From: Ronald.Fisher@dot.gov
To: Scheibe@pbworld.com
CC: Hamayasu, Toru
Sent: 10/22/2007 11:15:03 AM
Subject: Questions on AA results

Mark,
I finally read the AA and had a few questions. If you could answer these, it would give me a better understanding of some of the technical aspects of the study. They are:

- What is the utilization of each p&r lot in each alternative, i.e. have they been sized consistently to accommodate demand?
- While the increase of buses in the TSM alternative is about 25% versus the no build, the ridership goes up only about 5%. This suggests that the TSM buses are not as full as the no build alternative buses on average – something that equilibration of service levels to demand would mitigate. For the no build the buses are increased by about 25% and ridership increases 30%. Can you explain this? The performance of the TSM is best determined by its cost effectiveness compared to the no build alternative – what is that figure?
- Page 3-13: The following statement is counterintuitive because it implies that adding capacity leads to more congestion: "In general the two Managed Lane options would increase traffic on the overall road system and create more delay for buses". The explanation provided later states: ""Much of the time saved on the managed lane itself would be negated by the time spent in congestion leading up to the managed lane as well as exiting the lanes at their downtown terminus". The first quote states that more congestion occurs implying slower travel times while the second implies the travel times are faster. Can you clarify?

Ron

Ron Fisher
Office of Planning and Environment
Federal Transit Administration
1200 New Jersey Ave. S.E.
4th Floor - East Building
Washington, DC 20590
202 366-0257