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Connected, automated, and electric vehicles (CAEV) and Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS)

In the short term, many cities are testing low-speed automated electric shuttles as a shared on-demand mobility service in geo-fenced regions.

Transportation planners rely on travel demand simulation and models to understand the mobility and energy impacts.

Existing models lack the capabilities to model emerging mobility technologies such as on-demand shared mobility.

Automated Mobility District (AMD)

AMD simulation toolkit is desired
What is an Automated Mobility District?

An AMD is a campus-sized implementation of Connected and automated vehicle (CAV) technology to realize all the benefits of a fully electric automated mobility service within a confined region or district.
Real-World AMD Demonstrations
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How autonomous shuttles are changing city transportation
Automated Mobility Districts

**Characteristics**

- Fully automated and driverless cars
- Service constrained to an area with high trip demand
- Mix of on-demand and fixed-route services
- Multi-modal access within/at the perimeter

**Operational Challenges**

- Customer demand (adoption rate)
- Fleet size
- Operational configuration: Fixed route vs. on-demand
- Battery capacity
- Mobility/energy impacts
Current State of AMD Modeling

Where We Are

Existing tools primarily emphasize:

• The road network, with minimal to no consideration for pedestrian/bike/transit

• Privately owned vehicles, but do not model shared mobility

• Solutions not customized to guide early-stage deployments

Where We Want To Be

Need modeling tools that:

• Capture private as well as shared economies in vehicles

• Are built based on data from field deployments of emerging transportation technology

• Can quantify energy as well as mobility benefits
AMD Simulation Toolkit: Model Flow

Travel Demand
- Origin-destination data from regional travel demand model
- Local surveys or counts
- Induced travel demand
- Passenger travel behavior, adoption rates

SUMO (Mobility Analysis)
- SUMO — Simulator of Urban Mobility
- Carries out the network simulation of vehicles
- SUMO will output travel trajectories

FASTSim (Energy Analysis)
- FASTSim — Future Automotive Systems Technology Simulator
- FASTSim will output vehicle energy consumption

Mode Choice Modeling
- Initially tagged to be developed based on user surveys from Greenville
- Resorting to a model based on existing literature owing to lack of data from Greenville

Optimization Module
- Fleet size: How many electric shuttle units will be required?
- Routes: What are the optimal routes that minimize travel time and energy consumption?
- How do we find solutions that meet customers’ expected waiting time and overall trip duration?
AES: automated electric shuttle; GIS: geographic information system
• 2016 Toyota Camry is selected to represent gasoline shared and automated vehicles (SAV) and all regular cars
• Getthere’s GRT (group rapid transit) vehicles for shared and automated electric shuttles
Vehicle Ridesharing Service

1. **System Status Check**
   - Gathering information on current location and travel data of passengers as well as SAVs
2. **Ride Matching**
   - Matching passengers to available SAVs
3. **Vehicle Routing**
   - Calculating an SAV routing strategy
4. **Redistribution Strategy**
   - Relocating SAVs for incoming trip requests
Passenger Behavior States

States of passengers
0 - Initialization
1 - Arrive at pickup location and wait
2 - Get onboard
3 - Arrive at drop-off location and alight
4 - Arrive at destination and stop
Case Study: Greenville, South Carolina

- Location: Greenville, South Carolina
- Analysis period: morning peak hours (6 a.m. – 9 a.m.)
- The time-dependent demand distribution: Total 308 trips
- Four modes:
  - CAR: regular car
  - WAK: pedestrian
  - DTD: on-demand door-to-door ridesharing
  - FXR: on-demand fixed-route ridesharing
- AES configuration:
  - SAV Capacity: four passengers
  - Total 10 SAVs: six for FXR mode and four for DTD

Greenville, South Carolina, network has 554 nodes and 1,340 edges

Network in SUMO and two fixed routes

- In 2017, Greenville, SC won a Federal Highway Administration grant award to deploy automated taxis (A-Taxis) in three neighborhoods in the Greenville county.
- In phase 0, SAVs were envisioned to be deployed at the Clemson University International Center for Automotive Research (CU-ICAR) facility. In phase 1, SAV deployment was planned in the nearby Verdae District, which is a mixed-use urban development.
AMD Simulation Sample
Baseline
• Scenario 0: with CAR and WAK modes only

DTD mode only
• Scenarios 1 – 3: 10% increments shifting from CAR mode

FXR mode only
• Scenarios 4 – 6: 10% increments shifting from CAR mode

DTD and FXR modes
• Scenarios 7 – 9: 10% increments (5% of DTD, 5% of FXR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario ID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>WAK</th>
<th>DTD</th>
<th>FXR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDH</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>Vehicle deadheading miles traveled (distance traveled with no passenger on board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTT</td>
<td>seconds</td>
<td>Vehicle travel time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLR</td>
<td># of passengers per mile</td>
<td>Vehicle loading rate: distance weighted number of passengers onboard divided by the vehicle distance traveled for all SAVs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>gallons or kilowatt-hours</td>
<td>Vehicle energy consumption in fuel (gallons) or electricity (kilowatt-hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Passenger detour factor: trip distance of ridesharing modes divided by trip distance of regular car mode (time-dependent shortest path)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWT</td>
<td>seconds</td>
<td>Passenger waiting time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vehicle loading rate: distance weighted number of passengers on board divided by the vehicle distance traveled for all SAVs; DTD outperforms FXR.

Passenger detour factor: trip distance of ridesharing modes divided by trip distance of regular car mode (time-dependent shortest path).
Vehicle miles traveled (VMT): VMT increases as number of SAVs increases.
- When both modes are deployed, there are more SAVs operating in the system, leading to higher system-level VMT.

Vehicle energy consumption (VEC): In fuel (gallons) or electricity (kilowatt-hours); similar pattern as VMT
- Scenario 0 has VEC of 17.4 gallons for CAR mode only
- If all SAVs are electric vehicles, the fuel saving ranges from 11% to 38%.
Simulation Results

- The intent of this simulation tool is to help test a variety of deployment scenarios to see what works and what doesn’t before actual field deployment for SAVs.

- Network-level VMT, VTT, and VEC keep increasing as the SAV share goes up.

- DTD mode falls inferior to FXR mode in passenger detour factor (PDF) and passenger wait time (PWT).

- DTD outperforms FXR mode with lower VDH and higher VLR.

- Under same mode adoption ratios, deployment of both FXR and DTD modes leads to higher VMT, VTT, and VEC compared to deploying only one mode.
Next Steps

• Incorporation of additional “mobility on-demand” modes and mode choice model
  o Shared bikes, e-scooters, SAVs for first/last mile connections

• Integrating the toolkit into a regional travel demand model

• Utilizing the toolkit in the context of real-world AMD deployment
  o Collecting travel behavior and vehicle dynamics data from these deployments

• More sophisticated routing algorithms and an endogenous mode choice model
Thank you
Mode Choice Modeling

- Modes considered in Greenville AMD simulation
  1) Auto, 2) Walk, 3) AES, 4) Fixed Route
- General form of mode choice model
  \[ V_i = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \beta_j x_j \]
  Where
  \( i \in \{\text{Auto, Walk, AES, Fixed Route}\} \)
  \( \alpha \) is the constant value
  \( x_j \) is \( j^{\text{th}} \) mode choice attribute
  \( \beta_j \) is coeff. of attribute \( x_j \)
- Potential attributes of mode choice model
  - In-vehicle travel time (IVTT)
  - Out-of-vehicle travel time (OVTT)
  - Value of travel distance
  - Fixed cost (fare)
  - Other costs, e.g., parking cost
- Mode shift observed when value of IVTT changed
- More tests on other attributes in progress