

**PARK & RIDE OPERATION:
FACTORS AFFECTING TO THE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE**

A PROJECT REPORT

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF
THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ENGINEERING IN TRANSPORTATION

**SUBMITTED TO
UNIVERSITY OF MORATUWA, SRI LANKA**

SUBMITTED BY
Gayan Liyanagunawardena (118876F)

SUPERVISED BY
Prof: J.M.S.J Bandara,

**FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY OF MORATUWA**

September 2015

DECLARATION

“I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature of the candidate: Date:

The above candidate has carried out research for the Master’s thesis under my supervision.

Signature of the supervisor: Date:

Abstract

Colombo, the Capital of Sri Lanka, being the hub of commercial activities with the Port and other key business establishments, the vehicle fleet entering the city has increased steadily over the past decade. As a result the traffic congestion in Colombo has increased now to a higher level that is too intense within the city limits causing uneasy in travelling and inconvenience to road users. Further it was revealed that new registrations of the motor vehicles have been on the significant rise during the recent past and many of them added to the Colombo traffic fleet. On the other hand traveling speed has reduced during peak hours and thus travelers wasting time on the roads, burning more fuel, as the number of vehicles on the roads keep increasing.

Park and Ride is a concept used in developed countries in which the car travelers who enter the city center (or congestion area) park the cars in the designated peripheral zone and then reach the destination by using public transport. This model believed to be helpful to reduce the car traffic flow into the city center, relieve the traffic density and perfect the urban traffic structure.

“City Liner” was the first Park and Ride operation in Sri Lankan context implemented in 2009. It was proved to be unsuccessful due to various reasons. The operation was then reviewed and shortcomings were analyzed through a series of research and development and the idea had emerged with Park and Ride operation integrated with a Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) system for Colombo city.

The aim of this research paper is to analyze the major causes that contribute to a sustainable Park and Ride operation with integrated Mass Rapid Transit for the Colombo metropolitan region. In order to analyze the relationship between the public perceptive factors and the Park and Ride behavior intent, it is necessary to understand the perception levels of the related influencing factors of travelers through surveys. The study consists with distribution of a questionnaire to travelers and the feed-back from them, who travel to the Colombo city at least once a week. The survey was conducted both online and manual basis.

The Park & Ride system will operate along with a MRT concept but that would not solely address the car commuters. Hence over the phone interviews and questionnaires were focused on all categories of commuters who travel to Colombo. In addition the questionnaire focused on user preferences, drawbacks issues of existing system and expectations of proposed system.

In the analysis stage, acceptability of Park and Ride Scheme and expectations on improvements and characteristics were studied through frequencies, percentages, and other basic statistical methods to outline a generalized profile of daily travelers to Colombo city based on daily travelers personal travel behaviour. Meanwhile Chi-square tests were also performed to obtain a deeper understanding of peoples’ personal background, Traveling behaviour and Park and Ride acceptability. However, if the assumption of Chi-squared test was found not to be satisfied the Fisher’s exact test was used.

According to the survey results, for all modes of transport, daily travelers were highly concerned about the travel time to Colombo city. Meanwhile public vehicle users were unhappy with the safety, comfort and reliability of their service whilst private vehicle users were struggling to find suitable parking slots in the City. Daily traveler’s income level, vehicle ownership, age, and education level play a vital role to the acceptability of new Park and Ride Scheme. But present transport conditions (mode of transport, travel time, travel distance and entering time to Colombo city) do not affect much to the user perception for the Park & Ride. New scheme must be designed to cater these major factors.

As per the survey results, it is evident that the daily travelers are expecting high assurance of passenger safety, parking vehicle safety and reliability of service to accept new scheme. Further, it is revealed that they are much concerned about the cleanness, operating frequency and availability of cross-city transit but not the seating facilities, terminals/parking sites facilities, cost of service and disable access.

Findings of this research about the user’s perceptions can be helpful to design a successful and sustainable Park and Ride scheme to the suburb of Colombo city.

Key word: Park and Ride, passenger perception, Chi-squared test, Fisher’s exact test.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Prof. J.M.S.J. Bandara, Professor, Transportation Engineering Division, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for his generous guidance, continuous encouragement and supervision throughout the course of present work.

I express my sincere gratitude to Dr W.K. Mampearachchi, Course Coordinator, Senior Lecturer, Highway Engineering Division, Dept. of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for his stimulating guidance, continuous encouragement and supervision throughout the course of present work.

I am extremely thankful to Dr.H.R.Psindu and Mr. Loshaka Perera, Senior Lecturers, Transportation Engineering Division, Dept. of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, and all the staff of University of Moratuwa, Transportation Engineering divisions.

My special thanks to the passengers who helped me to filling the questionnaires.

Last but certainly not least, I would like to thank to my family members to their help to successfully complete my research.

Gayan Liyanagunawardena (118876F)

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Problem Identification	4
1.3	Research Objective	4
1.4	Limitation of the research.....	5
1.5	Structure of the Study	5
2	Literature Review	6
2.1	What is Park & Ride.....	6
2.2	The History and Development of Park & Ride Scheme	8
2.3	Pros and Cons of Park and Ride operation	10
2.3.1	Pros:	10
2.3.2	Cons:	10
2.4	Success and Failures with Park and Rides.....	11
2.5	Types of Park and Rides	11
2.6	What are the effects of Park & Ride.....	12
2.7	Generalized Transport Cost & Park & Ride	13
3	Methodology.....	17
3.1	Overview of the Methodology.....	17
3.2	Conceptualization of the study	17
3.3	Design of the Questionnaire	18
3.3.1	Details about user background.....	18
3.3.2	Identification of user travel behavior.....	19
3.3.3	Identification of issues of present travelling mode from the users' perspective	20
3.3.4	Identification of drivers for people's acceptability and non-acceptability of Park & Ride	22
3.3.5	Degrees of people's sensitivities to different impact features due to new scheme.....	24
3.4	Implication of the Survey	24
3.5	Data Analysis method.....	25
3.5.1	Chi-Square Test	25
3.5.2	Fisher's exact test	25
3.6	Conclusion of the Methodology	26
4	Data Analysis.....	27
4.1	Descriptive and frequency statistics	27
4.1.1	Data Characteristics	27
4.1.2	Analysis of basic trip related data.....	28

4.1.3	Analysis of level of service of the present transport mode	30
4.1.4	Analysis of Present mode of transport.....	33
4.1.5	Analysis of level of Income	34
4.1.6	Analysis of level of Education.....	38
4.1.7	Analysis of age group	41
4.1.8	Analysis of travel distance and travel time	45
4.1.9	Analysis of Travel Time to Colombo city	46
4.1.10	Analysis of entering time to Colombo city	47
4.1.11	Analysis of return trip.....	49
4.2	User perception.....	53
4.2.1	Analysis based on present mode of transport	53
4.2.2	Analysis of improvement due to proposed P&R system	61
4.2.3	Analysis of impact to traffic due to proposed P&R system.....	63
5	Conclusion and Recommendation	66
5.1	Summery.....	66
5.2	Recommendations	67
	References	68
	Appendices	I-XIII

List of Table

Table 0.1: Vehicle entering to the Colombo city per day (Approx.)	2
Table 0.2: Vehicle entering to the Colombo city on week day (Approx.)	3
Table 0.3: Vehicle entering to the Colombo city on week day (Approx.)	3
Table 0.4: Mass Transport Systems proposed for the Colombo by CoMTrans	4
Table 2.1: Overview components of the GTC	15
Table 3.1: Questions and options related to traveler's profile	18
Table 3.2: Questions and options related to user's travel behavior	19
Table 3.3: User satisfaction levels of their present transport mode	20
Table 3.4: Private transport user choices generalization	21
Table 3.5: Public transport user choices generalization	21
Table 3.6: Level of importance of influences to use Park and Ride Scheme	22
Table 3.7: Why Private vehicle users not accepting Park & Ride scheme	23
Table 3.8: Why Public transport users not accepting Park & Ride scheme	23
Table 3.9: user rating about the impact due to new scheme	24
Table 4.1: Respondents Modal Share	27
Table 4.2: Trip related data	28
Table 4.3: Respondent's satisfaction about the present transport modes	32
Table 4.4: Mode of Transport Vs P&R acceptability	33
Table 4.5: Income level Vs present transport modal share	34
Table 4.6: Income level Vs Vehicle ownership & P&R acceptance	35
Table 4.7: Level of Education Vs Present modal share	38
Table 4.8: Level of Education Vs Vehicle ownership & P&R acceptance	39
Table 4.9: Age Vs Present transport modal share	41
Table 4.10: Age Vs Vehicle ownership & P&R acceptance	42
Table 4.11: Travel distance Vs P&R acceptance	45
Table 4.12: Travel time Vs P&R acceptance	46
Table 4.13: Entering time Vs P&R acceptance	47
Table 4.14: Return mode of transport Vs P&R acceptance	49
Table 4.15: Travel time Vs P&R acceptance	50
Table 4.16: Attributes of present mode of transport	53
Table 4.17: Private vehicle user preferences	55
Table 4.18: Factors why Private vehicle user deny to us P&R	57
Table 4.19: Public transport user's preferences	58

Table 4.20: Factors why Public transport users deny P&R60
Table 4.21: User perception over the facilities proposed by the new P&R scheme61
Table 4.22: Daily travelers' (P&R accepted) expectations63
Table 4.23: Daily travelers' (P&R not accepted) expectations64

List of Figures

Fig 0.1 : Private vehicle ownerships per 10,000 populations	1
Fig 2.1: P&R facilities according to the kind of traffic they are supposed to intercept	7
Fig 2.2: Development pattern of urban parking policy	8
Fig 2.3: Generalized transport costs	14
Fig 4.1: Modal Share	28
Fig 4.2: Mode of Transport Vs Avg. Trip Length	29
Fig 4.3: Mode of Transport Vs Avg. Travel Time	29
Fig 4.4: Mode of Transport Vs Average Travel Speed	30
Fig 4.5: Mode of Transport Vs P&R acceptability	33
Fig 4.6: Income Vs Modal share	35
Fig 4.7: Income Vs P&R Acceptance	36
Fig 4.8: Income Vs Vehicle Ownership & P&R Acceptance	36
Fig 4.9: Level of Education Vs Modal Share	38
Fig 4.10: Level of Education Vs P&R Acceptance	39
Fig 4.11: Level of Education Vs Vehicle Ownership & P&R Acceptance	40
Fig 4.12: Age Vs Modal share	42
Fig 4.13: Age Vs P&R Acceptance	43
Fig 4.14: Age Vs Vehicle Ownership & P&R Acceptance	43
Fig 4.15: Travel distance Vs P&R Acceptance	45
Fig 4.16: Travel time Vs P&R Acceptance	46
Fig 4.17: Entering time Vs P&R Acceptance	48
Fig 4.18: Return mode is same Vs P&R Acceptance	49
Fig 4.19: Return mode isn't same Vs P&R Acceptance	49
Fig 4.20: Inward Time < Outward Time	51
Fig 4.21: Inward Time = Outward Time	51
Fig 4.22: Inward Time > Outward Time	52
Fig 4.23: Private Transport user (Why do they like to use private vehicles)	56
Fig 4.24: Private Transport user (Why do not like to use P&R?)	57
Fig 4.25: Private Transport user (Why do they use public transport?)	59
Fig 4.26: Public Transport user (Why do they not willing to use P&R?)	60
Fig 4.27: Facilities expecting from new Scheme Vs User perception	62
Fig 4.28: Daily travelers who accepted P&R scheme are believed that....	64
Fig 4.29: Daily travelers who deny P&R scheme are believed that....	65