

FINAL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Date: November 27, 2019 Project #: 23254.0

To: Tom Strader, SCTD
Carol Landsman, Landsman Transportation Planning, LLC
Seth Brumley and Hector Rodriguez-Ruiz, Oregon Department of Transportation

From: Susan Wright, Krista Purser, and Rachel Grosso, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

Project: SCTD Transit Development and Master Plan Update

Subject: Memorandum #5 – Final Evaluation Framework (Subtask 4.6)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Service Alternatives Evaluation 1

Next Steps 2

INTRODUCTION

This memorandum presents evaluation criteria to be used to compare service alternatives for the South Clackamas Transportation District (SCTD)'s Transportation Development and Master Plan (TDMP). Criteria are based on *Memorandum #3: Updated Goals and Policies* for SCTD, as well as regional, state, and federal plans. Potential evaluation criteria consider connections to land use, transit markets served, access for transportation-disadvantaged populations, fare recovery potential, and number of potential users served.

SERVICE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

Table 1 describes the draft evaluation criteria and provides notes on the development or use of the criteria. Criteria are generally categorized according to goal areas developed in *Memorandum #3: Updated Goals and Policies*.

The evaluation criteria will be used to assess the potential costs and tradeoffs, categorize, and prioritize service opportunities. For example, service alternatives that require additional buses and thus higher capital costs may be cost-prohibitive to implement in the short-term, while service alternatives that do not require additional buses could be implemented with no capital costs.

Several evaluation criteria can conflict with each other. For example, consolidating stops on a transit route may improve travel time but decrease the general population, employment, or transit-disadvantaged population served within ¼ mile of bus stops. Adding service hours could provide increased ridership but may not be at the same rides per hour efficiency.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria

| Evaluation Criteria | Notes |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Customer Experience | |
| Ridership Potential | Total ridership potential from Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) methodologies, existing ridership compared to population/employment near stops, etc. |
| Service Hours | Number of service hours |
| Rides per Hour | Cost-efficiency measure comparing potential ridership to service hours provided |
| Service Frequency | Can be further distinguished by frequency during peak periods vs. off-peak |
| Service Span | Number of hours per weekday and weekend day service is provided |
| Travel Time | Evaluates travel time impacts to existing service and travel time for new services |
| Stakeholder Support | Considers support and priorities of riders, community members, and other stakeholders |
| Accessibility and Connectivity | |
| Population within ¼ Mile of Transit Route or Service | Provides ridership proxy using population near stops or service |
| Employees within ¼ Mile of Transit Route or Service | Provides ridership proxy using employment near stops or service |
| Transportation-Disadvantaged Populations within ¼ Mile of Transit Route or Service | Measure of access to transit for transportation-disadvantaged populations |
| Coordination | |
| Connections to Other Routes/Providers | Evaluates how well an alternative is integrated with other routes and mobility services |
| Sustainability | |
| Access to Health-Supporting Destinations | Evaluates access to grocery stores, parks, community spaces, health care, and social services |
| Cost per Ride | Evaluates cost-efficiency of system |
| Total Capital Costs | Provides capital costs needed to start service alternative |
| Total Annual Operating Costs | Provides operating costs to maintain service alternative |

NEXT STEPS

The Project Management Team and Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the evaluation criteria and provide comments and revisions. Alternatives that will be identified in *Memorandum #6: Future Service Opportunities* will be evaluated based on the revised evaluation criteria to determine prioritization of service improvements.