

**Table 7: Predicted and Actual Ridership - Forecast vs. Most Recent Actual, listed by current vs. AA/DEIS**

Project - Current Study	Forecast Year	Forecast Average Weekday Boardings		Current Average Weekday Boardings	Current vs. Predicted Ridership	
		AA/DEIS (MIS or PE Entry)	FEIS (EA or Final Design Entry)		Current vs. AA/DEIS	Current vs. FEIS
NJ Newark Elizabeth MOS 1	2015	12,500	12,500	2,000	16.0%	16.0%
Memphis Medical Center*	2020	4,200	4,200	720	17.1%	17.1%
Tren Urbano	2010	113,643	114,492	27,567	24.3%	24.1%
South Florida Tri-Rail <sup>1</sup>	2015	42,100	42,100	11,503	27.3%	27.3%
BART to SFO	2010	67,400	68,600	26,284	39.0%	38.3%
Washington Largo	2020	14,270	14,270	6,361	44.6%	44.6%
South Boston Piers Phase 1	2010	24,300	24,300	12,500	51.4%	51.4%
Pittsburgh Stage II LRT*	2005	49,000	49,000	25,733	52.5%	52.5%
NJ Hudson Bergen MOS 1&2 <sup>2</sup>	2010	66,160	66,160	38,190	57.7%	57.7%
Baltimore Central Double Track*	2020	44,000	44,000	26,987	61.3%	61.3%
Sacramento South Phase 1	2015	12,550	12,550	8,734	69.6%	69.6%
San Diego Mission Valley East	2015	10,795	10,795	7,572	70.1%	70.1%
Minneapolis Hiawatha <sup>4</sup>	2020	37,000	24,800	26,574	71.8%	107.2%
Portland Interstate MAX <sup>3</sup>	2015	17,030	18,860	12,785	75.1%	67.8%
Denver Southeast (T-REX)	2020	30,000	38,100	22,545	75.2%	59.2%
Chicago Douglas Branch*	2020	33,000	33,000	25,106	76.1%	76.1%
Dallas North Central	2010	11,000	17,033	14,463	131.5%	84.9%
Salt Lake City Univ/Med Cen <sup>5</sup>	2020	10,050	10,050	13,999	139.3%	139.3%
<b>Average Ratio of Actual to Predicted Ridership</b>					<b>61.1%</b>	<b>59.1%</b>

\* These projects did not develop a DEIS/FEIS, but prepared a single EA.

1 The South Florida Tri-Rail project is in an existing rail corridor and was not required to undergo a full environmental impact study and did not have well documented ridership forecasts. For this analysis FTA relied on estimated project boardings reported to FTA to support the New Starts funding applications for this project.

2 Hudson Bergen LRT was planned as a full system and implemented in stages. The ridership forecasts for MOS 1 and 2 are based on the same forecasting model so they are combined and compared to the actual ridership on the combined project.

3 Portland Interstate MAX was planned as a much larger project. The AA/DEIS forecast reflects only the stations that were built but assumes that the larger system would be in place. The FEIS forecast is only for the project that was actually built.

4 Minneapolis Hiawatha conducted its AA/DEIS in the early 1980s long before the project actually entered the New Starts process. Interestingly, this project may well come closer to its early 1980s forecast than the lower estimate prepared more recently.

5 The two Salt Lake City projects were stages of a single project and the forecasts were prepared for the full project rather than the individual stages. Therefore, FTA combined the forecasts and compares them to the actual combined boardings. This project also had no usable forecasts of station boardings in the AA/DEIS. However, the summary results of the AA/DEIS forecasts are fairly close to the more detailed analysis in the FEIS. Therefore, FTA assumed that the same forecast results from the FEIS provide a valid comparison of information developed for the AA/DEIS.