## Defining

Exploratory EMA is a systematic approach to Modeling perform sensitivity analysis using and models when many of the model
Analysis inputs cannot be asserted with (EMA) confidence, so that a wide range of different input assumptions can be tested simultaneously, looking for patterns in the results to guide robust decision-making (RDM)

## What is typically allowed to vary in long-term travel demand forecasts?

| Yes | No |
| :--- | :--- |
| Spatial allocation of |  |
| households and employment | Total regional population, <br> employment, demographics |
| Transportation infrastructure, <br> services, and pricing | Basic types of modes available <br> (especially for auto) |
| Travel demand management | Model relationships and <br> parameters |

## What is typically allowed to vary in long term travel demand forecasts?

| Yes | No |
| :--- | :--- |
| Spatial allocation of <br> households and employment | Total regional population, <br> employment, demographics |
| Transportation infrastructure, <br> services, and pricing | Basic types of modes available <br> (especially for auto) |
| Travel demand management | Model relationships and <br> parameters |
|  |  |

Sometimes socio-demographic growth scenarios allow these to vary, but....

## What is typically allowed to vary in long-term travel demand forecasts?

| Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: |
| Spatial allocation of households and employment | Total regional population, employment, demographics |
| Transportation infrastructure, services, and pricing | Basic types of modes available (especially for auto) |
| Travel demand management | Model relationships and parameters |

## Approaches that Allow for Uncertainty

- Scenario-based planning
- Quantitative risk analysis
- Exploratory modeling and analysis / Robust decisionmaking


## Exploratory Modeling \& Analysis / Robust Decision-Making

Lempert, R.J., S.W. Popper and S.C. Bankes (2003). "Shaping the Next One Hundred Years: New Methods for Quantitative, Long-Term Policy Analysis". RAND Corporation

- Define the scope of the system to be analyzed.
- Define the key system relationships and sources of uncertainty.
- Define a method for modeling the system (interactions and inputs).
- Define a method for simultaneously varying the input assumptions to cover a wide range of future scenarios along the defined dimensions of uncertainty.
- Define the method for investigating and communicating the results of applying the model(s) across the wide range of scenarios.


## CV/AV Example

## Define the scope of the system to be analyzed.

- The transportation supply and demand in an urban metropolitan region over a 25-30 year time horizon. (The same as for an MPO long-range plan.)


## CV/AV Example: Key Variables \& Assumptions

## CV/AV Variables Network Side:

- Dedicated lanes for CV/AV
- Following distance / platooning
- Vehicle operating speeds
- Traffic control systems
- Parking supply and location
- Operating characteristics of paid ride-share/vehicle-share services
- Priority for empty vehicle-trips on the network.
- Frequency/severity of accidents

CV/AV Variables Demand Side:

- Private CV/AV ownership
- Use of paid ride-share/vehicleshare services
- Disutility of in-vehicle time
- Changes in parking behavior
- Changes in intra-household vehicle sharing and coordination
- Generation of empty vehicle-trips
- Latent demand for car travel in currently congested areas
- Supply and service levels for transit
- Location/density of housing and employment


## CV/AV Example: <br> Define a Method for Modeling the System



- Adapted existing models for the Jacksonville, Florida region:
- DaySim activity-based travel demand simulation
- TransModeler dynamic traffic simulation
- Feedback between the simulation models
- Assumptions
- Detailed simulation models will facilitate a realistic representation of new aspects of AV/CV demand and supply for exploratory analysis
- Relevant findings from these detailed models can be adapted for use with simpler (trip-based and static) models.


# CV/AV Example: method for varying the input assumptions Experimental design for 16 scenario runs 

| Scenario | Private AV Adoption | Shared AV Adoption | Reserved AV Capacity | Automation Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BB-NO | None | None | None | None |
| MM-L3 | Medium | Medium | Interstate left lanes | Level 3 |
| MM-AC | Medium | Medium | None | Level 3 + ACC |
| MM-LC | Medium | Medium | Interstate left lanes | Level $3+$ ACC |
| MM-IC | Medium | Medium | Interstate all lanes (only inside the I 295 ring road) | Level 3 + ACC |
| LH-L3 | Low | High | Interstate left lanes | Level 3 |
| LH-AC | Low | High | None | Level $3+$ ACC |
| LH-LC | Low | High | Interstate left lanes | Level $3+$ ACC |
| LH-IC | Low | High | Interstate all lanes (only inside the I 295 ring road) | Level 3 + ACC |
| HL-L3 | High | Low | Interstate left lanes | Level 3 |
| HL-AC | High | Low | None | Level $3+$ ACC |
| HL-LC | High | Low | Interstate left lanes | Level $3+$ ACC |
| HL-IC | High | Low | Interstate all lanes (only inside the I 295 ring road) | Level $3+$ ACC |
| HH-L3 | High | High | Interstate left lanes | Level 3 |
| HH-AC | High | High | None | Level $3+$ ACC |
| HH-LC | High | High | Interstate left lanes | Level $3+$ ACC |
| HH-IC | High | High | Interstate all lanes (only inside the I 295 ring road) | Level 3 + ACC |

## CV/AV Example:

Define the method for investigating and communicating the results of applying the models across the wide range of scenarios.

## Network Side:

- Speeds, delays and effective capacities for CV/AV by class:
- Conventional vehicles
- Occupied CV / AV
- Empty CV / AV
- Network maps and/or animations, by time of day
- Comparative graphics for key links under different types of scenarios


## Demand Side:

- Vehicle ownership levels, triplevel mode shares, average trip distances, VMT and PMT for:
- Conventional vehicles
- Private CV / AV
- Shared CV / AV
- Comparative graphics for different market segments under different types of scenarios
- Regression of outputs on inputs


## Visualizations of back of I- 295 Northbound queue in



## DTA Vehicle-Hours of Delay, by scenario



## CV/AV Example:

Define the method for investigating and communicating the results of applying the models across the wide range of scenarios.

## Network Side:

- Speeds, delays and effective capacities for CV/AV by class:
- Conventional vehicles
- Occupied CV / AV
- Empty CV / AV
- Network maps and/or animations, by time of day
- Comparative graphics for key links under different types of scenarios


## Demand Side:

- Vehicle ownership levels, triplevel mode shares, average trip distances, VMT and PMT for:
- Conventional vehicles
- Private CV / AV
- Shared CV / AV
- Comparative graphics for different market segments under different types of scenarios
- Regression of outputs on inputs


## AM VMT, by vehicle type and scenario



## Regression model on ABM output: total VMT (millions), by scenario / time period / vehicle type

| Vehicle Type | Non-AV | Non-AV | Private AV | Private AV | Shared AV | Shared AV | All types | All types |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variables | Coeff. | T-stat | Coeff. | T-stat | Coeff. | T-stat | Coeff. | T-stat |
| Constant | 0.262 | 11.1 | 0.443 |  | 0.226 | 12.9 | 0.931 | 117.6 |
| Demand - High Private, Low Shared | -0.174 | -9.8 | 0.346 | 11.0 | -0.103 | -7.8 | 0.068 | 11.4 |
| Demand - Low Private, High Shared | 0.116 | 6.5 | -0.281 | -8.9 | 0.108 | 8.1 | -0.057 | -9.6 |
| Demand - High Private, High Shared | -0.190 | -10.6 | 0.083 | 2.6 | 0.113 | 8.5 | 0.006 | 1.1 |
| Supply - Network scenario AC | 0.000 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
| Supply - Network scenario IC | -0.002 | -0.1 | -0.002 | -0.1 | 0.000 | 0.0 | -0.004 | -0.7 |
| Supply - Network scenario LC | 0.000 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.1 |
| Arrive Period - 5:00 to 5:29 | -0.182 | -7.2 | -0.434 | -9.7 | -0.237 | -12.7 | -0.853 | -100.7 |
| Arrive Period - 5:30 to 5:59 | -0.177 | -7.0 | -0.422 | -9.5 | -0.231 | -12.3 | -0.830 | -98.1 |
| Arrive Period - 6:00 to 6:29 | -0.051 | -2.0 | -0.109 | -2.5 | -0.075 | -4.0 | -0.235 | -27.8 |
| Arrive Period - 6:30 to 6:59 | -0.057 | -2.3 | -0.125 | -2.8 | -0.081 | -4.3 | -0.263 | -31.1 |
| Arrive Period - 7:00 to 7:29 | 0.035 | 1.4 | 0.107 | 2.4 | 0.051 | 2.7 | 0.192 | 22.7 |
| Arrive Period - 7:30 to 7:59 | 0.008 | 0.3 | 0.042 | 0.9 | 0.026 | 1.4 | 0.076 | 9.0 |
| Arrive Period - 8:30 to 8:59 | -0.017 | -0.7 | -0.048 | -1.1 | -0.018 | -1.0 | -0.083 | -9.8 |

How-To: Model Impacts of Connected and Autonomous/Automated Vehicles (CAVs) and RideHailing with an Activity-Based Model (ABM) and Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA)—An Experiment


Data
U.S. Department of Transportation

