TRANSIT CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

The Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis: Watsonville/Pajaro to Santa Cruz (TCAA), will use a triple-bottom line, performance-based planning approach for evaluating future investment decisions. The Triple Bottom Line Approach is a consistent analysis tool applied by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission to identify and prioritize transportation policies, programs, and projects in the County. An alternatives analysis will be performed to examine the performance of various transit options for the rail right of way and how well they advance the goals of the project. The following describes the analysis framework designed to evaluate the performance benefits of the alternatives in this planning process. The TCAA will identify a locally preferred alternative that best meets the Economic, Environmental, and Social Equity needs of the County.

Triple Bottom Line Approach to Alternatives Analysis

This Analysis Framework will build from the Triple Bottom Line goals of Economy, Environment, and Social Equity. A two phase approach will be used as described:

1. Phase 1. Initial high-level screening using the screening criteria to winnow the universe of alternatives to a smaller set of alternatives for detailed analysis
2. Phase 2. More detailed and data-driven alternatives analysis using the performance measures, designed to differentiate performance benefits between the smaller set of alternatives and to support the identification of the locally preferred alternative.

The following tables present the proposed Economic, Environmental, Social Equity, and Other Goals that supports the Triple Bottom Line Approach, with descriptions of supporting Evaluation Metrics, Phase 1 Screening Criteria and Phase 2 Performance Measures.

SUPPORTS ECONOMY

Goals	Evaluation Metric	Description	Phase 1 Screening	Phase 2 Performance Measure
Is fiscally feasible	Capital cost	How does the capital cost compare to other projects?	High, Medium, Low	Capital Cost
	O&M costs	Is the project relatively more expensive to maintain and operate?	High, Medium, Low	O&M Costs Cost/Rider
	Funding	How much funding will likely be available?	High, Medium, Low	% funding likely from existing sources
Results in a well-integrated transportation system that supports economic vitality	Tax revenue	Does the project generate new tax revenues?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	Jobs	Will the project support job growth – near term through construction, longer term through O&M activity and economic development?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	Freight	What is the impact on freight rail operators and shippers?	High, Medium, Low	Freight Rail Volume
	Contiguous transportation corridor	What is the level of risk that the corridor will remain contiguous?	High, Medium, Low	Risk Level

SUPPORTS EQUITY

Goals	Evaluation Metric	Description	Phase 1 Screening	Phase 2 Performance Measure
Promote active Transportation	Active Transportation	Does the project include features that support active transportation and promotes health?	High, Medium, Low	-Bicycle capacity on transit/day -Effects on Rail Trail
Support safer transportation for all	Safety	Does the project support public safety?	High, Medium, Low	Collisions by mode
Provide accessible and equitable transportation system that is responsive to the needs of all users	Access	Does the project provide transportation access to disadvantaged populations?	High, Medium, Low	-Location relative to disadvantaged populations -Transit vehicle miles traveled
Offer reliable and efficient transportation choices that serve the most people	Travel Time	Does the project improve transportation travel time?	High, Medium, Low	-Transit travel time -Auto travel time -Impacts at grade crossings -Regional connectivity
	Reliability	Does the project improve transportation reliability?	High, Medium, Low	Travel time reliability

SUPPORTS ENVIRONMENT

Goal	Evaluation Metric	Description	Phase 1 Screening	Phase 2 Performance Measure
Promote a Healthier Environment	Transit Ridership	Does the project have enough capacity to substantially increase transit ridership?	High, Medium, Low	Transit ridership (local, regional, weekday, weekend)
	Emissions reduction	Does the project support the goal of reduced emissions?	High, Medium, Low	-Auto vehicle miles traveled -Greenhouse gas -Criteria pollutants
	Climate Adaptation	Will the project adapt to climate change?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	Biological, Visual, Noise and Vibration	Are there effects of the project on biological resources, visual, noise and vibration?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	Energy usage	Does the project support the goal of reduced energy usage?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low

OTHER GOALS

Goal	Evaluation Metric	Description	Phase 1 Screening	Phase 2 Performance Measures
Addresses project-specific concerns	Technical Feasibility	Is the project technically feasible?	Yes/No	
	Consistent with Other Planning Efforts	Is the project consistent with other local, state and federal planning efforts?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	Consistent with Regulatory Requirements	Is this project consistent with local, state, and federal regulatory requirements?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	Integration	Does the project integrate into the existing transportation infrastructure?	High, Medium, Low	High, Medium, Low
	ROW	How easily can the project be integrated into the existing ROW?	High, Medium, Low	% of corridor where additional ROW is required