

Atlanta Regional Commission Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Calculator Tool – Technical Report

Technical Memorandum - FINAL

Prepared for the Atlanta Regional Commission

April 2020

Texas A&M Transportation Institute

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM – FINAL

Contract No: 613051

Sub-Task 1.2 – ARC CMAQ CALCULATOR TOOL - TECHNICAL REPORT

DATE: March 23, 2021

TO: Kyung-Hwa Kim
Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)

COPY TO: Shichen Fan, ARC

FROM: Madhusudhan Venugopal, P.E.
Chaoyi Gu, P.E.
Bob Huch, PG.
Marty Boardman
Reza Farzaneh, PhD, P.E.
Texas A&M Transportation Institute

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Madhusudhan Venugopal
972-994-2213
m-venugopal@tti.tamu.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Table of Contents.....iii
- Overview..... 7
- 1.0 Introduction..... 8
- 2.0 Roadway ITS/Operations/Incident Management..... 9
 - 2.1 Advanced Traffic Management Systems (ATMS)..... 9
 - Project Types9
 - Methodology Limitations9
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants9
 - Methodology..... 12
 - 2.2 Signal Synchronization 14
 - Project Types 14
 - Methodology Limitations 14
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 14
 - Methodology..... 16
 - 2.3 Intersection Improvement.....20
 - Project Types 20
 - Methodology Limitations 20
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 21
 - Methodology..... 25
 - 2.4 Roundabouts.....30
 - Project Types 30
 - Methodology Limitations 30
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 30
 - Methodology..... 32
 - 2.5 Incident Management 36
 - Project Types 36
 - Methodology Limitations 36
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 36
 - Methodology..... 38
 - 2.6 Diverging Diamond Interchange41
 - Project Types 41
 - Methodology Limitations 41
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 41
 - Methodology..... 43

- 3.0 Transit Start-Up Operations and Expansion 44
 - 3.1 New Transit Service and/or Transit Technology 44
 - Project Types 44
 - Methodology Limitations 44
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 44
 - Methodology 46
 - 3.2 Transit Signal Priority 48
 - Project Types 48
 - Methodology Limitations 49
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 49
 - Methodology 51
- 4.0 Managed Lanes 55
 - 4.1 Managed Lanes 55
 - Project Types 55
 - Methodology Limitations 55
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 56
 - Methodology 58
- 5.0 Travel Demand Management..... 62
 - 5.1 Bike/Pedestrian and Transit..... 62
 - Project Types 62
 - Methodology Limitations 62
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 62
 - Methodology 66
 - 5.2 Regional Bike/Pedestrian Projects..... 70
 - Project Types 70
 - Methodology Limitations 70
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 70
 - Methodology 72
 - 5.3 Employer Based Commute Strategies 75
 - Project Types 75
 - Methodology Limitations 75
 - User-Defined Inputs and Constants 75
 - Methodology 77
- 6.0 Clean Fuel and Technology..... 78

6.1 Retrofits..... 78

- Project Types 78
- Methodology Limitations 79
- User-Defined Inputs and Constants 79
- Methodology..... 81

6.2 Alternative Fuel Vehicles..... 82

- Project Types 82
- Methodology Limitations 82
- User-Defined Inputs and Constants 82
- Methodology..... 83

Table of Tables	
Table 1. ATMS Project User-Defined Inputs	10
Table 2. ATMS Project Constants	11
Table 3. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections (HCM 2010)	11
Table 4. Signal Synchronization Project User-Defined Inputs	15
Table 5. Signal Synchronization Project Constants.....	16
Table 6. Intersection Improvement Project User-Defined Inputs	21
Table 7. Intersection Improvement Project Constants	23
Table 8. Unsignalized Intersection Delay by LOS	23
Table 9. FHWA Signal Timing Manual Reference	24
Table 10. Roundabouts Project User-Defined Inputs	31
Table 11. Roundabouts Project Constants.....	32
Table 12. Incident Management Project User-Defined Inputs	37
Table 13. Incident Management Project Constants.....	38
Table 14. Assumptions for Number of Lanes Open During Partial Closure	39
Table 15. Diverging Diamond Interchange Project User-Defined Inputs	42
Table 16. Diverging Diamond Interchange Project Constants.....	42
Table 17. Transit Expansion Project User-Defined Inputs	45
Table 18. Transit Expansion Project Constants.....	46
Table 19. Transit Signal Priority User-Defined Inputs	49
Table 20. Transit Signal Priority Project Constants	51
Table 21. Managed Lanes Project User-Defined Inputs.....	56
Table 22. Managed Lanes Project Constants	57
Table 23. Bike/Pedestrian and Transit Project User-Defined Inputs.....	63
Table 24. Bike/Pedestrian and Transit Project Constants	66
Table 25. Increase in Transit Trips by Area Type and Transit Mode	68
Table 26. VMT per Capita by Area Type	68
Table 27. Regional Bike/Pedestrian Project User-Defined Inputs	70
Table 28. Regional Bike/Pedestrian Project Constants.....	72
Table 29. Employer-Based Commute Strategies Project User-Defined Inputs.....	75
Table 30. Employer-Based Commute Strategies Project Constants	77
Table 31. Clean Fuel and Technology Project User-Defined Inputs	79
Table 32. Clean Fuel and Technology Project Constants.....	80
Table 33. Alternative Fuel Vehicles Project User-Defined Inputs.....	82
Table 34. Alternative Fuel Vehicles Project Constants.....	83

OVERVIEW

In March 2019, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) sought for firms experienced in the development of sketch-level transportation and emissions models to update the existing Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Calculator tool. The existing CMAQ Calculator tool was developed by Cambridge Systematics along with the technical documentation.

Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) was selected to assist ARC in updating the existing CMAQ Calculator tool. The main tasks TTI completed as part of this project were (1) updating the assumptions and methods used in the existing calculator to assess congestion and air quality benefits of CMAQ-eligible projects, and (2) Updating the methodology and documentation to calculate MOVES emission rates necessary to determine emission benefits.

TTI updated the existing ARC CMAQ technical report corresponding to the updates made to the ARC tool. The structure of the document remains in the existing format. The updates in this technical report include methodologies/equations, inputs, constants, and sources where applicable.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

TTI assisted ARC in updating the existing CMAQ emissions calculator tool to support the selection of projects for CMAQ funding, and to assist in annual CMAQ reporting requirements after authorization of project funding. The calculator developed supports other potential applications as well to include:

- Calculating emissions for off-model projects in a conformity determination; and
- Estimating delay reduction, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction, and emissions for smaller-scale, off-model projects for project evaluation and prioritization process.

The calculator estimates emissions reductions associated with the eight-hour ozone standard (ozone precursors NO_x and VOC), annual $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ standard ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and NO_x), and greenhouse gases (CO_2 , CH_4 , and N_2O combined into GHG equivalent units). Emissions benefits can be calculated for any year between 2020 and 2050. The Calculator contains a separate tab for 14 separate transportation strategies, which are grouped into five emphasis areas:

- Roadway ITS/Operations/Incident Management;
- Transit Start-up Operations and Expansion;
- Managed Lanes;
- Travel Demand Management; and
- Clean Fuel and Technology.

The following sections in the report provide guidance on using each of the strategies arranged by the five emphasis areas.

2.0 ROADWAY ITS/OPERATIONS/INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

2.1 ADVANCED TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (ATMS)

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emission benefits of adding an advanced traffic management system (ATMS) along a corridor. Projects under this category can include signal equipment upgrade/retiming, installation of CCTV or other sensors, installation of a signal communications network, signal monitoring and real-time adjustment, among similar projects. The proposed project should have the effect of reducing the average delay at intersections through better signal timing, conveying traffic information to the public resulting in better route choice, etc. Installing sensors/communications equipment that only provides data that is not acted upon will not improve average delay or reduce emissions.

Projects that install adaptive signal systems are also included in this strategy, but use different delay reduction assumptions due to the higher level of delay reduction that can be achieved through this advanced technology.

Methodology Limitations

ATMS are a fairly new technology with new innovations being frequently applied. Up-to-date research and case studies should be consulted to ensure delay reduction assumptions are accurate and appropriate for the ATMS improvement.

This calculator predicts the overall emission benefits based on the average reduction in delay; therefore, the project under analysis must have an effect on delay.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 1. Three columns of inputs are required: one for the inbound direction during the morning peak, one for the outbound direction during the evening peak and average of

both directions or the direction in which ATMS is applied during off-peak period. The project-specific constants are presented in

Table 2. Table 3 provides intersection control delay associated with varying levels of service to help the user in selecting a general delay value if more detailed information is not available.

Table 1. ATMS Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Suggested Default Values	Input Guidance
Average Intersection Delay before ATMS (seconds/vehicles/intersection)	80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the intersection delay averaged over all intersections in the entire corridor in each period of the day. Table 3 below can be used to help select general values when detailed values are not available from other sources. 80 seconds/vehicle is the control delay at a LOS F signalized intersection and can be used as the default value if the intersection is known to be highly congested. Higher values may be entered if supported by a recent study.
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the analysis year of the project from the drop-down year list
Road Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type from road-type drop-down list
Average Hourly Volume Along Corridor (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average hourly volume along the corridor under analysis in each period of the day. Obtain from traffic counts or travel demand model.
Truck Percentage (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percentage of trucks in the corridor in each period of the day. Obtain from traffic counts or travel demand model.
Does the Project Include an Adaptive Signal Control System?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the project is an adaptive signal system, select 'Yes' otherwise select 'No'.
Number of Intersections along Corridor		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the total number of intersections along the corridor under analysis.

Table 2. ATMS Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Average Reduction on Delay by Applying ATMS (percent)	12.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Georgia of Department of Transportation, a recent Regional Traffic Operations Program (RTOP) study concluded that ATMS type projects reduced delay by an average of 12 percent. This 12 percent reduction factor was multiplied by the user-defined current average intersection delay to predict the improved delay.
Hours in Morning Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in evening peak period
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal
Average Reduction on Delay by Applying ATMS with Adaptive Signal Control System (percent)	31.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects that used adaptive signal control delays had an even greater delay reduction. From a U.S. Department of Transportation study, ATMS reduced delay between 19 to 44 percent .The average, 31.5 percent was multiplied by the current average intersection delay to calculate the improved delay.

Table 3. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections (HCM 2010)

Level of Service (LOS)	Control Delay (Seconds per Vehicle)	General Description
A	≤ 10	Free flow
B	> 10- 20	Stable Flow (slight delays)
C	> 20-35	Stable Flow (acceptable delays)
D	> 35-55	Approaching unstable flow (tolerable delay, occasionally wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)
E	> 55-80	Unstable flow (intolerable delay)
F	> 80	Forced flow (jammed)

Methodology

The purpose of ATMS is to improve travel time, flow, and safety along a corridor. These technological improvements are installed at most, if not all, intersections along a corridor to provide real-time traffic data. This data can subsequently affect signal timings, driver route choice, and other factors that reduce delay along a corridor.

The calculation for predicting emission reductions for this improvement is based on the average decrease in intersection delay. In each period of the day, the delay after applying ATMS calculation formula is:

$$D_{After} = (d_{Before} - d_{Before}f_R)NVh$$

$$D_{After-T} = D_{After}f_T$$

$$D_{After-LDV} = D_{After} - D_{After-T}$$

Where:

D_{After} = Total Corridor Delay after Applying ATMS,

d_{Before} = Average Intersection Delay before Applying ATMS,

f_R = Average Reduction on Delay by Applying ATMS with Adaptive Signal Control System. The default value is 12 percent¹ without adaptive signal control system and 31.5 percent² with adaptive signal control system,

N = Number of Intersections along Corridor

V = Hourly Volume along the Corridor in that period,

h = Hours in that period,

f_T = Truck percentage,

$D_{After-T}$ = Total Corridor Delay after applying ATMS – All Trucks; and

$D_{After-LDV}$ = Total Corridor Delay after applying ATMS – Light Duty Vehicles

These period delay reductions were summed up to daily delay reductions and annual delay reductions. The daily reductions and annual reductions were used along with

¹ Georgia Department of Transportation. (2014). Regional Traffic Operations Program. Accessed at: <http://www.dot.ga.gov/travelingingeorgia/trafficcontrol/Pages/Operations.aspx>.

² Sussman, J. et al. (2000). What Have We Learned About ITS? Federal High Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. Accessed at: <http://www.itsbenefits.its.dot.gov/its/benecost.nsf/0/B56A52DA1C256C8E8525725F00691912>

vehicle-type specific idle emission rates to estimate the daily emission reductions and annual emission reductions for ATMS projects.

2.2 SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emissions benefits associated with synchronizing traffic signals to allow vehicles to hit multiple green lights in a row when traveling at a reasonable speed along a corridor. Travel time savings at each intersection along the corridor are calculated and aggregated by applying different progression factors.

Methodology Limitations

This method specifically evaluates signal synchronization along an arterial corridor, and cannot estimate systemwide or areawide improvements. However, areawide improvements can be estimated by testing individual corridors separately and summing their unique impacts. The length of the corridors and the signals being improved for synchronization should be reasonably spaced to achieve a meaningful reduction in travel savings. For example, travel time savings will be minimal for two signals spaced a mile apart compared to seven signals in a one-mile corridor.

This method assumes the signal synchronization strategy is set up for a corridor with a pattern of high morning inbound traffic and high afternoon outbound traffic.

Alternations to the strategy would be required to consider a corridor with comparable traffic in both directions.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 4. Three columns of inputs are required: one for the inbound direction during the morning peak, one for the outbound direction during the evening peak and average of both directions during off-peak period. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 5.

Table 4. Signal Synchronization Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the analysis year of the project from the drop-down year list
Road Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type from road-type drop-down list
Length of the Signalized Corridor (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter length of corridor targeted for signal synchronization
Existing Number of Signalized Intersections		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter number of signalized intersections in the corridor
Existing Number of Lanes (one direction)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average number of through lanes in each direction in the corridor Intersection turn pockets are represented by ½ lane
Posted Speed Limit (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the posted speed limit of the corridor
Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) (one direction) (vehicles/day)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the annual average daily traffic over the period and over all segments in the corridor
Average Hourly Volume during the Time Period (one direction) (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average hourly volume over the peak period and over all segments in the corridor The average hourly volume of off-peak period is to calculate automatically from peak-period inputs and AADT inputs.
Truck Percentage (one direction) (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average truck percentage for each direction during each time period over all segments in the corridor
Average Corridor Travel Time (one direction) during the Time Period (one direction) (minutes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average time it currently takes for a vehicle to travel the length of the corridor in each direction during the peak period The corridor travel time of off-peak period is calculated automatically from other inputs
Existing Average Cycle Length (seconds)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average cycle length of all the signalized intersections in the corridor

Table 5. Signal Synchronization Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Start-up Lost Time for Signalized Intersections (seconds)	2.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Equation 17-6, 17-7, Chapter 17: Urban Street Segments, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2010.
Hours in Morning Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in evening peak period
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal
Saturation Flow Rate per Lane (vehicles/hour/lane)	1,900 (Urban)/1,750 (Rural)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Exhibit 18-28 in Chapter 18: Signalized Intersection, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2010.
Green Light Duration to Total Cycle Duration Ratio	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Equation 17-6, 17-7, Chapter 17: Urban Street Segments, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2010.
Progress Factor	0.67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncoordinated signals throughout a corridor correspond to an Arrival Type 3 and a progression factor, PF, of 1.00, while traffic subject to coordinated signals is characterized as an Arrival Type 4 with a PF of 0.67. Progression factor, PF, is calculated by the equation: $PF = (1 - [1.33g/C]) / (1 - g/C)$. Exhibit 31-46, Chapter 31: Signalized Intersections: Supplemental, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2014.

Methodology

This methodology uses Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) CMAQ emission calculation toolkit - Traffic Signal Synchronization Module³ evaluation algorithms to

³ Federal Highway Administration, CMAQ emission calculation toolkit - Traffic Signal Synchronization Module, Accessed at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/signal_sync.cfm

calculate delay at each intersection along a defined corridor. The module offers an established method of calculating various benefits of corridor traffic signal synchronization, and is consistent with the evaluation and calculation of fuel savings from signal synchronization projects.

Travel time savings due to the synchronization are estimated by calculating average delay at each intersection in the corridor. The travel time savings formulas are based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010 equations for intersection delay:

$$d_1 = \frac{0.5C(1 - \frac{g}{C})^2}{1 - \left[\min(1, X) \frac{g}{C} \right]}$$

$$X = \frac{v}{c} = \frac{v}{Ns \frac{g}{C}}$$

$$d_2 = (PF)d_1$$

$$f_v = \frac{2}{1 + \left(1 - \frac{v}{52.8NS_{PL}}\right)^{0.21}}$$

$$t_s = \frac{d_1 - d_2}{f_v}$$

Where:

- d_1 = Uniform intersection delay of existing condition,
- C = Cycle length,
- g/C = Green light duration to total cycle duration ratio,
- v = volume (one direction),
- c = roadway capacity,
- N = number of lanes (one direction),
- s = saturation flow rate per lane,
- d_2 = Uniform intersection delay of improved condition,
- PF = progression factor,
- f_v = volume proximity factor,
- S_{PL} = Posted speed limit; and
- t_s = travel time saving with signal synchronization.

The average travel time savings calculated is the difference in seconds per vehicle per signal. It is multiplied by the number of signals and divided by 60 to get the benefit in minutes per vehicle for the total length of the arterial. Finally, the approach multiplies this by the volume to get the total saving during each period in minutes. These period travel time savings were summed up to daily delay reductions and thereby annual delay reductions.

The emission benefits are due to differences in speed-related running emission rates between existing condition and improved condition. The existing corridor average speed and improved corridor average speed are calculated with total length of the corridor divided by existing corridor travel time and improved corridor travel time respectively. The improved corridor travel time is calculated as the existing corridor travel time subtracted by the corridor travel time savings. In peak periods (morning peak and evening peak), the existing corridor travel time during the time period is a user input. In off-peak period, the existing corridor travel time is calculated as:

$$t_c = N_s \frac{6.0 - l_1}{(0.0025L)5280} f_x + \frac{3600L}{S_{PL}} f_v + N_s d_1$$

Where:

d_1 = Uniform intersection delay of existing condition, defined previously,

L = Length of the corridor,

f_x = vehicle through movement factor, 1.0,

l_1 = start-up lost time,

S_{PL} = posted speed limit, defined previously; and

N_s = number of signals along the corridor.

The total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of each period along the corridor are calculated as volumes multiplied by the length of the corridor. The truck VMT are calculated as total VMT multiplied by truck percentage and the rest of the VMT are light-duty vehicle (LDV) VMT. The difference in vehicle-type specific running emission rates between existing condition and improved condition are multiplied by corresponding VMT to calculate the vehicle-type specific period emission reductions. These period emission reductions were summed up to daily emission reductions and annual emission reductions.

2.3 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT

Project Types

This approach evaluates following at-grade intersection improvement projects:

- **TYPE A – New Signal** – An unsignalized intersection approaching failure due to intolerable levels of delays is improved to a signalized intersection with an acceptable level of service.
- **TYPE B – New Phase** – Enabling a specific turn or movement at the intersection that was nonexistent or making a permissive turn into a protected turn by changing the signal phasing and/or timing.
- **TYPE C – Capacity and Phase** – Changes to the signalized intersection positively impacting level of service including improvements to geometry, approach redesign, or increased capacity.

For each case, average reduction in delay per vehicle due to the improvement is estimated to determine the emission reduction benefits as a result of the improvement. A major overarching assumption is that the design methodology considers the signals as pre-timed, given the difficulty of accounting for the dynamics of changes to signal times and phases under an actuated setting.

Methodology Limitations

The intersection improvement methodology calculates delay at a single intersection level, and is not equipped to estimate improvement benefits for multiple intersections or systemwide improvements. Intersection delay studies are the best source for delay measurements, if available. In the absence of observed intersection delay information, guidance to estimate existing delay is provided based on LOS, as presented in HCM tables found in the “Parameter&Source” tab of the calculator and in Table 7 below. This methodology is not applicable in case of a staggered (five-legged or more) intersection.

In the absence of accurate delay data, estimation through vehicle approach and progression should be made as accurately as possible. LOS corresponding to delay windows may only be used to approximate control delay due to the difference in lower and upper bounds of each LOS (for example, LOS F corresponds to a delay more than

50 seconds per vehicle, which might not be precise enough to provide an accurate estimation of emission reduction benefits).

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The three unique intersection project approaches requires the set of project-specific, user- defined inputs presented in Table 6. Three columns of inputs are required: one for the morning peak, one for the evening peak and one for off-peak period. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 7.

Table 6. Intersection Improvement Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Existing Condition		
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the analysis year of the project from the drop-down year list
Area Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type of the intersection location from the drop-down area type list
Existing Intersection Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the existing intersection type (Signalized or Unsignalized)
Facility Type (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type of street 1 and street 2 of the intersection
Total number of through lanes (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of through lanes of street 1 and street 2 of the intersection
Total number of left-turn lanes (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of left-turn lanes of street 1 and street 2 of the intersection
Total number of right-turn lanes (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of right-turn lanes of street 1 and street 2 of the intersection
Annual Average Daily Traffic (Street 1 and 2) (veh/day)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the AADT (sum of both directions) for each street

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Hourly Volume (Street 1 and 2) (veh/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average weekday peak hour volume (sum of both directions) for each street The average hourly volume of off-peak period is calculated automatically from peak-hour inputs and AADT inputs.
Truck Percentage (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input the percentage of trucks on each street from traffic counts or the travel demand model.
Existing Left-Turn Phase (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the existing left-turn phase condition from the list.
Existing Right-Turn Phase (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the existing right-turn phase condition from the list.
Effective Green Time to Cycle Time Ratio (Street 1 and 2)	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the existing effective green ratio on each street.
Existing Delay before Improvement (s/veh)	50 (peak period)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 second per vehicle is the default assumption for LOS F at unsignalized intersections. Higher values may be entered if supported by a recent study. Lower value may be entered for LOS A-E based on Table 8. The existing delay in off-peak period is calculated automatically with other inputs.
Proposed Condition		
New Cycle Length (sec) (including impact from new or extended turn phases)	60 – 120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance based on FHWA signal timing manual. See Table 9 for the recommended cycle length values on different signal conditions.
Number of Left-Turn Lanes to Add (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of left-turn lanes to add
Number of Right-Turn Lanes to Add (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of right-turn lanes to add
Left-Turn Phase (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the proposed left-turn phase
Right-turn Phase (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the proposed right-turn phase

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Effective Green Ratio (Street 1 and 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the proposed effective green ratio on each street.

Table 7. Intersection Improvement Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Hours in Morning Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in evening peak period
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal
The Equivalent Number of Through Cars for a Protected Right-Turning Vehicle	1.18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Equation, Chapter 18: Signalized Intersections, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2010.
The Equivalent Number of Through Cars for a Protected Left-Turning Vehicle	1.05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Equation, Chapter 18: Signalized Intersections, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2010.

Table 8. Unsignalized Intersection Delay by LOS

Level of Service	Unsignalized Intersection Delay	Progression Criteria (Unsignalized Intersection)
A	<10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very low control delay 10 or less seconds per vehicle. All drivers find freedom of operation. Very rarely more than one vehicle in queue.
B	10 to 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control delay greater than 10 and up to 15 seconds per vehicle. Some drivers begin to consider the delay troublesome. Seldom there is more than one vehicle in queue.
C	15 to 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control delay greater than 15 and up to 25 seconds per vehicle. Most drivers feel restricted, but tolerably so. Often there is more than one vehicle in queue.

Level of Service	Unsignalized Intersection Delay	Progression Criteria (Unsignalized Intersection)
D	25-35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control delay greater than 25 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle. Drivers feel restricted. Most often, there is more than one vehicle in queue.
E	35-50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control delay greater than 35 and up to 50 seconds per vehicle. Drivers find delays approaching intolerable levels. There is frequently more than one vehicle in queue. Level denotes a state in which the demand is close or equal to the probable maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by the movement.
F	>50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control delay in excess of 50 seconds per vehicle. Very constrained flow. Represents an intersection failure situation that is caused by geometric and/or operational constraints external to the intersection.

Table 9. FHWA Signal Timing Manual Reference

Signal Complexity	Commonly Assumed Cycle Lengths
Permissive left turns on both streets	60 seconds
Protected left turns, protected-permissive left turns, or split phasing on one street	90 seconds
Protected left turns, protected-permissive left turns, or split phasing on both street	120 seconds

Source: FHWA Traffic Signal Timing Manual, 2008.

The input adapts to three type intersection improvement projects with following input setups:

- TYPE A – New Signal
 - Input “Existing Intersection Type”: Un-Signalized,
 - Input “New Cycle Length” as what it is in your new project.
- TYPE B – New Phase
 - Input “Existing Left Turn Phase” and “Right Turn Phase”: No,

- Input “Left Turn Phase” or/and “Right Turn Phase” in Proposed Condition: Yes.
- TYPE C – Capacity and Phase
 - Input “Number of Left-Turn Lanes” and “Number of Right-Turn Lanes” in Existing Condition: 0 or what the existing condition of the intersection is.
 - Input “Existing Left Turn Phase” and “Right Turn Phase”: No,
 - Input “Number of Left-Turn Lanes to Add” and “Number of Right-Turn Lanes to Add” as what it is in your new project,
 - Input “Left Turn Phase” or/and “Right Turn Phase” in Proposed Condition: Yes.

Methodology

This methodology uses Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) CMAQ emission calculation toolkit – Intersection Improvements Module⁴ evaluation algorithms to calculate delay at each intersection along a defined corridor. Intersection improvements that provide additional turn lanes, better geometric design, improved signal timing and phasing can reduce vehicle delay in navigating the intersection. This delay reduction results in lower vehicle emissions due to less vehicle time spent decelerating, accelerating, or idling. Existing vehicle hours of delay for each intersecting street (by each approach) must be estimated separately, either via an intersection delay study or data from a traffic management center. Alternatively, estimation through vehicle approach and progression should be instrumental in estimating the average delay for each approach, and thereby for intersecting streets.

In each period of the day, delay at the intersection is calculated given the delays for individual approaches and flow rates as follows:

⁴ Federal Highway Administration, CMAQ emission calculation toolkit - Intersection Improvements Module, Accessed at:
https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/intersection_improvements.cfm

$$D = h \sum_{i=1}^n (v_i d_i)$$

$$D_T = D f_T$$

$$D_{LDV} = D - D f_T$$

Where:

D = Sum of Delay all approaches;

h = number of hours in the period;

d = Delay for the approach;

f_T = Truck percentage;

d_T = Delay for the approach – All Trucks;

d_{LDV} = Delay for the approach - Light duty vehicles;

v = Approach flow rate (vehicles per hour); and

n = Number of approaches to the intersection.

This reduction in average delay per vehicle approaching the intersection equates to less time spent idling, where emission rates are highest. Since control delay takes into consideration the time elapsed for deceleration, queuing, and idling, the difference in travel speeds for noncongested conditions before-and-after improvements are not included in the emission reduction calculation. The total change in vehicle hours of delay at the intersection in each period, before and after the improvement, is calculated as follows:

$$\Delta D_{int} = D_{intnb} - D_{intb}$$

Where:

D_{intnb} = Total delay at the intersection for the existing condition; and

D_{intb} = Total delay at the intersection for the proposed condition.

These period delay reductions (ΔD_{int}) were summed up to daily delay reductions and annual delay reductions. The change in delay in each period is multiplied by the vehicle-type specific idle emissions factor (g/hr) to estimate vehicle-type specific emission reductions in each time period of the day. These period emission reductions were summed up to daily emission reductions and annual emission reductions.

Project Type A – New Signal

For estimating the delay at a planned signalized intersection, short of obtaining basic design parameters of the intersection including turning movements and the lane configuration changes, the user is prompted to provide peak hour volumes for intersecting streets, respective capacity at the intersection and the total signal cycle length at the intersection.

Delay at the intersection is calculated using the following formula (this formula is used within each project type approach):

$$\frac{0.5C(1 - \frac{g}{C})^2}{1 - \left[\min(1, X) \frac{g}{C} \right]}$$

Where:

C = is the cycle length

g/C = is the default green time to cycle ratio is 0.5(for simplicity)

X = highest volume to capacity ratio of any turning movement or a lane group at the intersection

The improvement in delay experienced per vehicle due to signalization is transformed into total delay in vehicle hours and thereby used for estimation of emission reductions.

Estimated delay in this methodology is assumed to be uniform delay resulting due to uniform arrival of traffic at the intersection, which is an ideal assumption. In the absence of detailed turning movement data and proposed signal timing and phasing details, the default green time to cycle ratio is assumed to be 0.5. It should be recognized that the mid-block capacity of a street is different from the capacity at the intersection due to turning traffic and effects of signal controls on the traffic. Hence, intersection capacity should be input keeping view that it is not exactly the same as the mid-block capacity.

Project Type B – New Phase

Enabling a specific turn or movement at the intersection that was nonexistent or permissive before into a protected turn by providing a new phase or include the movement in an existing phase by changing the time allocated to such phase can reduce overall intersection delay. If the movement is not allowed at the intersection in

the existing set-up, the existing delay is assumed to reflect a level of service F or more, which translates into a delay of 80 seconds or more. By providing protected phase to this movement, we are not only changing the signal timing plan, but also potentially adding to the cycle length. Because the delay at the intersection will be reduced for this movement, due to the provision of a green time to serve this movement, delay can be calculated based on the new cycle time and the effective green time for that movement.

The same formula presented in project type 1 is used to calculate before and after intersection delay. This methodology relies on assuming several constants for estimation of delay at the intersection for the turning lane group. The though lane saturation flow rate needs to be adjusted for the type of turn, which is lower for right and left turns compared to the through movement. For right turns, the equivalent number of through cars vehicle is 1.18 and for left turns, it is 1.056⁵.

Project Type C – Capacity and Phase

Physical changes to the intersection for increasing capacity or geometric design will include provision of new lanes (through or turning lanes). These changes to the capacity will be reflected in estimating delay due to easing capacity restrictions due to changes caused by the improvement. Volume is considered constant for practical purposes, since it is hard to estimate the quantity of traffic which gets re-routed from other facilities due to improvement in delay at this intersection. Given the added capacity and geometric redesign resulting in delay reduction, a comparative analysis of intersection configuration before and after the improvement can be conducted to estimate the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions due to physical intersection design changes.

The same formula presented in project type 1 is used to calculate before and after intersection delay. The default effective green to cycle ratio is assumed to be 0.5 for simplification in absence of turning movement and signal timing data to calculate it. Traffic is assumed to arrive in a uniform fashion at the intersection and improvement in uniform delay is estimated for calculating reductions in total greenhouse gas emissions as a result of improved geometric design and approach changes at the intersection.

⁵ Equation, Chapter 18: Signalized Intersections, Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 2010.

2.4 ROUNDABOUTS

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emission benefits of constructing a roundabout at either an unsignalized or signalized intersection. Projects can have a maximum of four approaches and can be analyzed as a one-lane or two-lane roundabout. The average delay reduction per vehicle due to the roundabout improvement is estimated to determine the emission reduction benefit.

Methodology Limitations

The modern roundabout can have numerous design considerations including the size and shape of the roundabout based on the street layout and surrounding area. This approach does not completely consider the design elements of roundabouts, which can affect average vehicle delay. A user-change of the impedance factor when calculating capacity can account for any design considerations that may greatly influence the average critical gap or follow-up time.

The approach does not alter the capacity of the intersection due to an increase in driver's familiarity. Generally, capacity at a roundabout is initially lower when first installed until drivers gain more experience traversing the intersection.

When the Degree of Saturation (v/c) becomes greater than one, the intersection has failed and does not produce accurate delay calculations. The cells indicating v/c turns red when this occurs. Users should be mindful to test roundabouts that do not exceed a circulating flow greater than 1,800 veh/h.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 10. Four columns of inputs are required as each one for one approach of the roundabout, from approach 1 to approach 4, clockwise. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 11.

Table 10. Roundabouts Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the analysis year of the project from the drop-down year list
Road Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type of the project from the drop-down road-type list
Annual Average Daily Traffic of Each approach (AADT) (vehicles/day)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the entering AADT of each approach
Truck Percentage (using the roundabout) (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percentage of trucks using the roundabout
Average Peak-Hour Hourly Volume of Each Approach – Morning Peak (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average peak period weekday vehicle traffic during morning peak hours.
Average Peak-Hour Hourly Volume of Each Approach – Evening Peak (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average peak period weekday vehicle traffic during evening peak hours.
Existing Intersection Delay per Vehicle– Morning Peak (seconds/vehicle)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the current peak-period intersection delay during morning peak hours
Existing Intersection Delay per Vehicle – Evening Peak (seconds/vehicle)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the current peak-period intersection delay during evening peak hours
Existing Intersection Delay before Improvement – Off-Peak (seconds/vehicle)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the current off-peak period intersection delay during off-peak hours
Number of Entry Lanes of Each Approach		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select either 1 or 2 entry lanes
Percentage of Left Turns for Each Approach (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percentage of left turns for each approach
Percentage of Right Turns for Each Approach (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percentage of right turns for each approach
Percentage of U-turns for Each Approach (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percentage of U-turns for each approach
Proposed Number of Circulating Lanes for Roundabout		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select either a 1-Lane or 2-Lane Roundabout

Table 11. Roundabouts Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Hours in Morning Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in evening peak period
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

Roundabouts can improve traffic flow and decrease delay under certain conditions. Delay reduction results in lower vehicle emissions due to less time spent waiting to traverse the intersection, specifically the time spent idling. Each approach into the intersection must be analyzed separately due to the unique nature of how roundabout delay is calculated.

The source used to calculate the average intersection delay at roundabouts was derived from the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 672, Roundabouts: An Informational Guide, Second Edition⁶, which provides instructions on what information and steps are necessary for the calculations. This source was also the basis for the fifth edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010).

The delay calculation begins with the calculation of the entering, circulating, and exiting flow rates for each roundabout leg. The volume adjusts for the percentage of heavy vehicles into the number of passenger cars per hour. For each approach, the entry volume on passenger car base is calculated as:

$$v_{i,pce} = \frac{v_i}{f_{HV}}$$

⁶ Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (2010), NCHRP Report 672: Roundabouts: An Informational Guide, Second Edition, Transportation Research Board, Accessed at: http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_672.pdf.

$$f_{HV} = \frac{1}{1 + P_T(E_T - 1)}$$

Where:

$v_{i,pce}$ = entry flow rate for approach i in passenger car equivalent, pc/h;

v_i = entry volume for approach i, veh/h;

f_{HV} = heavy vehicle adjustment factor;

P_T = proportion of demand volume that consists of heavy vehicles; and

E_T = passenger car equivalent for heavy vehicles (default is 2.0).

Following the conversion from entry volumes to roundabout volumes, the capacity of each approach is then calculated. The opposing volumes passing by the approach contribute to how many vehicles can transverse the roundabout in an hour due to the need for a gap between opposing vehicles in order to enter the intersection. The equation for estimating the capacity of a one lane roundabout is:

$$c_{e,pce} = 1,130Ne^{(-1.0 \times 10^{-3})v_{c,pce}}$$

Where:

$c_{e,pce}$ = lane capacity, adjusted for heavy vehicles, pc/h,

N = number of lanes of the approach; and

$v_{c,pce}$ = conflicting flow of the subjecting approach, pc/h.

Capacity of one or two circulating lanes for the approach into a roundabout is defined with the following equation:

$$c_{e,pce} = \begin{cases} 1,130e^{(-0.7 \times 10^{-3})v_{c,pce}}, N_c = 1 \\ 1,130e^{(-0.7 \times 10^{-3})v_{c,pce}} + 1,130e^{(-0.75 \times 10^{-3})v_{c,pce}}, N_c = 2 \end{cases}$$

Where:

$c_{e,pce}$ = lane capacity, adjusted for heavy vehicles, pc/h,

N_c = number of circulating lanes of the approach; and

$v_{c,pce}$ = conflicting flow of the subjecting approach, pc/h.

The degree of saturation (v/c) is calculated similarly to other intersection improvements, dividing the roundabout entry flow rate by the approach capacity.

$$x_i = \frac{v_{i,pce} f_{HV}}{c_{i,pce} f_{HV}}$$

Where all variables are as giving previously.

The control delay for each approach was calculated separately, as described in the NCHRP Report 672. The calculation of this delay includes the total time the driver spends decelerating when approaching the intersection, waiting in queue, waiting for an acceptable gap, and accelerating out of the queue. The delay calculation for each approach is:

$$d = \frac{3,600}{c} + 900T \left[x - 1 + \sqrt{(x - 1)^2 + \frac{(\frac{3,600}{c})x}{450T}} \right] + 5 \times \min[x, 1]$$

Where:

d = average control delay, s/veh;

x = volume-to-capacity ratio of the subject lane;

c = capacity of subject lane, veh/h; and

T = time period, h ($T = 1$ for 1-h analysis, $T = 0.25$ for 15-min analysis).

The improved intersection peak hour and off-peak total delay for roundabout improvements is then calculated similarly to other intersection improvements, where:

$$D = h \sum_{i=1}^n (v_i d_i)$$

$$D_T = D f_T$$

$$D_{LDV} = D - D f_T$$

Where:

D = Sum of Delay all approaches;

h = number of hours in the period;

d = Delay for the approach;

f_T = Truck percentage;

d_T = Delay for the approach - All Trucks;

d_{LDV} = Delay for the approach - Light duty vehicles;

v = Approach flow rate (vehicles per hour); and
 n = Number of approaches to the intersection.

The peak and off-peak period delay results from proposed roundabouts were subtracted from the existing delays from the input section to calculate the delay reductions. These period reductions were summed up to daily delay reductions and annual delay reductions. The change in delay in each period is multiplied by the vehicle-type specific idle emissions factor (g/hr) to estimate vehicle-type specific emission reductions in each time period of the day. These period emission reductions were summed up to daily emission reductions and annual emission reductions.

2.5 INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emission benefits of implementing incident management along a corridor to improve incident clearance time over the existing highway patrol response and clearance times. Emission benefits are based on a reduction in vehicle delay (and therefore idling emissions) since incident management usually provides faster response and clearance time than the existing highway patrol.

Methodology Limitations

This method makes the simplifying assumption that all emissions benefits are from a reduction of vehicle idling (estimated using delay calculations); however, in the real world delay is due to a combination of being stopped (idling) and traveling at lower than normal speeds (slowing down at the bottleneck caused by the incident). It would be difficult to calculate the reduced speed associated with a partial highway closure due to the incident.

Each incident likely results in a different number of lanes being closed (e.g., a freeway with eight lanes in one direction could have anywhere from one to eight lanes closed). Therefore, in reality each incident would have a different capacity of open lanes and a different calculated delay. This method makes the simplifying assumption that on average somewhere between 1/3 and 1/2 of the total lanes will be open for vehicles to get by an incident during a partial closure. Table 14 below shows the exact assumptions on the number of open lanes depending on the total number of lanes in one direction.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 12. The calculator is set up to only consider one direction of the corridor at a time. If incident management will be implemented for both directions on a corridor, the incident management tab should be copied and repeated for the second direction. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 13.

Table 12. Incident Management Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the analysis year of the project from the drop-down year list
Road Type	Interstate/ Freeway Free-flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type for the incident management project from the road type drop-down list Normally interstate/freeway or expressway would be chosen for this strategy The facility type and area type is used to look up the capacity per lane
Area Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type for the incident management project from the area type drop-down list The facility type and area type is used to look up the capacity per lane
Number of Lanes (one direction)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of lanes in one direction along the corridor where incident management will be deployed
Average Hourly Volume along Facility when Incident Happens (one direction) (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the total volume for all lanes in one direction on the corridor (vehicles/hour) This should be preferably at the time of the incident, but averaging events makes it less significant
Annual Average Number of Incidents (one direction)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the annual number of incident in the corridor in the single direction that is being analyzed
Average IMS Response and Clear-up Time (minutes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the estimated average time that it will take incident management vehicles to respond to and clear an incident (average time of lane blockage)
Average Highway Patrol Response and Clear-up Time (minutes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the current average time that it takes the existing highway patrol to respond to and clear an incident (average time of lane blockage)

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Share of Incidents Resulting in Total Closures (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the percentage of total incidents that result in all lanes in that direction being closed (the remaining share of incidents will be assumed to result in partial lane closures)
Truck Percentage in the Corridor (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average truck percentage in the corridor (used to get a composite emission rate)

Table 13. Incident Management Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

The methodology for calculating emission reductions from the incident management strategy is based upon reduced vehicle delay due to special incident management vehicles responding to and clearing the incident faster than is normally done by the highway patrol. The following equation⁷ calculates total vehicle-hours of delay for each incident based upon the response and clear up time of the incident management vehicles or highway patrol. Additional variables related to the volume and capacity of the roadway are defined below.

$$D = \frac{t^2(v - c_R)(c - c_R)}{2(c - v)}$$

Where:

D = total delay due to incident (vehicle-hours).

t = duration of incident (response+clear-up time).

v = hourly volume (vehicles/hour).

c_R = capacity of open lanes (vehicles/hour).

⁷ Garber, Nicholas and Lester Hoel, Traffic and Highway Engineering – SI Version, page 252.

c = total roadway capacity(vehicles/hour).

Average delay per incident is calculated for four cases:

- Average delay per incident resulting in partial blockage with Incident Management,
- Average delay per incident resulting in complete blockage with Incident Management,
- Average delay per incident resulting in partial blockage with existing Highway Patrol, and
- Average delay per incident resulting in complete blockage with existing Highway Patrol.

This method allows for the user to input the percent of annual incidents that result in a total closure of all lanes of traffic. For these cases the capacity of open lanes becomes zero. The method assumes that the remaining incidents result in a partial closure of lanes and uses the values in Table 14 to determine how many lanes remain open during a partial closure. For partial closure incidents the capacity of open lanes is the capacity of a single lane multiplied by the number of lanes that remain open.

Table 14. Assumptions for Number of Lanes Open During Partial Closure

Number of Lanes	Lanes Open During Partial Closure
8	3
7	3
6	2
5	2
4	2
3	1
2	1

Once the average delay per incident is calculated for the four cases, the total annual delay for all incidents is calculated for the existing highway patrol strategy and the implementation of incident management strategy. The annual number of partial closure

and complete closure incidents is calculated based on the two user inputs: total annual incidents and share of incidents resulting in total closure. These annual incident estimates are multiplied by the appropriate average delay per incident (partial or complete closure) and then summed together to estimate total annual delay due to all incidents. The total annual delay for the incident management strategy is subtracted from the total annual delay for the existing highway patrol strategy to estimate the reduction in annual delay due to the implementation of incident management. This reduction in annual vehicle-hours of delay is multiplied by a composite gram/hour idle emission rate that includes both trucks and light duty vehicles to calculate the annual emission reduction for this strategy. The composite rate is derived by using the truck percent entered by the user.

2.6 DIVERGING DIAMOND INTERCHANGE

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emission benefits of constructing a diverging diamond interchange in place of any number of traditional interchange designs. Emission benefits are based on a reduction in delay since diverging diamond interchanges have fewer turning movements that experience delay. Diverging diamond interchanges also have fewer conflict points, which leads to traffic signals with fewer phases and shorter waiting times (less delay).

Methodology Limitations

This method does not automatically calculate the delay reduction associated with a diverging diamond interchange. Instead it relies on the user to enter average delay by turning movement (up to 16 movements) for both a no build (before) and build (after) scenario. Separate modeling through a traffic simulation model or similar tool is necessary to obtain the delay information and volume information to input into the emissions calculator.

The method assumes that benefits are realized only on weekdays and multiplies average weekday benefits by the number of weekdays in a year. It also calculates daily benefits based on peak period information and off-peak period information.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 15. Three columns of inputs are required: one for the morning peak, one for the evening peak and one for off-peak period. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 13.

Table 15. Diverging Diamond Interchange Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year from the year dropdown list
Area Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type from the area type dropdown list
Truck Percentage (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percent of trucks over all 16 movements through the intersection. The same percentage will be used for before and after the project
Existing/Traditional Interchange Turning Movements Hourly Volume in Morning Peak/Evening Peak/Off-Peak Period (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the no-build (before) period hour volume for up to 16 movements through the interchange (not necessary to use all 16 movements; many traditional interchanges only have 12 movements) See figures in “Parameter&Source” tab of calculator for several examples of traditional interchange turning movements
Existing/Traditional Interchange Average Delay in Morning Peak/Evening Peak/Off-Peak Period (seconds/vehicle)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the no-build (before) average delay in seconds per vehicle associated with each of the turning movements
Diverging Diamond Interchange Average Delay in Morning Peak/Evening Peak/Off-Peak Period (seconds/vehicle)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the build (after DDI) condition average delay in seconds per vehicle associated with each of the turning movements

Table 16. Diverging Diamond Interchange Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Hours in Morning Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period (hours)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in evening peak period

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

Diverging diamond interchanges can improve traffic flow and decrease delay under certain conditions. A delay reduction results in lower vehicle emissions due to less time spent waiting to traverse the interchange, specifically the time spent idling.

The methodology employed in this calculator calculates total vehicle hours of delay by multiplying the average delay per vehicle by the volume of vehicles conducting that movement and summing over all movements. This is done for both the no build condition (traditional interchange - before) and build condition (diverging diamond interchange - after). A composite light duty and truck idle emission rate is calculated using the truck percentage entered. This is multiplied by the daily vehicle-hours of delay, and the number of weekdays in a year to calculate annual emissions for the build and no-build conditions. The annual build emissions are subtracted from the annual no-build emissions to calculate the annual emission reduction.

3.0 TRANSIT START-UP OPERATIONS AND EXPANSION

3.1 NEW TRANSIT SERVICE AND/OR TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY

Project Types

Transit expansion projects, such as new or extended bus routes and rail lines, can cause shifts from auto travel, resulting in reductions in VMT and reduction of vehicle starts and thus reductions in emissions. This methodology also estimates the emission reduction benefits of real-time transit arrival information by estimating additional ridership due to shorter wait associated with having this arrival information. Increased frequency of service (or reducing headways) and fleet expansions could also be modeled using the “percent of travel time spent waiting” constants associated with the real-time arrival information calculations.

Methodology Limitations

Some transit improvements, such as general enhancement of transit amenities (stops, sidewalks, benches); transit signal priority; queue jumper lanes; or bus rapid transit (BRT) are beyond the scope of this strategy. For transit improvements that utilize transit signal priority, queue jumper lanes, or bus rapid transit (BRT), please refer to the “Transit Signal Priority” improvement.

Reduction in VMT due to real-time information is due to the reduction in total time spent waiting for the bus. This reduction in total travel time spent waiting has been investigated for bus travel, but not for rail. Caution is advised for applying this methodology for rail travel until further research is conducted in this area.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 17. Three columns of inputs are required: one for morning peak hours, one for evening peak hours and one for off-peak hours. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 18.

Table 17. Transit Expansion Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year of the project from year drop down list
Type of New/Current Transit Service		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the type of transit fuel/technology that will be used for the new/expanded transit service Four types of buses plus electric light rail and heavy rail are available
Road Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type of the project from road-type drop-down list
Average Headways (minutes)	15 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average daily headways (minutes) of the new transit service Default value of 15 minute headways represents a mid-level value for typical transit service frequencies
Transit Corridor Length (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the length of the corridor in miles where the transit will be operated.
Transit Corridor Hours of Service (hours)	(3/3/12) Total 18 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of hours per day that regularly scheduled transit service will be available in the transit corridor in each period Default value of 18 hours represents service from 6 AM to midnight.
Is Real-Time Information (RTI) Available?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if project involves real-time arrival information, select "No" otherwise.
Average Speed along the Transit Corridor (mile per hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average speed of the transit vehicles along the transit corridor
Estimated Hourly Transit Ridership without RTI (riders/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average hourly transit ridership added due to improvements without real time information

Table 18. Transit Expansion Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal
Light duty vehicle occupancy	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Percent of Total Travel Time Spent Waiting without RTI	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: National Center for Transit Research (20051). Public Transit in America: Results from the 2001 National Household Travel Survey. Accessed from: http://www.nctr.usf.edu/pdf/527-09.pdf.
Percent of Total Travel Time Spent Waiting with RTI	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: National Center for Transit Research (20051). Public Transit in America: Results from the 2001 National Household Travel Survey. Accessed from: http://www.nctr.usf.edu/pdf/527-09.pdf.
Wait Time Elasticity	-0.54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Iseki, H., Taylor, B. D., Miller, M. (2006). The Effects of Out-of-Vehicle Time on Travel Behavior: Implications for Transit Transfers. Tool Development to Evaluate the Performance of Intermodal Connectivity (EPIC) to Improve Public Transportation. Access at http://www.its.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2014/06/Appendix-A.pdf.

Methodology

In this project, the estimated hourly transit ridership without real time information (RTI) are provided in the input section. The additional ridership due to RTI is estimated due to a decrease in wait time for the bus.

According to the 2001 National Household Travel Survey, approximately 26 percent of the total travel time while riding transit is spent waiting⁸. The implementation of real-time information allows users to know exactly when the next bus is arriving at their stop. This reduces the user's wait time for the bus by removing the need to arrive early in case the bus is running ahead of schedule. It also allows riders to utilize their time more efficiently in case the bus is running late. A recent study found that riders who use real-

⁸ National Center for Transit Research (20051). Public Transit in America: Results from the 2001 National Household Travel Survey. Accessed at: <http://www.nctr.usf.edu/pdf/527-09.pdf>.

time information wait almost two minutes less than those who use traditional schedule information⁹. This decrease results in approximately 21 percent of total travel time spent waiting when real-time information is available. Using this decrease in total time spent waiting, a travel wait time elasticity of -0.54 is applied to predict the increase in transit ridership due to this new technology¹⁰. The additional ridership in each time period of day is formulated as:

$$R_{RTI} = (w_{RTI} - w_{NORTI})eRN$$

Where:

R_{RTI} = Additional ridership due to RTI,

w_{RTI} = percent of total travel time spent waiting with RTI,

w_{NORTI} = percent of total travel time spent waiting without RTI,

e = wait time elasticity,

R = Estimate hourly transit ridership without RTI; and

N = Number of hours in the period.

Once the ridership of the new service is known, it is used to calculate the VMT reduction. The equation to calculate decrease in light-duty VMT and decrease in light-duty starts are in each time period of the day as follows:

$$VMT_{LD} = \frac{R_{TOTAL}}{AVO} \times TL_{LD}$$

$$S_{LD} = \frac{R_{TOTAL}}{AVO}$$

Where:

VMT_{LD} = Reduction in period light-duty VMT;

R_{TOTAL} = Ridership associated with new transitservice;

AVO = Average passenger vehicle occupancy;

⁹ Watkins, K. E., Ferris, B., Borning, A., Rutherford, G. S., Layton, D. (2011). Where Is My Bus? Impact of mobile real-time information on the perceived and actual wait time of transit riders. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 45(8) 839-848.

¹⁰ Iseki, H., Taylor, B. D., Miller, M. (2006). The Effects of Out-of-Vehicle Time on Travel Behavior: Implications for Transit Transfers. Tool Development to Evaluate the Performance of Intermodal Connectivity (EPIC) to Improve Public Transportation. Access at: <http://www.its.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2014/06/Appendix-A.pdf>.

TL_{LD} = Average passenger vehicle trip length; and
 S_{LD} = Reduction in starts of light-duty trips.

On the other hand, the increase of transit starts and transit VMT are calculated as follows:

$$VMT_T = \frac{N}{h/60} \times TL_T$$

$$S_T = \frac{N}{h/60}$$

Where:

VMT_T = Increase in period transit VMT;
 N = Number of hours of transit service;
 h = Transit headway in minutes; and
 TL_T = Average transit vehicle trip length.
 S_T = Increase in starts of transit vehicles.

These period light-duty VMT/starts reductions and transit VMT/starts increases were summed up to daily reductions/increases and annual reductions/increases. The change in VMT in each period is multiplied by the vehicle type specific running emissions factors (g/vmt) to estimate running emission changes in each time period of the day. The change in start activities in each period is multiplied by the vehicle type specific start emissions factors (g/start) to estimate start emission changes in each time period of the day. These period emission reductions and increases were summed up to total daily emission reductions and total annual emission reductions.

3.2 TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emission benefits of providing transit signal priority (TSP) at a single signal intersection or along a signalized corridor. Bus Rapid Transit and Express Bus Services are the most likely project types to benefit from this analysis.

Methodology Limitations

This calculator can only estimate emission reductions from transit services with bus vehicles; rail technologies cannot be used in this analysis. It is also assumed that the TSP projects are implemented during peak hours only.

In many cases, Transit Signal Priority is supplemented with additional preferential treatments such as queue jump lanes. In these instances, emission benefits should only be calculated for the transit vehicle and not include general traffic along the same route. The calculator currently assumes the green extension/red truncation can be utilized by both the transit vehicle and the general main street traffic (Street 1, transit corridor), only applying a negative emission benefit to the cross street (Street 2) traffic.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 19. Two columns of inputs are required: one for morning peak hours and one for evening peak hours. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 20.

Table 19. Transit Signal Priority User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year of the project from the year drop down list.
Area Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type from the area-type drop-down list Seven different area types are available: Urban Very High Density, Urban High Density, Urban Medium Density, Urban Low Density, Suburban, Exurban, and Rural.
Cycle Length (seconds)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average cycle length of all intersections along the corridor.
Facility Type (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter what best describes the type of facility for Street 1 and Street 2

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Average Existing Number of Lanes (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average existing number of lanes for both approaches
Average Hour Volume (Street 1 and Street 2) (veh/h)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average peak hour volume for Street 1 (main TSP corridor) and Street 2 (intersecting streets)
Truck Percentage (percent)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average percentage of trucks along the corridor
Effective Green Time to Cycle Time Ratio (Street 1 and Street 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the effective green time ratio for Street 1 and Street 2.
Average Speed along the Transit Corridor (Street 1) (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average speed along the transit corridor
Average Number of Transit Trips along the Corridor per Hour (both directions)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of transit trips along the corridor
Transit Signal Priority Hours of Service (hours)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of hours with transit signal priority strategy implemented in each time period of the day
Transit Ridership without TSP (riders/trip)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the existing transit ridership per trip in each time period of the day
Number of Intersections with TSP in Corridor (Street 1)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of intersections in transit corridor (street 1)
Average Corridor Travel Time for Buses (One Direction) (minutes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average corridor travel time for buses along the corridor
Average Rider Trip Length on the TSP controlled Corridor (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the rider trip length on the TSP implemented corridor
Change in Green to Cycle Length Ratio with addition of TSP, or	10% ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the proposed change in percentage of the green to cycle length ratio when TSP is activated
Maximum Green Time Extension + Maximum Red Time Truncation (seconds)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the maximum number of seconds a green time extension and red time truncation can be implemented during a TSP activation.

^a Smith, H. R., B. Hemily, and M. Ivanovic, M, 2005, *Transit Signal Priority (TSP): A Planning and Implementation Handbook*, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, accessed at <http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/TSPHandbook10-20-05.pdf>.

Table 20. Transit Signal Priority Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal
Light duty vehicle occupancy	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: The average light duty vehicle occupancy is around 1.2.
Travel Time Elasticity with Respect to Ridership	-0.40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: ICF International, 2011, Analyzing Emission Reductions from Travel Efficiency Strategies: A Guide to the TEAM Approach. United States Environmental Protection Agency, accessed at http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/policy/420r11025.pdf.

Methodology

Transit Signal Priority improves overall travel time to transit vehicles along a corridor or when traveling through a congested intersection. When approaching an intersection, the bus is detected and either a green time extension or red time truncation is granted to the transit vehicle. The extension or truncation is granted depending on at what point in the cycle the bus is detected. For example, if the cross street has the green signal, the phase will shorten by a pre-determined number of seconds, effectively truncating the red time for the transit vehicle.

In determining the potential emission benefits of implementing transit signal priority, the current delay and other intersection characteristics are calculated. This methodology is similar to what is implemented for other intersection improvement strategies, where the delay for each approach is:

$$d_1 = \frac{0.5C(1 - \frac{g}{C})^2}{1 - \left[\min(1, X) \frac{g}{C} \right]}$$

Where:

C = is the cycle length;

g/C = green time to cycle ratio = 0.5 (for simplicity); and
 X = volume to capacity ratio.

It was assumed the delay for Street 1 was the same as the current delay for the transit vehicle.

The same methodology is then applied to calculate the change in delay when TSP is activated. Only the green time to cycle ratio (g/C) was changed for this calculation due to TSP altering this ratio for Street 1 and Street 2. When TSP is activated, Street 1's green time increases by a user-defined amount while the green time for Street 2 decreases. This increases the overall delay for Street 2 and decreases the delay for Street 1.

The total delay per vehicle hour is then calculated multiplying the peak hour delay and the total hourly volume and then converting to hours. However, TSP is only activated when a bus is detected; therefore, this improvement in Street 1 delay is not a permanent, continuous occurrence. The probability of a bus arriving during a cycle was calculated, taking into effect the transit hours of service, headway, and average cycle length¹¹:

$$P_{bus} = \frac{C}{H}$$

Where:

P_{bus} = probability of bus arriving during a cycle;

C = average signal cycle length in minutes; and

H = average daily headway in minutes.

This probability was used as a weight to factor that not every cycle will have TSP activated; therefore, the intersection peak hour delay when TSP is granted is defined as:

$$D = \frac{(v_1 d_{1,tsp} + v_2 d_{2,tsp}) \times P_{bus} + (v_1 d_{1,cur} + v_2 d_{2,cur}) \times (1 - P_{bus})}{3600}$$

¹¹ Skabardonis, A. & Christofa, E. (2011). Impact of Transit Signal Priority of Level of Service at Signalized Intersections. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* (16) 612-619.

Where:

- D = intersection peak hour delay with TSP granted, Veh-hr;
- v_1 = average peak hour volume of Street 1, veh/h;
- v_2 = average peak hour volume of Street 2, veh/h;
- $d_{1,tsp}$ = peak hour Street 1 and transit delay with TSP granted, s/veh;
- $d_{2,tsp}$ = peak hour Street 2 delay with TSP granted, s/veh;
- $d_{1,cur}$ = current peak hour Street 1 and transit delay, s/veh; and
- $d_{2,cur}$ = current peak hour Street 2 delay, s/veh.

These delay calculations were used to estimate the increase on Street 2 and decrease on Street 1 in emissions of the general traffic due to the implementation of TSP. Overall decreases in emissions for the transit vehicle were also used assuming the change in delay is the same for Street 1.

In addition to the decrease in delay, improvements in emissions were also considered from the potential increase in transit ridership due to the addition of TSP. The additional riders would be due to the overall decrease in travel time along the route, making it more viable for certain individuals to switch from single-occupancy vehicles to transit. With a travel time elasticity of -0.40^{12} , estimates in the increase in annual transit ridership were calculated. In other words, for every 1 percent decrease in travel time, there is an average 0.40 percent increase in ridership. The improvement in travel time was calculated where:

$$C_{TT} = \frac{N_{TT} - O_{TT}}{O_{TT}}$$

Where:

- C_{TT} = Percentage change in travel time; and
- N_{TT} = new corridor travel time or $O_{TT} - (d_C - d_i)$

Where:

- d_C = current average intersection delay to buses, minutes per trip;

¹² ICF International, 2011, *Analyzing Emission Reductions from Travel Efficiency Strategies: A Guide to the TEAM Approach*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Accessed at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/policy/420r11025.pdf>.

d_i = improved average intersection delay to buses, minutes per trip; and
 O_{TT} = current average corridor travel time, minutes.

This improvement in travel time was then multiplied by the elasticity of -0.40 to estimate the percent increase in ridership due to the improved travel time along the corridor.

In calculating the total emission benefits, the change due to delay improvements, as well as the increase in ridership, were both considered. Specifically, the emission benefits due to the decreased delay to Street 1 and the light duty vehicles were decreased to the emission benefits from the increase in transit ridership. The emission increase on Street 2 is due to the delay increase by the shortened green phase.

These period light-duty VMT/idle reductions and transit/truck idle reductions on Street 1 and all type of vehicle idle increases on Street 2 were summed up to daily vehicle activity reductions/increases and annual vehicle activity reductions/increases. The change in VMT in each period is multiplied by the vehicle type specific running emissions factors (g/vmt) to estimate emission changes in each time period of the day. The change in idling in each period is multiplied by the vehicle type specific idling emissions factors (g/hr) to estimate emission changes in each time period of the day. These period emission reductions and increases were summed up to total daily emission reductions and total annual emission reductions.

4.0 MANAGED LANES

4.1 MANAGED LANES

Project Types

This approach evaluates the emission benefits of constructing new managed lane(s) in a freeway corridor or converting existing HOV lane(s) to managed lane(s). The calculator is set up to assume that the new managed lane has the ability to limit the number of vehicles that enter the lane so that a maximum volume to capacity (v/c) ratio is not exceeded and a minimum operating speed can be maintained. Managed lanes with a pricing mechanism, such as toll lanes or High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes, are the most likely types of managed lanes that could ensure this requirement for the calculator. It is possible to model a reversible lane system by configuring lanes in only one direction in the morning and the opposite direction in the evening.

Methodology Limitations

This methodology assumes that all emissions benefits from the managed lane project will be realized during the weekday peak periods. The calculator does not pick up any emissions benefits during weekend and off peak periods, although these are likely small compared to the weekday peak period benefits. Also, the method is based on calculations for average hourly conditions over the multihour peak period, and then benefits are multiplied by the number of hours in the peak period (the default assumption is four hours in each peak period). In reality conditions that influence v/c ratios and speed may vary over the multihour peak period (possibly in increments as small as 15 minutes as shown by Georgia Tech researchers).

The method assumes the same vehicle fleet (same age distribution and vehicle type mix) before and after the project. Therefore, the same set of emission rates are used when looking up emission rates by speed. In reality, research has shown that managed lanes that use pricing strategies can impact the age of the vehicle fleet (and the associated emission rates) since high income drivers that can afford newer cars are attracted to toll lanes. Also, the calculator assumes the same vehicle type mix after the project is implemented, but some managed lanes projects may include components that provide additional bus transit service or encourage more or less of certain vehicle types.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 21. The calculator is set up to accept the inputs corresponding to the combination of morning peak and evening peak; general purpose lanes and HOV/HOT lanes. The calculator assumes that the number of general purpose lanes will stay the same after the project is completed so it only asks for the number of general purpose lanes before the project, but not after the project. Two columns of inputs are required: one for morning peak hours and one for evening peak hours. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 22.

Table 21. Managed Lanes Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year of the project from the year drop-down list
Corridor Length (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the length of the corridor in miles where the managed lanes will be implemented
Area Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type for the project from the drop-down list The facility type and area type is used to look up the capacity per lane
Facility Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the facility type of the project from the facility type drop-down list
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Number of Lanes – Before Project (General Purpose Lanes and HOV Lanes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of lanes in one direction along the corridor for both general purpose and HOV/HOT lanes The number of HOV/HOT lanes before the project can be zero in the case of new managed lanes or more than zero in the case of an HOV lane conversion
Volumes (vehicles/lane/hour) – Before Project (General Purpose Lanes and HOV Lanes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average hourly volume (vehicles/lane/hour) during the peak period for each lane type, direction, and morning/evening period.

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Truck Percentage – Before Project (General Purpose Lanes and HOV Lanes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the percent of trucks found in the average hourly volume The calculator assumes the same percentages for before and after the project
Bus Percentage – Before Project (General Purpose Lanes and HOV Lanes)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the percent of buses found in the average hourly volume The calculator assumes the same percentages for before and after the project This could be derived by using a bus schedule to get the number of buses per hour and dividing by the hourly volume.
New HOV Lane Facility Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the HOV Lane type from HOV Lane type drop down list
Additional Number of HOV Lanes – After Project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of lanes in one direction along the corridor for HOV/HOT lanes after the project is implemented (calculator assumes the same number of general-purpose lanes for before and after project) A reversible lane system could be modeled by setting the morning inbound lanes to a certain number and the afternoon outbound lanes to the same number. The morning outbound lanes and afternoon inbound lanes should be set to zero.

Table 22. Managed Lanes Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Alpha Values	0.83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for Freeways with free flow speed of 60 mph.

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Beta Values	5.50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for Freeways with free flow speed of 60 mph.
General Purpose Lane Capacity	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the capacity table in previous version based on area types and road types.
HOV Lane Capacity	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the capacity table in previous version based on area types and road types.
Free Flow Speed on General Purpose Lane	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the speed table in previous version based on area types and road types.
Free Flow Speed on HOV Lane	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the speed table in previous version based on area types and road types.
Hours in Morning Peak Period	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
HOV Lane v/c Ratio associated with Minimum Operating Speed	0.90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the previous version
General Purpose Lane v/c Ratio associated with Vehicles Jumping to HOV Lane	0.93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the previous version
Latent Demand Factor (Percentage of General-Purpose Volume Reduction Compared to Additional Managed Lane Capacity (percent))	92.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing the value from the previous version
Number of Weekdays per Year	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

The methodology for calculating emission reductions from managed lanes is based upon changes to the average speed due to different congestion levels (v/c ratios) in certain lanes before and after the project. The method also considers the emissions

increases associated with extra volumes in the corridor due to latent demand filling in extra capacity from the implementation of the project.

The Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) equation is used to estimate the average speed both before and after the project:

$$S = S_f [1 + \alpha(V/C)^\beta]$$

Where:

S = Predicted mean speed;

S_f = Free-flow speed (defined as 1.15 times the speed at “practical capacity”);

V = Volume; and

C = Practical capacity (defined as 80 percent of capacity).

The standard BPR coefficient values for α and β are 0.15 and 4.00, respectively; however, the calculator uses default values for α and β of 0.83 and 5.50, respectively, which are obtained from an NCHRP report¹³.

The capacity for each group of lanes (general purpose and HOV/HOT) is calculated by multiplying the number of lanes entered by the user by the default capacity/lane values in the constants section (1,800 veh/lane/hour for general purpose and 1,600 vehicle/lane/hour for buffer separated HOV/HOT lane). The default free-flow speed in the constants section is set from the free flow speed reference table in “Parameters&Source” tab in the tool.

Estimating the volume for each lane type before and after the project is a complex calculation that uses the following steps:

- Check to see if the current general purpose lane volume is leading to a high v/c ratio (associated with slower speeds) that would be associated with vehicle wanting to jump into the new managed lane (even if they have to pay a toll). In the constants section 0.9 is used as the default v/c ratio associated with vehicles jumping to the HOT lane, since it is associated with a speed of 38 mph using the BPR equation. The demand for the HOT lane from the general purpose lane is assumed to be the difference between the total volume of vehicles and the

¹³ NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for Freeways with free flow speed of 60 mph..

volume of vehicles associated with a 0.9 v/c ratio. If the current volume of vehicles leads to a v/c ratio less than 0.9, the GP lane demand for the HOT lane is assumed to be zero.

- If the new HOT lane can handle all of the GP lane demand without exceeding the 0.9 v/c ratio associated with a minimum operating speed, then all of that volume is added to the before volume (the existing HOV lane volume in the case of a conversion); otherwise the HOT lane volume is set to 0.9 times the capacity.
- The additional HOT lane volume is calculated by subtracting the existing HOV lane volume from the new HOT lane volume set in the previous step. In the case of a completely new HOT lane where there was no HOV lane conversion, the additional volume equals the newly set volume
- The GP lane reduction is calculated as the latent demand factor times the additional HOT lane volume. The default latent demand factor in the constants section is set at
- 77.2 percent based on an evaluation of an HOT lane project in Minnesota.¹⁴ This calculation assumes that 22.8 percent of the volume that jumped from the GP lane to the HOT lane is actually backfilled by latent demand. Therefore, the GP lane volume reduction is not the full amount of the additional HOT lane volume.
- The GP lane reduction is divided by the number of GP lanes. This number is subtracted by the GP volume/lane for before the project to provide the GP lane volume after the project.

After all of the volume calculations the v/c ratio for each lane type, direction, morning/evening period combination is calculated for both before and after the project. These v/c ratios are used in the BPR equation above to calculate before and after speed. The before and after speeds are used to lookup emission rates. The percent of vehicle types are used to calculate a composite emission rate. The annual VMT is calculated by multiplying the hourly volume by the length of the corridor, the number of hours in the

¹⁴ Cambridge Systematics. I-394 MnPass Technical Evaluation. Prepared for Minnesota Department of Transportation. November 2006. Accessed at: http://www.mnpass.org/pdfs/394mnpass_tech_eval.pdf. Accessed June 11, 2008.

peak period (3 hours default), and the number of weekdays per year (250 default). The annual emissions for before and after the project are calculated by multiplying the annual VMT by the composite emission rate. The emission reductions are calculated by subtracting the after project emission from the before project emissions.

5.0 TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

5.1 BIKE/PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT

Project Types

This approach evaluates bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements that are parallel to an arterial roadway with known annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes. The benefits of increased transit ridership are included for bike and pedestrian projects that provide increased accessibility to transit. Projects can be evaluated individually for bike or pedestrian facilities, or combined.

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities can reduce emissions when auto trips are replaced by walking, biking, and transit trips. The methodology estimates the annual number of vehicle trips reduced, and the annual auto VMT reduced to approximate the emissions reduction.

Methodology Limitations

The approach does not completely account for all elements of pedestrian bridges or multiuse facilities/greenways in exclusive ROW; however, the regional bike/pedestrian project strategy, which is based on total travel demand between an origin and destination, can be used instead.

The approach does not test potential mode shifts to nonmotorized and transit modes as a result of complete street elements (e.g., benches, lighting, improved buffers); traffic-calming strategies; transit station design elements, such as a bike station; employer-based strategies (e.g., bike lockers, showers); or improved transit amenities.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 23. Three columns of inputs are required: one for morning peak hours, one for evening peak hours and one for off-peak hours. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 24.

Table 23. Bike/Pedestrian and Transit Project User-Defined Inputs

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year of the year drop-down list
Area Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type of the project from area type drop-down list Select from Urban very high density, Urban high density, Urban medium density, Urban low density, Suburban, Exurban and Rural.
Parallel Facility Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the facility type of the facility-type drop-down list
Number of Lanes of Parallel Facility (both directions)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of lanes of parallel facility
Posted Speed on parallel arterial (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the speed limit in miles per hour on the parallel arterial This speed is used to calculate free-flow travel time.
AADT on the parallel arterial (both directions) (vehicles/day)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter average weekday passenger vehicle traffic on nearest parallel facility. Enter the sum of volumes in both directions for the entire day
Hourly volume (vehicles/hpur)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the hourly volume in both directions of the parallel arterial in vehicles/hour Single lane values can be looked up at the top of the "Parameters&Source" tab (based on area type and facility type) and multiplied by the number of lanes in both directions
Length of project (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter total length of the bike/pedestrian project.
Number of activity centers within ½ mile of project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select appropriate number of activity centers within the length of the project. Activity center examples include banks, churches, hospitals, park-and-ride, office parks, library, shopping, and schools.

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
College or University within 2 miles Range of Project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if any segment of project is within 2 miles of a university or college, select "No" otherwise
Does this Project Have a Bicycle Component?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if the project provides bicycle infrastructure; otherwise select "No."
Average Length of one-way Bicycle Trips (miles)	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter estimated average length of bicycle trips in the area; leave blank if a pedestrian project only. Default value (1.8 mi) is based on 2001 NHTS statistics, excluding purely recreational trips.
Does this Project Have a Pedestrian Component?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if the project provides pedestrian infrastructure; otherwise select "No."
Average Length of one-way Pedestrian Trips (miles)	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter estimated average length of pedestrian trips in the area; leave blank if bike project only. Default value (0.5 mi) is based on 2001 NHTS statistics, excluding purely recreational trips
Does this Project Provide Direct Access to Transit?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if any segment of project provides direct access to transit (station or bus stop). Otherwise select "No."
Average Length of Transit Trips (miles)	5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter estimated average length of transit trips in the area. Default value based on the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) 2009 Factbook,¹⁵ Table 7 (Bus = 3.9 mi; Commuter Rail = 24.3 mi; Heavy Rail = 4.7 mi; Average = 5.2 mi).
Transit Boardings in Project Transit Corridor		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the estimated transit boardings of each period

¹⁵ APTA (2009), *Public Transportation Factbook, 60th Edition*, American Public Transportation Association, accessed at http://www.apta.com/gap/policyresearch/Documents/APTA_2009_Fact_Book.pdf.

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Pedestrian/Bicycle Access to Fixed Guideway Transit?		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Select “Yes” if the segment provides direct access to fixed guideway transit. Otherwise select “No”.

Table 24. Bike/Pedestrian and Transit Project Constants

Constant	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Activity Center Credit near Project	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference the Destination Credits table in “Parameters&Source” Tab in the tool
Hours in Morning Peak Period	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Adjustment Factor for AADT	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference the ADT adjustment table in “Parameters&Source” Tab in the tool Source: CARB, 2008
Increase in Transit Trips due to Pedestrian/Bicycle Connections	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference increase in transit trip based on type of access table in “Parameters&Source” Tab in the tool Source: NHTS, 2001
Volume Density Function/BPR Curve Alpha	0.71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for multilane highways with free flow speed of 50 mph
Volume Density Function/BPR Curve Beta	2.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for multilane highways with free flow speed of 50 mph
Number of Weekdays per Year	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: assume delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

The bike project approach is consistent with *Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects*, a handbook prepared by the CARB in 2005. The CARB handbook describes how to evaluate Motor Vehicle Registration Fee Projects and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) projects, and is the basis for determining the amount of emissions reductions from bicycle facility projects.

The 2009 report *Methodologies for Evaluating Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Projects*, developed for the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), is the basis for determining emissions reductions resulting from auto trips replaced by pedestrian trips. The MAG document adapted the methodology for calculating the impact of pedestrian improvements from the 2005 CARB handbook.

The approaches for bike and pedestrian projects are consistent. Within the general CARB approach, two primary factors drive the calculation of reduced auto trips: 1) the number of activity centers adjacent to the project, and 2) the project location with respect to a nearby university or college.¹⁶

The number of activity centers within one-quarter mile of a pedestrian project and one-half mile of a bike project feed into a lookup table of factors generating percent auto trip reductions. The university/college location factor increases average trip lengths on the assumption that willingness to bike or walk, and the average distances for these trips are greater for college students.

Calculations for auto trips reduced as a result of increased bike and pedestrian trips generated by the project are listed below.

$$\text{Period auto trips reduced (bike)} = v * (A \frac{1}{2} \text{ mile} + C)$$

$$\text{Period auto trips reduced (walk)} = v * (A \frac{1}{4} \text{ mile} + C)$$

Where:

v = Period traffic on the adjacent or nearest parallel arterial

A = Adjustment factor for AADT; and

C = Activity center credit

¹⁶ Per CARB documentation, adjustment factors were derived from a limited set of bicycle commute mode split data for cities and university towns in the southern and western United States (Source: U.S. DOT (1992), *National Bicycling And Walking Study – Transportation Choices for a Changing America*). This data was then averaged and multiplied by 0.7 to estimate potential auto travel diverted to bikes. On average, about 70 percent of all person trips are taken by auto driving (Source: Caltrans (2002), *2000-2001 California Statewide Travel Survey*), and it is these trips that can be considered as possible auto trips reduced. Finally, this number was multiplied by 0.65 to estimate the growth in bicycle trips from construction of the bike facility. Sixty-five percent represent the average growth in bike trips from a new bike facility, as observed in before and after data for bike projects (Source: U.S. DOT (1994), *A Compendium of Available Bicycle and Pedestrian Trip Generation Data in the United States*). Benefits are scaled to reflect differences in project structure, length, traffic intensity, community size, and proximity of activity centers. The scale has been adapted from a method developed by Dave Burch of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

The additional transit access element within this project approach is addressed through a lookup table quantifying the increase in transit trips, based on type of access and area type (two percent for improved access to bus; four percent for improved access to fixed guideway).

The source for increases in transit trips is the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 95, *Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes, Chapter 17 – Transit- Oriented Development (TOD)*, which summarizes travel mode shifts of residents upon relocation into TODs. The TCRP report specifically references California results based upon a 2003 study by Lund, Cervero, and Willson.¹⁷ The shift to transit was larger for residents along the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) heavy-rail system (4.2 percent) than for TOD survey respondents statewide (1.8 percent). These results indicated a reasonable estimate for percent increases as a result of improved accessibility: two percent for bus trips and four percent for fixed guideway trips. Results from the *TCRP Report 95* sources are assumed to approximate responses in high-density areas. Increase percentages in suburban, mountain, and rural areas are based on VMT per capita relationships by population density from the 2001 NHTS (see Table 25 and Table 26).

Table 25. Increase in Transit Trips by Area Type and Transit Mode

Area Type	Bus	Fixed Guideway
Urban (Low density, Medium Density, High Density, Very High Density)	2.0%	4.0%
Exurban/Suburban	1.6%	3.2%
Rural	1.4%	2.8%

Table 26. VMT per Capita by Area Type

Area Type	Population Density People per Square Mile (ppsm)	Annual VMT Per Capita
Rural	0 – 499	11,818

¹⁷ H. Lund, R. Cervero, and R. Willson (2003), *Travel Characteristics of Transit-Oriented Development in California*, accessed at: <http://www.csupomona.edu/~rwillson/tod/Pictures/TOD2.pdf>.

Exurban/Suburban	500 -1,999	10,435
Urban low to medium density	2,000 – 3,999	9,678
Urban medium to high density	4,000 – 9,999	8,285
Urban very high density	10,000+	4,639

Source: NHTS, 2001.

The calculation for auto trips reduced by new transit trips is detailed below.

$$\text{Daily auto trips reduced}_{(transit)} = B_{(project\ corridor)} * I_{(area\ type\ \&\ mode)}$$

Where:

B = Daily transit boarding for all transit access points along bike/pedestrian project corridor; and

I = Percent increase in transit trips as presented in Table 25.

Auto trips reduced by bike, walk, and transit modes are translated into VMT based on average bike, walk, and transit trip lengths. The methodology uses default average trip lengths based on the NHTS and APTA 2009 Factbook data, but can be replaced with user-defined, local- specific data. The VMT reductions annualized (assumes a factor of 250 days, since commute benefits are assumed only to accrue during workdays) and summed together. The small increase in congested speed due to slightly lower volumes is calculated using the BPR equation as explained in the Managed Lanes section. Emission rates before and after the project are looked up based on the calculated speeds and multiplied by VMT before and after the project to calculate emissions. The emission reduction is calculated by subtracting the “after project” emissions from the “before project” emissions.

5.2 REGIONAL BIKE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

Project Types

This approach evaluates regionally significant bike and/or pedestrian infrastructure projects that are on a separated facility, not necessarily directly adjacent to a roadway. Potential emissions reductions result from the decrease in emissions associated with auto trips being replaced by bicycle and/or pedestrian trips. Projects can be evaluated singularly by mode or combined. The user specifies the average length of the bike and pedestrian trips on the corridor, and the number of activity centers along the corridor for each mode. If the project will only positively impact one mode (for example, a bicycle trail), then the user specifies inputs for that specific mode only. If the project implements both pedestrian and bike improvements (e.g., a multiuse path or trail), the user may input values for each mode.

Methodology Limitations

The approach does not test potential mode shifts to nonmotorized modes as a result of complete street elements (e.g., benches, lighting, improved buffers); traffic calming strategies; or employer-based support strategies (e.g., bike lockers, showers). If the predicted bike and pedestrian demand data are not available, use the method provided in strategy 5.1 instead.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 27. Three columns of inputs are required: one for morning peak hours, one for evening peak hours and one for off-peak hours. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 28.

Table 27. Regional Bike/Pedestrian Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year from the year drop down list

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Area type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the area type from the area-type drop-down list Select from Urban very high density, Urban high density, Urban medium density, Urban low density, Suburban, Exurban and Rural.
Parallel Facility Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the facility type from the facility type drop down list
Number of Lanes of Parallel Facility (both directions)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of lanes of parallel facility of both directions
Posted Speed on Parallel Arterial (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the speed limit in miles per hour on the parallel arterial This speed is used to calculate free-flow travel time.
AADT on Parallel Facility (both directions) (vehicles/year)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use results from travel demand model origin/destination data Alternatively, enter average weekday passenger vehicle traffic on parallel roadway with generally the same origin and destination
Hourly Volume of Parallel Facility (both directions) (vehicles/hour)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the hourly volume of all lanes in both directions of the parallel arterial in vehicles/hour Single lane values can be looked up at the top of the "Parameters&Source" tab (based on area type and facility type) and multiplied by the number of lanes in both directions
Length of Bike/Ped Project (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter total length of the bike/pedestrian project
Does this Project Have a Bicycle Component?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if the project provides bicycle infrastructure; otherwise select "No."
Average Length of Bicycle Trips (miles)	1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter estimated average length of bicycle trips in the area; leave blank if a pedestrian project only. Default value (1.8 mi) is based on 2001 NHTS statistics, excluding purely recreational trips.
Predicted Bicycle Demand for the Facility		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the estimated number of daily bicycle trips along the facility
Does this Project Have a Pedestrian Component?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select "Yes" if the project provides pedestrian infrastructure; otherwise select "No."

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Average Length of Pedestrian Trips (miles)	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter estimated average length of pedestrian trips in the area; leave blank if bike project only. Default value (0.5 mi) is based on 2001 NHTS statistics, excluding purely recreational trips
Predicted Total Daily Pedestrian Demand		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the estimated number of daily pedestrian trips along the facility
Commute Percentage (Bicycle and Pedestrian)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the commute percentage of the modes

Table 28. Regional Bike/Pedestrian Project Constants

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Hours in Morning Peak Period	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Hours in Evening Peak Period	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: 3 hours in morning peak period
Auto Occupancy	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: The average light duty vehicle occupancy is around 1.2.
Volume Density Function/BPR Curve Alpha	0.71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for multilane highways with free flow speed of 50 mph
Volume Density Function/BPR Curve Beta	2.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: NCHRP Report 716 Table 4.25 for multilane highways with free flow speed of 50 mph
Number of Weekdays per Year	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: assume delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

The bike project approach is consistent with *Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects*, a handbook prepared by the CARB in 2005. The CARB handbook describes how to evaluate Motor Vehicle Registration Fee Projects and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) projects, and is the basis for determining the amount of emissions reductions from bicycle facility projects.

The 2009 report Methodologies for Evaluating Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Projects, developed for the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), is the basis for determining emissions reductions resulting from auto trips replaced by pedestrian trips. The MAG document adapted the methodology for calculating the impact of pedestrian improvements from the 2005 CARB handbook.

The approaches for bike and pedestrian projects are consistent. Within the general CARB approach, two primary factors drive the calculation of reduced auto trips: 1) the number of activity centers adjacent to the project, and 2) the project location with respect to a nearby university or college.¹⁸

The number of activity centers within one-quarter mile of a pedestrian project and one-half mile of a bike project feed into a lookup table of factors generating percent auto trip reductions. The university/college location factor increases average trip lengths on the assumption that willingness to bike or walk, and the average distances for these trips are greater for college students.

Calculations for auto trips reduced as a result of increased bike and pedestrian trips generated by the project are listed below.

$$\text{Daily auto trips reduced (bike)} = vp_{bike}$$

$$\text{Daily auto trips reduced (walk)} = vp_{ped}$$

Where:

v = Period traffic on the adjacent or nearest parallel arterial; and

p_{bike} = Commute percentage of bicycle mode.

¹⁸ Per CARB documentation, adjustment factors were derived from a limited set of bicycle commute mode split data for cities and university towns in the southern and western United States (Source: U.S. DOT (1992), *National Bicycling and Walking Study – Transportation Choices for a Changing America*). This data was then averaged and multiplied by 0.7 to estimate potential auto travel diverted to bikes. On average, about 70 percent of all person trips are taken by auto driving (Source: Caltrans (2002), *2000-2001 California Statewide Travel Survey*), and it is these trips that can be considered as possible auto trips reduced. Finally, this number was multiplied by 0.65 to estimate the growth in bicycle trips from construction of the bike facility. Sixty-five percent represent the average growth in bike trips from a new bike facility, as observed in before and after data for bike projects (Source: U.S. DOT (1994), *A Compendium of Available Bicycle and Pedestrian Trip Generation Data in the United States*). Benefits are scaled to reflect differences in project structure, length, traffic intensity, community size, and proximity of activity centers. The scale has been adapted from a method developed by Dave Burch of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD).

P_{ped} = Commute percentage of pedestrian mode.

If the average daily vehicular traffic between the origin and destination is not known or does not accurately represent the vehicular path that would be taken if the project was not developed, then a predicted total daily bicycle and pedestrian demand for the facility must be known. This prediction may include commuting and noncommuting trips. From the *2012 National Survey of Bicyclist and Pedestrian Attitudes and Behaviors*, approximately 11 percent of bicycle trips and 8 percent of pedestrian trips are for commuting purposes. The inputted period demand is then multiplied by these percentages to predict the number of automobile trips reduced due to the regionally significant bicycle and pedestrian facility. Auto trips reduced by biking and walking modes are translated into VMT based on average bike and walk trip lengths and starts based on the trip numbers. Default average trip lengths based on the NHTS shown in Table 26 can be used or replaced with user-defined, local-specific data. The VMT and starts reductions annualized (assumes a factor of 250 days, since commute benefits are assumed only to accrue during workdays) and summed together. The small increase in congested speed due to slightly lower volumes is calculated using the BPR equation as explained in the 4.1 Managed Lanes section.

Running emission rates before and after the project are looked up based on the calculated speeds and multiplied by VMT before and after the project to calculate before and after running emissions. The running emission reduction is calculated by subtracting the "after project" emissions from the "before project" emissions. Start emission rates are looked up and multiplied by number of starts to calculate the start emission reductions. The annual start emission reduction and annual running emission reduction are summed to total annual emission reduction.

5.3 EMPLOYER BASED COMMUTE STRATEGIES

Project Types

This estimation methodology covers employer-based commuter trip reduction programs that entail providing financial incentives that can be used to encourage use of more efficient commute modes. These include parking cash out, travel allowance, transit benefits, and rideshare benefits. They are often provided as an alternative to subsidized employee parking.

Methodology Limitations

Commuter trip reductions are based on nationally observed data and need to be customized to Atlanta with local data.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

This method is one of the more input data intensive methods owing to the variability in trip reductions by area type, subsidies and other supporting data requirements like participation rates and mode shares. The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 29. Three columns of inputs are required: one for lower density work place, one for activity center and one for regional CBD. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 30.

Table 29. Employer-Based Commute Strategies Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year from the year drop-down list
Road Type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the road type from the road type drop-down list
Total Employment (Site or Areawide)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The total number of employees that would be eligible to participate in the financial incentive-based program
Percentage of Employees Working at Office/Nonoffice		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percent of the total employees that are office workers and nonoffice workers. The two percentages should sum to 100%

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Split of Total Employment by Area Type (low density suburb, activity center, regional CBD)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percent of total employees that are located in a low-density suburb, activity center, and regional CBD) The three percentages should sum to 100%. If the strategy is for a single site enter 100% for the area type corresponding to the site and enter 0% for the other two area types.
Average Roundtrip Commute Distance (miles)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average roundtrip commute distance between work area to home.
Average Roundtrip Commute Speed (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average roundtrip commute speed between work area to home.
Mode Shares (single-occupant vehicle, transit, rideshare)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each area type (each of three columns) enter the percent of employees that currently arrive by single-occupant vehicle, transit, and rideshare For each area type (each of three columns) the three percentages should sum to 100%
Base Employer Participation Rate (Office/Nonoffice)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each area type (each of three columns) and each worker type (office and nonoffice shown in two different rows) enter the percentage of office employees in that area type that have signed up to participate in the current program (making them eligible for the financial incentive if they take an alternative mode on a particular day)
Current Daily Transit/Rideshare Subsidy (in USD)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the current subsidy given to an employee for each day that they take an alternative mode
Scenario Employer Participation Rate (Office/Nonoffice)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For each area type (each of three columns) and each worker type (office and nonoffice shown in two different rows) enter the percentage of office employees in that area type that are expected to sign up to participate in the new program (making them eligible for the financial incentive if they take an alternative mode on a particular day)
New Daily Transit/Rideshare Subsidy (in USD)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the new subsidy that will be given to an employee for each day that they take an alternative mode

Table 30. Employer-Based Commute Strategies Project Constants

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Average Rideshare Occupancy	2.25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: assume average rideshare vehicle occupancy is around 2.25.
Number of Weekdays per Year	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: assume delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

This methodology can estimate commute trip reductions across an areawide or a site, given the total office and nonoffice employment by area type. It uses data on reduction in commute trips that can be expected from various combinations of parking charges and financial benefits for alternative modes from the Victoria Transport Policy Institute.¹⁹ The financial subsidies provided as input to the strategy are used to look up single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trip reduction percentages by area type. Different trip reduction rates for the base and new scenario are calculated based on the different financial subsidies. The Daily SOV VMT is estimated for each area type by multiplying the number of employees by area type by the SOV mode share for the area type and the average roundtrip commute length. The percent SOV trip reductions for the base and new scenario are multiplied by the weighted average participation rate (office and nonoffice) since the trip reductions are only possible for employees that have signed up for the program. These trip reductions are then multiplied by the average SOV VMT to estimate the SOV VMT reduction for the base and new scenario. The total incremental VMT reduction is calculated as the VMT reduction for all area types under the new scenario minus the VMT reduction for all area types under the base. General light duty emission rates are multiplied by the total incremental VMT reduction to estimate the emissions reduction.

¹⁹ <http://www.vtppi.org/tdm/tdm41.htm>

6.0 CLEAN FUEL AND TECHNOLOGY

6.1 RETROFITS

Project Types

This strategy estimates Particulate Matter (PM) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) emission reductions due to installation of one of two or both diesel retrofit devices in trucks or buses: Diesel Oxidation Catalysts (DOC) or Diesel Particulate Filters (DPFs)

Diesel oxidation catalysts (DOCs) are exhaust after-treatment devices that reduce emission from diesel engines. Typically packaged with the engine muffler, DOCs are widely used as a retrofit technology because they require little or no maintenance. DOCs consist of a flow-through honeycomb structure that is coated with a precious metal catalyst and surrounded by a stainless steel housing. As hot diesel exhaust flows through the honeycomb (or substrate), the precious metal coating causes a catalytic reaction that breaks down the pollutants. DOC can be enhanced with closed crankcase ventilation to provide more reductions to PM and HC emissions.

Diesel particulate filters (DPFs) are exhaust after-treatment devices that significantly reduce emissions from diesel-fueled vehicles and equipment. DPFs typically use metallic filters to physically trap particulate matter (PM) and remove it from the exhaust stream. After it is trapped by the DPF, collected PM is reduced to ash during filter regeneration, which occurs when the filter element reaches the temperature required for combustion of the PM. DPFs work best on engines built after 1995. They are typically effective at reducing emissions of PM by 85 to 90 percent or more²⁰. DPFs can also be enhanced with exhaust gas recirculation or selective catalytic reduction to provide more reductions to PM and HC emissions. DPFs generally cost between \$5,000 to \$15,000 or more, including installation, depending on engine size, filter technology and installation requirements.

²⁰ Diesel Emission Quantifier, EPA, Accessed at <https://cfpub.epa.gov/quantifier/index.cfm?action=main.home>

Methodology Limitations

Percent reductions in emission rates provided by EPA as a range of reductions since results can vary depending on the manufacturer, technology and application of the retrofit device. The midpoint of these ranges is used in the calculator; therefore actual results could be higher or lower than predicted. The range varies from 10 percent to 30 percent depending on pollutant and retrofit technology.

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 31. The estimation method assumes that this strategy is implemented on a select number of vehicles in a fleet, either operated by a single entity or limited by number. Since DPFs work best for engines built after the year 1995, only these newer trucks and buses should be entered when selecting the DPF technology. Two columns of inputs are required: one for the trucks and one for the buses. The project-specific constants are presented in Table 32.

Table 31. Clean Fuel and Technology Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Scenario Year		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the scenario year of the project from the year drop-down list
Retrofit Technology		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select retrofit technologies from the dropdown list.
Number of Vehicles Proposed to be Retrofitted (built after 1995 if using DPF)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If using DOC retrofit technology enter the number of trucks from any model year that the DOC retrofit will be installed on. If using the DPF retrofit technology enter the number of trucks built after 1995 that the DPF retrofit will be installed on (DPFs have minimal impact on engines built in 1995 or earlier; therefore, another retrofit technology should be considered for these older vehicles)
Annual Average Miles Traveled (miles)	26,609 for truck; 37,009 for bus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the average annual miles driven for each vehicle in the fleet that will be retrofitted. Default value obtained from FHWA Highway Statistics VMT tables.

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Annual Average Speed (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the annual average travel speed of each vehicle in the fleet that will be retrofitted.

Table 32. Clean Fuel and Technology Project Constants

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Typical Diesel Oxidation Catalysts (DOC) PM Reductions	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) PM Reductions	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Diesel Oxidation Catalyst + Closed Crankcase Ventilation PM Reductions	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Diesel Oxidation Catalyst + Diesel Particulate Filter PM Reductions	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Exhaust Gas Recirculation + Diesel Particulate Filter PM Reductions	85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Selective Catalytic Reduction + Diesel Particulate Filter PM Reductions	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Diesel Oxidation Catalysts (DOC) HC Reductions	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) HC Reductions	85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Diesel Oxidation Catalyst + Closed Crankcase Ventilation HC Reductions	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Typical Diesel Oxidation Catalyst + Diesel Particulate Filter HC Reductions	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Exhaust Gas Recirculation + Diesel Particulate Filter HC Reductions	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Typical Selective Catalytic Reduction + Diesel Particulate Filter HC Reductions	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference: United States Environmental Protection Agency Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ)
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

The method first multiplies annual VMT/truck by the number of trucks in the fleet and annual VMT/bus by the number of buses in the fleet to calculate annual VMT for the truck fleet and bus fleet respectively. The total emissions for PM and VOC without retrofit are calculated by multiplying the MOVES emission rates by the VMT for both trucks and buses and then summing the result together. The total emissions for PM and VOC with retrofit are calculated by multiplying the emission without retrofit by an appropriate percent reduction factor depending on retrofit technology. The reduction factors are obtained from the EPA’s Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ).²¹ The annual/daily emissions reduced are the without-retrofit annual/daily emissions minus the with-retrofit annual/daily emissions.

²¹Environmental Protection Agency, Diesel Emissions Quantifier, Accessed at: <https://cfpub.epa.gov/quantifier/index.cfm?action=main.home>

6.2 ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES

Project Types

This strategy estimates emission reductions due to purchasing new alternative fuel/advanced technology vehicles to replace a fleet of traditional gasoline or diesel vehicles.

Methodology Limitations

Emission rates included in the calculator for alternative fuel/advanced technology vehicles are compiled from a variety of different sources to cover 24 vehicle/fuel types. Therefore, there may be a lack of consistency on the method for computing the emission rates since there was not a single source that covered all 24 vehicle/fuel types. Also, most of the sources refer to an average on-road fleet during a particular calendar year, but some sources refer to a specific model year²² (assuming that the newest model year vehicle would be purchased in a particular calendar year).

User-Defined Inputs and Constants

The methodology requires the set of project-specific, user-defined inputs presented in Table 33.

Table 33. Alternative Fuel Vehicles Project User-Defined Inputs

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Average Model Year of Alternative Vehicle		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the model year from the year drop down list
Type of Alternative Vehicle		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the proposed vehicle type/fuel type from the list of 24 vehicles/fuels
Average Model Year of Existing Vehicle		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the model year of existing vehicle The existing vehicles should be much older than the alternative vehicle. The tool support the model year of existing vehicle as early as 1990.
Type of Existing Vehicle		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select the existing vehicle type/fuel type from the list of 24 vehicles/fuels

²² The July 2014 version of the calculator uses model year specific emission rates.

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Input Guidance
Number of Vehicles to be Replaced		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the number of vehicles in the fleet that will be replaced
Annual Miles Traveled per Vehicle (vehicle miles traveled)	37,009 for buses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the fleet average annual miles traveled per vehicle Default value for buses obtained from FTA report MOVES defaults by vehicle type could be used as a default for other vehicles if no project specific information is available
Annual Average Speed (mph)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter the annual average travel speed for the target vehicles.

Table 34. Alternative Fuel Vehicles Project Constants

User-Defined Input	Default Values	Constant Guidance
Number of Weekdays per Year (days/year)	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: delay reduction benefits on holidays and weekends are marginal

Methodology

1990 to 2050 emission rates for the 24 vehicle/fuel types are found in the “Transit-AltFuelER” tab in the calculator. Sources for these rates are also documented on this tab. Some of the sources used include MOVES, a TCRP report²³, and the U.S. Department of Energy Alternative Fuels Data Center.²⁴

The calculator looks up emission rates as early as 1990 for the existing vehicles and 2020 to 2050 for the proposed vehicles using the input years. The average annual miles traveled per vehicle is multiplied by the number of vehicles to calculate the annual fleet VMT. This VMT is multiplied by the emission rates to calculate emissions for the existing fleet and proposed fleet. The annual/daily emission reductions are equal to the

²³ TCRP H-41 Appendix B and C, Accessed at: <http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/167136.aspx>.

²⁴ U.S. Department of Energy Alternative Fuels Data Center, Accessed at: https://afdc.energy.gov/vehicles/natural_gas_emissions.html

annual/daily emission from the existing fleet minus the annual/daily emissions from the proposed fleet.