign NAVTEQ links with rid (i.e., RT_NE_UNIQ), fmeas (i.e., BEGIN_MP) and tmeas (i.e., END_MP) to their end points. The detailed procedure has been developed at KYTC (*1*).
- Find the coordinates of the end points for each link, and follow the NAVTEQ "direction of travel" defined in the bullets below to assign From_Node or To_Node to each end point. This will require the creation of additional fields that would be appended to the attribute table.
	- o The end point with lower latitude would be From_Node and the other would be To_Node.
	- o If both end points have the same latitude, the one with lower longitude would be the From_Node and the other would be To_Node.
- Add a cardinality field to the HIS attribute table, and assign direction code. This will align the "DIR_TRAVEL" (i.e., direction of travel) in NAVTEQ street (with the entry of "T" or "F") attribute with the cardinal direction.
	- o If the milepoint increases from From Node to To Node, then let cardinality = Y; \circ Otherwise, let cardinality = N
- For two-way operation, as defined in asset OP (Type of Operation) or as "B" (i.e., both ways) in NAVTEO field DIR_TRAVEL, duplicate each link ID in the data table. Change DIR TRAVEL from "B" to "T" in the original records and from "B" to "F" in duplicated records (or vice versa) based on the NAVTEQ "direction of travel" logic mentioned above.
- In the duplicated records, change the cardinality of the duplicated record to the opposite of the original.
- Perform manual check to identify and correct mismatches.

1.4 Data Quality Screening

1.4.1 Conflation Check

To generate performance measures, it was necessary to conflate the NAVTEQ links, (which contained speeds) with KYTC's highway network, (which contained volume and other important inventory data). The conflation task is part of Planning Study 20. The final report for that study will contain the description of the concept and methodology developed by the research team for the 2010 TMC-based network. The conflation technique evolved over time. The 2011 data were conflated to KYTC's HPMS network, while the 2012 data were conflated to KYTC's HIS network. A description of the latest technique was provided in Section 1.3.

While the parameters used in the automated conflation process can be adjusted to find the optimum match between the two networks, mismatches were inevitable due to the networks' complexities. For example, when conflating the 2011 networks, a mismatch occurred at the interchange of the Watterson Expressway and Newburg Road in the Louisville metro area, shown in Figure 1-4. Because of the extremely short length of the Watterson Expressway link (highlighted in the figure), the algorithm assigned the state's HIS attributes from the intersecting segment of Newburg Road to the expressway segment. This was the most typical type of mismatch observed during the manual check.

Figure 1-4 Example of mismatched link

While there is no systematic way to identify where mismatches happen and correct them at one time, a set of screening rules was developed to facilitate the quality assurance process.

For 2010 and 2011 data, the team observed that mismatches at interchanges could be identified by comparing the original NAVTEQ roadway class of a segment with its assigned FHWA functional class (from the state's inventory database) following conflation. This involved three steps. First, a rough mapping between the NAVTEQ roadway class and FHWA functional classification was created (see Table 1-1). Then, for a given segment, if its original NAVTEQ roadway class differed from the FHWA functional classification by two or more levels, the

record was flagged as a possible mismatch. For example, the NAVTEQ roadway class of the segment of Watterson Expressway is 1. If conflated correctly, the FHWA functional classification should be 11. However, if the assigned FHWA functional classification is 14, 16, 17, or 19, a mismatch most likely occurred. Manual checks of the flagged segments were conducted to fix the errors.

Table 1-1 Roadway class mapping

During analysis of the 2012 data, an additional rule (based on network connectivity) was adopted to find potentially incorrect integration that could not be identified by class mapping. The rule used the ending mile point of the upstream link and the beginning mile point of the downstream link when the combination of NAVTEQ link ID and direction were the same for those two links. For a possible mismatch, such as the example above, the link ID and direction combination was the same for the links on Watterson Expressway and Newburg Road. The mile points of those two links were not continuous. Therefore, those two links were flagged for further examination. It should be noted that when a route enters another county the milepoint may reset. Caution should be used when applying this milepoint-based quality-screening rule. Despite being labor intensive, milepoint-based screening is quite useful at identifying mismatched segments.

1.4.2 Sample Adequacy

The speeds in the 2011 and 2012 ATP data sets came directly from the probe vehicle speeds recorded at each link during a specified period. Since the number of probes sampled for a time interval determined the collected data's accuracy, the limited sample size of probe vehicle speeds in some time intervals cast doubt on the usability of these data. In practice, the floating car or probe vehicle technique has been widely used to collect traffic information, and the data from sampled probes can be used as a trusted estimate of population characteristics when sample size is deemed adequate. A previous study by Chen and Chien (2), who used a calibrated freeway traffic simulation model, demonstrated that a 3% sampling rate was adequate to produce statistically accurate estimates of travel time at the 95% confidence level. In a similar study, Turner and Holdener (*3*) analyzed the data collected from the Houston traffic monitoring system, and they indicated that the minimum number of samples was determined by the variation of travel time. For a 15-minute analysis period, 2-4 samples would be sufficient to achieve a 95% confidence level. Since the number of samples required to derive accurate information would vary, depending on facility type and traffic characteristics, it would be difficult to set a specific threshold for adequate sample size.

The research team developed a series of indicators to better understand the distribution of sample size on a link over time. They are shown in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2 Sample adequacy measures

TotalIntervals_Sampled and PcntIntervals_Sampled were calculated for 2011 and 2012 data, while the rest of the measures were only available for 2012 data. Additional time periods, such as mid-day period, weekdays, and weekends were also calculated for 2012 data.

The following example illustrates the temporal and spatial coverage of samples. Figure 1-5 shows the 2011 statewide network with probe data. The cyan-highlighted roads are those with probe speeds available less than 0.5% of the time during the year. That is, no more than 40 periods out of 8064 (i.e., 96 15-minute intervals a day and 7 days of a week for each of 12 months) total 15-minute periods in a year have probe vehicle speeds recorded for these roads. Most of the highlighted roadways are rural facilities or urban facilities with low functional classification. Larger sample sizes are most readily available from heavily traveled urban interstates and a small number of roads that are frequently traveled by commercial vehicles.

Figure 1-5 2011 Probe sample coverage

As the percentage of time intervals that have probe data decreases, confidence in the data diminishes. A minimum threshold of 1% probe coverage was chosen as the adequate sample size. This is equivalent to requiring a minimum of 80 15-minute intervals to have probe speeds in a year. Reasonable confidence can be gained for the time period being analyzed, including all days in the year, all weekdays, weekday AM periods, weekday PM periods, and so forth. Table 1-3 lists the smallest level of temporal coverage that should be satisfied for different time periods in this study. When the sample percentage of a link was less than 1%, the link was flagged in the record.

Table 1-3 Minimum sample size desired

1.4.3 Data Anomaly

Occasionally, the average speed on a segment was unreasonably low, such as less than 1 mph for a number of periods in a day across the entire year. Review of the original data did not find reasonable explanation for this anomaly. These segments were often low-volume rural roads that were not prone to recurring congestion. The probe sample sizes were usually quite limited for those segments. With a large portion of the data in very slow speed range, the performance measures generated would be skewed. In this study, segments with their yearly $85th$ percentile

speed below a specified threshold (such as one half of the speed limit) were flagged in the database. The criteria used to flag such outliers are listed in Appendix A for 2011 data and in Appendix B for 2012 data. For some short segments at signalized intersections, a large number of vehicles may travel at very low speeds because many of them may need to wait for a green light. Therefore, this rule was more suitable for corridor-level analysis, and applications at the link level required special caution.

The cyan-highlighted roads Figure 1-6 indicate $85th$ percentile speeds of all days in 2011 that were not flagged as suspicious by these quality-screening rules.

Figure 1-6 2011 Network with highlighted routes satisfying sample adequacy requirement

CHAPTER 2 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

This chapter discusses the analyses involved in developing performance measures based on travel times. Drawing from various studies at the national and state levels (4, 5), we developed the following performance measures based on the speed data:

- (1) Average AM peak speeds for (6-9am) and PM (3-6pm) periods
- (2) Travel time index for AM and PM periods by direction
- (3) Planning time index for AM and PM periods by direction
- (4) Buffer index for AM and PM periods by direction
- (5) Annual vehicle miles traveled (VMT) under congested condition
- (6) Annual vehicle hours traveled (VHT) VHT under congested condition
- (7) Annual vehicle hours of delay

For 2011 data, measures 1–4 were calculated based on all days of data for the entire year. For 2012 data, they were calculated separately for weekdays, weekends, and all days.

For many of these performance measures (e.g. travel time index), it was necessary to define the uncongested benchmark condition. The speed value that separates congested from uncongested conditions is defined as reference speed in this report. Section 2.1 discusses ways to determine reference speeds.

2.1 Determine Reference Speed

A benchmark condition should be defined before measuring congestion. Free-flow speed has been used widely as such a benchmark. However, for facilities on which the free flow speed conditions are rarely achieved during the day time, using free-flow speed may overestimate level of congestion. In this study, the term "reference speed" is used to confer more flexibility to agencies when setting the benchmark condition and the performance target. A typical reference speed used for performance measurement is the $85th$ percentile speed, which is measured using all time intervals throughout a year (*4;* 6). Variations of this measure have also been used (7, 8).

2.1.1 The 85th Percentile Speed

The 85th percentile speed is the speed value at the 85th percentile point of the cumulative speed distribution of a road segment for all time periods. For 2010 and 2011 data sets, the $85th$ percentile speed was selected based on all data from that year. There were few samples available from 2010, so only instances where there were at least two sample speeds per 30-minute interval were used to determine the 85th percentile speed. For 2012 data, the 85th percentile speed was determined for each of the three time periods: weekdays, weekends, and all days.

The 85th percentile speed worked well for uninterrupted facilities since traffic can potentially achieve that speed while traversing a road segment. On urban arterials, flow will be periodically interrupted by traffic signals – even when traffic volume is very light. Furthermore, signal timing plans may change throughout the day, especially in large urban areas. During peak

periods on heavily traveled corridors, a longer green time or wider green band was often established. As a result, peak hour speeds on roads or directions accorded preferential treatment may be higher than the speeds recorded on the same facilities during other periods of the day. The research team examined speed distributions on sample arterials, including the North Broadway and Nicholasville Road corridors in Lexington (see Figure 2-1(a) $\&$ (b) for specific locations). For the northbound travel direction on North Broadway, the cumulative distribution functions in Figure 2-1(c) showed that mid-day period speeds were often lower than the speeds during both the AM and PM peaks. 80% of the speeds during the mid-day were less than 25 mph, while only 60% of the AM peak speeds were less than 25 mph. An evaluation of the traffic flow indicated that the mid-day volume was 840 vehicles/hour while the AM peak hourly volume was 1433 vehicles/hour.

Similarly, for the northbound travel direction on the Nicholasville Road segment, the AM peak speed was generally higher than speeds observed during any other period except for the nighttime. Although this section's AADT was 44600 vehicles, vehicles moving north during the AM peak encountered significantly better conditions due to the extra lane added under the reversible lane operation. During the PM peak only one northbound through lane remained open, with the southbound direction having three operational through lanes. As a result, the PM peak speeds were the lowest in a day, as shown in Figure 2-1(d).

Data from these two sites revealed that on an urban arterial, low flow conditions may not always correlate with higher speeds, and peak period speeds are not always the slowest. This is often observed on urban arterials with signal timings that grant preferential treatment to specific lanes or to traffic moving in a particular direction. Nighttime speeds are most likely the highest compared to speeds during daytime periods. Therefore, using nighttime speed as the reference speed tended to inflate the level of congestion.

To determine an appropriate reference speed for the special characteristics of urban interrupted facilities, various percentile values were derived and compared to the speed curve (sorted by time of day). The $85th$ percentile speed during weekday daytimes was the preferred choice since it was derived from the daytime (6am–8pm) speed profile and it more accurately reflected the impact of traffic signals on speed. Therefore, this finding was added to the bundle of reference speeds produced for 2012 data.

2.1.2 The 60th Percentile Speed

For interrupted urban facilities, there has not been a strong consensus on how to select a proper reference speed for performance measurement. Many continue to use the $85th$ percentile speed as the reference speed, while others have tested different percentile values. A study conducted by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute explored using the use of $60th$ percentile speed during the daytime as the benchmark to measure congestion on urban arterials (9). This was to account for the fact that flow may be impeded by traffic control devices even when the intersections are operating at light traffic conditions. Such delay should not be viewed as the result of congestion. Tests conducted on sample road segments indicated that the $60th$ percentile speed was very similar to the average speed during the midday period and therefore, was selected as a candidate for the reference speed for urban interrupted facilities, i.e., FC14 or below.

For 2011, the $60th$ percentile speed was determined by using daytime data. This encompassed the period between 6am and 7pm for all days. At the request of the advisory committee, for 2012 data, the $60th$ percentile speed was based on weekday daytime data between 6am and 8pm. It should be noted that the 85th percentile speed was still used as the reference speed for other periods.

2.1.3 Speed Limit as Reference Speed

Speed limit, as indicated in the HIS data, can be used as a reference speed. Speed limit based performance measures are computed for the years of 2011 and 2012.

2.2 Other Performance Measures

Several metrics were applied to different aspects of traffic congestion in the Kentucky roadway system. Those measures included travel delay, VMT and VHT under congested conditions, travel time index, planning time index, and buffer index.

2.2.1 Travel Delay

Travel delay refers to the additional time spent traveling because of congestion. Due to fluctuating demand, traffic incidents, adverse weather and many other factors, it is unrealistic to suggest that transportation systems operate under ideal conditions all the time. Transportation agencies and MPOs have widely used total vehicle hours of delay to monitor the transportation system and trends in congestion. Annual hours of delay (AHD) can be calculated with the following equations. Formulas differ depending on the data format.

2010 data:

$$
AHD = \sum_{n} \sum_{m} \sum_{w} \sum_{h} VMT_{m,w,h} * \left(\frac{1}{V_{m,w,h}} - \frac{1}{RS}\right)
$$

Where:

E **denotes the number of specific weekdays in each month, for example, there are 5 Fridays in January in 2010;**

m denotes the month of year;

w denotes the day of week;

H **denotes the hour of the day;**

 $VMT_{m,w,h}$ denotes the vehicle miles traveled in hour of day *h*, day of week *w*, and month of **year** *m***;**

 $V_{m,w,h}$ denotes the hourly average speed in this time period; and

RS denotes the reference speed.

2011 and 2012 data:

$$
AHD = 52 * \sum_{w} \sum_{h} VMT_{w,h} * \left(\frac{1}{V_{w,h}} - \frac{1}{RS}\right)
$$

Where:

w denotes the day of week;

h denote the hour of the day;

 VMT_{wh} denotes the total vehicle miles traveled during hour of day *h*, day of week *w* in a **year;**

 $V_{w,h}$ denotes the hourly average speed during hour of day h , day of week w in a year; and RS denotes the reference speed.

For 2011 and 2012 data, the delay measure should be used with caution, because data was not available for all time intervals. For intervals lacking data, delays could not be estimated. This is not to suggest that delay did not occur during those periods.

2.2.2 VMT and VHT under Congested Condition

In addition to delay, both vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) under congested conditions were calculated. These metrics reflect the number of vehicle miles and vehicle hours traveled when observed traffic speed was less than the reference speed.

2010 data:

$$
VMT_{Congested} = \sum_{n} \sum_{m} \sum_{w} \sum_{h} VMT_{m,w,h} * \Delta_{m,w,h}
$$

$$
VHT_{congested} = \sum_{n} \sum_{m} \sum_{w} \sum_{h} \frac{VMT_{m,w,h}}{V_{m,w,h}} * \Delta_{m,w,h}
$$

Where $\Delta_{m,w,h}$ is a binary indicator and $\Delta_{m,w,h} = \left\{\begin{matrix} \mathbf{1}, & \textit{if } V_{m,w,h} > \mathbf{0} \textit{ and } V_{m,w,h} < RS \ \mathbf{0}, & \textit{otherwise} \end{matrix}\right.$ **Other terms are the same as in 2010 delay calculation formula.**

2011 and 2012 data:

$$
VMT_{congested} = 52 * \sum_{w} \sum_{h} VMT_{w,h} * \Delta_{w,h}
$$

$$
VHT_{congested} = 52 * \sum_{w} \sum_{h} \frac{VMT_{w,h}}{V_{w,h}} * \Delta_{w,h}
$$

Where $\Delta_{w,h}$ is a binary indicator and $\Delta_{w,h} = \left\{\begin{matrix} \mathbf{1}, & \textit{if } V_{w,h} > \mathbf{0} \textit{ and } V_{w,h} < RS \ \mathbf{0}, & \textit{otherwise} \end{matrix}\right.$ **Other terms are the same as in 2011 and 2011 delay calculation formula.**

2.2.3 Travel Time Index

The travel time index (TTI) measures the severity of congestion during the peak period. It is defined as the ratio between travel time during the peak period and the reference travel time. TTI is also unit-less and therefore can be used to compare the congestion conditions across facilities with different geometric characteristics. The calculation formula is:

$$
TTI = \frac{Average Travel Time}{Reference Travel Time}
$$

The above formula can be rewritten equivalently to the following formula:

$TTI = \frac{Reference\ Speed}{1}$ Average Speed

At the suggestion of the study advisory committee, 6-9am was designated as the AM peak period while 3-6pm was designated as the PM peak period.

2.2.4 Planning Time Index

The planning time index (PTI) is a measure for travel time reliability and is often computed as the ratio of the 95th percentile travel time (the $5th$ longest travel time) to the reference travel time. It reflects the travel time needed to ensure an on-time arrival at a destination on 19 days out of 20. Note that the PTI's definition is not restricted to the 95th percentile travel time. For example, an agency may choose to use $PTI(80)$, i.e., the ratio the of $80th$ percentile travel time to the reference travel time, to measure the amount of time needed to ensure an on-time arrival 4 out of 5 trips. PTI is calculated using the following formula:

$PTI = \frac{\text{The 95}th\text{ Percentage Travel Time}}{PIG}$ Reference Travel Time

The above formula can be rewritten equivalently into following formula:

$$
PTI = \frac{Reference Speed}{The 5th percentile speed}
$$

2.2.5 Buffer Index

The buffer index (BI) is closely related to the travel time index and the planning time index. It is the percentage time that a traveler needs to plan, relative to his/her own average travel time, to ensure a 95% chance of on time arrival. It indicates the extra effort a traveler needs to ensure an on-time arrival at a destination. It is calculated using this formula:

$BI = \frac{\text{The 95th } Percentage\text{ Travel Time} - Average\text{ Travel Time}}{1000}$ Average Travel Time

The above formula can be rewritten equivalently into following formula:

$$
BI = \frac{Average\ speed}{The\ 5th\ percentile\ speed} - 1
$$

2.3 Results and Analysis

Since the 2010 TMC based data was considered less useful, this report focused mainly on the performance results for the 2011 and 2012 data. Performance measures were calculated using the 2011 and 2012 data, and were included in the attribute tables of the 2011 and 2012

geodatabases. These files have been delivered to KYTC and the MPO stakeholders. The complete lists of measures and methodology used in their calculation are in Appendices A and B.

2.3.1 Sample Sizes

Travel speeds were aggregated to the 15-min level by day of the week and by month. This resulted in 8,064 time intervals per year. Probe vehicle speeds were not available for all of these periods. The temporal coverage of the probe speeds was measured as the proportion of 15-min intervals in a year for which probe data were available. Table 2-1 shows the direction-miles of Kentucky roadways according to the ranges of temporal coverage. For example, a temporal coverage range of $(1, 2)$ indicates probe speeds were available for $1\% -2\%$ of the 8064 intervals. This would equate to approximately 80-161 fifteen-minute periods. 16.097% of the 2012 total direction-miles have speed data at this temporal coverage range. The total direction-miles of the conflated network in 2011 and 2012 were 59,091.85 miles and 57,332.31 miles, respectively.

Table 2-1 indicates that data availability improved slightly between 2011 and 2012, both in terms of year-round statistics and peak-period statistics.

Table 2-2 partitions the data in Table 2-1 according to functional classification. Interstates and major arterials tend to have probe coverage at the high end, while lower functionally classified roadways, especially those in rural areas, have very limited data. The improvement in probe data coverage is mostly concentrated in higher functionally classified roads, such as interstates and major arterials.

2011												
Range	FC1	FC ₂	FC ₆	FC7	FC8	FC9	FC11	FC12	FC14	FC16	FC17	FC19
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.9	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.8
(0, 0.012]	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.6
(0.012, 0.5]	0.0	0.5	7.8	19.6	47.6	63.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.0	12.1	32.0
(0.5,1]	0.0	1.5	9.7	19.1	21.8	17.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	6.0	14.6	23.2
(1,2]	0.0	4.4	17.7	23.7	16.8	9.2	0.0	0.6	2.2	13.2	23.1	21.3
(2,5]	0.1	15.2	32.0	25.6	9.9	3.9	0.1	2.9	12.9	32.8	30.8	15.6
(5,10]	0.4	21.7	21.1	8.3	1.5	0.4	0.6	6.1	24.0	27.1	14.4	5.0
(10,20]	1.3	23.5	9.2	2.8	0.3	0.1	2.6	14.4	32.9	14.7	3.9	1.4
(20, 50]	10.3	26.9	2.2	0.6	0.1	0.1	18.3	44.7	25.9	3.2	0.8	0.3
(50, 100]	87.9	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	78.3	31.2	1.2	$0.0\,$	0.0	0.0
2012												
Range	FC1	FC ₂	FC ₆	FC7	FC ₈	FC9	FC11	FC12	FC14	FC16	FC17	FC19
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2
(0, 0.012]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4
(0.012, 0.5]	0.0	0.2	3.9	14.8	41.2	57.6	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.5	10.9	27.6
(0.5,1]	0.0	0.6	5.7	16.6	22.5	19.3	0.0	0.1	0.3	3.3	12.9	20.4
(1,2]	0.0	1.9	12.6	23.9	19.7	11.6	0.0	0.2	0.9	8.6	21.4	20.8
(2,5]	0.0	8.3	28.1	28.5	12.6	6.5	0.0	1.7	6.3	25.0	32.0	19.9
(5,10]	0.2	15.3	24.8	11.4	2.2	0.9	0.3	4.6	15.5	28.8	15.1	6.5
(10,20]	0.8	24.6	17.0	3.5	0.5	0.1	1.5	10.4	31.7	22.9	6.1	2.4
(20, 50]	6.0	34.1	7.9	$1.2\,$	0.1	0.1	14.0	41.2	41.6	9.8	1.4	1.6
(50, 100]	92.9	15.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.3	41.8	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1

Table 2-2 Sample size by functional classification (FC)

The distribution of probe samples was also analyzed over a 24-hour period. Figure 2-2 shows the percentage of the time on Kentucky interstates that a particular 15-minute period had probe speeds. This was calculated based on 84 periods in a year (i.e., 12 months and 7 days of a week). For 2011 and 2012, daytime hours received better coverage than nighttime and early morning hours.

Figure 2-2 Sample coverage by time of day on interstates in KY

A set of interstate segments were selected to further evaluate the time-of-day probe coverage by area type, as shown in Figure 2-3. Comparisons were made between the rural and urban segments, differentiated by color, and the results are shown in Figure 2-4. During nighttime, probe data are more abundant on rural interstates, which is evident on the pair of I-65 segments that were evaluated.

Figure 2-3 Interstate segments selected by area type

Figure 2-4 Time-of-day probe coverage on selected interstates

2.3.2 Performance Measures

Due to the high number of network links, comparing the performance measures for the two years on a link-by-link basis was challenging. Also, the segmentation of the 2012 network (HIS-based) was different from that of the 2011 network (HPMS-based). Comparisons were made at the area level by aggregating the link-based measures into regional measures. The weighting factor used was vehicle-miles traveled. Regional measures were also separated based on functional classes. Table 2-3 through Table 2-9 illustrate the comparisons between 2011 and 2012 for travel time

index, planning time index, buffer index, and annual hours of delay. Note that only the measures calculated with two options for reference speed $- (1)$ the 85th percentile speeds of all days and (2) the speed limit – are reported in these tables because they were the only reference speeds both years shared.

Table 2-3 Travel time index

Congestion levels for 2011 and 2012 were comparable. Based on the values of TTI, which used speed limit as the reference speed, the 2012 data showed a slight increase in congestion. Table 2-4 revealed that this increase was mostly attributable to FC14 and FC16 roadways in large urban areas such as OKI and KIPDA.

Table 2-4 Travel time index by functional classification

(a) The $85th$ percentile speed as reference speed

Note: blank cells mean there is no facility with designated functional class in the region.

Table 2-5 Planning time index

Planning time index (PTI) gauges the reliability of travel time. It measures variations in travel time against the reference speed. It appears that travel time reliability decreased from 2011 to 2012. One noticeable increase in PTI occurred for FC12 roadways in the OKI area. Further investigation indicated that there is only one section of highway where this change occurred, which is from the interchange of I-471 and I-275 to US27 near the campus of Northern Kentucky University, classified as Functional Class 12. It is highlighted in blue in Figure 2-5.

Figure 2-5 FC12 section in OKI region

In 2012 larger portions of the sample speeds were in a lower range, compared to speeds in 2011. Additionally, in 2012 the speed limit on one of the segments was increased to 55mph from 45mph. As a result, more congestion and unreliability were derived from the 2012 data.

Table 2-6 Planning time index by functional classification

(a) The $85th$ percentile speed as reference speed

Note: blank cells mean no facility with designated functional class in the region.

Buffer index indicates the variability of travel time experienced by users. Instead of choosing a fixed speed value as the reference, it uses the travelers' average speed as the "reference". The statewide buffer index was virtually unchanged between from 2011 to 2012, while the OKI and Lexington areas show slightly reduced variability. This indicates that the variability in travel time – for the average user – during peak periods decreased. Considering the slight increase in congestion (measured by TTI), we can conclude that travel time in these areas has become consistently longer.

	2011		2012				
Region	AM	PM	AM	PM			
Ashland	0.632	0.662	0.654	0.693			
Evansville	0.453	0.537	0.469	0.547			
Lexington	0.756	0.812	0.731	0.797			
KIPDA	0.586	0.674	0.562	0.714			
OKI	0.630	0.726	0.589	0.654			
Other	0.426	0.517	0.430	0.496			
Statewide	0.508	0.589	0.499	0.578			

Table 2-7 Buffer index

Region	Year	Period	FC1	FC ₂	FC6	FC7	FC8	FC9	FC11	FC12	FC14	FC16	FC17	FC19
Ashland	2011	AM	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7			0.9	0.9	0.9	0.6
		PM	0.2	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.8	1.1			0.9	1.1	0.9	0.9
	2012	AM	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.8			0.9	1.1	0.9	0.9
		PM	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.9			0.9	1.2	1.0	0.8
	2011	AM		0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6		0.2	0.8	0.8	0.7	2.5
		PM		0.2	0.4	0.4	0.8	0.8		0.2	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.7
Evansville	2012	AM		0.1	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.8		0.2	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.1
		PM		0.2	0.3	0.5	0.8	$1.0\,$		0.2	0.8	1.0	$1.0\,$	$1.0\,$
		AM	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.1	0.2	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.2
	2011	PM	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.1	0.4	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2
Lexington		AM	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.1	0.2	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.0
	2012	PM	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.8	1.0	0.1	0.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4
	2011	AM	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
		PM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.2	$1.4\,$	1.2	1.2	1.3
KIPDA	2012	AM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.2	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.3
		PM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.1	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.3
	2011	AM	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.7	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.3
OKI		PM	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.1
	2012	$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{M}$	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.4
		PM	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.4	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2
	2011	AM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.3	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9
Other		PM	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
	2012	AM	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
		PM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.1	0.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
State	2011	AM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0
		PM	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
	2012	AM	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2
		PM	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.4	0.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	$1.2\,$

Table 2-8 Buffer index by functional classification

The annual hours of delay are shown in Table 2-9. If using the $85th$ percentile speed as reference speed, the delay seems to have reduced from 2011 to 2012. It should be noted that the $85th$ percentile speed was derived entirely from the data, and therefore, its value may change from year to year.

On the other hand, the speed limit can be a relatively stable reference speed for this comparison. Based on data in Table 2-9(b), the delay increased in 2012 throughout the state, especially outside the major metropolitan areas. This seemingly significant increase in delay can be partly attributed to the improved probe sample size and to probe coverage in 2012. However, the change in delay for larger metropolitan areas such as OKI and KIPDA (where samples were abundant in both years), was not very significant.

Table 2-9 Annual hours of delay (in thousands of vehicle hours)

(a) The $85th$ percentile speed as reference speed

CHAPTER 3 NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

In response to MAP-21 requirements, the AASHTO Standing Committee on Performance Management (SCOPM) formed a Task Force on performance measure development, coordination, and reporting charged to "assist SCOPM and AASHTO in developing a limited number of national performance measures and to help prepare AASHTO members to meet the new federal performance management requirements" (10). The performance measures for the National Highway System (NHS) in Kentucky were calculated following the procedures recommended in a report by the Task Force of SCOPM (10). Annual hours of delay and the reliability index were suggested as the indicators of congestion and reliability of the NHS.

3.1 SCOPM Measures

3.1.1 Reliability Index

The Reliability Index (RI_{80}) is defined as the ratio of the 80^{th} percentile (the 80^{th} worst) travel time during weekday periods to the reference travel time. Similar to the planning time index, $RI₈₀$ estimates the travel time needed to ensure an on-time arrival at a destination 4 out of 5 times during peak congestion periods. The reliability index can be calculated using the following:

 $RI_{80} = \frac{80th \text{ Percentile Travel Time}}{\text{Error Area Time}}$ Free - flow Travel Time

3.1.2 Annual Hours of Delay

As defined in the Task Force document, Annual Hours of Delay(AHD) is the amount of travel time above a congestion threshold (defined by State DOTs or MPOs), measured in units of vehicle-hours of delay, on Interstates and on NHS corridors.

Due to the limitation of the data source, an alternative approach outlined in the SCOPM report (10) was used to calculate AHD. This approach involved the same equations as those used in the statewide roadway system for 2011 and 2012 data. As stated in Section 2.2.1, AHD should be used with caution because it is estimated from probe data, which is not available for all time periods.

3.2 Corridor Performance

Corridor level performance measures help transportation agencies and MPOs evaluate congestion and prioritize projects. For the purpose of this report, corridor level performance measures were derived by aggregating performance metrics calculated at the link level.

Without a specific segmentation scheme, a simple approach was adopted to automatically define corridors and to generate performance measures for NHS roads. Corridors were formed by combining links with the same route number, functional classification, and county code. This report contains this calculation for the 2011 and 2012 data. The results have been integrated into

geodatabases and delivered to KYTC and MPO stakeholders. The list of attributes and their descriptions are shown in Appendix C.

3.2.1 Reliability Index

The reliability index at the corridor level is shown in Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2. Comparing data from 2011 and 2012, it is apparent that more roadway segments are included in the NHS system in 2012. The reliability index was developed based on available data, and its value should only be used when the sample size and coverage are verified as being adequate.

Figure 3-1 2011 NHS corridor reliability index

National Highway System Reliability Index in the Non-Cardinal Direction 2012 AM Peak RI Using Speed Limit as Reference Speed $-1.00 - 1.25$ $-1.25 - 1.50$ $1.50 - 2.00$ $-2.00 - 3.00$ -3.00 COUNTY \sum_{z}

Figure 3-2 2012 NHS corridor reliability index

3.2.2 Annual Hours of Delay

The AHD calculated at the NHS corridor level is shown in Table 3-1.

CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION

This study provides an assessment of the purchased private sector speed data, the potential as a robust data source, and the limitations. Table 4-1 summarizes the data items evaluated. Among the three types of data, the link-reference speed data in 5-minute intervals (reported wherever probe sample was available) proved the most versatile. It offered details on speed distribution and provided critical insights into the dynamics of congestion and on the variability of travel times. These data provided crucial support to develop the performance measures required by MAP-21.

Table 4-1 Summary of travel speed data

These data need to be linked with traffic volumes to generate the full range of performance measures. The process of linking these two pieces of information will require combining a vendor's network with KYTC's highway inventory network. This process will be labor intensive although automated batch processing can accomplish some of the required steps. While the sample size and temporal coverage was consistently adequate on interstate highways and major arterials, data are still sparse on lower functionally classified roads, especially at the levels of collectors and local streets.

A range of congestion and reliability performance measures have been generated from these data and were provided to KYTC and MPO stakeholders in the form of geodatabases. These measures were generally reliable on roadways with adequate sample coverage. When the sample size may be a concern, data from other sources (such as Bluetooth, radar, etc.) can be used to supplement the speeds obtained from the private sector. Other applications can benefit from

these data, including the calibration and validation of simulation models, travel demand models, and air quality analyses.

These data were accompanied by information on sample size and sample standard deviation, which shed light on their quality. Unfortunately, the vendor plans to discontinue the production of these two data items. While it is more appropriate to evaluate performance at the corridor level, speed data at the link level measured directly by probe vehicles, without information from other sources blended in, remains the most valuable option to KYTC and MPOs.

REFERENCES

[1] Hulker, D. (2015). *KYTC HERE Link Location Procedures.* Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Unpublished.

[2] Chen, M., & Chien, S. Determining the Number of Probe Vehicles for Freeway Travel Time Estimation by Microscopic Simulation. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1719(1),* 61-68.

[3] Turner, S. M., & Holdener, D. J. (1995). *Probe Vehicle Sample Sizes For Real-Time Information: the Houston Experience.* (3-10).

[4] Schrank, David; Eisele, Bill; & Lomax, T. (2012). *Urban Mobility Report.* Texas A&M Transportation Institute, p. 70.

[5] Turner, S., Schrank, D., & Geng, L. (2011). *Twin Cities Metropolitan and MN Statewide IRC Arterial Travel Time Analysis: Use of Private Sector Traffic Speed Data.* Minnesota Department of Transportation.

[6] Meese, A. J., & Pu, W. (2011). *Applying Emerging Private Sector Probe-Based Speed Data in the National Capital Region's Planning Processes.* (16).

[7] Dantas, L., Pagitsas, E., Ostertog, H. (2004). *Mobility in the Boston Region: Existing Conditions and Next Steps - the 2004 Congestion Management System Report.*

[8] Maricopa Association of Governments. (2009, September). *Performance Measurement Framework and Congestion Management Update Study: Phase II Performance Measures Report*.

[9] Lomax, T., Turner, S., Eisele, B., Schrank, D., Geng, L., & Shollar, B. (2012). *Refining the Real-Timed Urban Mobility Report.* p. 204.

[10] AASHTO. (2012). *SCOPM Task Force Findings on National-Level Performance Measures.* p. 34.

APPENDIX A 2011 GEODATABASES LIST OF ATTRIBUTES

APPENDIX B 2012 GEODATABASES LIST OF ATTRIBUTES

APPENDIX C NHS GEODATABASES LIST OF ATTRIBUTES

