Revised Draft Corridor Concept Evaluation Criteria

| Hovisca Brait Corridor Correcti Evaluation Criteria | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| General Evaluation Criteria Grouping | Criteria Sub-Group | Evaluation Criteria | For Use in Preliminary Screening of Concepts | For Use in Comparative Evaluation of Concepts | Measurement Method |
| | | | | | |
| Effectiveness - Addresses stated transportation issues in the corridor | Coverage | Service to Population, Employment, and Other Destinations | ✓ | ✓ | Tabulate population, employment, key destinations, and similar, served by option |
| | | Transit Connectivity | \checkmark | ✓ | Access to other transit services (existing and planned) |
| | Operations | Running-way Configuration(s) | | ✓ | Quantify amount of runningway that is dedicated and amount that is mixed flow |
| | | Corridor Length | | √ | Measured length of the corridor (mi or feet) |
| | | Capacity | | ✓ | Potential corridor capacity (hourly) based on mode technology, headways, and other conditions |
| | | Interoperability | ✓ | ✓ | Identification of whether the chosen runningway configuration and transit mode technology are compatible with regionally planned systems |
| | | Avoidance of Congestion | | ✓ | Number and locations of LOS E/F intersections avoided |
| | | Intersection Priority | | ✓ | Percent of intersections where TSP is needed and can be implemented successfully - notation of where it cannot be implemented successfully |
| | | Ridership | | ✓ | Forecast number of riders |
| | Alignment | Geometrics | ✓ | ✓ | Geometric quality of alignment |
| | | Runningway Status | | ✓ | Percent of corridor to be located on new or realigned roadway |
| | Phasing | Phasing | | ✓ | Identification of ability to phase operations and implementation |
| Impacts - Extent to which economics, environment, community, transportation are affected | Economic | Development Incentive | | ✓ | Perceived value of transit mode technologies with regard to development potential |
| | Natural Environmental | Natural Environment | | ✓ | Summary of key environmental conditions affected (wetlands, floodplains, T&E, streams, and similar) |
| | | Parks and Open Space | | √ | Summary of parks and/or open spaces affected |
| | Neighborhood and Community | Property | ✓ | ✓ | Number, use type, and quantity of properties impacted with anticipated level of impact (ROW only, partial take, total take) |
| | | Community Resources | | √ | Identify number and location of historical, cultural, community, archaeological resources affected |
| | | Demographics | | ✓ | Identification of impacts to special populations |
| | | Noise and Vibration | | ✓ | Summarize relative noise and vibration impacts of different mode types and corridor configurations |
| | Transportation | Vehicular Capacity | \checkmark | ✓ | Effect of transit implementation on vehicular capacity of corridor |
| | | Traffic Signals | | ✓ | Number of existing signalized intersections affected by transit, identification of need for new signal phases, and number/location of new traffic signals needed to accommodate transit |
| | | Multimodal Accommodation | | ✓ | Impacts to, and ability to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians |
| | | Parking | | √ | Impacts to parking |
| Cost Effectiveness - Extent to which the costs are commensurate with their benefits | Cost | Capital cost | | ✓ | Order of magnitude capital cost for corridor (stations, runningway, etc.) |
| | | Operating cost | | ✓ | Order of magnitude operating cost |
| | | Cost Per Rider | | ✓ | Order of magnitude cost per rider |
| Financial Feasibility - Cost of system/concept is in alignment with available funding | Funding | Funding | | ✓ | Availability to specific funding sources |
| | | Private Capital Incentive | | ✓ | Judgment as to whether the concept has the potential to attract private capital investment and innovative procurement |