## **ANNEX 2**

## City level indicators

## Promoting Low Carbon Transport in Indian Cities

## 10/3/2011

G. Tiwari

D. mohan

K.R.Rao

D. Mahadevia R. Joshi





| Indicator Description      |  | Measurement/ data source  | Relevance   |  |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Name                       |  |   |   |  |
| Mobility and Accessibility |  |   |   |  |
| Modal shares*              | Modal shares by trip<br>purpose i.e. work,<br>education, health and<br>others <sup>1</sup>                     | Household surveys and some<br>relevant data may also be available<br>in City Traffic and Transport Study<br>(CTTS) and Comprehensive<br>Mobility Plan (CMP) | Average modal share helps decision makers understand the movement towards or away from the goal of low carbon transport. The indicator helps to identify the preferable modes for various trip purposes and thus the intervention areas. For example, improving infrastructure for students so that they can use Non-Motorized Transport (NMT).   |  |
|                            | Modal shares by social groups i.e. by income, women headed household1  | National Sample Survey<br>Organization (NSSO) data and<br>household surveys   | The indicator states the equity in service levels. It helps to understand whether the low carbon transport is by choice for vulnerable groups of society.   |  |
| Travel time*               | Average travel time by<br>trip purpose i.e. work,<br>education, health and<br>others using different<br>modes1 | Household surveys or use validated four step model for different cities   | The indicator is useful to understand the dynamics of land use and the properties of mode to reach specific destinations and accordingly plan strategies to achieve the low carbon goal. For example, less travel time to school using cycle will motivate students to use cycle to go to school and this can be done by taking up policies related to land use and infrastructure improvement. |  |
|                            | Trip purpose wise average travel time disaggregated by social groups   | Four step model to capture travel time by specific social groups for different trip purpose   | More travel time for vulnerable groups is an indicator of social exclusion and with the help of disaggregation by trip purpose, specific measures can be taken to increase social sustainability  |  |
| Trip length*               | Average trip length  | CMP or CTTS for specific cities or  | The indicator states the potential of using NMT and Public  |  |

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Needs to measured for all modes including pedestrians, bicycles, public transport (bus formal), public transport (tempos), para-transit (cycle rickshaw), para-transit (auto), motorized two wheeler and cars

<sup>\*</sup>For these indicators the data should be collected separately for vulnerable groups such as: i) Slum dwellers ii) Within the slums, of households living in katcha housing as that is indicating BPL households iii) Recent migrants to the city and temporary migrants to the city iv) Households living in relocated sites v) SC households vi) Minority groups vii) street vendors etc. The data should also be disaggregated by sex

|                        | frequency distribution  | four step model  | transport (PT).   |  |
|------------------------|---|--|---|--|
|                        | Mode wise average trip length disaggregated by social groups1                     | Household survey   | The indicator defines the social cohesiveness in city. Longer trip length using NMT by lower income group as compared to middle or high income group not only indicates social exclusiveness but also unaffordable public transport system for the group. |  |
|                        | Trip purpose wise average trip length disaggregated by social                     | Household survey or relevant data from NSSO  | The indicator helps to identify the required change in land use structure specifically for the different groups of society to attain social sustainability.   |  |
| Affordability*         | Affordability of PT and para-transit fare by social group                         | Measured as percentage of<br>Household income likely to be<br>spent if PT/ para-transit is used                                | Determines the affordability to different modes by different social groups.   |  |
|                        | Cost of commuting   | % of Household income spent on<br>travelling disaggregated by social<br>groups   | Depends on the destinations, mode choice and the fare and pricing policies. Determines social equity.   |  |
| Infrastructure         | and Land Use  |  |   |  |
|                        | Average speed on roads of different modes1  | Available in CTTS, CMP and City<br>Development Plan (CDP) for<br>specific roads in cities                                      | More the speed of vehicle, less travel time and hence more preferred the mode is. Infrastructure projects resulting in increase speed of Personal Motorized Vehicle (PMV) vs. PT will result in more users of PMV.  |  |
| Infrastructure quality | Percentage of Household within 10 min walking distance of PT and paratransit stop | Needs to be calculated based on<br>the PT stop inventory and number<br>of households in census records                         | It's a determinant of accessibility as well as pressure for low carbon transport. Short distance determines the ease of access to PT and hence higher probability of using PT.  |  |
|                        | Average number of interchanges per PT trip  | Household surveys  | Determines the efforts required to use public transport that effects competitiveness of PT with PMV   |  |
|                        | Accessibility of disadvantaged groups by different modes1                         | More specific indicators to be able to measure accessibility for disadvantaged people needs to be developed and data collected | Ensures barrier free accessibility to the society by Non-Motorized transport and Public transport system.   |  |
| Land use               | Land use mix intensity  | Job-housing balance determined   | Indicates land use pattern that has impact on the trip rate   |  |

| parameters    |  | using census data available at ward or electoral block level  | and trip length  |
|---------------|--|---|--|
|               | Income level heterogeneity                     | Concentration index of different income groups in a zone determined by the asset ownership or housing type data in censushouseholds                         | Indicates social cohesion  |
|               | Kernel density of roads, junctions and PT stop | Requires road inventory and public transport network data in vector form  | Determines all over accessibility of city areas to transport infrastructure irrespective of the scale of study   |
| Safety and Se | curity   |   |  |
|               | Risk exposure mode<br>wise1                    | Number of fatal accident per 100,000 users of the mode. Detailed accident data can be collected from traffic police   | The indicator is the state of social sustainability and also a pressure for environmental sustainability. More the risk to a mode user less is the preference. |
| Safety        | Risk imposed by modes1                         | Number of accidents involving different vehicles and victims per 100,000 of all the road users. Detailed accident data can be collected from traffic police | Determines the cost imposed by a mode on the society.  |
|               | Overall safety                                 | Number of fatal accidents per 100,000 populations. Detailed accident data can be collected from traffic police.   | Determine health impact of transportation on society   |
|               | Speed limit restrictions                       | Percentage of roads having speed limit ≥ 50 kmph  | More speed means more risk to the society  |
|               | Quality of footpath infrastructure             | Percentage of roads with $\geq 2 \text{ m}$   | Adds up to the safety and comfort of walking   |
| Security      | Percentage of road lighted                     | Data needs to be collected  | Determines the security aspect on the road   |
|               | Percentage of footpaths lighted                | Data needs to be collected  | Determines the security aspect on the footpath thereby encouraging people to walk  |

|                | Percentage of people        | Specially designed stated                                     | Perception of people regarding safety aspect of using low   |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
|                | feeling safe to walk/cycle  | household surveys   | carbon modes of transport that may avoid them to use these  |
|                | and use PT in city by       | •   | modes given the access to the carbon intensive modes of   |
|                | gender*                     |   | transport   |
| Environmental  | Impacts                     |   |   |
| Emissions      | GHG emissions               | Equivalent CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per passenger km by mode | Identify modes that require more attention either by causing either change in travel behavior or technology |
|                | Lifecycle cost of different | Total of-   | Identify the carbon intensive modes throughout their  |
|                | modes1                      | CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from construction                   | lifecycle   |
|                |                             | of facility per km  | The indicator is useful for technological improvements  |
|                |                             | CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from production of                  | J ,   |
|                |                             | vehicle or mode per unit                                      |   |
|                |                             | Co2 emission unit transit                                     |   |
|                | Per capita consumption of   | Land use data from CDP or master                              | Determines whether there is over or under consumption of  |
|                | land for transport activity | plans of cities   | land for transport infrastructure   |
| Depletion of   | Land consumed for           | Percentage of total land used in                              | Determines the impact of different type of transport  |
| land resource  | different transport         | transport for different type of                               | infrastructure on land depletion  |
|                | activities1                 | transport infrastructure- road,                               |   |
|                |                             | parking bus lanes, railways, etc.                             |   |
|                | Percentage of population    | Need to map air quality in city and                           | Determine the health impact of transportation and identify  |
|                | exposed to air pollution    | mark households in the buffer area                            | the obnoxious gases or other such factors that need to be   |
|                |                             | Or  | reduced from transport sector to improve health.  |
|                |                             | Get the relevant morbidity data                               | Also the indicator is helpful in raising concern regarding  |
| Health hazards |                             | from hospitals or medical                                     | sustainable transport.  |
|                |                             | authorities   |   |
|                | Percentage of population    | Need to map exceedance of noise                               |   |
|                | exposed to noise levels >   | levels in city and mark households                            |   |
|                | 50 dB*                      | in the buffer area  |   |
| Economic (Resp | oonse Indicators)           |   |   |
| _              | Trend in investments for    | Data from city budgets across                                 | Determines investment pattern on different types of   |
| Investment     | development of              | years   | infrastructure and trace the trend in development of  |
|                | infrastructure for various  |   | infrastructure for low carbon modes of transport  |

|                         | modes 1                  |                                    |   |  |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
|                         | Tax burden mode wise 1   | Data to be collected from Regional | Determines whether the tax policy takes into account the      |  |
|                         |                          | Transport Office                   | variation in external cost imposed by different modes         |  |
| Cost horne by           | Fuel prices at pumps by  |                                    | Determines the trend in fuel consumption as with the          |  |
| Cost borne by operators | fuel type                |                                    | change in fuel prices   |  |
|                         | Other charges levied as  | Transport Department               | Other charges have impact on the operational cost of the      |  |
|                         | applicable at city level |                                    | mode. For example, the high toll and parking charges on       |  |
|                         | disaggregated by modes1  |                                    | cars will discourage people from using it.                    |  |
| Fare policy             | Percentage of subsidies  | Transport department               | Determines vertical equity among different social group and   |  |
|                         | granted                  |                                    | preference of mode by the authority                           |  |
|                         | Percentage of population | Transport department               | Determines the utility of discounts offered on passes for the |  |
|                         | owning passes            |                                    | use of public transport                                       |  |