



Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Assessment

Technical Team Meeting
Thursday, May 24, 2007




National
BRT
Institute





Summary of Project

- BRT assessment
- Part of broader transit study
- Four major corridors
 - I-75, US 301, US 41
 - Fletcher, Fowler, Busch
 - Dale Mabry, Veterans, Himes
 - Selmon, SR 60, S. Brandon




Defining Alternatives

- Preliminary analysis
 - Densities
 - Transit orientation
 - Major activity centers
 - Density threshold assessment
 - Transit orientation index
- Team work session
- Brainstorming sessions



Recommended Alternatives for Evaluation

- 3 alternatives for each corridor
- Network connectivity





Evaluation Criteria


Feasibility Assessment				Thresholds			
Objectives	Criteria	Measure	Weights	5	3	1	Score
A. Ridership	1. Current ridership	Average weekday ridership per mile	2	>200	100-200	<100	
	2. Potential future ridership	Projected weekday ridership per mile (as available from MPO model data)	2	>500	250-500	<250	
B. Capital Cost Effectiveness	1. Right-of-way (ROW) availability	General assessment of ROW availability	1	High	Med	Low	
	2. Potential for coordinated improvements	Review of roadway improvement plans (including ITS improvements)	1	High	Med	Low	
	3. Order-of-magnitude cost	Sketch-level estimated cost per mile	2	High	Med	Low	
C. Operating Cost Efficiency	1. Intersection delay potential	Average signalized intersection Level of Service in corridor	2	High	Med	Low	
	2. Level of congestion	Average roadway Level of Service in corridor	1	D or better	E	F	



Evaluation Criteria

Feasibility Assessment				Thresholds			
Objectives	Criteria	Measure	Weights	5	3	1	Score
D. Rider Potential	1. Density threshold assessment (DTA)	DTA index based on residential and employment densities	2	High	Med	Low	
	2. Transit orientation index (TOI)	TOI index based on Census demographic characteristics	2	High	Med	Low	
E. Accessibility	1. Access to activity centers	Number of major activity centers per mile	1	>2	1-2	<1	
	2. Transit connectivity	Number of transfer opportunities with existing, non-parallel local & planned premium transit services per mile	1	≥2	1	0	
	3. Regional connectivity	Number of transfer opportunities with inter-county services or connection to adjacent counties	1	≥2	1	0	
	4. Pedestrian access	Average bicycle/pedestrian Level of Service in corridor	1	High	Med	Low	

BRT Levels



Next Steps...

- Corridor evaluation (May/June)
- Review meeting (July)
- Final Report (August)

