

MODELING THE EFFECT OF A ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ON
TRAVEL TIME AT LINK-LEVEL

by

Venu Madhav Kukkapalli

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Infrastructure and Environmental Systems

Charlotte

2018

Approved by:

Dr. Srinivas S. Pulugurtha

Dr. Martin R. Kane

Dr. Rajaram Janardhanam

Dr. Shen-En Chen

Dr. Didier Dréau

ABSTRACT

venu madhav kukkapalli Modeling the effect of a road construction project on travel time at link-level (UNDER THE DIRECTION OF DR. SRINIVAS S. PULUGURTHA)

Drivers observe variation in travel time due to congestion and delay on existing transportation facilities. A road construction project has a significant effect on travel time, leading to increased congestion, delay, and driver frustration. The effect on travel time due to the road construction project decreases as the distance from the road construction project location increases. The effect of the road construction project on travel time also extends to other roads that are connected to the road with the construction project. It also depends on traffic condition and time-of-the-day on these roads. Therefore, one needs to consider spatial dependency, and the influence on links within the proximity of the road construction project, over time, to model the effect of the road construction project on travel time at link-level. Findings from such research will help proactively plan construction activities on roads to mitigate mobility and congestion problems. Therefore, the goal of this research is to model the effect of a road construction project on travel time at link-level and help improve mobility of people and goods through dissemination or implementation of proactive solutions. The objectives of this research are 1) to examine travel time and travel time variations before, and during the road construction project period on a selected road, 2) to examine travel time and travel time variations on roads connected to the selected road with the construction project, 3) to examine the effect of network characteristics and develop models to estimate travel time on the selected road with the construction project and other connected roads, 4) to examine and develop models to estimate travel time by

the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week during the road construction project period, and, 5) to compare the models to estimate travel time during the construction project period with models to estimate travel time before the construction project period.

Data, from the year 2011 to the year 2016, was gathered from the Traffic Incident Management Systems (TIMS) and local agencies to identify a resurfacing construction project period for modeling the effect of road construction project on freeways and connecting arterial street links. The data obtained was processed by the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week to compute travel time performance measures using the Microsoft SQL 2012 software. A statistical t-test was conducted to examine the relationship between the change in travel time before and during the construction project period.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to check if the travel time data followed a normal distribution. From the normality test results, it was observed that the data followed a normal distribution. Generalized Linear Models (GLM) were developed with the average travel time on a link in the vicinity of the road construction project as the dependent variable. The characteristics of each link, such as the volume/capacity (V/C), the number of lanes, the speed limit, the shoulder width, the lane width, and whether the link is divided or undivided were considered as predictor variables for modeling. The characteristics such as the upstream and downstream link length, the upstream and downstream V/C, the upstream and downstream number of lanes, and, the upstream and downstream speed limit were also considered as predictor variables for modeling. Further, the time-of-the-day, the day-of-the-week, and the distance of the link from the road construction project were considered as predictor variables for modeling. The goodness-of-fit was assessed using the quasi likelihood under the independence model

criterion (QIC) and the corrected quasi likelihood under the independence model criterion (QICC). The developed models were then validated using randomly selected samples for the same construction project. The samples used for validation were not used for model development.

The travel times before and during the construction project period are significantly different than estimates obtained using the Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) travel time equation. A decrease in travel time was observed during the construction project period on the freeway links when compared to the before construction project period. Contrarily, an increase in travel time was observed during the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links when compared to the before construction project period.

The results obtained indicate that predictor variables such as, the V/C, the upstream number of lanes, the upstream speed limit, the downstream V/C, and the downstream number of lanes have a significant effect on travel time before the road construction project period on freeway links. However, the V/C, the upstream link length, the upstream V/C, the downstream link length, the downstream V/C, and the downstream number of lanes have a significant effect on travel time during the road construction project period on freeway links. The V/C, the speed limit, the upstream V/C, and the upstream number of lanes have a significant effect on travel time before the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links. Similarly, the V/C, the speed limit, the upstream V/C, the upstream link length, the upstream number of lanes, and the downstream number of lanes have a significant effect on travel time during the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my advisor and mentor, Dr. Srinivas S. Pulugurtha, for his continued guidance, support and encouragement. I offer my sincere appreciation for the learning and practical opportunities he provided me during my Ph.D. program. My completion of this dissertation would not have been accomplished without his support.

I also thank my committee members Dr. Martin R. Kane, Dr. Rajaram Janardhanam, Dr. Shen-En Chen, and Dr. Didier Dréau for their support and valuable input, which helped me to achieve quality results in my dissertation. I would like to extend my appreciation to my friends and colleagues in the transportation research lab for their insights and suggestions while working on my dissertation.

I would also like to thank the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDoT) for providing valuable data that helped me to complete this research.

At last but not the least, to my caring, loving, and supportive family members. I feel a deep sense of gratitude for my mother, father, and brother who formed part of my vision and taught me good things that really matter in life. Their patience and sacrifice will remain as my inspiration throughout my life. I am also very much grateful to all my family members for their constant inspiration and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Construction Zones on Freeways	3
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Objectives of This Dissertation	6
1.4 Organization of Report	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Congestion, Crashes and Delay Due to Construction Zones.....	8
2.2 Travel Time Reliability	9
2.3 Travel Time Estimation or Prediction	12
2.5 Travel Time Studies and Impacts of Travel Time Reliability	18
2.4 Limitations of Past Research	19
CHAPTER 3: DATA COLLECTION & METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 Selecting the Study Area and a Road Construction Project	20
3.2 Identifying Data Elements and Collecting Data	23
3.3 Travel Time Data and Data Processing	28

3.4 Examining the Relationship between the Travel Time Performance Measures before and during the Construction Project Periods	30
3.5 Conducting Pearson Correlation Analysis	30
3.6 Developing Generalized Linear Models (GLM)	31
3.7 Model Validation.....	34
 CHAPTER 4: EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAVEL TIME PERFORMANCE MEASURES BEFORE AND DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PERIOD	 36
4.1 Average Travel Time (ATT)	36
4. 2 Planning Time (PT) or 95 th Percentile Travel Time.....	40
4. 3 Buffer Time (BT)	44
4. 4 Buffer Time Index (BTI).....	49
4. 5 Travel Time Index (TTI)	54
4. 6 Summary of Relationships	58
 CHAPTER 5: MODEL DEVELOPMENT & VALIDATION	 61
5.1 Travel Time Before the Construction Project Period for Freeway Links	67
5.2 Travel Time Before the Construction Project Period for Connecting Arterial Street Links	71
5.3 Travel Time During the Construction Project Period for Freeway Links	77
5.4 Travel Time During the Construction Project Period for Connecting Arterial Street Links	86

5.5 Comparison of V/C and Link-Level Travel Times	94
5.5.1 Comparison of the V/C for the Freeway Links and the Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period	94
5.5.2 Comparison of Travel Time for the Freeway Links and the Connecting Arterial Street Links Before and During the Construction Project Period.....	98
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS	103
6.1 Limitations and Scope for Future Work.....	105
REFERENCES	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Travel Time Reliability Measures (Pulugurtha et al., 2015, 2017)	11
Table 2 Various Characteristics Considered for Modeling the Effect of the Resurfacing Construction Project.....	27
Table 3 Raw Travel Time Data from INRIX, 2013	29
Table 4 T-test Results: Average Travel Time	40
Table 5 T-test Results: Planning Time or 95th Percentile Travel Time	44
Table 6 T-test Results: Buffer Time (BT).....	49
Table 7 T-test Results: Buffer Time Index (BTI)	54
Table 8 T-test Results: Travel Time Index (TTI)	59
Table 9 Significance of Travel Time Performance Measures	59
Table 10. Validation Results from BPR	61
Table 11 Normality Test Results for Before and During the Construction on Freeway and Connecting Arterial Street Links	63
Table 12 Descriptive Statistics – Freeway Links.....	64
Table 13 Descriptive Statistics – Connecting Arterial Street Links	65
Table 14 Dependent and Predictor Variables	66
Table 15 Correlation Coefficients for Freeway Links Before the Construction Project Period	68

Table 16 Comparison of Model Parameters for Freeway Links Before the Construction Project Period.....	69
Table 17 Correlation Coefficients for Connecting Arterial Links Before the Construction Project Period.....	73
Table 18 Comparison of Model Parameters for Connecting Arterial Street Links Before the Construction Project Period.	75
Table 19 Comparison of Model Parameters for Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period Related to During and Before Travel Time.....	78
Table 20 Model During the Construction Project Period for Estimating V/C - Freeway Links	79
Table 21 Correlation Coefficients for Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period	81
Table 22 Comparison of Model Parameters for Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period.....	83
Table 23 Comparison of Model Parameters for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period Related to During and Before Travel Time.	86
Table 24 Model During the Construction Project Period for Estimating V/C – Connecting Arterial Street Links.....	88
Table 25 Correlation Coefficients for Connecting Arterial Links During the Construction Project Period.....	90
Table 26 Comparison of Model Parameters for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period	92

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Average Travel Time and Travelers Experience by Month (Source: FHWA, 2006)	
.....	2
Figure 2 Resurfacing Construction Project Study Corridor.....	23
Figure 3 Capturing Lane Widths Using Google Earth Pro Software.....	26
Figure 4 Capturing Shoulder Widths Using Google Earth Pro	26
Figure 5 Removing Outliers from the Model Database.....	34
Figure 6 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	37
Figure 7 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	37
Figure 8 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	38
Figure 9 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day.....	39
Figure 10 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	41
Figure 11 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday.....	42
Figure 12 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	43

Figure 13 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	43
Figure 14 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	45
Figure 15 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday.....	46
Figure 16 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	47
Figure 17 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	48
Figure 18 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	50
Figure 19 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	51
Figure 20 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	52
Figure 21 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day.....	53
Figure 22 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	55
Figure 23 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday	55

Figure 24 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day	56
Figure 25 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day.....	57
Figure 26 Comparison of V/C for the Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period	95
Figure 27 Comparison of V/C for the Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period	96
Figure 28 Comparison of V/C Ratios for the Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period.....	97
Figure 29 Comparison of V/C Ratios for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period	97
Figure 30 Comparison of Travel Time for Freeway Links Before the Construction Project Period	98
Figure 31 Comparison of Travel Time for the Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period.....	99
Figure 32 Comparison of Travel Time Ratios for the Freeway Links Before and During the Construction Project Period	100
Figure 33 Comparison of Travel Times for Connecting Arterial Street Links Before the Construction Project Period	100
Figure 34 Comparison of Travel Times for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period	101

Figure 35 Comparison of Travel Time Ratios for Connecting Arterial Street Links Before and During the Construction Project Period	102
--	-----

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Travel demand has been progressively increasing with the continuous growth of contemporary civilization and need for more movement of people and goods on the roads. The effect of this increasing travel demand is persisting congestion on limited road network, upsurge in air quality problem, and the absence of intact and reliable transportation. Therefore, fastest-path to travel from an origin to a destination was adopted, for years, by motorists. These motorists usually plan for some expected delay due to recurring congestion, which is common today in many United States cities and towns. However, motorists' approach towards trip planning has been changing due to variations and ambiguity in traffic condition. Further, non-recurring congestion on a day-to-day basis concerns motorist the most. Situations that may lead to non-recurring congestion include a crash, a mechanical failure of a vehicle, inclement weather, a special event, or, freeway or arterial construction zone and activity. Therefore, the reliability of a route is playing a prominent role in motorists' departure and route choice decisions among various other travel time performance measures (Pulugurtha et al., 2017).

Reliability is defined as the probability that a component or system will perform a required function (without failure) during a time period, when used under stated operating conditions (Ebeling, 1997). The reliability of a link, corridor or the road network, therefore, could be defined as the ability to consistently provide an acceptable level of service (LOS)

to the motorist under stated environmental and operational conditions during a given period (Pulugurtha et al., 2015; 2017).

Reliability as a performance measure is expected to be widely used in transportation planning, for project prioritization, and for allocation of resources (FHWA, 2006). The travel times are known to vary greatly from day-to-day, and motorists remember those few unexpected days they experience through unexpected delays (FHWA, 2006). Figure 1 shows the communication of traffic condition in the past and how travel times could vary by month (FHWA, 2006).




Figure 1 Average Travel Time and Travelers Experience by Month (Source: FHWA, 2006)

Reliability of a transportation network differs with situations that lead to non-recurring congestion. It also varies by the type of road construction project. These road construction projects include construction of new roads or lanes, pavement repair, resurfacing, installation of pavement markers, etc., and often involve one or more lane closures.

Accurate prediction of travel time for a given route or a freeway, however, remains a challenging problem, as it is influenced by many different traffic and road parameters. In addition, traffic would queue up upstream side of the construction due to the staggering,

queuing, and delay at the construction zone. Sometimes, vehicular traffic could also migrate from the freeway links to the connecting arterial street links to avoid congestion and major delays at the construction zone. These effects depend on the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week.

1.1 Construction Zones on Freeways

The number of work zones in the United States has increased in recent years to upgrade and expand the life span of highways and roads (Abdelmohsen, 2016). The reconstruction and rehabilitation work zones can be found, almost, on all interstates and freeways. Lane closures are required for different types of work activities, such as pavement repairs, resurfacing, installation of pavement markers, etc. While work zones serve to perform reconstruction and rehabilitation without completely shutting down traffic operations, they have significant effects. These effects include reduced freeway capacity, increased crash rates, increased fuel consumption and emissions, increased travel times, increased queue lengths, and additional congestion and delay (Martinelli, 1996; Kim 2001). Delay is one of the most significant problems associated with a work zone. In some cases, highway traffic operations can completely fail due to congestion caused by work zones, particularly during the morning and evening peak hours (Martinelli, 1996).

In short, road construction projects create physical changes on roads that result in capacity reduction and travel time escalation during the construction project period. Consequently, vehicles go through the construction zone at reduced speeds and with fluctuated traffic flow rates (Jiang, 2002). These fluctuations in traffic flow, further, lead to inconsistent travel times along the route. If the capacity can be predicted, a systematic planning of traffic management can be executed for maintaining certain capacity, for

improving travel time, and for reducing delay (Zheng, 2011) in the construction zones. Evaluating and predicting the effect of road construction projects on travel time variations, by the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week, will help better understand their effect on travel time variations or travel time reliability, and proactively adopt enhanced temporary traffic control practices.

1.2 Problem Statement

Network characteristics such as traffic volume, capacity, and speed limit influence travel times. Travel time increases as the traffic volume increases. On the other hand, travel time decreases as the speed limit and the number of lanes increases. In addition, shoulder width and lane width influence travel speed and travel time.

During the construction project period, speed limit is lowered from the actual speed limit, which tends to reduce the vehicle speed and increase the travel time. Likewise, one or multiple lanes may be closed during the construction project period. The reduction in the number of lanes, lane width and shoulder width at the construction zone makes the road difficult to accommodate high traffic volume. It also reduces the vehicle speed and increases travel time.

Upstream and downstream links characteristics, such as link length, traffic volume, capacity, number of lanes, and speed limit of upstream and downstream links, influence the travel time. If the downstream number of lanes are lower compared to the subject link, then the queue may build up resulting in an increase in congestion and travel time. Similarly, if the upstream and downstream links have entry ramps or exit ramps that connect to the arterial streets, they would influence travel time on the freeway and

connecting arterial street links. Therefore, the characteristics of downstream and upstream ramps should be considered when modeling travel time of a link.

In addition to network and construction zone factors, parameters such as the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week influence travel time. The traffic volumes are higher during the morning and evening peak hours, than during off-peak hours. The variation in traffic volume results in variation in travel time. Further, the construction activity is scheduled when traffic volume is low (say, nighttime). The variation in travel time due to construction activity at nighttime could be higher than during other times. Likewise, traffic volume is higher during weekdays when compared with the weekend days. Travel patterns and trip purposes are also different over the weekend when compared with the weekday. Therefore, the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week should also be considered for studying the effect of construction projects.

As stated previously, the construction on the freeway influences the travel time performance on connecting arterial street links. The traffic volume on the connecting arterial street links increases due to shift in traffic from the freeway links to the connecting arterial street links. The shift in patterns depends on the characteristics of the connecting arterial streets. Therefore, the characteristics of the connecting arterial street links such as, traffic volume, speed limit, number of lanes, and road is divided or undivided need to be considered for modeling and analysis.

The effect of a construction project decreases as the distance from the construction project increases. To study the effect of a construction zone, spatially, the distance of each link from the construction zone should also be considered.

1.3 Objectives of This Dissertation

The goal of this dissertation is to research and model the effect of a road construction project on travel time at link-level. The objectives are:

1. to examine travel time and travel time variations before, and during the road construction project period on a selected road,
2. to examine travel time and travel time variations on roads connected to the selected road with the construction project,
3. to examine the effect of network characteristics and develop models to estimate travel time on the selected road with the construction project and other connected roads,
4. to examine and develop models to estimate travel time by the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week during the road construction project period, and,
5. to compare with models to estimate travel time before the construction project period.

1.4 Organization of Report

The rest of the report consists of 5 chapters. Chapter 2 summarizes the past studies on delay and congestion at construction zones, travel time estimations and predictions on freeways, and the impact of travel time reliability. Also, the limitations of the past research are presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 summarizes the data collection, data processing, and methodology adopted to examine the effect of a road construction project on travel time at link-level. The relationship between the travel time before and during the construction project periods are discussed in Chapter 4. The analysis and results obtained from modeling

the effect of a road construction project on travel time are presented in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 summarizes conclusions, recommendations and scope for further research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of past studies that were carried out on congestion, delay, and travel time variations in work zones. It also provides a discussion on methodologies adopted by previous researchers.

2.1 Congestion, Crashes and Delay Due to Construction Zones

One of the major concerns at the work zones is traffic delay. Martinelli (1996) developed a mathematical model to estimate the optimal length of the work zone, so that the delay can be lowered on the freeways. Jiang (1999) predicted traffic flow rate by using Kalman predictor model. The predicted traffic flow was used to assess congestion in work zones.

Kim et al. (2001) developed a regression model to estimate the capacity at work zones. They observed that contributing factors, such as the number of closed lanes, the proportion of heavy vehicles, grade, and the intensity of work activity, have a significant effect on capacity reduction. Chien et al. (2002) utilized a simulation-based technique to demonstrate that delays may be underestimated by using deterministic queuing theory.

Ghosh-Dastidar and Adeli (2006) developed a neural network-wavelet micro-simulation model to track the travel time of individual vehicle, for estimating traffic delay and queue length at freeway work zones. The model developed was observed to be more accurate than other microscopic simulation models. Zheng et al. (2011) compared different traffic capacity predictions models from Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).

The comparison showed that neuro-fuzzy model is more accurate than other linear and multi-linear regression models.

Ramezani and Benekohal (2011) investigated the mechanism of queue propagation and dissipation at two potential bottlenecks at freeway work zones. They showed that, when the volume exceeds the capacity of the transition area and the workspace, both locations will be active bottlenecks. Fitzpatrick (2016) explained the operational implications of reduced shoulder and lane widths on freeways; higher the shoulder width, higher the speed. Abdelmohsen (2016) developed a novel multi-objective optimization model for generating optimal tradeoffs between minimizing traffic delay and the construction cost.

Venugopal and Tarko (2000) developed a regression model to estimate the number of crashes at work zones. The cost of various construction projects was found to be a good substitute for some of the exposure to risk variables, such as the number of on- and off-ramps, the type of work, and the intensity of road work. Garcia et al. (2006) presented possible options to improve safety at construction work zones on the freeways. Koilada et al. (2018) identified risk factors, and recommended implementation of real-time work zone information systems and dynamic lane merging system to control the safe transition of vehicles within the work zone area.

2.2 Travel Time Reliability

Unexpected congestion on a day-to-day basis troubles traveler the most. Travelers rely on travel time reliability, as measured from day-to-day or across different times of the day for decision-making. Several studies focused on the importance of travel time

measures. However, not many studies focused on travel time variations at construction zones.

Kwon et al. (2011) proposed an empirical, corridor-level method to divide the travel time unreliability or variability over a freeway section into incidents, weather, work zones, special events, and inadequate base capacity or bottlenecks. Devarasetty et al. (2012) studied travel behavior of managed lane users using a Bayesian efficient model.

Carrion (2012) performed a meta-analysis to determine the reasons behind the difference among the reliability estimates. Beaud et al. (2012) estimated the willingness to pay for travel time reliability using mean-dispersion approach and specific coefficient approach. Both the approaches yield quite similar values for the willingness to pay. Li et al. (2012) reviewed empirical measurement paradigms used to obtain willingness to pay for reliability. In addition, they also estimated different models to derive values of reliability, scheduling costs, and reliability ratios.

Nicholson (2015) stated that a few methods proposed in the past do not account for the standard deviation of trip time, which is sensitive to correlation between the travel speeds on the segments of a trip. Ignoring such correlations can result in substantial errors when estimating the benefits of projects that are expected to result in an improvement in reliability. Zhang et al. (2016) studied travel time performance of emergency vehicles and proposed a utility-based model to quantify the travel time performance of emergency vehicles.

Several travel time and related reliability performance measures were proposed and used in the past. A summary of these performance measures is presented in Table 1. Pulugurtha et al. (2016; 2017) evaluated the correlations between selected travel time

performance measures. They observed that average travel time is correlated with travel time-based measures, while buffer time index (BTI) is correlated with travel time indices and reliability measures. Buffer time is observed to be correlated with most travel time and travel time reliability measures.

Table 1 Summary of Travel Time Reliability Measures (Pulugurtha et al., 2015, 2017)

Index	Measure / Equation	Index	Measure / Equation
NCHRP (1998) Definition	Standard deviation of travel time	λ_{Skew} (Van Lint et al., 2004)	$(TT_{90}-TT_{50})/(TT_{50}-TT_{10})$
AASHTO (2008) Definition	On-time performance	λ_{Var} (Van Lint & Van Zuylen, 2008)	$(TT_{90}-TT_{10})/TT_{50}$
TranSystems Definition (2005)	Probability of on-time performance	Variability (Wakabayashi, 2010)	TT85-TT15
Buffer Time (BT) (Lomax et al., 2004)	$TT_{95}-TT_{\text{Avg}}$	Variability (Wakabayashi, 2010)	TT80-TT20
Buffer Time Index (BTI) (Lomax et al., 2004)	$TT_{95}-TT_{\text{Avg}}/TT_{\text{Avg}}\times 100$	Variability (Wakabayashi, 2010)	TT70-TT30
First worst travel time over a month (Wakabayashi & Matsumoto, 2012)	TT_{95}	Acceptable Travel Time Variation Index (Wakabayashi, 2010)	$P(TT_{\text{avg}}+ATTV)$
Second worst travel time over a month (Wakabayashi & Matsumoto, 2012)	TT_{90}	Desired Travel Time Reduction Index (Wakabayashi, 2010)	$P(TT_{\text{avg}}-DTTR)$
Planning Time (PT) (Wakabayashi & Matsumoto, 2012)	TT_{95}	Travel Time Index (TTI) (Lyman et al., 2008)	$TT_{\text{avg}}/TT_{\text{free flow}}$
Planning Time Index (PTI) (Sisiopiku & Islam, 2012)	$TT_{95}/TT_{\text{free flow}}$	Frequency of Congestion (Lyman et al., 2008)	Percent of days/periods that are congested
Travel Time Variability (TTV) (Tu et al., 2007)	$TT_{90}-TT_{10}$		

Yesantarao and Pulugurtha (2017) and Kukkapalli and Pulugurtha (2018) examined the travel time and travel time variations before, during, and after the completion of selected road construction projects, along a selected route, by computing the ratios of travel time performance measures before, during, and after the completion of selected road construction projects.

2.3 Travel Time Estimation or Prediction

Delay in travel time leads to an increase in trip cost, vehicular emissions, and energy consumption. Therefore, it is beneficial, though challenging, to use travel time estimation as an effective index to identify measures for reducing traffic congestion and improving reliability (Systematics, 2005).

Accurate travel time prediction is indeed important for, both, traffic managers and travelers. Polus (1979) used arterial travel time data and developed regression and statistical model to estimate the travel time. Nam and Drew (1996) estimated travel times directly from flow measurements. The analysis of the flow measurements showed that estimates have good agreement with empirical data measured at 30-second intervals.

Park et al. (1999) predicted link level travel times by utilizing spectral based artificial neural network (SNN). Their results obtained were compared with different conventional models. SNN was found to be more accurate in predicting travel times.

Uno et al. (2002) analyzed the relationship between traffic information and travel time reliability. They stated that providing additional information, like short-term trends of travel time, might improve travel time reliability. Zwahlen and Russ (2002) investigated the accuracy of real-time travel time prediction systems (TIPS). Their results obtained

showed that the real-time TIPS represent a definite improvement over any static non-real-time display system.

Chien and Kuchipudi (2003) developed link-based / path-based Kalman filtering algorithm model and tested the accuracy of the developed models. The results obtained revealed that during peak hours, the historic path-based data used for travel-time prediction are better than link-based data due to smaller travel-time variance and larger sample size.

Rice and Van-Zwet (2004) predicted travel time using current traffic situation in combination with historical data. They observed a relationship between any future travel time and the current status of travel times. Van-Lint (2004) compared state space neural network model (SSNN), Kalman filtering model, and Witham and Richards's traffic flow model for predicting the travel times. Among these models, SSNN results in more accurate predictions than the remaining models.

Van et al. (2005) proposed a freeway travel time prediction framework, which explains the accuracy and robustness with respect to missing input data. Van-Lint and Van-Zuylen (2005) proposed two reliability metrics; width and skew based on 10th, 50th, and 90th percentile for a given route, time-of-the-day, and day-of-the-week. The proposed reliability metrics can be used in developing discrete choice models.

Li et al. (2006) focused on field evaluation of four-speed based travel time estimation models, which are, the instantaneous model, the time slice model, the dynamic time slice model, and the linear model. All the aforementioned models were observed to underestimate the actual travel times.

Al-Deek and Emam (2006) presented methodology for multistate system reliability analysis of transportation networks, by considering dependent link failures. Xu and Sun

(2007) proposed macroscopic traffic model, which predicts the future speeds on link segments. Xu et al. (2008) estimated travel times by adopting Extended Kalman Filtering (EKF) framework. Their results demonstrated acceptable applicability and precision of the method's accuracy.

Steiner and Sick (2008) estimated travel time using time stamps and vehicle length captured at subsequent detector stations. Their proposed approach considerably extends the maximum distance for which travel time estimations can be carried out when compared with the traditional travel time estimation methods.

Liu et al. (2010) predicted travel time on urban networks by proposing granular computing theory based on rough dataset. Chang (2010) developed a logit-based choice model to derive monetary values of travel time variations. Yang et al. (2010) proposed Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroscedasticity (GARCH) for travel time forecasting. Their results predicted that the root-mean-square error, mean absolute error, and mean absolute percent error are all decreasing with an improvement in transportation system reliability.

Haseman et al. (2010) evaluated quantifiable travel mobility metrics for rural interstates. They suggested that acquisition of work zone travel time data provides a mechanism for assessing the relationship between crashes and work zone queuing. Thakuriah and Tilahun (2012) proposed a methodology for utilizing real-time weather information for predicting future speeds. Their methodology can be used for future weather responsive travel time estimations.

Taylor (2012) developed Burr statistical model to best represent the travel time reliability by utilizing day-to-day variability in travel times in urban areas. Further, Tu et

al. (2012) discussed an empirical example based on a large dataset of freeway traffic flow data from loop detectors, which revealed that the developed travel time reliability measure is, both, intuitively logical and consistent.

Yildirimoglu and Geroliminis (2013) used historic and real-time traffic information to provide travel time predictions. They proposed loop detectors, which result in promising travel time predictions under varying traffic conditions. Fei et al. (2013) proposed Bayesian inference based dynamic linear model (DLM) to predict short-term travel time with plate recognition data. This method provides accurate and reliable travel times. Chen et al. (2013) proposed a tendency-based model to estimate link-level travel time. Their results revealed that the long-term and the combined-term tendency-based models have a lower optimal boundary and higher optimization potential.

Jenelius and Koutsopoulos (2013) developed statistical models to estimate travel time by using vehicle trajectories obtained from low frequency Global Positioning System (GPS) based probes. Li et al. (2013) explored on how travel times are distributed on different types of urban roads. Their predictions showed that the best fitting travel time distribution for different road links, at 15-minute time intervals differ, for different traffic congestion levels.

Wan et al. (2014) predicted travel time by developing a stochastic model. This model utilizes Link-Node Cell Transmission (LN-CTM) to deliver probability travel time distributions. Lei et al. (2014) proposed a path travel time reliability of urban expressways with shock waves, by using a probability-based method. Tak et al. (2014) predicted travel time using multi-level k nearest neighbor algorithm and data fusion method. Instead of two

different models, when both the models were combined, the results are accurate with less than 5% error.

Reza et al. (2015) developed Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) model to integrate traffic information from neighboring links in estimating short-term travel time along a corridor due to an incident. Their results obtained revealed that travel times for the successive segments were highly correlated.

Pulugurtha and Mangilipalli (2015) developed different models to estimate average travel speed and travel time for assessing urban arterial street performance. Their results obtained revealed that an increase in the number of signals per mile has a negative effect on arterial street performance. Narayanan et al. (2015) examined travel time estimation techniques that use historical, instantaneous, and predictive data. Their results obtained revealed that dynamic predictive routing using multiple prediction horizons are better estimates.

Kim and Mahmassani (2015) developed compound probability distribution approach (Gamma-Gamma Model) for collecting both vehicle to vehicle and day-to-day variability in predicting travel time reliability. Their developed model estimates a systematic way of quantifying, comparing, and assessing different types of travel time characteristics.

Wang et al. (2016) integrated spatial and temporal autocorrelations of road traffic network by developing a novel space time delay neural network (STDNN) model that captures the autocorrelation locally and dynamically. Their results obtained showed that STDNN exceed the Naïve, ARIMA, and Space Time Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (STARIMA) models in prediction accuracy.

Hojati et al. (2016) proposed a Tobit model to quantify the effects of traffic incidents on freeway travel time reliability. Their results obtained revealed that models with random parameters offer a superior statistical fit for all types of incidents. Woodard et al. (2017) introduced a method called Travel Time Reliability Inference and Prediction (TRIP) to predict the probability distribution of travel times using GPS data from mobile phones. Their proposed method delivers accurate predictions of travel time for large scale road networks.

Marti (2016) estimated travel time directly from electronic toll collection devices. Bahuleyan and Vanajakshi (2016) predicted travel time on urban arterial networks utilizing data from GPS based probe vehicles. Chen et al. (2016) explored the problem of finding the K reliable shortest paths (KRSP) in stochastic networks under travel time uncertainty, by proposing deviation path approach. Their proposed approach determined KRSP under various travel time reliability values within reasonable computational times.

Ma et al. (2017) developed Markov chain approach for estimating the probability distribution of trip travel times from link travel time distributions. Kou et al. (2017) used trip scheduling model and binary logit model to estimate the value of travel time reliability. Their results revealed that the value of travel time reliability differed significantly for different income and time constraint levels, and transportation modes.

Xiao (2017) explained the role of scheduling preferences and cost benefit analysis on travel time reliability. Cost-benefit analyses of travel time reliability improvements yielded consistent results, even if departure time adjustments are not accounted. Departure time adjustments decrease congestion, which strongly mitigates the cost of travel time variability.

Pulugurtha and Imran (2017) explored a simulation-based approach to develop travel time performance-based thresholds for basic freeway sections. Pulugurtha and Kodupuganti (2017) used real-world travel time data to develop travel time and reliability thresholds for freeway links from planning perspective.

2.5 Travel Time Studies and Impacts of Travel Time Reliability

Lomax and Schrank (2002) explained that the use of mobility and reliability can provide a framework to analyze how the land use and transportation systems serve the needs of traveler's and businesses. Pesti et al. (2007) identified efficient ways to improve traffic conditions on freeway work zones. They used different control systems at the work zone locations.

Fosgerau and Karlstrom (2010) extracted the value of reliability using the formulation of scheduling utility model. Their results obtained showed that the mean and standard deviation of trip duration depends on the start time of the trip. Dong et al. (2014) discussed statistical and heuristic models for traffic flow prediction. The combination of both statistical and heuristic model, termed as a hybrid model, estimated accurate results.

Morrison and Lowell (2016) studied the short-term impacts of employment on travel time reliability. They predicted that travel time increases from 0.71 to 0.24 minutes per one-way commute trip, for each additional 10 workers added per square kilometer. Hajbabaie et al. (2016) presented decision-making framework on travel time reliability by considering variations in traffic demand levels, inclement weather condition, and incidents that occur on freeways. These framework can help improve operational performance of freeway facilities. Beaud (2016) analyzed traveler's willingness to pay for travel time reliability, by utilizing a microeconomic model of transport mode choice.

Pulugurtha et al. (2017) surveyed perceptions of motorists to assess the value of travel time, the willingness to pay, and the value of reliability. The computed values were used to illustrate the monetary impact of transportation projects and alternatives (Pulugurtha et al., 2017; Duddu et al., 2018).

2.4 Limitations of Past Research

Past researchers have developed various models for predicting and estimating the travel time reliability on freeways, travel time measures, and improving the reliability on freeways or work zones. In addition, past researchers also concentrated on reducing crash occurrence, delay, and congestion at work zones or construction zones, comparing different prediction models, and the accuracy of travel time reliability models for the freeways.

In the past studies, there is meager to no studies on examining the effect of a road construction project on travel time at link-level. Further, past researchers have not explored the role of construction location characteristics, such as the number of lanes open and closed during the construction, the speed limit, the shoulder width, the lane width, the upstream and downstream link characteristics, the time-of-the-day, and the day-of-the-week and the distance of a link from study corridor on travel time. Further, the effect of construction project on the connecting arterial street links was meagerly explored.

This research focuses on the effect of a road construction project on travel time at link-level using characteristics pertaining to the network, construction zone, upstream and downstream links, and connecting arterial street links.

CHAPTER 3: DATA COLLECTION & METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents details pertaining to the study area, data collection, and analytical process adopted in this research.

3.1 Selecting the Study Area and a Road Construction Project

The city of Charlotte, North Carolina was selected as the study area for modeling the effect of a road construction project. The list of recent road construction projects on the freeways was collected from the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDoT) and the Traffic Incident Management System (TIMS) maintained by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). The collected road construction projects were started and completed from year 2013 to year 2015. Construction projects prior to year 2013 were not considered as travel time data is not available for most of the links in the study area. The date of completion was set as year 2015, as research efforts were initiated during the spring of year 2017.

The precedent is to collect real-world and most recent travel time data which lasted for at least six months during the road construction project period, in and around the Charlotte city limits. There could be significant changes within the vicinity of a road construction project, such as new developments that affect the travel time at link-level. It is hard to assess the change in travel times and travel time variations due to a road construction project in such cases. Therefore, multi-year road construction projects were not considered in this research.

From the list of road construction projects, a resurfacing construction project which lasted for six months on I-485 in Charlotte, North Carolina was considered for analysis and modeling. The number of lanes closed during the construction is one-lane in both the directions, while two lanes were open for traffic in both the directions. The resurfacing construction project was started in June 2015. It was completed in six months. The data was collected for six months before the start of the resurfacing construction project and six months during the construction of the resurfacing project.

An aerial view of the resurfacing construction project is shown in Figure 2. The red color section in the figure is the actual extent of the construction project. Arterial streets that connect to the freeway are also shown in the figure. Upstream and downstream links were also identified and considered for analysis and modeling and are shown in blue color.

The length of the road construction project is around 8 miles. However, data related to upstream and downstream links, for up to 3 miles, were also collected. Since, the effect of the road construction project varies with time and space, the variation in travel times were checked along the upstream and downstream section to capture adequate distance from the study corridor. Similarly, links on the connecting arterial streets were also selected to account for the variations in travel times over the space and time.

For this research, 39 freeway links and 60 connecting arterial street links were selected for analysis and modelling purposes. Data related to four time periods, morning peak, morning off-peak, evening peak, and evening off-peak hours, during a weekday and weekend day for each freeway and connecting arterial street link was gathered. Overall, 312 samples ($39 \text{ freeway links} \times 4 \text{ time periods} \times 2 \text{ days of the week}$) on the freeway links and 480 samples ($60 \text{ freeway links} \times 4 \text{ time periods} \times 2 \text{ days of the week}$) on the connecting

arterial street links were considered. After selecting the samples, outliers, links that are less than 0.3 miles and null values were removed. From the final database, 80% of the samples were used for the modeling the travel time and the remaining 20% was used for validating the developed travel time model.

The selected resurfacing construction project corridor (I-485) was operating at 65 miles/hour speed limit during the study period. Data relevant to resurfacing construction project was collected and is discussed next.




Figure 2 Resurfacing Construction Project Study Corridor

3.2 Identifying Data Elements and Collecting Data

Travel time increases as the traffic volume increases. Similarly, a section would attract higher traffic volume if the number of lanes is more. In addition, travel time increases if the speed limit is lower. Similarly, travel time increases if the lane width and the shoulder width are lower (due to a decrease in motorist comfort level when driving).

Therefore, traffic volume, capacity, speed limit, the number of lanes, the shoulder width, and the lane width were considered for analysis and modeling.

One or more lanes may be closed for construction. The speed limit, the lane width, and the shoulder width may be reduced along the construction section, which in turn increases the travel time. Therefore, the number of lanes closed during the construction project period, the reduced work zone speed limit, the shoulder width, and the lane width were collected from TIMS for modeling.

Upstream and downstream traffic volume, the speed limit, the number of lanes, and the link length could have an influence on the travel time on a link in the construction section. Therefore, the characteristics of upstream and downstream links were identified and considered for modeling.

Further, construction on the freeway links could influence the operational performance of connecting arterial street links. During the construction project period when one or more lanes are closed on the freeway construction zones, travelers tend to change their paths and migrate to the connecting arterial streets to avoid congested sections and minimize their total travel delay. Therefore, connecting arterial street link characteristics, such as, traffic volume, the capacity, the number of lanes, divided or undivided, the shoulder width, and the lane width were also captured and added to the database for modeling purposes. In addition, the distance of a link from the construction zone was also collected since the effect on travel time decreases with an increase in the distance from the construction zone.

During the morning or evening peak hours, the traffic volume is typically higher than when compared with the off-peak hours. Traffic volume would also change with

respect to the time-of-the-day. Similarly, during the weekdays, the traffic volume is higher when compared with the weekend days. Therefore, the time-of-the-day and the day-of-week at which travel time data was collected is also added to the database, for each link. The time-of-the-day considered are morning peak (7AM–9AM), morning off-peak (10AM–12PM), evening peak (5PM–7PM), and evening off-peak (10PM–12AM) hours. Monday through Friday was considered as the weekday, while Saturday and Sunday were considered as the weekend.

A detailed summary of various characteristics considered for modeling the effect of the resurfacing construction project on travel time at link-level is presented in Table 2. The network characteristics, such as the capacity, the speed limit, and the number of lanes, summarized in Table 2 were gathered from the CDoT regional travel demand model and aerial images. Traffic volume before and during the construction project period were collected from the CDoT regional travel demand model. The average width of all lanes, for each freeway and connecting arterial street link, was captured using the Google Earth Pro software and added to the database. A pictorial representation of lane width captured for each link using the Google Earth Pro software is shown in Figure 3. Similarly, the shoulder width was also captured at two random points, using the Google Earth Pro software, for each freeway and connecting arterial street link. The captured shoulder width using the Google Earth Pro software is shown in Figure 4. The average shoulder width is computed and used for analysis and modeling.



Figure 3 Capturing Lane Widths Using Google Earth Pro Software



Figure 4 Capturing Shoulder Widths Using Google Earth Pro

Table 2 Various Characteristics Considered for Modeling the Effect of the Resurfacing Construction Project

Parameters	Characteristics
Freeway Link Parameters	Traffic Volume
	Capacity
	Number of Lanes
	Speed Limit (mph)
	Lane Width (ft)
	Shoulder Width (ft)
Upstream and Downstream Link Parameters	Number of Lanes Closed
	Upstream Link Length (mi)
	Upstream Link Traffic Volume
	Upstream Link Speed Limit (mph)
	Upstream Link Number of Lanes
	Upstream Link Capacity
	Downstream Link Length (mi)
	Downstream Link Traffic Volume
	Downstream Link Speed Limit (mph)
	Downstream Link Number of Lanes
	Downstream Link capacity
Connecting Arterial Street Link Parameters	Traffic Volume
	Capacity
	Number of Lanes
	Speed Limit (mph)
	Lane Width (ft)
	Shoulder Width (ft)
	Divided/Undivided
	Upstream Link Length (mi)
	Upstream Link Traffic Volume
	Upstream Link Speed Limit (mph)
	Upstream Link Number of Lanes
	Upstream Link capacity
	Downstream Link Length (mi)
	Downstream Link Traffic Volume
	Downstream Link Speed Limit (mph)
	Downstream Link Number of Lanes
	Downstream Link Capacity
Other Parameters	Time-of-the-day
	Day-of-the-week
	Distance of the Link from the Study Corridor (D) in Miles

3.3 Travel Time Data and Data Processing

Travel time data was downloaded from the Regional Integrated Transportation Information Systems (RITIS) website in a raw unprocessed format. The raw data file usually has Traffic Message Channel (TMC) code (`tmc_code`), time-stamp (`measurement_tstamp`), speed (`speed`), average speed (`average_speed`), reference speed (`reference_speed`), travel time (`travel_time_minutes`), and score (`confidence_score`). A snapshot of unprocessed raw travel time data is shown in Table 3. Each field in a typical raw data file is briefly described next (INRIX, 2013).

1. Traffic Message Channel (TMC) defines link identity.
2. Speed is the current estimated space mean speed for the TMC or link in miles per hour.
3. Average speed is the historical average mean speed for the link, for that hour-of-the-day and day-of-the-week in miles per hour.
4. Reference speed is the calculated “free flow” mean speed for the link in miles per hour. It is the 85th percentile point of the observed speeds on that link.
5. Travel time is the current estimated travel time it takes to traverse the link in minutes.
6. Confidence score is an indicator of data type (30 indicates real-time data; 20 indicates real-time data across multiple segments; 10 indicates historical data).

The data requested has average travel time at 1-minute interval, for different study periods (before and during). The data processing and mining was performed using Microsoft SQL Server 2012. A data dictionary was developed to explain all data elements in the processed database.

In the database, there are a few missing values and blank cells for some considered links. By using SQL query, the missing and blank cells were removed prior to analysis and modeling. The database consists of real-time data and historic data. Only real-time data (confidence score = 30) was considered for the analysis and modeling.

Table 3 Raw Travel Time Data from INRIX, 2013

tmc_code	measurement_tstamp	speed	average_speed	reference_speed	travel_time_seconds	confidence_score
125N04663	12/1/2014 0:00	64	59	59	38.86	30
125+04666	12/1/2014 0:00	64	65	65	38.1	30
125N04662	12/1/2014 0:00	66	61	61	35.98	30
125+04665	12/1/2014 0:00	65	61	61	104.89	30
125N04665	12/1/2014 0:00	59	63	63	75.02	30
125+04664	12/1/2014 0:00	65	58	58	21.46	30
125N04664	12/1/2014 0:00	57	59	59	41.29	30
125N04661	12/1/2014 0:00	64	63	63	31.03	30
125N04660	12/1/2014 0:00	64	66	66	28.66	30
125+04667	12/1/2014 0:00	63	66	66	40.34	30
125N04667	12/1/2014 0:00	66	68	68	36.46	30
125N04666	12/1/2014 0:00	65	67	67	35.25	30
125-04662	12/1/2014 0:00	65	60	60	104.64	30
125-04661	12/1/2014 0:00	65	61	61	64.08	30
125-04664	12/1/2014 0:00	59	60	60	104.87	30
125-04663	12/1/2014 0:00	58	58	58	19.57	30
125-04660	12/1/2014 0:00	67	65	65	109.41	30
125-04666	12/1/2014 0:00	66	68	68	32.67	30
125-04665	12/1/2014 0:00	63	64	64	37.26	30
125+10198	12/1/2014 0:00	63	67	67	41.69	30
125-04667	12/1/2014 0:00	65	68	68	45.21	30

Overall, travel times were extracted for, both, the freeway construction project links and the connecting arterial street links within the vicinity of the resurfacing construction project. Similarly, travel times were extracted for links within three miles upstream and downstream of the actual construction activity zone, to capture the travel times while entering and leaving the construction zone.

The data was used to compute travel time performance measures such as, the average travel time, the 95th percentile travel time (planning time, PT), the buffer time (BT), the buffer time index (BTI), and the travel time index (TTI). Several factors, such as

the time-of-the-day, the day-of-the-week, all weekdays of a year, all weekends of a year, and all days are considered when computing and evaluating the travel time performance measures before and during the construction project periods.

3.4 Examining the Relationship between the Travel Time Performance Measures before and during the Construction Project Periods

To check the statistical significance of change in travel times and travel time performance measures, one-tail paired t-test was performed at a 95% confidence interval. The null hypothesis is 'H0: Average travel time remained the same before and during the construction project period (i.e., mean difference between average travel times before and during the construction is zero). The alternative hypothesis is 'H1: Average travel time increased during the construction project period when compared to the before period (i.e., the mean difference between average travel times during and before is greater than zero). The same procedure was adopted to test the difference in PT, BT, BTI, and TTI.

3.5 Conducting Pearson Correlation Analysis

The average travel time (dependent variable) on the considered freeway links and the connecting arterial street links were checked for normality distribution, for the before and during the construction project period data. To check the distribution of data, SPSS tool was used. From the descriptive statistics in SPSS, statistics and significance values were examined. Null hypothesis is that the data is normally distributed, while the alternate hypothesis is that the data is not normally distributed. In the test for normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk were used for interpreting the statistical significance. Generally, if the sample size is less than 2000, Shapiro-Wilk significance is used for testing the normality of the samples (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). If the

significance value is greater than 0.05, the alternate hypothesis is rejected, indicating that the data is normally distributed.

The correlation between the average travel time and all the predictor variables pertaining to network characteristics, construction zone characteristics, upstream and downstream characteristics, connecting arterial street link characteristics, the time-of-the-day, the day-of-the-week and the distance of a link from the study corridor were examined using SPSS software. The computed Pearson correlation coefficients lie between -1 and +1. If the P-value is less than or equal to 0.05, at a 95% confidence interval, two variables are considered as strongly correlated with each other. The correlation between the dependent variable and each predictor variable was first examined. The correlation between the predictor variables was then examined to select predictor variables that are not correlated to each other for modeling. This was done to minimize the effect of multicollinearity and improve the accuracy of the travel time estimates. The generalized linear models (GLM) was then developed to model the effect of a road construction project before and during the construction project period.

3.6 Developing Generalized Linear Models (GLM)

A linear model specifies the relationship between a dependent variable (say, Y) and a group of predictor variables (X_1, X_2, \dots). The general form of a liner model is shown as Equation 1.

$$Y = C_0 + C_1X_1 + C_2X_2 + C_3X_3 + C_4X_4 + \dots + C_kX_k \quad \text{----- Equation 1}$$

In Equation 1, C_0 is the regression coefficient for the intercept, while C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k are regression coefficients for the predictor variables 1, 2, ... k. Y is the dependent variable (average travel time).

The structural form of a linear regression model describes the patterns of interactions and associations. In addition, the model parameters also provide measures of strength. However, the data may not be normally distributed all the time. A GLM is more appropriate if data is non-linearly (example, log-link) distributed. The general form of a GLM is as shown in Equation 2.

$$Y = \text{Exp}^{[C_0 + C_1X_1 + C_2X_2 + C_3X_3 + C_4X_4 + \dots + C_kX_k]} \quad \text{-----Equation 2}$$

The basic assumptions of GLM are listed next (Lesson 6: Logistic Regression, Penn State).

- The data related to ‘Y’ are independently distributed.
- The dependent variable ‘Y’ may not be normally distributed. Therefore, it assumes a distribution from an exponential family, such as binomial, Poisson, multinomial, or normal.
- GLM does not assume a linear relationship between the dependent variable and the predictor variables. However, it assumes a linear relationship between the transformed response in terms of the link function and the predictor variables.
- The predictor variables may even be power functions, or some other non-linear transformations of the considered original predictor variables.
- The homogeneity of variance is not necessary. Over-dispersion (when the observed variance is greater than the model assumes) may occur in some cases.
- Errors are independent but are not normally distributed.
- GLM uses maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) rather than ordinary least squares (OLS) to estimate the parameters, and, therefore, depends on higher sample approximations.

Goodness-of-fit measures rely on sufficiently large samples. The quasi likelihood under the independence model criterion (QIC) and corrected quasi likelihood under the independence model criterion (QICC) were considered to test the goodness-of-fit in this research. In general, a lower QIC and QICC indicates a good model. In addition, the difference between QIC and QICC should be lower for a valid model estimation.

GLM is sensitive to outliers. Therefore, link lengths which are less than 0.3 miles were removed from the model database. Such links may have uncertain and unexplainable travel times which could affect the model parameters.

Data related to crashes at the construction zone were not known from the TIMS database. The travel time due to the effect of crashes could be outliers and need to be removed to minimize the effect of such incidents on travel time. In addition, outlier's data could skew the GLM results. Therefore, the average travel times inside the oval shaped boundary (Figure 5) were considered as outliers and removed prior to conducting the analysis and developing the models.

The data for freeway and connecting arterial street links was checked for outliers for, both, before and during the construction project periods. The outliers were removed prior to conducting the analysis and modeling. The results obtained from the analysis and modeling are presented in chapters 4 and 5.




Figure 5 Removing Outliers from the Model Database

3.7 Model Validation

The Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and the Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE) were used for validating the model. RMSE measures the differences between values predicted by a developed model and the recorded values (Chai & Draxler, 2014). Similarly, MAPE measures the accuracy of the values predicted by the developed model (Chai & Draxler, 2014). If the values of RMSE and MAPE is closer to zero, then the model indicates the best fitted model. Formulas representing RMSE and MAPE are presented as Equation 3 and Equation 4.

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=1}^n (Actual_{ATT} - Estimated_{ATT})^2}{n}} \quad \text{----- Equation 3}$$

$$MAPE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left| \frac{Actual_{ATT} - Estimated_{ATT}}{Actual_{ATT}} \right| \quad \text{----- Equation 4}$$

where,

N = number of the observations,

Actual_ATT = Recorded average travel time, and,

Estimated_ATT= Estimated average travel time from the developed model.

CHAPTER 4: EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAVEL TIME PERFORMANCE MEASURES BEFORE AND DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PERIOD

It is important to examine if there exists any significant relationship between the average travel time and other travel time performance measures before and during the construction project period. Data obtained and processed for the resurfacing project was analyzed to examine the relationships between the travel time performance measures before and during the construction project period, for all the considered time periods. As stated in Chapter 3, a one-tail paired t-test was used to examine the difference in means and significance between before and during the construction project period travel time measures.

4.1 Average Travel Time (ATT)

Figure 6 shows the average travel time on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project period, for morning peak and morning off-peak hours during a weekday. The average travel times before and during the construction project periods are same on almost all the freeway links and connecting arterial street links, in case of morning peak and morning off-peak hours on a typical weekday. Figure 7 shows the average travel times before and during the construction project periods, for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekday. The average travel time is almost same during both the time periods on freeway links. However, the average travel times are greater during the construction project period on majority of the

connecting arterial street links when compared with the before construction project period, in case of evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a typical weekday.




Figure 6 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday




Figure 7 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday

Figure 8 and Figure 9 shows the average travel time before and during the construction project period for morning peak, morning off-peak, evening peak, and evening off-peak hours on a typical weekend day. All the four time periods on a weekend day have similar travel times on most of the freeway and connecting arterial street links for considered time periods on a weekend day.




Figure 8 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day




Figure 9 Average Travel Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

The mean differences, t-stat, and t-critical values computed using the average travel times are summarized in Table 4. The means of the average travel time during the construction project period are lower than the means of the average travel time before the construction project period on the freeway links. The t-stat and t-critical (one-tail test) results indicate that there was a significant decrease in the average travel time on freeway links at a 95% confidence interval. However, the mean average travel time on the connecting arterial street links increased during the construction project period when compared with before the construction project period. The mean difference is comparatively higher on connecting arterial street links during the construction project period, during the evening peak hours (weekday), when compared with the freeway links at a 95% confidence level. This could be because the vehicular traffic might have shifted

to the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period to avoid major delays on the freeway links.

Table 4 T-test Results: Average Travel Time

		7 AM - 9 AM		10 AM - 12 PM		5 PM - 7 PM		10 PM - 12 AM	
		Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Freeway Links									
Mean	During	1.01	0.95	0.96	0.93	1.40	0.94	1.03	1.00
	Before	1.16	0.98	1.00	0.98	1.54	1.00	1.05	1.02
Diff. between means		-0.15	-0.03	-0.04	-0.05	-0.14	-0.06	-0.02	-0.02
t-Stat		-2.91	-6.50	-4.15	-5.43	-0.64	-3.90	-1.36	-1.16
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.26	<0.01	0.09	0.13
t Critical one-tail		1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69
Connecting Arterial Links									
Mean	During	2.25	1.66	1.81	1.78	2.58	1.83	1.66	1.67
	Before	2.24	1.71	1.71	1.65	2.24	1.71	1.47	1.48
Diff. between means		0.01	-0.05	0.10	0.13	0.34	0.12	0.19	0.19
t-Stat		0.07	-1.91	5.48	5.77	6.75	5.06	8.99	8.27
P(T<=t) one-tail		0.47	0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
t Critical one-tail		1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67

4. 2 Planning Time (PT) or 95th Percentile Travel Time

Figure 10 shows the computed PTs on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for morning peak and morning off-peak hours during a weekday. The PTs are same on majority of the freeway links. However, the PTs during the construction project period are generally greater than before the construction project period on almost all the connecting arterial street links.




Figure 10 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday

Figure 11 shows the PTs on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekday. The PTs are same on majority of the freeway links. However, the PTs during the construction project period are generally greater than before the construction project period on almost all the connecting arterial street links, in case of both the study hours.




Figure 11 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday

Figure 12 and Figure 13 shows the computed PT's before and during the construction project period on the selected freeway and connecting arterial street links for morning peak, morning off-peak, evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a typical weekend days. Similar trends were observed on the weekend days where PT's has shown an increase on connecting arterial street links during the construction project period when compared with before the construction project period. The PT's are observed to be similar on the freeway links before and during the construction project period.




Figure 12 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day




Figure 13 Planning Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

The mean differences, t-stat, and t-critical values computed using the PTs are summarized in Table 5. The mean differences in the PT during and before the construction project period followed similar trend as the average travel time. The PT is significantly higher before the construction project period when compared with during the construction project period, at a 95% confidence level, during all the considered time periods. In addition, the mean PTs on connecting arterial street links are significantly higher during the construction project period when compared with mean PTs before the construction project period. As stated earlier, vehicular traffic might have shifted from the freeway links to the connecting arterial street links during the construction to avoid the non-enduring delays.

Table 5 T-test Results: Planning Time or 95th Percentile Travel Time

		7 AM - 9 AM		10 AM - 12 PM		5 PM - 7 PM		10 PM - 12 AM	
		Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Freeway Links									
Mean	During	1.06	0.93	0.97	0.91	2.11	0.92	1.17	1.10
	Before	1.42	0.95	0.98	0.96	2.21	0.97	1.13	1.06
Diff. between means		-0.36	-0.02	-0.01	-0.05	-0.10	-0.05	0.04	0.04
t-Stat		-4.23	-2.46	-0.28	-3.59	-0.37	-4.25	0.44	0.51
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	0.39	<0.01	0.36	<0.01	0.33	0.31
t Critical one-tail		1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69
Connecting Arterial Links									
Mean	During	3.73	2.26	2.63	2.60	4.62	2.72	2.34	2.40
	Before	3.19	1.97	2.41	2.26	3.84	2.36	1.85	1.84
Diff. between means		0.54	0.29	0.22	0.34	0.78	0.36	0.49	0.56
t-Stat		5.32	5.62	4.34	4.75	5.60	5.17	6.78	6.12
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
t Critical one-tail		1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67

4. 3 Buffer Time (BT)

Figure 14 shows the BTs on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for morning peak and morning

off-peak hours on a weekday. The BTs on a few freeway links are greater than before the construction project period when compared with during the construction project period. The freeway links on which they were higher varies by the time period. On the other hand, the BTs during the construction project period are generally greater than before the construction project period on almost all the connecting arterial street links, in case of both the time periods. The trends on connecting arterial street links are similar for BT and PT based graphs.




Figure 14 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday

Figure 15 shows the BTs on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekday. The BTs on a few freeway links are greater than before the construction project period when compared with during the construction project period.

The freeway links on which they were higher varies by the time period. On the other hand, the BTs during the construction project period are generally greater than before the construction project period on almost all the connecting arterial street links, in case of both the time periods.




Figure 15 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday




Figure 16 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

Figure 16 shows the computed BT's before and during the construction project period on the freeway and connecting arterial street links for morning peak and morning off-peak hours on a weekend day. The BT's before the construction project period were higher on most of the links when compared with during the construction project period. However, BT's during the construction project period on connecting arterial street links are higher when compared with before the construction project period. BT's has not shown any change during the evening off-peak hours on a weekend day. On connecting arterial street links, BT's increased during the construction project period when compared with before the construction project period.

Figure 17 shows the computed BT's before and during the construction project period on the freeway and connecting arterial street links for evening peak time and evening

off-peak hours on a weekend day. The BT's are similar on the freeway links before and during the construction project period. However, on the connecting arterial street links, BT's were higher during the construction project period when compared with before the construction on project period.




Figure 17 Buffer Time Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

The mean differences, t-stat, and t-critical values computed using the BTs are summarized in Table 6. The mean BTs are higher during the construction project period, during evening off-peak hour, when compared with the before construction project period. This could be possible since most of the construction activities commence during evening off-peak, as interruption to vehicular traffic would be minimum. In addition, from the t-stat and t-critical results, there was a decrease in mean travel times from before to during

the construction project period. However, it is not significant on the freeway links, excluding the morning peak (weekend day).

The mean BTs during the construction project period are significantly higher when compared with the before construction project period on the connecting arterial street links. The BT on the connecting arterial street links increased significantly from before to during the construction project period, at a 95% confidence level. The mean difference in BTs is high particularly during the evening peak (weekday) and evening off-peak (weekday and weekend day) hours.

Table 6 T-test Results: Buffer Time (BT)

		7 AM - 9 AM		10 AM - 12 PM		5 PM - 7 PM		10 PM - 12 AM	
		Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Freeway Links									
Mean	During	0.39	0.27	0.11	0.08	0.90	0.09	0.26	0.21
	Before	0.40	1.12	0.11	0.10	1.03	0.10	0.21	0.16
Diff. between means		-0.01	-0.85	0.00	-0.02	-0.13	-0.01	0.05	0.05
t-Stat		-0.17	-7.71	0.05	-1.18	-0.82	-1.47	0.68	0.75
P(T<=t) one-tail		0.43	<0.01	0.48	0.12	0.21	0.07	0.25	0.23
t Critical one-tail		1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69
Connecting Arterial Links									
Mean	During	1.47	0.60	0.81	0.81	2.04	0.89	0.67	0.73
	Before	1.18	0.42	0.70	0.60	1.60	0.65	0.37	0.36
Diff. between means		0.29	0.18	0.11	0.21	0.44	0.24	0.30	0.37
t-Stat		4.59	4.67	3.21	3.92	4.62	4.89	5.57	5.08
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
t Critical one-tail		1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67

4. 4 Buffer Time Index (BTI)

Figure 18 shows the computed BTIs on the selected freeway and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for morning peak and morning off-peak hours on a typical weekday. The trends on freeway links and connecting arterial street links seems to be higher before the construction project period when

compared with during the construction project period for morning peak hours on freeway links and connecting arterial street links, and for morning off-peak hours on connecting arterial street links. BTIs are similar on the freeway links during morning off-peak hours.




Figure 18 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday




Figure 19 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday

Figure 19 shows the computed BTIs on the selected freeway and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekday. The trends on freeway links seems to be consistent during the peak hour. However, the differences between before and during construction project periods are very high on a few freeway links. Except on a couple of connecting arterial street links, the trends in computed BTIs are similar before and during the construction project periods.

Figure 20 shows the computed BTIs before and during the construction project periods on selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links for morning peak and morning off-peak hours on a typical weekend day. BTIs were higher on freeway links and connecting arterial street links for morning peak hours. However, the BTIs were higher

before the construction project period when compared with during the construction project period of morning off-peak hours, on both freeway and connecting arterial street links.




Figure 20 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day




Figure 21 Buffer Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

Figure 21 shows the computed BTIs before and during the construction project period on freeway and connecting arterial street links for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekend day. The trends are similar to the BTIs for morning peak and morning off-peak hours, for both the freeway and connecting arterial street links.

The mean differences, t-stat, and t-critical values computed using the BTIs are summarized in Table 7. The results from the t-test analysis showed that the BTIs are nearly equal during and before the construction project period, on the freeway links, except during the morning peak period on a weekday and weekend day. Therefore, there is no significant change in BTI before and during the construction project period on the freeway links.

The mean differences in BTIs are significantly higher on the connecting arterial street links. The BTI has increased significantly during the construction project period

when compared with before the construction project period. The mean difference is higher particularly during the morning peak and evening peak hours on a weekday. When the vehicular traffic shifts from the freeway links to the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period, travel times increase significantly, and so is BTI. This seems to be during the peak hours. The BTI during night-time off-peak hour on a weekday did not show any increase or decrease when before and during construction project period data are compared.

Table 7 T-test Results: Buffer Time Index (BTI)

		7 AM - 9 AM		10 AM - 12 PM		5 PM - 7 PM		10 PM - 12 AM	
		Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Freeway Links									
Mean	During	17.30	12.57	11.07	11.94	65.19	12.51	21.89	19.40
	Before	31.51	10.79	13.04	12.38	66.23	12.38	21.59	15.54
Diff. between means		-14.21	1.78	-1.97	-0.44	-1.04	0.13	0.30	3.86
t-Stat		-4.06	2.83	-1.05	-0.57	-0.15	0.14	0.07	0.72
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	0.15	0.29	0.44	0.44	0.47	0.24
t Critical one-tail		1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69
Connecting Arterial Links									
Mean	During	96.16	64.24	73.56	74.32	111.70	80.80	62.23	64.11
	Before	159.78	73.89	108.19	98.72	196.39	96.56	62.14	59.90
Diff. between means		-63.62	-9.65	-34.63	-24.40	-84.69	-15.76	0.09	4.21
t-Stat		-4.80	-1.43	-5.73	-3.22	-5.47	-3.20	0.02	1.00
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.49	0.16
t Critical one-tail		1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67

4. 5 Travel Time Index (TTI)

Figure 22 shows the computed TTIs on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for morning peak and morning off-peak hours on a weekday. The TTIs were higher on the freeway links for both the time periods. However, TTIs were lower for most of the links on connecting arterial streets during the construction project period, for both the time periods.




Figure 22 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekday




Figure 23 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekday

Figure 23 shows the TTIs on the selected freeway links and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekday. The TTIs are close to each other, in case of both the study hours, except on a few links. However, the TTIs on majority of connecting arterial street links during the construction project period are greater than before the construction project periods, in case of both the time periods.




Figure 24 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Morning Peak and Morning Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

Figure 24 shows the TTIs on the selected freeway and connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project periods, for morning peak and morning off-peak hours on a weekend day. TTIs were similar on the freeway links before and during the construction project period for morning peak hours. However, TTIs were higher on freeway links for morning off-peak hours on weekend days. On the other hand, TTIs were

higher on the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period when compared with before the construction project period, for both the time periods.




Figure 25 Travel Time Index Before and During the Construction Project Period for Evening Peak and Evening Off-peak Hours on a Weekend Day

Figure 25 shows the TTIs on selected freeway and connecting arterial street links for evening peak and evening off-peak hours on a weekend day. TTIs before the construction project period were higher when compared with during the construction project period on freeway links for evening peak hours. However, TTIs are similar before and during the construction project period for evening off-peak hours on freeway links. TTIs were higher during the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links when compared with before the construction project period for both the time periods.

The mean differences, t-stat, and t-critical values computed using the TTIs are summarized in Table 8. Similar trends were observed on freeway links and connecting

arterial street links. The mean TTIs before the construction project period are higher when compared with during the construction project period on the freeway links. The TTIs during morning peak period and day-time off-peak hour on a weekday and weekend day decreased from before to during construction project period on the freeway links. A statistically significant change was not observed on the freeway links during the evening peak and evening off-peak hours.

The mean TTI values are higher during the construction project period, on connecting arterial street link links, when compared with the before construction project period. A significant increase was observed on the connecting arterial street links during all the considered time periods.

4. 6 Summary of Relationships

Table 9 summarizes the travel time performance measures and significance (positive, negative, or no significance) by the time-of-the-day and day-of-the-week. The “P” indicates an increase in travel time performance measure during the construction project period when compared with before the construction project period. On the other hand, “N” indicates a decrease in travel time performance measure during the construction project period when compared with the before construction project period. From Table 9, the average travel time (ATT) and PT can better explain the effect of road construction project, on freeway links, when compared with before the construction project period. No significant effect or consistent trend was observed when BT, BTI, and TTI are considered. Except in case of BTI, significant positive effect on connecting arterial street links performance was observed when compared with before the construction project period. The effect can be consistently observed when PT and TTI are used for assessment.

Table 8 T-test Results: Travel Time Index (TTI)

		7 AM - 9 AM		10 AM - 12 PM		5 PM - 7 PM		10 PM - 12 AM	
		Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Freeway Links									
Mean	During	0.21	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.89	0.12	0.15	0.19
	Before	0.48	0.12	0.12	0.13	1.07	0.13	0.18	0.15
Diff. between means		-0.27	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.18	-0.01	-0.03	0.04
t-Stat		-4.06	2.76	-2.91	-3.50	-1.05	-1.63	-1.21	0.91
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.15	0.06	0.12	0.19
t Critical one-tail		1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69
Connecting Arterial Links									
Mean	During	1.73	0.71	0.90	0.87	2.18	0.96	0.72	0.78
	Before	1.39	0.53	0.79	0.71	1.75	0.74	0.45	0.46
Diff. between means		0.34	0.18	0.11	0.16	0.43	0.22	0.27	0.32
t-Stat		4.37	4.66	3.21	3.62	4.61	4.71	6.43	5.25
P(T<=t) one-tail		<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
t Critical one-tail		1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67

Table 9 Significance of Travel Time Performance Measures

		7 AM - 9 AM		10 AM - 12 PM		5 PM - 7 PM		10 PM - 12 AM	
		Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend	Weekday	Weekend
Freeway Links									
ATT	N	N	N	N		N			
PT	N	N		N		N			
BT		N							
BTI	N	N							
TTI	N	P	N	N					
Connecting Arterial Links									
ATT			P	P	P	P	P	P	P
PT	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
BT	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
BTI	N		N	N	N	N			
TTI	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
P = Positive, N = Negative; Blank cell indicate no significant relation.									

The travel time performance measures during the construction project period decreased significantly on the freeway links and increased significantly on the connecting arterial street links. To avoid unnecessary delays during the construction, vehicular traffic

could have shifted from the freeway links to the connecting arterial street links. Lower speed limit, reduced capacity, and increased traffic volume on the connecting arterial street links resulted in significantly higher travel times during the construction project period when compared to the freeway links. The performance measures and significance values varied by time-of-the-day and day-of-the-week on the freeway and connecting arterial street links. The average travel time (ATT), planning time (PT), and travel time index (TTI) can better explain the effect of a road construction project on transportation system performance.

Predominantly, the performance on freeway links is expected to be lower during the construction project period, since the actual number of lanes, lane widths, shoulder widths, and speed limits are reduced. However, from the paired t-test analysis, it is observed that the average travel time and travel time performance measures have improved on the freeway links but have worsened on the connecting arterial street links. Therefore, practitioners should forecast the effects on freeway links and connecting arterial street links due to a construction project period.

The average travel time was selected for modelling, since the practitioners and researchers are interested in estimating the expected travel time. It was observed to better explain the effect of a road construction project. Therefore, the average travel time was selected as a dependent variable to model the effect of a construction project.

The models to estimate the average travel time before and during the construction project period, on the freeway and connecting arterial street links, are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: MODEL DEVELOPMENT & VALIDATION

Prior to developing the models for estimating the travel time before and during the construction period on freeways and connecting arterial street links, travel times were first estimated by using the formulation suggested by the Bureau of Public Roads (BPR). The BPR travel time equation is represented as follows.

$$\text{Travel Time} = \text{TT}_{\text{freeflow}} \times \left(1 + \alpha \times \left(\frac{v}{c}\right)^\beta\right) \text{----- Equation 5}$$

where, $\text{TT}_{\text{freeflow}}$ = Free flow travel time on the selected link.

$\alpha = 0.15$ and $\beta = 4$ were considered as the default values. The V/C is volume over the capacity on the selected link.

Travel time was computed for each selected link and compared with the actual travel time. The RMSE and MAPE were computed to assess the effectiveness of BPR equation in estimating travel time. Table 10 represents the RMSE and MAPE before and during the construction project period on freeway and connecting arterial street links.

Table 10. Validation Results from BPR

Freeway Links (BPR)		
	RMSE	MAPE
Before the Construction Project Period	0.27	19.67%
During the Construction Project Period	0.27	20.93%

Connecting Arterial Street Links (BPR)		
	RMSE	MAPE
Before the Construction Project Period	0.62	74.23%
During the Construction Project Period	0.70	83.01%

From the results summarized in Table 10, higher variations were observed from the estimated travel time using BPR equation when compared with the actual travel time for freeway and connecting arterial street links before and during the construction project period. This indicates that factors other than V/C influence travel time before and during the road construction project period. Therefore, models were developed to estimate travel times before and during the road construction project.

The average travel times, network characteristics, construction zone characteristics, upstream and downstream characteristics, time-of-the-day, day-of-the-week, and the distance from the construction project, for each link, could influence travel time and were segregated into two different databases; before and during the construction project period.

Firstly, normality tests were conducted to examine if the dependent variable (average travel time) before and during the construction are normally distributed. The null hypothesis is that the data is normally distributed, while the alternate hypothesis is that the data is not normally distributed. Since the sample size is less than 2000, Shapiro-Wilk significance was used for testing the normality of the samples (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). Significance results from SPSS for the freeway links and connecting arterial street links are presented in Table 11.

Table 11 Normality Test Results for Before and During the Construction on Freeway and Connecting Arterial Street Links

Dependent Variable	Data		Shapiro-Wilk		
			Statistic	Degrees of Freedom	Significance
Average Travel Time	Freeway Links	Before	0.94	226	0.09
		During	0.68	226	0.16
	Connecting Arterial Street Links	Before	0.52	260	0.12
		During	0.26	221	0.23

The significance values from the Shapiro-Wilk test shows that the P-value is greater than 0.05, indicating that the alternate hypothesis be rejected, and the data is normally distributed. Therefore, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed, and travel time models were generated as well as validated.

Descriptive statistics were computed using the freeway links and connecting arterial street links data, for before and during the construction project period. Table 12 summarizes the descriptive statistics for the freeway links, for before and during the construction project period. Table 13 summarizes the descriptive statistics for connecting arterial street links, for before and during the construction project period.

Table 12 Descriptive Statistics – Freeway Links

Before the Construction Project Period					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average Travel Time	226	0.16	1.97	0.88	0.31
Link Length (mi)	226	0.39	4.10	1.24	0.93
Traffic Volume	226	282	5130	2330	1336
Capacity	226	8800	29333	18985	6277
V/C	226	0.10	0.85	0.16	0.13
No.of Lanes	226	1	4	3	1
Speed Limit (mph)	226	55	65	60	5
Upstream Link Length (mi)	226	0.31	4.10	1.19	0.95
Upstream V/C	226	0.10	0.87	0.47	0.14
Upstream no.of lanes	226	1	4	2	1
Upstream Speed Limit	226	55	65	57	12
Downstream Link Length (mi)	226	0.30	4.10	1.10	0.80
Downstream V/C	226	0.12	0.87	0.46	0.14
Downstream no.of lanes	226	1	4	3	1
Downstream Speed Limit	226	55	65	57	12
D (mi)	226	0.15	4.48	1.32	1.62
During the Construction Project Period					
Average Travel Time	226	0.15	1.92	0.85	0.30
Link Length (mi)	226	0.39	4.10	1.24	0.93
Traffic Volume	226	200	4850	2130	1336
Capacity	226	5867	22000	14907	3971
V/C	226	0.08	0.56	0.19	0.16
No.of Lanes	226	1	3	2	0
Speed Limit (mph)	226	55	65	60	5
Upstream Link Length (mi)	226	0.31	4.10	1.19	0.95
Upstream V/C	226	0.12	0.56	0.47	0.14
Upstream no.of lanes	226	1	3	2	1
Upstream Speed Limit	226	55	65	57	12
Downstream Link Length (mi)	226	0.30	4.10	1.10	0.80
Downstream V/C	226	0.19	0.52	0.46	0.14
Downstream no.of lanes	226	1	3	2	1
Downstream Speed Limit	226	55	65	57	12
D (mi)	226	0.15	4.48	1.32	1.62

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics – Connecting Arterial Street Links

Before the Costruction Project Period					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Average Travel Time	260	0.20	1.99	1.46	0.38
Link Length (mi)	260	0.31	3.75	1.03	0.90
Traffic Volume	260	708	6250	2239	1454
Capacity	260	1106	29333	9500	7871
V/C	260	0.13	1.13	0.30	0.15
No.of Lanes	260	1	3	2	1
Speed Limit (mph)	260	35	55	47	5
Upstream Link Length (mi)	260	0.30	3.75	0.80	0.75
Upstream V/C	260	0.13	1.58	0.42	0.24
Upstream no.of lanes	260	1	3	2	1
Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	260	35	55	46	9
Downstream Link Length (mi)	260	0.31	3.75	0.77	0.78
Downstream V/C	260	0.17	1.13	0.42	0.20
Downstream no.of lanes	260	1	3	2	1
Downstream Speed Limit (mph)	260	35	55	47	5
D (mi)	260	0.21	3.75	1.38	0.97
During the Costruction Project Period					
Average Travel Time	221	0.25	1.99	1.74	0.41
Link Length (mi)	221	0.31	3.75	1.03	0.94
Traffic Volume	221	773	6818	3036	1581
Capacity	221	1106	29333	10242	8279
V/C	221	0.14	2.81	0.42	0.34
No.of Lanes	221	1	3	2	1
Speed Limit (mph)	221	35	55	47	6
Upstream Link Length (mi)	221	0.30	2.61	0.79	0.75
Upstream V/C	221	0.14	2.81	0.65	0.55
Upstream no.of lanes	221	1	3	2	1
Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	221	35	55	45	10
Downstream Link Length (mi)	221	0.31	3.75	0.72	0.76
Downstream V/C	221	0.20	1.42	0.58	0.33
Downstream no.of lanes	221	1	3	2	0
Downstream Speed Limit (mph)	221	35	55	47	5
D (mi)	221	0.22	3.75	1.48	0.99

On the freeway links, before and during the construction project period, the speed limit, the shoulder width, and the lane width were observed to be redundant (same through the study corridor). Therefore, the speed limit, the shoulder width, and the lane width variables were neglected in the model development for only freeway links. The details of the predictor variables considered for developing the travel time model for freeway links and the connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project period, are presented in Table 14.

Table 14 Dependent and Predictor Variables

S. No	Dependent Variables	Predictor Variables
1	Average Travel Time (ATT) Before & Average Travel time (ATT) During the Construction Project Period	Volume/Capacity (V/C)
2		Number of Lanes
3		Speed Limit (mph)
4		Shoulder Width (ft)
5		Lane Width (ft)
6		Divided/Undivided (0 or 1)
7		Upstream Link Length (mi)
8		Upstream V/C
9		Upstream Number of Lanes
10		Upstream Speed Limit (mph)
11		Downstream Link Length (mi)
12		Downstream V/C
13		Downstream Number of Lanes
14		Downstream Speed Limit (mph)
15		Link Distance to the Study Corridor (D)
16		Weekday (0 or 1)
17		Weekend Day (0 or 1)
18		Morning Peak (0 or 1)
19		Evening Peak (0 or 1)
20		Morning Off-peak (0 or 1)
21		Evening Off-peak (0 or 1)

5.1 Travel Time Before the Construction Project Period for Freeway Links

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted using before the construction project period data for 297 samples on the freeway. From the computed Pearson correlation coefficients, the predictor variables were selected to minimize the effect of multicollinearity between the predictor variables. The results obtained from the Pearson correlation coefficient analysis are presented in Table 15.

From the computed Pearson correlation coefficients, the predictor variables such as the number of lanes, the upstream link length, and the downstream number of lanes are positively correlated with the average travel time before the construction project period on the freeway links. The link distance from the study corridor is negatively correlated with the average travel time before the construction project period on the freeway links. As the number of lanes on the link and the number of lanes on the downstream link increases, there could be a possibility to attract a greater number of vehicles on the freeway section, which in turn increases the traffic volume and travel time. In addition, the travel time is expected to decrease as the distance from the study corridor increases.

The predictor variables such as the V/C, the upstream V/C, the upstream number of lanes, the upstream speed limit, the downstream V/C, the downstream number of lanes, and the downstream speed limit were correlated with the remaining predictor variables but were not correlated to each other at a 95% confidence level.

Generalized linear estimating equations analysis in SPSS software was used for developing the travel time model for freeway links, using the aforementioned predictor variables that are not correlated to each other.

Table 15 Correlation Coefficients for Freeway Links Before the Construction Project Period

	Average TT Before	V/C	(V/C) ²	(V/C) ³	(V/C) ⁴	(V/C) ⁵	# of Lanes	Upstream Link Length	Upstream V/C	Upstream # of lanes	Upstream Speed Limit	Downstream Link Length	Downstream V/C	Downstream # of lanes	Downstream Speed Limit (mi)	D Weekday	Weekend Day	Morning Evening Peak	Day-Time Off-Evening Time Peak	Off-Peak
Average TT Before	1																			
V/C	0.02	1																		
(V/C) ²	<0.01	.964**	1																	
(V/C) ³	-0.01	.895**	.980**	1																
(V/C) ⁴	-0.02	.830**	.943**	.990**	1															
(V/C) ⁵	-0.02	.777**	.907**	.971**	.995**	1														
# of Lanes	.121*	-.255**	-.263**	-.281**	-.297**	-.308**	1													
Upstream Link Length	.112*	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	-.166**	1												
Upstream V/C	-0.10	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.07	-.441**	.299**	1											
Upstream # of lanes	0.04	-0.09	-0.10	-.117*	-.131*	-.141*	.601**	-0.09	-.255**	1										
Upstream Speed Limit	0.04	-0.07	-0.09	-0.10	-.114*	-.122*	.227**	.203**	.561**	.526**	1									
Downstream Link	-0.06	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.07	.135*	-.195**	-.118*	-.256**	1								
Downstream V/C	-0.04	0.10	.125*	.144*	.156**	.163**	-0.03	-.207**	-.261**	.249**	-.240**	.210**	1							
Downstream # of lanes	.153**	-.223**	-.214**	-.215**	-.217**	-.218**	.601**	.158**	-.285**	.257**	.190**	0.00	-.210**	1						
Downstream Speed	0.03	-0.03	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.03	.227**	0.09	-.227**	.190**	-0.03	.229**	.588**	.526**	1					
D (mi)	-.125*	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	.160**	-.252**	-.199**	.127*	-.276**	-.149**	.193**	-.383**	-.311*	1				
Weekday	0.09	.433**	.447**	.409**	.365**	.328**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1				
Weekend Day	-0.09	-.433**	-.447**	-.409**	-.365**	-.328**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1				
Morning Peak	-0.01	.256**	.250**	.225**	.197**	.172**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Evening Peak	0.10	.394**	.327**	.273**	.237**	.214**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Day-Time Off-Peak	-0.06	-.144*	-.214**	-.221**	-.205**	-.188**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Evening Time Off-Peak	-0.03	-.506**	-.363**	-.278**	-.228**	-.197**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Of 297 freeway samples, 226 randomly selected samples were used for modelling the effect of the resurfacing construction project, while the remaining 71 randomly selected samples were used for validating the developed model. The maximum significance level considered was 0.05 (at a 95% confidence level). The predictor variables with a significance value greater than 0.05 were eliminated, except V/C, one after another while developing the models. The elimination process was repeated until all other predictor variables in the models have a significance value less than or equal to 0.05.

Linear, Gamma log-link distribution, Negative-Binomial log-link distribution, and Poisson log-link distribution based models were developed for the freeway links before the construction project using the selected predictor variables. Table 16 summarizes the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the various freeway links models for the before construction project period.

Table 16 Comparison of Model Parameters for Freeway Links Before the Construction Project Period

Before the Construction Project Period - Freeway Links												
Parameter	Linear Model			Gamma Log-Link			Negative Binomial Log-Link			Poisson Log-Link		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value
(Intercept)	1.26	0.07	0.01	-0.23	0.07	0.01	3.87	0.07	0.01	3.87	0.07	0.01
V/C	0.07	0.13	0.50	0.01	0.13	0.99	-0.01	0.13	0.99	0.02	0.13	0.85
Upstream V/C	-0.65	0.17	<0.01	-0.76	0.17	<0.01	-0.74	0.17	<0.01	-0.73	0.17	<0.01
Upstream no. of lanes	-0.25	0.04	<0.01	-0.28	0.04	<0.01	-0.28	0.04	<0.01	-0.29	0.04	<0.01
Upstream SL	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Downstream V/C	0.51	0.15	<0.01	0.54	0.15	<0.01	0.53	0.15	<0.01	0.59	0.15	<0.01
Downstream no. of	0.11	0.06	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.13	0.06	0.02
Downstream SL	-0.01	<0.01	0.04	-0.01	<0.01	0.07	-0.01	<0.01	0.06	-0.01	<0.01	0.01
QIC	30.24			39.87			29.77			1341.6		
QICC	33.97			46.33			44.57			1290.68		

(Note: For Negative-Binomial and Poisson Log-link, the Average Travel Time (ATT) was converted into seconds. In case of Linear and Gamma Log-Link distributions, ATT is in minutes)

The linear model has lower QIC and QICC, and most of the selected predictor variables are significant at a 95% confidence level when compared with other distributions. The QIC and QICC are also reasonably close to each other for the linear model. Therefore, the linear model was selected for the freeway links before the construction project period and validated.

The general form of the final best-fit linear model summarized in Table 16 is as shown in Equation 6.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Average Travel Time} = & 1.26 + 0.07 \times (\text{V/C}) - 0.65 \times (\text{Upstream V/C}) - 0.25 \times (\text{Upstream} \\ & \text{number of lanes}) + 0.01 \times (\text{Upstream Speed Limit}) + 0.51 \times (\text{Downstream V/C}) + 0.11 \times \\ & (\text{Downstream Number of Lanes}) - 0.01 \times (\text{Downstream Speed Limit}) \end{aligned}$$

-----Equation 6

Equation 6 can be used to estimate travel time on a freeway link before the road construction project period. Assume the V/C is 0.49, the upstream V/C is 0.58, the upstream number of lanes is 2, the upstream speed limit is 65 mph, the downstream V/C is 0.46, the downstream number of lanes is 2, and, the downstream speed limit is 55 mph for a freeway link. The average travel time for the freeway link = $1.26 + 0.07 \times (0.49) - 0.65 \times (0.58) - 0.25 \times (2) + 0.01 \times (65) + 0.51 \times (0.46) + 0.11 \times (2) - 0.01 \times (55) = 0.97$ min/mile.

The developed linear model (Equation 6) was then validated using data for 71 samples selected from the same construction project database. The average travel times were computed using the developed model and compared with the actual travel times.

The travel time model before the construction project period on freeway links shows that, upstream link characteristics such as upstream V/C and the upstream number of lanes have a smaller effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence level. However,

the upstream speed limit has a higher effect on link-level travel time. Downstream characteristics such as, downstream V/C and the downstream number of lanes have a higher effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence level. However, the downstream speed limit has a smaller effect on link-level travel time before the construction project period on freeway links.

If upstream V/C decreases, travel times would increase. While the traffic is entering a construction zone from the upstream link, there could be a possibility that the traffic would have staggered or queued due to the construction. Similarly, as the upstream number of lanes decrease, the travel times would increase. Further, an increase in the upstream speed limit would influence the travel times significantly. Vehicle queueing could be building on the upstream links due to the construction irrespective of higher speed limit. Similarly, as the downstream V/C is increases, the travel times are expected to increase. In addition, while the downstream number of lanes increase, more traffic would be attracted to freeway links, which in turn increases travel times significantly. Moreover, if the speed limit reduced on the downstream links, the travel time would also increase significantly.

The RMSE and MAPE were computed and used for validating the model. The computed RMSE is 0.11, while the computed MAPE is 7.75%. Around 6 seconds variation has been observed from the developed model when compared with the actual recorded average travel times.

5.2 Travel Time Before the Construction Project Period for Connecting Arterial Street Links

To understand the effect of a road construction project on connecting arterial street links before the construction project period, Pearson correlation coefficients were

computed, and the travel time model was developed as well as validated using data captured for the connecting arterial street links.

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted using before the construction project period data for 328 samples on connecting arterial street links. A few predictor variables were included while generating the correlations for the connecting arterial street links. Variables such as, link length, divided/undivided, the shoulder width, the lane width, the speed limit were added to the connecting arterial street link characteristics. The results obtained from the Pearson correlation analysis are presented in Table 17.

From the computed Pearson correlation analysis, nearly all the predictor variables were correlated with the average travel time before the construction project period at a 95% confidence level. The V/C, the number of lanes, the upstream link length, the upstream number of lanes, the downstream link length, the downstream V/C, the downstream number of lanes, the downstream speed limit, and morning and evening peak hours are positively correlated with the average travel time before the construction project period. As the V/C increases, the travel times would increase significantly; increase in number of lanes would attract more vehicular traffic, which in turn increases travel times.

Similarly, other predictor variables such as the upstream link length, the upstream number of lanes, the downstream link length, and the downstream number of lanes would eventually increase travel times by attracting traffic volume on the network. Further, travel time is expected to increase as the speed limit reduces. Similar trend follows with the lane and the shoulder width.

The travel times are expected to increase as the downstream speed limit reduces. It is expected that travel times would decrease as the distance from the study corridor

increase. During the weekday, traffic volume will be higher which would increase the travel time. However, during the weekend day traffic volume will be considerably less when compared to weekday, and so are travel times.

Table 17 Correlation Coefficients for Connecting Arterial Links Before the Construction Project Period

	ATT Before	Link Length (mi)	VC (V/C)1	VC (V/C)2	VC (V/C)3	VC (V/C)4	VC (V/C)5	Divided/Undivided	# of Lanes	Speed Limit (mph)	Shoulder Width (ft)	Lane Width (ft)	Upstream Link Length (mi)	Upstream V/C	Upstream # of Lanes	Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	Downstream Link Length (mi)	Downstream V/C	Downstream # of Lanes	Downstream Speed Limit (mph)	D (mi) Weekday	Weekend Day	Morning Peak	Evening Peak	Day-Time Off-Peak	Evening Time Off-Peak
ATT Before	1																									
Link Length (mi)	-0.162**	1																								
VC	0.392**	0.07	0.94**	1																						
(V/C)2	0.321**	0.07	0.94**	1																						
(V/C)3	0.236**	0.06	0.827**	0.94**	1																					
(V/C)4	0.172**	0.05	0.720**	0.898**	0.92**	1																				
(V/C)5	0.131**	0.05	0.643**	0.841**	0.951**	0.992**	1																			
Divided/Undivided	-0.233**	-0.07	-0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.04	1																		
# of Lanes	0.132**	0.132**	0.160**	0.123**	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.113*	1																	
Speed Limit in mph	-0.413**	-0.383**	-0.176**	-0.127**	-0.08	-0.06	-0.04	0.206**	-0.199**	1																
Shoulder Width (ft)	-0.461**	-0.194**	-0.268**	-0.232**	-0.182**	-0.148**	-0.123**	-0.238**	-0.237**	0.579**	1															
Lane Width (ft)	-0.250**	-0.185**	-0.214**	-0.138**	-0.08	-0.06	-0.04	0.07	0.08	0.474**	0.326**	1														
Upstream Link Length (mi)	0.132**	-0.190**	0.06	<0.01	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.148**	-0.225**	-0.06	-0.111**	-0.205**	1													
Upstream V/C	0.07	0.211**	0.188**	0.167**	0.150**	0.142**	0.139**	-0.03	0.06	0.00	-0.121**	-0.240**	0.161**	1												
Upstream # of Lanes	0.325**	-0.465**	0.08	0.05	0.02	<0.01	-0.01	-0.117**	0.07	-0.235**	-0.271**	-0.170**	0.177**	0.220**	1											
Upstream Speed Limit	-0.03	-0.02	0.04	0.01	<0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.092**	-0.07	0.175**	0.166**	-0.087**	-0.07	0.046**	0.207**	1										
Downstream Link Length	0.195**	-0.131**	0.195**	0.135**	0.08	0.05	0.02	-0.327**	-0.444**	-0.180**	-0.151**	-0.147**	0.427**	0.08	0.246**	-0.03	1									
Downstream V/C	0.138**	0.02	0.245**	0.292**	0.231**	0.202**	0.176**	0.08	0.01	-0.09	-0.121**	-0.169**	0.222**	0.156**	-0.03	0.118**	0.148**	1								
Downstream # of Lanes	0.177**	-0.165**	<0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.07	-0.04	-0.06	0.09*	-0.147**	0.09	0.134**	0.01	0.178**	0.229**	1							
Downstream Speed Limit	0.222**	0.07	-0.02	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.170**	-0.124**	0.421**	0.297**	0.03	0.03	0.185**	-0.152**	-0.02	-0.05	0.119**	0.20**	1						
D (mi)	-0.218**	-0.770**	0.03	<0.01	-0.01	-0.01	<0.01	-0.05	-0.108**	-0.04	0.03	-0.03	-0.07	0.156**	-0.435**	0.04	<0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	0.111*	1				
Weekday	0.224**	<0.01	0.227**	0.208**	0.177**	0.152**	0.135**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1				
Weekend Day	0.224**	<0.01	0.227**	0.208**	0.177**	0.152**	0.135**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1				
Morning Peak	0.185**	<0.01	0.131**	0.120**	0.102**	0.09	0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Evening Peak	0.185**	<0.01	0.131**	0.120**	0.102**	0.09	0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Day-Time Off-Peak	0.091**	<0.01	-0.131**	-0.120**	-0.102**	-0.09	-0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1		
Evening Time Off-Peak	0.279**	<0.01	-0.131**	-0.120**	-0.102**	-0.09	-0.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

° Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The predictor variables such as, either the link is divided or undivided, the V/C, the speed limit, the upstream V/C, the upstream number of lanes, and the link distance from the construction corridor were selected for modeling as they were correlated with all other predictor variables but are not correlated to each other at a 95% confidence level. The speed limit and the number lanes are correlated with each other. Therefore, either speed limit or the number lanes were used in for model development. Similar logic was applied with the upstream and downstream predictor variables.

Generalized linear estimating equations analysis in SPSS software was used for developing the travel time model for connecting arterial street links before the construction project period, using the aforementioned predictor variables that are not correlated to each other.

For the connecting arterial street links before the construction project period, 260 samples were used for the developing model while 68 samples were used for validating the developed models. The maximum significance level considered for developing the models was 0.07 (93% confidence level). The predictor variables with a significance value greater than 0.07 were eliminated, excluding V/C, one after another while developing the models. A few variables that are significant in estimating the travel times has a confidence level close to 93%. Therefore, the variables, which are less than 93% confidence level, was eliminated from the models.

The elimination process was repeated until all the predictor variables in the model have a significance value less than or equal to 0.07. The QIC and QICC were used to evaluate the strength of the predictor variables and model's goodness-of-fit.

Similar to the freeway links before the construction project period, linear, Gamma log-link, Negative Binomial log-link, and Poisson log-link distribution based models were developed for the connecting arterial street links before the construction project period. Table 18 summarizes the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the various connecting arterial street links models for the before construction project period.

Table 18 Comparison of Model Parameters for Connecting Arterial Street Links Before the Construction Project Period.

Before the Construction Project Period - Connecting Arterial Street Links												
Parameter	Linear Model			Gamma Log-Link			Negative Binomial Log-Link			Poisson Log-Link		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value
(Intercept)	2.80	0.20	<0.01	1.97	0.20	<0.01	6.05	0.20	<0.01	5.85	0.20	<0.01
Divided/ Undivided	0.15	0.05	<0.01	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.10
V/C	0.60	0.10	<0.01	0.41	0.10	0.03	0.41	0.10	0.39	0.41	0.10	0.01
Speed Limit	-0.04	<0.01	<0.01	-0.03	<0.01	<0.01	-0.04	<0.01	<0.01	-0.03	<0.01	<0.01
Upstream V/C	-0.24	0.13	0.06	-0.25	0.13	0.40	-0.24	0.13	0.50	-0.16	0.13	0.58
Upstream No. of Lanes	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.27	0.04	0.03	0.32	0.03	0.03	0.49
D (mi)	-0.04	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.60	-0.02	0.02	0.66	-0.02	0.02	0.46
QIC	34.66			86.25			23.41			1336.42		
QICC	30.30			31.94			31.18			985.21		

(Note: For Negative-Binomial and Poisson Log-link, the Average Travel Time (ATT) was converted into seconds. In case of Linear and Gamma Log-Link distributions, ATT is in minutes)

The linear model has lower QIC and QICC when compared with the Gamma log-link, Negative Binomial log-link, and Poisson log-link distribution based models. The QIC and QICC are also reasonably close to each other. Therefore, the linear model was used as a best-fit model for estimating travel times before the construction project period for connecting arterial street links.

The general form of the final best-fit model summarized in Table 18 is as shown in Equation 7.

$$\text{Average Travel Time} = 2.80 + 0.15 \times (\text{Divided/Undivided}) + 0.60 \times (\text{V/C}) - 0.04 \times (\text{speed Limit}) - 0.24 \times (\text{Upstream V/C}) + 0.04 \times (\text{Upstream Number of Lanes}) - 0.04 \times (\text{D})$$

-----Equation 7

Equation 7 can be used to estimate travel time on a connecting arterial street link before the road construction project period. Assume the V/C is 0.43, the speed limit is 45 mph, the upstream V/C is 0.47, the upstream number of lanes is 2, the road is divided (divided/undivided is 1), and the distance from the project location is 0.35 miles for a connecting arterial street link. The average travel time for the connecting arterial street link = $2.80 + 0.15 \times (1) + 0.60 \times (0.43) - 0.04 \times (45) - 0.24 \times (0.47) + 0.04 \times (2) - 0.04 \times (0.35)$ = 1.38 min/mile.

The developed linear model (Equation 7) was then validated using data for 68 samples selected from the same construction project database.

The developed travel time model for before the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links shows that, if the link is divided or undivided and V/C have a higher effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence interval. The upstream number lanes have a higher effect on link-level travel time at a 93% confidence interval. In addition, predictor variables such as, the speed limit, the upstream V/C, and the distance of a link from the study corridor have a smaller effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence interval.

As traffic volume increases and capacity decreases, travel times would increase significantly. Before the construction project period, if the speed limit is reduced, the travel

time is expected to increase. As the upstream V/C is reduced, the travel times would increase following the similar trends as freeway links. An increase in the upstream number of lanes attracts high traffic volume and increases travel time predominantly. The downstream link characteristics does not have a significant effect on travel times before the construction project period on connecting arterial street links.

The average travel times were computed using the developed model and compared with the actual travel times. The computed RMSE is 0.45 and MAPE is 24.28%. Around 20 seconds variation has been observed from the developed model when compared with the actual recorded average travel times.

5.3 Travel Time During the Construction Project Period for Freeway Links

The travel time during the road construction project period could be related to the travel time before the road construction project period. Therefore, linear model, linear model with no intercept, Gamma log-link, Negative-Binomial log-link, and Poisson log-link distribution models were developed with the average travel time during the road construction project period as the dependent variable and the average travel time before the road construction project period as the predictor variable. Data for 226 samples was used for developing the model and 71 samples was used for validation. A linear model with no intercept was selected since the QIC and QICC are lower and close to each other. The computed RMSE and MAPE are 0.05 and 3.53%. The results obtained show that travel time during the construction project period is lower than the travel time before the construction project period on a freeway link. Table 19 summarizes the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the various freeway link models for the during construction project period.

Table 19 Comparison of Model Parameters for Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period Related to During and Before Average Travel Time.

During the Construction Project Period - Freeway Links															
Parameters	Linear Model			Gamma Log-Link			Negative Binomial Log-Link			Poisson Log-Link			Linear Model (No Intercept)		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value
(Intercept)	0.12	0.04	<0.01	-1.07	0.08	<0.01	3.13	0.05	<0.01	3.02	0.08	<0.01	-	-	-
ATT Before	0.86	0.04	<0.01	1.02	0.08	<0.01	0.01	>0.01	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.98	<0.01	<0.01
QIC	10.32			19.96			394.77			11.3			6.14		
QICC	8.07			15.51			387.34			14.9			6.4		

(Note: For Negative-Binomial and Poisson Log-link, the Average Travel Time (ATT) was converted into seconds. In case of Linear and Gamma Log-Link distributions, ATT is in minutes)

The general form of the final best-fit model summarized in Table 19 is as shown in Equation 8.

$$\text{Average Travel Time During} = 0.98 \times (\text{Average Travel Time Before}) \text{ ----- Equation 8}$$

The travel time during the construction project period will depend on the V/C during the construction project period on freeway links. However, it is strenuous and not possible to collect the volume and capacity of the freeway links during the construction project period before the start of a future construction project. Therefore, V/C during the construction project period was estimated using the V/C before the construction project period as the predictor variable.

A model was developed for estimating V/C during the construction project period on the freeway links. The sample size used for estimating the V/C during the construction project period was 226 samples. Data for 71 samples was used for validating the developed model. Three models, linear model, linear model with no intercept and Gamma log-link

distribution models, were developed. Table 20 presents the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the freeway link V/C model, for during the construction project period.

Table 20 Model During the Construction Project Period for Estimating V/C - Freeway Links

During the Construction Project Period - Freeway Links									
Parameters	Linear Model			Linear Model (No Intercept)			Gamma Log-Link		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value
(Intercept)	-0.01	<0.01	<0.01	-	-	-	-2.91	0.08	<0.01
V/C Before	1.19	0.05	<0.01	1.16	0.03	<0.01	5.95	0.10	<0.01
QIC	8.69			6.78			30.42		
QICC	4.75			2.76			29.58		

The QIC and QICC were lower and closer to each other for the linear model with no intercept when compared with other developed models. Therefore, to avoid negative intercept, the linear model with no intercept was selected for estimating the V/C during the construction project period on freeway links. The general form of the V/C model summarized in Table 20 is as shown in Equation 9.

$$\text{Estimated (V/C)} = 1.16 \times (\text{V/C Before}) \quad \text{----- Equation 9}$$

The QIC and QICC values are lower and close to each other. The developed model was then validated with data for 71 links. From the developed model, V/C before the construction positively influences V/C during the construction project period on freeway links at a 95% confidence interval.

The computed RMSE and MAPE are 0.04 and 15.04%, respectively. The estimated V/C during the construction project period was then used as one of the predictor variable while developing the Pearson correlations and travel time model for during the construction project period on the freeway links.

During the construction project period, 297 samples were used for computing Pearson correlation coefficients. The results obtained from the correlation analysis are presented in Table 21. From the correlation analysis, the downstream number of lanes is positively correlated with the average travel time on the freeway links during the construction project period. As the downstream number of lanes increases, the traffic volume and, hence, travel time increases.

Table 21 Correlation Coefficients for Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period

	Avg TT During	V/C	No of Lanes (During)	Speed Limit (mph)	Upstream Link Length (mi)	Upstream V/C	Upstream # of lanes	Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	Downstream Link Length (mi)	Downstream V/C	Downstream # of lanes	Downstream Speed Limit (mph)	D (mi)	Weekday	Weekend Day	Morning Peak	Evening Peak	Day-Off- Peak	Evening Time Off- Peak
Avg TT During	1																		
V/C	0.03	1																	
# of Lanes	0.09	-.124*	1																
Speed Limit (mph)	-0.09	-0.01	.273**	1															
Upstream Link Length (mi)	0.10	-0.03	-0.11	.173**	1														
Upstream V/C	-0.09	-0.01	-.198**	-.243**	.298**	1													
Upstream # of lanes	0.05	0.01	.541**	.202**	-.005	0.10	1												
Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	-0.04	-0.01	.177**	-.002	.112*	.533**	.664**	1											
Downstream Link Length (mi)	-0.06	0.04	0.05	-.204**	.135*	-.264**	-.148**	-.239**	1										
Downstream V/C	0.10	<0.01	.200**	-.155**	-.003	.186**	.246**	0.08	.353**	1									
Downstream # of lanes	.122*	-0.09	.541**	-.005	0.05	-.143*	.223**	-0.07	<0.01	0.11	1								
Downstream Speed Limit (mph)	0.07	-0.02	.324**	-0.02	0.04	-0.04	.276**	-0.04	0.06	.520**	.664**	1							
D (mi)	-0.11	-0.02	.333**	.774**	-.252**	-.283**	.170**	-0.03	-.149**	-.136*	-.216**	-.122*	1						
Weekday	0.09	.483**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1					
Weekend Day	-0.09	-.483**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1					
Morning Peak	-0.04	.345**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Evening Peak	0.10	.310**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Day- Time Off-Peak	-0.06	-.152**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			
Evening Time Off-Peak	-0.01	-.504**	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	1			

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The generalized linear estimating equations analysis in SPSS software was used for developing the travel time during the construction project period on the freeway links.

The predictor variables such as, the V/C, the upstream link length, the upstream V/C, the downstream link length, the downstream V/C, the downstream number of lanes, and the downstream speed limit were considered for model development. The upstream speed limit and the upstream number of lanes are correlated to each other. Therefore, either the upstream number of lanes or the upstream speed limit could be used for model development. However, the upstream number of lanes were eliminated since the significance value is greater than 0.05. The downstream link characteristics were not correlated to each other and are significant at a 95% confidence interval.

Of 297 freeway samples, data for 226 samples was used for modeling while data for the remaining 71 randomly selected samples was used for validating the model. The maximum significance level considered was 0.05 (at a 95% confidence level). The predictor variables with a significance value greater than 0.05 were eliminated, except the V/C, one after another while developing the models. The elimination process was repeated until all the predictor variables in the models have a significance value less than or equal to 0.05.

Table 22 summarizes the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the various freeway links models for the during construction project period. The linear model has lower QIC and QICC when compared with other distributions. They are also reasonably close to each other for the linear model. In addition, most of the predictor variables are significant at a 95% confidence level for the linear model when compared with other distributions.

Table 22 Comparison of Model Parameters for Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period

During the Construction Project Period - Freeway Links												
Parameters	Linear Model			Gamma Log-Link			Negative Binomial Log-Link			Poisson Log-Link		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value
(Intercept)	1.14	0.08	<0.01	0.21	0.08	0.03	4.30	0.08	<0.01	4.26	0.08	<0.01
V/C	0.04	0.10	0.35	0.20	0.10	0.88	0.02	0.10	0.87	0.04	0.10	0.74
Upstream Link Length	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.02
Upstream V/C	-0.63	0.17	<0.01	-0.83	0.17	0.01	-0.81	0.17	<0.01	-0.69	0.17	<0.01
Downstream Link Length	-0.06	0.03	<0.01	-0.09	0.03	0.01	-0.09	0.03	0.01	-0.07	0.03	0.04
Downstream V/C	0.78	0.19	<0.01	0.93	0.19	0.01	0.93	0.19	<0.01	0.90	0.19	<0.01
Downstream no. of lanes	0.09	0.04	<0.01	0.08	0.04	0.18	0.08	0.04	0.17	0.10	0.04	0.06
Downstream SL	-0.01	0.00	<0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	<0.01	-0.01	0.00	<0.01
QIC	33.45			42.48			29.68			1349.28		
QICC	33.92			45.46			44.08			1282.77		

(Note: For Negative-Binomial and Poisson Log-link, the Average Travel Time (ATT) was converted into seconds. In case of Linear and Gamma Log-Link distributions, ATT is in minutes)

The general form of the final best-fit linear model summarized in Table 22 is as shown in Equation 10.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Average Travel Time} = & 1.14 + 0.04 \times (\text{V/C}) + 0.04 \times (\text{Upstream Link Length}) - 0.63 \times \\ & (\text{Upstream V/C}) - 0.06 \times (\text{Downstream Link Length}) + 0.78 \times (\text{Downstream V/C}) + 0.09 \\ & \times (\text{Downstream Number of Lanes}) - 0.01 \times (\text{Downstream Speed Limit}) \end{aligned}$$

-----Equation 10

Equation 10 can be used to estimate travel time on a freeway link during the road construction project period. Assume the V/C is 0.46, the upstream V/C is 0.58, the upstream link length is 0.53 miles, the downstream link length is 0.74 miles, the downstream V/C is 0.46, the downstream number of lanes is 2, and the downstream speed limit is 55 mph for a freeway link. The average travel time for the freeway link = 1.14 +

$$0.04 \times (0.46) + 0.04 \times (0.53) - 0.63 \times (0.58) - 0.06 \times (0.74) + 0.78 \times (0.46) + 0.09 \times (2) - 0.01 \times (55) = 0.76 \text{ min/mile.}$$

The developed linear model (Equation 10) during the construction project period on freeway links showed that, the upstream link length has a higher effect on link-level travel time. However, the upstream V/C has a smaller effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence interval. In addition, downstream characteristics such as, the link length and the speed limit have a smaller effect on link-level travel time during the construction project period. However, the downstream V/C and the downstream number lanes have a higher effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence interval.

An increase in the upstream link length increases the travel time. When the upstream V/C and the downstream link length decrease, the travel time would increase significantly. Also, an increase in the downstream V/C has a significant effect on the travel time. Further, an increase in traffic volume on the downstream links would ultimately increase the travel time. Similarly, as the downstream number of lanes increases, travel times would also increase. An increase in lane capacity would attract more traffic on the downstream links. Further, if the speed limit is reduced on the downstream links, the travel time is expected to increase. Overall, from before to during the construction project period on the freeway links, upstream and downstream link lengths have a significant effect on link-level travel time. The upstream number of lanes and the upstream speed limit do not have a significant effect during the construction project period when compared with before the construction project period on the freeway links.

The developed model was validated using data for the 71 randomly selected freeway samples. The RMSE and MAPE are 0.15 and 8.67%, respectively. From the

quantification results, the model was observed to be estimating precise travel times during the construction project period.

5.4 Travel Time During the Construction Project Period for Connecting Arterial Street Links

The travel time during the construction project period could be related to the travel time before the construction project period. Therefore, a linear model, linear model with no intercept, Gamma log-link, Negative-Binomial log-link, Poisson log-link distribution models were developed with the average travel time during the road construction project period as the dependent variable and the average travel time before the road construction project period as the predictor variable. Data for 221 samples was used for developing the model and 59 samples was used for validation. A linear model with no intercept was selected since the QIC and QICC are lower and close to each other. The computed RMSE and MAPE are 0.34 and 18.04%. The results obtained show that travel time during the construction project period is higher than the travel time before the construction project period on a connecting arterial street link. Table 23 summarizes the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the various connecting arterial street link models for the during construction project period.

Table 23 Comparison of Model Parameters for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period Related to During and Before Average Travel Time.

During the Construction Project Period - Connecting Arterial Street Links															
Parameters	Linear Model			Gamma Log-Link			Negative Binomial Log-Link			Poisson Log-Link			Linear Model (No Intercept)		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value
(Intercept)	0.05	0.05	0.30	-0.98	0.10	<0.01	3.27	0.06	<0.01	3.12	0.10	<0.01	-	-	-
ATT Before	1.01	0.03	<0.01	0.93	0.07	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	1.05	<0.01	<0.01
QIC	11.37			17.91			404.23			8.2			8.5		
QICC	9.77			12.12			397.65			11.86			7.81		

(Note: For Negative-Binomial and Poisson Log-link, the Average Travel Time (ATT) was converted into seconds. In case of Linear and Gamma Log-Link distributions, ATT is in minutes)

The general form of the final best-fit model summarized in Table 23 is as shown in Equation 11.

$$\text{Average Travel Time During} = 1.05 \times (\text{Average Travel Time Before}) \text{ ----- Equation 11}$$

The Pearson correlation coefficients were computed, and travel time model was developed for connecting arterial street links during the construction project period. The predictor variable V/C during the construction on connecting arterial street links is not known before the construction is commenced. Therefore, the V/C was estimated using the V/C before the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links as the predictor variable. Data for 221 samples was used for developing the model, while data for 59 samples was used for validating the developed model. Three models, linear model, linear model with no intercept and Gamma log-link distribution models, were developed. The developed V/C model was validated with the V/C from during the construction project period data for connecting arterial street links. The coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC are shown in Table 24.

Table 24 Model During the Construction Project Period for Estimating V/C – Connecting Arterial Street Links

During the Construction Project Period - Connecting Arterial Street Links									
Parameters	Linear Model			Linear Model (No Intercept)			Gamma Log-Link		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-Value
(Intercept)	-0.16	0.04	<0.01	-	-	-	-0.15	0.08	0.03
V/C Before	2.06	0.18	<0.01	1.59	0.12	<0.01	0.87	0.10	0.21
QIC	20.93			21.15			42.48		
QICC	9.12			8.41			45.46		

For the linear model with no intercept, the QIC and QICC are lower. In addition, to avoid the negative intercept, linear model with no intercept was selected for estimating the V/C during the construction project period on a connecting arterial street link.

The general form of the final V/C model summarized in Table 24 is as shown in Equation 12.

$$\text{Estimated (V/C)} = 1.59 \times (\text{V/C Before}) \text{ -----Equation 12}$$

For the developed V/C model, the QIC and QICC values are lower and close to each other. From the developed model, V/C before the construction project period influences V/C during the construction project period on connecting arterial street links. The V/C model was validated by comparing with the V/C during the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links. The RMSE and MAPE are 0.08 and 3.06%, respectively. The developed V/C model during the construction project period was then used as one of the predictor variables while developing the Pearson correlations and travel time model for the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period.

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted for connecting arterial street links similar to the freeways links. Data for 280 samples was used to compute the Pearson correlation coefficients. The correlation results showed that, majority of the variables are correlated to the average travel time on the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period.

The V/C, the number of lanes, the upstream link length, the upstream number of lanes, the downstream link length, the downstream V/C, the downstream number of lanes, and weekday evening peak are positively correlated with the average travel time during the construction project period. As the V/C increases, the average travel time would increase since the volume would increase while capacity is less. As the number of lanes increase, arterial streets would attract more traffic volume, which in turn increases the travel time. Similarly, the average travel time would increase if the downstream, upstream V/C, and the number of lanes increase.

On the other hand, divided/undivided, the speed limit, the upstream V/C, the downstream speed limit, the distance from the study corridor, weekend day, and evening off-peak hours are negatively correlated with the average travel time during the construction project period. As the speed limit reduces, the travel time would increase. If the link is not a divided section, the travel time could increase due to the reduced comfort level from close oncoming traffic. Similar trend follows with the upstream V/C and the downstream speed limit. In addition, as the vehicles move away from the study corridor, the travel time would reduce. The Pearson correlation coefficients and the significance values are presented in Table 25.

Table 25 Correlation Coefficients for Connecting Arterial Links During the Construction Project Period

Correlations														
	Avg TT Length During (mi)	Link Length (mi)	V/C	# of Lanes	Divided/ Undivided	Speed Limit (mph)	Upstream Link Length (mi)	Upstream V/C	Upstream # of lanes	Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	Downstream Link Length (mi)	Downstream V/C	Downstream # of lanes	Downstream Speed Limit (mph)
Avg TT During	1													
Link Length (mi)	-.202**	1												
V/C	.250**	.185**	1											
# of Lanes	.090*	.132**	.186**	1										
Divided/ Undivided	-.172**	-.007	.001	.113*	1									
Speed Limit (mph)	-.395**	-.288**	-.238**	-.199**	.206**	1								
Upstream Link Length (mi)	.122**	-.130**	.008	-.225**	-.148**	-.006	1							
Upstream V/C	-.101*	.156**	.261**	.007	-.009	.102*	.237**	1						
Upstream # of lanes	.327**	-.363**	.157**	.007	-.117**	-.235**	.177**	.219**	1					
Upstream Speed Limit (mph)	-.004	-.002	.002	-.007	.092*	.175**	-.007	.000	.207**	1				
Downstream Link Length (mi)	.177**	-.131**	.160**	-.444**	-.327**	-.180**	.427**	.008	.263**	-.003	1			
Downstream V/C	.105*	.005	.322**	.105*	.009	-.099*	.150**	-.001	-.006	.115*	.230**	1		
Downstream # of lanes	.186**	-.163**	.004	.007	-.002	-.004	-.147**	<.001	.134**	<.001	.178**	.224**	1	
Downstream Speed Limit (mph)	-.203**	.007	.007	-.124**	.170**	.421**	.003	.244**	-.152**	-.002	-.005	.002	.201**	1
D (mi)	-.245**	.770**	.103*	-.108*	-.005	-.004	-.007	.133**	-.435**	.004	<.001	<.001	-.002	.111*
Weekday	.234**	<.001	.172**	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
Weekend Day	-.234**	<.001	-.172**	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	1
Morning Peak	.004	<.001	.099*	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	1
Evening Peak	.235**	<.001	.099*	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	1
Day-Time Off-Peak	-.009	<.001	-.099*	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	1
Evening Time Off-Peak	-.189**	<.001	-.099*	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The predictor variables such as, whether the link is divided or undivided, the V/C, the speed limit, the upstream link length, the upstream V/C, the upstream number of lanes, the downstream number of lanes, and the distance of a link from the construction project were considered for model development. All the predictor variables considered are correlated to other predictor variables and are not correlated to each other. The logic applied for previous models while selecting the predictor variables was applied for selecting the predictor variables in developing the models for during the construction project period.

Data for 221 samples was used for developing the model, while data for 59 samples was used for validating the developed model. The maximum significance level considered was 0.05 (at a 95% confidence level). The predictor variables with a significance value greater than 0.05 were eliminated, except V/C, one after another while developing models. The elimination process was repeated until all the predictor variables in the models have a significance value less than or equal to 0.05.

Table 26 summarizes the coefficients, standard errors, significance values, QIC, and QICC for the various connecting arterial street links models for the during construction project period. The linear model was selected as the best-fit model for estimating the travel time. The QIC and QICC are lower, close to each other, and most of the predictor variables are significant at a 95% confidence level for the linear model when compared with other model distributions.

Table 26 Comparison of Model Parameters for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period

During the Construction Project Period - Connecting Arterial Street Links												
Parameter	Linear Model			Gamma Log-Link			Negative Binomial Log-Link			Poisson Log-Link		
	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value	Coeff.	Std. Error	P-value
(Intercept)	2.99	0.23	<0.01	2.10	0.23	<0.01	6.19	0.23	<0.01	5.89	0.23	<0.01
Divided/ Undivided	0.29	0.04	<0.01	0.22	0.04	<0.01	0.21	0.04	<0.01	0.20	0.04	<0.01
V/C During	0.32	0.05	<0.01	0.28	0.05	<0.01	0.28	0.05	<0.01	0.22	0.05	<0.01
Speed Limit (mph)	-0.04	0.00	<0.01	-0.03	0.00	<0.01	-0.03	0.00	<0.01	-0.03	0.00	<0.01
Upstream Link Length (mi)	0.11	0.02	<0.01	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.02	<0.01
Upstream V/C	-0.24	0.06	<0.01	-0.35	0.06	0.01	-0.34	0.06	0.02	-0.19	0.06	0.19
Upstream no. of lanes	0.04	0.04	<0.01	0.08	0.04	0.23	0.07	0.04	0.23	0.04	0.04	0.42
Downstream no. of lanes	-0.07	0.05	<0.01	-0.11	0.05	0.22	-0.11	0.05	0.22	-0.06	0.05	0.31
D (mi)	-0.03	0.02	<0.01	0.01	0.02	0.93	0.01	0.02	0.95	-0.01	0.02	0.65
QIC	32.88			106.6			19.57			1186.67		
QICC	32.21			32.51			31.86			875.88		

(Note: For Negative-Binomial and Poisson Log-link, the Average Travel Time (ATT) was converted into seconds. In case of Linear and Gamma Log-Link distributions, ATT is in minutes)

The general form of the final linear model summarized in Table 26 is as shown in Equation 13.

$$\text{Average Travel Time} = 2.99 + 0.29 \times (\text{Divided/Undivided}) + 0.33 \times (\text{V/C}) - 0.04 \times (\text{Speed Limit}) + 0.11 \times (\text{Upstream Link Length}) - 0.25 \times (\text{Upstream V/C}) + 0.04 \times (\text{Upstream Number of Lanes}) - 0.07 \times (\text{Downstream Number of Lanes}) - 0.03 \times (\text{D}) \text{ ----- Equation 13}$$

Equation 13 can be used to estimate travel time on a connecting arterial street link during the road construction project period. Assume the V/C is 0.47, the speed limit is 45 mph, the road is divided (divided/undivided is 1), the upstream link length is 0.39 miles, the upstream V/C is 0.39, the upstream number of lanes is 1, the downstream number of lanes is 2, and the distance of the link from the construction project location is 0.66 miles

for a connecting arterial street link. The average travel time for the connecting arterial street link = $2.99 + 0.29 \times (1) + 0.33 \times (0.47) - 0.04 \times (45) + 0.11 \times (0.39) - 0.25 \times (0.39) + 0.04 \times (1) - 0.07 \times (2) - 0.03 \times (0.66) = 1.54$ min/mile.

The developed linear model (Equation 13) during the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links shows that, if the link is divided/undivided and V/C have a higher effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence level. However, the speed limit has a smaller effect on link-level travel time. The upstream link length and the upstream number of lanes have a higher effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence interval. The upstream V/C has a smaller effect on link-level travel time during the construction project period. In addition, the downstream number of lanes and the distance of a link from the study corridor has a smaller effect on link-level travel time at a 95% confidence interval.

Most of the predictor variables that are observed to be significant before the construction project period are observed to be significant during the construction project period on connecting arterial street links. As the V/C increases, the travel time would increase on the connecting arterial street links. During the construction project period, if the speed limit reduced, the travel time would increase. In addition, the upstream link length and the upstream number of lanes has a significant effect on link-level travel time. As the length of the link increases, travel time would increase. Similarly, upstream V/C and the downstream number of lanes have a significant effect on link-level travel time. Since reduced V/C on the upstream links fail to accommodate incoming traffic, entering the construction zone would ultimately increase the travel time. From before to during the

construction project period, the upstream link length and the downstream number of lanes have a significant effect in increasing or decreasing the travel time. The effect of other predictor variables remained the same from before to during the construction project period on connecting arterial street links.

The developed travel time model was then validated using data for 59 randomly selected samples. The computed RMSE and MAPE are 0.44 and 11.42%, respectively. The developed travel time model is estimating precise travel times during the construction project period on the connecting arterial street links. The validation results from the freeway and connecting arterial street link models show that, the developed models are estimating better results when compared with the conventional BPR equation.

5.5 Comparison of V/C and Link-Level Travel Times

The V/C from the regional travel demand model were compared with the estimated V/C for the freeways links and the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period. Likewise, the actual travel times were compared with the estimated travel times for the freeway links and the connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project period. The ratio of the actual travel time over the estimated travel time for the freeway links and the connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction project period, were also computed and compared in this section.

5.5.1 Comparison of the V/C for the Freeway Links and the Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period

Figure 26 compares V/C from the regional travel demand model, for the freeway links during the construction project period, with the estimated V/C from the developed model.




Figure 26 Comparison of V/C for the Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period

From Figure 26, the V/C from the regional travel demand model are close to the estimated V/C for majority of the freeway links, when V/C is less than 0.2 (off-peak hours) during the construction project period. Similarly, Figure 27 compares the V/C from the regional travel demand model with the estimated V/C for the connecting arterial street links during the construction project period. The developed model for connecting arterial street links underestimates or overestimates for most of the link links, However, smaller differences were observed between the V/C from the regional travel demand models and the estimated V/C, when V/C is less than 0.2 (off-peak hours), during the construction project period on connecting arterial street links.




Figure 28 Comparison of V/C Ratios for the Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period




Figure 29 Comparison of V/C Ratios for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period

5.5.2 Comparison of Travel Time for the Freeway Links and the Connecting Arterial Street Links Before and During the Construction Project Period

Figure 30 compares the actual travel time with the estimated travel time for the freeway links before the construction project period. The actual and the estimated travel times are close to each other for majority of freeway links before the construction project period.




Figure 30 Comparison of Travel Time for Freeway Links Before the Construction Project Period

Figure 31 compares the actual travel time with the estimated travel time for the freeway links during the construction project period. Even in this case, the actual travel times are close to the estimated travel times for majority of freeway links during the construction project period.

One link has a higher variation in travel time during the evening peak hour when compared with the actual travel time recorded before and during the construction project period. This link is located near the entry and exit ramps to the charlotte-Douglas

International airport. Higher traffic volume during the evening peak hour could be influencing the travel time and error.




Figure 31 Comparison of Travel Time for the Freeway Links During the Construction Project Period

Figure 32 compares the ratios of the actual travel time over the estimated travel time, for freeway links, before and during the construction project period. Assuming a $\pm 10\%$ allowable error for estimating the travel time ratios, trend show that the developed model for, both, before and during construction project period estimates within the allowable error for 70% of the links. Both the developed models for the freeway links overestimate travel time for 30% of the links.

Figure 33 compares the actual and the estimated travel times before the construction project period for the connecting arterial street links. Trend indicates that the developed model underestimates or overestimates travel time for a majority of the connecting arterial street links.




Figure 32 Comparison of Travel Time Ratios for the Freeway Links Before and During the Construction Project Period




Figure 33 Comparison of Travel Times for Connecting Arterial Street Links Before the Construction Project Period

Similarly, Figure 34 compares the actual and the estimated travel time for connecting arterial street links during the construction project period. Trend shows that the estimated travel time is close to the actual travel time for a majority of the connecting arterial street links.




Figure 34 Comparison of Travel Times for Connecting Arterial Street Links During the Construction Project Period

Figure 35 shows the ratios of the actual travel time over the estimated travel time for the connecting arterial street links before and during the construction project period. Assuming a $\pm 10\%$ allowable error for estimating the travel time on the connecting arterial street links before the construction project period, trend shows that the developed model underestimates travel time for 40% of the links, while the developed model overestimates travel time for 30% of the links before the construction project period.

On the other hand, trend shows that the estimated and actual travel times are closer to each other for 60% of the links, while the actual travel times are greater than the estimated travel times for the remaining 30% of the links during the construction project period. In the Figure 35, since some outliers were removed from the dataset, there was a difference in the number of links before and during the construction project period.




Figure 35 Comparison of Travel Time Ratios for Connecting Arterial Street Links Before and During the Construction Project Period

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

A road construction project increases delay, congestion, and lowers travel time performance on the freeways links and the connecting arterial street links. By modeling the effect of a road construction project period on the travel time at link-level, this dissertation provides insights pertaining to factors that influence the travel time on the freeway and the connecting arterial street links, before and during the construction of a resurfacing project period.

The travel times are significantly different from estimates obtained using the BPR travel time equation. The travel time performance measures during the construction project period decreased significantly on the freeway links and increased significantly on the connecting arterial street links. To avoid unnecessary delay during the construction, vehicular traffic could have shifted from the freeway links to the connecting arterial street links. Lower speed limit, reduced capacity, and increased traffic volume on the connecting arterial street links resulted in significantly higher travel times during the construction project period when compared to the freeway links. The performance measures and the effect varied by the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week on the freeway and the connecting arterial street links. The aforementioned findings were observed during all times of the day, except during the evening off-peak hour. The increase in the average travel time during the evening off-peak hour could be attributed to the planned construction activity under low traffic condition. Overall, the average travel time, the planning time, and the travel time index can better explain the effect of a road construction project on

transportation system performance, when compared to the planning time index and the buffer time index.

Travel time models were developed for the freeway links and the connecting arterial street links before and during the construction project period. The upstream V/C and the downstream speed limit have a smaller effect on freeway link travel time before and during the construction project periods. On the other, the downstream V/C and the downstream number of lanes have a significantly higher effect on the freeway link travel time before and during the construction project period. While the upstream link length has a higher effect, the downstream link length has a smaller effect on the freeway link travel time during the construction project period. However, both, upstream and downstream link length have an insignificant effect on the freeway link travel time before the construction project period. The distance of a link from the construction project section seem to have a smaller effect before and during the construction project periods.

The V/C varies with the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week and was observed to have higher correlation with the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week. Therefore, V/C was forced into the models while the time-of-the-day and the day-of-the-week were not considered when developing the models. From the developed travel time model results for the connecting arterial street links, the findings indicate that an increase in the V/C will result in an increase in the average travel time. This could be attributed to an increase in the traffic volume, but no change in the capacity, on the connecting arterial street links. If the link is divided or undivided, the V/C and the upstream number of lanes have a higher effect on the connecting arterial link travel time before and during the construction project period. The speed limit and the upstream V/C have a smaller effect on link-level travel

time before and during the construction project periods. However, the downstream number of lanes have a smaller effect during the construction project period on the connecting arterial streets links. Its effect is insignificant before the construction project period.

Overall, predictor variables such as, the V/C, the speed limit, the upstream and downstream link characteristics have a significant effect on travel time on the freeway and the connecting arterial street links. Practitioners should take these factors into consideration, in addition to construction zone characteristics, when planning a resurfacing construction project on the freeways. The construction project also influences the travel time on the connecting arterial street links. The effect on these links should be taken into account when developing temporary traffic control and detour plans.

6.1 Limitations and Scope for Future Work

The data for the entire construction project period was considered for this research. However, the data related to construction activity or actual construction work times were not available. Collecting the actual start and end times of the construction activity and considering these details for analysis and modeling would improve the accuracy of estimates.

The developed travel time model and validation was based on the characteristics of a resurfacing construction project on the freeway links. Travel times may vary by the type of construction project on the freeway. Therefore, analyzing and modeling the effect of other construction projects merits an investigation.

Further, the effect of a construction project could be different on arterial streets. Data should be collected to analyze and model the effect of construction projects on the arterial street links.

Socioeconomic, demographic, and land use characteristics surrounding the construction project could have a significant effect on the travel time performance. These, along with data for other cities and towns, should be explored to better understand and quantify the effect of a construction project on travel time performance measures.

REFERENCES

- Abdelmohsen, A. Z., & El-Rayes, K. (2016). Optimal trade-offs between construction cost and traffic delay for highway work zones. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 142(7), 05016004.
- Al-Deek, H. M., & Emam, E. B. (2006). Computing travel time reliability in transportation networks with multistate and dependent link failures. *Journal of computing in civil engineering*, 20(5), 317-327.
- Bahuleyan, H., & Vanajakshi, L. D. (2016). Arterial Path-Level Travel-Time Estimation Using Machine-Learning Techniques. *Journal of Computing in Civil Engineering*, 31(3), 04016070.
- Beaud, M., Blayac, T., & Stéphan, M. (2012). Value of travel time reliability: two alternative measures. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 54, 349-356.
- Beaud, M., Blayac, T., & Stéphan, M. (2016). The impact of travel time variability and travelers' risk attitudes on the values of time and reliability. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 93, 207-224.
- Bissantz, N., Munk, A., & Scholz, A. (2003). Parametric versus non-parametric modelling? Statistical evidence based on P-value curves. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 340(4), 1190-1198.
- Bogers, E. A. I., & van Lint, H. (2007). Traveler's perception of reliability: How to measure and how to influence. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Transport Network Reliability*, Vol. 2, Behavior.
- Carrion, C., & Levinson, D. (2012). Value of travel time reliability: A review of current evidence. *Transportation research part A: policy and practice*, 46(4), 720-741.

- Chai, T., & Draxler, R. R. (2014). Root mean square error (RMSE) or mean absolute error (MAE)?—Arguments against avoiding RMSE in the literature. *Geoscientific model development*, 7(3), 1247-1250.
- Chang, J. S. (2010). Assessing travel time reliability in transport appraisal. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), 419-425.
- Chen, B. Y., Li, Q., & Lam, W. H. (2016). Finding the k reliable shortest paths under travel time uncertainty. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 94, 189-203.
- Chen, G., Teng, J., Zhang, S., & Yang, X. (2013). Tendency-based approach for link travel time estimation. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 139(4), 350-357.
- Chien, S. I. J., & Kuchipudi, C. M. (2003). Dynamic travel time prediction with real-time and historic data. *Journal of transportation engineering*, 129(6), 608-616.
- Chien, S. I. J., Goulias, D. G., Yahalom, S., & Chowdhury, S. M. (2002). Simulation-based estimates of delays at freeway work zones. *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 36(2), 131-156.
- Devarasetty, P. C., Burris, M., & Shaw, W. D. (2012). The value of travel time and reliability-evidence from a stated preference survey and actual usage. *Transportation research part A: policy and practice*, 46(8), 1227-1240.
- Dong, C., Richards, S. H., Yang, Q., & Shao, C. (2014). Combining the statistical model and heuristic model to predict flow rate. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 140(7), 04014023.
- Dong, S., Wang, H., Hurwitz, D., Zhang, G., & Shi, J. (2015). Nonparametric modeling of vehicle-type-specific headway distribution in freeway work zones. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 141(11), 05015004.

- Duddu, V. R., Pulugurtha S. S., & Penmetsa, P. (2018). Illustrating the Monetary Impact of Transportation Projects / Alternatives Using the Values of Travel Time and Travel Time Reliability. *Journal of Transportation Research Board*, National Research Council, Transportation Research Record Series, No. 18-05371.
- Ebeling, C. E. (1997). *Introduction to Reliability and Maintainability Engineering*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Fei, X., Zhang, Y., Liu, K., & Guo, M. (2013). Bayesian dynamic linear model with switching for real-time short-term freeway travel time prediction with license plate recognition data. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 139(11), 1058-1067.
- FHWA (2006). Travel time reliability: Making it there on time, all the time. Report # FHWA-HOP-06-070, US Department of Transportation, Washington, DC, https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/tt_reliability/brochure/ttr_brochure.pdf.
- Fitzpatrick, K., Dixon, K., & Avelar, R. (2016). Evaluating operational implications of reduced lane and shoulder widths on freeways. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 142(11), 04016052.
- Fosgerau, M., & Karlström, A. (2010). The value of reliability. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 44(1), 38-49.
- Garcia, C., Huebschman, R., Abraham, D. M., & Bullock, D. M. (2006). Using GPS to measure the impact of construction activities on rural interstates. *Journal of construction engineering and management*, 132(5), 508-515.
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. *International journal of endocrinology and metabolism*, 10(2), 486.

- Ghosh-Dastidar, S., & Adeli, H. (2006). Neural network-wavelet microsimulation model for delay and queue length estimation at freeway work zones. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 132(4), 331-341.
- Hajbabaie, A., Aghdashi, S., & Rouphail, N. M. (2016). Enhanced Decision-Making Framework Using Reliability Concepts for Freeway Facilities. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 142(4), 04016008.
- Haseman, R., Wasson, J., & Bullock, D. (2010). Real-time measurement of travel time delay in work zones and evaluation metrics using bluetooth probe tracking. Transportation Research Record: *Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2169, 40-53.
- Hojati, A. T., Ferreira, L., Washington, S., Charles, P., & Shobeirinejad, A. (2016). Modelling the impact of traffic incidents on travel time reliability. *Transportation research part C: emerging technologies*, 65, 49-60.
- Introduction to Generalized Linear Model (GLM). *Analysis of discrete data, Penn State Eberly College of Science*. Accessed on 10th August, 2018.
- Jenelius, E., & Koutsopoulos, H. N. (2013). Travel time estimation for urban road networks using low frequency probe vehicle data. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 53, 64-81.
- Jiang, Y. (1999). Dynamic Prediction of Traffic Flow and Congestion at Freeway. In Work Zones.” Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting in Washington DC.
- Jiang, Y. (2002). Dynamic prediction of traffic flow and congestion at freeway construction zones. *Journal of Construction Engineering*, 7(1), 45-57.

- Kim, J., & Mahmassani, H. S. (2015). Compound Gamma representation for modeling travel time variability in a traffic network. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 80, 40-63.
- Kim, T., Lovell, D. J., & Paracha, J. (2001). A new methodology to estimate capacity for freeway work zones. 80th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, DC.
- Koilada, K., Pulugurtha, S. S. & Mane, A. S. (2018). Risk Factors Affecting Crash Injury Severity by Work Zone Area *Transportation Research Board 97th Annual Meeting*, 18-05849. Washington, DC, January 7-11.
- Kou, W., Chen, X., Yu, L., Qi, Y., & Wang, Y. (2017). Urban commuters' valuation of travel time reliability based on stated preference survey: A case study of Beijing. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 95, 372-380.
- Kukkapalli, V. M., & Pulugurtha, S.S. (2018). Effect of Road Construction Projects on Travel Time Reliability. *In the Proceedings of International Conference on Transportation & Development (ICTD)*, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Kwon, J., Barkley, T., Hranac, R., Petty, K., & Compin, N. (2011). Decomposition of travel time reliability into various sources: incidents, weather, work zones, special events, and base capacity. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2229, 28-33.
- Lam, W. H., Tang, Y. F., & Tam, M. L. (2006). Comparison of two non-parametric models for daily traffic forecasting in Hong Kong. *Journal of Forecasting*, 25(3), 173-192.

- Lei, F., Wang, Y., Lu, G., & Sun, J. (2014). A travel time reliability model of urban expressways with varying levels of service. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 48, 453-467.
- Li, R., Chai, H., & Tang, J. (2013). Empirical study of travel time estimation and reliability. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2013.
- Li, R., Rose, G., & Sarvi, M. (2006). Evaluation of speed-based travel time estimation models. *Journal of transportation engineering*, 132(7), 540-547.
- Li, Z., Hensher, D. A., & Rose, J. M. (2010). Willingness to pay for travel time reliability in passenger transport: A review and some new empirical evidence. *Transportation research part E: logistics and transportation review*, 46(3), 384-403.
- Liu, H., Zhang, X., & Zhang, K. (2010). A Rough Set Model for Travel Time Prediction. *Journal of Highway and Transportation Research and Development*, 4(2), 91-96.
- Lomax, T. J., & Schrank, D. L. (2002). Using Travel Time Measures to Estimate Mobility and Reliability in Urban Areas (No. FHWA/TX-02/1511-3).
- Lomax, T., Turner, T., & Margiotta, R. (2004). Monitoring urban roadways in 2002: Using archived operations data for reliability and mobility measurement. Texas Transportation Institute, College Station.
- Lyman, K., & Bertini, R. L. (2008). Using travel time reliability measures to improve regional transportation planning and operations. 87th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, DC.
- Ma, Z., Koutsopoulos, H. N., Ferreira, L., & Mesbah, M. (2017). Estimation of trip travel time distribution using a generalized Markov chain approach. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 74, 1-21.

- Martí, F. S. (2016). Highway travel time estimation with data fusion. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Martinelli, D. R., & Xu, D. (1996). Delay estimation and optimal length for four-lane divided freeway work zones. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 122(2), 114-122.
- Morrison, G. M., & Lawell, C. Y. C. L. (2016). Does employment growth increase travel time to work: An empirical analysis using military troop movements. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 60, 180-197.
- Nam, D. H., & Drew, D. R. (1996). Traffic dynamics: Method for estimating freeway travel times in real time from flow measurements. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 122(3), 185-191.
- Narayanan, A., Mitrovic, N., Asif, M. T., Dauwels, J., & Jaillet, P. (2015). Travel time estimation using speed predictions. *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), IEEE 18th International Conference*, pp. 2256-2261.
- Nicholson, A. (2015). Travel time reliability benefits: Allowing for correlation. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 49, 14-21.
- Park, D., Rilett, L. R., & Han, G. (1999). Spectral basis neural networks for real-time travel time forecasting. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 125(6), 515-523.
- Pesti, G., Wiles, P., Cheu, R. L., Songchitruksa, P., Shelton, J., & Cooner, S. (2007). Traffic control strategies for congested freeways and work zones. FHWA/TX Report, 8, 0-5326.
- Polus, A. (1979). A study of travel time and reliability on arterial routes. *Transportation*, 8(2), 141-151.

- Pulugurtha, S. S. and Kodupuganti, S. R. (2017). Travel Time and Reliability Thresholds for Freeway Links from Planning Perspective. *4th Conference of Transportation Research Group of India (CTRG)*, Mumbai, India, December 17-20.
- Pulugurtha, S. S., & Muthyala, H. (2015). Modelling and assessing urban arterial street performance: Average Travel Speed or Travel Speed? *3rd Conference of Transportation Research Group of India (3rd CTRG)*.
- Pulugurtha, S. S., and Imran, M. S. (2017). Modeling Basic Freeway Section Level-of-Service Based on Travel Time and Reliability. *Case Studies on Transport Policy Journal*, (in press).
- Pulugurtha, S. S., Duddu, V. R. and Thokala, V. R. (2016). Travel-Time-Based Performance Measures: Examining Interrelationships and Recommendations for Analysis (Paper # 16-2802). *Transportation Research Board 95th Annual Meeting*, Compendium of Papers, Washington, DC, January 10-14.
- Pulugurtha, S. S., Duddu, V. R., Imran, E. M. S., Najaf, P., & Reza, R. Z. (2015). Commercial Remote Sensing & Spatial Information (CRS & SI) Technologies Program for Reliable Transportation Systems Planning: Volume 2 - Comparative Evaluation of Travel Time Related Performance Measures. Report No. RITARS-12-H-UNCC-2, Prepared for The United States Department of Transportation, Washington, DC.
- Pulugurtha, S. S., Penmetsa, P. & Duddu, V. R (2017). *Monetizing reliability to evaluate the impact of transportation alternatives*. FHWA/NC/2015-07, Final Report Submitted to the North Carolina Department of Transportation, Raleigh, NC.

- Qiao, W., Haghani, A., & Hamed, M. (2013). A nonparametric model for short-term travel time prediction using bluetooth data. *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 17(2), 165-175.
- Ramezani, H., & Benekohal, R. (2011). Analysis of queue formation and dissipation in work zones. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 16, 450-459.
- Reza, R. M., Pulugurtha, S. S., & Duddu, V. R. (2015). Arima model for forecasting short-term travel time due to incidents in spatio-temporal context. *In Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting*, No. 15-5553.
- Rice, J., & Van Zwet, E. (2004). A simple and effective method for predicting travel times on freeways. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 5(3), 200-207.
- Schnell, T., Mohror, J., & Aktan, F. (2002). Evaluation of traffic flow analysis tools applied to work zones based on flow data collected in the field. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1811, 57-66.
- Sisiopiku, V. P., & Islam, M. D. S. (2012). A freeway travel time reliability study. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Development*, 3(10), 83-101.
- Smith, B. L., Williams, B. M., & Oswald, R. K. (2002). Comparison of parametric and nonparametric models for traffic flow forecasting. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 10(4), 303-321.
- Steiner, A., & Sick, B. (2008). A new method for travel time estimation on long freeway sections. Institute of Data Analysis and Process Design, Zurich University of Applied Sciences. *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*, 8(4), ISSN 1567-7141.

- Systematics, C. (2005). Traffic congestion and reliability: Trends and advanced strategies for congestion mitigation. Final Report, Texas Transportation Institute. http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestion_report_04/index.htm.
- Tak, S., Kim, S., Jang, K., & Yeo, H. (2014). Real-time travel time prediction using multi-level k-nearest neighbor algorithm and data fusion method. *Computing in Civil and Building Engineering*, pp. 1861-1868.
- Taylor, M. A. (2012). Modelling travel time reliability with the Burr distribution. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 54, 75-83.
- Thakuriah, P., & Tilahun, N. (2012). Incorporating weather information into real-time speed estimates: comparison of alternative models. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 139(4), 379-389.
- TranSystems (2005). Executive summary, full-scale EMT demonstration. TranSystems Corporation.
- Tu, H., Li, H., Van Lint, H., & van Zuylen, H. (2012). Modeling travel time reliability of freeways using risk assessment techniques. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 46(10), 1528-1540.
- Tu, H., van Lint, H., & van Zuylen, H. (2007). The influence of road geometry on travel time variability. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Transport Network Reliability*, Vol. 1, Network Design II.
- Uno, N., Iida, Y., & Kawaratani, S. (2002). Effects of dynamic information system on travel time reliability of road network. *Traffic and Transportation Studies*, pp. 911-918.

- Van Lint, J. W. C., Tu, H., & van Zuylen, H. J. (2004). Travel time reliability on freeways. Proceedings of the 10th World Conference on Transportation Research (WCTR), Istanbul, Turkey.
- Van Lint, J. W. C., Hoogendoorn, S. P., & van Zuylen, H. J. (2005). Accurate freeway travel time prediction with state-space neural networks under missing data. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 13(5), 347-369.
- Van Lint, J., & Van Zuylen, H. (2005). Monitoring and predicting freeway travel time reliability: Using width and skew of day-to-day travel time distribution. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1917, 54-62.
- Venugopal, S., & Tarko, A. (2000). Safety models for rural freeway work zones. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1715, 1-9.
- Wakabayashi, H. (2010). Travel time reliability indexes for highway users and operators, The 4th International Symposium on Transportation Network Reliability, Minneapolis, MN.
- Wakabayashi, H., & Matsumoto, Y. (2012). Comparative study on travel time reliability indexes for highway users and operators, *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 46, 318-339.
- Wan, N., Gomes, G., Vahidi, A., & Horowitz, R. (2014). Prediction on travel-time distribution for freeways using online expectation maximization algorithm. In Transportation Research Board 93rd Annual Meeting, No. 14-3221.

- Wang, J., Tsapakis, I., & Zhong, C. (2016). A space–time delay neural network model for travel time prediction. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 52, 145-160.
- Woodard, D., Nogin, G., Koch, P., Racz, D., Goldszmidt, M., & Horvitz, E. (2017). Predicting travel time reliability using mobile phone GPS data. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 75, 30-44.
- Xiao, Y., Coulombel, N., & De Palma, A. (2017). The valuation of travel time reliability: does congestion matter? *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 97, 113-141.
- Xu, T., Hao, Y., & Sun, L. (2007). Travel time prediction of urban expressway in unstable traffic flow. *International Conference on Transportation Engineering*, pp. 2205-2210.
- Xu, T., Tomeh, O., & Sun, L. (2008). Urban expressway real-time traffic state estimation and travel time prediction within EKF framework. In *Transportation and Development Innovative Best Practices*, pp. 192-197.
- Yang, M., Liu, Y., & You, Z. (2010). The reliability of travel time forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 11(1), 162-171.
- Yesantarao, V. R. S. S., and S. S. Pulugurtha. (2017). Evaluating the Influence of a Freeway Capacity Improvement Project on Travel Time Based Performance Measures Within Its Vicinity. In the 4th Conference of Transportation Research Group of India (CTRG), Mumbai, India.
- Yildirimoglu, M., & Geroliminis, N. (2013). Experienced travel time prediction for congested freeways. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 53, 45-63.

- Zhang, Y., & Liu, Y. (2009). Comparison of parametric and nonparametric techniques for non-peak traffic forecasting. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 51(27), 8-14.
- Zhang, Z., He, Q., Gou, J., & Li, X. (2016). Performance measure for reliable travel time of emergency vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 65, 97-110.
- Zheng, N., Hegyi, A., Hoogendoorn, S., Van Zuylen, H., & Peters, D. (2011). A comparison of freeway work zone capacity prediction models. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 16, 419-429.
- Zwahlen, H., & Russ, A. (2002). Evaluation of the accuracy of a real-time travel time prediction system in a freeway construction work zone. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1803, 87-93.