

MEASURES	CRITERIA	PROBLEMS	CRITERIA	MEASURES	
Percent of Lane Miles of Congestion (2010)	Congestion Index	Core	Affordability Index	Existing Affordable Rental Units as a Percent of Households (2010)	
Percent of Lane Miles of Congestion (2030)				Percent of Households below Poverty Line (2010)	
Increase in Percent of Lane Miles of Congestion (2010-2030)				Percent Zero-Car Households (2010)	
Congested VMT per Lane Mile (2010)				Percent Population over 65 (2010)	
Congested VMT per Lane Mile (2030)			Economic Development Index	Future Project Value per Acre (2020)	
Percent of Congested VMT (2010)				City of Austin Property Tax Annual Revenue per Acre (2020)	
Percent of Congested VMT (2030)				City of Austin Sales Tax Revenue per Acre (2020)	
Increase in Percent of Congested VMT (2010-2030)					
Congested VHT per Lane Mile (2010)			Centers	Centers Index	Percent Area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Regional Centers
Congested VHT per Lane Mile (2030)					Percent Area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Town Centers
Percent of Congested VHT (2010)	Percent Area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Neighborhood Centers				
Percent of Congested VHT (2030)	Consistency with Regional and Local Plans	Percent Length of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Corridors			
Increase in Percent of Congested VHT (2010-2030)		Consistency with Regional and Local Transit-Supportive Plans and Policies			
Delay Hours per Lane Mile (2010)	Congestion	Future Ridership Potential			
Delay Hours per Lane Mile (2030)			Transit Orientation Index (TOI) (2030)		
Increase in Delay Hours per Lane Mile (2010-2030)			Transit Orientation Index (TOI) (2010)		
Accidents per Lane Mile (2008-2011)					
Total O-D Trips to the Core per Square Mile (2010)		Current Ridership Potential	Complementary HCT Connections (Number of Stops)		
Total O-D Trips to the Core per Square Mile (2030)			Competitive HCT Overlap (Number of Stops)		
Total Intra-Sub-Corridor Trips per Square Mile (2010)			Bus Route Miles per Lane Mile		
Total Intra-Sub-Corridor Trips per Square Mile (2030)			Length of Bicycle Facilities per Roadway Mile		
Regional Trips Passing through Sub-Corridor to Core (2010)		System	Connectivity Index	Percent Build-out of Sidewalks	
Regional Trips Passing through Sub-Corridor to Core (2030)					
Regional Trips Beginning or Ending in Sub-Corridor (2010)	Population Density (2010)				
Regional Trips Beginning or Ending in Sub-Corridor (2030)	Employment Density (2010)				
	Transit Demand Index		Existing Transit Ridership (Average Daily Boardings per Square Mile)		
			Percent of Households below Poverty Line (2010)		
Population Density Growth (2010-2030)	Growth Index	Constraints and Growth	Transit Demand Index	Percent Zero-Car Households (2010)	
Employment Density Growth (2010-2030)				Percent Population over 65 (2010)	
Population Density (2030)					
Employment Density (2030)					
	Constraints Index				
Physical Constraints					

Problem	Criterion	Measure	Weight	Definition	Raw Data (inputs)	Data Source
Congestion				Excessive roadway congestion surrounding the core and lack of transportation alternatives make travel time to the Central Corridor unreliable.		
	Congestion Index		100.0%	A measure based on the amount of congested lane miles, hours of vehicle delay, and delay due to accidents, and more. In other words: how congested is each sub-corridor?		
	Percent of Lane Miles of Congestion (2010)	3.0%	Total congested lane miles divided by total lane miles (2010)		Congested lane miles (2010), total CAMPO network lane miles (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Percent of Lane Miles of Congestion (2030)	5.0%	Total congested lane miles divided by total lane miles (projected for 2030)		Congested lane miles (2030), total CAMPO network lane miles (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Increase in Percent of Lane Miles of Congestion (2010-2030)	4.0%	Numeric difference in percent of congested lane miles between 2010 and 2030		Congested lane miles (2010, 2030), total CAMPO network lane miles (2010, 2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Congested VMT per Lane Mile (2010)	3.0%	Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) on congested links (where volume / capacity ratio is equal to or greater than 1.0); per lane mile (2010)		VMT (2010), congested CAMPO network lane miles (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Congested VMT per Lane Mile (2030)	5.0%	Total VMT on congested links (where volume / capacity ratio is equal to or greater than 1.0); per lane mile (2030)		VMT (2030), congested CAMPO network lane miles (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Percent of Congested VMT (2010)	3.0%	Percentage of congested VMT over total VMT (2010)		VMT (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Percent of Congested VMT (2030)	5.0%	Percentage of congested VMT over total VMT (projected for 2030)		VMT (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Increase in Percent of Congested VMT (2010-2030)	4.0%	Numeric difference in percent of congested VMT between 2010 and 2030		VMT (2010, 2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Congested VHT per Lane Mile (2010)	7.0%	Congested Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) is the number of hours spent traveling on congested roadways, where volume / capacity ratio is equal to or greater than 1.0 (2010)		VHT (2010), CAMPO network lane miles (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Congested VHT per Lane Mile (2030)	9.0%	Congested VHT is the number of hours spent on congested roadways (projected for 2030)		VHT (2030), CAMPO network lane miles (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Percent of Congested VHT (2010)	7.0%	Percentage of congested VHT over total VHT (2010); proportion of hours spent on congested roadways		VHT (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Percent of Congested VHT (2030)	10.0%	Percentage of congested VHT over total VHT (projected for 2030); proportion of hours spent on congested roadways		VHT (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Increase in Percent of Congested VHT (2010-2030)	10.0%	Numeric difference in percent of congested VHT between 2010 and 2030		VHT (2010, 2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Delay Hours per Lane Mile (2010)	4.0%	Number of hours of delay; delay includes any situation in which the modeled roadway speed is less than the "ideal" free flow speed (2010)		Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD) (2010), CAMPO network lane miles (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Delay Hours per Lane Mile (2030)	6.0%	Number of hours of delay (forecast for 2030)		VHD (2030), CAMPO network lane miles (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Increase in Delay Hours per Lane Mile (2010-2030)	5.0%	Increase in hours of delay between 2010 and 2030		VHD (2010, 2030), CAMPO network lane miles (2010, 2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Accidents per Lane Mile (2008-2011)	10.0%	Any non-recurring event that causes a reduction of roadway capacity or an abnormal increase in demand		Incidents (2008-2011), CAMPO network lane miles	TxDOT
Travel Demand Index		100.0%	A measure of trips to the Downtown/Capitol/UT core, trips within the sub-corridor, and volume of trips passing through the sub-corridor. In other words: how much travel occurs in each sub-corridor?			
	Total O-D Trips to the Core per Square Mile (2010)	20.0%	Total person trips traveling to or from the core, per square mile (2010) (Origin-Destination (O-D))		Person Trips (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Total O-D Trips to the Core per Square Mile (2030)	20.0%	Total person trips traveling to or from the core, per square mile (projected for 2030)		Person Trips (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Total Intra-Sub-Corridor Trips per Square Mile (2010)	15.0%	Total person trips traveling within a sub-corridor, per square mile (2010)		Person Trips (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Total Intra-Sub-Corridor Trips per Square Mile (2030)	15.0%	Total person trips traveling within a sub-corridor, per square mile (projected for 2030)		Person Trips (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Regional Trips Passing through Sub-Corridor to Core (2010)	10.0%	Regional vehicle trips originating outside of a sub-corridor and passing through that sub-corridor with a destination in the core (2010)		Person Trips (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Regional Trips Passing through Sub-Corridor to Core (2030)	5.0%	Regional vehicle trips originating outside of a sub-corridor and passing through a sub-corridor with a destination in the core (projected for 2030)		Person Trips (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
	Regional Trips Beginning or Ending in Sub-Corridor (2010)	10.0%	Regional trips with either origin or destination in the sub-corridor (2010)		Person Trips (2010)	Travel Demand Model*
	Regional Trips Beginning or Ending in Sub-Corridor (2030)	5.0%	Regional trips with either origin or destination in the sub-corridor (projected for 2030)		Person Trips (2030)	Travel Demand Model*
Constraints & Growth			Central Corridor mobility is constrained by existing physical infrastructure and anticipated employment and population growth.			
Growth Index		100.0%	A measure of 2030 population and employment densities and growth in population and employment densities (2010-2030). In other words: how much growth in population and employment is anticipated in each sub-corridor?			
	Population Density Growth (2010-2030)	25.0%	Population density growth between 2010 and 2030		Population (2010, 2030), geographic area (per sub-corridor)	Alliance**
	Employment Density Growth (2010-2030)	25.0%	Employment density growth between 2010 and 2030		Employment (2010, 2030), geographic area (per sub-corridor)	Alliance**
	Population Density (2030)	25.0%	2030 population in square miles of populated parcels; projected population divided by a geographic area		Population (2030), geographic area (per sub-corridor)	Alliance**
	Employment Density (2030)	25.0%	2030 employment in square miles of populated parcels; projected employment divided by a geographic area		Population (2010), geographic area (per sub-corridor)	Alliance**

Problem	Criterion	Measure	Weight	Definition	Raw Data (inputs)	Data Source
	Constraints Index		100.0%	A qualitative measure of physical constraints that can indicate a magnitude of cost. In other words: are there significant physical factors, such as crossing Lady Bird Lake, that can significantly affect the cost of a project in each sub-corridor?		
		Physical Constraints	100.0%	Qualitative assessment of the magnitude of cost factors to "break" through the physical and/or environmental constraints to the Downtown/Capitol/UT core	Variety of environmental and infrastructure data	Base map
Core				The economic health of the region's core is at risk--access to the core is critical to the region's continued success.		
	Affordability Index		100.0%	An indication of where household affordability is most at risk and needs to be protected.		
		Existing Affordable Rental Units as a Percent of Households (2010)	25.0%	Rental housing in which there is an income limit for tenants and the development has received a government subsidy	Affordable housing, total households	City of Austin 2012 Affordable Rental Housing Inventory
		Percent of Households below Poverty Line (2010)	30.0%	Proportion of households with poverty-level income.	Poverty households, total households (per sub-corridor)	U.S. Census Bureau
		Percent Zero-car Households (2010)	25.0%	Proportion of households that do not own automobiles	Zero-car households, total households (per sub-corridor)	U.S. Census Bureau
		Percent Population Over 65 (2010)	20.0%	Proportion of population above 65 years of age	Persons over 65 years of age, total population (per sub-corridor)	U.S. Census Bureau
	Economic Development Index		100.0%	An estimate of potential economic growth due to new development (unrelated to a potential Central Corridor project), primarily based on available site plans, the emerging projects inventory, and other high-confidence development pipeline data. In other words: what is the economic growth potential in each sub-corridor (based on anticipated increase in development and sales and property tax revenue from new development)?		
		Future Project Value per Acre (2020)	33.0%	New project value between 2010 and 2020	High and low projection average, geographic area	City of Austin
		City of Austin Property Tax Annual Revenue per Acre (2020)	33.0%	New annual city property tax revenue by 2020 derived from new project value projection	High and low projection average, geographic area	City of Austin
		City of Austin Sales Tax Revenue per Acre (2020)	34.0%	New annual city sales tax revenue by 2020 derived from retail square footage of new projects from 2010 to 2020	High and low projection average, geographic area	City of Austin
Centers				The Central Corridor lacks multimodal connectivity between activity centers.		
	Centers Index		100.0%	A measure of amount, type, and size of Imagine Austin Centers and Imagine Austin Activity Corridors. In other words: are there lots of areas in this sub-corridor that are planned to be transit friendly in our City's comprehensive plan, <i>Imagine Austin</i> ?		
		Percent Area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Regional Centers	30.0%	Proportional area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> (IA) "Regional" centers within each sub-corridor	IA Regional Centers, sub-corridor area	City of Austin
		Percent Area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Town Centers	30.0%	Proportional area of IA "Town" centers within each sub-corridor	IA Town Centers, sub-corridor area	City of Austin
		Percent Area of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Neighborhood Centers	10.0%	Proportional area of IA "Neighborhood" centers within each sub-corridor	IA Neighborhood Centers, sub-corridor area	City of Austin
		Percent Length of <i>Imagine Austin</i> Corridors	30.0%	Proportional length of IA activity corridors within each sub-corridor (of total lane miles)	IA Activity Corridors, CAMPO network total lane miles	City of Austin
	Consistency Index		100.0%	A qualitative measure of consistency with local transit-supportive plans and policies, as well as regional plans. In other words: would putting transit in this corridor be in agreement with local plans and policies?		
		Consistency with Regional and Local Plans	100.0%	Number of neighborhood or corridor plans in each sub-corridor that mention light rail or urban rail, and whether each sub-corridor appears in CAMPO and/or Project Connect plans	Regional and local plans	City of Austin, CAMPO, Project Connect
System				Existing and planned regional transit investments converge on the Central Corridor without adequate system integration.		
	Future Ridership Potential		100.0%	A measure of transit orientation based on household, employment and retail employment densities (2030). In other words: based on the densities of people expected to live and work in each sub-corridor in 2030, how many people are estimated to use transit there in the future?		
		Transit Orientation Index (2030)	100.0%	An empirically derived index based on household, employment and retail employment densities (projected for 2030)	Number of households, employment, retail employment	Tri-Met Primary Transit Network Phase II Report, Nelson\Nygaard Consulting, 1997
	Current Ridership Potential		100.0%	A measure of transit orientation based on household, employment and retail employment densities (2010). In other words: based on the densities of people who currently live and work in each sub-corridor, how many people should be using transit now?		
		Transit Orientation Index (2010)	100.0%	An empirically derived index based on household, employment and retail employment densities (estimated for 2010)	Number of households, employment, retail employment	Tri-Met Primary Transit Network Phase II Report, Nelson\Nygaard Consulting, 1997

Problem	Criterion	Measure	Weight	Definition	Raw Data (inputs)	Data Source
	Connectivity Index		100.0%	A measure of existing and planned high-capacity transit investments, existing transit ridership, and special generator ridership. In other words: how easy would it be to connect to other transit in this sub-corridor--existing and planned?		
		Complementary HCT Connections (Number of Stops)	30.0%	Number of high-capacity transit (HCT) stops that are opportunities for connection or transfer between HCT lines	Project Connect Vision HCT rail stations and bus stops	Project Connect
		Competitive HCT Overlap (Number of Stops)	30.0%	Number of HCT stops that serve the same travel path as a potential intended/planned HCT investment	Project Connect Vision HCT rail stations and bus stops	Project Connect
		Bus Route Miles per Lane Mile	15.0%	Existing local bus and UT shuttle route coverage per lane mile of roadway network	Capital Metro bus routes, CAMPO network lane miles	Capital Metro
		Length of Bicycle Facilities per Roadway Mile	15.0%	Proportion of high level-of-service bicycle facilities (Bike Boulevards, Bike Lanes, and Multi-Use Paths) per network roadway mile	Bike facilities, CAMPO network roadway miles	City of Austin 2009 Bicycle Master Plan Update, CAMPO
		Percent Build-out of Sidewalks	10.0%	Percent of existing sidewalks as compared to full build-out per the 2006-2007 Sidewalk Master Plan	Sidewalk facilities	City of Austin
	Transit Demand Index		100.0%	An estimate of demand for transit based on existing population and employment densities, ridership, and transit-dependent populations. In other words: how many people are actually using transit now?		
		Population Density (2010)	20.0%	2010 population in square miles of populated parcels; existing population divided by a geographic area	Population (2010), geographic area (per sub-corridor)	Alliance**
		Employment Density (2010)	20.0%	2010 employment in square miles of populated parcels; existing population divided by a geographic area	Employment (2010), geographic area (per sub-corridor)	Alliance**
		Existing Transit Ridership (Average Daily Boardings per Square Mile)	23.0%	Existing average weekday transit boardings - Fixed Route, UT Shuttle, and MetroRail (using Spring 2013)	Bus boardings (Including UT), MetroRail boardings	Capital Metro
		Percent of Households below Poverty Line (2010)	13.0%	Proportion of households with poverty-level income	Poverty households, total households (per sub-corridor)	U.S. Census Bureau
		Percent Zero-Car Households (2010)	13.0%	Proportion of households with zero vehicle ownership	Zero-car households, total households (per sub-corridor)	U.S. Census Bureau
		Percent Population Over 65 (2010)	11.0%	Proportion of population above 65 years of age	Persons over 65 years of age, total population (per sub-corridor)	U.S. Census Bureau

*The Travel Demand Model used for the Project Connect: Central Corridor High-Capacity Transit Study is a revised CAMPO Travel Demand Model based on a licensed, non-conforming use of the CAMPO model. It is non-conforming because it is based on reallocation of the demographics and changes to the control totals in order to recognize future land use not included in the current CAMPO 2010 demographic forecast.

**Based on the CAMPO Travel Demand Model 2010 population and employment demographic estimates and projected forward. Projections use parcel-level reallocation of the demographic changes to the control totals in order to recognize future land use not included in the current CAMPO 2010 demographic forecast.