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## 1. <br> InTraductian

This report presents a consolidated summary of the interim (or baseline) patronage forecasts prepared in support of the Los Angeles Metro Rail project. The overall work effort was conducted in three separate phases in order to provide preliminary design information prior to the development of more detailed forecasts as the preliminary engineering design phase proceeded.

The purpose of the analysis was to provide preliminary information on:

1. Estimates of starter line travel demand including forecasts for the basic line (i.e., Locally Preferred Alternative) with both alignment and station location variations.
2. The station design impacts of possible future extentions, including the provision of preliminary information on incremental staging strategies.
3. The impacts of selected key variables,including user costs, on passenger demand.

Prior to the formal initiation of Preliminary Engineering the district determined that an update of starter-line travel demand (as originally estimated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Alternative Analysis Document) was required to evaluate the various alignment and station location alternatives already being considered. Such investigations included the consideration of a minimum operational segment (Wilshire and Fairfax), analysis of patronage levels without the Crenshaw station, and a direct connection from the Fairfax alignment through to Universal City. It was felt that this information would be important in judging the various tradeoffs among the physical design alternatives.

The analysis of possible future extensions provided the basis to judge the longer range adequacy of the station designs and provided an initial look at the implications of logical and incremental additions to the starter line system ultimately reaching a nine corridor, 150 mile system.

And finally, the analysis of key variables offered a limited risk analysis in order to determine the likely variability of forecast results to modifications in some of the key assumptions particularly with respect to user costs.

## ANALYSIS ORGANIZATION ARD SEQURCE

Fifteen rail option networks were defined in the course of the three phase study to provide the above information together with a no-option network designed primarily for comparative purposes. Ten of the options focused on the basic starter line with selected alignment and station variations. Five of the options (options 2-6) examined the impact of future extensions on the individual station designs. Figures $1-6$ present both the basic starter line and each of these future extension options depicting both their general alignment and extent. Table 1 defines for each of the starter line system option alternatives their individual station content. The ICTS system referenced in that table is depicted in Figure 7. It was intended as an "Intermediate Capacity Transit System" providing service to the Hollywood area when the basic starter line system was realigned to provide a direct connection from Fairfax to Universal City. And finally, Table 2 defines for each of the extension options, in tabular form, the inclusion of individual corridors for each option.

It should be cautioned that the route aligmments, rail operating plans, and station locations for the extensions to the Metro Rail starter line (options 2-6) considered in this project were for study purposes only and are not to be interpreted as final. To determine the specific alignments and station locations for any future extension, detailed analysis will be performed and public hearings held in accordance with local and federal requirements for all proposed rapid rail projects. However, for initial study purposes they were considered to be at an adequate level of detail for baseline patronage estimates. Furthermore, any changes to these initial project alignments and/or station locations which would be adopted within a particular corridor would not have an appreciable affect on the result in station volumes on the Metro Rail starter line.







TABLE 1
STARTIER LINTS OPTION/STATICN CORRRESPONDENCE

| Station | I | VII | VIII | IX | X | Starter Line System Option |  |  |  | XV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | XI | XII | XIII | XIV |  |
| Union Station | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| lst \& Broadway | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| lst \& Hill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| 5th \& Broadway | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| 5th \& Hill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| 7th \& Flower | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wilshire \& Alvarado | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wilshire \& Vermont | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wilshire \& Normandie | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wilshire \& Western | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wilshire \& Crenshaw | X | X | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Wilshire \& La Brea | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Wilshire \& Fairfax | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Fairfax \& Beverly | X |  | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| Fairfax \& Santa Monica | X |  | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| Fairfax \& Sunset |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunset \& La Brea |  |  |  | X |  | X | X |  |  |  |
| Hollywood \& Cahuenga | X |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| Hollywood Bowl | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Universal City | X |  | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| Lankershim \& Chandler | X |  | X | X | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| Chandler \& Laurel Canyon |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| ICTS (Wilshire/Vermont) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |
| ICTS (Sunset/Gower) |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  | X |



FIGURE 7 INTERMEDIATE CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM

CORRIDOR/OPIVION CORRESTCNIRICR

| Corridor ${ }^{*}$ | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Starter Line | X | X | X | x | X | X |
| West Los Angeles (A) |  | X |  | X | X | X |
| El Monte (B) |  | x | X | X | X | X |
| San Fernando Valley (C) |  |  | X | X | X | X |
| Soüth Los Angeles (D) |  |  |  | X | X | X |
| Century Freeway (E) |  |  |  | X | X | X |
| Santa Ana Freeway ( $F$ ) |  |  |  |  | X | X |
| Los Angeles International Airport (G) |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Eagle Rock (H) |  |  |  |  |  | X |

[^0]
## ANALYSIS SEXUEMCE

The technical analysis of each of these system options was divided into three major steps. First was the design of each system concept including specifications of a rail operating plan and definition of the background feeder bus and auto access interfaces. This route and service level definition was developed in concert with the DISTRICT planning department staff in order to integrate the sector improvement program concept with the rail system, continue to offer local service where appropriate, and provide the maximum level of feeder service to each rail system station.

The second major step in the analysis sequence was to generate regional travel demand volumes for each of the system options through execution of the LARTS travel demand model sequence. In particular, it was the LARTS model choice model which was executed for each rail system option using, as basic input, the distribution of person-trip travel for each of the individual trip purposes. By assuming a constant person-trip distribütion for each rail option network, the difference in system wide patronage, particülarly in rail sẏstem üse, was directly related to the presence and level of rail service provided.

The third and final step in the analysis sequence was to develop preliminary mode of arrival estimates for each of the starter line stations. Formal parking opportunities were limited, however, to five major starter line stations: North Hollywood, Universal City, Fairfax/Beverly, Wilshire/Fairfax and Union Station. Implicit in the mode of arrival projections was the assumption that kiss-and-ride could occur at all other stations except the three central business district stations (First and Fifth/Broadway and Seventh/Flower). Although the mode of arrival estimates are preliminary, the model structüre and inputs can be used to iteratively
recycle the model to balance the level of bus service with passenger demand and simultaneously analyze the impact of alternative station designs and parking space limitations on the magnitude and behavior of individual station arrivals and departures.

## RTEPOFT ORGANIZATION

The remainder of this summary report is presented in four chapters. Chapter 2 documents the overall findings of the forecasting analysis, providing information on total daily station usage for each of the basic starter line options followed by the system extension options. A comparison of individual station impacts and maximum load point volumes for the extension options are also provided. Chapter 3 continues with a tabular presentation of preliminary design volumes and mode of arrival estimates for each of the starter line stations. Chapter 4 provides a description of the overall travel demiand forecasting methodology used in generating the travel demand forecasts including a brief discussion of each key model component (including the modal choice and mode of arrival models). Chapter 5 concludes with a discussion of the design of each optional network outlining the assumptions and operating characteristics included in each system option.
2.

## STARIER LINE TRAVEL, DEMAND RESUGTS

Travel demand forecasts were prepared for sixteen network options in total including the null. Nine options examined various alignment and station location alternatives for the starter line, while six options investigated the impact of future extensions on starter line volumes. The analysis of starter line volumes were all prepared for the year 2000 with the exception of options of 1,7 , and 8 for which 1995 forecasts were also prepared. The impact of future extensions on the Metro Rail starter line system was conducted in Phase I and were all prepared using 1995 as the forecast year.

## STARIEER LINTB ALIEKHAMTVES

These alternative networks (option 1 and 7 through 15) investigated:

1. Various alignment alternatives, including the Locally Preferred Alignment, a straight through alignment connecting Fairfax directly with Universal City, a La Brea "bend" including a station at Sunset/La Brea, and a CBD alignment under Hill Street rather than Broadway.
2. System extent, including a minimum operable segment terminating at Wilshire/Fairfax and an extension to Chandler and Laurel Canyon Boulevards.
3. The presence of an auxiliary support system or an "intermediate capacity transit system" serving Hollywood in support of the straight through alignment to Universal City.
4. Selected station additions and deletions focüsing primarily on Crenshaw and the Hollywood Bowl stations.

The basic starter line alternatives ranged from 16.2 miles with the straight-through alternative to 19.8 miles with the inclusion of the Laurel Canyon station. Daily ridership ranged from 326,000 to 376,000 as shown in Table 3. The maximum end of that range represents the full extent of the Metrorail system with all stations including Crenshaw while the miṇimum represents the straight-through alignment with the intermediate capacity transit system serving the Hollywood area. All the year 2000 forecasts shown in Table 3, were based upon the SCAG 82B forecasts and are generally 15 percent higher than the corresponding 1995 forecasts. The two minimum
tiens 3
Ergicuma mRIP sceaty - IEAR 2000

| Option |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | VII | VIII | IX | X | XI | XII | XIIII | XIV | XV |
| Rail Passenger Trips Boardings | $\begin{aligned} & 363,650 \\ & 363,650 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 262,143 \\ & 262,143 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 328,928 \\ & 328,928 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 362,488 \\ & 362,488 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 333,423 \\ & 333,423 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 352,581 \\ & 352,581 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 376,262 \\ & 376,262 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 253,209 \\ & 253,209 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 326,929 \\ & 326,929 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 327,165 \\ & 327,165 \end{aligned}$ |
| Maximum Load point | 193,000 | 162,000 | 181;000 | 192,000 | 183,000 | 191,000 | 196,000 | 158,000 | 178,000 | 177,000 |

operable segment alternatives (options 7 and 13) generated a ridership of 253,000 to 262,000 which was a 20 percent increase over 1995 ridership. The maximum load point volumes are also shown in that table and parallel the overall ridership changes. Table 4 presents the peak bus requirements for each of these alternatives and calculates the reduction in bus requirements relative to the null option.

## STARIHR LINE EXILENSION AHIERATHIVISS

As indicated earlier, the travel demand forecasts for each of the possible future extension options, were developed for the year 1995. Table 5 presents the summary of rail passenger boardings and maximum load point volumes for each of the future extension alternatives. These alternatives, which were depicted in Figures 1 through 6, incrementally extend the starter system to a full nine corridor, 150 mile system. The increase in rail passenger trips and boardings from options 1 through option 6 show a steady increase in regional rail ridership with each succeeding increment. Beyond the initial extension, however, the maximum load point, located within the starter line corridor, does not change appreciably. Table 6 summarizes the peak bus requirements, in 1995, for each of these alternatives and again compares them to the requirements of the null option.

## STATION PARKING DEMANDS

As indicated earlier, for each of the starter line system alternatives the mode of arrival model was used to estimate the maximum accumulation of park-and-ride vehicles at each of five stations. Table 7 reports these values for each of those starter line alternatives. As indicated in that table, four of the stations, Union Station, Wilshire/Fairfax, Universal City and

| Option | Coded Headways | Nominal <br> Headways | Reduction in Bus Requirements Relative to Null Option |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | coded | Nominal |
| Null | 2,435 | 2,666 | - | -- |
| IX | 2,237 | 2,422 | 198 | 244 |
| X | 2,241 | 2,447 | 194 | 219 |
| XI | 2,235 | 2,429 | 200 | 237 |
| XII | 2,236 | 2,427 | 199 | 239 |
| XIII | 2,290 | 2,574 | 145 | 92 |
| XIV | 2,234 | 2,811 | 201 | (145) |
| XV | 2,241. | 2,826 | 194 | (160) |

TABRE 5
RBGICNAL TRIP SUMNARY - 1995

|  | Option |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| Rail Passenger Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boardings | $315,000$ | $437,290$ | $392,140$ | $752,919$ | 807,539 | $993,813$ | $\begin{aligned} & 215,810 \\ & 215,810 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 285,588 \\ & 285,588 \end{aligned}$ |
| Maximum Load Point | 167,504 | 183,482 | 176;068 | 191,058 | 197,078 | 191,852 | 133,138. | 157,004 |


| Option | Coded Headways | Nominal <br> Headways | Reduction in Bus Requirements Relative to Null Option |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | coded | Nöminal |
| Null | 2,435 | 2,666 | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| I | 2,232 | 2,375 | 203 | 291 |
| II | 2,154 | 2,113 | 281 | 553 |
| III | 2,185 | 2,235 | 250 | 431 |
| IV | 2,119 | 2,115 | 316 | 551 |
| V | 2,117 | 2,168 | 318 | 498 |
| VI | 2,062 | 2,039 | 373 | 627 |
| VII | 2,291 | 2,389 | 144 | 277 |
| VIII | 2,239 | 2,431 | 196 | 235 |

TABRE 7
maxtimi siation parking accumilntion
Union Station
Wilshire \& Fairfax
Fairfax \& Beverly
Universal City
North Hollywood

North Hollywood, reach the maximum amount of space availability for nearly all of the alternatives. The exception is Fairfax/Beverly which reaches a maximum accumulation of 790 vehicles in both alternatives 9 and 12. It can be inferred from this information that parking demand at each of the other four stations is greater than the amount of available supply.

PEAK HOUR AND PEAR 20-MINUIE MAXIMIM LOAD POINT VOLIMES

Table 8 summarizes for the basic starter line (option 1), the minimum operable segment (option 7), and each of the possible future extension alternatives both the peak hour and peak 20-minute, peak direction, volumes on the starter line. For the peak hour they range between 12,000 for the minimal operable segment to nearly 18,000 for the full extent rail system. These values indicate that the system requirements under any of these alternatives remains fairly stable for the starter line.

TABLS 8


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | 24-Hoür. Maximün |  |  |
| Load |  |  |  |
| Point |  |  |  |$\quad$| Peak |
| :---: |
| Option |

## 3.

MODE OF ARRIVAL MODKL RESUTIS

In Phase III of the project, a detailed mode-of-arrival model (described in Chapter 4) was used to develop arrival and departure statistics for each Metrorail station for each of the basic starter line alternatives (options 1,7 and 8 through 15). The output from this model provided information by individual station and time period. The model predicts station arrivals and departures stratified by:

1. Waik trips
2. Feeder bus trips
3. Kiss and ride
4. Park and ride vehicles
5. Park and ride vehicle passengers

Tables 9-38 summarize these arrivals and departures by station for each of the options for the 24 hour, AM, and PM peak hour periods. Passenger movement volumes produced by the mode of arrival model were essential in the early planning and design of individual station facilities and in the development of an operating plan for the Metro Rail system.

Table 9
Option $I$
24-Hour Passenger Volumes (2000)


Table 10
option I
Constrained Demand for A.M. Peak Hour

| Station | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk | Bus | K/R | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ | Trps | Total | Walk | Bus | K/R | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ | Trps | Total |
| Number | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 97 | 4677 | 305 | 498 | 50 | 5627 | 127 | 814 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 963 |
| 2. lst E Broadway | 46 | 1278 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1324 | 1411 | 622 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2033 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 122 | 1623 | 0 | . 0 | 0 | 1745 | 3418 | 2268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5686 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 84 | 2915 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2999 | 2204 | 1986 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4190 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 648 | 1167 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 1998 | 1844 | 672 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2523 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 556 | 2548 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 3225 | 1744 | 1814 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3562 |
| 7. Wilshire $\&$ Normandie | 802 | 831 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 1815 | 1220 | 967 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2194 |
| 8. Wilshire Mestern | 36 | 1920 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 2061 | 1040 | 1294 | 4 | 0. | 0 | 2338 |
| 9. Wilshire Crenshaw | 231 | 1377 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 1674 | 532 | 508 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1042 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 14 | 1295 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 1388 | 394 | 1072 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1469 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 7 | 2398 | 132 | 463 | 46 | 3046 | 202 | 4421 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 4644 |
| 12. Fairfax Beverly | 32 | 339 | 144 | 294 | 29 | 838 | 352 | 700 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 1069 |
| 13. Fairfax Santa Monica | 5 | 1554 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 120 | 1153 | 4 | 0. | 0 | 1277 |
| 14. Hollymood \& Cahuenga | 737 | 1194 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 2303 | 1645 | 1113 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2771 |
| 15. Hollywood Bowl | 0 | 161 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 0 | 105 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| 16. Universal City | 160 | 974 | 141 | 914 | 91 | 2280 | 11 | 527 | 5 | 35 | 4 | 582 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 55 | 1011 | 381 | 1145 | 115 | 2707 | 44 | 548 | 17 | 36 | 4 | 649 |
|  | 3632 | 27235 | 2382 | 3314 | 331 | 36921 | 16308 | 20584 | 92 | 104 | 11 | 37099 |

Table 11
option I
Constrained Denand for P.M. Peak Hour

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk <br> Trps | Bus Trps | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & P / R \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps <br> Pass | Total Tros | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps |  | $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps Pass |  |
|  | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 177 | 2414 | 117 | 382 | 38 | 3128 | 150 | 6125 | 402 | 1178 | 118 | 7973 |
| 2. Lst E Broadway | 1644 | 1091 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2735 | 366 | 1707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2073 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 4142 | 3224 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7366 | 1015 | 2656 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3671 |
| 4. 7th oflower | 2662 | 3283 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5945 | 654 | 4205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4859 |
| 5. Wilshire a Alvarado | . 2422 | 1130 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 3609 | 1276 | 1597 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 3098 |
| 6. Wilshire ${ }^{\text {6 }}$ Vermont | 2240 | 2875 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 5150 | 1106 | 3551 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 4802 |
| 7. Wilshire * Nomandie | 1652 | 1364 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 3070 | 1258 | 1237 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 2716 |
| 8. Wilshire * Western | 1246 | 2078 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 3355 | 298 | 2654 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 3079 |
| 9. Wilshire Crenshaw | 691 | 990 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1701 | 407 | 1805 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 2292 |
| 10. Wilstire la Brea | 481 | 1668 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2172 | 120 | 1865 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 2080 |
| 11. Wilshire * Fairfax | 241 | 6065 | 49 | 152 | 15 | 6522 | 57 | 4112 | 172 | 599 | 60 | 5000 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 442 | 949 | 37 | 90 | 9 | 1527 | 136 | 600 | 168 | 360 | 36 | 1300 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Montica | 152 | 1789 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 1970 | 41 | 2154 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 2324 |
| 14. Hollywood \& Cahuenga | 2163 | 1650 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 3921 | 1300 | 1725 | 448 | 0 | 0 | 3473 |
| 15. Hollywood Bowl | 0 | 174 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 223 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 297 |
| 16. Universal City | 53 | 956 | 40 | 302 | 30 | 1381 | 194 | 1354 | 168 | 1145 | 114 | 2975 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 71 | 972 | 149 | 405 | 41 | 1638 | 80 | 1392 | 506 | 1517 | 152 | 3647 |
|  | 20479 | 32672 | 767 | 1331 | 133 | 55382 | 8458 | 38962 | . 2860 | 4799 | 480 | 55659 |

Table 12
Option VII
Constrained Daily Demand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode-of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps $-\quad$ Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus: Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 1004 | 26135 | 1687 | 3309 | 331 | 32466 | 1004 | 26135 | 1687 | 3309 | 331 | 32466 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 5269 | 8632 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13901 | 5269 | 8632 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13901 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 13939 | 18507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32446 | 13939 | 18507 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32446 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 9568 | 19174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28742 | 9568 | 19174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28742 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 12444 | 8566 | 2527 | 0 | 0 | 23537 | 12444 | 8566 | 2527 | 0 | 0 | 23537 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 10908 | 19881 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 31361 | 10908 | 19881 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 31361 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 7576 | 7998 | 844 | 0 | 0 | 16418 | 7576 | 7998 | 844 | 0 | 0 | 16418 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 4757 | 14466 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 19756 | 4757 | 14466 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 19756 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 2586 | 10652 | 430 | 0 | 0 | 13668 | 2586 | 10652 | 430 | 0 | 0 | 13668 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 1251 | 12375 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 14099 | 1251 | 12375 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 14099 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 700 | 32257 | 617 | 1977 | 198 | 35749 | 700 | 32257 | 617 | 1977 | 198 | 35749 |
| 13. 'Fairfax \& Santa:Monica | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| 15. Hollywood Bowl | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 70607 | 178720 | 7683 | 5615 | 529 | 262220 | 70002 | 178720 | 7683 | 5901 | 745 | 262220 |

Table 13
Option VII
Constrained Demand for A.M. Peak Hour

| Station <br> Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk | Bus | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ | Trps | Total | Walk | Bus | K/R | P/R | Trps | Total |
|  | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 87 | 4374 | 294 | 498 | 50 | 5303 | 123 | 697 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 841 |
| 2. 1st \& Broadway | 46 | 1245 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1291 | 1123 | 527 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1650 |
| 3. 5th E Broadway | 100 | 1640 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1740 | 2799 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4826 |
| 4. 7th Flower | 74 | 2334 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2408 | 1937 | 1503 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3440 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 798 | 1185 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 2483 | 1737 | 551 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2306 |
| 6. Wilshire Vermont | 558 | 2419 | 118 | 0 | 0. | 3095 | 1721 | 1684 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3409 |
| 7. Wilshire Normandie | 697 | 807 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 1674 | .915 | 880 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1801 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 34 | 1857 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 1999 | 980 | 1110 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2094 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 219 | 1568 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 1874 | 326 | 610 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 939 |
| 10. Wilshire La Brea | 9 | 1446 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 1552 | 243 | 1060 | 3. | 0 | 0 | 1306 |
| 11. Wilshire \% Fairfax | 5 | 2445 | 115 | 437 | 44 | 3046 | 142 | 4007 | 4 | 16 | 2 | 4171 |
| 13. Fairfax Eanta Monica | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15. Hollywood Bowl | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17. Lankershim Chandler | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2627 | 21320 | 1489 | 935 | 94 | 29753 | 12046 | 14688 | 54 | 24 | 3 | 26795 |

Table 14
option VII
Constrained Demand For P.M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station | Walk: | Bus | K/R | P/R | Trps | Total | Walk | Bus |  | P/R | Trps | Total |
| Number | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 169 | 2136 | 110 | 383 | 38 | 2836 | 136 | 5659 | 385 | 1220 | 122 | 7522 |
| 2. 1st Broadway | 1320 | 969 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2289 | 310 | 1644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1954 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 3398 | 2938 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6336 | 837 | 2612 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3449 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2340 | 2476 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4816: | 575 | 3290 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 3865 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 2331 | 993 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 3477 | 1429 | 1591 | 612 | 0 | 0 | 3632 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 2214 | 2675 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 4923 | 1104 | 3352 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 4597 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 1260 | 1253 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 2564 | 1056 | 1186 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 2448 |
| 8. Wilshire \% Hestern | 1174 | 1844 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 3050 | 281 | 2534 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 2946 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 445 | 1161 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1632 | 343 | 2060 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 2508 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 300 | 1692. | 28 | 0 | 0 | 2020 | 77 | 2040 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 2233 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 171 | 5616 | 39 | 135 | 13 | 5974 | 42 | 4082 | 145 | 536 | 54 | 4859 |
| 13. Fairfax Santa Monica | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 15. Hollywood Bowl | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 15122 | 23771 | 473 | 518 | 51 | 39935 | 6190 | 30050 | 1841 | 1756. | 176 | 40018 |

Table 15
Option VIII

- Constrained Daily Demand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station <br> Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { Trpe } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P/R } \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps <br> Pass | Total <br> Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 1124 | 26960 | 1629 | 3363 | 336 | 33412 | 1124 | 26960 | 1629 | 3363 | 336 | 33412 |
| 2. Lst \& Broawwy | 6086 | 8612 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14698 | 6086 | 8612 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14698 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 16195 | 20225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36420 | 16195 | 20225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36420 |
| 4. 7th Clower | 10783 | 21220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32012 | 10783 | 21229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32012 |
| 5. Wilshire Alvarado | 12040 | 9541 | 902 | 0 | 0 | 22483 | 12040 | 9541 | 902 | 0 | 0 | 22483 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 10916 | 20851 | 547 | 0 | 0 | 32314 | 10916 | 20851 | 547 | 0 | 0 | 32314 |
| 7. Wilshire Normandie | 8747 | 8395 | 762 | 0 | 0 | 17904 | 8747 | 8395 | 762 | 0 | 0 | 17904 |
| 8. Wilshire \% Western | 4868 | 15441 | 505 | 0 | 0 | 20814 | 4868 | 15441 | 505 | 0 | 0 | 20814 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 3405 | 9960 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 13695 | 3405 | 9960 | 330 | 0 | 0 | 13695 |
| 10. Wilshire \& Eia Brea | 1780 | 11091 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 13256 | 1780 | 11091 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 13256 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 933 | 32146 | 705 | 1925 | 193 | 35002 | 933 | 32146 | 705 | 1925 | 193 | 35002 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 1864 | 5162 : | 528 | 1199 | 120 | 8873 | 1864 | 5162 | 528 | 1199 | 120 | 8873 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 523 | 9540 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 10474 | 523 | 9540 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 10474 |
| 16. Universal City | 844 | 7838 | 833 | 5019 | 502 | 10536 | 844 | 7838 | 833 | 5019 | 502 | 15036 |
| 17. Lankershim Chandler | 440 | 7964 | 2424 | 5174 | 517 | 16519 | 440 | 7964 | 2424 | 5174 | 517 | 16519 |
| 18. Fairfax \& Sunset | 1842 | 3829 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 6016 | 1842 | 3829 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 6016 |
|  | 82390 | 217875 | 10306 | 16836 | 1684 | 324428 | 82390 | 218784 | 10306 | 17295 | 1729 | 328928 |

Trale 16
Option VIII
Constrained Demand For A.M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total <br> Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} / R \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 99 | 4379 | 279 | 498 | 50 | 5305 | 136 | 784 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 941 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 43 | 1182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1225 | 1326 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1900 |
| 3. 5th E Broadway | 116 | 1738 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1854 | 3265 | 2226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5491 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 83 | 2415 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2498 | 2181 | 1779 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3960 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 635 | 1266 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 2078 | 1819 | 672 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2498 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont. | 554 | 2500 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 3167 | 1742 | 1803 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3549 |
| 7. Wilshire Normandie | 734 | 863 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 1752 | 1125 | 930 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2060 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 35 | 1922 | 102: | 0 | 0 | 2059 | 1003 | 1249 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2256 |
| 9. Whishire \& Crenshaw | 223 | 1470 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 1759 | 503 | 557 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1062 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 13 | 1212 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 1304 | 351 | 1026 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1380 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax: | 7 | 2129 | 123 | 440 | 44. | 2743 | 195 | 4161 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 4375 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 28 | 336 | 115 | 237 | 24 | 740 | 344 | 703 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 1061 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 4 | 921 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 1009 | 91 | 1040 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1134 |
| 16. Universal City | 168 | 957 | 164. | 1014 | 101 | 2404 | 11 | 562 | 6 | 38 | 4 | 621 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 54 | 999 | 432 | 1139 | 114 | 2738 | 33 | 575 | 18 | 38 | 4 | 668 |
| 18. Fairfax \& Sunset | 394 | 254 | 71 | 0 | 0. | 719 | 15 | 546 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 563 |
|  | 3190 | 24543 | 1960 | 3328 | 333 | 32354 | 14140 | 19187 | 75 | 106 | 11 | 33519 |

rable 17
Option VIII
Constrained Demand for P.M. Peak Hour


Table 18
Option IX
24-Hour Passenger Volumes

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bus <br> Trps | $\mathbf{R} / \mathbf{R}$ Trps | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total <br> Tros | Walk <br> Trps | Bus Trps | K/R Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Vehs } \end{aligned}$ | Trps Pass | Total |
|  | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Vehs | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 1104 | 28856 | 1770 | 3389 | 339 | 35458 | 1104 | 28856 | 1770 | 3389 | 339 | 35458 |
| 2. 1st \& Broadway | 6522 | 9240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15762 | 6522 | 9240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15762 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 17053 | 19924 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36977 | 17053 | 19924 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36977 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 10787 | 25412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36199 | 10787 | 25412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36199 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 12612 | 8901 | 2563 | 0 | 0 | 24076 | 12612 | 8901 | 2563 | 0 | 0 | 24076 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 11085 | 21518 | 622 | 0 | 0 | 33225 | 11085 | 21518 | 622 | 0 | 0 | 33225 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 9205 | 8484 | 888 | 0 | 0 | 18577 | 9205 | 8484 | 888 | 0 | 0 | 18577 |
| 8. Wilshire: \& Western | 6452 | 18043 | 1130 | 0 | 0 | 25625 | 6452 | 18043 | 1130 | 0 | 0 | 25625 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 1996 | 13676 | 544 | 0 | 0 | 16216 | 1996 | 13676 | 544 | 0 | 0 | 16216 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 980 | 34561 | 787 | 1965 | 197 | 38490 | 980 | 34561 | 787 | 1965 | 197 | 38490 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 1911 | 4800 | 668 | 1510 | 151 | 9040 | 1911 | 4800 | 668 | 1510 | 151 | 9040 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 792 | 12715 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 13923 | 792 | 12715 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 13923 |
| 14. Hollywood \& Cahuenga | 10453 | 12666 | 1494 | 0 | 0 | 24613 | 10453 | 12666 | 1494 | 0 | 0 | 24613 |
| 16. Universal City | 852 | 8049 | 731 | 4978 | 498 | 15108 | 852 | 8049 | 731 | 4978 | 498 | 15108 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 511 | 8132 | 2325 | 5048 | 505 | 16521 | 511 | 8132 | 2325 | 5048 | 505 | 16521 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 181 | 1433 | 1058 | 0 | 0 | 2672 | 181 | 1433 | 1058 | 0 | 0 | 2672 |
|  | 92496 | 229210 | 14996 | 16890 | 1690 | 362482 | 92496 | 226410 | 14996 | 16890 | 33519 | 359782 |

pable 19
option IX
Constrained Demand For A.M. Peak Hour


Table 20
option IX
Constrained' Demand for P.M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk. <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \operatorname{Trps} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total <br> Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 184 | 2442 | 116 | 382 | 38 | 3162 | 151 | 6134 | 401 | 1183 | 118 | 7987 |
| 2. 1st \& Broadway | 1654 | 1109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2763 | 370 | 1687 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2057 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 4166 | 3302 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7468 | 1021 | 2684 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3705 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2637 | 3385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6022 | 649 | 4211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4860 |
| 5. Wilshire f Alvarado | 2370 | 1112 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 3638 | 1440 | 1575 | 620 | 0 | 0 | 3635 |
| 6. Wilshire ${ }^{\text {6 V }}$ Vemont | 2260 | 2921 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 5218 | 1113 | 3596 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 4862 |
| 7. Wilshire 6 Normandie | 1590 | 1353 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 2996 | 1222 | 1234 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 2673 |
| 8. Wilshire \% Western | 1594 | 2395 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 4056 | 380 | 3065 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 3722 |
| 10. Whlshire 5 La Brea | 484 | 1856 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2372 | 121 | 2264 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 2518 |
| 11. Wilshire 6 Fairfax | 243 | 6196 | 51 | 156 | 16 | 6662 | 57 | 4224 | 181 | 615 | 61 | 5138 |
| 12. Fairfax Beverly | 438 | 866 | 38 | 92 | 9 | 1443 | 136 | 579 | 170 | 365 | 37 | 1287 |
| 13. Fairfax 6 Santa Monica | 185 | 1795 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 2004 | :50 | 2076 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 2231 |
| 14. Hollywood \& Cahuenga | 2071 | 1839 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 3999 | 1111 | 2000 | 367 | 0 | 0 | 3478 |
| 16. Universal City | 55 | 981 | 43 | 313 | 31 | 1423 | 205 | 1418 | 181 | 1187 | 119 | 3110 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 72 | 1005 | 153 | 413 | 41 | 1684 | 81 | 1433 | 527 | 1548 | 155 | 3744 |
| 19. Sunset \% La Brea | 25 | 211 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 299 | 30 | 224 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 514 |
|  | 20028 | 32768 | 922 | 1356 | 135 | 55209 | 8137 | 38404 | 3592 | 4898 | 490 | 55521 |

Table 21
Option $x$
Constrained Daily Demand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | K/R <br> Trps | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total <br> Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 1134 | 27155 | 1661 | 3370 | 337 | 33657 | 1134 | 27155 | 1661 | 3370 | 337 | 33657 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 6087 | 8607 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14685 | 6078 | 8607 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14685 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 16532 | 20813 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37345 | 16532 | 20813 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37345 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 10807 | 21952 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32759 | 10807 | 21952 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32759 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 12433 | 9589 | 2545 | 0 | 0 | 24567 | 12433 | 9589 | 2545 | 0 | 0 | 24567 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 10948 | 21461 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 32992 | 10948 | 21461 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 32992 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 8716 | 8299 | 858 | 0 | 0 | 17873 | 8716 | 8299 | 858 | 0 | 0 | 17873 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 6168 | 17649 | 1120 | 0 | 0 | 24937 | 6168 | 17649 | 1120 | 0 | 0 | 24937 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 1837 | 12985 | 537 | 0 | 0 | 15359 | 1837 | 12985 | 537 | 0 | 0 | 15359 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 964 | 31815 | 1065 | 2186 | 219 | 36249 | 964 | 31815 | 1065 | 2186 | 219 | 36249 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 1868. | 5107 | 615 | 1388 | 139 | 9117 | 1868 | 5107 | 615 | 1388 | 139 | 9117 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 559 | 19227 | 687 | 0 | 0 | 20473 | 559 | 19227 | 687 | 0 | 0 | 20473 |
| 16. Universal City | 890 | 8575 | 1061 | 5045 | 504 | 16075 | 890 | 8575 | 1061 | 5045 | 504 | 16075 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 466 | 8572 | 2525 | 5247 | 525 | 17335 | 466 | 8572 | 2525 | 5247 | 525 | 17335 |
|  | 79409 | 221806 | 13257 | 17236 | 1724 | 333423 | 79400 | 221806 | 13257 | 17236 | 1724 | 333423 |

Table 22
Option $x$
Constrained Demand For A.M. Peak Hour


Table 23
Option $x$
Constrained Demand For P.M. Peak Hour

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Node of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk | Bus | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ | P/R | Trps | Total | Walk | Bus | K/R | P/R. | Trps | Total |
|  | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Vehs | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union station | 189 | 2305 | 110 | 383 | 38 | 3025 | 156 | $5766^{\circ}$ | 376 | 1192 | 119 | 7609 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 1542 | 1021 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2563 | 344 | 1579 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1923 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 4039 | 3342 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7381 | 989 | 2889 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3878 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2641 | 3013 | 0 | 0. | 0 | 5654 | 651 | 3564 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4215 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 2337 | 1166 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 3658 | 1419 | 1730 | 615 | 0 | 0 | 3764 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 2225 | 2926 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 5185 | 1104 | 3575 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 4823 |
| 7. Wilshire Normandie | 1504 | 1316 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 2871 | 1159 | 1215 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 2583 |
| 8. Wilshire Western | 1525 | 2296 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 3888 | 363 | 3044 | 275 | 0 | 0 | 3682 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 445 | 1786 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2263 | 111 | 2127 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 2370 |
| 11. Wilshire E Fairfax | 239 | 5819 | 67 | 192 | 19 | 6336 | 56 | 3771 | 251 | 756 | 76 | 4910 |
| 12. Fairfax Beverly | 430 | 937 | 35 | 84 | 8 | 1494 | 132 | 601 | 157 | 336 | 34 | 1260 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 128 | 3034 | 41 | 0. | 0 | 3203 | 36 | 2805 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 3010 |
| 16. Universal City | 57 | 1065 | 67 | 357 | 36 | 1582 | 214 | 1492 : | 248 | 1372 | 137 | 3463 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 62 | 1076 | 161 | 445 | 45 | 1789 | 78 | 1488 | 587 | 1661 | 166 | 3980 |
|  | 17363 | 31102 | 1150 | 1461 | 146 | 50892 | 6812 | 35646 | 3163 | 5317 | 532 | 51470 |

Table 24
Option XI
Constrained Daily Demand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station. <br> Number | Walk Trps | Bus <br> Trps | K/R <br> Trps | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \mathbf{T r p s} \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trps } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 111 | 28772 | 1780 | 3387 | 339 | 35389 | 111 | 28772 | 1780 | 3387 | 339 | 35389 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 6586 | 9171 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15757 | 6586 | 9171 | 0 |  |  | 15757 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 17139 | 19992 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37131 | 17139 | 19992 | 0 |  |  | 37131 |
| 4. 7th of Flower. | 10913 | 25448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36361 | 10913 | 25448 | 0 |  |  | 36361 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 12573 | 9015 | 2541 | 0 | 0 | 24129 | 12573 | 9015 | 2541 |  |  | 24129 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 11154 | 21655 | 618 | 0 | 0 | 33427 | 11154 | 21655 | 618 |  |  | 33427 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 8827 | 8503 | 862 | 0 | 0 | 18192 | 8827 | 8503 | 862 |  |  | 18192 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 6340 | 17785 | 1121 | 0 | 0 | 25246 | 6340 | 17785 | 1121 |  |  | 25246: |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 1897 | 13362 | 538 | 0 | 0 | 15797 | 1897 | 13362 | 538 |  |  | 15797 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 974 | 33958 | $766{ }^{\circ}$ | 1944 | 194 | 37836 | 974 | 33958 | 766 | 1944 | 194 | 37836 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 1911 | 4839 | 651 | 1471 | 147 | 9019 | 1911 | 4839 | 651 | 1471 | 147 | 9019 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 780 | 12205 | 426 | 0 | 0 | 13411 | 780 | 12205 | 426 | 0 | 0 | 13411 |
| 16. Universal City | 850 | 8382 | 794 | 5033 | 503 | 15562 | 850 | 8382 | 794 | 5033 | 503 | 15562 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 525 | 8657 | 2405 | 5124 | 512 | 17223 | 525 | 8657 | 2405 | 5124 | 512 | 17223 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 4212 | 11774 | 2115 | 0 | 0 | 18101 | 4212 | 11774 | 2115 | 0 | 0 | 18101 |
|  | 84792 | 233518 | 14617 | 16959 | 1695 | 352581 | 84792 | 233518 | 14617 | 16959 | 1695 | 352581 |

Table 25
Option $8 I$
Constrained Demand For A.M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\mathbf{k} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Trps | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 96 | 4646 | 308 | 498 | 50 | 5598 | 135 | 843 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 1000 |
| 2. Lst E Broadway | 47 | 1239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1286 | 1431 | 637 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2068 |
| 3. 5th Eroadway | 123 | 1634 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1757 | 3456 | 2353 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5809 |
| 4. 7th Flower | 84 | 2887 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2971 | 2210 | 2089 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4299 |
| 5. Wilshire 6 Alvarado | 797 | 1167 | 501 | 0 | 0 | 2465 | 1766 | 662. | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2446 |
| 6. Wilshire Vermont | 557 | 2585 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 3269 | 1787 | 1884 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3675 |
| 7. Wilshire Normandie | 742 | 872. | 173 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 1134 | 945 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2085 |
| 8. Wilshire Western | 45 | 2187 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 2459 | 1309 | 1450 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2767 |
| 10. Wilshire Ea Brea | 14 | 1548 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 1672 | 376 | 1143 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1523 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 7 | 2403 | 133 | 462 | 46 | 3051 | 203 | 4444 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 4668 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 31 | 334 | 142 | 291 | 29 | 827 | 349 | 636 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 1002 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 6 | 1403 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 1497 | 142 | 1140 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1285 |
| 16. Universal City | 169 | 1056 | 160 | 995 | 99 | 2479 | 11. | 570 | 6 | 38 | 4 | 629 |
| 17. Lankershim. Chandler | 56 | 1096 | 422 | 1141 | 114 | 2829 | 46 | 614 | 18 | 37 | 4 | 719 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 300 | 1066 | 431 | 0 | 0 | 1797 | 569 | 1369 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1953 |
|  | 3074 | 26123 | 2822 | 3387 | 338 | 35744 | 14924 | 20779 | 106 | 108 | 11 | 35928 |

Table 26
Option $x$ I
Constrained Demand For P.M. Peak Hour

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Depar ture |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk | Bus | K/R | P/R | Trps | Total | Halk | Bus | K/R | P/R | Trps | Total |
|  | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Vehs. | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 186 | 2446 | 117 | 382 | 38 | 3169 | 151 | 6099 | 404 | 1178 | 118 | 7950 |
| 2. 1st \& Broadway | 1670 | 1104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2774 | 374 | 1669 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2043 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 4187 | 3321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7508 | 1026. | 2684 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3710 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2669 | 3403 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6072 | 656 | 4202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4858 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 2365 | 1122 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 3641 | 1434 | 1598 | 614 | 0 | 0 | 3646 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 2285 | 2960 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 5281 | 113 | 3605 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 4871 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 1533 | 1336 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 2921 | 1165 | 1266 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 2641 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 1567 | 2350 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 3984 | 373 | 3029 | 275 | 0 | 0 | 3677 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 459 | 1829 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2320 | 115 | 2195 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 2442 ; |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 242 | 6101 | 50 | 152 | 15 | 6560 | 57 | 4130 | 174 | 599 | 60 | 5020 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 439 | 875 | 37 | 89 | 9 | 1449 | 135 | 581 | 165 | 356 | 36 | 1273. |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 181 | 1736 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1942 | 50 | 1974 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 2129 |
| 16. Universal City | 55 | 1032 | 48 | 325 | 33 | 1493 | 204 | 1467 | 194 | 1242 | 124 | 3231 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 74 | 1081 | 157 | 425 | 43 | 1780 | 83 | 1513 | 550 | 1592 | 159 | 3897 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 767 | 1932 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 2825 | 510 | 1639 | 520 | 0 | 0 | 2669 |
|  | 18679 | 32628 | 901 | 1373 | 138 | 53719 | 6446 | 37651 | 3496 | 4967 | 497 | 54057 |

Table 27
Option XII
Constrained Daily Demand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | K/R <br> Trpes | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Vehs } \end{aligned}$ | Trps <br> Pass | Total <br> Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 1116 | 28980 | 1824 | 3392 | 339 | 35651 | 1116 | 28980 | 1824 | 3392 | 339 | 35651 |
| 2. Lst \& Broadway | 6838 | 9448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16286 | 6838 | 9448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16286 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 17674 | 20200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37874 | 17674 | 20200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37874 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 1112 | 25539 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36661 | 11122. | 25539 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36661 |
| 5. Wilshire 6 Alvarado | 12884 | . 9149 | 2588 | 0 | 0 | 24621 | 12884 | 9149 | 2588 | 0 | 0 | 24621 |
| 6. Wilshire 6 Vermont | 11292 | 21421 | 619 | 0 | 0 | 33332 | 11292 | 21421 | 619 | 0 | 0 | 33332 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 9671 | 8605 | 904 | 0 | 0 | 19180 | 9671 | 8605 | 904 | 0 | 0 | 19180 |
| 8. Wilshire ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Western | 5150 | 15901 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 21623 | 5150 | 15901 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 21623 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 4231 | 9616 | 440 | 0 | 0 | 14287 | 4231 | 9616 | 440 | 0 | 0 | 14287 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | $1993{ }^{\circ}$ | 11825 | 465 | 0 | 0 | 14283 | 1993 | 11825 | 465 | 0 | 0 | 14283 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 1008 | 34385 | 770 | 1956 | 196 | 38315 | 1008 | $34385{ }^{\prime}$ | 770 | 1956 | 196 | 38315 |
| 12. Fairfax a Beverly | 1952 | 4884 | 669 | 1512 | 151 | 9168 | 1952 | 4884 | 669 | 1512 | 151 | 9168 |
| 13. Fairfax Eanta Monica | 795 | 12315 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 13526 | 795 | 12315 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 13526 |
| 14. Hollywood \& Cahuenga | 10488 | 12643 | 1461 | 0 | 0 | 24592 | 10488 | 12643 | 1461 | 0 | 0 | 24592 |
| 16. Universal City | 946 | 8505 | 629 | 4084 | 408 | 14572 | 946 | 8505 | 629 | 4084 | 408 | 14572 , |
| 17. Lankershim 6 Chandler | 349 | 2022 | 900 | 3650 | 365 | 7286 | 349 | 2022 | 900 | 3650 | 365 | 7286 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 177 | 1519 | 1039 | 0 | 0 | 2735 | 177 | 1519 | 1039 | 0 | 0 | 2735 |
| 30 Laurel Canyon a Chandler | 1011 | 10360 | 899 | 0 | 0 | 12270 | 1011 | 10360 | 899 | 0 | 0 | 12270 |
|  | 87676 | 236957 | 13296 | 14594 | 1459 | 363992 | 97686 | 236957 | 13296 | 14594 | 1459 | 363992 |

Table 28
Opticn XII
Constrained Demand For A. M. Peak Hour

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Tros | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total | Walk | Bus | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ | Trps | Total |
|  | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Vehs | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 97 | 4682 | 315 | 498 | 50 | 5642 | 135 | 854 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 1011 |
| 2. 1st \& Broadway | 48 | 1275 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1323 | 1486 | 663 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2149 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 127 | 1644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1771 | 3564 | 2381 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5945 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 86 | 2883 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2969 | 2254 | 2113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4367 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 806 | 1164 | 510 | 0 | 0 | 2480 | 1820 | 692 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 2531 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 558 | 2530 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 3215 | 1802 | 1878 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3684 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandle | 802 | 833 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 1817 | 1253 | 982 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2242 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Vestern | 37 | 1931 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 2084 | 1060 | 1336 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2400 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 359 | 1432 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 1880 | 539 | 528 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1070 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 14 | 1292 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 1401 | 396 | 1092 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1491 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 7 | 2396 | 136 | 462 | 46 | 3047 | 210 | 4562 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 4793 |
| 12. Fairfax E Beverly | 33 | 335 | 146 | 298 | 30 | 842 | 356 | 646 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 1019 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 6 | 1441 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 1537 | 145 | 1141 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1289 |
| 14. Hollywood \& Cahuenga | 571 | 1371 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 2240 | 1625 | 1248 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2883 |
| 16. Universal City | 189 | 1125 | 131 | 776 | 78 | 2299 | 12 | 540 | 4 | 30 | 3 | 589 |
| 17. Lankershim Boulevard | 34 | 249 | 186 | 676 | 68 | 1213 | 33 | 172 | 6 | 27 | 3 | 241 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 20 | 162 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 394 | 17 | 152 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 176 |
| 30. Laurel Canyon \& Chandler | 157 | 1652 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 1976 | 44 | 448 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 499 |
|  | 3794 | 26745 | 2633 | 3062 | 272 . | 36154 | 16707 | 20980 | 94 | 90 | . 9 | 37880 |

rable 29
Option XII
Constrained Demand For P:M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Made of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 187 | 2467 | 120 | 381 | 38 | 3193 | 152 | 6143 | 414 | 1177 | 118 | 8004 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 1734 | 1142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2876 | 388 | 1717 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2105 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 4317 | 3361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7678 | 1058 | 2707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3765 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2721 | 3431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6152 | 668 | 4202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4870 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 2433 | 1158 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 3748 | 1460 | 1603 | 625 | 0 | 0 | 3688 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont. | 2311 | 2946. | 37 | 0 | 0 | 5294 | 1124 | 3543 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 4820 |
| 7. Wilshire ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Normandie | 1690 | 1382 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 3126 | 1265 | 1242 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 2728 |
| 8. Wilshire ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Western | 1271 | 2134 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 3439 | 304 | 2681 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 3125 |
| 9. Wilshire \& Crenshaw | 731 | 1029 | 26 | 0. | 0 | 1786 | 561 | 1877 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 2545 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 483 | 1694 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 2205 | 121 | 1868 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 2103 |
| 11. Wilshire 6 Fairfax | 250 | 6229 | 50 | 154 | 15 | 6698 | 59 | 4140 | 177 | 608 | 61 | 5045 |
| 12. Pairfax 6 Beverly | 448 | 886 | 38 | 92 | 9 | 1473 | 138 | 584 | 170 | 365 | 37 | 1294 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 185 | 1740 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1949 | 51 | 2009 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 2165 |
| 14. Hollywood \& Cahuenga | 2096 | 1863 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 4046 | 1096 | 1973 | 359 | 0 | 0 | 3428 |
| 16. Universal City | 61 | 1008 | 37 | 254 | 25 | 1385 | 228 | 1535 | 156 | 969 | 97 | 2985 |
| 17. Lankershim chandler | 52 | 275 | 53 | 231 | 23 | 634 | 52 | 339 | 222 | 856 | 86 | 1555 |
| 19. Sunset \& La Brea | 25 | 225 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 29 | 235 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 519 |
| 30. Laurel Canyon \& Chandler | 99 | 1000 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1156 | 204 | 2126 | 211 | 0 | 0 | 2541 |
|  | 20995 | 32970 | 807 | 1112 | 110 | 1385 | 8754 | 38398 | 3218 | 3975 | 399 | 54744 |

Table 30
OXtion XIXI
Constrained Daily Denand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station | Walk | Bus | $R / R$ | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ | Trps | Total | Walk | Bus | $\mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{R}$ | Trps | Total |
| Number | Trps | Trps | Trps | Veh | Pass | Trps | Trps | Trps | Trps | Vehs | Pass | Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 860 | 26047 | 1856 | 3347 | 335 | 32445 | 860 | 26047 | 1856 | 3347 | 335 | 32445 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 4528 | 10100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14628 | 4528 | 10100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14628 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 14638 | 15594 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30232 | 14638 | 15594 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30232 |
| 4. 7th crower | 9092 | 21024 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30116 | 9092. | 21024 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30116 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 12060 | 8071 | 2479 | 0 | 0 | 22610 | 12060 | 8071 | 2479 | 0 | 0 | 22610 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 10806 | 19775 | 569 | 0 | 0 | 31150 | 10806 | 19775 | 569 | 0 | 0 | 31150 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 7082 | 7935 | 801 | 0 | 0 | 15818 | 7082 | 7935 | 801 | 0 | 0 | 15818 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 5258 | 16292 | 1069 | 0 | 0 | 22619 | 5258 | 16292 | 1069 | 0 | 0 | 22619 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 1301 | 15038 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 16872. | 1301 | 15038 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 16872 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax: | 669 | 33139 | 777 | 1940 | 194 | 36719 | 669 | 33139 | 777 | 1940 | 194 | 36719 |
|  | 66294 | 173015 | 8084 | 5287 | 529 | 253209 | 66294 | 173015 | 8084 | 5287 | 529. | 253209 |

rable 31
Option XIII
Constrained Denand For A.M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Hode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Trps | P/R <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K/R } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | Trps Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 73 | 4314 | 327 | 498 | 50 | 5262 | 106 | 703 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 832 |
| 2. 1st \& Broadway | 43 | 1459 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1502 | 990 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1537 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 105 | 1391 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1496 | 2943 | 1771 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4714 |
| 4. 7th Flower | 70 | 2526 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2596 | 1839 | 1627 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3466 |
| 5. Wilshire f Alvarado | 792 | 1147 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 2429 | 1669 | 494 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2181 |
| 6. Wilshire f Vermont | 561 | 2420 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 3099 | 1694 | 1665 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3363 |
| 7. Wilshire Nomandie | 660 | 811 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 1632 | 848 | 864 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1.718 |
| 8. Wilshire 6 Western | 38 | 2122 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 2377 | 1081 | 1221 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2310 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 9 | 1858 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 976 | 254 | 1182 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1440 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 5 | 2547 | 138 | 462 | 46 | 3198 | 136 | 4057 | 6 | 14 | 1 | 4214 |
|  | 2356 | 20595 | 1560 | 960 | 96 | 24567 | 11560 | 14167 | 60 | 22 | 2 | 25775 |

rable 32
Option XIII
Constrained Demand For P:M. Peak Hour

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | K/R <br> Trps | $\mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Veh | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk Trps | Bus Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | Trps Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 146 | 2146 | 121 | 381 | 38 | 2832 | 115 | 5608 | 426 | 1205 | 121 | 7475 |
| 2. lst Broadway | 1143 | 1115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2263 | 264 | 1930 | 0 : | 0 | 0 | 2194 |
| 3. Sth \& Broadway | 3571 | 2518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6089 | 878 | 2187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3065 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2222 | 2705 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4927 | 547 | 3595 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4142 |
| 5. Wilshire Alvarado | 2244 | 910 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 3304 | 1401 | 1527 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 3528 |
| 6.: Wilshire \%ermont | 2184 | 2650 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 4867 | 1102 | 3346 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 4589 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 1170 | 1234 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 2452 | 995 | 1186 | 196 | 0 | 0 | 2377 |
| 8. Wilshire \% Western | 1297 | 2049 | 64 | . 0 | 0 | 3410 | 310 | 2882 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 3454 |
| 10. Wilshire La Brea | 313 | 1958 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2303 , | 80 | 2576 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 2787 |
| 11. Wilshire Fairfax | 164 | 5719 | 50 | 152 | 15 | 6100 | 40 | 4235 | 179 | 604 | 60 | 5118 |
|  | 14454 | 23004 | 1858 | 533 | 53 | 38547 | 5660 | 29072 | 1935 | 1809 | 181 | 38729 |

Table 33
Option XIV
Constrained Daily Denand

|  | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station Number | Walk Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\mathbf{K} / \mathbf{R}$ <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} / \mathbf{R} \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R/R } \\ & \text { Txps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | Trps <br> Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 1072 | 26818 | 1595 | 3361 | 336 | 33182 | 1072 | 26818 | 1595 | 3361 | 336: | 33182 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 6156 | 8817 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14973 | 6156 | 8817 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14973 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 16391 | 20515 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36906 | 16391 | 20515 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36906 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 10583 | 21477 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32060 | 10583 | 21477 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32060 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 12452 | . 9394 | 2510 | 0 | 0 | 24356 | 12452 | 9394 | 2510 | 0 | 0 | 24356 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 10985 | 21.153 | 582 | 0 | 0 | 32720 | 10985 | 21153 | 582 | 0 | 0 | 32720 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Nommandie | 8367 | 8157 | 838 | 0 | 0 | 17362 | 8367 | 8157 | 838 | 0 | 0 | 17362 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 6151 | 18199 | 1116 | 0 | 0 | 25466 | 6151 | 18199 | 1116 | 0 | 0 | 25466 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 1839 | 13140 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 15503 | 1839 | 13140 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 15503 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 948 | 32161 | 856 | 2114 | 211 | 36290 | 948 | 32161 | 856 | 2114 | 211 | 36290 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 1849 | 5052 | 540 | 1224 | 122 | 8787 | 1849 | 5052 | 540 | 1224 | 122 | 8787 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 570 | 15321 | 578 | 0 | 0 | 16469 | 570 | 15321 | 578 | 0 | 0 | 16469 |
| 16. Universal City | 842 | 8296 | 1015 | 5035 | 503 | 15691 | 842 | 8296 | 1015 | 5035 | 503 | 15691 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 458 | 8473 | 2483 | 5227 | 523 | 17164 | 458 | 8473 | 2483 | 5227 | 523 | 17164 |
|  | 78663 | 216973 | 12637 | 16961 | 1695 | 326929 | 78663 | 216973 | 12637 | 16961 | 1695 | 326929 |



Table 35
option XIV
Constrained Demand For P.M. Peak Hour

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk <br> Trps | Bus <br> Trps | K/R <br> Trps | P/R <br> Veh | Trps Pass | Total Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Walk } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bus } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trps } \\ & \text { Pass } \end{aligned}$ | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 185 | 2270 | 105 | 383 | 38 | 2981 | 142 | 5702 | 361 | 1.195 | 119 | 7519 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 1561 | 1051 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2612 | 349 | 1611 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1960 |
| 3. 5th \% Broadway | 4006 | 3306 | 0 | 0 : | 0 | 7312 | 980 | 2832 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3812 |
| 4. 7th \& Flower | 2587 | 2942 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5529 | 637 | 3491 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4128 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 2342 | 1126 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 3620 | 1419 | 1711 | 606 | 0 | 0 | 3736 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 2235 | 2909 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 5178 | 1105 | 3501 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 4750 |
| 7. Wilshire a Normandie | 1449 | 1291 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 2790 | 1108 | 1196 | 205 | 0 | 0 | . 2509 |
| 8. Wilshire 6 Western | 1520 | 2379 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 3965 | 362 | 3126 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 3762 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 445 | 1803 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 2279 | 111 | 2156 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 2396 |
| 11. Wilshire G Fairfax | 235 | 5897 | . 54 | 180 | 18 | 6384 | 55 | 3793 | 200 | 705 | 71 | 4824 |
| 12. Fairfax 6 Beverly | 427 | 927 | 30 | 74 | 7 | 1465 | 128 | 594 | 137 | 296 | 30 | 1185 |
| 13. Fairfax S Santa Monica | 131 | 2292 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 2457 | 37 | 2366 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 2545 |
| 16. Universal City | 54 | 1037 | 64 | 350 | 35 | 1540 | 203 | 1436 | 239 | 1348 | 135 | 3361 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 61 | 1066 | 159 | 442 | 44 | 1772 | 76 | 1468 | 575 | 1647 | 165 | 3931 |
|  | 17238 | 30296 | 779 | 1429 | 142 | 49884 | 6712 | 34983 | 3012 | 5191 | 420 | 50418 |

Table 36
Option XV
Constrained Daily Demand


Table 37
Option XV
Constrained Demand For A.M. Peak Hour

| Station Number | Mode of Arrival |  |  |  |  |  | Mode of Departure |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Walk <br> Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bus } \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R} \\ & \mathrm{Trps} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P/R } \\ & \text { Veh } \end{aligned}$ | Trps Pass | Total <br> Trps | Walk Trps | Bus Trps | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} / \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { Trps } \end{aligned}$ | P/R <br> Vehs | Trps Pass | Total Trps |
| 1. Union Station | 99 | 4371 | 279 | 498 | 50 | 5297 | 137 | 785 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 943 |
| 2. lst \& Broadway | 43 | 1175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1218 | 1323 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1913 |
| 3. 5th \& Broadway | 118 | 1745 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1863 | 3306 | 2299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5605 |
| 4. 7th \% Flower | 83 | 2382 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2465 | 2162 | 1862 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4024 |
| 5. Wilshire \& Alvarado | 788 | 1267 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 2554 | 1746 | 664 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2428 |
| 6. Wilshire \& Vermont | 555 | 2550 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 3225 | 1760 | 1878 | 4. | 0 | 0 | 3642 |
| 7. Wilshire \& Normandie | 708 | 862 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 1739 | 1075 | 917 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1998 |
| 8. Wilshire \& Western | 44. | 2241 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 2512 | 1268 | 1455 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2731 |
| 10. Wilshire \& La Brea | 3 | 1520 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 1639 | 364 | 1129 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1497 |
| 11. Wilshire \& Fairfax | 7 | 2146 | 158 | 457 | 46 | 2814 | 198 | 4298 | 6. | 15 | 2 | 4519 |
| 12. Fairfax \& Beverly | 28 | 335 | 117 | 241 | 24 | 745 | 340 | 682 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 1036 |
| 13. Fairfax \& Santa Monica | 4. | 1624 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 1744 | 101 | 1550 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1655 |
| 16. Universal City | 168 | 1030 | 188 | 1080 | 108 | 2574 | 11 | 580 | 7 | 41 | 4 | 643 |
| 17. Lankershim \& Chandler | 54 | 1046 | 445 | 1138 | 114 | 2797 | 36. | 609 | 18 | 38 | 4 | 705 |
|  | 2712 | 24294 | 2424 | 3414 | 342 | 33186 | 13827 | 19298 | 91 | 111 | 12 | 33339 |

## Table 38

Option $x$
Constrained Demand For P.M. Peak Hoir


## 4. <br> TRAVET DFENAND MELHRDOLOGY

## YEAR 2000 REGICNRL FORECAST

Comparison of the travel demand model results presented in this report with other previous demand results (i.e., the Alternatives Analysis Study) must consider the underlying forecasting assumptions supporting each respective forecast.

The modeling process utilized in this study began with the modal choice model using as input the year 2000 person-trip distributions for the homebased work, home-based nonwork, and non-home-based trip purposes prepared previously by LARTS. These person-trip distributions reflect both the demographic and land-use conditions projected in the Los Angeles region for the year 2000 as well as the physical facility and level of service provided by the highway system. The key difference between these projections and those developed in previous studies is the updated edition (SCAG 82B) of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) long-range socioeconomic and land-use forecasts. While this version reflects a
slightly lower population and economic growth for the region, the previous transit forecasts (i.e., Alternatives Analysis) were developed for the year 1990, whereäs the projections descriibed in this report are for the year 2000.

## MODE CHOICB MODESL STRDCTURE

A series of revisions to the LARTS mode choice models have been implemented since development of the original marginal disutility model in 1972. That basic model, which was used as the primary mode choice model, and the more recent extensions to the model developed since that time, are shown in Figure 8. Three basic extensions or improvements were made to the marginal disutility model by SCAG and LARTS to provide the capability needed to address the emerging variety of planing issues.

While it was hoped that the multinominal work-trip mode-split model developed in 1976 could become the model used for primary mode-split analysis, its deficiencies relegated it to a model for disaggregating auto person-trips to drive-alone vehicle-trips and shared-ride auto person-trips. The mechanics of this application were based on a "pivot point" algorithm in which the model was used as a tool for estimating the relative change in mode shares given the introduction of shared-ride opportunities.

The second extension to the model structure occurred as part of the regional air quality planning effort. This extension utilized the Shirley Highway carpool model to dispaggregate shared-ride auto person-trips generated by the combined logit model into three separate categories. It predicts the individual probabilities of two-person, three-person, and four or more person carpools.


HOME-BASED WORK MODEL SPLIT STRUCTURE
Figure 8

A mode of arrival model was also included to estimate the mode-of-arrival usage at each Starter Line station. All of these model extensions, which function basically as a series of submode models; build üpon the initial estimate of transit and auto person-trips.

Perceived automobile operating cost-per-mile and the average transit passenger fares were two key inputs to the mode choice model. Because of the importance of these two variables, detailed analyses were conducted to ascertain appropriate values for use in the travel model runs. These technical analyses were documented in two technical memoranda during the course of the project. 1 The final value assumed for automobile operating cost was 5.51 cents per mile as approved by the Modeling Task Force. This value was slightly lower than the 5.80 cents per mile suggested in Technical Memorandum No. 3 prepared for this project; but was based upon a set of logical assumptions that assumed the fuel efficiency of autos to be slightly higher than the Technical Memorandum No. 3 analyses had suggested.

Specification of average transit passenger fares was based upon fiscal year 1980 and 1981 information that disaggregated passenger fares into an average base boarding fare, transfer fare, and an express fare increment. Table 39

1
Technical Memorandum 3, Auto Operating cost Analysis, Barton=Aschman Associates, Inc., Aügust, 1980. Technical Memorandum 4, Transit Fare Matrix Specification, Barton-Aschman Associates, Inc., and SCRTD Metro Rail Department, October, 1980.

Table 39
AVERAGE TRANSIT PASSENGER VALUES

|  | $(1980$ Dollars) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | FY 1980 |  |
|  | $\$ 1981$ |  |
| Base Boarding Fare | $\$ 0.35$ | $\$ 0.43$ |
| Transfer Fare | $\$ 0.02$ | $\$ 0.10$ |
| Express Fare Increment | $\$ 0.13$ | $\$ 0.19$ |

lists these fare values. The fiscal year 1981 values were used in the mode choice model analysis.

Other modal choice model inputs such as daily and hourly parking costs, highway terminal times, and path building parameters remained unchanged from the existing LARTS values.

MODR-CF-ARRTVAL MODESL

The mode of access and egress model consists of a set of algorithms linked to two travel demand models which together produce a set of reports and computer files which describe the mode of access and egress to each station by time of day. the model contains several unique features not generally found in other mode of arrival models. Some of these unique features are:

1. A capacity constraint technique: This feature insures that no parking lot will receive more vehicles than there are spaces. If the model determines that there is more demand than supply, the surplus trips are either shifted to feeder bis or kiss-n-ride, or are removed from the transit trip file.
2. A procedure to identify and follow transit trips which use satellite parking lots: This procedure will show the mode of arrival for the initial lot and also show bus arrivals at the proper rail station.
3. The model produces reports which show mode of arrival and departure by station for daily trips, A.M. and P.M. peak hours, and morning, mid-day, afternoon, and evening periods.
4. The model produces tables of peak-hour trips which can be assigned to the transit networks. These assignments can be used to analyze all transit routes, not just rapid rail routes.
5. The model produces a set of park-n-ride and kiss-n-ride vehicle trip tables. These trips can be assigned to the highway network in order to allow the analyst to estimate highway impacts near station locations and regional air pollutants.

As stated above, the mode of arrival models used in this procedure were developed and calibrated using Washington, D.C., and Seattle data. In general, the model system is a series of nested models which first split transit trips into walk and non-walk trips, then into transit and highway arrivals, and finally into park-n-ride and kiss-n-ride trips. This nested structure is shown in Figure 9. The walk/non-walk model is a simple set of diversion curves using, as an independent variable, the zone-to-station distance. This model is described in Table 40. The transit/highway model is described in Table 41. The transit/highway model is a binary logit choice model using the following basic model equations:

- Probability of choosing transit access $=$ EXP (feeder) $/ 1+$ EXP (feeder)
- Probability of choosing highway access = 1.0-transit access probability

The term "feeder" is a linear utility equation described in Table 41. The park-n-ride/kiss-n-ride access model also is a logit model, and the calculation steps and coefficients are illustrated in Table 42. For access stations where no parking is available but drop-off trips are probable, the


FIGURE 9
GENERAL FLOW DIAGRAM FOR MODE OF ARRIVAL MODELING PROCEDURE

Table 40
WALK/NON-WALK MODEL DIVERSION

| Type off <br> Station | Proportion of Walk Trips for Each: <br> Zone-to-Station Dlstance (Miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\underline{0.1}$ | $\underline{0.2}$ | $\underline{0.3}$ | $\underline{0.4}$ | $\underline{0.5}$ | $\underline{0.6}$ | $\underline{0.7}$ | $\underline{0.8}$ | $\underline{0.9}$ | $\underline{1.0}$ |
| 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.73 | 0.30 | 0.01 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.57 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 0.57 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.69 | 0.56 | 0.42 | 0.31 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.04 |

${ }^{(1)}$ Type of Station definitions:

1. A station where no highway access of any type is anticipated, such as a station in the central business district.
2. A station where the only highway access anticipated is the drop-off mode (i.e., kiss-nride).
3. A station where the access is walk or bus; but potential Kiss-n-ride trips would go to another type 2 station.
4. A station where all types of highway access are anticipated and which has some parking facilities.

Note: Model is applied to both choice and non-choice trips since calibration of this model used entire transit market.

Source: Mode of Access User's Guide, prepared by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell \& Co. for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments:

Table 41
TRANSIT/HIGHWAY ACCESS MODEL LINEAR EQUATION

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Feeder }= & =0.0417 *(\text { IVTFBM-IVTHWM) }-0.10425 *(\text { WAITFBM-WAITHWM) } \\
& -0.7249 *(\text { XFERFBM-XFERHWM) }-0.084 * \text { HWYDST } \\
& -0.024611 *(C S T F B M-C S T H W M)-0.164073 * \text { ACTHWM + INC (I) } \\
& \text { Where: }
\end{aligned}
$$

IVTFBM: is the in-vehicle transit time for the transit access mode ${ }^{(1)}$
IVTHWM: is the in-vehicle transit time for the highway access mode
WAITFBM: is the total waiting time for the transit access mode
WAITHWM: is the total waiting time for the highway access mode
XFERFBM: is the number of transfers for the transit access mode
XFERHWM: is the number of transfers for the highway access mode
HWYDST: is the total highway distance of the trip, measured over the highway network (miles)
CSTFBM: is the cost associated with the transit access mode CSTHWM: is the cost associated with the highway mode
ACTHWM: is the highway access time (in-vehicle time) from the origin zone to the station
INC (I): are bias coefficients associated with each income level The values of these coefficients are as follows:


LOW 2.94297
Low-Medium 2.58120
High-Medium $\quad 2.58120$
High 1.12427

Notes: All travel times are in minutes, costs are in cents. Highway mode values are for park-n-ride mode.
(1) Unless otherwise specified, the value of the independent variables is for the entire interchange; i.e.; from the origin zone to the destination zone.
(2) Includes the parking terminal time, i.e., the time to park a vehicle and walk to the station entrance.

## Table 42

PARK-N-RIDE/KISS-N-RIDE ACCESS MODEL CALCULATION STEPS
For each income level (4)
Calculate Kiss-n-Ride Utile (KRUT)
KRUT $=5.0$ * (origin zone terminal time + station terminal time) +2.0 * zone-to-station highway time +2.0 * zone-to-station highway distance * highway cost/mile * income factor

Calculate Park-n-Ride Utile (PRUT)
PRUT $=2.5$ * (origin zone terminal time + station terminal time) + zone-to-station highway time + ((highway distance * highway cost/mile) $+(0.5$ * station parking cost)) * income factor/car occupancy

Calculate difference in Utility (DELU) DELU $=$ KRUT - PRUT

Calculate Park-n-Ride market share for single-car households (SCPAR) SCPAR $=1.0 /(1.0+\operatorname{EXP}(-0.05001 *(10.03+$ DELU $))$ )

Calculate Park-n-Ride market share for multi-car households (MCPAR) MCPAR $=1.0 /(1.0+\operatorname{EXP}(-0.032929 *(35.01+$ DELU) ))

Calculate total Park-n-Ride market share for income level (PRMS) PRMS = SCPAR * proportion of single car households + MCPAR * proportion of multi-car households

Calculate total Kiss-n-Ride market share for income level (KRMS) KRMS $=1.0-$ PRMS

## Constants and Factors Used in Model

|  | Income Quartile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | LowMedium | HighMedium | High |
| Income Factor | 0.55866 | 0.330579 | 0.330579 | 0.18939 |
| Proportion of Single-car | 0.947 | 0.800 | 0.800 | 0.626 |

Households
program üses a simple distance-related model to estimate the proportion of kiss-n-ride trips. These relationships are as follows:

1. For distances greater than 3.8 miles: kiss-n-ride proportion $=$ 0.0 .
2. For distances greater than 2.0 miles but less than 3.8 miles: kiss-n-ride proportion $=0.218-0.0559$ * highway distance (miles) .
3. For distances greater than 1.0 miles but less than 2.0 miles: kiss-n-ride proportion $=0.464-0.170$ * highway distance (miles)
4. For distances less than 1.0 mile: kiss-n-ride proportion $\approx 0.30$.
5. 

OPHICN NWHORK DESIGN DKSCRIPIICM

This chapter documents the design and construction of the computerized networks for each of the system alternatives. The design process was focused on the background feeder bus system. In the design effort, applicable Sector Improvement Program (SIP) routes were carefully tailored to serve each of the rail system stations defined in each of the transportation corridors. In addition to the feeder bus system design, a rail operating plan was prepared (by SCRID) for each option and, together with the system operating characteristics, was used to calculate Level-ofService information for system route.

The network development process was initiated with a review and update of the 1995 LARDS low capital transit system. This refined low-capital network served as the departure point for preparation of the Option I Starter Line network.

The design and construction of each option network was performed in a modular fashion (i.e., by corridor) to insure coding accuracy and to provide the capability to define other alternative option concepts that could combine any number of the other eight regional corridors to form logical extension of the Starter Line system. The actual construction of network options was, therefore, a mechanical process of combining individual corridor designs to create a specific option.

## MODIFICAYTON OP THE 1995 LOM-CAPITAL TRANSIT NETMORK

The basic underlying bus system in all option networks was SCRTD's Sector Improvement Program (SIP) as originally presented and approved by the board on February 27, 1979. Two subsequent revisions to those planned routes were reflected in the basic background system were the revisions approved on September 28, 1979, and the set of final revisions approved in June, 1980. These two SIP revisions exclude several routes shown in the initial version due to community objections or to various operating problems such as the unintended use of narrow streets or the lack of adequate layover space. The final revision (in June, 1980) also included several lines which were placed on a temporary hold status in order to reduce costs of the full plan. The decision at that time was to phase the full implementation plan over several years, starting with the initial service changes that were already in place by June, 1980. As a result of these revisions, the Sector improvement Program was considered a route-specific master plan. It did represent the latest thinking on bus route planning and was, therefore, the most appropriate information for projecting bus routes which, with minor modifications, would interface effeectively with the planned rapid transit system.

All of the Sector Improvement Program routes included in the 1995 lowcapital network were reviewed and adjusted where necessary, to be compatible with the latest SIP revisions as of June, 1980. In general, most of these revisions were minor and in only three cases were routes completely removed.

The final step in the detailed review of the 1995 low-capital transit network was to analyze the routes of each operator within Los angeles county and to update those coded routes to reflect the most recent schedule revisions as published by each of the respective operators as of August, 1980. The changes for these non-SCRID routes were generally more comprehensive than the Sector Improvement Route Modifications.

## BUS CI-FRTRMAY CORCETPT

CALTRANS (District 7) with technical assistance from SCRTD, had investigated the feasibility of constructing a high-occupancy vehicle lane for both express bus and carpool vehicles in the right-of-way of three freeway facilities:

- The Harbor,
- Century, and
- Santa Ana Freeways.

The freeway transit concept, like the Starter Line, represented one of four elements of the Regional Transportation Development Plan (RIDP). For this reason, it was given special attention in the refinement of the 1995 lowcapital transit network. The design of the bus-on-freeway routes was subdivided into two separate components. The first was comprised of the Harbor and Century freeway corridors which operate in concert to provide a
high level of bus service to downtown Los Angeles; the second was the Santa Ana Freeway corridor which operates in a manner similar to the Harbor and Century, but is an operationally and physically separate facility.

The design and subsequent coding of these routes involved a substantial amount of interaction with the SCRID Bus Plamning Department and the Transit Branch of CALIRANS' District 7 office. The conceptual definition of transit freeway service was first translated into a definition of specific station locations and physical access restrictions where full directional ramps were not considered feasible. Route configurations were defined in relation to the location and level of service to be provided from each service area and station location. The most crucial aspect of the freeway transit design was the service concept. Buses were routed to collect passengers along major arterial right-of-ways, accessing the high-occupancy vehicle lanes at specific guideway locations, and operate in the exclusive lane to the central business district, stopping at each intermediate station to both board and alight any transferring passengers.

The development of routes and service levels for both the Harbor and Century freeway corridors was based upon a SCRID technical memorandum of August 10, 19801 and modified as a result of the joint work effort between the SCRID Bus Planning Department and CALTRAS' Transit Branch. As indicated earlier these two corridors were always considered to function in concert with direct connections available between the Harbor and Century freeway lanes at their intersection.

[^1]All 10 routes within these two corridors were oriented toward the central business district and were derived from existing Sector Improvement Program routes. Figure 10 graphically depicts these routes. As shown in that figure, the route coverage provided by these lines is rather comprehensive in nature and provides a high level of service entering the central business district. The Harbor Century routes were classified into one of three categories:

1. Routes that terminate at the Convention Center terminal.
2. Routes that interface the Convention Center terminal but continue.
3. Routes that completely bypass the terminal.

The Santa Ana Freeway express bus service, much simpler in concept and operation, consisted of three basic sector improvement program routes: the 757,758 , and the 800.

## PLANNING POKICY ASSUPPTIONS

As indicated earlier, the Sector Improvement Program (SIP) formed the basic building block for the development of an integrated bus feeder/distribution system. The modification of SIP routes was based upon a set of planning and operating concepts described in more detail below.

PROJECTED FREQUENCY OF SERVICE

Several SIP routes were eliminated under the assumption that the Starter Line would divert a sufficient number of passengers to make it feasible to eliminate these lines.


The level of service assumed for the Sip bus network consisted of the peak period and off-peak headways (time interval between buses) as defined in November, 1979. This frequency of service amounts to a 10 to 20 percent increase in frequency of service over the (existing) June, 1980, service levels.

Some adjustments in service levels, both increases and decreases in frequency of service, were considered in sübsequent analyses as a result of the rail station boarding and alighting volumes generated by the travel demand model forecasts. These bus schedule adjustments occurred in two categories.

1. Reductions in frequency of service for bus lines which parallel the rail line, and
2. Increases in frequency of service for bus routes which serve as feeder routes to rail service.

The manner in which certain lines received increased frequency of service was referred to as "shortline operation". This means that supplemental service would operate over the portion of a line having high ridership for feeder trips to and from the rail station. Assuming the feeder ridership
demand was limited to short distances on either side of a rail station, these supplemental bus trips will turn back at these points rather than operate to the regular end of the bus route.

SIP ROUIE MODIFICATIONS BY SERVICE AREA

In general, SIP route modifications were based on the following criteria: (1) eliminate bus lines duplicating rapid transit service, (2) provide the opportunity for operating cost savings, and (3) provide rider time savings where comparative paths between the rail line and parallel bus routes (taking into account transfer times between bus and rail) favor use of rail. The modifications were as follows:

1. San Fernando Valley local and express routes serving Hollywood and downtown Los Angeles.
a. Local Lines: In most instances where local service terminated in Hollywood or downtown Los Angeles, the lines were rerouted to terminate at the North Hollywood or Universal City Station.
b. Express Lines: All of these lines, mostly from the West San Fernando Valley area, currently terminate in downtown Los Angeles. They were rerouted into the North Hollÿwood or Universal City Stations. One express bus line was, however, retained on the Hollywood Freeway between downtown Los Angeles and Universal City. A frequency of 15 minutes between buses all day was assumed in order to provide convenient service to the existing three well-patronized

Hollÿwood Freeway bus stops at Alvarado, Vermont, and Western.
2. Local and limited lines serving stations in Hollywood and West

Hollywood. Most of these lines are major trunk routes between downtown Los Angeles and the west side.
a. Local Lines: Ail of the Starter Line rail stations such as Hollywood/Hollywood Bowl, Hollywood/Cahuenga, Fairfax/Santa Monica, and Fairfax/Beverly are adjacent to major bus lines carrying significant numbers of daily riders. Very few route changes were made specifically to accommodate rapid transit. It was intended that some lines which interface with rapid transit stations would ultimately be modified to include supplementary short line service for short distances on either side of the station to accommodate feeder trips.

Several other lines terminating in Hollywood but not serving downtown Los Angeles were extended to either the Hollywood Bowl or Hollywood/Cahuenga Station.
b. Limited Lines: Within the SIP, limited lines are those operating along standard city streets usually in conjunction with a companion local line stopping at only certain bus stops to allow passengers to board or alight. These stops usually are points where transfers can be made to other routes.

In the SIP, several limited lines were established in the West Hollywood-Mid-Wilshire area to provide faster service between those areas and downtown Los Angeles particularly during peak periods. With inauguration of rapid transit service, rider time savings on those routes would be eliminated. In several cases, the lines parallel to the rail
corridor were eliminated.
3. Local and Limited services along Wilshire Boulevard and intersecting thoroughfares between Fairfax and the Los Angeles Central Business District.
a. Major changes in this area reflect service redüctions due to direct competition along North Fairfax Avenue and Wilshire boulevard between bus and rapid transit service. Also, on lines crossing Wilshire boulevard, it is intended that additional shortline service might be added to reflect increased ridership from persons traveling to their rapid transit iine (i.e., feeder function).

Sịgnificant reductions in service were made in bus service on Fairfax Avenue and on Olympic boulevard. Half of the planned SIP service (every other trip) was eliminated north of Wilshire Boulevard along Fairfax Avenue. Similarly, in the case of Olympic Boulevard, half of the base service was eliminated east of Fairfax in order to route half of the trips north on Fairfax to terminate at the Fairfax Rail Station.
b. Limited Service: With respect to the discussion of limited routes between Los Angeles and West Hollywood as detailed in
the previous section, limited lines on Wilshire and Olympic were handled in the following manner:

> Limited service from Santa Monica and Brentwood was terminated at the Wilshire/Fairfax Station.

## CORRIDOR/OPIION DESCRIPIIOUS

Based upon the planning policy criteria described above, modifications to Sector Improvement Program routes were developed for each corridor and alternative. With few exceptions, each Sector Improvement Program route was affected by only one corridor. Implicit within the option definition was the fact that the Sector Improvement Program route modifications made to a corridor are consistent within individual options in other words, if a route were modified to interface with a West Los Angeles station in Option II, it would operate in that manner for all options in which West Los Angeles was to function as a rail corridor.

One of the three possible actions was taken for each Sector Improvement Program route. No change was specified if the route should not logically or physically interface with the station. The route may have been deleted if it operates in parallel or direct competition with the rail line.

The route may have been modified slightly to interface with the station by either terminating it at the station point or rerouting it to serve the station and then continue on its existing route. A systematic coding process, along with some specifically developed programs for this purpose, was used to identify and summarize routes which had any possibility of interfacing or serving station locations within one or more rail corridors.

## Barton-Aschman Associates, Inc.

Evanston: à2 Davis Street. Evanstion, Illinois 80204 (312) 491-1000
Pasadena: $\quad 180$ South Lake Avenve. Suite 260, Pasadena. California 91101 (618) 449-3917
Phoenta: $\quad 3020$ East Camelback Road. Suite 240. Phoenix. Arizona 85016 (602) 224-0804
Waehtngton, D.C.: 1400 K Street. N.W. Suite 800. Washington. D.C. 20005 (202) 289-0519
Minneapoils: $\quad 1610$ South Sixth Streat. Minneapolis. Minnesota 55454 (012) 332-0421
San Jose: $\quad 100$ Park Center Plaza. Suite 450. San Jose, California 95113 (408) 280-6600
Houston: Citicorp Center, 1200 Smith. Suite 2640. Houston, Texas 77002 (713) 757-1120
Dallat: 11551 Forest Central Drive. Suite 238. Dallas. Texas 75243 (214) 343-3891
Tampa: $\quad 2901$ W. Busch Eoulevard. Suite 1010. Tampa. Florida 33618 (613) 932-5220

## Atilliated Company:

Toronto: Barton-Aschman Associates Limited. 111 Avenue Road, Suite 604. Toronto, Ontario. Canada M5R 3.58 (416) $961-7110$

Calgary: Earton-Aschman Associates Limited, 204-1211-14th Street S.W.. Calgary. Alberta. Caṇada T3C 1C4 (403) 245-0211


[^0]:    * It should be cautioned that the route alignmnents, rail operating plans, and station locations for the extensions to the Metro Rail Starter line considered in this report are for stüdy purposes only, and are not to be interpreted as final. To determine the specific alignments and station locations for all future extensions, detailed analyses will be performed and public hearings held in accordance with the "Alternatives Analysis" process that the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) requires for all proposed rail rapid transit projects. However, for initial study purposes, they are considered to be at an adequate level of accuräcy for baseline patronage estimates. Furthermore, any changes to these initial project alignment's and/or station locations which would be adopted within a particular corridor would not have an appreciable effect on the resultant station volumes of the Starter Line.

[^1]:    1 Harbor Freeway and I-105 Freeway Transitway Line Haul Service Concepts, August 10, 1978, SCRID Bus Planning Departiment

