Office of Mobile Sources



# TRAQ

Transportation Air Quality Center

# Index of Transportation Measure Quantification Efforts: Methodology Matrix









# Index of Transportation Measure Quantification Efforts: Methodology Matrix

Regional and State Programs Division Office of Mobile Sources U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

#### **NOTICE**

This technical report does not necessarily represent final EPA decisions or positions.

It is intended to present technical analysis of issues using data which are currently available.

The purpose in the release of such reports is to facilitate the exchange of technical information and to inform the public of technical developments which may form the basis for a final EPA decision, position, or regulatory action.

Index of Transportation Measure Quantification Efforts: Methodology Matrix

#### **Final Report**

#### Prepared for:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional and State Programs Division 2000 Traverwood Drive Ann Arbor Michigan 48105

#### Prepared by:

ARCADIS Geraghty & Miller, Inc. 555 Clyde Avenue Mountain View California 94043 Tel 650 961 5700 Fax 650 254 2496

Our Ref.;

SJ007262

Date

30 September 1998

Authors:

Daniel R. Luscher Douglas A. Coleman Diana K. Popek Fanta Kamakaté Date:

20 January 1999

Subject:

Requested documents

From:

TRAQ Center

Office of Mobile Sources

To:

Barb Laurenson

Kaiser Permanente

1950 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94612

Please find enclosed the documents that you requested through the EPA's Transportation Air Quality Information Request Line.

- 1) Quantification of Episodic Control Programs; EPA 420-R-97-006
- 2) Voluntary Mobile Source Programs: Crediting Innovation and Experimentation; EPA 420-K-97-004
- 3) Driving Alone brochure; EPA 420-F-95-011
- 4) Transportation Control Measure Information Documents; EPA 420-R-92-006
- 5) Benefits Estimates for Selected TCM Programs, EPA 420-R-98-002 (was 94-006)

The Episodic Emissions Control Programs factsheet can be downloaded from the TRAQ Center website at <a href="https://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/traqvolm.htm">www.epa.gov/oms/transp/traqvolm.htm</a> in either PDF or text only format.

Quantification document (waiting to hear from Matt)

Thank you for your request.

#### 1. Introduction

As the importance of transportation measures and voluntary measures in air quality programs increases, a growing body of research focuses on the quantitative evaluation and analysis of these measures. The purpose of this work assignment is to develop a comprehensive index of methodologies used in assessing transportation measures and other non-mandatory programs. Quantification refers to any effort to numerically evaluate transportation measures (or other related measures) in terms of developing air quality benefits, program costs, VMT reductions, trip reductions, and/or cost-effectiveness.

#### 2. WA Task 2 results

The results of WA Task 2 are embodied in the extensive matrix shown in Attachment 2 (and provided on the accompanying diskette in both WordPerfect and Excel format). The matrix lists transportation measures and voluntary measures along with the types of methodologies used to quantify them, and a description of the strengths and weaknesses of each methodology. In addition, the matrix lists specific reports and studies that have utilized each methodology for a particular transportation measure, along with particular advantages and disadvantages of the methodology as used in that particular research or evaluation study. Reports that analyze several transportation measures were placed in each of those transportation measure categories.

ARCADIS Geraghty & Miller developed this matrix through a detailed review of transportation measure quantification literature collected under a previous work assignment (0-04). (For more information on that work assignment, see "Index of Transportation Measure Quantification Efforts: Final Report for Task 2 and Task 3," prepared by Acurex Environmental Corporation for USEPA, September 30, 1997.)

The methodology matrix provides a clearly organized, easy-to-use summary of available methodologies for evaluating a given transportation measure, strengths and weaknesses of those methodologies, and examples of research and evaluation efforts that have utilized each of those methodologies. Local planners using this matrix should easily be able to obtain important comparative information on transportation measures and voluntary measures of interest to them, and on the particular methodologies used to estimate or evaluate the travel and emissions impacts of these measures.

The completed methodology matrix covers 27 different transportation measures, and summarizes and analyzes 38 distinct quantification methodologies, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. Note that the methodologies listed in Figure 2 are shown in the same heirarchical order in which they appear (where applicable) within each transportation measure. The methodology matrix describes the use of these methodologies in 102 documents. These documents are listed in Attachment 1.

The methodology matrix reveals certain strengths and weakness of the transportation measure quantification literature. Certain transportation measures, including HOV facilities, telecommuting, and ridesharing, have been analyzed by many researchers, using a variety of analytical techniques. Others have not received the same amount of attention. In particular, Intelligent Transportation Systems are only recently moving from "crystal ball" discussions to analytically rigorous emissions quantification. In addition, shuttle projects have received limited attention.

Similarly, certain methodologies have been used extensively in the literature. Travel demand models have been used to provide detailed travel and emissions impact assessments for a wide variety of transportation measures. Many planners and researchers, however, have found sketch planning tools to provide the right balance between cost and accuracy. Advanced analytical models that integrate existing models, or that rely on

the "next generation" of travel and emissions models, will assume increasing importance in evaluating transportation measures in the future.

#### 3. Recommendations for further EPA research

This Work Assignment effort produced an extensive matrix for planners and policy makers to use when they need to evaluate the travel and emissions impacts of their own existing or planned transportation measures. Additional efforts to compile and index the existing literature on transportation and voluntary measure quantification efforts could focus on the following areas:

- Procurement and analysis of additional documents. Because the literature on transportation measures is developing rapidly, many valuable quantification efforts have been completed in the past year and were therefore not available during the literature collection portion of WA 0-04. Identifying these most recent research efforts, and preparing methodology matrix entries for them, would help keep the methodology matrix as up-to-date as possible, particularly for those segments of the literature that are developing most rapidly (ITS, for example).
- Preparation of methodology matrix entries for additional documents already identified. While
  ARCADIS Geraghty & Miller succeeded in this Work Assignment in analyzing a very large portion
  of the best transportation measure quantification documents collected in WA 0-04, available funding
  did not allow us to analyze all of the documents. Preparing methodology matrix entries for more
  documents from WA 0-04 would create additional value and comprehensiveness for the methodology
  matrix.
- Document procurement support for planners. The methodology matrix developed in this Work Assignment will allow local planners and policy makers to identify documents that may be most useful to them, but some of the documents may be difficult to obtain. Providing a document procurement service that helps planners obtain documents they are interested in could provide an efficient means of disseminating research results, and represent part of a "full-service" approach to helping local planners. However, copyright issues would need to be carefully worked out.
- Prepare analysis of previous research results targeted to SIP credit issues. In many cases, existing research results and methodologies may help planners and policy makers quantify the emissions impacts of their own local transportation measures, but in ways that may not meet EPA's standard for establishing State Implementation Plan emissions credit. A focused review and critique of selected quantification methodologies with SIP crediting requirements in mind (e.g., evaluating whether the emissions reductions are surplus and enforceable) will help local planners in working with EPA to create SIP-creditable transportation programs.

Figure 1. Transportation measures included in methodology matrix

Alternative Commute Programs

Alternative Transportation-Friendly Workplace

Bicycles

Clean Fuel Fleets

Compressed Work Week/Flex Time

Congestion Pricing

Database/Information

Emissions Fees

Employee Commute Subsidies

Episodic/ Seasonal Controls

Feebate

Fuel Tax Increases

General

High-Occupancy Vehicle Facilities

Intelligent Transportation Systems

Intermodal

Local Land Use/Urban Design

Market Incentives

Parking Pricing/Parking Management

Regional Land Use / Growth Management

Rideshare

Scrappage

Shuttles/Station Cars

Telecommuting

Traffic Management

Trip Reduction

VMT Fees

Figure 2. Heirarchy of quantification methodologies included in matrix

#### Modeling

- 1 Integrated travel demand, mode choice, traffic simulation, and emissions model
- 2 Integrated planning/simulation model
- 3 Travel demand/mode choice model
- 4 Modal emissions model
- 5 Conventional transportation planning network model
- 6 Vehicle queuing model
- 7 Freeway throughput model
- 8 Travel cost model
- 9 Demand elasticity model
- 10 Economic scrappage supply curve model
- 11 Vehicle fleet characterization and emissions model
- 12 Emission dispersion model (used for freeways)

#### Statistical and empirical analysis

- 13 Statistical analysis of average speed of congestion pricing scenarios
- 14 Use of economic theory to estimate congestion price levels
- 15 Statistical analysis of the impacts of land use characteristics and TDM strategies on mode choice
- 16 Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice
- 17 Statistical analysis of factors affecting travel behavior
- 18 Parking supply and demand model

#### Analysis of existing programs

- 19 Analysis of existing program(s) using travel diaries
- 20 Empirical analysis of employer-based trip reduction program
- 21 Empirical analysis of transportation measure implementation programs
- 22 Empirical analysis of transportation measure demonstration projects
- 23 Statistical analysis of employer ridesharing initiatives

#### Sample survey analysis

- 24 Sample surveys of ridematching database program success
- 25 Sample survey of customer travel patterns and preferences at shopping centers
- 26 Sample survey of employer trip reduction program cost
- 27 Sample survey analysis of existing program(s)
- 28 Transportation survey analysis
- 29 Sample surveys

#### General evaluation and analysis

- 30 Macro-level analysis
- 31 Evaluative matrix
- 32 Cross-sectional analysis of bicycle facilities
- 33 Sketch planning
- 34 Employer TDM cost-effectiveness model
- 35 Case study analysis
- 36 Policy analysis of transportation measures
- 37 Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation
- 38 Comparison and analysis of other studies

#### **ATTACHMENT 1**

#### Report Bibliography

The following documents were reviewed and summarized in the Attachment 2 methodology matrix.

- "A Case for Freeway Mainline Metering." Haboian, Kevin A. Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas. In Transportation Research Record 1494, 1995.
- "A Micro-Analysis of Land Use and Travel in Five Neighborhoods in the San Francisco Bay Area." Kitamura, Ryuichi, et al. Institute of Transportation Studies, UC Davis. November, 1994.
- "A Survey and Analysis of Employee Responses to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Incentive Programs." Schreffler, Eric N., and Mortero, Jose. COMSIS Corp. California Air Resources Board, Contract No. A983-187. February 1994.
- "Air Quality Impacts of HOV Facilities." Chatterjee, Aun. et al. University of Tennessee. Transportation Research Board 960425, January 1996.
- "Air Quality Offsets for Parking." Loudon, William, et al. In Transportation Research Record 1232, 1992.
- "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes." Dahlgren, J. W. Institute of Transportation Studies, UC Berkeley. UCB-ITS-DS-94-2, 1994.
- "An Assessment of IVHS-APTS Technology Impacts on Energy Consumption and Vehicle Emissions of Transit Bus Fleets." Jolibois, Sylvan C. Jr., and Adib Kanafani. California PATH Research Report. August 1994.
- "An Assessment of the Land Use Transportation System and Travel Behavior." McNally, Michael G., and Anup Kulkarni. U.C. Irvine. TRB 971120, January 1997.
- "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995.
- "An Economic Analysis of Scrappage." Hahn, Robert W. American Enterprise Institute, July 1993.
- "An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives." Giuliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In *Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications*, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.
- "Analysis of Indirect Source Trip Activity: Regional Shopping Centers." Prepared by JHK & Associates and K.T. Analytics for the California Air Resources Board. ARB-R-94/510, November 1993.
- "AQMD Survey Follow-Up." Ernst & Young. For South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1992.
- "Assessing the Emission Impacts of IVHS in an Uncertain Future." Washington, Simon P., Randall Guensler, and Daniel Sperling. University of California Transportation Center. Working Paper UCTC No. 298, 1993.
- "Assessment of High-Occupancy Vehicle Facilities in North America: Executive Report." Turnbull, Katherine. Texas Transportation Institute. Prepared for Federal Transit Administration, August 1992.

"Assessment of Travel Demand Management Approaches at Suburban Activity Centers." Bhatt, Kiran, and Higgins, Thomas. K.T. Analystics. U.S. DOT, July 1989.

"Bay Bridge Congestion Pricing Project: Lessons Learned to Date." Frick, Karen, et al. Metropolitan Transporation Commission. Transportation Research Board Paper 961317, 1996.

"Cashing Out Employer-Paid Parking: A Precedent for Congestion Pricing?" Shoup, Donald. University of California, Los Angeles. Contained in Transportation Research Board SR 242, 1994.

"Comparative Assessment of Travel Characteristics for Neotraditional Designs." McNally, Michael and Sherry Ryan. Institute of Transportation Studies. In Transportation Research Record 1400.

"Congestion Pricing and Motor Vehicle Emissions: An Initial Review." Guensler, Randall and Daniel Sperling. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994.

"Cost-Effectiveness of Private Employer Ridesharing Programs: An Employer's Assessment." Wegmann, Frederick J. University of Tennessee. In Transportation Research Record 1212, 1989.

"Critical Analysis of Sketch-Planning Tools for Evaluating the Emission Benefits of Transportation Control Measures." Crawford, Jason A., and Raymond A. Krammes. Prepared by Texas Transportation Institute for FHWA, FHWA/TX-92/1279-5, December 1993.

"Demand Elasticity Under Time-Varying Prices: Case Study of Day-of-Week Varying Tolls on Golden Gate Bridge." Gifford, Jonathan L. and Scott W. Talkington. George Mason University, 1996.

"Effect of Urban Development Patterns on Transportation Energy Use." Cheslow, Melvyn D., and J. Kevin Neels. In Transportation Research Record 764, 1980.

"Effects of Variable Work Hour Programs on Ridesharing and Organizational Effectiveness: A Case Study, Ventura County." Freas, Alyssa M. and Stuart M. Anderson. Commuter Transportation Services, Inc. In Transportation Research Record 1321, 1991.

"Emissions Impacts of Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems." Washington, Simon, Randall Guensler, and Daniel Sperling. U.C. Davis Institute of Transportation Studies, UCD-RP-13-93, 1993.

"Employee Trip Reduction Programs: An Evaluation." Orski, C. Kenneth. In *Transportation Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 3, July 1993.

"Employee Trip Reduction Without Government Mandates: Cost and Effectiveness Estimates From Chicago." Pagano, Anthony and JoAnn Verdin. University of Illinois at Chicago. Transportation Research Board Paper 971281, 1997.

"Energy Efficiency in the U.S. Economy, Technical Report One: Energy, Emissions, and Social Consequences of Telecommuting." U.S. Department of Energy, DOE/PO-0026, June 1994.

"Environmental Considerations for Planning Advanced Traffic Management Systems." Kraft, Walter H., and William A. Redl. In Resource Papers for the 1994 ITE International Conference, 1994.

"Estimating an Emissions Supply Function from Accelerated Vehicle Retirement Programs." Alberini, Anna et al. Resources for the Future, January 1994.

"Estimating the Travel and Parking Demand Effects of Employer-Paid Parking." Willson, Richard. UCTC No. 39, University of California Transportation Center, Berkeley, 1992.

"Evaluating the Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures for San Luis Obispo County, California." Morrow, David D., San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, 1992.

"Evaluating the Seattle I-5 North HOV Lane 2+ Occupancy Requirement Demonstration." Turnbull, Katherine F. et al. Texas Transportation Institute. January 1993.

"Evaluating Travel and Air Quality Cost-Effectiveness of Transportation Demand Management Projects." Schreffler, Eric N., Therese Costa, and Carl B. Moyer. In Transportation Research Record 1520, 1996.

"Evaluation of Congestion Pricing Alternatives in the Twin Cities." Lari, Adeel Z. and Kenneth R. Buckeye. Minnesota Department of Transportation, January 1997.

"Evaluation of Employee Trip Reduction Programs Based on California's Experience with Regulation XV." Orski, C. Kenneth. Institute of Transportation Engineers, January 1994.

"Evaluation of Employer-Sponsored Ridesharing Programs in Southern California." Ferguson, Erik T., Georgia Institute of Technology. In Transportation Research Record 1280, 1990.

"Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures to Relieve Congestion." Kuzmyak, J.R., and E.N. Schreffler. Prepared by COMSIS Corp. for FHWA. FHWA/SA-90/005; DOT-T-90-14. February 1990.

"Feasibility of Employee Trip Reduction as a Regional Transportation Control Measure." Lupa, Mary R. University of Illinois at Chicago. In Transportation Research Record 1459.

"Framework for Evaluating Transportation Control Measures: Mobility, Air Quality, and Energy Tradeoffs." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research, SWUTC-94-60034-1, July 1994.

"Freeway Congestion Pricing: Another Look." Levinson, Herbert. Transporation Research Board Paper 940977, January 1994.

"Freeway Ramp Metering Effects in Denver." Corcoran, Lawrence J. and Gordon A. Hickman. ITE 1989 Compendium of Technical Papers.

"High-Occupancy Vehicle Project Case Studies: Historical Trends and Project Experiences." Turnbull, Katherine. Texas Transportation Institute. Prepared for Federal Transit Administration, August 1992.

"HOV Lanes and Ramp Metering: Can They Work Together for Air Quality?" Shoemaker, Bill R. and Edward C. Sullivan. Transportation Research Board Paper 940444. January 1994.

"If You Build Them, Commuters Will Use Them: Cross-sectional Analysis of Commuters and Bicycle Facilities." Nelson, Arthur C., and David Allen. Georgia Institute of Technology. TRB 970132, January 1997.

"Impacts of Center-Based Telecommuting on Travel and Emissions: Analysis of the Puget Sound Demonstration Project." Henderson, Dennis K., and Mohktarian, Patricia L. Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Davis. Vol. 1, 1996.

"Impacts of Compressed Work Week on Vehicle Trips and Miles Traveled: Final Report." School of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Southern California, for the California Air Resources Board. Contract No. A 132-136, October 1994.

"Impacts of Congestion Pricing on Transit and Carpool Demand and Supply." Kain, John. Harvard University, TRB 940444, 1994.

"Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience." COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, DOT-T-94-02, September 1993.

"Improving the Effectiveness of Ridesharing Programs." Stevens, William F. Transportation Quarterly, Vol. 44 No. 4, October 1990.

"Intelligent Transportation Systems Impact Assessment Framework: Final Report." Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, September 30, 1995.

"ITS Benefits: Continuing Successes and Operational Test Results." Prepared by Mitretek Systems for Federal Highway Administration. Draft, September 19, 1997.

"Land Use Regulations to Promote Ridesharing: An Evaluation of the Seattle Approach." McCutcheon, Melody, and Jeffrey Hamm. *Transportation Quarterly*, Vol. 37 No. 4, 1983.

"Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Giuliano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation. Policy Insight No. 142, September 1992.

"Meeting Clean Air Act Emissions Standards: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Car Scrappage." DeCardy, Christopher. Harvard University, April 1994.

"Methodological Issues in the Estimation of the Travel, Energy, and Air Quality Impacts of Telecommuting." Mokhtarian, Patricia L. et al. Transportation Research A. Vol. 29A, No. 4, 1995.

"Methodology for Evaluating ATIS Impacts on Air Quality." Al-Deek, H. et al. Journal of Transportation Engineering, Vol. 121, No. 4, pp. 376-384, Jul/Aug 1995.

"Negative Impacts of HOV Facilities on Transit." Vuchic, Vukan R., et al. University of Pennsylvania/University of Delaware. TRB 950543. January 1995.

"Overview of the Georgia Tech GIS-Based Modal Emissions Model." Guensler, Randall, et al. Georgia Tech Research Partnership. April 1997.

"Parking Subsidies and Travel Choices: Assessing the Evidence." Willson, Richard W. and Donald C. Shoup. In *Transportation*, Vol. 17, 1990.

"Potential Contributions of Intelligent Vehicle/Highway Systems (IVHS) to Reducing Transportation's Greenhouse Gas Production." Shladover, Steven E. PATH, Institute of Transportation Studies, U.C. Berkeley. August 1991.

"Potential Emission and Air Quality Impacts of Intelligent Vehicle-Highway Systems." Ostria, Sergio, and Michael F. Lawrence. In *Transportation Research Record* 1444, 1994.

"Ramp Metering: Does it Really Work?" Robinson, James, and Mark Doctor. FHWA/ITE 1989 Compendium of Technical Papers.

"Reducing Drive-Alone Rates at Small Employer Sites: Costs and Benefits of Local Trip Reduction Ordinances: Pasadena Towers Case Study." Stewart, Jacqueline. In *Transportation Research Record* 1433, 1994.

"Rideshare Placement Mesurement: A Proposed Standard Methodology." King, Michael, and Barbara Alderson. California State University at Chico, June 1995.

"Sacramento Regional Spare the Air 1996: A Report on Two Public Opinion Surveys." Lamare, Jude, The Cleaner Air Partnership. 1997.

"SB 836 Evaluation Methodology: Baseline and Methodology to Measure the Effectiveness of Voluntary Ridesharing and Other Rule 2202 Replacement Measures," Final Report. Schreffler, Eric et al, for Regional Transportation Agencies' Coalition. July 1997.

"Selection and Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures." Taylor, Christopher J., et al. TRB Paper 971114, January 1997.

"Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances." Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993.

"South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XV Cost Survey." Ernst & Young. For South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1992.

"TCM Analyst 1.0 and User's Guide." Crawford, Jason A., et al. Texas Transportation Institute. For the Federal Highway Administration, November 1994.

"Testing the Impact of Alternative Land Use Scenarios Using a Travel Demand Forecasting Model." Steiss, Todd Alan. Baltimore Metropolitan Council, Transportation Planning Division. Transportation Research Board Paper 960898.

"The Determinants of Ridesharing: Literature Review." Hwang, Keith and Genevieve Giuliano. University of California Transportation Center, UCTC 38, May 1990.

"The Effect of HOV Lanes in Reducing Emissions." Bieberitz, John A. ITE 1993 Compendium of Technical Papers.

"The Effectiveness of Ridesharing Incentives." Brownstone, David, and Thomas F. Golob. In Regional Science and Urban Economics, Vol. 22, 1992.

"The Effectiveness of Telecommuting as a Transportation Control Measure." Sampath, Srikanth, S. Saxene, and P. Mokhtarian. In Transportation Planning and Air Quality: Proceedings of the National Conference, American Sociaty of Civil Engineers, 1991.

"The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition, AWMA 93-RP-149.05, 1993.

"The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior: Final Report." Prepared by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Transportation, November 1994.

"The Effects of New High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on Travel and Emissions." Johnston, Robert A., and Raju Ceerla. In *Transportation Research A*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 35-50, 1996.

"The Equity and Cost Effectiveness of Employee Commute Options Programs." Farkas, Z. Andrew. Morgan State University. TRB 960078, January 1996.

"The Impacts of Various Land Use Strategies on Suburban Mobility." Middlesex Somerset Mercer Regional Council (MSM). For the Federal Transit Administration. December 1992.

"The Influence of Employer Ridesharing Programs on Employee Mode Choice." Ferguson, Erik. *Transportation, Vol.* 17, 1990.

"The Los Angeles County Route 14 Vanpool and Buspool Demonstration Project: An Analysis of its Effectiveness in Reducing Long Distance Commuter Trips." Blanchard, Donna et al. Transportation Research Board. July 1993.

"The Odds on TODs: Examining the Potential of Transit-Oriented Development in the San Francisco Bay Area." Luscher, Dan. Harvard University, April 1995.

"The Travel and Emissions Impacts of Telecommuting for the State of California Telecommuting Pilot Project." Koenig, Brett E., et al. Transportation Research, Vol 4 no. 1. pp. 13-32, 1996.

"Transit-Oriented Development in the Sun Belt." Messenger, Todd, and Reid Ewing. In Transportation Research Record 1552, 1996.

"Transportation-Related Impacts of Compressed Work Week: The Denver Experiment." Atherton, Terry J., et al. In Transportation Research Record 845, 1982.

"Transportation-Related Land Use Strategies to Minimize Motor Vehicle Emissions: An Indirect Source Research Study." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates, Inc. For California Air Resources Board. June 1995.

"Transportation Control Measure Analysis Procedures." Austin, Barbara S., et al. Systems Applications International/California Air Resources Board. SYSAPP-91/141, Nov 1991.

"Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.

"Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991.

"Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404.

"Transportation Demand Management: Case Studies of Medium-Sized Employers." Rutherford, G. Scott et al. In Transportation Research Record 1459.

"Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994.

"Transportation Pricing Strategies for California: An Assessment of Congestion, Emissions, Energy and Equity Impacts." California Air Resources Board, Report No. 92-316, June 1995.

"Travel Behavior as a Function of Accessibility, Land Use Mixing, and Land Use Balance: Evidence from the San Francisco Bay Area." Kockelman, Kara M. University of California, Berkeley. TRB 970048.

"Travel Markets: An Approach to TCM Effectiveness Evaluation." Torluemke, Donald A. Ekistic Mobility Consultants, 1992.

"Travel, Emissions, and Consumer Benefits of Advanced Transit Technologies in the Sacramento Region." Johnston, Robert and Caroline Rodier. University of California, Davis. California PATH Research Report, July 1996.

"Uncertain Air Quality Impacts of Automobile Retirement Programs." Shi-Ling Hsu and Daniel Sperling. In Transportation Research Record 1444, 1995.

"Using Residential Patterns and Transit to Decrease Auto Dependence and Costs." Holtzclaw, John. For Natural Resources Defense Council, June 1994.

"Vehicle Scrappage: An Alternative to More Stringent New Vehicle Standards in California." Lyons, James, et al. Sierra Research. For Texaco Inc. SR95-03-02. March 1995.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Transportation Control Measures: Methodology Matrix

| Transportation Measure                                   | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>Coll Methodology  | and the  |  | A Topini (C) (A Simo)  |   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|-----|
| Alternative<br>Commute<br>Programs                       | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the TCM implementation  Cost can vary greatly                                   | *Transportation Control<br>Measures Analyzed for<br>the Washington<br>Region's 15 Percent<br>Rate of Progress Plan.*<br>FHWA/Metropolitan<br>Washington Council of<br>Governments, February<br>1995. | Provides compre-<br>hensive<br>evaluation of the<br>selection and<br>quantification<br>process<br>performed by the<br>MWCOG for<br>assessing various<br>TCM measures                   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific TCM evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, & emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process)                                 | dad |
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model                                 | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters  | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience.* COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.                               | Summarizes<br>broad range of<br>TDM measures,<br>provides example<br>case study<br>analyses of each,<br>and uses<br>computer model<br>to benchmark the<br>effectiveness of<br>each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs                      | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness.  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module.  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Level of service<br>provided by<br>employer:<br>information,<br>matching services,<br>preferential parking,<br>ride home programs | dad |

| Transportation.  Measure  | Methodology                                    | Advantages: | Disacvantajo<br>of Methodology | Перод   |  | winacasaisv.  |   | Pácto L'Analyzec  | *C. 10. |
|---|--|-------------|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---------|
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |             |                                | "A Survey and Analysis of Employee Responses to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Incentive Programs." Schreffler, Eric N., and Mortero, Jose. COMSIS Corp. California Air Resources Board, February 1994. Contract No. A983-187. | Describes results of new survey data regarding employee travel behavior; uses mode choice and travel demand model to predict impacts of certain employer-based transportation measures | Clearly explains the process that was used: survey data acquisition, mode choice computation, and TCM effectiveness model use  Data requirements are more readily available than other models  User-friendly model is available for outside use; users guide is also available  Survey links incentives directly to impacts on travel behavior Model includes an awareness sub-model that simulates how many people know about the possible transportation measures available to them | Does not accurately address trip-chaining and VMT reductions (only trips)  Household conditions are not extensively accounted for  Cost-effectiveness was not calculated  Employer-level analyses only, with focus upon incentive TCMs    | Guaranteed ride home  Company vanpools  Preferential parking  Parking fees for ridesharers  Carpool subsidies & transportation allowances | d       |
|   |  |             |                                | "Selection and<br>Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures." Taylor,<br>Christopher J., et al.<br>TRB Paper 971114,<br>January 1997.   | Uses Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area                 | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to-zone travel  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer-based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies  | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions | Transit fare levels and travel time  HOV lane time savings  Parking costs  Employer transit encouragement level                           |         |

| 3 |
|---|
| 0 |

| Transportation<br>Measure   | Methodology  | Adventages<br>of Methodology   | Dierdyanteges, i<br>To (Mellipadio <b>sy</b> ).  | Systematics and the second  | - instalbijon e  |  |  | F. Giordy Analyzad   | Î   |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|-----|
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.)   |  |  | "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model employed to model the VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculation uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost- effectiveness estimates | Does not provide<br>detail on model<br>operation   | Many; not specified  | dac |
|   | Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but likely to be influenced heavily by local factors of the study area)  Can be replicated (at moderate to high cost)  Does not require extensive computer model  Uses actual survey data | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Personal preference and workplace conditions difficult to impact through public policy | "The Influence of Employer Ridesharing Programs on Employee Mode Choice." Ferguson, Erik. Transportation, vol 17, 1990.   | Analyzes aggregate-level data compiled by a large Southern California regional ridesharing agency; assesses impact of employer characteristics on employee mode split      | Analyzes a large data set comprising almost 10% of Los Angeles area workforce  Utilizing existing agency database is a costeffective approach  Less accurate than disaggregated (employee by employee) data  Includes costeffectiveness estimations  | Some findings may have been contradicted by more recent studies (e.g., study finds that large corporations have better success with rideshare programs)  Aging data source: 1985 survey data  Los Angeles area factors may be uncharacteristic of other regions, so results may not be applicable elsewhere  Employer-derived data was acquired using different methods  No estimates of emissions impacts | Level of employer effort to encourage ridesharing Size of firm | dac |

| Transportation  Measure   | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Memodology   | Following.   | 1000  |   |  |  | Medical Mayor   |     |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----|
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model              | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | "An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives." Gluliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.           | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and- after-TCM conditions                              | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey                | Not described   | dec |
|   | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects  | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measures | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions                | "Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion."<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs  | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented | Generally does not evaluate specific TCM individually; programs of multiple TCMs are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures | dac |

| Transportation  Measure   | Methodology                               | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadventages<br>of Methodology  | A VIOLOTO A T  |  | Actions for conflictions  |  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace<br>(cont.) | Employer TDM cost-<br>effectiveness model | Estimates reduction in and costs of daily trips and peak period trips  Aids employer determination of cost-effectiveness of TDM measures for their particular worksite | Results may vary widely from one employer to the next Many inputs may be difficult for employers or planners to quantify | "Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404. | Reports on the development of a model to individually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of 15 different employer-based TDM measures in suburban settings | Focus on suburban employers reflects different travel-related characteristics of suburban and urban areas  Spreadsheet-based model is user-friendly and readily accessible for use at the site-specific level; model makes sensitivity analysis relatively simple  Eight transportation environments were defined to represent various combinations of transportation service characteristics  For employers without access to entire range of data necessary to operate model, default values are included | Most employers surveyed to develop model were unable to provide detailed cost information on the TDM measures they had implemented  Does not calculate emissions directly  Potential for regional bias, as model was developed in part based on a survey of suburban San Francisco Bay Area employers; model also used the SCAQMD Regulation XV and Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Program employer plan databases  Only some TDMs included in model provide for estimates of VT reductions  Use of default values could diminishes accuracy of estimates for some users | Suburban employer-based TDM measures  Daily trips and peak period trips  Costs and cost-effectiveness |

| Transportation<br>Measure   | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Perevoices   | aronier.   |  | www.pression   |  |   | ACCOUNT OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the TCM implementation  Cost can vary greatly                                 | Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan.* FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.  | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific TCM evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, & emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of aiready-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) | dac  |
|   | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be   | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of transportation measure options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                   | dac  |
|   |  | used if other directly applicable research is not available identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  |  | "Assessment of Travel Demand Management Approaches at Suburban Activity Centers." Bhatt, Kiran, and Higgins, Thomas. K.T. Analystics. U.S. DOT, July 1989.   | Surveys research studies and interviews TCM program coordinators to provide an overview of the range of effectiveness of employer-based TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program  | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Only generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness   | Relative effectiveness of various transportation measure programs implementation mechanisms       | dad  |

| Transportation<br>Measure   | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disacyantages//<br>Dof Methodology/th  | 1,0000   |  | Zumedae ijot  |   | Factors: Analyzed   | 2   |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|-----|
| Alternative<br>Transporta-<br>tion-Friendly<br>Workplace<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |  |  | *Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates.* Giuliano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation. Policy Insight No. 142, September 1992.           | Compares congestion pricing with Regulation XV for the Southern California area; describes pros and cons of each measure and discusses implications                                    | Provides typology of transportation measures and identifies effectiveness and common barriers to implementation  Simple side-by-side comparison of VMT reduction and cost-effectiveness for each transportation measure  Makes policy recommendations to improve each transportation measure        | Provides little detail about logistics of implementing the policy recommendations  Does not quantify emission reductions  | Direct vs. indirect implementation  Market-based vs. performance-based implementation  Efficiency and equity considerations | dac |
|   |   |  |  | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996.   | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Baltimore and Philadelphia regions   | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions   | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions                | Rideshare promotion<br>level Parking charge level Transit subsidy<br>levels Work schedule<br>flexibility                    | dac |
| Bicycles  | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model                    | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary Input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience." COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02. | Summarizes<br>broad range of<br>TDM measures,<br>provides example<br>case study<br>analyses of each,<br>and uses<br>computer model<br>to benchmark the<br>effectiveness of<br>each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Bicycle mode share  | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Mathodology  |   | in a supple  | e verinor   | wangan jersing/   |  | Zottira Arrapyzed   |    |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|----|
| Bicycles<br>(cont)        | Parking supply<br>and demand<br>model   | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary Input parameters   | Requires computer model  Potentially high cost to use   | "Air Quality Offsets for<br>Parking." Loudon,<br>William, et al. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1232,<br>1992.  | Develops and uses parking supply model for downtown Portland to estimate CO emissions   | Uses observed price and travel time sensitivities Uses proven models of travel behavior Incorporates integrated CO emissions model  | Requires parking database: number of spaces, location, type, use patterns Requires travel database: time of arrival, travel & work mode split  | Travel time & cost  | de |
|                           | Statistical analysis of the impacts of land use characteristics and TDM strategies on mode choice | Identifies land use and urban design characteristics that are supportive of walk/bike mode choice.  Standard analysis of variance using principle components allows examination of the effects of land use and TDM incentive strategies on mode choice individually and in combination.  Results transferable to other urban areas in terms of relative ranking of importance of the land use and TDM factors analyzed. | Precise causality and individual impacts of factors such as transit availability or urban density on mode choice cannot be measured due to limitations of the database  Potential for need to conduct extensive field research to determine land use characteristics at each sample work site.  Cannot be used to determine land use and urban design characteristics' impact on a specific mode choice | "The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior. Final Report." Prepared by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Transportation, November 1994. | Develops an integrated database of land use characteristics and travel demand management (TDM) strategies (for a sample of employment locations) to determine the combined impacts of TDM programs, land use, and urban design on employee travel behavior. | Added land use and site information from field observation to the "Regulation XV" dataset of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (which included aggregate employee travel characteristics and employer incentive programs) | Study conducted in Los Angeles County, and thus may be less applicable in more dense urban areas with factors such as higher average density and transit service.  Share of work trips made by bicycle as a percentage of the total trips in the data set is small, making identification of work site characteristics that encourage utilization of bikes difficult.  Did not address residential trip end of commute, midday travel, or trip chaining as factors which influence mode choice  To simplify a complicated data collection process, somewhat arbitrary indicators were used for assessment of a site's urban design and land use characteristics. | Land use and urban design of worksite  TDM incentive strategies | d  |

| Transportation Measure | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadyantages<br>of Methodology   | 10:01   | Description   | radung dia sila   | Disadvantages  | Factore Analyzed  | 01  |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|-----|
| Bicycles<br>(cont.)    | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs               | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model                  | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results                        | *An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives.* Giuliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.           | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and-after-TCM conditions  | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey                | Not described   | dac |
|                        | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects                | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measures     | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions                                       | "Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion."<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs  | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented  | Generally does not evaluate specific TCM individually; programs of multiple TCMs are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures | dac |
|                        | Sample survey<br>of customer<br>travel patterns<br>and prefer-<br>ences at<br>shopping<br>centers | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but influenced by local factors of the study area)  Does not require an extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Moderate to high cost | *Analysis of Indirect<br>Source Trip Activity:<br>Regional Shopping<br>Centers.* JHK &<br>Associates/ K.T.<br>Analytics/ California Air<br>Resources Board.<br>November 1993, ARB-<br>R-94/510.                           | Surveyed customers of regional shopping centers to determine potential impact of various travel reduction measures  | Uses actual survey data (Including customer demographic and stated preference data)  Developed calculation methodologies specific to each trip reduction measure, using site- specific data  Compares data between shopping centers in different land-use types | Assumptions are required to translate stated preference data to expected outcome  Does not quantify emission reductions  | Distance of travel for consumers                              | dac |

| Transportation Measure | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages (5)<br>Of Methodology  | i POSO  | or cipion   | And the state of the second   | electovalneose / **<br>Substitution of the substitution of the substi | Factors Analyzed   |
|------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Bicycles<br>(cont.)    | Cross-sectional<br>analysis of<br>bicycle facilities | Low cost to<br>perform (if<br>database is<br>available)   | Requires considerable database  Study results do not necessarily apply to other regions      | "If You Build Them,<br>Commuters Will Use<br>Them: Cross-sectional<br>Analysis of Commuters<br>and Bicycle Facilities."<br>Nelson, Arthur C., and<br>David Alten. Georgia<br>Institute of Technology.<br>TRB 970132, January<br>1997. | Analyzed a clatabase of 18 US cities to determine which factors most influence increased bicycle use  | Identifies some important factors affecting bicycle use, as well as several that do not affect bicycle use                    | Does not assess many factors that could influence bloycle use Cannot predict effectiveness of new facilities  Does not perform before-and-after analysis of actual inuse facilities  Requires larger database to perform more rigorous analysis   | Bikeway miles per 100,000 population Terrain type Annual rain days Percent students Mean high- temperature |
|                        | Sketch<br>planning                                   | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures for San Luis Obispo County, California." Morrow, David D., San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, 1992.   | Develops and uses a calculation methodology for estimating the trip reduction and air quality benefits of bicycle facility improvements in San Luis Opispo County | Methodologies are developed specifically for the bicycle facility improvement program  Explains calculation process in detail | Requires extensive, region-specific information to accurately estimate benefits and effectiveness of the program  Assumes a level of program participation (as required by the measure)   | Many; not specified  |



| Transportation<br>Measure | , Methodology           | Advantages<br>of Methodology | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | respectively.  | Pergipuore  |   | iplanty; mage.  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Bicycles<br>(cont.)       | Sketch planning (cont.) |                              |                                 | "Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances." Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993. | Describes development of simple method- ologies for quantifying reductions in vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from TCMs, for use in a planning- level context; developed originally for the South Coast Air Basin | Methods to quantify VT and VMT reductions from TCMs were based upon relatively simple methods for estimating emissions and individual TCM effectiveness developed prior to this report for the South Coast AQMD  Performance-based approach was developed rather than use mandated transportation performance standards  Actual experience data used as much as possible: estimated trip reduction levels from each TCM was collected from other studies, and planning-level analysis uses site-specific data inputs, thus offering increased precision in emissions estimates  Ranges in VT reductions estimates address the interactive impacts of the application of multiple transportation measures  Equivalency factor used to convert VMT to VT can account for region-specific average trip lengths | Expected reductions In VT and VMT from TCMs were estimated based upon a general survey, so for a particular location different assumptions may be needed  Applicability to other regions outside California limited by report's use of transportation data and emissions factors in the analysis which were quantified using BURDEN and EMFAC runs for 1994  Does not incorporate any consideration of cost-effectiveness | Employee particl- pation (percentage and frequency)  Trip length  Bike parking facilities  Existence/extent of bike path system  Existence of shower facilities |

| Transportation Measure | Methodology,   | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | sol cynndae<br>G Mohotology  | Dia  |   | CENTIFIC COMP  |  | Factors Analyzed  | i de |
|------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|------|
| Bicycles<br>(cont.)    | Sketch<br>planning (cont.)   |   |  | "Evaluating Travel and<br>Air Quality Cost-<br>Effectiveness of<br>Transportation Demand<br>Management Projects."<br>Schreffler, Eric N.,<br>Therese Costa, and<br>Carl B. Moyer. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1520,<br>1996. | Describes simple methodologies used to evaluate projects funded by the AB 2766 vehicle registration fee program in Southern California  | Methodology can be used to evaluate prior projects or proposed future projects  Uses available EMFAC emission rates to calculate ROG, PM10, NOx, and CO  Study develops standardized worksheet to evaluate projects  Study points out drawbacks of self-reported project results   | Methodology relies on participation data provided by project proponents, which may not always be unbiased  EMFAC7E factors are California-specific | Trips reduced Trip length Prior travel mode   | dri  |
|                        | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the TCM implementation  Cost can vary greatly | "Transportation Control<br>Measures Analyzed for<br>the Washington<br>Region's 15 Percent<br>Rate of Progress Plan."<br>FHWA/Metropolitan<br>Washington Council of<br>Governments, February<br>1995.                                     | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various TCM measures | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific TCM evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, & emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of aiready-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) | de   |

٠.

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | i Dponii   | . verelpton  | tanianing and Study   | Dissoventages  | Factore Analyzed   | 33  |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|-----|
| Bicycles<br>(cont.)       | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of transportation measure options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT                                       | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                              | dac |
|                           |  | which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies                            | g  | "Assessment of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Approaches at<br>Suburban Activity<br>Centers." Bhatt, Kiran,<br>and Higgins, Thomas.<br>K.T. Analystics. U.S.<br>DOT, July 1989.  | Surveys research studies and interviews TCM program coordinators to provide an overview of the range of effectiveness of employer-based TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Only generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness   | Relative effective-<br>ness of various<br>transportation<br>measure programs<br>implementation<br>mechanisms | dac |
| Clean Fuel<br>Fleets      | Parking supply<br>and demand<br>model          | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters  | Requires computer<br>model<br>Potentially high cost<br>to use  | *Air Quality Offsets for<br>Parking.* Loudon,<br>William, et al. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1232,<br>1992.  | Develops and uses parking supply model for downtown Portland, Oregon to estimate CO emissions  | Uses observed price and travel time sensitivities  Uses proven models of travel behavior  Incorporates integrated CO emissions model  | Requires parking database: number of spaces, location, type, use patterns  Requires travel database: time of arrival, trave & work mode split  | Vehicle emissions rates  Number of alternative fueled vehicles   | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure             | Methodology                                    | Adventages of Methodology  | sontavio ett.  | 1, 1,1101,5  |  | vociji <mark>siji jo</mark> ksi <u>do</u> k   |   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|-----|
| Clean Fuel<br>Fleets (cont.)          | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates   | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits     | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions                  | Impacts: vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions Costs | dad |
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model         | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters  | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience.* COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.   | Summarizes broad range of TDM measures, provides example case study analyses of each, and uses computer model to benchmark the effectiveness of each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | 4/40, 3/36, and 9/80<br>work weeks<br>Participation levels          | da  |

. .

|   | 10 |
|---|----|
| , | cu |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology                                    | Advantages ( | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | Albania.   | Haoerenion a  | v.ov muod pasindy,  | Disavventages  (All Of Budy   | Factors Analyzed   |    |
|--|--|--------------|---------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|----|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |              |                                 | "Transportation Control Measure Analysis Procedures." Austin, Barbara S., et al. Systems Applications International/California Air Resources Board. Nov 1991. SYSAPP-91/141. | Describes a developed transportation demand model and explicitly discusses the calculation methodology used for several transportation measures                         | Model quantifies key secondary effects of TCMs (e.g. new carpooling programs may attract transit riders rather than SOV riders)  Presents all the primary equations and variables used to calculate the effects of TCMs  Contains a step-by-step process for evaluating packages of TCMs  Explains multi-attribute analyses as applied to multiple TCM packages | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient; participation level data is required; base cases need to match real conditions  Model does not cover all TCMs, but can be modified to do so  Temporal treatment is limited to on-peak/off-peak, no spatial treatment  Emissions calculations are not explicitly described in the same fashion as travel effects | Participation levels  Potential shift in commute time of day   | da |
|  |  |              |                                 | "Selection and<br>Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures." Taylor,<br>Christopher J., et al.<br>January, 1997. TRB<br>971114.                                 | Uses Travel Dernand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to- zone travel  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer- based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies  | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions   | Transit fare levels and travel time HOV lane time savings Parking costs Employer transit encouragement level | de |

| Transportation Measure                           | Meinceblogy                                    | . Vov. integed at<br>act Methodology.                                     |   |  |  | Andrew Turking Line  |   | Eactors Analyzed                   |     |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |   |   | 'Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Managernent District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model employed to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations use standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, Including cost- effectiveness estimates | Does not provide<br>detail on rnodel<br>operation   | Many; not specified                | dao |
|  | Parking supply<br>and damand<br>model          | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires computer model  Potentially high cost to use | *Air Quality Offsets for<br>Parking.* Loudon,<br>William, et al. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1232,<br>1992.  | Develops and uses parking supply model for downtown Portland to estimate CO emissions  | Uses observed price and travel time sensitivities  Uses proven models of travel behavior  Incorporates integrated CO emissions model   | Requires parking database: number of spaces, location, type, use patterns  Requires travel database: time of arrival, trave & work mode split | Time of arrival (in downtown area) | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Statistical<br>analysis of the<br>impacts of land<br>use character-<br>istics and TDM<br>strategies on<br>mode choice | Use of Principle Components Analysis generated composite variables (groups of land use characteristics with similar impacts) Standard analysis of variance using principle components allowed examination of the effects of land use and TDM incentive strategies on mode choice individually and in combination.  Results transferable to other urban areas in terms of relative ranking of importance of the land use and TDM factors analyzed. | Precise causality and individual impacts of factors such as transit availability or urban density on mode choice cannot be measured due to limitations of the database  Potential for need to conduct extensive field research to determine land use characteristics at each sample work site.  Cannot be used to determine land use and urban design characteristics' impact on a specific mode choice | "The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior: Final Report." Prepared by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Transportation, November 1994. | Develops an integrated database of land use characteristics and travel demand management (TDM) strategies (for a sample of employment locations) to determine the combined impacts of TDM programs, land use, and urban design on employee travel behavior. | Added land use and site information from field observation to the "Regulation XV" dataset of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (which included aggregate employee travel characteristics and employer incentive programs) | Study conducted in Los Angeles County, and thus may be less applicable in more dense urban areas with factors such as higher average density and transit service.  Did not address residential trip end of commute, midday travel, or trip chaining as factors which influence mode choice  To simplify a complicated data collection process, somewhat arbitrary indicators were used for assessment of a site's urban design and land use characteristics. | Land use and urban design of worksite  TDM incentive strategies |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report S   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but likely to be influenced heavily by local factors of the study area)  Can be replicated (at moderate to high cost)  Does not require extensive computer model  Uses actual survey data | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Personal preference and workplace conditions difficult to impact through public policy            | "The Influence of Employer Ridesharing Programs on Employee Mode Choice." Ferguson, Erik. Transportation, vol 17, 1990.  | Analyzes aggregate-level data compiled by a large Southern California regional ridesharing agency; assesses impact of employer characteristics on employee mode split | Analyzes a large data set comprising almost 10% of Los Angeles area workforce  Utilizing existing agency database is a cost-effective approach  Less accurate than disaggregated (employee by employee) data  Includes cost-effectiveness estimations                      | Some findings may have been contradicted by more recent studies (e.g., study finds that large corporations have better success with rideshare programs)  Aging data source: 1985 survey data  Los Angeles area factors may be uncharacteristic of other regions, so results may not be applicable elsewhere  Employer-derived data was acquired using different methods  No estimates of emissions impacts | Level of employer effort to encourage ridesharing Size of firm |
|  | Analysis of<br>existing<br>program(s)<br>using travel<br>diaries                                 | Analyzes actual CWW/fiex time programs  Addresses travel behavior patterns  Can differentiate between work and nonwork travel, and between weekday and weekend travel  | Potential high cost associated with implementing travel diaries  Does not address total demand for CWW/flex time  Applicability of results to other regions and conditions is uncertain | *Impacts of<br>Compressed Work<br>Week on Vehicle Trips<br>and Miles Traveled:<br>Final Report.* School<br>of Urban and Regional<br>Planning, University of<br>Southern California, for<br>the California Air<br>Resources Board,<br>October 1994.<br>Contract No. A132-136. | Evaluates the effectiveness of CWW schedules; quantifies VT, VMT.   | Controls for individual and household characteristics to isolate independent effect of work schedules on VT and VMT  Differentiated between "4/40" and "9/80" CWW schedules  Sample size (and therefore cost) can be varied based on level of statistical accuracy desired | Does not directly calculate emissions impacts  Large sample size is needed to provide statistically robust results  Travel diaries rely on honest recordkeeping by study respondents   | Type of CWW schedule Individual and household characteristics  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model               | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | "An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives." Gluliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997. | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and-after-TCM conditions            | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey                | Not described   |
|  | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects  | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measuress | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions                | "Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures to Relieve Congestion." Kuzmyak, J.R., and E.N. Schreffier. Prepared by COMSIS Corp. for FHWA. FHWA/SA-90/005; DOT-T-90-14. February 1990.                     | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs  | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of TCMs  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented | Generally does not evaluate specific TCM individually; programs of multiple TCMs are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology | Disadventages | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed                       |    |
|--|--|---------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|----|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects (cont.) |                           |               | "Transportation-Related Impacts of Compressed Work Week: The Deriver Experiment." Atherton, Terry J., et al. In Transportation Research Record 845, 1982.   | Provides before and after comparison of travel behavior for an experimental compressed-work week program for federal employees in Denver | Before-and-after approach (with a control group) accurately assesses changes in travel  Utilizes actual travel diaries and surveys to track travel patterns  identifies some non-work travel impacts of compressed work weeks  Information was complete and accurate due to government workplace focus | Results not as applicable to private organizations, which may not respond as well to requirements to implement compressed work week plans  | 9/80 schedule vs.<br>4/40 schedule     | da |
|  |  |                           |               | "Effects of Variable Work Hour Programs on Ridesharing and Organizational Effectiveness: A Case Study, Ventura County." Freas, Alyssa M. and Stuart M. Anderson. Commuter Transportation Services, Inc. In Transportation Research Record 1321, 1991. | Assesses several impacts of a pilot employer-based voluntary compressed work week program in Ventura County                              | Case study was carefully designed to achieve easily obtainable, useful information at the end of the study  Studied the impact of CWW on not only commutes, but also employee performance, office performance, and supervisor perspectives   | Study was performed within a proactive county agency, rather than a private company, which may affect the results  Does not assess VMT or emissions reductions, only assesses ride share percent | Flextime, 4/40 weeks<br>and 9/80 weeks | de |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology        | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed |
|--|--------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|------------------|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Sketch<br>planning | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "TCM Analyst 1.0 and<br>User's Guide."<br>Crawford, Jason A., et<br>al. Texas<br>Transportation Institute.<br>For the Federal<br>Highway<br>Administration,<br>November 1994. | Describes a computerized sketch planning tool, TCM Analyst 1.0, including input data requirements, methods of use, and an overview of the model's structure and calculation procedures | Provides a useful and relatively easy instruction manual for using TCM Analyst 1.0  Uses MOBILE5a output data (emission factors) as inputs to the model, providing more accurate emission benefit calculations for each TCM | Program only models limited TCMs and cannot model multiple TCM packages  Requires several runs with MOBILE5a to obtain input emission factors  Modeling on regional (rather than microscale) basis only | Not stated       |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology             | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantagea   | Factors Analyzed  | $\Big]$ |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---------|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Sketch planning (cont.) |                           | •                               | "Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances." Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993 | Describes development of simple methodologies for quantifying reductions in vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from TCMs, for use in a planning- level context; developed originally for the South Coast Air Basin | Methods to quantify VT and VMT reductions from TCMs were based upon relatively simple methods for estimating emissions and individual TCM effectiveness developed prior to this report for the South Coast AQMD  Performance-based approach was developed rather than use mandated transportation performance standards  Actual experience data used as much as possible: estimated trip reduction levels from each TCM was collected from other studies, and planning-level analysis uses site-specific data inputs, thus offering increased precision in emissions estimates  Ranges in VT reductions estimates address the interactive impacts of the application of multiple TCMs  Equivalency factor used to convert VMT to VT can account for region-specific average trip lengths | Expected reductions in VT and VMT from TCMs were estimated based upon a general survey, so for a particular location different assumptions may be needed  Applicability to other regions outside California limited by report's use of transportation data and emissions factors in the analysis which were quantified using BURDEN and EMFAC runs for 1994  Does not incorporate any consideration of cost-effectiveness | Employee participation (percentage and frequency)  Employer- implemented alternative work week schedule |         |

dkφ

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology                | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Adventages of Study                                   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Sketch<br>planning (cont.) |                           |                              | "Critical Analysis of<br>Sketch-Planning Tools<br>for Evaluating the<br>Emission Benefits of<br>Transportation Control<br>Measures." Crawford,<br>Jason A., and<br>Raymond A. Krammes.<br>Prepared by Texas<br>Transportation Institute<br>for FHWA, FHWA/TX-<br>92/1279-5. December<br>1993. | Critical analysis and sensitivity analysis (using data for El Paso, Texas) of San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) TCM Tools method and the Systems Applications International (SAI) method; summarized in TRR 1472 | Provides detailed sketch-<br>planning analysis for El | Many of the inputs to<br>the SANDAG and SAI<br>models are difficult to<br>quantity  The SANDAG and SAI<br>models do not fully<br>account for indirect<br>impacts and latent<br>travel demand | Vehicle trips  VMT  Average vehicle speed  Emissions (HC, CO, NOx) |

9/30/98

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology                               | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |   |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Employer TDM cost-<br>effectiveness model | Estimates reduction in and costs of daily trips and peak period trips  Aids employer determination of cost-effectiveness of TDM measures for their particular worksite | Results may vary widely from one employer to the next  Many inputs may be difficult for employers or planners to quantify | *Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers.* Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404. | Reports on the development of a model to individually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of 15 different employer-based TDM measures in suburban settings | Focus on suburban employers reflects different travel-related characteristics of suburban and urban areas  Spreadsheet-based model is user-friendly and readily accessible for use at the site-specific level; model makes sensitivity analysis relatively simple  Eight transportation environments were defined to represent various combinations of transportation service characteristics  For employers without access to entire range of data necessary to operate model, default values are included | Most employers surveyed to develop model were unable to provide detailed cost information on the TDM measures they had implemented  Does not calculate emissions directly  Potential for regional bias, as model was developed in part based on a survey of suburban San Francisco Bay Area employers; model also used the SCAQMD Regulation XV and Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Program employer plan databases  Only some TDMs included in model provide for estimates of VT reductions  Use of default values could diminishes accuracy of estimates for some users | Suburban employer-based TDM measures  Daily trips and peak period trips  Costs and cost-effectiveness | ď |

dkp

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology                              | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages  | Report 3.75  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|-----|
| (cont.) measure planning and implementation | analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the TCM implementation  Cost can vary greatly                                 | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various TCM measures  | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific TCM evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, & emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) | da  |
|   | Comparison and analysis of other studies | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be   | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits                               | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT   | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                   | dad |
|   | ·  | used if other directly applicable research is not available Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  |  | *Assessment of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Approaches at<br>Suburban Activity<br>Centers.* Bhatt, Kiran,<br>and Higgins, Thomas.<br>K.T. Analystics. U.S.<br>DOT, July 1989.  | Surveys research<br>studies and<br>interviews TCM<br>program<br>coordinators to<br>provide an<br>overview of the<br>range of<br>effectiveness of<br>employer-based<br>TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program  | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Only generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness   | Relative effectiveness of various transportation measure programs Implementation mechanisms       | da  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report: /  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|-----|
| Compressed<br>Work Week/<br>Flex Time<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.)  |   |  | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996.   | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Battimore and Philadelphia regions | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions |  | dad |
| Pricing tra<br>mo<br>tra<br>sin<br>en            | Integrated<br>travel demand,<br>mode choice,<br>traffic<br>simulation, and<br>emissions<br>model | If developed, an integrated model to simulate demand, mode choice, traffic simulation, and emissions could avoid some of the shortcomings inherent in applying travel and emissions models sequentially | Integrated model has<br>not yet been<br>developed and would<br>be cosity to develop  | *Framework for<br>Evaluating<br>Transportation Control<br>Measures: Mobility, Air<br>Quality, and Energy<br>Tradeoffs.* Euritt, Mark<br>A., et al. University of<br>Texas, Austin, Center<br>for Transportation<br>Research, Jul 94.<br>SWUTC-94-60034-1 | Proposes that an integrated model should be developed, but the performed analysis uses current models sequentially               | Provides a framework for<br>the development of a<br>future integrated<br>transportation and<br>emissions model  | Performed analysis<br>not transferable to<br>other situations  | Vehicle operating cost levels Vehicle occupancy rates  | dac |
|  | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model   | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters   | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Transportation Pricing<br>Strategies for<br>California: An<br>Assessment of<br>Congestion, Emissions,<br>Energy and Equity<br>Impacts." California Air<br>Resources Board, June<br>1995. Report No. 92-<br>316.   | Develops and uses a comprehensive travel demand model to estimate the impacts of multiple transportation measures                | Uses actual, available price elasticities  Establishes base case by comparing to actual travel data  Explores interrelations between pricing strategies   | Does not model specific travel corridors (requires additional model for this purpose)  Relies on uncertain forecasts of travel demand  | Price level, period and location of application  Price elasticity  Interrelationships between pricing strategies | dac |

ر

| - 1 | ` |
|-----|---|
| 1   | > |

| Transportation<br>Measure  | Methodology | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages  of Study   | Factors Analyzed                              |    |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|----|
| Congestion Pricing (cont.)  Travel demands mode choice model (cont.) | i :         |                           |   | "Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience." COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.                        | Summarizes broad range of TDM measures, provides example case study analyses of each, and uses computer model to benchmark the effectiveness of each TDM   | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs   | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Travel and traffic impact  Cost-effectiveness | da |
|  |             |                           | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05. | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model  | Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient  | Participation level   | da  |    |
|  |             |                           |   | "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area  | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations use standardized methods, but take into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost- effectiveness estimates | Does not provide<br>detail on model<br>operation  | Many; not specified                           | d  |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report :  | Description F  | Adyantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Pricing (cont.)           | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |  |   | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridfock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994. | Overview paper on the effects of transportation system pricing on activity patterns and travel behavior; some emissions results                        | Paper presents modeling results from the San Francisco Bay Area Pricing Study using the STEP model  Quantifies VMT, trips, fuel usage, ROG, CO, NOx, and CO2  Shows quantified travel and emissions modeling results that correspond to specific, clearly defined pricing proposals | Use of model developed for San Francisco Bay Area may limit usefulness of results to other regions  Study acknowledges that the STEP model does not accurately account for regional growth or employment allocation, and treats time of day in a simplified way | VMT Vehicle trips Fuel usage Emissions (ROG, CO, NOx, CO2)   |
|                           | Travel cost model                              | Most accurate way of measuring true travel costs a priori  Allows comparison of multiple scenarios | Results do not necessarily apply to other regions  Requires extensive information gathering | "Impacts of Congestion<br>Pricing on Transit and<br>Carpool Demand and<br>Supply." Kain, John.<br>Harvard University,<br>1994. TRB 940444.  | Uses economic theory of travel demand, supply, and pricing, as well as assumptions about the value of time to estimate total travel costs to commuters | Compares impact of congestion pricing on various income groups  Provides excellent discussion of total costs of travel and relationship between congestion pricing and transit use  | Requires many assumptions that could significantly affect results, including relationship between price level and traffic flow speed  Does not quantify emission reductions   | Congestion price level Flow speed Parking price level Transit service level Personal value of time |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology             | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|-----|
| Congestion<br>Pricing<br>(cont.) | Demand elasticity model | Simple model based on economics fundamentals, using readily available data, that captures primary determinants of travel behavior  Can vary inputs to model based on level of complexity desired | Model may fall to<br>account for non-price<br>determinants of<br>travel behavior, or<br>other congestion<br>pricing program<br>design details | "Demand Elasticity Under Time-Varying Prices: Case Study of Day-of-Week Varying Toils on Golden Gate Bridge." Gifford, Jonathan L. and Scott W. Talkington. George Mason University, 1996. | Provides a survey overview of literature on road pricing; develops a demand elasticity model to analyze travel demand under time-varying pricing using data from the Golden Gate Bridge in 1979-1984 | Presents correlation between time-varying pricing and traffic patterns; indirectly illustrates change in VT  Data used are from actual applied day-of- week varying pricing | Focus on aggregate travel behavior precludes analysis about the details of travel preferences  Results have limited application to other regions, as local variables such as limited transit alternatives may have influenced model results  Use of single case study over period of one price change limits results applicability in other situations  Elasticity estimates do not include costs of travel other than toll and gas, and include no assessment of possible mode shifts  Does not quantify emissions | Travel demand characteristics Level of toll Gasoline price Price elasticity of traffic | dkı |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages = of Methodology   | Report Control   | '' Description  | Adventages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Congestion<br>Pricing<br>(cont.) | Statistical<br>analysis of<br>average speed<br>of congestion<br>pricing<br>scenarios | Existing knowledge of speed/emissions relationships can be used to estimate the emissions impact of "peak- spreading" resulting from congestion pricing Actual travel data and congestion pricing scenarios can be compared | Speed/emissions relationships under real-world conditions are difficult to characterize accurately and are somewhat poorly understood  Modal effects are not directly addressed in "average speed" analysis  May only address "peak-spreading" emissions impact, not the trip-reduction and mode shift impacts of congestion pricing | "Congestion Pricing and Motor Vehicle Emissions: An Initial Review." Guensler, Randall and Daniel Sperting. In Curbing Gridiock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994. | Examines the air quality impacts likely to result from congestion pricing; focuses on the effects of postulated changes in average vehicle operating speeds on emission rates by looking at four congestion pricing scenarios | Utilizes data from existing study on changes in travel behavior as input to analysis  Statistical analysis is fairly simple and could be replicated for any data sets from travel demand and emission rate models incorporates uncertainty associated with the use of speed correction factors | "Bootstrap" statistical approach to extrapolate data resulted in highly sample-dependent numbers, thus test samples may not have been representative of the fleet impact of flow smoothing not well represented in an average speed modeling regime that is based on a limited number and variety of test cycles.  Changes in average vehicle speed yield significantly different percentage changes in emission rates for older and newer vehicles, thus fleet composition must be considered in congestion pricing scenarios.  Study did not include sensitivity analysis of the models—how sensitive models are to errors in estimation of the independent variable (average speed) | Average speed changes and associated emission rate changes  Congestion pricing scenarios: targeted freeway pricing, partial freeway pricing, comprehensive freeway pricing, comprehensive pricing |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure   | Methodology                                     | Advantages of Methodology   | Digadvantages of Methodology  | Report -   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages ;  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Congestion Pricing (cont.)  Use of economic theory to estimate congestion price levels  Evaluative matrix | economic<br>theory to<br>estimate<br>congestion | Based upon sound economic theory Relatively easy and inexpensive to perform Somewhat applicable to multiple regions   | Real life conditions may not be easily accounted for by theory  | "Freeway Congestion<br>Pricing: Another Look."<br>Levinson, Herbert.<br>Transportation<br>Research Board Paper<br>940977, January 1994.                          | Identifies the appropriate level of congestion charges based upon the marginal cost of driving  | Analysis based upon<br>economic theory and<br>Highway Capacity<br>Manual speed-flow data   | Does not address political acceptability or tolling options available for congestion pricing  Prices resulting from the study may need to be adjusted downward to minimize the adverse impacts on traveling  Does not quantify emissions                                     | Variation in speed-<br>flow relationships   |
|   |   | Matrix of evaluative criteria which details and compares congestion pricing options could be applied to other regions Relatively flexible in level of complexity and number of evaluation criteria or pricing scenarios input into matrix | Theoretical analysis based on models, not actual congestion pricing project data  Relatively extensive location-specific study conducted from which matrix numbers were developed | *Evaluation of Congestion Pricing Alternatives in the Twin Cities.* Lari, Adeel Z. and Kenneth R. Buckeye. Minnesota Department of Transportation, January 1997. | Study evaluated the relative relative relationships and impacts of eleven congestion pricing options in the Twin Cities metropolitan area for 1995-96 using statistically modeled data, public outreach data, and overall feasibility studies | Compared eleven different congestion pricing scenarios for the Twin Cities area against one another according to same criteria  Air quality impacts measured in percent reductions in hydrocarbons (PM peak period only) | Unclear from this brief evaluative report how matrix numbers were quantified  Matrix developed specifically from a congestion pricing study for the Twin Cities metropolitan area, and thus results and recommendations may only be applicable to Minneapolis/St.  Paul area | Congestion relief  Mode shift potential  Local street impacts  Air quality improvements  Social and geographical equity  Land use/economic impacts  Public acceptability  Technical feasibility  Revenue and costs  Operational effectiveness |

| Transportation Measure | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report 7  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|-----|
| Pricing and transmet   | Procese analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the TCM implementation | "Bay Bridge Congestion<br>Pricing Project:<br>Lessons Learned to<br>Date." Frick, Karen, et<br>al. Metropolitan<br>Transportation<br>Commission, 1996.<br>Transportation<br>Research Board paper<br>961317. | Reviews and assesses the process by which the Bay Area Congestion Pricing Task Force examined the viability of variable tolls on the San Francisco Bay Bridge | Develops detailed, valuable lessons learned during the implementation of this specific congestion pricing TCM  Makes recommendations on how to develop a congestion pricing TCM that gains the approval of the public and public officials   | Does not evaluate the end result effectiveness: VT, VMT, emissions reduced | Public reaction to the measure under varying toll levels and alternative commute options  Allocation of toll monies and equity issues | dac |
|                        |  |  |   | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.                                | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various TCM measures                       | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific TCM evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, & emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-<br>performed process               | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process)                                     | dad |

| Methodology                                    | Advantages ::<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages :   | Factors Analyzed   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates  | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995.  | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits   | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions  | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs  | dac  |
|  | used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies   |   | "Demand Elasticity Under Time-Varying Prices: Case Study of Day-of-Week Varying Tolls on Golden Gate Bridge." Gifford, Jonathan L. and Scott W. Talkington. George Mason University, 1996.  | Provides a survey overview of literature on road pricing; develops a demand elasticity model to analyze travel demand under time-varying pricing using data from the Golden Gate Bridge in 1979-1984   | Survey includes both<br>theoretical and applied<br>work   | Focus on aggregate travel behavior precludes analysis about the details of travel preferences  Results limited in indirect applicability to congestion pricing on bridges   | Travel demand characteristics  Level of toli  Gasoline price  Price elasticity of traffic  | dkp  |
|  | · ·   |   | "Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Gluliano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation, September 1992. Policy Insight No. 142.  | Compares congestion pricing with Regulation XV for the Southern California area; describes pros and cons of each measure and discusses implications  | Provides typology of TCMs and identifies effectiveness and common barriers to implementation  Simple side-by-side comparison of VMT reduction and cost-effectiveness for each TCM   | Provides little detail about logistics of implementing the policy recommendations  Does not quantify emission reductions  | Direct vs. Indirect implementation  Market-based vs. performance-based implementation  Efficiency and equity considerations  | dad  |
|  | Comparison and analysis of  | Comparison and analysis of other studies  Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Comparison and analysis of other studies  Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | Comparison and analysis of other studies  Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  Identifies  advantages of several methodologies  A Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates  "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995.  "Demand Elasticity Under Time-Varying Tolls on Golden Gate Bridge." Glifford, Jonathan L. and Scott W. Talkington. George Masson University, 1996.  "Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Glullano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation, September 1992. | Comparison and analysis of other studies inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  Identifies and vanitages of vanitation per vanitation | Comperison and analysis of other regions (they do not incorporate range of results produced by different studies and trade of the regions)  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable essearch is not available essearch available methodologies  Methodology  Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate frame primary research)  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable essearch is not available essearch is not available methodologies  Methodology  Advantages of study.  Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate frame provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable essearch is not available essearch is not available essearch is not available and disadvantages of several methodologies  Manual methodologies  Methodologies  Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate frame proportion). The provides a construction of Transportation proportion and policities for total effectiveness and costs/benefits  Demand Elasticity applicable (season from the golden Gate Bridge). Gilfford, Jonathan L. and Scott W. Talkington, George Mason Unitversity, 1996.  "Managing  Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Gate Bridge in 1979-1984  "Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Giuliano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation, September 1982. Policy Insight No. 142.  Respont Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, and total studies that analyze patents that analyze patents that analyze a host of TotAl policy of | Comparison and analysis of latelytely and analysis of history applicable to other regions (they do other regions). Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies which could be used if other inferent studies and disadvantages of sexural methodologies.  **Total Comparison and analysis of the regions (they do other regions). Utilikely to provide process estimates of the regions). Utilikely to provide process estimates of the regions. Utilikely to provide process estimates. The SEDC1, the studies and the regions of the regions. Utilikely to provide process estimates or the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available. The second of the regions of the regio | Comperison and analysis of Paleutives no primary research produced by different studies and introduction to the ragione)   Provides an introduction to the ragione of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available and disahvantages of several methodologies   Provides and content of the regione of th |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology                              | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages :  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----|
| Congestion<br>Pricing<br>(cont.) | Comparison and analysis of other studies (cont.)                                   |   |  | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994.                       | Overview paper on the effects of transportation system pricing on activity patterns and travel behavior; some emissions results | Paper reviews empirical results and anecdotal from several transportation pricing projects and studies  Review of existing results focuses on aggregate demand elasticity    | Wide variability of<br>results reviewed limits<br>their usefulness   | Aggregate demand elasticity                                   | drl |
| Database/<br>Information         | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measures | Case study results do not necessarily apply to other regions | "Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion."<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs                                      | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented | Generally does not evaluate specific transportation measure individually; programs of multiple transportation measures are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures | dac |

•

| Transportation<br>Measure           | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Database/<br>Information<br>(cont.) | Sample<br>surveys of<br>ridematching<br>database<br>program<br>success | Uses statistically representative sample population to make estimates of overall impact of ridematching services on ridesharing  Sample size (and therefore cost) can be varied based on level of statistical accuracy desired  Surveys can be done periodically to determine changes in rideshare placement rates over time, and impacts of special promotions such as "Try Transit" weeks | Surveys can entail significant costs  "Revolving door" characteristic of ridesharing programs can be difficult to address with accuracy  Relationship between ridesharing participation, VMT, and emissions requires additional analysis  If surveys are performed differently in different regions, direct comparisons of results may not be valid | "Rideshare Placement Measurement: A Proposed Standard Methodology." King, Michael, and Barbara Alderson. California State University at Chico, June 1995.  | Develops methodology for quantifying rideshare placement levels for ridematching services; discusses pilot testing of methodology (note: this methodology is currently used by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters in the San Francisco Bay Area). | Survey methodology is generic and can be applied to any region  Methodology distinguishes between three types of rideshare placements (trial, maintenance, and ongoing) to reflect their different impact on travel and emissions | Only quantifies rideshare placement; does not directly quantify VMT and emissions impact  | Rideshare placement rate (trial, maintenance, and ongoing)  Survey response rate  Statistical sampling error                  | drl |
| Emissions<br>Fees                   | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model                                 | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters   | Requires region-<br>specific household<br>survey, land use,<br>socioeconomic, and<br>travel cost data  Requires complex<br>computer model  Potentially high cost<br>to use  | "Transportation Pricing<br>Strategies for<br>California: An<br>Assessment of<br>Congestion, Emissions,<br>Energy and Equity<br>Impacts." California Air<br>Resources Board, June<br>1995. Report No. 92-<br>316. | Develops and uses a comprehensive travel demand model to estimate the impacts of multiple transportation measures   | Establishes base case by comparing to actual travel data  Explores interrelations between pricing strategies  | Does not contain a highway-network model to include level-of-service changes  Forecasts rely on estimations of changes in household travel data | Fee level as a function of mileage, make, model & model year  Price elasticity  Interrelationships between pricing strategies | da  |

| Transportation  Measure          | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | PriReport L   | Description %  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed   |    |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|----|
| Emissions<br>Fees (cont.)        | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |   |  | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994. | Overview paper<br>on the effects of<br>transportation<br>system pricing on<br>activity patterns<br>and travel<br>behavior; some<br>emissions results     | Paper presents modeling results from the San Francisco Bay Area Pricing Study using the STEP model  Quantifies VMT, trips, fuel usage, ROG, CO, NOx, and CO2  Shows quantified travel and emissions modeling results that correspond to specific, clearly defined pricing proposals                 | Use of model developed for San Francisco Bay Area may limit usefulness of results to other regions  Study acknowledges that the STEP model does not accurately account for regional growth or employment allocation, and treats time of day in a simplified way | VMT Vehicle trips Fuel usage Emissions (ROG, CO, NOx, CO2) | dr |
| Employee<br>Commute<br>Subsidies | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model         | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience." COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.                              | Summarizes broad range of TDM measures, provides example case study analyses of each, and uses computer model to benchmark the effectiveness of each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level   | Subsidy level Average vehicle ridership                    | da |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Employee<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                              |                              | "A Survey and Analysis of Employee Responses to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Incentive Programs." Schreffler, Eric N., and Mortero, Jose. COMSIS Corp. California Air Resources Board, February 1994. Contract No. A983-187. | Describes results of new survey data regarding employee travel behavior; uses mode choice and travel demand model to predict impacts of certain employer-based transportation measures | Clearly explains the process that was used: survey data acquisition, mode choice computation, and TCM effectiveness model use Data requirements are more readily available than other models  User-friendly model is available for outside use; users guide is also available  Survey links incentives directly to impacts on travel behavior  Model includes an awareness sub-model that simulates how many people know about the possible TCMs available to them | Does not accurately address trip-chaining and VMT reductions (only trips)  Household conditions are not extensively accounted for  Cost-effectiveness was not calculated  Employer-level analyses only, with focus upon incentive TCMs    | Guaranteed ride home  Company vanpools  Preferential parking  Parking fees for ridesharers  Carpool subsidies & transportation allowances |
|   |  |                              |                              | *Selection and Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures.* Taylor, Christopher J., et al. TRB 971114, January 1997.   | Uses Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area                 | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to-zone travel  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer-based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies   | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions | Transit fare levels<br>and travel time<br>HOV lane time<br>savings<br>Parking costs<br>Employer transit<br>encouragement level            |

| Transportation Measure                      | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology, | Disadvantages  Of Methodology | hepon.  | i i description —   | Advantages of Study  | Disadventages                                    | Factors Analyzed    |     |
|---|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------------|-----|
| Employes<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                            |                               | "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost-effectiveness estimates | Does not provide<br>detail on model<br>operation | Many; not specified | dad |

·

|   |   | Disadvantages                             | Factors Analyzed                         | 10  |
|---|---|---|--|-----|
|   | Quantified interactive effect of financial  | Study conducted in<br>Los Angeles County, | Land use and urban<br>design of worksite | dkp |
| ļ | incentives and one or<br>more land use site | and thus may be less                      | TDM incentive                            | 1   |

strategies

**Employee** Commute Subsidies (cont.)

Transportation

Measure

Statistical Use of Principle analysis of the Components impacts of land Analysis use generated characteristics composite and TDM variables (groups strategies on of land use mode choice characteristics with similar impacts)

Methodology

Advantages

of Methodology

of variance using

examination of the

effects of land use

individually and in

principle

allowed

and TDM

Incentive

strategies on

mode choice

combination.

Results transferable to other urban areas in terms of relative ranking of importance of the land use and TDM factors analyzed.

components

and individual impacts of factors such as transit availability or urban density on mode choice cannot be measured due to limitations of the database Standard analysis Potential for need to conduct extensive

field research to

determine land use

characteristics at

each sample work

Cannot be used to

determine land use

impact on a specific

and urban design

characteristics'

mode choice

site.

Disadvantages

of Methodology

Precise causality

\*The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior: Final Report.\* Prepared by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Transportation. November 1994.

Report

Develops an integrated database of land characteristics and travel demand management (TDM) strategies (for a sample of employment locations) to determine the combined impacts of TDM programs. land use, and urban design on employee travel behavior.

Description

more land use site characteristics. Added land use and site information from field observation to the "Regulation XV" dataset of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (which included aggregate employee travel characteristics and employer incentive programs)

higher average density and transit service. Did not address residential trip end of commute, midday travel, or trip chalming as factors which influence mode choice

dense urban areas

with factors such as

To simplify a complicated data collection process, somewhat arbitrary indicators were used for assessment of a site's urban design and land use characteristics.

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology *  | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | May Report  | Description !   | Advantages of Study.  | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|-----|
| Employee<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but likely to be influenced heavily by local factors of the study area)  Can be replicated (at moderate to high cost)  Does not require extensive computer model  Uses actual survey data | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Personal preference and workplace conditions difficult to impact through public policy | "The Influence of Employer Ridesharing Programs on Employee Mode Choice." Ferguson, Erlk. Transportation, vol 17, 1990. | Analyzes aggregate-level data compiled by a large Southern California regional ridesharing agency; assesses impact of employer characteristics on employee mode split | Analyzes a large data set comprising almost 10% of Los Angeles area workforce  Utilizing existing agency database is a costeffective approach  Less accurate than disaggregated (employee by employee) data  Includes costeffectiveness estimations | Some findings may have been contradicted by more recent studies (e.g., study finds that large corporations have better success with rideshare programs)  Aging data source: 1985 survey data  Los Angeles area factors may be uncharacteristic of other regions, so results may not be applicable elsewhere  Employer-derived data was acquired using different methods  No estimates of emissions impacts | Level of employer effort to encourage ridesharing Size of firm | dac |
|   | Parking supply<br>and demand<br>model  | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters  | Requires computer model  Potentially high cost to use  | *Air Quality Offsets for<br>Parking.* Loudon,<br>William, et al. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1232,<br>1992. | Develops and uses parking supply model for downtown Portland to estimate CO emissions   | Uses observed price and travel time sensitivities  Uses proven models of travel behavior  Incorporates integrated CO emissions model  | Requires parking database: number of spaces, location, type, use patterns  Requires travel database: time of arrival, travel & work mode split   | Price level  | dad |

| 1                             | Wethodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report 2   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|-----|
| Commute and Subsidies (cont.) | ansportation<br>leasure<br>nplementation<br>rograms | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | "An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives." Giuliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.              | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies       | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and- after-TCM conditions  | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey   | Not described  | dac |
|                               |   |  |  | "Employee Trip Reduction Without Government Mandates: Cost and Effectiveness Estimates From Chicago." Pagano, Anthony and JoAnn Verdin. University of Illinois at Chicago. Transportation Research Board Paper 971281, 1997. | Evaluated the cost and effectiveness of employee trip reduction programs through the use of an independent evaluation of demonstration projects implemented in the Chicago area | Estimates planning, maintenance, and voluntary implementation, and incentive costs for trip reduction programs  Intensive data collection, especially for cost estimates, including before and after surveys and interviews of program administrators participating in the demonstration projects  Addresses statistical relationships of organization type to costs and outcomes, of costs to strategies and incentives, of outcomes to strategies and incentives, and of cost to outcomes  Addresses differences in outcome by organizational type | Made generalized assumption of staff costs needed to implement trip reduction programs Intensive data collection requires demonstration project and surveys, or application of Chicago area data Results have limited application to other regions, as local Chicago variables such as availability of transit alternatives may have influenced model results | Trip reduction program implementation process utilized  Obstacles and success factors  Program costs and effectiveness | dkp |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|-----|
| Employes<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects | Requires little or no new data acquisition Relatively low cost Shows actual potential of transportation measures  | Case study results do not necessarily apply to other regions                                 | "Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion."<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs   | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented | Generally does not evaluate specific transportation measure individually; programs of multiple transportation measures are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures | dac |
|   | Sketch<br>planning   | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures for San Luis Obispo County, California." Morrow, David D., San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, 1992.   | Develops and uses a calculation methodology for estimating the trip reduction and air quality benefits of employer trip reduction requirements in San Luis Obispo County | Methodologies are<br>developed specifically for<br>the employer trip<br>reduction program<br>Explains calculation<br>process in detail                                       | Requires extensive, region-specific information to accurately estimate benefits and effectiveness of the program  Assumes a level of program participation (as required by the measure)  | Many; not specified   | dac |

-

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | Report 4   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| Employee<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Employer TDM cost- offectiveness model  Alds employer determination of cost-effectiveness of TDM measures for their particular worksite |                                 | "Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404. | Reports on the development of a model to individually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of 15 different employer-based TDM measures in suburban settings | Focus on suburban employers reflects different travel-related characteristics of suburban and urban areas  Spreadsheet-based model is user-friendly and readily accessible for use at the site-specific level; model makes sensitivity analysis relatively simple  Eight transportation environments were defined to represent various combinations of transportation service characteristics  For employers without access to entire range of data necessary to operate model, default values are included | Most employers surveyed to develop model were unable to provide detailed cost information on the TDM measures they had implemented  Does not calculate emissions directly  Potential for regional bias, as model was developed in part based on a survey of suburban San Francisco Bay Area employers; model also used the SCAQMD Regulation XV and Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Program employer plan databases  Only some TDMs included in model provide for estimates of VT reductions  Use of default values could diminishes accuracy of estimates for some users | Suburban employer-based TDM measures  Daily trips and peak period trips  Costs and cost-effectiveness |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Pescription  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantagea<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Employee<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods   | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly              | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG.  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method.  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness. | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) |
|   | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively Inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | *An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies.* Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT   | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                   |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages | Report   | 2 Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |   |
|---|---|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Employee<br>Commute<br>Subsidies<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |                           | ·             | "Assessment of Travel Demand Management Approaches at Suburban Activity Centers." Bhatt, Kiran, and Higgins, Thomas. K.T. Analystics. U.S. DOT, July 1989.           | Surveys research studies and interviews TCM program coordinators to provide an overview of the range of effectiveness of employer-based TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Onty generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness   | Relative effectiveness of various transportation measure programs Implementation mechanisms                                 | d |
|   |   |                           |               | "Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Giuliano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation. Policy Insight No. 142, September 1992.         | Compares congestion pricing with Regulation XV for the Southern California area; describes pros and cons of each measure and discusses implications  | Provides typology of transportation measures and identifies effectiveness and common barriers to implementation  Simple side-by-side comparison of VMT reduction and cost-effectiveness for each transportation measure                         | Provides little detail about logistics of implementing the policy recommendations  Does not quantify emission reductions   | Direct vs. Indirect implementation  Market-based vs. performance-based implementation  Efficiency and equity considerations | d |
|   |   |                           |               |  |  | Makes policy<br>recommendations to<br>improve each<br>transportation measure  |  |   |   |
|   | ·   |                           |               | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996. | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Baltimore and Philadelphia regions                     | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions   | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions | Rideshare promotion<br>level  Parking charge level  Transit subsidy<br>levels  Work schedule flexibility                    |   |

| Measure                           | Methodology  | of Methodology  | of Methodology  | Report 201   | Description 8   | Adventages of Study  | of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Episodic/<br>seasonal<br>controls | Sample survey<br>analysis of<br>existing<br>program(s) | Uses sample population to make estimates of overall impact of episodic/ seaonal controls  Sample size (and therefore cost) can be varied based on level of statistical accuracy desired  Surveys can be done periodically to determine changes in program effectiveness over time | Surveys can entail significant costs  Daily travel patterns are influenced by so many things that isolating the impact of episodic programs can be difficult to address with accuracy through statistical sampling  If surveys are performed differently in different regions, direct comparisons of results may not be valid | "Sacramento Regional Spare the Air 1996: A Report on Two Public Opinion Surveys." Lamare, Jude, The Cleaner Air Partnership. 1997. | Summarizes findings regarding public participation in Sacramento's Spare the Air program, based on telephone interviews | Generates estimates of awareness of program and participation in program (in terms of trips reduced)  By identifying reasons for program participation, and how participants shifted trips, study results can be used to improve episodic program design | Telephone survey responses may be biased for several reasons  Uses only brief telephone interviews  Survey repondents may not be statistically representative of regional population  Only uses survey data from one smog episode in a given year, with no control group  Unable to assess with confidence the relationship between program | Awareness of episodic program  Participation in episodic program |

đđ

characteristics and program effectiveness

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| Feebate                   | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates   | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions Costs      | dao |
| Fuel Tax<br>Increases     | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model         | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters  | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Transportation Pricing<br>Strategies for<br>California: An<br>Assessment of<br>Congestion, Emissions,<br>Energy and Equity<br>Impacts." California Air<br>Resources Board, June<br>1995. Report No. 92-<br>316.                                   | Develops and uses a comprehensive travel demand model to estimate the impacts of multiple transportation measures                                    | Establishes base case by comparing to actual travel data  Explores interrelations between pricing strategies   | Does not contain a highway-network model to include level-of-service changes Forecasts rely on estimations of changes in household travel data   | Tax level Price elasticity Interrelationships between pricing strategies | da  |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology | Disadventages<br>of Methodology | Sal Report  | Description (1)  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |      |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|------|
| Fuel Tax<br>Increases<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) | ·                            |                                 | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05. | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model | Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions          | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient   | Tax level  | dac  |
|                                  |  |                              |                                 | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994.   | Overview paper on the effects of transportation system pricing on activity patterns and travel behavior; some emissions results        | Paper presents modeling results from the San Francisco Bay Area Pricing Study using the STEP model  Quantifies VMT, trips, fuel usage, ROG, CO, NOx, and CO2  Shows quantified travel and emissions modeling results that correspond to specific, clearly defined pricing proposals | Use of model developed for San Francisco Bay Area may limit usefulness of results to other regions Study acknowledges that the STEP model does not accurately account for regional growth or employment allocation, and treats time of day in a simplified way | VMT Vehicle trips Fuel usage Emissions (ROG, CO, NOx, CO2) | drl. |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|-----|
| Fuel Tax<br>Increases<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies | Relatively Inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates       | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures; technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits          | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs | dad |
| ·                                |  | used if other directly applicable research is not available identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  |  | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994.  | Overview paper on the effects of transportation system pricing on activity patterns and travel behavior; some emissions results                               | Paper reviews empirical results and anecdotal from several transportation pricing projects and studies  Review of existing results focuses on aggregate demand elasticity              | Wide variability of results reviewed limits their usefulness   | Aggregate demand elasticity   | drl |
| General                          | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model         | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters   | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complicated computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Travel Markets: An<br>Approach to TCM<br>Effectiveness<br>Evaluation."<br>Torluemke, Donald A.<br>Ekistic Mobility<br>Consultants, 1992.  | Describes a TDM evaluation methodology and model (GRACIE) that utilizes "travel market" characteristics rather than origin-destination data to classify trips | Travel market segmentation provides useful groupings with similar consumer attributes that can be affected homogeneously by TDMs  Travel markets are more easily understood            | Travel market data is lacking; requires converting origin-destination data to travel market data  Does not show results of using the model   | Travel market characteristics   | dad |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages - of Methodology  | g Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed                                      |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| General<br>(cont.)                          | Modal<br>emissions<br>model  | A modal emissions model, which estimates emissions as a function of vehicle operating modes rather than average vehicle speeds, would greatly improve the evaluation of transportation measures that affect the modal operation of vehicles | An emissions model, unless integrated with a travel model, does not calculate travel activity impacts of transportation measures  Model emissions models are still in the development stage | "Overview of the<br>Georgia Tech GIS-<br>Based Modal<br>Emissions Model."<br>Guensier, Randall, et<br>al. Georgia Tech<br>Research Partnership.<br>April 1997.   | Describes Georgia Tech's development of a motor vehicle emissions model within a geographic information system (GIS) framework | Model is GIS-based, and is compatible with the analytical frameworks currently employed by most state DOTs and metropolitan planning organizations  All model components, assumptions, and algorithms can be validated against real-world data  Paper discusses how the model would provide better evaluations of certain transportation measures such as grossemitter strategies | Model is still under<br>development                           | Fleet composition Vehicle activity Emission rates     |
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities | Integrated<br>travel demand,<br>mode choice,<br>traffic<br>simulation, and<br>emissions<br>model | If developed, an integrated model to simulate dernand, mode choice, traffic simulation, and emissions could avoid some of the shortcomings inherent in applying travel and emissions models sequentially                                    | Integrated model has<br>not yet been<br>developed and would<br>be costly to develop   | "Framework for Evaluating Transportation Control Measures: Mobility, Air Quality, and Energy Tradeoffs." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research, Jul 94, SWUTC-94-60034-1 | Proposes that an integrated model should be developed, but the performed analysis uses current models sequentially             | Provides a framework for<br>the development of a<br>future integrated<br>transportation and<br>emissions model  | Performed analysis<br>not transferable to<br>other situations | Vehicle operating cost levels Vehicle occupancy rates |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology                                    | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Integrated<br>planning/<br>simulation<br>model | Combines the strengths of regional transportation planning models and traffic simulation models  Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires very detailed input data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use   | "Intelligent Transportation Systems Impact Assessment Framework: Final Report." Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, September 30, 1995                       | Describes development and application of an analytical tool to predict ITS impacts, with a focus on Advanced Traffic Management Systems                  | Model Integrates transportation planning and traffic simulation in an iterative fashion, and includes emissions and fuel consumption modules  Report describes use of model to analyze the potential use of ITS in the I-880 corridor in Alameda County, California, modeling ramp metering, traffic signal coordination, integrated traffic management, incident management, and HOV lanes  Emissions module uses accepted EMFAC and MOBILE factors | Relatively high cost and complexity  Locally specific input data makes the I-880 results of limited use in other areas  | Operational Measures of Effectiveness: VMT, traffic volume, average vehicle speed, vehicle hours of delay, fuel consumption  Emission Measures of Effectiveness: CO, HC, NOx  Safety Measures of Effectiveness: personal injury levels, property damage, total accidents |
|  | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model         | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters   | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience." COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02. | Summarizes broad range of TDM measures, provides example case study analyses of each, and uses computer model to benchmark the effectiveness of each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs  | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Vehicle occupancy:<br>2, 3, or 4 or more<br>people required for<br>HOV lane use<br>Preferential parking<br>Average vehicle<br>ridership  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report L  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|----|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |  |   | "The Effects of New High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes on Travel and Emissions." Johnston, Robert A., and Raju Ceerla. In Transportation Research A, vol. 30 no. 1, pp. 35-50, 1996.    | Reviews past modeling efforts and travel dernand simulations of HOV lanes, including interactions between HOV lanes, pricing measures, transit expansion, and transit-oriented development. | Incorporates feedback procedure to account for potential induced travel demand resulting from new HOV lanes  Compares HOV lanes with other transportation strategies, including pricing, transit improvements, and transit-oriented development  Uses available EMFAC7E emission rates to calculate TOG, NOx, and CO | Results are geared toward specific Sacramento policy proposals, and are not directly transferable to other areas  EMFAC7E factors are California-specific   | Travel characteristics: VMT, total v ehicle hours, vehicle hours of delay, transit trips, HOV trips Emissions: TOG, CO, NOx | Q. |
|  |  |  |   | "Selection and Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures." Taylor, Christopher J., et al. TRB 971114, January 1997.   | Uses Travel Dernand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area                     | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to- zone travel  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer- based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies   | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions | Transit fare levels and travel time  HOV lane time savings  Parking costs  Employer transit encouragement level             | da |
|  | Vehicle<br>queuing model                       | Calculates aggregate vehicle delay (not just individual vehicle travel time)  Applicable to any highway  Analyst can vary input parameters  Relatively low cost to use | Requires computer model Theoretical rather than empirical Requires many simplifying assumptions | "An Analysis of the<br>Effectiveness of High<br>Occupancy Vehicle<br>Lanes." Dahlgren, J.<br>W. Institute of<br>Transportation Studies,<br>UC Berkeley, 1994.<br>UCB-ITS-DS-94-2. | Develops and uses extensive freeway queuing model that simulates the addition of HOV or general purpose lanes   | Uses range of travel mode (HOV or LOV) sensitivities  Addresses impact on route choice, travel time, induced trips & growth  Incorporates integrated emissions model  Requires limited data  | Assumes bottleneck<br>creates delay (not<br>maximum flow<br>capacity)   | Percentage of HOV<br>drivers<br>Initial vehicle delay<br>Number of lanes<br>Travel time<br>elasticities                     | d  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Freeway<br>throughput<br>model  | May be applicable to actual corridors, given accurate knowledge of key assumptions  Low to moderate cost                 | Assumptions are required that may heavily impact the results                         | "Negative Impacts of HOV Facilities on Transit." Vuchic, Vukan R., et al. University of Pennsylvania/University of Delaware. January 1995. TRB 950543.                                 | Surveyed the quantity and quality of bus and HOV lanes in several cities; modeled differences in impacts between bus-only and HOV lanes  | Provides quantitative and qualitative arguments for bus-only lanes  Results are consistent with actual demonstration project findings, and show potential to reduce VMT  | Amount and composition of latent demand for freeway use is assumed  Shifts in passengers from SOV to HOV lanes are assumed  Does not model emissions   | Addition of bus-only<br>or HOV lane<br>Conversion of bus-<br>only or HOV lane  |
|  | Emission<br>dispersion<br>model (used for<br>freeways)                              | Readily available models  Applicable to any highway  Analyst can vary input parameters  Relatively low cost to use       | Requires computer model  Requires many simplifying assumptions                       | "Air Quality Impacts of<br>HOV Facilities."<br>Chatterjee, Aun. et al.<br>University of<br>Tennessee, January<br>1996. TRB 960425.   | Uses an emissions dispersion model to estimate CO and NOx concentrations along a freeway with HOV lanes  | Establishes and upper<br>and lower bound on<br>emission concentration<br>impacts due to HOV<br>lanes<br>includes impacts of latent<br>demand   | Highly theoretical<br>study with idealized<br>conditions; does not<br>use actual data<br>Assumes mode choice<br>splits   | Bus-only lanes vs.<br>multiple passenger<br>lanes  |
|  | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | "Evaluating the Seattle<br>I-5 North HOV Lane 2+<br>Occupancy<br>Requirement<br>Demonstration."<br>Tumbull, Katherine F.<br>et al. Texas<br>Transportation Institute.<br>January 1993. | Summarizes the impact (on the HOV lane and general purpose lanes) of a demonstration project which lowered the minimum vehicle occupancy requirement on the I-5 North HOV lanes in Seattle from 3 or more persons per vehicle to 2 or more persons per vehicle | Provides overview of general trends and impacts of a reduction in HOV lane requirements information evaluated in study was obtained through special surveys and from ongoing monitoring efforts by Washington State's Department of Transportation | Factors under study in travel corridor may have been influenced and confounded by additional variables  Changes in travel characteristics as a result of demonstration project may not have emerged immediately after implementation, and thus may not show up in evaluation  Analysis limited by availability of data, especially for the period immediately preceding the start of the demonstration | Impact of changing HOV lane vehicle occupancy requirements  Traffic levels and traffic conditions during morning and afternoon peak hours and peak periods |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology            | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description     | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|--|--|---|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Case study<br>analysis | Analyzing case studies is relatively easy and inexpensive  Different case studies can be compared to determine factors influencing the effectiveness of an HOV strategy | Case-study analysis frequently does not provide rigorous quantitative results  Effectiveness of case studies may be due to local factors specific to that case | "High-Occupancy Vehicle Project Case Studies: Historical Trends and Project Experiences." Turnbull, Katherine. Texas Transportation Institute. Prepared for Federal Transit Administration, August 1992. | HOV projects on | Selected case studies evaluated represent a mix of old and new projects, HOV design treatments, and geographic coverage  Provides a summary of the experience to date with a variety of HOV projects in North America.  Utilizes existing data from case studies, such as mode choice surveys of HOV facility users to draw general conclusions  Identifies measures of effectiveness for use in evaluating each of the factors analyzed, and provides examples of how the case studies relate to the different measures | Conclusions and comparisons drawn from relatively little data in some cases  Effectiveness of HOV facilities not calculated in terms of emissions but are generally given in before-and-after person and vehicle volume comparisons and percentages relative to general traffic lanes  Compares case studies of ongoing projects of differing ages, and in different locations (each with unique factors such as weather, transit issues, and public opinions); thus, conclusions drawn could include errors in consistency or comparability of data  Does not provide emissions estimates | Person movement capacity and perlane efficiency of the freeway facility  Bus service operating efficiencies  Travel time savings and trip time reliability  Air quality and energy impacts  Impacts on the operation of the freeway general-purpose lanes  Safety  Public support  Cost-effectiveness |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology                    | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages  | Report  | Description :  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  | ] ~ |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|-----|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Case study<br>analysis (cont.) |   |  | "Assessment of High-Occupancy Vehicle Facilities in North America: Executive Report." Tumbull, Katherine. Texas Transportation Institute. Prepared for Federal Transit Administration, August 1992. | Included in a series of reports prepared as part of a three-year assessment  | Selected case studies evaluated represent a mix of old and new projects, HOV design treatments, and geographic coverage  Provides a summary of the experience to date with a variety of HOV projects in North America.  Utilizes existing data from case studies, such as mode choice surveys of HOV facility users to draw general conclusions identifies measures of effectiveness for use in evaluating each of the factors analyzed, and provides examples of how the case studies relate to the different measures | Conclusions and comparisons drawn from relatively little data in some cases  Effectiveness of HOV facilities not calculated in terms of emissions but are generally given in before-and-after person and vehicle volume comparisons and percentages relative to general traffic lanes  Compares case studies of ongoing projects of differing ages, and in different locations (each with unique factors such as weather, transit issues, and public opinions); thus, conclusions drawn could include errors in consistency or comparability of data  Does not provide emissions estimates | Person movement capacity and perlane efficiency of the freeway facility  Bus service operating efficiencies  Travel time savings and trip time reliability  Air quality and energy impacts  Impacts on the operation of the freeway general-purpose lanes  Safety  Public support  Cost-effectiveness | dkp |
|  | Sketch<br>planning             | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "TCM Analyst 1.0 and<br>User's Guide."<br>Crawford, Jason A., et<br>al. Texas<br>Transportation Institute.<br>For the Federal<br>Highway<br>Administration,<br>November 1994.                       | Describes a computerized sketch planning tool, TCM Analyst 1.0, including input data requirements, methods of use, and an overview of the model's structure and calculation procedures | Provides a useful and relatively easy instruction manual for using TCM Analyst 1.0  Uses MOBILE5a output data (emission factors) as inputs to the model, providing more accurate emission benefit calculations for each TCM   | Program only models limited TCMs and cannot model multiple TCM packages  Requires several runs with MOBILE5a to obtain input emission factors  Modeling on regional (rather than microscale) basis only  | Not stated  | dad |

| Measure  | Methodology  | of Methodology  | of Methodology   | Report # T   | Description V  | Advantages of Study.  | of Study   | Factors Analyze   |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly  | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWAMetropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.  | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of aiready-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) |
| -<br>-   | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV facilities in North America, which  | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (local inputs may play a significant role in determining the travel and emissions impacts of HOV facilities)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                   |
|  |  | could be used if other directly applicable research is not available Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies   |  | "The Effects of New<br>High-Occupancy<br>Vehicle Lanes on<br>Travel and Emissions."<br>Johnston, Robert A.,<br>and Raju Ceerla. In<br>Transportation<br>Research A, vol. 30 no.<br>1, pp. 35-50, 1996.   | Reviews past modeling efforts and travel demand simulations of HOV lanes   | Provides an overview and critique of previous HOV impact assessment efforts, with recommendations for improvements  Summarizes modeling issues related to the Federal and California Clean Air Acts   | ·  | Various travel<br>characteristics,<br>depending on the<br>specific study<br>reviewed              |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |                           |                              | "Assessment of High-Occupancy Vehicle Facilities in North America: Executive Report." Turnbull, Katherine. Texas Transportation Institute. Prepared for Federal Transit Administration, August 1992. | Summarizes an assessment of HOV lane projects on freeways or separate rights-of-way in North America; includes suggested procedures for evaluating HOV projects (summarizes four other reports prepared as part of the same three-year assessment) | Identifies clear objectives for developing HOV facilities and corresponding measures of effectiveness, as well as general threshold guidelines (ranges) and data needs  Details suggested approach for evaluating operating HOV projects  Focuses on overall impacts of HOV facilities on person and vehicle movement, cost effectiveness, implementation risks and flexibility, and use  Extensive data collection done which provides a large data set detailing the status of HOV facilities in North America (including HOV utilization by passengers and vehicles) | Compares case studies of ongoing projects of differing ages, and in different locations (each with unique factors such as weather, transit issues, and public opinions); thus, conclusions drawn could include errors in consistency or comparability of data  Conclusions and comparisons drawn from relatively little data in some cases  Does not provide emissions estimates | Design treatments, operating scenarios, enforcement techniques, utilization levels, and general experiences with HOV facilities Institutional arrangements associated with the development and operation, historical trends in use, and impacts of the facilities |
|  |   | ·                         |                              | "HOV Lanes and Ramp<br>Metering: Can They<br>Work Together for Air<br>Quality?" Shoemaker,<br>Bill R. and Edward C.<br>Sullivan.<br>Transportation<br>Research Board Paper<br>940444. January 1994.  | Comments on the analysis process used to assess the air quality impacts of HOV land and ramp metering projects, and examines the degree to which these measures are effective and compatible where jointly applied to improve freeway operations   | Illustrates the process of analysis and decision-making, as well as the key role of analytical modeling, required in the San Francisco Bay Area to gain approval for HOV fane and ramp metering projects at the regional level  Examines the interrelationships, and potentially perverse effects, between HOV lanes and ramp metering  | Identifies need for estimating disaggregate mode-specific emission factors, including vehicle fleet characteristics, and identifies difficulties in doing so   | Interrelationships<br>between HOV lanes<br>and ramp metering  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                              | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|-----|
| High-<br>Occupancy<br>Vehicle<br>Facilities<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |   |  | "The Effect of HOV<br>Lanes in Reducing<br>Emissions." Bieberitz,<br>John A. ITE 1993<br>Compendium of<br>Technical Papers.                      | Describes and assesses analyses of several HOV demonstration projects to inform estimates of a HOV lane use in the Milwaukee area       | Compares data from demonstration projects in several cities Estimates include traffic growth rates   | Does not provide cost- effectiveness of HOV lanes  Assumes HOV lanes are constructed on all segments of the freeways in the Milwaukee area | Traffic growth rates   | da  |
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems             | Integrated planning/ simulation model                     | Combines the strengths of regional transportation planning models and traffic simulation models  Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires very detailed input data Requires complex computer model Potentially high cost to use | "Intelligent Transportation Systems Impact Assessment Framework: Final Report." Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, September 30, 1995 | Describes development and application of an analytical tool to predict ITS impacts, with a focus on Advanced Traffic Management Systems | Model integrates transportation planning and traffic simulation in an iterative fashion, and includes emissions and fuel consumption modules  Report describes use of model to analyze the potential use of ITS in the I-880 corridor in Alameda County, California, modeling ramp metering, traffic signal coordination, integrated traffic management, incident management, and HOV lanes  Emissions module uses accepted EMFAC and MOBILE factors | Relatively high cost and complexity  Locally specific input data makes the I-880 results of limited use in other areas                     | Operational Measures of Effectiveness: VMT, traffic volume, average vehicle speed, vehicle hours of delay, fuel consumption  Emission Measures of Effectiveness: CO, HC, NOx  Safety Measures of Effectiveness: personal injury levels, property damage, total accidents | dia |

| Transportation<br>Measure                             | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems<br>(cont.) | nsporta- i Systems nt.)  model applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complicated computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area   | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost- effectiveness estimates | Does not provide<br>detail on model<br>operation  | Many; not specified   |   |
|   |  | ·  |   | "Travel, Emissions, and Consumer Benefits of Advanced Transit Technologies in the Sacramento Region." Johnston, Robert and Rodier, Caroline. University of California, Davis. California PATH Research Report, July 1996. | Uses comprehensive Sacramento Regional Travel Demand Model (SACMET 95) to estimate the possible future impact of ITS on travel mode, emissions, and consumer welfare  | Appendices provide thorough explanation of modeling equations, assumptions and variables  Explores interrelations between income level and consumer welfare | Model is not integrated with a land use model; effects of major changes in transportation network are not taken in account  Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  More research is necessary to generate useful results | Vehicle miles and total hours traveled  Hours of delay and free flow  Transportation mode split: single occupant shared ride, transit, walk, bike |

| Transportation<br>Measure                             | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems<br>(cont.) | Vehicle<br>queuting model  | Calculates vehicle delay and vehicle speeds, to which emission factors can be applied  Applicable to any roadway or roadway type  Analyst can vary input parameters  Relatively low cost to use | Queuing model is theoretical in nature rather than empirical It is difficult to check results of theoretical ITS studies against empirical results due to the relatively low current level of ITS deployment  Requires computer model  Requires many simplifying assumptions | "Methodology for<br>Evaluating ATIS<br>Impacts on Air Quality."<br>AI-Deek, H. et al.<br>Journal of<br>Transportation<br>Engineering, vol. 121,<br>no. 4, Jul/Aug 1995, pp.<br>376-384.     | Presents an analytical method for evaluating the emissions impact of rerouting traffic guided with ATIS (using a deteriministic queuing model), and applies the method to a simple network. Evaluates CO, VOC, and NOx impact. | Uses MOBILE5a emission factors to estimate CO, VOC, and NOx impacts  Estimates impacts of ATIS at different levels of market penetration and in different years  Can be applied to simple or complex road networks  | Does not account for transient emissions associated with acceleration                | ATIS market penetration level Road network characteristics Traffic incident characteristics |
|   | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measuress  | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions  | *Environmental Considerations for Planning Advanced Traffic Management Systems.* Kraft, Walter H., and William A. Redl, in Resource Papers for the 1994 ITE International Conference, 1994. | Reviews environmental factors related to ITS strategies, and presents a case study of New Jersey DOT I-80 Metropolitan Area Guidance Information and Control (MAGIC) project   | Combines general discussion with case study results from an actual ITS project  Evaluates changes in VMT and emissions (CO, HC, and NOx) at the corridor level  Includes cost/benefit analysis results  Tracks changes in VMT and emissions impacts over time | Emissions calculation<br>methodology and<br>results not presented<br>in great detail | Land use and physical features  Emissions (CO, HC, NOx)  Benefit/cost ratio                 |

| Transportation<br>Measure                             | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems<br>(cont.) | Empirical analysis of transportation measure demonstration projects (cont.) |   | ·   | "ITS Benefits: Continuing Successes and Operational Test Results." Prepared by Mitretek Systems for Federal Highway Administration. Draft, September 19, 1997.                                       | Highlights existing and predicted ITS benefits identified from a variety of ITS implementation programs, focusing on U.S. DOT-funded Field Operational Tests and other programs resulting from recent federal initiatives | Reports benefits from a variety of projects covering a variety of ITS technologies  Includes ITS benefits related to safety, time, throughput, cost, customer satisfaction, energy, and environment  Describes quantified emissions impacts for projects in Seattle, Boston, Oklahoma, New Jersey, Los Angeles, and Abeline (Texas)  Includes example emissions results for Advanced Traveler Information Systems, electronic toll collection, and traffic signal systems | Reports results but does not show analysis methods or calculations  Not all reported results have been validated for completeness and reliability   | Varies depending on project summarized, but can include: VMT, vehicle trips, vehicle speeds, fuel usage, emissions (HC, CO, Nox) |
|   | Sketch<br>planning  | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters  The relatively low current level of ITS deployment makes validation of sketch planning results difficult  Requires many simplifying assumptions | "Potential Emission and<br>Air Quality Impacts of<br>Intelligent Vehicle-<br>Highway Systems."<br>Ostria, Sergio, and<br>Michael F. Lawrence.<br>In Transportation<br>Research Record 1444,<br>1994. | Discusses shorterm and long-<br>term impacts of<br>ITS technology<br>bundles on trips,<br>mode split, and<br>emissions at a<br>regional and<br>corridor level   | Provides a broad initial assessment of the expected direction of impact (positive, negative, insignificant, uncertain) of ITS bundles on travel behavior and emissions (HC, CO, NOx)  Utilizes solid a priori reasoning to predict impacts  | Discussion is theoretical rather than empirical  Does not estimate the magnitude of travel or emissions impacts  Evaluates ITS technology bundles rather than individual ITS technologies or ITS-related policy options | Traffic flow Vehicle trips Trip distance Mode shifts Emissions (HC, CO, NOx)   |

| Transportation<br>Measure                             | Methodology                | Advantages<br>of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed                 |     |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|----------------------------------|-----|
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems<br>(cont.) | Sketch<br>planning (cont.) |                              |                              | "Potential Contributions of intelligent Vehicle/Highway Systems (IVHS) to Reducing Transportation's Greenhouse Gas Production." Shladover, Steven E. PATH, Institute of Transportation Studies, U.C. Berkeley. August 1991. | Identifies role of<br>ITS in affecting<br>travel demand<br>and supply and<br>categorizes<br>subtypes of ITS  | Good categorization of various subtypes of ITS Identifies clearly how ITS influences short-term travel patterns and reduces traffic incidents  | Provides little quantification of VMT and delay reductions, no emissions reductions  Inconclusive evidence for effect on greenhouse gases, since long-term effects of ITS are unknown   | Several subtypes of ITS          | dac |
|   |                            |                              |                              | *Assessing the Emission Impacts of IVHS in an Uncertain Future.* Washington, Simon P., Randall Guensler, and Daniel Sperling. University of California Transportation Center. Working Paper UCTC No. 298, 1993.             | Summarizes the likely impacts of three ITS technology bundles (Advanced Traffic management Systems, Advanced Traverler Information Systems, and Advanced Vehicle Control Systems) under different sets of current and future assumptions | Provides background for evaluating a range of emissions impacts of ITS  Assesses potential changes in ITS emissions impacts due to future changes in vehicle fleet composition and driver behavior  Highlights potential synergies among ITS technologies and policy options | Does not address specific policies or programs that would impact vehicle fleet composition and driver behavior  Assesses the expected direction, but not the magnitude, of ITS emissions impacts  Does not draw upon data from specific existing ITS projects | Travel impacts Emissions impacts | dıl |

| Transportation<br>Measure                             | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems<br>(cont.) | Sketch<br>planning (cont.)   |   |   | *Emissions Impacts of Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems.* Washington, Simon, Randall Guensler, and Daniel Sperling. U.C. Davis Institute of Transportation Studies, UCD-RP-13-93. 1993. | A preliminary<br>assessment of<br>emissions<br>impacts of ITS<br>technology<br>bundles   | Provides framework for evaluating emissions impacts of ITS  Discusses potential ITS impacts of VMT, trip-end emissions, engine idling, diurnal and refueling emissions, and modal emissions activity  Identifies role of ITS in reducing emissions impacts associated with non-recurrent traffic congestion  Addresses potential role of ITS technologies in implementing demand management strategies such as congestion priding and preferential treatment of shared modes | Assesses the expected direction, but not the magnitude, of ITS emissions impacts  Does not draw upon data from specific existing ITS projects | VMT Vehicle trips Modal emissions activity  |
|   | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.              | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness  | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) |

| Transportation<br>Measure                             | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|-----|
| Intelligent<br>Transporta-<br>tion Systems<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV facilities in North America, which | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits   | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategles  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs   | dac |
|   |  | could be used if other directly applicable research is not available Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  |  | "An Assessment of IVHS-APTS Technology Impacts on Energy Consumption and Vehicle Emissions of Transit Bus Fleets." Jolibois, Sylvan C. Jr., and Adib Kanafani. California PATH Research Report. August 1994.                                       | Examines the potential impacts of Advanced Public Transportation Systems (APTS) technologies in terms of vehicle emissions, air quality, and fuel consumption through a research review, and makes subsequent policy recommendations | Provides a qualitative assessment of Intelligent Vehicle-Highway Systems technologies on air quality and energy consumption in both short and long term  Presents review of certain APTS program areas, specifically transit operations of motorized bus fleets  Provides ratios of transit bus emissions to auto emissions (per passenger and per vehicle) for HC, CO, NOx, and PM | Report does not contain a methodology for quantification of emissions from specific transportation measures  Emissions ratios may be based on overty optimistic ridership estimates            | Impacts of Advanced<br>Public Transportation<br>Systems (APTS)<br>technologies on<br>vehicle emissions<br>and fuel<br>consumption<br>Smart Traveler,<br>Smart Vehicle, and<br>Smart Intermodal<br>systems |     |

**这种种种的。** 

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology Advantages of Methodolog  | Disadvantages of Methodology                                 | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Intermodal                | Empirical analysis of transportation measure demonstration projects  Requires little or no new data acquisition Relatively low co Shows actual potential of transportation measures | Case study results do not necessarily apply to other regions | *Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion.*<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case<br>studies of the<br>effectiveness of<br>11 transportation<br>demand<br>management<br>programs | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented | Generally does not evaluate specific transportation measure individually; programs of multiple transportation measures are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology                            | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| ocal Land<br>Ise/Urban<br>Jesign | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model | State-of-the-art method of analyzing individual travel behavior  Model's structure and parameters offer considerable insight into what factors influence travel mode selection, and therefore can be used to evaluate different scenarios and details in program design | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use  Does not directly provide emissions estimates  Precision of analysis will depend on accuracy of both | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05.                     | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model | Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions  | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient                            | Commute trip length reduction through new zoning controls  |
|                                  |  | Travel demand models can be used to evaluate combinations of transportation measures as well as individual measures  Can be used to isolate the impact of land use changes on a transportation network, minimizing other factors such as other transportation measures  | growth projections and estimates of "holding capacity" of targeted household and employment growth transfer zones  | "Testing the Impact of<br>Alternative Land Use<br>Scenarios Using a<br>Travel Demand<br>Forecasting Model."<br>Stelss, Todd Alan.<br>Baltimore Metropolitan<br>Council, Transportation<br>Planning Division.<br>Transportation<br>Research Board Paper<br>960898. | Used travel demand forecasting model software to analyze four different land use alternatives in the Baltimore metropolitan area       | Travel forecasting model used was MINUTP, a typical and familiar model to planning agencies in the Baltimore region (thus no learning curve), and techniques for evaluating model output had already been established  Study compared baseline transit network projections and 1) Baltimore's long-range plan without TCMs, 2) Plan with TCMs, 3) land use alternatives separately and in composite | More sophisticated land use model not utilized due to time constraints  Emissions actually calculated for composite of land use alternatives only | VMT, VT, and transit ridership  Land use alternatives: "Inside Beltway," "Fixed Transit," "Community" development and a composite scenario |
| 1 11 11 11                       |  | W. P. I. WILL   |  |   |  | Emissions can be calculated for each land at use alternative  | ×:  | garage controller in the second  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology .                                      | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | Conventional transportation planning network model | Can be used to isolate the effect on travel patterns of different street layouts for neotraditional and conventional neighborhoods | Hypothetical modeling exercise; does not use actual performance data from existing neotraditional and conventional developments  Models do not account for many aspects of local land use strategies, such as mixed land uses, street characteristics like street and lane width and landscaping, and differences in development densities and parking availability  Modeling analysis of a local street network does not account for interaction between neighborhood and regional travel | "Comparative Assessment of Travel Characteristics for Neotraditional Designs." McNally, Michael and Sherry Ryan. Institute of Transportation Studies. In Transportation Research Record 1400. | Evaluates the performance differences of two hypothetical street networks designed to replicate a neotraditional and a conventional suburban community; determines that neotraditional street networks can improve transportation system performance | Uses generalized, hypothetical transportation network designs in order to generate broad conclusions rather than localized network-specific conclusions  Examines effect neotraditional design has on reducing vehicle kilometers and vehicle hours traveled  Generates results consistent with earlier findings by others  To isolate the impact of the street layout, all other aspects of the modeled communities are held constant | The study does not calculate emissions directly; transportation impacts are measured in terms of vehicle kilometers traveled, average trip lengths, and congestion on links and at intersections  Model does not take into account narrower rights-of-way and denser grid that usually typify neotraditional developments; assumed equal tradeoff  Because hypothetical subarea is only 0.5 square miles, many assumptions need to be made about external trips  Trip generation rates, other travel parameters, and friction factors which were adopted from the City of Irvine could have introduced some error, as they were developed for a study area larger than that used in this exercise | Transportation systems of hypothetical neotraditional and conventional subdivisions  Vehicle kilometers traveled  Mean trip length by trip type Intersection capacity utilization (ICU) |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure  | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|----|
| Jse/Urban Design cont.)  analysis of diarie and/o house chara  Relati appronent recomp mode  Some have | Utilizes actual data from travel diarles, surveys, and/or local and household characteristics  Relatively simple approach (does not require computer modeling)  Some results may have applicability | Complexity of relationship between travel behavior and urban form can make it difficult to achieve statistically significant results  Causality can be difficult to establish  Uncertain applicability to multiple regions (but can be duplicated at | "A Micro-Analysis of<br>Land Use and Travel in<br>Five Neighborhoods in<br>the San Francisco Bay<br>Area." Kitamura,<br>Ryuichi, et al. Institute<br>of Transportation<br>Studies, UC Davis.<br>November, 1994. | Analyzes surveys of five Bay Area neighborhoods; assesses impact of land use characteristics and attitudes on travel behavior                      | Utilizes actual survey data from five different neighborhoods for comparison  Distinguishes between impact of land use characteristics, attitudes, and income  Explores multiple variables (household size, profession, environmental attitude, time pressure, etc.) | More research is necessary to reach conclusions that are useful to land use planners  Diaries and surveys require time-intensive, methodical approach  | Land use characteristics (access to transit, sidewalk/bikeway availability, etc.)  Personal attitudes related to environment, mobility, etc.  | da  |    |
|  |   | to other regions   | moderate cost, if<br>necessary)   | "Using Residential Patterns and Transit to Decrease Auto Dependence and Costs." Holtzclaw, John. For Natural Resources Defense Council, June 1994. | Evaluates the effects of neighborhood characteristics (density, transit accessibility, neighborhood shopping, and pedestrian accessibility) on household vehicle ownership and VMT, based on data from 27 neighborhoods in California.                               | Explores some key relationships between often-overlooked neighborhood characteristics and travel behavior  Uses innovative techniques to account for transit accessibility, neighborhood shopping, and pedestrain accessibility  Uses data from a wide variety of California neighborhoods, from central city to suburban fringe | Evaluates VMT per household, but does not estimate emissions impacts directly  Study does not account for several potentially important neighborhood characteristics, including parking availability and proximity to the urban center  Results may not be applicable outside of California | Annual VMT per household  Household vehicle ownership  Neighborhood characteristics (density, transit accessibility, neighborhood shopping, and pedestrian accessibility)  Household income | di |

•

-

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   | ]   |
|--|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|-----|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | Statistical<br>analysis of<br>factors<br>affecting travel<br>behavior (cont.) |                           |                              | *Effect of Urban Development Patterns on Transportation Energy Use.* Cheslow, Melvyn D., and J. Kevin Neels. In Transportation Research Record 764, 1980. | Addresses the influence of travel patterns on energy use, and analyzes the relationships between these travel characteristics and measures of urban form  | Analyzes actual trip data from a pooled sample of Interview surveys in eight standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSAs) nationwide  Focuses on variation in fuel use between different neighborhoods and metropolitan areas   | Does not define exactly how urban structure may affect travel characteristics  Study sample included few metropolitan areas, and was therefore unable to pinpoint the urban- scale characteristics that distinguished the different metropolitan regions  Study does not include mixed land-use scenarios, or walking trips in travel characteristics analyzed  Does not address economic and social costs and feasibility of implementing changes in urban development patterns | Land use characteristics  Household travel patterns  Transportation energy use   | dkp |
|  |   |                           |                              | "The Odds on TODs: Examining the Potential of Transit-Oriented Development in the San Francisco Bay Area." Luscher, Dan. Harvard University, April 1995.  | Quantifies VMT Impact of hypothetical transit-oriented developments based on regression analysis; estimates costs and benefits of transit-oriented development; shorter version appears in Berkeley Planning Journal, vol. 9, 1995. | Identifies key relationships between neighborhood characteristics and total travel  Uses hypothetical transitoriented developments that are similar to actual developments being built  Estimates a range of travel impacts per transitoriented development as well as for the San Francisco Bay region as a whole | Does not estimate emissions impacts directly  Results assume very widespread implementation of transit-oriented development  Results may not be applicable outside of California   | Annual VMT per household  Household income  Neighborhood characteristics (density, transit accessibility, distance from central business district) | drl |

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology       | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed  |      |
|--|---|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | Statistical<br>analysis of<br>factors<br>affecting travel<br>behavior (cont.) |                           |                                    | "Travel Behavior as a Function of Accessibility, Land Use Mixing, and Land Use Balance: Evidence from the San Francisco Bay Area." Kockelman, Kara M. University of California, Berkeley. TRB 970048. | Correlates land use and travel behavior databases for the San Francisco Bay Area to determine the impact of land use mix, balance, and accessibility on travel patterns | Utilizes 1990 census and hectare-level land-use description data from actual surveys for accurate characterizations of local populations and land use zones  Develops descriptive definitions for characterizing land use data (accessibility, mix, and balance) to more accurately determine the influence of land use on travel behavior  Results may not be heavily influenced by local conditions | Similar data may not be available in the same format in other areas  Results show elasticities of VMT, auto ownership, and personal vehicle choice with respect to land use accessibility, mix, and balance, but do not calculate VMT or emission reductions from these characteristics | Land use access- ibility, mix, and balance income per house- hold member Auto ownership Household size Job and population density | đ    |
|  |   |                           |                                    | "An Assessment of the<br>Land Use -<br>Transportation System<br>and Travel Behavior."<br>McNally, Michael G.,<br>and Anup Kulkami.<br>U.C. Irvine. TRB<br>971120, January 1997.                       | Correlates land use, socioeconomic, and travel behavior databases for Orange County neighborhoods to determine the impact of land use on travel patterns                | Uses comprehensive list of indices to evaluate neighborhood characteristics (e.g., population density, number of 3-way intersections, etc.) and cluster them into 3 distinct themes  Studied socioeconomic demographics in conjunction with land use patterns to determine which is more influential on trip patterns   | Cannot investigate correlation between household income and choice of neighborhood theme  Quantifies only trip rate and mode share  | Neighborhood<br>network<br>characteristics<br>Socioeconomic<br>demographics<br>Land use types<br>Accessibility                    | da   |
| and a second                                 |   |                           | g state the movement of the second | "Transit-Oriented<br>Development in the<br>Sun Belt." Messenger,<br>Todd, and Reid Ewing.<br>In Transportation<br>Research Record 1552,<br>1996.  | Determined the minimum housing and workplace density required to support a given transit service level in the Dade County, Florida area                                 | Provides detailed equations used to calculate results  Allows for interactive effects between variables  Utilizes traffic analysis zone data from the   | Accuracy may be very region-specific  Does not quantify travel or emission reductions   | Residence and work-<br>place density  Automobile ownership  Rail availability  Parking charge                                     | - da |

| _   |  |
|-----|--|
| _   |  |
| 62. |  |
| ~   |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | analysis of the impacts of land use characteristics and TDM strategies on mode choice | Use of Principle Components Analysis generated composite variables (groups of land use characteristics with similar impacts) Standard analysis of variance using principle components allowed examination of the effects of land use and TDM incentive strategies on mode choice individually and in combination.  Results transferable to other urban areas in terms of relative ranking of importance of the land use and TDM factors analyzed. |                              | "The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior: Final Report." Prepared by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Transportation, November 1994. | Develops an integrated database of land use characteristics and travel demand management (TDM) strategies (for a sample of employment locations) to determine the combined impacts of TDM programs, land use, and urban design on employee travel behavior. | Added land use and site information from field observation to the "Regulation XV" dataset of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (which included aggregate employee travel characteristics and employer incentive programs) | Study conducted in Los Angeles County, and thus may be less applicable in more dense urban areas with factors such as higher average density and transit service.  Did not address residential trip end of commute, midday travel, or trip chaining as factors which influence mode choice  To simplify a complicated data collection process, somewhat arbitrary indicators were used for assessment of a site's urban design and land use characteristics. | Land use and urban design of worksite  TDM Incentive strategies |

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects | Requires little or no new data acquisition Relatively low cost Shows actual potential of transportation measures Identifies barriers to implementing transportation   | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions                        | "Land Use Regulations to Promote Ridesharing: An Evaluation of the Seattle Approach." McCutcheon, Melody, and Jeffrey Hamm. Transportation Quarterly, vol. 37 no. 4, 1983.                                    | Evaluates the effectiveness of developer-based land use regulations to promote ridesharing in Seattle's central business district  | Identifies barriers to<br>enforcing parking<br>management practices at<br>businesses; suggests<br>improvements  | Does not quantify trip, VMT, or emissions reductions  Study was performed before significant data existed on the effectiveness of the whole program   | Availability of nearby parking  Developer cooperation with requirements |
|  | Sketch<br>planning   | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "Transportation-Related Land Use Strategies to Minimize Motor Vehicle Emissions: An Indirect Source Research Study." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates, Inc. For California Air Resources Board. June 1995. | Based upon a review of relevant literature, case studies, and a travel survey study, this report recommends community-level performance goals, and presents appropriate transportation-related land use strategies and implementation mechanisms | Performance goals are expressed as annual VT per household, annual VMT per household, modal shares, and estimated related vehicular emissions  Addresses differences in community type, as three ranges of performance goals for urban and suburban areas and two ranges of performance goals for exurban/rural areas are specified  Recommended community-wide packages of transportation-related land use strategies address difficulty of quantifying reductions in VT and emissions from individual strategies applied separately or on | Applicability of performance goals and strategy recommendations to regions outside California limited by study's use of primarily Californian communities case studies and data  Performance goals, strategies, and implementation mechanisms do not include consideration of cost-effectiveness  Performance goal development can not use available BURDEN activity data, as it is not specific enough to allow accurate segmentation by type of community within a metropolitan | Transportation-related land use strategies                              |

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology             | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | Sketch planning (cont.) |                           |                              | "Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances." Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993 | Describes development of simple methodologies for quantifying reductions in vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from TCMs, for use in a planning- level context; specifically analyzes pedestrian improvements | Methods to quantify VT and VMT reductions from TCMs were based upon relatively simple methods for estimating emissions and individual TCM effectiveness developed prior to this report for the South Coast AQMD  Performance-based approach was developed rather than use mandated transportation performance standards  Actual experience data used as much as possible: estimated trip reduction levels from each TCM was collected from other studies, and planning-level analysis uses site-specific data inputs, thus offering increased precision in emissions estimates  Ranges in VT reductions estimates address the interactive impacts of the application of multiple TCMs  Equivalency factor used to convert VMT to VT can account for region-specific average trip lengths | Expected reductions in VT and VMT from TCMs were estimated based upon a general survey, so for a particular location different assumptions may be needed  Applicability to other regions outside California limited by report's use of transportation data and emissions factors in the analysis which were quantified using BURDEN and EMFAC runs for 1994  Does not incorporate any consideration of cost-effectiveness | Employee participation (percentage and frequency)  Trip length  Existence/extent of pedestrian path system  Existence of shower facilities |



| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|-----|
| Local Land<br>Use/Urban<br>Design<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods                       | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly              | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) |     |
|  | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV facilities in North America, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995.   | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions                                     |     |
| a es e sessibilità                           |  | Identifies<br>advantages and<br>disadvantages of<br>several<br>methodologies  | A STANSON WAS TO SECURE SECURE SECURE  | - A SECTION OF THE SERVICE SECTION OF THE SECTION O |  | . १५८ <b>० क्या</b>   | ी प्रज्ञान करणा करणा विश्व स्थापन करणा ।<br>   | . н <b>ад</b> — Слежне <b>ру закабия</b> зг   | *** |

•

| ransportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology Advantages of Methodology            | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|--|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| ocal Land<br>Ise/Urban<br>lesign<br>cont.) | Comparison and analysis of other studies (cont.) |                              | "Transportation-Related Land Use Strategies to Minimize Motor Vehicle Emissions: An Indirect Source Research Study." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates, Inc. For California Air Resources Board. June 1995. | Based upon a review of relevant literature, case studies, and a travel survey study, this report recommends community-level performance goals, and presents appropriate transportation-related land use strategies and implementation mechanisms | Includes an extensive literature review matrix and annotated bibliography summarizing quantifiable effectiveness data of transportation-related land use strategies in local, national, and international cases  Preliminary estimates of individual transportation-related land use strategy effectiveness are developed from the literature review  Utilized as a resource an existing detailed examination of travel data and transportation and land use characteristics in California (by John Holtzclaw for the Natural Resources Defense Council, 1994)  Travel and land use data from selected Portland, Oregon, and Canadian cities were examined to provide a basis of comparison for the characteristics found in the Californian case studies | Much of literature on transportation-related land use strategies does not contain analyses of modeled or empirical data, thus somewhat limiting scope of data included Literature survey does not contain emissions estimates, but subsequent sketch planning focuses on emissions related to VT and VMT performance goals | Transportation-related land use strategies  Land use and transportation characteristics' impact on creation and support of public transit systems and pedestrian-accessible communities |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description *  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyze  |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Market<br>Incentives      | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model  | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters   | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complicated computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Selection and Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures." Taylor, Christopher J., et al. TRB 971114, January 1997.   | Uses Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to- zone travel  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer- based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies  | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions | Transit fare levels and travel time  HOV lane time savings  Parking costs  Employer transit encouragement levels |
|                           |   |   |  | "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991.                           | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area          | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost- effectiveness estimates | Does not provide detail on model operation  | Many; not specified  |
|                           | Sample survey<br>of customer<br>travel patterns<br>and<br>preferences at<br>shopping<br>centers | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but influenced by local factors of the study area)  Does not require an extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Moderate to high cost  | *Analysis of Indirect<br>Source Trip Activity:<br>Regional Shopping<br>Centers.* Prepared by<br>JHK & Associates and<br>K.T. Analytics for the<br>California Air<br>Resources Board.<br>ARB-R-94/510,<br>November 1993. | Surveyed<br>customers of<br>regional shopping<br>centers to<br>determine<br>potential impact<br>of various travel<br>reduction<br>measures                             | Uses actual survey data (including customer demographic and stated preference data)  Developed calculation methodologies specific to each trip reduction measure, using site- specific data  Compares data between shopping centers in different land-use types   | Assumptions are required to translate stated preference data to expected outcome  Does not quantify emission reductions   | Transit subsidy/validation   |

| Transportation<br>Measure       | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Stucy   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Market<br>incentives<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods     | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly             | "Transportation Control<br>Measures Analyzed for<br>the Washington<br>Region's 15 Percent<br>Rate of Progress Plan."<br>FHWA/Metropolitan<br>Washington Council of<br>Governments, February<br>1995. | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures  | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of aiready-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process)                           |
|                                 | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions) Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Glullano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation. Policy Insight No. 142, September 1992.   | Compares congestion pricing with Regulation XV for the Southern California area; describes pros and cons of each measure and discusses Implications | Provides typology of transportation measures and identifies effectiveness and common barriers to implementation  Simple side-by-side comparison of VMT reduction and cost-effectiveness for each transportation measure  Makes policy recommendations to improve each transportation measure  | Provides little detail about logistics of implementing the policy recommendations  Does not quantify emission reductions   | Direct vs. indirect implementation  Market-based vs. performance-based implementation  Efficiency and equity considerations |
|                                 |  | available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies   |   | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996.                                 | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Baltimore and Philadelphia regions                    | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions   | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions | Rideshare promotion level Parking charge level Transit subsidy levels Work schedule flexibility                             |

| Transportation<br>Measure                    | Methodology                            | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|-----|
| Parking<br>Pricing/<br>Parking<br>Management | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost | "Transportation Pricing<br>Strategles for<br>California: An<br>Assessment of<br>Congestion, Emissions,<br>Energy and Equity<br>Impacts." California Air<br>Resources Board, June<br>1995. Report No. 92-<br>316.                              | Develops and uses a comprehensive travel demand model to estimate the impacts of multiple transportation measures  | Uses actual, available price elasticities  Establishes base case by comparing to actual travel data  Explores interrelations between pricing strategies   | Does not contain a highway-network model to include level-of-service changes  Forecasts rely on estimations of changes in household travel data   | Price level, period and location of application  Price elasticity  Interrelationships between pricing strategies | dac |
|  |  |   | to use  | "Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience." COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.  | Summarizes broad range of TDM measures, provides example case study analyses of each, and uses computer model to benchmark the effectiveness of each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Fee level  | dac |
|  |  |   |   | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05. | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model                   | Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions                          | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient  | Fee level during<br>commute trip parking<br>times  | dad |

dа

C

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Parking Pricing/ Parking Management (cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                              | *Transportation Control Measure Analysis Procedures.* Austin, Barbara S., et al. Systems Applications International/California Air Resources Board. Nov 1991. SYSAPP-91/141. | Describes a developed transportation demand model and explicitly discusses the calculation methodology used for several transportation measures | Model quantifies key secondary effects of TCMs (e.g. new carpooling programs may attract transit riders rather than SOV riders)  Presents all the primary equations and variables used to calculate the effects of TCMs  Contains a step-by-step process for evaluating packages of TCMs  Explains multi-attribute analyses as applied to multiple TCM packages | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient; participation level data is required; base cases need to match real conditions  Model does not cover all TCMs, but can be modified to do so  Temporal treatment is limited to on-peak/off-peak, no spatial treatment  Emissions calculations are not explicitly described in the same fashion as travel effects | Level of people affected by parking measures  Availability of spillover parking Interaction with rideshare & transit programs  Price level |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study.  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| Parking Pricing/ Parking Management (cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                              | "A Survey and Analysis of Employee Responses to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Incentive Programs." Schreffler, Eric N., and Mortero, Jose. COMSIS Corp. California Air Resources Board, February 1994. Contract No. A983-187. | Describes results of new survey data regarding employee travel behavior; uses mode choice and travel demand model to predict impacts of certain employer-based transportation measures | Clearly explains the process that was used: survey data acquisition, mode choice computation, and TCM effectiveness model use Data requirements are more readily available than other models  User-friendly model is available for outside use; users guide is also available  Survey links incentives directly to impacts on travel behavior  Model includes an awareness sub-model that simulates how many people know about the possible TCMs available to them | Does not accurately address trip-chaining and VMT reductions (only trips)  Household conditions are not extensively accounted for  Cost-effectiveness was not calculated  Employer-level analyses only, with focus upon incentive TCMs | Guaranteed ride home  Company vanpools  Preferential parking  Parking fees for ridesharers  Carpool subsidies & transportation allowances |
|   |  |                           |                              | "Estimating the Travel and Parking Demand Effects of Employer-Paid Parking." Willson, Richard. UCTC No. 39, University of California Transportation Center, Berkeley, 1992.   | Uses a multinomial logit model to estimate the influence of employer-paid parking on the mode of transportation used to the workplace  | Explains the main variables and equations used to compute probabilities Includes impact of complementary transportation measures such as rideshare incentives and flextime   | Data set not developed for this particular modeling effort and missing key variables such as vehicle availability per household  Model mostly useful in metropolitan area where parking market is more developed                       | Transportation mode<br>(solo, carpool, or<br>transit)  Cars per 100<br>employees  Elasticity of demand<br>for each mode                   |

The second secon

**三年** 计非常数据计**页** 

| Transportation<br>Measure                               | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | /<br>Factors Analyzed  | ] : |
|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|-----|
| Parking<br>Pricing/<br>Parking<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                                 | "Selection and<br>Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures." Taylor,<br>Christopher J., et al.<br>TRB 971114, January<br>1997.   | Uses Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to-zone travel .  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer-based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies   | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions                       | Transit fare levels and travel time HOV lane time savings Parking costs Employer transit encouragement level | dac |
|   |  |                           |                                 | "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs." Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991.       | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area          | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost-effectiveness estimates | Does not provide detail on model operation  | Many; not specified  | dac |
|   |  |                           | <b>.</b>                        | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994. | Overview paper<br>on the effects of<br>transportation<br>system pricing on<br>activity patterns<br>and travel<br>behavior; some<br>emissions results                   | Paper presents modeling results from the San Francisco Bay Area Pricing Study using the STEP model  Quantifies VMT, trips, fuel usage, ROG, CO, NOx, and CO2  Shows quantified travel and emissions modeling results that correspond to specific, clearly defined pricing proposals                    | Use of model developed for San Francisco Bay Area may limit usefulness of results to other regions  Study acknowledges that the STEP model does not accurately account for regional growth or employment allocation, and treats time of day in a simplified way | VMT Vehicle trips Fuel usage Emissions (ROG, CO, NOx, CO2)   | dri |

| Transportation<br>Measure                               | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages in of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|-----|
| Parking<br>Pricing/<br>Parking<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Parking supply<br>and demand<br>model   | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters                                    | Requires computer<br>model<br>Potentially high cost<br>to use                        | "Air Quality Offsets for<br>Parking." Loudon,<br>Wittiam, et al. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1232,<br>1992.   | Develops and uses parking supply model for downtown Portland to estimate CO emissions   | Uses observed price and travel time sensitivities  Uses proven models of travel behavior  Incorporates integrated CO emissions model           | Requires parking database: number of spaces, location, type, use patterns  Requires travel database: time of arrival, trave & work mode split   | Price level   | dac |
|   | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be repticated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | *An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction incentives.* Giuliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.                           | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and-after-TCM conditions | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey | Not described   | dac |
|   |   |  |  | "Reducing Drive-Alone<br>Rates at Small<br>Employer Sites: Costs<br>and Benefits of Local<br>Trip Reduction<br>Ordinances: Pasadena<br>Towers Case Study."<br>Stewart, Jacqueline. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1433,<br>1994. | Evaluates the cost effectiveness of a building-based trip reduction plan implemented in compliance to a local ordinance in Pasadena, California                           | Attitudinal survey includes the influences of building tenant company size as well as schedule and lifestyle of employees                      | Uses small data sets therefore results vary widely with the behavior of a few individuals  Does not establish a standard to evaluate average vehicle ridership results obtained   | Program cost and distribution of cost  Benefits to developer, tenants and city  Average vehicle ridership | tk  |
| त्रक्षक्ष्यां कृतिक स्थापित                             |   |  | <b>國</b> 住 鐵 新   | Friday and a  | i cairsage d  | ā  | Results may not be transferable to other amployer sites or regions  Does not quantify emission impacts  | And the section of the  |     |

| Transportation<br>Measure                         | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report  | Description .   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  | ]   |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|-----|
| Pricing/ enaly. Parking transp Management (cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects | Requires little or no new data acquisition Relatively low cost Shows actual potential of transportation measures Identifies barriers to implementing transportation measures | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions | "Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion."<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case<br>studies of the<br>effectiveness of<br>11 transportation<br>demand<br>management<br>programs  | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented                              | Generally does not evaluate specific transportation measure individually; programs of multiple transportation measures are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures               | dac |
|   |  |  |   | *Land Use Regulations to Promote Ridesharing: An Evaluation of the Seattle Approach.* McCutcheon, Melody, and Jeffrey Hamm. <i>Transportation Quarterly</i> , vol. 37 no. 4, 1983.  | Evaluates the effectiveness of developer-based land use regulations to promote ridesharing in Seattle's central business district                                 | Identifies barriers to<br>enforcing parking<br>management practices at<br>businesses; suggests<br>improvements  | Does not quantify trip, VMT, or emissions reductions  Study was performed before significant data existed on the effectiveness of the whole program  | Availability of nearby parking i t  Developer cooperation with requirements | dac |
|   | Transportation<br>survey analysis  | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but influenced by local factors of the study area)  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process                                | *Cashing Out Employer-Paid Parking: A Precedent for Congestion Pricing?* Shoup, Donald. University of California, Los Angeles, 1994. Contained in Transportation Research Board SR 242.                                   | Uses transportation survey data to assess vehicle trip, VMT, and fuel use changes if cash payments were made available to employees in lieu of subsidized parking | Uses actual transportation behavior data for the Los Angeles region in addition to available supplementary data  Requires only simple calculations  Provides rebuttals to arguments against cash payments | Requires care when inferring applicability of results to other regions   | Value of parking subsidy  Level of cash payments in lieu of parking subsidy | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure                               | Methodology                            | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|-----|
| Parking<br>Pricing/<br>Parking<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Transportation survey analysis (cont.) |  |  | "Analysis of Indirect<br>Source Trip Activity:<br>Regional Shopping<br>Centers." Prepared by<br>JHK & Associates and<br>K.T. Analytics for the<br>California Air<br>Resources Board.<br>ARB-R-94/510,<br>November 1993.   | Surveyed customers of regional shopping centers to determine potential impact of various travel reduction measures   | Uses actual survey data (Including customer demographic and stated preference data)  Developed calculation methodologies specific to each trip reduction measure, using site- specific data  Compares data between shopping centers in different land-use types | Assumptions are required to translate stated preference data to expected outcome.  Does not quantify emission reductions.   | Parking fee level Amount of other nearby parking Proximity of potential high-occupancy preferred parking | dac |
|   | Sketch<br>planning                     | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "TCM Analyst 1.0 and<br>User's Guide."<br>Crawford, Jason A., et<br>al. Texas<br>Transportation institute.<br>For the Federal<br>Highway<br>Administration,<br>November 1994.   | Describes a computerized sketch planning tool, TCM Analyst 1.0, including input data requirements, methods of use, and an overview of the model's structure and calculation procedures                                       | Provides a useful and relatively easy instruction manual for using TCM Analyst 1.0  Uses MOBILE5a output data (emission factors) as inputs to the model, providing more accurate emission benefit calculations for each TCM                                     | Program only models limited TCMs and cannot model multiple TCM packages Requires several runs with MOBILE5a to obtain input emission factors Modeling on regional (rather than microscale) basis only | Not stated   | dac |
|   |  | input parameters   | · .  | *Critical Analysis of<br>Sketch-Planning Tools<br>for Evaluating the<br>Emission Benefits of<br>Transportation Control<br>Measures.* Crawford,<br>Jason A., and<br>Raymond A. Krammes.<br>Prepared by Texas<br>Transportation Institute<br>for FHWA, FHWA/TX-<br>92/1279-5. December<br>1993. | Critical analysis and sensitivity analysis (using data for El Paso, Texas) of San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) TCM Tools method and the Systems Applications International (SAI) method; summarized in TRR 1472 | Provides a thorough review of the state of the practice (as of 1993)  Identifies weaknesses in the SANDAG and SAI methods as well as strengths  Provides detailed sketch-planning analysis for El Paso, Texas   | Many of the inputs to the SANDAG and SAI models are difficult to quantify  The SANDAG and SAI models do not fully account for indirect impacts and latent travel demand                               | Vehicle trips VMT Average vehicle speed Emissions (HC, CO, NOx)  | dil |

| Transportation<br>Measure                               | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|-----|
| Parking<br>Pricing/<br>Parking<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods   | Does not necessarily<br>help quantify VT,<br>VMT, or emissions<br>reductions from the<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>Cost can vary greatly | *Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan.* FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG.  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method.  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors<br>analyzed are<br>applicable to each<br>transportation<br>measure analyzed<br>during the process) | dao |
|   | Comparison and analysis of other studies                               | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV facilities in North America, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Untikely to provide precise estimates        | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                                  | dad |

| Transportation Methodol                     | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|----|
| Parking Pricing/ Parking Management (cont.) | of                        |                              | *Assessment of Travel Demand Management Approaches at Suburban Activity Centers.* Bhatt, Kiran, and Higgins, Thomas. K.T. Analystics. U.S. DOT, July 1989. | Surveys research studies and interviews TCM program coordinators to provide an overview of the range of effectiveness of employer-based TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program   | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Only generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness  | Relative effectiveness of various transportation measure programs Implementation mechanisms | di |
|   |                           |                              | *Parking Subsidies and Travel Choices: Assessing the Evidence.* Willson, Richard W. and Donald C. Shoup. In <i>Transportation</i> , vol. 17, 1990.         | Reviews empirical case studies of the relationship between employer-paid parking and solo commuting  | Draws out analogous results from a variety of existing case studies to show range of impacts of employer-paid parking and solo driving  Case studies cover a variety of locations (downtown and suburban), employer types (public and private) and employee categories (professional and clerical)  Case study results are reinforced by survey findings cited in the paper Provides an estimated range for the elasticity of demand for solo driving | Because most case studies are from Los Angeles, results may not be representative of other areas  Range of results is very wide, so the results cannot directly be used to accurately estimate the impacts of another program  Does not quantify VMT or emissions impacts | Existence of employer-paid parking  Travel mode (solo driver, non-solo driver)              | dr |

والمراز فالمحتمد وبهدا مجهر سارمين

| Transportation<br>Measure                               | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed            |     |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-----|
| Parking<br>Pricing/<br>Parking<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |                           |                              | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996.                                | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Baltimore and Philadelphia regions                     | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions |                             | dac |
|   |   |                           |                              | "Transportation Pricing and Travel Behavior." Harvey, Greig W. In Curbing Gridlock: Peak-Period Fees to Relieve Traffic Congestion. Vol. 2. Transportation Research Board Special Report 242, 1994. | Overview paper<br>on the effects of<br>transportation<br>system pricing on<br>activity patterns<br>and travel<br>behavior; some<br>emissions results | Paper reviews empirical results and anecdotal from several transportation pricing projects and studies  Review of existing results focuses on aggregate demand elasticity                       | Wide variability of results reviewed limits their usefulness   | Aggregate demand elasticity | dri |

i 🕶 🕛

| Transportation<br>Measure                     | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Regional<br>Land Use/<br>Growth<br>Management | Conventional<br>transportation<br>planning<br>network model           | Can be used to isolate the effect on travel patterns of different land use patterns  | Hypothetical modeling exercise; does not use actual performance data from existing neighborhoods  Models do not account for many aspects of land use strategies, such as mixed land uses, street characteristics like street and lane width and landscaping, and differences in development densities and parking availability  Modeling analysis of a local street network does not account for interaction between neighborhood and regional travel | "The Impacts of<br>Various Land Use<br>Strategies on Suburban<br>Mobility." Middlesex<br>Somerset Mercer<br>Regional Council<br>(MSM). For the<br>Federal Transit<br>Administration.<br>December 1992. | Examines the Interaction between suburban land use trends and regional traffic conditions utilizing three different models of high density, mixed-use centers; tested the model's transportation effects on Trenton and New Brunswick suburban region | Used TransCAD transportation modeling package, which incorporates land use elements in a GIS format with a traditional four- step transportation planning model Regional transportation model used to evaluate effects of the 3 mixed- use centers (transit, short-drive, and walking) includes modeling of trip generation, distribution, mode split, and route assignment | Regionwide tripmaking formulas concentrated on suburban practices and do not provide a good reflection of urban tripmaking conditions  Study does not calculate emissions directly; transportation impacts are measured in Vehicle Trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled  Model assumes that all new development locates in cities or in higher-density, mixeduse centers | Transportation effects of suburban, higher density, mixed use centers, measured in: vehicle trips, level of vehicle miles traveled, level of delay experienced, and average speed           |
|   | Statistical<br>analysis of<br>lactors<br>affecting travel<br>behavior | Utilizes actual data from travel diaries, surveys, and/or local and household characteristics  Relatively simple approach (does not require computer modeling)  Some results may have applicability to other regions | Complexity of relationship between travel behavior and urban form can make it difficult to achieve statistically significant results  Causality can be difficult to establish  Uncertain applicability to multiple regions (but can be duplicated at moderate cost, if necessary)   | *Using Residential Patterns and Transit to Decrease Auto Dependence and Costs.* Holtzclaw, John. For Natural Resources Defense Council, June 1994.   | Evaluates the effects of neighborhood characteristics (density, transit accessibility, neighborhood shopping, and pedestrian accessibility) on household vehicle ownership and VMT, based on data from 27 neighborhoods in California.                | Explores some key relationships between often-overlooked neighborhood characteristics and travel behavior  Uses innovative techniques to account for transit accessibility, neighborhood shopping, and pedestrain accessibility  Uses data from a wide variety of California neighborhoods, from central city to suburban fringe  | Evaluates VMT per household, but does not estimate emissions impacts directly  Study does not account for several potentially important neighborhood characteristics, including parking availability and proximity to the urban center  Results may not be applicable outside of California  | Annual VMT per household  Household vehicle ownership  Neighborhood characteristics (density, transit accessibility, neighborhood shopping, and pedestrian accessibility)  Household income |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                            | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  | ֓֞֞֓֞֓֓֓֓֞֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֟֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֟֓֓֓֓֟ |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Aldeshare                 | Travel damand/<br>mode choice<br>model | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience.* COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.  | Summarizes broad range of TDM measures, provides example case study analyses of each, and uses computer model to benchmark the effectiveness of each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Level of service<br>provided by<br>employer:<br>Information,<br>matching services,<br>preferential parking,<br>ride home programs<br>Average vehicle<br>ridership | da                                     |
|                           |  |   |  | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05. | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model                   | Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs  Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient  | Employee incentives   | da                                     |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                              | "Transportation Control Measure Analysis Procedures." Austin, Barbara S., et al. Systems Applications International/California Air Resources Board. Nov 1991. SYSAPP-91/141. | Describes a developed transportation demand model and explicitly discusses the calculation methodology used for several transportation measures | Model quantifies key secondary effects of TCMs (e.g. new carpooling programs may altract transit riders rather than SOV riders)  Presents all the primary equations and variables used to calculate the effects of TCMs  Contains a step-by-step process for evaluating packages of TCMs  Explains multi-attribute analyses as applied to multiple TCM packages | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient; participation level data is required; base cases need to match real conditions  Model does not cover all TCMs, but can be modified to do so  Temporal treatment is limited to on-peak/off-peak, no spatial treatment  Emissions calculations are not explicitly described in the same fashion as travel effects | Effect of park and ride lots  Formation of new versus existing carpools | dad |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                              | "A Survey and Analysis of Employee Responses to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Incentive Programs." Schreffler, Eric N., and Mortero, Jose. COMSIS Corp. California Air Resources Board, February 1994. Contract No. A983-187. | Describes results of new survey data regarding employee travel behavior; uses mode choice and travel demand model to predict impacts of certain employer-based transportation measures | Clearly explains the process that was used: survey data acquisition, mode choice computation, and TCM effectiveness model use Data requirements are more readily available than other models  User-friendly model is available for outside use; users guide is also available  Survey links incentives directly to impacts on travel behavior  Model includes an awareness sub-model that simulates how many people know about the possible TCMs available to them | Does not accurately address trip-chaining and VMT reductions (only trips)  Household conditions are not extensively accounted for  Cost-effectiveness was not calculated  Employer-level analyses only, with focus upon incentive TCMs    | Guaranteed ride home  Company vanpools  Preferential parking  Parking fees for ridesharers  Carpool subsidies & transportation allowances |
|                           |  | ·                         |                              | "Selection and Evaluation of Travel Demand Management Measures." Taylor, Christopher J., et al. TRB 971114, January 1997.   | Uses Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS to evaluate the impact of transportation measures on mode choice and VT for the Syracuse, NY metropolitan area                 | Uses journey-to-work census data to develop estimates of zone-to-zone travel  Evaluates both area-wide programs and employer-based programs  Assesses revenue generation potential and transit subsidies   | Sufficiently detailed journey-to-work census data may not be available for all cities: Syracuse has this data available due to a pilot program  Requires assuming some estimates of effectiveness  Does not quantify emissions reductions | Transit fare levels and travel time  HOV lane time savings  Parking costs  Employer transit encouragement level                           |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|-----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.)   |  |  | *Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs.* Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculation; uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including cost- effectiveness estimates | Does not provide detail on model operation  | Many; not specified  | dac |
|                           | Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but likely to be influenced heavily by local factors of the study area)  Can be replicated (at moderate to high cost)  Does not require extensive computer model  Uses actual survey data | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Personal preference and workplace conditions difficult to impact through public policy | "Improving the Effectiveness of Ridesharing Programs." Stevens, William F. Transportation Quarterly, October 1990. Vol. 44 No. 4.   | Describes the methodology and results of a survey to determine which personal preference and workplace factors affect rideshare participation                 | Uses actual data from a survey of current and past rideshare participants as well as a random sample of potential participants  Survey instrument developed through focus groups and interviews for better results  | Some findings may have been contradicted by more recent studies (e.g., study finds that large corporations have better success with rideshare programs) | Rideshare logistics<br>and personal<br>flexibility  Monetary: parking,<br>fuel  Interpersonal issues<br>("having someone to<br>talk to")  Altruism | dac |

| Š | : |
|---|---|
|   |   |

| Transportation<br>Measure M   | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|-----|
| (cont.) and implemental imperior of the control of | mpirical malysis of the malysis of the mpacts of prisonal reference and orkplace onditions on mode choice ont.) |                           |                              | "The Influence of Employer Ridesharing Programs on Employee Mode Choice." Ferguson, Erik. <i>Transportation</i> , vol 17, 1990. | Analyzes aggregate-level data compiled by a large Southern California regional ridesharing agency; assesses impact of employer characteristics on employee mode split | Analyzes a large data set comprising almost 10% of Los Angeles area workforce  Utilizing existing agency database is a costeffective approach  Less accurate than disaggregated (employee by employee) data  Includes costeffectiveness estimations | Some findings may have been contradicted by more recent studies (e.g., study finds that large corporations have better success with rideshare programs)  Aging data source: 1985 survey data  Los Angeles area factors may be uncharacteristic of other regions, so results may not be applicable elsewhere  Employer-derived data was acquired using different methods  No estimates of emissions impacts | Level of employer effort to encourage ridesharing Size of firm | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology -  | Report  | Description :  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice (cont.) |  |  | "The Effectiveness of Ridesharing incentives." Brownstone, David, and Thomas F. Golob, in Regional Science and Urban Economics, vol. 22, 1992.  | Evaluates the travel impacts of certain incentives designed to promote ridesharing (carpooling and vanpooling) on work trips, using data from a study of full-time workers' commuting behavior in the Los Angeles area | Analysis is based on a rich data set  Evaluates potential impact on ridesharing of employer-provided preferential parking and HOV lanes  Provides insight into which household characteristics and employer characteristics influence ridesharing | Does not directly quantify VMT or emissions impacts  Conclusions may not apply to areas other than Southern  California   | Mode choice (always rideshare, sometimes rideshare, always drive alone) Individual characteristics (income, age, gender) Commute characteristics (distance, HOV lane available) Employer incentives (flexible schedule, preferential parking, cost subsidy, guaranteed ride home) Employer size |    |
|                           | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs                      | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | "An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives." Gluliano, Genevleve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997. | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAOMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies  | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and-after-TCM conditions  | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey | Not described   | de |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology                                 | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|-----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs<br>(cont.) |  | ·  | "The Los Angeles County Route 14 Vanpool and Buspool Demonstration Project: An Analysis of its Effectiveness in Reducing Long Distance Commuter Trips." Blanchard, Donna et al. Transportation Research Board. July 1993. | Addresses the effectiveness of a demonstration vanpool and buspool project, an incentive-based program established to relieve congestion and improve air quality along the Los Angeles County Route 14 corridor | Calculates the total number of vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled reduced, by origin and destination, of program participants  Phase II follow-up project to include computerized tracking program and data collection | Does not provide emissions estimates Requires costly administration, tracking and data collection efforts; participant program exit information often incomplete Report does not contain details of participants' prior mode choice or commute length  | Vanpool and buspool incentives: rider rebate, child care bonus, and emergency (guaranteed) rides home  Program participation  Cost-effectiveness | dkp |
|                           | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects             | Requires tittle or no new data acquisition Relatively low cost Shows actual potential of transportation measures Identifies barriers to implementing transportation measures | Case study results do not necessarily apply to other regions | "Evaluation of Travel<br>Dermand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion."<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schrefter.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs  | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented   | Generally does not evaluate specific transportation measure individually; programs of multiple transportation measures are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures  | dac |
|                           |  |  | -  | "Land Use Regulations to Promote Ridesharing: An Evaluation of the Seattle Approach." McCutcheon, Melody, and Jeffrey Hamm. Transportation Quarterly, vol. 37 no. 4, 1983.  | Evaluates the effectiveness of developer-based land use regulations to promote ridesharing in Seattle's central business district   | Identifies barriers to<br>enforcing parking<br>management practices at<br>businesses; suggests<br>improvements   | Does not quantify trip, VMT, or emissions reductions  Study was performed before significant data existed on the effectiveness of the whole program  | Availability of nearby parking  Developer cooperation with requirements  | dad |

| Transportation<br>Measure                   | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----|
| (cont.) enalysi transpo measu demon project | Empirical<br>enalysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects (cont.) |  |  | "Transportation-Related impacts of Compressed Work Week: The Denver Experiment." Atherton, Terry J., et al. in Transportation Research Record 845, 1982.                          | Provides before and after comparison of travel behavior for an experimental compressed-work week program for federal employees in Denver      | Before-and-after approach (with a control group) accurately assesses changes in travel  Utilizes actual travel diarles and surveys to track travel patterns  Identifies some non-work travel impacts of compressed work weeks  Information was complete and accurate due to government workplace focus | Private organizations may not respond as well to requirements to implement compressed work week plans                                      | 9/80 schedule vs.<br>4/40 schedule  | dac |
|   | Statistical<br>analysis of<br>employer<br>ridesharing<br>initiatives                       | Utilizes large database of existing employers that implement transportation measures Relatively low-cost (provided data does not need to be collected) | May not assess causes of statistical significance found.  Results not necessarily applicable to other regions. | "Evaluation of Employer-Sponsored Ridesharing Programs in Southern California." Ferguson, Erik T., Georgia Institute of Technology. In Transportation Research Record 1280, 1990. | Analyzes database of surveys of employer- sponsored ridesharing programs in Southem California to determine relevant factors on effectiveness | Utilizes large existing database for the region, increasing validity of results  Assesses costeffectiveness at varying program sizes  Assesses interaction between alternative work schedules and ridesharing  Attempts to explain reasons behind statistical significance of certain factors          | Sample database may be biased (they were all clients of a centralized ridesharing agency)  Primarily analyzes employer-based measures only | Level and type of<br>direct ridesharing<br>incentives  Firm size and type  Dollars spent on<br>rideshare programs | dad |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology    | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |  |
|---------------------------|----------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Sample surveys | Uses statistically representative sample population to make estimates of impact of ridesharing strategies on the ridesharing participation and effectiveness  Sample size (and therefore cost) can be varied based on level of statistical accuracy desired  Surveys can be done periodically to determine changes in ridesharing rates over time, and impacts of special promotions such as "Try Transit" weeks | Surveys can entail significant costs  "Revolving door" characteristic of ridesharing programs can be difficult to address with accuracy  Relationship between ridesharing participation, VMT, and emissions requires additional analysis  If surveys are performed differently in different regions, direct comparisons of results may not be valid  Survey results can be subject to various kinds of response bias | *Rideshare Placement Mesurement: A Proposed Standard Methodology.* King, Michael, and Barbara Alderson. California State University at Chico, June 1995.  *Cost-Effectiveness of Private Employer Ridesharing Programs: An Employer's Assessment.* Wegmann, Frederick J. University of Tennessee. In Transportation Research Record 1212, 1989. | Develops methodology for quantifying rideshare placement levels for ridematching services; discusses pilot testing of methodology (note: this methodology is currently used by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters in the San Francisco Bay Area).  Conducts and analyzes sample surveys with the aim of documenting the cost and benefits available to private-sector employers through the operation of employer ridesharing programs | Survey methodology is generic and can be applied to any region  Methodology distinguishes between three types of rideshare placements (trial, maintenance, and ongoing) to reflect their different impact on travel and emissions  Survey methodology is generic and can be applied to any region  Diverse study sample included respondents from throughout the U.S., and represented companies in central business districts, within city timits, and in suburbs, from a diversity of industry types | Only quantifies rideshare placement; does not directly quantify VMT and emissions impact  Only quantifies rideshare cost-effectiveness to employers; does not directly quantify VMT and emissions impact  Quantitative estimates of ridesharing benefits are very difficult to make; therefore, further follow up with a subset of the sample surveyed was required to convert general estimates of benefits into annual monetary values  Most benefits cited by respondents were of an intangible nature; therefore, the data base necessary to generate cost-benefit analyses does not exist | Rideshare placement rate (trial, maintenance, and ongoing)  Survey response rate  Statistical sampling error  Employer ridesharing costs, including vanpooling and vanpooling subsidy costs; employer parking costs. Ridesharing costeffectiveness  Ridesharing benefits |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology        | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed | ]  |
|---------------------------|--------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|------------------|----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Sketch<br>planning | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "TCM Analyst 1.0 and<br>User's Guide."<br>Crawford, Jason A., et<br>al. Texas<br>Transportation Institute.<br>For the Federal<br>Highway<br>Administration,<br>November 1994. | Describes a computerized sketch planning tool, TCM Analyst 1.0, including input data requirements, methods of use, and an overview of the model's structure and calculation procedures | Provides a useful and relatively easy instruction manual for using TCM Analyst 1.0  Uses MOBILE5a output data (emission factors) as inputs to the model, providing more accurate emission benefit calculations for each TCM | Program only models limited TCMs and cannot model multiple TCM packages Requires several runs with MOBILE5a to obtain input emission factors Modeling on regional (rather than microscale) basis only | Not stated       | da |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology             | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factora Analyzed  |    |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Sketch planning (cont.) |                           |                              | *Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances.* Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993 | Describes development of simple methodologies for quantifying reductions in vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from TCMs, for use in a planning- level context; developed originally for the South Coast Air Basin | Methods to quantify VT and VMT reductions from TCMs were based upon relatively simple methods for estimating emissions and individual TCM effectiveness developed prior to this report for the South Coast AQMD  Performance-based approach was developed rather than use mandated transportation performance standards  Actual experience data used as much as possible: estimated trip reduction levels from each TCM was collected from other studies, and planning-level analysis uses site-specific data inputs, thus offering increased precision in emissions estimates  Ranges in VT reductions estimates address the interactive Impacts of the application of multiple TCMs  Equivalency factor used to convert VMT to VT can account for region-specific average trip lengths | Expected reductions in VT and VMT from TCMs were estimated based upon a general survey, so for a particular location different assumptions may be needed  Applicability to other regions outside California limited by report's use of transportation data and emissions factors in the analysis which were quantified using BURDEN and EMFAC runs for 1994  Does not incorporate any consideration of cost-effectiveness | Employee participation (percentage and frequency)  Employer tripreduction plan  Distance to work  Distance to and existence of Park-n-Ride lots | dk |

Page 99

| Transportation<br>Measure                 | Methodology | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Rideshare (cont.) Sketch planning (cont.) |             |                           | *Evaluating Travel and<br>Air Quality Cost-<br>Effectiveness of<br>Transportation Dermand<br>Management Projects.*<br>Schreffler, Eric N.,<br>Therese Costa, and<br>Carl B. Moyer. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1520,<br>1996. | Describes simple methodologies used to evaluate projects funded by the AB 2766 vehicle registration fee program in Southern Catilornia  | Methodology can be used to evaluate prior projects or proposed future projects  Uses available EMF/.C emission rates to calculate ROG, PM10, NOx, and CO  Study develops standardized worksheet to evaluate projects  Study points out drawbacks of self-reported project results | Methodology relies on participation data provided by project proponents, which may not always be unbiased  EMFAC7E factors are California-specific  | Trips reduced Trip length Prior travel mode   | drl   |    |
|   |             |                           |   | *Critical Analysis of<br>Sketch-Planning Tools<br>for Evaluating the<br>Emission Benefits of<br>Transportation Control<br>Measures.* Crawford,<br>Jason A., and<br>Raymond A. Krammes.<br>Prepared by Texas<br>Transportation Institute<br>for FHWA, FHWA/TX-<br>92/1279-5. December<br>1993. | Critical analysis and sensitivity analysis (using data for El Paso, Texas) of San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) TCM Tools method and the Systems Applications international (SAI) method; summarized in TRR 1472  | Provides a thorough review of the state of the practice (as of 1993)  Identifies weaknesses in the SANDAG and SAI methods as well as strengths  Provides detailed sketch-planning analysis for El Paso, Texas | Many of the inputs to the SANDAG and SAI models are difficult to quantify  The SANDAG and SAI models do not fully account for indirect impacts and latent travel demand | Vehicle trips VMT Average vehicle speed Emissions (HC, CO, NOx) | da |

.

-

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                               | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Employer TDM cost-<br>effectiveness model | Estimates reduction in and costs of daily trips and peak period trips  Aids employer determination of cost-effectiveness of TDM measures for their particular worksite | Results may vary widely from one employer to the next Many inputs may be difficult for employers or planners to quantify | "Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404. | Reports on the development of a model to individually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of 15 different employer-based TDM measures in suburban settings | Focus on suburban employers reflects different travel-related characteristics of suburban and urban areas  Spreadsheet-based model is user-friendly and readily accessible for use at the site-specific level; model makes sensitivity analysis relatively simple  Eight transportation environments were defined to represent various combinations of transportation service characteristics  For employers without access to entire range of data necessary to operate model, default values are included | Most employers surveyed to develop model were unable to provide detailed cost information on the TDM measures they had implemented  Does not calculate emissions directly  Potential for regional bias, as model was developed in part based on a survey of suburban San Francisco Bay Area employers; model also used the SCAOMD Regulation XV and Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Program employer plan databases  Only some TDMs included in model provide for estimates of VT reductions  Use of default values could diminishes accuracy of estimates for some users | Suburban employer-based TDM measures  Daily trips and peak period trips  Costs and cost-effectiveness | dk |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods   | Does not necessarily help quantily VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly              | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-<br>performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) | da |
|                           | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV tacilities in North America, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | 'An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions Costs                               | da |

·

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|-----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |                           |                              | *Assessment of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Approaches at<br>Suburban Activity<br>Centers.* Bhatt, Kiran,<br>and Higgins, Thomas.<br>K.T. Analystics. U.S.<br>DOT, July 1989. | Surveys research<br>studies and<br>interviews TCM<br>program<br>coordinators to<br>provide an<br>overview of the<br>range of<br>effectiveness of<br>employer-based<br>TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program   | E.  | Relative effectiveness of various transportation measure programs Implementation mechanisms | da  |
| ·                         |   |                           |                              | *Parking Subsidies and Travel Choices: Assessing the Evidence.* Willson, Richard W. and Donald C. Shoup. In Transportation, vol. 17, 1990.                                      | Reviews empirical case studies of the relationship between employer-paid parking and solo commuting  | Draws out analogous results from a variety of existing case studies to show range of impacts of employer-paid parking and solo driving  Case studies cover a variety of locations (downtown and suburban), employer types (public and private) and employee categories (professional and cterical)  Case study results are reinforced by survey findings cited in the paper Provides an estimated range for the elasticity of demand for solo driving with respect to parking price | Because most case studies are from Los Angeles, results may not be representative of other areas  Range of results is very wide, so the results cannot directly be used to accurately estimate the impacts of another program  Does not quantify VMT or emissions impacts | Existence of employer-paid parking  Travel mode (solo driver, non-solo driver)              | drl |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|-----|
| Rideshare<br>(cont.)      | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |                           |                                 | "Managing<br>Transportation<br>Demand: Markets<br>Versus Mandates."<br>Giuliano, Genevieve,<br>and Martin Wachs.<br>Reason Foundation.<br>Policy Insight No. 142,<br>September 1992. | Compares congestion pricing with Regulation XV for the Southern California area; describes pros and cons of each measure and discusses Implications | Provides typology of transportation measures and identifies effectiveness and common barriers to implementation  Simple side-by-side comparison of VMT reduction and cost-effectiveness for each transportation measure  | Provides little detail about logistics of implementing the policy recommendations  Does not quantity emission reductions   | Direct vs. Indirect<br>Implementation  Market-based vs. performance-based<br>implementation  Efficiency and equity<br>considerations | dac |
|                           |   |                           |                                 |  |   | Makes policy recom-<br>mendations to improve<br>each transportation<br>measure   |  |  |     |
|                           |   |                           |                                 | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996.                 | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Baltimore and Philadelphia regions                    | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions  | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions | Rideshare promotion<br>level Parking charge level Transit subsidy<br>levels Work schedule flexibility                                |     |
|                           |   |                           |                                 | "The Determinants of<br>Ridesharing: Literature<br>Review." Hwang, Keith<br>and Genevieve<br>Giuliano. University of<br>California<br>Transportation Center,<br>May 1990. UCTC 38.   | Reviews dozens<br>of studies in a<br>general<br>discussion of<br>ridesharing  | Integrates results and citations of many papers in a clear description of each issue impacting ridesharing, including reasons for effectiveness of programs, as well as employee and workplace characteristics that are favorable for ridesharing Describes some | Comments about each study may be too brief to provide clear guidance for TCM planning  Does not provide VMT or emissions reduction, only mode share data   | Many are briefly<br>touched upon   | dad |
|                           |   |                           |                                 |  |   | interaction between other<br>transportation measures<br>(e.g., HOV facilities) and<br>ridesharing  |  |  |     |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | ` Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|----|
| Scrappage                 | Economic<br>scrappage<br>supply curve<br>model | A rigorous approach based on economic fundamentals  Allows analyst to estimate scrappage emissions reductions for various levels of "bounty," which is a key program design element | Level of precision most applicable to small-scale programs, as models of this type usually will not capture price effects on the used-car market following withdrawal of a large fraction of the existing old vehicles  Models of this type are theoretical rather                  | "An Economic Analysis<br>of Scrappage." Hahn,<br>Robert W. American<br>Enterprise Institute,<br>July 1993.  | Estimates the number and value of old vehicles to determine costs and benefits of scrappage program  | Uses available EMFAC7E emission rates  Uses available fleet composition figures  Uses available "Gold Book" vehicle value figures  | Operating costs not included in economic assessment  EMFAC7E factors are California-specific  Assumes unknown human factors and behaviors  | Fleet composition  Vehicle "Gold Book" value  Replacement vehicle characteristics  Variable discount rates  Interaction with I&M programs   | da |
|                           |  | Relatively low cost to use  Models of this type could be extended to evaluate impacts of other transportation measures that impact older vehicles, such as I/M and emissions lees   | than empirical, and therefore may not accurately characterize participation rates and other aspects of real-world behavior.  Remaining life and usage of scrapped vehicles, as well as replacement vehicle characteristics, are fundamentally difficult to estimate with precision. | "Estimating an Emissions Supply Function from Accelerated Vahicle Retirement Programs." Alberini, Anna et al. Resources for the Future, January 1994. | Study develops methodology which predicts participation rates, expected remaining life, and an emissions supply function at alternative offer prices for several types of pre-1980s vehicle scrap programs | Analysis is based on extensive surveys of old vehicle owners and vehicle emissions testing data collected through a particular scrappage program  Study develops empirical measure of the link between vehicle condition and expected remaining life, and owner's estimation of vehicle value to determine costs and emission reduction potential of program  Study conducts surveys of participants and non-participants for information about remaining life and usale of scrapped vehicle | Survey data used is specific to scrappage program in Delaware 1992-93, so results may not be applicable to other regions and programs  Sample of owners surveyed did not represent a random sample of the population of pre-1980 vehicle owners  Scope of data on emissions of scrapped vehicles is limited as only a sample of vehicles valued at less than the bounty amount offered were tested  Assumes that scrapped vehicle replacement is from "average" fleet in terms of emissions levels | Individual owner behavior and vehicle's remaining life  Minimum willingness to accept bounty amount; also determined by blue book value, condition of car, and past and future costs of operating the car |    |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| (cont.) char<br>zatio<br>emis | Vehicle fleet<br>characteri-<br>zation and<br>emissions<br>model       | Utilizes standard planning model used by regulatory agencies High flexibility to manipulate Input data   | Requires detailed understanding of computer model's methodologies and source code Results are not readily applicable to other regions Difficult and costly to replicate | *Vehicle Scrappage:<br>An Alternative to More<br>Stringent New Vehicle<br>Standards in<br>California.* Lyons,<br>James, et al. Sierra<br>Research. For Texaco<br>Inc. SR95-03-02.<br>March 1995. | Modifies source code for California-specific EMFAC/BURDEN fleet characterization and emissions model to evaluate the effect of scrappage programs on emissions in the South Coast Air Basin | Use of EMFAC/BURDEN makes analysis highly consistent with California Air Resources Board's fleet and emissions characterizations, which helps compare emissions reductions to inventory  Allows considerable flexibility in testing specific scrappage scenarios  Compares scrappage scenarios to other emission reduction alternatives (e.g., reduced standards) | Does not incorporate actual elasticities between scrappage bounty and number of vehicles scrapped (elasticities are assumed) | Age threshold for scrapped vehicles  Number of total vehicles scrapped   |
|                               |  |  |   | ·  |   | Light-, medium-, and<br>heavy-duty programs<br>assessed   | ·  |  |
|                               | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources | Does not necessarily<br>help quantify VT,<br>VMT, or emissions<br>reductions from the<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>Cost can vary greatly           | "Transportation Control Measures Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.                     | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures  | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG.  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific  | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process   | None (factors<br>analyzed are<br>applicable to each<br>transportation<br>measure analyzed<br>during the process) |
| con<br>and<br>imp             | Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods          | -  |   |  | transportation measure<br>evaluation method<br>Estimates VT, VMT, and<br>emission reductions and<br>cost-effectiveness  |   |  |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|-----|
| Scrappage<br>(cont.)      | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                   | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no       | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of | *Meeting Clean Air Act<br>Emissions Standards:<br>A Cost-Effectiveness<br>Analysis of Car<br>Scrappage.* DeCardy,  | Compares 4<br>studies on<br>scrappage cost-<br>effectiveness;<br>proposes new  | Provides several estimates of cost-<br>effectiveness from each study  | Estimates may still be<br>too rough to apply to<br>other programs in<br>other regions  | Outside factors<br>affecting scrappage<br>programs (e.g I&M<br>programs)   | dac |
|                           |  | Provides a review of the results produced by                               | other regions) Unlikely to provide precise estimates   | Christopher. Harvard<br>University, April 1994.  | scrappage study<br>that would<br>develop accurate<br>inputs for<br>calculating cost-   | Identifies reasons why 4 studies overestimate cost-effectiveness of scrapping   | Does not identify all costs and benefits of scrappage programs  Does not address   | Levels of partipation<br>in scrappage<br>programs<br>Sources of data (e.g.   |     |
|                           |  | different HOV<br>facilities in North<br>America, which<br>could be used if |  |  | effectiveness  | Performing the proposed study would clarify uncertainties in cost-effectiveness   | potential equity<br>impacts of scrappage<br>Analyzes only HC   | for emission rates,<br>MOBILE vs. actual<br>testing)   |     |
|                           |  | other directly<br>applicable<br>research is not<br>available               |  |  |  |   | emissions  | Level of bounty offered  Affect of scrappage programs on market  |     |
|                           | Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | disadvantages of several   |  | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Focuses upon energy<br>efficiency impacts in<br>addition to emissions and<br>VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | forces Impacts: vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions Costs   | dac |
|                           |  |  |  | *Uncertain Air Quality<br>Impacts of Automobile<br>Retirement Programs.*<br>Shi-Ling Hsu and<br>Daniel Sperting. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1444,<br>1995.  | Identifies and analyzes the areas of uncertainty in determining emission impacts of scrappage programs   | Provides a comprehensive list of parameters needed to calculate the cost effectiveness of a scrappage program  Identifies the reasons why previous estimates are inaccurate | Does not propose suggestions to reduce uncertainty encountered in previous studies Impacts of regional differences are not thoroughly discussed  | Average annual mileage and remaining life of retired autos  HC, NOx and CO emissions of retired autos  Annual mileage of replacement autos and average emissions | fk  |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|-----|
| Shuttles/<br>Station Cars | Sample survey<br>of customer<br>travel patterns<br>and<br>preferences at<br>shopping<br>centers | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but influenced by local factors of the study area)  Does not require an extensive computer model   | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Moderate to high cost | *Analysis of Indirect<br>Source Trip Activity:<br>Regional Shopping<br>Centers.* Prepared by<br>JHK & Associates and<br>K.T. Analytics for the<br>California Air<br>Resources Board.<br>ARB-R-94/510,<br>November 1993.               | Surveyed<br>customers of<br>regional shopping<br>centers to<br>determine<br>potential impact<br>of various travel<br>reduction<br>measures | Uses actual survey data (including customer demographic and stated preference data)  Developed calculation methodologies specific to each trip reduction measure, using site-specific data  Compares data between shopping centers in different land-use types                   | Assumptions are required to translate stated preference data to expected outcome.  Does not quantify emission reductions                           | Avaitability of nearby<br>transit<br>Availability of nearby<br>rail | dac |
|                           | Sketch<br>planning  | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usualty not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters                | 'Evaluating Travel and Air Quality Cost-<br>Effectiveness of<br>Transportation Demand<br>Management Projects.'<br>Schreffler, Eric N.,<br>Therese Costa, and<br>Carl B. Moyer. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1520,<br>1998. | Describes simple methodologies used to evaluate projects funded by the AB 2766 vehicle registration fee program in Southern California     | Methodology can be used to evaluate prior projects or proposed future projects  Uses available EMFAC emission rates to calculate ROG, PM10, NOx, and CO  Study develops standardized worksheet to evaluate projects  Study points out drawbacks of self-reported project results | Methodology relies on participation data provided by project proponents, which may not always be unbiased  EMFAC7E factors are California-specific | Trips reduced  Trip length  Prior travel mode                       | drl |

| Transportation<br>Measure            | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|----|
| Shuttles/<br>Station Cars<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and Implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly                | "Transportation Control<br>Measures Analyzed for<br>the Washington<br>Region's 15 Percent<br>Rate of Progress Plan."<br>FHWA/Metropolitan<br>Washington Council of<br>Governments, February<br>1995. | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures                                     | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) |    |
| Telecom-<br>muting                   | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model                                 | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters   | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socloeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience.* COMSIS Corporation. USDOT, September 1993. DOT-T-94-02.                               | Summarizes<br>broad range of<br>TDM measures,<br>provides example<br>case study<br>analyses of each,<br>and uses<br>computer model<br>to benchmark the<br>effectiveness of<br>each TDM | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs   | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Participation levels  | da |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  | $\Big]$ |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                              | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05. | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model          | Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions  | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient  | Participation levels  | da      |
|                               |  |                           |                              | "Transportation Control Measure Analysis Procedures." Austin, Barbara S., et al. Systems Applications International/California Air Resources Board. Nov 1991. SYSAPP-31/141.  | Describes a developed transportation demand model and explicitly discusses the calculation methodology used for several transportation measures | Model quantifies key secondary effects of TCMs (e.g. new carpooling programs may attract transit riders rather than SOV riders)  Presents all the primary equations and variables used to calculate the effects of TCMs  Contains a step-by-step process for evaluating packages of TCMs  Explains multi-attribute analyses as applied to multiple TCM packages | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient; participation level data is required; base cases need to match real conditions  Model does not cover all TCMs, but can be modified to do so  Temporal treatment is limited to on-peak/off-peak, no spatial treatment  Emissions calculations are not explicitly described in the same fashion as travel effects | Work and non-work<br>trip increases by the<br>telecommuter and<br>other household<br>members<br>Satellite centers | dad     |

9/30/98

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|-----|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs | Analyzes actual telecommuting programs  Addresses travel behavior patterns  Does not require extensive computer model                  | Applicability of results to other regions and conditions is uncertain.  Is not likely to address total demand for telecommuting | *An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives.* Giuliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.   | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and-after-TCM conditions | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey | Not described   | dac |
|                               | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects  | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measuress | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions   | "Impacts of Center-<br>Based Telecommuting<br>on Travel and<br>Emissions: Analysis of<br>the Puget Sound<br>Demonstration Project."<br>Henderson, Dennis K.,<br>and Mohktarian,<br>Patricla L. Institute of<br>Transportation Studies,<br>University of California,<br>Davis, 1996. Vol. 1. | Analyzes the<br>Puget Sound<br>telecommuting<br>project data to<br>determine trip,<br>VMT, and<br>emissions<br>reduction  | Uses both case-study<br>and composite-average<br>approaches<br>Implemented travel diary<br>togs rather than surveys                            | Travel mode choice impacts not extensively studied  Study participants not representative of general workforce  Household members not included in study   | Center versus Home-based telecommuting  Center-based telecommuting versus not telecommuting .  Total VMT versus number of cold starts | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology              | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report                                  | Description                         | Advantages of Study                           | Disadvantages<br>of Study                    | Factors Analyzed                   |    |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|----|
| Telecom-                  | Empirical                |                           |                              | *The Travel and<br>Emissions Impacts of | Analyzes the<br>State of California | Identifies the number of and effects of non-  | Study participants are not representative of | Affect of                          | da |
| muting                    | analysis of              | , i                       |                              | Telecommuting for the                   | telecommuting                       | commute trips during                          | general workforce and                        | telecommuting on non-commute trips |    |
| (cont.)                   | transportation           |                           |                              | State of California                     | project data to                     | days in which                                 | emission reductions                          | non-continue inps                  | 1  |
|                           | measure<br>demonstration |                           |                              | Telecommuting Pilot                     | determine trip.                     | telecommuting took place                      | should not be applied                        | Average speeds, hot                | 1  |
| 1                         | projects (cont.)         |                           |                              | Project.* Koenig, Brett                 | VMT, and                            |   | to whole population                          | and cold starts                    |    |
| 1                         | projects (cont.)         |                           |                              | E., et al.                              | emissions                           | Implemented travel diary                      | , ,  |                                    |    |
| 1                         |                          |                           |                              | Transportation                          | reduction                           | logs to account for all                       | Does not accurately                          | Total VMT versus                   |    |
| <b>!</b>                  | 1                        |                           | 1                            | Research, 1996. Vol 4                   | ļ.                                  | trips taken by study                          | model emissions from                         | number of cold starts              | 4  |
|                           | 1                        |                           | ļ                            | no. 1. pp. 13-32.                       |                                     | partipants                                    | accelerations and                            |                                    | 1  |
|                           | l                        |                           |                              |   |                                     |   | decelerations; only                          | Variation between                  | 1  |
| [                         | 1                        |                           |                              |   |                                     | Actual vehicle model                          | average speed used                           | before and after                   |    |
|                           |                          |                           | }                            |   |                                     | year and speed data is                        |  | telecommuting                      |    |
|                           |                          |                           |                              |   |                                     | used instead of fleet                         | Travel mode choice                           | groups                             |    |
|                           |                          |                           |                              |   |                                     | averages                                      | impacts not                                  |                                    | 1  |
|                           |                          | ł                         |                              | 1                                       |                                     | Assesses the impact of                        | extensively studied                          | Time of day for trips              |    |
| 1                         | ]                        |                           |                              |   |                                     | Assesses the impact of lowered average speeds | Household are                                | }                                  | 1  |
|                           | 1                        | Ĭ                         |                              |   |                                     | caused by telecommuting                       | members not included                         |                                    | 1  |
|                           | ł                        |                           |                              |   |                                     | Cadsed by tolocontinuoung                     | In the study analysis                        |                                    |    |
|                           | l                        | l                         |                              | İ                                       |                                     | Analyzes exhaust,                             | lin the steet analysis                       |                                    |    |
|                           |                          |                           |                              |   | i                                   | running, and evaporative                      | Does not model                               | Í                                  | 1  |
|                           |                          |                           |                              | i                                       |                                     | losses  | indirect telecommuting                       |                                    |    |
|                           |                          |                           |                              |   |                                     |   | impacts (e.g.                                |                                    | i  |
|                           |                          | <b>,</b>                  | <u> </u>                     |   |                                     | Participants were studied                     | residential location                         | i ·                                |    |
|                           |                          |                           |                              |   |                                     | before and after                              | shifts)                                      | <b>,</b>                           |    |
|                           |                          |                           |                              | ł                                       |                                     | telecommuting began                           | 1  | 1                                  |    |

9/50/98

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |    |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|----|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects (cont.) |                           |                                 | "The Effectiveness of Telecommuting as a Transportation Control Measure." Sampath, Srikanth, S. Saxene, and P. Mokhtarian. In Transportation Planning and Air Quality: Proceedings of the National Conference, American Sociaty of Civil Engineers, 1991. | Examines the potential of telecommuting as a strategy for managing travel demand by studying the travel and air quality implications of the State of California Telecommuting Pilot Project | Evaluates the Index of efficiency (ratio of emissions reductions to distance reduction) for telecommuting's success in reducing travel  Computes and compares travel and emissions evaluations from before the telecommuting project's implementation, as well as both commute and stay-at-home days once the program had begun  Emissions analysis includes conversion to vehicle-based numbers from person-based telecommuting data using "vehicle movement profiles"  Uses accepted EMFAC7D emission factors | Uses existing State of California Telecommuting Pilot Project data, thus may have limited replicability without same type of data from other telecommuting projects  EMFAC7D emission factors are California-specific  Only addresses the direct air quality impacts of telecommuting (does not address indirect impacts such as net air quality effects of non-transportation energy consumed while telecommuting) | Travel Factors and Trip Characteristics (Including: distance traveled by auto, number of hot and cold starts, speed, type of vehicle, and ambient temperature) | dk |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |      |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|------|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects (cont.) |                           |                              | "Methodological Issues in the Estimation of the Travel, Energy, and Air Quality Impacts of Telecommuting." Mokhtarian, Patricia L. et al. Transportation Research A. Vol. 29A, No. 4, 1995. | Examines existing empirical findings with respect to the impacts of telecommuting on travel, energy use, and air quality, by addressing eight telecommuting pilot projects that included evaluations of the transportation-related impacts of telecommuting | Utilizes existing data from telecommuting pilot projects to draw general conclusions on travel, air quality and energy impacts in short and long term  Selected pilot projects evaluated represented a mix of telecommuting project evaluation methodologies and varied geographic coverage  Presents an ideal method for evaluating the transportation impacts of telecommuting programs | Study compared pilot projects in different locations (each with unique factors such as weather, transit issues, and traffic congestion levels); therefore, conclusions drawn could include errors of comparability of data  Pilot projects chosen disproportionately represent western U.S.  Only one pilot project included in study quantified emissions (used California EMFAC7E and BURDEN7E emissions inventory models)  Differences in data and methodologies from pilot projects influences precision in evaluation of a number of factors | Travel impacts: commute, total weekday, and household travel  Energy impacts: transportation, household and net energy  Air quality impacts  Potential long-term impacts | cike |



| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology             | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report .   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Macro-level<br>analysis | Provides estimates of overall travel and emissions impacts of telecommuting Applicable to multiple geographic areas   | Generally unable to evaluate impacts of smaller-scale telecommuting programs  Cannot be used to evaluate impacts of specific program design elements on telecommuting  Macro-level results may have substantial uncertainty | "Energy Efficiency in<br>the U.S. Economy,<br>Technical Report One:<br>Energy, Emissions, and<br>Social Consequences<br>of Telecommuting."<br>U.S. Department of<br>Energy, DOE/PO-0026.<br>June 1994. | Evaluates, at the national level, the direct and indirect effects of telecommuting on travel, traffic congestion, energy use, and emissions; also examines social impacts.             | Incorporates indirect impacts such as latent travel demand and urban decentralization  Evaluates current and projected future impacts  Uses MOBILE emission factors  Includes sensitivity analysis  Uses existing algorithms such as the Roadway Congestion Index developed by the Texas Transportation Institute | Study does not distinguish between market-driven telecommuting and potential policy-driven telecommuting (i.e., telecommuting resulting from a specific government policy or program.  Study does not show results for individual urban areas | Telecommuting levels  Level of roadway congestion  Latent travel demand  Location patterns and urban density  Total hours of delay  Average speeds  Emissions (HC, CO, NOx)  Monetized costs and benefits |
|                               | Sketch<br>planning      | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters  | "TCM Analyst 1.0 and<br>User's Guide."<br>Crawford, Jason A., et<br>al. Texas<br>Transportation Institute.<br>For the Federal<br>Highway<br>Administration,<br>November 1994.                          | Describes a computerized sketch planning tool, TCM Analyst 1.0, including input data requirements, methods of use, and an overview of the model's structure and calculation procedures | Provides a useful and relatively easy instruction manual for using TCM Analyst 1.0  Uses MOBILE5a output data (emission factors) as inputs to the model, providing more accurate emission benefit calculations for each TCM   | Program only models timited TCMs and cannot model multiple TCM packages  Requires several runs with MOBILE5a to obtain input emission factors  Modeling on regional (rather than microscale) basis only                                       | Not stated  |

| Transportation Measure Meti          | thodology           | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology. | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages   | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|----|
| Telecom- muting (cont.)  Sketc plann | ich<br>ning (cont.) |                           |                               | *Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances.* Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993 | Describes development of simple methodologies for quantifying reductions in vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from TCMs, for use in a planning- level context; developed originally for the South Coast Air Basin | Methods to quantify VT and VMT reductions from TCMs were based upon relatively simple methods for estimating emissions and individual TCM effectiveness developed prior to this report for the South Coast AQMD  Performance-based approach was developed rather than use mandated transportation performance standards  Actual experience data used as much as possible: estimated trip reduction levels from each TCM was collected from other studies, and planning-level analysis uses site-specific data inputs, thus offering increased precision in emissions estimates  Ranges in VT reductions estimates address the interactive impacts of the application of multiple TCMs  Equivalency factor used to convert VMT to VT can account for region-specific average trip lengths | Expected reductions in VT and VMT from TCMs were estimated based upon a general survey, so for a particular location different assumptions may be needed  Applicability to other regions outside California limited by report's use of transportation data and emissions factors in the analysis which were quantified using BURDEN and EMFAC runs for 1994  Does not incorporate any consideration of cost-effectiveness | Employee participation (percentage and frequency)  Employer-Implemented horne-based telecommuting program | di |

| ų.<br>į | ٠. | • |
|---------|----|---|
| ζ       |    |   |
|         |    |   |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology             | Advantages<br>of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed                            |    |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|----|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Sketch planning (cont.) |                              |                              | "Evaluating Travel and<br>Air Quality Cost-<br>Effectiveness of<br>Transportation Demand<br>Management Projects."<br>Schreffler, Eric N.,<br>Therese Costa, and<br>Carl B. Moyer. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1520,<br>1996. | Describes simple methodologies used to evaluate projects funded by the AB 2766 vehicle registration fee program in Southern California | Methodology can be used to evaluate prior projects or proposed future projects  Uses available EMFAC emission rates to calculate ROG, PM10, NOx, and CO  Study develops standardized worksheet to evaluate projects  Study points out drawbacks of self-reported project results | Methodology relies on participation data provided by project proponents, which may not always be unbiased  EMFAC7E factors are California-specific | Trips reduced Trip length Prior travel mode | dı |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology                               | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Employer TDM cost-<br>effectiveness model | Estimates reduction in and costs of daily trips and peak period trips  Aids employer determination of cost-effectiveness of TDM measures for their particular worksite | Results may vary widely from one employer to the next Many inputs may be difficult for employers or planners to quantify | "Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404. | Reports on the development of a model to individually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of 15 different employer-based TDM measures in suburban settings | Focus on suburban employers reflects different travel-related characteristics of suburban and urban areas  Spreadsheet-based model is user-friendly and readily accessible for use at the site-specific level; model makes sensitivity analysis relatively simple  Eight transportation environments were defined to represent various combinations of transportation service characteristics  For employers without access to entire range of data necessary to operate model, default values are included | Most employers surveyed to develop model were unable to provide detailed cost information on the TDM measures they had implemented  Does not calculate emissions directly  Potential for regional bias, as model was developed in part based on a survey of suburban San Francisco Bay Area employers; model also used the SCAQMD Regulation XV and Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Program employer plan databases  Only some TDMs included in model provide for estimates of VT reductions  Use of default values could diminishes accuracy of estimates for some users | Suburban employer-based TDM measures  Daily trips and peak period trips  Costs and cost-effectiveness |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods   | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation  Cost can vary greatly              | *Transportation Control<br>Measures Analyzed for<br>the Washington<br>Region's 15 Percent<br>Rate of Progress Plan.*<br>FHWA/Metropolitan<br>Washington Council of<br>Governments, February<br>1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) |
|                               | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV facilities in North America, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                   |

| Transportation<br>Measure     | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Telecom-<br>muting<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |   |  | *Assessment of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Approaches at<br>Suburban Activity<br>Centers.* Bhatt, Kiran,<br>and Higgins, Thomas.<br>K.T. Analystics. U.S.<br>DOT, July 1989. | Surveys research<br>studies and<br>interviews TCM<br>program<br>coordinators to<br>provide an<br>overview of the<br>range of<br>effectiveness of<br>employer-based<br>TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program  | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Only generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness | Relative effective-<br>ness of various<br>transportation<br>measure programs<br>Implementation<br>mechanisms   |
| Traffic<br>Management         | Integrated planning/ simulation model                     | Combines the strengths of regional transportation planning models and traffic simulation models  Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires very detailed input data Requires complex computer model Potentially high cost to use | "Intelligent Transportation Systems Impact Assessment Framework: Final Report." Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, September 30, 1995                                | Describes development and application of an analytical tool to predict ITS impacts, with a focus on Advanced Traffic Management Systems  | Model integrates transportation planning and traffic simulation in an iterative fashion, and includes emissions and fuel consumption modules  Report describes use of model to analyze the potential use of ITS in the I-880 corridor in Alameda County, California, modeling ramp metering, traffic signal coordination, integrated traffic management, incident management, and HOV lanes  Emissions module uses accepted EMFAC and MOBILE factors | Relatively high cost<br>and complexity  Locally specific input<br>data makes the I-880<br>results of limited use in<br>other areas         | Operational Measures of Effectiveness: VMT, traffic volume, average vehicle speed, vehicle hours of detay, fuel consumption  Emission Measures of Effectiveness: CO, HC, NOx  Safety Measures of Effectiveness: personal injury levels, property damage, total accidents |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology                            | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed                              | ]   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data Requires complex computer model Potentially high cost to use | "The Effectiveness of Transportation Control Measures in Reducing Congestion and Improving Air Quality." Loudon, William R., et al. JHK & Associates. Air & Waste Management Association Annual Meeting & Exhibition 1993. AWMA 93-RP-149.05. | Describes a developed transportation demand model that integrates emissions calculations; provides example calculations from the model          | Model has a user manual that leads the analyst step-by-step through the input of data for region specific analyses  Contains extensive cost-effectiveness module  Can be used at either regional or a smaller area or location  Includes exhaust and evaporative emissions  | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient  | Signal timing improvements (level not stated) | dac |
|                                  |  | ·   |  | "Trànsportation Control<br>Measure Analysis<br>Procedures." Austin,<br>Barbara S., et al.<br>Systems Applications<br>International/California<br>Air Resources Board.<br>Nov 1991. SYSAPP-<br>91/141.   | Describes a developed transportation demand model and explicitly discusses the calculation methodology used for several transportation measures | Model quantifies key secondary effects of TCMs (e.g. new carpooling programs may attract transit riders rather than SOV riders)  Presents all the primary equations and variables used to calculate the effects of TCMs  Contains a step-by-step process for evaluating packages of TCMs  Explains multi-attribute analyses as applied to multiple TCM packages | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness; default values may not be sufficient; participation level data is required; base cases need to match real conditions  Model does not cover all TCMs, but can be modified to do so  Temporal treatment is limited to cn-peak/off-peak, no spatial treatment  Emissions calculations are not explicitly described in the same fashion as travel effects | Addition of a lane                            | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology                                  | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  | }   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |  |   | *Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analysis of Effectiveness and Costs.* Harvey, G., and E. Deakin. For Bay Area Air Quality Management District, October 1991. | Describes use and results of a travel demand model to model VT, VMT, and emission reductions of various transportation measures in the San Francisco Bay Area | Utilized high-quality household travel survey data and advanced modeling capabilities  Emissions calculations uses standardized methods, but takes into account more subtle effects of emissions generation  Provides succinct, clear data on results of study, including costeffectiveness estimates | Does not provide<br>detail on model<br>operation  | Many; not specified   | dac |
|                                  | Freeway<br>throughput<br>model                 | May be applicable to actual corridors, given accurate knowledge of key assumptions  Low to moderate cost | Assumptions are required that may heavily Impact the results  | *A Case for Freeway<br>Mainline Metering.*<br>Haboian, Kevin A.<br>Parsons Brinckerhoff<br>Quade & Douglas. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1494,<br>1995.                            | Uses INTRAS freeway model to rneasure the impact of ramp metering and freeway (mainline) metering to improve vehicle travel times and reduce traffic clelay   | INTRAS model simulates vehicles as separate units rather than groups, improving simulation  Provides average vehicle speeds on the freeway for several scenarios and metering configurations  | Does not clearly explain fundamental principle behind effectiveness of freeway metering  Does not assess impact of vehicles diverting around metering point  Does not calculate VMT or emission reductions  Does not discuss ways to counter political resistance to freeway metering | Ramp metering intervals  Mainline meter activation thresholds | dac |
|                                  | Parking supply<br>and demand<br>model          | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters                    | Requires computer<br>model<br>Potentially high cost<br>to use | *Air Quality Offsets for<br>Parking.* Loudon,<br>William, et al. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1232,<br>1992.   | Develops and uses parking supply model for downtown Portland to estimate CO emissions   | Uses observed price and travel time sensitivities  Uses proven models of travel behavior  Incorporates integrated CO emissions model  | Requires parking database: number of spaces, location, type, use patterns  Requires travel database: time of arrival, travel & work mode split  | Average speed of vehicles                                     | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-----|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects | Requires little or<br>no new data<br>acquisition<br>Relatively low cost<br>Shows actual<br>potential of<br>transportation<br>measures | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions | "Ramp Metering: Does it Really Work?" Robinson, James, and Mark Doctor. FHWA/ITE 1989 Compendium of Technical Papers.   | Evaluates effectiveness of several ramp metering projects across the nation, identifies limitations and issues for implementation  | Compares several types of ramp-metering projects under different circumstances  Provides effectiveness in terms of vehicle speed increases or travel time decreases as well as reductions in accidents  Discusses types of ramp-metering systems, metering rates, ramp geometries, and diversion problems | Some of the projects implemented other transportation measures concurrently with the ramp-metering project, so it is difficult to examine the effectiveness of this program only  Does not quantify VMT or emissions reductions | On-ramp queue<br>length<br>Wait times                                     | dad |
|                                  |  | ·   |   | "Environmental Considerations for Planning Advanced Traffic Management Systems." Kraft, Walter H., and William A. Redl, in Resource Papers for the 1994 ITE International Conference, 1994. | Reviews environmental factors related to ITS strategies, and presents a case study of New Jersey DOT I-80 Metropolitan Area Guidance Information and Control (MAGIC) project | Combines general discussion with case study results from an actual ITS project  Evaluates changes in VMT and emissions (CO, HC, and NOx) at the corridor level  Includes cost/benefit analysis results  Tracks changes in VMT and emissions impacts over time   | Emissions calculation<br>methodology and<br>results not presented<br>in great detail  | Land use and physical features Emissions (CO, HC, NOx) Benefit/cost ratio | drl |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|-----|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Empirical analysis of transportation measure demonstration projects (cont.) |   |  | "ITS Benefits: Continuing Successes and Operational Test Results." Prepared by Mitretek Systems for Federal Highway Administration. Draft, September 19, 1997.                | Highlights existing and predicted ITS benefits identified from a variety of ITS programs, including traffic management projects, focusing on U.S. DOT-tunded Field Operational Tests and other programs resulting from recent federal initiatives | Reports benefits from a variety of projects covering a variety of ITS technologies, including several traffic management strategies includes ITS and traffic management benefits related to safety, time, throughput, cost, customer satisfaction, energy, and environment includes example emissions results for electronic toll collection and traffic signal system projects in Oklahoma, New Jersey, Los Angeles, and Abeline (Texas) | Reports results but does not show analysis methods or calculations  Not all reported results have been validated for completeness and reliability   | Varies depending on project summarized, but can include: VMT, vehicle trips, vehicle speeds, fuel usage, emissions (HC, CO, NOx) | drl |
|                                  | Sketch<br>planning  | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters | "TCM Analyst 1.0 and<br>User's Guide."<br>Crawford, Jason A., et<br>al. Texas<br>Transportation Institute.<br>For the Federal<br>Highway<br>Administration,<br>November 1994. | Describes a computerized sketch planning tool, TCM Analyst 1.0, including input data requirements, methods of use, and an overview of the model's structure and calculation procedures  | Provides a useful and relatively easy instruction manual for using TCM Analyst 1.0  Uses MOBILE5a output data (emission factors) as inputs to the model, providing more accurate emission benefit calculations for each TCM   | Program only models limited TCMs and cannot model multiple TCM packages  Requires several runs with MOBILE5a to obtain input emission factors  Modeling on regional (rather than microscale) basis only | Not stated   | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|-----|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Sketch<br>planning (cont.)  |   |  | "Potential Emission and<br>Air Quality Impacts of<br>Intelligent Vehicle-<br>Highway Systems."<br>Ostria, Sergio, and<br>Michael F. Lawrence.<br>In Transportation<br>Research Record 1444,<br>1994. | Discusses short-<br>term and long-<br>term impacts of<br>ITS technology<br>bundles, including<br>traffic and<br>incident<br>management<br>systems, on trips,<br>mode split, and<br>emissions at a<br>regional and<br>corridor level | Provides a broad initial assessment of the expected direction of impact (positive, negative, insignificant, uncertain) of traffic and incident management systems on travel behavior and emissions (HC, CO, NOx)  Utilizes solid a priori reasoning to predict impacts  | Discussion is theoretical rather than empirical  Does not estimate the magnitude of travel or emissions impacts  Evaluates traffic and incident management systems mostly as an ITS technology bundle rather than as individual ITS technologies or specific traffic management strategies | Traffic flow  Vehicle trips  Trip distance  Mode shifts  Emissions (HC, CO, NOx) | drl |
|                                  | Process<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>planning and<br>implementation | Explains lessons learned during the implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions from the public and funding sources, as well as projected versus actual benefits  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the transportation measure implementation | *Freeway Ramp Metering Effects in Denver.* Corcoran, Lawrence J. and Gordon A. Hickman. ITE 1989 Compendium of Technical Papers.   | Reviews and assesses the implementation, system expansion, projected and actual benefits of the freeway ramp metering demonstration project begun in 1981 in the Denver metropolitan area   | Compares projected and actual benefits, in percentages, of increased speed, reduced VHT, reduced emissions, reduced accidents, and minimized diversion  Long term nature of the demonstration project, and subsequent expansion of ramp metering, demonstrated a quantified level of motorist and media support, as well as a measure of motorist violation rates | Does not evaluate the end result effectiveness in terms of VT or VMT reduced   | Speed Increase  Reduced VHT, emissions, and accidents  Diversion minimization    | dkţ |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|-----|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation (cont.) |   |  | "Transportation Control<br>Measures Analyzed for<br>the Washington<br>Region's 15 Percent<br>Rate of Progress Plan."<br>FHWA/Metropolitan<br>Washington Council of<br>Governments, February<br>1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures   | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific transportation measure evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, and emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process   | None (factors analyzed are applicable to each transportation measure analyzed during the process) | dac |
|                                  | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                                 | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides a review of the results produced by different HOV facilities in North America, which could be used if other directly applicable research is not available  Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | 'An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Researct/Tellus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costs/benefits | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of TCM options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies  Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                   | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure        | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| Traffic<br>Management<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |   |  | "HOV Lanes and Ramp<br>Metering: Can They<br>Work Together for Air<br>Quality?" Shoemaker,<br>Bill R. and Edward C.<br>Sullivan.<br>Transportation<br>Research Board Paper<br>940444. January 1994. | Comments on the analysis process used to assess the air quality impacts of HOV land and ramp metering projects, and examines the degree to which these measures are effective and compatible where jointly applied to improve freeway operations | Illustrates the process of analysis and decision-making, as well as the key role of analytical modeling, required in the San Francisco Bay Area to gain approval for HOV tane and ramp metering projects at the regional level  Examines the interrelationships, and potentially perverse effects, between HOV tanes and ramp metering | Identifies need for estimating disaggregate mode-specific emission factors, including vehicle fleet characteristics, and identifies difficulties in doing so  | Interrelationships<br>between HOV lanes<br>and ramp metering  |
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.)     | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model                    | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions Analyst can vary input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | *Implementing Effective<br>Travel Demand<br>Management<br>Measures: Inventory of<br>Measures and<br>Synthesis of<br>Experience.* COMSIS<br>Corporation. USDOT,<br>September 1993.<br>DOT-T-94-02.   | broad range of<br>TDM measures,  | Excellent overview of the range of TDMs possible; provides description, nature of effectiveness, application setting, effectiveness potential, and cost  Uses actual case studies to inform the use of a computer model for forecasting TDM effectiveness  Provides a road-map to implementing TDMs                                    | Use of the model requires local input parameters to forecast local effectiveness  Model does not incorporate an emissions calculation module  Most analysis is at the employer-level rather than the area-level | Level of service<br>provided by<br>employer:<br>information,<br>matching services,<br>preferential parking,<br>ride home programs |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology                                    | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |    |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model (cont.) |                           |                              | "A Survey and Analysis of Employee Responses to Employer-Sponsored Trip Reduction Incentive Programs." Schreffler, Eric N., and Mortero, Jose. COMSIS Corp. California Air Resources Board, February 1994. Contract No. A983-187. | of new survey<br>data regarding<br>employee travel<br>behavior; uses<br>mode choice and<br>travel demand<br>model to predict<br>impacts of certain<br>employer-based<br>transportation<br>measures | Clearly explains the process that was used: survey data acquisition, mode choice computation, and TCM effectiveness model "ise.  Data requirements are more readily available than other models.  User-friendly model is available for outside use; users guide is also available.  Survey links incentives directly to impacts on travel behavior.  Model includes an awareness sub-model that simulates how many people know about the possible transportation measures available to them. | Does not accurately address trip-chaining and VMT reductions (only trips)  Household conditions are not extensively accounted for  Cost-effectiveness was not calculated  Employer-level analyses only, with focus upon incentive TCMs | Guaranteed ride home  Company vanpools  Preferential parking  Parking fees for ridesharers  Carpool subsidies & transportation allowances | da |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Empirical analysis of the impacts of personal preference and workplace conditions on mode choice | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but likely to be influenced heavily by local factors of the study area)  Can be replicated (at moderate to high cost)  Does not require extensive computer model  Uses actual survey data | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Personal preference and workplace conditions difficult to impact through public policy | "The Influence of Employer Ridesharing Programs on Employee Mode Choice." Ferguson, Erik. Transportation, vol 17, 1990. | Analyzes aggregate-level data compiled by a large Southern California regional ridesharing agency; assesses impact of employer characteristics on employee mode split | Analyzes a large data set comprising almost 10% of Los Angeles area workforce  Utilizing existing agency database is a costeffective approach  Less accurate than disaggregated (employee by employee) data  Includes costeffectiveness estimations | Some findings may have been contradicted by more recent studies (e.g., study finds that large corporations have better success with rideshare programs)  Aging data source: 1985 survey data  Los Angeles area factors may be uncharacteristic of other regions, so results may not be applicable elsewhere  Employer-derived data was acquired using different methods  No estimates of emissions impacts | Level of employer effort to encourage ridesharing Size of firm | dac |

| Transportation<br>Measure | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| (com.)                    | Statistical<br>analysis of the<br>impacts of land<br>use<br>characteristics<br>and TDM<br>strategies on<br>mode choice | choice.  Standard analysis of variance using principle components allows examination of the effects of land use and TDM incentive strategies on mode choice individually and in combination.  Results transferable to other urban areas | Precise causality and individual impacts of factors such as transit availability or urban density on mode choice cannot be measured due to limitations of the database  Potential for need to conduct extensive field research to determine land use characteristics at each sample work site.  Cannot be used to determine land use and urban design characteristics' impact on a specific mode choice | "The Effects of Land Use and Travel Demand Management Strategies on Commuting Behavior: Final Report." Prepared by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. and Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Transportation, November 1994. | Develops an integrated database of land use characteristics and travel demand management (TDM) strategies (for a sample of employment locations) to determine the combined impacts of TDM programs, land use, and urban design on employee travel behavior. | Added land use and site information from field observation to the "Regulation XV" dataset of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (which included aggregate employee travel characteristics and employer incentive programs) | Study conducted in Los Angeles County, and thus may be less applicable in more dense urban areas with factors such as higher average density and transit service.  Share of work trips made by bicycle as a percentage of the total trips in the data set is small, making identification of work site characteristics that encourage utilization of bikes difficult.  Did not address residential trip end of commute, midday travel, or trip chaining as factors which influence mode choice  To simplify a complicated data collection process, somewhat arbitrary indicators were used for assessment of a site's urban design and land use characteristics. | Land use and urban design of worksite  TDM incentive strategies |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>employer-<br>based trip<br>reduction<br>program | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | "SB 836 Evaluation Methodology: Baseline and Methodology to Measure the Effectiveness of Voluntary Ridesharing and Other Rule 2202 Replacement Measures," Final Report. Schrettler, Eric et al, for Regional Transportation Agencies' Coalition. July 1997. | Describes methodology for evaluation of voluntary ridesharing in the South Coast Air Basin; includes review of current employer trip reduction program evaluation practices | Methodology is rigorous and uses multiple data sources: a "State of the Commute" survey, an employer worksite activity survey, and an employee AVR survey  Methodology is designed to compare voluntary ridesharing with mandatory ridesharing, thus isolating the relative emissions impact of ridesharing rules  Uses existing data sources where possible  Attempts to identify causality  Methodology is designed to meet EPA requirement for State Implementation Plan credit | Extensive data sources are required  Obtaining analogous "before" and "after" data to compare mandatory and votuntary ridesharing can be difficult  Data sources and analysis are specific to Southern California | Primary measures: vehicle trips, VMT, emissions (CO, VOC, NOx)  Secondary measures: average vehicle ridership, mode split |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>employer-<br>based trip<br>reduction<br>program (cont.) |  |  | "Employee Trip Reduction Without Government Mandates: Cost and Effectiveness Estimates From Chicago." Pagano, Anthony and JoAnn Verdin. University of Illinois at Chicago. Transportation Research Board Paper 971281, 1997. | Evaluated the cost and effectiveness of employee trip reduction programs through the use of an independent evaluation of demonstration projects implemented in the Chicago area | Estimates planning, maintenance, and voluntary implementation, and incentive costs for trip reduction programs  Intensive data collection, especially for cost estimates, including before and after surveys and interviews of program administrators participating in the demonstration projects  Addresses statistical relationships of organization type to costs and outcomes, of costs to strategies and incentives, of outcomes to strategies and incentives, and of cost to outcomes  Addresses differences in outcome by organizational type (factory vs. office) | Made generalized assumption of staff costs needed to implement trip reduction programs Intensive data collection requires demonstration project and surveys, or application of Chicago area data  Results have limited application to other regions, as local Chicago variables such as availability of transit afternatives may have influenced model results | Trip reduction program implementation process utilized.  Obstacles and success factors.  Program costs and effectiveness. | dkı |
|                              | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Can be replicated (at moderate cost)  Does not require extensive computer model | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results | *An Employer Panel for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Trip Reduction Incentives.* Giuliano, Genevieve, and Wachs, Martin. In Panels for Transportation Planning and Applications, ed. T.F. Golob, et al, 1997.              | Discusses results collected on Southern California employment sites subject to SCAQMD Regulation XV, and assesses the relative effectiveness of trip reduction strategies       | Utilizes the largest trip reduction measure database available in the world  Panel method allows for assessing before-and-after-TCM conditions  | Database does not provide exceptional detail; report does not contain details of the level of incentive support provided to employees  Only generalized effectiveness results are shown  TCMs were not always implemented at the time of the survey  | Not described   | cda |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report         | Description   | ,<br>Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |   |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs<br>(cont.) |                           |                              | Transportation | Evaluates the cost effectiveness of a building-based trip reduction plan implemented in compliance to a local ordinance in Pasadena, California | Attitudinal survey includes the influences of building tenant company size as well as schedule and lifestyte of employees | Uses small data sets therefore results vary widely with the behavior of a few Individuals  Does not establish a standard to evaluate average vehicle ridership results obtained  Results may not be transferable to other employer sites or regions  Does not quantity emission impacts | Program cost and distribution of cost  Benefits to developer, tenants and city  Average vehicle ridership | 1 |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology  | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology                                       | Report  | Description   | : Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>implementation<br>programs<br>(cont.) |  |   | *Feasibility of Employee Trip Reduction as a Regional Transportation Control Measure.* Lupa, Mary R. University of Illinois at Chicago. In Transportation Research Record 1459.   | Conducts a policy analysis of employee trip reduction, and a preliminary cost comparison of employee trip reduction among transportation measures | Evaluates effectiveness of employee trip reduction measures on improving air quality according to relief of traffic congestion, relief of ROG, maintenance of personal privacy and autonomy, and according to market-based VMT pricing possibilities  Calculates the megagrams per year reduced of the pollutant chosen to measure the effectiveness of the transportation measure, as well as the cost of the strategy  Determines that employee trip reduction strategies cannot successfully be separated from related mode split component strategies such as transit expansion, transit user subsidy, and parking fees | Does not evaluate emissions other than ROG   | Cost effectiveness of employee trip reduction  Effectiveness of employee trip reduction measures on improving air quality | dkp |
|                              | Empirical<br>analysis of<br>transportation<br>measure<br>demonstration<br>projects             | Requires little or no new data acquisition Relatively low cost Shows actual potential of transportation measures | Case study results<br>do not necessarily<br>apply to other<br>regions | *Evaluation of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Measures to Relieve<br>Congestion.*<br>Kuzmyak, J.R., and<br>E.N. Schreffler.<br>Prepared by COMSIS<br>Corp. for FHWA.<br>FHWA/SA-90/005;<br>DOT-T-90-14.<br>February 1990. | Performs case studies of the effectiveness of 11 transportation demand management programs  | Shows potential for reduction in commute-based trips due to implementation of transportation measures  Provides high level of detail about the specific programs implemented  | Generally does not evaluate specific TCM individually; programs of multiple TCMs are evaluated for effectiveness  Does not quantify emission reductions  Trip reductions based upon vehicle occupancy assumptions for each mode choice (carpool, vanpool, transit) | Not applicable in context of specific transportation measures   | dac |

Page 114

| ١, | , | • |
|----|---|---|
| •  |   | ` |
|    |   |   |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Statistical<br>analysis of<br>employer<br>ridesharing<br>initiatives                            | Utilizes large database of existing employers that implement transportation measures Relatively low-cost (provided data does not need to be collected) | May not assess causes of statistical significance found Results not necessarily applicable to other regions | "Evaluation of<br>Employer-Sponsored<br>Ridesharing Programs<br>in Southern California."<br>Ferguson, Erik T.,<br>Georgia Institute of<br>Technology. In<br>Transportation<br>Research Record 1280,<br>1990. | Analyzes database of surveys of employer- sponsored ridesharing programs in Southern California to determine relevant factors on effectiveness | Utilizes large existing database for the region, increasing validity of results  Assesses cost- effectiveness at varying program sizes  Assesses interaction between alternative work schedules and ridesharing  Attempts to explain reasons behind statistical significance of certain factors | Sample database may be biased (they were all clients of a centralized ridesharing agency)  Primarily analyzes employer-based measures only | Level and type of<br>direct ridesharing<br>incentives  Firm size and type  Dollars spent on<br>rideshare programs | dac |
|                              | Sample survey<br>of customer<br>travel patterns<br>and<br>preferences at<br>shopping<br>centers | Somewhat applicable to multiple regions (but influenced by local factors of the study area)  Does not require an extensive computer model              | Requires large data collection process to generate statistically significant results  Moderate to high cost | "Analysis of Indirect<br>Source Trip Activity:<br>Regional Shopping<br>Centers." JHK &<br>Associates/ K.T.<br>Analytics/California Air<br>Resources Board.<br>November 1993, ARB-R-94/510.                   | Surveyed<br>customers of<br>regional shopping<br>centers to<br>determine<br>potential impact<br>of various travel<br>reduction<br>measures     | Uses ectual survey data (including customer demographic and stated preference data)  Developed calculation methodologies specific to each trip reduction measure, using site- specific data  Compares data between shopping centers in different land-use types                                 | Assumptions are required to translate stated preference data to expected outcome  Does not quantify emission reductions                    | Distance of travel for consumers  | dad |

9730/98

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report  | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Sample survey of employer trip reduction program cost | Uses statistically representative sample population to make estimates of overall impact of general trip reduction strategles such as employer-based trip reduction rules.  Sample size (and therefore cost) can be varied based on level of statistical accuracy desired.  Surveys can be done periodically to determine changes in program effectiveness over time. | Surveys can entail significant costs  If surveys are performed differently in different regions, direct comparisons of results may not be valid  Survey results can be subject to various kinds of response blas | "South Coast Air<br>Quality Management<br>District Regulation XV<br>Cost Survey," and<br>"AQMD Survey Follow-<br>Up." Ernst & Young.<br>For South Coast Air<br>Quality Management<br>District, 1992.  | Estimates cost of complying with South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XV trip reduction rule using employer surveys; follow-up document presents results of on-site interviews of 17 companies             | Survey methodology is generic and can be applied to any region.  Regulation XV compliance paperwork allowed for an exact definition of the "target population".  All affected companies surveyed, not just a representative sample.  Methodology combines broad survey with focused on-site interviews to gauge validity of responses. | Only quantifies cost of ridesharing programs; does not directly quantify trip reductions or emissions reductions  Accuracy of employer responses is questionable  Study results do not allow characterization of the linkage between a given company's spending on a trip reduction program with the effectiveness of that program | Cost of ridesharing<br>program (in \$ per<br>employee)          |
|                              | Sketch<br>planning                                    | Simple tools can generate planning-level estimates of transportation measure effectiveness at low cost  Generalized tools can be somewhat applicable to multiple regions  Analyst can vary input parameters  | Sketch planning results are usually not the most accurate, depending on the input parameters   | "Critical Analysis of<br>Sketch-Planning Tools<br>for Evaluating the<br>Emission Benefits of<br>Transportation Control<br>Measures." Crawford,<br>Jason A., and<br>Raymond A. Krammes.<br>Prepared by Texas<br>Transportation Institute<br>for FHWA, FHWA/TX-<br>92/1279-5. December<br>1993. | Critical analysis and sensitivity analysis (using data for El Paso, Texas) of San-Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) TCM Tools method and the Systems Applications International (SAI) method; summarized in TRR 1472 | Provides a thorough review of the state of the practice (as of 1993)  Identifies weaknesses in the SANDAG and SAI methods as well as strengths  Provides detailed sketch-planning analysis for El Paso, Texas  | Many of the inputs to the SANDAG and SAI models are difficult to quantify  The SANDAG and SAI models do not fully account for indirect impacts and latent travel demand  | Vehicle trips VMT Average vehicle speed Emissions (HC, CO, NOx) |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology             | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Sketch planning (cont.) |                           |                              | "Simple Methodologies for Quantifying VT and VMT Reductions from Transportation Control and Growth Management Measures for Developing Local Trip Reduction Ordinances." Evans, V. and D. Morrow. Sonoma Technology, Inc. Air & Waste Management Assoc. 1993. | Describes development of simple methodologies for quantifying reductions in vehicle trips (VT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from TCMs, for use in a planning- level context; developed originally for the South Coast Air Basin | Methods to quantify VT and VMT reductions from TCMs were based upon relatively simple methods for estimating emissions and individual TCM effectiveness developed prior to this report for the South Coast AQMD  Performance-based approach was developed rather than use mandated transportation performance standards  Actual experience data used as much as possible: estimated trip reduction levels from each TCM was collected from other studies, and planning-level analysis uses site-specific data inputs, thus offering. increased precision in emissions estimates | Expected reductions in VT and VMT from TCMs were estimated based upon a general survey, so for a particular location different assumptions may be needed  Applicability to other regions outside California limited by report's use of transportation data and emissions factors in the analysis which were quantified using BURDEN and EMFAC runs for 1994  Does not incorporate any consideration of cost-effectiveness | Employee participation (percentage and frequency)  Trip length  Bike parking facilities  Existence/extent of bike path system  Existence of shower facilities |
|                              | ,                       |                           | ·                            |  |   | Ranges in VT reductions estimates address the interactive impacts of the application of multiple transportation measures  Equivalency factor used to convert VMT to VT can account for region-specific average trip lengths   |   |   |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology                               | Advantages of Methodology  | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |  |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Employer TDM cost-<br>effectiveness model | Estimates reduction in and costs of daily trips and peak period trips  Aids employer determination of cost-effectiveness of TDM measures for their particular worksite | Results may vary widely from one employer to the next Many inputs may be difficult for employers or planners to quantify | "Transportation Demand Management Cost-Effectiveness Model for Suburban Employers." Dagang, Deborah A. JHK & Associates. In Transportation Research Record 1404. | Reports on the development of a model to individually evaluate the cost-effectiveness of 15 different employer-based TDM measures in suburban settings | Focus on suburban employers reflects different travel-related characteristics of suburban and urban areas  Spreadsheet-based model is user-friendly and readily accessible for use at the site-specific level; model makes sensitivity analysis relatively simple  Eight transportation environments were defined to represent various combinations of transportation service characteristics  For employers without access to entire range of data necessary to operate model, default values are included | Most employers surveyed to develop model were unable to provide detailed cost information on the TDM measures they had implemented.  Does not calculate emissions directly.  Potential for regional bias, as model was developed in part based on a survey of suburban San Francisco Bay Area employers; model also used the SCAQMD Regulation XV and Pima Association of Governments Travel Reduction Program employer plan databases.  Only some TDMs included in model provide for estimates of VT reductions.  Use of default values could diminishes accuracy of estimates for some users. | Suburban employer-<br>based TDM<br>measures  Daily trips and peak<br>period trips  Costs and cost-<br>effectiveness |  |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology   | Advantages<br>of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study   | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Case study<br>analysis                                | Analyzing case studies of transportation projects is relatively easy and inexpensive  Different case studies can be compared to determine factors influencing the effectiveness of an transportation measure                                   | Case-study analysis frequently does not provide rigorous quantitative results  Effectiveness of case studies may be due to local factors specific to that case | "Transportation Demand Management: Case Studies of Medium-Sized Employers." Rutherford, G. Scott et al. In Transportation Research Record 1459.                                 | Presents travel mode split results for 14 medium-sized employers that practice various forms of transportation demand management                  | Chosen compenies represent a variety of locations, business type, and transportation measures.  Explains regional variation of policy and constraints for transportation measures (parking availability, price, public transportation network)  | Data collected do not contribute to a clear conclusion on the most effective transportation measure  Does not provide discussion of emission benefits  Does not contain cost/benefit analysis | Transportation mode split: single occupant vehicle, transit, carpool  Employee transportation coordination support time | fk  |
|                              | Policy analysis<br>of transpor-<br>tation<br>measures | Addresses political feasibility of transportation measure implementation and generalized estimate of success given local travel behavior and characteristics. Relatively simple and inexpensive to conduct, as it requires no primary research | Unlikely to provide precise emission estimates   | "Feasibility of Employee Trip Reduction as a Regional Transportation Control Measure." Lupa, Mary R. University of Illinois at Chicago. In Transportation Research Record 1459. | Conducts a policy analysis of employee trip reduction, and a preliminary cost comparison of employee trip reduction among transportation measures | Analyzes shortcomings to indirect transportation measures such as employee trip reduction  Provides a solid overview of employee trip reduction as an evolving TCM and an arena for strategic planning using tools such as direct political action, classic economics, technological implementation, pricing, and regional consensus building | Draws conclusions as to feasibility of implementing employee trip reduction, but gives no precise estimation of emissions   | Employee trip reduction   | dkp |

The Post of the

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology  | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages of Methodology   | Report   | Description  | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed   |     |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Process analysis of transportation measure planning and implementation | Explains lessons learned during the planning and implementation of an actual transportation measure, such as reactions to expect from the public and funding sources  Provides pros and cons of planning and implementation methods | Does not necessarily help quantify VT, VMT, or emissions reductions from the TCM implementation  | "Transportation Control Measules Analyzed for the Washington Region's 15 Percent Rate of Progress Plan." FHWA/Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, February 1995.   | Provides comprehensive evaluation of the selection and quantification process performed by the MWCOG for assessing various transportation measures                                 | Addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up, multiple committee planning process used by the COG  Provides extensive, clear detail (and strengths and weaknesses) of both the evaluation tools used and each specific TCM evaluation method  Estimates VT, VMT, & emission reductions and cost-effectiveness | Requires an extensive study of already-performed process  | None (factors<br>analyzed are<br>applicable to each<br>transportation<br>measure analyzed<br>during the process) | dao |
|                              | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies                         | Relatively inexpensive and simple to conduct, because it requires no primary research  Provides an introduction to the range of results produced by different studies, which could be   | Results are not directly applicable to other regions (they do not incorporate characteristics of other regions)  Unlikely to provide precise estimates | "An Assessment of Transportation Control Measures, Transportation Technologies, and Pricing/Regulatory Policies." Euritt, Mark A., et al. University of Texas, Austin, Center for Transportation Research/Teitus Institute. CTR SEDC-1, June 1995. | Assesses several studies that analyze a host of transportation measures, technology options, and policies for total effectiveness and costa/benefits                               | Provides a solid overview of the range (and effects) of transportation measure options, as well as technology and policy options  Focuses upon energy efficiency impacts in addition to emissions and VMT  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans, but follow-on report focuses upon these strategies Estimates may be too rough to apply to other programs in other regions | Impacts: vehicle<br>trips, vehicle miles<br>traveled, and<br>emissions<br>Costs                                  | dac |
|                              |  | used if other directly applicable research is not available Identifies advantages and disadvantages of several methodologies  | -  | "Assessment of Travel<br>Demand Management<br>Approaches at<br>Suburban Activity<br>Centers." Bhatt, Kiran,<br>and Higgins, Thomas.<br>K.T. Analystics. U.S.<br>DOT, July 1989.  | Surveys research<br>studies and<br>interviews TCM<br>program<br>coordinators to<br>provide an<br>overview of the<br>range of<br>effectiveness of<br>employer-based<br>TCM programs | Provides a large number of case study examples of both effective and ineffective TCM programs  Makes recommendations to employers on how to develop a TCM program  Provides a good checklist of topics to address when developing a TCM program  | Report does not contain a methodology for forecasting the effectiveness of new TCM plans  Only generalized evaluation of TCM effectiveness  | Relative effectiveness of various transportation measure programs Implementation mechanisms                      | dac |

;

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology                                      | Advantages of Methodology | Disadvantages of Methodology | Report  | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study  | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Comparison and analysis of other studies (cont.) |                           |                              | "Managing Transportation Demand: Markets Versus Mandates." Giuliano, Genevieve, and Martin Wachs. Reason Foundation. Policy Insight No. 142, September 1992.                  | Compares congestion pricing with Regulation XV for the Southern California area; describes pros and cons of each measure and discusses implications | Provides typology of transportation measures and identifies effectiveness and common barriers to implementation  Simple side-by-side comparison of VMT reduction and cost-effectiveness for each transportation measure  Makes policy recommendations to improve each transportation measure | Provides little detail about logistics of implementing the policy recommendations  Does not quantify emission reductions   | Direct vs. indirect<br>Implementation  Market-based vs. performance-based<br>implementation  Efficiency and equity considerations   | dac |
|                              |  |                           |                              | "The Equity and Cost<br>Effectiveness of<br>Employee Commute<br>Options Programs."<br>Farkas, Z. Andrew.<br>Morgan State<br>University. TRB<br>960078, January 1996.          | Analyzes the results of surveys and transportation measure modeling studies performed for the Baltimore and Philadelphia regions                    | Shows different methods of using the same model: Travel Demand Evaluation Model developed by COMSIS  Provides a discussion of social equity considerations based on a survey of the two regions  | Philadelphia modeling assumed average vehicle ridership targets were reached and results are only applicable relative to each scenario  Baltimore modeling did not estimate emissions reductions | Rideshare promotion<br>level  Parking charge level  Transit subsidy<br>levels  Work schedule flexibility                            | dac |
|                              |  |                           |                              | "Evaluation of Employee Trip Reduction Programs Based on California's Experience with Regulation XV." Orski, C. Kenneth. Institute of Transportation Engineers. January 1994. | Summarizes the results of an evaluation of employee trip reduction programs, based on California's experience with Regulation XV                    | As their techniques and targets are closely parallel, empirical data for Regulation XV was used to represent projected results of the Federal Clean Air Act, so tessons evaluated may be relevant to other metropolitan areas  | Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans  California-specific factors may influence and limit applicability of conclusions to other regions                            | South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XV results to date  Areawide program impact  Program costs and effectiveness | dkp |
|                              |  |                           |                              |   |   | Able to draw general conclusions of employee trip reduction program effectiveness, based on assessment of numerous California studies available at the time  |  |   |     |

| Transportation<br>Measure    | Methodology   | Advantages of Methodology   | Disadvantages<br>of Methodology  | Report   | Description   | Advantages of Study  | Disadvantages<br>of Study   | Factors Analyzed  |     |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|-----|
| Trip<br>Reduction<br>(cont.) | Comparison<br>and analysis of<br>other studies<br>(cont.) |   |  | "Employee Trip Reduction Programs: An Evaluation." Orski, C. Kenneth. In Transportation Quarterly, Vol. 47, No. 3, July 1993.  | Addresses feasibility and cost of attaining the mode shift goal in CAA 182(d)(1)(B), and the resulting impact on regional trip' volume, vehicle miles traveled, automotive emissions, and air quality if the goals were met | As their techniques and targets are closely parallel, empirical data for Regulation XV was used to represent projected results of the Federal Clean Air Act, so lessons evaluated may be relevant to other metropolitan areas  Able to draw general conclusions of employee trip reduction program effectiveness, based on assessment of numerous California studies available at the time | California-specific factors may influence and limit applicability of conclusions to other regions  Report does not contain a methodology for evaluating new TCM plans | South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XV results to date Long-term program effects on modal choice Areawide program impact Program costs and effectiveness | dkp |
| VMT Fees                     | Travel demand/<br>mode choice<br>model                    | Somewhat<br>applicable to<br>multiple regions<br>Analyst can vary<br>input parameters | Requires region- specific household survey, land use, socioeconomic, and travel cost data  Requires complex computer model  Potentially high cost to use | "Transportation Pricing<br>Strategies for<br>California: An<br>Assessment of<br>Congestion, Emissions,<br>Energy and Equity<br>Impacts." California Air<br>Resources Board, June<br>1995. Report No. 92-<br>316. | Develops and uses a comprehensive travel demand model to estimate the impacts of multiple transportation measures   | Uses actual, available price elasticities  Establishes base case by comparing to actual travel data  Explores interrelations between pricing strategies  | Does not contain a highway-network model to include level-of-service changes Forecasts rely on estimations of changes in household travel data                        | Fee level Price elasticity Interrelationships between pricing strategies  | dac |