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## Introduction

## Public transit is...

- Essential in dense areas
- Efficient
- Outdated
- Underfunded


## Advantages of Bus networks

- Flexible routing and stop location
- Low operation and maintenance costs
- Low infrastructure costs
- Effective in high or low density areas
- Local, express or feeder service
- Eliminates coverage gaps
- What is stop spacing?

The distance between two consecutive stops along a bus route

## About stop spacing

- Useful to specify:
- Coverage area
- Type of service
- It is typically predefined
- System-wide policy
- Local deviations based on locations of interests or other factors


## Why bother?

- Long spacing reduces travel time (typically)
- Long spacing also decreases coverage area
- Long spacing increases dwell time
- Short spacing minimizes walking times (think elders and riders with disabilities)
- Short spacing frustrates commuters


## Study Area Chicago Transit Authority

## Second largest public transit agency in the US

- 1.97 billion annual passenger miles
- 1.5 million average weekday unlinked trips
- 140 bus routes
- 52.3 million annual bus revenue miles on over 25,000 daily bus trips


## Studied Corridors

- Halsted (\#8)
- Ashland (\#9, \#X9)
- Damen (\#50)
- Western (\#49, \#X49)


## Stop Spacing Policy

- $1 / 8$ mile on regular routes
- $1 / 2$ mile on express routes
- $1 / 4$ mile on routes $\# 9, \# 49$ with the introduction of express service
- $1 / 4$ mile walking distance to bus stop


## Goals and Objectives

- Analyze coverage area of each route based on stop spacing
- Analyze scheduling and ridership patterns along these corridors
- Compare these patterns before and after the stop consolidation
- Discuss the patterns related to stop spacing


## Methodology
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## Service Area Analysis

- Stop buffer
- 1/4 mile circular buffer around stop
- May overlap with other stops
- Stop Voronoi polygon
- The area that, at any location, one stop is the closest of all in a route
- Cannot overlap with other stops
- Stop service area
- The combination of the stop's buffer and Voronoi polygon
- Route service area
- The total of the service areas of all stops serving the route


## Bus Stop Buffers



Bus Route

- Bus Stop

Bus Stop Buffer

Bus Stop Thiessen Polygons


## Bus Stop Service Areas



- Bus Stop


## Service Area - Performance Measures

- Stop service area ratio
- The percentage of the buffer area that is dedicated to this stop
- Measured as stop service area / stop buffer
- Longer spacings lead to higher values and less overlap between stops
- Route service area ratio
- The ratio of the route service area to the route line buffer ( $1 / 4$ mile along the line)
- Measured as route service area / route buffer
- Shorter spacings lead to higher values and fewer coverage gaps along the route


## Travel Time and Ridership Analysis

- GTFS weekday scheduled data extracted and summarized:
- By route: travel times between routes are compared
- By period: each route is compared in different periods, having modified stop spacing in each period
- Examined segments: Southbound Addison to Cermak
- Ridership:
- Average weekday boardings per route
- Summarized by quarter


## Results - Service Area Analysis

| Route | Stop Spacing <br> [mi] | Stop Service <br> Area [acres] | Stop Buffer Size <br> [acres] | \% Stop Service Area to Buffer | Route Service <br> Area [acres] | Route Buffer <br> Size [acres] | \% Route <br> Service Area to <br> Buffer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 0.138 | 4.075 | 11.626 | 35.05\% | 423.84 | 426.58 | 99.36\% |
| 9 | 0.203 | 5.907 | 11.626 | 50.81\% | 531.66 | 543.67 | 97.80\% |
| X9 | 0.483 | 11.626 | 11.626 | 100.00\% | 410.37 | 525.88 | 78.03\% |
| 50 | 0.133 | 3.936 | 11.626 | 33.86\% | 340.43 | 354.89 | 95.93\% |
| 49 | 0.193 | 5.777 | 11.626 | 49.69\% | 473.72 | 482.83 | 98.11\% |
| X49 | 0.445 | 10.836 | 11.626 | 93.20\% | 379.27 | 482.83 | 78.55\% |

## Results - Travel Time Analysis

## Before Stop Consolidation



## After Stop Consolidation



## Results - Travel Time Analysis (cont.)

\#9 Ashland

\#49 Western


## Results - Travel Time Analysis (cont.)

|  | 2013 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2018 |  | \% Mea | \% Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | Mean <br> Travel <br> Time | Std <br> Travel <br> Time | Mean <br> Travel <br> Time | Std <br> Travel <br> Time | Mean <br> Travel <br> Time | Std <br> Travel <br> Time | Mean <br> Travel <br> Time | Std <br> Travel <br> Time | $\begin{aligned} & 2013- \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ | 2016- <br> 2018 |
| 8 | 40:04 | 4:26 | 45:14 | 5:39 | 45:14 | 5:39 | 43:11 | 5:19 | 7.78\% | -4.53\% |
| 9 | 38:28 | 4:24 | 38:34 | 4:27 | 37:29 | 4:17 | 36:36 | 4:13 | -4.85\% | -2.36\% |
| X9 |  |  |  |  | 34:48 | 2:40 | 40:17 | 5:03 |  | 15.76\% |
| 50 | 37:02 | 3:18 | 36:56 | 3:14 | 36:58 | 3:15 | 37:02 | 3:16 | 0.00\% | 0.18\% |
| 49 | 38:33 | 5:01 | 38:24 | 4:56 | 37:09 | 4:42 | 35:46 | 4:24 | -7.22\% | -3.72\% |
| X49 |  |  |  |  | 35:56 | 3:39 | 36:07 | 3:39 |  | 0.51\% |

## Results - Ridership Analysis



## Results - Ridership Analysis (cont.)

Cumulative Ridership
Ashland Ave (\#9, \#X9)


## Cumulative Ridership

Western Ave (\#49, \#X49)


## Discussion

- The stop consolidation led to decreased travel times without identified ridership impacts
- Stop spacing should be based on a balanced compromise of speed and coverage
- Consolidating bus stops may make transit more attractive; savings can be reallocated to network improvements
- Consolidating bus stops may also lead to longer dwell times
- A specific coverage level should be maintained, based on each case
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