APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS

- A-1.1-1.12 Oregon Transportation Plans and Policies
- A-1.13 Transportation Performance Measures Compendium
- A-1.14 Synthesis of Oregon Plans
- A-1.15 Oregon Policies lacking Adequate Performance Measures
- A-2 Performance Measure Evaluation Criteria

TEA-21 Planning Elements: Metropolitan and State Planning

A. Support the economic vitality of the US, states, and metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency

B. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

C. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight.

D. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life.

E. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight

F. Promote efficient system management and operations

G. Emphasize the preservation of the existing

transportation system.

2003 Oregon Benchmarks: Progress Board

68a. Travel delay per capita per year in the Portland area 68b. Travel delay per capita per year in urbanized areas

other than Portland.

70. %Oregonians commuting by means other than a SOV during peak hours

71. VMT per capita in metropolitan areas for local, noncommercial trips.

72a. Percent of state roads in fair or better condition

72b. Percent of county roads in fair or better condition

75. Percent of time air is healthy to breathe

Policy Themes <u>Overall Goal</u> : To promote the deve the automobile so that the air poll availed	Objectives elopment of safe, convenied ution, traffic and other liva	Policies The and economic transportation systems that are designed to reduce reliance on bility problems faced by urban areas in other parts of the country might be	Per capita VMT in Oregon metropolitan areas for local, non-commercial trips (0035 (4)(a-c)) (Oregon Benchmark)	Number of Parking Spaces per capita in MPO area (0045(5)(c))	Mode share (alternative modes & SOV) (0035 (5)(d))	Per capita vehicle hours travelled (VMH) (0035 ((5)(d))	Per capita vehicle trips (0035 (5)(d))	Measures of accessibility by alternative modes (0035(5)(d))	Percent non-SOV commuters during peak-hour (0035(5)(d); Oregon Benchmark)	Hours of travel delay per capita per year (Oregon Benchmark)	Percent of roads in fair or better condition (Oregon Benchmark)	Percent of time that the air is healthy to breathe for all Oregonians (Oregon Benchmark)
The transportation system shall avoid		Local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulationsto support transit in	v									
principal reliance on any one mode of		urban areas (0045(4))	X									
transportation and shall reduce principal reliance on the automobile.	In MPO areas, regional and	Local governments shall provide for safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation;direct routes for pedestrians and bicycles;avoidlevels of	х									
(660-012-0035(3)(e))	local TSPs shall be designed	trafficwhich might discourage pedestrian or bicycle travel.(0045(3))										
	for reducing automobile vehicle miles traveled per	Local governments shall allow transit-oriented developments; implement demand management program; implement parking plan ; requiredevelopments to provide	х	x								
	capita for the MPO area. (660-012-0035(4))	transit stop(0045(5)) Local governments shall identify improvements to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian trips,										
		to provide for more direct, convenient and safer bicycle or pedestrian travel within and between residential areas and neighborhood activity centers (0045(6))	X									
		Local governments shall establish standards for local streets and accessways that	v									
		minimize pavement width and total right-of-way(0045(7))	^									
	Alternative standards may used in metropolitan areas in	Strategies may include land use plan designations, densities and design standards (0035(2))	х		х	х	х	х	х			
	place of VMT reduction	Implement new transportation demand measures (0035(2))	Х		Х	Х	Х	Х	Х			
	standard in 0035(4)(660-	Significant expansion in transit service (0035(2))	Х		X	Х	Х	Х	Х	-		
	012-0035(5))	Review and manage major roadway improvements (0035(2))	Х		Х	Х	Х	Х	Х			

Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	Per capita VMT in Oregon metropolitan areas for local, non-commercial trips (0035 (4)(a-c)) (Oregon Benchmark)	Number of Parking Spaces per capita in MPO area (0045(5)(c))	Mode share (alternative modes & SOV) (0035 (5)(d))	Per capita vehicle hours travelled (VMH) (0035 (5)(d))	Per capita vehicle trips (0035 (5)(d))	Measures of accessibility by alternative modes (0035(5)(d))	Percent non-SOV commuters during peak-hour (0035(5)(d); Oregon Benchmark)	Hours of travel delay per capita per year (Oregon Benchmark)	Percent of roads in fair or better condition (Oregon Benchmark)	Percent of time that the air is healthy to breathe for all Oregonians (Oregon Benchmark)
The transportation system shall										<u> </u>		
support urban and rural development by providing types and levels of transportation facilities and services appropriate to serve the land uses identified in the acknowledged comprehensive plan (660-012- 0035(3)(a))	Access control measures consistent with limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities (0045(2)(a))											
The transportation system shall be												
consistent with state and federal												
standards for protection of air, land												
and water quality including the State												х
Implementation Plan under the												
Federal Clean Air Act and the State												
Water Quality Management Plan. (660-												
U12-0035(3)(b)) The transportation system shall												
minimize adverse economic, social												
environmental and energy												х
consequences (660-012-0035(3)(c))												
The transportation system shall												
minimize conflicts and facilitate												
connections between modes of												
transportation (660-012-0035(3)(d))												
The transportation system plan shall												
Identify transportation												
needsincluding needs of the												
The transportation system plan shall												
identify transportation	Local governments shall	Standards to protect future operation of roads, transitways and major transit corridors									х	
needsincluding needs for movement	protect transportation	(0045(2)(b))										
of goods and services to support	facilities, corridors and sites											
industrial and commercial development (0030(1)(c))	for their identified functions (0045(2))	Measures to protect public use airports (0045(2)(c))									х	

Oregon Transportation Plan

Policy Themes	Policies	Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	% of mileage of the NHS for which there has been no decrease in average travel speed from 1995 levels	%Oregonians commuting less than 30 mins t	% Oregonians who commute during peak hours by other than SOV (OR Benchmark)	% Oregonians living in communities that meet minimum levels of service for public transportation	%Oregonians in communities with daily scheduled intercity air, bus, van/shuttle or rail service	%urban arterials and local collectors in urban areas that have adequate pedestrian and bicycle facilities	Vehicle miles traveled per capita in metropolitan areas per year	Transportation related deaths and major injuries per 100,000 population	%infrastructure that is classified as "fair or better" or "sufficient" (pavement, bridges, publicly owned transportation vehicles and facilities, runways)	%involved citizens satisfied and informed	Amount of transportation funding as %OTP 20-yr plan needs.	%Oregonians living where air meets air quality stds (Benchmark)	Miles of scenic byways	%regional and local governments with acknowledged transportation system plans	Heavy and light vehicle payments to the Highway Fund as % of amount in Cost Responsibility Study
					accessibi	ility and m	obility		land use	safety	maintenance, preservation of infrastructure	Public Involvement	Finance	Air Quality	Aesthetic Values - Tourism	Planning	Finance
OTP Policy and System Elements																	
1. Characteristics of the System:	1A. Balance	X							Х								
to enhance Oregon's comparative	1B. Efficiency								Х								X
economic advantage and quality of life	1C. Accessibility	X	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х								
by providing a transportation system	1D. Environmental Responsibility													Х			
with these characteristics	1E. Connectivity Among Places	X															
	1F. Connectivity Among Modes and Carriers	X															
	1G. Safety									X							
	1H. Financial Stability												X				
2. Livability:	2A. Land Use								X								
Develop a multimodal transportation	2B. Urban Accessibility			X					X								
system that provides access to the	2C. Relationship of Interurban and Urban Mobility			_					X								
entire state, supports acknowedged	2D. Facilities for Pedestrians and Bicyclists								X								
and comprehensive land use plans, is	2E. Minimum Levels of Service	X		V													
sensitive to regional differences, and	2F. Rufal Mobility			X													
supports livability in urban and rural	2G. Regional Differences														V		-
areas.	2A. Palanced and Efficient Freight System														~		
3. Economic Development:	38. Linkages to Markets			-						-	V		-				
Promote the expansion and	3C Expand System Canacity										^						
through the officient mexament of	3D Intermodal Hubs	-		+									<u> </u>				<u> </u>
through the efficient movement of	3E Tourism														X		
4 Implementation:	4A Adequate Funding												X		~		
Implement the Transportation Plan by	4B. Efficient and Effective Improvements		1			1	1						X				t
creating a stable but flexible financing	4C. Cost/Benefit Relationships																Х
system, by using good mat practices	4D. Flexibility		1			1			1	1			Х				
by supporting transp. research and	4E. Achieve State Goals																
technology, by working cooperatively	4F. Equity																Х
teermology, by working cooperatively.	4G. Management Practices										Х						
	4H. Research and Technology Transfer																
	41. State Responsibilities															Х	
	4J. MPO and Other Regional Responsibilities															Х	
	4K. Local Government Responsibilities															Х	
	4L. Federal and Indian Tribal Govt. Relationships																
	4M. Private/Public Partnering																
	4N. Public Participation											Х					
	40. Public Information and Education						1					Х					

Oregon Highway Plan

Policy Themes Oregon Highway Plan	Policies	Minimum Standards or Levels of Service	% Special Transportation Areas where highway mobility (v/c) meets standard	Highway v/c ratio within a Special Transportation Area (for corridor planning)	% Freight System Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards During Peak Hours	# and % of Accidents Involving Trucks	% Customers Reporting Favorable Perception of Scenic Byways	OR Scenic Byway Committee Rating	% Bridges on Lifeline Route with Satisfactory Seismic Rating	# Bridges on Lifeline Routes with Satisfactory Rating	% OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Defined and Evaluated	% OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Access Meets Bridge Rating Standards	% Highway Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards	% miles on limited-access highways in urban areas that do not meet highway mobility ends	% state expenditures saved through cost-sharing	and other partnership arrangements Net Benefit of Off-System Improvements	# Route Miles With Potential for Interjurisdictional Transfer	# and % of Potential Total of Route Miles Transferred	Deaths Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes	% of Occupants Using Safety Restraints	# Deaths Due to Alcohol and Drug-Related Crashes	# of Accidents With fatality/serious injury	Annual % Reduction in Fatal and Injury Crashes	# of Newly Constructed At-Grade Crossings	# of At-Grade Crossings Eliminated or Replaced With Grade-Separated	% of identified obstacles to freight movements that are eliminated	% or # Intermodal Connectors Improved	% Oregonians Who Commute To and From Work During Peak Hours Not in SOV	Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita In Metro Areas	% Total Person Miles of Travel Made in HOV	% VMT Reduction Due to HOV Lanes	% Oregonians Who Commute To and From Work in SOV	Inventory # of Park-and -Ride Spaces within and adjacent to State Hwy ROM	Miles of State Hwys w/ Up-To-Date natural resource Maps relative to total miles needing	mapping # Culverts Retrofitted For Salmon	% Customers By Region Reporting Favorable or	Better Perception of Hwy System for aesthetics, safety and performance
1. System Definition: To maintain the safe and	1A. State Highway Classification System: to guide																																		Τ		
efficient movement of	priorities for system investment and management 1B. Land Use and Transportation: coordinate to	++						-						-		_			_								-			+	+-'	 		+	+	+	
contribute to the health	maintain mobility and safety, foster compact																																				
of Oregon's local,	devlopment, transp. alternatives, liveability,		×																																		
regional, and statewide	1C. State Highway Freight System: balance and	++	X	X				-								_		-	_								-			+	+-'	<u> </u>			+	+	
of its communities	maintain efficient movement on major truck freight	t																																			
	routes		_		X	Х									_			_	_										_	—	_	 			—		
	1D. Scenic Byways: preserve, enhance, consider aesthetics with safety and performance						x	x																													
	1E. Lifeline Routes:secure network to facilitate emergency services and rapid economic recovery																																				
	after disaster								х	x	х	х																-	_							\bot	
	1F. Highway Mobility Standards: maintain mobility												x	x																							
	1G. Major Improvements: improve system	T																																			
	efficiency and management before adding capacity.																																				
2. System Management:	2A. Partnerships: establish cooperative partnerships for more efficient and effective use of																																				
To develop, operate and	Imited resources 2B. Off-System Improvements: finance	++	-	+	+	+		\vdash			+		+	-	X				+	\vdash		\vdash		\vdash			+		+	+	+-	├──		+	+	+	
road system for	development, enhancement and maintenance of															v																					
tunctionality, integrity,	2C. Interjurisdictional Transfers: to increase	++			1	+		+			1		+			-			-	\vdash		+		+			+		+	+	+	<u> </u>		+	+	+-	
accessibility, system	efficiencies in operation and maintenance																х	х																			
efficiency and safety.	2D. Public Involvement: ensure public have input into proposed actions affecting state highway					1																									1						
	system 2E Intelligent Transportation Systems: to improve	++						-											_								_			+	—	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	_	—	
	system efficiency and safety in cost-effective					1																									1						
	manner 2F. Traffic Safety: improve safety using	++	-	+	-			┢			-	-	-			_								$\left \right $			+		+	+	+	──		+	+	+	
	engineering, education, enforcement and emergency medical services					×													x	x	×	x	x								1						
	2G. Rail and Highway Compatibility: reduce and	+						\vdash					1	1					^		~	Â	~				+		1	+	+	<u> </u>		+	+	+	
	prevent conflicts between railroad and highway					1																		X	v						1						
1	users	11		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1		1		1		X	X	1	1 1		1		1 '	1	1	1		1	

Oregon Highway Plan

Policy Themes Oregon Highway Plan,	Policies 1999	Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	% Special Transportation Areas where highway mobility (v/c) meets standard	Highway v/c ratio within a Special Transportation Area (for corridor planning)	% Freight System Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards During Peak Hours	# and % of Accidents Involving Trucks	% Customers keporting ravorable Perception of Scenic Byways OD Scenic Byway Committee Dation	% Bridges on Lifeline Route with Satisfactory Seismic Rating	# Bridges on Lifeline Routes with Satisfactory Rating	% OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Defined and Evaluated	% OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Access Meets Bridge Rating Standards	% Highway Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards	% miles on limited-access highways in urban areas that do not meet highway mobility stds	% state expenditures saved through cost-sharing and other partnership arrangements	Net Benefit of Off-System Improvements	# Route Miles With Potential for Interjurisdictional Transfer	# and % of Potential Total of Route Miles Transferred	Deaths Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes	∞ or occupants using salety restraints # Deaths Due to Alcohol and Drug-Related	urasnes # of Accidents With fatality/serious injury	Annual % Reduction in Fatal and Injury Crashes	# of Newly Constructed At-Grade Crossings	# of At-Grade Crossings Eliminated or Replaced With Grade-Separated	% of identified obstacles to freight movements that are eliminated	% or # Intermodal Connectors Improved	% Oregonians Who Commute To and From Work During Peak Hours Not in SOV	Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita In Metro Areas	% Total Person Miles of Travel Made in HOV	% Oregonians Who Commute To and From Work	in SOV Inventory # of Park-and -Ride Spaces within and	adjacent to State Hwy ROW	miles היו אומר דישיאי אישר אישר אישר אישריאיי אישר אישר	# Culverts Retrofitted For Salmon	% Customers By Region Reporting Favorable or Better Perception of Hwy System for aesthetics, safety and performance
3. Access	3A. Classification and Spacing Stds: manage																													Τ				
To ensure safe and	efficient operation of state hwys																																	
efficient highways,	3B. Medians: maange and place for efficiency and safety of hwys, influence and support land use			1					1					1																				
goods and services,	patterns																																	
enhance community	3C. Interchange Access Management Areas: plan																																	
planned development	and manage grade-separated interchange areas																																	
patterns, which	3D. Deviations: manage deviations from adopted access mot standards and policies																																	
recognizing the needs of motor vehicles transit	access mgr standards and policies																													1				
pedestrians and																																		
bicyclists.	3E. Appeals																																	
4. Travel Alternatives:	4A. Efficiency of Freight Movement: improve																																	
To optimize the overall efficiency and utility of	intermodal connections				х																			х	x									
the state highway	4B. Alternative Passenger Modes: support																																	
system through the use	alternative passenger transportation systems where travel demand land use, and other factors																																	
of alternative modes and travel demand strategies	indicate potential for successful alternative																																	
autor domand stratogios	passenger modes																									Х	Х	¥ .	_	_				
	4C. High-Occupancy Venicle (HOV) Facilities					_									-				-									<u> </u>	4	-	-			
	4D. Transportation Demand Management: invest in																																	
	move demand out of peak period, improve flow of																																	
	traffic; investigate toll and congestion-based																																	
	pricing; support rideshire programs.				Х							Х	Х																X					
C. Cauda and and	4E. Park-and-Ride Facilities 5A. Environmental Resources: design_construct			_															_	_		_							—	_	x			
5. Environmental and Scenic Resources:	operate and maintain state hwy system to maintain																																	
To protect and enhance	or improve the natural and built environment																																	
the natural and built	including air quality, fish passage and habitat,																																	
environment throughout	wildlife nabitatwater quality, noise levels,							1						1																				
the process of	hevegetation, wettand wildlife nabital mitigation							1													1											X	x	
constructing, operating,	Schung.							1	1					1	\top			++			1				\square				+	+			<u> </u>	
state highway system.	5B. Scenic Resources: use best mgt practices to protect and enhance scenic resources						x)	(x

Policy Themes Bicycle and Pedestrian C To provide safe, accessible and convenient bicycling and walking facilities and to support and encourage	Policies omponent, 1995 Provide bikeway and walkway systems that are integrated with other transportation systems	Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	× # Projects that Meet Criteria for Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians	★ Bikeway and Walkway Projects Meet Adopted Criteria	× Miles of Rural State Highways Suitable for Bicycling	 Miles of Urban State Highways that Accommodate Pedestrians and Bicyclists 	X # person trips by bicycling and walking	estimations and storage available at all employment and shopping centers, and shopping centers, and shopping centers, and recreation destinations
increased levels of bicycling and walking.	Create a safe, convenient and attractive bicycling and walking environment							х
	Develop education programs that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety							

Appendix	A-1.6
----------	-------

Policy Themes			Selected Measures for Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	Peak period Service Frequency for all routes of no less than 1/2 hr	er off-peak service frequency for all the routes of no less than 1 hr	the manufacturer's retirement and age	Provide dial a ride services to general public on weekdays	provide at least 1.7 annual hours ber capita of public transportation	provide at least one accessible vehicle for every 40 hrs of service	Provide one backup vehicle for every 3.5 vehicles	and set ability in the set of the	provide accessible ride to anyone	provide phone access to scheduling system at least 40 hrs weekly M-F	6 과 respond to service requests within 24 hrs	provide hourly service to major communities within Willamette Valley in conjunction with passenger rall service	provide daily round trip connections to market areas of 50,000 population more than 70 miles from Portland	ti province transmy round into service for areas with population of 2,500 publicated 20 miles or more from nearest city with larger population	Provide reliable service with on- time arrivals within 15 mins of published schedules	increase passenger speeds from 79 to 110 mph in high-volume ridership areas
GOAL 1: Purpose of Public Transportation	Policy 1A: Urban Access, Rural Access, Basic Mobility provide urban areas with access to jobs and add	Strategy 1A.1. Work with local governments to promote development and use of public transportation bicycle and pedestrian services						x											
mobility alternatives to meet daily medical,	capacity to regional transportation system; provide intermodal connections between urban and statewide	Strategy 1A.2. Work with local governments to identify and seek funding for high priority public transportation projects.																	
educational, business and leisure needs without dependence on SOV transportation.	transportation systems. Provide access to rural and frontier areas, connections to other parts of state and all parts of the community; be economical, convenient	Strategy 1A.3. Promote the development of interurban bus and rail passenger services to improve linkages among urban areas and achieve land use goals.																	
Enhance livability and economic opportunities for all Oregonians; lessen transporation impact on environment; provide condect in	to use. Provide basic level of mobility to meet essential travel needs, including ability to travel conveniently, economically, safely and securely to meet medical, employment, educational,	Strategy 1A.4. Encourage adequate and efficient public transportation for access to emploment, shopping and other commerce, medical care, housing and leisure activities, including access for the transportation disadvantaged.		x	x		x		x		x	x			x	x	x	x	
coordinated, integrated and efficient manner.	Policy 18: Environmental Protection The public transportation system should be designed, operated and maintained to lessen the impact on air and water quality, the natural environment and energy consumption.	Strategy 1B.1. Minimize transporation energy consumption through improved public transportation vehicle efficiencies, use of clean burning fuels, and increased use of fuel efficient modes including rail, transit, transportation demand management, bicycle and walking.				x													
		Strategy 1B.2. Carry out requirements of federal and state clean air standards consistent with the long-term air quality goals of the Oregon Benchmarks.				x													
	Policy 1C: Economic Prosperity Strengthen economic opportunities by providing travel options that increase access to jobs.			x			x				x	x			x	x	x	x	
	Policy 1D: Land Use — The public transportation system and local land use planning should be complementary and	Strategy 1D.1. Encourage public transportation projects that support compact or in-fill development or mixed use projects.																	
	coordinated. Be both responsive to and facilitate implementation of land use laws.	interurban bus and rail passenger services to improve linkages among urban areas and achieve land use goals.													x	x	x		x
	Policy 1E. Reduce Highway Demand The public transportation system, especially in urbanized areas and large cities, should function as an integral component of and reduce pressure on the overall transportation system.	Strategy 1E.1. Use demand management and transportation system management techniques that reduce peak period SOV travel and VMT, spread traffic volumes away from peak period and improve traffic flow. Including HOV lanes with express transit service, carpools, parking management, peak period pricing, ramp metering, traveler information systems, incident management, bicycling and walking modes, telecommuting, and flexible hour work scheduling.																	
GOAL 2: Components of the Public Transportation System statewide, well-maintained and managed, safe and	Policy 2A. Urban, Small City and Rural Public Transportation Systems In urbanized areas and large cities, serve as alternative to SOV to provide mobility, access employment, reduce congestion and maintain air quality. Use	Strategy 2A.1. Encourage adequate public transportation for access to employment, shopping and other commerce, medical care, housing and leisure activities, including access for the transportation disadvantaged.		x	x		x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	

Policy Themes			Selected Measures for Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	eak period Service Frequency for all routes of no less than 1/2 hr	Off-peak service frequency for all outes of no less than 1 hr	the manufacturer's retirement	Provide dial a ride services to general public on weekdays	provide at least 1.7 annual hours per capita of public transportation	provide at least one accessible service for every 40 hrs of service	Provide one backup vehicle for every 3.5 vehicles	sstablish ridematching and Jemand mgt. programs in communities of 5,000 where there are employers with 500 or thore workers	provide accessible ride to anyone equesting service	provide phone access to scheduling system at least 40 hrs weekly M-F	espond to service requests within 24 hrs	provide hourly service to major provide hourly service to major communities within Willamette Zalley in conjunction with assenger rail service	provide daily round trip connections to market areas of 50,000 population more than 70 miles from Portland	roover early round inp service for areas with population of 2,500 coated 20 miles or more from nearest city with larger population	Provide reliable service with on- time arrivals within 15 mins of oublished schedules	ncrease passenger speeds from 79 to 110 mph in high-volume idership areas
			0, 0,	large co ur	ommunit ban area	ies and as	comm	unities :	> 25,000	communities > 2,500	communities of 2,500 within 20 miles of urban core	ru	al and from	ntier es		interc	ity bus and rail		
pleasant to use. Be hierarchical with type of service based on population and density.	light rail, fixed-route bus and demand responsive tranit, rideshare matching and TDM services, as well as taxi, special needs transportation services and other	Strategy 2A.2. Implement the public transportation requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.					x		x			x							
Elements should work together to accommode unique needs of different regions of state according to their	alternatives. In small cities and towns, at a minimum serve the transportation disadvantaged with rideshare, volunteer programs, taxis or minibus sonices. Pideshare matching	Strategy 2A.3. Promote development of transit centers that are safe, near residential areas, and easily accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists.		x															
population, density, form and function. To ensure	and TDM services should be available in communities of 10,000, and in	Strategy 2A.4. Define appropriate minimum levels of service for public transportation.		x	х	х	x	x	х	x	x	х	х	x	x	x	x	х	х
coordination and efficiency, provide single unified public	communities of 5,000 where there are large employers with a base of at least 500 employees who are not covered by a	Strategy 2A.5. Encourage modal alternatives to the automobile.		x	x														
transporation system. Integrate systems for special needs and general public. TDM projects should not be	regional program. All places of 10,000 people or more should have demand response service.	Strategy 2A.6. Pursue revision of regulatory systems to stimulate the provision of transportation services by private companies in rural areas.																	
restricted to metropolitan areas.	Policy 2B. Intercity Bus and Rail Systems The intercity bus and rail system should operate to provide a well- coordinated unified network which enables Oregonians and visitors to	Strategy 2B.1. Promote the growth of intercity bus, rail passenger and commuter air services to link all areas of the state with national and international transportation facilities.													x	x	x	x	х
	access services and activities as identified in the minimum levels of service section. The passenger rail system should provide service through Oregon's main regional and interstate corridors. The passenger	Strategy 2B.2. Promote the development of interurban bus and rail passenger services to improve linkages among urban areas and achieve land use goals.													x	x	x	x	x
	bus element should complement rail service by augmenting train schedules, providing feeder service, and serving the	Strategy 2B.3. Implement the public transportation requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.							х			х							
	bulk of intercity travel needs to communities outside of rail corridors.	Strategy 2B.4. Consider acquiring and upgrading low-density rail lines where current owners are seeking to sell or abandon them.																	
		Strategy 2B.5. Preseve corridors for future public transportation development.																	
		Strategy 2B.6. Facilitate development and operation of transportation hubs with statewide, interstate and international functions. Encourage development of a system of passenger facilities throughout the state that expedites transfers between modes, routes and carriers.																x	x
GOAL 3: Management and Financing of the Public Transportation System - The public transportation system should be planned, operated, managed and financed cooperatively by public and private organizations representing statewide, regional and local interacte	Policy 3A. State Role development of a framework for decision making and coordination among transporation agencies, providing leadership over statewide issues and concerns, building consensus among different regions and transportation organizations, assisting with funding and providing technical assistance. The state, in partnership with others, should develop and maintain intercity bus and rail service contingent on the availability of adequate funding.	Stategy 3A.1. Broaden ODOT's research responsibility to include research for all modes.																	

Policy Themes			Selected Measures for Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	Peak period Service Frequency for all routes of no less than 1/2 hr	Off-peak service frequency for all routes of no less than 1 hr	the manufacturer's retirement age	Provide dial a ride services to general public on weekdays	provide at least 1.7 annual hours per capita of public transportation	provide at least one accessible vehicle for every 40 hrs of service	Provide one backup vehicle for every 3.5 vehicles	establish ridematching and demand mgt. programs in ecommunities of 5,000 where there are employers with 500 or there workers	provide accessible ride to anyone requesting service	provide phone access to scheduling system at least 40 hrs weekly M-F	respond to service requests within 24 hrs	provide hourly service to major communities within Willamette Valley in conjunction with passenger rail service	provide daily round trip connections to market areas of 50,000 population more than 70 miles from Portland	rrowne dany rownu rnp service for areas with population of 2,500 located 20 miles or more from nearest city with larger population	Provide reliable service with on- time arrivals within 15 mins of published schedules	increase passenger speeds from 79 to 110 mph in high-volume ridership areas
				large co ur	mmuniti ban area	ies and as	commu	unities >	25,000	communities > 2,500	2,500 within 20 miles of urban core	rur	al and fron communitie	itier is		interc	ity bus and rail		
ninerests.	Policy 3B. State Financing State financial support for public transportation should be reliable, flexible and stable, based on level of service factors, linked to state objectives and financial resources. The state, in partnership with others, should continue to seek development of new financing mechanisms that contribute to the overall financial adequacy of the public transportation sustom																		
	Policy 3C. Public Transportation Facilities and Equipment Management System (PTMS) ODOT in cooperation with affected local and regional governments, will develop end endetice DTME The DTME will	Strategy 3C.1 Develop, establish and implement management systems, as appropriate.																	
	and maintain a PTMS. The PTMS Will supply data and other information to help guide public transportation planning, decision making and financing.	Strategy 3C.2. Provide management training and technology sharing for public and private transportation providers and operators.																	
	Policy 3D. Projects serving Statewide Functions The state should participate with local governments and other organizations to develop the public transportation system. The level of ODOT's support should be greater for projects serving a state level or statewide public transportation function or need.	Strategy 3D.1. Form partnerships to develop and maintain intercity public transportation services that link small communities and rural areas to basic goods and services, appropriate to community size and the availability of resources.																	

Policy Themes	Policies	Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	Availability of modal choices	Ease of use	Relative Costs	Fragmenty to Service	Reliable on-time arrivals within 15 mins of	published schedules Increase passenger speeds up to 110-125 mph	on existing mainline trackes Coordinate intercity bus and local transit with	intercity rail for timely and convenient connections	Major intermodal rail/truck facilitiies should exist on rail mainlines with a service area of 150 miles	Branch rail lines allowing a min. speed of 25 mph
								n	inimum	level of	service	
Rail Component, 2001						į.						
OTP Goal 1, Policy 1B- Efficiency: Assure provision of an efficient transportation system; one that is (1) fast and economic for users, (2) users face prices that reflect the full costs of their transportation choices; and (3) transportation investment decisions maximize the full benefits of the system	Preserve corridors for future transportation development. Obtain ROWs for multimodal transportation system improvements						x	x				x
OTP Goal 1 - Policy 1C- Accessibility: To promote a transportation system that is reliable and accessible to all potential users, including the transportation disadvantaged	Cooperatively define acceptable levels of accessibility through standards for minimum levels of service and system design for passenger and freight for all modes.		х	x	x)	k x	x					
OTP Goal 1, Policy 1E - Connectivity among Places: To identify and develop a statewide transportation system of corridors and facilities that ensures appropriate access to all areas of the state, nation and the world	Develop and promote service in statewide transportation corridors by the most appropriate mode including intercity bus, truck, rail, passenger vehicle and bicycle									x		
OTP Goal 1, Policy 1G - Safety: To improve continually the safety of all facets of statewide transportation for system users including operators, passengers, pedestrians, receipients of goods and service, and property owners	Promote high safety and compliance standards for operation, construction and maintenance of the rail system											
OTP Goal 2, Policy 2E - Minimum Levels of Service: To define and assure minimum levels of service to connect all areas of the state	Define minimum levels of service for all modes and all potential users	х					х	х		x	х	х
OTP Goal 2, Policy 2F - Rural Mobility: To facilitate the movement of goods and services and to improve access in rural areas	Facilitate the movement of goods and services and improve access in rural areas Acquire and upgrade low-density rail lines where current owners are											
	seeking to seel or abandon them											
OTP Goal 3, Policy 3A - Balanced and Efficient Freight System: To promote a balanced freight transportation system that takes advantage of the inherent efficiencies of each mode	Identify level of support for freight transportation Provide more efficient railroad service at railroad crossings and yard areas through grade separations and alternative motor vehicle circulation routes											
OTP Goal 3, Policy 3B - Linkage to Markets: To assure effective transportation linkages for goods and passengers to attract a larger share of international and interstate trade to the state	Promote retention of rail service and ROWs										x	
OTP Goal 3 , Policy 3C - Expanding System Capacity : expand capacity of freight industry by facilitating increased cooperation among transportation providers.	Remove barriers to convenient and efficient shipping by rail by promoting track sharing, interlining, and shared use of terminals.											
OTP Goal 3, Policy 3D - Intermodal Hubs: To promote intermodal freight and passenger hubs to enhance competitiveness, improve rural access and promote efficient transportation	Support Portland's role as a major freight hub for goods transported by air, highway, rail, barge and ship, and recognize other areas as main connectors for multimodal system.										x	
OTP Goal 4, Policy 4G - Management Practices: To manage effectively existing transportation infrastructure and services before adding new facilities	Control access to state highways, minimizing rail crossings and controlling incompatible land use around airports											
Integrate rail freight considerations into the State's land use planning process	Recognize social, economic and environmental importance of rail freight				╡							1
	Enhance and protect existing rail freight service through land use zoning											
	Minimize conflicts between railroad operations and other urban activities											

Policy Themes	Objectives and Policies	Minimum Standards or Levels-of-Service	Availability of Airport with commercial service where population is greater than 50,000 and further than 70 miles from nearest other airport	Minimum of three round trips per day of 19 passengers between Portland/West Coast hubs and other areas of Oregon.	Availability of airport service to areas with population > 25000, central urban area > 15000, more than 50 miles from other commercial air and more than 100 miles from metro area
			mi	nimum service le	evel
Aviation Component, 2000		_			
Preservation	Preserve Oregon's system of airports and its current level of service				
Protection	Protect airports from incompatible land uses	_			
Safety					
Feenemie Development	Increase understanding of economic importance of air transportation				
Economic Development					
Intermedial Accessibility	Integrate airport system with surface transportation modes and allow for				
Internoual Accessibility	choice of modes for movement of neonle and goods				
Environment	Comply with state and federal environmental laws				
Modernization and Capacity	Support airport modernization				
wodernization and capacity	Support airport system to meet future demands				
Funding	Establish state funding program for system public-use airports				
, and ng	Solicit federal funding support				
Advocacy and technical assistance	Provide advocacy and technical assistance				
	Facilitate intergovernmental coordination, and cooperation				
	Providing planning framework for integrated airport system				
State-owned airport mgt	Continue operation of airports in state ownership				
OTP Goal 2, Policy 2E - Minimum Levels of Service: define					
and assure minimum levels of service to connect all areas of the			Х	х	x
state		_			
OTP Goal 2, Policy 2F - Rural Mobility: Facilitate the movement					
of goods and services and improve access in rural areas					
OTP Goal 3 Policy 3B - Linkages to Markets: assure effective					
transportation linkages for goods and passengers to attract a larger					
share of international and interstate trade to the state					
OTP Goal 3, Policy 3D - Intermodal Hubs: provide intermodal					
freight and passenger transportation hubs to enhance					
competitiveness, improve rural access and promote efficient					
transportation					
OTP Goal 3, Policy 3E - Tourism: support tourism and access to					
recreational destinations					

Policy Themes	REF: 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (incl. Appx. 1.2), August 10, 2000, Metro Regional Services. Fif: The Portland Region: How are we doing?. March 2003, Metro Regional Services.	Minimum motor vehicle levels of service	4. Average Weekday Person Trips	4. Average Weekday Work Trips 4. Average Weekday Non-Work Trips	12. Average Home-Based Work Trip	4-8. Vehicle Miles of Travel per capita and VMT/capita channe.	1. Total lane miles (freeway, arterial)	 Total Lane Miles Added Average Weekday Total Auto Person 	Trips 9. SOV percent of person trips	10. Non-SOV percent of person trips (shared ride, walk, bike, transit)	11. Average weekday motor vehicle average trip length (miles)	12. Auto occupancy	15. Average Motor Vehicle Speed	14: Average would venue haven mile 17. % of Freeway Miles Experiencing Connection	T. % of Arterial Street Miles Experiencing Congestion (System	Performance) 10 Total Motor Vehicle Hours of Delav	20. Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay on Freeway	20. Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay on Arterial Streets	21. Total Roadway Capacity Miles (freeway, arterial)	1, 2. Walk Trips and Walk Percent of Person Trips	1, 2. Bike Trips and Bike percent of Person trips	 Average Weekday Transit Trips Average weekday transit revenue 	hours 3. Transit % of Person trips	5. % of Households within 1/4-mile of Transit	6. % of Jobs within 1/4-mile of Transit	1. Average weekday Total Truck Trips (Freight System Performance)	2. Average weekday Total Truck Average Trip Length (miles)	4. Two hour PM truck hours	5, 6. I wo-hour Peak Period Truck venicle Hours of Delay	 Two-Hour Peak Period Average Truck Travel Time 	7. Lane miles added to freight network	9, 10. Congested Freight Network miles	Total transit time compared with auto travel time during off-peak hours (pg. 1- 38)	Total transit time on regional bus routes compared with total auto travel time (pg.	1-38) Avg Annual regional transportation capital	needs Annual capital spending	Air Quality: number of days exceeding the standard	Air quality: comparison of metropolitan regions: summer days ozone violation of Clean Air Act
				perf	orman	em ce					motor	vehi	cle sys	tem pe	rforman	e				an	ernativ in	/e moae cluding	transi	mance	'		Freig	ght sys	stem	perforr	nance							
Public Process			T T	Ť			T																		T													
Public Involvement																																						
Intergovernmental Coordination																																						
Connecting Land Use																																						
Urban Form										X										Х	Х	X	х х	Х	Х								X	Х				
Consistency Between Land-use and					х					х			x		x		(X	х		х	х	x	x x	х	x								X	X			1	1
Transportation Planning			\vdash				+					+		_	^	-							-									_				_		$ \longrightarrow $
Equal Access and Safety		_		_	_							_		_			_																	_				L
Barrier-Free Transportation		_					+							_	_							X		X	X													L
Interim Special Needs Transportation																						X		X	X													L
Interim Job Access and Reverse																																						
Commute Policy		_		_	_	_				_		_		_			_							_	_									_				L
Transportation Safety and Education				_	_							_		_			_								_									_				<u> </u>
Protecting the Environment				_	_							_		_	_	_	_	_							_							_						
Natural Environment		_		_	_							_		_	_	_	_	_							_							_						
Water Quality		-		_	-	_	+		_	_	-	-		_	-	_	_	-	-					_	-			_				-	-	_		-	V	× ×
Clean All		-		_	-	_	+		_	_	-	-		_	-	_	_	-	-					_	-			_				-	-	_		-	X	<u> </u>
Energy Efficiency		V		_	-	_	+		_	_	-	-		_	-	_	_	-	-					_	-			_				-	-	_		-		<u> </u>
Designing the Transportation System	n	X		_	V	v		<u></u>	_	_	-	-		_	-	_	_	-	V					V	v			_			× .	,	-	_		-		<u> </u>
Regional Street Design		-		_	X	X	X	X	_	V		-		_	-	_	_	-	X	V	V	V,	<u> </u>	X	X			_			X		V	V	_	-		<u> </u>
Local Street Design		-		_	~	×	V	V	_	~	-	-			V		/ V	V	-	×	×	× ·	<u> </u>	×	~			_			V V	,		×		-		<u> </u>
Regional Public Transportation System		_			-	<u> </u>	-	^		V	-	_									~	÷	v v	<u>~</u>	÷						<u> </u>		V	V				
Regional Public Transportation System		-		_	-	X			_	X	-	-		_	-	_	_	-	-			X .	x x	X	X			_				-	X	X		-		<u> </u>
and Education																						X	x x															
Bublic Transportation Safety and		-		_	-	_	+		_	_	-	-		_	-	_	_	-	-						-			_				-	-	_		-		<u> </u>
Environmental Impacts																																						
Environmental Impacts	100	_	++		v	-	++			1	-	+	\vdash	+	-		-	+	<u> </u>					1	+			\vdash			\vdash	-	V	Y		_		<u> </u>
Pogional Freight System	160	_	++		×		++			1	-	+	\vdash	+	-		-	+	<u> </u>					1	+	×	V	V	V	V	V V		~	X	_	_		<u> </u>
Regional Freight System Investments		_			-		-				-	_		_	-		_	-							-	~				~	<u> </u>							
Regional Ricycle System Connectivity		+	++	-+	1	+	++		_	1	-	+	\vdash	+	+	+	-	+	+			\vdash		1	+			\vdash			\vdash	+	1	+	_		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Regional Bicycle System Mode Share and		-		-		_			_					-		-	-	-							-			-						_				
Accessibility					1	х				Х									1	1	х			1	11								1				1	1
Regional Pedestrian System		1		-	1											-				X																		
Pedestrian Mode Share		1		-	1		+ +			X						-				X																		
Regional Pedestrian Access and Connecti	vitv	1		-	1		+ +			~						-				~																		
Managing the Transportation System	n –				1	1	11			1	1				1		1	1	1					1									1	1			1	
Transportation System Management			X	XX	X	X	X	X		1	X		X	ĸ	1	-	1	1	X					1	1					Х	X	C	1	1			1	
Regional Transportation Demand Manage	ement								X	X		Х		X	X)		X		Х	х	X	х х	X	X				Х	X			1	1			1	
Regional Parking Management			t t			1	11											1	1														1					
Peak Period Pricing	l l		t t			1	11			1	1				1			1	1					1									1					
Implementing the Transportation Sy	stem				1	1	11			1	1						1	1	1			1 1		1									1				1	
Transportation Funding					1	1	11			1	1						1	1	1			1 1		1									1		X	X		
2040 Growth Concept Implementation					1	1	11			1	1					1	1	1	1				1	1									1				1	
Transportation System Maintenance and	Preservation		11																																			
Transportation Safety																																						

Policy Themes	Objectives and Policies	REF: RVMPO 2001-2003 RTP 25 April 02	Per Capita Vehicle Trips	Per Capita Vehicle Miles of Travel	Number of Lane-Miles of New Roadway Construction	% of Population Within 1/4 Mile of Transit Route	% of Population Within Service Area for Lift Service	Transit Ridership-Frequency and Hours	Amount of Paratransit Services	% Collector and Arterials Accommodating Bicvelists	% Collectors and Arterials With Sidewalks	Intrusion into Existing Veighborhoods	Street System Connectivity	Access Restrictions Canital Improvement Costs for	existing infrastructure	Taviol Travol	Minimize Impact on Air Quality	Minimize Impact on Ag and Forest Land and Open Spaces	Minimize ROW Impacts	Accident Data by Mode	Accident Data by Trip Purpose	Fill Impact on User Safety	% of Lane-Miles on Collector and Arterials Not Congested	Per Capita Vehicle Hours	% of Trips by Purpose by Time	%total daily trips by transit and by bicycles+walking	%mixed use DUs in new development	%mixed use employment in new development	Alternative transportation funding
		Chap. 4	reo	duce re on au	liance to	provi	de acce of	ess to transp	alterr portat	native ion	modes	nb	hds/ nunitie	es	utiliza ex infrasti	tion of ist ructure	tra	sensiti nsport	ve ation	s tran	afety sport	of ation	effic trans	ciency portati	of ion				
		Chap. 18				alt. meas				alt.	meas															alt.	meas t requir	o TPR ement	VMT
Multi Modal		Chap.3																											
Plan for, develop, and	Design a transportation system for the future (2015 and																										1	1	x
maintain a multi-modal	beyond) that learns from and builds on the past.																										L'	\square	^
transportation system	Provide for smoother traffic flow and less congestion,												x	x									х				1	ĺ	1 1
that will address existing	particularly as it relates to commuter transportation												^	^									^				L'	\square	
and future needs for	Create an integrated and linked network of arterial and																											ĺ	1 1
transportation of people	collector streets that serves the mobility and multimodal travel																										1	ĺ	1
and goods in the region,	needs of the region and consider network-wide improvements																										1	ĺ	1 1
recognizing the	(i.e. beltways bypasses new interchanges transportation				Х			X		х	Х		X		X								Х				1	ĺ	1 1
importance of the street	demand management methods, etc.) to sustain acceptable																										1	ĺ	1 1
network to most surface	levels of service and anticipate future needs																										1	ĺ	1 1
travel modes.																											<u> </u>		
	Explore innovative alternative travel modes and fuel sources in																											ĺ	1
	order to reduce single occupany vehicles, vehicle miles		X	Х													x										1	ĺ	1 1
	traveled, and reliance on fossil fuels.															_											<u> </u> '	—	1
	Improve accessibility, availability, efficiency, and viability of																										1 '	ĺ	1
	public and private mass transportation systems for all users					х	х	X	X						x									х	х	х	1 '	ĺ	1
	(including disabled, elderly, and children)		_													_	_										<u> </u>	—	1
	Improve bicycle and pedestrian access and viability.		_						_	X	X					<u> </u>										X	 '	—	\vdash
	Provide for intermodal connections, present and future		-						_						<mark>/</mark>		-				_						<u> </u>	┝──	└──
	Ensure the safety of all current and future travel modes for all																			х	х	Х					1	ĺ	1
	Make the transportation system assessible to all users		-				v		V	v	v			_		-	+										'	├──	───
	Finance the transportation system accessible to all users.		+				^		^	~	^					-	+		<u> </u>	\vdash					\vdash		<u> </u> '	├──	
	transportation system are conserved through maintenance and																										1	1	
	preservation system are conserved through maintenance and				x										x b	<i>(</i>											1	ĺ	x
	replacement scheduling, all through utilization of sound fiscal				<u>^</u>										î l'	`											1	ĺ	
	nlanning																										1	ĺ	
	Ensure the provision of adequate intercity travel modes and																												
	facilities															X											1	ĺ	1
Community Character	and Environment	Chap.3				l												l	1										
Develop a Plan that	Provide transportation systems that minimize air, water, and																												
builds on the character of	noise pollution while maintaining/enhancing surrounding						1	1			1						х		Х						1		1	1	1
the community, is	environment																										1	ĺ	1 1
sensitive to the	Provide transportation systems that emphasize and encourage						1			[
environment, and	compact, interrelated, pedestrian and transit-friendly		Х	Х		Х							Х					Х							Х	Х	Х	Х	
enhances quality of life.	development and revitalization.																												
	Maintain the integrity of and minimize impacts to																											1	
	neighborhoods and local business communities while											Х		Х					Х								1	1	
	addressing regional transportation needs.																											\square	
	Preserve, where possible, agricultural and forest land.		1	1		1		1			1			X				Х	Х						1		1	1	1

Policy Themes	Objectives and Policies	Ind A 2001-2003 RTP 25 April 02 Cybr 4	ਕੂ Per Capita Vehicle Trips	Per Capita Vehicle Miles of Travel	option of Lane-Miles of New Roadway Construction	면 Mithin 1/4 Mile Route Route	9 20 Within Service 9 20 Area for Lift Service	Transit Ridership-Frequency and Hours	Amount of Paratransit Services	Accommodating Bicyclists	Sidewalks	Intrusion into Existing her Neighborhoods	 Street System Connectivity uo Access Restrictions 	드 Capital Improvement Costs for 고 프 existing infrastructure	fficient exist	ant of Maximize use of I-5 Inter-Urban Travel	Minimize Impact on Air Quality	Forest Land and Open Spaces	Minimize ROW Impacts	Light and the second se	b in the section of t	A of Lane-Miles on Collector	der Capita Vehicle Hours bistimistickeinen Traveled	a g % of Trips by Purpose by Time	%total daily trips by transit and by bicycles+walking	%mixed use DUs in new development	%mixed use employment in new development	Alternative transportation funding
		Chap. 18				alt. meas			а	alt. me	as														alt. r	neas tr requir	ט TPR ement	/MT
Public Process		Chap.3																										
Provide an open,	Provide a process to involve citizens in planning the																										1 I	1
objective, and credible	transportation systemensuring plans address public values																										, I	1
process for planning and	and have the flexibility to respond to changing needs																											
developing a	Educate and involve the public and policy makers in																										, I	1
transportation system	developing our transportation system - including changing how																										, I	1
that complies with state	we as a community travel.		_																									
and federal regulations	Develop policies and procedures that encourage cooperation																										, I	1
	and coordination of all jurisdictions within the study area to																										, I	1
	Coordinate the planning for existing and implementing the Plan		-					+ +			-				+		_	_	_								<u> </u>	
	with the planning of the transportation system																										, I	1
Financial	with the planning of the transportation system.	Chap.3	1								-															\neg		
Develop a plan that can	Develop innovative and sound funding policies to implement		1		1	1	1							1	1													
be funded and that	the Plan		1		1									1													1 I	х
reflects responsible	Ensure that the costs of planned improvements are																										1	
stewardship of public	commensurate with the benefits																										I I	

Lane Council of Governments TRANSPLAN

Policy Themes	REF: Transplan: The Eugene-Springfield Transportation System, Dec 2001	Parkings spaces per capita	Congested Miles of travel (% of total VMT)	agg Roadway Congestion Index	Network Vehicle Hours of Delay	91 % Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors	Internal VMT (no commercial § vehicles)	us Internal VMT/Capita	Average Trip Length (miles)	% Person Trips Under 1 Mile	Walk Mode Share	Bike Mode Share		Shared Ride (2 or more) Mode Share	Drive Alone Mode Share	% Non-Auto Trips	Person Trips per Auto Trip	Average Fuel Efficiency (VMT/Gal.)	CO Emissions (Weekday Tons)	Acres of zoned nodal development	% of dwelling units built in nodes	% of New "Total" Employment in Nodes	% of Roadway Miles with Sidewalks	Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial &Collector Miles	% of Roadways in Fair or Better	% of Hhds Within 1/4 Mile of a Transit Stop	E Transit Service Hours per Capita	% HHIds w/Access to 10-minute Transit Service	% Emp w/Access to 10-min Transit	Bikeway Miles	Priority Bikeway Miles	Arterial and Collector Miles	Arterial and Collector Miles (excluding fwys)
Goals				Me	asures		Leng	th Me	asur	es		wode	e Cho	Dice IVI	easu	les		ENVILO	nmentai	Li	ina u	se			112	insporta	ILION	system	weasu	res			
Integrate LU & Trans for livability, quality of life and																																	
reduced reliance on auto			S	S	S		S	S	S	S	S	S :	S	S	s	S	s			S	s	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Provide a Transportation System that is:																																Ш	
a) Balanced,						S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S			S	S	S	S	S		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
b) Accessible,						S			S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S			S	S	S	S	S		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
c) Efficient,			X	Х	Х	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	s	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
d) Safe,									S	S	S	S	s	S	S	S	S		S	S	S	S	S	S		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
e) Interconnected,						S	S	S	S	S	S	S :	s	S	s	s	S						S	S		S	s	S	S	S	S	S	S
f) Environmentally responsible,									S	S	S	S :	s	S	s	s	s	Х	Х	S	S	S	S	S		S	s	S	S	S	S	S	S
g) Supportive of responsible and sustainable																																1	
development						S			s	S	s	S :	s	S	s	s	s	S	S	S	s	S	S	S	S	S	s	S	S	s	s	S	S
h) Responsive to community needs and neighborhood																																1	
impacts						s			s	s	S	S :	s	S	s	s	s	S	S	S	s	S	S	s	S	S	s	S	S	S	s	S	s
i) Economically viable and financially stable.						S			S	S	S	S :	S	S	S	S	S	S	S						S							-	
Land Use																																	
Apply Nodal Development in selected areas									Х	Χ										Х	Х	Х				S		S	S				
Support for Nodal Development																				Х	Х	Х											
Provide for Transit-Supportive Land Use Patterns						S	S	S	S	S	S	S]	X	S	S	S	S									X		X	Х			-	
Require Multi-Modal Improvements in New											v	v		<	v	v	v						v	v		v	v	v	v				
Development							S	s	s	s	^	^ _	^	^	^	^	^						^	^		^	1	^	^	1^	^		
Implement of Nodal Development per LCDC																				v	v	V										1	
Requirement																				^	^	^										1	
TDM																																	
Expand Existing TDM Programs			S	S	S		S	S	S	S	Х	X	X	Х	Х	Х	Χ																
Increase Parking Management Strategies		X									S	S :	S	S	S	S	S																
Implement Congestion Management			X	Х	Х	Х																											
TSI System-Wide																																	
Protect and Manage Transportation Infrastructure			X	Х	X	X	X	Χ	S	S	S	S	s	S	S	S	S			S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Develop and Promote Intermodal Connectivity							S	S															S	S							S	LП	
Preserve Corridors																																LП	
Support Enhancement of Neighborhood Livability			S	S	S	S			S	S	S								S														
TransPlan Project List adopted for Metro Plan purposes																																	

Lane Council of Governments TRANSPLAN

Policy Themes	REF: Transplan: The Eugene-Springfield Transportation System, Dec 2001	Parkings spaces per capita	Congested Miles of travel (% of total VMT)	Roadway Congestion Index	Network Vehicle Hours of Delay (Daily)	% Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors	Internal VMT (no commercial vehicles)	Internal VMT/Capita	Average Trip Length (miles)	% Person Trips Under 1 Mile	Walk Mode Share	Bike Mode Share Transit Mode Share	Shared Ride (2 or more) Mode Share	Drive Alone Mode Share	% Non-Auto Trips	Person Trips per Auto Trip	Average Fuel Efficiency (VMT/Gal.)	CO Emissions (Weekday Tons)	Acres of zoned nodal development	% of dwelling units built in nodes	% of New "Total" Employment in Nodes	% of Roadway Miles with Sidewalks	Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial &Collector Miles	% of Roadways in Fair or Better Condition	% of Hhds Within 1/4 Mile of a Transit Stop	Transit Service Hours per Capita	% HHIds w/Access to 10-minute Transit Service	% Emp w/Access to 10-min Transit Service	Bikeway Miles	Priority Bikeway Miles Arterial and Collector Miles	Arterial and Collector Miles	(excluding fwys)
Goals			Т	raffic	Conges	tion	VM	T and	Trip			Mode	Choice	Meas	sures	;	Enviro	nmental	La	and L	lse			Tra	nsporta	tion	System	Measur	es			
TSI Roadway				ivie	asures	<u> </u>	Lengi	n ivie	asure	es	Т			Т	Т											1	-			—		
Address Mobility and Safety for all Modes			X	X	X	s	X	s	_						-															5		s
Use motor vehicle level of service stds to maintain					~	3	~	3			-																					
performance			s	s	s																											
Promote or Develop Coordinated Roadway Network							Х		S	S																						
Preserve Roadway safety and operations thru Access		1		1										1															11			
Mgmt			s	s	S																											
TSI Transit																																
Improve Transit Facilities to increase accessibility for all												x																				
includ. disadv.				_		S								_	S	S									S	S	S	S		_	_	
Establish Bus Rapid Transit				_		S				_		X	_		S	S									S	S	S	S			_	
Implement Transit/High-Occupancy Vehicle Priority				_		X						X		_	S	S									S	S	S	S			_	
Expand Park-and-Ride Facilities		5		_						_	_	^		_	5	S									5	5	5	S		_	_	
				_						_	_	_	_	_	_	_														_	_	
Construct/Improve Bikeway System & Support Facilities												x											Х						х	x		
Require Bikeways on Arterials and Collectors												X											Х									
Require Bikeway Connections to New Development												X											Х						Х	X		
Implement Priority Bikeways												X																				
TSI Pedestrian																																
Integrate pedestrian envir. with adj. landuse for										v	V																					
safety, comfort, convenience							S	s	s	^	^	s s	S	S																		
Provide Continuous and Direct Routes							S	S	s	s	X																					
Construct Sidewalks along Arterials and Collectors											X											Х										
TSI Goods Movement																																
Support Reasonable and Reliable travel times for			x	x	x																											
Freight Movement			^	^	^	S																										
TSI Other Modes																																
Support Public Investment in Eugene Airport and limit																																
Support Pail Polated Infrastructure Improvements				-							_	-	-		_	_															_	
Support Improvements to Passenger Pail & Inter-city				-						-	-			-	-															_	-	
Bus Facilities																																
Finance																																
Support Adequate Funding			S	S	S																					Х				X		X
Operate and maintain transp. Facilities to reduce need																								v								
for more expensive future repair																								^								
Prioritization of State and Federal Revenue for safety			X	X	x			ΙT	Т	T	T																		$ \top$			
and major capacity problems			^	^	^	S																								S	;	S
Require New Development to Pay for its Impact																																
Give short-term priority to investments that support								ΙĪ	ſ																					x]
mixed-use ped-friendly development											S	S S	S	S	S															· ·		

			Specified) Quantities	(pg. 6-2; Census))	; (pg. 6-3)	strian Projects	o work (pg. 7-5, Census)	J.7-1)	constructed (pg.7-5) -6)	og 8-6)	ning at Salem Railroad	arpools, buspools,	carpools and vanpools	g. 13-10)	3-12) nr 13-17 8-11)	aacity (pg. 13-17)	sportation (pg 14-3)		4-5) 14 EV	Field (pa 9-5)	g 8-10)	ed (pg 12-2)	n Update; Adopted May
			Vo Performance Measures sed to describe Trends	of workers walking to work	of trips made by pedestrians	inding \$\$ Requested for Pede	of workers riding a bicycle to	of trips made by bicycles (po	of Regional Bicycle System of bike lockers rented (pa 7-	<pre># gross tons shipped by rail (</pre>	passengers boarding/ detrair ation.(pg 11-7)	commuters participating in c npools (pg 13-8)	parking spaces reserved for (g 13-8)	parking spaces per capita (p	park and ride facilities (pg. 1 tromobile volume /ranarity /r	ak period transit volume/ cal	of workers using public tran:	of transit trips (pg 14-3)	fleet that is accessible (pg 1	paratranstrutus per year (pg aircraft operations at McNarv	train-pedestrian incidents (po	lbs of intermodal cargo loade	EF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interir 8, 2002.
OVERALL GOAL: "To prov	ide an adequate level of mobility on th	e regional transportation system while maintaining or	63	%	%	Ę	%	%	% %		# St	# ^	# C	#	5 #	ă	%	#	* *	ŧ #	#	#	28 RI
improving our overall qua	ality of life."	e regional transportation system while maintaining of																				İ	Chap 2
Pedestrian Element																							Chap 6
A continuous network of safe, convenient, and		Pedestrian issues shall be included in the prioritization of projects for allocation of all regional funds.				x																	
accessible pedestrian facilities to and within	To opeuro a viable system of podestrian	Support continuation of current (or equivalent) federal, state, and local funding sources to construct or improve pedestrian facilities in the				x																	
regional activity centers and major transit facilities.	facilities of regional significance	reation. Encourage the timely repair and maintenance of existing pedestrian facilities in regionally significant settions				x																	
		Ensure that all pedestrian facilities are accessible and constructed in accordance with ADA standards, including reasonable grades and adequate clearances																					
A substantial increase in the percentage of trips made by	Encourage local land use patterns, densities, and designs that decrease trip	Support an urban design that adequately considers pedestrian needs.		x	x																		
walking for all trip purposes in the region.	lengths and that support walking as a practical and attractive transportation	Encourage the delineation of safe pedestrian ways, emphasizing separation from vehicular areas using planting strips, crosswalks, and		x	x																		
	Encourage appropriate linkages with other	increased lighting where appropriate. Support the incorporation of multimodal connections and modal balance into regional transportation facilities.								1						T							
	alternative modes of transportation, including public transit and bicycling.					x																	
Bicycle Element	Establish a system of regional bisycle	The Disuse System Element of the Decisional Transportation Systems																			'	\vdash	Chap 7
within the Salem-Keizer urban area.	facilities within the Salem-Keizer urban area that provides an adequate level of service to meet regional bicycling mobility needs.	Plan shall designate the bicycle system of regional significance the Regional Bicycle System (RBS) within the Salem-Keizer urban area.																					
	Develop and maintain an accurate and up- to-date inventory of the RBS in order to respond to the changing needs of the bicycling public in the region.	The RBS facilities inventory shall be included in the Bicycle System Element of the RTSP and up-dated on a regular basis to maintain currency and accuracy.																					
A safe system of regional bicycle facilities within the Salem-Keizer urban area.	Design a system of regional bicycle facilities that enhances safety by	All bicycle facilities on the Regional Bicycle System shall be constructed in accordance with ODOT bicycle facility standards where applicable.																					
	improving compatibility among bicycles and other transportation modes.	Project designs that accommodate bicycle facilities within the roadway rights-of-way shall be implemented on the Regional Bicycle System where practicable.																					
	Drouble for well maintained Devianet	Jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt routine maintenance standards and practices that ensure smooth, clean, and safe conditions on the RBS facilities.			L																T		
	Bicycle System facilities that afford a safe environment and reduce potential hazards	Local jurisdictional support of volunteer community services and programs that assist in the provision of adequate maintenance service on RRS facilities																					

		-																					
Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	unding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5)	% of bike lockers rented (pg 7-6) # gross tons shipped by rail (pg 8-6)	# passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad station.(pg 11-7)	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, anpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12) intromobile volume /renarity (no. 13.17, 8.11)	beak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	¥ of transit trips (pg 14-3)	% fleet that is accessible (pg 14-5) # paratransit trips per year (pg 14-5)	≄aircraft operations at McNary Field (pg 9-5)	# train-pedestrian incidents (pg 8-10)	≠ Ibs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)	REF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim Update: Adopted May 28, 2002.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Bicycle safety devices such as bicycle proof drain grates, rubberized or	0 3	0	0	LL_	0	<u>~</u>	<u>~</u>	o`	+F (X)	* >	#)	#	7 7	3 0	0`	** (0 *	- ++	* '	77	LL N
		concrete pads at railroad crossings, and appropriate signage shall be																					
		utilized on RBS facilities wherever practicable.		_						_						_				_	┢──┢		
		and education programs aimed at all are encouraged in order to																					
	bicycling and motoring practices	improve bicycle skills, increase the observance of traffic laws, and en-																					
	procedures, and skills.	hance the overall safety of the traveling public in the region.		_						_						_				_	┢──┢		
		formulate ways to improve bicycle safety)																				
A continuous and direct	Establish a continuous and direct system	Designate a continuous and direct system of regional bicycle facilities																					
system of regional bicycle	of regional bicycle facilities that	in the Bicycle System Element of the SKATS Regional Transportation					х	х	х														
facilities in the Salem-Keizer	adequately responds to the regional	Systems Plan.														_			_	-	┝─┼╴		
responds to the	transportation needs of bicyclists in the	continuous network of bicycle facilities on the Regional Bicycle System																					
transportation needs and									_			-				_					\vdash		
desires of bicyclists.		Designate a continuous and direct system of regional bicycle facilities that provides access to regional activity centers and other major					x	x	x														
	Establish a Regional Bicycle System that	destinations.					~	~	~														
	and other major destinations.	Identify necessary facility improvements on the Regional Bicycle						~															
	-	System to ensure adequate bicycle access to regional activity centers and other major destinations					x	x															
A constructed system of		Affected jurisdictions shall include bicycle facilities on all newly																					
regional bicycle facilities	Construct the bicycle facilities necessary to	constructed regional arterials.							_			-				_					\vdash		
within the Salem-Keizer	Bicycle System by the year 2025	Affected jurisdictions shall include bicycle facilities as part of major																					
urban area.		constraints can be demonstrated.																					
	Adequately fund the construction of the	Support continuation of current (or equivalent) federal, state, and loca	I																				
	bicycle infrastructure and supporting	funding mechanisms to implement regional and local bicycle facilities and amenities within the Salem-Keizer urban area																					
	facilities necessary to complete the	SKATS and local jurisdictions shall cooperatively seek additional																					
	year 2025.	revenue sources as necessary to ensure timely completion of the																					
	Ensure multimodal equity by incorporating	bicycle facilities that comprise the RBS. Needed projects on the RBS shall be fully integrated into the								-						-			_		┢──┼╴		
	bicycle facilities into the planning, design,	evaluation and selection process associated with the development of																					
	construction, and maintenance activities	the Region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).																					
	associated with roadways identified as																						
A coordinated system of		The Regional Bicycle System shall provide bicycle access to public		1												1			+	1	\square		
regional bicycle facilities in		transit transfer node(s), park-and-ride sites, and other major					х	x	x														
the SKATS area.		transportation centers such as regional airport terminals and	1																				
	Integrate the Regional Bicycle System	Regional bicycle planning efforts shall be coordinated with other	1															\neg		1	\vdash	\dashv	
		transportation service providers to assure the opportunity for	1																				
		intermodal connectivity. Support the continuation of the "Bikes On Ruses" Program for all public	_	+		-								\vdash	_	_		-+		+	\vdash	+	
		transit routos	-																				

-											-						-						
Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	unding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5)	% of bike lockers rented (pg 7-6) # gross tons shipped by rail (pg 8-6)	<pre># passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad station.(pg 11-7)</pre>	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, anpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12) intomobile volume /remarkt, (no. 12-17, 8-11)	beak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	⊭ of transit trips (pg 14-3)	% fleet that is accessible (pg 14-5)	≠ parauransu unps per year (pg 14-5) ¥aircraft operations at McNarv Field (pg 9-5)	¥ train-pedestrian incidents (pg 8-10)	# lbs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)	REF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim Update; Adopted May 88, 2002.
Toncy memes	Objectives		63	8	8	Ē	8	~	8	8	# S	# >	# U	#	* 0	5 0	8	#	~ :	* *	#	#	2 2
	Ensure a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative planning process that provides for the efficient and timely implementation of the Regional Bicycle System Plan.	Coordinate bicycle system planning and development efforts in the Salem-Keizer urban area with federal, state, and local agencies, as well as other public and private transportation providers. Prepare, adopt, and update a Bicycle System Element of the Regional Transportation Systems Plan that is consistent with federal and state guidelines and developed through a continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process, including thorough public review. Ensure that the portions of the Local Transportation Systems Plans dealing with bicycling are consistent with the Regional Bicycle System Plan through recurring Plan review. Coordinate roadway improvement projects in the region with																					
	Provide for an open and ongoing public involvement process that ensures full participation and input into the planning process associated with the development of the Bicycle System Element of the Regional Transportation Systems Plan.	Establish a region wide public participation process that ensures to sharing opportunities (i.e., resurfacing, widening, upgrading, etc.). Establish a region wide public participation process that ensures timely public notice, adequate information and appropriate opportunities for public input regarding all improvement projects affecting the Regional Bicycle System.	r																				
	Provide a network of supporting facilities and amenities designed to enhance the Regional Bicycle System and encourage	Encourage the development and implementation of a system of supportive bicycle facilities and amenities (i.e., bicycle parking, storage, showers, system maps, etc.) within the Salem-Keizer urban area. Encourage the development of adequate internal bicycle circulation								x													
	the use of bicycling as a practical transportation mode.	systems at major regional activity centers.		_					_	_												\vdash	
		throughout the SKATS area.																					
Aviation System Element																							Chap 9
A regional aviation system that provides an adequate level of facilities and	Encourage the provision of appropriate regional aviation system operations and facilities adequate to serve the demand	Support appropriate, cost-effective improvements to the region's aviation and related facilities based on sound economic analysis. Support efforts to renew commercial airline service for the SKATS area	1																	x		\square	
services to meet the needs A regional aviation facility that can accommodate commercial operations as passenger demand increases	associated with the residents and Retain the capability to support commercial airline operations as potential ridership increases	as demand and financial considerations warrant Support maintenance efforts that will preserve the region's general aviation facility in a manner that makes resumption of commercial aviation activities viable																					
A regional aviation facility with adequate multimodal access	Ensure adequate multimodal access to the regional aviation facility	Support development of an appropriate multimodal transportation infrastructure that provides adequate access to the regional aviation facility.																					
Maritime System Elemen	New -	A1												\vdash		_	<u> </u>	\vdash	-+		-	\vdash	Chap 10
Rail System Element	Inone	Inone		+										$\left \right $	_	+	+		_			┢──┼	Chap 11

-																			_				
Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	Funding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5)	% of Dire fockets reflect (pg 7-o) # gross tons shipped by rail (pg 8-6)	# passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad Station.(pg 11-7)	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12) automobile volume /capacity (pg 13-17, 8-11)	peak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	# of transit trips (pg 14-3) % flaat that is accessible (no 14.5)	// itect triat to accessible (pg 14-5) # paratransit trips per year (pg 14-5)	#aircraft operations at McNary Field (pg 9-5)	# train-pedestrian incidents (pg 8-10) # lbs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)		REF: SKATS, KTSP 2002 INTErm Update, Adopted May 28, 2002.
A regional rail system that	Support the provision of rail service within	Encourage continued and improved rail service to and from the SKATS			-	_			-														
provides an adequate level	the SKATS area that adequately addresses	area.								x	×												
of service to passenger and	service demands of both passengers and	Promote the enhancement of intercity passenger rail service to provide	è								x												
freight rail consumers within	freight Promote the development and	an option to workers commuting along the I-5 corridor								_						_							
the SKATS area.	maintenance of an adequate infrastructure	Encourage the continued improvement of the region's existing rail																					
	and facility system to support continued	Encourage the development and implementation of adequate																					
	and improved rail service in the SKATS	infrastructure and facilities to address the needs of both passenger																					
	area.	and freight movements in the region.																					
A safe system of regional	Support efforts to maintain and improve	Encourage improvements to the regional transportation system that																					
rail transport serving the	regional rail transportation safety by	enhance rail safety as well as safety between railroads and other																					
SKATS died	safety standards	transportation modes.																					
Efficient use of existing	Promote the maximization of efficient use	Encourage actions that maximize efficient use of existing rail																					
regional rail transporation	of existing regional rail transportation	infrastructure and improved service levels to address SKATS area rail																					
infrastructure.	infrastructure	transportation needs.	_																				
Staged intrastructure	Support provisions of rail-related	Encourage infrastructure upgrades needed for the successful implementation of the High Speed Pail Project																					
High Speed Rail Corridor	infrastructure upgrades as part of the High	implementation of the high speed Kall Project.																					
Project	Speed Rail Corridor Project																						
Preserve rail rights-of-way	Reserve all regional rail corridor rights-of-	Designate all regional rail corridor rights-of-way as "Transportation																					
for transportation-related	way for transporation-related uses where	Corridor Preserves" pending results of alignment specific suitability																					
uses where viable	viable	studies.	-							_		-				-			_				
regional passenger rail	Support improved multimodal access to	terminal.																					
terminal	regional passenger rail terminal.	Develop and promote intercity and intracity public transportation																					
		system connections to the regional passenger rail terminal.								_						_							
A program of transportation	ficiency Element	The Degland Transportation Systems Efficiency Management Element							_	_									_			C	hap 13
system efficiency		(RTSEME) of the Regional Transportation Systems Plan (RTSP) shall																					
management strategies and		establish a program of transportation systems efficiency management																					
actions implemented on the	Establish a program of transportation	strategies and actions to be implemented incrementally on the regiona	1																				
regional transportation	systems efficiency management strategies	transportation system over the 20-year planning horizon.																					
system in the Salem-Keizer	and actions to be implemented on the	The strategies and actions contained in the PTSEME shall be evaluated								-						-			_		—	+	
urban area.	regional transportation system.	and updated on a recurring basis in order to respond to the changing	•																				
		mobility needs of residents and businesses in the Salem-Keizer area.																					
	Support Transportation Systems Efficiency			_			ļ								_						\rightarrow	4	
	Management (TSEM) strategies and	Support the continued allocation of regional funds to successfully	1	1							1	х	х								1		
	actions on the regional transportation	Cooperatively seek additional revenue sources to ensure the		1																+		++	
	system that provide the greatest level of	development and implementation of TSEM strategies and actions that	1	1							1										1		
	mobility for residents and businesses in	provide cost-effective transportation alternatives to the single-	1	1							1										1		
1	the Salem-Keizer area.	occupant vehicle and peak period travel demand.	1	1	1		1	1 1			1						1			1 1	1		

			leasures Specified) Quantities ends	to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	destrians (pg. 6-3)	for Pedestrian Projects	bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	cycles (pg.7-1)	System constructed (pg.7-5)	ed (pg /-6) I by rail (pg 8-6)	g/ detraining at Salem Railroad	ating in carpools, buspools,	rved for carpools and vanpools	capita (pg. 13-10)	es (pg. 13-12)	apacity (pg 13-17, 8-11)	ublic transportation (pg. 13-17)	4-3)	ble (pg 14-5)	year (pg 14-5)	t McNary Field (pg 9-5)	dents (pg 8-1u) rgo loaded (pg 12-2)	72 Interim Lindate: Adopted Mav	
Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance N used to describe Tr	% of workers walking	% of trips made by pe	Funding \$\$ Requestec	% of workers riding a	% of trips made by bi	% of Regional Bicycle	% of bike lockers rent # gross tons shipped	# passengers boardin Station (nd 11-7)	# commuters participa vanpools (pg 13-8)	<pre># parking spaces rese (pg 13-8)</pre>	# parking spaces per	# park and ride faciliti	automobile volume /c	% of workers using pr	 , # of transit trips (pg 1 	% fleet that is accessi	# paratransit trips per	#aircraft operations a	# train-pedestrian incomplete training	RFF SKATS, RTSP 20	28, 2002.
A regional transportation system that maximizes the safe and efficient utilization of existing and planned transportation capacity and		Promote the implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and programs in the Salem-Keizer area to reduce both reliance on the single-occupant vehicle as well as peak period vehicle demand on the regional transportation system.																						
infrastructure	Maximize the efficient use of existing and planned regional transportation capacity and infrastructure	Promote the implementation of Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Congestion Management System (CMS) strategies and actions to improve the operating efficiency of the existing regional transportation infrastructure in the Salem-Keizer area.														x	‹							
		Implement TSEM strategies and actions in lieu of major widening projects on roadways identified as part of the regional transportation system unless significant constraints or insufficient improvements in service levels can be demonstrated. Support the efforts of implementing jurisdictions to adequately																						
A balanced regional transportation system that	Dravida a ragional transportation sustam	maintain and maximize the useful service life of the existing regional transportation infrastructure Promote the design and development of a regional transportation system infrastructure that incorporates vehicle, transit, walking,													x	+		_				+	╢	
affords the residents and businesses in the Salem- Keizer area a range of viable modal options for the	that employs a variety of viable modes to facilitate options in personal and commercial travel choices.	bicycling, and rideshare modes Promote the development of land use patterns and architectural designs that facilitate multimodal travel options. Identify transportation system improvements that effectively																<u> </u>				+	╫	
movement of people and A public well informed about the availability, cost, and tradeoffs of transportation and travel behavior choices in the Salem-Keizer area.	Encourage public education and information programs and activities that increase public awareness of the available transportation and travel choice options in the Salem-Keizer area.	accommodate and enhance the use of a variety of modal options. Support the development and provision of public educational opportunities and informational materials in order to increase public awareness of transportation efficiency and travel choice options available in the SKATS region																						
For the Regional Parking Supply		Where practicable, existing on-street parking will be removed from the regional system in preference to acquiring new rights-of-way for the addition of travel lanes. Efforts shall be made to mitigate the impacts of such removals in those areas where abutting properties have no ability to provide their own supply of adequate offstreet parking or where on-street parking is needed to support an existing business district												×										
		An adequate supply of carpool and vanpool parking spaces should be provided in the region to accommodate the demand for such parking. The provision of spaces shall have preference over those intended for deneral purpose uses.											x											
		Jurisdictions within the region should provide for the restriction of overflow parking impacts in residential areas through the use of residential parking permit programs and other means as appropriate.																						

Salem-Keizer Metropolitan Planning Organization (Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments)

Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	Funding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5)	% of bike lockers rented (pg 7-6) # aross tons shipped by rail (ng 8-6)	# passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad Station.(pg 11-7)	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12)	automobile volume /capacity (pg 13-11, 8-11) beak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	# of transit trips (pg 14-3)	% fleet that is accessible (pg 14-5)	# paratransit trips per year (pg 14-5)	#aircraft operations at MCNary Field (pg 9-5) # train prodoctrian incidents (no 0-10)	# train procession including (pg 0-10) # lbs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)	REF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim Update; Adopted May	28, 2002.
		New development in the region should provide sufficient access to an appropriate supply of off-street parking subject to the standards established by the local jurisdictions within the region. Those jurisdictions are encouraged to developparking maximums that clearly reflect an intent to effectively manage the overall parking supply.																						
		Major regional activity centers should be effectively accessible by transit, bicycles, and pedestrians; should provide priority spaces for carpools when practicable; and should meet their parking requirements through a combination of shared, leased and new off- street parking opportunities, as well as automobile demand reduction stratenies.																						
Perional Public Transpor	tation Element	Local jurisdictions within the region are encouraged to allow owners and lessees of nonresidential properties to satisfy off-street parking requirements by implementing plans that provide for and promote the increased use of modes of travel other than the automobile by both employees and customers.																					Chan	2.14
Develop and maintain a public transit system that is conveniently accessible to all Salem-Keizer urban area residents	Provide transit service throughout the urbanized portions of the Salem-Keizer area.	Ensure, as practicable, that all residents and major employers in the Salem-Keizer area have transit service within 1/4 mile walking distance.																						/ 14
Develop and maintain a public transportation system that provides convenient access for a variety of trip destinations and purposes	Provide a diverse system of transit routes that ensures convenient accessibility to destinations throughout the urban area with a minimum of transfers	Support the development and implementation of a public transit route system and support facilities that effectively combine appropriate elements of radial, feeder/trunk and circumferential service.																						
	Provide a convenient system of transfer opportunities witin the urban area to facilitate timely and convenient access to a wide variety of destinations																							
Develop and maintain a public transportation system that serves travel needs over a variety of times of day and days of the week	Provide transit service for area residents that operates over an appropriately diverse time frame.	Support prudent, incremental extensions in the hours and days of operation of the transit system.																						
Facilitate increasing levels of ridership on the public transit system	Increase overall daily ridership of the transit system	Support effective marketing and responsiveness to consumer needs of transit services in the region. Include transit operations in the design of street infrastructure and land use developments wherever practicable.																					\parallel	

Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	Funding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5) % of hite horkers rented (nor 7.6)	# gross tons shipped by rail (pg 8-6)	# passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad Station.(pg 11-7)	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12)	peak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	# of transit trips (pg 14-3)	% fleet that is accessible (pg 14-5)	# paratransit trips per year (pg 14-5) #sirrent popertions at MeNow Field (pg 0.5)	# train-pedestrian incidents (pg 8-10)	# lbs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)	REF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim Update; Adopted May 28, 2002.
	Increase the percentage of journey to work trips made by transit in the Salem- Keizer area.	Support the implementation of region wide transportation system efficiency management strategies and activities (such as employer subsidized bus pass programs) that encourage the diversion of commute trips away from the single occupant vehicle onto the public transportation system.															x	x					
Develop and maintain a system of public transit routes that provides efficient, competitive service in the regional	Provide an efficient and convenient system of public transit services in the regional travel corridors	Encourage preferential transit treatments, transit-related facility improvements, and appropriate transit-supportive land uses and <u>development along the regional transit corridors</u> . Support incremental increases in the frequency and capacity of service in the regional transit corridors as warranted by demand.																					
Develop and maintain affordable transit service throughout the urban area	Develop and implement funding strategies that provide adequate, long-term, stable revenue source(s) for the public transportation system	Support regional efforts to identify and implement transit funding strategies and programs that will provide adequate, long-term, stable revenue source(s) for the public transportation system.																					
	To maintain a system of transit fares that balance the need for passenger revenues with the goal of maximizing ridership	Support ongoing review and analysis of farebox revenues, noership levels, and service costs to optimize the transit fare structure.															x	x					
ADA/Elderly-Related Services: Convenient, economical and safe transportation services for the disabled and elderly residents of the Salem- Keizer area	Consistent with the adopted Salem Area Transit District (SATD) Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Transit Plan Update, provide transportation services which adequately meet the needs of the elderly and disabled populations in the region.	Support the continued development and implementation of accessible fixed-route and appropriate complementary paratransit services which are identified in the adopted SATD ADA Transit Plan as updated.																	x	×			
Intercity Bus and Rail Service: An integrated transportation system that provides convenient service in the interregional and interstate corridors.		Support public and private efforts to develop and implement appropriate expansions of bus and rail service, including commuter rail, between the Salem-Keizer area and locations outside the region.																					
An adequate system of regional highway facilities to serve the vehicular movements of people and goods into, out of, across, and through the Salem-	Establish a system of regional highway facilities within the Salem-Keizer urban area the Regional Road System that adequately serves the "regional" vehicular movements of people and goods.	Identify, designate, and adopt as part of the RTSP the facilities that comprise the highway system of regional significance for the Salem- Keizer Urban area.																					Chap 15
Keizer urban area	Establish and maintain an accurate, up-to- date inventory of the characteristics of the Regional Road System	The Regional Road System facility inventory shall be updated on an ongoing basis to maintain currency and accuracy.																					

			Specified) Quantities	og. 6-2; Census))	(pg. 6-3)	trian Projects	work (pg. 7-5, Census)	7-1)	Instructed (pg.7-5)	g 8-6)	ng at Salem Railroad	rpools, buspools,	arpools and vanpools	. 13-10)	-12)	g 13-17, 0-11) acity (pg. 13-17)	oortation (pg 14-3)		-5) 14-5)	ield (pg 9-5)	8-10)	i (pg 12-2)	Update; Adopted May
Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	No Performance Measures . ised to describe Trends	6 of workers walking to work (p	6 of trips made by pedestrians	unding \$\$ Requested for Pedes	6 of workers riding a bicycle to	6 of trips made by bicycles (pg.	6 of Regional Bicycle System co	a of birde rockers refited (pg / -c # gross tons shipped by rail (p	⁴ passengers boarding/ detraini tation. (pg 11-7)	⁴ commuters participating in cal anpools (pg 13-8)	⁴ parking spaces reserved for copg 13-8)	[£] parking spaces per capita (pg	* park and ride facilities (pg. 13 (construction)	eak period transit volume/ capa	6 of workers using public transl	⁴ of transit trips (pg 14-3)	6 fleet that is accessible (pg 14 * paratransit trips per vear (pg	aircraft operations at McNary F	⁴ train-pedestrian incidents (pg	Ibs of intermodal cargo loaded	EF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim 8, 2002.
An adequate level of mobility on the regional highway system for all users		Capacity deficiency shall be considered to exist where the Level of Service (LOS) in the peak periods on a regional highway facility exceeds the E/F boundary (volume to capacity ratio > 1.0). Regional highway facilities approaching capacity deficiency shall be defined as those facilities operating within the LOS E range (volume to capacity ratio from 0.88 to 0.99) in the peak periods			0.	H					R . 07	* /	£	4	X		0.	£		t	<i>t</i> -	£	
	Ensure adequate levels of service on the Regional Road System for the "regional" movement of people and goods	Recognize that the mobility standard for State operated facilities will be held to ODOT standards, as defined in the current Oregon Transportation Plan. As such, these may be different from the standards for the rest of the regional road system. The RTSP shall identify prudent investments necessary to improve capacity deficient segments of the Regional Road System. Capacity deficient segments for which a preferred solution cannot be identified at this time shall be considered an "outstanding issue" location or area requiring further study. Improvements on facilities that are approaching capacity deficiency that add capacity, improve the safety and/or operation of a facility, or otherwise meet the goals, objectives, and policies of the RTSP may also be recommended in the RTSP.																					
		The improvements of facilities at LOS F should be designed to provide operating characteristics within the LOS D (peak period) range, unless circumstances warrant a lesser degree of improvement.													x								
A safe system of regional highway facilities within the Salem-Keizer urban area	Maximize the safety of the Regional Highway System wherever practicable	Safety issues shall be considered a priority when comparing alternative projects for inclusion in the RTSP. Prudent investments necessary to improve current safety problems shall be identified in the regional TIP. All locations of bicycle and pedestrian accidents on the Regional Road System should be evaluated for potential safety improvements.																					
Preserve the existing facilities that comprise the regional highway system	The preservation of the existing Regional Road System should be given priority over building new facilities	Improvements related to the maintenance and preservation of existing regional facilities shall be considered a high priority. The costs associated with maintaining the existing Regional Road System at an acceptable condition shall be determined and addressed prior to the allocation of funds for new construction in the RTSP.																					
An efficient system of regional highway facilities within the Salem-Keizer urban area	Maximize the efficiency of existing and planned Regional Road System facilities wherever practicable	The Regional Road System shall utilize existing facilities and rights-of- way, using Transportation System Efficiency Management techniques to improve traffic flows to the extent practicable. Access management strategies shall be employed where appropriate on major regional arterials and above to improve safety and facilitate through-traffic flow.																					
A regional highway system that minimizes adverse neighborhood, opvironmental and operation	The Regional Road System should serve to protect and minimize adverse impacts on neighborhoods and environments	In cooperation with local jurisdictions, actions to provide sufficient mobility on the regional system and/or discourage through trips on local streets will be considered in order to minimize neighborhood influctions by "regional" travel movement																					

			1	1			1	1 1	-	1				1	1			- T		-	, ,	c T	1 1
Policy Themes	Objectives	Policies	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	-unding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5)	% of bike lockers rented (pg /-6) # aross tons shinned hv rail (na 8-6)	# passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad Station.(pg 11-7)	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12)	automobile volume / capacity (pg 13-17, 8-11) beak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	# of transit trips (pg 14-3)	% fleet that is accessible (pg 14-5) # naratransit trins nor voar (nn 14-5)	#aircraft operations at McNary Field (pg 9-5)	# train-pedestrian incidents (pg 8-10)	# lbs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)	REF: SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim Update; Adopted May 28, 2002.
impacts associated with	wherever practicable	The design and construction of new regional transportation facilities											1								\square		
regional travel demand	The projects and programs included in the RTP should reduce regional ambient air pollutants, as required. Highway projects in the plan should be designed to not increase localized pollutants, as required, and further reduce localized pollutants whenever practicable.	shall minimize disruption to neighborhoods. The Regional Road System and recommended improvements included in the Highway Element of the RTSP shall meet the require-ments stipulated in the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 and the Oregon State Conformity Rule (OAR Section 340-20-700, et. seq.)																					
	The Regional Road System should	Analysis of potential future highway facilities shall consider potential impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. Facilities that avoid those areas shall be encouraged.																					
	environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands and endangered species habitat(s)	The planning and construction of future highway facilities shall meet the requirements of applicable federal, state, and local environmental legislation. Facility modernization and construction improvements shall include																			\square		
	The Regional Road System should minimize adverse effects on water quality	measures for environmental remediation, where necessary. Potential impacts from increased surface runoff associated with facility modernization and construction improvements shall be evaluated wher comparing alternative projects for inclusion in the RTSP.																					
	in the Salem-Keizer urban area.	Facility modernization and construction improvements shall be in compliance with all federal, state, and local water quality regulations.																					
An integrated system of regional highway facilities in the Salem-Keizer area	Integrate the Regional Road System with other transportation modes	Improvements to the Regional Road System shall be integrated with other modes where practicable to assure the opportunity for both mult and intermodal connectivity and efficiency.	į																				
	Integrate the Regional Road System with current and projected land uses	Regional Road System facilities and the land uses they provide access to should be functionally compatible, both currently and in the future.																					
	Ensure continuity and connectivity of the Regional Road System	The Regional Road System shall provide connectivity and continuity of travel between regional ingress and egress points and major regional destinations and activity centers to minimize out-of-direction travel and circuitous routing.																					
Regional Goods Movemer	nt Element																				\square		Chap 8
Efficient and coordinated transport of goods into, out of, within and through the SKATS area	Provide a system of efficient and coordinated transport of goods into, out of, within, and through the region	Support continued public and private efforts to develop and enhance the efficiency of the SKATS area's goods movement transportation systems.								×					2	×							
Safe transport of goods into, out of, within, and through the SKATS area	Support private, ODOT, PUC, and law enforcement commercial vehicle safety programs (all modes)	Support private, ODOT, PUC, and law enforcement commercial vehicle safety programs (all modes).																			x		

	-									-	-												
Policy Themes A goods movement system that provides a competitive advantage for SKATS area shippers whenever possible	Objectives Maximize modal options that facilitate nonpredatory competition between SKATS area commercial transportation providers	Policies Identify and support appropriate development and expansion in services offered by commercial transportation providers.	(No Performance Measures Specified) Quantities used to describe Trends	% of workers walking to work (pg. 6-2; Census))	% of trips made by pedestrians (pg. 6-3)	Funding \$\$ Requested for Pedestrian Projects	% of workers riding a bicycle to work (pg. 7-5, Census)	% of trips made by bicycles (pg.7-1)	% of Regional Bicycle System constructed (pg.7-5) % of hike Increase rented (ng.7-6)	# gross tons shipped by rail (pg 8-6)	# passengers boarding/ detraining at Salem Railroad Station.(pg 11-7)	# commuters participating in carpools, buspools, vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces reserved for carpools and vanpools (pg 13-8)	# parking spaces per capita (pg. 13-10)	# park and ride facilities (pg. 13-12)	peak period transit volume/ capacity (pg. 13-17)	% of workers using public transportation (pg 14-3)	# of transit trips (pg 14-3)	# perturbation accessible (pg 14-5) # paratransit trips per year (pg 14-5)	#aircraft operations at McNary Field (pg 9-5)	# train-pedestrian incidents (pg 8-10)	# lbs of intermodal cargo loaded (pg 12-2)	REF : SKATS. RTSP 2002 Interim Update; Adopted May 28, 2002.
																							1
Maximize access to viable, economical, alternative modes for SKATS area shinners	Provide efficient access to a range of viable, economical, alternative modes of transportation for SKATS area commercial needs	Ensure adequate goods movement system carrying capacities to adequately serve current and future needs of SKATS area shippers and transportation providers.								x													
Maximize SKATS area's exposure to international marketplace	Improve SKATS area's global goods movement capability	Support efforts to increase the range and breadth of transportation services offered in the SKATS area that have, or directly connect to, an international component.																					
Minimize negative impacts assoicated with the regional	Deduce regetive poice, emission, and	Encourage use of noise overlay zones in areas adjacent to air and around transportation corridors.																					
goods movement system	safety impacts associated with goods	Clearly identify, and enforce the use of, truck routes within the SKATS area.																				Π	
	SKATS area	Control, where appropriate, the operations of commercial activities so as to minimize disruption to residential land uses and peak hour arterial flows.																					
Regional Intermodal Eler	ment																						Chap 12
An integrated regional system of intermodal	Ensure adequate intermodal opportunities to SKATS area shippers as part of the	Support continued improvements to provide efficient access to intermodal facilities servicing SKATS area shippers.																				x	
transportation options for SKATS area shippers	regional transportation system	Encourage efforts to maximize intermodal goods movement routing options within the region.																					
Maximize SKATS area intermodal efficiency	Provide enhanced intermodal efficiency within the region	Support appropriate development of needed intermodal freight transfer facilities in the SKATS area.																				Π	
An integrated regional system of intermodal	Ensure adequate intermodal opportunities to SKATS area travelers as part of the	Promote efficient and convenient access to intermodal facilities servicing SKATS area passengers									х											Π	
transportation options for	regional transportation system	Maximize connectivity of intermodal travel options within the region																					
Maximize SKATS area intermodal efficiency	Provide enhanced intermodal efficiency within the region	Encourage development of consolidated intermodal passenger facilities in the SKATS area																				Π	

			Sou	irce				Tra	ans	porta	tior	n Plan Po	licy	Area	0	Data	Туре	è	PN	l Ch	arac	cteri	stic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP	Other	Accessibility Mobility	Fconomic Vitality	Cuality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability	system Preservation Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \	Data Transmert Sutem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Average travel time from facility to destination (by mode)	х							1 2				7					х		х	х		х		х	х	х	Т
Average travel time from facility to major highway network	х							1 2				7					х		х	х		х		х			
Average travel time between intermodal facility and rail	х							1 2				7				,	x		х	х		х					х
Perceived deficiencies	х							1 2										х									
Percent of transit demand-response trip requests met	x							1 2											х		х				x		
Frequency of transit service	х							1 2									:		х		х				x		
Percent use of walking and bicycling for commute trips (or all trips)	х							1 2			5						x		х	x		х				х	
Percent of State residents aware of intermodal opportunities	х							1	3									х	х		х						х
Percent of wholesale and retail sales in the significant economic centers served by unrestricted (10-ton) market artery																										.	
routes	x				_			1	3							>			X		x		x			<u> </u>	X
Number of snipping establishments per 1,000 businesses	x				_			1	3						X				X		x					<u> </u>	x
Employee-related percent or employers who have relocated for transportation reasons.	x				_			1	3									х	X			х	x			<u> </u>	
Percent of employers that cite difficulty in accessing desired labor supply due to transportation.	x	-			_			1	3			-						X	X			х	х			<u> </u>	
How time in minutes as it compares to the number of connecting transfers	x				_			1				7	9			>	x					х			X	<u> </u>	
Number of projects (area and population) accessible to designated development centers	x				_			1				7	0		X	>			-		x	_	x			<u> </u>	
Percent of transfers between modes to be under 'X minutes and 'N feet	x							1		4		7	9			,	x	-	X		x	x			x		
worktrips completed per venicle nour or commute travel	x							1		4		/					_		X	x		x		x			
referent of region's mobility-impaired who can reach specific activities by public transportation of by waiking/wheelchail	x							1		4					x		x		x			x	x			x	
Average number of hours spent traveling	x							1		4							x		x	x	-	x	x				
Customer perception of guality of transit service	x							1		4								х		-	_	x			x		-
Accessibility index (STEAM?)	x							1									x			x	_	x	х				-
Average trip length	x							1									x			x	_	х	х				-
Number of miles with intelligent transportation service	х							1								2					x						-
Number of new rest areas constructed v. planned	x							1								>	1		х		x			х			-
Number of Trunk System lane miles planned v. completed	х							1								,			х		x						
Total freeway lane-miles (or per capita or per measure of regional business volume or per square mile or truck VMT)	x							1								,	:		x		x			x			x
Total freeway lane-miles in acceptable condition (or per capita or per measure of regional business volume or per square mile or truck VMT)	x							1								,	:		x		x			x			x
Mode split by facility or route	х							1			5	7					х			х		х			х	х	
Overall mode split	х							1			5						х			х		х			х	х	
Percent of users with option of more than one modal choice	х							1								,	x			х	х		х				
User identification of access issues	х							1										х			х						
Existence of railroad electrification	х							1							х	2	1				х						х
Air transportation capacity	х							1											х		х					x	
Airport improvement and cost scheduled at airports	х							1								>	1				х					x	
Airports within a 30-minute drive of agricultural centers capable of supporting twin engine piston powered aircraft	x							1	3							,					x					x	
Amount of scheduled service between major cities	х	-			-			1	3				_	+	 	>	:		х		x					x	_
Number of cities over 1 million population served directly by nonstop commercial airline flights from airports in state	x							1	3							,			x		x					x	
Percent of aviation community reached through aviation service programs	х							1	3								:				х					x	
Percent of general aviation needs funded	х							1	3							,	:		х		x					x	
Percent of manufacturing industries within 30 miles of interstate or four lane highway	х							1	3						х	2	1		х		х		х				х
Availability of real-time cargo information	х				_			1	3							>	:				x						x
Capacity of package express carriers	х							1	3						х						х						х
Number of package express carriers	х	-			-			1	3						x						x						x
Percent of goods moved with option of more than one modal choice	х	-			-			1	3						x	>					х						x
Average circuity for truck trips of selected O-D pattern	х	-			-			1	3				_			>					\rightarrow	х	х			\square	x
Bridge weight limits	х	-			-			1	3				_			>			х		x					\square	x
Geometrics of connector link	х	-	\square		_			1	3						 	>					x					<u> </u>	x
Number of overload permits rejected due to structural capacity deficiency	х	-	\square		_			1	3						 	>					x					<u> </u>	X
inumber of structures with vertical (or horizontal) clearance less than X ft.	x	-	-	_				1	3				_			>	-		\vdash		x				$\left \right $		X
inumber or truck-days of highway closure on major freight routes	x	-	-	_				1	3				_	+		>			\vdash		x				$\left \right $		X
Percent of truck highway bridges sufficient in load capacity, vertical and horizontal clearance	х	1	1	1	1	1 1		1	3				1	1 1		2	1	1			х				1	. 1	х

			Sou	rce			Tra	ans	portatio	on P	Plan Poli	cy A	rea	Dat	ta Ty	ре		PM C	hara	acter	istic		Sys	tem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	Accessibility Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Percentage of highway system with bridges that structurally deficient or functionally obsolete	х						1	3							х		X		х						х
Sufficiency rating (percent bridges meeting federal sufficiency rating)	х						1	3							х		х		х						х
Amount of turning radius from major highway to intermodal facility	х						1	3							х				х						х
Average distance to intermodal terminals from different community shipping points	х						1	3							х	x			х		х				х
Capacity of intermodal terminals	х						1	3							х		x		х						х
Number of intermodal facilities	х						1	3							х		x	:	х						х
Number of T.E.U.'s (10'x 21') (or railroad cars or containers) that can be stored on the premises of the intermodal																									
facility	x						1	3		_					x		X	·	х				⊢┼	_	х
Number of trucks that can be loaded with bulk material per hour of loading time	х					_	1	3			_				x				х	\square			\vdash	_	х
Number of intermodal facilities that agency assists in development	x						1	3		_					x			_	х				⊢┼	_	х
Number of ports with railroad connections	х					_	1	3			_				x				х	\square			\vdash	_	х
Percent of population that can reach specified services by transit, bicycle, or walk	х					_	1				_			х		x	Х	. X		X	х		x	_	
Existence of handicap access to all areas	х					_	1			_					x				х	\parallel			⊢	'	
Percent of elderly and disabled persons with special transit service available	x						1			_				X	x		X	·	х				x	_	
Percent of transit dependent population served	х						1			_				X	x		X	·	х		Х		x	_	
Percent of transit facilities accessible to handicapped	x						1			_					х		X		х				x	_	
Connectivity deficiency	x	_				_	1	_		_		9			X	x				X			⊢	_	
Iranster distance	x						1	_				9			x			_	х	\parallel			⊢⊢	_	
Number of counties in State with county-wide transit systems	x	_				_	1	_		_					X		X	·	x	\square			x	_	
Number of transit systems in state	x	_				_	1	_		_					x		X	-	x	\square			x	_	
Percent of population with access to (or within X miles or) transit (or fixed route transit) service	X					_	1			_				X	x		X	-	x	⊢ –∣	X		x		
Percent of rural population with access to transit service	x	_				_	1	_		_				X	x				x	\square	х		x	_	
Percent of urban and rural areas with direct access to passenger rail and bus service	x					_	1			_				X	x				x	⊢ –∣			x		
Percent of workforce that can reach worksite in transit within one hour, and with no more than two transfers	x						1							x		x				x	x		x		
Access time to passenger facility	х						1								х				х				х		
Percent of total transit trip time spent out of vehicle	х						1									x	x	x		х			х		
Route spacing	х						1								x		x		х				х		
Route-miles (or seat-miles or passenger miles) of transit service (or per capita or per employee or per licensed driver)	x						1							x	x		x		x				x		
Availability of intermodal ticketing and luggage transfer	x						1								х				х				x		
Existence of information services and ticketing	х						1								х				х				x		
Transfer distance at passenger facility	x						1								x				х				х		
Number of pick up and discharge areas for passengers	х						1								x				х				х		
Percent of rail station parking lots with mid-day spaces available	х						1								х					х			х		
Parking spaces available loading/unloading by autos	x						1								х				х				x		
Parking spaces per passenger	х						1								х					х			x	_	
Utilization rate of parking spaces during daily peak hours for bus, rail, park and ride or other passenger terminal lots	x						1								x		x			x			x		
Percent of population within 5 miles or 10 minutes of state-aided public roads	x						1							х	x		x		х		х	х			\mathbf{t}
Number of miles of non-motorized facilities	x	1					1		5						x		x		х				$\neg \uparrow$	x	1
Minimum layover times at airports or passenger terminals	x						1								x		x		х					x	
Percent jobs within 45 minutes of airports	x						1							х	x		x	1	х		х			х	
Tonnage moved on various transportation components (by mode)	х						2	3							х					x					x
Traffic at border crossings	x						2	3							х					x					x
Cost/benefit of existing facility v. new construction	x						2				7		10	х	x		x	1							
Average speed	х						2				7				x	x	x	x		х		х			
Total travel time (by mode)	x						2				7					х	1	x		x		х	x	x	
Delay time at primary commercial airports	х						2				7				x		1			х				x	
Origin-destination travel times (by mode)	х						2				7					х	1	х		x		х	x	x	
Average daily traffic per freeway lane	х						2				7				x	х	1	х		x		х			
Number of people provided service at travel information centers	х						2			T	7				x					х			1		
Line haul speed	х						2				7				х					х					х
Average processing time for shipments at intermodal terminals	х						2				7	_			х		х			x					х
Average transfer time/delays	х						2				7				х				х						х

			Sou	irce			T	ran	sportati	ion	Plan Poli	icy /	Area	Da	ita T	ype		PM (Char	acte	ristic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Delay of trucks at facility per ton-mile	х							2			7				х		T	х	T	x		Π			x
Delay of trucks at facility per VMT	х							2			7				х			х		х					х
Freight carrier (or local shippers) appraisal of quality of highway service in terms of travel time/speed, delay, circuity,																									
scheduling convenience	х							2			7						х		_	х			+		х
Facility usage by mode (V/C)	х							2			7				х			X X	_	х		х	х	х	х
Average commuting time for urban population	х							2			7				х	х		X X		x		x	x	x	_
Cost of an intermodal trip as a percent of cost of auto use	х							2			7			х				х	x				+		
Percent of workers who work at home because of transportation cost or level of service	х							2			7					х			_	х			+		
Average wait time to board transit (or between modes)	х							2			7				х			х		х			x		
V/C for bicycle and pedestrian facilities	х							2			7				x			х	╨	x		1	\downarrow	х	
Lost time due to congestion	х							2	4							х		x x	╨	x		1	\square		
Customer perception of satisfaction with commute time	х							2	4								х			х					
Travel time between major cities	х							2								х				х					
Delay due to incidents	х							2							х			х		х		х	х		
Delay per VMT (by mode)	х							2								х		х		х		х	х		
Interference of movement at grade crossings—delay time and speed	х							2							х					x					
Intersection LOS	х							2							x	х		x		x		х			
LOS	х							2							х	х		x		х		х			
Number and percent of lane-miles congested	х							2							х	х		x x		x		х			
Percent of highways not congested during peak hours	х							2							x	х		х		x		x			
Percent of VMT at LOS 'X'	х							2							х	х		x x		x		х			
Percent of VMT which occurs on facilities with V/C greater than 'X'	х							2							х	х		x x		x		х			
Percentage of time average speed is below threshold value	х							2							х	х		x x		x		х			
Queuing of vehicles (including rail) and its relationship to overall delays	х							2							х					х		х			
Reserve capacity	х							2							х			x x		х		х			
Travel time under congested conditions	х							2							х	х		x x		х		х			
V/C ratio	х							2							х	х		x x		х		х			
VMT by congestion level	х							2							х	х		x x		х		х			
Average daily traffic	х							2							х	х		x x		х		х			
Total VMT	х							2							х	х		x x		х		х			
VHT per capita	х							2						х	х	х		x x		х		х			
VHT per employee	х							2						х	х	х		x x		х		х			
VMT growth rate relative to population, employment	х							2						х	х	х		x x		х		x			
VMT per capita	х							2						х	х	х		x x		х		х			
VMT per employee	х							2						х	х	х		x x		х		х			
VMT within urban areas	х							2							х	х		x x		х		х			
Fluctuations in traffic volumes	х							2								х				х		х			
Minute variation in trip time	х							2								х				x		х	х		
Percentage of scheduled departures that do not leave within a specified time limit	х							2							x					x			х		
Percentage on-time performance	х							2							х			х		х			х		
Travel time contours	х							2							x	х		x		x		x	х		
Mode split	х							2							x	х		x x		х			х	х	
Percent of change in mode splits	х							2								х		x x		х			х	х	
Modal Interchange	х							2								х				х		x	х	х	
Number of users of intermodal transfer facilities	х						1				7					х				х			х	x	х
Transfer time between modes	х							2								х				х			х	x	
LOS at intersections serving facility	х							2							х					x		х			
LOS on facility access roads	х							2							х					x		х			
Time to access intermodal facilities	х							2							х	х				x		х	х		
V/C on facility access roads	х							2							х					х		х			
Customer perception of ease of travel through highway construction areas	х							2									х			х		х			
Customer perception of time it takes to drive through highway construction areas	х							2									х			х		х			
Customer perception of time it takes to travel to places people/goods need to go	х							2									х			х		х			
Dollar value of projects that improve travel time on key routes	х							2						х	х				х			x	х		х

				Sou	rce				Tra	ansp	ortat	tion	n Plan P	olic	y Are	ea	Da	ta Type	è	P	ЛCh	ara	cter	istic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS DV DTD	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balarice V Audptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Capacity restrictions	х								2									x			П		T		х	х	<u> </u>	x
Delay per ton-mile traveled (by mode)	х								2									х					х					х
Miles of freight routes with adequate capacity	х								2									x				х						x
Percent lane-miles which are truck priority (or excluded)	х								2									х				х						х
Ton-miles of rail freight into/through metropolitan areas	x								2									х					x			$ \rightarrow $		x
Ton-miles traveled by congestion level	x								2									х		x	x		x			+		X
Truck delivery and loading interference with street traffic	X			_	_			-	2	_								X					x					X
Truck VMT by light duty, heavy duty, and through trips	x			_	_			-	2	_								x			x							X
Customs delays	X			_			-	_	2	_						_		X				\rightarrow	-+			++		X
Divent unite at intermodal radiates	X			_			-	_	2	_						_		X				\rightarrow	-+			++		X
Trequency of detays at intermodal facilities	X				-			-	2									X					—			+		- X
Tarké troparoval time at intermedal transler	A V				-			-	2									X					—			+		- A
Truck furnaround time at intermitodal terminats	A v				_			-	2							_		x		v		-			-	+		- A
Number of dockage days at seaports	x							-	2									x		^		_	<u> </u>		-	++		- X
	x								2									x				_	x		x	x		-
PMT by congestion level	x							-	2									x		x	x		x		x	-		+
Proportion of persons delayed	x								2									x		~	~		x		x			1
Number non-work trips	x								2									x			x		x		x			1
Passenger-trips per household	х								2									x					х		х			
PHT	х								2									x x		х	х		х		х	x		
PMT per capita	х								2									x x		х	х		х		х	х		
PMT per per worker	х								2								х	x		х	х		х		х	х		
Vehicle-trips per household	х								2									x		х	х		х		х			
Percent of passengers traveling under five miles made by means other than SOV	х								2									x		х	х		х		х	х		
Percent of workers who work at home	х								2									х					х					
Percent trips with transit advantage	х								2									х								х		
Mobility index (person-miles (or ton-miles) of travel/vehicle-miles of travel (PMT/VMT) times average speed)	x								2									x		x	x		x		x	\square		
Percent lane miles of recreational routes operating below LOS D	X			_			_	_	2	_								X	_	x	x	_	<u>x</u>		x			
Venicle ownership, demand per licensed driver (or worker)	x			-			_	-	2	_								X		X	x	-	<u>x</u>		x			-
Number of commuters using transit park and rule facilities	X			_			_	_	2	_						_		XX		X	x	\rightarrow	<u>×</u>			X		
Number of public transportation trips	A V				-			-	2									X		v	v		- X			X		
On-time performance of transit	x							-	2									X X		X V	~	_	-			x x		-
Passengers per capita within urban service area	x	-			+		+	11-	2		+							x	1	x	x	\rightarrow	x			x	+-	+
Bicycles per boarding	x							-	2									x		-	~		x		-	x	x	+
Property damage accidents/vehicle miles traveled	x									3			6					x		x			x		x			-
Percent of region's unemployed or poor that cite transportation access as a principal barrier to seeking employment	x									3	4				9				x				x	x				
Direct jobs supported (or created)	х									3							х						х					1
Economic costs of accidents	х									3			6				х	x		х					х			
Economic costs of congestion	x	[3							х	х		х			[х			
Economic costs of fatalities	х									3							х	х		х					х	х	х	
Economic costs of lost time	x	[3							х	х		х			[
Economic costs of pollution	х									3							х	х		х							$ \rightarrow $	_
(Transport Costs as) Percent of state gross product	x					+	-	1		3							X		1	х			-			\vdash	\rightarrow	4
Indirect jobs supported (or created)	x					+	-	1		3							x		1	x		$ \rightarrow $	- +			\vdash	\rightarrow	4
Business volume by commodity group	x			_	_		_	1	_	3							x		1			$ \rightarrow $				\vdash	\rightarrow	x
Economic indicator for goods movement	x		_	_	_	+ $+$	_	1-	_	3	+						X	+ $+$				\rightarrow	_			+ +	\rightarrow	x
Ivial ket share of international or regional trade by mode	x		+	_	_	+ $+$	+	1-		5	++	_					x	+		x			X			┢─┤	$\rightarrow -$	X
Percent increase in intermoual facilities use	X	_		_	-	+	_		_	2	+	_		_		_	X					\rightarrow	_ł	v	-	+	-+-	X
Drice index for selected local delivery service					+	+ +	+		_	2								- X				\rightarrow	-	л		┼──┼	$\rightarrow \rightarrow$	- A
Tonnage originating and terminating	x x			-	+		+	1-	-	3	++	-				_	v		1			\rightarrow	-+			++	-+-	- A
					1	1 1	1		1	1 -	1 1		1 1		1	1		1 1	1				1			1 1	1	1

			So	urce	•		Tr	ans	porta	ition	ı Pla	n Poli	cy A	Area	Da	ta T	ype	PM	Char	acte	ristic		Syster	m			
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	ОТР	TransPlan Metro DTD	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway Tronoit	l ransit Ped\Bike	Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air			
Economic indicator for people movement	x							3					1														
Number of cruise embarkations	х							3								х											
Percent of population that perceives that its environment has become more 'livable' over the past year with regard to																											
ability to access desired activities	х								4	5							х										
Sprawl: difference between change in urban household density and suburban household density	х								4	5					х					х	х						
Customer perception of satisfaction with air quality	х								4	5							х			х							
Number of days that Pollution Standard Index is in unhealthful range	х								4	5					х												
Number of urban areas (or population in areas) classified as nonattainment status	х								4	5					х												
Tons of pollution (or vehicle emissions) generated	х								4	5							x	X 2		х		х					
Number of noise receptor sites above threshold	х								4	5					х			х									
Number of residences exposed to noise in excess of established thresholds	x								4	5			9		х			х			х						
Percent of population exposed to levels of highway noise above 60 decibels	х								4	5			9		х			х			х	х					
Customer perception of amount of salt used on trunk highways	х								4	5							х			х		х					
Customer perception of satisfaction with transportation decisions which impact the environment	х								4	5							х			х							
Number of archeological and historical sites that are not satisfactorily addressed in project development before										_																	
construction begins	x								4	5	_				X				_								
Customer perception of safety while in travel system	X							_	4		6						X		_	х							
Percent of population which perceives that response time by police, tire, rescue or emergency services has become	v								4		6						v			v	v						
Detter of worse, and whether that is due to transportation factors	N N								4		6					v	× A	v	_	A V	~	v					
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities)//WT	×								4		6					X	X	A V	_	X		X					
Accurements (or injuries or latentices/rwin)	A V							-	4		0	7					<u>л</u>	х	_								
Custome perception of promises kept on project completion	A							-	4			7					X		_	X							
Customer perception of satisfaction with bunchment in pre-projects	X								4			/	0				X	-	_	X		-					
Compliance with a filtrarities action and a	×				_			-	4				9				X	v	_	X			_				
Compliance with animitative action goals	A V							-	4	5	6		2		А.			х	_								
Number of accuents involving narities for colocted trips (or chipmonts)	×									5	0	7				X		× ,		X		v		X			
Average rule consumption per un for selected unps (or simplifients)	A V							-		5		7						X	·								
Modar Interchange [[1:1]	×									5		/			v			v	_	v							
Air quality rating	x				_			-		5					л У			~	~	л		v	_				
Amount of recycled material used in road construction	×									5					x				- X			x					
Amount of salt used on roadways [[output measure]]]	x									5					A V				- A			A V					
Average miles per gallon (MDC)	x							-		5							v	v	^	v		A V					
Constraints to utilization (wird)	N N									5							Λ	^	_	~		^					
Constraints to utilization due to noise (noise of operation)	×									5									_								
Environmentally friendly partnership projects per year	x	+			+	+		+		5			1		v	-				1				-+			
Fuel consumption per PMT	x	-								5					<u> </u>	1	x	x ·		x		x ,	x	x			
Fuel consumption per ton-mile traveled	x									5							x	x		x		x	x	x			
Fuel consumption per VMT	x	1	+					+		5			1				x	x		x		x	x	x			
Fuel usage	x									5							x	x		x		x	x	x			
Highway emissions levels within non-attainment areas	x									5					x	x		x		x		x					
Number and miles of 'nature' routes [[??]]	x									5																	
Number of environmental problems to be taken care of with existing commitments	x	1								5						1								-			
Number of pipeline spills	x									5								x									
Number of transportation control measures (TCMs) accomplished v. planned	x	1								5						1		x	x			x x	x x				
Percent of region which is developed	х	1								5			1		х			х			х						
Percent of vehicles using alternative fuels	х	1								5			1			х		х		x		х					
Public transportation passenger-miles/ total vehicle-miles	х									5						х	x	X 2		х		x x	x				
The degree to which pipeline spills and accidents are minimized	х									5	6		1														
Tons of greenhouse gases generated	х	1								5			1		х			x :		x							
VMT/speed relationships	х	1								5						1		x		x							
Percentage of state truck highway system rated good or better	х	1									6	8	1			х								х			
Ratio of number of transit incidents to investment in transit security	x	1									6	7				х						,	x	-			
Accident rate, deaths, injury, property loss by type of corridor	x	1									6					x		x									
Alcohol-related fatal accidents/all fatal accidents	х	1									6					х		х									
			S	our	се				Trar	nspo	ortat	tion Pla	n Pol	icy A	Irea	Da	ata Type	2	P	M CI	hara	acter	istic		Sy	stem	
--	-----------	-----------	---------------------------	-----------	--------------------	--------	-------	---------------	----------	-------------------	-----------------	---	---	-----------------------	---	--	--	--------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	--	----------	-------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility OTP	TransPlan	Metro RTP SKATS	RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \	Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Average accident cost per trip	x			1								6					x x		x			х		х			T
Fatality (or injury) rate of accidents	х											6															-
Hazard index (calculated based on accidents per VMT by severity)	х											6							х								
National rank for accident, injury, fatality rates	х											6					x		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per capita	х											6				х	х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per intermodal movement	х											6					х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per per ton-mile traveled	х											6					х		х			х					х
Number of accidents per trip	х											6					х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per VMT	х											6					x		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per year	х											6					х		х			х		х			
Accident risk index ('Safety Index')	х											6					х		х					х			
Number of high accident (or hazardous) locations	х											6					х		х			х		х			
Number of safety related improvements	х											6					х		х		х			х			
Average duration of incidents	х											6					х		х			х		х			
Response time to incidents	х											6					х		х		х			х			
Number of safety related complaints	х											6						х				х		х			
Number of Statewide traffic accidents (or injuries or fatalities)	х											6					х		х			х		х			
Accidents related to bridge characteristics	х											6					x					х		х			
Customer satisfaction with snow/ice removal	х											6						х				х		х			
Number of highway miles driven at high accident locations	х											6					х		х	х		х		х			
Percent highway miles built to target design and operational standards to handle traffic at a steady 55 mph rate																											
Percent of vehicle crashes on highway system where roadway related conditions were listed as a contributing factor	x							-				6					x		x		x	x		x			-
Roadway sections not meeting safety standards	x											6					x		x		x			x			-
Number (or percent) of highway miles driven above speed limit	x											6					x		-		<u> </u>	x		x			-
Number (or percent) of motorists driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs	x											6					x					x		x			-
Number of accidents in which speed or traffic violation is a factor	x											6					x					x		x			-
Percent of drivers complying with seat belt law	x											6					x					x		x			-
Construction fatalities/dollars of construction cost (or per 100 highway related crew)	x											6					x		x			x		x			-
Number of accidents occurring in highway construction zones	x											6					x							x			-
Average response time for emergency services	х											6				x			х					x			-
Percentage of emergency road calls that get through to state highway agency	x											6					x										-
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities) per 1.000 vehicles at park and ride lot	х											6					x							x			-
Crime at rest areas and other facilities	х											6				x											-
Lighting and security staff at parking areas	x			1								6				х									\square		1
Percentage of parking areas that are secured	х											6				x								х			
Accidents at major intermodal crossings	х											6					х					х		х			х
Exposure (AADT and daily trains) factor for rail crossings	х											6					х		х			х		х			х
Grade crossing safety improvements (MI)	х											6					х										х
Number of fatalities and injuries occurring on the rail system	х											6															х
Railroad/highway at-grade crossings	х											6															х
Crimes per 1,000 passengers	х											6				х	х					х			х		
Number of intercity bus and rail accidents	х											6													х		
Transit accidents (or injuries or fatalities)/PMT	х											6					x		х			х			х		
Transit accidents (or injuries or fatalities)/VMT	х											6					х		х			х			x		
Number of commercial vehicle safety inspections performed [[output measure?]]	х			1								6							х		x	⊢			\square		x
Number of commercial vehicles weighed (by fixed and portable scales) [[output measure?]]	х			1								6							х		х				\square		х
Percent of commercial vehicles that pass safety inspections	х			1								6							х			x			\square		x
Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that are overweight (by fixed and portable scales)	х			1								6		-				1	х	\square		х			\square		х
Percent of traffic on regional highway which is heavy truck	х			1								6		-			х	1	х	х		х			\square		x
Bicycle accidents (or injuries or fatalities) per bicycle-mile of travel	х			<u> </u>				L				6		1			x	1	x	$\parallel \parallel$		x		<u> </u>	\vdash	x	_
Joint-use bicycle crossings	х			-				L				6		-			+ $-$			\parallel		⊢–∥			$\downarrow \downarrow$	x	4
Number of pedestrian accidents (or injuries or fatalities)	X			-				L	+			6					x	-	X	⊢	┢─┘	X		<u> </u>	$\downarrow \downarrow$	x	_
Use of safety equipment by bicyclists	X			1								6					х	1								х	

			5	Sou	rce				T	rans	sport	tatio	n Pla	an Poli	су А	rea	Da	ta Typ	е	Р	M CI	hara	acter	ristic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other		Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality Ouality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities) caused by air transportation	х							Т					6					х							T T		x	T
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities) caused by waterborne transportation	х												6					x									x	-
Number of airports where weather information is collected for dissemination to pilots	х												6					х									х	
Number of landing areas inspected	х							Т					6					х									х	
Number of weather products provided to pilots on computer weather terminals	х												6														х	
Percentage of airports that meet federal and State planning and design standards	х												6														x	
Shipping accidents occurring on waterways	х												6															х
Total annual attendance at pilot safety seminars	х												6														x	
Maintenance cost of connector link	х													7 8														
Dollar value of flexible federal funding programmed for non-highway projects	х													7			х			х		х				х	x x	
Percent variances between actual versus predicted DOT revenues	х													7			х											
Private cost for transportation system	х													7				x		х								
Public cost for transportation system	х													7				x		х								
Total public expenditures on modal systems (freight v. passenger)	х													7				x		х		х						
Administrative costs as a percent of total program	х													7				x		х								
Administrative, engineering and construction cost/person- (or ton)mile (owner cost)	х													7														
All engineering costs/construction funds	х													7														
Average cost per lane-mile constructed	х													7				x		х								
Construction Productivity Index (Cost of contract lettings, utilities, real estate acquisition, construction, change orders, and cost overruns DIVIDED BY staff costs, consultant contracts, and design construction change orders)	x													7				x										
Cost per percentage point increase in lane miles rates fair or better on pavement condition	х													7				x		х	х		х		х			
Data center costs as percentage of total program	х													7				x		х								
Dollar allotment and percent of department funds consumed by overhead	х													7				x		х								
Dollar allotment and percent of funds going to non-engineering activities	х													7				x		х								
Dollar allotment and percent of trunk highway funds going to construction	х													7				х		х					х			
Number and dollar value of projects jointly funded	х													7				х										
Number and dollar value of projects that improve travel time on key routes	х													7				х			\perp				1			_
Partnership benefits (to taxpayers and partners)	х													7				x			\perp				1			_
Percent cost of re-work	х													7				х		х			⊢		4—			_
Percentage increase in final amount paid for completed construction over original contract amount	х													7				х		х			⊢		4—			_
Proportion of infrastructure investment from private sources	х				_			┛┣						7				х		х	+	\square	⊢–		∥—	+		_
Savings to taxpayers/public from partnerships	х				_			┛┣						7			x			х	+	\square	⊢–		∥—	+		_
Unprogrammed construction costs as a percentage of total construction costs	x				_	_						_		7				x		х	+	х	⊢–∣		4┣──	+		_
Intrastructure maintenance expense	x				_	_						_		/				x		x	+	x	⊢–∣		4┣──	+		_
Uperational cost per toil transaction	x				_									7				X		X	+	x			{	+		
Auditional costs per trib (user lees)	X							┥╟╴						7		10		XX		X	+	\vdash	X		{┣──	+		-
Average cost per trip	A V													7		10		X X		A V	+	┢──┤			{┣──	++		
Average costs	x													7		10		A A X		^	+		x		1	-		
Padurad costs per trip (subsidias)	x													7				x		-	+		x			-		
Ilse cost/nerson-mile (lise cost)	x													7				x		-	+		x			+		-
Value of fuel savings	x													7				x		-	+		x		x	+		-
Vehicle operating cost reductions	x													7				x					x					
Average days to complete driver licensing or vehicle registration transactions	x													7				x		x					x			-
Percent of invoices processed within five days of receipt	x													7			x			x					x	-		-
Percentage increase in number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days								╢																			-+	1
	x													7			х					 _ ∣						
Units of work completed per hour worked [[output measure?]]	x													7			х											
Hours of incident related delay on highway system	х													7				x										
Speed limits and difference between modes	х							1						7				x		х		х	х		х	х	x	
Number of projects applying technology developed or available in last 'X' years	х							1						7														
Percent of error free data in IMS database	х							╢						7							\square					$ \downarrow \downarrow$	$ \rightarrow $	
Percent of projects rated good to excellent in quality audits	х							╢						7				х		х	\square					$ \downarrow \downarrow$	$ \rightarrow $	
Percent projects requiring few or no significant change orders due to plan errors	х				1								1	7				х		х	1 1	a '	i 🖡		1	1		

			Sou	rce			Tra	ansp	ortatio	on P	Plan Pol	icy A	Irea	Da	ata T	уре		PM	Chai	acte	eristic		S	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Plan Implementation (outnut)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Hinbway	Transit	Ped\Bike ^ i.	Alr Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Percent projects with no premature maintenance problems	х										7	1			х			х		T	1	Т			T
Percentage of information and data exchanged between intrastate agencies	х										7			х											
Transactions completed per motor vehicle division employee	х										7			х	х			х							
Vehicle-miles traveled per highway department employees	х										7			х	х			х				х			
Number of toll transactions	х										7				х							x			
Percent of highway tolls pre-paid	х										7				х							х			
Percent of lane miles with toll pricing	x										7				x							х			
Performance of State roads based on HPMS ratings	х										7				х			х				х			
Ton/miles per gallon of fuel	x										7				x					х					х
V/C by route	x						2				7				х	х		X X	۲.	x		х			
VMT per mile of roadway	x										7				x	х		x x	c –	х					
Management/employee satisfaction communication of agency goals	х										7						х								
Management/employee satisfaction with diversity efforts	х										7						х								
Management/employee satisfaction with progress toward targeted focus area	x										7						х								
Percent of customers satisfied with licensing and registration process	x										7						х			х					
Overall mode splits	х										7					х		X X	c –	х		x	x	х	
Number of users of intermodal facilities	х										7				x										
Percent of intermodal connecting points and facilities accurately placed on a map	x										7				x										
Additional revenue earned by producers when shipping via rail	х										7				х										х
Average transfer costs	х										7				х										х
Cost by commodity	x										7				х				_					+	X
Cost per fuel-mile as it compares to cost per air (or water or rail) mile	х										7				х										х
Cost per ton of freight shipped	x										7				х				_					+	X
Cost per ton-mile by mode	x										7				х				_					+	Х
Rail freight revenue versus operating expenses	х									_	7			х	х				_					+	X
Ratio of oversize/overweight permit tees collected to dollar value of damage caused	x										7			X	х			x	_					+	х
Revenue per ton-mile by mode	x										7				x			X	_		_				X
Shipping cost per shipment	x										7								_					+	х
Customs and administrative processing time	x	_								_	7				_		_		_				_	+	X
Hours of access lost	x									_	/						_		_					+	X
Ions transferred per nour	x									_	7				x		_	x	_	_				+	X
Mode spiit (by ton-mile)	x									_	/				x		_	x	_	X				+	X
Number of cardioads snipped/received on rail project lines	x									_	7						_		_					+	X
Number of restricted routes, additional milledge, increased costs Dercentage of street traffic delivered off peak	x	-	\vdash	+		-+	\vdash	-	-		7	-	- -		~		-	v				+	-	+ + -	- X
Droductivity and utility by mode	-	-	\vdash					+	+		7	1			-		-	^		-	1	- - [*]		+	- A
Producting and dring by mode	x										7						-							+	- X
Proportion of neight dame at the series of portion of network	x										7			x	v		-	x						+	- x
Change in commute travel person-miles and vehicle-miles per telecommuting occasion	x										7			~	-	x		~		x					
Demand service elasticities for auto v. transit	x										7												x		
Demand service elasticities for work v. non-work	x										7									-			x		
Percent of work trips that are SOV	x										7					x		x x		x		x			
Percentage of all trips made by bicycling and walking	x										7													+	
Tourist/recreation area utility by mode	x										7									-				+	
Average vehicle occupancy	x	1									7	1			х	x		х х		x		x			+
Cost per vehicle for parking fees	x										7				x					-					
Percent of vehicles using high-occupancy lanes	x	1									7	1				x		X X		x	1	x			
Percent of workers who have free parking at employment sites	x	1									7	1				x				1	1	x			
Percent of workers who have paid parking at employment sites	х										7					x						x			
VMT/PMT	x										7					x		х У	ι.	x	1	x			
Cost passenger in rural areas	x										7				х			х					х		
Cost per passenger for urban transit systems	х										7				х			х					х		
Cost per PMT for urban transit systems	х										7				х			х					х		
Cost per PMT in rural areas	х										7				х			х					х		

			S	Sour	rce				Tra	ans	porta	atio	n Pla	an Poli	су А	rea		Data	а Туре	e	P٨	/I Ch	hara	cter	istic		Sy	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility OTP	TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	A	Accessibility Mobility	Fconomic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \	Data	Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike A in	Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Cost per revenue-mile for urban transit systems	x			1				11	1	1				7					x		x					Ē	x		
Cost per revenue-mile in rural areas	x													7					x		x						x		
Cost per VMT for urban transit systems	x													7					x	+	x		, T				x		
Cost per VMT in rural areas	x													7					x		x						x		-
Fare recovery rate of urban transit systems	х													7					x		х		1	х			x		-
Grant dollars per transit trip	х													7					х		х			х		1	x		-
Total transit operating expenditures per transit-mile	х													7					x		х		1	х			x		-
Intercity rail and bus service ridership	х													7					х							1	х		x
PMT on intercity rail and bus service	х							1	1					7					х							1	х		x
Riders at maximum load point	х													7												1	х		
Ridership per VMT in rural areas	x													7							х		1	х		1	х		
Rural service passengers	х													7					х		х			х		1	х		
Transit passengers per capita	х													7			х		х		х	х		х			х		
Transit peak-load factor	х													7					х		х	х		х		1	х		
Transit riders per gallon of fuel	х													7					х		х			х			х		
Transit riders per revenue-mile	х													7					х		х	х		х			х		
Transit riders per route-mile	х													7					х		х	х		х			х		
Transit riders per VMT	х													7					х		х	х		х			х		
Transit ridership per capita	х													7			х		х		х	х		х			x		
Transit ridership to capacity ratio	х													7					х		х	х		х			x		
Number of peak period transit vehicles	х													7					x	+			х	_			x		
Revenue vehicle hours per transit employee	X			_										7					X		х		x			4┣──	X		
Average cost for vehicle on ferry system	X			_	_							_		7					x	+	X		-	x		x	+		X
Enplanements per aviation system employee	X													7					x	+	x			x		(⊢	+		x
Alignment (number of curves/grades defined as excessive by HPMS)	X						_		_					8					x	+			ł	— I		X			
Distribution of miles in PSC intervals	X						_		_					8					x	+			ł	— I					
nighway perioritance based on nYMS	X	_		_	-					_	_	_		8					<u>x</u>	+	X		\rightarrow	-+			+	\vdash	_
Maintenance conductor as measured against departmental statuards	X	_		_	-					_	_	_		0					x	+	X		\rightarrow	-+			+	\vdash	_
retent of rodoway/biologe system below standard condition	A V													0					x	+	X			-					
and distribution of transit vehicles	x													8					x	+	x		x				x		
Age distribution of transfer tenees	x													8					x	+	x		~				- x		
Departy remaining as for the mack	x													8					x	+	x		_				x		-
Remaining service life of transit vehicles	x													8					x	+	x		, T				x		
Distress extent/severity by type (pavement)	x													8					x		x					x			-
Distress index	х													8					x		х		1			x			-
Joint condition	х													8					х							x			-
New composite index incorporating roughness and distress (pavement)	х													8					х		х					x			
Pavement quality index	х													8					х		х					x			
Percent of lane-miles by pavement condition	х													8					х		х					х			
Percentage of highway mainline pavement rated good or better	х													8					х		х					x			
Remaining life of pavement	х													8					х							x			
Roughness/ride index (IRI)	х													8					х		х					x			
Rut depth	х			_										8					х	\downarrow			╷──┤			x	\downarrow		
Skid/friction	х											-		8					x	+			⊢			X	+	\square	
I ons of asphalt placed by maintenance crews	x			-	_					_	_			8			1—		x	+]	,↓			X	+	+-+	
Accidents related to bridge characteristics [[Safety Measure?]]	x			-	_					_	_		6				1—		x	+]	,↓			X	+	+-+	
Backlog of repairs by different priority categories (bridges)	x		_	_					_	-	_	-		8					x	+						X	+	+-+	_
Deck chloride content (bridges)	X		_	_					_	-	_	-		8					x	+						X	+	+-+	_
Element condition state distributions (Pontis) (bridges)	X	_		-	-	+		-		_	+	+	+	8			1	\rightarrow	<u>x</u>	+	\vdash					X	+	\vdash	
Paint uisitess (binuges) Dercentage of highway mainline bridges rated good or better	X		_	-							_	+	6	8				-	X	+ - +			<u> </u>				+ -	++-	_
Delling below standard (bridges)	X V	_		+	-	+		-		-			0	8 0			1		<u>х</u>	+	X		+			⊢× v	+	++-	_
Scour criticality (bridges)	x	_	-	+	-			╟─	-	-	-	+	+	0			1		x -	+			-+	-+		I⊢^	+ - 1	+ + -	
	· · · ·	1		1	1	1 1	1 1		1	1	1	1	1 1	0	1 1	1	11	1	**	. /		- 1			,	.	1 1	1 I	1

				Sou	irce				Tr	rans	sport	tatio	on P	Plan Po	licy	Area		Data	а Туре		P	N CH	hara	cter	istic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	ULF TrancDlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other		Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality Ouality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	gystern Frese varion Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \	Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Steel bridges with section loss in a member (bridges)	x	1		Т	1			Т			T			8	3		П		х			, T	i T	_		х	T		Τ_
Miles of roadway not useable by certain traffic because of design or condition deficiencies	х							11						8	;				x		x					x			-
Pavement condition on links to intermodal facilities	х							11						8	;				x										x
Percent of road system carrying unrestricted loads year round	х							11						8	;				x		x								x
Miles of highway rated 'good' or 'fair' for bicycle travel	x							11						8	3				x		x							x	
Miles of rail line acquired and rehabilitated for rail service	х							11						8	;				x		х								x
Miles of track in operation (by FRA rating)	х							11						8	;				x		x								x
Miles of track not useable by certain traffic because of design or condition deficiencies	х							11						8	;				x		x								x
Track condition	x							11						8	3				x				1						x
Track-miles abandoned	x							11						8	1				x		x		i – †						x
Track-miles under threat of abandonment	x							11						8					x		x						-		x
Miles between road calls for transit vehicles	x							11						8	2				x		x						x		-
Miles to be dredged	x							11						8					x		x								-
Number of state owned navinational aids	x							11						8	2				x		<u> </u>						-		-
Runway resultación frequency (aironts)	x							١ŀ						8	2				x		v	 				-	++		-
Racklag of ranging by different priority categories	v							╢╴						5	2				N N		Ĥ	 	+			-	++		-
Customer percent priority during the work being done to improve system	x							╢╴						5	2				v	v		 	+			-	++		-
Custome perception of andation of extern	v							╢╴						5	2				N N	- A		 	+	÷		-	++		-
Hours (or days) out of service for roads or bridges or transit equipment or airports)	x							╢╴						5	2				v			 	+	_		-	v		
Missed trips due to operation failures	v							╢╴						5	2				N N			 	+			-	-		-
Number of deficiencies corrected vs. number remaining	x			-	_			╢┝						5	2				x	-		 	$ \longrightarrow $			-	+		-
Number of Dicht of Way needs acquired	v							╢╴						5	2				N N			 	+			-	++		
Number of Night-on-Way parcers acquired	×														,				A V			—	+				++		-
Maintonance hours	v							╢╴						5	2				N N			 	+			-	++		
Number of bridges let to contract for repair (or replacement)	x							╢╴						5	2				v			 	+			-	++		
Number of lange miles lat to contract for canacity improvements	x							╡┠						8	2				x			 					+		
Number of lane miles let to contract for resurgaring	x							╡┠						8	2				x			 					+		
Number of projects certified ready for construction	x							╡┠						8	2				x			 					+		
Number of projects demined reduction or intermodal) projects funded (capital and operating)	x							╡┠						8	2				x			 					x		x
Percent of contracts hanned for letting that were actually let	x													8	2				x			 							-
State (or federal) construction (or maintenance) grants (sued	x													8	2				x			 							+
Agency and user cost of doing nothing or cost-benefit of MD&P (Pontis) (bridges)	x							١ŀ						8	2			x	x			 				-	++		
Current average maintenance costs	x							11						8	2			~	x								-		-
Expenditures for freight rail	x							11						8					x								-		x
Expenditures to retire deficiencies	x							11						8	3				x										-
Net present value of future transit vehicle (or facility or bridge or pavement), equipments and facility capital, operating and maintenance costs	x													8	3				x								x		
Non-motorized expenditures	х	T												8	3				х		x	ך ו	, T	1					
Percent of budget allocated to system preservation activities	х							Т						8	3				х										
Congested Miles of Travel (% of total VMT)				х	(Т		2									x x		х	х		х		х			
Network Vehicles Hours of Delay (daily)				х	(Т		2									x x		х	х		х		х			
% Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors				х	(Т	1	2									x x		х	х		х			х		
Internal VMT (no commercial vehicles)				х	C				1										x x			х		х		х			
Internal VMT/Capita				х	(Т	1					7					x x		х	х		х		х			
Average Trip Length (miles)				Х	(1					7					x		х	х		х					
% Person Trips Under 1 mile				х	C			Т	1			5							х		х	х		х					
Walk Trips				Х	(1			5							x			х		х				x	
Shared Ride (2 or more)				Х	(JE	1			5							х			х		х		х			
Drive Alone				Х	(1								1		x	\Box		х	\Box^{\top}	х		х	\Box^{\top}		
Person Trips per Auto Trip				Х	(7					x		x	х		х		х			
Average Fuel Efficiency (VMT/Gal.)				х	(I				5		7					x		x	[х		х			
CO Emissions (Weekday Tons)				Х	(5							x	\square	х			х		х			
% of dwelling units built in nodes*				х	(I	1									x			x	[х	x				
% of New *Total* Employment in Nodes*				х	(Т	1								1	х			x			х	х				

			Sour	rce			Tr	ans	sporta	tion	n Plar	n Poli	cy A	rea	Da	ita T	Гуре		PM	Cha	ract	eristi	с	5	Systen	n
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility		Economic Vitality Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land	Use \ Transport Measure	Highway Transit	Ped\Bike	Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
% of Roadway miles with Sidewalks			Х				1			ſ						х			х	3	ĸ	T		<u> </u>		
Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial and Collector Miles			Х				1					7				х			х	2	κ.				x	
% of Roadways in Fair or Better Condition			Х									8				x			x 7	х У	ζ.				_	
% of Households Within ¼ Mile of a Transit Stop			Х				1								х	х			X J	x	x	X		x	i	
Transit Service Hours per Capita			Х				1				1	7			х	х		\square	x	y	٢			x		
% Households with Access to 10 min Transit Service			Х				1								х	х		—	X 7	к у	(X	X	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>	x	<u> </u>	
% Employment with Access to 10 min Transit Service			X				1								х	х		⊢	<u>x</u> 7	к У	(X	X	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>	X	<u> </u>	
Bikeway Miles			X X				1									х		<u> </u>	x		(X	
Percent Non-Auto Trips			X				1									_	X	<u> </u>	<u>x</u> 7	<u>×</u>	X				++	
Percent mansit wode Share on Congested Corridors		$\left \right $	X	+		+	1 2	2		_		_					X	\square	x 7	-	X		$- \parallel$	X	+_+	
Priority Bikeway Miles		$\left \right $	X	+		+	1			_		_				X	+	\square	X		<u>i</u>		-+	+	X	
Acres of zonea nodal development			X				1										+		x		<u>.</u>	-			+++	
Percent of aweiing units built in nodes			X				1					_				_		—	\vdash		<u> </u>	-			++	
Percent of New Total Employment in Nodes			×				1	~				_						—		-	X			-	++	
Arteriar and Conecol mines (exclude, mws)a			×				1 2	2								X	+				-			x	++	
avg. peak in . navet times-selected regional destinations (all modes)			×				1 2	2									+		\vdash		—				++	
Consistency with local state, reueral parts / regulations			×										8								+-	-			++	
Economic Development Policy, Goals			X						3				0								+-	-			++	
Looking Decologinet Forey, Cours			x					2	5								++				+-				+++	
model shares by trip purpose			x				1	-						10		x	x				x	-			++	
net change in # of parking spaces/capita/planning period			X				-							11			-				-	-				
number of intersections above LOS standard			х				2	2													-	-				
Ozone - precursors (tons per vear)			х					-		5							-					-				
safety (accidents by mode, and/or other accident measure(s))			х								6											-				-
Total person trips/vehicles to major destinations (discrete list)			х				1				1	7										-				
total system-wide annual fuel consumption			х							5	(6				х	х					-				
transit & auto travel times in major corridors			х				1 2	2																х	1	
travel time by mode by corridor			Х				1 2	2														_				
vehicle (or person) trips < 1/2 mile by trip purpose			х				1							11								x	:		х	
visual & aesthetic impacts			х						4																	
VMT by LOS (specify: peak hours, other?)			Х				2	2									х								_	
PM-10 (tons per year)			х							5																
total vehicle trips per capita			х				1																			
Average Home-Based Work Trip Length				х			1										Х	—			X					
Average Weekday Non-Work Trips		$\left \right $		X		\rightarrow				_			-		 	-	X	⊢	\vdash	_⊩	X			+	++	+
Average Weekday Person Trips				X			1									_	X	—			X	4			++	
Average weekday work trips				X			1										X	-			X	-			+++	
% of Arterial Street Miles Experiencing Congestion (System Performance)				X			2	2								X	X	-			X	-			+++	
% of Inseedaly whiles Experiencing Congestion				X			1	2						10 11		X	X	—			<u> </u>	-		<u> </u>	++	
26 of households within 174-thile of Transit				v			1							10 11	л У	X	+				- A				·	
Average Weekday Transit Trins				×			1							10 11		x x	v		X /	<u>+</u> -		-			; 	
Average Weekuay Hansi Tips				x			1	2								~	- A		x i	÷	- <u>^</u>	-			+++	
Avergage Motor Vehicle Speed				x		+		2	+ +	-			1		1	-	x	\square	x	<u>,</u> ⊢⊢	- A			+	++	+
AWD total Truck Average Trip Lenth (miles)				x			1	-									x		x	x	x	-			++	x
AWD Total Truck Trips				x			1	+					1				x		x	x	x				++	x
Bike Trips			х	х			1			5							x		x	x	x				x	
Comparison of Motor Vehicle Volumes				х			2	2		-			1			х	x			x	x			x		
Comparison of Selected Transit Volumes				x			2	2					1			х			1	x	x			х	:	
Motor vVehicle Hours of Delay on Arterial Streets				х			2	2									x			х	х			x		-
Motor vVehicle Hours of Delay on Freeway				х			2	2									x			х	x			x		
Total Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay				х			2	2									х		:	х	х	.				
Transit Trips				х			1			5						х	x		x :	х	х			х	1	

			Sour	ce			Tra	nsport	atio	n Plai	n Poli	су А	rea	Da	ta T	ype		PM C	hara	acter	ristic		Sys	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP Other	Other Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Two-Hour Peak Period Average Truck Travel Time				х			2	3								х		х	1	х					х
Two-Hour Peak Period Truck Vehicle Hours of Delay				х			2	3								х		х		х					х
Vehicle Miles of Travel				х		1	Į.									х		х		х	_				
Person Trips				x		1	L									x		х		х					
Total Lane Miles				х			2								х			x x	х			х	\square		∟
Freeway lane-miles				х	_		2				_				х			x x	х			х	\vdash		└──
Arterial lane-miles				х			2								х			X X	х			х	\vdash	\rightarrow	<u> </u>
I otal Lane Miles Added (from 1994)				x			2				-				х			X X	x						
AWD Total Auto Person Trips				x							7					x		X		X					<u> </u>
AWD Total VMI (no trucks or externals)				x							/				X	x		x		X					<u> </u>
AWD VM1/Capita (no trucks or externals)				x							/			X	X	x		X X		X			–+		
Change in AWD VMT/Capita from 1994				X							7			X	x	X		X X		X				\rightarrow	<u> </u>
AWD VMT/Employee (ho tracks of externals)				X						<u> </u>	7			X	X	x		XX		X					<u> </u>
AwD Wittenpioyee change non 1774				A V						<u> </u>	7				л	x		X X		×					<u> </u>
Non SOV parent venue (Sov) retent of reson mps				x v		_					7					x		A A	-	× ×			\vdash		<u> </u>
AWD Motor Vehicle Average Trin Length (milec)				v		_					7					x		v v	-	- N		v	\vdash		<u> </u>
Home-Based-Work Average Trip Length (miles)				x							7					x		x x		x		Â	\vdash		+
Auto Occupancy				x							7				v	x		x x		x	-		\vdash		t
PM 2-HR Motor Vehicle Average Travel Time (minutes)				x			2				,				x	~		x		x				-	
PM 2-HR Average Motor Vehicle Travel Speed (miles per hour)				x			2								x			x		x				-	
Total Miles in Network				x											x				х						
Freeway Miles				x			2								х				x						
Arterial Miles				x			2								х				х						
PM 2-HR Total Congested miles (v/c >0.9) (percentage of total miles in network)				x			2								х			х		x					
Freeway (percentage of freeway miles in network)				x			2						10		х				х						
Arterial (percentage of arterial miles in network)				х			2						10		х				х						
PM 2-HR Motor Vehicle Hours				х			2								х	х		х		х					
PM 2-HR Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay (time accrued above v/c > 0.9)				x			2								х	x		x		х					
PM 2-HR Percent Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay				х			2								х	x		х		х					L
Freeway (percentage of total motor vehicle hours)				х											х			х		x		х			L
Arterial (percentage of total motor vehicle hours)				х											х			х		X		х	\vdash		_
Total Roadway Capacity-Miles				x			_								х			х	x			x	\vdash	\rightarrow	<u> </u>
rreeway/Highway cap-mi				x											х		_ -	X	x			X			<u> </u>
Arteria cap-mi				x											x			X	x			x	–+		+
AWD Fluck Average Training (miles)				X			2									x		X							X
M 2 HD Funck Average Haver Time (Initiality)				A V			2									x		X		×					×
PM 2-HR Truck Holds				x			2									x		x		x	-		\vdash		v
PM 2-HR Percent Truck Hours of Delay				x			2									x		x		x	-		\vdash		v
Lane Miles Added to Freight Network (from 1994)				x			-								x	~		x	x	<u> </u>				-	x
Freight Network Miles				x											x				x					-	x
PM 2-HR Congested Freight Network Miles				x			2								x			x	~	x					x
PM 2-HR Percent Congested Freight Network Miles				x			2								x			x		x					x
AWD Total Transit Trips (originating riders)				x		1	1								х	x		x		x			x		
AWD Transit Revenue Hours				x		1	L								х			х	х				x		
Transit Percent of Person Trips				x							7					x		х		х		1	x		
AWD Originating Riders Per Revenue Hour				x							7				х			х		х			х		
Total Walk Trips** (does not include walk trips to transit)				x		1										x		х		x				x	
Walk Percent of Person Trips				x							7					х		х		x				x	
Total Bike Trips***				х		1										х		х		x				x	
Bike Percent of Person Trips				х							7					х		х		x			\square	x	\square
% of Population Within 1/4 Mile of Transit Route					х	1								х	х			х	х	x	х		x		
% of Population Within Service Area for Lift Service				1	х	1			1	1 1		9		x	х	1		х	х	x	х		x		İ.

			Sc	ourc	е			Trai	nspo	ortat	tion	Plan	Polic	уA	rea	Da	ta T	ype	PM (har	acter	ristic	Sys	tem
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398 TTT Urban Mobility	OTP	TransPlan	Metro RTP SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	sarety and security Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway Transit	Peatbike Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Collector and Arterials Accommodating Bicyclists						х	1							1			х			х				x
Number of Lane-Miles of New Roadway Construction						х	1	2									x			х			x	
Per Capita Vehicle Miles of Travel						х	1							Ī		х		х	x		х			
Per Capita Vehicle Trips						х	1									х		x	x		х			
Access Restrictions						х	1										х			х				
Amount of Paratransit Services						х	1							9			х			х			х	
Capital Improvements						х						7					х			х				
Collectors and Arterials With Sidewalks						х	1				(6					х			х				ĸ
Intrusion into Existing Neighborhoods						х				4	5					х				х		х	х	
Street System Connectivity	L					х	1										х			х			х	
Transit Ridership-Frequency and Hours	L					х	1										х	х		х	х		x	
Percent of trips accessible by non-auto modes within x% max. time difference						х	1								10			х	x	1			x z	ĸ
VMT - weighted Network LOS under various "de-linking" scenarios						х	1								10			х	x		х			
Unoccupied Seat-Miles of Travel (Vehicle Occupancy / Average Vehicle Capacity)*Miles of Travel						х									10		х		x		х		X X	
Percent of regional trips on the links carrying x greatest O-D pairs.						х									10			х	x		х			
Percent of regional trips on the x greatest volume links						х									10			х	x		х			
Percent of regional trips on the x greatest volume river crossings						х									10			х	x		х			
Percent of regional trips on the x greatest volume structures						х									10			х	x		х			
Distribution of emergency services (police, fire, hospitals) across rivers, other barriers						х					(6			10	х				х		х		
Population-weighted average access time to nearest trauma center						х					(6				х								
Average Transit OVTT						х	1										х	х					х	
Percent of of Roadway miles with Sidewalks			х				1				(6					х		х	х			X 2	x
Percent of of Roadways in Fair or Better Condition			х										8				х		х	х			х	
Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial and Collector Miles			х				1										х		х	х			3	ĸ
Percent of Employment with Access to 10 min Transit Service			х				1									х	х		х	х	х	х	х	
Percent of Households with Access to 10 min Transit Service			х				1									х	x		х	х	х	х	x	
Percent of of Households Within ¼ Mile of a Transit Stop			х				1									х	х		х	х	x	х	х	
Number of and Percent of of Accidents Involving Trucks			х								(6					х							х
Number of and Percent of of Potential Total of Route Miles Transferred			х									7				х	х		х	х			х	
Percent of Freight System Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards During Peak Hours			х					2									х		х		х		x	X
Percent of STAs where v/c meets standard			х					2									х		х		х	х	x	
Net Benefit of Off-System Improvements			х						3															
Number of Bridges on Lifeline Routes with Satisfactory Rating			х								(6	+				х		х	1			x	+
Number of Culverts Retrofitted For Salmon	<u> </u>		х	\vdash			┨──				(6	+				х		x	1	\vdash		\vdash	+
Inumber of or Accidents with F/SI per Million venicle Miles Traveled	<u> </u>		x	\vdash		+					(D C	+			l	х		x	1	х		x	-
Number of of At-Grade Crossings Eliminated or Replaced With Grade-Separated			X	\vdash		+ $-$		-				6	+	_			X		x	X	+	\vdash	X	X
Number of or Newly Constructed At-Grade Crossings	-		X								(0 7					x		X	X			X	X
Number of Rote Miles with Potential of Interfulsational Hansler	-		X				1					/		-			X		x	X			X	
Number of State rwys wr Op-10-Date NK waps	-		X				1					6		-			A V		A V				x	
Percent of Didges on Element outer with a starter by Seismic Nating	-		A V							4		0			_			v	x				x	
Percent of Customers Deporting Favorable Percention of Scenic Ruways	-		v							4					_			A V	x				x v	
Dercent of Highway Lang Miles Meeting Meeting Meeting Standards	-		x x					2		-							v	^	^		-		x	
Percent of nr Nimber of Intermedial Connectors Improved	-		v				1	2									v				-		^	
Percent of OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Access Meets Bridge Rating Standards	-		x	\vdash					3	4	-	-				x	x		x	1	+	x		+ $+$
Percent of OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Defined and Evaluated	-		x				1		3	4			+			x	x		x	1-	+	x		+ + -
Percent of Oregonians Who Commute To and From Work in SOV	-		x							·	5					^	x	x	x x	1	x		x	+ +
Percent of Oregonians Who Comute To and From Work During Peak Hours Not in SOV	-		x								5						x	x	x x	1	x			x
Percent of Total Person Miles of Travel Made in HOV	-		x								5		+				x	x	X X	1	x		x	x
Percent of VMT Reduction Due to HOV Lanes	-		x								5		+					x	X X	1	x		x	++
Annual Percent of Reduction in Fatal and Injury Crashes			x									6					х		x	1	x		x	
Percent of of Occupants Using Safety Restraints			x				1				(6					х	x	x	1	x		x	+ + -
Number of of Park-and -Ride Spaces W/I State Hwy ROW			x				1										х		x	1	x			
OR Scenic Byway Committee Rating			x							4							х		х	1				

				Sou	irce				Tra	insp	orta	tior	n Plan	Poli	cy A	rea	D	ata 1	Гуре		PM (har	acte	ristic		Sy	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	UIP TrancDlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \	Data Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	, Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Number of Deaths Due to Alcohol and Drug-Related Crashes			3	x									6					х			x		х		x			
Number of Deaths Due to Motor Vehicle Crashed			3	х									6					х			х		х		х			
Projects Meeting Criteria for Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians			3	х				х										х			х						х	
Bikeway and Walkway Projects Meeting Adopted Criteria			3	x				х										x			х						х	
Miles of Rural State Highways Suitable for Bicycling)	х				х										х									х	
Miles of Urban State Highways Accommodate Pedestrians and Bicyclists			3	х				х										x							х		x	
Availability of modal choices			3	х				х										х		х						х	x	
Ease of use			3	х				х												х						х	х	
Relative Cost			3	х				х									x		х							х	x	
Proximity to Service			3	х				х											х			х		x		х	x	
Frequency of Service			3	х				х										x				х				х		
Mode split at major destinations (discrete list)				Х	<								7					x	х		x		х					
auto occupancy-average system-wide				X	<							5	7					х	х		x x		х					
Vehicle trips per capita				Х	(7						х		x x		х					
auto VMT per capita (define parameters)				X	<								7						х		x x		х					
miles of system exceeding LOS standard				Х	(2									х			x		х		х			
transit & auto travel times in major corridors				X	(2									х			x					х		
avg. peak hr. travel times-selected regional destinations (all modes)				Х	<				2									х			x		х					
net change in # of parking spaces/capita/planning period				X	(х					х					
Capital costs - includes construction (all modes, by mode) *				X	<													х										
Costs & benefits distribution among community members *				Х	<										1		x	x										_
average trip length (system-wide) by trip purpose (8)				X	<								7			10			X		X X		х					
average trip length by functional class (6)				Х	<								7			10			x		X X		х					_
vehicle hours of delay				×	<				2									х	х		X X		х					_
transit, auto, bicycle and ped travel times in major corridors				X	(2										Х	_	x		х		╢┝	х	x	
peak hr. travel times-selected regional destinations (by mode) Time Contour Maps				×	<				2									X	X	_	X		x		╢┝			
Average personal/user travel cost of transportation system **				×	<			<u> </u>	_				7					X	X	_		_	x		╢──			
Intrazonal trips & trips to neighboring TAZs				×	<			1								11			X	_	X		x	x	╢┝		X	
percentage of total land by plan designation within metro UGB w/in 1/4, 1/2 mile of transit (by service frequency)				х	(1								11	x	x			x	x		x		x		
% of residences w/in 1/4 mile of transit (by service frequency), w/in 1/2 mile of bike system and w/in 1/2 mile of				×	,			1								11	v	×			v	v		v		v	× I	
convenience commercial 96 of employment w/in 1/4 mile of transit (by service frequency), w/in 1/2 mile of bike system and w/in 1/2 mile of				-	•	+ $+$	<u> </u>	-	-	1						11	^	Å	+	-			+	\vdash	1			+
20 of employment with 174 mile of transit (by service requency), with 172 mile of bike system and with 172 mile of convenience commercial	1			×	<			1								11	x	x			x	x		x		x	x	
% of residences w/in 1 mile of maj, employment ctrs. (discrete list)				Х	<			1								11	x				х			x				1
modal shares				X	(1								10		х	х		х		x					
Mode split at major destinations (discrete list) at TAZ level				Х	<			1								10		х	х		х		x					
total vehicle trips per capita				Х	(1										х	х		x		х					
auto VMT per capita (define parameters)				X	<			1					6					х	х		x x		х		х			
net change in # of parking spaces/capita/planning period	1			Х	<											11		х			x	х		х				
CO (tons per year)				×	<							5						x	x		x x		х					
Ozone - precursors (tons per year)				×	<							5						х	x		x x		х					
PM-10 (tons per year)				X	<							5						х			x x		х					
visual & aesthetic impacts				Х	<						4	5								х				x				
open space/wetlands/ natural areas removed				Х	(4	5					x	x			x			x				
impacts upon significant cultural features - historic, archaeological, churches, cemeteries				Х	<						4	5					x									Ш		
water quality performance measure(s) (Impervious Surface)				Х	(5					x											
Measure of Cost vs. Revenue available				Х	<								7				x	х			х					Ш		
Capital costs - includes construction (all modes, by mode) *				Х	<								7				x	x				х		<u> </u>	╨			1
Operating, maintenance & preservation costs (all modes, by mode)				X	<								7	8			х	x				х						
Administrative capacity / costs (policy level) **				X	<								7				x	x				х		<u> </u>	┺			
Supportive of Sustainable Development				X	(х		х		<u> </u>	┺			
OMP Cost / Capital Cost Ratio				Х	(-			7				x				х	x	\square		╢	$\downarrow \downarrow$		1
\$ per PMT				X	(-	-			7				X				х		х		┺	\downarrow		4
Number of Local Intersections per Square Mile	I		1	Х	<		1	1	2	1								x			х	x	1	х	1	1 1	1 1 1	1

			S	our	ce				Trar	nspoi	tatio	on Pla	an Poli	cy Ar	ea	Da	ta Type	е		PM C	hara	cter	istic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHPD 308	TTI TEAs Mobility		TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality or Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Ohlactiva)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Elasticity of Accessibility w/r/t Fuel Price			1	Х											0		x	1	П			T					
Reserve Capacity of System				х					2								x					x		x			
% of Trips that could be accommodated on other modes in emergency				х					_						0		X X		x	(x	x	
Amount of Travel in Excess of User's "Ideal" Amount of Travel				х				1	2									x				x					
Number of Activity/Goods Opportunities within User's Time/Cost Budget				х				1								х	x					x	х				
Quality of Activity/Goods Avaialble within User's Time/Cost Budget				х				1								х	x					x	х				
Percentage of person trips within defined nonauto to auto time difference				х													x x		х	K X		х					
Percentage of person trips with travel time advantage for non-DA vehicles				х				1									x x		х	K X		х					
Peak / Non-Peak travel time ratios				х					2								x		х	x x		x					
Noise Exposure Index (dBa times # Households exposed to transportation noise levels in excess of x dBa)				x								6		9		x	x					x	x				
Households exposed to CO concentrations in excess of x ppm				х								6		9		х				х		x	х				
Differences in Multi-Modal Accessibility by S-E group				Х				1						9		х				х							
Differences in Noise Exposure by S-E group				х										9		х				х							
Average travel time / cost to work by S-E group				х				1						9		х	x			х		х					
Difference is CO exposure by S-E group				х										9		х				х	х						
Non-Auto Accessibility for Persons age 12 - 18				х				1									x				х						
Non-Auto Accessibility for Persons age 65+				Х				1									x										
Differences in Accessibility to Community Resources and Amenities by S-E Group				х				1								х	x			х		x					
Roadway Congestion Index		>	ĸ						2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Travel Rate Index		>	ĸ						2								x		х	x x		х		х			
Travel Time Index		>	ĸ						2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Travel Delay		>	ĸ						2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Buffer Index: ((95%ile min/mile - mean min/mile)/mean min/mile)*100%		>	ĸ						2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Travel Rate	х	K							2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Delay Rate	х	K							2								х		х	к х		х		х			
Total Delay	х	¢.							2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Relative Delay Rate	х	¢.							2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Delay Ratio	х	C C							2								x		х	x x		x		х			
Congested Travel : Congested vehicle-miles	х	¢.							2								x		х	x x		х		х			
Accessibility: sum of objective fullment opportunities within x minutes travel time	х	(1									x		х	ι .		х	х				
Speed Reduction Index: ratio of decline of speeds from free-flow conditions	х	¢.							2								x		х	ι.		x		х			
Congestion Severity Index	х	(2								x		х	ι .		х		х			
Lane-mile duration index	х	(2								x		11			х		x			
Peak 1-Hr Percent of Peak 2-Hr and Daily Traffic (a measure of reserve capacity)							х		2								х					х		х			
Ratio of Population or Employment Density to Street Intersection Density							х								11	x	x		11		x		х	x		x	
TOTAL NUMBER OF MEASURES				1	1			180	176	59	37 65	5 93	195 72	18	22 10	126	5 504 205	5 36	5 3	72 208	150	362	57	224	151	55 20	133

				Tra	ans	nor	tati	ion	Po	licy	Are	а	
						001	ce c			, of		с.	
Performance Measures	Source	. Accessibility	. Mobility	Economic Vitality	. Quality of Life	. Sustainability	. Safety and Security	. Affordability	. System Preservation	. Environmental Justice	0. Balance	1. Adaptability	2. Land Use Compatibility
		-	7	(C)	4	2	9		8	6			_
VEHICLE IRAVEL	METRO	1					-			 	/	<u> </u>	
4. Average weekday Person Trips	METRO	1	-		\vdash			┢──┾		⊢			
4. Average Weekday Work Trips	METRO	1	-		\vdash			┢──┾		⊢			
4. Average weekday Non-Work Trips	METRU BVCOC	1	-		\vdash			┢──┾		⊢	10		
76 OF THPS by Pulpose by Time	RVCOG	_	-		\vdash			┢──┾		⊢	10		
Per Capita Vehicle Trips		_			<u> </u>			┢──┢		┝──┤	10		
Per Capita venice rips	RVCOG	1	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
3. Average weekday lotal Auto Person Trips	METRO	1	-		<u> </u>	-		┢──╂		┝──┤			
reison miss bei Auto mis	LCOG	-	-		<u> </u>	2		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
Per capita VMT in Oregon metropolitan areas for local, non-commercial trips	IPK Denebraark	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
rei capita vivi in oregon metropolitan areas loi local, non-commercial trips	Benchmark	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
Internal VMT (or commercial vahialas)	LCOG	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
	LCOG	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
Venicle whee naveled relicipita in metro Aleas		1	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
4-8. Vehicle Miles of Travel per capita and VMT/capita change	METRO	1	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		10
Venicle miles traveled per capital in metropolitari areas per year	DVCCC	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		12
Per Capita Venice Miles Of Have	RVCOG	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
Arterial and Collector Miles (avaluding func)	LCOG	-	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
Arterial and Collector Miles (excluding Twys)	LUUG	_	-		\vdash			┢──┾		⊢	10		
Number of Late-Miles of New Roadway Construction	RVCOG	1	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
2. Total Lane Miles Added	METRO	1	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤			
1. Total lane miles (freeway, arterial)	METRO	1			<u> </u>		┝──┼	┢──╋		\vdash	10		
Parkings spaces per capita	LCOG	_			<u> </u>		┝──┼	┢──╋		\vdash	10		
Number of Parking spaces per capita in MPO area	IPR							┢━━┢	_		10		
	1000					-			ļ		10		
	LCOG	1	-		<u> </u>	┝──┤		┢──╂		┝──┤	10		
9. Sov percent of person trips	IVIE I RO	1	-		──'			┢━━╋		┝──┤	10		
70 Oregonians who commute to and From Work in SOV	OHP	_			<u> </u>	5		┢──┢		┝──┤	10	11	
76 Oregonials who commute during peak hour.		_			<u> </u>	3		┢──┢		┝──┤	10	11	
Percent non-SOV commute during peak-noul		1	2		\vdash		 +	┢──┾		⊢	10		
% Oregonians who commute during peak hours by other than SOV	Depekment	1	2		<u> </u>			┢──┢		┝──┤			
76 Oregoniaris who commute during peak nodis by other transition	METRO	1	2		<u> </u>			┢──┢		┝──┤	10	11	
D. Non-Sov percent of person tips (shaled fide, waik, bike, transit)	IVIETRO	_			<u> </u>	5		┢──┢		┝──┤	10	11	
Janeta Kue (2 of more) mode Share	METRO	-			<u> </u>	5	r	┢──╉		┝──┦	10		-+
Mode share (alternative modes & SOV)			+	-	<u> </u>	┝─┤	┌──┼	┢──╉	-+	┢──┤	10	-+	-+
Would share (anternative modes & 300)		-			<u> </u>	┝──┤	r	┢──╉		┝──┦	10		-+
% VMT Reduction Due to HOV Lanes		-	-	1	\vdash	┝─┤	 	┢──┨	-+	┝──┦	10	-+	\rightarrow
BICVCLE AND DEDESTDIAN ELEMENTS	UNF					ليهيها	ليهي	ليوري			10		
Availability of modal choices											10		
Massures of accessibility by alternative modes		1	+	-	<u> </u>	┝─┤	┌──┼	┢──╉	-+	┢──┤	10	-+	-+
# Projects that Meet Criteria for Accommodating Ricyclists and Pedestrians		1	+	-	\vdash	┝─┤	┌──┼	┢──╂	-+	┢──┤	10	-+	-+
# Rikeway and Walkway Projects Meet Adonted Criteria	OTP-Bike/Fed	+	-	1	\vdash	┝─┤	┌──┼	┢──┨	-+	┢──┤	10	-+	-+
ד הוגבייימי מות ייימוגייימי ו'וטןכנוג ויוכבו אנטטובע טווברום	OIF-DIKE/Peu		1	1	1 '	1 1		i		. !	10		

				Tra	ns	por	tati	ion	Po	licy	Are	ea	
Performance Measures	Source	1. Accessibility	2. Mobility	3. Economic Vitality	4. Quality of Life	5. Sustainability	6. Safety and Security	7. Affordability	8. System Preservation	9. Environmental Justice	10. Balance	11. Adaptability	12. Land Use Compatibility
% Non-Auto Trips	LCOG										10		
Walk Mode Share	LCOG										10		
1, 2. Walk Trips and Walk Percent of Person Trips	METRO										10	11	
Bike Mode Share	LCOG										10		
# person trips by bicycling and walking	OTP-Bike/Ped										10		
1, 2. Bike Trips and Bike percent of Person trips	METRO										10	11	
%total daily trips by transit and by bicycles+walking	RVCOG										10		
Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial &Collector Miles	LCOG										10		
Bikeway Miles	LCOG										10		
Priority Bikeway Miles	LCOG										10		
% Collector and Arterials Accommodating Bicyclists	RVCOG										10		
Miles of Rural State Highways Suitable for Bicycling	OTP-Bike/Ped										10		
Miles of Urban State Highways that Accommodate Pedestrians and Bicyclists	OTP-Bike/Ped										10		
%urban arterials and local collectors in urban areas that have adequate pedestrian and bicycle facilities	OTP	1	2										
% Collectors and Arterials With Sidewalks	RVCOG										10		
% of Roadway Miles with Sidewalks	LCOG										10		
Secure bicycle storage available at all employment and shopping centers, park and rids, passenger													
terminals and recreation destinations	OTP-Bike/Ped										10		
Inventory # of Park-and -Ride Spaces within and adjacent to State Hwy ROW	OHP										10		12
TRANSIT ELEMENTS													
%Oregonians living in communities that meet minimum levels of service for public transportation	LCOG										10		12
Coordinate intercity bus and local transit with intercity rail for timely and convenient connections	OTP-Rail		2								10		
Transit Mode Share	METRO	1									10	11	
1. Average Weekday Transit Trips	METRO	1									10	11	
3. Transit % of Person trips	OTP	1	2										
5. % of Households within 1/4-mile of Transit	METRO										10		12
% of Households Within 1/4 Mile of a Transit Stop	LCOG	1											12
% of Population Within 1/4 Mile of Transit Route	RVCOG	1											12
% HHIds w/Access to 10-minute Transit Service	LCOG	1											12
% of Population Within Service Area for Lift Service	RVCOG	1	2		4					9	10		
Transit Service Hours per Capita	LCOG										10		
2. Average weekday transit revenue hours	METRO	1										11	
Transit Ridership-Frequency and Hours	RVCOG	1	2								10		
Amount of Paratransit Services	RVCOG	1	2		4					9	10		
%Oregonians in communities with daily scheduled intercity air, bus, van/shuttle or rail service	OTP	1	2								10		12
Total transit time compared with auto travel time during off-peak hours	METRO	1	2										
Total transit time on regional bus routes compared with total auto travel time	METRO	1	2										
FREIGHT ELEMENTS													
Major intermodal rail/truck faciltiies should exist on rail mainlines with a service area of 150 miles	OTP-Rail			3							10		
7. Lane miles added to freight network	METRO			3									
8. Freight Network miles	METRO	1		3									
1. Average weekday Total Truck Trips (Freight System Performance)	METRO			3									
Ease of use (rail)	OTP-Rail	1		1 1									

				Tra	ans	por	rtat	ion	Po	licy	Are	a	
Performance Measures	Source	1. Accessibility	2. Mobility	3. Economic Vitality	4. Quality of Life	5. Sustainability	6. Safety and Security	7. Affordability	8. System Preservation	9. Environmental Justice	10. Balance	11. Adaptability	12. Land Use Compatibility
Relative Costs (rail)	OTP-Rail	1						7					
Frequency of Service (rail)	OTP-Rail	1											
AIR ELEMENT													
Availability of Airport with commercial service where population is greater than 50,000 and further than 70													
miles from nearest other airport	OTP-Air	1									10		
Availability of airport service to areas with population > 25000, central urban area > 15000, more than 50													
miles from other commercial air and more than 100 miles from metro area	OTP-Air	1									10		
COMMUNITY													
%Oregonians living where air meets air quality stds (Benchmark)	OTP					5							
Percent of time that the air is healthy to breathe for all Oregonians	TPR				4								
Percent of time that the air is healthy to breathe for all Oregonians	Benchmark				4								
Air quality: comparison of metropolitan regions: summer days ozone violation of Clean Air Act	METRO				4								
Air Quality: number of days exceeding the standard	METRO				4								
Minimize Impact on Air Quality	RVCOG				4	5							
CO Emissions (Weekday Tons)	LCOG					5							
Average Fuel Efficiency (VMT/Gal.)	LCOG					5							
# Culverts Retrofitted For Salmon	OHP					5							
Miles of scenic byways	OTP				4								
% Customers Reporting Favorable Perception of Scenic Byways	OHP				4								
OR Scenic Byway Committee Rating	OHP				4								
Miles of State Hwys w/ Up-To-Date natural resource Maps relative to total miles needing mapping	OHP					5							
Minimize ROW Impacts	RVCOG				4	5							12
Intrusion into Existing Neighborhoods	RVCOG				4								12
Minimize Impact on Ag and Forest Land and Open Spaces	RVCOG				4	5							
CONNECTIVITY													
% of identified obstacles to freight movements that are eliminated	OHP	1	2										
% or # Intermodal Connectors Improved	OHP	1	2										
Maximize use of I-5 Inter-Urban Travel	RVCOG							7	8		10		
Street System Connectivity	RVCOG	1											12
CONGESTION													
21. Total Roadway Capacity Miles (freeway, arterial)	METRO	1											
Per Capita Vehicle Hours Traveled	RVCOG	1	2										
Per capita vehicle hours travelled (VMH)	TPR		2								10		
Roadway Congestion Index	LCOG	1											
Congested Miles of travel (% of total VMT)	LCOG	1											
% Highway Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards	OHP		2										
17. % of Arterial Street Miles Experiencing Congestion (System Performance)	METRO	1	2										
17. % of Freeway Miles Experiencing Congestion	METRO	1	2										
% miles on limited-access highways in urban areas that do not meet highway mobility stds	OHP		2										
% of Lane-Miles on Collector and Arterials Not Congested	RVCOG	1										Ī	
Hours of travel delay per capita per year	Benchmark		2									Ī	
Network Vehicle Hours of Delay (Daily)	LCOG	1	2										
Minimum motor vehicle levels of service	METRO	1	2									Ī	

				Tra	ans	por	tat	ion	Ро	licy	Are	a	
Performance Measures	Source	1. Accessibility	2. Mobility	3. Economic Vitality	4. Quality of Life	5. Sustainability	6. Safety and Security	7. Affordability	8. System Preservation	9. Environmental Justice	10. Balance	11. Adaptability	12. Land Use Compatibility
15. Average Motor Vehicle Speed	METRO		2	1									
14. Average Motor Vehicle Travel Time	METRO	1	2	1									
19. Total Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay	METRO	1	2	1									
20 Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay on Freeway	METRO	1	2	1									
20. Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay on Arterial Streets	METRO	1	2										
% of mileage of the NHS for which there has been no decrease in average travel speed from 1995 levels	OTP	1											
3 Two-Hour Peak Period Average Truck Travel Time	METRO	1	2										<u> </u>
A Two hour Part ruck hours	METRO	-	-										<u> </u>
5. 6. Two-Hour Peak Period Truck Vehicle Hours of Delay	METRO												<u> </u>
9, 10, Congested Freihelt Network miles	METRO	1	2										
% Freight System Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards During Peak Hours	OHP	-	2										<u> </u>
% Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors		1	-										<u> </u>
Reliable on-time arrivals within 15 mins of published schedules (rail)	OTP-Rail	-	2										<u> </u>
Increase passenger speeds up to 110-125 mph on existing mainline trackes (rail)	OTP-Rail		2										<u> </u>
Branch rail lines allowing a min speed of 25 mph	OTP-Rail		2										<u> </u>
Minimum of three round trips per day of 19 passengers between Portland/West Coast hubs and other	Off Hum		-										<u> </u>
areas of Oregon (air)	OTP-Air		2										ł
	011 /		2										
%involved citizens satisfied and informed	OTP									9			
% Customers By Region Reporting Favorable or Better Perception of Hwy System for aesthetics, safety	011									-			<u> </u>
and performance	OHP				4					9			ł
SYSTEM CONDITION	••••				-					,			
Percent of roads in fair or better condition	Benchmark								8				
% of Roadways in Fair or Better Condition	LCOG								8				<u> </u>
%infrastructure that is classified as "fair or better" or "sufficient" (pavement, bridges, publicly owned									-				<u> </u>
transportation vehicles and facilities, runways)	OTP								8				ł
Capital Improvement Costs for existing infrastructure	RVCOG							7	8				
LAND USE INTEGRATION													
% Special Transportation Areas where highway mobility (v/c) meets standard	OHP												12
Highway v/c ratio within a Special Transportation Area (for corridor planning)	OHP												12
6. % of Jobs within 1/4-mile of Transit	METRO			3							10		12
% Emp w/Access to 10-min Transit Service	LCOG			3							10		12
% mixed use employment in new development	RVCOG			3									12
% of New "Total" Employment in Nodes	LCOG												12
Average Trip Length (miles)	LCOG		2	1									12
12. Average Home-Based Work Trip Length	METRO	1											ł
11. Average weekday motor vehicle average trip length (miles)	METRO												12
% Person Trips Under 1 Mile	LCOG												12
%Oregonians commuting less than 30 mins to work	OTP	1	2										12
%mixed use DUs in new development	RVCOG												12
Acres of zoned nodal development	LCOG												12
% of dwelling units built in nodes	1000												12
	LCOG												

				Tra	ins	por	tati	ion	Ро	licy	Are	а	
Performance Measures	Source	1. Accessibility	2. Mobility	3. Economic Vitality	4. Quality of Life	5. Sustainability	6. Safety and Security	7. Affordability	8. System Preservation	9. Environmental Justice	10. Balance	11. Adaptability	12. Land Use Compatibility
Use of Abandoned ROW	RVCOG								8		10		12
FINANCES					Ċ								
Alternative transportation funding	RVCOG							7			10		
Annual capital spending	METRO							7	8				
Avg Annual regional transportation capital needs	METRO							7					
Amount of transportation funding as %OTP 20-yr plan needs.	OTP							7			10		
% state expenditures saved through cost-sharing and other partnership arrangements	OHP							7					
Heavy and light vehicle payments to the Highway Fund as % of amount in Cost Responsibility Study	OTP							7					
Net Benefit of Off-System Improvements	OHP							7					
# Route Miles With Potential for Interjurisdictional Transfer	OHP							7					
# and % of Potential Total of Route Miles Transferred	OHP							7					
SAFETY													
% Bridges on Lifeline Route with Satisfactory Seismic Rating	OHP						6						
# Bridges on Lifeline Routes with Satisfactory Rating	OHP						6						
% OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Defined and Evaluated	OHP						6						
% OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Access Meets Bridge Rating Standards	OHP						6						
Transportation related deaths and major injuries per 100,000 population	OTP						6						
# and % of Accidents Involving Trucks	OHP						6						
Deaths Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes	OHP						6						
% of Occupants Using Safety Restraints	OHP						6						
# Deaths Due to Alcohol and Drug-Related Crashes	OHP						6						
# of Accidents With fatality/serious injury	OHP						6						
Annual % Reduction in Fatal and Injury Crashes	OHP						6						
Accident Data by Mode	RVCOG						6						
Accident Data by Trip Purpose	RVCOG						6						
Impact on User Safety	RVCOG						6						
# of Newly Constructed At-Grade Crossings	OHP		2				6						
# of At-Grade Crossings Eliminated or Replaced With Grade-Separated	OHP		2				6						
%regional and local governments with acknowledged transportation system plans	OTP												
TOTAL NUMBER of MEASURES		53	38	7	14	11	16	12	7	4	65	7	26

			Soi	irce	÷				Po	olicy	Торі	c Cla	assif	icati	on			
Policy	TPR	ОТР	TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability	LUT Compatability	Comment
Reduce Reliance on the Automobile	x						x									x	x	VMT per Capita has been the main transporation planning PM in Oregon. However, it is a better measure of estimated automobile USE than automobile RELIANCE, and it has been found to be more closely linked to economic activity than demographics.
Balanced System: accommodate multiple modes within corridors, provide choices		x	x													x		There are many aspects to "balance" modal choices, allocation of resources, balanced network, weighing conflicting goals, etc
Efficiency: take advantage of inherent efficiencies of each mode; don't optimize cost effectiveness of one mode at the expense of another; "most appropriate mode"		x											x					
Multimodal Accessibility: measured by availability of modal choices, ease of use, relative cost, proximity to service, and frequency of service		x					x											Plans currently have PM's to measure some specific elements of accessibility. Warrants further research.
Enhance the aesthetic value of transportation corridors		х								х								"Eye of the Beholder" must elicit subjective public response
Connectivity policies; within and between modal systems		x	x				х											Some PM's, like intersection density, touch on this. Further research needed.
Support Compact, Mixed-Use Development to reduce travel demand		x	x	x													x	Many PM's measure travel demand, a secondary measure that is influenced by numerous non-land use factors. There are few Oregon PM's that directly measure the 'fit' or 'support' between transportation and land use.
Economically Viable, Financially Stable System			Х										х					
Maintain the integrity of and minimize impacts to neighborhoods and local business communities while addressing regional transportation needs.			x	x		x				x					x			Numerous aspects noise, pollution, safety (actual and perceived)
Barrier-Free Transportation; Accessibility for Everyone		x		x			x								x			We find PM's for specific components, such as paratransit services, but not broader measures of accessibility for mobility impaired people
Provide access to jobs and services for low-income people				x											x			
Protect the natural environment		х		х	х	х					х							Many PM's related to emissions and noise. Few relating to visual impacts and physical segmentation of spaces.
Protect water quality				х							х							impate and physical cognitication of opticion
Reduce Consumption of Resources				х							x							Some related to energy use, need PM's regarding other resources
Design streets with a modal orientation that reflects the function and character of the surrounding land uses.				x					x	x							x	Metro RTP contains a land use / street design table and narrative guidelines. The City of Portland ASCP may offer additional insights.
The Regional Road System shall provide connectivity and continuity of travel between regional ingress and egress points and major regional destinations and activity centers to minimize out-of-direction travel and circuitous routing.					x		x		x				x					

		S	our	ce				Pc	licy	Торі	c Cla	assifi	catio	on			
Policy	TPR	OTP	TransPlan	SKATS	RV RTP	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability	LUT Compatability	Comment
Ensure adequate goods movement system carrying capacities to adequately serve current and future needs of area shippers and transportation providers.				х			x	x									
Encourage efforts to maximize intermodal goods movement routing options within the region.				x		x		x									
Safety issues shall be considered a priority when comparing alternative projects for inclusion in the RTSP.				x							x						Oregon plans presently lack PM's to deal with safety and security in a comprehensive way.
Prudent investments necessary to improve current safety problems shall be identified in the regional TIP.				x							х						
Ensure that the costs of planned improvements are commensurate with the benefits.					x							x					Few Oregon PM's currently assess full costs and benefits.

			Sou	irce				Tra	ans	porta	tior	n Plan Po	olicy	Area		Dat	a Ty	/pe		PM (hara	acte	ristic		S	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP	Other	Accessibility Mobility	Fconomic Vitality	Cuality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability	system Preservation Environmental Instice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \	Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Average travel time from facility to destination (by mode)	х							1 2				7						х		X X		х		x	х	х	Т
Average travel time from facility to major highway network	х							1 2				7						х		x x		х		x			
Average travel time between intermodal facility and rail	х							1 2				7					х	х		x x		х					х
Perceived deficiencies	х							1 2											х								
Percent of transit demand-response trip requests met	x							1 2									х			x	х				х		
Frequency of transit service	х							1 2									х			х	х				х		
Percent use of walking and bicycling for commute trips (or all trips)	х							1 2			5							х		x x		х				х	
Percent of State residents aware of intermodal opportunities	х							1	3										х	х	х						х
Percent of wholesale and retail sales in the significant economic centers served by unrestricted (10-ton) market artery																											
routes	x				_			1	3				_				х		_	X	X		X	-			X
Number of snipping establishments per 1,000 businesses	x				_			1	3				_			X			_	х	X			-			x
Employee-related percent or employers who have relocated for transportation reasons.	x				_			1	3				_						x	X	_	x	X	-			
Percent of employers that cite difficulty in accessing desired labor supply due to transportation.	x	-			_			1	3			-							x	х		x	x		_	+-+-	_
How time in minutes as it compares to the number of connecting transfers	x				_			1				7	9				х	х	_		_	x		-	X		
Number of projects (area and population) accessible to designated development centers	x				_			1				7	0			X	X		_		x		x				_
Percent of transfers between modes to be under 'X minutes and 'N feet	x							1	-	4		7	9				х	x	_	X	x	x			x	+	_
worktrips completed per venicle nour or commute travel	x							1		4		/							_	X X	-	x		x		++	
referent of region's mobility-impaired who can reach specific activities by public transportation of by waiking/wheelchail	x							1		4						x	x	x		x		x	x			x	
Average number of hours spent traveling	x							1		4								x		x x		x	x				
Customer perception of guality of transit service	x							1		4									х			x			x		-
Accessibility index (STEAM?)	x							1										х		x		x	x				-
Average trip length	x							1										х		х		x	х				
Number of miles with intelligent transportation service	х							1									х				x						
Number of new rest areas constructed v. planned	х							1									х			х	х			x			
Number of Trunk System lane miles planned v. completed	х							1									х			x	х						
Total freeway lane-miles (or per capita or per measure of regional business volume or per square mile or truck VMT)	x							1									x			x	x			x			x
Total freeway lane-miles in acceptable condition (or per capita or per measure of regional business volume or per square mile or truck VMT)	x							1									x			x	x			x			x
Mode split by facility or route	х							1			5	7						х		х		х			х	х	
Overall mode split	х							1			5							х		х		х			х	х	
Percent of users with option of more than one modal choice	х							1									х	х		х	х		х				
User identification of access issues	х							1											х		х						
Existence of railroad electrification	х							1								х	х				х						х
Air transportation capacity	х							1									х			x	х					x	1
Airport improvement and cost scheduled at airports	х							1									х				х					x	1
Airports within a 30-minute drive of agricultural centers capable of supporting twin engine piston powered aircraft	x							1	3								x				x					x	:
Amount of scheduled service between major cities	х	-			-			1	3						1		х			х	x	+			-	x	-
Number of cities over 1 million population served directly by nonstop commercial airline flights from airports in state	x							1	3								x			x	x					x	:
Percent of aviation community reached through aviation service programs	х							1	3								х				х					x	2
Percent of general aviation needs funded	х							1	3								х			х	x					x	£
Percent of manufacturing industries within 30 miles of interstate or four lane highway	х							1	3							х	х			х	х		х				х
Availability of real-time cargo information	х				_			1	3								х				х	\square			-	\square	x
Capacity of package express carriers	х							1	3							х					х					\vdash	х
Number of package express carriers	х	-			-			1	3							х					х	\downarrow			-	\square	x
Percent of goods moved with option of more than one modal choice	х							1	3							х	х				х					\vdash	х
Average circuity for truck trips of selected O-D pattern	х	-			-			1	3								х				1	x	х	4	-	\vdash	х
Bridge weight limits	х	-			-			1	3								х			х	х	\downarrow		4	-	\vdash	х
Geometrics of connector link	х	-	\square		_	\vdash		1	3				_		4—		х				x	+		4		++	X
Number of overload permits rejected due to structural capacity deficiency	х	-	\square		_	\vdash		1	3				_		4—		х				x	+		4		++	X
ivumber of structures with vertical (or horizontal) clearance less than X ft.	x	-	-	_				1	3				_	+			х		_		x	+		4	-	++	x
inumber or truck-days of highway closure on major freight routes	x	-	-	_				1	3				_	+ $-$			х				х	+/		4	-	++	x
Percent of truck highway bridges sufficient in load capacity, vertical and horizontal clearance	х	1	1	1	1	1		1	3				1	1 1	1		х			1 1	X	1		1	1	1 1	х

			Sou	rce			Tra	ans	portatio	on l	Plan Pol	icy /	Area	Da	ita T	Гуре		PM	Cha	racte	eristic		S	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP Transplan	Metro RTP	SKATS DV PTD	оther Оther	Accessibility Mobility	Economic Vitality	Countries vitairy Quality of Life Environmental Sustainability	Environmentar Justamaumy Sefety and Security	sarery and security Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Dian Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transnort Measure	Hindhway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Percentage of highway system with bridges that structurally deficient or functionally obsolete	х						1	3	3						х			х	Х						х
Sufficiency rating (percent bridges meeting federal sufficiency rating)	х						1	3	3						x			x	х						х
Amount of turning radius from major highway to intermodal facility	х						1	3	3						x				Х						х
Average distance to intermodal terminals from different community shipping points	х						1	3	3						x	х			х		x				х
Capacity of intermodal terminals	х						1	3	3						x			х	Х						х
Number of intermodal facilities	х						1	3	3						х			х	Х						х
Number of T.E.U.'s (10'x 21') (or railroad cars or containers) that can be stored on the premises of the intermodal																									
facility	x						1	-	5						X		_	x	Х						X
Number of trucks that can be loaded with bulk material per hour of loading time	x						1	-	5						x		_		X						X
Number of intermodal raciities that agency assists in development	x						1	-	5						X		_		Х						X
Number of ports with raincad connections	x						1	-	5						x		_		X						X
Percent of population that can reach specified services by transit, bicycle, or walk	x						1							X	_	х	_	X	(X	X		X		
Existence of handicap access to all areas	x						1			_					X		_		X				_	+	_
Percent of elderly and disabled persons with special transit service available	x						1							X	X		_	x	Х				X		
Percent of transit dependent population served	x						1							X	X		_	X	Х		х		X		_
Percent of transit facilities accessible to nanocapped	x						1					0			X		_	x	X				X		
Connectivity dericiency	X						1	_				9			X	X	_		-	X				+	
Halister Ustalite	X						1	_				9			X		_		,					+	
Number of counties in state with county-wide transit systems	X						1			-					X		_	X			-		X		
Number of ransit systems in scale	A V					_	1							~	л х		_	X	-		×		X		_
Percent of purel population with access to transition and the solution in the of the solution	x						1							× ×	v			^	- É		×		x x	+	
Percent of runan population with decess to that a second runal second runal and hus service	x						1							x	x						~		x		
Percent of workforce that can reach worksite in transit within one hour and will so the	<u>^</u>						-							^	^				-				~		-
	x						1							х		x				x	x		x		
Access time to passenger facility	х						1								х				Х	1			х		
Percent of total transit trip time spent out of vehicle	х						1									х		X :	κ.	х			х		
Route spacing	х						1								х			х	Х				х		
Route-miles (or seat-miles or passenger miles) of transit service (or per capita or per employee or per licensed driver)	x						1							x	x			x	,				x		
Availability of intermodal ticketing and luggage transfer	х						1								x				Х				х		
Existence of information services and ticketing	х						1								х				х				х		
Transfer distance at passenger facility	х						1								x				Х				х		
Number of pick up and discharge areas for passengers	х						1								x				Х				х		
Percent of rail station parking lots with mid-day spaces available	х						1			Τ					х					x			x		
Parking spaces available loading/unloading by autos	х						1								x				Х				х		
Parking spaces per passenger	х						1								х					x			x	\square	
Utilization rate of parking spaces during daily peak hours for bus, rail, park and ride or other passenger terminal lots	x						1								x			x		x			x		
Percent of population within 5 miles or 10 minutes of state-aided public roads	х						1							х	х			х	Х		х	x			
Number of miles of non-motorized facilities	х						1		5	i 🗌					х			х	х					х	
Minimum layover times at airports or passenger terminals	х						1			Τ					х			х	х					x	
Percent jobs within 45 minutes of airports	x						1							х	х			x	х		х			x	
Tonnage moved on various transportation components (by mode)	х						2	(1)	3						х					х					х
Traffic at border crossings	х						2	3	3						x					х					х
Cost/benefit of existing facility v. new construction	х						2				7		10	х	x			х						\square	
Average speed	х						2				7				x	х	_	X :	(X		x			
Total travel time (by mode)	х						2				7	1				х			(X		x	х	x	
Delay time at primary commercial airports	х	_					2	_	+ $-$		7				х					x	-		_	x	_
Origin-destination travel times (by mode)	х	1					2				7	1		 		х			(X	<u> </u>	x	х	x	
Average daily traffic per freeway lane	х						2	_	+		7	1			x	x			(x	∦	x	_	++	_
Number of people provided service at travel information centers	x						2	_	+		7	-			x					X	┨───			\vdash	
Line haul speed	x	-					2	_	+ $+$	_	7	-		 	x	+		\vdash		X		_	_	++	х
Average processing time for shipments at intermodal terminals	x	-					2	_	+ $+$	_	7	-		 	X	+		х		X		_	_	++	х
Average transfer time/delays	х	1					2				7	1			х			1 1	х	.					х

			Sou	irce			Т	rar	nsportat	tion	n Plar	n Poli	су А	rea	Da	ata T	Гуре		PM	Cha	racte	eristic		S	ystem	
Performance Measure	ICHRP 446 ICHRP 308	TI Urban Mobility	0TP	letro RTP	KATS	.V RTP Dther	ccessibility	obility	conomic Vitality buality of Life	nvironmental Sustainability	afety and Security	triciency and Affordability ystem Preservation	nvironmental Justice	alance \ Adaptability UT Compatability	and Use \ Economic \ bemographic \ Environmental \	ransport Sytem Data	ravel Model \ Travel Survey	ttitudinal Survey	enchmark? (Objective)	lan Imnlementation (outmut)	farket Response (outcome)	and Use or Combined Land Ise \ Transnort Measure	ichway	ransit	ed\Bike ir	n reight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
	ZZ		0 +	- ≥	S	20	4	Σ	ώO	ш	Ś	ы v	ш	B	יסב	Η	-	4			. ≥			- F		(LL
Delay of trucks at facility per ton-mile	х							2				7				х			х		х					x
Delay of trucks at facility per VMT	х							2				7				x			х		х					х
Freight carrier (or local shippers) appraisal of quality of highway service in terms of travel time/speed, delay, circuity,												-														
scheduling convenience	x							2			,	7						x		_	x					X
Facility usage by mode (V/C)	x			_				2				/				x		_	X X	<u>د</u>	x		x	x	x	X
Average commuting time for urban population	x			_				2				/				X	X	_	X 2	<u>د</u>	X		X	X	x	_
Cost of an intermodal trip as a percent of cost of auto use	x							2				/			X			_	х	х	٤				<u> </u>	_
Percent of workers who work at home because of transportation cost or level of service	x							2				/					X			_	X				<u> </u>	_
Average wait time to board transit (or between modes)	x	_						2				/				X			х	_	Х			X	$ \rightarrow $	_
V/C for bicycle and pedestrian facilities	x	-		_				2				7			 	х			х	_ _	x			_	x	
Lost time due to congestion	х							2	4								Х		X 2	۲. ۲	Х					_
Customer perception of satisfaction with commute time	х							2	4									х			х					
Travel time between major cities	х							2									х				х					
Delay due to incidents	х							2								x			х		х		x	х		
Delay per VMT (by mode)	х							2									х		х		х		х	х		
Interference of movement at grade crossings-delay time and speed	х							2								х					х					
Intersection LOS	х							2								x	х		х		х		x			-
LOS	x							2								x	x		х		х		x			-
Number and percent of lane-miles congested	x							2								x	x		x	1	x		x			-
Percent of highways not congested during peak hours	x							2								x	x		x		x		x			-
Percent of VMT at LOS 'X'	x							2								x	x		x	-	x		x			
Percent of VMT which occurs on facilities with V/C greater than 'X'	x							2								v	v		x y		v					-
Percentage of time average speed is below threshold value	x							2								v	x		x y		x				-+	
Ducuing of vahicles (including rail) and its relationship to overall delays	x							2								v	^			· -	x		- Ê			
	A V							2								~ ~			× .		A V		- Ê		<u> </u>	-
Reserve capacity	<u>л</u>	_						2								X			X	-	X		- X		<u> </u>	
Have the under congested conditions	X							2								X	X		X		X		X		<u> </u>	_
V/c ratio	x	_						2								x	X		X 2	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>	X		X	_	\vdash	_
VMI by congestion level	x	_						2								X	Х		X X	۲. 	х		X	_	$ \rightarrow $	_
Average daily traffic	x							2								X	X		X X	٤	Х		X		⊢	
Total VMT	х							2								x	X		X X	ί.	х		X		\vdash	_
VHT per capita	х							2							X	х	Х		X X	۲. E	Х		X		\square	
VHT per employee	х							2							х	x	x		X 2	۲.	x		X			
VMT growth rate relative to population, employment	х							2							х	x	х		X 2	ι	х		X			
VMT per capita	х							2							х	x	х		x	۲. I	х		х			
VMT per employee	х							2							х	x	х		x	£	х		x			
VMT within urban areas	х						⊺ _ו	2		[х	х	_1	x	۲. I	х		х		∟ _	
Fluctuations in traffic volumes	х	T						2			-					T	х				х	ľ	x		. —	
Minute variation in trip time	х	T						2								T	х				х		x	х		
Percentage of scheduled departures that do not leave within a specified time limit	х							2								x					х			х		
Percentage on-time performance	х							2								х			х		х			х		
Travel time contours	х							2								x	х		3	۲.	х		x	х		-
Mode split	х							2								x	х		x x	1	х			х	х	-
Percent of change in mode splits	x							2									x		x		x			x	x	-
Modal Interchange	x							2									x				x		x	x	x	-
Number of users of intermodal transfer facilities	x	1		1			1			-		7				1	x				x	1	1	x	x	(X
Transfer time between modes	x							2									x				x			x	v	
I OS at intersections serving facility	x	+		+				2								y	A		\vdash		y	11	v	A .	^	-
I OS on facility access roads	x			_	+			2								v		_			v		- L-		-+	
Time to access intermodal facilities	A V	-		+	+			2							 	A V	v			-11	A V	1		v	-+	
	-	-		_	-	$\left - \right $	┨──┼	-				_	-			A Y	A		\vdash	_ _	A X	1			-+	
And the second s		-	$\left - \right $	_		$\left - \right $	┨──┼	2				_				X		-	\vdash	_ _	X	1		-	-+	
Customer perception of ease of travel through highway construction areas	X		+	-			┨──┼	2										X	\vdash	_	X			_	\vdash	
Customer perception or time it takes to unive through highway construction areas	X		+	-			┨──┼	2										X	\vdash	_	x		X	_	\vdash	
Customer perception or time it takes to travel to places people/goods need to go	x		++		-			2							I			х			х		X		<u> </u>	_
Dollar value of projects that improve travel time on key routes	х				1			2					1		Х	X	1			X	٤	1	X	х		х

				Sour	ce				Tra	insp	orta	tion	Plar	n Poli	cy A	Area	Dat	ta T	ype	PM	Char	acte	ristic	Sy	stem
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	I I I Urban Mobility	TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Ouality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway Transit	Ped\Bike Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Connoitu rostriationa									2		U		0/ 2									-			
Capacity restrictions	X		_					-	2									X			_			X X	X
Detay per ton-time staveed (by houe)								-	2					-				X				X			X
Immes of neight routes with adequate capacity Dercent lane miles which are truck priority (or excluded)	×		_					-	2									X							
Ton miles of rail freight into/through metropolitan areas	x								2									x			X	v			X
Ton miles traviale by concession lavel	×		_					-	2									A V		v v	-	x v			X
Tark delivery and loading interference with street traffic	×		_					-	2									v		^ ^	-	v			X
Truck VMT by light duty, heavy duty, and through trus	x								2									x		x		x			x
Customs delays	x								2									x				~			X
Dwell time at intermodal facilities	x								2									x							X
Frequency of delays at intermodal facilities	x								2									x							x
Tons of commodity undergoing intermodal transfer	x								2									x							x
Truck turnaround time at intermodal terminals	x								2									x							x
Average cost (or speed) for a sample of shipments	x								2									x		x		x			X
Number of dockage days at seaports	х								2									x							x
In-vehicle travel time	х								2									х				х		x x	
PMT by congestion level	х								2									х		x x		х		x	
Proportion of persons delayed	х								2										x			х		x	
Number non-work trips	х								2										x	x		х		x	
Passenger-trips per household	х								2										x			х		x	
PHT	х								2									х	x	x x		х		x x	
PMT per capita	х								2									х	x	x x		х		x x	
PMT per per worker	х								2								х		x	x x		х		x x	
Vehicle-trips per household	х								2										х	x x		х		x	
Percent of passengers traveling under five miles made by means other than SOV	х								2										х	x x		х		x x	
Percent of workers who work at home	х								2										х			х			
Percent trips with transit advantage	х								2									х						х	
Mobility index (person-miles (or ton-miles) of travel/vehicle-miles of travel (PMT/VMT) times average speed)	x								2									x		x x		x		x	
Percent lane miles of recreational routes operating below LOS D	х								2									х		x x		x		х	
Vehicle ownership, demand per licensed driver (or worker)	х								2									х		x x		x		х	
Number of commuters using transit park and ride facilities	х								2									х	х	x x		x		х	
Number of demand response trip requests	х								2									х				х		х	
Number of public transportation trips	х	\square		_				<u> </u>	2						1			х	х	x x		х		x	
Un-time performance of transit	X	\vdash		_	\square			<u> </u>	2			\square			1	$\left - \right $		х	\vdash	x				x	\rightarrow
Passengers per capita within urban service area	X	\vdash		_	\square			<u> </u>	2			\square			1	$\left - \right $		х	\vdash	X X		х		x	$\rightarrow \rightarrow$
Bicycles per boarding	x								2				-	_				х			_	х		x	X
Property damage accidents/venicle miles traveled Percent of region's unemployed or poor that cite transportation access as a principal barrier to seeking employment	x									3	4		6		0			x		x		x		x	
Direct jobs supported (or created)	X	+		+	+		_		-	2	4	\vdash			9	$\left - \right $			X	\vdash	+	X	x	\vdash	-+
Economic costs of accidents	×	++	_	_	+	_		⊪—		2		\vdash	6	_	-	\vdash	x	v	++	v		X			-+-
Economic costs of accidents	×									2			0				л 	X		X	-			X	
Economic costs of stalities	v	++		+	++	+		1-	-	3		\vdash	_		-		x x	A V		x				x v	x
Economic costs of retainties	x		_					-		3							x x	v		A V	-			^ ^	<u>^</u>
Economic costs of nollution	x			-					+	3					1		x	x		x				\vdash	+
(Transport Costs as) Percent of state gross product	x			-					+	3					1		x			x				\vdash	+
Indirect jobs supported (or created)	x	+		_	++	+				3					1		x			x					+
Business volume by commodity group	x	++		+	+	+				3		\vdash			1		x			<u> </u>					x
Economic indicator for goods movement	x	\vdash		+						3					1		x								x
Market share of international or regional trade by mode	x							1	1	3					1		x			x		x			x
Percent increase in intermodal facilities use	х							1	1	3					1		х								x
Percent of manufacturers/shippers have relocated for transportation purposes	х									3									x			x	х		x
Price index for selected local delivery service	х									3									x						x
Tonnage originating and terminating	х									3							х								x

			S	ourc	e				Tra	anspo	orta	ation P	lan	Poli	cy A	rea	Da	ata T	ype		PM (Char	acter	ristic		Sy	/stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility OTP	TransPlan	Metro RTP SKATS	RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Economic indicator for people movement	х									3																		
Number of cruise embarkations	х									3								х										
Percent of population that perceives that its environment has become more 'livable' over the past year with regard to																												
ability to access desired activities	х										4	5								х								
Sprawl: difference between change in urban household density and suburban household density	х										4	5					х						х	х				
Customer perception of satisfaction with air quality	х										4	5								х			х				$ \rightarrow $	
Number of days that Pollution Standard Index is in unhealthful range	х										4	5					х											
Number of urban areas (or population in areas) classified as nonattainment status	х										4	5					х										$ \rightarrow $	
Tons of pollution (or vehicle emissions) generated	х										4	5							х		X X		х		х		$ \rightarrow $	
Number of noise receptor sites above threshold	х					-		<u> </u>	-		4	5	_				х	_			x		\square		∥—		<u> </u>	+
Number of residences exposed to noise in excess of established thresholds	х					_		L			4	5	_		9		х	_			x	-		х			\vdash	4
Percent of population exposed to levels of highway noise above 60 decibels	х										4	5			9		х				х			х	х		$ \rightarrow $	
Customer perception of amount of salt used on trunk highways	х										4	5								х			х		х			_
Customer perception of satisfaction with transportation decisions which impact the environment	х										4	5								х			х					_
Number of archeological and historical sites that are not satisfactorily addressed in project development before	~										4	E															.	
construction begins	-										4	5	_				X					-					<u> </u>	
Customer perception or salety willer in traver system.	-							-			4	0								~		-	л				<u> </u>	
releting of population which perceives that response time by police, the, rescue of emergency services has become batter or worse, and whather that is due to transportation factors.	x										4	6								x			x	x			.	
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities)/PMT	x										4	6						x	x		x		x		x			-
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities)/VMT	x										4	6						x	x		x		x		x			1
Customer perception of promises kept on project completion	x										4		7							x			x					-
Customer perception of satisfaction with completed projects	x										4		7							x			x					-
Customer perception of satisfaction with involvement in pre-project planning	x										4				9					х			х					-
Compliance with affirmative action goals	х										4				9		х				x							
Number of accidents involving hazardous waste	х											5 6						х					х					x
Average fuel consumption per trip for selected trips (or shipments)	х											5	7					х			x x		х		х			х
Modal Interchange [[??]]	х											5	7															
Air quality rating	х											5					х				х		х					
Amount of recycled material used in road construction	х											5					х					х			х			
Amount of salt used on roadways [[output measure?]]	х											5					х					х			х			
Amount of salt used per VMT [[output measure?]]	х											5					х					х			х			
Average miles per gallon (MPG)	х											5							х		х		х		х			1
Constraints to utilization due to noise (hours of operation)	х											5																
Constraints to utilization due to water (dredge fill permits)	х											5																
Environmentally friendly partnership projects per year	х											5					х										.	
Fuel consumption per PMT	х											5							х		x x		х		х	х		х
Fuel consumption per ton-mile traveled	х											5							x		x x		х		х	x		х
Fuel consumption per VMT	х											5							x		x x		х		х	x		х
Fuel usage	х											5							х		x x		х		х	х		х
Highway emissions levels within non-attainment areas	х											5					х	х			x x		х		х			
Number and miles of 'nature' routes [[??]]	х											5																
Number of environmental problems to be taken care of with existing commitments	х											5															$ \rightarrow $	
Number of pipeline spills	х											5									х							
Number of transportation control measures (TCMs) accomplished v. planned	х							L	-			5	_					_			х	х			x	х	x	+
Percent of region which is developed	х							L	-			5	_				х	_			х	-		х			$ \rightarrow $	4
Percent of vehicles using alternative fuels	x							L	-			5	_					х			x		х		х		<u> </u>	4
Public transportation passenger-miles/ total vehicle-miles	х						+	L	-			5	_					х	x		x x	-	х	l	х	x	<u> </u>	4
I ne degree to which pipeline spills and accidents are minimized	x			\vdash		-	\parallel	L	-			5 6	_										\square		┨───		<u> </u>	4
I ons of greenhouse gases generated	x			\vdash		-	\parallel	L	-			5	_				x				X X		x		┨───		<u> </u>	4
VM I/speed relationships	X			+		-	+	<u> </u>	-			5	_					_			X X		х		┨───		$ \longrightarrow $	+
Percentage of state truck highway system rated good or better	X			+		-	+	<u> </u>	-			6		8				х					\vdash		┨───		$ \longrightarrow $	х
Ratio or number or transit incidents to investment in transit security	x			+		-	+	<u> </u>	-			6	7					x					\parallel			x	<u> </u>	+
Accident rate, deaths, injury, property loss by type of corridor	X					-	+	<u> </u>	-			6	_					x			x		+				$ \rightarrow $	+
Alconol-related ratal accidents/all fatal accidents	Х			1		1	1		1		1	6		1				х	1		х		1				.	1

			S	our	ce				Tra	ansp	orta	ation	Plan	Poli	су А	rea	D	ata Typ	е	P	мс	hara	acter	ristic		Sy	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility OTP	TransPlan	Metro RTP cvarc	SNA13 RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \	Data Transport Sytem Data Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Average accident cost per trip	x												6					x x		x			х		х			T
Fatality (or injury) rate of accidents	х												6															-
Hazard index (calculated based on accidents per VMT by severity)	х												6							х								
National rank for accident, injury, fatality rates	х												6					х		х		1	х		х			
Number of accidents per capita	х												6				х	х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per intermodal movement	х												6					х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per per ton-mile traveled	х												6					х		х			х					х
Number of accidents per trip	х												6					х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per VMT	х												6					х		х			х		х			
Number of accidents per year	х												6					х		х			х		х			
Accident risk index ('Safety Index')	х												6					х		х					х			
Number of high accident (or hazardous) locations	х												6					х		х			х		х			
Number of safety related improvements	х												6					х		х		х			х			
Average duration of incidents	х												6					х		х			х		х			
Response time to incidents	х												6					х		х		х			х			
Number of safety related complaints	х												6						х				х		х			
Number of Statewide traffic accidents (or injuries or fatalities)	х												6					х		х			х		х		\square	_
Accidents related to bridge characteristics	х												6					х					х		х		\square	_
Customer satisfaction with snow/ice removal	х												6						х			 '	X		х		⊢⊢	_
Number of highway miles driven at high accident locations	х												6					х		х	х		X		х		$ \square $	_
Percent highway miles built to target design and operational standards to handle traffic at a steady 55 mph rate													6															
Percent of vehicle crashes on highway system where roadway related conditions were listed as a contributing factor	x							-					6					x		x		X	x		x			
Roadway sections not meeting safety standards	х												6					х		х		х			х			
Number (or percent) of highway miles driven above speed limit	х												6					х					х		х			
Number (or percent) of motorists driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs	х												6					х					х		х			
Number of accidents in which speed or traffic violation is a factor	х												6					х				1	х		х			
Percent of drivers complying with seat belt law	х												6					x					х		х			
Construction fatalities/dollars of construction cost (or per 100 highway related crew)	х												6					х		х		1	х		х			
Number of accidents occurring in highway construction zones	х												6					х							х			
Average response time for emergency services	х												6				х			х					х			
Percentage of emergency road calls that get through to state highway agency	х												6					х										
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities) per 1,000 vehicles at park and ride lot	х												6					х							х			
Crime at rest areas and other facilities	х												6				х										\square	_
Lighting and security staff at parking areas	х												6				х										\square	_
Percentage of parking areas that are secured	х												6				х					 '			х		⊢⊢	_
Accidents at major intermodal crossings	х												6					х				 '	Х		х		⊢⊢	Х
Exposure (AAD1 and daily trains) factor for rail crossings	х			_									6					х		x		 '	X		х		\vdash	X
Grade crossing safety improvements (MI)	х			_									6					х				 '	⊢–				\vdash	x
Number of ratalities and injuries occurring on the rail system	x			_			_	-	_				6	_							_	1—	⊢–∣				<u> </u>	X
Rainoad/nighway at-grade crossings	X			_			_	-	_				6	_							_	1—	⊢–∣				<u> </u>	X
Crimes per 1,000 passengers	x			_		_		-	_	_			6				X	X				1'	X			x	<u> </u>	
Number of intercity bus and rail accidents	X			_			-						0					-	_			1				x	<u> </u>	-
Transit accidents (or injuries or fatalities)//MT	×			+	+			⊢				\vdash	6					X	-	X		"⊢−	X		⊪—	X	<u> </u>	
Number of commercial vehicle safety inspections performed. [foutput measure?]]	×			-				⊢					6	+						Ň		-	\rightarrow			^	r – † – –	
Number of commercial vehicles weighed (by fived and nortable scales). [[output measure?]]	- v			-	+		+	⊢					6						-	×	-		⊢ –∥				-+	
Percent of commercial vehicles that hass safety inspections	×			-	+		+	⊢					6						-	- v	-						-+	-
Percent of commercial vehicles weighed that are overweight (by fixed and portable scales)	x			-		+		⊢		+			6						1	Ŷ	1	1'	x		11	$\left \right $	-+	- x
Percent of traffic on regional highway which is heavy truck	x							┢					6					x	1	x	x	1	x		1		-+	x
Bicycle accidents (or injuries or fatalities) per bicycle-mile of travel	x							┢					6					x	1	x	+ .	1	x		1		x	+-
Joint-use bicycle crossings	x			+				F					6						1	l –	1		٣Ì				x	+
Number of pedestrian accidents (or injuries or fatalities)	x			+				F					6					x	1	x	1		x				x	+
Use of safety equipment by bicyclists	x			L									6					x									х	
								_			_									_								_

			Sou	urce	2			Tra	ins	portat	ion	Plan Pol	icy /	Area	Da	ta T	Гуре		PM C	har	acte	ristic		Sy	stem	
															al /			ד								
											itγ	~			enta		vey			put)	ne)	pu				, Air
											lide	pilit			_ mu		Sur		(e)	(out	tcor	d La ure				ship
											tain	y n da	tice	lity	viro	ata	<u>e</u>		ectiv	Б	no)	inec				, 1
		ility	'n						2		Sus	Affo	Just	tabi lity	En	2	Tra	е	Dbje	tatio	ŝ	dm ™				Ra
		4oh							tali	fe	tal	Seci	tal .	lap	c / L	/ter	-	S I	3 (C	ien	i i i	CO				, K
	46	2		<u>د</u>	2			lity	, S	f Li	Jen	/ ar	jen	Ac Ipat	l ∕ e phi	t S	ode	al >	able	ler	esp	e or insp				Тг
	P 4	rba	i	Plai	2 0	₽.		sibi	, include	N O	nu	/ ar	nn	Ce	Use	por	Ξ.	qin	asta	đ	H H	Use Tra	vay	÷	Sike	÷
	H H		4	ans	ATIC	R R	Le	bilit	l	liler	Vic	ficie ste	Virc	lan JT (nd emc ata	ans	ave	titu	rec	an L	arke	nd se \	ghv	ans	de l	eigh
Performance Measure	žž	É	5		N N	R C	5	Mo Ac	Ц	άđ	Б	Sa Sv	μ	Ba	De	É	μË i	Ĩ	B 문	ä	ŝ	La Us	Ξ	É	Air Air	Ē
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities) caused by air transportation	х											6				х									х	
Accidents (or injuries or fatalities) caused by waterborne transportation	x											6	_			х									x	_
Number of airports where weather information is collected for dissemination to pilots	x											6				х		_		-	+				X	_
Number of landing areas inspected	x											6				х		-		-	+		-		X	
Percentage of airports that meet federal and State planning and design standards	x											6						-		1-	+		-	++	x	
Shipping accidents occurring on waterways	x											6						-			+			+		x
Total annual attendance at pilot safety seminars	x											6													х	
Maintenance cost of connector link	x											7 8														-
Dollar value of flexible federal funding programmed for non-highway projects	х											7			х				х	х				х	x x	
Percent variances between actual versus predicted DOT revenues	x											7			х											
Private cost for transportation system	x											7				х			х							
Public cost for transportation system	x											7				х			x							
Total public expenditures on modal systems (freight v. passenger)	x											7				х		_	x	x				+		
Administrative costs as a percent of total program	x									_		7				X		_	x	-	+			+		
Administrative, engineering and construction cost/person- (or ton/mile (owner cost)	x			_								7						-1			+		-			_
	x											7	-			v			x	1	+			+		
Construction Productivity Index (Cost of contract lettings, utilities, real estate acquisition, construction, change orders,	^															~			<u> </u>	1-	+			+++		
and cost overruns DIVIDED BY staff costs, consultant contracts, and design construction change orders)	x											7				x										
Cost per percentage point increase in lane miles rates fair or better on pavement condition	x											7				х			x x		х		х			
Data center costs as percentage of total program	х											7				х		_	x	⊢	+		-	\vdash		_
Dollar allotment and percent of department funds consumed by overhead	x											7				х		_	x	-	+		-	+		
Dollar allotment and percent of funds going to non-engineering activities	x				_					_		7				X		-1	x	-	+			++		_
Number and dollar value of projects jointly funded	x											7				x			×	1	+		X	+		
Number and dollar value of projects formy funded	x											7				x			\vdash	1-	+			+++		
Partnership benefits (to taxpavers and partners)	x											7				x		-1								-
Percent cost of re-work	x											7				х		-1	x							-
Percentage increase in final amount paid for completed construction over original contract amount	x											7				х			х						-	
Proportion of infrastructure investment from private sources	x											7				х			х							
Savings to taxpayers/public from partnerships	x											7			х				х							
Unprogrammed construction costs as a percentage of total construction costs	x											7				х			х	x						
Infrastructure maintenance expense	x											7	_			х		_	х	x	+					_
Operational cost per toll transaction	x									_		7				X	_	_	X	x				+		
Additional costs per trip (user rees)	x											7		10		X	X	-1	x	-	X		-	+		_
	x											7	-	10		x	x		x	1	x			+		
	x											7		10		~	x	-1	<u> </u>	1	x			+		-
Reduced costs per trip (subsidies)	x											7					x	-1			x					
Use cost/person-mile (user cost)	x											7					х				х					-
Value of fuel savings	х											7					х				х		х			
Vehicle operating cost reductions	x											7					x				х					
Average days to complete driver licensing or vehicle registration transactions	x											7				х			х				х			
Percent of invoices processed within five days of receipt	x								-	++		7			х	1	+		x	-∥	$\downarrow \downarrow$		х	\vdash	-+	_
Percentage increase in number of days required for completed construction contracts over original contract days	x											7			x					1						
Units of work completed per hour worked [[output measure?]]	x	-							1			7	+		x			-	\vdash	1	+			\vdash	-	+
Hours of incident related delay on highway system	x	1			-				1	+		7			<u> </u>	х	+	-		1	+				+	+
Speed limits and difference between modes	х									+		7	1			х			x	x	x		х	x	x	1
Number of projects applying technology developed or available in last 'X' years	х											7														
Percent of error free data in IMS database	х											7														
Percent of projects rated good to excellent in quality audits	х											7				х			х							
Percent projects requiring few or no significant change orders due to plan errors	x	1							1			7	1			х	1		х	1	1 1			1 1		

			S	ource	•				Transp	ort	ation F	Plan	Policy	Area	Da	ta T	ype	PM C	harad	cteri	istic	Sy	stem	'n
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility OTP	TransPlan	SKATS	RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway Transit	Ped\Bike	Aır Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Percent projects with no premature maintenance problems	x									1		7				x		x	T T	Т				_
Percentage of information and data exchanged between intrastate agencies	x											7			x			~						
Transactions completed per motor vehicle division employee	x											7			x	x		x						
Vehicle-miles traveled per hidrway department employees	x											7			x	x		x				x		
Number of foll transactions	x											7			~	x						x		
Percent of highway tolls pre-paid	x											7			-	x						x		
Percent of Jane million is with tall pricing	x											7				x						x		
Performance of State roads based on HPMS ratings	x											7				x		x				x		
Tonomias per callon of fuel	x						_					7				x		~		x		Ê –		x
V/C by route	x				+	+			2	+		7				x	x	x v	╟─┼	x		x		-
VMT per mile of roadway	v				+	+	-			+	+	7	+ -			v	x	x v	╟─┼	x		\vdash		+
Win per time or roadway	X						_					7					A V	× ×						
Waragement/employee satisfaction communication of agency goals	X						_					7					л 							
Management/employee satisfaction with oversity enoris	X				_		_					7					X					\vdash		_
Management/employee satisfaction with progress toward targeted focus area	X						_					/					X							_
Percent or customers satisfied with licensing and registration process	x						_					/					X			x				_
Overall mode splits	x											/					X	X X		x		X X	X	_
Number of users of intermodal facilities	x											7				х								_
Percent of intermodal connecting points and facilities accurately placed on a map	х											7				х								_
Additional revenue earned by producers when shipping via rail	х											7				х								x
Average transfer costs	х											7				х								х
Cost by commodity	х											7				х								х
Cost per fuel-mile as it compares to cost per air (or water or rail) mile	х											7				х								х
Cost per ton of freight shipped	х											7				х								x
Cost per ton-mile by mode	х											7				x								х
Rail freight revenue versus operating expenses	х											7			х	x								х
Ratio of oversize/overweight permit fees collected to dollar value of damage caused	х											7			х	х		x						x
Revenue per ton-mile by mode	х											7				х		х						х
Shipping cost per shipment	х											7												х
Customs and administrative processing time	х											7												х
Hours of access lost	х											7												х
Tons transferred per hour	х											7				х		х						x
Mode split (by ton-mile)	х											7				х		х		х				x
Number of carloads shipped/received on rail project lines	х											7												x
Number of restricted routes, additional mileage, increased costs	х									1		7				1								x
Percentage of street traffic delivered off-peak	х									1		7				х		x		х		x		x
Productivity and utility by mode	x											7												x
Proportion of freight traffic at facility on portion of network	x									1		7				1								x
Regional truck VMT per unit of regional economic activity/output	х									1		7			х	х		x						x
Change in commute travel person-miles and vehicle-miles per telecommuting occasion	x											7					x			x				
Demand service elasticities for auto v. transit	x		-		-					+		7										x		-
Demand service elasticities for work v. non-work	x											7										x		
Percent of work trips that are SOV	x											7					x	x x		x		x		
Percentage of all trips made by bicycling and walking	x				1			<u> </u>		-	+	7				1				<u> </u>		<u> </u>		+
Tourist/recreation area utility by mode	x											7										++		
Average vehicle occupancy	v				+	+	-			+	+	7	+			v	x	x v	╟─┼	x		x		+
Cost per vehicle for parking fees	x x		-		+	+	-	<u> </u>		+		7				v	- A		╟─┼	^				+
Percent of vehicles using high-occupancy lanes	v				_		_	<u> </u>		1		7				^	v	v v	┢─┼╴	x		x		
Percent of workers who have free parking at employment sites	×			\vdash	+	+	-			+	+ $+$	7	+ +	+ $-$		-	x		╟─┼	^				+
Dercent of workers who have nee parking at employment sites	×			\vdash	+	+	-			+	+ $+$	7	+ +	+ $-$		-	A V	\vdash	╟─┼			×		+
VIAT/DAT	X	$\left - \right $	_		-	+		I	\vdash	+	+	7	+			-	<u> </u>		+	_				+
VWI1/1WI	X	$\left - \right $	_		-	+		I	\vdash	+	+	7	+				X	X X	+	<u>×</u>				+
Cost passenger for urban transit outcome	x	$\left \right $			_	+		 		+	+ $+$	- /	$\left - \right $	+ $-$		X		x	╟─┼					_
Cost per passenger för urban transit systems	x			\vdash	_	+	_	L	├─-	-	+ $+$	7	+ $+$	+ $-$		X	- -	X	╟─┼			x		_
cost per Pivi i for urban transit systems	x			\vdash		+		I		-		7	\vdash			х		x	╟─┼			x		_
Cost per PMT in rural areas	х		1	1 1		1				1	1 1	7	1 1			Х		x				X		

			Sou	rce			Tra	nspo	rtatio	n Pla	n Poli	cy Ar	ea	Da	ta Ty	/pe	P	M CH	hara	cter	istic		Sys	stem	
														-											
									Ę					enta		/ey			out)	(ər	p				Air
									ilide		ility			ů.		L,	(i)		ont	con	Laı re				'nj,
									ainé		dab 1	e	≥	/irol	ata	e	cti		с С	out	asu				l, SI
		ξ						~	ust	ity	for	rsti	ty an	Env	õ	y rav	bje(atio	0	Me				Rail
		lido						ality	alS	n pe	d Ai	L E	apta	con	terr	T _ T	9		ente	Suc	ort				×
	စ္စ	ĕ					≥	Vita	inta life	I Se	anc	inte	Ada	hic Eq	Syt	Su	Ŷ	ole?	Ĕ.	spc	or (spo				,Ĕ
	39	ban	lan	L L			ilidi	nic	Ju of	and	Pr Pr	Ĕ		rap	ort	Mo	nar	stal	nple	Re	lse Tar	Σ		ê	17
	HRP HRP	P	- dsc	2	ST I	τ Έ	ess lity	nor	iror lity	ety .	terr	io,	S S	o d U a nog	dsu	tud	ch	Sca	1 =	ket		2MU	nsit	Bil	ght
Performance Measure	NC NC	E	DTF	Met	SKA RV	dt 2	Acc	ECO	En V	Saf	Sys	Ē		Lan Der Dat	Tra	Atti	Ben	For	Plar	Mar	Lan Use	Hig	Tra	Air	Frei
Cost per revenue-mile for urban transit systems	x	1									7				x		x	—					x	<u> </u>	+
Cost per revenue-mile in rural areas	x										7				x		x						x		
Cost per VMT for urban transit systems	x										7				x		x						x		
Cost per VMT in rural areas	x										7				х		х						х		-
Fare recovery rate of urban transit systems	х										7				х		х			х			х		
Grant dollars per transit trip	х										7				x		х			х			x		
Total transit operating expenditures per transit-mile	x						\vdash		_		7				x		x	⊢∥	\vdash	х			х	\rightarrow	4
Intercity rail and bus service ridership	x			+	+		\vdash	+			7				х			⊢–∥	⊢			—	х	\rightarrow	x
PMT on intercity rail and bus service	x			+			1	+			7				x			⊢–∥	⊢			-	X	+	X
kiders at maximum load point	x	-		+			\vdash	+			7				$\left - \right $			┢──┦	⊢	_			X	+-	+
Ridership per vivit in tutal areas	x	-		+	+		\vdash	+	_		7				v		x	┝──┦		x			x	+-	+
Transit passengers per canita	x	-						+			7		_	x	x		x	x	\vdash	x			x	+	+
Transit peak-load factor	x										7				x		x	x		x			X		-
Transit riders per gallon of fuel	x										7				x		x			x			x		
Transit riders per revenue-mile	x										7				х		х	х		х			х		
Transit riders per route-mile	х										7				х		х	х		х			х		
Transit riders per VMT	х										7				х		х	х		х			х		
Transit ridership per capita	x										7			х	x		x	x		х			х		
Transit ridership to capacity ratio	х										7				х		х	x		х			х		_
Number of peak period transit vehicles	x					_					7				х			⊢_	х				х		_
Revenue vehicle hours per transit employee	x										7				X		X	⊢┦	х	_		_	X		
Average cost for vehicle off feity system	X										7				X		X	⊢−₽	\vdash	X		x			X
Alignment (number of curves/grades defined as excessive by HPMS)	x				_						/ 8				X X			⊢−∥				x			-
Distribution of miles in PSC intervals	x										8				x							x			-
Highway performance based on HPMS	х										8				x		x					х			+
Maintenance condition as measured against departmental standards	х										8				х		х					х			-
Percent of roadway/bridge system below standard condition	х										8				х		х					х			
Percent of VMT on roads with deficient ride quality	х										8				х		х			х					_
Age distribution of transit vehicles	х										8				х		х	⊢	х				х		_
Capacity/Remaining useful life index	x					_					8				х		x	⊢_	\vdash				х		_
Present serviceability rating	x										8				X		X	⊢	⊢ ⊢				x		
Distrass extent/severity by type (nevernet)	x					_					8				x		x	┝──┦				v	х		-
Distress index	x										8				x		x					x			-
Joint condition	x										8				x							x			
New composite index incorporating roughness and distress (pavement)	х										8				х		х					х		-	1
Pavement quality index	х										8				х		х					х			
Percent of lane-miles by pavement condition	х										8				х		х					х			
Percentage of highway mainline pavement rated good or better	x										8				х		х					х			
Remaining life of pavement	x										8				х			⊢–∥	\vdash			х			_
Roughness/ride index (IRI)	x										8				X		X	_∥	\vdash			x			_
Rui depin	x					_					8		_		X			⊢–∥	\vdash			X			-
Tons of asphalt placed by maintenance crews	x	-		+	+		\vdash	+	_		0				x			┝──┦				X v	\vdash	+-	+
Accidents related to bridge characteristics [[Safety Measure?]]	x									6	0				x			⊢┦				x			
Backlog of repairs by different priority categories (bridges)	x	-						+		Ť	8				x							x		+	+
Deck chloride content (bridges)	х	1			+						8	\pm			x							x		+	1
Element condition state distributions (Pontis) (bridges)	х	L									8				x							х			1
Paint distress (bridges)	х										8				х							х			
Percentage of highway mainline bridges rated good or better	х									6	8				х		х		\square			х			_
Railings below standard (bridges)	х										8				х			⊢	\vdash			х		\perp	_
Scour criticality (bridges)	х	1									8				x			1 /	1						1

			Sou	rce			Tra	inspor	tatio	n Pla	an Poli	су А	ea	Da	ta Ty	/pe		РМ С	hara	acter	ristic		Sys	tem
Performance Measure	VCHRP 446 VCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	DTP TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS DV DTD	av kilp Other	Accessibility Mobility	Economic Vitality	Juality of Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	3alance \ Adaptability -UT Compatability	_and Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey Attitudinal Survev		sencrimark. (Objective) Forecastable?	olan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	_and Use or Combined Land Jse \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	∂ed\bike Air Treinht - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Stool bridges with section less in a member (bridges)			<u> </u>		•/ =										, v	-	1		1	H			تبريخ	
Miles of roadway not useable by certain traffic because of design or condition deficiencies	x	_									8				x			x		<u>+ </u>		-	<u> </u>	++
Pavement condition on links to intermodal facilities	x										8				x			`				Ê		x
Percent of road system carrying unrestricted loads year round	х										8				х			ĸ						x
Miles of highway rated 'good' or 'fair' for bicycle travel	х										8				х			ĸ						x
Miles of rail line acquired and rehabilitated for rail service	х										8				х			ĸ						x
Miles of track in operation (by FRA rating)	х										8				х			ĸ					<u> </u>	x
Miles of track not useable by certain traffic because of design or condition deficiencies	х	_				_					8				х		_	ĸ				◢—	⊢∔-	X
Track condition	X										8				X			-		/		/──		X
Track-miles abandoned	x	_				_					8				X			x				. ⊢ ⊢	<u> </u>	X
Miles between read calls for transit vehicles	X										8				X			x v					~	X
Miles be deaded	A V					_		+			0				A V		-	л. И						
Number of state owned navigational aids	x										8				x		-	<u>`</u>						++
Runway resurfacing frequency (airports)	x										8				x			x						
Backlog of repairs by different priority categories	x										8				x									
Customer perception of amount of work being done to improve system	х										8				х	х				х				
Customer perception of condition of system	х										8				х	х				x				
Hours (or days) out of service (for roads or bridges or transit equipment or airports)	х										8				х								х	
Missed trips due to operation failures	х										8				х									
Number of deficiencies corrected vs. number remaining	х										8				х								⊢⊢	
Number of Right-of-Way parcels acquired	х										8				х								<u> </u>	\rightarrow
System condition	x					_					8				х							/──	<u> </u>	\rightarrow
Maintenance hours	X	_									8				х					/				++
Number of bridges let to contract for repair (or replacement)	x	_				_					8				X									
Number of lane miles let to contract for resurfacing	x										0				X								<u> </u>	+
Number of noisets certified ready for construction	x										8				x									
Number of transit (or rail or aviation or intermodal) projects funded (capital and operating)	x										8				x					<u> </u>			x	x
Percent of contracts planned for letting that were actually let	x										8				x									
State (or federal) construction (or maintenance) grants issued	х										8				х									
Agency and user cost of doing nothing or cost-benefit of MR&R (Pontis) (bridges)	х										8			х	х								1	
Current average maintenance costs	х										8				х								1	
Expenditures for freight rail	х										8				х									x
Expenditures to retire deficiencies	х										8				х								$ \rightarrow $	
Net present value of future transit vehicle (or facility or bridge or pavement), equipments and facility capital, operating	v										•				v									
And maintenance costs Non-motorized expenditures	x										8				x			x						++
Percent of budget allocated to system preservation activities	x										8				x									
Congested Miles of Travel (% of total VMT)			x					2							x	x		x x		x		x		
Network Vehicles Hours of Delay (daily)			х				1	2							х	х		x x		х		х	1	
% Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors			Х				1 :	2							х	х		x x		х			х	
Internal VMT (no commercial vehicles)			х				1								х	x		х		х		х		
Internal VMT/Capita			х				1				7				х	х		x x		x		х	$ \rightarrow $	
Average Trip Length (miles)		-	X				1		_		7					х	Ŀ	x x	-	x			<u> </u>	++
% Person Trips Under 1 mile			X			_	1		5							х		x x		x			<u> </u>	\rightarrow
Walk Trips Charad Dida (2 or mara)	\vdash	_		+		+		++	5							X	╢	X		X			-+	<u>K</u>
Drive Alone	\vdash	-		+	_	+		++	5	+		\vdash			$\left \right $	x	╢	X	1	X		X	-+	++-
Person Trins per Auto Trin	\vdash			+	+	+		+ +		+ +	7	+			$\left \right $	A Y			-			×	-+	++-
Average Fuel Efficiency (VMT/Gal.)	\vdash	-	x	+		+			5		7					x		x A		x		x		++
CO Emissions (Weekday Tons)		-	x	+				+	5							x		x		x		x	+	++-
% of dwelling units built in nodes*	\vdash		x				1		-					x				x	1	x	х		-+	++
% of New "Total" Employment in Nodes*			x				1							х				x	1	х	х			

				Sou	rce			T	rans	por	tatio	on P	lan P	olic	y Ar	ea	Da	ta T	ype		PM	Cha	racte	eristic		S	ysten	n
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	от Р TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality Ouslity of Life	Cuairty of Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	balarice \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Dian Imnlamentation (quitput)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land		Higriway Transit	Ped\Bike	Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
% of Roadway miles with Sidewalks				х				1										х			х	x	:	T			TT	
Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial and Collector Miles				х				1					7					х			x	х	1			-	x	
% of Roadways in Fair or Better Condition				х										8				х			x x	x	1					
% of Households Within ¼ Mile of a Transit Stop				х				1									х	х			x x		х	х		x		
Transit Service Hours per Capita				х				1					7				х	х			х	х	í.			х		
% Households with Access to 10 min Transit Service				х				1									х	х			x x	х	x	х		х		
% Employment with Access to 10 min Transit Service				х				1									х	х			x x	х	x	х		х		
Bikeway Miles				х х				1										x			х	х	<i>i</i> .				x	
Percent Non-Auto Trips				х				1											х		x x		х					
Percent Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors				х				1	2										х		x x		х			x		
Priority Bikeway Miles				х				1										x			х	х	<i>i</i> .				x	
Acres of zoned nodal development				х				1													х	х	1					
Percent of dwelling units built in nodes				Х				1															х					
Percent of New "Total" Employment in Nodes				х				1															х					
Arterial and Collector Miles (exclud. Frwys)				Х					2									х			х	x	1		,	(
avg. peak hr. travel times-selected regional destinations (all modes)				х				1	2																			
consistency with local, state, federal plans / regulations				х																			_			_	+	_
Costs & benefits distribution among community members *				х											8													
Economic Development Policy, Goals				х						3													_			_	+	_
miles of system exceeding LOS standard				х					2														_			_	+	_
modal shares by trip purpose				х				1							1	0		х	Х	_			X				+	_
net change in # of parking spaces/capita/planning period				х												11							_			_	+	_
number of intersections above LOS standard				х					2											_							+	_
Ozone - precursors (tons per year)				X							5									_			_	-			+	
sarety (accidents by mode, and/or other accident measure(s))				X			_	1				6	-							_							+	
lotal person trips/venicles to major destinations (discrete list)				X			_	1			-	_	1							_							+	
total system-wide annual rue consumption				X				1		_	5		6					x	X	_							+	
transit & auto travel times in major corridors				X				1	2	_										_						X	+	
				X				1	2	_		_				11				_						—	+	
venice (or person) rips < 1/2 mile by trip purpose	-			~			_	1		1	1					11				_			+	- <u>x</u>				
Visual & asstrette impacts VMT by (DS (specific, pack bourg other?))	-			×			_		2	4	+								v	_			+				+	
Im 10 (top par year)	_			×					2	_	5								Λ							—	+++	-
that which trips par capita	_			x				1		_	5															—	+++	
Average Home-Based Work Trip Length	-			~	x			1											x			-	x	-		-	+	
Average Weekday Non-Work Trins	-				x			1											x			-	x	-		-	+	
Average Weekday Person Trips					X			1											x				x	-				
Average Weekday Work Trips					х			1											x			-	x	1		-		
% of Arterial Street Miles Experiencing Congestion (System Performance)					х				2									х	х				x			-		-
% of Freeway Miles Experiencing Congestion					х				2									х	х				х			-		
% of Households within 1/4-mile of Transit Route					Х			1							1	0 11	х	х					х			x		
% of Jobs within 1/4-mile of Transit					Х			1							1	0 11	х	х			x x		х			x		
Average Weekday Transit Trips					Х			1										х	х		x x		х			х		
Avergae Motor Vehicle Travel Time					Х				2										х		x x		х					
Avergage Motor Vehicle Speed					х				2										х		x x		х					
AWD Total Truck Average Trip Lenth (miles)					х			1											х		x x		х					x
AWD Total Truck Trips					х			1											х		x x		х					х
Bike Trips				Х	х			1			5								х		x x		x				x	
Comparison of Motor Vehicle Volumes					х				2									х	х		x		х		,	ζ.		
Comparison of Selected Transit Volumes					х				2									х			x		x			x	+	
Motor vVehicle Hours of Delay on Arterial Streets					х				2									_	х		x	╨	x	1	,	1	+	
Motor vVehicle Hours of Delay on Freeway					х	_			2								∥	-	х		x	╨	x		,	٤	+	\square
Total Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay					х				2	_									х		x	╨	x	1			+	
Transit Trips		1		1	х		1	1	1		5	1	1				I	x	х		X X	. 📕	X	1		X	1	1

				Sour	rce			T	ran	spo	rtati	on F	Plan I	Polic	y Ar	ea	Da	ta T	ype		PM	Char	acte	ristic		S	ystem	h
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	01P TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Ouality of Life Environmental Sustainahility	Environmental sustainaumity Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Errecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Hiahway	Transit	Ped\Bike	Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Two-Hour Peak Period Average Truck Travel Time					х				2	3									х		x		х		Π	T		x
Two-Hour Peak Period Truck Vehicle Hours of Delay					х				2	3									х		x		х					х
Vehicle Miles of Travel					Х			1											х		x		х					
Person Trips					x			1											x		x		х					
Total Lane Miles					х				2									х			x x	x	_		х			
Freeway lane-miles					х				2									х			X X	x	_		x			
Arterial lane-miles					х				2									х		_	X X	x	_	┨────	X		\vdash	
Total Lane Miles Added (from 1994)					х				2									х		_	X X	x	_	┨────			\vdash	
AWD Total Auto Person Trips					х								7						х	_	x	_	X	·			\vdash	
AWD Total VMT (no trucks or externals)					X								7					х	x	_	x	_	X				\vdash	
AWD VMT/Capita (no trucks or externals)					х								7				х	х	х	_	X X	_	X				\vdash	
Change in AWD VMT/Capita from 1994					х								7				Х	х	x		X X	_	X					
AWD VMT/Employee (no trucks or externals)					х								7				х	х	х	_	X X	_	X				\vdash	
AWD VMT/Employee change from 1994					X								7				х	х	x	_	X X	_	X				\vdash	
Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Percent of Person Trips					х								7						x	_	X X	_	X		4	+		
Non-SOV Percent of Person Trips (shared ride, walk, bike, transit)					х								7						х	_	X	_	X		4	+		
AWD Motor Venicle Average Trip Length (miles)	-				X							_	7						X	_	X X	_	X		x	+	–	
Home-Based-Work Average Trip Length (miles)					х								7						х	_	X X	_	X		4	+		
Auto Occupancy	-				X							_	7					X	X	_	X X	_	X			+	–	
PM 2-HR Motor Venicle Average Travel Time (minutes)	-				x				2			_	_					x		_	X	_	X			+	–	
PM 2-HK Average motor venicle travel Speed (miles per nour)					X				2									x		_	X	_	X	I	┨──		├ ─- ├ ─	
I Otal Miles in Network	-				X							_	_					x		_		X		┨────	4—	+	–+	
Preeway Miles					X				2									x		_		x		I	┨──		├ ─- ├ ─	
Ai terital milles	-				X				2				_					X		_	-	X		 			\vdash	
The 2-th foregoing of frequencies (vic >0.7) (percentage of total times in network)	-				X				2							0		X		-	X		X			+	├──┼─	
Arterial (percentage of arteria) miles in network)	-				v				2							10		v		_		- A	+			+		
M 2-M Motor Vabicla Hours					x				2							10		x	v		v	^	v			+	<u> </u>	
PM 2-HK Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay (time accrued above $y/c > 0.9$)					x				2									x	x		x x		- x			+	<u> </u>	
PM 2-HR Percent Motor Vehicle Hours of Delay	-				x				2									x	x		x		x			+ +		
Freeway (percentage of total motor vehicle hours)					x				-									x			x		x		x	+		-
Arterial (percentage of total motor vehicle hours)					x													x			x		x		x	+		
Total Roadway Capacity-Miles					x													х			x	x			x			-
Freeway/Highway cap-mi					x													х			x	x			x			-
Arterial cap-mi					х													х			х	x			x			
AWD Truck Average Trip Length (miles)					х														х		x							x
PM 2-HR Truck Average Travel Time (minutes)					х				2										х		x		х					х
PM 2-HR Truck Hours					х				2										х		х		х					х
PM 2-HR Truck Vehicle Hours of Delay (time accrued above v/c > 0.9)					х				2										x		x		х					x
PM 2-HR Percent Truck Hours of Delay					х				2										x		x		х					х
Lane Miles Added to Freight Network (from 1994)					х													х			х	х						х
Freight Network Miles					х													х				х	_					х
PM 2-HR Congested Freight Network Miles					х				2									х			x		х					х
PM 2-HR Percent Congested Freight Network Miles					х				2									х			x	_	х					х
AWD Total Transit Trips (originating riders)	L				x		 	1					_					х	x		X		X		╢	x	\vdash	
AWD Transit Revenue Hours					х			1										х		_	x	X				X	\vdash	
Iransit Percent of Person Trips	—	\vdash		_	x			\vdash				_	7					-	x		X		X	╢────	╢─	x	\vdash	_
AWD Originating Kiders Per Kevenue Hour Tatal Wally Talastit (dasa patilashuda wally talas ta tagash)	┣—				X	_	<u> </u>			_		_	7			_		х		_	X		X		╢──	x	\vdash	
Note wark mips (does not include wark trips to transit)	-	\vdash	_	+	X		<u> </u>	1		-+				\vdash		_		-	X		X		X	⊪	╢──	+	X	_
Total Diko Tripo***	⊢	++	-+		X				_	_	_	_	/			_		-	X	_	X		X		╢──	+	X	_
Rike Percent of Person Trins	-	$\left - \right $	_		x x			1				_	7	\vdash				-		_	- X		- X	╂────	╢──	+	A v	
% of Population Within 1/4 Mile of Transit Poute	⊢	+	-+			-	x						/				v	v		_		-		v	╢──	+-		+
% of Population Within Service Area for Lift Service	-				+		x	1	+			-			9		x	x	+		v v	T v	x	x	1	x	\vdash	
		·	1		- i - I -			-				1	1		- 1	1			1 1									

			5	Sour	rce				Trar	nspor	tatio	on Pla	lan Poli	cy A	Area	Da	ata Typ	e		РМ С	hara	acter	ristic		Sy	stem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility OTP	TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	duality of Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Dete	Transport Sytem Data	Attitudinal Survey	Bonchmark? (Objective)	Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Collector and Arterials Accommodating Bicyclists						X		1									х		Т		х	T	,			x	· · · · ·
Number of Lane-Miles of New Roadway Construction						х		1	2								х				х			х			
Per Capita Vehicle Miles of Travel						х		1								х	:	ĸ		х		х					1
Per Capita Vehicle Trips						х		1								х		ĸ		х		х					1
Access Restrictions						х		1									х				х						1
Amount of Paratransit Services						х		1						9			х				х				х		1
Capital Improvements						х							7				х				х						1
Collectors and Arterials With Sidewalks						х		1				6					х				х					х	i
Intrusion into Existing Neighborhoods						х				4	4 5					х					х		х	х			i
Street System Connectivity						х		1									x				х		1 1	х			i.
Transit Ridership-Frequency and Hours						х		1									x	ĸ			х	х			х		1
Percent of trips accessible by non-auto modes within x% max. time difference							х	1							10		3	ĸ		х					х	х	1
VMT - weighted Network LOS under various "de-linking" scenarios							х	1							10			ĸ		х		х					i
Unoccupied Seat-Miles of Travel (Vehicle Occupancy / Average Vehicle Capacity)*Miles of Travel							х								10		х			х		х		х	х		i
Percent of regional trips on the links carrying x greatest O-D pairs.							х								10			ĸ		х		х					i
Percent of regional trips on the x greatest volume links							х								10		3	ĸ		х		х					1
Percent of regional trips on the x greatest volume river crossings							х								10		3	ĸ		х		х					L
Percent of regional trips on the x greatest volume structures							х								10		1	ĸ		х		х					L
Distribution of emergency services (police, fire, hospitals) across rivers, other barriers							х					6			10	х					х		х				L
Population-weighted average access time to nearest trauma center							х					6				х											
Average Transit OVTT							х	1									x	ĸ							х		
Percent of of Roadway miles with Sidewalks			x					1				6					х		>	:	х			х		х	
Percent of of Roadways in Fair or Better Condition			x										8				х		>	1	х			х			L
Ratio of Bikeway to Arterial and Collector Miles			x					1									х		>	ί.	х					х	I
Percent of Employment with Access to 10 min Transit Service			x					1								х	х		>	ί.	х	х	х		x		
Percent of Households with Access to 10 min Transit Service			x					1								х	х		>	:	х	х	х		x		
Percent of of Households Within ¼ Mile of a Transit Stop			x					1								х	х		>	1	х	x	x		x		⊢
Number of and Percent of of Accidents Involving Trucks			X									6					х										x
Number of and Percent of of Potential Total of Route Miles Transferred			X										7			х	x		>	í.	х			X			—
Percent of Freight System Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards During Peak Hours			X						2								х		>	ί.		X		X			х
Percent of STAs where v/c meets standard			X						2	-							х		>	:		X	х	X			
Net Benefit of Off-System Improvements			X							3												└──┦		4┣──			-
Number of Bridges on Lifeline Routes with Satisfactory Rating			X									6					x		>	1		└──┦		X			-
Number of Culverts Retrotited For Salmon			X									6					x		>	1		—		4┣──	++		
Number of of Accidents with F/SI per Million vehicle Mills Taveled			X								_	0					x		,			x	L	<u>x</u>	+	-+-+	
Number of or At-Grade Crossings Eliminated or Replaced With Grade-Separated			X									0					x		,		x	──╿		X		-+-+	X
Number of or newly constructed Actorate Crossings			X					r -				0	7				X		2		X	──╿		X		-+-+	X
Number of Rode Miles with Potential of Interfulsational Hansler			X					1					/				X		÷Ľ,		x	┼──┦		X		-+-+	
Number of Bridger on Lifeline Durke Durke Asteractory Seismic Pating			л У					-				6					~		÷.					- v	++		
Percent of Diages on Percent Page Market State Percent Percent of Percent Perc			- A								1	0					^	v	١÷			I	<u> </u>	- v	+	-+-+	
Percent of Customers Reporting Favorable Percention of Scenic Ruways			v							-	1							v	١÷		-	⊢ –∣		- v	++	-+-+	
Percent of Binkway Lane Miles Meeting Mobility Standards			x						2		•						v	~	ť			┝──┦		x	+		
Percent of rr Number of Intermedial Connectors Improved			v					1	2								v					I	<u> </u>	Ê	+	-+-+	
Percent of OP Desidents Whose Lifeline System Arcess Meets Bridge Pating Standards			x					1		3 4	1					v	x					┝──┦	v	1-	+		
Percent of OR Residents Whose Lifeline System Defined and Evaluated			v							3 4	1	+		1		x	x	_	1H			├── ┦	x		++	++	
Percent of Oregonians Who Commute To and From Work in SOV			x	1							. 5			-		Â	x	«	ال	x		x		x	++	\rightarrow	
Percent of Oregonians Who Comute To and From Work During Peak Hours Not in SOV			x	1							5			-			x	«	ال	x		x		II –	x	x	
Percent of Total Person Miles of Travel Made in HOV			x								5			1			x	c l	1Ľ,	x		x		1	x	x	·
Percent of VMT Reduction Due to HOV Lanes			x								5			1				c l	1	x		x	ا ا	x	++		·
Annual Percent of Reduction in Fatal and Injury Crashes			x									6					x		1,	:		x		x			
Percent of of Occupants Using Safety Restraints			x									6					x	ĸ	1,	:		x		x			
Number of of Park-and -Ride Spaces W/I State Hwy ROW			x					1						1			x		5	:		x			\square		
OR Scenic Byway Committee Rating			x	L						4	1						x)	:							

				Sou	irce				Tra	inspo	orta	tior	n Plan I	Poli	су А	rea	D	ata	Туре		PM	Char	acte	ristic		Sy	ystem	
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446	NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	Urr TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS RV RTP	Other	Accessibility	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Quality of Life	Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security Efficiency and Affordability	System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \	Data Transnort Svrtem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective)	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike Air	Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Number of Deaths Due to Alcohol and Drug-Related Crashes			Х	K									6					х			х		х		х			
Number of Deaths Due to Motor Vehicle Crashed			х	ĸ									6					x	ί.		x		х		х			
Projects Meeting Criteria for Accommodating Bicyclists and Pedestrians			Х	(х										x	ί.		x						x	
Bikeway and Walkway Projects Meeting Adopted Criteria			Х	<				х										x	í.		x						х	
Miles of Rural State Highways Suitable for Bicycling			Х	(х										x	ί.								x	
Miles of Urban State Highways Accommodate Pedestrians and Bicyclists			Х	<				х										x	í –						х		х	
Availability of modal choices			Х	(х										x	í.	х		_				х	х	
Ease of use			Х	(х												х		_				х	x	
Relative Cost			Х	(х									x		х	\square				1		х	X	
Proximity to Service			Х	(х											х			x		x		х	X	
Frequency of Service			Х	(х										x	2	\square		x		1		х		_
Mode split at major destinations (discrete list)				х	(7					х	x	\square	<u>y</u>	<u>. </u>	Х	1				
auto occupancy-average system-wide				х	(_				5	7					X	x	<u>н н</u>	X Y	<u>. </u>	Х	1			\square	_
Vehicle trips per capita				X	(_					7						x	<u>н н</u>	X X	<u>. </u>	X	1			\square	_
auto VMT per capita (define parameters)				X	(7						x	<u> </u>	X Y	<u>. </u>	X				\vdash	_
miles of system exceeding LOS standard				X	(2									X		<u> </u>	х	<u>: </u>	X		x		\vdash	
transit & auto travel times in major corridors				X	(2									X	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	х	<u> </u>	+	4		X		_
avg. peak hr. travel times-selected regional destinations (all modes)				X	(2									X	-	<u> </u>	×	<u> </u>	х	4				_
net change in # of parking spaces/capita/planning period				X				_	_									X	-	<u> </u>			X		4		–	
Capital costs - includes construction (all modes, by mode) *				X	(X	-	<u> </u>			+	4				_
Costs & benefits distribution among community members "				X	(/								7		1	10	x	X	-	\vdash		_	_				├ ─-	
average trip length (system-wide) by trip purpose (8)				~									7			10		_	x	\vdash	X X		X				├ ─┤──	
average tip length by functional class (6)								_	2				/			10			X	\vdash	X X		X	{───	-		\vdash	-
Venice nous of delay								_	2									X	. <u>x</u>	\vdash			X	{───	-	-		-
transit, auto, bicyce and ped traver times in major contours				- Û	· ·			-	2										X			<u>-</u>	X	(├───		X	X	
peak m. traver inter-selected regionar desinations (by mode) nine Contour Maps				Û	· · ·			-	2				7					×	. A				X	(├───			├ ─┼──	
Interactional trins & trins to neitoboring TAZe				Ŷ	·			1								11			- <u> </u>			_		v	-		v	-
Intrazonar unps & unps to negroboring TACs paraontage of total land by plan designation within metro LICR w/in 1/4, 1/2 mile of transit (by service frequency)				- î	`			-								11			-				A	<u> </u>			-	
				x	c			1								11	x	x	£ .	ı	x	x		x		x		
% of residences w/in 1/4 mile of transit (by service frequency), w/in 1/2 mile of bike system and w/in 1/2 mile of convenience commercial				x	(1								11	x	x	ε I		x	x		x		x	x	
% of employment w/in 1/4 mile of transit (by service frequency), w/in 1/2 mile of bike system and w/in 1/2 mile of																								11				
convenience commercial				X	(1								11	x	х	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	x	X		X		X	x	_
% or residences w/in 1 mile of maj. employment ctrs. (discrete list)		_		X		+ $+$		1								10	X	_	+	\parallel	<u>x</u>		+	X	-	+	\vdash	+
modal shares				X				1								10		X	. x	<u> </u>	×	<u> </u>	X	1			⊢	_
Mode spit at major destinations (discrete list) at TAZ level								1	_							10		X	. <u>x</u>	\vdash			X	{───			\vdash	-
uta VIII per capita				Û	· · ·			1					6					×	. A		× .		X	(├───			├── ├──	
auto vim per capita (denne parameters)					(-					0			11		^				- -		v	- <u> </u>			
CO (tops par year)					· ·			-				5						^^	· ·		x ,			-				
Ozone – precussors (tons per year)				x				-				5						v	. <u>A</u>		x y		x	1				-
PM-10 (Inspective)				x	(5						x			x		x					-
visual & aesthetic impacts				x	(-			4	5								x		-		x				
open space/wellands/ natural areas removed				×	(-			4	5					x	x		Ē	x	-	+	x				-
impacts upon significant cultural features - historic, archaeological. churches. cemeteries				x	(-	1		4	5					x		+				+	1		+		+
water quality performance measure(s) (Impervious Surface)				x	(5					x					-	+					-
Measure of Cost vs. Revenue available				x	(F	1			-	7				x	x			x		1-1	1	1	1		1
Capital costs - includes construction (all modes, by mode) *				x	(F	1				7				x	x				x	1-1	1	1	1		1
Operating, maintenance & preservation costs (all modes, by mode)				х	(1					7	8			х	x				x		1		+		1
Administrative capacity / costs (policy level) **				Х	(7				х	x				x		1	1			
Supportive of Sustainable Development				Х	(Ĺ												х		x	T	íf 👘				1
OMP Cost / Capital Cost Ratio				Х	(Ĺ					7				х				x	x	T	íf 👘				1
\$ per PMT				Х	(7				х				х		х					
Number of Local Intersections per Square Mile				х	(1	2									x	۲ L		х	х		х				

			Sou	rce			Tra	ans	portatio	n P	Plan Poli	су А	rea	Da	ta T	ype		PM C	hara	acter	ristic		Sys	tem	6
Performance Measure	NCHRP 446 NCHRP 398	TTI Urban Mobility	OTP TransPlan	Metro RTP	SKATS	RV RTP Other	Accessibility Mobility	Economic Vitality	Cuality of Life Environmental Sustainability	Safety and Security	Efficiency and Affordability System Preservation	Environmental Justice	Balance \ Adaptability LUT Compatability	Land Use \ Economic \ Demographic \ Environmental \ Data	Transport Sytem Data	Travel Model \ Travel Survey	Attitudinal Survey	Benchmark? (Objective) Forecastable?	Plan Implementation (output)	Market Response (outcome)	Land Use or Combined Land Use \ Transport Measure	Highway	Transit	Ped\Bike	Air Freight - Truck, Rail, Ship, Air
Elasticity of Accessibility w/r/t Fuel Price			Х										10			х									
Reserve Capacity of System			Х				2								х					х		х			
% of Trips that could be accommodated on other modes in emergency			Х										10		х	х		х					х	х	
Amount of Travel in Excess of User's "Ideal" Amount of Travel			Х				1 2										х			х					
Number of Activity/Goods Opportunities within User's Time/Cost Budget			Х				1							х		х				х	х				
Quality of Activity/Goods Avaialble within User's Time/Cost Budget			Х				1							х		х				х	х				
Percentage of person trips within defined nonauto to auto time difference			Х												х	х		x x		х					
Percentage of person trips with travel time advantage for non-DA vehicles			Х				1								х	х		x x		х					
Peak / Non-Peak travel time ratios			Х				2								х			x x		х					
Noise Exposure Index (dBa times # Households exposed to transportation noise levels in excess of x dBa)			x							6		9		x	x					x	x				
Households exposed to CO concentrations in excess of x ppm			Х							6		9		х				х		х	х				
Differences in Multi-Modal Accessibility by S-E group			Х				1					9		х				х							
Differences in Noise Exposure by S-E group			Х									9		х				х							
Average travel time / cost to work by S-E group			Х				1					9		х		х		х		х					
Difference is CO exposure by S-E group			Х									9		х				х	х						
Non-Auto Accessibility for Persons age 12 - 18			Х				1									х			х						
Non-Auto Accessibility for Persons age 65+			Х				1									х									
Differences in Accessibility to Community Resources and Amenities by S-E Group			х				1							х		х		х		х					
Roadway Congestion Index		x					2								х			x x		х		х			
Travel Rate Index		х					2								х			x x		х		х			
Travel Time Index		x					2								х			x x		х		х			-
Travel Delay		х					2								х			x x		х		х			
Buffer Index: ((95%ile min/mile - mean min/mile)/mean min/mile)*100%		x					2								х			x x		х		х			-
Travel Rate	х						2								х			x x		х		х			
Delay Rate	x						2								х			x x		х		х			-
Total Delay	х						2								х			x x		х		х			
Relative Delay Rate	x						2								х			x x		х		х			
Delay Ratio	x						2								х			x x		х		х			
Congested Travel : Congested vehicle-miles	х						2								х			x x		х		х			
Accessibility: sum of objective fullment opportunities within x minutes travel time	x						1	1		1						x		x		х	x				
Speed Reduction Index: ratio of decline of speeds from free-flow conditions	x						2	1		1					х			x		х		х			
Congestion Severity Index	x						2	1		1					х			x		х		х			
Lane-mile duration index	x						2								х					х		х			
Peak 1-Hr Percent of Peak 2-Hr and Daily Traffic (a measure of reserve capacity)						x	2	1		1					х					х		х			
Ratio of Population or Employment Density to Street Intersection Density						х							11	х	х				х		х	х		х	
TOTAL NUMBER OF MEASURES				1			180 17	6 5	59 37 65	5 9	3 195 72	18	22 10	126	504	205	36	372 208	150	362	57	224	151	55	20 133

APPENDIX B: PROGRAMS FOR CALCULATING PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Appendix B.1 – R Script to Calculate Mobility Measures

calculate_mobility_measures.R

Author:Brian GregorContact:brian.j.gregor@odot.state.or.usDate:09/26/05Revisions:Elicense:License:GPL2

Read in data and define variables

Read in network data

```
Links.Lk_ <- read.table("eug_netdata_rev_names.txt", header=TRUE)
rownames(Links.Lk_) <- paste(Links.Lk_$Inode, Links.Lk_$Jnode,
sep="-")
Capacities.Lk_ <- read.table("EUG_CAPS.TXT", header=TRUE)
rownames(Capacities.Lk_) <- paste(Capacities.Lk_$inode,
Capacities.Lk_$jnode, sep="-")</pre>
```

Join the capacities data to the link data and calculate volume to capacity ratios

```
Links.Lk__$Cap <-
Capacities.Lk__[rownames(Links.Lk__),"link_cap_per_day"]
Links.Lk__$VcA <- Links.Lk__$AdtA / Links.Lk__$Cap
Links.Lk__$VcB <- Links.Lk__$AdtB / Links.Lk__$Cap
```

Define link types

```
# Link types classify all functional classes of interest
Lt <- c(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
names(Lt) <- c("Freeway", "Principal Arterial", "Major Arterial",
"Minor Arterial",
"Major Collector", "Neighborhood Collector", "Local",
"Freeway Ramp")
```

Only keep data of these link types

Links.Lk_ [Links.Lk_\$Type %in% Lt,]

Add IncidentDelayRatio to the dataframe

```
Links.Lk_$InciDlyRatio <- rep(NA, nrow(Links.Lk_))
Links.Lk_$InciDlyRatio[Links.Lk_$Type %in% c(1,8)] <- 2.4
Links.Lk $InciDlyRatio[Links.Lk $Type %in% 2:7 ] <- 1.1
```

Define several standard parameters

```
# Vehicle occupancy
VehOcc <- 1.25
# Working days
WorkDays <- 250
# Population
Population <- 235000</pre>
```

Define functions to calculate measures

Define a function to calculate recurring vehicle hours of delay (VHD) by link

parameter: Delay.Lk - vector of link delay

parameter: Vol.Lk - vector of traffic volume by network link

return: RecurVhd.Lk - vector of vehicle-hours of recurring delay per link

```
calcRecurVhd <- function(Delay.Lk, Vol.Lk){
    RecurVhd.Lk <- Delay.Lk * Vol.Lk / 60
    RecurVhd.Lk
  }</pre>
```

Define a function to calculate recurring and incident vehicle hours of delay (VHD) by link

parameter: Delay.Lk - vector of link delay

parameter: Vol.Lk - vector of ADT by network link

parameter: InciDlyRatio.Lk - vector of ratios of incident delay to recurring delay

return: TotVhd.Lk - vector of total minutes of recurring and incident delay per link

```
calcTotVhd <- function(Delay.Lk, Vol.Lk, InciDlyRatio.Lk) {
   TotVhd.Lk <- Delay.Lk * (1 + InciDlyRatio.Lk) * Vol.Lk / 60
   TotVhd.Lk
  }</pre>
```

Define a function to calculate link vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

```
parameter: Length.Lk - link length in miles
parameter: Vol.Lk - link volume in vehicles
return: Vmt.Lk - link vehicle miles traveled
calcVmt <- function(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk) {
    Vmt.Lk <- Length.Lk * Vol.Lk
    Vmt.Lk
    }</pre>
```
Define a function to calculate annual person delay

parameter: TotVhd.Lk - vector of total vehicle hours of delay
parameter: VehOcc - average vehicle occupancy
parameter: WorkDays - number of work days per year
return: TotPhd.Lk - number of annual person hours of delay per year
calcTotPhd <- function(TotVhd.Lk, VehOcc, WorkDays) {
 TotPhd.Lk <- TotVhd.Lk * VehOcc * WorkDays
 TotPhd.Lk
 }
</pre>

Define a function to calculate average speed by link type

```
parameter: Length.Lk - link length in miles
parameter: Vol.Lk - link traffic volume
parameter: Time.Lk - link travel time in minutes
parameter: Type.Lk - link type
return: AveSpeed.Lt - average speed by link type
calcAveTypeSpeed <- function(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk, Time.Lk, Type.Lk){
    Vmt.Lk <- calcVmt(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk)
    Speed.Lk <- 60 * Length.Lk / Vime.Lk
    VmtWtSpeed.Lk <- Speed.Lk * Vmt.Lk
    SumVmtWtSpeed.Lk <- tapply(VmtWtSpeed.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)
    SumVmt.Lt <- tapply(Vmt.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)
    AveSpeed.Lt <- SumVmtWtSpeed.Lt / SumVmt.Lt
    AveSpeed.Lt
```

Define a function to calculate travel rate index by link type (freeflow comparison)

```
parameter: Length.Lk - link length in miles
parameter: Vol.Lk - link traffic volume
parameter: Time.Lk - link travel time in minutes
parameter: Ffs.Lk - link free flow speed
parameter: Type.Lk - link type
return: AveTri.Lt - average travel rate index by link type
calcAveTypeTril <- function(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk, Delay.Lk, Ffs.Lk,
Type.Lk) {
    Vmt.Lk <- calcVmt(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk)
    FfsTime.Lk <- 60 * Length.Lk / Ffs.Lk
    RecurCongTime.Lk <- FfsTime.Lk + Delay.Lk
    Tri.Lk <- RecurCongTime.Lk / FfsTime.Lk
    VmtWtTri.Lk <- Tri.Lk * Vmt.Lk
    SumVmtWtTri.Lt <- tapply(VmtWtTri.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)
    SumVmt.Lt <- tapply(Vmt.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)</pre>
```

```
AveTri.Lt <- SumVmtWtTri.Lt / SumVmt.Lt
AveTri.Lt
}</pre>
```

Define a function to calculate travel rate index by link type (LOS D/E comparison)

```
parameter: Length.Lk - link length in miles
parameter: Vol.Lk - link traffic volume
parameter: Time.Lk - link travel time in minutes
parameter: Ffs.Lk - link free flow speed
parameter: Type.Lk - link type
  return: AveTri.Lt - average travel rate index by link type
calcAveTypeTri2 <- function(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk, Delay.Lk,</pre>
                       DelayDe.Lk, Ffs.Lk, Type.Lk) {
     Vmt.Lk <- calcVmt(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk)</pre>
     FfsTime.Lk <- 60 * Length.Lk / Ffs.Lk</pre>
     RecurCongTime.Lk <- FfsTime.Lk + Delay.Lk</pre>
     DeTime.Lk <- RecurCongTime.Lk - DelayDe.Lk</pre>
     Tri.Lk <- RecurCongTime.Lk / DeTime.Lk</pre>
     VmtWtTri.Lk <- Tri.Lk * Vmt.Lk
     SumVmtWtTri.Lt <- tapply(VmtWtTri.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)</pre>
     SumVmt.Lt <- tapply(Vmt.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)</pre>
     AveTri.Lt <- SumVmtWtTri.Lt / SumVmt.Lt
     AveTri.Lt.
```

Define a function to calculate travel time index by link type (freeflow comparison)

parameter: Length.Lk - link length in miles
parameter: Vol.Lk - link traffic volume
parameter: Time.Lk - link travel time in minutes
parameter: Ffs.Lk - link free flow speed
parameter: Type.Lk - link type

return: AveTri.Lt - average travel rate index by link type

}

Define a function to calculate travel time index by link type (LOS D/E comparison)

```
parameter: Length.Lk - link length in miles
parameter: Vol.Lk - link traffic volume
parameter: Time.Lk - link travel time in minutes
parameter: Ffs.Lk - link free flow speed
parameter: Type.Lk - link type
 return: AveTri.Lt - average travel rate index by link type
calcAveTypeTti2 <- function(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk, Delay.Lk, DelayDe.Lk,</pre>
Ffs.Lk,
                      InciDlyRatio.Lk,
                                         Type.Lk) {
Vmt.Lk <- calcVmt(Length.Lk, Vol.Lk)</pre>
TotDelay.Lk <- Delay.Lk * (1 + InciDlyRatio.Lk)
FfsTime.Lk <- 60 * Length.Lk / Ffs.Lk</pre>
RecurCongTime.Lk <- FfsTime.Lk + Delay.Lk</pre>
TotCongTime.Lk <- FfsTime.Lk + TotDelay.Lk
DeTime.Lk <- RecurCongTime.Lk - DelayDe.Lk</pre>
Tti.Lk <- TotCongTime.Lk / DeTime.Lk</pre>
VmtWtTti.Lk <- Tti.Lk * Vmt.Lk
SumVmtWtTti.Lt <- tapply(VmtWtTti.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)</pre>
SumVmt.Lt <- tapply(Vmt.Lk, Type.Lk, sum)</pre>
AveTti.Lt <- SumVmtWtTti.Lt / SumVmt.Lt
```

Conduct tests of measures

attach(Links.Lk__)

AveTti.Lt

}

Calculate average annual delay per person for two reference speeds and two network scenarios

Scenario A - with Ferry Street Bridge Link

```
# Freeflow reference speed all Links
# Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay
ARecurVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyFfsA, AdtA)
ATotVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyFfsA, AdtA, InciDlyRatio)
# Calculate annual person hours of delay
ARecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ARecurVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDays)
ATotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ATotVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDays)
# Calculate annual hours of delay per capita
AAnnRecurDlyCapFreeflow <- sum(ARecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population
AAnnTotDlyCapFreeflow <- sum(ATotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population</pre>
```

Freeflow reference speed freeway and principal arterial links # Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay ARecurVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyFfsA[Type %in% c(1,2)], AdtA[Type %in% c(1,2)]) ATotVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyFfsA[Type %in% c(1,2)], AdtA[Type %in% c(1,2)], InciDlyRatio[Type %in% c(1,2)]) # Calculate annual person hours of delay ARecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ARecurVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,</pre> WorkDavs) ATotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ATotVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc, WorkDavs) # Calculate annual hours of delay per capita AAnnRecurDlyCapFreeflow2 <- sum(ARecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population AAnnTotDlyCapFreeflow2 <- sum(ATotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population # Moderate flow reference speed for all links # Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay ARecurVhdModflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyDeA, AdtA)</pre> ATotVhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyDeA, AdtA, InciDlyRatio) # Calculate annual person hours of delay ARecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ARecurVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc,</pre> WorkDavs) ATotAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ATotVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc, WorkDays) # Calculate annual hours of delay per capita AAnnRecurDlyCapModflow <- sum(ARecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population AAnnTotDlyCapModflow <- sum(ATotAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population # Moderate flow reference speed for freeway and principal arterial links # Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay ARecurVhdModflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyDeA[Type %in% c(1,2)], AdtA[Type %in% c(1,2)]) ATotVhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyDeA[Type %in% c(1,2)], AdtA[Type %in% c(1,2)], InciDlyRatio[Type %in% c(1,2)]) # Calculate annual person hours of delay ARecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ARecurVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc,</pre> WorkDavs) ATotAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(ATotVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc, WorkDays) # Calculate annual hours of delay per capita AAnnRecurDlyCapModflow2 <- sum(ARecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population AAnnTotDlyCapModflow2 <- sum(ATotAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population

Scenario B - without Ferry Street Bridge Link

```
# Freeflow reference speed all Links
# Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay
BRecurVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyFfsB, AdtB)
BTotVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyFfsB, AdtB, InciDlyRatio)
# Calculate annual person hours of delay
BRecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BRecurVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDays)
BTotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BTotVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDays)
```

```
# Calculate annual hours of delay per capita
BAnnRecurDlyCapFreeflow <- sum(BRecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population
BAnnTotDlyCapFreeflow <- sum(BTotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population
# Freeflow reference speed freeway and principal arterial links
# Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay
BRecurVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyFfsB[Type %in% c(1,2)],
AdtB[Type %in% c(1,2)])
BTotVhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyFfsB[Type %in% c(1,2)],
                         AdtB[Type %in% c(1,2)], InciDlyRatio[Type %in%
c(1,2)])
# Calculate annual person hours of delay
BRecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BRecurVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,</pre>
WorkDavs)
BTotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BTotVhdFreeflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDays)
# Calculate annual hours of delay per capita
BAnnRecurDlyCapFreeflow2 <- sum(BRecurAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population
BAnnTotDlyCapFreeflow2 <- sum(BTotAnnPhdFreeflow.Lk) / Population
# Moderate flow reference speed for all links
# Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay
BRecurVhdModflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyDeB, AdtB)</pre>
BTotVhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyDeB, AdtB, InciDlyRatio)
# Calculate annual person hours of delay
BRecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BRecurVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDavs)
BTotAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BTotVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc, WorkDays)
# Calculate annual hours of delay per capita
BAnnRecurDlyCapModflow <- sum(BRecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population
BAnnTotDlyCapModflow <- sum(BTotAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population
# Moderate flow reference speed for freeway and principal arterial
links
# Calculate daily vehicle hours of delay
BRecurVhdModflow.Lk <- calcRecurVhd(DlyDeB[Type %in% c(1,2)], AdtB[Type
%in% c(1,2)])
BTotVhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotVhd(DlyDeB[Type %in% c(1,2)],
                    AdtB[Type %in% c(1,2)], InciDlyRatio[Type %in%
c(1,2)])
# Calculate annual person hours of delay
BRecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BRecurVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc,
WorkDays)
BTotAnnPhdModflow.Lk <- calcTotPhd(BTotVhdModflow.Lk, VehOcc, WorkDays)
# Calculate annual hours of delay per capita
BAnnRecurDlyCapModflow2 <- sum(BRecurAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population
BAnnTotDlyCapModflow2 <- sum(BTotAnnPhdModflow.Lk) / Population
```

Calculate Travel Time Index

UmsType <- 1 * (Type %in% c(1,2))

```
# calculate TTI for Scenario A freeflow speed, all classes
calcAveTypeTtil(Length, AdtA, DlyFfsA, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, rep(1,
length(Length)))
```

calculate TTI for Scenario A freeflow speed, freeway and principal arterial calcAveTypeTti1(Length, AdtA, DlyFfsA, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, UmsType) # calculate TTI for Scenario A modflow speed, all classes calcAveTypeTti2(Length, AdtA, DlyFfsA, DlyDeA, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, rep(1, length(Length))) # calculate TTI for Scenario A modflow speed, freeway and principal arterial calcAveTypeTti2(Length, AdtA, DlyFfsA, DlyDeA, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, UmsTvpe) # calculate TTI for Scenario B freeflow speed, all classes calcAveTypeTtil(Length, AdtB, DlyFfsB, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, rep(1, length(Length))) # calculate TTI for Scenario B freeflow speed, freeway and principal arterial calcAveTypeTtil(Length, AdtB, DlyFfsB, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, UmsType) # calculate TTI for Scenario B modflow speed, all classes calcAveTypeTti2(Length, AdtB, DlyFfsB, DlyDeB, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, rep(1, length(Length))) # calculate TTI for Scenario B modflow speed, freeway and principal arterial calcAveTypeTti2(Length, AdtB, DlyFfsB, DlyDeB, Ffs, InciDlyRatio, UmsTvpe)

Appendix B.2 – R Script to Set Up TCI Calculations

tci_setup.R

Author:Brian GregorDate:9/26/05Contact:brian.j.gregor@odot.state.or.usCopyright:Oregon Department of Transportationlicense:GPL2

Description

This script prepares the workspace and file directories for calculating the Travel Cost Index and related measures. The script needs to be executed at the top level of a JEMnR model structure.

Load generic JEMnR functions

```
codeLoc <- "rcode"
source(paste(codeLoc, "/jemnrFunctions.R", sep=""))
attach(fun) #Attach function list fun to workspace</pre>
```

Make tci directory if doesn't exist

```
if(!file.exists("tci")) dir.create("tci")
if(!file.exists("tci/graphics")) dir.create("tci/graphics")
```

Load Variable Definitions

```
# Define income group abbreviation
Ic <- c("lowInc", "midInc", "highInc")
# Define zone abbreviation and limit to internal zones
load("inputs/RData/districts.RData")
externalZones <- districts$zone[districts$zone<100]
zoneNames <- districts$zone
Zo <- as.character(zoneNames)
IsInternal <- !(Zo %in% as.character(externalZones))
Zi <- Zo[IsInternal]; rm(IsInternal)
# Define trip purpose abbreviation
# The purposes for this study (now) are limited to the home-based trips
# They exclude nonhome-based trips, school trips and college trips
Pr <- c("hbw", "hbs", "hbr", "hbo")
# Define the travel modes
```

Calculate and Save the Size Variables for each Trip Purpose

```
# Load the utility descriptions
sizeVarUtils <- readUtils("inputs/sizeVarUtils.csv")
verifyVarName("sizeVarUtils", varDictionary)
# Load function for calculating the size variables and saving them to
disk
source("rcode/tci/calc_size_vars.R")
for(pr in Pr){
    for(ic in Ic){
        CombinedPrIc <- paste(pr, ic, sep="")
        calcSizeVars(CombinedPrIc)
        }
    }
```

Calculate utilities and logsums

```
for(pr in Pr){
    accessUtilities(pr)
    }
for(pr in Pr){
    accessLogSum(pr)
    }
```

<u>Appendix B.3 – R Script to Calculate Reference Zone and</u> <u>Market Baskets</u>

calc_reference_attractions.R

Author:Brian GregorDate:9/26/05Contact:brian.j.gregor@odot.state.or.usCopyright:Oregon Department of Transportationlicense:GPL2

Description

This script identifies a reference zone for the travel cost index and related measures and computes the reference market place attractions.

The reference zone is identified as the TAZ that has the most attractions within it's market area. The log sums of the JEMnR access utilities are used to identify market areas. These measure the composite cost of travel between zones and are calculated in JEMnR for each trip purpose and income group. The reference zone is identified as the zone that has greatest market attractions, subject to limits of transit availability and presence of households. Attraction scores are calculated by dividing the market attractions for each zone by the maximum market attractions for all zones. This is done for each trip purpose and income group. The results are summed for each zone to get a total score. Since there are three income groups and four trip purposes, the maximum score is 12. Reference market baskets are calculated for each combination of income and trip purpose. Market baskets are calculated for each TAZ by calculating the percentage of trip attractions to each TAZ and placing this vector of values in order of descending log sums. Then a cumulative sum of the percentages is calculated and the zones whoses values add to 50% are identified. This is the market area for the TAZ. The market basket for the TAZ is calculated by summing the size terms from the destination choice model for TAZs in the market area. The reference market basket is calculated as the mean of the market baskets for all zones

Define a function that calculates zonal market access scores and market baskets

This function is applied to each TAZ by trip purpose and income group the steps are: * Calculate the percent of trips going to each zone * Order the percent of trips by the order of the log sums * Calculate the cumulative sums of the percents * Identify the zones that sum to 50% * Sum the size terms for those zones to get values for calculating the market basket * Identify zones that have a log sum of one or greater * Sum the size terms in those zones to get values for calculation reference zone scores :Parameter: Trips.Zi - A vector of trips from a production zone to attraction zones :Parameter: SizeVar.Zi - A vector of size variables :Parameter: LogSum.Zi - A vector of logsums from a production zone to attraction zones :Parameter: PctBreak - A percentage of trips to be the criteria for determining a market area :Return: TripAttractions - The total of size variables to be used for calculating market basket :Return: ScoreAttractions - The total of size variables to be used for calculating scores

```
calcMarketAccess <- function(Trips.Zi, SizeVar.Zi, LogSum.Zi,
PctBreak=50){
    TripPct.Zi <- 100 * Trips.Zi / sum(Trips.Zi)
    LogsumOrder <- rev(order(LogSum.Zi))
    TripPctCumSum <- cumsum(TripPct.Zi[LogsumOrder])
    MarketZones <- names(TripPctCumSum)[TripPctCumSum <= PctBreak]
    TripAttractions <- sum(SizeVar.Zi[MarketZones])
    ScoreAttractions <- sum(SizeVar.Zi[LogSum.Zi > 1])
    c(TripAttractions, ScoreAttractions)
  }
```

Calculate market attractions and logsums for each trip purpose, income group and zone

Iterate through each trip purpose and income group and call calcMarketAccess for each TAZ. Create arrays of values by zone, income group and trip purpose. TripAttractions.ZiIcPr is an array containing the values of total size terms that is used to calculate reference market baskets. ScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr is an array containing the values of total size terms used to identify the reference zone. The abbreviations after the period in the names of these arrays indicates their dimensionality. Zi is a vector of the

names of TAZs that are internal to the model. Ic is a vector of the names of income

groups. Pr is a vector of the names of trip purposes.

```
# Create arrays to store trip attractions and score attractions
TripAttractions.ZilcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic),</pre>
length(Pr)),
                        dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
ScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic),</pre>
length(Pr)),
                        dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
# Begin iteration by trip purpose
for(pr in Pr) {
     # Load trip distribution matrices for each income group
     for(ic in Ic){
          DistFileName <- paste("tripdist/", pr, ic, "Dist.Rdata",</pre>
sep="")
          load(DistFileName)
          rm(DistFileName)
          }
```

```
# Load size variable matrices for each income group
     for(ic in Ic){
          SizeVarFileName <- paste("sizevars/SizeVar", pr, ic,</pre>
".RData", sep="")
          load(SizeVarFileName)
          rm(SizeVarFileName)
          }
     # Load log sums
     # Unlike trip distribution data, the logsums for all income groups
     # are contained in one list.
     LogsumFileName <- paste("access/", "logSum", pr, ".Rdata", sep="")</pre>
     load(LogsumFileName)
     rm(LogsumFileName)
     # Calculate Accessibility of Market Areas by Income Group and Zone
     # Create a matrices to store the market area logsums, times and
costs for a purpose
     TripAttractions.ZiIc <- matrix(0, length(Zi), length(Ic),</pre>
dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     ScoreAttractions.ZiIc <- matrix(0, length(Zi), length(Ic),</pre>
dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     for(ic in Ic){
          # Get trip matrix trim off external TAZs
          TripsObjName <- paste(pr, ic, "Dist", sep="")</pre>
          Trips.ZoZo <- get(TripsObjName) ; rm(TripsObjName)</pre>
          dimnames(Trips.ZoZo) <- list(Zo, Zo) # Zo is vector of names
of all zones
          Trips.ZiZi <- Trips.ZoZo[Zi,Zi] ; rm(Trips.ZoZo)</pre>
          # Get size data matrix and trim off external TAZs
          SizeVarObjName <- paste("sizeVar", pr, ic, sep="")</pre>
          SizeVar.ZoZo <- get(SizeVarObjName); rm(SizeVarObjName)</pre>
          dimnames(SizeVar.ZoZo) <- list(Zo, Zo)</pre>
          SizeVar.ZiZi <- SizeVar.ZoZo[Zi,Zi] ; rm(SizeVar.ZoZo)</pre>
          # Get log sum data matrix and trim off external TAZs
          LogSumObjName <- paste("logSum", pr, sep="")</pre>
          LogSum.ZoZo <- get(LogSumObjName)[[ic]] ; rm(LogSumObjName)</pre>
          dimnames(LogSum.ZoZo) <- list(Zo, Zo)</pre>
          LogSum.ZiZi <- LogSum.ZoZo[Zi,Zi] ; rm(LogSum.ZoZo)
          # For each TAZ, calculate trip attractions and score
attractions
          MarketValues <- matrix(0, length(Zi), 2, dimnames=list(Zi,</pre>
c("Attractions", "Logsum")))
          for(zi in Zi) {
               MarketValues[zi,] <- calcMarketAccess(Trips.ZiZi[zi,],</pre>
SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                               LogSum.ZiZi[zi,])
                }
          # Assign values to TripAttractions.ZiIc and
ScoreAttractions.ZiIc
```

```
TripAttractions.ZiIc[,ic] <- MarketValues[,1]
ScoreAttractions.ZiIc[,ic] <- MarketValues[,2]
rm(MarketValues)
}
# Assign values for a purpose to TripAttractions.ZiIcPr and
ScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr
TripAttractions.ZiIcPr[,,pr] <- TripAttractions.ZiIc ;
rm(TripAttractions.ZiIcPr[,,pr] <- ScoreAttractions.ZiIc ;
rm(ScoreAttractions.ZiIc)
# End iteration by trip purpose
}</pre>
```

Find the Reference Zone

The reference zone is the zone which has transit available, has at least 10 households low, middle and high income households, and has the greatest number of attractions in the market area.

```
# Calculate a total score for each TAZ
MaxAttractions <- apply(ScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr, c(2,3), function(x)
max(x))
NormScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr <- sweep(ScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr, c(2,3),
       MaxAttractions, "/")
AttractionScore.Zi <- apply(NormScoreAttractions.ZiIcPr, 1, sum)
# Select zones that have at least 10 households and has transit service
# Load household data
load("pregen/whiazAry.RData")
Hh.ZoIc <- t(apply(whiazAry, c(3,5), sum))</pre>
rownames(Hh.ZoIc) <- Zo
Hh.ZiIc <- Hh.ZoIc[Zi,]</pre>
rm(whiazAry, Hh.ZoIc)
Hh.ZiIc <- t(apply(Hh.ZiIc, 1, function(x) c(x[1] + x[2], x[3], x[4])))
colnames(Hh.ZiIc) <- Ic</pre>
HasEnoughHh <- apply(Hh.ZiIc >= 10, 1, all)
# Identify available internal zones where transit is available
tAvail <- read.csv("inputs/tAvail.csv")</pre>
tAvail <- tAvail[order(tAvail$taz),]</pre>
tAvail <- as.logical(tAvail$tAvail)
TransitAvailable <- tAvail
names(TransitAvailable) <- Zo</pre>
TransitAvailable <- TransitAvailable[Zi]</pre>
# Select the zones that have enough households and transit is available
AttractionScoreQualified.Zi <- AttractionScore.Zi[HasEnoughHh &
TransitAvailable]
# Identify the zone with the maximum score from the qualified zones
ReferenceZone <- names(AttractionScoreQualified.Zi)[</pre>
          which(AttractionScoreQualified.Zi ==
```

```
max(AttractionScoreQualified.Zi))]
```

Find the Reference market baskets

The reference market baskets are the mean of the market baskets calculated for each zone.

```
ReferenceAttractions <- apply(TripAttractions.ZiIcPr, c(2,3), mean)</pre>
```

Save the results

```
save(TripAttractions.ZiIcPr, file="tci/TripAttractions.ZiIcPr.RData")
save(AttractionScore, file="tci/AttractionScore.RData")
save(AttractionScoreQualified.Zi,
file="tci/AttractionScoreQualified.Zi.RData")
save(ReferenceZone, file="tci/ReferenceZone.RData")
save(ReferenceAttractions, file="tci/ReferenceAttractions.RData")
```

<u>Appendix B.4 – R Script to Calculate the Transportation Cost</u> <u>Index, Percent of Market Accessible by Non-Auto Modes, and</u> <u>Auto Dependence Index</u>

calc_tci.R

Author:Brian GregorDate:9/26/05Contact:brian.j.gregor@odot.state.or.usCopyright:Oregon Department of Transportationlicense:GPL2

Description

This script calculates the travel cost index (TCI), percent of market accessible by nonauto travel modes, and auto dependence index.

Load the reference data

```
# Identify the path to the model run where the reference data is stored
ReferenceDirectory <- ""
# Load the reference zone
load(paste(ReferenceDirectory, "tci/ReferenceZone.RData", sep=""))
# Load the reference attractions
load(paste(ReferenceDirectory, "tci/ReferenceAttractions.RData",
sep=""))
```

Define functions used in the script

Define a function to calculate cost to travel to market place

This function is applied to each TAZ by trip purpose and income group the steps are: * Put zones in order of ascending cost. This is used to define the market place for the zone. The costs used for this purpose may be different than the costs used to calculate average market access costs. For example, the average cost for all modes might be used to define the market place, but the market access cost might be calculated for a particular mode. * Calculate the cumulative sum of size variables for the zones in the ascending cost order. * Identify the market place as the set of zones that have size variables equal to the reference market basket. * Calculate a weighted average of travel costs. :Parameter: SizeVar.Zi - A vector of size variables :Parameter: AveCost.Zi - A vector of costs to use for placing zones in order of cost :Parameter: Cost.Zi - The vector of costs to use for calculating the average market cost :Parameter: RefAttr - The reference market basket for the trip purpose and income group :Return: AveMarketCost - The average cost to access the market basket

Define a function to calculate the average cost for non-auto modes to travel to market place

This function is applied to each TAZ by trip purpose and income group the steps are: * Put zones in order of ascending cost. * Calculate the cumulative sum of size variables for the zones in the ascending cost order. * Identify the market place as the set of zones that have size variables equal to the reference market basket. * Identify the minimum nonauto cost to each zone. * Calculate the non-auto market access cost as a weighted average of the minimum non-auto costs. :Parameter: SizeVar.Zi - A vector of size variables :Parameter: AveCost.Zi - A vector of costs to use for placing zones in order of cost :Parameter: ModeCost.ZiMd - The matrix of costs by zone and mode to use for calculating the average non-auto market access cost :Parameter: RefAttr - The reference market basket for the trip purpose and income group :Return: NonAutoMarketCost - The average non-auto cost to access the market basket

```
calcNonAutoMarketCost <- function(SizeVar.Zi, AveCost.Zi,</pre>
ModeCost.ZiMd, RefAttr) {
     CostOrder <- order(AveCost.Zi)
     AttrCumSum <- cumsum(SizeVar.Zi[CostOrder])</pre>
     MarketZones <- names(AttrCumSum) [AttrCumSum <= RefAttr]</pre>
     NonAutoMarketCosts.ZiMd <- ModeCost.ZiMd[MarketZones,
                                     c("busWalk", "parkAndRideBus",
"bike", "walk")]
     NonAutoMarketCosts.ZiMd[is.infinite(NonAutoMarketCosts.ZiMd)] <-
NA
     MinNonAutoCosts.Zi <- apply(NonAutoMarketCosts.ZiMd, 1,</pre>
function(x)
                               min(x, na.rm=TRUE))
     NonAutoMarketCost <- sum (MinNonAutoCosts.Zi *
SizeVar.Zi[MarketZones]) /
                           sum(SizeVar.Zi[MarketZones])
     NonAutoMarketCost
     }
```

Define a function to calculate the average cost for auto modes to travel to market place

This function is applied to each TAZ by trip purpose and income group the steps are: * Put zones in order of ascending cost. * Calculate the cumulative sum of size variables for the zones in the ascending cost order. * Identify the market place as the set of zones that have size variables equal to the reference market basket. * Identify the average auto cost to each zone. * Calculate the auto market access cost as a weighted average of the average auto costs. :Parameter: SizeVar.Zi - A vector of size variables :Parameter: AveCost.Zi - A vector of costs to use for placing zones in order of cost :Parameter: ModeCost.ZiMd - The matrix of costs by zone and mode to use for calculating the average auto market access cost :Parameter: RefAttr - The reference market basket for the trip purpose and income group :Return: AveMarketCost - The average auto cost to access the market basket

Define a function to calculate percent of market place accessible by nonauto modes

This function is applied to each TAZ by trip purpose and income group the steps are: * Put zones in order of ascending cost. * Calculate the cumulative sum of size variables for the zones in the ascending cost order. * Identify the market place as the set of zones that have size variables equal to the reference market basket. * Identify the zones in the market place that are accessible by non-auto modes * Sum the size variables in the zones that are accessible by non-auto modes * Divide by the sum of size variables for all zones in the market place :Parameter: SizeVar.Zi - A vector of size variables :Parameter: AveCost.Zi - A vector of costs to use for placing zones in order of cost :Parameter: AltPractical.ZiMd - A matrix identifying the zones that are accessible by each mode :Parameter: RefAttr - The reference market basket for the trip purpose and income group :Return: PctAltCoverage - The percentage of the market basket that is accessible by alternate modes

```
calcModeMarketPct <- function(SizeVar.Zi, AveCost.Zi,
AltPractical.ZiMd, RefAttr){
    CostOrder <- order(AveCost.Zi)
    AttrCumSum <- cumsum(SizeVar.Zi[CostOrder])
    MarketZones <- names(AttrCumSum)[AttrCumSum <= RefAttr]
    AltMarketSet.ZiMd <- AltPractical.ZiMd[MarketZones,]</pre>
```

```
AltMarket.Md <- apply(AltMarketSet.ZiMd, 2, function(x)
sum(SizeVar.Zi[MarketZones][x]))
NonAutoMarketSet.Zi <- apply(AltMarketSet.ZiMd, 1, function(x)
any(x))
NonAutoMarket <- sum(SizeVar.Zi[MarketZones][NonAutoMarketSet.Zi])
AltMarket.Md <- c(AltMarket.Md, allNonAuto=NonAutoMarket)
PctAltCoverage <- 100 * AltMarket.Md /
sum(SizeVar.Zi[MarketZones])
PctAltCoverage
}</pre>
```

Calculate the measures for each zone, mode, income and purpose

Make an array which identifies zones impractical to reach by non-auto modes of travel

This is used in the subsequent calculations that loop through purpose and income but only has to be done once.

```
AltImpractical.ZiZiMd <- array(FALSE, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Zi), 4),
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Zi, Md[4:7]))
# Load trip distance and time data
load("inputs/RData/tripDist.Rdata")
dimnames(tripDist) <- list(Zo,Zo)</pre>
tripDist.ZiZi <- tripDist[Zi,Zi]</pre>
BikeTime.ZiZi <- 60 * tripDist.ZiZi / 10
WalkTime.ZiZi <- 60 * tripDist.ZiZi / 3
load("inputs/RData/ivTimepeakbusWalk.RData")
dimnames(ivTimepeakbusWalk) <- list(Zo,Zo)</pre>
BusWalkTime.ZiZi <- ivTimepeakbusWalk[Zi,Zi]; rm(ivTimepeakbusWalk)</pre>
load("inputs/RData/ivTimepeakparkAndRideBus.RData")
dimnames(ivTimepeakparkAndRideBus) <- list(Zo,Zo)</pre>
BusPnRTime.ZiZi <- ivTimepeakparkAndRideBus[Zi,Zi];</pre>
rm(ivTimepeakparkAndRideBus)
load("inputs/RData/ivTimepeakdriveAlone.RData")
dimnames(ivTimepeakdriveAlone) <- list(Zo,Zo)</pre>
AutoTime.ZiZi <- ivTimepeakdriveAlone[Zi,Zi]; rm(ivTimepeakdriveAlone)
# Impractical trips are those that take longer than 30 minutes and are
# 30 minutes longer than corresponding auto trips
AltImpractical.ZiZiMd[,,"bike"] <- (BikeTime.ZiZi > 30) |
                                    (BikeTime.ZiZi > 30 + AutoTime.ZiZi)
AltImpractical.ZiZiMd[,,"walk"] <- (WalkTime.ZiZi > 30) |
                                    (WalkTime.ZiZi > 30 + AutoTime.ZiZi)
AltImpractical.ZiZiMd[,,"busWalk"] <- (BusWalkTime.ZiZi > 30) |
                                    (BusWalkTime.ZiZi > 30 +
AutoTime.ZiZi)
AltImpractical.ZiZiMd[,,"parkAndRideBus"] <- (BusPnRTime.ZiZi > 30) |
                                    (BusPnRTime.ZiZi > 30 +
AutoTime.ZiZi)
# Convert NA values (no bus service) to TRUE
AltImpractical.ZiZiMd[is.na(AltImpractical.ZiZiMd)] <- TRUE</pre>
# Convert into array of zones that are practical to reach by alt modes
```

AltPractical.ZiZiMd <- !AltImpractical.ZiZiMd ;
rm(AltImpractical.ZiZiMd)</pre>

Begin iteration by trip purpose

```
for(pr in Pr) {
     # Define Arrays to Store Results
     AveMarketCost.ZiIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic)),</pre>
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     BestMarketCost.ZiIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic)),</pre>
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     CompMarketCost.ZiIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic)),</pre>
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Md),</pre>
length(Ic)),
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Md, Ic))
     NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic)),
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     AutoMarketCost.ZiIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic)),</pre>
                          dimnames=list(Zi, Ic))
     AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), 5,</pre>
length(Ic)),
                          dimnames=list(Zi, c(Md[4:7], "allNonAuto"),
IC))
# Begin iteration by income group
     for(ic in Ic){
          # Load the size variable data and assign to SizeVar.ZiZi
          SizeVarFileName <- paste("sizevars/SizeVar", pr, ic,</pre>
".RData", sep="")
          load(SizeVarFileName) ; rm(SizeVarFileName)
          SizeVarObjName <- paste("sizeVar", pr, ic, sep="")</pre>
          SizeVar.ZoZo <- get(SizeVarObjName)</pre>
          rm(list=ls()[ls()==SizeVarObjName]) ; rm(SizeVarObjName)
          dimnames(SizeVar.ZoZo) <- list(Zo, Zo)</pre>
          SizeVar.ZiZi <- SizeVar.ZoZo[Zi,Zi] ; rm(SizeVar.ZoZo)</pre>
          # Identify the reference market attractions
          RefAttr <- ReferenceAttractions[ic,pr]</pre>
          # Initialize an array to hold all the mode utility data
          ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi),</pre>
length(Zi), length(Md)),
                                dimnames=list(Zi, Zi, Md))
          # Populate the array with the mode utility data
          for(md in Md) {
                # Load the array of zone to zone utilities and assign to
Util.ZiZi
                if(md == "bike") {
                     ExpUtil.ZiZi <- exp(BikeAccessCoeff.Pr[pr] * 60 *</pre>
tripDist.ZiZi / 10)
                     }
```

if(md == "walk"){ ExpUtil.ZiZi <- exp(WalkAccessCoeff.Pr[pr] * 60 *</pre> tripDist.ZiZi / 3) } if((md != "bike") & (md != "walk")) { ModeUtilFileName <- paste("access/util", md, ic,</pre> pr, ".Rdata", sep="") load(ModeUtilFileName) ; rm(ModeUtilFileName) ModeUtilObjName <- paste("util", md, ic, pr,</pre> sep="") ExpUtil.ZoZo <- get(ModeUtilObjName)</pre> rm(list=ls()[ls()==ModeUtilObjName]) ; rm(ModeUtilObjName) dimnames(ExpUtil.ZoZo) <- list(Zo, Zo)</pre> ExpUtil.ZiZi <- ExpUtil.ZoZo[Zi,Zi] ;</pre> rm(ExpUtil.ZoZo) } # Add the mode matrix to the array ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd[,,md] <- ExpUtil.ZiZi ;</pre> rm(ExpUtil.ZiZi) } # Correct problem with utility for short walk and bike trips # Setting everything greater than 1 to 1 makes a minimum # trip time of approximately X minutes ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd[ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd > 0.99] <- 0.99</pre> # Calculate the dollar cost corresponding to the utilities ModesCosts.ZiZiMd <- log(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd) /</pre> OpCostCoeff.PrIc[pr,ic] # Calculate the mode probabilities for all modes ModeProbs.ZiZiMd <- sweep(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd, c(1,2), apply(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd, c(1,2), sum), "/") # Calculate the best cost among the modes BestCosts.ZiZi <- apply(ModesCosts.ZiZiMd, c(1,2),</pre> function(x) min(x, na.rm=TRUE)) # Calculate the composite cost of all modes CompCosts.ZiZi <- log(apply(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd, c(1,2),</pre> sum)) / OpCostCoeff.PrIc[pr,ic] # Calculate the average cost across all modes AveCosts.ZiZi <- apply(ModesCosts.ZiZiMd * ModeProbs.ZiZiMd, c(1,2), function(x) sum(x, na.rm=TRUE)) # Clean up memory rm(ModeProbs.ZiZiMd); gc() # Calculate the mode probabilities for just the non-auto modes AltModeProbs.ZiZiMd <- sweep(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd[,,4:7], c(1,2),

```
apply(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd[,,4:7],
c(1,2), sum), "/")
          # Calculate the average cost across non-auto modes
          AveAltCosts.ZiZi <- apply(ModesCosts.ZiZiMd[,,4:7] *</pre>
AltModeProbs.ZiZiMd, c(1,2),
                                function(x) sum(x, na.rm=TRUE))
          # Clean up memory
          rm(AltModeProbs.ZiZiMd); gc()
          # Calculate the mode probabilities for just the auto modes
          AutoModeProbs.ZiZiMd <- sweep(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd[,,1:3],
c(1,2),
                                     apply(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd[,,1:3],
c(1,2), sum), "/")
          # Calculate the average cost across auto modes
          AveAutoCosts.ZiZi <- apply(ModesCosts.ZiZiMd[,,1:3] *</pre>
AutoModeProbs.ZiZiMd, c(1,2),
                                function(x) sum(x, na.rm=TRUE))
          # Clean up memory
          rm(AutoModeProbs.ZiZiMd); gc()
          # Calculate best cost to access market place
          BestMarketCost.Zi <- numeric(length(Zi))</pre>
          names(BestMarketCost.Zi) <- Zi</pre>
          for(zi in Zi) {
                BestMarketCost.Zi[zi] <-</pre>
calcAveMarketCost(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                    BestCosts.ZiZi[zi,], BestCosts.ZiZi[zi,], RefAttr)
                }
          BestMarketCost.ZiIc[,ic] <- BestMarketCost.Zi;</pre>
rm(BestMarketCost.Zi)
          # Calculate composite cost to access market place
          CompMarketCost.Zi <- numeric(length(Zi))</pre>
          names(CompMarketCost.Zi) <- Zi</pre>
          for(zi in Zi) {
                CompMarketCost.Zi[zi] <-</pre>
calcAveMarketCost(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                   CompCosts.ZiZi[zi,], CompCosts.ZiZi[zi,], RefAttr)
              }
          CompMarketCost.ZiIc[,ic] <- CompMarketCost.Zi;</pre>
rm(CompMarketCost.Zi)
          # Calculate average cost to access market place
          AveMarketCost.Zi <- numeric(length(Zi))</pre>
          names(AveMarketCost.Zi) <- Zi</pre>
          for(zi in Zi) {
               AveMarketCost.Zi[zi] <-
calcAveMarketCost(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                          AveCosts.ZiZi[zi,], AveCosts.ZiZi[zi,],
RefAttr)
```

```
}
          AveMarketCost.ZiIc[,ic] <- AveMarketCost.Zi;</pre>
rm(AveMarketCost.Zi)
          # Calculate average cost to access market place by mode
          AveMarketCost.ZiMd <- matrix(0, length(Zi), length(Md),</pre>
dimnames=list(Zi,Md))
          for(zi in Zi) {
                for(md in Md) {
                     AveMarketCost.ZiMd[zi,md] <-</pre>
calcAveMarketCost(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                          AveCosts.ZiZi[zi,], ModesCosts.ZiZiMd[zi,,md],
RefAttr)
                     }
                }
          AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc[,,ic] <- AveMarketCost.ZiMd;</pre>
rm(AveMarketCost.ZiMd)
          # Calculate non-auto market costs
          NonAutoMarketCost.Zi <- numeric(length(Zi))</pre>
          names(NonAutoMarketCost.Zi) <- Zi</pre>
          ModesCostsInfToNa.ZiZiMd <- ModesCosts.ZiZiMd
ModesCostsInfToNa.ZiZiMd[is.infinite(ModesCostsInfToNa.ZiZiMd)] <- NA
          for(zi in Zi) {
               NonAutoMarketCost.Zi[zi] <-
calcNonAutoMarketCost(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                     AveCosts.ZiZi[zi,], ModesCostsInfToNa.ZiZiMd[zi,,],
RefAttr)
                }
          rm (ModesCostsInfToNa.ZiZiMd)
          NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc[,ic] <- NonAutoMarketCost.Zi;</pre>
rm(NonAutoMarketCost.Zi)
          # Calculate auto market times
          AutoMarketCost.Zi <- numeric(length(Zi))</pre>
          names(AutoMarketCost.Zi) <- Zi</pre>
          for(zi in Zi) {
               AutoMarketCost.Zi[zi] <-
calcAutoMarketCost(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
                     AveCosts.ZiZi[zi,], ModesCosts.ZiZiMd[zi,,],
RefAttr)
                }
          AutoMarketCost.ZiIc[,ic] <- AutoMarketCost.Zi;</pre>
rm(AutoMarketCost.Zi)
          # Calculate market proportions accessible by non-auto modes
          AltMarketCoverage.ZiMd <- matrix(0, length(Zi), 5,</pre>
                dimnames=list(Zi,c(Md[4:7], "allNonAuto")))
          for(zi in Zi) {
                AltMarketCoverage.ZiMd[zi,] <-</pre>
calcModeMarketPct(SizeVar.ZiZi[zi,],
```

AveAltCosts.ZiZi[zi,], AltPractical.ZiZiMd[zi,,],

```
RefAttr)
```

AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc[,,ic] <- AltMarketCoverage.ZiMd; rm(AltMarketCoverage.ZiMd)

}

```
# Clean up memory
          rm(ModesExpUtils.ZiZiMd, ModesCosts.ZiZiMd)
     # Save the results for each income group
    save(BestMarketCost.ZiIc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "BestMarketCost.ZiIc.RData", sep=""))
     save(CompMarketCost.ZiIc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "CompMarketCost.ZiIc.RData", sep=""))
     save(AveMarketCost.Zilc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "AveMarketCost.ZiIc.RData", sep=""))
     save(AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc.RData", sep=""))
     save(NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData",
sep=""))
     save(AutoMarketCost.ZiIc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "AutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData", sep=""))
     save(AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc,
          file=paste("tci/", pr, "AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc.RData",
sep=""))
     # End loop through income groups
     }
# Clean up memory
rm(BestMarketCost.ZiIc, CompMarketCost.ZiIc, AveMarketCost.ZiIc,
    AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc, NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc, AutoMarketCost.ZiIc,
    AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc)
gc()
# End loop through purposes
}
```

Combine the results into arrays by purpose

```
CompMarketCost.ZiIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic),</pre>
length(Pr)),
                                      dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
for(pr in Pr) {
      FileName <- paste("tci/", pr, "CompMarketCost.ZiIc.RData",</pre>
sep="")
      load(FileName)
      CompMarketCost.ZiIcPr[,,pr] <- CompMarketCost.ZiIc</pre>
      rm(CompMarketCost.ZiIc)
      save(CompMarketCost.ZilcPr,
file="tci/CompMarketCost.ZiIcPr.RData")
      l
AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic),
length(Pr)),
                                      dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
for(pr in Pr) {
      FileName <- paste("tci/", pr, "AveMarketCost.ZiIC.RData", sep="")</pre>
      load(FileName)
      AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr[,,pr] <- AveMarketCost.ZiIc</pre>
      rm(AveMarketCost.ZiIc)
      save(AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr, file="tci/AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr.RData")
AveMarketCost.ZiMdIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Md),</pre>
length(Ic), length(Pr)),
                                      dimnames=list(Zi,Md,Ic,Pr))
for(pr in Pr) {
      FileName <- paste("tci/", pr, "AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc.RData",</pre>
sep="")
      load(FileName)
      AveMarketCost.ZiMdIcPr[,,,pr] <- AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc</pre>
      rm(AveMarketCost.ZiMdIc)
      save(AveMarketCost.ZiMdIcPr,
file="tci/AveMarketCost.ZiMdIcPr.RData")
      }
NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic),
length(Pr)),
                                      dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
for(pr in Pr) {
      FileName <- paste("tci/", pr, "NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData",</pre>
sep="")
      load(FileName)
      NonAutoMarketCost.ZilcPr[,,pr] <- NonAutoMarketCost.Zilc</pre>
      rm(NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc)
      save(NonAutoMarketCost.ZilcPr,
file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIcPr.RData")
      }
AutoMarketCost.ZilcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic),
length(Pr)),
                                      dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
for(pr in Pr) {
      FileName <- paste("tci/", pr, "AutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData",</pre>
sep="")
      load(FileName)
```

```
AutoMarketCost.ZilcPr[,,pr] <- AutoMarketCost.Zilc</pre>
      rm(AutoMarketCost.ZiIc)
      save(AutoMarketCost.ZiIcPr,
file="tci/AutoMarketCost.ZiIcPr.RData")
      }
AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), 5, length(Ic),</pre>
length(Pr)),
                                      dimnames=list(Zi,c(Md[4:7],
"allNonAuto"), Ic, Pr))
for(pr in Pr) {
      FileName <- paste("tci/", pr, "AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc.RData",</pre>
sep="")
      load(FileName)
      AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIcPr[,,,pr] <- AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc</pre>
      rm(AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIc)
      save(AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIcPr,
file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIcPr.RData")
      }
```

Summarize the aternative mode market coverage

```
#Extract the average value that was computed
AltMarketCoverage.ZiIcPr <- AltMarketCoverage.ZiMdIcPr[,5,,]</pre>
```

Calculate averages by income group and purpose

The number of trips produced by income group and purpose will be used to aggregate tci measures

Load trip data by purpose and aggregate to zone and income group level

```
# Load trip production data
load("tripgen/hbwTripProdAry.RData")
load("tripgen/hbsTripProdAry.RData")
load("tripgen/hbrTripProdAry.RData")
load("tripgen/hboTripProdAry.RData")
# Aggregate trips to income group level
hbwTripProd.ZiIc <- t(apply(apply(hbwTripProdAry, c(5,3), sum), 1,
     function(x) c(x[1] + x[2], x[3], x[4])))[Zo %in% Zi,]
dimnames(hbwTripProd.ZiIc) <- list(Zi, Ic)</pre>
rm(hbwTripProdAry)
# Aggregate hbs trips
hbsTripProd.ZiIc <- t(apply(apply(hbsTripProdAry, c(5,3), sum), 1,
     function(x) c(x[1] + x[2], x[3], x[4])))[Zo %in% Zi,]
dimnames(hbsTripProd.ZiIc) <- list(Zi, Ic)</pre>
rm(hbsTripProdAry)
# Aggregate hbr trips
hbrTripProd.ZiIc <- t(apply(apply(hbrTripProdAry, c(5,3), sum), 1,</pre>
```

```
function(x) c(x[1] + x[2], x[3], x[4])))[Zo %in% Zi,]
dimnames(hbrTripProd.ZiIc) <- list(Zi, Ic)
rm(hbrTripProdAry)
# Aggregate hbo trips
hboTripProd.ZiIc <- t(apply(apply(hboTripProdAry, c(5,3), sum), 1,
    function(x) c(x[1] + x[2], x[3], x[4])))[Zo %in% Zi,]
dimnames(hboTripProd.ZiIc) <- list(Zi, Ic)
rm(hboTripProdAry)
# Put all the trips into an array
TripProd.ZiIcPr <- array(0, dim=c(length(Zi), length(Ic), length(Pr)),
    dimnames=list(Zi,Ic,Pr))
TripProd.ZiIcPr[,,"hbw"] <- hbwTripProd.ZiIc
TripProd.ZiIcPr[,,"hbs"] <- hbsTripProd.ZiIc
TripProd.ZiIcPr[,,"hbw"] <- hbsTripProd.ZiIc
TripProd.ZiIcPr[,,"hbw"] <- hbsTripProd.ZiIc
TripProd.ZiIcPr[,,"hbw"] <- hbsTripProd.ZiIc</pre>
```

Calculate proportions by income and purpose

```
TripProd.ZiPr <- apply(TripProd.ZiIcPr, c(1,3), sum)
TripProd.ZiIc <- apply(TripProd.ZiIcPr, c(1,2), sum)
TripProd.Zi <- apply(TripProd.ZiIcPr, 1, sum)
TripProdIncProp.ZiIcPr <- sweep(TripProd.ZiIcPr, c(1,3), TripProd.ZiPr,
"/")
TripProdPurProp.ZiIcPr <- sweep(TripProd.ZiIcPr, c(1,2), TripProd.ZiIc,
"/")
TripProdIncPurProp.ZiIcPr <- sweep(TripProd.ZiIcPr, 1, TripProd.Zi,
"/")</pre>
```

Calculate best market cost by purpose and income

Calculate composite market cost by purpose and income

Calculate average market cost by purpose and income

```
AveMarketCost.ZiIC <- apply(AveMarketCost.ZiICPr *

TripProdPurProp.ZiICPr,

c(1,2), sum)

AveMarketCost.ZiPr <- apply(AveMarketCost.ZiICPr *

TripProdIncProp.ZiICPr,

c(1,3), sum)

AveMarketCost.Zi <- apply(AveMarketCost.ZiICPr *

TripProdIncPurProp.ZiICPr,

1, sum)
```

Calculate transportation cost index (tci) from averages

The TCI is calculated from the average market cost

```
Tci.ZiIc <- sweep(AveMarketCost.ZiIc, 2,
AveMarketCost.ZiIc[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci.ZiPr <- sweep(AveMarketCost.ZiPr, 2,
AveMarketCost.ZiPr[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci.Zi <- AveMarketCost.Zi / AveMarketCost.Zi[ReferenceZone]</pre>
```

Calculate transportation cost index (tci) from best costs

The TCI2 calculates the TCI using the minimum market access cost

```
Tci2.ZiIc <- sweep(BestMarketCost.ZiIc, 2,
BestMarketCost.ZiIc[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci2.ZiPr <- sweep(BestMarketCost.ZiPr, 2,
BestMarketCost.ZiPr[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci2.Zi <- BestMarketCost.Zi / BestMarketCost.Zi[ReferenceZone]</pre>
```

Calculate transportation cost index (tci) from composite costs

The TCI3 calculates the TCI using the composite market access cost

```
Tci3.ZiIc <- 1 / sweep(CompMarketCost.ZiIc, 2,
CompMarketCost.ZiIc[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci3.ZiPr <- 1 / sweep(CompMarketCost.ZiPr, 2,
CompMarketCost.ZiPr[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci3.Zi <- 1 / (CompMarketCost.Zi / CompMarketCost.Zi[ReferenceZone])</pre>
```

Calculate average auto market cost by purpose and income

Calculate average non-auto market cost by purpose and income

Calculate average alternative mode market coverage

Calculate ratio of non-auto time to auto time

```
NonAutoCostRatio.ZiICPr <- NonAutoMarketCost.ZiICPr /
AutoMarketCost.ZiICPr
NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIC <- NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIC / AutoMarketCost.ZiIC
NonAutoCostRatio.ZiPr <- NonAutoMarketCost.ZiPr / AutoMarketCost.ZiPr
NonAutoCostRatio.Zi <- NonAutoMarketCost.Zi / AutoMarketCost.Zi
```

Calculate regional averages

Load district designations

```
load("inputs/RData/districts.RData")
District.Zo <- districts$ugb
names(District.Zo) <- districts$zone
District.Zi <- District.Zo[Zi] ; rm(District.Zo)
District.Zi <- as.character(District.Zi)
Di <- unique(District.Zi)</pre>
```

Calculate intra-district proportions

```
TripProd.Di <- tapply(TripProd.Zi, District.Zi, sum)
TripProdDi.Zi <- TripProd.Di[match(District.Zi, names(TripProd.Di))]
```

```
TripProdDiProp.Zi <- TripProd.Zi / TripProdDi.Zi
```

```
TripProd.DiIc <- apply(TripProd.ZiIc, 2, function(x) tapply(x,
District.Zi, sum))
TripProdDi.ZiIc <- apply(TripProd.DiIc, 2, function(x)
x[match(District.Zi, names(x))])
TripProdDiProp.ZiIc <- TripProd.ZiIc / TripProdDi.ZiIc
TripProd.DiPr <- apply(TripProd.ZiPr, 2, function(x) tapply(x,</pre>
```

```
District.Zi, sum))
TripProdDi.ZiPr <- apply(TripProd.DiPr, 2, function(x)
x[match(District.Zi, names(x))])
TripProdDiProp.ZiPr <- TripProd.ZiPr / TripProdDi.ZiPr
```

Calculate best market time by district

```
BestMarketCost.Di <- tapply(TripProdDiProp.Zi * BestMarketCost.Zi,
District.Zi, sum)
BestMarketCost.DiIc <- apply(TripProdDiProp.ZiIc * BestMarketCost.ZiIc,
2, function(x)
tapply(x, District.Zi, sum))
BestMarketCost.DiPr <- apply(TripProdDiProp.ZiPr * BestMarketCost.ZiPr,
2, function(x)
tapply(x, District.Zi, sum))
```

Calculate composite market time by district

Calculate average market time by district

Calculate transportation cost index (tci) by district

The TCI is calculated from the average market cost

```
Tci.DiIc <- sweep(AveMarketCost.DiIc, 2,
AveMarketCost.ZiIc[ReferenceZone,], "/")
```

```
Tci.DiPr <- sweep(AveMarketCost.DiPr, 2,
AveMarketCost.ZiPr[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci.Di <- AveMarketCost.Di / AveMarketCost.Zi[ReferenceZone]</pre>
```

Calculate tci2 by district

The TCI2 calculates the TCI using the minimum market access cost

```
Tci2.DiIc <- sweep(BestMarketCost.DiIc, 2,
BestMarketCost.ZiIc[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci2.DiPr <- sweep(BestMarketCost.DiPr, 2,
BestMarketCost.ZiPr[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci2.Di <- BestMarketCost.Di / BestMarketCost.Zi[ReferenceZone]</pre>
```

Calculate tci3 by district

The TCI3 calculates the TCI using the composite market access cost

```
Tci3.DiIc <- 1 / sweep(CompMarketCost.DiIc, 2,
CompMarketCost.ZiIc[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci3.DiPr <- 1 / sweep(CompMarketCost.DiPr, 2,
CompMarketCost.ZiPr[ReferenceZone,], "/")
Tci3.Di <- 1 / (CompMarketCost.Di / CompMarketCost.Zi[ReferenceZone])</pre>
```

Calculate average auto market cost by district

```
AutoMarketCost.Di <- tapply(TripProdDiProp.Zi * AutoMarketCost.Zi,
District.Zi, sum)
AutoMarketCost.DiIc <- apply(TripProdDiProp.ZiIc * AutoMarketCost.ZiIc,
2, function(x)
tapply(x, District.Zi, sum))
AutoMarketCost.DiPr <- apply(TripProdDiProp.ZiPr * AutoMarketCost.ZiPr,
2, function(x)
tapply(x, District.Zi, sum))
```

Calculate average non-auto market cost by district

Calculate average alternative mode market coverage by district

```
AltMarketCoverage.Di <- tapply(TripProdDiProp.Zi *
AltMarketCoverage.Zi, District.Zi, sum)</pre>
```

Calculate ratio of non-auto time to average time by district

NonAutoCostRatio.DiIc <- NonAutoMarketCost.DiIc / AutoMarketCost.DiIc NonAutoCostRatio.DiPr <- NonAutoMarketCost.DiPr / AutoMarketCost.DiPr NonAutoCostRatio.Di <- NonAutoMarketCost.Di / AutoMarketCost.Di

Save the results

```
# Best market cost
save(BestMarketCost.ZiIc, file="tci/BestMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
save(BestMarketCost.ZiPr, file="tci/BestMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
save(BestMarketCost.Zi, file="tci/BestMarketCost.Zi.RData")
save(BestMarketCost.Dilc, file="tci/BestMarketCost.Dilc.RData")
save(BestMarketCost.DiPr, file="tci/BestMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
save(BestMarketCost.Di, file="tci/BestMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Composite market cost
save(CompMarketCost.ZiIc, file="tci/CompMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
save(CompMarketCost.ZiPr, file="tci/CompMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
save(CompMarketCost.Zi, file="tci/CompMarketCost.Zi.RData")
save(CompMarketCost.Dilc, file="tci/CompMarketCost.Dilc.RData")
save(CompMarketCost.DiPr, file="tci/CompMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
save(CompMarketCost.Di, file="tci/CompMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Average market cost
save(AveMarketCost.ZiIc, file="tci/AveMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
save(AveMarketCost.ZiPr, file="tci/AveMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
save(AveMarketCost.Zi, file="tci/AveMarketCost.Zi.RData")
save(AveMarketCost.Dilc, file="tci/AveMarketCost.Dilc.RData")
save(AveMarketCost.DiPr, file="tci/AveMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
save(AveMarketCost.Di, file="tci/AveMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Travel Cost Index
save(Tci.ZiIc, file="tci/Tci.ZiIc.RData")
save(Tci.ZiPr, file="tci/Tci.ZiPr.RData")
save(Tci.Zi, file="tci/Tci.Zi.RData")
save(Tci.DiIc, file="tci/Tci.DiIc.RData")
save(Tci.DiPr, file="tci/Tci.DiPr.RData")
save(Tci.Di, file="tci/Tci.Di.RData")
# Travel Cost Index 2
save(Tci2.ZiIc, file="tci/Tci2.ZiIc.RData")
save(Tci2.ZiPr, file="tci/Tci2.ZiPr.RData")
save(Tci2.Zi, file="tci/Tci2.Zi.RData")
save(Tci2.DiIc, file="tci/Tci2.DiIc.RData")
save(Tci2.DiPr, file="tci/Tci2.DiPr.RData")
save(Tci2.Di, file="tci/Tci2.Di.RData")
```

```
# Travel Cost Index 3
save(Tci3.ZiIc, file="tci/Tci3.ZiIc.RData")
save(Tci3.ZiPr, file="tci/Tci3.ZiPr.RData")
save(Tci3.DiIc, file="tci/Tci3.DiIc.RData")
save(Tci3.DiPr, file="tci/Tci3.DiPr.RData")
save(Tci3.Di, file="tci/Tci3.DiPr.RData")
```

```
# Average non-auto market cost
save(NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc, file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
save(NonAutoMarketCost.ZiPr, file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
save(NonAutoMarketCost.Zi, file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.Zi.RData")
save(NonAutoMarketCost.DiIc, file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.DiIc.RData")
save(NonAutoMarketCost.DiPr, file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
save(NonAutoMarketCost.DiPr, file="tci/NonAutoMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
```

Average auto market cost

```
save(AutoMarketCost.ZiIc, file="tci/AutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
save(AutoMarketCost.ZiPr, file="tci/AutoMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
save(AutoMarketCost.Zi, file="tci/AutoMarketCost.Zi.RData")
save(AutoMarketCost.DiIc, file="tci/AutoMarketCost.DiIc.RData")
save(AutoMarketCost.DiPr, file="tci/AutoMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
save(AutoMarketCost.Di, file="tci/AutoMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
```

NonAutoCostRatio

```
save (NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIcPr, file="tci/NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIcPr.RData")
save (NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIc, file="tci/NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIc.RData")
save (NonAutoCostRatio.ZiPr, file="tci/NonAutoCostRatio.ZiPr.RData")
save (NonAutoCostRatio.DiIc, file="tci/ANonAutoCostRatio.DiIc.RData")
save (NonAutoCostRatio.DiIc, file="tci/NonAutoCostRatio.DiIc.RData")
save (NonAutoCostRatio.DiPr, file="tci/NonAutoCostRatio.DiPr.RData")
save (NonAutoCostRatio.DiPr, file="tci/NonAutoCostRatio.DiPr.RData")
```

```
# Alternative mode market coverage
save (AltMarketCoverage.ZiIcPr,
file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiIc, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiIc.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.ZiPr, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiPr.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.Zi, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.Zi.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.Zi, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.Zi.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.DiIc, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.DiIc.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.DiPr, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.DiPr.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.DiPr, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.DiPr.RData")
save (AltMarketCoverage.DiPr, file="tci/AltMarketCoverage.DiPr.RData")
```

<u>Appendix B.5 – R Script to Plot TCI, Percent Non-Auto</u> <u>Market Coverage, and ADI</u>

plot_tci_measures.R

Author:Brian GregorDate:9/26/05Contact:brian.j.gregor@odot.state.or.usCopyright:Oregon Department of Transportationlicense:GPL2

Description

This script generates a variety of plots and maps of the tci related measures.

Load the results

```
# Reference data
load("tci/MarketAttractions.ZiIcPr.RData")
load("tci/MarketLogSums.ZiIcPr.RData")
load("tci/AttractionScore.RData")
load("tci/AttractionScoreTransit.RData")
load("tci/ReferenceZone.RData")
load("tci/ReferenceAttractions.RData")
# Best market cost
load("tci/BestMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/BestMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/BestMarketCost.Zi.RData")
load("tci/BestMarketCost.DiIc.RData")
load("tci/BestMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/BestMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Composite market cost
load("tci/CompMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/CompMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/CompMarketCost.Zi.RData")
load("tci/CompMarketCost.Dilc.RData")
load("tci/CompMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/CompMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Average market cost
load("tci/AveMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/AveMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/AveMarketCost.Zi.RData")
load("tci/AveMarketCost.DiIc.RData")
load("tci/AveMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/AveMarketCost.Di.RData")
```

```
# Travel Cost Index
load("tci/Tci.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/Tci.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/Tci.Zi.RData")
load("tci/Tci.DiIc.RData")
load("tci/Tci.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/Tci.Di.RData")
# Travel Cost Index 2
load("tci/Tci2.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/Tci2.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/Tci2.Zi.RData")
load("tci/Tci2.DiIc.RData")
load("tci/Tci2.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/Tci2.Di.RData")
# Travel Cost Index 3
load("tci/Tci3.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/Tci3.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/Tci3.Zi.RData")
load("tci/Tci3.DiIc.RData")
load("tci/Tci3.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/Tci3.Di.RData")
# Average non-auto market cost
load("tci/NonAutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/NonAutoMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/NonAutoMarketCost.Zi.RData")
load("tci/NonAutoMarketCost.Dilc.RData")
load("tci/NonAutoMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/NonAutoMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Average auto market cost
load("tci/AutoMarketCost.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/AutoMarketCost.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/AutoMarketCost.Zi.RData")
load("tci/AutoMarketCost.Dilc.RData")
load("tci/AutoMarketCost.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/AutoMarketCost.Di.RData")
# Alternative mode market coverage
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiIcPr.RData")
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiIc.RData")
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.ZiPr.RData")
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.Zi.RData")
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.DiIc.RData")
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.DiPr.RData")
load("tci/AltMarketCoverage.Di.RData")
# NonAutoCostRatio
load("tci/NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIcPr.RData")
load("tci/NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIc.RData")
```

load("tci/NonAutoCostRatio.ZiPr.RData") load("tci/ANonAutoCostRatio.Zi.RData") load("tci/NonAutoCostRatio.DiIc.RData") load("tci/NonAutoCostRatio.DiIc.RData") load("tci/ANonAutoCostRatio.Di.RData")

Load mapping data and functions

```
# load required libraries
library("maptools")
library("RColorBrewer")
# identify location of data
ShapesDirectory <- "C:/medfordmodel/gis"</pre>
# read in the taz data shapefile
TazFile <- paste(ShapesDirectory, "TAZ.shp", sep="/")</pre>
TazShape <- read.shape(TazFile)</pre>
# extract the attribute data
TazData <- TazShape$att.data
# convert to polygon file for mapping
TazPoly <- Map2poly(TazShape, TazShape$att.data$TAZ)</pre>
# make an index vector to the taz
TazIndex <- as.character(TazData$TAZ)</pre>
# get the location of the reference zone
TazCentroids.ZiXy <- get.Pcent(TazShape)</pre>
rownames(TazCentroids.ZiXy) <- TazIndex</pre>
RefZoneCent <- TazCentroids.ZiXy[ReferenceZone,]</pre>
# write a function to plot taz values as a coropleth map
coropleth <- function(geo=TazPoly, data, DataIndex=TazIndex,</pre>
palette="Blues", breaks,
                          LegendSize=1, PlotRef=TRUE,
LegendOffset=c(1,1),
                          LegendTitle=NULL, RefColor="red", ...) {
     DataCut <- cut(data[DataIndex], breaks, include.lowest=TRUE,</pre>
labels=FALSE)
     ColorPalette <- brewer.pal(length(breaks)-1, palette)
     colors <- ColorPalette[DataCut]</pre>
     plot(geo, col=colors, xaxt="n", yaxt="n", border=NA, ...)
     if(PlotRef) points(RefZoneCent[1], RefZoneCent[2], pch=1,
col=RefColor, cex=2, lwd=2)
     LegendText <- paste(breaks[1:(length(breaks)-1)],</pre>
breaks[2:length(breaks)], sep=" - ")
     if(LegendSize != 0) {
          legend(720000*LegendOffset[1], 277100*LegendOffset[2],
legend=LegendText,
               title=LegendTitle, cex=LegendSize, fill=ColorPalette)
          }
     if(PlotRef){
       points(619220, 150140, pch=1, col=RefColor, cex=2, lwd=2)
       text(623250, 150140, "Reference Zone", pos=4)
       }
     1
```

Make names for household income groups and trip types for plotting

```
IcNames <- c("Low Income", "Mid Income", "High Income")
names(IcNames) <- Ic
PrNames <- c("Work", "Shopping", "Recreation", "Other")
names(PrNames) <- Pr</pre>
```

Plot histograms and maps of various measures

Plot histograms and map of attraction scores

```
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(c(1,2),nrow=2), widths=4, heights=c(3,1))</pre>
# Calculate log of scores and set -Inf to -14
AttractionScore2 <- log(AttractionScore)</pre>
AttractionScore2[is.infinite(AttractionScore2)] <- -14
# Set margins for 1st plot
Opar <- par(mar=c(1,1,2.25,1))</pre>
# Plot map of scores
coropleth (TazPoly, AttractionScore2, TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
     breaks=c(-14, seq(-10, 0, 2), 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4),
     main="", LegendOffset=c(1.05,1), LegendTitle="log(score)",
     RefColor="red")
# Add plot title
# mtext("Geographic and Frequency Distributions of Attraction Scores",
line=1, cex=1.15)
# Set margins for 2nd plot
par(mar=c(4,5,1,1))
# Plot histogram of scores, using the same breaks and colors as the map
HistData <- rep(AttractionScore2, rowSums(Hh.ZiIc))</pre>
hist(HistData, xlab="", ylab="",
     breaks=c(-14, seq(-10, 0, 2), 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4),
     col=brewer.pal(11, "RdYlBu"), main="", freq=FALSE)
mtext("Household\nFrequency", side=2, line=2.25)
mtext("log(score)", side=1, line=2)
# Save the plot and restore the graphics parameters
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/attraction scores")
par(Opar)
```

Plot household histograms of average market costs for all purposes and incomes

```
# Define breaks and limits for histograms
Breaks <- seq(0, 3, 0.25)
Xlim <- c(0,3)
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))
Opar <- par(mar=c(2,2,1,1), oma=c(2,3,2,1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ic in Ic){
    for(pr in Pr){
        HistData <- rep(AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr], Hh.ZiIc[,ic])
        hist(HistData, xlab="", xlim=Xlim, breaks=Breaks, axes=FALSE,
        ylab="", col="skyblue", main=NULL, freq=FALSE, ylim=c(0,2.5))
        axis(1, at=seq(0,2.5,0.5))
        if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=3)
```

```
if(pr == "hbw") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=3, line=1)
}
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/hist ave cost by income purpose")
```

Plot maps of average market costs for all purposes and incomes

```
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(0.5,0.5,0.5,0.5), oma=c(1,2.5,2.5,1))</pre>
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ic in Ic){
     for(pr in Pr) {
          if((ic == "highInc") & (pr == "hbw")){
               coropleth(TazPoly, AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr],
TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=c(seq(0, 2, 0.25), 3, 4.5), LegendSize=0.75,
PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="", LegendOffset=c(1.014, 1.012))
          } else {
               coropleth(TazPoly, AveMarketCost.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr],
TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=c(seg(0, 2, 0.25), 3, 4.5), LegendSize=0,
PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="")
          }
          if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=1.75)
          if(pr == "hbw") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=3, line=1)
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/map ave cost by income purpose")
```

Plot household histograms of TCI values by purpose for each mode aggregregation type

```
# Define a vector of data aggregation types
Ag <- c("Tci.ZiPr", "Tci2.ZiPr", "Tci3.ZiPr")
names(Ag) <- c("Average", "Minimum", "Composite")</pre>
# Define breaks and limits for histograms
Breaks <- seq(0, 6, 0.5)
Xlim <- c(0, 6)
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(2, 2, 1, 1), oma=c(2, 3, 2, 1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ag in names(Ag)) {
     for(pr in Pr) {
          HistData <- rep(get(Ag[ag])[,pr], rowSums(Hh.ZiIc))</pre>
          HistData <- HistData[(HistData > 0) & (HistData < 6)]</pre>
          hist(HistData, xlab="", breaks=Breaks, xlim=Xlim,
vlim=c(0,1.75),
          ylab="", col="skyblue", main=NULL, freq=FALSE, axes=FALSE)
```
```
axis(1, at=seq(0,6,1))
if(ag == "Average") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=3)
if(pr == "hbw") mtext(ag, side=3, line=1)
}
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/hist tci by modeagg purpose")
```

Plot household histograms of TCI values by income for each mode aggregregation type

```
windows (6, 4.5)
# Define a vector of data aggregation types
Aq <- c("Tci.ZiIc", "Tci2.ZiIc", "Tci3.ZiIc")</pre>
names(Ag) <- c("Average", "Minimum", "Composite")</pre>
# Define breaks and limits for histograms
Breaks <- seq(0, 6, 0.5)
Xlim <- c(0, 6)
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:9,nrow=3))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(2, 2, 1, 1), oma=c(2, 3, 2, 1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ag in names(Ag)) {
     for(ic in Ic){
          HistData <- rep(get(Ag[ag])[,ic], Hh.ZiIc[,ic])</pre>
          HistData <- HistData[(HistData > 0) & (HistData < 6)]</pre>
          hist(HistData, xlab="", breaks=Breaks, xlim=Xlim,
ylim=c(0,1.75),
          ylab="", col="skyblue", main=NULL, freq=FALSE, axes=FALSE)
          axis(1, at=seq(0, 6, 1))
          if(ag == "Average") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=2, line=3)
          if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(ag, side=3, line=1)
     }
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/hist tci by modeagg income")
dev.off()
```

Plot maps of TCI values by aggregation type by incomes

```
windows(6, 4.5)
# Define a vector of data aggregation types
Ag <- c("Tci.ZiIc", "Tci2.ZiIc", "Tci3.ZiIc")
names(Ag) <- c("Average", "Minimum", "Composite")
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:9,nrow=3))
Opar <- par(mar=c(0.5,0.5,0.5,0.5), oma=c(1,2.5,2.5,1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ag in names(Ag)){
    for(ic in Ic){
        MapData <- get(Ag[ag])[,ic]
        if((ic == "lowInc") & (ag == "Composite")){
            coropleth(TazPoly, MapData, TazIndex, "RdYlBu",</pre>
```

Plot maps of TCI values by aggregation type by purpose

```
# Define a vector of data aggregation types
Ag <- c("Tci.ZiPr", "Tci2.ZiPr", "Tci3.ZiPr")
names(Ag) <- c("Average", "Minimum", "Composite")</pre>
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(0.5,0.5,0.5,0.5), oma=c(1,2.5,2.5,1))</pre>
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ag in names(Ag)) {
     for(pr in Pr) {
          MapData <- get(Ag[ag])[,pr]</pre>
          MapData[MapData < 0] <- 35</pre>
          if((pr == "hbw") & (ag == "Composite")){
               coropleth(TazPoly, MapData, TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=c(seq(0.25, 2, 0.25), 3, 6, 12, 36),
LegendSize=0.75, PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="", LegendOffset=c(1.02, 1.02))
          } else {
               coropleth(TazPoly, MapData, TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=c(seq(0.25, 2, 0.25), 3, 6, 12, 36),
LegendSize=0, PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="")
          if (ag == "Average") mtext (PrNames [pr], side=2, line=1.75)
          if(pr == "hbw") mtext(ag, side=3, line=1.75)
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/map tci by modeagg purpose")
```

Plot histograms of alternative mode market coverage by purpose and income

```
# Set up breaks and limits for plotting
Breaks <- c(0,10,20,30,40,50,60,70,80,90,100)
Xlim <- c(0,100)</pre>
```

```
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(2, 2, 1, 1), oma=c(2, 3, 2, 1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ic in Ic){
     for(pr in Pr) {
          HistData <- rep(AltMarketCoverage.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr],</pre>
Hh.ZiIc[,ic])
          hist(HistData, xlab="", xlim=Xlim, breaks=Breaks, axes=FALSE,
          ylab="", col="skyblue", ylim=c(0,0.07), main=NULL,
freq=FALSE)
          axis(1, at=seq(0, 100, 20))
          if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=3)
          if(pr == "hbw") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=3, line=1)
          }
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/hist nonauto percent by income purpose"
)
# Restore graphics parameters
par(Opar)
```

Map alternative mode market coverage by purpose and income

```
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(0.5,0.5,0.5,0.5), oma=c(1,2.5,2.5,1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ic in Ic){
     for(pr in Pr) {
          if((ic == "highInc") & (pr == "hbw")){
               coropleth (TazPoly,
round(AltMarketCoverage.ZilcPr[,ic,pr],0), TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=seq(0,100,10), LegendSize=0.75, PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="", LegendOffset=c(1.02, 1.012))
          } else {
               coropleth(TazPoly,
round(AltMarketCoverage.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr],0), TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=seq(0,100,10), LegendSize=0, PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="")
          }
          if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=1.75)
          if(pr == "hbw") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=3, line=1.75)
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/map nonauto percent by income purpose")
```

Plot histograms of non-auto cost ratio by purpose and income

```
# Set up breaks and limits for plotting
Breaks <- seq(0, 275, 25)
Xlim <- c(0, 275)
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))
Opar <- par(mar=c(2,2,1,1), oma=c(2,3,2,1))</pre>
```

```
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
 for(ic in Ic){
      for(pr in Pr) {
           HistData <- rep(NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr],</pre>
Hh.ZiIc[,ic])
           hist(HistData, xlab="", xlim=Xlim, breaks=Breaks,
axes=FALSE,
           ylab="", col="skyblue", ylim=c(0,0.025), main=NULL,
freq=FALSE)
           axis(1, at=seq(0, 250, 50))
           if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=3)
           if(pr == "hbw") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=3, line=1)
           }
      }
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/hist nonauto auto cost ratio by income
purpose")
 # Restore graphics parameters
par(Opar)
```

Map non-auto cost ratio by purpose and income

```
# Set up plot layout, map will go on top and histogram on bottom
nf <- layout(matrix(1:12,nrow=4))</pre>
Opar <- par(mar=c(0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5), oma=c(1, 2.5, 2.5, 1))
# Iterate through all purposes and incomes and plot histograms
for(ic in Ic){
     for(pr in Pr) {
          if((ic == "highInc") & (pr == "hbw")){
               coropleth (TazPoly,
round(NonAutoCostRatio.ZiIcPr[,ic,pr],0), TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=seq(0, 275,25), LegendSize=0.75, PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="", LegendOffset=c(1.02, 1.012))
          } else {
               coropleth(TazPoly,
round(NonAutoCostRatio.ZilcPr[,ic,pr],0), TazIndex, "RdYlBu",
               breaks=seq(0, 275,25), LegendSize=0, PlotRef=FALSE,
               main="")
          }
          if(ic == "lowInc") mtext(PrNames[pr], side=2, line=1.75)
          if(pr == "hbw") mtext(IcNames[ic], side=3, line=1.75)
          }
     }
par(Opar)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/map nonauto auto cost ratio by income p
urpose")
```

Set up districts reference vectors

Districts.Zi <- Districts.Zo[Zi] ; rm(Districts.Zo)</pre>

Plot comparisons of travel cost indices by UGB

```
# Set up graphic parameters
Opar <- par(mfrow=c(2,2), mar=c(2,3,2,2), oma=c(1,1,2.25,1))
#Barplot of average market costs by district
BarCenter <- barplot(Tci.Di, xlab="", ylab="Travel Cost Index",</pre>
col=brewer.pal(8, "Pastel1"),
     main=NULL, axisnames=FALSE)
mtext("Average Market Cost", side=1, line=0.5, cex=1)
mtext("TCI", side=2, line=2.5)
text(as.vector(BarCenter), 0.1, labels=DiNames, srt=90, pos=4,
offset=0)
#Barplot of auto market costs by district
BarCenter <- barplot(Tci2.Di, xlab="", ylab="Travel Cost Index",</pre>
col=brewer.pal(8, "Pastel1"),
     main=NULL, axisnames=FALSE)
mtext("TCI", side=2, line=2.5)
mtext("Minimum Market Cost", side=1, line=0.5, cex=1)
text(as.vector(BarCenter), 0.2, labels=DiNames, srt=90, pos=4,
offset=0)
#Barplot of non-auto market costs by district
BarCenter <- barplot(Tci3.Di, xlab="", ylab="Travel Cost Index",</pre>
col=brewer.pal(8, "Pastel1"),
     main=NULL, axisnames=FALSE)
mtext("Composite Market Cost", side=1, line=0.5, cex=1)
mtext("TCI", side=2, line=2.5)
text(as.vector(BarCenter), 0.075, labels=DiNames, srt=90, pos=4,
offset=0)
# mtext("Comparison of TCI Values by Calculation Method and UGB",
outer=TRUE, line=1, cex=1.15)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/district tci")
# Restore graphics parameters
par(Opar)
```

Plot alternative mode coverage

```
windows(6.5, 4)
# Set up graphic parameters
Opar <- par(mar=c(2,3,2,2), oma=c(1,1,1,1))
# Barplot of alternative mode market coverage
BarCenter <- barplot(AltMarketCoverage.Di, xlab="", ylab="",
col=brewer.pal(8, "Pastel1"),
            main=NULL, axisnames=FALSE, ylim=c(0,100))
mtext("Percent", side=2, line=2.5)
text(as.vector(BarCenter), 5, labels=DiNames, srt=90, pos=4, offset=0)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/district_alt_mode_coverage")
# Restore graphics parameters
par(Opar)
dev.off()</pre>
```

Plot non-auto to auto cost ratio

```
windows(6.5, 4)
# Set up graphic parameters
Opar <- par(mar=c(2,3,2,2), oma=c(1,1,1,1))
# Barplot of ratio of non-auto market cost to auto market cost
BarCenter <- barplot(NonAutoCostRatio.Di, xlab="", ylab="",
col=brewer.pal(8, "Pastell"),
    main=NULL, axisnames=FALSE)
mtext("Ratio", side=2, line=2.5)
text(as.vector(BarCenter), 5, labels=DiNames, srt=90, pos=4, offset=0)
# mtext("Alternative Mode Coverage and Cost Ratio", outer=TRUE, line=1,
cex=1.15)
savePlot(filename="tci/graphics/district_nonauto_auto_cost")
# Restore graphics parameters
par(Opar)
dev.off()</pre>
```

<u>Appendix – B.6 R Script to Calculate Road Network</u> <u>Concentration Index</u>

calculate_rnci.R

Author:Brian GregorContact:brian.j.gregor@odot.state.or.usDate:09/26/05Revisions:Evisions:License:GPL2

Read in data and define variables

Read in network data

```
Links <- read.table("eug_netdata_rev_names.txt", header=TRUE)
rownames(Links) <- paste(Links$Inode, Links$Jnode, sep="-")
Capacities <- read.table("EUG_CAPS.TXT", header=TRUE)
rownames(Capacities) <- paste(Capacities$inode, Capacities$jnode,
sep="-")</pre>
```

Join the capacities data to the link data and calculate volume to capacity ratios

```
Links$Cap <- Capacities[match(rownames(Links),
rownames(Capacities)),"link_cap_per_day"]
Links$VcA <- Links$AdtA / Links$Cap
Links$VcB <- Links$AdtB / Links$Cap</pre>
```

Define link types

Define functions to calculate and plot

Define a function to calculate the RNCI

parameter: LinkAdt - a vector of link traffic volumes
parameter: LinkLanes - a vector of the number of lanes for each link

```
return: Rnci - a value of the road network concentration index
calcRnci <- function(LinkAdt, LinkLanes) {
    LaneVol <- sort(LinkAdt / LinkLanes)
    PctLaneVol <- cumsum(LaneVol)/sum(LaneVol)
    PctEqVol <-
cumsum(rep(1,length(LaneVol)))/(sum(rep(1,length(LaneVol))))
    Rnci <- (sum(PctEqVol)-sum(PctLaneVol))/sum(PctEqVol)</pre>
```

Define a function to plot a Lorenz curve

Rnci

parameter: LinkAdt - a vector of link traffic volumes

```
parameter: LinkLanes - a vector of the number of lanes for each link
```

Produce pdf plots of several RNCI comparisons

Plot RNCI for each functional class comparing scenarios A and B

Plot RNCI for each functional class comparing area types

pdf("AreaTypeCompare.pdf", width=10, height=7)

Calculate and plot aggregate values for arterials and collectors by area types

```
pdf("ArtCollAreaTypeCompare.pdf", width=10, height=7)
OldPar <- par(mfrow=c(1,2), oma=c(1,1,4,1))
IsArterial <- Links$Type %in% c(2,3,4)</pre>
IsCollector <- Links$Type %in% c(5,6)</pre>
LinkAdtA <- Links$AdtA[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LanesA <- Links$Lanes[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LinkAdtB <- Links$AdtB[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
LanesB <- Links$Lanes[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
plotRnci(LinkAdtA, LanesA, main="Low Connectivity")
plotRnci(LinkAdtB, LanesB, main="High Connectivity")
mtext ("Average Arterial Road Network Concentration Index",
     line=1, outer=TRUE, cex=2)
LinkAdtA <- Links$AdtA[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LanesA <- Links$Lanes[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LinkAdtB <- Links$AdtB[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
LanesB <- Links$Lanes[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
plotRnci(LinkAdtA, LanesA, main="Low Connectivity")
plotRnci(LinkAdtB, LanesB, main="High Connectivity")
mtext ("Average Collector Road Network Concentration Index",
     line=1, outer=TRUE, cex=2)
par(OldPar)
dev.off()
```

Calculate a composite RNCI based on capacities

Make Metafiles for Report

Plot RNCI for each functional class comparing scenarios A and B

```
for(lt in Lt[c(1:6,8)]) {
     FileName <- paste("FerryStComp", lt, ".emf", sep="")</pre>
    win.metafile(FileName, width=10, height=7)
    OldPar <- par(mfrow=c(1,2), oma=c(1,1,4,1))
    plotRnci(Links$AdtA[Links$Type == lt], Links$Lanes[Links$Type ==
lt],
          main="With Ferry St. Bridge")
    plotRnci(Links$AdtB[Links$Type == lt], Links$Lanes[Links$Type ==
lt],
          main="Without Ferry St. Bridge")
    mtext(paste(names(Lt)[Lt == lt], "Road Network Concentration
Index"),
          line=1, outer=TRUE, cex=1.5)
    par(OldPar)
    dev.off()
     ł
```

Plot RNCI for each functional class comparing area types

Calculate and plot aggregate values for arterials and collectors by area types

```
win.metafile("ArterialAreaTypeComp.emf", width=10, height=7)
OldPar <- par(mfrow=c(1,2), oma=c(1,1,4,1))
IsArterial <- Links$Type %in% c(2,3,4)
IsCollector <- Links$Type %in% c(5,6)</pre>
```

```
LinkAdtA <- Links$AdtA[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LanesA <- Links$Lanes[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LinkAdtB <- Links$AdtB[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
LanesB <- Links$Lanes[IsArterial & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
plotRnci(LinkAdtA, LanesA, main="Low Connectivity")
plotRnci(LinkAdtB, LanesB, main="High Connectivity")
mtext ("Average Arterial Road Network Concentration Index",
     line=1, outer=TRUE, cex=1.5)
par(OldPar)
dev.off()
win.metafile("CollectorAreaTypeComp.emf", width=10, height=7)
OldPar <- par(mfrow=c(1,2), oma=c(1,1,4,1))
LinkAdtA <- Links$AdtA[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LanesA <- Links$Lanes[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 1]</pre>
LinkAdtB <- Links$AdtB[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
LanesB <- Links$Lanes[IsCollector & Links$AreaType == 2]</pre>
plotRnci(LinkAdtA, LanesA, main="Low Connectivity")
plotRnci(LinkAdtB, LanesB, main="High Connectivity")
mtext("Average Collector Road Network Concentration Index",
     line=1, outer=TRUE, cex=1.5)
par(OldPar)
dev.off()
```

Calculate a composite RNCI based on capacities

```
win.metafile("CompositeAreaTypeComp.emf", width=10, height=7)
OldPar <- par(mfrow=c(1,2), oma=c(1,1,4,1))
IsMajor <- Links$Type %in% c(2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
plotRnci(Links$AdtA[IsMajor & Links$AreaType == 1], Links$Cap[IsMajor &
Links$AreaType == 1],
        main="Low Connectivity")
plotRnci(Links$AdtB[IsMajor & Links$AreaType == 2], Links$Cap[IsMajor &
Links$AreaType == 2],
        main="High Connectivity")
mtext("Capacity Weighted Average Arterial and Collector\nRoad Network
Concentration Index",
        line=0, outer=TRUE, cex=1.5)
par(OldPar)
dev.off()
```

APPENDIX C: EXPERT PANEL RESPONSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Summary: Performance Measures – Expert Panel Conference Call April 19, 2004

Attendees:

Expert Panel: Tim Lomax, Ken Dueker, Susan Handy, Mike Meyer, Doug Hunt Others: Brian Gregor (ODOT), Alan Kirk (ODOT), Caroline Gassaway (ODOT) Bud Reiff (LCOG), Tom Schwetz (LCOG), Paul Thompson (LCOG), Susan Payne (LCOG),

PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT SHOULD BE AVOIDED OR USED WITH CAUTION:

"Average" measures

- Lose richness of underlying data
- Often meaningless when aggregated over entire region
- May be insensitive to changes
- Can be developed as a roll-up measure when aggregating over selected geographic area

Public Opinion/Customer surveys

- Not useful if measure only what people approve of
- Focus instead on what people are dissatisfied with
- More useful if repeated over time to view trends
- Most useful if connected with a numerical measure

Traditional congestion indices

- Inadequate: Free flow speed comparison with actual travel speed
- Better: Most efficient travel speed compared with actual speed

Important characteristics of a useful measure:

- Context
- Comparable over time
- Comparable over regions
- Applicable to subareas and corridors
- Both forecastable and measurable measures are needed
- Can be rolled-up to broader aggregations
- Understandable link to the policies or goals
- Winnowed from a large set of potential measures to an essential set there may be many PM's for internal use, but only a few essential ones communicated to policy makers and the public
- Matched to the audience agency, decision-makers, public
- Matched to the intention of the policy.

PARTICULARLY USEFUL PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Population and Employment

- Track over time by TAZ and other small functional areas
- Use to validate land use model

Safety

• Fatalities over time

Accessibility

- Household employment opportunities within a certain distance
- Disaggregate by population groups for e.g., environmental justice

Congestion / Mobility

- Hours of congestion
- Not v/c ratios and LOS not understandable by public
- The Urban Mobility Report documentation can provide useful insights into how congestion can be conveyed to the public.

Reliability

- See Tim Lomax's work (Note: We are investigating ideas in TTI and Cambridge Systematics "Selecting Travel Reliability Measures" May 2003)
- Important issue for freight, transit or road systems
- Relates to variability small variability implies more reliable
- Correlated to congestion, but more important to customers perception of performance
- Cannot forecast adequately yet
- Possibly need to include probability of incidents when modeling reduced capacity

Accessibility

- Chandra Bhat (TXDOT, report 4938-3?
 http://www.utexas.edu/research/ctr/pdf_reports/index.html
 - By TAZ, trip purpose, time of day, mode aggregated along any of the dimensions

(Note: We are investigating possibility of disaggregating along socio-economic dimensions, as well)

- Change in consumer surplus of travel by population segment Doug Hunt
 - Transformed into \$ equivalents
 - Examines equity issues both spatially and by population segment
 - Insight into the *benefits* of travel improvements, balances the discussion.
 - Difficult for public to understand
 - See papers by Jim Ryan

(Note to Doug: We have found descriptions of how these ideas have been applied in the Sacramento models. Can you guide us to other recent research in this area?)

- Market basket of activities and choices
 - *1.* Measure cost of accessibility over time or change in the market basket over time
 - 2. Issue of whether one basket for all or different baskets for different population groups.

MEASURES OF INTEREST TO OREGON PM TAC

Reliance on Automobile

- Dependence implies not having a choice
- Possibility of using multiple scenarios to test for reliance on the auto under variety of different futures
- Use perhaps accessibility by different modes equal transit and auto accessibility implies low dependence on car. Compare at different times of day, by different socio-economic groups.
- Accessibility measures often don't include factors such as frequency that is important in determining patronage of the system. Ridership trends showing faster growth in transit than in auto use is what is important.
- VMT measures *use of the auto*, not reliance
- VMT affected by economy more than by population change.
- Is the policy to provide the option of choice or try to change behaviour? FOCUS on the intention and design the measure to match.
- Walking and transit accessibilities would measure how well land use patterns serve to reduce reliance on automobile.

Balance

- Ken Dueker's paper on transportation investment in Portland RTP
 \$ investment per mode by number of forecast trips
- Could range from relative investment by mode to balance of who benefits from investment.
- Similar issue to affirmative action debate investment could be proportional to the number of trips by mode, or could be skewed to compensate for past inadequacies.
- Need monitoring over time to measure effect of policies.
 - Extensive monitoring before and after policy enactment in Australia and NZ to see if benefits accrued following investment (Michael Meyers, International PM Scan trip)
- Develop measures for desired goal of balanced modes determine how to get to that goal. Monitor to track progress and provide feedback loop.

Economic Vitality

- Influenced by mobility, accessibility and reliability which are first in the causal path
- Important to measure in context with other cities
- Oregon II model will be able to investigate this by looking at production costs and cost of exports as affected by transportation changes. But, effects will be very small.
- Simplistic approach is to relate it to improvements in freight movement on the designated freight network
- Accessibility measures to look at market size changes due to changes in the transportation system as they affect retail businesses

Safety and Security

- Assign societal cost to crashes; use to assess cost/benefit.
- How to forecast future fatalities and injuries for use in long range planning?
- University of Arizona -- forecasting at TAZ level using population, schools, driveway access etc.
- Trends are useful especially when linked to policies implemented Vic Roads monitoring fatalities since 1970, linking trend with policies
- "Performance Measures to Improve Transportation Systems: Second National Conference. TRB is sponsoring the Performance Measures to Improve Transportation Systems: Second National Conference on August 22-24, 2004, in Irvine, CA." <u>http://gulliver.trb.org/news/blurb_detail.asp?id=2469</u> --- this conference will include a paper from TSA on security measures
- Mostly treated as dealing with recovery from, not protection against catastrophes.
- Redundancy availability of alternative modes and networks when key links go out; perhaps balance measures might apply here.

Quality of Life

- Defined as a set of desirable characteristics of region set by policy makers; score card of how transportation affects these.
- Direct impact of transportation with access to parks, green space.

Summary of Expert Panel Comments on Proposed Performance Measures

General Comments:

- The TCI-based measures are particularly useful because they measure opportunities rather than actual behavior, and are sensitive to land use policies and improvements for non-automobile modes. *(note: another panelist expressed a preference for the "behavior" measures)*
- The challenge is to explain these measures in a clear and simple way, and to show how they fit together and complement each other to provide an overall assessment of the transportation plan. Do they all get equal weight?
- A measure of safety is still needed, perhaps some combination of number of crashes or "safety cost to society" would be very useful.

Comments on Specific Measures:

Urban Mobility

- Useful to show changes over time, but not to measure mobility at any particular point in time.
- It is more a measure of road network congestion than urban mobility.
- The use of free-flow conditions as the standard by which delay is measured is not realistic.
- Need a clearer articulation of the role mobility measures play in the planning process and a stronger justification than "leverage a great deal of research and development".
- The results may differ from those published in the Urban Mobility Report for many reasons, including the area covered, types of roads included, etc.

Transportation Cost Index

- This is a form of accessibility measure, but that overcomes some of the issues with other forms. The "market basket" concept is useful, but the process of deriving it and explaining it in generally understandable terms are at least as difficult as "regular" accessibility measures.
- The choice of reference TAZ seems critical, but the methodology is not wellspecified. Should do sensitivity analysis, comparing the results for different reference TAZ's.
- Instead of "travel opportunities", the notion of "activity opportunities" puts the emphasis back on the travel goal activities at the destinations.
- "Weighted travel costs" requires much more definition / explanation. Weighted by modal size term in the utility function? Does this method bias the resulting cost information to any one particular mode?
- Need to emphasize / describe the role of travel time in the cost results.

- This measure is best used to determine the relative transportation cost burden to different income groups, which is done at the disaggregate level.
- Rather than average travel costs, it would be interesting to see the distribution of travel costs; for example, how many zones have costs above some specified level?
- This measure might be more useful to show changes over time rather than average transportation costs at any particular point in time.

Percent of Market Basket Accessible by Non-Auto Modes

- The point about this being a more direct measure of automobile dependence than VMT is important and could be more clearly articulated.
- Why is the "ratio of travel time to activity time" important for setting the threshold for public transportation relative to auto transit time?
- How is the proportion of households for which bicycling is considered to be a viable travel choice determined?
- How does this measure handle intermodal trips that include both a bicycle collection/distribution trip and a line-haul transit trip? (note: this is an important emerging market in Oregon urban areas, but not yet dealt with in Oregon MPO models, estimated from 1994 survey data.)

Auto Dependence Index

- The aggregated regional index is not very informative, and will probably not change very much from year to year. A better measure would be, for example, the percentage of TAZ's that are auto dependent, perhaps weighted by TAZ households or population.
- What are the effects of *(arbitrary)* TAZ size on the calculation of walk/bike accessibility?

Freight Delay Costs

- This is an important measure, but it is not clear what is recommended. Are these just total delay costs? Weighted averages?
- Is this just for truck movements, or is rail included? (note: While the Oregon MPO model do not include the rail mode, the Statewide model does.)

Road Network Concentration Index

- This is a measure of network redundancy and, although security related, is also common sense in terms of developing an effective network.
- Needs further explanation. If the "Gini" coefficient is aggregated for the entire region, this measure will not be very useful. Will be more useful if calculated by corridor, subregion, or functional classification.