Predicting highly-resolved traffic noise (using data available as a by-product of Urban Traffic Management and Control systems)

Dr Shadman Marouf, Professor Margaret C. Bell, CBE Future Mobility Group, Newcastle University

Presented by Dr Paul Goodman,

Environmental Engineering Group, Newcastle University

Presented at MATTS 2018, TU Delft, 18th October 2018



Background

- Modelling noise has been a topic since the 1960s.
- Since the END 2002, there has been the need for noise maps every 5 years in 'agglomerations' – last 2017
- Recognition that we can calculate noise very well for freely-flowing traffic conditions, but less well for interrupted flows
- Can we use the wealth of UTMC information to assist in calculation and mapping?
- Can we control for noise? (and would we want to?)



A Spatio-Temporal Model

Spatially:

- We have a network made of 'nodes and links'
- We have a fleet of multiple vehicle types (car, MGV, HGV/Bus)
- Our vehicles have four operational modes
 - Cruising, Accelerating, Decelerating, Idling



Temporally, we have two operational modes:

- Uninterrupted operation under a green signal
- Interrupted operation by a red signal



Calculating Sound

- Use CNOSSOS-EU based procedure
 - Calculate Sound Power Level (SPwL)
 - 2x sources on an individual vehicle (Rolling & Power)
 - 8x octave bands for broadband total
- Calculate look-up table of Sound Exposure Level values (SELs) for individual vehicle modes
- Scale by vehicle flow in mode
- Propagate and convert contributions from all sources to get $\mathsf{L}_{\mathsf{Aeq}}$ levels



Calculating Sound (Simplified...)

Basic CNOSSOS-EU Sound Power (speed and vehicle type dependent): $L_{Veh} = f(L_{power} + L_{rolling}), L_{rolling} = a + b \log_{10}[\frac{V}{V_{ref}}], L_{power} = c + d [\frac{V - V_{ref}}{V_{ref}}]$ Correction of Sound Power to SELs (speed and geometry dependent):

 $\succ SEL_{Veh} = L_{Veh} - 10log_{10}v + 10log_{10}d + 10log_{10}a - 10log_{10}[4\pi d'^2] - \Delta Lg$

Sound 'Energy' contribution from a vehicle class in a period: $\geq E_{Veh} = 10 log_{10} [(10^{0.1E_{Veh,idl}}, Q_{Veh}) + (10^{0.1E_{Veh,cru}}, Q_{Veh}) + (10^{0.1E_{Veh,acc}}, Q_{Veh}) + (10^{0.1$

Correction to $L_{Aeq,T}$: $> L_{Aeq}(T) = 10 \log_{10}[\frac{1}{T}(E_{car} + E_{MGV} + E_{HGV} + (T - Q_{car} - Q_{LGV} - Q_{HGV}). 10^{0.1L_{back}}]$

We're glossing over loads of assumptions regarding CNOSSOS parameters (e.g. road surface) here! – see also Paoprayoon *et al.,* 2005 and Watts et al., 2004

Newcastle University UK | Malaysia | Singapore

Where to get Traffic Data?

- Use Newcastle City Council's SCOOT (Split, Cycle, Offset, Optimisation) system (TRL UK, Hunt *et al.*, 1981)
- Data either measured or generated from SCOOT used in this research include:
 - Flow: an estimate of stop-line arrival flow in veh/h or veh/5min;
 - Delay: an estimate of the total delay experienced by all vehicles arriving at the stop-line, in units of 1/10th vehicle hours/hour;
 - Occupancy: the number of quarter-second intervals a traffic loop detector embedded in the road pavement is occupied by vehicles during the overall time period (in this study 5 min)
- Collected via NUIDAP (Newcastle University Integrated Data Access Platform)



How to Calibrate/Validate?

• Use data collected from inexpensive eMote sensors





• See for yourself at: www.urbanobservatory.co.uk



Study Area – eMotes 1707, 1703





Sample SCOOT data (Flow, Occupancy, Speed)



- Link 10141Z is straight-ahead flow, 10141P is a right-turn pocket
- Mote 1707 is near the stop-line whilst 1703 is mid-link.







NUIDAP and Flow States (Hodges et al., 2009)



States provided for each 5 minutes namely Quiet (1) Smooth Flow (2) Start-Stop (3) and Congestion (4) for each five minutes used in CNOSSUS

School of

Engineering



Models Tested

- Three Scenarios (Weekdays 07:00 19:00):
 - 'Free-Flow' assumed average flows and speed
 - 'Free-Flow' and speed with CNOSSUS junction corrections assuming constant periods of SCOOT state. Each state has defined proportions of traffic mode
 - N10141Z (straight-ahead) quiet and smooth states 40% and 60% respectively
 - N10141P (right-turn movement only) quiet (67%), smooth (24%) and busy (9%).
 - Using SCOOT derived flow and speed with known flow regime for each five minute period and corrected for the spatial changes upstream and downstream of the link.



Results: Site 1707 - Stopline

1. 'Free Flow'



2. +CNOSSOS Junction Correction



3. Spatio-Temporal using SCOOT data



Absolute error: 3.7dBA RMSE: 4.1dBA

Absolute error: 2.0dBA RMSE: 2.0dBA Absolute error: 0.5dBA RMSE: 1.9dBA



Results: Site 1703 – Mid-Link

1. 'Free Flow'



2. +CNOSSOS Junction Correction



3. Spatio-Temporal using SCOOT data



Absolute error: 4.3dBA RMSE: 4.7dBA

Absolute error: 3.9dBA RMSE: 4.3dBA Absolute error: 1.4dBA RMSE: 1.9dBA



Difference (predicted-measured) in L_{Aeq,5-min}





Conclusions and Limitations

- Three variants of a noise prediction model developed each using UTMC (SCOOT) data in a different way
- Most effective model used breakdown of links into four sections and included flow regimes. Using free-flow, average speed underestimated noise
- Also can obtain distributions of noise, rather than just single values
- Limited by simple calculations of speed from SCOOT occupancy and delay – e.g. masking can occur using inductive loops
- No way (yet) of getting different attributes for different vehicle classes from SCOOT, or in assumptions
- Other effects? Road surface? Site characterstics? Non-traffic noise?
- Nearside links only considered



Thank you for listening Any questions? Contacts:

Professor Margaret C. Bell, CBE

Science City Professor of Transport and Environment Future Mobility Research Group School of Engineering, Cassie Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU <u>Margaret.bell@ncl.ac.uk</u>

Dr. Paul Goodman

Researcher in Transport and Environment Environmental Engineering Research Group School of Engineering, Cassie Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU Paul.goodman@ncl.ac.uk







