



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

FC

Mr. Doug Wentworth  
TRI-MET  
Pacific Building  
520 S.W. Yamhill Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204

NOV 14 1977

Dear Mr. Wentworth:

We have reviewed the draft materials sent by TRI-MET with Mr. Fishers' letter to Mr. Hillegass of August 26, 1977. These drafts were:

- A. Data Base
- B. Methodology
- C. Existing Transit System (Validation)

These are generally complete and clear with the exception of the access modelling procedure, concerning which we will need a more coherent description as detailed in the attachment, item A.

Mr. Fisher's letter further mentions that results for "alternatives tested so far" will be sent. These results have not yet been received but we would like to review them as a part of our judgment of the overall acceptability of the patronage estimation process. Item B in the attachment suggests a format that would facilitate our comparison of forecast patronage with the (already submitted) validation patronage.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, likely belonging to Charles H. Graves, is positioned above the typed name.

Charles H. Graves  
Acting Associate Administrator  
for Transportation Planning

## ATTACHMENT

### A. Access Modelling

TRI-MET's extensive efforts in access representation demonstrate their recognition of the critical nature of this component. However, the materials submitted treat the subject partially in five different places with some resulting gaps and confusion. We request a single, complete description of how access was modelled for validation and for forecast applications. As a minimum the following questions should be answered by such a description:

1. Why were walk access volumes and auto access volumes subject to interpolation when the mutually exclusive nature of the "percent served" fractions suggest that they be added?
2. What determined whether a zone would be connected by an auto connector to a line? Was this different for the validation bus system than for the future systems? How did availability of station parking on a line enter this determination?
3. What value of auto access time penalty was used? Was this different for the validation bus system than for the future systems? Was a different penalty used where station parking was available than for other locations?

### B. Forecast Results

When submitting the patronage for future systems, it will greatly facilitate our review if the numbered items below are included for the "null" alternative, the "TSM" alternative, the separate busway in Banfield alternative and the LRT in Banfield/Burnside alternative. These data may be reported for the East Portland corridor only, if so desired. This is not to limit your report to these data or alternatives, of course, only to be sure we have some directly comparable results to compare to validation results.

1. Person trips by purpose and mode as in Table Y-8 of the validation report (except please show "downtown" trips separately).

2. Screenline patronage as in Table Y-11 of the validation report.
3. Line patronage for the separate busway and LRT Alternatives.
4. Patronage breakdown by mode of access and analysis of parking requirements at station lots for the separate busway and LRT alternatives.
5. Sensitivity of patronage to variation in downtown employment growth. (TRI-MET may suggest an alternate employment level for this test and a subset of alternatives to apply it to.)

1. operating costs
2. Operating plan
3. capital cost - long term investment  
moderate cost (LRT)
3. rider preference
4. operational considerations - safety, flex.,  
conn. to local buses, reliability
5. effect on regional growth  
commitments by local jurisdictions
6. impact on downtown Portland  
less buses downtown
7. East side impacts - less relocations,  
fewer buses on city radial streets, less noise
8. less energy - less drawdown on  
fossil fuel
9. citizen preference

Taylor  
 should look @ Portland as a whole  
 operating cost primarily local responsibility  
 local match assurance  
 UMTA likes cheap LRT (Buffalo too expensive)  
 What uses will Interstate Transfer  
 Will work with our time schedule

Estimote  
 concerned that answers to UMTA comments will be seen  
 by decision makers

Why couldn't buses have more strokes