



Date: October 16, 2008
To: MTAC/TPAC High Capacity Transit System Plan Subcommittee
From: Tony Mendoza, Transit Project Analysis Manager
Re: HCT Screening Criteria

At the October 22, 2008 meeting, you will be asked to confirm the attached Screening Criteria (Figure 1) and to recommend the Screening Criteria to MTAC and TPAC. The Screening Criteria constitutes the first phase of the HCT evaluation framework (Figure 2 displays the HCT evaluation framework). The Screening Criteria will be used to narrow the wide array of High Capacity Transit Corridors and System Improvements that were developed for the RTP Scenario B¹ and suggested in stakeholder interviews, public workshops, and Metro Committee meetings.

Attached is an updated draft of the Screening Criteria prepared for the High Capacity Transit System Plan. An original draft was presented to the HCT MTAC/TPAC Subcommittee on 9/12/08.

Refinements were made to that draft and then presented to TPAC on 9/26/08 and MTAC on 10/1/08. The following suggestions are incorporated in the attached draft:

- Use a “high to low” rating system for each screening criterion that can be incorporated into a “scorecard” matrix for all improvements.
- Refine the Existing and Future Potential Ridership screening targets to better reflect local conditions. Include a five-tiered rating system from “low” to “high” where the “low” rating is indicative of areas where land use densities are not supportive of any HCT investment.
- Include “congestion” conditions in parallel arterials or freeways as a new screening criterion, favoring corridors where congestion is worse. The assessment would be conducted using the regional travel demand model, focusing on current and predicted levels of congestion using 2005 and 2035 regional travel demand forecasts.
- Include a new screening criterion that addresses the issue of “equity.” This is included in the attached memo as a qualitative criterion that would evaluate access to HCT projects from identified census tracts with high densities of low-income and/or minority residents.
- Include 2040 Regional Centers as priorities for connecting HCT. Other 2040 centers and corridors should also be ranked in order of 2040 designations.

In the second phase of the evaluation framework, the Evaluation Criteria will be used to help prioritize High Capacity Transit improvements. At the October 22, 2008 meeting, you will also be given the opportunity to review and begin to discuss the Evaluation Criteria. You will be asked to confirm the Evaluation Criteria at the November 14, 2008 Subcommittee meeting.

Attachments:

Figure 1 – Screening Criteria

Figure 2 – Evaluation Framework diagram

¹ Scenario B HCT improvements were gathered from the following sources: Region 2040 Concept, TriMet Transit Investment Plan (2007), RTP Federal Component (2007), and local jurisdiction comments received from TPAC/MTAC/JPACT/MPAC.

Figure 1 Proposed Initial Screening Criteria

CRITERION	MEASUREMENT	PROPOSED SCREENING TARGET	
QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA			
Existing Potential Ridership *, **	Transit Orientation Index	High	> 5.0 riders per acre
		Medium-High	4.0-5.0 riders per acre
		Medium	3.0-4.0 riders per acre
		Low-Medium	1.5-3.0 riders per acre
		Low	< 1.5 rider per acre
Future Potential Ridership *, **	Transit Orientation Index	High	> 10.0 riders per acre
		Medium-High	7.0-10.0 riders per acre
		Medium	4.0-7.0 riders per acre
		Low-Medium	2.5-4.0 riders per acre
		Low	< 2.5 rider per acre
QUALITATIVE CRITERIA			
Corridor Availability and Cost	Qualitative assessment of right of way availability and associated access improvements	High	Minimal right of way development needs.
		Medium	Moderate right of way development needs.
		Low	Major land acquisition, tunneling, bridge work or extensive ROW development
Environmental Constraints	Qualitative assessment of habitat loss	High	Minimal potential habitat loss and mitigation
		Medium	Moderate potential habitat loss and mitigation
		Low	Significant potential habitat loss and mitigation
Equity	Qualitative assessment of social equity needs	High	Good access provided to low-income and minority communities
		Medium	Moderate access provided to low-income and minority communities – no change in riders per acre
		Low	Poor access provided to low-income and minority communities
Connectivity and System *	Qualitative assessment of intermodal connectivity, maintenance yard site or other transit system needs.	High	Strong connectivity and/or system benefits –
		Medium	Moderate connectivity and/or system benefits –
		Low	Poor connectivity, and/or system benefits –
Congestion	Assessment of ability to address congestion	High	Significant congestion
		Medium	Moderate congestion
		Low	Minimal congestion

*: a ridership adjustment factor could be added for stations that would collect from larger catchment or make regional connections or this could simply be accounted for in Connectivity and System criterion.

** : testing is needed to set the exact target values, those included in this figure are placeholders

Figure 2 Evaluation Framework

