

¹Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering, Tennessee State University, Nashville, TN

²Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering, Tennessee State University, Nashville, TN

³Research Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Vanderbilt University

⁴Research Assistant, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Vanderbilt University

⁵Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT)



ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the performance of existing HOV lanes in Tennessee as viable travel-time incentives for promoting carpooling and reducing congestion. While the overall person-moving capacity of the HOV lanes may be slightly higher than the general-purpose lanes, the travel-time incentives for legitimate HOV lanes users in Tennessee have been severely diminished by violators. The study conducted a literature review on HOV lane occupancy detection technologies which could be utilized to assist in managing both HOV corridors and evaluation of performance strategies to address high violation rates. Furthermore, the study evaluated HOV lane utilization rates and HOV lane occupancy violation rates in the state. Estimating utilization rates as the percentage of vehicles that use the HOV lane compared to all other General Purpose (GP) lanes, the study found that the average HOV lane utilization in Tennessee is 23% and the HOV lane violation rate is about 84%. The HOV lane occupancy violation rates were evaluated by taking the percentage of Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOVs) compared to the total vehicles using the HOV lanes during AM and PM peak hours. It was found that only 15% to 20% of vehicles using the HOV lanes in Tennessee are those with 2+ occupants as required by law; the remaining 80% to 85% are single occupancy vehicles (SOVs). Findings are expected to support operational goals of transportation agencies with HOV systems and potential improvement strategies.

HOV DETECTION TECHNOLOGY

- From the literature, the most recent study on video HOV detection technology was conducted by Xerox for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Pilot in Orange County, California using the Xerox Vehicle Passenger Detection System (VPDS).
- Xerox installed the VPDS equipment on the northbound lane of Interstate 5 with a view to the inside lane. The findings from the Caltrans Pilot of the Xerox VPDS indicated that the system was able to perform at an accuracy rate of 95+% for the purposes of identifying SOVs in the HOV lanes. Human roadside observers achieved a 36% accuracy rate during the pilot.
- Based on the literature review, it was observed that most HOV lane monitoring and enforcement activities are largely done manually. While research indicates that no automated HOV detection systems have been established to detect occupancy at 100% accuracy, commendable efforts have developed systems to determine occupancy to high degrees.



FIELD DATA COLLECTION

- Data was collected in selected locations along the HOV lane corridors listed below, and operational performances were then evaluated with respect to (1) HOV lane utilization rates and (2) HOV lane occupancy violation rates.
- Two sources of data collection were used: (1) a high-speed traffic video unit called Miovision Scout to measure traffic flow by lane and (2) manual/visual counting using observation of the HOV lanes only. Data from the site (HOV lanes) and Google Earth helped identify a number of sites for traffic counts and occupancy observations.

| Location | Corridor | Direction | HOV lane Miles |
|-----------|------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Nashville | I-40 East | Eastbound and Westbound | 32 |
| | I-24 | Eastbound and Westbound | 52 |
| | I-65 North | Northbound and Southbound | 10 |
| | I-65 South | Northbound and Southbound | 28 |
| Memphis | I-40 | Eastbound and Westbound | 13 |
| | I-55 | Northbound and Southbound | 10 |

HOV LANE OCCUPANCY VIOLATION RATES

- HOV lane occupancy data was gathered during peak hours within the same periods the traffic flow per lane data was collected. These in-vehicle occupancy visual inspections were conducted from a high point (bridge/overpass) above the subject HOV lane. The aim was to determine whether the occupants in the vehicles traveling on the HOV lane had one (i.e., SOV) or two or more people (i.e., HOV).

$$\text{HOV Lane Violation Rate} = \frac{\text{SOVs on HOV Lane}}{\text{SOVs} + \text{HOV on HOV Lane}}$$

- the HOV lane occupancy violation rate traveling toward downtown Nashville (AM hours) is 82%, and outward from downtown Nashville (PM hours) is 81%.
- The HOV lane occupancy violation rate traveling toward downtown Memphis (AM hours) is 88%, and the rate outward from downtown Memphis (PM hours) is 86%.
- HOV lane violations are higher in Memphis compared to Nashville HOV corridors (87% vs. 81%).
- Only 15% to 20% of vehicles using HOV lanes were those with 2+ occupancy, as required by law. A higher percentage of the vehicles using HOV lanes during HOV operational hours were SOVs. The PM traffic was found to be slightly higher than that of the AM traffic; however, the AM violation rates were higher than PM violation rates.

| Data Location | | AM Peak | | PM Peak | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Violation Rate | Total on HOV Lane (SOV) | Violation Rate | Total on HOV Lane (SOV) |
| I-65 North Side of Nashville | Chadwell Dr. | 83% | 1970 (1635) | 84% | 2639 (2201) |
| | Due West Ave. | Data Not Collected | | 80% | 2083(1669) |
| | Average | 83% | | 83% | |
| I-65 South Side of Nashville | Cool Springs Blvd. | 79% | 1275(1005) | 83% | 1545(1278) |
| | Harding Place | 82% | 2673(2208) | 81% | 3071(2477) |
| | Average | 81% | | 82% | |
| I-40 East Side of Nashville | Old Hickory Blvd. | 85% | 1820(1543) | 79% | 2500(1983) |
| | Waldron Rd. | 85% | 2036(1731) | 79% | 2757(2161) |
| I-24 East Side of Nashville | Fortress Blvd. | 73% | 1224(898) | Data Not Collected | |
| | Average | 79% | | 79% | |
| I-40 East of Memphis | Whitten Rd. | 87% | 2414(2110) | 86% | 3323(2861) |
| I-55 South Memphis | Winchester Rd. | 89% | 1924(1712) | 85% | 2584(2187) |

HOV LANE UTILIZATION RATES

- The per lane traffic counts using the Miovision Scout video unit were disaggregated and sorted before calculating utilization rates. The utilization of the HOV lanes during peak hours was evaluated as the percentage of vehicles that use the HOV lane to those using general purpose (GP) lanes. The table below summarizes the data collected by lanes and the utilization rates.

$$\text{HOV Utilization Rate} = \frac{\sum \text{HOV Lane traffic}}{\sum \text{GP lanes traffic} + \sum \text{HOV Lane traffic}}$$

- The average HOV lane utilization during morning (AM) hours toward downtown areas is 22% for Nashville area and 25% for Memphis area.
- The HOV lane utilization when traffic is moving outside downtown areas during PM peak hours are 25% for Nashville area and 27% for Memphis area.
- Combining Nashville and Memphis area numbers, the AM HOV lane utilization rates toward downtown areas in Tennessee is about 24% and the utilization rate during PM peak hours from downtown areas is 26%.
- Overall, the average of combined utilization of HOV lanes (percentage of traffic that is in the designated HOV lane) in Tennessee is 23%.

| | AM | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | Towards Nashville Downtown | | | | Out of Nashville Downtown | | | |
| | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization |
| I-65 South of Nashville | 3312 | 3994 | 6530 | 24% | 3210 | 3818 | 4903 | 27% |
| I-65 North of Nashville | 1952 | 2258 | 11131 | 13% | | | | |
| I-24 East of Nashville | 2090 | 2609 | 3374 | 26% | 1589 | 2138 | 3620 | 22% |
| I-40 East of Nashville | 1897 | 2469 | 2804 | 26% | 618 | 1361 | 1732 | 17% |
| | PM | | | | | | | |
| | Towards Nashville Downtown | | | | Out of Nashville Downtown | | | |
| | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization |
| I-65 South of Nashville | 2820 | 3479 | 4777 | 25% | 3248 | 3017 | 5384 | 28% |
| I-65 North of Nashville | 834 | 1399 | 6680 | 9% | 2369 | 2554 | 10508 | 15% |
| I-24 East of Nashville | 2139 | 2495 | 3061 | 28% | 3634 | 3554 | 6269 | 27% |
| I-40 East of Nashville | 748 | 1525 | 1980 | 18% | 2444 | 2788 | 3008 | 30% |
| | AM | | | | | | | |
| | Towards Memphis Downtown | | | | Out of Memphis Downtown | | | |
| | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization |
| I-55 South of Memphis | 2062.5 | 2339.5 | 5002 | 22% | 934 | 1492 | 2389 | 19% |
| I-40 East of Memphis | 2661 | 2895 | 4007 | 28% | 1120 | 1870 | 3166 | 18% |
| | PM | | | | | | | |
| | Towards Memphis Downtown | | | | Out of Memphis Downtown | | | |
| | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization | HOV Lane | GP (Adjacent to HOV) | All other GP lanes | Utilization |
| I-55 South of Memphis | 900 | 1764 | 3223 | 15% | 2626 | 3125 | 4825 | 25% |
| I-40 East of Memphis | 1867 | 2461 | 3301 | 24% | 3436 | 3314 | 4871 | 30% |

CONCLUSIONS

- Infrared (IR) technology is superior to the visible light-based technology with an infrared (IR) technology from Xerox, known as the Xerox Vehicle Passenger Detection System (XVPD) as a potential option for states such as Tennessee.
- The average HOV lanes utilization rate in Tennessee is 23%.
- The average HOV lanes occupancy violation rate in Tennessee is 83%.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DISCLAIMER

This research was funded through the State Research and Planning (SPR) Program by the Tennessee Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration. This paper is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Tennessee Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The State of Tennessee and the United States Government assume no liability of its contents or use thereof. The contents of this paper reflect the views of the authors who are solely responsible for the facts and accuracy of the material presented. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Tennessee Department of Transportation or the USDOT.