MINETA NATIONAL TRANSIT RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

Developing Seamless Connections in the Urban Transit Network: A Look Toward High-Speed Rail Interconnectivity

MNTRC Report 12-23

MNTRC
MINETA NATIONAL TRANSIT RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

UNLV
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA LAS VEGAS

MINETA TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE
LEAD UNIVERSITY OF MNTRC

The Norman Y. Mineta International Institute for Surface Transportation Policy Studies was established by Congress in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). The Institute's Board of Trustees revised the name to Mineta Transportation Institute (MTI) in 1996. Reauthorized in 1998, MTI was selected by the U.S. Department of Transportation through a competitive process in 2002 as a national "Center of Excellence." The Institute is funded by Congress through the United States Department of Transportation's Research and Innovative Technology Administration, the California Legislature through the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and by private grants and donations.

The Institute receives oversight from an internationally respected Board of Trustees whose members represent all major surface transportation modes. MTI's focus on policy and management resulted from a Board assessment of the industry's unmet needs and led directly to the choice of the San José State University College of Business as the Institute's home. The Board provides policy direction, assists with needs assessment, and connects the Institute and its programs with the international transportation community.

MTI's transportation policy work is centered on three primary responsibilities:

Research

MTI works to provide policy-oriented research for all levels of government and the private sector to foster the development of optimum surface transportation systems. Research areas include: transportation security; planning and policy development; interrelationships among transportation, land use, and the environment; transportation finance; and collaborative labor-management relations. Certified Research Associates conduct the research. Certification requires an advanced degree, generally a Ph.D., a record of academic publications, and professional references. Research projects culminate in a peer-reviewed publication, available both in hardcopy and on TransWeb, the MTI website (http://transweb.sjsu.edu).

Education

The educational goal of the Institute is to provide graduate-level education to students seeking a career in the development and operation of surface transportation programs. MTI, through San José State University, offers an AACSB-accredited Master of Science in Transportation Management and a graduate Certificate in Transportation Management that serve to prepare the nation's transportation managers for the 21st century. The master's degree is the highest conferred by the California State University system. With the active assistance of the California Department of Transportation, MTI delivers its classes over a state-of-the-art videoconference network throughout the state of California and via webcasting beyond, allowing working transportation professionals to pursue an advanced degree regardless of their location. To meet the needs of employers seeking a diverse workforce, MTI's education program promotes enrollment to under-represented groups.

Information and Technology Transfer

MTI promotes the availability of completed research to professional organizations and journals and works to integrate the research findings into the graduate education program. In addition to publishing the studies, the Institute also sponsors symposia to disseminate research results to transportation professionals and encourages Research Associates to present their findings at conferences. The World in Motion, MTI's quarterly newsletter, covers innovation in the Institute's research and education programs. MTI's extensive collection of transportation-related publications is integrated into San José State University's world-class Martin Luther King, Jr. Library.

REPORT 12-23

DEVELOPING SEAMLESS CONNECTIONS IN THE URBAN TRANSIT NETWORK: A LOOK TOWARD HIGH-SPEED RAIL INTERCONNECTIVITY

Hualiang (Harry) Teng, Ph.D.
Tarik Toughrai
Tingting Yu
Russell Ozawa
Bingyi Hu, Ph.D.

July 2014

A publication of
Mineta National Transit Research Consortium

College of Business
San José State University
San José, CA 95192-0219

TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Report No. CA-MNTRC-14-1148	**2. Government Accession No.**	**3. Recipient's Catalog No.**
4. Title and Subtitle Developing Seamless Connections in the Urban Transit Networks: A Look Toward High-Speed Rail Interconnectivity		**5. Report Date** July 2014 **6. Performing Organization Code**
7. Authors Hualiang (Harry) Teng, Ph.D., Tarik Toughrai, Tingting Yu, Russell Ozawa, and Bingyi Hu, Ph.D.		**8. Performing Organization Report** MNTRC Report 12-23
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Mineta National Transit Research Consortium College of Business San José State University San José, CA 95192-0219		**10. Work Unit No.** **11. Contract or Grant No.** DTRT12-G-UTC21
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation Research & Innovative Technology Admin. 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20590	University of Nevada, Las Vegas 4505 S Maryland Pkwy Las Vegas, NV 89119	**13. Type of Report and Period Covered** Final Report **14. Sponsoring Agency Code**

15. Supplemental Notes

16. Abstract

In the past, U.S. studies on high-speed rail (HSR) have focused primarily on the economic implications of high-speed rail development. Recently, however, studies have begun evaluating multimodal connectivity of HSR stations. The ways in which different modes are connected to HSR stations influences the ridership of HSR. As the development of the U.S. HSR system has reached the stage of design and construction, guidelines on multimodal connectivity are necessary to maximize that ridership.

The objective of this study was to quantify multimodal connectivity of HSR stations and its impact on ridership in four countries where HSR has been established, setting the basis for future rail interconnectivity. In this study, multimodal connectivity is measured by the number of different modes of transportation connected to HSR stations, the number of installed arrival and departure facilities for each mode, the transfer time from connecting modes to boarding platforms at HSR stations, and the arrival time intervals of public transportation modes. To achieve this objective, data were collected from HSR systems of France, Spain, Japan and China. Various characteristics of the connecting modes were observed and compared. The relationship between ridership and the characteristics of multimodal connectivity was identified using regression models developed in this study.

It was observed from the analysis that the multimodal connectivity at HSR stations in various countries presents a variety of profiles. For example, HSR stations in China connect with more bus lines than those in other countries. Relatively, there are more bus stops/terminals provided in France. Transfer times in Japan and China are significantly longer than those in France and Spain. The average bus arrival interval in France is longest, at more than double that in China.

All the connectivity variables considered in this study influence ridership in these four countries in various ways. On the whole, bus, subway, and regional railroad service influence ridership significantly. For instance, the more bus services connected to the station, the higher the ridership. This trend is apparent in three of the four countries, France being the exception. Also, subway, light rail, and traditional rail are modes of high-capacity transportation. Their connection to HSR stations always implies high ridership for high-speed rail. The number of facilities also shows significant impacts on HSR ridership. For instance, the more bus and subway stops, and the more bicycle parking and taxi stands, the higher the ridership. Transfer time also has a significant influence.

These findings have important implications for the proposed California and Nevada HSR stations. Accommodations for arrival on foot or by bicycle are recommended. More issues on transfer time at HSR stations in the metropolitan areas in California are elaborated upon. Also discussed are the unique needs of visitors to Las Vegas and their implications for HSR design.

17. Key Words High-speed ground transportation; Multimodal transportation; Railroad stations	**18. Distribution Statement** No restrictions. This document is available to the public through The National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	**20. Security Classif. (of this page)** Unclassified	**21. No. of Pages** 98	**22. Price** $15.00

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number:
2014943182

To order this publication, please contact:

Mineta National Transit Research Consortium
College of Business
San José State University
San José, CA 95192-0219

Tel: (408) 924-7560
Fax: (408) 924-7565
Email: mineta-institute@sjsu.edu

transweb.sjsu.edu/mntrc/index.html

070714

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Dr. Nobuaki Ohmori, Associate Professor of Department of Urban Engineering, The University of Tokyo, for providing the ridership data and some relevant information on the high speed rail stations in Japan. The authors also thank Mr. Eduardo Romo, Presidente of Fundación Caminos de Hierro for providing the ridership data on the high speed rail stations in Spain.

The authors also thank MTI staff, including Executive Director Karen Philbrick, Ph.D.; Director of Communications and Technology Transfer Donna Maurillo; Research Support Manager Joseph Mercado; and Webmaster Frances Cherman, who also provided additional editorial and publication support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the past, studies in the U.S. on high-speed rail (HSR) have focused on economic impact. A few recent studies have addressed multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations. High-speed rail stations are accessed via multiple modes of public transportation by which passengers are transported from their point of origin and to their final destinations. The specific transportation modes connected to high-speed rail stations differ depending upon their location and the land use surrounding the stations. The way in which these different modes are connected to high-speed rail stations influences the ridership of high-speed rail. If travelers do not care for the connecting modes of transportation, they may choose to forego rail entirely in favor of other modes, such as automobile or airplane. Even those who do ride high-speed rail may choose to use other connecting modes based on their valuation of publicly available modes. As America's high-speed rail system begins development, a set of guidelines on multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations is essential to ensure the success of the system.

The objective of this study is to quantify multimodal connectivity of high-speed rail stations. For purposes of this study, a station's multimodal connectivity is measured by the number of modes connected to each station, the number of transportation facilities installed at HSR stations, the transfer time from the connecting modes to and from HSR stations, and arrival time intervals. To achieve this objective, data were collected from the high-speed rail systems of France, Spain, Japan and China. Google maps were utilized to obtain aerial images of high-speed rail stations that showed the locations of connecting modes in relation to the station. Pictures of different transportation facilities connecting HSR stations were also collected. This information was then used to characterize the HSR stations in terms of their locations in a city and how other transit modes are connected to them. In addition, the number of services (e.g., bus route) provided by each connecting mode, the number of facilities (e.g., bus stop and subway station) for different modes, transfer time from different modes to high-speed rail stations, and scheduled service arrival intervals were collected from different sources. Ridership data were also collected for the HSR stations included in this study. With these data collected, the characteristics of the high-speed rail stations in terms of their connectivity to other modes were observed. The relationship between ridership and the characteristics of multimodal connectivity of high-speed rail stations was then identified through regression models.

It was observed from the analysis that multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations in different countries presents different profiles. China provides more access by bus than the other countries studied; yet, the number of bus terminals at China's HSR stations is modest because bus stops are shared among the various lines. The same is true for Spain. France provides relatively more bus terminals. The numbers of subway lines connected to high-speed rail stations in these three countries are approximately the same. In France and Japan, at least two subway lines provide access to and from HSR stations.

Car and bicycle parking accommodations are most plentiful in France, followed by Japan and Spain. HSR stations in China offer the fewest car parking facilities. Japan has more taxi stands than other countries. China offers no bicycle parking facilities at all at the 17 stations included in this study. This may be due to the fact that these stations are located outside of cities, reducing the practicality of access via bicycle.

Transfer times at the HSR stations in these countries also present different profiles. Transfer times in Japan and China are significantly longer than those in France and Spain. China had the longest transfer time for bus access, but other access modes provide transfer times comparable to those in France and Spain. Spain boasts the shortest transfer times for all modes compared with those in other countries. This was especially true for Spain's taxi service. This may be due to the fact that taxi service is very inexpensive in Spain.

From the operation perspective, the average bus arrival interval in France is the longest—at more than double that of China. (Japan's arrival interval data was not readily extractable, so it is not presented here.) Subways in France have the shortest arrival interval; Spain's subways have the longest—ten times longer than in France.

All the connectivity variables considered in this study influence ridership in these four countries in different ways. For instance, the number of bus services (routes/lines) influences ridership in Spain, Japan, and China, but not in France. The more bus services connected to HSR stations, the higher the HSR ridership, as demonstrated by stations in these three countries. In addition, the availability of access by subway, light rail, and traditional rail (high-capacity modes of transportation) usually implies high ridership for HSR. However, the small sample size of these modes in this study makes it difficult to identify their impact on ridership.

There is a clear correlation between HSR ridership and the number of access points or accommodations for bicycles, buses, subways, and taxis. Note that parking facilities for private cars are not identified as an influencing factor. No facility factor was identified for HSR ridership in France. Ridership in that country is significantly influenced only by regional/commuter train arrival intervals. The arrival intervals of high-speed trains did not influence HSR ridership in the other two countries. Transfer time influences HSR ridership—specifically, transfer time by commuter rail or bicycle in France and by taxi in China. Not surprisingly, these modes also serve as major connecting transit modes for the HSR stations in these two countries.

Influencing factors vary for each country. For example, the greatest influence in France was exerted by regional and commuter service, arrival interval and transfer time, and bicycle transfer time. Passengers who use the regional and commuter services have unique characteristics and may represent a significant sector of the population. In Spain, the influencing factors are bus service and its facility, and the facilities for bicycle parking and taxi service. It appears that in Spain simply *getting* passengers to the station has more of an impact on ridership than how they get there or how the system is operated. Japan's situation is similar. In China, service by bus and taxi are most important. Transfer times for taxi passengers are noticeably shorter than those in other countries, contributing to higher HSR ridership.

This study discusses the implications of these findings for the HSR stations proposed for California and Nevada. Pedestrian access is also discussed and recommended. Additional issues regarding transfer times in California's metropolitan areas are addressed. The study also discusses the special case of Las Vegas, Nevada, and its unique needs regarding station design.

I. INTRODUCTION

Research on high-speed rail in the U.S. has typically been conducted from an economic perspective. Sands' report (1993) reviews the economic development fostered by high-speed rail systems in countries such as Japan and France. The reviews describe the economic impacts over time on the areas surrounding specific HSR stations in those countries. The report strongly recommends the development of a high-speed rail network in California for economic recovery in 1990s. Nuworsoo and Deakin (2009) and Murakami and Cervero (2010) focused their studies on the economic impact around high-speed rail stations, while Loukaitou-Sideris et al. (2012) looked into the impact of high-speed rail on cities in California.

A few recent studies have addressed multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations. Gregg and Begley (2011) focuses on providing adequate public transit connection to high-speed rail stations proposed for Orlando, Florida. That study discusses the many existing bus routes that represent HSR connection opportunities. A study by City of Fresno (2012) focuses on economic impact and urban revitalization. Neither study provides an extensive description of high-speed rail multimodal connectivity.

A high-speed rail station can be thought of as a hub that passengers can access through various modes of public transportation. From the hub, they will travel from their point of origin to their destination. The transportation modes connected to high-speed rail stations differ depending on their locations in the city and the land uses surrounding them. They also differ from the modes that connect to bus stops or subway stations because high-speed rail travel is different in nature from travel by bus or subway. Each HSR station, with its unique set of connection modes, facilities, and accessibility, offers travelers a different experience depending on variables such as arrival intervals, travel time, transfer time and convenience, parking facilities, etc. These variables influence ridership. If travelers perceive poor value in the services offered by high-speed rail and its connecting modes, they may use other modes of transportation to their destination. Even travelers who do ride high-speed rail may use connection modes other than public transportation. As America's high-speed rail system begins development, a set of fact-based guidelines for multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations is essential.

The objective of this study is to quantify the relationship of multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations to HSR ridership. Here, multimodal connectivity is defined as the number of modes connected to high-speed rail stations, the number of transportation facilities or terminals installed at HSR stations, the transfer time to and from the HSR stations via those modes, and arrival time intervals (passenger wait times). To achieve this objective, data were collected from various high-speed rail stations in France, Spain, Japan and China. Google maps were utilized to obtain aerial images of high-speed rail stations that showed the locations of connecting modes in relation to the station. Pictures of different transportation facilities connecting HSR stations were also collected. This information was then used to characterize the HSR stations in terms of their locations in a city and how other transit modes are connected to them. In addition, the number of services (e.g., bus routes) provided by each connecting mode, the number of facilities (e.g., bus stops and subway stations) for different modes, transfer time from different modes to high-speed rail stations, and scheduled service arrival intervals were collected from multiple sources. Ridership data were also collected for the HSR stations included in this study. With these data collected, the characteristics of the high-speed rail stations in terms of their connectivity to other modes were observed. The relationships between ridership and the characteristics of multimodal connectivity of high-speed rail stations were then identified through regression models. Implications of the findings on high-speed rail in California and Nevada are discussed in this study.

The report includes 16 chapters. The first chapter presents the background and problem statement. The second discusses the methodology used. Chapter III provides a brief literature review. Each country covered by this study receives three chapters addressing data collection, characteristics of high-speed rail stations, and data analysis, respectively. France is covered in chapters IV, V and VI; Spain in chapters VII, VIII and IX; Japan in chapters X, XI and XII; and China in Chapters XIII, XIV and XV. Chapter XVI presents conclusions, implications of findings, and areas for further study.

II. METHODOLOGY

Factors that influence the ridership of high-speed rail were identified in this study through the process presented in Figure 1. After a literature review of relevant studies, data on transportation mode connectivity at high-speed rail stations were collected for four countries: France, Spain, Japan, and China. The collected data were analyzed separately. In the analysis, descriptive statistics were developed for the collected data. Linear regression models were calibrated based on the data from which the influencing factors on ridership were identified.



Figure 1. Flowchart of the Study

The interconnectivity data collected in this study include:

- Number of public transportation services, i.e., routes/lines available for different modes:
  - Number of bus services (lines, routes)
  - Number of subway lines
  - Number of tramway lines
  - Number of light-rail lines

- Number of facilities for public and private transportation:
  - Number of bus stops
  - Number of light-rail or tramway entrances
  - Number of car rental facilities
  - Number of parking lots, including drop-off, short-term or long-term parking spaces
  - Number of taxi spaces
  - Number of bicycle parking lots
- Transfer time
- Service interval in peak periods
- Ridership for high-speed rail stations

The data sources differed for each country.

Transfer time for each mode is defined as the time required for passengers to traverse the distance between the drop-off points of their initial mode of transportation to their destination, i.e., the boarding platform. Note that HSR passengers typically plan to be at the station half an hour before their train's departure time, which is not considered in this study. Transfer time is calculated by dividing that distance by an average walking velocity of 4/3 ms^{-1}. Delays encountered at obstacles such as stoplights are not taken into account in the calculation. An additional 30 seconds is added if the traveler must take an escalator or an elevator. The destination "platform" is defined as the platform located in the middle of all available boarding platforms for that rail line.

Ridership data were analyzed by presenting the descriptive statistics and plotting the relationship between ridership and the influencing factors. The ridership data are modeled using the linear regression model:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_p x_{ip} + \varepsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

in which, $\beta_0 \dots, \beta_p$ are the unknown partial regression coefficients. y_i denotes ridership; x_i represents influencing factors; ε_i is the error term that captures all other factors influencing ridership. This error term is assumed to be normally distributed.

The partial regression coefficients in equation (1) are estimated using ordinary least-squares technique. The fit of the regression model can be measured by using the sample coefficient of determination, which gives the proportion or percentage of the total variation in ridership, explained jointly by the characteristics of different modes for passengers accessing high-speed rail stations. It is given as:

$$R^2 = \frac{SST - SSE}{SST} \qquad (2)$$

in which, SST is the total sum of squares given as:

$$SST = \sum_{i}^{n} (y_i - \bar{y})^2 \qquad (3)$$

SSE is the error sum of squares given as:

$$SSE = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \widehat{y_i})^2 \qquad (4)$$

Testing hypotheses about the insignificance of a population parameter at a given significant level uses a *t* test. The test of the influence of any population parameter uses an individual partial regression coefficient and can be conducted using a *t* statistic based on the regression coefficients and their standard errors as:

$$t_{\hat{\beta}_j} = {\hat{\beta}_j}/{se(\hat{\beta}_j)} \qquad (5)$$

The coefficient is considered significant if the value in equation (5) is greater than the critical value determined from the level of significance and the number of degrees of freedom. For this study, a 5% level of significance is used.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

MULTIMODAL CONNECTIVITY

Mbatta (2008) conducted a study on developing and evaluating the criteria for transit stations with a focus on multimodal connectivity. In that study, the authors studied the paths that young, senior, and mobility-challenged passengers can follow from point of arrival at a transit station (either bus or rail) to their seats in a transit vehicle. The study established minimum design and evaluation criteria for public transit stations, with a special focus on seamless movement of passengers between transportation modes. Their proposed guidelines included a recommendation that transit stops not be located on the far side of a road that passengers must cross in order to access a given transit station. They presented layouts of transit stations showing the relative, recommended locations of key facilities such as park-and-ride, kiss-and-ride, and bus stops.

Isekil et al. (2007), discussed: (1) what criteria passengers use to evaluate transit stops and stations, and (2) what factors influence their evaluations of transit stops and stations based on five top criteria: 1) access, 2) connection and reliability, 3) information, 4) amenities, and 5) security and safety. In this study, connection is defined as the distance and time it takes to make connections. Five transfer facility types were considered, from the simple form, such as a stop serving a single transit mode, to a city center, grade-separated, multimodal, multilevel bus or rail transfer facility. A survey was conducted in the Los Angeles area at selected transit stops or stations classified as one of five transfer facility types. The survey found that improvements in service quality (i.e., good connection and reliability) and personal safety and security are much more important to transit users than physical conditions of transit stops and stations.

The MTC Transit Connectivity study conducted in 2006 indicated that, for transit hubs, the keys to success include reliable service, three-minute maximum transfer time, effective wayfinding, and seamless fare systems. They examined each of these four factors at the hubs in the San Francisco Bay area and provided recommendations for improvements.

Report *TOD 202: Station Area Planning - Reconnecting America* (2008), identified eight TOD place types: (1) regional center, (2) urban center, (3) suburban center, (4) transit town center, (5) urban neighborhood, (6) transit neighborhood, (7) special-use//employment district, and (8) mixed-use corridor. Some of the proposed guidelines for station area planning relate to transit connectivity: (1) maximize ridership with transit-oriented development, (2) manage parking effectively (e.g., minimize parking to the extent possible and maximize access for pedestrians, bicyclists, and those who arrive at stations by bus or shuttle), (3) maximize neighborhood and station connectivity (e.g., the walkability of the streets surrounding a station has a significant impact on whether people will choose to walk and ride transit). With the information on TOD, attention was given to the availability of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations at high-speed rail stations. Attention was also given to the question of whether the amount of car parking space has any impact on the number of passengers who choose to arrive on foot or by bicycle.

Transit Ridership

Taylor and Fink (2003) provided a literature review of the studies on transit ridership. The ridership studies were classified into descriptive and causal approaches (see Figure 2). The descriptive approach focuses on traveler attitudes and perceptions, with travelers and operators as the unit of analysis, while the causal approach considers the environment: systems and behavior characteristics associated with ridership. The causal approach includes aggregate and disaggregate studies, in which aggregate studies use system operators as the unit of analysis, and the disaggregate studies focus on mode choice decision making of individual travelers. The factors that influence ridership are classified into internal and external. The internal factors include those that system operators control, such as fare and service level, while external factors are those that are exogenous to the system and managers, such as population and employment in service areas.



Figure 2. Categories of Ridership Studies (Taylor and Fink 2003)

There is a different category of ridership model that focuses on transit stations. One example is the study by Chan and Miranda-Moreno (2013) in which trip production and attraction models at the station level for the metro network in Montreal, Quebec were developed. This study found that population density, average income, bus service connectivity, distance to the central station, and service frequency are linked to the number of trips started from an area during morning peak hours, while factors such as commercial and governmental land uses, bus connectivity, and transfer stations are associated with the number of trips ended in an area during morning peak hours.

Cervero, et al. (2009) is another study that estimates ridership at the station/stop level. Their study includes three categories of variables: service attributes (frequency, vehicle brand, dedicated lane); location and neighborhood attributes (population and employment density, mixed land use measures, etc.); and bus stop/site attributes (bus shelter, bus bench, etc.). It was found that service frequency, intermodal connectivity, population and employment density are highly related to ridership at Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stops.

High-speed rail connectivity and ridership

Only a few studies address multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations. Gregg and Begley's (2011) study focuses on providing adequate public transit connection to the high-speed rail stations proposed in Orlando, Florida. In this study, many bus routes are noted for their potential connectivity to the proposed high-speed rail stations. City of Fresno (2012) is another such study, focused exclusively on that city. It discusses a proposed high-speed rail station in the context of economic impact and urban revitalization. In these two studies, only the station itself was discussed; multimodal HSR connectivity was not addressed.

The economic impact of high-speed rail has been studied more frequently and more thoroughly. Sands (1993) is among the early studies on high-speed rail in California. It includes reviews of the economic development generated by the presence of high-speed rail in countries such as Japan and France. The reviews describe the economic impacts of certain stations on the surrounding areas over a period of time. Possible conclusions are suggested regarding high-speed rail development in California. Nuworsoo and Deakin (2009) and Murakami and Cervero (2010) focused their studies on the economic impact on areas surrounding high-speed rail stations, while Loukaitou-Sideris, et al. (2012) looked into the impact of high-speed rail on cities in California.

This study evaluates the relationship of multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations on ridership. Linear regression models were developed in which transit service, service facilities, transfer time and HSR service intervals are considered. These four groups of variables represent the multimodal connectivity at HSR stations. From the results of regression models, the aspects of multimodal connectivity at HSR are identified.

IV. DATA COLLECTION – FRANCE

HIGH-SPEED RAIL IN FRANCE

The French high-speed rail system—official name: Train à Grande Vitesse but commonly known as “TVG”—began operations in 1981. Initially, it linked only two major cities: Paris and Lyon. It has since become a global network with a consistently growing ridership.

The TVG operates at an average speed of 200 km/h but certain lines, known as the LGV (Ligne a Grande Vitesse), can reach a maximum speed of 320 km/h. The French high-speed rail network was been built along old railway lines. Nine LGV lines are in service as of this writing:

- LGV Sud-Est: 409 km long, joining Paris and Lyon

- LGV Atlantique: 279 km long, serving the west and the southwest areas of the country

- LGV Nord: 333 km long, joining Paris to the Belgium border, via Lille

- LGV Interconnexion Est: 57 km long, divided into three parts connecting the LGVs Nord and Sud-Est

- LGV Rhône-Alpes: 115 km long, extending the LGV Sud-Est

- LGV Méditerranée: 250 km long, extending the LGV Rhône-Alpes to Marseille

- LGV Est Européenne: 300 km long, connecting Paris to the country’s eastern regions, with an eventual goal of connecting Paris to Eastern Europe

- LGV Perpignan - Figueras: 44 km long, crossing the Spanish border to Figueras

- LGV Rhin-Rhône: 137 km long, running between Dijon and Mulhouse in eastern France

Figure 3. High-Speed Rail Network in France

The network presents a radial structure with Paris at the center, a reflection of the organization of the French territory.

French Rail Network (RFF) owns and maintains the railway network, while the French National Railway Corporation (SNCF) operates it. These two companies are the primary financiers of the nation's HSR infrastructure. Financing is also provided by local authorities, who are in charge of the service at high-speed rail stations and connections to public transportation. Currently, the network includes more than 250 stations, including stations in Germany, Belgium, Spain, Great Britain, Italy, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands and Switzerland.

Each station is unique in its design and architectural characteristics. Stations in major cities differ from those in small cities rural areas. Those in major cities are typically older stations that reflect the city's character. With their highly stylized architecture, they are widely regarded as city monuments. Figure 4 illustrates that they are located in densely populated areas at the heart of the city. Most stations on an LGV line outside of Paris are new construction with simple and modern design. These are typically located on the city's periphery (see Figure 5).

(a) Location of Gare de Paris-Est

(b) Gare de Paris-Est, built in 1849

Figure 4. High-Speed Rail Station in Dense Urban Area

(a) Location of Gare d’Aix-en-Provence TGV

(b) Gare d’Aix-en-Provence TGV, built on the LGV Méditerranée

Figure 5. High-Speed Rail Station in Rural France

The data for this study were collected for the 34 French high-speed rail stations, listed in Table 1.

Table 1. France: 34 High-Speed Rail Stations Studied

Stations	
1. Paris-Nord	18. Grenoble
2. Paris-Lyon	19. Metz-ville
3. Paris-Montparnasse	20. St-Roch
4. Paris-Est	21. Rouen-rive-droite
5. CDG2 TGV	22. Dijon-ville
6. Part-Dieu	23. Angers St-Laud
7. Perrache	24. Mans
8. Lille-Flandres	25. Toulon
9. Lille-Europe	26. Tours
10. Strasbourg	27. Avignon TGV
11. St-Charles	28. Colmar
12. Bordeaux St-Jean	29. Nîmes
13. Nantes	30. Mulhouse-ville
14. Toulouse-Matabiau	31. Marne-la-Vallée-Chessy
15. Niceville	32. Aix-en-Provence TGV
16. Nancy-ville	33. St-Pierre-des-Corps
17. Rennes	34. Lons-le-Saugnier

As shown in Figure 6, these 34 stations are located in diverse parts of the country, including major cities, outside of major cities and in rural areas. Seven are terminal stations: Paris-Nord, Paris-Est, Paris-Montparnasse, Paris-Lyon, Lille-Flandres, Marseille-St-Charles and Tours. Five were built for the new LGVs: Avignon TGV, Aix-en-Provence TGV, Charles-de-Gaulle 2 TGV, Marne-la-Vallée Chessy and Lille-Europe.

All of the data collected in this study is taken from www.gares-en-mouvement.com/, which is the official website of the SNCF stations in France, the website passengers usually access for the schedules of public transportation and the trains, as well as the locations of the parking lots. High-speed rail data includes the number of services provided by the high-speed train in each station as well as its ridership. They are taken from SNCF sources.



Figure 6. Location of the 34 High-Speed Rail Stations Studied

V. HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATION CHARACTERISTICS – FRANCE

High-speed rail stations are hubs that are accessed via different modes of public transportation and allow passengers to transfer from one mode to another. They are interfaces between different scales of territory: regional, national and international.

High-speed rail stations in France are situated in different parts of cities. Most are historical landmarks, frequently dating from the 19th century. Lyon Part-Dieu is an exception. It is not a historical station; yet, it is located in the center of the city. The other stations are located either at the city limits or outside of the agglomeration. These are the stations of the new LGVs. Lille-Europe is an exception because it was built on the new LGV Nord. For political reasons, it is located in the center of the city near the historical station of Lille-Flandres.

LAYOUT OF HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS AND PLATFORMS

In general, there are three types of high-speed rail stations: terminal stations, bridge stations and underground stations (see Figure 47 in the Appendix). Among the 34 stations included in this study, seven are terminal stations, where tracks end at the station. Trains must pull out of the stations in the direction opposite that from which they arrive. Platforms in these stations are on ground level, eliminating the need to take an escalator or an elevator. The seven terminal stations are Lille-Flandres, Paris-Est, Paris-Lyon, Paris-Nord, Paris-Montparnasse, Marseille-St-Charles and Tours. Some stations can be viewed as bridges, where the platforms are under the station. In these stations, passengers must use escalators or elevators to access platforms. Some high-speed rail stations are underground, where platforms are above stations. In these stations, passengers must use an escalator or an elevator to access the platforms.

MODES CONNECTING TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Bus

Bus remains one of the modes most widely used in public transportation. It can be operated either within an urban transportation system or as an interurban transportation system. Urban buses are managed by the municipalities or the federations of municipalities in France, and thus are connected to all of the stations included in this study except the Aix-en-Provence TGV station, which is not located in a city with an urban bus system.

Urban buses are usually highly efficient for city use because they can bypass typical urban congestion in dedicated bus lanes. Buses offer many routes that serve high-speed rail stations (see Table 2). Additionally, high-speed rail stations are also served by interurban bus systems. These interurban buses bring passengers from other cities of the region into the cities where high-speed rail stations are located. Their travel distance is longer than the travel distance of urban buses, and their speed is higher than urban buses. They are present in almost all the high-speed rail stations (Table 2). For each high-speed rail station, the number of routes is often larger than the number of urban bus routes. However, in large cities like Paris and Lyon, the urban buses are dominant.

Tramway

Tramway is also a popular mode of public transportation in urban area. It has its own right-of-way on the surface of the road. This transit mode is not provided in all cities included in this study (see Table 2). Only the largest communes can often afford to have a tramway system. Among the 34 high-speed rail stations in this study, 15 are served with at least one tramway. Note that Paris does have a tramway system, which, however, is not connected to the four high-speed rail stations included in this study. It can be seen from Table 2 that the number of tramway routes is lower than that of bus routes. However, their ridership capacity is much larger.

Subway

Subway is a mode of public transportation usually seen in large cities. It has exclusive dedicated right-of-way, most times running underground. It carries masses of passengers. It is similar to a tramway in that only the larger cities can afford a subway system. Among the 34 high-speed rail stations studied, 12 are served by at least one line of subway. Five of them are also served by the tramway: Lille-Europe, Lille-Flandres, Lyon-Part-Dieu, Lyon-Perrache and Marseille-St-Charles. It can be observed from Table 2 that the number of subway routes serving each station is similar to that of tramway routes serving stations.

RER (RéseauxExpressRégional – RegionalExpressNetwork)

RER is a mode of public transportation inside Paris that is similar to a subway, but with fewer stops and a higher ridership capacity. It is exclusively underground within the city of Paris. Outside Paris, where it operates on ground level, it serves as a commuter train for the suburbs around Paris. As shown in Figure 7, the RER system is composed of five lines (A, B, C, D and E). In this study, only the Ile-de-France region (Parisian region) has this mode of public transportation. The RER serves three of the four Parisian high-speed rail stations (Paris-Est, Paris-Lyon, Paris-Nord) and the high-speed rail station of Charles-de-Gaulle 2 TGV.



Figure 7. RER Network in the Ile-de-France Region

Taxi

Taxi is an individual mode of public transportation. It is used when passengers wish to travel to high-speed rail stations with their luggage. All the high-speed rail stations in this study are connected with taxi service.

Car

Despite the efforts made by society to limit the use of the car for environmental reasons, cars are still widely used in France, particularly for driving or being driven to a high-speed rail station. It is an individual mode of transportation that can be used in different ways:

- A traveler can drive to the station and leave the car at a parking facility
- A second party can drop off and pick up the traveler at the station
- The traveler can rent a car

All three choices are accommodated at all high-speed rail stations in this study.

Table 2. Modes Connecting to High-Speed Rail Stations in France

Stations	Number of Urban Bus Routes	Number of Interurban Bus Routes	Number of Tramway Routes	Number of Subway Routes	Number of Routes of RER
Aix-en-Provence TGV		4			
Angers St-Laud	9	32	1		
Avignon TGV	1	9			
Bordeaux St-Jean	5	3	1		
CDG2 TGV	2	6		1	1
Colmar	16	11			
Dijon-ville	8	14			
Grenoble	2	24	2		
Le Mans	4	13	1		
Lille-Europe	3	4	2	2	
Lille-Flandres	9	4	2	2	
Lyon-Part-Dieu	12	5	2	1	
Lyon-Perrache	14	5	2	1	
Marseille-St-Charles	6	16	1	2	
Metz-ville	15	29			
Montpellier-St-Roch	7	9	2		
Mulhouse-ville	8	13	1		
Nancy-ville	8	26	1		
Nantes	4	19	1		
Niceville	9	4	1		
Nîmes	12	24			
Paris-Est	10			3	1
Paris-Lyon	10	2		2	2
Paris-Montparnasse	8	2		4	
Paris-Nord	15			3	3
Rennes	7	22		1	
Rouen-rive-droite	4	2		3	
Strasbourg	2	6	5		
Toulouse-Matabiau	7	32		1	
Tours	21	12			
Average	*8.21*	*12.57*	*1.67*	*2.00*	*1.75*

Passengers can also use the Motorail train, which carries the passenger’s car along with the passenger, much like a ferry. Commuters can leave their cars in a parking lot, and the Motorail service will put them onto a train. Among the 34 high-speed rail stations included in this study, such a service is available at eight stations: Lyon-Perrache, Strasbourg, Marseille-Saint-Charles, Bordeaux-Saint-Jean, Nantes, Toulouse-Mat abiau, Niceville and Metz-Ville. Passengers can also share a car with another commuter heading for a high-speed rail station, given the rideshare program available for some stations, including Paris-Montparnasse, Lille-Flandres, Strasbourg, Nantes, Rennes and Grenoble. Finally, travelers may use a public car service system in which a fleet of cars may be shared by a group of people. Only two high-speed rail stations—Lyon-Part-Dieu and Montpellier-Saint-Roch—are equipped with such a system.

Bicycle and motorcycle

Bicycles and motorcycles are individual modes of transportation that can be used to access high-speed rail stations. Bicycle travel is much appreciated in France because of its low environmental impact. Among the 30 stations included in this study, only one station—Charles-de-Gaulle 2 TGV—does not offer bicycle or motorcycle facilities. Thus, this high-speed rail station is difficult to reach for those who prefer these two modes of transportation. Bicycles can be a public or private mode. Out of the 34 HSR stations considered in this study, 20 possess a bicycle sharing system. They are: Paris-Nord, Paris-Lyon, Paris-Montparnasse, Paris-Est, Part-Dieu, Perrache, Lille-Flandres, Lille-Europe, Strasbourg, St-Charles, Bordeaux St-Jean, Nantes, Toulouse-Matabiau, Niceville, Nancy-Ville, Rennes, St-Roch, Rouen-rive-droite, Dijon-ville and Mulhouse-ville. To access high-speed rail stations by bicycles more quickly and safely, bicycle paths are often provided along primary routes to high-speed rail stations.

FACILITIES AND CONNECTION TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Each mode of transportation requires unique facilities, including:

Bus

The most commonly used facility for buses are bus stops, which can consist of anything from a simple signpost to a shelter. The same bus stop can be shared by several bus lines. Where several bus lines share a bus stop, the stop can be expanded into a bus station, a larger infrastructure that may play the role of a multimodal station. These bus stations sometimes present as a building. They are widely used by interurban buses in France.

Bus stops and bus stations are usually located outside train stations. Bus passengers must walk a long way to reach high-speed rail platforms. Table 3 presents the number of bus stops, some of which are shared by urban and interurban buses at each high-speed rail station.

Tramway

Like bus passengers, tram passengers bound for HSR stations board at tramway stops. As tramways are usually at ground level, passengers must cross streets to reach train platforms. The number of tramway stations is usually the same as the number of tramway lines because tramway lines rarely share stations. The high-speed rail station of Strasbourg, Lille-Flandres and Lille-Europe are exceptions because some tramway routes run underground, and passengers disembark at a level below the train station.

Subway

As their name implies, subways operate and deliver passengers below ground level. Commuters can depart the subway at various points. Indeed, a single subway station can have exit points either inside or outside a high-speed rail station. Transferring to train platforms requires riding an escalator or elevator.

RER

Like subways, the RER operates and stops underground while inside the city of Paris, where it serves three high-speed rail stations (Paris-Est, Paris-Lyon, Paris-Nord). It also stays underground at the CDG2 TGV station. Usually, passengers depart these stations at the same points as the subway exits and ride an elevator or escalator to reach train platforms.

Taxi

Taxi stations are dedicated for use by taxis. They are located next to high-speed rail stations, often in front of the main entrance. Passengers may be required to cross streets to reach the station.

Car

Regardless of the specific strategy used by car commuters (e.g., pick up, long-term parking, motorail), parking facilities are necessary. Depending on the station, the number of available spaces and the price of parking vary.

Parking may be underground, at ground level or elevated. In particularly dense urban areas, underground parking and elevated parking permit closer access to a station. Thus, some parking facilities require taking an escalator or an elevator to reach a high-speed rail platform. The exit of the parking lot may be located inside or outside the station. For ground level parking, passengers often must cross a street to reach the station.

Drop-off zones are essentially on-street parking. Like taxi stations, they are located very close to a station.

Bicycle and motorcycle

Passengers using bicycles and motorcycles can leave their vehicles in parking facilities reserved for them. Typically, there are numerous bicycle and motorcycle parking lots around high-speed rail stations. Again, however, travelers must cross streets to reach the station. At some stations, bicycles are provided by a public bicycle system. Sometimes bicycle parking is provided inside the rail station, leaving passengers very close to platforms.

Table 3. Facilities for HSR Connection Modes in France

Stations	Number of Bus Stops	Number of Tramway Facilities	Number of Subway Station Exits	Number of RER Station Exits	Number of Taxi Stations	Number of Parking Lots and Drop-off Zones	Number of Bicycle or Motorcycle Parking Stations
Aix-en-Provence TGV	3				2	16	2
Angers St-Laud	9	1			1	8	8
Avignon TGV	3				2	16	1
Bordeaux St-Jean	8	1			3	9	13
CDG2 TGV	12		1	2	4	12	0
Colmar	13				3	7	4
Dijon-ville	10				1	7	2
Grenoble	9	2			2	16	4
Le Mans	8	1			2	10	5
Lille-Europe	4	1	1		1	8	6
Lille-Flandres	9	5	5		3	13	11
Lyon-Part-Dieu	11	2	3		5	17	17
Lyon-Perrache	10	2	1		1	16	9
Marseille-St-Charles	11	1	3		2	13	7
Metz-ville	11				1	10	5
Montpellier -St-Roch	6	2			3	13	8
Mulhouse-ville	15	1			2	3	8
Nancy-ville	5	1			2	10	17
Nantes	6	1			3	18	6
Niceville	6	1			2	12	11
Nîmes	9				1	5	2
Paris-Est	13		3	1	1	5	6
Paris-Lyon	16		13	12	3	11	18
Paris-Montparnasse	14		2		5	17	15
Paris-Nord	10		6	4	4	7	31
Rennes	7		2		3	9	9

Stations	Number of Bus Stops	Number of Tramway Facilities	Number of Subway Station Exits	Number of RER Station Exits	Number of Taxi Stations	Number of Parking Lots and Drop-off Zones	Number of Bicycle or Motorcycle Parking Stations
Rouen-rive-droite	8		3		1	6	4
Strasbourg	11	6			1	11	5
Toulouse-Matabiau	7		3		1	5	10
Tours	9				1	6	5
Average	*9.10*	*1.87*	*3.54*	*4.75*	*2.20*	*10.53*	*8.59*

In summary, high-speed rail stations offer various connecting modes, each with different transfer facilities. These facilities can be large in number and located in various places around high-speed rail stations.

Urban and interurban buses can share bus stops. They can also be grouped in bus stations that require larger facilities. This is not the case for high-speed rail stations located in big cities, such as Paris and Lyon, where bus stops group no more than two or three bus lines. Consequently, big stations located in densely populated areas have a greater number of these types of facilities.

Because tramway routes are more divergent than bus routes, tramway lines rarely share stations. On the other hand, underground subway station exits can be shared, even with the RER, one example being Parisian HSR stations where the RER is underground. For both RER and subways, the number of exits can be multiple and located inside or outside the station.

Each high-speed rail station offers between one and five taxi stations. The stations in Paris and Lyon offer larger numbers.

The number of automobile parking lots per station varies. The HSR stations of Paris and Lyon have the largest number of parking lots. The stations of Aix-en-Provence TGV and Avignon TGV, which are new and located in rural areas, also have a large number of parking lots. It should be noted that stations in large cities, such Paris and Lyon, have the largest number of parking lots for bicycles and motorcycles.

Figure 8 indicates that the connection facilities for public transportation modes carrying the largest number of passengers, such as tramway, subway or RER, are usually located closer to HSR stations than those for modes carrying fewer passengers, such as buses.

It can be seen from Figure 9 that bicycle and motorcycle parking are close to high-speed rail stations but generally scattered.



Figure 8. Bus Stop, Subway and RER Exits in Paris-Lyon Station



Figure 9. Bicycle and Motorcycle Parking at Nancy-ville Station

Figure 10 shows that drop-off zones and taxi stations are closer to the station than car parking lots.



Figure 10. Taxi Stations and Car Parking Lots around Nantes Station

Subway, RER and some parking lots have their exits located inside high-speed rail station. To transfer, people must take one or more escalators or elevators to reach their desired platforms. Placing exits inside stations permits faster and easier access to stations and conserves space around the station, which is desirable in densely populated areas. For the other modes, transfer locations can generally be placed in front of stations or within a few blocks. In that case, passengers must make their way through the station or cross streets.

This chapter assessed high-speed rail station connectivity in France as a function of the number and variety of transportation modes providing access and the availability of adequate and convenient transfer facilities at the station. Depending on the station, these facilities may be closer to or further away from boarding platforms. They may be physically linked to platforms via escalator, elevator or tunnel. All of these parameters play a role in the calculation of the transfer time.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS – FRANCE

The data collected in this study were analyzed using a linear regression model. The descriptive statistics of the data are listed in Table 4. It is seen that the passengers arriving by taxi have the lowest transfer time: 141.9 seconds, or a little more than 2 minutes. The RER has the longest transfer time at 206.3 seconds, more than 3 minutes.

Among the four modes of travel not under passenger control, RER had the longest interval between regular trains arriving during peak periods, followed by buses. Subway trains had the shortest interval. Buses consistently offered more connecting routes. With regard to facilities, each HSR station in France provided an average of 10 car parking lots, 8.6 bus stops, 8.1 bike parking lots, 4 RER stations, 3.5 subway stations, 2.1 taxi rental services and 1.9 tramway stations.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Transfer Time

	RER	Subway	Tramway	Bus	Bike	Car	Taxi
Transfer time	206.3	170.4	203.5	199.8	173.1	188.0	131.9
Schedule	13.5	2.8	6.2	29.5			
No. of Services	1.6	2.0	1.7	7.8			
No. of Facilities	4.0	3.5	1.9	8.6	8.1	10.0	2.1

Relating the connectivity of multiple modes of transportation at HSR stations to ridership, Figure 11 shows that bus services number more than other modes, and this may not have a substantial correlation to high ridership. From Figure 12 it can be seen that there are many car parking facilities, bus stops and bike parking facilities at an HSR station. However, a high number of facilities may not be directly associated with high HSR ridership. Figure 13 shows that bus service intervals during peak period vary significantly, while the arrival intervals of other modes are shorter. The relationship between service intervals and ridership is not clear. From Figure 14, it cannot be determined which mode has a longer transfer time, nor the relationship of transfer time to ridership.



Figure 11. Ridership vs. Number of Services



Figure 12. Ridership vs. Number of Facilities



Figure 13. Ridership vs. Service Interval



Figure 14. Ridership vs. Transfer Time

These data are analyzed using a linear regression model to identify the relationship between them and ridership. The statistical software SST was used in the analysis. Table 28 in the Appendix provides the correlation coefficients for these variables. It was found that these four sets of variables are highly correlated: transfer time, schedule, number of service and number of facilities, as highlighted in yellow in Table 28. In the modeling, only one set of these four groups of variables was used. Table 5, Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8 show the results from the regression models.

Table 5 indicates that the transfer time for RER and bikes is significant. The transfer time for other modes is not significant, which implies that the improvement on the transfer time for these five modes may not noticeably increase ridership. Their coefficients are negative, implying that the decrease in transfer time for RER and bikes would increase ridership significantly, thus the effort in increasing ridership should focus on the modes of RER and bikes.

Table 6 shows the results when the intervals between regular trains for RER, subway and tramway are considered, while their transfer time, services and facilities are not included in the regression modeling. The results indicate that the transfer time for bikes is also significant. The interval between RER trains is significant. The negative coefficient implies that the longer the interval, the less ridership. These results indicate that, in addition to improve bike transfer time, reducing the time intervals between RER trains is important.

Table 7 lists the results when the number of services (such as bus routes) for RER, subway and tramway are considered, while their transfer times, schedules and facilities are not included. Bike transfer time shows statistical significance again. The coefficient for the number of services provided by RER is significant. Its coefficient is positive, implying that the more services provided by RER, the more ridership. In addition to improving bike transfer time, it is important to provide more RER service.

Table 8 provides the results from the regression model when the number of facilities for the modes of RER, subway and tramway are considered. The bike transfer time is the only significant variable, which confirms the results in previous modeling.

Table 5. Linear Regression Results - 1

Independent Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t- Statistic
Constant	1.35907e+002	51.04971	2.66225
RER Transfer Time	-0.13361	2.54636e-002	-5.24718
Subway Transfer Time	9.84538e-003	1.43825e-002	0.68454
Tramway Transfer Time	-2.64553e-003	1.46650e-002	-0.18040
Bus Transfer Time	8.47004e-002	0.16407	0.51623
Bike Transfer Time	-0.15232	3.80119e-002	-4.00710
Car Transfer Time	-0.14540	0.15921	-0.91331
Taxi Transfer Time	8.04043e-002	0.20022	0.40158
Bus Interval	-8.06694e-002	0.19274	-0.41855
No. of Bus Lines	0.88551	1.22324	0.72391
Existence of Airport	5.86729	9.18237	0.63897
No. of Bus Stops	-1.50352	1.98298	-0.75821
No. of Car Parks	-0.23952	1.44638	-0.16560
No. of Taxi Stands	9.87281	7.58208	1.30212
Number of Observations	34		
R-squared	0.82231		
Corrected R-squared	0.65507		
Sum of Squared Residuals	6.99818e+003		
Standard Error of the Regression	20.28935		
Durbin-Watson Statistic	1.61997		
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.37324		

Table 6. Linear Regression Results - 2

Independent Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t- Statistic
Constant	88.53207	53.47015	1.65573
Bus Transfer Time	0.14717	0.18752	0.78482
Bike Transfer Time	-0.12277	4.31714e-002	-2.84385
Car Transfer Time	-0.15901	0.18722	-0.84934
Taxi Transfer Time	3.00708e-002	0.24443	0.12302
RER Interval	-0.18731	4.82314e-002	-3.88351
Subway Interval	2.32839e-002	2.98751e-002	0.77937
Tramway Interval	-2.70109e-003	2.89868e-002	-9.31832e-002
Bus Interval	-9.74626e-002	0.22287	-0.43730
No. of Bus Lines	0.95781	1.44789	0.66152
Existence of Airport	5.89763	11.10551	0.53105
No. of Bus Stops	-1.31245	2.26667	-0.57902
No. of Car Parks	-0.65323	1.69207	-0.38606
No. of Taxi Stands	13.41133	8.78512	1.52660
Number of Observations	34		
R-squared	0.75426		
Corrected R-squared	0.52297		
Sum of Squared Residuals	9.67831e+003		
Standard Error of the Regression	23.86026		
Durbin-Watson Statistic	1.50634		
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.37324		

Table 7. Linear Regression Results - 3

Independent Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t- Statistic
Constant	89.34172	50.68241	1.76278
Bus Transfer Time	0.13943	0.18605	0.74941
Bike Transfer Time	-0.12424	4.10857e-002	-3.02399
Car Transfer Time	-0.15467	0.18502	-0.83596
Taxi Transfer Time	5.14576e-002	0.23919	0.21513
Bus Interval	-6.60952e-002	0.21495	-0.30748
No. of RER Lines	1.80023	0.43513	4.13720
# Subway Lines	-0.18284	0.26795	-0.68236
No. of Tramway Lines	5.21627e-002	0.27286	0.19117
No. of Bus Lines	0.85778	1.41785	0.60498
Existence of Airport	7.50743	10.38732	0.72275
No. of Bus Stops	-1.14196	2.28587	-0.49957
No. of Car Parks	-0.50534	1.64588	-0.30703
No. of Taxi Stands	12.11124	8.59992	1.40830
Number of Observations	34		
R-squared	0.76797		
Corrected R-squared	0.54959		
Sum of Squared Residuals	9.13827e+003		
Standard Error of the Regression	23.18502		
Durbin-Watson Statistic	1.52009		
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.37324		

Table 8. Linear Regression Results - 4

Independent Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t- Statistic
Constant	82.74677	53.40629	1.54938
Bus Transfer Time	2.29990e-002	0.21908	0.10498
Bike Transfer Time	-0.11617	4.55839e-002	-2.54846
Car Transfer Time	-0.10258	0.20750	-0.49435
Taxi Transfer Time	0.23251	0.28879	0.80512
Bus Interval	-7.33637e-002	0.22641	-0.32403
No. of RER Lines	14.88439	11.44513	1.30050
No. of Subway Lines	-12.61284	9.93080	-1.27007
No. of Tramway Lines	10.70337	12.68338	0.84389
No. of Bus Lines	0.81747	1.48383	0.55092
Existence of Airport	7.06587	10.91619	0.64728
No. of RER Stations	-13.08631	11.34970	-1.15301
No. of Subway Stations	12.33786	9.85873	1.25147
No. of Tramway Station	-10.69085	12.70460	-0.84149
No. of Bus Stops	-0.43621	2.59505	-0.16809
No. of Car Parks	0.13132	1.84421	7.12077e-002
No. of Taxi Stands	4.69245	10.82805	0.43336
Number of Observations	34		
R-squared	0.79164		
Corrected R-squared	0.50886		
Sum of Squared Residuals	8.20606e+003		
Standard Error of the Regression	24.21047		
Durbin-Watson Statistic	1.55920		
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.37324		

VII. DATA COLLECTION – SPAIN

HIGH-SPEED RAIL IN SPAIN

Spain's high-speed rail system is the Alta Velocidad Española (AVE) (see Figure 15). Spanning 1,900 miles (3,100 km), it is the longest high-speed rail system in Europe. It can travel up to 193 mph (310 km/h).

Figure 15. Map of High-Speed Rail in Spain

AVE NETWORK

There are three types of operation lines within Spain's high-speed rail system: the newly built high-speed rail service (the AVE), the mid-distance high-speed rail system (the AVANT), and the mixed high-speed rail/conventional system (the ALVIA). Table 9 lists the lines currently in operation in Spain. These lines are shown in the map in Figure 15.

Table 9. Lines of High-Speed Rail in Spain

AVE	AVANT (mid-distance)	ALVIA (mixed high-speed and conventional)
AVE Madrid–Seville via Ciudad Real, Puertollano, and Córdoba	Madrid–Ciudad Real–Puertollano	Madrid–Irún, via Valladolid, Burgos and San Sebastián
AVE Madrid–Barcelona via Guadalajara, Calatayud, Saragossa, Lleida and Tarragona	Madrid–Toledo	Madrid–Bilbao, via Valladolid and Burgos
AVE Barcelona–Seville via Saragossa and Córdoba	Málaga–Córdoba–Seville via Antequera and Puente Genil	Gijón–Alicante, via Valladolid and Madrid
AVE Barcelona–Málaga via Saragossa and Córdoba	Segovia–Madrid	Madrid–Logroño
AVE Madrid–Huesca via Guadalajara, Calatayud, and Saragossa	Calatayud–Saragossa	Barcelona–Irún, via Saragossa, Pamplona and San Sebastián
AVE Madrid–Valladolid via Segovia	Zaragoza–Huesca	Barcelona–Bilbao, via Saragossa and Logroño
AVE Madrid–Málaga via Ciudad Real, Puertollano, Córdoba, and Antequera	Barcelona–Lleida	Barcelona–Vigo, via Saragossa, Pamplona, Vitoria, Burgos, Palencia and Leon. With connection services to Gijón in Leon and to A Coruña in Monforte de Lemos
		Madrid–Huelva, via Madrid and Seville

In this study, the data were collected for 16 high-speed rail stations in Spain, which are listed in Table 10.

Table 10. Spain: 16 High-Speed Rail Stations Studied

1. Barcelona- Sants	9. Ciudad Real
2. Madrid- Chamartin	10. Puertollano
3. Madrid-Puerta de Atocha	11. Cordoba
4. Valladolid	12. Sevilla
5. Segovia	13. Zaragoza
6. Toledoo	14. Lleida-pirineus
7. Valencia	15. Camp de Tarragona
8. Malaga	16. Ciudad Real

VIII. HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATION CHARACTERISTICS – SPAIN

LAYOUT OF HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS AND PLATFORMS

The layout of platforms at high-speed rail stations in Spain is an important factor in the transfer time of passengers. There are three typical platform layouts. Terminal stations are usually located at the heart of an urban center. The platforms in these stations are typically on ground level, which allows easy access from other modes of public transportation. Among the 16 stations in Spain, nine place the station above the platform. When passengers arrive at the station, they take elevators or escalators to reach the lower platform. Another layout is an underground station. In this design, passengers can take escalators or elevators to ascend to the overhead platform. The advantage of this design is that it is typically more convenient for passengers who take underground transit, such as the subway or metro, to access the overhead platform.

MODES CONNECTING TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Bus

Traveling by bus in Spain is usually far more affordable and faster than traveling by train. Many companies provide bus links from local routes between villages to fast intercity connections. Buses offer many routes that serve high-speed rail stations.

Metro

Only two cities in Spain employ metro systems: Madrid and Barcelona. The HSR system in Madrid is the sixth longest in the world. Note that Madrid is also approximately the 50th most populous metropolitan area in the world. The Madrid Metro is in operation every day from 6:00 a.m. until 1:30 a.m.

Bicycle

There is apparently little encouragement for biking in Spain. Barcelona, however, is an exception. In that city, cycling lanes have been implemented along main roads and several residential routes, making it possible for visitors to enjoy the city via bicycle. Years of highway improvement programs across the country have made cycling a much more appealing mode of travel and sightseeing than it was previously. In addition to commuter cycling, there are plenty of options for recreational biking, from mountain biking in the Pyrenees to distance riding along the coast. Still, drivers are not always supportive of bicycle traffic.

Taxi

Taxi stands in Spain are typically located outside railway stations. In major cities, travelers can hail a taxi directly from the street, but in small towns, taxis are usually available only at taxi stands. A recent consumer survey found that the most expensive taxis were in Castellón, Murcia and Tarragona, and the least expensive in Almería, Cádiz and Santa

Cruz de Tenerife. However, Spanish taxis are among the cheapest in Europe, which is evident from their use by the general public for everyday errands, such as shopping. Table 11 presents the data on the modes of public transportation available at high-speed rail stations in Spain.

Table 11. Modes Connecting to High-Speed Rail Stations in Spain

Station	Number of bus routes	Number of Metro lines	Regional bus lines	Suburban bus lines	Suburban railway lines
Barcelona- Sants	5	2	6	10	5
Madrid- Chamartin	3	1			
Madrid-Puerta de Atocha	33	1	8		
Valladolid					
Segovia	1				
Toledo	3				
Valencia	11				
Malaga	12				
Ciudad Real					
Puertollano					
Cordoba	6			30	
Sevilla	6				
Zaragoza	5			33	
Lleida-pirineus				7	
Camp de Tarragona					
Figueres- Vilafant	5				
Average	*8.18*	*1.33*	*7.00*	*20.00*	*5.00*

FACILITIES AND CONNECTION TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Bus

Local buses can take passengers just about anywhere, but most buses connecting villages and provincial towns are not geared to tourist needs. According to the Lonely Planet website, frequent weekday services drop off to a trickle Saturdays and Sundays. In the smaller towns, often there is only one daily pickup for travel between towns during the week, and none on Sunday. It is usually unnecessary to make reservations.

In most large towns and cities, buses leave from a single bus station. In smaller towns, they tend to operate from a set street or plaza, often unmarked. Locals know where to go. Usually, tickets are purchased at a specific bar, although in some cases they may be purchased on the bus. Cities and provincial capitals all operate reasonable bus networks. Regular buses run from approximately 6:00 a.m. to shortly before midnight.

Metro

Metro terminals at high-speed rail stations in Spain often are located inside the station, significantly decreasing transfer time.

Bicycle

Bicyclists are often able to bring their bicycles with them on the train. All regional trains have space for bikes. Bikes are also permitted on most local area trains near big cities such as Madrid and Barcelona. On long-distance trains there are more restrictions. It is not known whether high-speed trains allow bikes on board. Table 12 lists the number of transportation facilities at high-speed rail stations in Spain.

Table 12. Facilities for HSR Connection Modes in Spain

	TMB bus stops	Metro stations	Regional bus stops	Suburban bus stops	Suburban railway stations	Taxi stands	Bicycle parking	Car parking
Barcelona- Sants	5	1	1	1	1	1	4	6
Madrid- Chamartin	3	1				1		4
Madrid-Puerta de Atocha	17	1				3	2	2
Valladolid						1	3	7
Segovia	1					1	1	2
Toledo	1					1	1	3
Valencia	1	1				1		2
Malaga	3					1	1	2
Ciudad Real	2					1	2	5
Puertollano						1	1	7
Cordoba	5			1		1	1	1
Sevilla	4					1	1	7
Zaragoza	8			1		2	2	1
Lleida-pirineus				1		1	1	4
Camp de Tarragona						1	1	4
Figueres- Vilafant	2					1		1
Average	*4.33*	*1.00*	*1.00*	*1.00*	*1.00*	*1.19*	*1.62*	*3.63*

IX. DATA ANALYSIS – SPAIN

The relationship between the connectivity of multiple modes of transportation and ridership was investigated by first examining the charts representing their relationship. Figures 16, 17, 18 and 19 present the relationship between ridership and each of the four categories of variables representing connectivity. From Figure 16 it can be seen that there are more suburban bus lines connected to high-speed rail stations than metro and regular bus lines. However, their services were not associated with high-speed rail ridership. This could be due to the fact that most of the high-speed rail stations included in this study are located in small cities that are typically connected by suburban bus lines and do not generate significant ridership. Figure 17 shows that there are more accommodations for buses, cars and bicycles at Spain's HSR stations than for other modes of transportation. But the ridership associated with these three modes is necessarily high. It can be seen from Figure 18 that buses and metro services are available at relatively shorter intervals than those of suburban buses, and their frequent arrivals are associated with higher ridership. Figure 19 indicates that taxis, bicycles and buses usually have a shorter transfer time than other modes of transportation. But, again, their short transfer time may not necessarily be associated with high ridership.



Figure 16. Ridership vs. Number of Services



Figure 17. Ridership vs. Number of Facilities



Figure 18. Ridership vs. Service Interval



Figure 19. Ridership vs. Transfer Time

A linear regression model was developed to identify the connectivity factors that influence ridership at high-speed rail stations. The regression results are presented in Table 13. The data that have small sample sizes were removed from the regression analysis. The correlation coefficients of the variables included in the regression models are calculated and presented in Table 14. From Table 13 it can be seen that only two variables are significant: number of bus lines and number of bicycle parking stations. Both coefficients are positive, implying that ridership is higher for a high-speed rail station served by more bus routes and bicycle parking facilities.

Table 13. Regression Results

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-Stat	P-value
Intercept	-4.9913	1.6237	-3.0740	0.0180
No. of Bus Lines	0.4124	0.0531	7.7646	0.0001
No. of Bike Parks	1.4379	0.5243	2.7424	0.0288
No. of Car Parks	0.2765	0.2066	1.3381	0.2227
Bus Interval	0.0000	0.0000	0.6799	0.5184
Bus Transfer Time	0.0000	0.0000	-0.8538	0.4214
Taxi Transfer Time	1.1405	0.9397	1.2137	0.2642
Bike Transfer Time	0.0000	0.0000	1.2300	0.2584
Car Transfer Time	0.9069	0.4618	1.9635	0.0903
R-Square	0.941526886			
Adjusted R-Square	0.874700469			
Observations	16			

Table 14. Correlation Coefficients

	Ridership	No. of Bus Lines	No. of Bike Parks	No. of Car Parks	Bus Interval	Bus Transfer Time	Taxi Transfer Time	Bike Transfer Time	Car Transfer Time
Ridership	1								
No. of Bus Lines	0.87	1.00							
No. of Bike Parks	0.35	0.04	1.00						
No. of Car Parks	-0.08	-0.38	0.41	1.00					
Bus Interval	-0.42	-0.53	0.14	0.44	1.00				
Bus Transfer Time	-0.32	-0.41	0.10	0.50	0.75	1.00			
Taxi Transfer Time	0.29	0.13	0.26	0.13	0.17	0.36	1.00		
Bike Transfer Time	-0.07	0.04	-0.60	-0.29	-0.37	-0.28	-0.26	1.00	
Car Transfer Time	-0.14	-0.15	-0.57	-0.11	-0.12	-0.09	-0.12	0.32	1.00

X. DATA COLLECTION – JAPAN

HIGH-SPEED RAIL IN JAPAN

Japan was the first country in the world to develop high-speed railway technology. High-speed rail in Japan, also known as Shinkansen, began operations in 1964 and has continued to grow and evolve ever since. Reaching maximum operating speeds of approximately 320 km/h, it is an enormously popular for long-distance travel and commuting.

Currently, there are 100 high-speed rail stations in Japan that are in operation, with future stations planned. The Shinkansen essentially runs the length of Japan, forming a nearly contiguous line. The Shinkansen is broken into six main lines, as well as two mini-Shinkansen lines (upgraded narrow gauge railway lines to standard railway lines for Shinkansen use).

The main Shinkansen lines include (see Figure 20):

- Tokaido Shinkansen: Begins in Tokyo; ends in Shin-Osaka. (Track length: 515.4 km).
- Sanyo Shinkansen: Begins in Shin-Osaka; ends in Hakata. (Track length: 553.7 km).
- Tohoku Shinkansen: Begins in Tokyo; ends in Shin-Aomori. (Track length: 674.9 km).
- Jotetsu Shinkansen: Begins in Omiya; ends in Niigata. (Track length: 269.5 km).
- Nagano Shinkansen: Begins in Takasaki; ends in Nagano. (Track length: 117.4 km).
- Kyushu Shinkansen: Begins in Hakata; ends in Kagoshima-Chuo. (Track length: 256.8 km).

Mini-Shinkansen lines include:

- Yamagata Shinkansen: Begins in Fukushima; ends in Shinjo. (Track length: 148.6 km).
- Akita Shinkansen: Begins in Morioka; ends in Akita. (Track length: 127.3 km).



Figure 20. High-Speed Rail Network in Japan

The data collection for this study includes 37 high-speed rail stations in Japan (see Table 15). To ensure diversity, the stations were selected randomly from among those that had maintained ridership records.

Table 15. Japan: 37 High-Speed Rail Stations Studied

Stations	
1. Tokyo (東京)	20. Sendai (仙台)
2. Shin-Yokohama (新横浜)	21. Fukushima (福島)
3. Mishima (三島)	22. Oyama (小山)
4. Shizuoka (静岡)	23. Omiya (大宮)
5. Hamamatsu (浜松)	24. Akita (秋田)
6. Nagoya (名古屋)	25. Kakunodate (角館)
7. Kyoto (京都)	26. Shinjo (新庄)

Stations	
8. Shin-Osaka (新大阪)	27. Murayama (村山)
9. Shin-Kobe ((新神戸)	28. Yamagata (山形)
10. Okayama (岡山)	29. Niigata (新潟)
11. Shin-Onomichi (新尾道)	30. Nagaoka (長岡)
12. Hiroshima (広島)	31. Jomo-Kogen (上毛高原)
13. Shin-Yamaguchi (新山口)	32. Takasaki (高崎)
14. Kokura (小倉)	33. Honjo-Waseda (本庄早稲)
15. Shin-Aomori (新青森)	34. Kumagaya (熊谷)
16. Hachinohe (八戸)	35. Nagano (長野)
17. Morioka (盛岡)	36. Sakudaira (佐久平)
18. Kitakami (北上)	37. Annaka-Haruna (安中榛名)
19. Furukawa (古川)	

As shown in Figure 21, the 37 stations are located in different parts of the country, spanning almost the entire length of the network. (It should be noted that none of the stations on the Kyushu Shinkansen line were chosen due to a lack of data from this new line.) The stations are located in major metropolitan areas, as well as outside of major cities, in small towns and in rural areas.



Figure 21. Location of 37 High-Speed Rail Stations in Japan

As part of the data collection, the modes of transportation connecting each high-speed rail station were identified. They include:

1. Buses
2. Taxis
3. Railways
4. Cars
5. Bicycles

In addition, the ridership numbers for each high-speed rail station in this study were also found. The interconnectivity of these transportation modes was used in the data analysis to determine how they affect the ridership numbers for each station.

XI. HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATION CHARACTERISTICS – JAPAN

Transportation infrastructure is one of the most visually dominating components of any city or open landscape. Railway stations are considered important public buildings. Not only do they provide access to trains and function as urban landmarks, they may also house various commercial enterprises, from shopping centers to meeting facilities.

LAYOUT AND HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS AND PLATFORMS

Japan's rail stations have undergone many changes since opening in the late 1800s. With the inception of high-speed rail in 1964 and subsequent growth of the network, revitalization of stations began. Today's stations generally can be classified as one of the following: metropolitan stations with commercial facilities; stations with fewer facilities in major urban areas (regional city stations in the process of deterioration); commuter stations in residential areas; and primarily unmanned stations.

Japan's Shinkansen trains run on elevated tracks with no level crossings; most stations are below the tracks (See Figures 22, 23, 24 and 25). However, some of the Shinkansen stations have offices located on one side of the tracks, so those stations were built over the tracks, creating free passage between the station sides (See Figures 26, 27 and 28). Shinkansen are constructed with public funds, so only the minimum amount of land needed for railway operation is bought, and the boundary of the stations must be within the viaduct walls. New Shinkansen stations often include memorable entrances, facilities to promote local tourism and other public facilities set up by the local government in the station plaza. This demonstrates that the community's confidence that the Shinkansen station will help stimulate the region.



Figure 22. Under-the-Tracks Station Layout



Figure 23. Station Layout in Shin-Yokohama

Figure 24. Plan View of Shin-Yokohama Station (Google Maps)

Figure 25. Ticket Gate Entrance/Exit to Shinkansen Platform in Shizuoka



Figure 26. Over-the-Tracks Station Layout



Figure 27. Station Layout in Nagano

Figure 28. Station Platform in Nagano

MODES CONNECTING TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Each Shinkansen station offers multimodal connectivity to local destinations as well as to other Japanese cities.

Buses

Buses are one of the more popular modes of transportation in Japan, and all cities offer local and intercity service. Local buses provide transportation within city limits, while highway buses allow travel on the expressways and link cities to other cities, or cities to tourist destinations. Travel times can vary depending on traffic or accidents, but for the most part Japan's buses are punctual.

Taxi

Taxis are widely available in Japan and provide door-to-door service. Taxis are an expensive alternative to public transportation, but they often are the only way to get around once trains and buses stop operating for the day. One advantage of taxi transportation is that taxi drop-off locations are immediately adjacent to high-speed rail stations, making the transfer times shorter.

In smaller cities or rural areas in a Japan, public transportation tends to be less convenient, increasing the importance of taxi service as an alternative.

Railways

Railways are the most efficient and convenient way to travel and commute in metropolitan cities that offer this service. Tokyo, for example, boasts one of the largest and most intricate railway networks in Japan, making rail one of the most popular modes of public transportation.

Railway transportation is also offered between cities, but the Shinkansen trains are more feasible and economical for this purpose. While Japan's rail service is not only extensive, it is also considered to be a very reliable source of public transportation. The Japanese pride themselves on the punctuality of their railways and the predictably accurate arrivals, departures and travel times (notwithstanding natural events, such as poor weather or earthquakes). Larger metropolitan areas tend to have a higher number of railway services compared with the smaller cities.

Car

In large metropolitan areas such as Tokyo and Osaka, some people do not own a car or have a driver's license; they rely primarily on public transportation. However, in smaller cities or rural areas where public transportation is inconvenient or less frequent, people do rely on cars for mobility. All Shinkansen stations in Japan provide some type of car-related amenity, whether it is car parking, car rentals or passenger drop-off areas for cars.

Bicycles

Bicycles are widely used in Japan, both in large metropolitan areas and in small rural towns. They are the most sustainable mode of transportation and can be the most efficient way to travel or commute short distances, especially in densely populated urban areas.

Bicyclists are expected to use streets and not sidewalks unless otherwise indicated by signage (See Table 16).

Table 16. Modes Connecting to High-Speed Rail Stations in Japan

HSR Station / (City)	Bus	Taxi	Railway	Car Parking	Bike Parking
Tokyo (Tokyo)	22	-	9	-	-
Shin-Yokohama (Yokohama)	7	-	2	-	-
Mishima (Mishima)	6	-	2	-	-
Shizuoka (Shizuoka)	6	-	1	-	-
Hamamatsu (Hamamatsu)	6	-	1	-	-
Nagoya (Nagoya)	7	-	6	-	-
Kyoto (Kyoto)	8	-	5	-	-
Shin-Osaka (Osaka)	14	-	3	-	-
Shin-Kobe (Kobe)	16	-	2	-	-
Okayama (Okayama)	12	-	5	-	-
Shin-Onomichi (Onomichi)	38	-	0	-	-
Hiroshima (Hiroshima)	38	-	5	-	-
Shin-Yamaguchi (Yamaguchi)	5	-	3	-	-
Kokura (Kitakyushu)	10	-	3	-	-
Shin-Aomori (Aomori)	6	-	1	-	-
Hachinohe (Hachinohe)	6	-	2	-	-
Morioka (Morioka)	3	-	5	-	-
Kitakami (Kitakami)	3	-	2	-	-
Furukawa (Osaki)	6	-	1	-	-
Sendai (Sendai (Miyagi))	6	-	6	-	-
Fukushima (Fukushima)	4	-	4	-	-
Oyama (Oyama)	2	-	4	-	-
Omiya (Saitama)	13	-	8	-	-
Akita (Akita)	3	-	3	-	-
Kakunodate (Senboku)	3	-	2	-	-
Shinjo (Shinjo)	6	-	3	-	-
Murayama (Murayama)	6	-	1	-	-
Yamagata (Yamagata)	6	-	3	-	-
Niigata (Niigata)	5	-	3	-	-
Nagaoka (Nagaoka)	5	-	2	-	-
Jomo-Kogen (Minakami)	8	-	0	-	-
Takasaki (Takasaki)	8	-	7	-	-
Honjo-Waseda (Honjo)	13	-	0	-	-
Kumagaya (Kumagaya)	13	-	2	-	-
Nagano (Nagano)	10	-	5	-	-
Sakudaira (Saku)	10	-	1	-	-
Annaka-Haruna (Annaka)	8	-	0	-	-
Average	*9.41*		*3.39*		

Summary

Various connection modes are offered at Shinkansen stations. Stations located in larger metropolitan areas offer more varieties, such as railways, buses and taxis because the transportation infrastructure is more complex and must accommodate a larger population.

In 2000, a commuting survey with approximately 4000 participants was conducted in Japan. While the study was not representative for the entire country, it provided a broad outlook on the relative popularity of various commuting modes. As seen in Figure 29, rail was the mode of choice for commuters, followed by car, bicycle and bus.



Figure 29. Commuting Mode Preferences in Japan

The efficiency and convenience of the various modes of transportation at each Shinkansen station depends on its location. Shinkansen stations in smaller cities or rural towns, such as Shinjo or Annaka-Haruna, tend to rely more on buses and cars, while stations in larger cities, such as Tokyo or Osaka, tend to rely more on railways.

FACILITIES AND CONNECTION TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Each mode of transportation connecting to Japan's high-speed rail stations has unique facilities.

Bus

Bus facilities at a Shinkansen station may range from a simple bus stop to a full bus terminal (See Figure 31). Shinkansen stations located in larger metropolitan areas most likely have bus terminals to accommodate higher ridership, while Shinkansen stations in smaller cities have a few bus stops located near the entrances/exits of the station.



Figure 30. Bus Terminal at Kyoto Station (Aerial View)

Bus stops and bus terminals are usually located on the outside of the Shinkansen stations. Passengers typically need to walk from the drop-off point to the boarding platform. This may require crossing streets and traversing plazas or even department stores. Stations in larger cities offer correspondingly more and larger facilities, while the facilities at smaller cities are fewer and smaller.

Taxi

Taxi stands are usually designated in specific areas near station entrances/exits. Transfer from taxi to trains typically requires walking from the taxi stand to the station platform. At most stations, taxis line up near taxi stands, so they are readily available.

Railway

Railway stations are usually located in the same facility as the HSR station (see Figure 47 in Appendix). Local rails may be adjacent to the Shinkansen trains or sometimes below them. Subways are located underground. Transfer between local railways to Shinkansen trains requires passengers to walk from the railway platform to the Shinkansen platform. This may include using an escalator or elevator, as well as passing through ticketed gates. Large metropolitan cities typically have more railway platforms than smaller cities.

Car

While cars are not the favored source of transportation in Japan, they are nonetheless widely used. The decision whether to use a car usually depends on the type of city. In larger metropolitan areas, car use is lower, while they are used more frequently in smaller rural areas of necessity because public transportation alternatives are fewer and less convenient.

Car parking is available at all Shinkansen stations, but fees vary by city. Parking at urban stations can be very expensive, while small towns and rural areas may charge no fee at all. Parking facilities at Shinkansen stations may include parking lots near the station or garages located in the train facility. While parking lots are usually on ground level, parking garages may include several stories above or below ground. Parking facilities usually require passengers to walk to the train platforms and typically involve crossing streets and/or using an escalator or elevator. Table 17 shows the approximate number of car parking lots at each Shinkansen station examined for this study. It should be noted that some parking lots/garages for large cities may not be included due to lack of information available online.

Bicycle

All Shinkansen stations in Japan provide designated areas for bicycle parking. While some stations may have bike parking lots, other parking facilities may be on sidewalks adjacent to station entrances. Transferring from a bike to a train usually requires walking from the bike parking area to the Shinkansen platform. Bike parking lots are typically on ground level, but some may be in garages or even underground. Table 17 shows the number of bicycle parking facilities at each station examined for this study. It should be noted that most bicycle parking information in Japan is not readily available on the internet, and the figures in Table 17 were approximated for use in this study.

While bicycle use is very popular in Japan, the parking situation for bicycles at some of the larger metropolitan stations has become a problem. Designated bike parking is located in most Shinkansen stations; however, many bicyclists park wherever convenient near the station, causing hazardous conditions for pedestrians and surrounding businesses. Recently, the Tokyo Metropolitan Government banned bicycle parking outside of designated bicycle parking areas, and there are plans to increase the number of bicycle parking facilities around the station.

Table 17. Facilities for HSR Connection Modes in Japan

HSR Station / (City)	Bus	Taxi	Railway	Car Parking	Bike Parking
Tokyo (Tokyo)	32	11	20	10	2
Shin-Yokohama (Yokohama)	8	6	4	5	3
Mishima (Mishima)	12	12	4	7	2
Shizuoka (Shizuoka)	21	12	4	6	2
Hamamatsu (Hamamatsu)	19	15	4	7	3
Nagoya (Nagoya)	22	15	18	4	2
Kyoto (Kyoto)	42	22	21	6	2
Shin-Osaka (Osaka)	6	7	10	5	15
Shin-Kobe (Kobe)	6	8	3	4	2
Okayama (Okayama)	20	10	7	6	2
Shin-Onomichi (Onomichi)	5	4	0	6	2
Hiroshima (Hiroshima)	22	17	12	6	2
Shin-Yamaguchi (Yamaguchi)	8	6	8	3	2

HSR Station / (City)	Bus	Taxi	Railway	Car Parking	Bike Parking
Kokura (Kitakyushu)	5	10	10	8	2
Shin-Aomori (Aomori)	10	6	2	3	2
Hachinohe (Hachinohe)	6	8	5	8	2
Morioka (Morioka)	24	6	10	4	2
Kitakami (Kitakami)	10	8	4	6	2
Furukawa (Osaki)	7	4	2	7	2
Sendai (Sendai (Miyagi))	36	14	10	8	4
Fukushima (Fukushima)	17	10	6	9	2
Oyama (Oyama)	5	6	8	6	2
Omiya (Saitama)	12	12	17	6	4
Akita (Akita)	18	7	8	6	2
Kakunodate (Senboku)	2	2	3	1	1
Shinjo (Shinjo)	6	6	4	4	2
Murayama (Murayama)	2	2	2	2	2
Yamagata (Yamagata)	8	8	5	6	4
Niigata (Niigata)	28	10	7	6	4
Nagaoka (Nagaoka)	22	4	5	5	2
Jomo-Kogen (Minakami)	2	2	0	2	2
Takasaki (Takasaki)	14	6	8	6	4
Honjo-Waseda (Honjo)	2	4	0	5	2
Kumagaya (Kumagaya)	9	6	6	10	4
Nagano (Nagano)	13	9	9	4	4
Sakudaira (Saku)	3	7	1	6	2
Annaka-Haruna (Annaka)	1	1	0	4	1
Average	*13.11*	*8.19*	*7.48*	*5.59*	*2.73*

Summary

High-speed rail stations in Japan accommodate different modes of transportation, with facilities for each. Large cities will usually have a greater number of facilities, while the smaller cities have fewer. The popularity of each mode usually depends on the location of the high-speed rail station. While railways are more popular in large metropolitan areas, smaller cities may see higher use of buses or cars. Since the majority of high-speed rail stations have similar layouts, passengers can easily locate their preferred transportation mode. High-speed rail stations also have ample signage to indicate the location of transit terminals and parking. Japan has a very efficient public transportation network, especially within metropolitan areas and between large cities. Japanese public transportation is characterized by its punctuality, reliability, frequent service and popularity. The number and type of facilities at each HSR station are generally influenced by ridership.

XII. DATA ANALYSIS – JAPAN

The data collected in this study were analyzed using a correlation test and a linear regression model. Table 18 shows the descriptive statistics of the data found for this study. The values in Table 18 represent averages of the 37 stations used for this study. Regarding to the location of high-speed rail station platforms to the different transportation modes, the shortest transfer time was for taxi service, with an average transfer time of approximately 317 seconds (a little over five minutes). The highest average transfer time was for cars, with an average time of 397 seconds (a little over 6.5 minutes) to traverse the distance from parking lot to platform and vice versa. From the collected data, it appears that Japan offers more bus service than any other type of public transportation, followed by railway (which includes local rail, light rail, subway and metro). However, the type of public transportation offered to passengers may depend on the type of city and its infrastructure. For example, railway would be used most in highly populated areas such as Tokyo, which has a very intricate network of local rail and subway service, while residents of a smaller rural area would choose bus, taxi or car. Regarding to the number of facilities offered at HSR stations, bus stops and taxi outpace other modes, with an average of 13 and eight facilities per station, respectively. Railway facilities average seven per station, with car and bicycle parking lots coming in last at respective averages of seven and three facilities per station.

Table 18. Descriptive Statistics

(Averages)	Bus	Taxi	Railway	Car	Bicycle
Transfer Time (sec)	349.35	317.30	370.90	397.45	354.85
Number of Services	9.41	-	3.03	-	-
Number of Facilities	13.11	8.19	6.68	5.59	2.73

The descriptive statistic variables for high-speed rail stations with total ridership were plotted against the ridership numbers for each of its stations. Figures 31, 32 and 33 show the plotted results. From Figure 31, it can be seen that there may be a positive relationship between the number of services and ridership. Figure 32 shows that ridership for a transportation mode tends to increase with the number of facilities offered, relative to ridership for all modes collectively. Figure 33 demonstrates that the same relationship can be seen regarding ridership and transfer time.



Figure 31. Ridership vs. Number of Services



Figure 32. Ridership vs. Number of Facilities



Figure 33. Ridership vs. Transfer Times

The data were analyzed using a linear regression model to identify relationships between the descriptive and ridership data. The analysis was performed with the statistical software package in Microsoft Excel. The results listed in Table 19 (correlation coefficients are in Table 20) indicate that the number of bus services, taxi stands and railroad stops significantly impact ridership. That is the greater the number of services and facilities, the higher the ridership.

Table 19. Regression Results

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-Stat	P-value
Intercept	-49169.54	25340.97	-1.94	0.07
Taxi Transfer Time	12.53	96.49	0.13	0.90
No. of Bus Services	2313.00	1007.08	2.30	0.03
No. of Bus Stops	-1858.90	996.90	-1.86	0.08
No. of Taxi Stands	5770.79	2448.14	2.36	0.03
No. of Railway Stations	9981.38	1893.06	5.27	0.00
No. of Car Parks	-2993.69	3603.65	-0.83	0.42
No. of Bike Parks	-741.85	7002.49	-0.11	0.92
R-Square	0.841817112			
Adjusted R-Square	0.786453102			
Observations	28			

Table 20. Correlation Coefficients

	Ridership	Taxi Transfer Time	Number of Bus Services	Number of Bus Stops	Number of Taxi Stands	Number of Railway Stations	Number of Car Parks	Number of Bike Parks
Ridership	1							
Taxi Transfer Time	0.34	1.00						
No. of Bus Services	0.59	0.16	1.00					
No. of Bus Stops	0.27	0.60	0.13	1.00				
No. of Taxi Stands	0.66	0.40	0.48	0.59	1.00			
No. of Railway Stations	0.82	0.51	0.34	0.45	0.57	1.00		
No. of Car Parks	0.10	0.41	0.14	0.20	0.39	0.10	1.00	
No. of Bike Parks	0.19	0.44	0.10	0.28	0.22	0.29	0.33	1

XIII. DATA COLLECTION – CHINA

HIGH-SPEED RAIL IN CHINA

Despite its relatively late entry into high-speed rail relative to countries such as Japan and France, China boasts the world's longest high-speed rail network, with approximately 5,800 miles of rail as of December 2012. In the mid-1990s, trains in China traveled at a top speed of about 37 mph. Today, China's high-speed railcars travel at an average speed in excess of 124 mph.

Daily ridership of high-speed rail services in China has grown from 237,000 in 2007 to 796,000 in 2010. China's high-speed rail network includes three types of lines: upgraded conventional railways, newly built high-speed passenger-designated lines (PDLs) and the world's first high-speed commercial magnetic levitation (maglev) line. The country is enjoying a high-speed rail building boom in response to funding from the government's economic stimulus program. The network is expanding rapidly, and the total network length is expected to reach 25,000 miles within the next 20 years (see Figure 34).

Figure 34. Proposed High-Speed Network in P.R. China



Figure 35. National High-Speed Rail Grid (Four North-South, plus Four East-West)

The centerpiece of the expansion of conventional rail into high-speed rail is a new national rail grid overlain onto the existing railway network. According to China's "Mid-to-Long-Term Railway Network Plan," as revised in 2008, this grid is composed of eight high-speed rail corridors: four running north and south, and the other four running east and west. Together, these corridors cover 12,000 km (see Figure 35). Most of the new lines, known as passenger-designated lines (PDL), follow the routes of existing trunk lines and are designated for passenger travel only. Several sections of the national high-speed railway networks were built to link cities that had no pre-existing rail connections. Those sections will carry a mix of passengers and freight. The speed of high-speed trains on PDLs can reach approximately 300–350 km/h. This national grid project was planned for completion by 2020. Due to influx of economic plan stimulus funds, many lines now project considerably earlier completion dates.

The above-mentioned railway network plan, also notes that the government plans to expand the railway network in western China and to fill gaps in the networks of eastern and central China. Some of these new railways are being designed to accommodate speeds of 200~250 km/h for both passengers and freight. These railways are also considered high-speed rail, although they are not part of the national PDL grid or intercity high-speed rail.

In this study, data for 17 stations in China were collected. These stations are primarily along the east-west high-speed line from Xi'an to Zhengzhou in the center of China. These stations are listed in Table 21. Some data for other major high-speed rail stations, such as Beijing South, were also collected. Because ridership data cannot be made available for these stations, they were not included in this study.

Table 21. China: 17 High-Speed Rail Stations Studied

1. Zhengzhou East	10. Mianchi South
2. Luoyang Longmen	11. Anyang
3. Xi'an North	12. Shangqiu
4. Sanmenxia South	13. Xinxiang
5. Weinan North	14. Xinxiang East
6. Huashan North	15. Xuchang
7. Anyang East	16. Xuchang East
8. Kaifeng	17. Zhengzhou
9. Lingbao West	

XIV. HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS CHARACTERISTICS – CHINA

LAYOUT OF HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS AND PLATFORMS

Chinese high-speed rail lines run either over or under passenger platforms, allowing efficient movement of trains in and out of stations. Terminal-type stations are rare in China.

MODES CONNECTING TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Bus

Buses operate either within a city or between cities. They remain widely used as the major mode of public transportation, especially in the less-developed cities in China. To effectively use the capacity of buses, many cities adopt bus-only lanes.

Table 22 lists the number of bus routes in urban areas and the number of suburban bus routes for the stations included in this study.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Bus rapid transit has been successfully adopted in China. Many high-speed rail stations have a connection with BRT.

Subway

Due to China's extraordinarily large urban population, many Chinese cities offer subway service. In major cities, most subways connect to high-speed rail stations. However, most of the 17 stations included in this study are not located in major cities, and only one has a subway connection.

Taxi

Taxis are commonly used by passengers traveling with luggage. As such, all high-speed rail stations provide taxi connections. Passenger loading and unloading is allowed at station entrances.

Cars

Passengers arriving by car may park in short-term or long-term parking facilities or be dropped off and picked up at convenient areas designated for this purpose. Alternatively, rental cars are available. These facilities and services are available at all stations considered in this study.

Bicycle and motorcycle

Despite China's efforts to reduce pollution and its appreciation for vehicles with a low environmental impact, such as motorcycles and bicycles—especially public bicycles—neither of these transportation modes is well accommodated at HSR stations in China. Among the 17 stations included in this study, only a few provide bicycle or motorcycle facilities.

Table 22. Modes Connecting to High-Speed Rail Stations in China

	Number of bus lines	Number of BRT lines	Number of suburban bus lines	Number of subway lines
Zhengzhou East	8	1	14	
Luoyang Longmen	8			
Xi'an North	4			1
Sanmenxia South				
Weinan North	2			
Huashan North	4			
Anyang East	1			
Kaifeng	19		1	
Lingbao West				
Mianchi South				
Anyang	23			
Shangqiu	6			
Xinxiang	39			
Xinxiang East	3			
Xuchang	20			
Xuchang East	4			
Zhengzhou	80	2	1	
Average	*15.79*	*1.50*	*5.33*	*1.00*

FACILITIES AND CONNECTION TO HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS

Bus

Bus is one of the most popular urban transportation modes in China, especially in less-developed cities where there are no subways. In some newly built high-speed rail stations in China, passengers may transfer to suburban buses without leaving the station.

BRT

Bus stops consisting of a stop or shelter are the most commonly used facilities for BRT at HSR stations. Several buses can share BRT bus stops. If many bus lines use a bus stop jointly, the stop can be transformed into a bus terminal that acts as a multimodal station.

Bicycles and motorcycles

In addition to the 17 stations included in the data analysis for this study, connectivity data for some of the major high-speed rail stations in China were also collected; they were not included in the analysis, however, due to a lack of available ridership data. Many of these provide nearby bicycle and motorcycle parking lots. Typically, passengers must cross squares and/or streets to traverse from these lots to the station.

Subway

Subway access points are located both inside and outside of HSR stations. Escalators or elevators are used to transfer passengers from the subway stop to the HSR station.

Taxi

Taxi stations are dedicated to taxi vehicles. These stations are typically located directly outside HSR stations, often by the main entrance. However, a common inconvenience for taxi commuters is the travel distance between taxi stations and platforms.

Car

Automobile parking lots are underground, at ground level or on elevated levels. In particularly dense urban areas, underground and elevated parking facilities allow more direct access to stations. However, in such cases, escalators or elevators are necessary for passengers to move from one facility to another. For ground-level parking, passengers typically must cross a street to reach the station. Drop-off zones, in this study, are not considered as parking. However, like taxi stands, these zones are located very close to the station. Table 23 lists the number of BRT stops, bicycle and motorcycle parking lots, subway stations, taxi stands and car parking facilities at the stations included in this study.

Table 23. Facilities for HSR Connection Modes in China

	Number of Bus Stops	Number of BRT Stops	Number of Subway Stations	Number of Suburban Bus Stops	Number of Car Parks	Number of Taxi Stands	Number of Bike Stands
Zhengzhou East	1	1		1	2	2	
Luoyang Longmen	4				1	1	
Xi'an North	1		1		4	1	
Sanmenxia South					4	1	
Weinan North	5					1	
Huashan North					5	1	
Anyang East	1				1	1	
Kaifeng	10			1	1	1	
Lingbao West					1	1	
Mianchi South					2	1	
Anyang	4				4	1	
Shangqiu	1				2	1	
Xinxiang	10				4	1	
Xinxiang East	3					1	
Xuchang	10				1	1	
Xuchang East	1					1	
Zhengzhou	9	2		2	8	2	
Average	*4.62*	*1.50*	*1.00*	*1.33*	*2.86*	*1.12*	*0.00*

XV. DATA ANALYSIS – CHINA

The characteristics of high-speed rail stations in China are listed in Table 24. There are just a few stations included in the data that have BRT and subway connection, and there are no bicycle facilities found on these stations, thus the descriptive data for other modes are more revealing. It can be seen from the table that there are more bus stops/terminals at these high-speed rail stations than the facilities for suburban bus, cars and taxis. The transfer time for the passengers from buses is longer than for those arriving by suburban bus, car and taxi.

Table 24. Descriptive Data

	BRT	Subway	Bus	Suburban Bus	Bike	Car	Taxi
Number of Services	1.50	1.00	14.19	5.33			
Number of Facilities	1.50	1.00	4.36	1.33	0.00	1.11	1.11
Service Interval	5.25	8.25	8.78	40.00			
Transfer Time	8.34	3.78	5.79	5.26	N/A	3.38	1.84

The relationship between ridership and the four categories of factors (number of services, service intervals, number of facilities and transfer times) are presented in Figures 36, 37, 38 and 39. Figure 36 shows that the number of bus service lines is greater than those offered by subway, BRT and suburban buses. Bus, BRT and suburban bus services may be associated with high ridership. It can be seen from Figure 37 that stations having BRT and subways have short service intervals similar to suburban bus service. The associated ridership varied significantly.

Figure 38 indicates that there are substantially more bus stops, car parking facilities and taxi stands than there are BRT stops, subway stations and suburban bus stops. However, there may be no association between high ridership and the presence of many bus stops. It can be observed from Figure 39 that cars, taxis, subways and suburban buses tend to have shorter transfer times. However, these shorter times may not be associated with high ridership.



Figure 36. Ridership vs. Number of Services



Figure 37. Ridership vs. Service Interval



Figure 38. Ridership vs. Number of Facilities



Figure 39. Ridership vs. Transfer Time

Regression analysis was performed for ridership in relation to the four categories of influencing factors. The regression results are presented in Table 25. The correlation coefficients for the variables included in the regression analysis are listed in Table 26. Variables related to BRT, subway, bicycle and suburban bus are excluded from the analysis because the sample for these modes is small. It can be observed from Table 25 that three variables are significant at the level of 0.95: number of bus lines, number of taxi stands and taxi transfer times. The coefficient of the number of bus line is negative, which implies that the ridership may not be high when there are many bus lines connected to a high-speed rail station. The coefficient for the number of taxi stands is positive, indicating that higher ridership should result from providing more taxi stands at high-speed rail stations. This may portray the situation of the high-speed rail stations for which the data were collected in this study. Data for some major high-speed rail stations in China were also collected. These major stations, primarily located in urban areas, were not included in the analysis due to the lack of ridership data. Most of the stations included in this analysis are new and not in urban areas. The variable taxi transfer time is a negative figure, suggesting, reasonably, that high ridership is associated with short transfer time. It should be noted that bus travel may not be convenient for passengers with luggage.

Table 25. Regression Results

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t-Stat	P-value
Intercept	-789,688	1,671,846	-0.47	0.65
Bus Interval	-47	21	-2.19	0.06
No. of Bus Lines	-68,673	28,670	-2.40	0.04
No. of Bus Stops	-169,726	152,555	-1.11	0.30
No. of Car Park	126,616	170,944	0.74	0.48
No. of Taxi Stands	4,786,021	751,027	6.37	0.00
Bus Transfer Time	-30	16	-1.85	0.10
Car Transfer Time	-41	19	-2.14	0.06
Taxi Transfer Time	-810,580	300,204	-2.70	0.03
R-Square	0.909035107			
Adjusted R-Square	0.818070213			
Observations	17			

Table 26. Correlation Coefficients

	Ridership	Bus Arrival Interval	No. of Bus Services	No. of Bus Stops	No. of Car Park	No. of Taxi Stands	Bus Transfer Time	Car Transfer Time	Taxi Transfer Time
Ridership	1								
Bus Arrival Interval	-0.12	1.00							
No. of Bus Services	-0.06	-0.31	1.00						
No. of Bus Stops	-0.19	-0.43	0.71	1.00					
No. of Car Parks	0.05	0.00	0.68	0.15	1.00				
No. of Taxi Stands	0.64	-0.17	0.58	0.14	0.46	1.00			
Bus Transfer Time	-0.27	0.63	-0.42	-0.56	-0.12	-0.27	1.00		
Car Transfer Time	-0.23	-0.21	-0.24	-0.07	-0.52	-0.17	0.30	1.00	
Taxi Transfer Time	0.24	-0.35	-0.02	-0.36	0.29	0.23	-0.35	-0.35	1.00

XVI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE STUDY NEEDS

CHARACTERISTICS AND HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Multimodal connectivity at high-speed rail stations in various countries presents a variety of profiles. Figure 40 shows the number of public transportation services connected to high-speed rail stations. Other public transportation modes including BRT and tramway are connected to HSR stations in these countries. Because their sample sizes included in this study are small, these modes are not presented in Figure 40. From Figure 40 it can be seen that the high-speed rail stations in China offer connections to more bus lines than do those in other countries. Subway connections in these other countries also are at the same level. Note that the sample size in this study (i.e., number of stations with subway connections) is small, particularly for China and Spain. France and Japan have at least two subway lines connected to their HSR stations.



Figure 40. Number of Services in Other Countries

Regarding to connection facilities, Figure 41 shows that the number of facilities for buses within the HSR system in China is not high, although each serves more bus lines than in other countries. This is due to the fact that these lines share bus stops/terminals at HSR stations, which is the same for Spain. Relatively, there are more bus stops/terminals provided in France. Stations in France and Japan offer many subway stops. Sometimes there is more than one subway stop per station per line. France has more car parking than the other countries in this study, followed by Japan and Spain. The HSR stations in China offer the smallest number of car parking facilities. Japan has more taxi stands at their HSR stations than other countries in the study. In France, there are significantly more parking facilities for bicycles than in other countries in the study. China, a country known for its bicycle use, does not have any bicycle parking at the 17 HSR stations covered in this study. This may be due to the fact that the stations are located outside of cities, making bicycle access impractical.



Figure 41. Number of Transportation Facilities in Other Countries

Transfer times also present different profiles. From Figure 42, it can be seen that the transfer times in Japan and China, regardless of connection mode, are significantly higher than those in France and Spain. Among the various modes, transfer time is longest by bus, while other modes offer transfer times relatively comparable to those in France and Spain. Spain boasts the shortest transfer times of any country in all modes, particularly for taxis. This might be related to the fact that taxi service is so inexpensive in Spain that it is used even for daily errands, such as shopping.



Figure 42. Transfer Time in Different Countries

From an operations perspective (see Figure 43), France has the longest average bus arrival interval in the study—more than twice that of China. Arrival intervals in Japan were not studied because the data could not be easily extracted. Subway train arrival intervals in France are shorter than those in Spain and China. Spain has the longest train arrival intervals in the study—up to ten times longer than France.



Figure 43. Service Intervals in Different Countries

CONNECTIVITY AS AN INFLUENCE ON HIGH-SPEED RAIL RIDERSHIP

The results from the regression analysis for the four countries are listed in Table 57. It can be seen that all four categories of connectivity variables influence ridership in these countries in different ways. Bus, subway and regional railroad service influences ridership significantly.

The number of bus services influences ridership in three of the countries, France being the exception. The more bus services connected to high-speed rail stations, the higher the ridership at these stations. Subway, light rail and traditional rail are high-capacity modes of transportation. Their connection to high-speed rail stations always implies high ridership. The sample sizes for HSR stations with these high-capacity connecting modes were small; thus, the impact of the number of services of these modes cannot be derived from the regression analysis. However, the charts illustrate a high-impact relationship between ridership and these connecting modes.

The number of facilities provided for bus, subway, bicycles and taxis also appears to have a significant impact on ridership. The more bus and subway stops, bicycle parking, and taxi stands, the higher the HSR ridership. Note that parking facilities for private cars are not identified as an influencing factor. No such facility factor was identified for HSR ridership in France.

Table 27 shows that the only factor significantly influencing ridership in France is regional rail train arrival intervals. Operation of this mode did not influence HSR ridership in Spain and Japan (data were not available for Japan).

Transfer time is identified to be a significant influencing factor: RER and bicycle transfer time in France, and taxi transfer time for China.

Influencing factors vary by country. In France, ridership appears to be most influenced by RER services, arrival intervals, and transfer times, and by bicycle transfer time. Passengers who use these two modes have unique characteristics and may constitute a significant population. In Spain, the influencing factors are bus service and facilities, as well as facilities for bicycle parking and taxis. Transfer time and arrival intervals are not shown to be significant. It appears that the availability of a connection mode is more important than its transfer time and arrival intervals. The situation is similar in Japan. In China, bus and taxi service are important to ridership. Transfer times for taxi passengers are significantly shorter than for other modes, and this is associated with higher HSR ridership.

Table 27. Connectivity Influencing Factors

	Number of Service	Number of facility	Interval	Transfer time
France	Number of RER services		RER interval	RER and bike transfer time
Spain	Number of bus service	Number of bicycle parking stations, bus stops, taxi stands		
Japan	Numbers of bus and railway services	Taxi stands and railroad stops	N/A	
China	Number of bus lines	Number of taxi stands		Taxi transfer time

IMPLICATIONS FOR CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL

The findings from this study have significant implications for high-speed rail in the U.S. Figure 43 presents multimodal public transportation connectivity for each station in the proposed California high-speed rail system. Accommodations for private modes, such as car, taxi, bicycle and pedestrians are not indicated but may be assumed. The following insights are offered:

First, special attention should be given to bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Transit-oriented development will occur around high-speed rail stations. These developments may produce passengers within walking or cycling distance of the station. This is also true for stations that will be developed from existing transit facilities in the San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas where bicycle facilities may have already been established. Additional bicycle facilities should be provided when high-speed rail is added. From the experiences of other countries, such as France, it can be concluded that high-speed rail stations with bicycle facilities see higher ridership than those without.

Second, transforming an existing transit station into a high-speed rail station will cause some connections to have excessively long transfer times because they were not originally designed for high-speed rail. In China, for example, some high-speed rail stations are older stations that were adapted for HSR. Thus, when weighing the tradeoff between building a new station and adapting an existing one, transfer time for all connections should be taken into account.

Third, a more convenient fare payment system should be used to facilitate transfer between high-speed rail and other modes of transportation. Since the fare structure for high-speed rail differs from that of other modes, additional fare collection systems may be needed to reduce ticketing time, one of the components of transfer time. New technologies that eliminate fare collection at stations altogether may be considered for this purpose.

Fourth, coordinating the arrivals and departures of different modes of transportation at high-speed rail stations is very important. In general, passengers disembarking from high-speed rail trains may have to wait an exorbitant length of time for the arrival of local transit, which would not only increase transfer time but also crowd waiting areas.

IMPLICATIONS FOR NEVADA HIGH-SPEED RAIL

XpressWest is a proposed high-speed rail between Las Vegas and Los Angeles. Several locations have been proposed for the Las Vegas station, one of which is presented in Figure 44. This location, at the intersection between Flamingo Rd. and U.S. Interstate 15, is in close proximity to the Las Vegas Strip. For this project, it is expected that most passengers will be tourists whose visits primarily occur on weekends. Train arrivals and departures would therefore peak from Friday to Monday. Cars, taxis and shuttle buses are currently the primary modes of transportation, and it is expected that this will continue to be the case after the HSR is built.

Based on the experience of other countries, recommendations for Nevada HSR are as follows:

First, pedestrians and bicycles may be the major transit mode at the start of operation. This is because there are three residential towers to the south that are within walking distance of the proposed station. The station must provide access and accommodations for these potential passengers. It is expected that transit-oriented development around this station will generate demand for a commute between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. In that case, additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be provided.

Second, the peak use anticipated on weekends makes it necessary to establish a light rail or similar local transportation mode that can accommodate large numbers of passengers arriving simultaneously. A continuously operating light rail service running the length of the Strip would be ideal for this purpose. Scheduled to accommodate peak arrival periods, the light rail would quickly transport passengers from the train to destination casinos and hotels.

Figure 44. Full High-Speed Rail System with Connections

Figure 45. Optional Station for XpressWest in Las Vegas



Figure 46. One Proposed XpressWest Station in Las Vegas

FUTURE STUDY NEEDS

The following improvements would yield observations that are more conclusive:

1. The sample size for high-speed rail stations with railroad connections is small. Only two such stations in Spain and one in China were included in the data analysis of this study due to a lack of ridership data for the others. There are in fact many stations in China with railroad connections.

2. The railroad data for Japan encompass all the various modes of rail transportation, including light rail, traditional rail and subways. Given this mix of modes, the ability to analyze the data is limited.

3. No operational data were collected for Japan, further limiting analysis. This study can be improved if such data can be made available.

4. The analysis conducted in this study can be improved by distinguishing urban stations from those in rural areas. HSR stations in cities exhibit different layout characteristics than those in rural areas.

5. Layouts of high-speed rail stations should be obtained. From these layouts, different measures of layout should then be obtained for analysis. In this study, there is just one variable—transfer time—used for analysis. With more variables representing the layout, the impact of connectivity can be evaluated more thoroughly.

6. The data from these four countries can be combined for analysis. Then the unique characteristics that influence ridership can be identified in a more convenient and comprehensive manner.

APPENDIX



Plan around Paris-Montparnasse Station

Plan around Montpellier-St-Roch Station



Plan around Lyon Part-Dieu Station

Platforms at Paris-Lyon Station

Access to the Platform in Angers-St-Laud

Underground HSR Station: Access to the Platform in Strasbourg Station

Terminal station	Bridge station	Underground station

Figure 47. Layout of High-Speed Rail Stations and Platforms

Table 28. Correlation Coefficients

	rdship	rertt	swtt	twtt	bustt	bikett	cartt	taxitt	totaltt	rersch	swsch	twsch	bussch	rerser	swser	twser	busser	airport	rerfac	swfac	twfac	busfac	bikefac	carfac	taxifac	numacc	numser
rdship	1.16E+03	-1.32E+05	-1.27E+05	5.38E+04	3.25E+02	-1.52E+04	2.48E+02	4.25E+02	3.24E+02	-1.33E+05	-1.23E+05	5.43E+04	-2.64E+02	1.33E+05	1.28E+05	-5.44E+04	41.27508	4.56143	1.33E+05	1.28E+05	-5.44E+04	35.80232	1.64E+02	-1.19324	16.77246	23.5467	14.43036
rertt	-0.55291	4.91E+07	2.40E+07	-2.54E+07	-1.22E+05	-1.98E+07	-7.28E+04	-1.11E+05	-7.76E+04	4.96E+07	2.25E+07	-2.57E+07	2.76E+04	-4.97E+07	-2.43E+07	2.57E+07	-4.08E+03	-7.07E+02	-4.97E+07	-2.43E+07	2.57E+07	-6.81E+03	-8.47E+03	5.81E+03	-1.58E+03	-39.8322	-8.42E+03
swtt	-0.38768	0.35552	9.29E+07	-8.65E+06	-2.01E+05	-2.90E+06	-3.60E+04	-2.33E+05	-1.74E+05	2.43E+07	8.92E+07	-8.57E+06	1.16E+05	-2.43E+07	-9.37E+07	8.57E+06	-5.61E+03	-1.01E+03	-2.43E+07	-9.37E+07	8.57E+06	-1.14E+04	-2.20E+04	-5.24E+03	-4.22E+03	-1.11E+04	-1.33E+04
twtt	0.1609	-0.36893	-9.13E-02	9.66E+07	1.22E+05	1.01E+07	-2.28E+04	5.86E+04	-1.64E+04	-2.57E+07	-2.19E+06	9.76E+07	9.81E+04	2.57E+07	8.73E+06	-9.76E+07	6.32E+03	-9.35E+02	2.57E+07	8.73E+06	-9.76E+07	1.00E+03	-1.21E+04	-1.57E+04	-1.24E+03	-1.18E+04	-3.69E+03
bustt	0.16116	-0.29385	-0.35234	0.21027	3.50E+03	9.37E+04	1.87E+03	2.69E+03	2.04E+03	-1.23E+05	-1.90E+05	1.23E+05	-8.89E+02	1.23E+05	2.03E+05	-1.23E+05	39.71328	2.87738	1.23E+05	2.03E+05	-1.23E+05	75.84522	42.43808	24.16684	17.97887	-51.315	2.43373
bikett	-9.56E-02	-0.60682	-6.44E-02	0.22101	0.33914	2.18E+07	6.10E+04	1.02E+05	2.72E+04	-2.00E+07	-2.23E+06	1.02E+07	8.14E+03	2.00E+07	2.89E+06	-1.02E+07	-2.03E+03	5.16E+02	2.00E+07	2.89E+06	-1.02E+07	-6.86E+02	-9.30E+03	-1.70E+03	5.33E+02	-2.77E+03	3.87E+03
cartt	0.14134	-0.20157	-7.25E-02	-4.50E-02	0.61284	0.25387	2.65E+03	2.51E+03	1.61E+03	-7.34E+04	-3.39E+04	-2.27E+04	-3.50E+02	7.34E+04	3.62E+04	2.27E+04	5.94723	4.36592	7.35E+04	3.63E+04	2.27E+04	80.42215	42.37976	88.44118	37.02768	3.87111	32.391
taxitt	0.19985	-0.25321	-0.38755	9.55E-02	0.72685	0.34983	0.78106	3.90E+03	2.09E+03	-1.12E+05	-2.40E+05	5.96E+04	-7.23E+02	1.12E+05	2.35E+05	-5.97E+04	3.55E-02	7.18945	1.12E+05	2.35E+05	-5.97E+04	93.33391	96.79152	93.29412	51.41003	22.16522	61.24394
totaltt	0.22049	-0.25687	-0.41768	-3.87E-02	0.799	0.13519	0.72357	0.77456	1.86E+03	-7.87E+04	-1.77E+05	-1.73E+04	-7.57E+02	7.87E+04	1.75E+05	1.73E+04	23.1955	3.89792	7.87E+04	1.75E+05	1.73E+04	83.58304	73.74394	60.17647	23.07439	4.52768	38.74567
rersch	-0.55233	0.99999	0.35634	-0.36893	-0.29346	-0.60438	-0.20131	-0.25244	-0.25771	5.01E+07	2.28E+07	-2.59E+07	2.80E+04	-5.01E+07	-2.45E+07	2.59E+07	-4.13E+03	-7.09E+02	-5.01E+07	-2.46E+07	2.59E+07	-6.91E+03	-8.55E+03	5.88E+03	-1.59E+03	-50.4747	-8.51E+03
swsch	-0.36861	0.32665	0.94039	-2.27E-02	-0.32611	-4.85E-02	-6.68E-02	-0.38992	-0.41673	0.32747	9.69E+07	-2.08E+06	1.27E+05	-2.28E+07	-9.00E+07	2.08E+06	-5.81E+03	-6.92E+02	-2.28E+07	-9.00E+07	2.07E+06	-9.38E+03	-2.75E+04	-5.29E+03	-4.22E+03	-1.45E+04	-1.30E+04
twsch	0.16082	-0.36893	-8.96E-02	0.99998	0.20991	0.22101	-4.44E-02	9.62E-02	-4.05E-02	-0.36894	-2.12E-02	9.86E+07	9.91E+04	2.59E+07	8.65E+06	-9.86E+07	6.42E+03	-9.51E+02	2.59E+07	8.65E+06	-9.86E+07	1.00E+03	-1.22E+04	-1.59E+04	-1.25E+03	-1.19E+04	-3.77E+03
bussch	-0.23571	0.11937	0.36551	0.30302	-0.45604	5.30E-02	-0.20617	-0.35133	-0.53258	0.11998	0.39283	0.30311	1.09E+03	-2.80E+04	-1.17E+05	-9.92E+04	-26.8897	-3.61929	-2.80E+04	-1.17E+05	-9.92E+04	-54.3228	-81.6876	9.18206	-5.75664	4.59858	-8.33031
rerser	0.55266	-0.99999	-0.35642	0.36893	0.29344	0.60409	0.20129	0.25239	0.25773	-1	-0.32755	0.36894	-0.12004	5.02E+07	2.46E+07	-2.60E+07	4.14E+03	7.09E+02	5.02E+07	2.46E+07	-2.60E+07	6.92E+03	8.57E+03	-5.88E+03	1.59E+03	52.07785	8.51E+03
swser	0.38822	-0.35596	-1	9.13E-02	0.35254	6.37E-02	7.24E-02	0.38718	0.41819	-0.35679	-0.9404	8.97E-02	-0.36574	0.35687	9.45E+07	-8.65E+06	5.69E+03	1.02E+03	2.46E+07	9.45E+07	-8.65E+06	1.15E+04	2.23E+04	5.29E+03	4.26E+03	1.12E+04	1.34E+04
twser	-0.16081	0.36893	8.96E-02	-0.99998	-0.20993	-0.22101	4.43E-02	-9.62E-02	4.05E-02	0.36894	2.12E-02	-1	-0.30311	-0.36894	-8.96E-02	9.86E+07	-6.42E+03	9.52E+02	-2.60E+07	-8.66E+06	9.86E+07	-1.00E+03	1.22E+04	1.59E+04	1.25E+03	1.19E+04	3.77E+03
busser	0.30056	-0.14433	-0.14431	0.15932	0.16626	-0.10797	2.86E-02	1.41E-04	0.13332	-0.14457	-0.14638	0.1602	-0.2023	0.14469	0.14514	-0.16019	16.28114	-6.14E-02	4.14E+03	5.69E+03	-6.42E+03	6.07439	12.51817	-4.08824	0.60035	-4.09775	-3.1782
airport	0.26992	-0.20311	-0.21199	-0.1915	9.79E-02	0.22258	0.17071	0.23179	0.18206	-0.2017	-0.14161	-0.19298	-0.22127	0.20169	0.21152	0.193	-3.07E-02	0.24654	7.10E+02	1.02E+03	9.52E+02	7.96E-02	0.50952	0.82353	0.23183	0.58045	0.69377
rerfac	0.55271	-0.99999	-0.35644	0.36893	0.29341	0.60403	0.2013	0.25239	0.25773	-1	-0.32757	0.36894	-0.12005	1	0.35689	-0.36894	0.14469	0.20171	5.02E+07	2.46E+07	-2.60E+07	6.92E+03	8.57E+03	-5.88E+03	1.59E+03	53.38408	8.52E+03
swfac	0.3883	-0.35603	-1	9.14E-02	0.35252	6.37E-02	7.24E-02	0.38715	0.41817	-0.35686	-0.9404	8.97E-02	-0.36574	0.35694	1	-8.97E-02	0.14518	0.21155	0.35696	9.45E+07	-8.65E+06	1.15E+04	2.23E+04	5.29E+03	4.26E+03	1.12E+04	1.34E+04
twfac	-0.16081	0.36893	8.96E-02	-0.99998	-0.20993	-0.22101	4.43E-02	-9.62E-02	4.05E-02	0.36894	2.12E-02	-1	-0.30311	-0.36894	-8.96E-02	1	-0.16019	0.193	-0.36894	-8.96E-02	9.86E+07	-1.00E+03	1.22E+04	1.59E+04	1.25E+03	1.19E+04	3.77E+03
busfac	0.31311	-0.28932	-0.35197	3.03E-02	0.38136	-4.37E-02	0.46473	0.44473	0.57696	-0.29075	-0.28354	3.01E-02	-0.49084	0.29081	0.35289	-3.01E-02	0.44809	4.77E-02	0.29087	0.35293	-3.01E-02	11.2872	8.58997	-0.61765	1.31488	-1.62976	1.48443
bikefac	0.75241	-0.18906	-0.35781	-0.19243	0.11217	-0.31185	0.12874	0.24245	0.26759	-0.18891	-0.4373	-0.19164	-0.388	0.18921	0.35848	0.19163	0.48543	0.16056	0.18926	0.35854	0.19163	0.40006	40.84516	1.35294	4.28893	5.02509	1.6436
carfac	-8.21E-03	0.1942	-0.12726	-0.37382	9.56E-02	-8.56E-02	0.40208	0.34974	0.32681	0.19446	-0.12594	-0.37455	6.53E-02	-0.19447	0.12755	0.37453	-0.23727	0.3884	-0.19444	0.12755	0.37454	-4.31E-02	4.96E-02	18.23529	2.61765	7.70588	6.23529
taxifac	0.41527	-0.19013	-0.36915	-0.10646	0.25593	9.63E-02	0.60575	0.6935	0.45092	-0.18929	-0.36139	-0.10571	-0.14725	0.18937	0.36901	0.10569	0.12537	0.39345	0.18939	0.36902	0.1057	0.3298	0.5655	0.51654	1.4083	1.2128	1.84083
numacc	0.19231	-1.58E-03	-0.32069	-0.3337	-0.24096	-0.16512	2.09E-02	9.86E-02	2.92E-02	-1.98E-03	-0.40946	-0.33366	3.88E-02	2.04E-03	0.32015	0.33368	-0.28229	0.32495	2.09E-03	0.32017	0.33368	-0.13484	0.21856	0.50161	0.28408	12.94204	7.4654
numser	9.26E-02	-0.26241	-0.30177	-8.20E-02	8.98E-03	0.18091	0.13731	0.21409	0.19621	-0.26248	-0.28863	-8.29E-02	-5.52E-02	0.2624	0.30162	8.29E-02	-0.17199	0.30511	0.26248	0.30168	8.29E-02	9.65E-02	5.62E-02	0.31884	0.33872	0.45314	20.97232



Figure 48. Kyoto Station Layout

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AVANT	Medium-distance high-speed rail system in Spain
AVE	Alta Velocidad Española
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
HSR	High-Speed Rail
INSEE	Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques (France)
LGV	Ligne a Grande Vitesse (France)
PDL	Passenger-Designated Lines
RFF	French Rail Network
SNCF	French National Railway Corporation
TGV	Train à Grande Vitesse

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ando Keiichiro. 2010. "Japan's Rail Stations." *Japan Railway and Transport Review*, (56), 26–35.

Aoki, Daisuke. 2013. *Dream Super Express Train – Part I. Hakumon Herald*. http://www.hakumon-herald.com/column/society/bullet-train/ (accessed April 7, 2013).

Aoki, Daisuke. 2013. *Dream Super Express Train – Part II. Hakumon Herald.* http://www.hakumon-herald.com/column/society/bullet-train2/ (accessed May 6, 2013).

California High-Speed Rail Authority, 2012. California High-Speed Rail Program Draft 2012 Business Plan. http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/about/business_plans/BPlan_2012Draft_web.pdf (accessed January 10, 2014).

Central Japan Railway Company. 2012. *Fact Sheets – 2012.* Central Japan Railway Company. http://english.jr-central.co.jp/ (accessed November 10, 2013).

Cervero, Robert, Jin Murakami, and Mark A. Miller. 2009. *Direct Ridership Model of Bus Rapid Transit in Los Angeles County*. UC Berkeley: UC Berkeley Center for Future Urban Transport: A Volvo Center of Excellence.

Chan, Sabrina and Luis Miranda-Moreno. 2013. "A station-level ridership model for the metro network in Montreal, Quebec", *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 40(3): 254–262.

City of Fresno, California. 2012. *High-Speed Train Station Area Complete Street Connectivity Project, TIGER 2012*. http://www.fresno.gov/NR/rdonlyres/2AD4C88B-9C6B-4581-BF39-57DC024DBA89/27257/TIGERnarrative_mediumcompression.pdf (accessed November 10, 2013).

Data and Statistical Services. (2013). *Interpreting Regression Output*. Princeton University. http://dss.princeton.edu/online_help/analysis/interpreting_regression.htm (accessed June 2013).

East Japan Railway Company. 2013. *Ride Personnel of Station*. http://www.jreast.co.jp/passenger/index.html (accessed April 4, 2013).

East Japan Railway Company. 2012. *Fact Sheets – 2012*. http://www.jreast.co.jp/E/investor/factsheet/index.html (accessed November 10, 2013).

Ewa, Maria. 2005. "Aesthetic Aspects of Railway Stations in Japan and Europe". *Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies*, (6): 4381–4396.

Gregg, Rob and Justin Begley. 2011. *Enhancing the Connectivity of High Speed Rail in the Orlando-Tampa Corridor with Local Public Transportation Systems: Issues and Opportunities*, Report No. 977-24 National Center for Transit Research and Center for Urban Transportation Research University of South Florida.

Iseki, Hiroyuki, Adina Ringler, Brian D. Taylor, Mark Miller, and Michael Smart. 2007. *Evaluating Transit Stops and Stations from the Perspective of Transit Users.* Report to California Department of Transportation.

Japan-guide.com. 2013. *Transportation in Japan*. http://www.japan-guide.com/e/e627.html (accessed May 1, 2013).

Japan-guide.com. 2013. *Survey: Commuting*. http://www.japan-guide.com/topic/0011.html (accessed July 1, 2013).

LonelyPlanet.com. 2013. Spain: Getting Around. http://www.lonelyplanet.com/spain/transport/getting-around (accessed July 3, 2014).

Loukaitou-Sideris, Anastasia, Dana Cuff, Harrison Higgins, and Wenbin Wei. 2012. *Planning for Complementarity: An Examination of the Role and Opportunities of First-Tier and Second-Tier Cities along the High-Speed Rail Network in California*, CA-MTI-12-1030, MTI Report 11-17.

Mbatta, Geophrey J., 2008. *Developing Design and Evaluation Criteria for Transit Station with the Focus on Intermodal Connectivity*. Master's thesis submitted to the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Florida State University.

Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism. 2011. *White Paper on Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism in Japan*. http://www.mlit.go.jp/english/white-paper/mlit-index.html (accessed November 10, 2013).

Murakami, Jin and Robert Cervero. 2010. *California High-Speed Rail and Economic Development: Station-Area Market Profiles and Public Policy Responses*, Research Paper Prepared for the Center for Environmental Public Policy in the Richard & Rhoda Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley.

Nuworsoo, Cornelius and Elizabeth Deakin. 2009. *Transforming High-speed Rail Stations to Major Activity Hubs: Lessons for California.* Transportation Research Board 2009 Annual Meeting CD-ROM.

Parsons Brinckerhoff. 2011. *Economic Impact Analysis Report, California High-Speed Rail Project*, California High Speed Rail Authority.

Sands, Brian D. 1993. *The Development Effects of High-Speed Rail Stations and Implications for California*, California High Speed Rail Series, Working Paper, UCTC No. 115, The University of California Transportation Center, University of California at Berkeley.

Taylor, Brain D. and Camille N.Y. Fink. 2003. *The Factors Influencing Transit Ridership: An Analysis of the Literature*, Research Report Number 681, University of California Transportation Center, Berkeley.

TOD 202: Station Area Planning - Reconnecting America, http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/resource-center/books-and-reports/2008/tod-202-station-area-planning/(accessed November 12, 2013).

West Japan Railway Company. 2012. *Fact Sheets – 2012.* https://www.westjr.co.jp/global/en/ (accessed November 10, 2013).

Wilbur Smith Associates, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Harley & Associates, and Moore Iacofano Goltsman. 2006. *MTC Transit Connectivity Study Technical Memorandum 6, Schedule Coordination / Real-Time Transit Information*. http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/connectivity (accessed January 10, 2014).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

HUALIANG (HARRY) TENG

Dr. Teng, an Associate Professor in Transportation Engineering at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), has approximately 30 years of research and education experience in transportation engineering and management. He graduated from China's Beijing Jiaotong University with his B.S. and M.S. degrees in railroad engineering and management. He has a second M.S. degree from West Virginia University on railroad operations, and a Ph.D. in civil engineering from Purdue University. He has taught at Beijing Jiaotong University, Polytechnic University of New York, The University of Virginia (UVa), and UNLV. He was the Associate Director for the Center of Transportation Studies at UVa.

Dr. Teng leads the railroad and high-speed rail program at UNLV. Currently, he is operating the Transit UTC at UNLV for which he has been involved in research with federal and local agencies and organized distinguished seminars. He has initiated the railroad, high-speed rail, and transit program at UNLV for which he has developed a curriculum and certificate program on railroad. He is the advisor for the AREMA student chapter at UNLV. In addition, he has been active in railroad professional activities.

Dr. Teng also is interested in Intelligent Transportation Systems, infrastructure maintenance, air quality analysis, freight transportation, safety, and demand forecasting. So far, he has published approximately 40 peer-reviewed technical papers.

TARIK TOUGHRAI

A graduate Student of School of Engineering at the Ecole Nationale des Travaux Publics de l'Etat, Lyon, France, Tarik Toughrai was an intern at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, when he worked on this research project.

TINGTING YU

Tingting Yu is pursuing a M.S degree in Civil Engineering at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. She obtained her B.S. degree of Economics from Wuhan University in China.

RUSSELL OZAWA

Russell Ozawa graduated from the University of California at Davis (UCD) with a B.S. degree in civil engineering and a minor in Japanese. He also graduated from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), with an M.S. degree in civil engineering. Prior to obtaining his M.S. degree, he worked at Miyamoto International, Inc. in Los Angeles, California, for several years as a project engineer. Miyamoto International is a global structural and earthquake engineering private firm.

Mr. Ozawa is currently helping Dr. Teng at UNLV in the research of high-speed rail station multimodal connectivity. He has been researching the high-speed rail systems of Japan.

His research interests include high-speed rail systems, transportation systems, structural engineering design, as well as sustainability construction and design.

BINGYI HU, PH.D.

Bingyi Hu is an Associate Professor in the School of Computer Science at Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing, China. He obtained his Ph.D. degree from Tsinghua University. Dr. Hu has developed a railway information network for a railway bureau in China. He has been working in the chief engineer office of Xi'an railway bureau for over a year and is familiar with railway information exchange among departments. His research interests include information sharing and network construction.

In addition, Dr. Hu is also interested in device design and development. He has designed more than ten devices and systems and holds more than 30 patents from China. These designs are related to medical instruments and monitoring device of railway systems.

PEER REVIEW

San José State University, of the California State University system, and the MTI Board of Trustees have agreed upon a peer review process required for all research published by MNTRC. The purpose of the review process is to ensure that the results presented are based upon a professionally acceptable research protocol.

Research projects begin with the approval of a scope of work by the sponsoring entities, with in-process reviews by the MTI Research Director and the Research Associated Policy Oversight Committee (RAPOC). Review of the draft research product is conducted by the Research Committee of the Board of Trustees and may include invited critiques from other professionals in the subject field. The review is based on the professional propriety of the research methodology.

MTI FOUNDER

Hon. Norman Y. Mineta

MNTRC
MINETA NATIONAL TRANSIT RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

Funded by U.S. Department of Transportation