

# Upper Midwest Freight Corridor Study

## *Summary*

Research Team Meeting

October 30, 2003 – 10:30-11:30am Central

### **Participants**

Ernie Wittwer (MRUTC)

Mark Vonderembse (Toledo)

Sue McNeil (UIC)

Travis Gordon (MRUTC)

Lane Pille (UW-Madison)

Suphawut Malaikrisanachalee (UW-Madison)

Teresa Adams (UW-Madison)

Peter Lindquist (Toledo)

Kazuya Kawamura (UIC)

Lisa Kramer (UIC)

Laura Franke (UW-Madison)

### **Updates**

McNeil reported that still no word has come on our TRB paper submission. The next person to contact will be the TRB staffer for the committee.

Kawamura reported that he had made contact with the UW-Parkside retired professor. This person has been an author in Trains magazine and Kawamura feels that it is worthwhile to follow up on the specific data that he has.

Michigan data has been received by UIC and catalogued. McNeil met with Ron Vibbert of Michigan DOT, thinks that he will be able to follow up with any gaps from Michigan.

FTP site at the University of Toledo is being set up.

The University of Toledo to represent the study at next week's Ohio Transportation Engineering Conference through parts of a presentation and an exhibit.

Kawamura reported that the Waybill data was approved for a \$50 fee to STB. Also stated that they are currently searching for economic data or forecasts by industry or state. Recently catalogued AADT data for Chicago from CATS. With help from Toledo, UIC plans to start looking at gaps in the data collection efforts.

Wittwer updated the group on the performance metrics area of the study. Described a successful literature review, with more sources than expected.

### **Data Catalog**

Toledo and UIC reps to discuss this issue at a separate conference call.

### **December Meeting**

What should be discussed at this meeting?

- How do the subprojects related to each other? How do they depend on each other?
- What are we going to deliver to the states? More than flows and capacities?
- How would they like the data presented and what data do they want?

## **Data Issues**

Adams presented the following notes to the group regarding her issues with the current data model:

----

### **Spatial Data Observation**

#### **NHPN Data**

- ❑ It is inconclusive that the NHPN is “non-planar” (Nodes only exist at at-grade intersections. Node doesn’t exist when it is overpass or underpass.)
  - I noticed that it is non-planar in the Wisconsin and Michigan areas. However, since the data came from various sources (various states), I doubt that it would be non-planar across the NHPN network.
- ❑ Arcs (links) are not directed. This would cause a problem if we want to do routing.
  - Should we assume that traffic could go both directions?
  - What if there is a turn restriction?
- ❑ We cannot identify whether it is divided or non-divided highway. If it is divided highway, what does the linear distance (ENDMP – BEGMP) represent? Does it represent the distance of the highway in the cardinal direction?
- ❑ NHPN does not have explicit distance between two consecutive intersections. Distance between two consecutive intersections will need to be derived if needed.
- ❑ We may be able to use LGURB (large urban area code) and SMURB (small urban area code) as a key to relate local jurisdictions with NHPN.
  - Alternatively, we could do spatial overlay by overlaying local jurisdiction boundary on NHPN network. But because the positional accuracy of the NHPN is limited (80 meters), the results may not be accurate.

#### **Additional Data Needed**

- ❑ ITS project locations
- ❑ Posted bridges
- ❑ Rest areas (both public and private)
- ❑ Exit locations

----

There was support for the creation of a list of intuitive bottlenecks as the team begins their meetings with MPOs. Data could also come from trucking companies that we have good relations with. The list would document the location and description of the issue. Others noted that unexpected delay and resulting congestion from construction or regulations could pose a sizeable challenge also.

Lindquist to search for posted bridges data, possible from Oakridge.

**Adjourn (11:40 Central)**

**Next conference call planned for Thursday, November 20, 10:30-11:30am Central.**