Improving railway passengers experience, two perspectives: Travel time well saved and well spent
Door-to-door appreciation of time

Origin

Time value

High

Access mode

Transfer

Train journey

Gap of lost time

Enhance the appreciation of the travel time

Egress mode

Low

Destination

Time spent

Shorten the travel time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
<th>Solution method (Control objective)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abkowitz &amp; Lepofsky (1990)</td>
<td>HC (forward hw)</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger and operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrasekar (2002)</td>
<td>SA (forward hw) + TSP</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger and operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daganzo &amp; Pilachowski (2009)</td>
<td>HC (even hw) + SA + SS</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger, operator and driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilachowski (2009)</td>
<td>SA (even hw)</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger and operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuan, Argote &amp; Daganzo (2011)</td>
<td>HC (forward hw with virtual schedule)</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity + Punctuality)</td>
<td>Passenger and operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batholdi III &amp; Eisenstein (2012)</td>
<td>HC (backward hw) + SA + SS</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger, operator and driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Xie &amp; Han (2012)</td>
<td>HC + SA + TSP</td>
<td>Opt (Fuel consumption)</td>
<td>Passenger and operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Oort, Boterman &amp; van Nes (2012)</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Rule-based (Punctuality)</td>
<td>Passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampountolas &amp; Kring (2015)</td>
<td>SA (forward hw)</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger and operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present study</td>
<td>HC + SA</td>
<td>Rule-based (Regularity)</td>
<td>Passenger, operator and driver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Note:
HC = Holding control  
SA = Speed adjustment  
SS = Stop-skipping  
TSP = Transit Signal Priority  
BL = Boarding limit
CUSTOMER WISH PYRAMID

1. Trust
   Safe and secure journey, get what you expect

2. Travel time door-to-door
   The faster the better

3. Mental effort
   No hassle, no stress

4. Physical effort
   Personal convenience

5. Emotions
   Quality time
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Circle of enhancement quality train journey

theoretical framework → policy → measures

measurement (questionnaire)
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Conclusions

• Two approaches to improve level of service; focus on dissatisfiers and satisfiers

• Both offer added value for passenger quality (each 50%)

• But when dissatisfiers are at an acceptable level, more attention has to be paid to satisfiers

• It depends on the context what the most (cost)efficient measure is

• Travel time well saved and well spent
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