Maryland Department of Transportation
The Secretary's Office

Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr.
Governor
Michael S. Steele
Lt. Governor
Robert L. Flanagan
Secretary
James F. Ports, Jr.
Deputy Secretary

November 1, 2006

The Honorable Ulysses Currie
Chairman, Senate Budget & Taxation Committee
3W Miller Senate Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

The Honorable Norman Conway
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee
131 Lowe House Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991

Dear Chairmen:

Attached is a report concerning the Reopening of the *Light Rail System After Double Tracking* as required in the 2006 Joint Chairmen's Report (JCR), page 71. The language states:

> *"...that the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) shall review and study the impact of the double-track construction of the Baltimore Light Rail System and submit a report to the budget committees by October 31, 2006, and the budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment from the date of receipt. The report shall include the following information:*
>
> *(1) for a period of six months prior to double-track construction and since the reopening of the Light Rail system, a compilation of reported crimes and calls for law enforcement services in or adjacent to Light Rail trains and Light Rail stations from all relevant law enforcement agencies in police department reporting areas containing Light Rail stations;*
> *(2) the changes in MTA's deployment of fare inspectors, MTA police, and video surveillance on trains and in stations between July 2005, and the reopening of the double-track Light Rail system;*
> *(3) the number of citizen contacts and other services provided to the public by MTA security staff during the six months prior to double-track construction and since the reopening of the Light Rail system; and*
> *(4) a comparison of service performance between the new double-track system with the former single-track system; by segments (north of Baltimore City, within Baltimore City, and sough of Baltimore City) and for the overall system; for peak and non-peak commuter routes; and special events, including farebox recovery, parking lot usage and availability, schedule performance, and peak and non-peak ridership on comparable MTA bus routes."*

My telephone number is 410-865-1000
Toll Free Number 1-888-713-1414 TTY User Call Via MD Relay
7201 Corporate Center Drive, Hanover, Maryland 21076

If you have additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Ms. Lisa Dickerson, Administrator, Maryland Transit Administration, at 410-767-8760. Of course, you should always feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Flanagan
Secretary

Attachment

cc: Members of the Senate Budget & Taxation and House Appropriations Committees
Ms. Lisa L. Dickerson, Administrator, Maryland Transit Administration

bcc Ms. Sarah Albert, Library Associate, Mandated State Agency Reports, Library & Information Services Division, Department of Legislative Services (5 copies)
Mr. Jack Cahalan, Director, Office of Public Affairs, Maryland Department of Transportation
Mr. Ned Cheston, Committee Staff, Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
Ms. Elizabeth delCastillo, Budget Analyst, Department of Budget and Management
Ms. Cathy Kramer, Department of Legislative Services
Mr. Jon Martin, Department of Legislative Services
Mr. Ed Miller, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Governor
Ms. Elizabeth Moss, Staff to House Appropriations Committee
Ms. Nanette M. Schieke, State Legislative Officer, Maryland Department of Transportation (3 copies)
Mr. Jim Knighton, Director, Office of External Affairs, Maryland Transit Administration

A Report to the Maryland General Assembly

Senate Budget and Taxation Committee

and

House Appropriations Committee

regarding

"Reopening of the Light Rail System After Double Tracking"
(2006 JCR, Page 71)

October 2006

The Maryland Transit Administration
The Maryland Department of Transportation

Pursuant to 2006 JCR Page 71-72
SB 110/Ch. 216, 2006
Budget Code J00H01.05

"Reopening of the Light Rail System After Double Tracking"
(2006 JCR, Page 71)

This report is in response to the 2006 Joint Chairmen's Report request (page 71), which specifically states:

> *"Provided that the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) shall review and study the impact of the double-track construction of the Baltimore Light Rail System and submit a report to the budget committees by October 31, 2006, and the budget committees shall have 45 days to review and comment from the date of receipt. The report shall include the following information:*
>
> *(1) for a period of six months prior to double-track construction and since the reopening of the Light Rail system, a compilation of reported crimes and calls for law enforcement services in or adjacent to Light Rail trains and Light Rail stations from all relevant law enforcement agencies in police department reporting areas containing Light Rail stations;*
>
> *(2) the changes in MTA's deployment of fare inspectors, MTA police, and video surveillance on trains and in stations between July 2005, and the reopening of the double-track Light Rail system;*
>
> *(3) the number of citizen contacts and other services provided to the public by MTA security staff during the six months prior to double-track construction and since the reopening of the Light Rail system; and*
>
> *(4) a comparison of service performance between the new double-track system with the former single-track system; by segments (north of Baltimore City, within Baltimore City, and south of Baltimore City) and for the overall system; for peak and non-peak commuter routes; for special events, including farebox recovery, parking lot usage and availability, schedule performance, and peak and non-peak ridership on comparable MTA bus routes."*

Background

The Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) operates a light rail system that provides passenger service to 33 stations on a north-south line extending from Glen Burnie in Anne Arundel County through Baltimore City to Hunt Valley in Baltimore County. The system is a major provider of transit to important events in the Baltimore area, such as Orioles baseball games, Ravens Football games, Artscape, State Fair.

In October 2003, MTA began construction of a second track to the light rail line, to allow for more reliable and efficient service and to reduce service delays associated with track maintenance and repair. On February 28, 2004, MTA closed eleven stations on the southern end of the line for double tracking to speed the construction process. Passengers who normally would have taken the train from these eleven stations to travel north into the city were

transported from the stations directly to locations in Baltimore's Central Business District by shuttle bus. The southern end of the line was re-opened to the North Linthicum stop by July 1, 2004 and the remaining portion was reopened on December 6, 2004. The northern portion of the line was closed for double tracking in early 2004 and re-opened to Hunt Valley on February 27, 2006. During the time that the northern portion was closed, shuttle buses were used to transport passengers in a method similar to that used on the southern portion of the line.

Throughout the double-track process and after the reopening of the entire line in 2006, many questions and misconceptions arose regarding criminal activity in and around Light Rail stations. This report will show that, relative to the number of passenger trips provided by MTA on Light Rail, criminal incidents remain extremely rare. This report will also detail a range of data that compares various performance measurements for the Light Rail system as a whole, before the double-track project began and since it has concluded. The performance measurements will show that, while the Light Rail system experienced a decrease in ridership over the course of the double-track project, it is showing positive trends in terms of reductions in service delays. This report also shows that before double-track construction began, ridership on Light Rail was significantly higher than ridership on comparable MTA bus lines. This historical data indicates that as the Light Rail system continues to function with fewer delays, and as MTA continues its efforts to communicate the improved safety and efficiency of Light Rail to the public at large, ridership could increase as passengers who formerly used Light Rail return to the system.

I. Law Enforcement and Security

Law Enforcement Calls and Reported Crimes

MTA Police maintain monthly data on crimes and calls for law enforcement at Light Rail stations. Law enforcement agencies in other jurisdictions that encompass the Light Rail system maintain similar data. However, this report uses only MTA data, because MTA Police personnel have compiled it and are confident of its accuracy.

MTA's law enforcement data in this report encompasses the following periods: April 1-December 31, 2003, since double-track construction began in October 2003; and January 1-June 30, 2006, which includes all data available for the period following reopening of the entire, double-tracked system.

Transit system law enforcement agencies usually classify criminal activity on their property as either "Part I" or "Part II" crimes as defined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Part I crimes include homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, breaking and entering, larceny, vehicle theft, and arson. Part II crimes include other "less serious" crimes such as disorderly conduct, loitering, vandalism, and trespassing.

"Reopening of the Light Rail System After Double Tracking"
(2006 JCR, Page 71)

The following table shows all calls for law enforcement services and separate figures for Part I crimes. "Calls for service" include Part I offenses, Part II offenses, miscellaneous incidents, and calls involving fare equipment maintenance issues.

Overview of Calls for Service on the Central Light Rail Line

Jurisdiction	Total Calls for Part I Crimes*		Total Calls for Service**	
	April – December 2003	January – June 2006	April – December 2003	January – June 2006
♦ Baltimore County	10	2	45	272
♦ Baltimore City	43	34	529	816
♦ Anne Arundel County	12	18	87	260
Total Calls for Service	**65**	**54**	**661**	**1,348**

* Homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, breaking and entering, larceny, vehicle theft and arson are considered "Part I Crimes."

**Total Calls include Part I Crimes, Part II Crimes, assisting other agencies, fare related incidents and fare maintenance, trespassing, warrant arrests, and other miscellaneous

Since the reopening of the Light Rail system, MTA police have begun a focused effort to maintain a visible presence at all stations and on the light rail trains. These pro-active efforts of the MTA Police Force are meant to reduce crime, reduce the fear of crime, improve the quality of life and address Homeland Security related issues on the Light Rail. These pro-active efforts include officer-initiated calls by the MTA Police Force, and are represented in the table above. In comparing the two time periods, the number of calls for Part I Crimes decreased. While the total number of law enforcement calls increased overall following the reopening, incidents involving Part I crimes decreased from 65 to 54, a 17% reduction. In the period of January 1-June 30, 2006, the Light Rail system provided 2,953,062 passenger trips; in this context, the rate of Part I crime on the system is extremely low, with one Part I crime occurring approximately every 54,686 passenger trips. Total Officer calls for service also include removing unruly patrons, reporting suspicious persons and increased observation/reporting through homeland security programs." Calls for service include:

- homeland security related efforts have increased the number of police/dispatcher initiated calls for trespassers on our system from 5 to 101;
- disorderly conduct and drunkenness calls for service which increased from 14 to 96 thus removing more unruly patrons from our system;

- fare maintenance calls for service increased from 45 to 391, this type of call requires a police officer to stand by while the new type of ticket machine is being repaired to guard from any theft or robbery of the monies contained in the machines;
- 111 warrant arrests for officer-initiated calls for suspicious passengers/criminals are ultimately removed from the system;
- other miscellaneous calls for service account for 354 calls, these calls include minor incidents such as abandoned vehicles, accidents, alarms, found property, littering, lost property and towed vehicles.

Deployment of Fare Inspectors, Police Activities, and Video Surveillance

Light Rail fare inspectors were first deployed in July 2004. Currently, 33 fare inspectors are deployed throughout the Light Rail system. They are supervised by a director and assistant director. These 35 positions are the maximum allowed by MTA's budget. Of the 33 inspectors, 23 have been deployed since July 2005. Anecdotal evidence indicates that the presence of the fare inspectors, who wear uniforms similar to law enforcement personnel, contributes to a perception of improved safety by Light Rail riders.

Since July 2005, MTA Police have implemented a comprehensive operational plan directed specifically at enhancing the existing coverage of the Light Rail system. This plan includes the following elements:

- Use of foot patrol officers at specified locations such as train platforms and in neighboring communities surrounding Light Rail stations;
- Use of bicycle patrol units;
- Use of motorized (motorcycle) patrol officers;
- Use of sectored MTA mobile patrol units (units that patrol a specific portion of the system);
- Use of sectored patrol units from the Anne Arundel county police department under the terms of MTA's Memorandum of Understanding with the county;
- Deployment of fare inspectors;
- Use of MTA Transit Operations supervisors as a visual deterrent and "eyes and ears" to report incidents;
- Deployment of "ghost car" (unmanned police car) at various locations;
- Use of MTA Police midnight patrol units to canvass parking lots;
- Regular contact with community groups such as Neighborhood Watch
- Use of saturation patrol efforts (large numbers of law enforcement personnel patrolling a specific area) as part of "sweeps" by specialized units;
- Use of Zone Enforced Unified Sweeps (ZEUS) program to target-harden stations, trains, and other transit facilities (this program consists of exercises involving unannounced comprehensive search and security check of specific transit facilities);
- Ongoing, comprehensive review of crime statistics, identification of "hot spots", and redeployment of law enforcement assets through the Comp Stat process;

- Development of permanent MTA Police posts at Anne Arundel County and Hunt Valley area stations.

Video surveillance cameras are currently installed on all Light Rail trains; all trains have been equipped with cameras since 1996. Installation of video surveillance cameras at all Light Rail stations is included as part of a current MTA capital project to install closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras throughout the MTA system and to construct a centralized monitoring location at the MTA Police training facility. As part of the first phase of this project, CCTV cameras will be installed at the Timonium Light Rail station and connected to the central monitoring facility. The first phase of the CCTV project is expected to begin in late 2006.

Citizen Contacts and Outreach

Systematic and comprehensive public outreach has been a key component of MTA's Light Rail security strategy both during and after the double-track project. An accurate picture of MTA safety and security outreach is best obtained by examining outreach efforts throughout the project, since outreach began before construction, and has continued since the reopening, but it did not stop during construction.

The following is a breakdown by area of meetings held by MTA Police and External Affairs staff to discuss Light Rail safety and security:

Baltimore County

- Hunt Valley Business Forum: monthly meetings, from April 2003 to the present
- Hunt Valley Towne Center Merchants Association meeting, February 24, 2006
- Greenberg Gibbons Commercial Group (Hunt Valley Towne Center management company): weekly and monthly meetings before opening of line in 2006
- Wegman's Supermarket (tenant of Hunt Valley Towne Center): monthly meetings before opening of line in 2006
- Baltimore County Police, Cockeysville Precinct: ongoing throughout the double-track project, and currently
- Greater Timonium Community Council meeting: May 2006
- Baltimore County Executive, County Police Chief and Police Command Staff: meeting before system reopened with MDOT Deputy Secretary and MTA Police Chief and Deputy Police Chief

Anne Arundel County

- Ferndale Community Association meetings: ongoing throughout the double-track project, and currently
- Light Rail Advisory Committee meetings: ongoing throughout the double-track project, and currently
- Anne Arundel County Police, Northern District: ongoing throughout the double-track project, and currently

"Reopening of the Light Rail System After Double Tracking"
(2006 JCR, Page 71)

II. System Performance Comparisons

Ridership

One of the difficulties inherent in the normal measuring of Light Rail ridership is that passengers do not enter the system through turnstiles or other barriers that can easily count the numbers of people boarding each train. Passengers instead purchase tickets before boarding the trains from ticket vending machines (TVMs) that are located at each station. Light rail has always operated on the "honor system" of payment. Because of these unique characteristics of the Light Rail system, MTA uses a sampling method, explained below, to calculate ridership. The method MTA uses was developed by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and FTA has approved it for use by MTA.

Normally, light rail ridership figures are obtained by counting riders on approximately 30 randomly selected trains each month. Since the monthly sample is small, the full fiscal year ridership estimates, which were extrapolated from the monthly estimates, are more reliable than the estimates for any individual month. In addition, the system-wide ridership estimates are more reliable than the estimates for any individual station.

For these reasons, the data set forth below is for the Light Rail system as a whole, because MTA does not usually collect Light Rail data by geographic segment, nor are separate statistics kept for system performance during peak and non-peak travel times. Also, ridership for special events is not tracked separately.

To compare the performance of the single tracked system and the system following completion of the entire double-track project, this report uses data from State Fiscal Year 2003 and compares it to State Fiscal Year 2006.

In FY2003, MTA Light Rail provided 7,238,036 passenger trips. In FY2006, the Light Rail system provided 5,124,820 passenger trips. Of the trips provided in FY06, 1,795,048, or approximately 35%, were provided since the conclusion of double-track construction. It is significant that over one-third of the FY06 ridership occurred during the quarter of the year (April-June) following reopening of the entire double-tracked system. The decline in ridership from 2003 to 2006 is expected in light of the line closures during double-track construction. However, if ridership were to remain at the levels of April-June 2006, it could reach an annual total of 7,180,192, passenger trips, which are only 57,844 fewer passenger trips than the system provided in FY03.

Farebox Recovery

In FY2003, MTA's Light Rail system achieved a farebox recovery rate of 21.6%. In its 2005 annual Managing for Results (MFR) report to the General Assembly, MTA projected a Light Rail farebox recovery rate for FY2006 of 17.7%. This decrease in farebox recovery is

not unexpected in light of the decrease in ridership during double-track construction. MTA is currently preparing its 2006 MFR report, which will contain updated Light Rail farebox data for FY2006 as well as projections for FY2007.

Service Headway

Before the double-tracking project began, Light Rail operated on a headway of service every 8 ½ minutes for stations between Penn Station in Baltimore and BWI Airport (which comprise 18 of the 33 stations on the system), and 17 minutes for stations on the rest of the system (15 of the 33 total stations). Since the conclusion of double track construction, headway on the Light Rail system still varies depending on segment of the line. On the segment between Linthicum and Timonium stations, which encompasses 24 of the 33 stations on the system, trains run every 10 minutes during peak hours (6 a.m.-9 a.m. and 3 p.m.-6 p.m.) Monday through Friday, and every 15 minutes at all other times Monday through Friday as well as on Saturdays, Sundays, and major holidays. Service that operates from the respective ends of the line at Hunt Valley in the north and BWI Thurgood Marshall Airport and Cromwell station in the south has a headway of 20 minutes during peak hours Monday through Friday and 30 minutes at all other times Monday through Friday as well as on Saturdays, Sundays, and major holidays. In short, double tracking has allowed for more uniform headway throughout the system, with 24 of 33 stations having service either every 10 or 15 minutes.

On-Time Performance and Service Delays

One of the best indicators of schedule performance for any transit mode is its on-time performance record. In FY2003, Light Rail's on-time performance was 99.66%. In the same fiscal year, Light Rail experienced 339 major service delays, of which 221 resulted in delays of 10-20 minutes and 118 resulted in delays of over 20 minutes. In FY 2006, Light Rail's on-time performance rate was 99.12%, and the system experienced 759 major service delays, of which 184 involved delays of 10-20 minutes and 575 involved delays of over 20 minutes. Of these major service delays, 546, or 72%, occurred before the conclusion of the double-track project.

Given that double-track construction occurred for the first eight months of FY06, the miniscule reduction in on-time performance relative to FY03 is remarkable. The increase in major service reductions in FY06, as well as the marked decrease since the entire system has reopened, are also to be expected in light of the ongoing construction work for most of that fiscal year.

"Reopening of the Light Rail System After Double Tracking"
(2006 JCR, Page 71)

Traffic Signal Prioritization in Baltimore City

The timing patterns of traffic lights along the Light Rail line in Baltimore City have posed a significant challenge for the system in terms of achieving more efficient service ever since Light Rail began operations in the early 1990s. Since at least 1994, MTA has attempted to work collaboratively with the City Department of Transportation to implement signal prioritization. Unfortunately, these efforts have been hindered by repeated failures on the part of the City DOT to put in place essential components of the project, as well as ongoing refusal to dedicate adequate staff and other resources to the effort.

From the very beginning of the Ehrlich Administration in 2003, MDOT Secretary Robert Flanagan has directed that signal prioritization be an area of primary effort for MTA, because improving Light Rail running time will provide a major benefit to current customers, and could very well draw new riders to the system. Only by taking the initiative to move this complex project forward has MTA been able to make such progress as has occurred so far. In the spring of 2004, MTA completed traffic signal timing plans for the Howard Street corridor that the City had originally promised to provide the agency in late 2003; however, the City did not implement the changes proposed in the plan until October 2005. Throughout the summer of 2005, City staff delayed providing MTA with key equipment that would have allowed MTA to proceed with a signal priority simulation model. Despite these setbacks, MTA has proceeded with equipment procurements and testing to integrate Light Rail vehicles into a signal prioritization system. The agency has also moved forward with site surveys and completion of the simulation model mentioned above. Another major issue arose recently, when City staff informed MTA that, due to lack of appropriate contractual arrangements, the City would select a new equipment vendor for the project, even though the former vendor had provided traffic control equipment for the City since 2002 and previous planning and testing efforts were based on the former vendor's equipment.

MTA is committed to successful implementation of signal prioritization, and continues to work steadily to move the project forward. As of October 2006, MTA has received a cost proposal for installation of traffic signal controllers at 17 intersections on the Howard Street corridor and has provided comments on that proposal to the City DOT. A separate cost proposal has been submitted to, and is now under review by, the City for a software upgrade for the City's entire traffic control system. Finally, an MTA ancillary contractor is in the process of negotiating a contract for the installation of global positioning system (GPS) equipment on board Light Rail vehicles and testing for electro-magnetic interference. MTA will continue to lead the effort to bring this project to fruition.

Station Parking Lot Usage

Since the conclusion of the double-track project, MTA has surveyed usage of Light Rail parking lots on a regular basis. The table below reflects, for the period following conclusion of double-track construction, the average daily percentage of parking space usage at Light Rail stations that have parking lots.

Average Daily % of Parking Space Usage at Stations with Parking Lots (after double-track construction completed)	
Station	**Parking Lot Usage**
Hunt Valley	20%
Warren Road	10%
Timonium	65%
Lutherville	70%
Falls Road	95%
Mt. Washington	100%
North Avenue	100%
Patapsco	50%
Baltimore Highlands	60%
Nursery Road	100%
North Linthicum	95%
Cromwell	35%

These figures are virtually unchanged from the average parking lot usage before the double-track project began. Remarkably, parking lot usage has remained relatively constant even though ridership on the Light Rail system as a whole has not yet returned to pre-double track levels.

Comparison to MTA Bus Routes

It is practically impossible to compare ridership on the Light Rail system with ridership on MTA buses in a meaningful way. The reason for this is that certain segments of various bus routes serve areas that are roughly similar to the area served by the Light Rail, but, as stated earlier in this report, the most accurate and recent Light Rail ridership figures are for the system as a whole. The most meaningful comparison between Light Rail and bus ridership is drawn from data collected before the double-track project began, as set forth in Attachment A to this report. The process of collecting and analyzing bus ridership data for the period after conclusion of the double-track project is still underway; the most complete post-double-track statistics that MTA could produce currently would be annual passenger trips for entire bus lines, which could only be compared to the annual ridership on the Light Rail system as a whole. This would not be a meaningful comparison because there is no single bus line that approximates the Light Rail line in terms of service area.

"Reopening of the Light Rail System After Double Tracking" (2006 JCR, Page 71)

Attachment A to this report sets forth a table of average daily boardings for ten different segments of five MTA bus lines that are comparable to the Light Rail system. The ridership data for the bus lines was collected during FY2003 as part of MTA's Comprehensive Ridecheck Project. As part of the project, individual checkers rode every line in MTA's system to count all passengers getting on or off at every stop and recording data on the passenger load for each trip. The ridership data for the Light Rail system in Attachment A is taken from MTA's Transit Route Profiles, published in 2002. The data in Attachment A shows that before the double-track project began, average daily boardings on the Light Rail system were over four times higher than on the comparable bus routes. This information indicates that before double-track construction began, considerably more passengers chose Light Rail as an option for commuting, shopping, or other travel needs, relative to comparable bus routes. With the Light Rail line now operating fully on double track and experiencing fewer service delays as a result, MTA is continuing its ongoing efforts to encourage customers to use Light Rail by stressing the safety and improved service of the post-double track system. The marked preference for Light Rail before double-tracking began (as shown in Attachment A) suggests that there is good potential for an increase in Light Rail ridership in the future.

Conclusion

The double-track construction project was the most significant capital enhancement to the MTA's Light Rail system since the first portion of the line opened for service in 1992. Throughout the double-track process, safety and security of both passengers and residents of the Light Rail service area were one of the primary concerns of MTA management. Security-specific outreach has been consistent and is continuing. MTA's police force has developed a comprehensive security and safety strategy that has resulted in a decrease in serious crimes since the Light Rail system has reopened, relative to the period immediately preceding the start of construction. While ridership and farebox recovery have both decreased during double tracking, there are fewer system delays since the conclusion of construction, and parking lot usage has been virtually unchanged. As more time elapses from the conclusion of the double-track project, MTA will continue to monitor the performance of the Light Rail system, and a clearer picture of ridership and farebox recovery should emerge. In the meantime, MTA will continue its public outreach and security enhancement programs, to help insure that riders can enjoy safe trips on this improved system.

Report to the General Assembly on
"Reopening of the Light Rail After Double-Tracking"
Attachment A

Comparison of Ridership on Light Rail System and Comparable MTA Bus Lines Before Double-Track Construction			
Bus Line Segment	**Average Daily Boardings**	**Light Rail Line Segment**	**Average Daily Boardings**
No. 8 Between Hunt Valley and York Rd/Cranbrook Rd	392	Hunt Valley to Warren Road	2,383
No. 8 Between York/Cranbrook and Joppa Rd	1,899	Timonium to Lutherville	1,965
M10 Between Mt. Washington and Greenspring Station	86	Falls Rd.	303
No. 27 Between Mt. Washington and Roland Ave.	299	Mt. Washington to Cold Spring Ln.	1,322
No. 27 Between Roland Ave. and Maryland General Hospital	711	Woodberry to Cultural Center	3,889
No. 27 Between Maryland General Hospital & MLK Blvd.	784	Centre Street to Camden Yards	9,701
No. 27 Between MLK Blvd. and Cherry Hill Light Rail Stop	1,000	Westport to Cherry Hill	2,672
No. 14 From Patapsco Station to Cromwell Station	1,458	Patapsco to Cromwell	5,026
No. 17 from Nursery Rd. to BWI Business District	135	BWI Business District	135
No. 17 from BWI Business District to Amtrak Way	117	BWI Airport	1,183
Total for Comparable Bus Routes	**6,881**	**Total for Light Rail**	**28,579**