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This report examines state-of-practice for performance measurement and focuses on federal requirements for traveler information mandated by SAFETEA-LU Section 1201 Real-Time System Management Information Program. Guidance for November 2016 compliance is provided by identifying 17 candidate Routes of Significance within the Las Vegas metropolitan area based on usage criteria. A prioritized list of required sensor locations for full route coverage of these routes is provided. It is recommended that NDOT explore the use of private probe data to generate travel time information along arterial routes.
Executive Summary

This report examines recent changes in state-of-practice to compute performance measurements and new legislation focused on performance-based outcomes. MAP-21 legislation identified congestion reduction as a major goal area for the country and helped establish a Real-Time System Management Information Program (RTSMIP) that requires states to provide traveler information related to construction, weather, incidents, and travel-time along all interstates and in large metropolitan areas which includes the Las Vegas area in Nevada.

This report finds that the main barrier to meet the SAFETEA-LU Section 1201 RTSMIP requirements for metropolitan area routes of significance by the November 8, 2016 deadline is the need for travel time information. Routes of significance need to be established before selecting technologies to address travel time. A preliminary list of routes were identified by screening the Las Vegas Valley road network based on VMT, daily flow, average speed, road type designation, and geo-spatially which include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 573) Craig Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 159) Charleston Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 589) Sahara Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 593) Tropicana Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 592) Flamingo Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 160) Blue Diamond Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 146) St. Rose Pky.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Summerlin Pky.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to fully cover these routes, 26 new Radar installations are recommended at the following coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC 215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-115.288851</td>
<td>36.077549</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-115.295786</td>
<td>36.106194</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-115.335286</td>
<td>36.131069</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-115.334853</td>
<td>36.212604</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-115.325145</td>
<td>36.238587</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-115.314961</td>
<td>36.255053</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-115.32762</td>
<td>36.268663</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-115.318078</td>
<td>36.282547</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-115.277389</td>
<td>36.278621</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-115.205649</td>
<td>36.276122</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-115.150683</td>
<td>36.293668</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-115.081441</td>
<td>36.291113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summerlin Pky.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-115.322718</td>
<td>36.194745</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-115.294165</td>
<td>36.179754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and 18 camera installations are recommended at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Edna Ave</td>
<td>2 S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Hacienda</td>
<td>4 S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Alta Dr</td>
<td>6 S Valley View Blvd</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Apple Dr</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
<td>8 S Lamb Blvd</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
<td>10 S Maryland Pky</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 S Eastern</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>12 Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 S Town Center</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
<td>14 S Lamb Blvd</td>
<td>E Sahara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Sahara</td>
<td>16 S Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cactus Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 N Martin L King</td>
<td>Gowan</td>
<td>18 N Martin L King</td>
<td>Carey Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that NDOT initiate conversations with third party private probe data providers to fill arterial data gaps without the high cost of hardware installation and maintenance since these have been proven to meet the reporting accuracy and availability requirements. This type of data would take advantage of newer social media techniques for prompt response times and provides a scalable solution that could be applied throughout Nevada, not just Las Vegas.

The outputs from this research include:

- Reports on data collection technology, performance measures, and recommendations to meet upcoming real-time data requirements for metropolitan areas.
- Las Vegas ITS inventory with associated coverage maps and data gap identification in GIS format.
- The Performance Measurement Research System with web interface to 1-minute resolution transportation data.
- An early congestion prediction algorithm using historical traffic measurements for highways which also resulted in a submission to TRB.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Objectives

This study explores the collection of performance measures as designated by the Real-Time System Management Information Program (RTSMIP) included in Section 1201 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This work primarily focuses on the steps required to satisfy the November 8, 2016 requirement for on Routes of Significance (ROS) within metropolitan areas within the Nevada. The study examines the Las Vegas Valley metro area to:

- determine a criteria to define meaningful routes of significance and identify Las Vegas ROS.
- determine the critical data gaps within the ROS and make suggestion to fill these gaps.

1.2 Organization

In Chapter 2, a review of data collection techniques and performance measures is presented. The current state-of-practice and national best-practices for urban/rural data collection technologies, strategies and derived performance measures is reviewed.

Chapter 3 reviews legislative requirements outlined in SAFETEA-LU Section 1201 for the establishment of a Real-Time System Management Information Program (RTSMIP) to provide consistent traveler information on major state roadways. The chapter highlights state examples to define important routes of significance (ROS) in large metropolitan areas and introduces private probe data services to obtain system-wide travel time measures.

An assessment of Nevada’s RTSMIP program and ROS recommendations for Las Vegas are presented in Chapter 4. A data gap analysis was performed using geographic information system (GIS) tools to identify and prioritize the installation locations of new sensors to meet the 2016 metropolitan reporting requirements.

Chapter 5 describes a new Performance Monitoring Research (PMR) system that provides access to traffic measurements at one minute resolution suitable for calculating more advanced performance measures and real-time data.

In Chapter 6 a field study on congestion performance measurement is performed using the PMR. The demonstration application is able to use pattern recognition techniques to predict congestions a few minutes before it begins.
Finally, in Chapter concluding discussion and recommendations for data collection gaps in arterial travel time are presented for final guidance through the RTSMIP November 8, 2016 final deadline. This section also highlights the outputs of the research project.
Chapter 2

Data Collection and Performance Measurement Background

Over the past few years, there has been increased emphasis on system-wide performance measurement. In July 2012, President Obama signed Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) into law to fund long-term highway investments [1]. A critical component of MAP-21 legislation is the establishment of a performance- and outcome-based surface transportation program. This performance management aims to increase efficiency and maximize return on investments.

National performance goals were identified for the seven areas in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: MAP-21 National Performance Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area</th>
<th>National Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure condition</td>
<td>To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion reduction</td>
<td>To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System reliability</td>
<td>To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight movement and economic vitality</td>
<td>To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced project delivery delays</td>
<td>To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies work practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These goal areas directly affect state DOT divisions. Safety goals can help develop incident management strategies to reduce crashes. Planning divisions will have the necessary data to
prioritize projects based on a particular criteria such as delay from congestion. The effects of construction and intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvement on travel time, speed, and delay can be directly characterized by Operations.

In order to meet these goals, performance measures must be established with regard to

- Pavement condition on Interstate System and National Highway System (NHS)
- Performance of Interstate and NHS
- Bridge condition on NHS
- Fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- Traffic congestion
- On-road mobile source emissions
- Freight movement on Interstate

In each category, states were required to set performance targets based on these measures which required the definition of measures of effectiveness (MOE) [2]. The MOEs can be determined by having reliable and robust data sources and derived measures to address performance goals.

In the following Sections of this chapter, data collection techniques and common derived performance measures are highlighted.

### 2.1 Data Collection Techniques

Sensors and detection technologies have been in use by transportation engineers for many years. Fundamentally, the presence of a vehicle is desired. However, newer sensing technology is providing significantly more than just the count of passing vehicles including the speed, type of vehicle, and travel time. In the last few years, new crowd sourced data collection has been enabled by widespread deployment of GPS receivers and cellular networks. Beyond position information, social platforms are providing detailed information by the traveling public to improve performance.

The following section provides a short summary of leading sensing technologies:

- **Intrusive Detector Technologies**
  - Inductive Loop
  - Magnetic Detector
  - Pneumatic Road Tube
  - Weigh-in-Motion

- **Non-Intrusive Detector Technologies**
  - Active and Passive Infrared
  - Microwave Radar
  - Ultrasonic and Passive Acoustic
  - Cameras and Video Image Processing
  - Combined Detector Technologies

- **Off-Road Technologies**
• Pedestrian and Bicycle Detection

More detailed treatment of these technologies can be found in [3–5].

2.1.1 Intrusive Detector Technologies

Intrusive detector technologies typically work very well at detecting vehicles because of “contact” with a sensor strategically placed on the roadway. They are mature technologies that are favored by transportation engineers. However, these detectors have to be placed on or in the roadway which requires lane closures and regular maintenance which can be costly.

Inductive loops are popular detectors composed of looped wires that measure a change of inductance when a vehicle passes over it in order to measure presence, volume, occupancy, speed, and basic length classification. However, loop installation is a disruptive process to cut the pavement and seal the loop inside. They have a high failure rate due to poor installation or environmental conditions such as the extreme heat in Las Vegas.

Similar in operation to loops, magnetic detectors can detect the presence of a vehicle based on its metal composition affecting the Earth’s magnetic field. These can be small and effectively monitor slowly moving and stationary vehicles.

The simple low cost pneumatic tube was developed in the 1920s. When a vehicle drives over a tube placed over the roadway, air pressure in the rubber tube changes. The tubes are usually used for short-term traffic counting since they must be placed over the road and can measure volume, speed, and some classification by axle count and spacing.

Strain guages are used in weigh-in-motion systems to measure weight for each axle of a vehicle. Based on calibration parameters for speed and pavement suspension dynamics, the weight of a vehicle can be measured and used for truck load restrictions.

2.1.2 Non-Intrusive Technology

In contrast to Intrusive Technology, Non-Intrusive technology can be installed and maintained without the need to disrupt traffic. Often times these sensors are installed on the side of the roadway and multiple lanes can be monitored with a single sensor. Since there is no longer a direct contact point, these sensors need extra processing to discern a vehicle from a sensor signature.

Active Infrared systems utilize low energy invisible infrared light from diodes or high energy laser diodes to measure the time for reflected energy to return to the detector. When a vehicle is present, the time is lower. These systems can be designed with multiple beams to measure speed and are used in a variety of applications such as toll collection, bridge/tunnel clearance verification, and as a trigger for enforcement cameras.

Using Radar system, volume, occupancy, speed, and classification can be measured. Doppler Radars measure the shift in frequency from a moving vehicle so requires a minimum speed for detection. Frequency modulated continuous wave detectors have increased reliability because it measures distance along with speed to handle multiple moving sources in its view.
Active ultrasonic sensors operate in a manner similar to Doppler Radar systems but use ultrasonic sound waves rather than microwave. Passive acoustic sensors are microphones that measure the noise of a passing vehicle. Sound-based systems have limited range due to the prevalence of disruptive noise source.

Cameras have become a favorite transportation management technology because they are naturally accessible for human operators. Operators can view cameras and understand the traffic situation. Automated analysis systems have been designed using video image processing techniques to detect vehicles in images based on motion causing changes in pixel intensities. The computer vision community has been very active in developing advanced algorithms which are able to detect, track, classify, and measure vehicles. In addition, cameras provide area coverage for density, can be used for travel time, as well as intersection analysis of queue length and turning movements. However, these have been slow for adoption because of limited applicability during adverse weather or when lighting is poor (i.e. sunrise or sunset).

Newer sensing technologies are combining sensor types to overcome a single technology’s weakness. For example, camera and radar combinations are now on the market that can help solve visual ambiguity with depth information. These provide Radar measurements but also visual tracking of an area and potential for applications like license plate recognition.

2.1.3 Off-Road Technologies

Off-road sensing technologies utilize communication channels for detection. Specialized transportation hardware can be mounted on the side of the road for direct communication such as RFID used with electronic toll-collection systems. The DSRC band has been allocated specifically for automotive use and ITS. However, the recent trend has been to move away from specialized equipment and more toward consumer mobile technology with the rapid growth of smart devices.

Probe vehicle technology can fulfill real-time monitoring applications. A probe vehicle is a special vehicle that is sent into the road network to take specific measurements. This is very useful for direct measurement of travel time, however is costly for a DOT to run at large scale. Bluetooth sensors are being deployed to utilize private vehicles as probes. Bluetooth stations communicate with phones and use unique identifiers to calculate the time to travel between important roadway points. One drawback of this technology is that Bluetooth is a short range communication protocol and must be mounted close to the road and it requires an active Bluetooth connection on a cell phone. Currently, penetration rates may not be high enough to obtain significant measurements.

GPS enabled smart devices are able to actively track position and speed and transmit this information to private companies that provide transportation services. These private probe vehicle companies partner with professional drivers (e.g. taxi and fleet vehicles), use in-vehicle navigation devices, and utilize smart phone apps to collect data over large areas and provide access to cleaned and processed data to interested parties. Using GPS it is possible to directly measure travel time using an individual vehicle but typically aggregation methods are utilized.
2.1.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Detection

Similar sensing technologies for vehicles (infrared, microwave radar, ultrasonic, magnetic, and piezoelectric) have been used for pedestrian and bicycle detection. The sensors need to be modified to handle smaller objects with lower speeds. These sensors are mounted curbside and can supplement pushbutton pedestrian indicators. However, very few systems are commercially viable with use in only a few jurisdictions. In fact, pedestrian and bicycle utilization is typically not well understood.

2.2 Performance Measures

System-wide performance monitoring and measurement methods and tool are critical research areas for state DOTs. Each must develop a set of performance targets and goals based on performance metrics from which to gauge the ability to meet objectives. The key performance areas are:

- Mobility
- Accessibility
- Reliability
- Safety
- Environment
- Cost
- Infrastructure Condition
- Economic Impact
- Industry Productivity
- Traffic Data Quality
- Congestion (through mobility and reliability)

Table 2.2 lists a number of measures that are commonly used to assess the different areas. (See Appendix A for a full list of measures in use around the country). Often times, the use of a performance measure and its calculation is mandated by law. As an example, many of the safety performance measures are required by Federal rule for reporting the the National Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). Operational measures such as travel time, speed, and delay are most effective for public reporting since they relate directly to what is experienced by the traveler while derived measures are more relevant to policy planners [2]. In a similar vein, the commonly used level of service (LOS) grade is a simple measure that can provide a quick snapshot for roadway performance that can be included in high-level executive reports but does not provide sufficient granularity for engineering. Mobility and Reliability measures help define Congestion statistics which are useful for traveler information.

In Nevada, the Integrated Transportation Reliability Program (ITRP) has been working to provide NDOT with a system of performance measures that provide meaningful ways to improve operations, better inform planning and programming, and to effectively track progress toward a more reliable transportation system. The Connecting Nevada projects has focused on communication and state-wide coordination for more comprehensive planning.
Table 2.2: Common Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio)</td>
<td>The volume divided by capacity. The volume is often estimated as the 30th yearly highest volume available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td>A grade interval expressing how well a roadway segment is serving its traffic. It is graded from A to F, which A means free flow and F means very congested. LOS is based on a (V/C Ratio) and has long been used as the primary measure of congestion for planning purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hours of Truck Delay (AHTD)</td>
<td>Travel time above the congestion threshold in units of vehicle-hours for trucks on the Interstate Highway System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability Index (RI80)</td>
<td>The ratio of the 80th percentile travel time to the agency-determined threshold travel time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Moving average of the number of traffic fatalities within 3 or 5 year intervals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Pollutant Emissions</td>
<td>Daily kilograms of on-road, mobile source criteria air pollutants (VOC, NOx, PM, CO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Consumption per Ton-Mile</td>
<td>The cost associated with transport that is related to highway condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Percentage of 0.1 mile segments of non- Interstate NHS pavement mileage in good, fair and poor condition based on the following criteria: good if IRI &lt; 95, fair if IRI is between 95 and 170, and poor if IRI is greater than 170.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition</td>
<td>Percentage of National Highway System bridges in good, fair and poor condition, weighted by deck area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Data Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>The measure or degree of agreement between a data value or set of values and a source assumed to be correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (Availability)</td>
<td>The degree to which data values are present in the attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hours of Delay (AHD)</td>
<td>Travel time above a congestion threshold (defined by State DOTs and MPOs) in units of vehicle-hours of delay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A robust mix of various measures need to be developed to meet different needs and requirements. Some will be required for federal reporting, for planning, operations, and public reporting. Measures that directly measure congestion are often best for public reporting since these reflect conditions a traveler will encounter. A number of these measures have been adopted for real-time information disbursement.
Chapter 3

Real-Time System Management Information Program

RTSMIP was included in Section 1201 of SAFETEA-LU \[6\]. The Real-Time System Management Information Program is to provide the capability to monitor in real-time the traffic and travel conditions of the major highways across the U.S. and provide a means of sharing these data with state and local governments and with the traveling public.

3.1 SAFETEA-LU RTSMIP

On August 10, 2005, the President signed into law SAFETEA-LU, the largest surface largest surface transportation investment in the Nation’s history, which guaranteed funding for highways, highway safety, and public transportation totaling $244.1 billion \[7\]. It was designed to address modern transportation challenges such as improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment. The Act promotes more efficient and effective Federal surface transportation programs by focusing on transportation issues of national significance, while giving State and local transportation decision makers more flexibility for solving transportation problems locally.

Targeted investments through SAFETEA-LU include Safety, Equity, Innovative Finance, Congestion Relief, Mobility & Productivity, Efficiency, Environmental Stewardship, and Environmental Streamlining. Within the Congestion Relief area, a new RTSMIP was established to provide all states the capability to monitor, in real-time, traffic and travel conditions and to share that information to

“improve the security of the transportation system, address congestion problems, support improved response to weather events and surface transportation incidents, and facilitate national and regional highway traveler information.”

Section 1201 of SAFETEA-LU established the RTSMIP to combat congestion and provide a common foundation of basic traffic and travel condition information. This information would be made available by the states to improve security, address congestion problems, support improved response to weather events and incidents, and to facilitate comprehensive traveler information. Data exchange format specifications were designed for key interfaces to
enable improved information services from public agencies, private parties designing value-added products, and the general traveling public.

A final Rule for Section 1201 of SAFETEA-LU was published on November 8, 2010, establishing the provisions and parameters for the RTSMIP to be established by State DOTs and their partners. The Program mandated establishment on all Interstate routes by November 8, 2014 and on other metropolitan area routes of significance by November 8, 2016.

### 3.1.1 Program Requirements

The following requirements were identified for traffic and travel conditions through the RTSMIP program:

1. **Construction activities** – The timeliness for the availability of information about full construction activities that close or reopen roadways or lanes will be 20 minutes or less from the time of the closure for highways outside of Metropolitan Areas and 10 minutes or less from the time of the closure or reopening for roadways within Metropolitan areas. Short-term or intermittent lane closures of limited duration that are less than the required reporting times are not included as a minimum requirement under this section.

2. **Roadway or lane blocking incidents** – The timeliness for the availability of information related to roadway or lane blocking traffic incident will be 20 minutes or less from the time that the incident is verified for highways outside of Metropolitan Areas and 10 minutes or less from the time that the incident is verified for roadways within Metropolitan areas.

3. **Roadway weather observations** – The timeliness for the availability of information about hazardous driving conditions and roadway or lane closures or blockages because of adverse weather conditions will be 20 minutes or less from the time the hazardous conditions, blockage, or closure is observed.

4. **Travel time information** – The timeliness for the availability of travel time information along limited access roadway segments within Metropolitan Areas will be 10 minutes or less from the time that the travel time calculation is completed.

5. **Information accuracy** – The designed accuracy for a real-time information program shall be 85 percent accurate at a minimum, or have a maximum error rate of 15 percent.

6. **Information availability** – The designed availability for a real-time information program shall be 90 percent available at a minimum.

Construction, incident, weather, and travel time information should be reported within 10 minutes of verification within metropolitan area limits and within 20 minutes outside these areas.

### 3.1.2 Routes of Significance

The RTSMIP rule mandates traffic and travel conditions to be reported not only for highways but also ROS in 2016. However, there is some uncertainty on the definition of a ROS. The law does not provide specific guidelines but instead gives states the opportunity to define ROS as appropriate for their jurisdiction. Part 511 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 511) designates the RTSMIP and provides the following ROS guidance
“Routes of significance are non-Interstate roadways in metropolitan areas that are designated by States as meriting the collection and provision of information related to traffic and travel conditions. Factors to be considered in designating routes of significance include roadway safety (e.g., crash rate, routes affected by environmental events), public safety (e.g., routes used for evacuations), economic productivity, severity and frequency of congestion, and utility of the highway to serve as a diversion route for congestion locations. All public roadways including arterial highways, toll facilities and other facilities that apply end user pricing mechanisms shall be considered when designating routes of significance.”

Further, the RTSMIP rule designated “Metropolitan Areas” to mean

“geographic areas designated as Metropolitan Statistical Areas by the Office of Management and Budget with a population exceeding 1,000,000 inhabitants.”

The current standards were adopted in 2010 [9] and provide a single set of geographic delineations for the Nation’s largest centers of population and activity. These metropolitan areas are defined for statistical purposes and denote an area containing a large population nucleus and adjacent communities with a high degree of integration with that nucleus.

The 2010 standards resulted in new Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas delineations in February 2013. The new delineations resulted in 51 metropolitan areas with populations greater than one million, including Las Vegas in Nevada. Each of these are then required to identify non-Interstate roads that should be included as a ROS thanks to meeting some significance criteria as agreed upon by the state DOT and partners.

3.2 State Examples

Each state is required to develop a plan to meet reporting requirements for RTSMIP. This plan should be customized to meet the unique needs of each state and the population it serves. In preparation for the 2014 highway and eventual 2016 metro implementation deadlines, many states have been actively engaged in this planning process. As guidance for states with less mature programs, FHWA hosted a webinar in May 2014 to highlight various state efforts and techniques to meet the RTSMIP requirements [10].

3.2.1 Kansas

In the Kansas Division Office they recognize the great progress in real-time management today versus 5-10 years ago. They avoid getting bogged down in too fine level of detail and instead emphasize a process that is consistent and progresses toward the 2016 deadline. They considered ROS to be roadways of similar importance to interstates. They used a network screening process using the following criteria (Table 3.1) to generate a preliminary list of candidate routes.

By considering various factors, a list of potential ROS candidates are generated which satisfy at least one of the meaningful criteria. They then plan to monitor these routes over the next two years to be ready to select the ROS and provide data in Nov. 2016.
### Table 3.1: Kansas Key Factors for ROS Screening and Identification

- Roadway safety through crash rates
- Congestion severity and frequency
- Economic productivity through rates of national and state freight
- Value as an evacuation or diversion route

### Table 3.2: California ROS Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/30/14</td>
<td>Provide contact information of the individual/individuals that will assume responsibilities regarding ROS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/14</td>
<td>Provide a list of proposed ROS and demonstrate how each ROS meets or will meet the criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/15</td>
<td>If criteria for proposed ROS cannot be met prior to deadline, then roadway will not be given consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/16</td>
<td>Local or regional agency must share the strategic plan for Accuracy and Availability with Caltrans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/16</td>
<td>Provide traveler information for the identified ROS approved by FHWA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2.2 California

As a large state with six metropolitan areas with over one million, the California FHWA Division has been actively working on RTSMIP since early 2013. They assess the accuracy requirement for the data the public sees (online or on the road) for lane closures. They use a required notification system for construction personnel which consists of two reports:

- **“Event Start”** – when a cone is placed down on the road, a call must be made to a transportation management center (TMC).
- **“Event End”** – when the cones are picked up and lane is open to traffic, a call must be made to the TMC.

Accuracy was assessed based on all proposed and planned lane closures either through permits, construction, or maintenance. If the Event Start and End calls were received for a planned closure, it was considered an accurately statused closure, and if only one of the two calls were placed then it was non accurately statused. The accuracy was the total number of accurate statuses divided by the total number of statuses and was 91% for all CA districts combined.

In addition, CA had a timeline in place to address ROS as given in Table 3.2. What is noteworthy in their timeline are the second and third stages. Candidate ROS are proposed based on the Program criteria. However, only those candidates which will be able to meet the Nov. 2016 deadline in terms of the six requirements are retained for further consideration. This practical approach suggests that ROS should only be routes that can be effectively monitored without any major efforts. This means that the areas that are currently under observation now are likely to be the RTSMIP ROS in 2016.
3.2.3 Tennessee

The Tennessee FHWA Division office noted that the RTSMIP rules were equivalent to basic user needs and asked themselves three basic questions

- Can our systems meet these needs?
- Do we need to specify interface control?
- Do external users have access?

These questions in turn lead to a prioritized deployment plan by first identifying gaps and determining where equipment such as cameras, speed or travel time detectors, or dynamic message sign (DMS) might be required. These gaps can then be aligned with other construction projects. The RTSMIP also ties directly into other programs; incident detection as part of their Strategic Highway Safety Plan and traffic, closure, and incident information can be paired for business performance management and quantification of improvement investments.

Tennessee currently operates the TNSmartWay brand in order to provide a single source of external information. The service provides both web and mobile app interfaces, statewide 511 and HAR, DMS information, as well as twitter and RSS feeds. All “events” (incidents, lane closures, etc.) are latitude and longitude encoded and provided as map overlays. Data is provided by various sources such as traffic cameras, speed detectors, public reporting of incidents, and informal data collection from TDOT personnel on their commutes. They meet the 90% availability rate through their contract with their ITS provider. In this case, only verified incidents are reported and can be monitored based on timestamps.

Although operating a very modern transportation communication system, they do have areas for improvement. They needed to identify gaps for speed detection and travel time calculation. They note travel times and speed are a concern since probe runs would be costly and are looking to evaluate commercial data sources. They are also hoping to provide simple information exchange protocols for interoperability with their local partners.

3.2.4 North/West Passage Coalition

The recent North/West Passage Coalition conformance report \[1\], highlights efforts through eight states, including Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, to meet the RTSMIP requirements. Along the corridor, the three metro areas considered for ROS are Seattle, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Milwaukee.

In Seattle, Washington State DOT will define their ROS network based on AADT, freight use, long range transportation plans, NHS designation, emergency or alternate routes, and other factors. The candidate road segments include 15 state routes, West Seattle Bridge, and US 2 for 17 total ROS. The same criteria was used by Minnesota DOT to identify candidate non- interstate routes for travel time coverage in the Twin Cities Metro Area. In this case, five US highways and seven state highways make up the list of 12 ROS candidates. The Milwaukee Metro Area had three US highways and four state highways identified as candidate ROS. In addition to the previously mentioned factors, these ROS were selected using the OSOW priority network and Connections 2030 Corridors programs.

Along the North/West Passage Coalition, the ROS are almost exclusively on highway road segments where loop and other mature sensors are able to provide travel time information.
Major arterials did not seem to be a concern for meeting the 2016 rule, likely due to difficulty producing travel time measurements in stop controlled traffic.

### 3.3 Probe Data Services

With the ubiquity of modern GPS devices, either stand-alone, in-vehicle, or in mobile phones, has given rise to a new type of user supplied data collection. Probe data is obtained from GPS devices silently while navigation is in use. Using GPS, it is possible to geo-locate the device and determine the roadway section it is traversing as well as measuring speed. The advantage of probe data is that users provide the information freely while navigating the entire road network. There are no additional sensors to install and information can be obtained over the entirety of the network. The same probe system works just as well on highways as arterials.

#### 3.3.1 Floating Car Data

Researchers have used probe (floating car) data to estimate travel time in the same way a professional probe vehicle on the road can measure time directly. In 2011, the technical and institutional issues associated with the use of private sector probe data for public sector performance management of congestion was studied [12]. This report noted the main concern was the “blending” of traffic data between real-time measurements and historical statistics but concludes that “what is most important is the accuracy of the end product (i.e., average travel times and speed)” which can be assessed via quality assurance methods.

Probe data is now mature and in fact is used as the primary speed data source for the annual Urban Mobility Report by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) [13]. Many states have initiated feasibility studies for the use of probe data and validated travel time accuracy to within a few minutes during typical flow and able to distinguish more congested situations [14]. The I-95 Corridor Coalition has performed large-scale deployment of probe data and provided significant documentation on data validity [15] and guidelines to evaluate the accuracy of this data [16].

More accurate travel times can be obtained by direct travel time measurement using Bluetooth systems. These systems perform re-identification of vehicles as they travel a road network based on the Bluetooth ID similar to how a license plate recognition system operates. The Bluetooth communication protocol provides unique identification for very accurate travel times. However, these systems only work on the small portion of vehicles that have Bluetooth enabled and still require base stations installed at critical locations along the transportation network which could become complex.

In addition, social media sites and apps have gained prominence in the mobile era. Now more than ever, individuals are willing to share information for the greater good. Services such as Google Maps [17], Waze [18], and HERE by NAVTEQ [19] all provide probe data. Additional information besides speed and location data have made these systems popular for advanced route navigation. The systems tie into various data streams to obtain information about construction, incidents, locations of speed cameras or police officers. Users can personally upload information to the system as they are encountered for the fastest possible notification time. The large user base and up-to-date information often outperforms more
3.3.2 INRIX

One of the more popular providers of private probe data is Inrix [20]. They provide solutions for Nevada and the country as a whole. The wide-view this affords improves the ability to coordinate with neighboring states and could actually improve NV in-state operations. Their current technology is almost exclusively probe data with little reliance on ITS infrastructure. Early incarnations of their system needed more tradition TMC ITS data because of lower penetration rates.

The data they provide comes in one minute increments and has metadata attached to indicate how it was collected. Data can be directly

1. measured from probe vehicles,
2. be based on historical information, or
3. be a fusion between measured and fusion.

Their propriety algorithms decided which scheme to use based on data availability and reliability.

The system uses the standard traffic message channel (TMC) roadway segment definition as well as their own open XD standard. The XD standard utilizes higher resolution segments with a maximum length of 1.5 miles for finer detail in analysis. A comparison between traditional TMC and XD segments in Nevada is provided in Table 3.3 and highlights the high resolution coverage from INRIX. Integration of TMC or XD segments will require some effort to integrate with NDOT referencing schemes through a roadway mapping table.

The Inrix service is highly customizable. They provide access to data as well as a number of APIs for map overlays as well as analysis. The four main data layers that are available

---

Table 3.3: Comparison Between TMC and XD Road Segments for Nevada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRC</th>
<th>TMC Miles</th>
<th>XD Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Interstate</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Freeways &amp; Expressways</td>
<td>3798</td>
<td>4111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Major Arterial</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>4591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Minor Arterial</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Major Collector</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Minor Collector</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Local</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles</td>
<td>8258</td>
<td>10798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Centerline Miles</td>
<td>4145</td>
<td>5399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>5008</td>
<td>13634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are Speed, Incident, Weather, and an Analytics Suite. The Analytics Suite is hosted by the
University of Maryland and provides advanced analysis of the Inrix data. Example analyses
are bottleneck studies and calculation of user delay costs.

There is a free site available for all public agencies

http://Inrixtraffic.us

While this provides access to the entire United States, most coverage in Nevada is along
the major Interstate highways. Las Vegas area is well represented as shown in Fig. 3.1. In
addition to the highways, data is available along major arterials which is currently missing
through the FAST Dashboard. Unfortunately, Reno and Carson City do not have arterial
coverage limiting this system’s usage to Southern Nevada. However, there is the possibility
for expansion into Northern Nevada as device penetration and usage increases.

It should be noted that private sector probe data is best suited for travel times and speeds
on highways and major arterials which are best suited for real-time traveler information.
More advanced traffic management and control applications which require traffic flows, lane
occupancy and detection data will need to utilize public sector sensors in the near term [20].
Therefore, probe data should be considered a complementary data source rather than a
replacement.
Figure 3.1: Inrix coverage maps for Las Vegas. Note that major arterials are covered by the probe data.
Chapter 4

Nevada RTSMIP

Nevada’s ITS infrastructure has consistently been on the forefront of national practice with a robust network of sensors and management centers running 24/7. This network of high speed fiber communication between field sensors (microwave radar) and traffic cameras provides dense coverage of major metropolitan areas and has the state well positioned to meet all the RTSMIP requirements.

4.1 Interstate Highways

In early 2014, Nevada began RTSMIP compliance efforts by assessing the state’s capabilities at gathering and disseminating data in the four areas of construction, incidents, weather, and travel time information with emphasis on the interstate highway system. The state either met or exceeded the reporting requirements in each area.

Construction activities are managed and reported directly to NDOT personnel. The information is provided to TMC operators who upload the data to various reporting channels such as the state 511 system, nvroads.com, bugatti.nv.fast.org FAST dashboard, and email notifications. In addition, TMC operators use the traffic camera network to actively monitor construction zones for detailed traffic updates.

In a similar manner, Incident activities are handled by TMCs. Specific incident information can be obtained through various means. Field observations can be reported by law enforcement (NHP, LV METRO), freeway service patrol personnel, other initial response vehicles, and through notification by the general public. In addition, more technological identification methods are used. Side-fire microwave Radar detectors measure speed along highways. An unusual or unexpected slowing may indicate an incident which can be verified using traffic cameras. Incidents are then reported through the 511 channel, nvroads.com, bugatti.nv.fast.org, through DMS and travel time specific signs, as well as email updates and highway advisory radio (HAR). The collaborative process and multiple distribution channels exceeds RTSMIP regulations.

Weather observations is another area where Nevada excels. Information is reported by the previously mentioned parties as well as maintenance operators and TMCs are able to use the same channels for dissemination. In addition, a number of road weather information system (RWIS) stations are installed throughout Nevada (mostly in the North) that help with rain, snow, and wind warnings. Weather information is also obtained through partnerships with
meteorologists through the MXweather Synder Electric agreement and using the National Weather Service Radar storm tracking and predictions.

Finally, travel time information is available in Nevada by using the ITS sensor network. The side-fire Radar detectors that are instrumented on highways give speed and flow information which are tied into the Freeway Management System (FMS). Using these speed measurements, travel time estimates are computed along various important points and provided to the public on DMS and travel time signs. Arterial travel times are more difficult to obtain because of limited sensors and because of stop controlled devices. Along arterials, travel time can be manually determined by visual tracking of vehicles through a corridor camera view. However, this manual process takes time and effort so a more automated process is desirable. More modern technologies such as Bluetooth sensors and GPS probes have recently been explored. Bluetooth travel time systems (BlueToad) have been tested in limited fashion in Las Vegas with some success. RTC Paratransit GPS provides data that could give arterial travel time with data by expanding to more vehicles such as on bus routes.

Nevada has a robust system in place for the collection of data and for addressing the information needs outlined by RTSMIP. The ITS infrastructure and communication protocols in place provide adequate coverage of Nevada as a whole with superior coverage in major population centers. The main area that is lacking is in the difficult area of arterial travel times. It may take significant effort, manpower or new ITS infrastructure, to provide reliable travel times on non-highway roadway sections in the short term without the use of private data collection services.

4.2 Metropolitan Areas

Figure 4.1a gives the population distribution by county in Nevada. Only the Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise metro area fits the RTSMIP designation with a 2010 population of 1,941,269 people. The two other major metropolitan areas in Nevada are Reno (425,417) and Carson City (55,274). Using Nevada State Demographer projections [21], even in 20 years, neither Reno or Carson City would fall under the rule (Figure 4.1).

4.3 Routes of Significance

The main uncertainty in the RTSMIP program is in the definition of ROS. Nevada’s RTSMIP Kick-Off Meeting with FHWA in January 2014 recommended using a collaborative process between NDOT and FAST to determine ROS in compliance with 23 CRF Parts 420 and 940 by the beginning of 2016. The suggestion was to develop a preliminary list of ROS from stakeholders such as Clark County and the TIM Coalition. However, the final ROS should be based on traveler information, where drivers go.

Following the Kansas example and utilizing 23 CFR 511, the Las Vegas road network can be screened using various importance criteria related to roadway use. Using this guidance, the following criteria were utilized to screen the Valley road network and identify potential ROS:

- Speed - belief that higher speeds are more important.
- Daily traffic - belief that number of vehicles is important.
(a) 2013 Nevada Population by County  
(b) 2032 Nevada Population Predictions

Figure 4.1: Nevada State Population Information

- Major roads - define large cross cutting roads.
- Evacuation routes - non-highway routes out of the city.
- Sensor coverage - pragmatic definition based on available coverage which indicates importance.

4.3.1 Network Screening

Using Clark County GIS data from the GIS Management Office [22], the Las Vegas road network was screened using the selection criteria highlighted in Table 4.1 to determine candidate ROS. Fixed attributes, Major Road and Evacuation Routes, were determined by examining the map and FRC designation for each roadway segment. The dynamic attributes were also evaluated for each road segment. Only segments that had average speed greater than 30 MPH and VMT greater than 10,000 were considered. Figure 4.2 highlights the meaningful roads after screening by the criteria. Using the speed criteria, most of the Las Vegas Valley is eligible while the VMT criteria significantly reduced the possible routes. In addition, the locations of sensors (green circles) and their coverage can be seen in purple.

For arterials, only cameras are available for traffic observation. FAST has experimented with other data collection techniques such as Bluetooth stations for travel time measurement but without much success to date. While the traffic cameras do not directly and automatically provide traffic time, they are well suited for this type of analysis. Visual inspection can be used to follow platoons of vehicles along corridors to compute travel time. In addition, the cameras are able to provide information on construction, incidents, and weather making it an ideal multipurpose sensor. However, we recommend developing clear practices for travel time estimation. This could either be from periodic intervention manually or through the development of image and video processing to help automate the process.

Based on these coverage maps (Fig. 4.2), a set of 17 potential ROS were designated as provided in Table 4.2. The major ROS were selected to span the various cardinal regions in
Table 4.1: Network Screening Criteria for ROS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>Higher speeds are more important.</td>
<td>Avg. speed &gt; 30 MPH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Traffic</td>
<td>Greater number of vehicles is more important</td>
<td>Daily VMT &gt; 10,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Road</td>
<td>Only consider large cross cutting roads.</td>
<td>Consider FRC Major Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>Require non-highway routes out of the city center.</td>
<td>ROS must span the highway system (i.e. should be able to exit from highway and travel until reaching another highway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensor Coverage</td>
<td>Existing sensors indicate routes of importance.</td>
<td>Sensor must be within defined distance of a sensor “view”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Las Vegas Routes of Significance
(Green Indicates Need for Major Sensorization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (SR 573)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 582)</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (SR 159)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 595)</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (SR 589)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 607)</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (SR 593)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>(SR 612)</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (SR 592)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Blvd.</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (SR 160)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>Las Vegas Blvd (Strip)</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (SR 146)</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>US 95</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Summerlin Pky.</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>US 93</td>
<td>N-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 CC 215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las Vegas. In the North, Craig Rd. going East-West and Nellis Blvd. and MLK going North-South were identified. In the West, the ROS are Charleston Blvd., Sahara Ave., Flamingo Rd., and Tropicana Ave. are the East-West routes and Rainbow Blvd. is the North-South route. Only Blue Diamond Rd. and St. Rose Pky., both going East-West, were identified in the South. Finally, in the East were Eastern Ave. and Boulder Hwy in the North-South direction. Additionally, four highways of US 95, US 93, Summerlin Pky., and Clark County 215 are included.

4.3.2 Gap Identification

In order to identify gaps, the road network was divided into highways and arterials. Highways are instrumented with Radar detectors for speeds and travel time and cameras to observe congestion while arterials only utilize cameras. Using GIS tools existing sensor coverage was determined using the following parameters:
(a) Las Vegas Valley VMT View

(b) Zoomed West Las Vegas VMT View
Figure 4.2: ROS Network Screening: GIS maps were used to determine significant routes and gaps along these routes. Purple color indicates coverage area for an existing camera. (a)-(b) Red color denotes VMT > 10,000. (c)-(d) Red are highest speed sections > 45 MPH and Blue indicate speeds between 30-45 MPH.
Table 4.3: 23 High Priority Radar Locations for CC 215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-115.288851</td>
<td>36.077549</td>
<td>115.288851</td>
<td>36.092776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.313425</td>
<td>36.118517</td>
<td>-115.313425</td>
<td>36.118858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.31069</td>
<td>36.131069</td>
<td>-115.31069</td>
<td>36.131069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.325526</td>
<td>36.228213</td>
<td>-115.325526</td>
<td>36.228213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.322956</td>
<td>36.259431</td>
<td>-115.322956</td>
<td>36.259431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.32762</td>
<td>36.268663</td>
<td>-115.32762</td>
<td>36.268663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.318078</td>
<td>36.282547</td>
<td>-115.318078</td>
<td>36.282547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.276122</td>
<td>36.276122</td>
<td>-115.276122</td>
<td>36.276122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.15623</td>
<td>36.290399</td>
<td>-115.15623</td>
<td>36.290399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: 3 High Priority Radar Locations for Summerlin Pky.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-115.322718</td>
<td>36.194745</td>
<td>-115.307728</td>
<td>36.186893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-115.294165</td>
<td>36.179754</td>
<td>-115.307728</td>
<td>36.186893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Radar – 0.5 mile range only highways.
- Traffic Camera – 450 meter viewing range.

Radar Detectors

The highway system in Las Vegas is very well covered with one of over 440 Radar detectors approximately every 0.5 miles. All interstate routes are completely covered and satisfy the RTSMIP requirements. Although four non-interstate highways are in the Las Vegas area, US 93 and I-15 have shared numbering and does not have any data gaps. In addition, US 95 is covered by existing sensors. The side-fire Radar sensors provide speed and flow data which can be used for incident detection and for travel time computation.

The two remaining routes have gaps to be filled by Radar sensors. The list of 23 CC 215 sensor location are presented in Table 4.3. Sensors were spaced along the roadway between S Durango Dr. and Summerlin Pky. for even coverage. Similarly, the length of Summerlin Pky. (between US 95 and CC 215) should be equipped with 3 Radar sensors locations as provided in Table 4.4. In order to meet the 2016 deadline, NDOT should coordinate with Clark County Public Works and the City of Las Vegas in their jurisdictions.

Traffic Cameras

Traffic cameras are a valuable tool for transportation management. They provide operators a visual interface to monitor the road network. The traffic cameras can be used to detect and monitor construction events, weather events, and incidents. They work very well in conjunction with Radar as a verification tool. In addition, traffic cameras can be used as
a travel time tool in non-highway situations by tracking vehicles. Because traffic cameras provide information for all RTSMIP areas, they are valuable investments.

It is important to note that Las Vegas has invested heavily in the traffic camera network with over 500 in the Valley along arterial streets. It is clear that they already provide significant coverage. However, some gaps in coverage along these routes exist. A data gap analysis was performed to make recommendations on locations for new sensor installations along all potential ROS. During gap analysis, no preference was given to roads that were already sensorized.

The VMT and Speed screen maps were used to identify all roads that had large traffic volume and speed. Each criteria was considered separately and gaps were found for installation of cameras. An example of a data gap can be seen in Fig. 4.2b in the top left corner below the Badlands Golf Club along Charleston. The road is marked red for passing the VMT screen but the purple sensors do not cover it. Each gap location was given a priority ranking to indicate how important a sensor would be at the location. The highest priority, Priority 1, was given to a gap that was at the intersection of two major streets both in the NS and EW directions. If the intersection was between a major and minor street, a medium priority 2 was applied. Any intersection of minor streets or non-intersection midblocks were selected as the lowest priority 3. The process was performed for both VMT and Speed. The Speed criteria selected most roads so only the largest roads were used in the gap analysis. The full list of gaps can be found color-coded by priority in Appendix B.

The gap locations provided by the VMT criteria and Speed criteria were combined using a priority mapping function. The final priority \( p \) was a combination of the individual criteria priority \((p_{VMT}, p_{SP})\)

\[
p = \begin{cases} 
1 & (p_{VMT}, p_{SP}) = (1, 1) \text{ or } (2, 1) \text{ or } (1, 2) \\
2 & (p_{VMT}, p_{SP}) = (0, 1) \text{ or } (1, 0) \text{ or } (2, 2) \\
3 & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]  

The gap analysis resulted in 144 (39 high) priority locations for dense coverage of Las Vegas with video sensors. Figure 4.3 highlights all the gap locations on a map. The color-code shows the highest priority in red, mid priority in blue, and low priority in green circles. The existing sensors are plotted in yellow diamonds. Notice, the gap locations are designed to provide long coverage between highway segments along major through routes.

Since even the 39 high priority locations is still a large number of installations for the 2016 deadline, a smaller subset of highest priority locations were identified for minimum ROS coverage. The locations highlighted in Table 4.5 are the highest priority installations along existing sensor routes. These 18 locations are the fewest number that could still provide complete ROS coverage of the Valley and meet the reporting requirements.

All the gap analysis ArcGIS files are available online at

http://rtis.oit.unlv.edu/cazzi/indexUI.php

In addition, Google Maps Fusion tables were created for interactive browsing of the Radar coverage, Camera coverage, and priority color-coded sensor installation locations for ROS coverage are provided.
Figure 4.3: Recommended locations for new sensor installations based on VMT, speed, and roadway type color-coded to indicate priority (Red = High, Blue = Medium, Green = Low). In general, higher priority was given to intersections along routes with existing infrastructure to fill small data gaps while lower priority was selected for midblock areas. (Yellow Diamonds indicate locations of existing sensors)
Table 4.5: 18 Highest Priority Camera Locations for Minimum ROS Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Edna Ave</td>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Hacienda</td>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Alta Dr</td>
<td>S Valley View Blvd</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Dr</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
<td>S Lamb Blvd</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
<td>S Maryland Pky</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Eastern</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Town Center</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
<td>S Lamb Blvd</td>
<td>E Sahara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Sahara</td>
<td>S Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cactus Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Martin L King</td>
<td>Gowan</td>
<td>N Martin L King</td>
<td>Carey Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Performance Measurement Research System

A data dashboard was created, similar to the FAST Dashboard - Performance Monitoring and Measurement System (PMMS) [23], with emphasis on RTSMIP analysis.

http://rtis.oit.unlv.edu/cazzi/indexUI.php

This system collects data at the highest temporal resolution (1 minute data) to provide access to the highest fidelity data streams for research and analysis. The FAST Dashboard only provides 15 minute data aggregates which does not always provide sufficient temporal resolution for response. The PMR Dashboard is composed of five major modules:

- database,
- data collection,
- ITS inventory,
- performance measures,
- and visualization and access

with a functional schematic as provided in Fig. 5.1

5.1 Data Collection

The data collection layer is designed to insert live traffic data into the the PMR database. This abstraction layer requires an interface program which can access a particular sensor and automatically generate the SQL commands to insert into the database. Various data sources can be utilized such as radar sensors, cameras, or even social media.

5.1.1 FMS Radar Data

The main distinction between the PMR and FAST systems is the temporal aggregation period. FAST only provides data at 15 minute aggregates while the PMR system archives at 1 Hz. The higher sampling rate was utilized to provide better temporal resolution for analysis. For example, an incident can only be localized within a 15 minute window using FAST while higher resolution data can isolate down to the minute.
The PMR system currently provides access to 1-minute Radar data in Las Vegas. The same Freeway Management System (FMS) sensors are utilized. The FMS system provides an XML interface to the Radar data which is accessible on a FAST FTP site. The following XML files are provided

- **DMSInventoryDistrict1.xml** – Provides metadata for dynamic message signs (DMS).
- **DMSStatusDistrict1.xml** – Provides information of messages on DMS.
- **metadata.xml** – Provides metadata about the sensors, including location in latitude and longitude, name of street location, detector id, etc.
- **realtime.xml** – Provides 1 minute sensor data of lane level vehicle flow, occupancy, and speed.

A python script was created to automatically fetch new measurements every minute. The script accesses the FAST FTP site to download the newest data .xml files and parses the files to extract the measurements for each detector. The script then saves the data in a more accessible format by pushing the data into a specially designed database (Section 5.2). Insertion checks are performed to prevent duplication of data. This can happen if a new measurement file has not been received at the FTP site.
5.1.2 Additional Data Sources

Only FMS Radar data has been processed. However, the abstraction layer enables various sensor types to be integrated into the PMR system. Each sensor should have its own separate process to access its data and to push it into the database. This provides a simple diversification procedure where sensors are combined at the data level. Gaps from in the system can then be more easily filled using the appropriate technology.

Current research [24–26] has developed computer vision algorithms that operate on existing traffic cameras to provide highway measurements. This is complementary information to the FMS but provides the advantage of having better area coverage instead of a single “spot”. By using cameras, lane-level measurements of speed and lane changes can be used to augment the existing traffic measures. In addition, many intersections and corridors are equipped with traffic cameras which can be used for arterial measurements which are currently missing. Mid-block (or highway) cameras can do vehicle counts and speed [26] while intersection cameras can provide turning movement counts (TMC) [24]. Example output from video processing algorithms is presented in Figure 5.2.
5.2 Back-End Database

A back-end MSQL database was designed to provide access to historical traffic measurements from any type of sensor that might be incorporated into the system. (At this stage, the only sensor type incorporated is Radar). The database is built around lanes to enable quick access to lane measurements for individual detectors for a given date range. Archival was performed at this resolution to provide the ability to perform lane level analysis and control in the future.

The database is indexed based on date, a detector id, and the lane number of the road. Each sensor measurement is timestamped upon insertion. The timestamp provides a search index and also prevents duplication of data. As described in Section 5.1.1, an improperly functioning sensor might not provide an updated measurement each collection time period resulting in a copy of the previous value.

The full database schema is provided in Figure 5.3. Separate tables were created for each lane (up to seven maximum) to store traffic information of flow, occupancy, and speed for highway segments. The lane tables are linked geospatially to a specific detector and temporally through timestamps. By creating primary-foreign key pairs on detector name and timestamp, the database has savings in terms of storage space since detector locations with fewer lanes do not need to store values for non-existent lanes. The Detector table is a fixed size equal to the number of sensors in the system while the Dates table increases each time a there is a sensor insertion (this occurs every minute).

In addition, to space savings, the design provides indexing on specific detector id and date range for better performance during retrieval. For a typical query (i.e. for all data from a sensor over a specific time period), only the timestamp and the detector indices are required to parse through the large lane data tables in a single pass.

In order to get a specific date range, the Dates table is queried for all data between given time period as shown in the following SQL query command.

```sql
SELECT date_index FROM dates WHERE date_time BETWEEN '2014-06-02 14:43:00' AND '2014-06-02 14:43:59') AND ( SELECT date_index FROM dates WHERE date_time BETWEEN '2014-06-03 14:43:00' AND '2014-06-03 14:43:59')
```

A specific detector is isolated by finding it’s detector_id within the Detectors table and can be used as a unique index to the lane data tables.

```sql
SELECT detector_index FROM detectors WHERE detector_id = '10.2.268'
```

An example SQL query is provided below to retrieve a full day’s worth of data (all lanes and traffic parameter) from detector id=10.2.268.

```sql
SELECT a.detector_id, c.date_time, b.lane_vehicle_count, b.lane_vehicle_count1, b.lane_vehicle_count2, b.lane_vehicle_count3, b.lane_vehicle_count4, b.lane_vehicle_count5, b.lane_vehicle_count6, b.occupancy, b.lane_vehicle_speed FROM detectors a, lane1 b, dates c WHERE lane1_index_detector = ( SELECT detector_index FROM detectors WHERE detector_id = '10.2.268') AND lane1_index_date BETWEEN ( SELECT date_index FROM dates WHERE date_time Between '2014-06-02 14:43:00' AND '2014-06-02 14:43:59') AND ( SELECT date_index FROM dates WHERE date_time BETWEEN '2014-06-03 14:43:00' AND '2014-06-03 14:43:59') AND a.detector_index=(SELECT detector_index FROM detectors WHERE detector_id = '10.2.268') AND date_index=lane1_index_date
```
Figure 5.3: Back-end database schema designed for efficient access to lane level traffic measurements.
The database can be managed through a web interface at

http://rtis.oit.unlv.edu/phpmyadmin.

The web interface uses the phpMyAdmin tool to provide remote access to the database and basic management functionality as shown in Figure 5.4. Through the interface, it is possible to directly issue SQL commands to access and retrieve data as well as view the contents of the database.

Further improvements for the database are required for continued long-term usage. Currently, new detectors can be added to the system automatically, but the addition of new lanes to an existing sensor requires manual intervention. In addition, new tables should be created to handle intersections, e.g. the turning movement counts in each direction. Proper database maintenance is also required periodically to keep data time ordered for best performance.
5.3 ITS Inventory and End-User Access

In order to use the PRM system, an inventory of ITS devices was needed to populate the database and a visualization interface was required to access the data. While the phpMyAdmin web interface could be utilized, this required more expert knowledge of databases and the sensors. A map-based web portal was built to provide an intuitive wrapper for data access, located at

\[ \text{http://rtis.oit.unlv.edu/cazzi/indexUI.php} \]

A user could see the location of various ITS devices on a map and extract data without having to perform complicated database SQL commands.

5.3.1 Device Inventory

The ITS device inventory from Southern Nevada was integrated into the PMR site. The inventory consisted of all the FMS devices which included Detector Stations, Ramp Meters, CCTV, DMS, RWIS, and HAR locations as well as devices from FAST through the Dashboard. Although the FAST and FMS Detector information reference the same physical devices, the FAST device list was used as the primary Detector source. Due to visualization constraints through the FMS system, the coordinates of a sensor might not actually reflect the true locations. The FAST data was corrected to reflect the true locations. In addition, FAST maintains a more up-to-date list of sensors as they are installed. Table 5.1 provides a summary of the devices included in the PMR system.

5.3.2 Visualization Interface

The PMR homepage provides an overview of all the sensors in the system using Google Maps API (Figure 5.5). By clicking on a particular sensor icon on the map, the device info, such as the device type, identification numbers, location, etc., are provided in a table below the map for reference (Figure 5.6). This basic information is useful for correlation with other systems such as FMS and the FAST Dashboard.

Further information about the Radar detectors are obtained through a separate “Detectors Info” tab. Detectors are logically grouped and organized for direct access to detector
Figure 5.5: Map View of ITS Inventory: Includes all FMS sensor data and FAST detectors.

measurements. The PRM system utilizes FAST’s corridor definitions to match the Dashboard. Sensor data can be downloaded as a comma separated value (CSV) file by selecting the appropriate search parameters:

- Freeway: the highway number and direction
- Corridor: the subsection of the highway between exits
- Detector: the detectors within the road section
- Lanes: the lanes of the highway
- Date and Time: the range of dates and time to consider.

As shown in Fig. 5.7, the system is designed to actively update the map visualization during the selection process. After selecting a Freeway and Corridor, the highway section is highlighted in blue with end points denoted by markers. The map is zoomed to optimize the corridor view. The detectors are placed on the map after selection and all the data can be extracted for the selected lanes over the given date range. All available data is returned in a CSV file at 1 minute resolution. This is the highest resolution available for the Radar data. This resolution is important for fine-grained and detailed analysis of events. The 15 minute timescale provided by the FAST Dashboard does not allow for precise temporal localization of events which is necessary to meet the 10 and 20 minute deadlines imposed by the RTSMIP program.
Figure 5.6: Information about individual sensors is obtained through click of a device icon.

5.4 Performance Measurement Algorithms

The most important block in the PMR system calculates Performance Measures through utilization of the database of historical and real-time measurements. The sensor systems provide the data which can be processed for advanced understanding of Las Vegas’ network performance. Any of the measures listed in Tables A.1 or A.2 can be computed given the appropriate sensors.

As an example, the AADT can be computed by extracting all the flow measurements over a year. By actively mining ITS device data, new measures can be computed and recorded into the database for better analysis. An example of next generation analysis that is possible using this paradigm is early congestion prediction through machine learning which will be outlined in the next Section.
Figure 5.7: Radar detector sensor data can be downloaded from the PMR website using a simple corridor selection mechanism.
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Early Congestion Prediction

Growing congestion in urban transportation networks has resulted in significant economic burdens to our society. It causes waste of time, money, fuel and energy for commuters and consequently has major impacts on daily life. Based on the 2011 Congested Corridors Report presented by TTI [27], traffic congestion had a $121 billion cost for drivers. Being aware of the status of congestion in the future can help decision makers, intelligent systems, and transportation apps improve their accuracy and enable more efficient and less stressful route choice. To achieve these goals accurate traffic status classification techniques are required.

Transportation systems are data rich with systems in place to provide real-time understanding of current traffic conditions. Data mining techniques can be utilized to determine correlations between historical observations and future roadway conditions. In particular, a congestion prediction algorithm is desired that can use historical traffic parameters of vehicle counts, occupancy, and speed on highways to understand when congestion will appear in the future.

The following Chapter highlights an early congestion prediction system that was designed for I-15 Northbound between I-215 and Desert Inn in Las Vegas. This research resulted in a paper submission to the 2015 Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting.

6.1 Previous Studies

One of the advantages of ITS is the ability to reduce the impact of traffic congestion which is a common problem all over the world. ITS utilizes many detectors and sensors to collect vast quantities of data. Data mining techniques can be used to analyze this large amount of traffic flow data to extract previously unknown traffic patterns. Congestion analysis has been an active research topic during the last decade. Researchers have been interested in trying to predict the status of highways, e.g. whether there will be congestion or not.

Yu et al. [28] presented a logistic regression model to measure congestion intensity for different roadways. Hongsakham et al. [29] developed a technique based on an artificial neural network (ANN) to estimate road traffic congestion levels. Their congestion estimation model had a recall of 79.43% and precision ranging from 73.53-85.19%. The studies by Pongpaibool et al. [30] utilized fuzzy logic and neuro-fuzzy techniques to estimate the congestion level using data from traffic cameras with an accuracy of 88% and 75% respectively. Porikli and Li [31] used a hidden Markov modeling approach to estimate congestion status. The accuracy of their developed model is 95%. Tsai et al. [32] developed a traffic congestion classification
framework that classifies congestion into four levels. Automatic roadway detection, bidirectional roadway analysis, and virtual detector setting method are the three stages of their framework. The accuracy of their approach was 93.2%. Zhan-quan et al. [33] used an SVM to identify the real-time congestion status. By using speed, volume, and occupancy as input features, they were able to obtain 94% precision. Wang et al. [34] combined clustering and a decision tree classification technique for real-time congestion status with 99.3% accuracy. However, they only classified the current traffic state and did not give predictions.

A wide variety of congestion classification and prediction schemes have been attempted in literature but there is little comparison between techniques. Without common datasets, the performance from different research cannot not be fairly compared to determine which data mining technique performs best at congestion prediction. Moreover, these works do not study how far into the future congestion can be accurately predicted (prediction horizon).

### 6.2 Methodology

Historical data from the PMR system was utilized along with data mining techniques to predict the congestion status of a highway some minutes into the future. Different data mining techniques were compared to determine the most effective classification scheme for various amounts of historical data and prediction horizons. Evaluation was performed using one minute traffic data from I-15 Northbound from I-215 to Desert Inn in Las Vegas, Nevada.

#### 6.2.1 Data Preparation

The flow, occupancy, and speed data was collected from the Radar sensors on I-15 Northbound between I-215 and Desert Inn. A training dataset was formed from the 1 minute historical measurements and a label for the congestion state (congested or non-congested) of a section of the highway determined by the travel speed rate (TSR) [35]

\[
TSR = \frac{|free\_flow\_speed - average\_speed|}{free\_flow\_speed}. \tag{6.1}
\]

The TSR is the rate of reduction in speed from free flow speed due to congestion. In the TSR index calculation, the posted speed limit (65 mph) was utilized for the \textit{free\_flow\_speed}. The highway is considered congested during a particular minute interval based on the following TSR threshold [32]

\[
congestion = TSR > 0.5. \tag{6.2}
\]

To classify the future traffic status, historical measurement data was paired with a future congestion state in order to find a relationship between observed traffic patterns and a future traffic state. A training example is composed of a label \(y(t)\) and feature vector \(x(t)\) for each time \(t\) in the training data set. The label is given by the TSR as \(y(t) = TSR(t)\). The feature vector is

\[
x_m^f(t) = [s(t - f - m + 1), c(t - f - m + 1), o(t - f - m + 1), \ldots, s(t - f), c(t - f), o(t - f)], \tag{6.3}
\]
where \( s(t - f - m + 1), c(t - f - m + 1), \) and \( o(t - f - m + 1) \) are the speed, count, and the occupancy respectively for a one minute sample \( f + m - 1 \) minutes before time \( t \). The parameter \( m \) specifies how many minutes of historical data is used (up to five minutes) and \( f \) indicates the number of minutes into the future to predict.

Using a training data set of thousands of pairs \( \{y(t), x(t)\} \), a classifier can be learned to output a future congestion state. By using data before the congestion occurs with a true congestion label, patterns can be learned that indicate the relationship between current traffic parameters and upcoming congestion events.

### 6.2.2 Congestion Classifiers

The WEKA data mining tool developed by the University of Waikato [36] was used to train a number of different classifiers since one of the challenges in data mining is to determine which classifier best suits a particular problem. A number of popular classification algorithms were considered for comparison. The classifiers that were used consisted of straight-forward prototype matching, rule-based algorithms, and more sophisticated machine learning techniques to develop non-linear decision rules. The list of classifiers is summarized in Table 6.1 and include

- **K Nearest Neighborhood (KNN) algorithm** [37] – baseline classifier that requires no “training” but instead searches for the majority vote of the \( K \) closest examples in the training dataset.
- **PART algorithm** [38] – a decision rule algorithm that combines a C4.5 decision tree with the RIPPER divisive algorithm to build partial trees for rule generation.
- **J48 algorithm** [39] – greedy algorithm to generate a decision tree in a top-down recursive manner by examining individual input features based on information gain (entropy).
- **Support Vector Machine (SVM)** [40] – a popular machine learning algorithm that his able to generate highly non-linear decision rules for classification between two classes using kernel methods to embed data into higher dimensional space.
6.3 Comparative Results

The different classifier algorithms were compared using historical data collected over the winter season between January and March in 2014. The evaluation trained optimized classifiers for different settings of historical data \( m \) and prediction horizon \( f \). The performance was measured by the recall and precision defined as

\[
\text{recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad \text{precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP},
\]

where \( TP \) are the number of true positives or correctly labeled examples, \( FN \) are the false negatives or missed times of congestion, and \( FP \) are the false negatives or examples that were incorrectly labeled as congested. Ideally, a strong classifier would have high recall (all congested times are recognized) with high precision (few extra times incorrectly labeled as congested).

6.3.1 J48 Classifier

As an illustrative example of classifier performance we detail the J48 algorithm. The other classifiers have similar characteristics. The final classification rule for the J48 algorithm, a decision tree using historical measurement, is presented in Fig. 6.1 after optimization and the classifier performance is presented in Fig. 6.2. The classifier performance degrades as the prediction time becomes larger because there is less correlation between older measurements and current conditions. The rows show the performance based on the amount of historical data. There seems to be a “sweet” spot at around four minutes of historical data which is unexpected. The time horizon does not seem to matter as much, since the degradation in performance is similar for all amounts of historical information, but instead having the correct amount of data to discover the temporal trends. Too little data \( (m < 3) \) and the trend does not seem to be visible, but too much data \( (m > 6) \) and the meaningful trend is polluted by stale data.

6.3.2 Congestion Classifier Comparison

The comparison of the J48, ANN, SVM, PART and KNN using a four minute historical window is presented in Figure 6.3. The J48 algorithm has better performance compared with other algorithms. The J48 is able to classify future traffic status up to 10 minutes into future with good performance while the performance of other classifiers presented here will decrease dramatically after 6 or 7 minutes. After the J48 algorithm, the machine learning techniques SVM and ANN have reasonable performance suggesting that with more data (e.g. greater than three months) could outperform the decision tree. Note that in all cases, congestion prediction benefits from the use of historical data. Prediction accuracy is poor using only the current traffic statistics or greater than 8 or 9 minutes in the past. Clearly, only
considering real-time measurements is not a good indicator of future events. This indicates that temporal characteristics are being leveraged to improve performance. However, this dataset only shows correlation under 8 minutes. Future work could also consider the effects of upstream and downstream sensors for predictability.

### 6.4 Further Research

This research presented is able to classify the future state of traffic congestion. But there are still many issues that can be considered in congestion classification. Some of the research options to improve the predictability are as follows:

- Evaluating the performance of the classifier during different seasons to determine if adaption is necessary.
- Using ensemble classifier to build more sophisticated prediction algorithms.
- Utilizing upstream and downstream sensors to improve corridor prediction rather than just for single segments.
- Extending the model to arterials and streets which have much less data and more complicated relationships.
Figure 6.2: J48 recall and precision performance for various amounts of historical data and prediction horizons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>horizon</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>horizon</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.3: Comparison of various classification techniques for congestion prediction using a four minute historical window.
Chapter 7

Discussion and Recommendations

This project examined data collection and performance measurements for Nevada. Its focus was on the reporting requirements in the areas of construction, incidents, weather, and travel time as required by the RTSMIP. The November 2014 deadline for interstate highways was met this year leaving study of requirements for the Las Vegas metropolitan area for the second 2016 deadline. In order to meet this upcoming deadline, important ROS need to be identified for reporting.

This project identified 17 potential ROS in Las Vegas using a network screening process that accounted for usage (VMT), speed, and ability to serve as an evacuation route. Many were State Routes but unlike in some other states, these SR designations included non-highway roads which make travel time information more difficult to obtain. The report prioritizes locations for new sensor installations to provide complete ROS coverage. New side-fire microwave Radar installations are suggested for CC 215 and Summerlin Pky. which will provide travel time. Along arterial routes, a number of traffic camera locations are recommended which provide visual coverage to satisfy construction, weather, and incident monitoring and could potentially be used for travel times as well (through manual or automated video processing).

It is recommended that NDOT explore options for arterial travel time. One lower cost option is the multi-purpose use of the dense traffic camera network. This would require developing a manual “tracking” protocol along ROS at important times or by the use of automated video processing. In parallel, NDOT could initiate conversations with third party private probe data providers to fill arterial data gaps without the high cost of hardware installation and maintenance since these have been proven to meet the reporting accuracy and availability requirements. This type of data would take advantage of newer social media techniques for prompt response times and provides a scalable solution that could be applied throughout Nevada, not just Las Vegas.

The outputs from this research include:

- Reports on data collection technology, performance measures, and recommendations to meet upcoming real-time data requirements for metropolitan areas.
- Las Vegas ITS inventory with associated coverage maps and data gap identification in GIS format.
- The Performance Measurement Research System with web interface to 1-minute resolution transportation data.
• An early congestion prediction algorithm using historical traffic measurements for highways which also resulted in a submission to TRB.
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List of Abbreviations

AADT  Annual Average Daily Traffic
ANN  Artificial Neural Network
API  Application Program Interface
CCTV  Closed Circuit Television
CFR  Code of Federal Regulations
CMAQ  Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program
CSV  Comma Separated Value
DMS  Dynamic Message Sign
DOT  Department of Transportation
FAST  Freeway and Arterial System of Transportation
FHWA  Federal Highway Administration
FMS  Freeway Management System
FRC  Functional Road Class
GIS  Geographic Information System
HAR  Highway Advisory Radio
IRI  International Roughness Index
ITS  Intelligent Transportation System
LOS  Level of Service
MAP-21  Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
MOE  Measure of Effectiveness
NHS  National Highway System
NDOT  Nevada Department of Transportation
PMR  Performance Measurement Research System
ROC  Road Operations Center
ROS  Routes of Significance
RTC  Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
RTSMIP  Real-Time System Management Information Program
RWIS  Road Weather Information System
SAFETEA-LU  Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SQL  Structured Query Language
TMC  Transportation Management Center
UNLV  University of Nevada, Las Vegas
VMT  Vehicle Miles Traveled
Appendix A

Performance Measures

The following comprehensive list of performance measures, divided into area, were identified through review of literature and state-of-practice.

Table A.1: List of Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description (Widely used in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (V/C Ratio)</td>
<td>The volume divided by capacity. The volume is often estimated as the 30th yearly highest volume available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td>A grade interval expressing how well a roadway segment is serving its traffic. It is graded from A to F, which A means free flow and F means very congested. LOS is based on a (V/C Ratio) and has long been used as the primary measure of congestion for planning purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hours of Truck Delay (AHTD)</td>
<td>Travel time above the congestion threshold in units of vehicle-hours for Trucks on the Interstate Highway System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Index</td>
<td>Ratio of average peak travel time to an off-peak (free-flow) standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Delay</td>
<td>The amount of extra time which is needed for traveling due to congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Congested Travel</td>
<td>The congested vehicle-miles of travel divided by total vehicle-miles of travel. This measure is actually a relative measure of the amount of travel affected by congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of urban population within X miles of transit. The number of people accessing the system are considered to be indicators of transportation accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Opportunity</td>
<td>Percentage of employment sites within X miles of major highways. This approach counts the number of potential opportunities that can be reached within a predetermined travel time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page . . .
Table A.1: List of Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gravity or Opportunities Approach</td>
<td>This approach counts the mass of opportunities available to travelers considering transportation cost. The cost of moving from origin to destination affects the attractiveness of an opportunity. The further an opportunity is from the origin, in terms of time or distance or generalized cost, the lower its accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place rank</td>
<td>This measure ranks each location based on the number of people commuting to the location to reach an opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Travel Time Window       | The standard deviation of travel time or travel rate can be combined with the average for any of several measures to create a variation or reliability measure.  
                           | \[ TTW = \text{Avg}(\text{Travel Time}) \pm \text{STD}(\text{Travel Time}). \] |
| Reliability Index (RI80) | The Reliability Index is defined as the ratio of the 80th percentile travel time to the agency-determined threshold travel time. |
| Percent variation        | The average and standard deviation values can also be combined in a ratio to produce a value that the 1998 California Transportation Plan calls percent variation.  
                           | \[ PV = \frac{\text{STD}(\text{Travel Time})}{\text{Avg}(\text{Travel Time})} \times 100. \] |
| Misery Index             | This measure focuses on the length of delay of only the worst trips. The average travel rate is subtracted from the upper 10%, 15% or 20% of travel rates to get the amount of time beyond the average for some amount of the slowest trips.  
                           | \[ MI = (\text{Avg}(\text{longest 20\%}) - \text{Avg}(\text{trip}))/\text{Avg}(\text{trip}). \] |
| Variability Index        | The index is a ratio of peak to off-peak variation in travel conditions. The index is calculated as a ratio of the difference in the upper and lower 95% confidence intervals between the peak period and the off-peak period.  
                           | This measure the amount of extra time needed to be on time for 95% of the trips.  
                           | \[ BT = 95\% \text{ travel time for a trip - } \text{Avg}(\text{Travel Time}). \] |
| Buffer Time Index        | Using the Buffer Time concept and the travel rate simultaneously (in minutes per mile), rather than average travel time, can address the concerns about identifying an average trip.  
                           | \[ BTI = \text{Avg}(\text{VMT weighted section}) \times \text{Buffer time} \times 100. \] |

Continued on next page . . .
Table A.1: List of Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description (Widely used in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Time Index</td>
<td>The upper end of the Buffer Time Index can also be concerned as an useful measure in some situations. The 95th percentile Travel Time Index or the travel rate (expressed in minutes per mile) is a good measure to estimate of travel time budget and is calculated as part of the Buffer Time Index process. Planning time index is relatively easy to communicate and is a good estimate of trip planning measure for trips that require on-time arrivals. The Florida reliability method uses a percentage of the average travel time in the peak to estimate the limit of the acceptable additional travel time range. The sum of the additional travel time and the average time defines the expected time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Reliability Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Arrival</td>
<td><em>FRM</em> =100% - (% of trip with travel time greater than expected) = 100% - (% of trip with travel rate greater than average for plus small (5, 10, 15, 20)% of average. A concept similar to the Florida method uses an acceptable lateness threshold of some percentage to indicate the percentage of trip travel times that can be termed reliable. This measure is used in a variety of travel modes and services and might be particularly useful in cross-modal comparisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTA</td>
<td><em>OTA</em> =100% - (% of travel time greater than 110% expected) = 100% - (% of daily peak period travel rate average greater than 110% of average peak period travel rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Traffic Fatalities</td>
<td>Number of fatalities per 100 million vehicle-mile of travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of accidents per 100 million vehicle-miles of travel Average number of fatalities per 100,000 passenger miles by considering AVO (Average Vehicle Occupancy). The moving average of the number of traffic fatalities within 3 or 5 years of intervals Number of serious injuries in traffic crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities/VMT</td>
<td>Number of fatalities over VMT including rural, urban, and total fatalities. (VMT is the sum of distances traveled by all vehicles in certain areas for a specified period of time and is typically presented as the vehicle miles traveled per person each day or year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, all seat positions. Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcyclist operator with a blood alcohol concentration of .08 g/dL or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of speeding-related fatalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description (Widely used in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of motorcyclist fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of un-helmeted motorcyclist fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of drivers 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of pedestrian fatalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of seat belt citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of impaired-driving arrests made during grant-funded enforcement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environment**

| Criteria Pollutant Emissions | Tons (in millions) of mobile source emissions from on-road vehicles. |
|------------------------------| Daily kilograms of on-road, mobile source criteria air pollutants (VOC, NOx, PM, CO). |
|                              | Amount of carbon equivalent emissions or greenhouse gas emissions from transportation sources. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Emission per Vehicle Miles</th>
<th>Total amount of pollutions emitted per vehicle miles in a year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of gallons spilled per ton-miles (waterborne and pipeline transportation systems).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people or percentage of being affected by or exposed to a significant (dangerous) decibel of noise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Highway Freight per Ton-Mile</th>
<th>This measure is related to freight, and is affected by highway conditions. It is also affected by factors unrelated to the highway system, such as truck technology, drivers’ wages, and fuel costs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel Consumption per Ton-Mile</strong></td>
<td>It reflects the costs associated with transport that is related to highway condition. It presents the same things as costs per ton-mile presents, but would not be affected by the prices of labor and fuel. Therefore, it is a better measure of the performance of highway-system performance in freight carriage because it reflects more costs related to highway conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public and Private Cost of Travel</td>
<td>One weakness associated with cost measures is that they do not typicall account for the quality of service. This measure not only concentrates on shipping cost of goods but also costs associated with damages to goods, constructing roads, expanding and maintaining high ways. Thus this measure considers all the resource cost associated with travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Costs</td>
<td>This measure considers the costs of constructing roads and expanding and maintaining high ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure Condition**

| The number of bridges per 100 miles and the number of deficient bridges per 100 Miles. |

Continued on next page . . .
### Table A.1: List of Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description (Widely used in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane-miles of high-level highway requiring rehabilitation. This measure can be a direct reflection of infrastructure condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of state trunk lines which has a surface condition classified as good. Percentage of .1 mile segments of non- Interstate NHS pavement mileage in good, fair and poor condition based on the following criteria: good if International Roughness Index (IRI) &lt; 95, fair if IRI is between 95 and 170, and poor if IRI is greater than 170.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of National Highway System bridges in good, fair and poor condition, weighted by deck area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of direct and indirect jobs created.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of growth in GDP associated with transportation activities. Revenue per ton-mile. The value of the freight that is moved from, to, and within the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles per capita.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips per capita.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue hours per Employee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips per employee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The measure or degree of agreement between a data value or set of values and a source assumed to be correct. The degree to which data values are present in the attributes. The degree to which data values satisfy acceptance requirements of the validation criteria or fall within the respective domain of acceptable values. The degree to which data values or a set of values are provided at the time required or specified. The degree to which data values in a sample accurately represent the whole of that which is to be measured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relative ease with which data can be retrieved and manipulated by data consumers to meet their needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.2: Congestion Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description (Widely used in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This index focuses on the physical capacity of the roadway in term of vehicles. This index measure the congestion by concentrating on daily vehicle miles traveled on roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Rate Index</td>
<td>This index calculates the amount of additional time that is needed to make a trip because of congested conditions on the roadway. It examines how fast a trip can occur during the peak period by focusing on time rather than speed. It uses freeway and arterial road travel rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Index</td>
<td>This index compares peak period travel and free flow travel while considering for both recurring and incident conditions. This index specify how long it to travel peak hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Delay</td>
<td>Travel delay is the extra amount of time spent traveling due to congested conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hours of Delay (AHD)</td>
<td>Travel time above a congestion threshold (defined by State DOTs and MPOs) in units of vehicle-hours of delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Index</td>
<td>The buffer index computes the extra percentage of travel time a traveler should consider when making a trip in order to be on time 95 percent of the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misery Index</td>
<td>The misery index shows the worst 20 percent of trips that happen in congested conditions. This index examines the negative aspect of trip reliability by taking into account only the travel rate of trips that exceed the average travel rate. This index measures how bad the congestion is on the days which the congestion is the worst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Rate</td>
<td>Travel rate, expressed in minutes per mile, represent how quickly a vehicle travels over a certain segment of roadway. It can be used for specific segments of roadway or averaged for an entire roadway. An estimate of travel rate is usually compared to a target value to show unacceptable levels of congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Rate</td>
<td>The delay rate is the rate of time loss for vehicles operating in congested conditions on a roadway segment or during a trip. This measure can evaluate system performance and compare actual and expected performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>This index is the sum of time lost on a segment of roadway associated with vehicles. This measure can show how improvements affect a transportation system, such as the effects on the entire transportation system of major improvements on one particular corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Delay Rate</td>
<td>The relative delay rate is used to compare mobility levels on roadways or between different modes of transportation. This measure compares system operations to a standard or target. It can also be utilized to compare different parts of the transportation system and reflect differences in operation between transit and roadway modes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.2: Congestion Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description (Widely used in bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay Ratio</td>
<td>The delay ratio can be used to compare mobility levels on roadways or between different modes of transportation. This measure identifies the importance of the mobility problem in relation to actual conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Travel</td>
<td>This measure takes into account the amount and extent of congestion on roadways. Congested travel is a measure of the amount of travel that occurs during congestion in terms of vehicle-miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested Roadway</td>
<td>This measure takes into account the amount and extent of congestion that happens on roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Reduction Index</td>
<td>This measure represents the ratio of the decline in speeds from free flow conditions. It provides a way to compare the amount of congestion on different transportation facilities by using a continuous scale to differentiate between different levels of congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Severity Index</td>
<td>Measure of freeway delay per million miles of travel. This measure evaluates congestion considering freeway and arterial road delay and vehicle miles traveled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane-mile Duration Index</td>
<td>This index takes into account recurring freeway congestion. This index measures congestion by summing the product of congested lane miles and congestion duration for segments of roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>LOS differs by facility type and is presented by specifications such as vehicle density and volume to capacity ratio. Congested conditions often fall into a LOS F range, where demand exceeds capacity of the roadway. Volume to capacity ratios is compared to LOS to reach conclusions about congested conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queues</td>
<td>Queues, or traffic back-ups, represent the publics view of congestion. Queues are measured using aerial photography Queues can be measured using aerial photography that often specify performance measures such as LOS and queued volume.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Sensor Installation Priority Tables

The following tables provide the full list of recommended camera installations for ROS coverage. The Las Vegas Valley was screened as four separate areas {North, East, South, West}. These locations were identified through network screening using various indicators of important roadways, e.g. VMT, Speed, daily flow, and FRC (Major Arterial). The rows are colored based on priority {high, medium, low} = {red, blue, green}.

Table B.1: 22 Recommended Sensors - North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>VMT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 N Decatur</td>
<td>Vegas Dr</td>
<td>−115·206131</td>
<td>36·188266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 N Decatur</td>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>−115·20772</td>
<td>36·217318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Simmon</td>
<td>Lake Mead</td>
<td>−115·178869</td>
<td>36·19739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 N 5th St</td>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>−115·134254</td>
<td>36·217764</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lamb</td>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>−115·08027</td>
<td>36·217466</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lamb</td>
<td>Carey Ave</td>
<td>−115·079824</td>
<td>36·202892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 N Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>Carey Ave</td>
<td>−115·062424</td>
<td>36·203784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N Decatur</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>−115·207423</td>
<td>36·23204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 N Decatur</td>
<td>Lone Mountain</td>
<td>−115·207423</td>
<td>36·247061</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 N MLK</td>
<td>Gowan</td>
<td>−115·161618</td>
<td>36·224902</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 N Decatur</td>
<td>Smoke Ranch Rd</td>
<td>−115·205782</td>
<td>36·202699</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 N Decatur</td>
<td>W Lake Mead</td>
<td>−115·205925</td>
<td>36·195489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 N Decatur</td>
<td>W Washington Ave</td>
<td>−115·206068</td>
<td>36·18095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 N Jones Blvd</td>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>−115·225805</td>
<td>36·216817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 N Jones Blvd</td>
<td>Vegas Dr</td>
<td>−115·224021</td>
<td>36·18862</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 N Rancho Dr</td>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>−115·211885</td>
<td>36·217174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 N Rancho Dr</td>
<td>Smoke Ranch Rd</td>
<td>−115·198917</td>
<td>36·202897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 N MLK</td>
<td>Carey Ave</td>
<td>−115·16037</td>
<td>36·203254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Simmon</td>
<td>Carey Ave</td>
<td>−115·16037</td>
<td>36·203037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 N Rancho Dr</td>
<td>Vegas Dr</td>
<td>−115·18583</td>
<td>36·188501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 N Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Lake Mead Blvd</td>
<td>−115·062205</td>
<td>36·196163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Rampart</td>
<td>Vegas Dr</td>
<td>−115·28761</td>
<td>36·188658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-S Street</td>
<td>E-W Street</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Priority Speed</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mountain Vista</td>
<td>E Sunset Rd</td>
<td>−115-071303</td>
<td>36-071334</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pecos, McLead</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115-109753</td>
<td>36-129897</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pecos, McLead</td>
<td>E Flamingo</td>
<td>−115-100901</td>
<td>36-115239</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 S Pecos</td>
<td>Tropicana</td>
<td>−115-100996</td>
<td>36-100011</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 S Pecos</td>
<td>E Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115-100996</td>
<td>36-0864</td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 S Pecos</td>
<td>E Sunset Rd</td>
<td>−115-100711</td>
<td>36-071648</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 S Pecos</td>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>−115-100425</td>
<td>36-056895</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 S Eastern</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115-118289</td>
<td>36-12979</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Green valley</td>
<td>E Windmill</td>
<td>−115-0823</td>
<td>36-043534</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mountain Vista</td>
<td>E Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115-073377</td>
<td>36-08577</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
<td>−115-062372</td>
<td>36-159087</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Sahara</td>
<td>−115-065346</td>
<td>36-144661</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115-065643</td>
<td>36-12979</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Nellis Blvd</td>
<td>E Tropicana</td>
<td>−115-063859</td>
<td>36-100344</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Spencer St</td>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>−115-127554</td>
<td>36-057629</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Pecos</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115-100996</td>
<td>36-129802</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 McLeod Dr</td>
<td>E Flamingo</td>
<td>−115-109848</td>
<td>36-115144</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Pecos, McLead</td>
<td>E Harmon</td>
<td>−115-100806</td>
<td>36-10772</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 S Pecos</td>
<td>Hacienda</td>
<td>−115-101091</td>
<td>36-093348</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 S Pecos</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>−115-100901</td>
<td>36-078976</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sandhill</td>
<td>E Tropicana</td>
<td>−115-091818</td>
<td>36-100344</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sandhill</td>
<td>E Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115-091074</td>
<td>36-085918</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Sandhill</td>
<td>E Sunset</td>
<td>−115-092264</td>
<td>36-07179</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 S Maryland Pky</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115-13689</td>
<td>36-129939</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Valle Verde</td>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>−115-068766</td>
<td>36-056621</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Stephanie</td>
<td>American Pacific Dr</td>
<td>−115-046756</td>
<td>36-041601</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 S Lamb Blvd</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
<td>−115-07992</td>
<td>36-158789</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 S Lamb Blvd</td>
<td>E Sahara</td>
<td>−115-083043</td>
<td>36-144215</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 S Maryland Pky</td>
<td>E Charleston</td>
<td>−115-137033</td>
<td>36-158921</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 S Maryland Pky</td>
<td>E Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115-136747</td>
<td>36-089108</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Pacific Ave</td>
<td>Vanwagenen</td>
<td>−114-987769</td>
<td>36-028657</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Green Valley</td>
<td>Vanwagenen</td>
<td>−114-970816</td>
<td>36-022114</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Green Valley</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>−114-976705</td>
<td>36-012715</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 College Dr</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>−114-963261</td>
<td>36-01265</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 S Racetrack Rd</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>−114-949757</td>
<td>36-02723</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 S Racetrack Rd</td>
<td>Burkholder</td>
<td>−114-949757</td>
<td>36-034487</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 S Racetrack Rd</td>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>−114-949817</td>
<td>36-049002</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 S Racetrack Rd</td>
<td>Athens Ave</td>
<td>−114-949698</td>
<td>36-071071</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 S Magic Way</td>
<td>Eqestrian Dr</td>
<td>−114-940775</td>
<td>36-012596</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 S Magic Way</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>−114-940775</td>
<td>36-02723</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page ...
Table B.2: 54 Recommended Sensors - East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>VMT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Apaloosa</td>
<td>Eqestrian Dr</td>
<td>−114.931792</td>
<td>36.012537</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Apaloosa</td>
<td>Wagon Wheel</td>
<td>−114.931495</td>
<td>35.998081</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Foothills</td>
<td>Eqestrian Dr</td>
<td>−114.923167</td>
<td>36.012596</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Foothills</td>
<td>Wagon Wheel</td>
<td>−114.923167</td>
<td>35.99826</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Sunset Rd</td>
<td>−115.157793</td>
<td>36.071332</td>
<td>3   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Sunset Rd</td>
<td>−115.134621</td>
<td>36.071762</td>
<td>3   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>S Maryland</td>
<td>−115.136925</td>
<td>36.153177</td>
<td>3   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115.14097</td>
<td>36.088991</td>
<td>3   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Swenson St</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.146009</td>
<td>36.129834</td>
<td>2   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Cambridge St</td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.141406</td>
<td>36.129775</td>
<td>2   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.128312</td>
<td>36.130087</td>
<td>3   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.107468</td>
<td>36.100011</td>
<td>3   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td>Heater Dr</td>
<td>−114.976645</td>
<td>36.005279</td>
<td>2   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>College Dr</td>
<td>Heater Dr</td>
<td>−114.963201</td>
<td>36.00522</td>
<td>2   3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.3: 61 Recommended Sensors - West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>VMT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Town Center</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.324933</td>
<td>36.129757</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Fort Apach Rd</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.297033</td>
<td>36.129899</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Durango Dr</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.278593</td>
<td>36.129304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Durango Dr</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115.279039</td>
<td>36.114878</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Durango Dr</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.279375</td>
<td>36.100071</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.261004</td>
<td>36.129197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115.260976</td>
<td>36.114686</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>W Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115.260933</td>
<td>36.08489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.243071</td>
<td>36.099836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.224949</td>
<td>36.129138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115.224864</td>
<td>36.1145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Decatur Blvd</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.208088</td>
<td>36.130048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Decatur Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.208016</td>
<td>36.100923</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Valley View Blvd</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
<td>−115.19257</td>
<td>36.15908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Valley View Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.189774</td>
<td>36.100843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Valley View Blvd</td>
<td>W Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115.190012</td>
<td>36.086269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>Alta Dr</td>
<td>−115.259897</td>
<td>36.166626</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>W Twain Ave</td>
<td>−115.262978</td>
<td>36.121976</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Edna Ave</td>
<td>−115.242904</td>
<td>36.134957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Hacienda</td>
<td>−115.243005</td>
<td>36.092376</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>−115.242619</td>
<td>36.077862</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Torrey Pines Dr</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.234098</td>
<td>36.129287</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Torrey Pines Dr</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115.233884</td>
<td>36.114478</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Torrey Pines Dr</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.234098</td>
<td>36.09988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Twain Ave</td>
<td>−115.224921</td>
<td>36.121781</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Harmon Ave</td>
<td>−115.22494</td>
<td>36.107162</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.225035</td>
<td>36.09989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Hacienda</td>
<td>−115.225073</td>
<td>36.092676</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
<td>−115.216703</td>
<td>36.144365</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.216494</td>
<td>36.129593</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115.216456</td>
<td>36.114993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115.216494</td>
<td>36.100373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115.216627</td>
<td>36.085887</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Decatur Blvd</td>
<td>W Twain Ave</td>
<td>−115.208183</td>
<td>36.122553</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Decatur Blvd</td>
<td>W Harmon Ave</td>
<td>−115.20804</td>
<td>36.108157</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Decatur Blvd</td>
<td>W Hacienda</td>
<td>−115.207945</td>
<td>36.093666</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arville st</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.199114</td>
<td>36.129991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arville st</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115.199292</td>
<td>36.115298</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arville st</td>
<td>W Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115.199233</td>
<td>36.086388</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S El Capitan</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115.288023</td>
<td>36.129579</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>VMT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Cimarron Rd</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115·269748</td>
<td>36·129364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Cimarron Rd</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115·269963</td>
<td>36·114659</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaya</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115·252113</td>
<td>36·099739</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaya</td>
<td>W Flamingo</td>
<td>−115·251716</td>
<td>36·114697</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenaya</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115·251866</td>
<td>36·129019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Town Center</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
<td>−115·326348</td>
<td>36·144181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Hualapai</td>
<td>W Desert Inn</td>
<td>−115·314739</td>
<td>36·129858</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Durango</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115·279232</td>
<td>36·100064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115·261043</td>
<td>36·099788</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>W Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115·225265</td>
<td>36·085449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>W Sahara</td>
<td>−115·287664</td>
<td>36·144324</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>Edna Ave</td>
<td>−115·261023</td>
<td>36·136488</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Torrey Pines Dr</td>
<td>W Russel Rd</td>
<td>−115·234092</td>
<td>36·085223</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Jones Blvd</td>
<td>Edna Ave</td>
<td>−115·225182</td>
<td>36·136757</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arville st</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115·199173</td>
<td>36·100902</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Dr</td>
<td>W Charleston</td>
<td>−115·303067</td>
<td>36·158988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Fort Apach Rd</td>
<td>Mariner Cove Dr</td>
<td>−115·297382</td>
<td>36·137566</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Rainbow Blvd</td>
<td>W Tropicana</td>
<td>−115·267907</td>
<td>36·099769</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Dr</td>
<td>−115·244253</td>
<td>36·166483</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindel Rd</td>
<td>W Sunset Rd</td>
<td>−115·215997</td>
<td>36·071388</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Buffalo Dr</td>
<td>W Oakey Blvd</td>
<td>−115·26155</td>
<td>36·15131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.4: 7 Recommended Sensors - South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>N-S Street</th>
<th>E-W Street</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>VMT</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S Buffalo</td>
<td>Blue Diamond</td>
<td>−115.26128</td>
<td>36.02034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S Durango</td>
<td>Blue Diamond</td>
<td>−115.279364</td>
<td>36.020111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S Decatur</td>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>−115.208218</td>
<td>36.057469</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S Durango</td>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>−115.279126</td>
<td>36.055327</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>St Rose</td>
<td>−115.126207</td>
<td>35.998909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S Las Vegas</td>
<td>Cactus Ave</td>
<td>−115.172526</td>
<td>35.999172</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S Bermuda Rd</td>
<td>St Rose</td>
<td>−115.154895</td>
<td>35.978062</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

PRM SQL Database Creation Script

The following SQL code generates the database tables. Care should be taken when using the script because the code was designed during the creation and testing phase. The script will drop all existing databases during creating therefore cannot be used to modify an existing database without modification or data will be lost. Each row in a lane table as a unique index as well as two foreign indices to point to the detector id and the timestamp for efficient search and retrieval.

```
1 SET @OLD_UNIQUE_CHECKS=@@UNIQUE_CHECKS, UNIQUE_CHECKS=0;
2 SET @OLD_FOREIGN_KEY_CHECKS=@@FOREIGN_KEY_CHECKS, FOREIGN_KEY_CHECKS=0;
3 SET @OLD_SQL_MODE=@@SQL_MODE, SQL_MODE='TRADITIONAL,ALLOW_INVALID_DATES';

−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−
5 
−− Table ‘fast实时3’.’detectors’

7 DROP TABLE IF EXISTS ‘fast实时3’.’detectors’ ;
8 CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS ‘fast实时3’.’detectors’ ( 
9     ‘detector_index’ INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
10     ‘detector_id’ VARCHAR(45) NULL,
11     PRIMARY KEY (‘detector_index’),
12     UNIQUE INDEX ‘detector_id_UNIQUE’ (‘detector_id’ ASC),
13     UNIQUE INDEX ‘detector_index_UNIQUE’ (‘detector_index’ ASC))
14 ENGINE = InnoDB;

−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−
15 
−− Table ‘fast实时3’.’dates’

17 DROP TABLE IF EXISTS ‘fast实时3’.’dates’ ;
18 CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS ‘fast实时3’.’dates’ ( 
19     ‘date_index’ INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
20     ‘date_time’ DATETIME NULL,
21     PRIMARY KEY (‘date_index’),
22     UNIQUE INDEX ‘date_time_UNIQUE’ (‘date_time’ ASC),
23     UNIQUE INDEX ‘date_index_UNIQUE’ (‘date_index’ ASC))
24 ENGINE = InnoDB;

−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−
26 
−− Table ‘fast实时3’.’lane1’

28 DROP TABLE IF EXISTS ‘fast实时3’.’lane1’ ;
29 CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS ‘fast实时3’.’lane1’ ( 

'index' INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
'lanel_index_detector' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count1' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count2' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count3' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count4' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count5' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count6' INT NULL,
'occupancy' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_speed' INT NULL,
PRIMARY KEY ('index', 'lanel_index_detector', 'lanel_index_date'),
UNIQUE INDEX 'index_UNIQUE' ('index' ASC),
INDEX 'fk_lanel_detector_idx' ('lanel_index_detector' ASC),
INDEX 'fk_lanel_date_idx' ('lanel_index_date' ASC),
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lanel_detector'
FOREIGN KEY ('lanel_index_detector')
REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'detectors' ('detector_index')
ON DELETE CASCADE
ON UPDATE CASCADE,
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lanel_date'
FOREIGN KEY ('lanel_index_date')
REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'dates' ('date_index')
ON DELETE CASCADE
ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;

-- Table 'fast_realtime3'.'lanel'

DROP TABLE IF EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'.'lanel';
CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'.'lanel' ( 
'index' INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
'lanel_index_detector' INT NOT NULL COMMENT '','
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lanel_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'occupancy' INT NULL,
'lanel_vehicle_speed' INT NULL,
PRIMARY KEY ('index', 'lanel_index_detector', 'lanel_index_date'),
UNIQUE INDEX 'index_UNIQUE' ('index' ASC),
INDEX 'fk_lanel_date_idx' ('lanel_index_date' ASC),
INDEX 'fk_lanel_detector_idx' ('lanel_index_detector' ASC),
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lanel_detector'
FOREIGN KEY ('lanel_index_detector')
REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'detectors' ('detector_index')
ON DELETE CASCADE
ON UPDATE CASCADE,
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lanel_date'
FOREIGN KEY ('lanel_index_date')
FOREIGN KEY ('lanel_index_date')
REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'. 'dates' ( 'date_index' )
ON DELETE CASCADE
ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;

-- Table 'fast_realtime3'. 'lane3'
DROP TABLE IF EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'. 'lane3';
CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'. 'lane3' ( 'index' INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
'lane3_index_detector' INT NOT NULL,
'lane3_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count1' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count2' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count3' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count4' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count5' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count6' INT NULL,
'occupancy' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_speed' INT NULL,
PRIMARY KEY ( 'index', 'lane3_index_detector', 'lane3_index_date' ),
UNIQUE INDEX 'index_UNIQUE' ( 'index' ASC ),
INDEX 'fk_lane3_detector_idx' ( 'lane3_index_detector' ASC ),
INDEX 'fk_lane3_date_idx' ( 'lane3_index_date' ASC ),
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lane3_detector'
FOREIGN KEY ( 'lane3_index_detector' )
REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'. 'detectors' ( 'detector_index' )
ON DELETE CASCADE
ON UPDATE CASCADE,
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lane3_date'
FOREIGN KEY ( 'lane3_index_date' )
REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'. 'dates' ( 'date_index' )
ON DELETE CASCADE
ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;

-- Table 'fast_realtime3'. 'lane4'
DROP TABLE IF EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'. 'lane4';
CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'. 'lane4' ( 'index' INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
'lane4_index_detector' INT NOT NULL,
'lane4_index_date' INT NOT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count1' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count2' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count3' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count4' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count5' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_count6' INT NULL,
'occupancy' INT NULL,
'lane_vehicle_speed' INT NULL,
PRIMARY KEY ( 'index', 'lane4_index_detector', 'lane4_index_date' ),
UNIQUE INDEX 'index_UNIQUE' ( 'index' ASC ),

INDEX 'fk_lane4_detector_idx' ('lane4_index_detector' ASC),
INDEX 'fk_lane4_date_idx' ('lane4_index_date' ASC),
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lane4_detector'
    FOREIGN KEY ('lane4_index_detector')
    REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'detectors' ('detector_index')
    ON DELETE CASCADE
    ON UPDATE CASCADE,
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lane4_date'
    FOREIGN KEY ('lane4_index_date')
    REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'dates' ('date_index')
    ON DELETE CASCADE
    ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;

-- Table 'fast_realtime3'.'lane5'

DROP TABLE IF EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'.'lane5';
CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'.'lane5' (  
    'index' INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,  
    'lane5_index_detector' INT NOT NULL,  
    'lane5_index_date' INT NOT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count1' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count2' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count3' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count4' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count5' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_count6' INT NULL,  
    'occupancy' INT NULL,  
    'lane5_vehicle_speed' INT NULL,  
    PRIMARY KEY ('index', 'lane5_index_detector', 'lane5_index_date'),  
INDEX 'fk_lane5_detector_idx' ('lane5_index_detector' ASC),  
INDEX 'fk_lane5_date_idx' ('lane5_index_date' ASC),  
UNIQUE INDEX 'index_UNIQUE' ('index' ASC),  
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lane5_detector'
    FOREIGN KEY ('lane5_index_detector')
    REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'detectors' ('detector_index')
    ON DELETE CASCADE
    ON UPDATE CASCADE,
CONSTRAINT 'fk_lane5_date'
    FOREIGN KEY ('lane5_index_date')
    REFERENCES 'fast_realtime3'.'dates' ('date_index')
    ON DELETE CASCADE
    ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;

-- Table 'fast_realtime3'.'lane6'

DROP TABLE IF EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'.'lane6';
CREATE TABLE IF NOT EXISTS 'fast_realtime3'.'lane6' (  
    'index' INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,  
    'lane6_index_detector' INT NOT NULL,  
    'lane6_index_date' INT NOT NULL,  
    'lane6_vehicle_count' INT NULL,  
    'lane6_vehicle_count1' INT NULL,
```sql
CREATE TABLE `fast_realtime3`.`lane6` (
    `index` INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
    `lane6_index_detector` INT NOT NULL,
    `lane6_index_date` INT NOT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count1` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count2` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count3` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count4` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count5` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count6` INT NULL,
    `occupancy` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_speed` INT NULL,
    PRIMARY KEY (`index`, `lane6_index_detector`, `lane6_index_date`),
    UNIQUE INDEX `index_UNIQUE` (`index` ASC),
    INDEX `fk_lane6_date_idx` (`lane6_index_date` ASC),
    CONSTRAINT `fk_lane6_detector` FOREIGN KEY (`lane6_index_detector`) REFERENCES `fast_realtime3`.`detectors` (`detector_index`) ON DELETE CASCADE ON UPDATE CASCADE,
    CONSTRAINT `fk_lane6_date` FOREIGN KEY (`lane6_index_date`) REFERENCES `fast_realtime3`.`dates` (`date_index`) ON DELETE CASCADE ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;

CREATE TABLE `fast_realtime3`.`lane7` (
    `index` INT NOT NULL AUTO_INCREMENT,
    `lane7_index_detector` INT NOT NULL,
    `lane7_index_date` INT NOT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count1` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count2` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count3` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count4` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count5` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_count6` INT NULL,
    `occupancy` INT NULL,
    `lane_vehicle_speed` INT NULL,
    PRIMARY KEY (`index`, `lane7_index_detector`, `lane7_index_date`),
    UNIQUE INDEX `index_UNIQUE` (`index` ASC),
    INDEX `fk_lane7_date_idx` (`lane7_index_date` ASC),
    INDEX `fk_lane7_detector_idx` (`lane7_index_detector` ASC),
    CONSTRAINT `fk_lane7_detector` FOREIGN KEY (`lane7_index_detector`) REFERENCES `fast_realtime3`.`detectors` (`detector_index`) ON DELETE CASCADE ON UPDATE CASCADE,
    CONSTRAINT `fk_lane7_date` FOREIGN KEY (`lane7_index_date`) REFERENCES `fast_realtime3`.`dates` (`date_index`) ON DELETE CASCADE ON UPDATE CASCADE)
ENGINE = InnoDB;
```

SET SQL_MODE=@OLD_SQL_MODE;
SET FOREIGN_KEY_CHECKS=@OLD_FOREIGN_KEY_CHECKS;
SET UNIQUE_CHECKS=@OLD_UNIQUE_CHECKS;
Appendix D

FMS Data Download and PMR Storage Script

A Python script was written to obtain sensor data from the field. The script is automatically run each minute through a cron job on a Linux server. The script connects with the FAST FTP server to obtain the FMS XML output metadata.xml and realtime.xml. The realtime data is parsed based off of XML tags and organized for insertion into the PMR database.

Code for the script is provided below:

```python
# mysql connector lib and dictionary
import mysql.connector
from collections import OrderedDict

# library for the exraction from the ftp server
import ftplib
import urllib

# timer lib
import time
import math

# library to convert xml file to other format
from xmlutils.xml2json import xml2json
from xmlutils.xml2sql import xml2sql

import os
import re

def realtime_data_collector():
    ## Obtaining Realtime file from FTP server ##

    # creating a new directory and change directory
    if not os.path.exists("realtime_files"):
        os.makedirs("realtime_files")

    a=os.getcwd()
    print(a)
    os.chdir(a+"/realtime_files")
    b=os.getcwd()
    print(b)
```
decision=True
ret_realtime=[]
ret_metadata=[]
rFile='realtime.xml'

# connect to TRC server
print("connecting to TRC server...")
ftp=ftplib.FTP(’www.nvfast.org’, ’anonymous’, ’anonymous@sunet.se’)
ftp.cwd(’/FMSXML/”)

while (decision):
files=ftp.dir()

ftp.sendcmd("TYPE i")
rSize = ftp.size(rFile)
ftp.dir(’realtime.xml’, ret_realtime.append)

str_realtime=’’.join(ret_realtime)
realtime_words=str_realtime.split()

#parse file for data collection info
fileSizeRT=realtime_words[4]
monthRT=realtime_words[5]
dayRT=realtime_words[6]
timeRT=realtime_words[7]
hourRT=timeRT[0:2]
minuteRT=timeRT[3:5]

#timestamp file
fileName_realtime= monthRT+dayRT+’_’+hourRT+minuteRT+’_r.xml’
fileName_realtime2=monthRT+’_’+dayRT+’_’+hourRT+’_’+minuteRT

copyRealTime=open(fileName_realtime, ’wb’)
ftp.retrbinary( ’RETR realtime.xml’ , copyRealTime.write)
copiedSize=copyRealTime.tell()

if copiedSize==rSize:
print("Transfer completed", rSize, copiedSize)
decision=False
else:
print("Bad Transfer", rSize, copiedSize)
os.remove(fileName_realtime)
del ret_realtime [:]

ftp.close()

realtimedatabaseSQL=fileName_realtime2+”_r.sql”
timeSQL=fileName_realtime2+”_r_stamp.sql”

#convert xml to sql-like format for easier parsing
converter_data = xml2sql(fileName_realtime, realtimedatabaseSQL, encoding=’utf-8’)
ignore1=[”lane-data”, ”lane-data-item”, ”detector-lane-number”, ”detector-
status", "lane−status"]
num=converter_data.convert(tag="detector−report", table="Realime_Data", ignore=ignore1)

converter_time_stamp=xml2sql(fileName_realtime, timeSQL, encoding="utf−8")
converter_time_stamp.convert(tag="detection−time−stamp",table="Realime_Data_time_stamp")
SQLcomplete=[realtimedataSQL, timeSQL]

SQLcomplete=[realtimedataSQL, timeSQL]

## comment out this line if you don’t want to keep xml file
os.remove(fileName_realtime)
return SQLcomplete

def parsingDetectors(names):
    ##10.18.17.93
    ##131.216.87.107
    cnx=mysql.connector.connect(user='jmc', password='jmc', host='10.18.17.93',
database='fast_realtime3')
    print('connection is established to mysql database: fast_realtime3')
cursor_mysql=cnx.cursor()
cnx.autocommit=False

    insertCommandDetectors="INSERT IGNORE INTO 'detectors' ('detector_id') VALUES"

    insertCommandDate="INSERT IGNORE INTO 'dates' ('date_time') VALUES"

    insertCommandLane1="INSERT INTO 'lane1' ('lane1_index_detector', 'lane1_index_date', 'lane_vehicle_count', 'lane_vehicle_count1', 'lane_vehicle_count2', 'lane_vehicle_count3', 'lane_vehicle_count4', 'lane_vehicle_count5', 'lane_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed') VALUES"

    insertCommandLane2="INSERT INTO 'lane2' ('lane2_index_detector', 'lane2_index_date', 'lane_vehicle_count', 'lane_vehicle_count1', 'lane_vehicle_count2', 'lane_vehicle_count3', 'lane_vehicle_count4', 'lane_vehicle_count5', 'lane_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed') VALUES"

    insertCommandLane3="INSERT INTO 'lane3' ('lane3_index_detector', 'lane3_index_date', 'lane_vehicle_count', 'lane_vehicle_count1', 'lane_vehicle_count2', 'lane_vehicle_count3', 'lane_vehicle_count4', 'lane_vehicle_count5', 'lane_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed') VALUES"

    insertCommandLane4="INSERT INTO 'lane4' ('lane4_index_detector', 'lane4_index_date', 'lane_vehicle_count', 'lane_vehicle_count1', 'lane_vehicle_count2', 'lane_vehicle_count3', 'lane_vehicle_count4', 'lane_vehicle_count5', 'lane_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed') VALUES"

    insertCommandLane5="INSERT INTO 'lane5' ('lane5_index_detector', 'lane5_index_date', 'lane_vehicle_count', 'lane_vehicle_count1', 'lane_vehicle_count2', 'lane_vehicle_count3', 'lane_vehicle_count4', 'lane_vehicle_count5', 'lane_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed') VALUES"
lane_vehicle_speed ') VALUES
insertCommandLane6="INSERT INTO 'lane6' ('lane6_index_detector', 'lane6_index_date', 'lane6_vehicle_count', 'lane6_vehicle_count1', 'lane6_vehicle_count2', 'lane6_vehicle_count3', 'lane6_vehicle_count4', 'lane6_vehicle_count5', 'lane6_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed ') VALUES"
insertCommandLane7="INSERT INTO 'lane7' ('lane7_index_detector', 'lane7_index_date', 'lane7_vehicle_count', 'lane7_vehicle_count1', 'lane7_vehicle_count2', 'lane7_vehicle_count3', 'lane7_vehicle_count4', 'lane7_vehicle_count5', 'lane7_vehicle_count6', 'occupancy', 'lane_vehicle_speed ') VALUES"

lines=[]
replacedLine2=[]
detectorsInfo=[]
dateInfo=[]
detectorsDate=[]
detectorTime=[]
counter2=0
a=[]
counter=0

print("SQL file name: "+names[0])
print("SQL file name: "+names[1])

fb_data2=open(names[1], 'r')
for line2 in fb_data2:
    replacedLine2=line2.replace('"', '')
dateInfo.append(replacedLine2)
fb_data2.close()
dates=dateInfo

for i in range(2, len(dates)-1):
datetime=dates[i]
checkdate=date
cursor_mysql.execute("SELECT LAST_INSERT_ID( MAX( date_time ) ) FROM
    dates ")
checkdateDB=cursor_mysql.fetchall()
checkdateDB=str(checkdateDB[0])
checkdateDB=checkdateDB[1:-2]

if(checkdate!=checkdateDB):
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandDate+SQLdatetime)

fb_data=open(names[0], 'r')
for line1 in fb_data:
    replacedLine1=line1.replace('"', '')
detectorsInfo.append(replacedLine1)
fb_data.close()
detectorsID=detectorsInfo

for i in range(2, len(detectorsID)-1):
    word=detectorsID[i].split(' , ')

    laneNo=math.ceil((len(word)-2)/9)
    if i==len(detectorsID)-2:
        word[len(word)-1]=word[len(word)-1][:-2]
        laneNo=math.ceil((len(word)-1)/9)

    if laneNo==1:
        detector=word[0]
        A="(SELECT ' detector_index ' from ' detectors ' WHERE ' detector_id '='"+detector[1:]+") , "
        B="(SELECT ' date_index ' from ' dates ' WHERE ' date_time '='"+SQLdatetime+" ) , "
        lane1=[word[1], word[2], word[3], word[4], word[5], word[6], word[7], word[8], word[9]]
        insertCommandValueLane1=" ( "+insertCommandValueLane1+" ) "
        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandDetectors+(""+detector[1:]+")")

        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane1+
        insertCommandValueLane1)

    elif laneNo==2:
        detector=word[0]
        A="(SELECT ' detector_index ' from ' detectors ' WHERE ' detector_id '='"+detector[1:]+") , "
        B="(SELECT ' date_index ' from ' dates ' WHERE ' date_time '='"+SQLdatetime+" ) , "
        lane1=[word[1], word[2], word[3], word[4], word[5], word[6], word[7], word[8], word[9]]
        lane2=[word[10], word[11], word[12], word[13], word[14], word[15], word[16], word[17], word[18]]
        insertCommandValueLane1=" ( "+insertCommandValueLane1+" ) "
        insertCommandValueLane2=" ( "+insertCommandValueLane2+" ) "

        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandDetectors+(""+detector[1:]+")")

        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane2+
        insertCommandValueLane2)"
def insertCommandValueLane1=


if (laneNo==3):
    detector=word[0]
    A="(SELECT detector_index from detectors WHERE detector_id="+detector[1:]+"" ) , "
    B="(SELECT date_index from dates WHERE date_time="+SQLdatetime+"" ) , "

lane1=[word[1], word[2], word[3], word[4], word[5], word[6], word[7], word[8], word[9]]
lane2=[word[10], word[11], word[12], word[13], word[14], word[15], word[16], word[17], word[18]]
lane3=[word[19], word[20], word[21], word[22], word[23], word[24], word[25], word[26], word[27]]


insertCommandValueLane1="("+insertCommandValueLane1+")"
insertCommandValueLane2="("+insertCommandValueLane2+")"
insertCommandValueLane3="("+insertCommandValueLane3+")"

if (laneNo==4):
    detector=word[0]
    A="(SELECT detector_index from detectors WHERE detector_id="+detector[1:]+""
    B="(SELECT date_index from dates WHERE date_time="+SQLdatetime+""

else:
    pass

insertCommandValueLane1="(" + insertCommandValueLane1 + ")"
insertCommandValueLane2="(" + insertCommandValueLane2 + ")"
insertCommandValueLane3="(" + insertCommandValueLane3 + ")"
insertCommandValueLane4="(" + insertCommandValueLane4 + ")"
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandDetectors + "(" + detector + ":")"
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane1 + insertCommandValueLane1)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane2 + insertCommandValueLane2)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane3 + insertCommandValueLane3)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane4 + insertCommandValueLane4)

elif (laneNo==5):
detector=word[0]

A="(SELECT 'detector_index' from 'detectors' WHERE 'detector_id'=" + detector + ":")"
B="(SELECT 'date_index' from 'dates' WHERE 'date_time'=" + SQLdatetime + ")"

lane1=[word[1], word[2], word[3], word[4], word[5], word[6], word[7], word[8], word[9]]
lane2=[word[10], word[11], word[12], word[13], word[14], word[15], word[16], word[17], word[18]]
lane3=[word[19], word[20], word[21], word[22], word[23], word[24], word[25], word[26], word[27]]
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\[\text{lane}1 = \left[ \text{word }[28], \text{word }[29], \text{word }[30], \text{word }[31], \text{word }[32], \text{word }[33], \text{word }[34], \text{word }[35], \text{word }[36] \right] \]

\[\text{lane}5 = \left[ \text{word }[37], \text{word }[38], \text{word }[39], \text{word }[40], \text{word }[41], \text{word }[42], \text{word }[43], \text{word }[44], \text{word }[45] \right] \]

\begin{align*}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{insertCommandValueLane1} &= (" + \text{insertCommandValueLane1} + "") \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane2} &= (" + \text{insertCommandValueLane2} + "") \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane3} &= (" + \text{insertCommandValueLane3} + "") \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane4} &= (" + \text{insertCommandValueLane4} + "") \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane5} &= (" + \text{insertCommandValueLane5} + "") \\
\end{align*}

cursor_mysql.execute(\text{insertCommandDetectors} + (" + \text{detector [1:] + "")")

cursor_mysql.execute(\text{insertCommandLane1} + \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane1})

cursor_mysql.execute(\text{insertCommandLane2} + \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane2})

cursor_mysql.execute(\text{insertCommandLane3} + \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane3})

cursor_mysql.execute(\text{insertCommandLane4} + \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane4})

cursor_mysql.execute(\text{insertCommandLane5} + \\
\text{insertCommandValueLane5})

\text{elif (laneNo==6):}
\quad \text{detector}=\text{word [0]}

\begin{align*}
A &= (\text{SELECT 'detector_index' from 'detectors' WHERE 'detector_id' =""+detector [1:] + "")", \\
B &= (\text{SELECT 'date_index' from 'dates' WHERE 'date_time' =""+SQLdatetime + "")", \\
\text{lane}1 &= \left[ \text{word }[1], \text{word }[2], \text{word }[3], \text{word }[4], \text{word }[5], \text{word }[6], \text{word }[7], \text{word }[8], \text{word }[9] \right] \\
\text{lane}2 &= \left[ \text{word }[10], \text{word }[11], \text{word }[12], \text{word }[13], \text{word }[14], \text{word }[15], \text{word }[16], \text{word }[17], \text{word }[18] \right] \\
\text{lane}3 &= \left[ \text{word }[19], \text{word }[20], \text{word }[21], \text{word }[22], \text{word }[23], \text{word }[24], \text{word }[25], \text{word }[26], \text{word }[27], \text{word }[28], \text{word }[29], \text{word }[30], \text{word }[31], \text{word }[32], \text{word }[33], \text{word }[34], \text{word }[35], \text{word }[36] \right]
\end{align*}
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandDetectors+"("+detector[1:]+")")
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandValueLane2)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandValueLane3)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandValueLane4)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandValueLane5)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandValueLane6)
elif (laneNo==7):
detector=word[0]
A="(SELECT 'detector_index' from 'detectors' WHERE 'detector_id'='"+detector[1:]+"')"
B = "(SELECT 'date_index' FROM 'dates' WHERE 'date_time' = " + SQLdatetime + ")",

lane1 = [word[1], word[2], word[3], word[4], word[5], word[6], word[7], word[8], word[9]]
lane2 = [word[10], word[11], word[12], word[13], word[14], word[15], word[16], word[17], word[18]]
lane3 = [word[19], word[20], word[21], word[22], word[23], word[24], word[25], word[26], word[27]]
lane4 = [word[28], word[29], word[30], word[31], word[32], word[33], word[34], word[35], word[36]]
lane5 = [word[37], word[38], word[39], word[40], word[41], word[42], word[43], word[44], word[45]]
lane6 = [word[46], word[47], word[48], word[49], word[50], word[51], word[52], word[53], word[54]]
lane7 = [word[55], word[56], word[57], word[58], word[59], word[60], word[61], word[62], word[63]]

        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandDetectors + "(" + detector[1:] + ")")


        insertCommandValueLane1 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane1 + ")")

        insertCommandValueLane2 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane2 + ")")

        insertCommandValueLane3 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane3 + ")")

        insertCommandValueLane4 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane4 + ")")

        insertCommandValueLane5 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane5 + ")")

        insertCommandValueLane6 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane6 + ")")

        insertCommandValueLane7 = "(" + insertCommandValueLane7 + ")")

        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane1 + insertCommandValueLane1)

        cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane2 + insertCommandValueLane2)
```python
sql.execute(insertCommandLane3+insertCommandValueLane3)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane4+
insertCommandValueLane4)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane5+
insertCommandValueLane5)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane6+
insertCommandValueLane6)
cursor_mysql.execute(insertCommandLane7+
insertCommandValueLane7)

else:
    print("new lane is established")
    print(laneNo)

else:
    print("Duplicated date: data already inserted")

## closing connection
    cnx.commit()
    print("fast realtime3: disconnecting...")
    cnx.close()

##################################### main section#####################################

#fileName=realtime_data_collector()
a=os.getcwd()
    os.chdir(a+"/realtime_files")
names=realtime_data_collector()
##names=['May_31_01_08.r.sql","May_31_01_08.r_stamp.sql"
fileName=names
parsingDetectors(fileName)
    os.remove(names[0])
    os.remove(names[1])
    print(names[0]+" and "+ names[1]+" have been deleted")
```
Appendix E

Congestion Prediction Script

A Python script was developed to provide early prediction of congestion events using machine learning techniques. During a training phase, historical data during the Winter season of 2014 was used to train a decision tree classifier able to predict oncoming congestion reliably up to 10 minutes early using four minutes of past traffic measurements.

The code for the script is provided below:

```python
#!/bhusal/bin/python
import csv
import array
# import numpy

# READING SENSORS.CSV FILE
ifile=open('sensors.csv', 'rU');
reader = csv.reader(ifile, delimiter=',');
counter=0
for row in reader:
    counter = counter +1;
ifile.close()

# parameter setting
rownum = 0
minbak=4
count_b=[0,0,0,0,0]  # count value in 5 min back from current time
occupancy_b=[0,0,0,0,0]  # occupancy value in 5 min back
speed_b=[0,0,0,0,0]  # speed value in 5 min back from current time
decision=[0]*(counter−1) # congestion prediction 4 min ahead of current time
# 0 FOR NON CONGESTION AND 1 FOR CONGESTION

ifile=open('sensors.csv', 'rU');
reader = csv.reader(ifile, delimiter=',')

for row in reader:
    #print('TEST')
    # Save header row.
    if rownum == 0:
        header = row
    elif rownum<6:
```
colnum = 0
for col in row:
    if ((colnum>2) and (colnum<10)):
        count_b[5-rownum]=count_b[5-rownum]+int(col)
    elif (colnum==10):
        occupancy_b[5-rownum]=occupancy_b[5-rownum]+int(col)
    elif colnum==11:
        speed_b[5-rownum]=speed_b[5-rownum]+int(col)
    colnum += 1
else:
    #IMPLEMENTING THE J-48 DECISION TREE
    if speed_b[0]>36.4:
        con=0
    elif count_b[0]>20:
        con=1
    elif occupancy_b[0]>29:
        if speed_b[4]>12.6:
            con=0
        else:
            con=1
    elif occupancy_b[2]<=9.6:
        con=0
    elif occupancy_b[3]>=13.8:
        con=0
    elif speed_b[3]>30.6:
        con=0
    elif count_b[3]>13.6:
        con=0
    else:
        con=1
    decision[rownum-5]=con
for k in range(4,-1,-1):
    count_b[k]=count_b[k-1]
    occupancy_b[k]=occupancy_b[k-1]
    speed_b[k]=speed_b[k-1]

count_b[0]=0
occupancy_b[0]=0
speed_b[0]=0
for col in row:
    if ((colnum>2) and (colnum<10)):
        count_b[0]=count_b[0]+int(col)
    elif (colnum==10):
        occupancy_b[0]=occupancy_b[0]+int(col)
    elif colnum==11:
        speed_b[0]=speed_b[0]+int(col)
    colnum += 1
rownum += 1
ifile.close()
print (decision)
""
print (count_b)
print (occupancy_b)
print ("\n")
print (speed_b)