



2016 MOTORCOACH TASK FORCE – EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

Staff has carefully reviewed the feedback on evaluation criteria from Motorcoach Task Force Meeting #1. Evaluation criteria data will be collected, compiled, and analyzed by staff to provide the Task Force with an objective depiction of the benefits and disadvantages of potential motorcoach locations. During Meeting #1, the Task Force suggested and/or emphasized the evaluation criteria shown in **bold font** under the “Evaluation Indicator” heading.

Next Steps:

- The Task Force will provide any comments, questions, or concerns about the Evaluation Criteria by 5pm on Tuesday, May 3.
- Staff will provide the Task Force with data collection results at Meeting #2 (May 31).
- The Task Force will be asked to determine weights for the evaluation criteria (based on importance) at Meeting #2 (May 31).

Evaluation Indicator	Description	How will staff obtain/quantify this information?
Quality of Life Bucket	The evaluation criteria in the “quality of life bucket” are intended to inform residents about how a potential future motorcoach facility may impact their homes and day-to-day lives.	
• Proximity to single-family and/or multifamily residential structures	This indicator is used as a baseline to assess potential future motorcoach facilities’ impact residential structures. Single-family structures tend to be stick built and are more susceptible to vibrations and noise. Multifamily structures tend to be less susceptible to vibrations and noise due to their typical construction and height.	Staff will use Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to determine the closest single-family residential structure. This value will be captured in linear feet.
• Median age of structures within 1 mile buffer	As the Task Force indicated that motorcoach operations (and other heavy vehicle operations) cause vibrations and potentially damage older residential structures, this indicator captures the “typical” age of a structure. Newer median dates suggest a location may be better suited for motorcoaches.	Staff will use GIS geoprocessing tools and internal year-built data (a compilation of tax assessment data, plat/subdivision data, and development application data) to determine the median year-built date.
• Proximity to environmental resources/protected areas	The Task Force indicated that it values environmental resources and hopes to keep motorcoach operations away from environmentally sensitive areas. This indicator captures the distance between sensitive areas and potential future facilities.	Staff will work with the City’s Infrastructure and Environmental Quality & Sanitary Sewer/Stormwater Infrastructure Divisions to locate environmentally sensitive areas. Staff will measure the distance between the potential future facility and the environmentally sensitive area in linear feet using GIS.

Evaluation Indicator	Description	How will staff obtain/quantify this information?
Convenience & Accessibility Bucket	The evaluation criteria in the “convenience & accessibility bucket” are intended to inform those representing the industry about how beneficial a potential future motorcoach facility may or may not be in relation to load-generating points and amenities.	
• Distance to publically accessible bathroom facility and/or retail uses.	The Task Force indicated that it is important for motorcoaches facilities to be located in proximity to restroom facilities and retailers. Minimal distance is important for passengers at loading and unloading locations, and important for operators at short-term parking locations.	Staff will use the City’s internal land use GIS data to identify distance to retailers in linear feet. Staff will also run field surveys at each potential site to locate nearby restroom opportunities in cases where retail is not within walking distance.
• Distance to waterfront access	The waterfront is a significant load-generating point; therefore, minimal distance to the waterfront is beneficial for operators and passengers.	Staff will use GIS to measure the distance between a potential future facility and the closest waterfront access. Measurements will be captured in linear feet.
• Distance to King Street	King Street is a significant load-generating point; therefore, minimal distance to the waterfront is beneficial for operators and passengers.	Staff will use GIS to measure the distance between a potential future facility and the closest point on King Street. Measurements will be captured in linear feet.

Evaluation Indicator	Description	How will staff obtain/quantify this information?
<u>City Operations Bucket</u>	The “city operations bucket” captures mobility and transportation indicators that are important to the City.	
• Traffic volumes	Busy streets typically indicate high levels of activity, which are good; however, lower volumes are beneficial for motorcoaches insofar as they suggest lower potential for queuing.	City staff will use the more recent, up-to-date, existing traffic counts (supplied by recent traffic studies and VDOT, only where available).
• Potential conflicts with pedestrians/bicycles	Motorcoach operators unfamiliar with Alexandria may not be aware of existing designated bicycle facilities. For the purposes of efficiency and safety, it is best if motorcoaches avoid interactions with pedestrians and bicyclists.	City staff will use the City’s pedestrian and bicycle network identify locations that present potential conflicts for pedestrians and bicyclists, and/or other modes.
• Turning movements on assumed approaches	A designated location dictates a probable approach. Motorcoach buses need to be able to navigate to loading/unloading and parking facilities, and such approaches will require acceptable turning movements.	Staff will use existing data and field studies, and will map assumed routes to ensure that motorcoach buses can access a location.
• On-street parking & parking revenue impact (for on-street locations only)	If a potential future facility is located on-street, it is likely inhibiting on-street space for other uses, such as parking. Using a street for unloading/loading also potentially inhibits the City from collecting revenue from meters at potential future locations located on-street.	A consultant will assess the parking impact of a potential future location through occupancy and turnover surveys.
• Access to transit connections	The Task Force indicated that access to transit connecting King Street and/or the waterfront with an unloading/loading or parking point is important.	Staff will identify and examine existing transit connections at each proposed location.

Evaluation Indicator	Description	How will staff obtain/quantify this information?
<u>Miscellaneous Considerations Bucket</u>	The “miscellaneous considerations bucket” contains evaluation criteria that do not neatly fit into the buckets listed above, or, whose benefits/disadvantages are not clearly aligned with a representative group of the Task Force.	
• Existing truck loading zone	This indicator captures the opportunity that existing truck loading zones present in regard to co-location to support the highest and best utilization of a given amount of roadway space.	Staff will identify loading-zone opportunities in the field.
• Distance to other motorcoach parking facilities	This indicator captures two issues raised by the Task Force: the ease/viability of enforcement, as well as general benefits for wayfinding and convenience regarding co-location.	Staff will use GIS to measure the travel distance between the potential future facility and the closest existing facility that is not slated for removal.
• Potential for part-time or peak season only usage	This indicator captures the preference to select locations that are operable throughout the year rather than solely at peak season to best account for a growing tourist season that expands during fall, contracts during the winter, and expands again in the spring.	Staff will assess existing conditions around the location to determine whether or not designating the space for “peak time/season only” may be preferable.
• Facility horizon/shelf-life	This indicator intends to capture whether or not a potential future facility is a temporary solution that will need to be replaced at a future date, or a long-term solution with no projected end date on the horizon.	Staff will use its best judgment, knowledge of development opportunities and small area plans (SAPs), and coordination with property owners to estimate the shelf-life of a potential facility.