



Branch LRT Line at the Bachman Station. The No-Build Alternative would result in 64,700 system-wide transfers from buses to the LRT system daily.

<b>TABLE 4-3 TRANSIT TRAVEL TIMES FROM SELECT ORIGINS AND DESTINATIONS</b>		
<b>To West Transfer Station from:</b>	<b>In-Vehicle Transit Travel Time (minutes)</b>	
	<b>No-Build (Bus) (AM/Off-peak/PM)</b>	<b>LRT Alternative</b>
Belt Line Road	95 / 71 / 90	28
North Lake College	54 / 57 / 55	25
Carpenter Ranch	26 / 24 / 31	24
North Las Colinas	22 / 20 / 25	22
Lake Carolyn	20 / 16 / 21	20
University of Dallas	43 / 66 / 54	17

Source: Parsons Transportation Group, DART; December 2005

With the LRT Alternative, many transit riders would use the feeder bus network to transfer to the proposed LRT stations along the project corridor. For the LRT Alternative, there would actually be more transfers than the No-Build Alternative because more riders would be attracted to the system, the feeder bus network would supply a large number of the transit riders to the LRT extension, and several express bus routes to downtown would no longer exist within the corridor. The LRT Alternative would result in 72,850 system-wide transfers from buses to the LRT system daily, an increase of almost 13 percent compared to the No-Build Alternative.

The predominant mode of access to the LRT system will vary by each LRT station; however, most of the LRT riders would transfer from the feeder bus service. Approximately 16 percent of LRT riders would transfer to the new rail line from other rail lines, 3 percent would transfer from the Las Colinas Automated People Mover, 24 percent would drive to the LRT stations, 9 percent would access the system by walking, and 48 percent would use local bus service to access the LRT Alternative in 2030.

**Reliability**

The No-Build Alternative would use the DART bus transit system on the existing corridor roadways under mixed-traffic travel conditions. Therefore, the bus system in the No-Build Alternative would be subjected to similar travel speeds and delays resulting from peak hour congestion on the roadways within the corridor. Many of the major arterials and freeways within the corridor operate at Volume to Capacity ratios meeting or exceeding the upper limit of 0.9, an indication that traffic conditions are unacceptable during the peak hour. As a result, the buses operating in the mixed traffic environment would generally have decreased reliability and increased travel times.

The LRT Alternative would operate on an exclusive guideway and would not be subjected to traffic and traffic signal delays on the major thoroughfares within the corridor. The LRT vehicles would have preemption traffic signals at all grade crossings to insure few, if any, delays. Although the LRT may experience longer travel times compared to the No-Build Alternative during optimal traffic conditions, the LRT Alternative would provide transit riders with a more reliable transit service than the No-Build Alternative because it would not be susceptible to the occasional congestion created by traffic incidents. This is also reflected in the increased number of system-wide transit riders after implementation of the LRT Alternative.

**Comfort and Convenience**

The No-Build Alternative would provide few enhancements to the existing comfort and convenience of transit service in the corridor. In fact, the No-Build Alternative would be more