

Alternatives Evaluation Criteria – Draft

March 2018



Purpose and Need ⁽¹⁾	Evaluation Criteria ⁽²⁾	Measure ⁽³⁾	Quantitative (no.) or Qualitative (high/med/low) ⁽⁴⁾	
Provide high quality rapid, reliable, and efficient peak and off-peak light rail transit service to communities in the West Seattle and Ballard corridors	Reliable Service	Potential service interruptions and recoverability	Qualitative	Number of service interruptions during peak a openings, at-grade crossings, etc.) and reduce
	Travel Times	LRT travel times	Quantitative	Estimated travel times from Ballard and Alask characteristics
	Regional Connectivity	Network integration and operational flexibility to meet future demand	Qualitative	Regional LRT system connectivity and operat
Improve regional mobility by increasing connectivity and capacity through downtown Seattle to meet projected transit demand	Transit Capacity	Passenger carrying capacity in downtown	Qualitative	Combined carrying capacity of downtown tran
	Projected Transit Demand	Ridership potential	Quantitative	Future 2040 total population and employment
Connect regional growth centers as described in adopted regional and local land use,	Regional Growth Centers Served	Station proximity to PSRC growth centers	Quantitative	Number of regional growth centers served by
transportation, and economic development plans and Sound Transit's Long-Range Plan	Sound Transit Long-Range Plan Consistency	Accommodates future LRT extension beyond ST3	Qualitative	Ability to accommodate expansion potential of Range Plan
	ST3 Consistency	Mode, route and general station locations per ST3	Qualitative	Consistency of mode, route and general static
		Potential ST3 operating plan effects	Qualitative	Integration of WSBLE Project into existing LR moveable bridge implications, etc.)
Implement a system that is consistent with the ST3 Plan that established transit mode,	Technical Feasibility	Engineering constraints	Qualitative	Compliance with Sound Transit Design Criteri federal regulations
corridor, and station locations and that is technically feasible and financially sustainable		Constructability issues	Qualitative	Major constructability issues based on potenti existing infrastructure, geotechnical, tunnel po
to build, operate, and maintain		Operational constraints	Qualitative	Consideration of operational constraints (e.g., temporary construction phasing, access to ma
	Financial Sustainability	Order-of-magnitude capital cost comparison	Qualitative	ST3 cost consistency based on identification of configuration, bridge type, etc.)
Expand mobility for the corridor and region's residents, which include transit dependent, low income, and minority populations	Historically Underserved Populations	Opportunities for historically underserved populations	Qualitative	Assessment of improved access to opportunit underserved populations (i.e., environmental j frequent transit network that would serve the s
	Local Land Use Plan Consistency	General station locations consistent with local land use plans	Qualitative	Compatibility and consistency of station location
Encourage equitable and sustainable urban growth in station areas through support of transit-oriented development, station access, and modal integration in a manner that is consistent with local land use plans		Station proximity to Seattle-designated Urban Centers and Villages	Qualitative	Proximity of station locations to centroid of del Seattle Comprehensive Plan
	Modal Integration	Bus/rail and rail/rail integration	Qualitative	Potential ability to integrate with bus and rail s
		Bicycle, pedestrian and persons with limited mobility connectivity	Qualitative	Accessibility of station locations to major exist identification of major physical barriers to walk pedestrians, including persons with limited mo
	Station Area Development Opportunities	Development potential	Qualitative	Likelihood of land potentially available for futu composition
Preserve and promote a healthy environment by minimizing adverse impacts on the natural and built environments through sustainable practices	Environmental Effects	Protected natural resources	Qualitative	Impacts to known natural resources (e.g., wat
		Protected built environment	Qualitative	Impacts to known built resources (e.g., parks, impacts, etc.)
	Traffic Operations	Traffic circulation and access	Qualitative	Effects on traffic operations for both automobi restrictions, and parking

Table 1 Level 1 Screening Evaluation Criteria, Measures and Methods (by segment)

Notes:

(1) Based on Draft Purpose and Need Statement (dated January 24, 2018).

(2) Criteria are subject to change as alternatives are refined and screened at each level, as well as to incorporate stakeholder input.

(3) Screening criteria and associated measures get progressively more detailed and quantitative as the alternatives are screened through Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3.

(4) Qualitative measures ranked from high to low based on anticipated ability to achieve evaluation measure; "High" = high ability to achieve measure, "Medium" = moderate ability to achieve measure, "Low" = low ability to achieve measure.

(5) Agency and stakeholder input will be considered in the overall alternatives evaluation and screening process.

Methods ⁽⁵⁾

and off-peak travel periods (e.g., number of moveable bridge indancy and ability to re-route service

ska Junction to Downtown Seattle based on alignment

ational flexibility to meet future demand

ansit tunnels

nt within 0.5-mile buffer of WSBLE Project stations

y stations

of future LRT extensions identified in Sound Transit Long-

tion locations per ST3

RT spine and overall system (e.g., spine segmentation,

eria Manual, design criteria from agencies with jurisdiction and

ntial conflicts and technical challenges (e.g., utility conflicts, portals, etc.)

g., interim terminus, interim operational impacts due to

naintenance facility, headways, moveable bridge, etc.)

n of major capital cost drivers (e.g., route miles, route

nities (i.e., employment, housing and transit) for historically al justice populations) within station areas, as well as along the e station

ations with local land use plans

lefined urban centers and villages as identified in City of

service and ease of transfers for transit customers

sting and planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities and alking and biking within general station areas for bicyclists and nobility

ture development within station areas based on zoning

aterbodies, wetlands, etc.)

s, historic properties/districts, Section 4(f)/6(f), construction

biles and freight, including potential lane restrictions, turn

Purpose and Need ⁽¹⁾	Evaluation Criteria ⁽²⁾	Measure ⁽³⁾	Quantitative (no.) or Qualitative (high/med/low) ⁽⁴⁾	
Provide high quality rapid, reliable, and efficient peak and off-peak light rail transit service to communities in the West Seattle and Ballard corridors	Reliable Service	Potential service interruptions and recoverability	Quantitative	Number of service interruptions during peak an moveable bridge openings, at-grade crossings
	Travel Times	LRT travel times	Quantitative	Estimated travel times from Ballard and Alaska characteristics, including interim terminus effect
	Regional Connectivity	LRT network integration	Qualitative	Regional LRT system connectivity and operati
Improve regional mobility by increasing connectivity and capacity through downtown Seattle to meet projected transit demand	Transit Capacity	Passenger carrying capacity in downtown	Qualitative	Combined carrying capacity of downtown trans
Seattle to meet projected transit demand	Projected Transit Demand	Ridership potential	Quantitative	Future 2040 total population and employment
Connect regional growth centers as described	Decience Crowth Contors Corrigod	Station proximity to PSRC growth centers served	Quantitative	Percent of PSRC growth centers within 10-mir
in adopted regional and local land use, transportation, and economic development	Regional Growth Centers Served	Population and job densities	Quantitative	Population and job densities within 10-minute
plans and Sound Transit's Long-Range Plan	Sound Transit Long-Range Plan Consistency	Accommodates future LRT extension beyond ST3	Qualitative	Ability to accommodate expansion potential of Range Plan
		Mode, route and general station locations per ST3	Qualitative	Consistency of mode, route and general statio
	ST3 Consistency	Potential ST3 implementation schedule effects	Quantitative	Constructability, environmental or other issues needs, in-water work restrictions, etc.)
		Potential ST3 operating plan effects	Qualitative	Integration of WSBLE Project into existing LR moveable bridge implications, etc.)
Implement a system that is consistent with the ST3 Plan that established transit mode,	Technical Feasibility	Engineering constraints	Quantitative	Compliance with Sound Transit Design Criteri federal regulations; incorporate conclusions of
corridor, and station locations and that is technically feasible and financially sustainable		Constructability issues	Quantitative	Constructability issues based on potential con infrastructure, geotechnical, tunnel portals, etc
to build, operate, and maintain		Operational constraints	Quantitative	Assessment of operational constraints (e.g., in moveable bridge, etc.); incorporate conclusion
	Financial Sustainability	Capital costs	Quantitative	ST3 cost consistency and conceptual capital c current Sound Transit unit pricing
		Operating cost impacts	Qualitative	Assessment of operations and maintenance (
	Historically Underserved Populations	Opportunities for historically underserved populations	Qualitative	Assessment of improved access to opportuniti underserved populations (i.e., environmental ju frequent transit network that would serve the s
Expand mobility for the corridor and region's		Low-income population	Quantitative	Low-income population within 10-minute walks transit
low income, and minority populations		Minority population	Quantitative	Minority population within 10-minute walkshed
		Youth population (under 18)	Quantitative	Youth population (under 18) within 10-minute frequency transit
		Elderly population (65 and over)	Quantitative	Elderly population (65 and over) within 10-min frequency transit
Encourage equitable and sustainable urban growth in station areas through support of transit-oriented development, station access, and modal integration in a manner that is consistent with local land use plans	Local Land Use Plan Consistency	Compatibility with Seattle designated Urban Centers and Villages	Quantitative	Percent of Seattle-designated Urban Centers a
		Activity nodes served	Quantitative	Number of activity nodes, including public and
	Modal Integration	Major transfer hubs	Quantitative	Number of major bus and rail service transfer
		Bus/rail and rail/rail integration	Quantitative	Number of rail stations and bus stops within 0. service frequencies during peak and off-peak
		Bicycle accessibility	Quantitative	Number of existing bike routes or trails within 2 planned regional bike facilities
		Pedestrian and persons with limited mobility accessibility	Quantitative	Intersection density within 10-minute walkshed

Table 2Level 2 Screening Evaluation Criteria, Measures and Methods (by segment)

Methods ⁽⁵⁾

and off-peak travel periods (e.g., frequency and duration of ngs, etc.) and redundancy and ability to re-route service

ska Junction to Downtown Seattle based on alignment ffects

ational flexibility to meet future demand

ansit tunnels

nt within 10-minute walkshed of WSBLE Project stations

minute walkshed of stations

te walkshed of stations

of future LRT extensions identified in Sound Transit Long-

tion locations per ST3

es that may cause schedule delays (e.g., ROW acquisition

RT spine and overall system (i.e., spine segmentation,

eria Manual, design criteria from agencies with jurisdiction and of engineering feasibility studies

onflicts and technical challenges (e.g., utility conflicts, existing etc.); incorporate conclusions of engineering feasibility studies , interim terminus, access to maintenance facility, headways, ions of engineering feasibility studies

cost comparison based on conceptual design quantities and

(O&M) cost impacts, including annual and lifecycle costs

nities (i.e., employment, housing and transit) for historically I justice populations) within station areas, as well as along the e station

Ikshed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high frequency

ed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high frequency transit

te walkshed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high

ninute walkshed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high

s and Villages within 10-minute walkshed of stations

nd private destinations, within 10-minute walkshed of stations

er hubs and ease of transfers for transit customers

0.25-mile buffer of stations operating at 15-minute or better ak periods

n 20-minute bikeshed of stations and distance to existing and

ed of stations

Purpose and Need ⁽¹⁾	Evaluation Criteria ⁽²⁾	Measure ⁽³⁾	Quantitative (no.) or Qualitative (high/med/low) ⁽⁴⁾	
	Station Area Development Opportunities	Development potential	Quantitative	Likelihood of developable or re-developable pa smaller geographic area
		Equitable development opportunities	Qualitative	Assessment of compatibility with Seattle's equ
	Environmental Effects	NRHP-eligible properties	Quantitative	Number of adjacent NRHP-eligible property im
		Parks and recreational resources	Quantitative	Number of adjacent parks and recreational res
		Water resources	Quantitative	Estimated square feet of in-water impacts
		Hazardous materials	Quantitative	Number of adjacent listed hazardous material
		Visual	Quantitative	Proximity to residential areas or protected view
Preserve and promote a healthy environment by minimizing adverse impacts on the natural		Noise and vibration	Quantitative	Number of potentially affected sensitive receiv
and built environments through sustainable practices		Property acquisitions and displacements	Quantitative	Number of potentially affected properties, inclu
		Burden on historically underserved populations	Qualitative	Assessment of how potential acquisitions and populations (i.e., environmental justice populations (i.e., environmental justice populations)
		Construction impacts	Qualitative	Assessment of temporary construction impacts vibration, and visual effects that could disrupt
	Traffic Operations	Traffic circulation and access	Quantitative	Effects on traffic operations for both automobil restrictions, turn restrictions, driveways impact
		Existing transportation facilities	Quantitative	Effects on transportation, including bicycle lan

Notes:

(1) Based on Draft Purpose and Need Statement (dated January 24, 2018).

(2) Criteria are subject to change as alternatives are refined and screened at each level, as well as to incorporate stakeholder input.

(3) Screening criteria and associated measures get progressively more detailed and quantitative as the alternatives are screened through Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3.

(4) Qualitative measures ranked from high to low based on anticipated ability to achieve evaluation measure; "High" = high ability to achieve measure, "Medium" = moderate ability to achieve measure, "Low" = low ability to achieve measure.

(5) Agency and stakeholder input will be considered in the overall alternatives evaluation and screening process.

Methods (5)

parcels within station areas; downtown stations will have a

quitable development goals

impacts

resource impacts

ial site impacts

iews

eivers

cluding potential residential and business displacements

nd displacements would affect historically underserved ulations) relative to other communities

acts to community, including potential for transportation, noise, pt the community

biles and freight, including potential number of lane acted, and parking taken

anes, sidewalks, and other infrastructure as warranted

March 2018

Purpose and Need ⁽¹⁾	Evaluation Criteria ⁽²⁾	Measure ⁽³⁾	Quantitative (no.) or Qualitative (high/med/low) ⁽⁴⁾	
Provide high quality rapid, reliable, and efficient peak and off-peak light rail transit	Reliable Service	At-grade crossings	Quantitative	Number of at-grade signalized intersections tra
		Potential service interruptions and recoverability	Quantitative	Number of service interruptions during peak ar moveable bridge openings, at-grade crossings
service to communities in the West Seattle and Ballard corridors	Travel Times	LRT travel times	Quantitative	Estimated travel times from Ballard and Alaska characteristics, including interim terminus effect
		Transit travel time savings	Quantitative	Change in transit travel times during peak com
	Regional Connectivity	LRT network integration	Qualitative	Regional LRT system connection and operation
Improve regional mobility by increasing connectivity and capacity through downtown	Transit Capacity	Passenger carrying capacity in downtown	Quantitative	Combined carrying capacity of downtown trans capacities)
Seattle to meet projected transit demand	Projected Transit Demand	Ridership forecasts	Quantitative	Average weekday riders for West Seattle and E
Connect regional growth centers as		Station proximity to PSRC growth centers served	Quantitative	Percent of PSRC growth centers within 10-min
described in adopted regional and local land use, transportation, and economic development plans and Sound Transit's	Regional Growth Centers Served	Population and job densities	Quantitative	Population and job densities within 10-minute w
Long-Range Plan	Regional Plan Consistency	Accommodates future LRT extension beyond ST3	Qualitative	Ability to accommodate expansion potential of Range Plan
	ST3 Consistency	Mode, route and general station locations per ST3	Qualitative	Consistency of mode, route and general station
		Potential ST3 implementation schedule effects	Quantitative	Constructability, environmental or other issues needs, in-water work restrictions, etc.)
		Potential ST3 operating plan effects	Qualitative	Integration of WSBLE Project into existing LRT moveable bridge implications, etc.)
Implement a system that is consistent with the ST3 Plan that established transit mode,	Technical Feasibility	Engineering constraints	Quantitative	Compliance with Sound Transit Design Criteria federal regulations; incorporate conclusions of
corridor, and station locations and that is technically feasible and financially sustainable to build, operate, and maintain		Constructability issues	Quantitative	Major constructability issues based on potentia existing infrastructure, geotechnical, tunnel por studies
		Operational constraints	Quantitative	Assessment of operational constraints (e.g., int moveable bridge, etc.); incorporate conclusions
	Financial Sustainability	Capital costs	Quantitative	ST3 cost consistency and conceptual capital co current Sound Transit unit pricing
		Operating costs	Quantitative	Annual O&M costs
	Historically Underserved Populations	Opportunities for historically underserved populations	Qualitative	Assessment of improved access to opportunitie underserved populations (i.e., environmental ju frequent transit network that would serve the st
Expand mobility for the corridor and region's residents, which include transit dependent, low income, and minority populations		Low-income population	Quantitative	Low-income population within 10-minute walks transit
		Minority population	Quantitative	Minority population within 10-minute walkshed
		Youth population (under 18)	Quantitative	Youth population (under 18) within 10-minute v frequency transit
		Elderly population (65 and over)	Quantitative	Elderly population (65 and over) within 10-minu frequency transit
		Affordable housing accessibility	Quantitative	Number of affordable housing units within 10-m connecting high frequency transit
Encourage equitable and sustainable urban	Local Land Use Plan Consistency	Compatibility with Seattle designated Urban Centers and Villages	Quantitative	Percent of Seattle-designated Urban Centers a
growth in station areas through support of transit-oriented development, station access,		Activity nodes served	Quantitative	Number of activity nodes, including public and
and modal integration in a manner that is consistent with local land use plans	Modal Integration	Major transfer hubs	Quantitative	Number of major bus and rail service transfer h

Table 3 Level 3 Screening Evaluation Criteria, Measures and Methods (corridorwide)

Methods ⁽⁵⁾

traversed

and off-peak travel periods. (e.g., frequency and duration of gs, etc.) and redundancy and ability to re-route service ska Junction to Downtown Seattle based on alignment fects

ompared to No Build Alternative based on select trip pairs

tional flexibility to meet future demand

nsit tunnels (e.g., headways and vehicle passenger carrying

d Ballard Link Extensions, including passenger transfers

ninute walkshed of stations

te walkshed of stations

of future LRT extensions identified in Sound Transit Long-

tion locations per ST3

es that may cause schedule delays (e.g., ROW acquisition

RT spine and overall system (e.g., spine segmentation,

ria Manual, design criteria from agencies with jurisdiction and of engineering feasibility studies

tial conflicts and technical challenges (e.g., utility conflicts, portals, etc.); incorporate conclusions of engineering feasibility

interim terminus, access to maintenance facility, headways, ons of engineering feasibility studies

cost comparison based on conceptual design quantities and

nities (i.e., employment, housing and transit) for historically I justice populations) within station areas, as well as along the e station

Ikshed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high frequency

ed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high frequency transit

e walkshed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high

inute walkshed and/or 10-minute ride on connecting high

0-minute walkshed of stations and/or 10-minute ride on

and Villages within 10-minute walkshed of stations

d private destinations, within 10-minute walkshed of stations

r hubs and ease of transfers for transit customers

Purpose and Need ⁽¹⁾	Evaluation Criteria ⁽²⁾	Measure ⁽³⁾	Quantitative (no.) or Qualitative (high/med/low) ⁽⁴⁾	
		Bus/rail and rail/rail integration	Quantitative	Number of rail stations and bus stops within 0. service frequencies during peak and off-peak
		Bicycle accessibility	Quantitative	Number of existing bike routes or trails within 2 planned regional bike facilities
		Pedestrian and persons with limited mobility accessibility	Quantitative	Intersection density and number of existing sid minute walkshed of stations
	Station Area Development	Development potential	Quantitative	Inventory of developable or re-developable par smaller geographic area
	Opportunities	Equitable development opportunities	Qualitative	Assessment of compatibility with Seattle's equ
	Environmental Effects	NRHP-eligible properties	Quantitative	Number of adjacent NRHP-eligible property im
		Parks and recreational resources	Quantitative	Number of adjacent parks and recreational res
		Water resources	Quantitative	Estimated square feet of in-water impacts
		Hazardous materials	Quantitative	Number of adjacent listed hazardous material
Preserve and promote a healthy environment		Visual	Quantitative	Proximity to residential areas or protected view
by minimizing adverse impacts on the natural and built environments through sustainable		Noise and vibration	Quantitative	Number of potentially affected sensitive receive
practices		Property acquisitions and displacements	Quantitative	Number of potentially affected properties, inclu
		Burden on historically underserved populations	Qualitative	Assessment of how potential acquisitions and populations (i.e., environmental justice populat
		Construction impacts	Qualitative	Assessment of temporary construction impacts vibration, and visual effects that could disrupt t
	Traffic Operations	Traffic circulation and access	Quantitative	Effects on traffic circulation and access for bot restrictions, turn restrictions, driveways impact
		Traffic level of service	Quantitative	Assessment of intersection level of service (LC

Notes:

(1) Based on Draft Purpose and Need Statement (dated January 24, 2018).

(2) Criteria are subject to change as alternatives are refined and screened at each level, as well as to incorporate stakeholder input.

(3) Screening criteria and associated measures get progressively more detailed and quantitative as the alternatives are screened through Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3.

(4) Qualitative measures ranked from high to low based on anticipated ability to achieve evaluation measure; "High" = high ability to achieve measure, "Medium" = moderate ability to achieve measure, "Low" = low ability to achieve measure.
 (5) Agency and stakeholder input will be considered in the overall alternatives evaluation and screening process.

Methods ⁽⁵⁾
0.25-mile buffer of stations operating at 15-minute or better k periods
n 20-minute bikeshed of stations and distance to existing and
sidewalks, ADA-accessible slopes and curb ramps within 10-
parcels within station areas; downtown stations will have a
quitable development goals
impacts
resource impacts
al site impacts
iews
eivers
cluding potential residential and business displacements
nd displacements would affect historically underserved lations) relative to other communities
cts to community, including potential for transportation, noise, of the community
both automobiles and freight, including potential number of lane acted, and parking taken

(LOS)

March 2018