



TPB TRAVEL FORECASTING SUBCOMMITTEE

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MAY 15, 2026 MEETING, 9:30 AM TO 11:00 AM

The meeting was held virtually via web conferencing software. There was no on-site meeting.

MEETING ATTENDEES

MEMBERS, ALTERNATES, AND PARTICIPANTS

- Jim Bunch (Mead & Hunt)
- Manfredo Davila (M-NCPPC, Prince George's Co.)
- Kevin Chai (Fairfax County)
- Ali Etezady (RSG, Inc.)
- Dan Goldfarb (VDOT)
- Anxi Jia (Texas A&M Transportation Institute)
- Li Li (Whitman, Requardt & Assoc.)
- Feng Liu (Cambridge Systematics)
- Krishna Patnam (AECOM)
- Md. Mokhlesur Rahman (BMC)
- Andrew Rohne (Caliper)
- Thomas Rossi (Cambridge Systematics)
- Brent Selby (Cambridge Systematics)
- Rana Shams (MDOT)
- Elham Shayanfar (MDOT)
- Aichong Sun (AECOM)
- Nicole Taylor
- Chris Wichman (Geotab)
- Jun Yang (M-NCPPC, Montgomery Co.)

COG STAFF

- Timothy Canan
- Anant Choudhary
- Robert d'Abadie
- Nazneen Ferdous
- Kenneth (Ken) Joh
- Glenn Lang
- Ray Ngo
- Wanda Owens
- Jinchul (JC) Park
- Bahar Shahverdi
- Dusan Vuksan
- Feng Xie
- Zhuo Yang

1. OPENING: MEETING ROLES, RULES, AND ROLL CALL OF PARTICIPANTS

Ray Ngo opened the meeting by thanking the TFS members for their presence and kind words for Mark Moran's retirement at the March 2026 TFS meeting. He then proceeded to discuss the meeting roles (e.g., host, technical host, and note taker). This meeting of the TFS was chaired by Jun Yang.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING, HELD ON MARCH 20, 2026

The highlights of the March 20, 2026, TFS meeting were approved without any changes.

3. COG/TPB GEN3 TRAVEL MODEL: STATUS REPORT FROM COG/TPB STAFF

Dr. Feng Xie presented this item using a set of presentation slides. During his presentation, Feng provided a regular status report on COG/TPB's Gen3 Travel Model. He first announced that, on April 22, TPB staff released the Gen3 Travel Model for production use. He provided a brief overview of the official model release and introduced the Gen3 Model transmittal package prepared by COG/TPB staff. Feng then discussed the major updates made to the COG/TPB Travel Demand Forecasting webpages¹ and walked the audience through the new pages. Feng concluded by discussing the post-release model development activities, including in-house and consultant-assisted work activities, and outlined the next steps.

No questions were raised immediately following the presentation. However, later in the meeting, Rana Shams asked if COG/TPB staff had previously shared their work on the model visualizer. Feng responded that the existing ABM Visualizer, which was developed by RSG, is available as part of the model transmittal package. COG/TPB staff are also developing a new model visualizer in the Gen3 Travel Model, but, since it is still in development, COG/TPB staff has not yet shared their work.

4. NEW YORK METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL (NYMTC) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE MODEL

Brent Selby presented an overview of the New York Metropolitan Council's (NYMTC) updated truck model using a set of presentation slides. He explained that the effort modernized an existing two-component freight modeling framework, which considered long- and short-distance trips. Key changes included restricting the long-distance model to focus exclusively on external trips, as it previously also considered any trips exceeding 50 miles, and replacing the simplified rate-based approaches in the short-distance model with a more advanced, data-driven framework. Brent then highlighted that central to this new design was truck GPS Big-Data (from LOCUS), which provided recent, detailed, and geographically specific data on truck trips. He continued discussing the theoretical implementation of both models, highlighting the shift from a Gravity Model to a Destination Choice Model for the trip distribution part of the short-distance model and how Freight Analysis Framework² 5 (FAF5) data is used in the long-distance model. Brent concluded his presentation by highlighting the validation of the truck model, which was performed alongside the validation of the full Activity-Based Model (ABM).

After the presentation, Dr. Feng Xie asked whether the impedance function or the accessibility indices used in the trip distribution step of the short-distance model considered tolls, noting the implementation of congestion pricing in New York City last year. He suggested that tolls may be intentionally disregarded in destination choice because the cost can be passed on to the end consumer. Brent clarified that the truck distribution model is a Logit Model and thus does not rely on an impedance function. He explained that, due to high interest, especially considering congestion pricing, tolls were tested in several different ways, but were either statistically insignificant or showed unexpected positive relationships. He added that while tolls may affect route choice during assignment, however noting the caveat of unavoidable tolls in New York City, truck destination choice is not impacted.

Tom Rossi provided additional context, highlighting that the base year of the model and a lot of the data used to estimate it predate congestion pricing and confirming that some of the tolls are unavoidable, such as when crossing a river. He also emphasized that particular care must be taken

¹ MWCOG Travel Demand Forecasting. <https://www.mwcog.org/transportation/data-and-tools/modeling/>

² Freight Analysis Framework, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, April 29, 2026. <https://www.bts.gov/faf>

when implementing tolls, as tour-based modeling in the activity-based framework includes both out- and inbound trips.

Ray Ngo asked about how the model will be used in scenario testing and whether any tests for specific scenarios have already been performed. Brent explained that none were conducted as part of this project. Tom further elaborated that the truck model update was only recently completed, though testing of the full model, which includes the truck model, is currently ongoing.

Ray inquired about the transferability of the model to a different region, such as which components can be adopted and which ones are specific to New York. Brent answered that the data are available for the whole country, so the model structure and segmentation could be adopted for Metropolitan Washington. However, he noted that, due to the size and shape of the DC region, the distances would probably be different, so calibration to the trip length distribution would be distinctly different. Furthermore, due to the presence of ports in New York and New Jersey, special generators had to be placed.

5. STATUS REPORT ON COG/TPB'S FY 26 PROJECT FOR CONSULTANT ASSISTANCE WITH TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTING METHODS USED BY COG/TPB STAFF

This item was presented by Dr. Feng Xie, Tom Rossi, and Ali Etazady, who spoke without presentation slides. Feng first provided a high-level status update on COG/TPB's FY 26 Project for Consultant Assistance with Travel Demand Forecasting Methods. Feng noted that, with the release of TPB's Gen3 Travel Model, COG/TPB is now shifting back to the previous approach of using yearly contracts for consultant assistance with travel demand forecasting methods. He explained that two consulting teams (RSG and Cambridge Systematics) were awarded part of the contract for FY 26, and both their contracts were recently extended into FY 27. Feng also mentioned that the contracts encompass five tasks, and since the kickoff of the project in February, the consultants have been mainly working on Task 1 for admin and ad-hoc model support and Task 2 for model strategic plan update. He concluded by highlighting that COG and RSG just activated Task 3 with a fully executed task order agreement for software review.

Tom Rossi then gave an update on the status of the strategic modeling plan, for which the scope of work was presented at the last TFS meeting. He explained that the first task is to conduct two surveys, one for stakeholders of the COG/TPB models, and one for peer MPOs, with a different set of questions for each survey. Tom noted that the questionnaires for both surveys have been created and MWCOG comments were received on the questionnaires and incorporated into the surveys. He then highlighted that the stakeholder survey questions were coded as an online survey using Survey Monkey and will be sent to COG by the end of the week for feedback. Once this feedback has been incorporated, invitations will be sent out to the stakeholders, many of which were present at the TFS meeting, with 2-3 weeks to respond. Tom concluded by mentioning that the peer MPO survey is longer and more complex, and that they are currently working on the online version.

Ali Etezady concluded this item by providing an overview of RSG's ongoing support activities, which are structured around four primary tasks, two of which are currently underway. He gave an overview of the first task, which focuses on project management, coordination, and ad hoc technical support, and includes regular bi-weekly coordination meetings with MWCOG staff and responsive support on modeling and data-related questions. Ali then explained that the second task involves evaluation of commercially available travel demand modeling software platforms. Under this effort, RSG is assisting MWCOG in assessing the capabilities, strengths, limitations, and implementation considerations associated with a range of modeling platforms and tools. He noted that the evaluation is intended to support MWCOG's long-term planning regarding future model development, maintenance, usability,

flexibility, and integration with regional modeling practices. Ali concluded his presentation by briefly discussing upcoming work associated with the Gen2 and Gen3 model update effort.

No questions were raised by the subcommittee.

6. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF CURRENT MODELING EFFORTS AROUND THE REGION

No updates were provided by members of the subcommittee.

7. NEXT MEETING AND OTHER BUSINESS

Feng first announced the dates for the next TFS meetings and noted that the next meeting on July 17 will be held in a hybrid format and encourages participants to attend in-person if they are able to. Ray proceeded to inform the subcommittee that the TFS is seeking out external presenters and urged interested parties to contact Feng. He noted that presentations did not have to be long but could be shorter technical updates and especially encouraged users of COG/TPB data and models to present on their projects at the upcoming TFS meetings.

Ken Joh then gave an update on the ongoing 2026 Regional Travel Survey. He first announced that the spring wave was launched in early April, with data collection concluding end of May. From the responses gathered, the team has started planning for the fall wave of data collection, focusing on aspects such as outreach, survey design, and methodology. Ken noted that since March, significant efforts have been made to publicize and bring awareness to this survey effort, such as through a press release, or a partnership with WMATA. Ken concluded his update by briefly noting that Prince George's County has purchased oversampling of households in their jurisdiction, which will begin in July.

Ray briefly announced that there will be a change in how the meeting rules and guidelines are shared with the subcommittee. Until now, there was a slide at the start of the meeting, with the required details, but from now on, participants can view a video³ with all the required information, and staff will briefly mention the most important rules at the start of the meeting.

8. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at about 11:00 AM.

Attribution: This meeting summary was developed using a variety of sources, including notes from participants, a recording of the meeting, presentation slides, and a meeting summary generated by artificial intelligence (AI), via Webex and ChatGPT. Any sections of the meeting summary based on AI-generated content were reviewed and edited for accuracy by humans. The primary authors of the meeting summary were the meeting presenters and Glenn Lang.

³ TFS Meeting Guidelines, YouTube, May 7, 2026. <https://youtu.be/23AEeDF1w6w?si=P50jhfsfGTbvt1ZE>