

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 17, 2022
TO: Ally Holmqvist, Metro
FROM: Ryan Farncomb, Kirsten Pennington (KLP Consulting), Oren Eshel (Nelson\Nygaard)
SUBJECT: Approach to assessing HCT corridor readiness, modes, and tiering
CC: Metro High Capacity Transit (HCT) Strategy Update

This memorandum documents the proposed approach to determining high capacity transit (HCT) corridor “readiness,” corridor ranking, and discussion of factors that will influence future mode choice in each corridor. Metro will use this assessment to shape the HCT Strategy update, including identifying which corridors are priorities for implementation. The approach in this memo builds on the evaluations conducted previously for the 2009 and 2018 iterations of the HCT Strategy.

CORRIDOR READINESS EVALUATION

The prior *Revised Corridor Evaluation Memorandum* describes the overall approach to identifying the preliminary vision of possible HCT corridors and evaluating them through a two-step process. Corridors that emerge from this “Level 1” screening, including previously identified corridors from 2009 and 2018 HCT system planning work that have not yet advanced, will be evaluated with this Level 2 screening. The Level 1 evaluation identified the preliminary HCT vision corridors that are subject to further screening and evaluation. Corridors with existing regional commitments – such as Southwest Corridor LRT, 82nd Avenue, and the Interstate Bridge Project, will not be evaluated further and are assumed to be included in the final vision as “Tier 1” corridors (see Corridor Ranking section below).

This memo describes the Level 2 screening which focuses on corridor “readiness,” meaning, whether the right conditions are in place to support advancing a given corridor for HCT investment. The Level 2 criteria are shown in Table 1. Attachment A shows an example evaluation using these criteria. These criteria are refined based on the 2018 evaluation and include criteria related to climate and equity, among other RTP policy priorities, and federal funding. The project team added these criteria to reflect regional policy priorities.

The federal funding criteria are based on the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Capital Investment Grants (CIG) program. This program is the most substantial non-local source for HCT funding in the Portland-Vancouver region and has funded many HCT investments, including much of the existing LRT system. Because of the outsize influence this program has on funding viability, the Level 2 screening criteria were revised to reflect the CIG program’s criteria, thereby helping to ensure readiness of project corridors.

Table 1. Level 2 Corridor Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Measure	Data Source/Notes	Methodology
Transit Travel Time Benefit	Ratio of personal vehicle travel time to transit travel time	HCT Plan (2018) Core Criteria Meets Section 5309 Capital Investments Grants (CIG) Small Starts Program “Mobility Improvements”	The team will compare the average travel time at 3:00 PM on a typical weekday for personal vehicles versus transit; the higher this ratio, the greater the opportunity to improve transit travel times.

Criteria	Measure	Data Source/Notes	Methodology
		Travel model data	
Productivity + Cost Effectiveness	Existing boardings per revenue hour in a given corridor Capital Cost per Rider (range to account for modal options)	HCT Plan (2018) Core Criteria Input to 5309 Capital Investments Grants (CIG) Program "Cost Effectiveness" measure	Boardings per revenue hour will be calculated based on 2019 and modeled 2040 boardings and transit revenue hours. Capital cost per rider will be presented as a range, based on average per-mile costs for two HCT modes (LRT and BRT).
Environmental Benefit	Change in GHG emissions associated with HCT investment in a given corridor.	"Reduction in emissions" meets HCT Plan (2018) Core Criteria VMT used as key performance measure in Metro 2021 TSMO Strategy	Using established transit elasticities, estimate the change in ridership that is likely occur in a given corridor by investing in HCT and the corresponding change in auto VMT that would be expected. Convert this change in VMT to GHG emissions using an average fleet emissions factor for year 2030.
Equity Benefit	Access to employment – Essential Jobs and Essential Services by Census Block within ½ mile of corridors Relative proportion of historically marginalized populations in each corridor, based on Metro's Focus Areas	TriMet and Metro Essential Destinations data. Remix Online Tool for Existing Routes Consider specific impact to in-person jobs in the region (data from TriMet <i>Forward Together</i> project)	The team will rely on data from TriMet's Forward Together program. Forward Together included location analysis of in-person jobs in the Metro region. The team will assess the relative number of in-person jobs within ½ mile of corridors using 20th percentiles. The relative proportion of historically marginalized populations within ½ mile of each corridor will be reported.
Land Use Supportiveness and Market Potential	2040 Population Density by TAZ within ½ mile of corridors 2040 Employment Density by TAZ within ½ mile of corridors Presence of higher education institutions, multi-family and affordable housing	Metro Travel Model HCT Plan (2018) Core Criteria "Land Use Supportiveness and Market Potential" Meets Section 5309 Capital Investments Grants (CIG) Small Starts Program "Land Use" and "Economic Development" criteria	Using existing 2040 Metro travel model data, the team will develop population densities within ½ mile of each corridor and rank by 20 th percentiles. The project team will also provide for purposes of comparison the average density within 1/2 mile of (1) the average existing frequent service bus line and (2) average light rail line. The same approach will be applied for total employment within ½ mile of the corridors. The presence of multi-family and affordable housing, and higher education institutions will be applied as an additional land use check.

Jurisdictional Readiness Evaluation

After screening the corridor with the quantitative criteria, the project team will conduct a “jurisdictional readiness” evaluation to provide additional context. This next evaluation will be conducted on those corridors that score highly on the quantitative evaluation. This evaluation will be qualitative and based on the following factors:

- **Documented community support**, as determined by inclusion of a given corridor in local plans, supportive language in local Comprehensive Plans, etc.
- **Political support**, as determined by an identified jurisdictional “champion” for a given corridor. HCT corridors require strong political support and usually a local agency(s) that is strongly supportive of the project and that will maintain that support over the long-term.
- **Transit-supportive local policies**, such as those encouraging multifamily housing, minimum land use densities, mixed uses, affordable housing, employment, and other areas.
- **Local anti-displacement strategies or policies**
- **Identified local funding** for implementation (either as match or as a locally-funded project).
- **Physical conditions in the corridor**, looking at the likely availability of ROW broadly within a given HCT corridor or the need for mobility solutions that could require additional ROW within a high travel and constrained corridor; known environmental constraints, and presence of sidewalks and cycling facilities. Corridors with major physical constraints would score lower relative to this criterion. However, a major influx of funding could influence the readiness of corridors with major physical constraints.
- **Assessment of work conducted to-date**, meaning, the level and amount of planning, design, environmental, or other work that has been completed to define and advance the HCT investment in a given corridor.

CORRIDOR RANKING

After both evaluation steps have been completed, the project team will conduct an initial sort of corridors into one of four tiers based on their performance. These tiers are based on the original 2009 HCT System Plan Report:

- **Tier 1 – Regional Priority Corridors:** these include corridors with an adopted Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), or those where determination of the LPA is already underway (such as 82nd Avenue). These corridors are likely to score well with respect to the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program. These corridors already have regional consensus and so were not evaluated with the Level 2/readiness criteria described above.
- **Tier 2 – Emerging Regional Priority Corridors:** Tier 2 includes corridors that score highest based on the quantitative and qualitative assessment where additional policy or planning actions may elevate the corridor to advance within the next five years. With steps taken to advance regional discussion on these corridors and/or some changes in the corridor itself, Tier 2 corridors may score well with respect to the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program.
- **Tier 3 – Developing Corridors:** corridors that scored in the middle relative to others based on the quantitative evaluation and where the qualitative assessment shows multiple issues or needs that must be addressed, or where land use or employment and population density is marginal for HCT investment. These corridors likely require more time before advancing.
- **Tier 4 – Future Corridors:** these corridors score lowest on the quantitative and qualitative evaluation and lack policy or land use conditions that warrant near-term HCT investments.

Funding considerations will be an important “lens” applied to the initial tiering that emerges from this assessment. Available funding is fundamental to the number of corridors the region is able to advance in the

near-term and as such is an important final screen on the initial tiering. The project team will also conduct a final “policy check” to ensure the corridors that emerge from the analysis align with the HCT policy framework and the intended regional outcomes. The final funding and policy check reviews are qualitative in nature; limited modifications, additions, removals, or changes in assigned Tier may result.

Finally, the project team will describe conditions that are likely to influence future discussions on the appropriate HCT mode for each corridor. A specific mode may not be assigned to corridors, given that further study and evaluation is required to determine the appropriate mode in each corridor, as well as the final corridor routing, as part of further studies outside of this process. The team will review the following factors that contribute toward mode selection, including:

- Existing corridor ridership.
- The personal vehicle to transit travel time ratio, determined for each corridor previously (Table 1). The greater this ratio, the greater the need for corridor investment in transit priority or other interventions (e.g., stop consolidation) to improve travel times.
- Existing roadway capacity and available right-of-way: this qualitative assessment will look at the likely availability of ROW broadly within a given HCT corridor or the need for mobility solutions that could require additional ROW within a high travel and constrained corridor. This assessment aims to understand the relative difficulty of implementing HCT.

These criteria will be used to determine if they likely require <50% priority or >50% priority.

However, the project team will assign a **representative corridor and mode** for purposes of modeling corridors only to understand the high-level impacts of HCT investments on regional transit ridership and mode split. The project team will determine these representative modes based on ridership and connections to the existing HCT system. Future corridor refinement studies will make alignment and mode determinations.

AREAS SUBJECT TO FURTHER REFINEMENT

This evaluation will result in high-level information useful for confirming the vision for HCT and ranking corridors based on readiness to advance. However, identifying and tiering corridors is the first step toward advancing HCT. Detailed study and public involvement is required to advance corridors through the various phases of project development, design, construction, and implementation. An **important early step** in advancing corridors is a detailed look at alignments, potential termini, and segmentation to further define the corridor and project; it may be that only part of a corridor is ready to proceed, or that segmenting a given corridor is the preferred approach to move forward. Additional work that would occur outside of the HCT Strategy Update process and would define elements of the project further includes:

- Mode and vehicle type
- Exact alignment and termini
- Level of transit priority needed
- Station locations
- Roadway design
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Integration with the broader transportation system, including first/last mile considerations, park and rides, traffic impacts, etc.