

LB/TH/44/2025

TH6028

**ANALYSIS OF ATTRIBUTES INFLUENCING A
FUNCTIONAL PARK AND RIDE SYSTEM FOR
COLOMBO**

J.A.H. Kithmal Samarasekara

209582H

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Engineering in Highway & Traffic Engineering

Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

May 2025

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work, and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date: 14.05.2025

The above candidate has carried out research for the PhD/MPhil/Masters thesis/dissertation under my supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of Supervisor: Dr. Dimantha De Silva

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 14.05.2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the University of Moratuwa and the Department of Civil Engineering for providing me with the opportunity to pursue this research and for their invaluable support, which was essential for the successful completion of my study.

I am deeply thankful to Dr. Dimantha De Silva for his unwavering guidance, insightful advice, and readiness to engage in discussions throughout the research process. His mentorship has been pivotal in shaping this work.

I sincerely appreciate the constructive feedback and technical suggestions provided by the panel of examiners during the progress reviews, which greatly contributed to the improvement of my study.

My gratitude also goes to the lecturers of the Transport Engineering Division for their guidance, encouragement, and support throughout the research period.

I would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance and collaboration of my fellow research assistants, as well as the technical officers and non-academic staff of the Transport Division. Their support has been greatly appreciated and instrumental in completing this research.

ABSTRACT

Traffic congestion in Colombo, Sri Lanka's commercial capital, poses serious challenges to urban mobility, environmental sustainability, and economic productivity. Park and Ride (P&R) is identified as a solution worldwide for reducing congestion, lowering vehicular emissions, and encouraging greater use of public transportation. The research focuses on identifying the critical factors influencing the success of P&R systems and evaluating user perceptions to propose practical, context-specific solutions for Colombo's unique transportation needs.

The study begins with an extensive review of global P&R practices, highlighting key attributes related to parking facilities, station characteristics, transport modes, travel time, wait time, and other influencing factors. By analyzing international case studies, the research identifies the essential attributes needed to attract commuters to P&R systems.

Data collection was conducted in two phases: an initial survey of 405 respondents to identify and prioritize key attributes, followed by a Stated Preference (SP) survey with 205 participants to evaluate trade-offs among selected factors. The SP survey was administered digitally, utilizing randomized scenarios to systematically assess commuter preferences. Key attributes analyzed included parking cost, secured parking, travel time, wait time, seating availability, and transport mode availability.

Using discrete choice modeling with ALOGIT software, the analysis provided significant insights into commuter decision-making. Results show that waiting time is perceived as approximately 2.1 times more burdensome than travel time, while features like secured parking and seating availability significantly enhance mode attractiveness.

Segmentation based on travel distance and gender reveals that short-distance travelers prioritize travel time, while long-distance travelers emphasize parking security. Gender differences also emerge, with women more dislike to waiting times and men showing stronger preferences for seating availability. Additionally, current travel mode influences preferences—private vehicle users tend to avoid bus-only options, whereas public transport users value multimodal integration, particularly access to both bus and rail/LRT services.

Further, the findings indicate that low-income commuters are about 2.4 times more sensitive to parking costs than high-income users, while high-income commuters value secured parking nearly four times more. Accordingly, high-income users value secured parking as equivalent to a reduction of approximately Rs. 1,250, while low-income users associate it with a cost saving of around Rs. 130. Wait time sensitivity also varies significantly with trip length, as commuters with longer journeys perceive waiting as twice as inconvenient.

Comfort-related features, such as seating availability, emerge as critical factors influencing mode choice. High-income users equate seating to a Rs. 450 reduction in

parking cost, while low-income users value it at Rs. 190. Furthermore, seating is perceived as equivalent to a 43-minute reduction in travel time, underscoring its importance. The model also highlights the negative perception of bus-only systems and the positive impact of multimodal integration.

The final model, validated through T-stat checks, retains only statistically significant factors, ensuring a robust framework for optimizing Colombo's P&R system.

Keywords: Park and Ride (P&R) systems, public transportation, urban mobility, commuter preferences, discrete choice modeling, urban transport planning, transportation policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	i
Acknowledgement.....	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Abbreviations.....	xi
List of Appendices	xii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 What is Park and Ride?	1
1.3 Sri Lankan Context: Colombo.....	2
1.4 Research Problem.....	3
1.5 Objectives	3
2 Literature Review.....	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Identification of Factors	4
2.2.1 Parking Facilities.....	4
2.2.2 Facilities and Services provided in the P&R Station	5
2.2.3 Characteristics and Facilities Provided in Public Transportation Mode 6	6
2.2.4 Travel Time Characteristics	7
2.2.5 Transport Modes	8
2.3 Stated Preference Surveys	9
3 Methodology	11
3.1 Methodological Framework	11
3.2 Identification of Key Attributes.....	12
3.2.1 Category 1: Parking Facilities.....	13
3.2.2 Category 2: Facilities and Services Provided at P&R Station	13

3.2.3	Category 3: Characteristics and Facilities Provided in Public Transportation Mode.....	14
3.2.4	Category 4: Travel Time Characteristics	15
3.2.5	Category 5: Availability of Public Transport Mode	15
3.2.6	Category 6: General Characteristics of P&R	15
3.3	Preliminary Survey and Attribute Validation.....	16
3.3.1	Preliminary Survey Design and Questionnaire Structure	16
3.3.2	Attribute Selection Process Based on the Preliminary Survey Findings	16
3.4	Stated Preference (SP) Survey Design	19
3.4.1	Survey Administration Procedure and Data Collection Method	19
3.4.2	Attribute Selection Criteria and Quantitative Value Assignment.....	20
3.4.3	Structure of the SP survey.....	22
3.5	Data Analysis and Interpretation of SP Survey Response.....	24
4	DATA Analysis and Discussion	26
4.1	Preliminary Survey	26
4.1.1	Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents	26
4.1.2	Ranking of Attributes Within Each Category based on M1 score.....	29
4.1.3	Ranking of Categories Based on M2 Scores.....	38
4.1.4	Overall Ranking of Attributes based on M3 Scores.....	39
4.2	Design and Conduct of the SP Survey	43
4.2.1	Selection of Attributes for the SP Survey	43
4.2.2	Socio-Economic Characteristics in SP Survey	45
4.3	Analysis of SP survey results	48
4.3.1	Function 1: Baseline Preferences	51
4.3.2	Function 2: Income-Based Sensitivities.....	52
4.3.3	Function 3: Travel Distance-Based Sensitivities	53
4.3.4	Function 4: Travel Time-Based Sensitivities.....	54
4.3.5	Function 5: Gender-Based Sensitivities	55
4.3.6	Function 6: Transport Mode-Based Sensitivities.....	56
4.3.7	Function 7: Recommended Discrete Choice Model	58
4.4	Case Study: Comparison of Two Park-and-Ride Systems.....	63

4.4.1	Scenario 1: A high-income commuter with a longer travel time	64
4.4.2	Scenario 2: A low-income commuter with a longer travel time.	65
4.4.3	Scenario 3: A high-income commuter with a shorter travel time.	65
4.4.4	Scenario 4: A low-income commuter with a shorter travel time.	66
4.5	Comparative Review of Colombo and Global Studies.....	67
4.6	Relevance of Research Findings to the Existing Park and Ride System in Colombo.....	68
4.6.1	Parking Cost.....	68
4.6.2	Secured Parking	69
4.6.3	Seating Availability.....	69
4.6.4	Multimodal Availability.....	70
4.6.5	Travel Time and Waiting Time Considerations.....	70
4.7	Policy Implications of Research Findings.....	70
4.7.1	Parking Fees	70
4.7.2	Seating Availability, Travel Time, and Waiting Time.....	71
4.7.3	Transport Modes	72
5	Conclusion and Recommendations	73
5.1	Recommendations for Future Work	75
5.1.1	Expansion of Study Population.....	75
5.1.2	Examination of Additional Attributes	75
5.1.3	Longitudinal Studies	75
5.1.4	Technology Integration	75
5.2	Study Limitations	76
5.2.1	Temporal Variation in Living Conditions.....	76
5.2.2	Ambiguity in Bus Service Type.....	76
6	References	77

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1 : Functionality of a Park and Ride System.....	2
Figure 3-1: Outline of the Methodology	12
Figure 3-2 : Ranking and Scoring Process for Attributes and Categories	18
Figure 3-3 : Stated Choice Survey Creator Interface	20
Figure 3-4 : Sample SP Survey Interface	23
Figure 4-1 : Gender Distribution.....	26
Figure 4-2 : Age Distribution.....	26
Figure 4-3 : Employment Status	27
Figure 4-4 : Monthly Income	27
Figure 4-5 : Most frequent transport mode	28
Figure 4-6 : Most frequent travel type	28
Figure 4-7: Distribution of the responses for Category 1	29
Figure 4-8 : Distribution of responses for Category 2.1	30
Figure 4-9: Distribution of responses for Category 2.2	31
Figure 4-10: Distribution of responses for Category 3.1	32
Figure 4-11: Distribution of responses for Category 3.2	33
Figure 4-12: Distribution of responses for Category 4	34
Figure 4-13: Distribution of responses for Category 5	35
Figure 4-14: Distribution of responses for Category 6	36
Figure 4-15: Distribution of responses for the selection of the most important category	38
Figure 4-16 : Employment Status	45
Figure 4-17 : Monthly Income	45
Figure 4-18 : Frequent Mode of Transport	46
Figure 4-19 : Frequent Travel Purpose	46
Figure 4-20 : Average Travel Time	47
Figure 4-21 : Average Travel Distance.....	47
Figure 4-22 : Age Group Distribution.....	48
Figure 4-23: Illustration of the Coefficient Values of the Recommended Discrete Choice Model (Function 7)	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1 : Assigned Values for the Attributes.....	22
Table 4-1 : Gender Distribution	26
Table 4-2 : Age Distribution	26
Table 4-3 : Employment Status.....	27
Table 4-4 : Monthly Income	27
Table 4-5 : Most frequent transport mode.....	28
Table 4-6 : Most frequent travel type.....	28
Table 4-7 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Parking Facilities’ Category.....	30
Table 4-8 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Facilities Provided at the Station’ Category	31
Table 4-9 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Services Provided at the Station’ Category	32
Table 4-10 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Characteristics of the Public Transport Mode’ Category	33
Table 4-11 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Facilities Provided in Public Transport Mode’ Category	34
Table 4-12 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Travel Time Characteristics’ Category ...	35
Table 4-13 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘Availability of Public Transport Modes’ Category	36
Table 4-14 : M1 Scores for Attributes in ‘General Characteristics’ Category	37
Table 4-15 : Category Ranking Based on M2 Score.....	39
Table 4-16 : Overall Ranking of Attributes based on M3 Scores	39
Table 4-17 : Employment Status.....	45
Table 4-18 : Monthly Income	45
Table 4-19 : Frequent Mode of Transport.....	46
Table 4-20 : Frequent Travel Purpose.....	46
Table 4-21 : Average Travel Time.....	47
Table 4-22 : Average Travel Distance	47
Table 4-23 : Age Group Distribution.....	48
Table 4-24: List of attributes and their respective units.....	48

Table 4-25: Summary of the coefficients and T-ratios	50
Table 4-26: Summary of the T-statistics.....	57
Table 4-27: Coefficients and T-ratios of the recommended discrete choice model (function 7).....	58
Table 4-28: T-statistics of the recommended discrete choice model (function).....	59
Table 4-29: Attributes Values for the Case Study	63

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

P&R	Park and Ride
SP	Stated Preference
LRT	Light Rail Transit
PT	Public Transport
WTP	Willingness to Pay

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Page
Appendix - A	Preliminary Survey Questionnaire	79
Appendix – B	Sample SP Survey Interfaces	106