Leveraging GTFS to explore spatial patterns in transit supply with respect to social needs

James Reynolds[a,1], Yanda Qu[a,2], Graham Currie[a,3,*]

[a]*Public Transport Research Group (PTRG), Institute of Transport Studies, Department of Civil Engineering Engineering, Monash University, Clayton Campus, Melbourne, 3800, Victoria, Australia*

Abstract

This is the abstract.

It consists of two paragraphs.

Keywords: keyword1, keyword2

1. Introduction

Spatial distribution of transport disadvantage, gaps in transit supply and accessibility, and related issues have been addressed in much previous research[4]. Much of this literature persents methods for calculating transport need and transit supply, and then comparing the two across some geographic area. However, such methodologies rarely appear to have been used again, in further research, to study other cases or time periods. This may in part be because applying an existing methodology to another location or time period may not generate sufficient 'new' knowledge for publication, or be more practice that research. As well, describing a new methodology in a research paper might only require presentation of enough results to demonstrate the concepts, rather than widespread application to multiple geographic contexts and development of software tools to facilitate broader use.

An example is provided by the Currie et al. (2003) Currie (2004), Currie and Senbergs (2007), Currie (2010) studies on spatial gaps between the social need for transport and the supplied transit levels. This work presented a transit Supply Index (SI) and compared it to measures of social need for transport, but it is unclear whether the problems relating to social needs and transit supply identified this previous research in the almost two decades since the original analysis. Nor is it clear whether the identified spatial patterns of transit need, supply and gap in these cities are generalizable to other places as the Currie (2010) approach does not appear to have been widely used since those studies. This is perhaps in part because at the time it was first published the data needed to calculate the transit Supply Index (SI) for a particular location

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: `james.reynolds@monash.edu` (James Reynolds), `yanda.qu@monash.edu` (Yanda Qu), `graham.currie@monash.edu` (Graham Currie)

[1]Research Fellow

[2]PhD Student

[3]Professor

[4]See for example Ricciardi et al. (2015) Currie et al. (2003); Currie (2010); Fransen et al. (2015); Guzman et al. (2017a); Jaramillo et al. (2012); Preston and Rajé (2007a); Delbosc and Currie (2011c); Delbosc and Currie (2011b); Engels and Liu (2011); Pavkova et al. (2016); Delbosc and Currie (2011a); Murray and Davis (2001); Currie and Delbosc (2010); Currie et al. (2007); Currie and Senbergs (2007); Yigitcanlar et al. (2007); Wu and Hine (2003); Currie and Delbosc (2013); Preston and Rajé (2007b); Hurni (2005); Mamun and Lownes (2011); El-geneidy et al. (2016); Kaplan et al. (2014); Martens et al. (2012); Lucas et al. (2016); Liu and Engels (2012); Lucas (2012); Lei and Church (2010); Mavoa et al. (2012); Delmelle and Casas (2012); Foth et al. (2013); Welch (2013); Bell and Currie (2007); Jaramillob and Grindlayc (2011); Guzman et al. (2017a); Wee and Geurs (2011); Currie (2004); Engels and Liu (2011); Litman (2002); Parolin and Rostami (2017); Xia et al. (2016); Welch and Mishra (2013); Jang et al. (2017).

was not typically readily available. The Currie (2010) analysis of Melbourne was based on combining multiple operator databases and service frequency data that had been manually extracted from transit agency websites. Similar studies in Hobart, Perth and elsewhere in Australia (Currie et al., 2003, Currie (2004), Currie and Senbergs (2007), Currie (2010)) appear likely to have required bespoke data collection, cleaning and analysis efforts, given that different oppoerators used different scheduling software.

Nowadays, however, the General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) allows timetable data to be published in a standardized format, with more than 10,000 agencies releasing data this way (MobilityData, undated). Various tools for analysing GTFS data are now available, but there does not appear to have been many developed to allow the analysis of spatial gaps between the social need for transport and the amount of transit that is supplied.

While the previous literature provides a wealth of methodologies, the availability of tools that might be used by researchers, practitioners and advocates to use these approaches with GTFS data relativey easily appears to be limited.

These gaps provide the motivation for the research reported in this paper, in which a new R package (gtfssupplyindex) specifically developed to calculate SI scores is presented. The paper also reports results for Greater Melbourne in 2016 and 2021, matching the most recent censuses and allowing comparison to the 2006 result reported in Currie (2010).

Comparisons are also made to other parts of Australia, so as to explore whether findings about Greater Melbourne are generalizable.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: the next section outlines the background to this research, including the formulation of the Transit Supply Index (SI), and an explanation of the GTFS. Section 3 then describes the study methodology, followed by presentation of results in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the results and the limitations of this study, and outlines directions for future research. A brief conclusion is provided in Section 6.

2. Background

2.1. Transit metrics

Even a brief search reveals many metrics available for benchmarking transit services. Examples include those in: the extensive Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) Report 88 guidebook on developing performance-measurement systems, (Ryus et al., 2003); and those used across benchmarking databases and programs

(Florida Transit Information System, 2018; International Association of Public Transport (UITP), 2015; Imperial College London, undated); and The Fielding Triangle (Fielding, 1987) provides a framework for combining indicators of service inputs, outputs and consumption to describe cost efficiency, cost effectiveness and service effectiveness. More broadly: Litman (2003) and Litman (2016) discuss some of the traffic, mobility, accessibility, social equity, strategic planning and other rational decision-making-based perspectives underling transport indicators; Reynolds et al. (2017) extends these into models of how institutionalism, incrementalism and other public policy analysis concepts might apply to decision-making processes relating to transit prioritization; Guzman et al. (2017b), developed a measure of accessibility in the context of policy development and social equity for Latin American Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) networks; and Creutzig et al. (2020) introduced street space allocation metrics based around 10 ethical principles

However, many of these, and other, transit metrics may be difficult to calculate, and/or complex to explain or understand, especially for those who are not planners, engineers or other technical specialists. Where pre-calculated metrics are immediately available it may not be possible for practitioners, researchers or advocates to independently generate scores so as to test proposed system changes, or demonstrate impacts to politicans, the general public or others.

Contrasting examples are provided by the metrics in the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual (TCQSM) and the Transit Score metric, readily available on the Walk Score (2023) website, A Transit Score is available for locations with a published GTFS feed, eliminating the need for any calculations. The meaning of these Transit Scores also appears easy to explain, with the highest possible score of 100 representing what



Figure 1: GTFS entity relationship diagram. Source: adapted by author from Alamri et al (2023) and the GTFS Schedule Reference (16/11/2023 revision).

might be experienced in the center of New York. However, the Transit Score algorithm is unpublished, and effectively a black box. It does not appear that Transit Scores can be calculated independently or generated for proposed changes to networks. In contrast, the TCQSM provides a wide range of metrics for measuring different aspects of a transit system. The TCQSM scores themselves appear easy to understand or explain, ranging from A to F, although the number of metrics is very large and this might limit the practicality of using the TCQSM in practice for communicating with non-technical audiences. All of these can be calculated independently, given sufficient data, and Wong (2013) provides an example reporting various TCQSM metrics across 50 transit operators. This analysis by Wong (2013) is made possible by the availability of General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) datasets for each of the transit systems

The GTFS is an open, text-based format, developed originally to allow transit to be included in the Google Maps navigation platform (MobilityData, undated). Figure @ref(fig:GTFS_ERD) shows an Entity Relationship Diagram (ERD) of the GTFS data structure, indicatating how GTFS data is stored as a series of tables (agency, routes, trips etc.) with primary and foreign keys (agency_id, route_id, trip_id etc.) providing links. While there are many software tools for analyzing, visualizing or otherwise manipulating GTFS data, one to calculate Transit Supply Index (SI) scores is not yet available.

2.2. The Transit Suppy Index

A generalized form of the SI equation, adapted from Currie (2010), is:

$$SI_{area,time} = \sum \frac{Area_{Bn}}{Area_{area}} * SL_{n,time}$$

where:



Figure 2: Distribution of supply measure scores – Metropolitan Melbourne (2006), Source: Currie (2010)

- $SI_{area,time}$ is the Supply Index for the area of interest and a given period of time;
- $Area_{Bn}$ is the buffer area for each stop (n) within the area of interest (in Currie (2010) this was based on a radius of 400 metres for bus and tram stops, and 800 metres for railway stations);
- $Area_{area}$ is the area of the area of interest; and
- $SL_{n,time}$ is the number of transit arrivals for each stop for a given time period.

Figure 2 shows a map of SI scores across Greater Melbourne in 2006, which was included in Currie (2010). The general patterns appear to be higher levels of transit supply closer to the city's centre and along passenger railway lines, and outer areas with very low SI scores or no transit supply at all.

2.3. Social need and needs gap

Currie (2010) also assessed the social need for transit across Greater Melbourne using: the Australian Bureaus of Statistics' Index of Related Socio-Economic Advantage/Disadvantage (IRSAD); a transport needs index derived by Currie (2010) from eight weighted indicators; and a combination of the two.

Figures 3 and 4 reproduce a chart comparing transport needs and transit supply, and a map of areas with very high social needs but zero or very low transit supply.

The results indicated service gaps of concern, especially in outer parts of Melbourne where low density development patterns make provision of transit more challenging. Currie (2010) found that "(o)verall, 8.2%



Figure 3: Log supply score and need index values – Melbourne needs-gap study, Source: Currie (2010)

of Melbourne residents have 'very high' needs but 'zero', 'low' or 'very low' public transport supply.", and suggested that this approach was "substantially more useful than the presentation of anecdotal evidence, which is the most common means of identifying transport needs in local transport studies throughout the world."

However, it doesn't appear that this approach has been widely adopted in practice or academia. Our suspicion is that while the SI has a relatively simple formula and requires only geographic and timetable data, the lack of a software tool to perform these calculations may be part of the reason that it has not been more widely adopted and why formal needs-supply-gap analysis may still be uncommon.

It is also unclear whether the patterns in Melbourne, where areas with very high transport needs but zero or very low transit supply tend to be in outer areas serviced by buses, are similar to patterns in other cities. Nor is it clear whether the patterns in Melbourne itself have changed since the 2006 analysis.

Developing a software tool, and then using it to comparing current conditions and other locations to the findings of Currie (2010), therefore, is the primary aim of this paper.

3. Methodology

This study developed a R programming language (R Core Team, 2023) package of tools for calculating the SI from GTFS data Wickham and Bryan (2023) informed the package setup and development approach. Various existing packages were relied upon including: the sf package (Pebesma, 2023) for geospatial analysis; the tidyverse (Wickham et al., 2019); gtfstools (Herszenhut et al., 2022); and tidytransit (Poletti et al., 2023). Some code was adapted from examples, vignettes and other documentation in these and other packages.

Two cases were used during the code development and testing, such that results might be generated for real GTFS data: the Mornington Peninsula Tourist Railway GTFS feed; and the Public Transport Victoria (PTV) GTFS feed, both in Victoria, Australia. Both were selected primarily for convenience, given that the



Figure 4: Melbourne needs-gap – very high transport need areas with zero or very low public transport supply, Source: Currie (2010)



Figure 5: Areas of interest

authors are familiar with the typical service patterns and geography. Adopting the Mornington Peninsula Tourist Railway network, which consists of only three stations, also facilitated hand calculation of the SI as a cross-check of the results produced by the developed package.

Figure @ref(Melbourne_map)) shows the areas of interest relevant to the code development and testing, and selected railway stations. Statistical Area (SA) zones were adopted from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (Australian Bureau of Statistics, undated) as the areas of interest, and included SA3 zones[5] across the Greater Melbourne Greater Capital City statistical area (main); and SA1 zones[6] within 800 metres of the Mornington Penninsula railway (right).

3.1. Mornington Penninsula Tourist Railway

The Morning Peninsula Tourist Railway is in the outer south-east of Melbourne, running on Sundays and Wednesdays between Mornington and Moorooduc, with an intermediate stop at Tanti Park (see https://transitfeeds.com/p/mornington-railway/806/latest/stops). A GTFS feed from 2018 was selected for the purposes of tests and demonstrating the code and output. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data was also used, sources via the strayr and absmapsdata packages (Mackey et al., 2023). The Mornington Peninsular Statistical Area 3 (SA3) zone and the Statistical Area 1 (SA1) zones contained within it were adopted as the areas of interest.

3.2. Public Transport Victoria (PTV)

The Victorian GTFS feed, published by Public Transport Victoria (PTV) and with historical feeds sourced via Transit Mobility Data, (2023), was used for analysis of Victoria. SI scores were obtained for the weeks starting on the day of the census in 2016 and 2021, which were on Tuesday 9th and 10th of August respectively.

3.3. Social disadvantage measurement approach

This paper adopts the same approach to social disadvantage measurement as in Currie (2010).

Continue from here»»»

[5] These are generally similar to Local Government Area (LGA) boundaries.
[6] SA1 zones are the smallest geographical areas for which results are reported in the Australian census.



Figure 6: Entity Relationship Diagram (ERD) showing the data structure and functions related to the gtfssupplyindex package

4. Results

4.1. Code structure and functionality

Developed code is available and documented on github (Reynolds, 2024). The structure of the package, functions developed, and data tables are shown in Figure @ref(fig:SI_ERD). This shows
how the package takes input from three files: a gtfs feed (gtfs.zip); a sf object describing the geometry of the areas for which the SI is to be calculated; and a csv file (included in the package) defining the buffer zone distances for each route type. The ultimate output is a si_by_area_and_hour table (bottom-right), which reports the SI score for each hour of the day across dates specified by the user.

Various functions and their output are explained in the following, using the Mornington Peninsula GTFS for December 30th, 2018, and SA1 zone boundaries as a worked example. Individual steps are:

(1) loading the gtfs.zip file: the gtfs_by_route_type function loads the gtfs data and splits it into a list (by route_type) of tidygtfs objects, using the filter_by_route_type function from the gtfstools package (Herszenhut et al., undated).
(2) loading geometry information about the areas of interest: geographical data about the areas of interest are loaded by the load_areas_of_interest.R function into an sf object, using the sf package (Pebesma, 2023). The resultant areas_of_interest table contains each area_id and its associated geometry. Data about buffer zones, specifically the walking distance threshold assigned to each route_type (mode) is then loaded, again through a function (load_buffer_zone.R).



Figure 7: Step 3, stop catchments for the Mornington Penninsula Tourist Railway, showing intersections with SA1 zones

(3) calculating which stops are within the catchment walking distance of which areas: using the stops_in_walk_dist function. Figure @ref(fig:calculate_stop_in_or_near_areas_verbose)) shows how this function identified SA1 areas within the 800 metre catchment of the three Mornington stations.

(4) Calculating SI scores for a given time period: The si_calc.R function calculates the number of arrivals in a given time period, using code adapted from an article included in the tidytransit package (Poletti, undated), and combines this with the calculated area components. The si_total.R and hourly.R functions provided aggregation, giving the results mapped in Figure @ref(fig:SI_mornington_20181230_output).



Figure 8: Mornington Penninsula Tourist Railway hourly SI values for December 30, 2018



Figure 9: SI scores, census day 2016 and 2021

4.2. SI scores

4.2.1. IMRAD

4.3. Comparing cases

4.3.1. Population and equality

4.4. Purpose of transit in the city's transport policy

4.5. Indexes and comparing cities

5. Discussion

5.1. Limitations

5.2. Directions for furture research

6. Conclusions

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics. Abs maps, undated. URL https://maps.abs.gov.au/.

D. Bell and G. Currie. Travel and lifestyle impacts of new bus services in outer suburban melbourne. 2007. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/4167c66104aacdc1b8d48db8f5b8ed1f292c0a02.

Felix Creutzig, Aneeque Javaid, Zakia Soomauroo, Steffen Lohrey, Nikola Milojevic-Dupont, Anjali Ramakrishnan, Mahendra Sethi, Lijing Liu, Leila Niamir, Christopher Bren d'Amour, Ulf Weddige, Dominic Lenzi, Martin Kowarsch, Luisa Arndt, Lulzim Baumann, Jody Betzien, Lesly Fonkwa, Bettina Huber, Ernesto Mendez, Alexandra Misiou, Cameron Pearce, Paula Radman, Paul Skaloud, and J. Marco Zausch. Fair street space allocation: ethical principles and empirical insights. *Transport Reviews*, 40(6):711–733, 2020. doi: 10.1080/01441647.2020.1762795. URL https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2020.1762795.

G. Currie. Gap analysis of public transport needs:measuring spatial distribution of public transport needs and identifying gaps in the quality of public transport provision. *Transportation Research Record*, 1895:137 – 146, 2004. doi: 10.3141/1895-18. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/428fdef8b83dffb26b1ec4ff7e709e23e4dd8dc8.

G. Currie and A. Delbosc. Modelling the social and psychological impacts of transport disadvantage. *Transportation*, 37:953–966, 2010. doi: 10.1007/S11116-010-9280-2. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/adc1420d9caa2254909c872b4bf306fb88422b58.

G. Currie and A. Delbosc. Exploring trends in forced car ownership in melbourne. 2013. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/97096997b05affaffdbea1da2ca9bdaae36a659a.

G. Currie and Zed Senbergs. Identifying spatial gaps in public transport provision for socially disadvantaged australians: the melbourne 'needs gap' study. 2007. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/9759acfacc8f91558157a7da8b85ad1847f35173.

G. Currie, T. Richardson, P. Smyth, D. Vella-Brodrick, J. Hine, K. Lucas, J. Stanley, Jenny Morris, R. Kinnear, and J. Stanley. Investigating links between transport disadvantage, social exclusion and well-being in melbourne: preliminary results. 2007. doi: 10.1016/J.TRANPOL.2009.02.002. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ea11570b2056294854b4b538d5737063289fee97.

Graham Currie. Quantifying spatial gaps in public transport supply based on social needs. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18 (1):31–41, 2010. ISSN 0966-6923. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2008.12.002. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0966692308001518.

Graham Currie, David Enright, Craig Hoey, and D. Paterson. Quantitative approaches to needs based assessment of public transport services: The hobart transport needs gap study. 2003. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/2c049091cafb56c66efc532ad2bdd774d8efc0eb.

A. Delbosc and G. Currie. Using lorenz curves to assess public transit equity. 2011a. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2011.02.008. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/54cf02c5d7457e0f9b5d87abf6050e39202ea217.

Alexa Delbosc and Graham Currie. The spatial context of transport disadvantage, social exclusion and well-being. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19:1130–1137, 2011b. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2011.04.005,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/186710cde795653e3e96c15651ac9be65c44e486.

Alexa Delbosc and Graham Currie. Transport problems that matter - social and psychological links to transport disadvantage. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19:170–178, 2011c. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2010.01.003,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/3b2f52a8c9a6ee26e3c444c531228d7586724484.

E. Delmelle and Irene Casas. Evaluating the spatial equity of bus rapid transit-based accessibility patterns in a developing country: The case of cali, colombia. *Transport Policy*, 20:36–46, 2012. doi: 10.1016/J.TRANPOL.2011.12.001. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/a59fdc75581aff98a2ccd10dbbb15092bcff44da.

A. El-geneidy, D. Levinson, Ehab Diab, G. Boisjoly, David Verbich, and Charis Loong. The cost of equity: Assessing transit accessibility and social disparity using total travel cost. 2016. doi: 10.1016/J.TRA.2016.07.003. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/cc857dde6e66e8db6f647bed3210a5f80c3938cf.

B. Engels and Gang-Jun Liu. Social exclusion, location and transport disadvantage amongst non-driving seniors in a melbourne municipality, australia. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19:984–996, 2011. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2011.03.007,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/104a39ed5a82d2d7d21b559888a5d065be80d6b5.

Gordon J Fielding. *Managing public transit strategically: a comprehensive approach to strengthening service and monitoring performance*. Jossey-Bass public administration series. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1st ed. edition, 1987. ISBN 1555420680.

Florida Transit Information System. Urban integrated national transit database, 2018. URL http://www.ftis.org/urban_intd.aspx.

Nicole Foth, Kevin Manaugh, and A. El-geneidy. Toward equitable transit: Examining transit accessibilityand social need in toronto, canada, 1996-2006. 2013. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2012.12.008. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/9f9a6a9df6430dd101c4490b219cbf6666757715.

K. Fransen, Tijs Neutens, S. Farber, P. Maeyer, G. Deruyter, and F. Witlox. Identifying public transport gaps using time-dependent accessibility levels. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 48:176–187, 2015. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2015.09.008,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/9bb10b31679a0f29b888dd38b9560253c77262b3.

L. Guzman, D. Oviedo, and C. Rivera. Assessing equity in transport accessibility to work and study: The bogotá region. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 58:236–246, 2017a. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2016.12.016,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/e240a21ad76714711b7b027a31addbef94490802.

Luis A. Guzman, Daniel Oviedo, and Carlos Rivera. Assessing equity in transport accessibility to work and study: The bogotá region. *Journal of transport geography*, 58:236–246, 2017b. ISSN 0966-6923.

Daniel Herszenhut, Rafael H. M. Pereira, Pedro R. Andrade, and Joao Bazzo. *gtfstools: General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) Editing and Analysing Tools*, 2022. URL https://ipeagit.github.io/gtfstools/. R package version 1.2.0, https://github.com/ipeaGIT/gtfstools.

Danile Herszenhut, Rafael H. M. Pereira, Pedro R. Andrade, and Joao Bazzo. *gtfstools; filter GTFS object by route type (transport mode)*, undated. URL https://ipeagit.github.io/gtfstools/reference/filter_by_route_type.html. R package version 1.2.0.9000, last accessed June 30, 2023.

A. Hurni. Transport and social exclusion in western sydney. 2005. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/0daa6030bb2f43842f096dccb7471d6cc87f8e3b.

Imperial College London. Transport strategy centre (tsc); applied research, undated. URL https://www.imperial.ac.uk/transport-engineering/transport-strategy-centre/applied-research/.

International Association of Public Transport (UITP). Mobility in cities database 2015, 2015. URL uitp.org/publications/mobility-in-cities-database/.

Seongman Jang, Youngsoo An, Changhyo Yi, and Seungil Lee. Assessing the spatial equity of seoul's public transportation using the gini coefficient based on its accessibility. *International Journal of Urban Sciences*, 21:107 – 91, 2017. doi: 10.1080/12265934.2016.1235487. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/0c58d437e6395d34034abd311fe76f746b7d2da1.

Ciro Jaramillo, C. Lizárraga, and A. Grindlay. Spatial disparity in transport social needs and public transport provision in santiago de cali (colombia). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24:340–357, 2012. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2012.04.014,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/809e55ee864e22899ac91dcf22398ea4661a83d0.

C. Jaramillob and A. L. Grindlayc. Urban development and transport disadvantage: Methodology to evaluate social transport needs in latin american cities. 2011. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/bef8bb54ef1a03b2656db09ec9fdf2c8158bb354.

Sigal Kaplan, Dmitrijs Popoks, Carlo G. Prato, and A. Ceder. Using connectivity for measuring equity in transit provision. 2014. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2014.04.016. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/41a075e75776f5674fb1f222a232e603b78bf2ff.

Ting L. Lei and R. Church. Mapping transit-based access: integrating gis, routes and schedules. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 24:283 – 304, 2010. doi: 10.1080/13658810902835404. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/aa6d399dbf17d054f6398c5c587a9e66984d3b9f.

Todd. Litman. Evaluation transportation equity. *World Transport Policy and Practice*, 8:50–65, 2002. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/19ca0cba6e35030171c1d37e39bd1f531df6b6f8.

Todd Litman. Measuring transportation: traffic, mobility and accessibility. Technical Report 10, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, D.C., 2003.

Todd Litman. When are bus lanes warranted? considering economic efficiency, social equity and strategic planning goals. Technical report, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 2016. URL http://www.vtpi.org/blw.pdf.

Gang-Jun Liu and B. Engels. Accessibility to essential services and facilities by a spatially dispersed aging population in suburban melbourne, australia. 2012. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-24198-7_21. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/44a5c5c369a938367d233a755ee89f6f3ec8b1b9.

K. Lucas. Transport and social exclusion: Where are we now? *Transport Policy*, 20:105–113, 2012. doi: 10.1016/J.TRANPOL.2012.01.013. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/5b0f06f3c0a2caf504a8c81e1c09d17d6b1ef38b.

K. Lucas, B. Wee, and K. Maat. A method to evaluate equitable accessibility: combining ethical theories and accessibility-based approaches. *Transportation*, 43:473–490, 2016. doi: 10.1007/S11116-015-9585-2. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/d1df10d5878031d8eeaee1f11d9cc0f86e0a7e61.

Will Mackey, Matt Johnson, David Diviny, Matt Cowgill, Bryce Roney, William Lai, and Benjamin Wee. strayr, 2023. URL https://runapp-aus.github.io/strayr/.

S. Mamun and N. Lownes. Measuring service gaps. *Transportation Research Record*, 2217:153 – 161, 2011. doi: 10.3141/2217-19. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/9bd0eec880c9007f956bd6e3a01f123b889afc3b.

K. Martens, A. Golub, and G. Robinson. A justice-theoretic approach to the distribution of transportation benefits: Implications for transportation planning practice in the united states. *Transportation Research Part A-policy and Practice*, 46:684–695, 2012. doi: 10.1016/J.TRA.2012.01.004. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/cdce6387d2793d3fa5eb75f4e897c0b6aa45c356.

S. Mavoa, K. Witten, T. McCreanor, and David O'Sullivan. Gis based destination accessibility via public transit and walking in auckland, new zealand. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 20:15–22, 2012. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2011.10.001. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/96d0b3049fc8717b2fd66474c43fcb7741b59a48.

MobilityData. *General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS)*, undated. URL https://gtfs.org/.

Alan T. Murray and Rex. Davis. Equity in regional service provision. *Journal of Regional Science*, 41:557–600, 2001. doi: 10.1111/0022-4146.00233. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/1fa9a8ad083035df9a1b87c1aef2e98c35392cbe.

B. Parolin and S. Rostami. Identifying the transport needs of the transport disadvantaged groups in rural areas of new south wales , australia : A case study. 2017. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/06f1da763aa62a29dd1821cefd519d8d257824ad.

Katerina Pavkova, Graham Currie, Alexa Delbosc, and Majid Sarvi. Selecting tram links for priority treatments - the lorenz curve approach. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 55:101–109, 2016. ISSN 0966-6923. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2016.07.011. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096669231630103X.

Edzer Pebesma. *sf: Simple Features for R*, 2023. URL https://r-spatial.github.io/sf/. R package version 1.0-14.

Flavio Poletti. *tidytransit: generate a departure timetable*, undated. URL https://r-transit.github.io/tidytransit/articles/timetable.html. R package version 1.5.0, last accessed June 22, 2023.

Flavio Poletti, Daniel Herszenhut, Mark Padgham, Tom Buckley, and Danton Noriega-Goodwin. *tidytransit: Read, Validate, Analyze, and Map GTFS Feeds*, 2023. URL https://github.com/r-transit/tidytransit. R package version 1.6.1.

J. Preston and F. Rajé. Accessibility, mobility and transport-related social exclusion. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 15:151–160, 2007a. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2006.05.002,. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/b292fbed496f2f6692414c3c130baa84393d05a3.

J. Preston and F. Rajé. Accessibility, mobility and transport-related social exclusion. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 15:151–160, 2007b. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2006.05.002. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/b292fbed496f2f6692414c3c130baa84393d05a3.

R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2023. URL https://www.R-project.org/.

James Reynolds. gtfssupplyindex, 2024. URL https://github.com/James-Reynolds/gtfssupplyindex.

James Reynolds, Graham Currie, Geoff Rose, and Alistair Cumming. Moving beyond techno-rationalism: new models of transit priority implementation. In *Australasian Transport Research Forum 2017*, Auckland, New Zealand, 2017.

A. Ricciardi, J. Xia, and G. Currie. Exploring public transport equity between separate disadvantaged cohorts: A case study in perth, australia. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 43:111–122, 2015. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2015.01.011. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/af1539594b964b69c6e4e91aaffd438b6eaec3c2.

Paul Ryus, M Connor, S Corbett, A Rodenstein, L Wargelin, L Ferreira, Y Nakanishi, and K Blume. Tcrp report 88: a guidebook for developing a transit performance-measurement system. Technical report, 2003.

Transit Mobility Data,. Ptv gtfs - openmobilitydata, 2023. URL https://transitfeeds.com/p/ptv/497.

Walk Score. Transit score methodology. 2023. URL https://www.walkscore.com/transit-score-methodology.shtml.

B. Wee and K. Geurs. Discussing equity and social exclusion in accessibility evaluations. *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*, null:null, 2011. doi: 10.18757/EJTIR.2011.11.4.2940. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/372fbd5aa0c547caa033a53ef6bcba55127dbf41.

Timothy F. Welch. Equity in transport: The distribution of transit access and connectivity among affordable housing units. *Transport Policy*, 30:283–293, 2013. doi: 10.1016/J.TRANPOL.2013.09.020. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/944eae59c3eb2355c3aee7f220bd2ed6f611ec36.

Timothy F. Welch and Sabyasachee Mishra. A measure of equity for public transit connectivity. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 33:29–41, 2013. doi: 10.1016/J.JTRANGEO.2013.09.007. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ef8c49b5f27af8c53da5239bca820c4b556ee53c.

Hadley Wickham and Jennifer Bryan. *R packages.* " O'Reilly Media, Inc.", 2023. URL https://r-pkgs.org/.

Hadley Wickham, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy D'Agostino McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Grolemund, Alex Hayes, Lionel Henry, Jim Hester, Max Kuhn, Thomas Lin Pedersen, Evan Miller, Stephan Milton Bache, Kirill Müller, Jeroen Ooms, David Robinson, Dana Paige Seidel, Vitalie Spinu, Kohske Takahashi, Davis Vaughan, Claus Wilke, Kara Woo, and Hiroaki Yutani. Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(43):1686, 2019. doi: 10.21105/joss.01686.

James Wong. Leveraging the general transit feed specification for efficient transit analysis. *Transportation Research Record*, 1 (2338):11–19, 2013. doi: 10.3141/2338-02.

Belinda Wu and J. Hine. A ptal approach to measuring changes in bus service accessibility. *Transport Policy*, 10:307–320, 2003. doi: 10.1016/S0967-070X(03)00053-2. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/cd3c2a52bb2b475efe47b82be12ee54639b40436.

J. Xia, Joshua Nesbitt, R. Daley, Arfana Najnin, T. Litman, and S. P. Tiwari. A multi-dimensional view of transport-related social exclusion: A comparative study of greater perth and sydney. *Transportation Research Part A-policy and Practice*, 94:205–221, 2016. doi: 10.1016/J.TRA.2016.09.009. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/d66443244a6c410993694610b4b18007061927d4.

Tan Yigitcanlar, N. Sipe, R. Evans, and Matthew Pitot. A gis-based land use and public transport accessibility indexing model. *Australian Planner*, 44:30 – 37, 2007. doi: 10.1080/07293682.2007.9982586. URL https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/961548ebaf8f035d70d23352be2a480ad3fd40c9.