






















1 **4.2. Results**

2 The three case studies have been analyzed using the combination of POLARIS and Autonomie. The  
3 models have been run in a deterministic mode, which allows a direct comparison for specific travelers  
4 between cases. This allows the benefits of ATIS to be evaluated at both the system-level and for affected  
5 travelers only. In the following results, the benefits are shown for affected travelers only, which are  
6 defined as travelers in the no-information (unmanaged) case who are directly impacted by the traffic  
7 incident – a total of about 21,000 individuals. The same set of travelers are then tracked in the ATIS  
8 deployment (managed) case, and changes in mobility and energy use are evaluated.

9  
10 In terms of mobility, the deployment of ATIS assets for responding to traffic incidents has a clear benefit  
11 to the affected users as seen in Figure 2. The figure shows the total hours of delay experience by all  
12 affected travelers during each five-minute interval throughout the day, as well as the incident times for  
13 comparison purposes. The impact of the incidents on excess delay can clearly be seen as peaks in the  
14 figure, with the peaks being substantially lower in the managed case, indicating that the same travelers  
15 who are affected by the incident in the unmanaged case are finding better routes when informed by the  
16 ATIS. Overall experienced delay for informed travelers is reduced from 5,567 hours to 5,049 hours

17



18

19 *Figure 2. Vehicle Hours of Delay for Affected Travelers (per 5-minute interval)*

20

21 Overall, the figure demonstrates that in the unmanaged (no-ATIS) case, affected travelers spend a  
22 substantial proportion of overall travel time (50.8%) moving at very low speed (<20% of free flow), due  
23 to being stuck in congestion with few alternate routes as expected. Alternatively, in the managed case  
24 (with-ATIS), travelers spend less of the overall travel time (48.3%) on highly congested links and more

1 time traveler near free flow speed (22.4% vs. 20.9% for unmanaged case). This can also be seen in Table  
 2 2 which shows the hours and miles traveled, average speeds and experienced delay for the unmanaged  
 3 and managed cases for affected travelers and for the system as a whole. The results show a statistically  
 4 significant increase in average travel speed in the managed case of 4.5%, and a decrease in hours  
 5 traveled of 6.3% and delay of 9.3%.


6 **Table 2. Aggregate Travel Characteristics for Affected Travelers and All Travelers**

	Affected travelers			All travelers		
	No ATIS	ATIS	% change	No ATIS	ATIS	% change
VHT	8,189	7,673	-6.3%*	198,892	198,287	-0.3%*
VMT	108,229	107,852	-0.3%	5,451,218	5,450,853	0.0%
Avg. speed (by time)	18.1	18.9	4.5%*	31.8	31.9	0.3%*
Delay	5,567	5,049	-9.3%*	67,010	66,383	-0.9%*


\* differences statistically significant at  $p=0.05$

7  
 8 The impacts shown above can also be seen at the overall system level, which is important as it is  
 9 possible that improving the situation for informed travelers could be detrimental to the system as a  
 10 whole, for example by pushing more travelers onto congested arterial streets when routing around  
 11 incidents. However, the results in Table 2 show this to not be the case. In fact, there is minor, though  
 12 significant, improvement at the system-wide level, with the delay reduced approximately 100 hours  
 13 beyond the reduction for affected travelers alone, and average speed increasing from 31.8 to 31.9 mph,  
 14 which affects the overall energy consumption, and no significant change in the miles traveled.

15  
 16 The primary purpose of the proposed modeling effort is on estimating the energy impacts of  
 17 transportation policies and system investments (i.e. ATIS deployment in this case) as these policies  
 18 interact with various vehicle technologies. Previous research has shown that there are complex  
 19 interaction effects between transportation policies and vehicle powertrain technologies which can  
 20 either multiply or inhibit the expected benefits from either in isolation, as in the case of heavy vehicle  
 21 hybridization and managed lane deployment (Sokolov et al 2014). The results of the vehicle simulation  
 22 using the generated speed profiles demonstrate this to an extent. The overall distribution of fuel  
 23 consumption for affected travelers in each case is shown in Figure 3, where fuel consumption is  
 24 measured in kilograms of gasoline. The results show that the deployment of ATIS to travelers does  
 25 result in a fuel consumption savings of approximately 2.5% in terms of the overall weight of fuel used by  
 26 affected travelers. There is a clear reduction in trips using more than 0.6 kg of fuel, which are shifted  
 27 closer to the 0.2-0.4 kg range in the managed case. This is likely due to improved performance in long-  
 28 distance, highway trips coming into the CBD, which subsequently route around the traffic incidents  
 29 using local streets.



1  
 2 *Figure 3. Plot of fuel consumption distribution shows managed case reduce energy use by 2.5% for*  
 3 *affected travelers*  
 4



5  
 6 *Figure 4. Fuel consumption by travel distance*  
 7

1 This result can clearly be seen in Figure 4. There is very little difference in fuel consumption between the  
2 managed and unmanaged cases for short distance trips (0-5 km) as the local trips in the CBD largely  
3 avoid the affected highway segments. However, in the unmanaged case there is a large cluster of trips  
4 in the 5-15 km range which have very high fuel usage, in the 0.6-1.6 kg range, which are largely reduced,  
5 as previously observed. The trend lines in the figure clearly show the improvement in fuel consumption  
6 with increasing distance as expected. The variability in fuel consumption for a given distance is a result  
7 of the combination of various vehicle technologies as specified by the fleet mix and differing drive  
8 patterns (i.e. highway vs. arterial where variability due to traffic signals is introduced. However, it is  
9 clear that this variability is reduced in the managed case, where highly congested travel segments are  
10 mostly eliminated.

11

## 12 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

13 This case study has demonstrated how multiple levels of model integration, i.e. connection between  
14 travel demand, traffic flow and network operations for POLARIS, and between POLARIS outputs and  
15 Autonomie, can be leveraged to assess the energy use impacts of transportation system policies and  
16 operations. The model process made use of a new methodology for extracting detailed second-by-  
17 second speed profiles from aggregated link performance measures which are generated by the POLARIS  
18 model. The speed profile generation process is guided by the constraints imposed by the POLARIS link  
19 performance measures, but is estimated using real-world travel data obtained from the Chicago GPS  
20 travel tracker survey. In other words, the speed profiles are synthesized statistically, but in such a way  
21 that the replicate observed driving cycles and behavior to an acceptable degree (Karbowski et al. 2014).  
22 The process stands in for detailed traffic flow microsimulation when such is either infeasible due to  
23 scale, data limitations, etc., or when such detail is unnecessary.

24

25 The ATIS deployment analyzed in this case was a fairly simplistic example, but a clear benefit was  
26 identified, both in terms of mobility and energy use. Users who are affected by the traffic incidents save  
27 approximately 500 hours of excess delay when they are informed of incidents via the ATIS system as  
28 compared to the case where they are not informed. Their average travel speed increases from 18.1 to  
29 18.9 mph, primarily due to a reduction in time spent in highly congested links. The results in terms of  
30 energy usage are more mixed. While there was a reduction in overall fuel consumed of 2.5%, which is  
31 smaller than the travel time savings and speed increase. This is most likely due to increases in non-  
32 highway driving, stopping at intersections, and interfering with existing surface street traffic. This result,  
33 however, is clearly dependent on context, i.e. the mix of long-distance vs. local trips, the time of day, the  
34 location of the ATIS infrastructure, and the availability of suitable alternatives. The availability of such a  
35 wide range of complex and interacting effects indicates the importance of this type of integrated  
36 modeling when planning for such deployment scenarios.

37

38 The process demonstrated in this work is extensible to more complex scenarios, especially those  
39 pertaining to future connected and autonomous vehicle technologies and the intersection with such  
40 technologies with advanced vehicle powertrains (Sokolov et al 2014), which complicates the analysis  
41 even further. Future work in this area will include more detailed analysis of fleet characteristics and

1 forecasting of fleet vehicle technology market penetration. The addition of individual level vehicle  
2 choice models, rather than assigning vehicle technologies randomly to trajectories, will add another  
3 dimension of interest to the work. Finally, comparisons of the speed profile disaggregation approach  
4 with both real world data on speed and energy use, as well as alternative traffic microsimulation  
5 approaches will be undertaken.

## 7 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

8 This research was supported by the Federal Highway Administration TRANSIMS Research and  
9 Deployment Support program under DOT Interagency Agreement No. DTFH61-11-X-30029.

## 11 REFERENCES

- 12 Abou-Senna, H., & Radwan, E. (2013). VISSIM/MOVES integration to investigate the effect of major key  
13 parameters on {CO<sub>2</sub>} emissions. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 21(0),  
14 39 – 46.
- 15 Arentze, T. and H. Timmermans (2000). ALBATROSS – A Learning Based Transportation Oriented  
16 Simulation System. European Institute of Retailing and Services Studies (EIRASS), Technical  
17 University of Eindhoven.
- 18 Argonne National Laboratory. (n.d.). Autonomie - Home. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from  
19 <http://www.autonomie.net/>
- 20 Auld, J.A. and A. Mohammadian (2009). Framework for the Development of the Agent-based Dynamic  
21 Activity Planning and Travel Scheduling (ADAPTS) Model. *Transportation Letters, International  
22 Journal of Transportation Research*, 1 (3), 245-255.
- 23 Auld, J.A., M. Hope, H. Ley, V. Sokolov, B. Xu and K. Zhang (2015). POLARIS: Agent-Based Modeling  
24 Framework Development and Implementation for Integrated Travel Demand and Network and  
25 Operations Simulations. Paper submitted for publication in *Transportation Research Part C:  
26 Emerging Technologies*.
- 27 AVL. (n.d.). AVL CRUISE. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from <https://www.avl.com/cruise/>
- 28 Balmer, M., Rieser, M., Meister, K., Charypar, D., Lefebvre, N., Nagel, K. (2009). "MATSim-T: Architecture  
29 and simulation times." *Multi-agent systems for traffic and transportation engineering*: 57-78.
- 30 Borge, R., de Miguel, I., de la Paz, D., Lumberras, J., Pérez, J., & Rodríguez, E. (2012). Comparison of road  
31 traffic emission models in Madrid (Spain). *Atmospheric Environment*, 62, 461–471.
- 32 Boriboonsomsin, K., & Barth, M. (2008). Impacts of freeway high-occupancy vehicle lane configuration  
33 on vehicle emissions. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 13(2), 112 – 125.
- 34 California Air Resource Board. (n.d.). EMFAC2011 Technical Documentation. California Air Resources  
35 Board. Retrieved from [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/emfac2011-technical-documentation-final-  
36 updated-0712-v03.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/emfac2011-technical-documentation-final-updated-0712-v03.pdf)
- 37 Ciesla, C., Keribar, R., & Morel, T. (2000). Engine/Powertrain/Vehicle Modeling Tool Applicable to All  
38 Stages of the Design Process. In SAE Technical Paper 2000-01-0934. Detroit: SAE International.
- 39 Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (n.d.). "Travel Tracker Survey - CMAP". Retrieved July 30,  
40 2015 from <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/data/transportation/travel-tracker-survey>
- 41 Emisia SA. (n.d.). Copert 4. Retrieved March 27, 2015, from <http://emisiasa.com/copert>

1 Gamma Technologies. (n.d.). GT-Suite Overview. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from  
2 [http://www.gtisoft.com/products/GT-SUITE\\_Overview.php](http://www.gtisoft.com/products/GT-SUITE_Overview.php)

3 Hao, J.Y., M Hatzopoulou, E. J. Miller (2010) Integrating an Activity-Based Travel Demand Model with  
4 Dynamic Traffic Assignment and Emission Models, *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the*  
5 *Transportation Research Board*, 2176, 1-13.

6 INFRAS. (n.d.). HBEFA - Handbook Emission Factors for Road Transport. Retrieved March 27, 2015, from  
7 [www.hbefa.net](http://www.hbefa.net)

8 Jayakrishnan, R., Mahmassani, H. S., Hu, T.-Y., (1994). An Evaluation Tool for Advanced Traffic  
9 Information and Management Systems in Urban Networks. *Transportation Research Part C*, 2(3), pp.  
10 129-147.

11 Karbowski, D., A. Rousseau, V. Smis-Michel, and V. Vermeulen (2014). Trip Prediction Using GIS for  
12 Vehicle Energy Efficiency, 2014 ITS World Congress. Detroit.

13 Kwon, J., Rousseau, A., & Sharer, P. (2007). Analyzing the Uncertainty in the Fuel Economy Prediction for  
14 the EPA MOVES Binning Methodology. In SAE Technical Paper 2007-01-0280. Detroit: SAE  
15 International.

16 Mahmassani, H. S., Stephan, D. G., (1988). Experimental Investigation of Route and Departure Time  
17 Dynamics of Urban Commuters, *Transportation Research Record*, 1203, pp. 69-84.

18 Miller, E.J. and M.J. Roorda (2003). Prototype Model of Household Activity-Travel Scheduling.  
19 *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1831, 114-121.

20 Newell, G. F. 1993. A simplified theory of kinematic waves in highway traffic, Part I: general theory; Part  
21 II: queuing at freeway bottlenecks; Part III: multi-destination flows. *Transportation Research Part B*,  
22 27(4), 281-314.

23 Ntziachristos, L., Gkatzoflias, D., Kouridis, C., & Samaras, Z. (2009). COPERT: A European Road Transport  
24 Emission Inventory Model. In D. I. N. Athanasiadis, P. A. E. Rizzoli, P. A. Mitkas, & P. D.-I. J. M. Gómez  
25 (Eds.), *Information Technologies in Environmental Engineering* (pp. 491–504). Springer Berlin  
26 Heidelberg.

27 Pendyala, R. M. (2014, September). Low Emissions Zones: Simulation of Behavioral Impacts. Presented  
28 at the AERIS Workshop. Retrieved from  
29 [http://www.its.dot.gov/aeris/pdf/AERIS\\_LowEmissionZones2014.pdf](http://www.its.dot.gov/aeris/pdf/AERIS_LowEmissionZones2014.pdf)

30 Pendyala, R.M., K.C. Konduri, Y-C. Chiu, M. Hickman, H. Noh, P. Waddell, L. Wang, D. You, and B.  
31 Gardner (2012) Integrated Land Use–Transport Model System with Dynamic Time-Dependent  
32 Activity-Travel Microsimulation. *Transportation Research Record, Journal of the Transportation*  
33 *Research Board*, 2303, 19-27.

34 Pendyala, R.M.; R. Kitamura, A. Kikuchi, T. Yamamoto, S. Fujii (2005). Florida Activity Mobility Simulator:  
35 Overview and Preliminary Validation Results. *Transportation Research Record*, 1921, 123-130.

36 Rakha, H. A., Ahn, K., Moran, K., Saerens, B., & Bulck, E. V. den. (2011). Virginia Tech Comprehensive  
37 Power-Based Fuel Consumption Model: Model development and testing. *Transportation Research*  
38 *Part D: Transport and Environment*, 16(7), 492–503.

39 Rakha, H. A., Kamalanathsharma, R. K., & Ahn, K. (2012). AERIS : Eco-Vehicle Speed Control at Signalized  
40 Intersections Using I2V Communication (No. FHWA-JPO-12-063) (p. 37). United States. Joint  
41 Program Office for Intelligent Transportation Systems.

1 Rousseau, A., Halbach, S., Shidore, N., Sharer, P., & Vijayagopal, R. (2010). Plug-and-Play Software  
2 Architecture to Support Automated Model-Based Control Process. In SAE Technical Paper 2010-01-  
3 1996. Detroit: SAE International.

4 Sokolov, V., Karbowski, D., & Kim, N. (2014). Assessing the Energy Impact of Traffic Management and ITS  
5 Technologies. In 21st ITS World Congress.

6 Stevanovic, A., Stevanovic, J., Zhang, K., & Batterman, S. (2009). Optimizing Traffic Control to Reduce  
7 Fuel Consumption and Vehicular Emissions. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the*  
8 *Transportation Research Board*, 2128, 105–113.

9 University of California, Riverside. (n.d.). Center for Environmental Research & Technology:  
10 Comprehensive Modal Emission Model (CMEM). Retrieved March 27, 2015, from  
11 <http://www.cert.ucr.edu/cmem/index.html>

12 US EPA. (n.d.-a). Advanced Light-Duty Powertrain and Hybrid Analysis (ALPHA) Tool. Retrieved April 3,  
13 2015, from <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/alpha.htm>

14 US EPA. (n.d.-b). Greenhouse Gas Emissions Model (GEM) for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicle  
15 Compliance. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/gem.htm>

16 US EPA. (n.d.-c). MOVES (Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator). Retrieved March 27, 2015, from  
17 <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/moves/index.htm>

18 Xie, Y., Chowdhury, M., Bhavsar, P., & Zhou, Y. (2012). An integrated modeling approach for facilitating  
19 emission estimations of alternative fueled vehicles. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and*  
20 *Environment*, 17(1), 15–20.

21 Zachariadis, T., & Samaras, Z. (1999). An Integrated Modeling System for the Estimation of Motor  
22 Vehicle Emissions. *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, 49(9), 1010–1026.

23 Zhang, K., Zhou, X., Lu, C.-C., (2013). Novel Integer Program Formulation for Dynamic Traffic Assignment  
24 Problem. *Proceedings of the 92nd Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board (DVD)*,  
25 January 2013, Washington, D.C.

26 Zhou, X., J. Taylor (2014). DTALite: A queue-based mesoscopic traffic simulator for fast model evaluation  
27 and calibration.. *Cogent Engineering*, Vol. 1(1).

28 Zhou, X., Lu, C.-C., Zhang, K., (2012). Dynamic origin-destination demand flow estimation under  
29 congested traffic conditions: a general framework. *Proceedings of the 91st Annual Meeting of the*  
30 *Transportation Research Board (DVD)*, January 2012, Washington, D.C.