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**1 INTRODUCTION (luka)**

Transportation network analysis is crucial to urban planners, researchers, and policy makers to ensure accessibility remains is a key feature of the urban landscape. This requires both a realistic and a scalable measure for accessibility, which can impact the planning and development of roads and city districts, while also helping analyze a population’s access to healthcare, schools, grocery stores, and other amenities. On a fundamental level, having proper accessibility measures allows urban resource distribution to be more equitable, optimal, and based on informed decisions.

Despite the importance of such measures, much of past accessibility research only considers a limited set of travel modes. These include driving, biking, and walking, but overlook the importance of public transit as a primary mode of travel. (Liu & Zhu, 2004) This may be for a few reasons such as a lack of standardized public transit data, or simply a lack of routing engines that can efficiently model complex journeys through transit networks.

Measuring transit accessibility is crucial and will be more than ever for a few major reasons. First, being in the midst of a Third Industrial Revolution, much focus will be diverted to urban and regional planning. (Roberts, 2015) Sharing economies and sustainability driven planning will undoubtedly increase our dependence on public transit and electric vehicles, although it is uncertain what fraction of society will own such technology within the next few decades. Instead, one might find access to electric vehicles through autonomous ridesharing systems, which will more than likely be useful for filling holes in current public transit networks (this *may require a reference*). Not to mention, car dependence generally has poor outcomes on physical health, psychological health, and the environment through traffic congestion, substantial loss of time, physical inactivity, and accidents. (Martin *et al.*, 2014; Royal Society for Public Health, 2016; Sallis *et al.*, 2004; EMBARQ, 2013) As more and more people lessen their reliance on full car ownership, (*reference*) the importance of developing and improving public transit systems becomes vital for supporting urban growth.

To better understand the scale of public transportation in Canada, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 31.4% of Canadians regularly used sustainable transportation, where public transit comprised almost 40% of those cases. When considering Canada’s largest three metropolitan areas, as much as 40.4% of the population used sustainable transportation, of which 55% was public transit. (Statistics Canada Census, 2016). To say the least, public transit will remain an imperative area for urban developers to focus on.

Secondly, we must recognize that certain population segments do not readily have access to private transportation. These populations will tend to be more vulnerable whether they be marginalized, elderly, or youth, and are likely to rely on public transit relative to other social segments (need a refence). Therefore, when considering society in its entirety, modeling transit accessibility becomes paramount in urban planning.

To address the lack of standardized methods for obtaining transit accessibility information, this project responds with a first iteration methodology for simple, scalable, and high performing network travel time computation, city block accessibility scoring, and finally visualization. A case study of Vancouver was performed measuring access to cultural amenities such as museums, libraries, art galleries, and theatres, to serve as an initial proof of concept.

**2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION**

**2.1 Literature Review**

**2.3 Research Questions**

**3 METHODOLOGY**

In this section, we detail how the research problem was approached computationally. We explain what data a scalable model would require, and how transit accessibility scores are computed and visualized from the data in an efficient manner.

**3.1 Data**

**3.2 Computing Travel Time Matrices (luka)**

To evaluate transit accessibility across an urban landscape, many-to-many point travel times need to be computed into a travel time matrix. This requires a street network (Open Street Maps), a transit network (GTFS), origin-destination coordinates, and a routing engine.

Popular open-source routing engines include Open Trip Planner 1 (OTP1), Open Trip Planner 2 (OTP2), Conveyal’s R5 (Rapid Realistic Routing on Real-world and Reimagined networks), and GraphHopper. OTP1 and OTP2 are generally focused on passenger facing journey planning. OTP1 has analysis functionality but performs slow relative to other engines, using a generalized cost A\* algorithm. OTP2 is better optimized with a Multi-criteria range-RAPTOR algorithm but does not support one-to-many point routing analysis. Most importantly however, OTP optimizes routing on generalized cost instead of on minimizing travel time. For example, OTP may opt for a single long bus ride over one with a few transfers that yields a shorter travel time. In reality, transit users typically aim to optimize time.

R5 supports and is optimized for time-window trip planning which better reflects how people use the transportation system. R5, being implemented in Java, was also intended for analysis applications being magnitudes faster and less memory intensive than engines that are similar to OTP1, particularly for one-to-many point routing and travel time matrix generation. (OTP website) As such, travel times were computed using the open source r5r library, an R implementation of Conveyal’s R5 routing engine, with multimodal transit networks built from the GTFS and OpenStreetMap data detailed in 3.1. (Pereira, 2021) The final travel time matrix was an aggregation of 36 trips, departing every hour from 7:00am to 7:00pm with a 30-minute departure window on a weekday, a Saturday, and a Sunday (12 x 3). This allowed us to average travel times across changing bus schedules throughout the week.

**3.3 Measuring Transit Accessibility (luka)**

*These rough notes are more like discussion in nature. For methods simply state what was done and nothing else. The usefulness of it all will be touched on later.*

*.*

* there are multiple ways to measure accessibility:
  + scoring (less interpretable than quantiles)
  + quantiles (less interpretable than isochrones)
  + isochrones (most interpretable)

1) only raw scoring requires some basic mathematical intuition. Since we want a final accessibility score to be between 0 and 1, with most accessible areas having scores close to 1, we can take the inverse of the specific travel time from the travel time matrix.

- Smallest travel times will have the greatest values. Normalization was then done to fit all scores to the 0-1 range.

- since we also want to account for the average uncertainty in transit time (standard deviation of the average trip time), we chose to add 2 standard deviations to the average trip. This effectively generates a best trip worst case scenario similar to real world situations where individuals may opt for the best possible trip, but often the actual trip length will be greater than what is expected.

- (insert equations and notation for this calculation)

2) quantiles prove advantageous if looking to uniformly spread accessibility scores. It’s more interpretable in a sense that we can directly see the accessibility percentile of a particular region, however many areas with similar scores will become spread across larger percentile ranges. (show example in discussion / map of raw scores vs map of percentiles)

3) isochrones involved simply grouping the nearest destination travel times for each block into a time group ranging from 15 minutes and under, to 90 minutes and over.

* Nearest 1, 2, 3, accessible destinations were considered in the scoring. All accessible destinations were also visualized but generally yields the best average accessibility across a city however it also provides less information about transit network isolated communities.

**3.4 Amenity Accessibility Weights**

**3.5 Visualization**

To summarize the dataset, the produced html files of the score sets, Kepler file and isochrone were summarized in a dashboard using r shiny. R shiny was preferred over other dashboards due to its sleekness and ease of use. The dashboard was inspired by an existing dashboard create by Washington Post's feature ‘Washington: A world apart’ (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/local/2013/11/09/washington-a-world-apart/>) and would comprise four tabs which allows users to switch between accessibility scores.

Originally the dashboard was created using Leaflet choropleth maps that were generated each time a new selection is selected. This however led to the rendering of the newly selected maps inefficient. To improve the efficiency of the dashboard the Leaflet choropleth maps were initial exported as html files before being displayed on the dashboard. The switch to the use of html files significantly improved the efficiency of the dashboard by over 10x. This however led to significant complications in the creation of the dashboard.

Due to the scores and properties of the census blocks being built into the html files, to switch between score sets the dashboard had to select a new html file by editing the file path. This also led to the removal of graphs summarize the data as no active interaction between the html files and the dashboard.

For each new parameter, a new html file had to be created. In total 32 html files were created for the score sets. To limit the number of parameters, only 4 parameters were used when filtering the score sets: ‘Amenity Type’, ‘Weight’, and the number of amenities ‘Nearest n Amenities’. Four htmls were required for the isochrones as they were based on the time to the nearest one amenity rather than a calculated score. The Kepler animation allowed for the inclusion of more parameters than the score sets as the html incorporates a filter requiring only a single html file. However, as the html file incorporates a multitude of maps, the size of the file would grow exponentially for each new parameter introduced. Due to a file size limit of 500 MB in Kepler and to improve performance of the dashboard the number of parameters was limited to the Amenity “Type”, “time”, and the “day” of the week.

The dashboard was originally published using Shinyapps.io cloud. Due to the file size limits the dashboard was published as open sourced on the r shiny server.

**4 RESULTS**
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