A Framework For Integrating Pedestrians

Kelly J. Clifton

Symposium for the Integration of Land-Use & Transport Models Technical University of Munich November 2 – 4, 2016







Background

How do travel models estimate walking?

Among 48 large MPOs in US:

- 38% did not estimate walking
- 33% estimated non-motorized (walking + bicycling) travel
- 29% estimated walking

Lacking pedestrian built environment measures & small spatial units Trip-based model sequence

- 1. Generation
- 2. Distribution
- 3. Mode choice
- 4. Assignment

Source: Singleton, P. A., & Clifton, K. J. (2013). Pedestrians in regional travel demand forecasting models: State-of-the-practice.



Why model pedestrians?



Pedestrian investments



Mode shifts



Greenhouse gas emissions



Health & safety



- Transit access/egress
- New research opportunities

Incorporating pedestrians





Adapted from: Wegener and Fürst, 1999

Incorporating pedestrians





Adapted from: Wegener and Fürst, 1999

New MoPeD method



Portland State

Contributions



- Nests within current structure but can be used alone
- Pedestrian scale analysis (PAZs)
- Pedestrian-relevant variables (PIE)
- One of the first studies to examine pedestrian destination choice in demand modeling framework
- Highlights policy relevant variables: distance, size, pedestrian supports & barriers



Q Pedestrian analysis zones ^{Portland} State



264 feet = 80 m ≈ 1 minute walk

Metro: ~2,000 TAZs \rightarrow ~1.5 million PAZs







PAZs

Home-based work trip productions



Pedestrian Index of the Environment (PIE)

20–100 score = calibrated \sum (6 dimensions)



People & job density



Transit access







Comfortable facilities

ULI = Urban Living Infrastructure: pedestrian-friendly shopping and service destinations used in daily life.



Trip Generation





Trip Generation



Metro currently has 8 trip production models applied to ~2,000 TAZs:

- HBW Home-based work;
- HBshop Home-based shopping;
- HBrec Home-based recreation;
- HBoth Home-based other (excludes school and college);
- NHBW Non-home-based work;
- NHBNW Non-home-based non-work;
- HBcoll Home-based college; and
- HBsch Home-based school.

After testing for scalability, we applied <u>the same models</u> to our pedestrian scale ~1.5M PAZs

Trip Generation Outputs

TAZ: **HB Work** 0 (trips/PAZ) 0 - 1 1 - 2.5 2.5 - 5 5 - 10 10 - 25 25 - 50 50 - 100 100 - 250 250 - 500 500 - 1000 1000 - 2500 2500 - 5000 5000 - 10000

Ν

TAZ Home-Based Work Productions







Walk mode split





Walk mode split





Prob(walk) = f(traveler characteristics, PIE)

Data:	2011 OHAS, Production trip ends,	
	90% sample	
Method:	binary logit model	
Spatial unit:	pedestrian analysis zone (PAZ)	

Walk mode split models ^{Portland State}



Traveler characteristics: Household size, income, age, # of workers, # children, # vehicles

Built environment:

PIE

Walk model application





Destination choice





Destination choice





Destination choice

- pedestrian environment
- traveler characteristics
- Data: 2011 OHAS
- Method: multinomial logit model

Spatial unit: super-pedestrian analysis zone

Six trip types: home-based: work (HBW), shopping (HBS), recreation (HBR), & other (HBO); non-home-based: work (NHBW) and non-work (NHBNW)





Destination Choice



Model Validation – Avg. Distance Walked



Future work

- Pedestrian Environment
 - Policy Sensitivity & Forecasting
- Microsimulation –integration with ABM
- Trip Generation
 - Multinomial Logit model
- Pedestrian mode choice
 - Feedbacks to trip generation & destination choice
 - Better representation of attributes of other modes
- Destination Choice
 - Explore non-linear effects & other interactions
- Route choices or potential pathways
 - Need fundamental research to improve understanding







OPPORTUNITIES & CHALLENGES

Adapted from: Wegener and Fürst, 1999

BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

Behavioral research

Decision sequencing: activity, mode, destination; activity, destination, mode; mode, activity, destination

Destination choice considerations

choice set generation

Willingness to walk

Path/route choice considerations





K 2 ==



Behavioral Research





Built environment

- Thresholds & nonlinearities
- Mixing
- Scale



Lifestyle questions:

- Vehicle ownership & residential location
- Attitudes, motivations & values



Positive Utility of Travel

- What aspects?
- Diminishing returns?



Mode feedbacks to trip generation

DATA & MODELS

Spatial/Temporal Scale



- Depends on output needed for policy/research
- Capture variations in the pedestrian built & natural environment
- Spatial accuracy
- Theory/Behavior



Built environment





S.R. Gehrke, & K.J. Clifton. (2016). Toward a spatialtemporal measure of land-use mix. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, *9*(1):171–186

S.R. Gehrke, & K.J. Clifton. (2014). Operationalizing land use diversity at varying geographic scales and its connection to mode choice: Evidence from Portland, Oregon. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2453: 128-136.



Configuration

- How & what to represent?
- Indices, proxies
- Forecasting



Networks



- Network representation
- How do we attribute networks?
- Feedbacks of travel costs
- Do we need to assign trips to a network?

Zone-based: Aggregate built environment into irregular zones around trip origin and destination (may not cover entire trip).Buffer: Aggregate built environment into circular or network- based polygon buffers around trip origin and destination (may not cover entire trip).Route: Measure built environment around or along shortest path or actual (reported) path (shortest path may not correspond to actual path; reported path may not correspond to actual path for all modes).	•	•	[]
	Zone-based: Aggregate built environment into irregular zones around trip origin and destination (may not cover entire trip).	Buffer: Aggregate built environment into circular or network- based polygon buffers around trip origin and destination (may not cover entire trip).	Route: Measure built environment around or along shortest path or actual (reported) path (shortest path may not correspond to actual path; reported path may not correspond to actual path for all modes).

Broach, J. P. (2016). *Travel mode choice framework incorporating realistic bike and walk routes* (Order No. 10061477). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Portland State University; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Link to Health Outcomes

- Health impact analysis
- Total time spent walking + speeds
- Physical activity budgets
- Crash risk exposure
- Pollutant exposure
- Feedback into life expectancy



Portland State

Woodcock J, Givoni M, Morgan AS. Health Impact Modelling of Active Travel Visions for England and Wales Using an Integrated Transport and Health Impact Modelling Tool (ITHIM). Barengo NC, ed. PLoS ONE. 2013;8(1):e51462

Questions?



Project info & reports: <u>http://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/510</u> <u>http://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/677</u>

- Singleton, P. A., Schneider, R. J., Muhs, C. D., & Clifton, K. J. (2014). "The Pedestrian Index of the Environment (PIE): Representing the Walking Environment in Planning Applications," Proceedings of the 93rd Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, 2014.
- Clifton, K. J., Singleton, P. A., Muhs, C. D., & Schneider, R. J. 2016. "Representing pedestrian activity in travel demand models: Framework and applications", *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol. 52:111-122. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrange0.2016.03.009</u>.
- Clifton, K. J., Singleton, P. A., Muhs, C. D., & Schneider, R. J. 2016. "Development of destination choice models for pedestrian travel", *Transportation Research Part A*, 94: 255-265

Kelly J. Clifton - kclifton@pdx.edu

