# Macro Design Models for a Single Route

#### Outline

- Introduction to analysis approach
- Bus frequency model
- Bus size model
- Stop/station spacing model

### **Introduction to Analysis Approach**

- Basic approach is to establish an aggregate total cost function including:
  - operator cost as f (design parameters)
  - user cost as g (design parameters)
- Minimize total cost function to determine optimal design parameter (s.t. constraints)
- Variants include:
  - Maximize service quality s.t. budget constraint
  - Maximize consumer surplus s.t. budget constraint



1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J Lecture 11, Spring 2017

1

# Bus Frequency Model: Square Root Rule

- **Problem** define bus service frequency on a route as a function of ridership
- total cost = operator cost + user cost

$$Z = c \bullet \frac{t}{h} + b \bullet r \bullet \frac{h}{2}$$

where Z = total (operator + user) cost per unit time

- c =operating cost per unit time
- t = round trip time
- h = headway the decision variable to be determined
- b = value of unit passenger waiting time
- r = ridership per unit time

Minimizing Z w.r.t. h yields :

$$h = \sqrt{\frac{2ct}{br}} \text{ or } \sqrt{2\left(\frac{c}{b}\right)\left(\frac{t}{r}\right)}$$

## Bus Frequency Model: Square Root Rule

1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J

Lecture 11, Spring 2017

- This is the Square Root Rule with the following implications:
  - High frequency is appropriate where (cost of wait time/cost of operations time) is high
  - Frequency is proportional to the square root of ridership per unit time for routes of similar length



1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J Lecture 11, Spring 2017

# Bus Frequency Model: Square Root Rule

 Load factor is proportional to the square root of the product of ridership and route length



- Critical Assumptions
  - bus capacity is never binding
  - wait time savings are the only benefits of higher frequency

Bus Frequency Model: Square Root Rule

- ridership f (frequency)
- o simple wait time model
- budget constraint is not binding
- Possible Remedies
  - introduce bus capacity constraint
  - modify objective function
  - introduce r = f(h) and re-define objective function
  - modify objective function
  - introduce budget constraint

| 1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J<br>Lecture 11, Spring 2017 | 5 | 1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J<br>Lecture 11, Spring 2017 |
|--|---|--|
|  |   |  |

# Bus Frequency Example

### lf

c =\$90/bus hour

b = \$10/passenger hour

t = 90 mins

r = 1,000 passengers/hour

#### Then

h<sub>OPT</sub> ≈ 11 mins

### Bus Size Model

- **Problem** define optimal bus size for a route
- Assumptions
  - Desired load factor is constant
  - Labor cost/bus hour is independent of bus size
  - Bus dwell time costs per passenger are independent of bus size
- Using the same notation as before, plus
  - $\circ$  w = labor cost per bus hour
  - p = passenger flow past peak load point
  - k = desired bus load (the decision variable)

Then 
$$Z = w \cdot \frac{t}{h} + b \cdot r \cdot \frac{h}{2}$$
  
Now  $h = \frac{k}{p}$  by assumption above  
 $\therefore \qquad Z = \frac{wtp}{k} + \frac{brk}{2p}$ 

Minimizing Z w.r.t. k gives :  $k_{OPT} = \sqrt{\frac{2p^*v}{rb}}$ 

## Bus Size Model

- Stop/Station Spacing Model
- Result is another square root model, implying that optimal bus size increases with:
  - round trip time
  - ratio of labor cost to passenger wait time cost
  - o peak passenger flow
  - concentration of passenger flows
- Previous example extended with
  - p = 500 pass/hour
  - $\circ$  w = \$40/bus hour
  - all other parameters as before
- Then  $k_{OPT} = 55$  passengers

- Problem determine optimal stop or station spacing
   Trade-off is between
  - walk access time (increases with station spacing)
  - in-vehicle time (decreases as station spacing increases)
  - operating cost (decreases as station spacing increases)
  - Z = total cost per unit distance along route and per headway
  - T<sub>st</sub> = time lost by vehicle making a stop
  - c = vehicle operating cost per unit time
  - s = station/stop spacing the decision variable to be determined
  - N = number of passengers on board vehicle
  - v = value of passenger in-vehicle time
  - D = demand density in passenger per unit route length per headway

1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J

Lecture 11, Spring 2017

- v<sub>acc</sub> = value of passenger access time
- w = walk speed
- cs = station/stop cost per headway

1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J Lecture 11, Spring 2017

## Stop/Station Spacing Model

$$Z = \frac{T_{st}}{s}(c + N \bullet v) + \frac{c_s}{s} + \frac{s}{4} \bullet D \bullet \frac{v_{acc}}{w}$$

Minimizing Z w.r.t. s gives :

$$s_{OPT} = \left[\frac{4w}{Dv_{acc}} \left[c_s + T_{st}(c_v + Nv)\right]\right]^{1/2}$$

- · Yet another square root relationship, implying that
  - station/stop spacing increases with
    - walk speed w
    - station/stop cost c<sub>s</sub>
    - time lost per stop T<sub>st</sub>
    - vehicle operating cost c<sub>v</sub>
    - number of passengers on board vehicle N
    - value of in-vehicle time v
  - and decreases with
    - demand density D
    - value of access time v<sub>acc</sub>

## Bus Stop Spacing

U.S. Practice

- 200 m between stops (8 per mile)
- shelters are rare
- little or no schedule information

**European Practice** 

- 320 m between stops (5 per mile)
- named & sheltered
- up to date schedule information
- scheduled time for every stop





9

# Stop Spacing Tradeoffs

- Walking time
- Riding time
- Operating cost
- Ride quality



1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J

Lecture 11, Spring 2017





14

far side

near side

## **Example: MBTA Route 39**



#### AM Peak Inbound results

- Average walking time up 40 s
- Average riding time down 110 s
- Running time down 4.2 min
- Save 1, maybe 2 buses

Furth, P.G. and A. B. Rahbee, "Optimal Bus Stop Spacing Using Dynamic Programming and Geographic Modeling." Transportation Research Record 1731, pp. 15-22, 2000.

@ National Academies of Sciences. All rights reserved. This content is excluded from our Creative Commons license. For more information, see https://ocw.mit.edu/help/faq-fair-use/.

### Bus Stop Locations and Policies

1.258J 11.541J ESD.226J

Lecture 11, Spring 2017

- Far-side (vs. near-side)
  - less queue interference
  - easier pull-in
  - fewer pedestrian conflicts
  - snowbank problem demands priority in maintenance
- Curb extensions
  - benefit transit, pedestrians, and traffic (0.9 min/mi speed increase)
- Pull-out priority
  - it's the law in some states
- Reducing dwell time
  - vehicle design
  - fare collection
  - fare policy

MIT OpenCourseWare <a href="https://ocw.mit.edu/">https://ocw.mit.edu/</a>

1.258J / 11.541J Public Transportation Systems Spring 2017

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <u>https://ocw.mit.edu/terms</u>.