

Draft Corridor Evaluation Criteria

- 1. Trip Demand** Based on the Bicycle Priority Index (BPI), a measure of population and employment density, land use, local schools, and transit that influences usage.
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 1.0
- 2. Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)** Addresses perceived safety related to traffic volume and existing bikeway type. In addition to serving as a proxy for safety, the existing bikeway factor is a measure of existing network supply.
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 1.0
- 3. Reported Collisions** Address safety through five years of reported data, normalized by crashes per mile. Unlike auto crashes, the lower volume of bike crashes and lack of robust, long term exposure data (i.e., number of bicyclists using each corridor) means that this dataset is not as statistically sound. However, it is still commonly reported and easily understood.
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 0.5
- 4. Public Support** Incorporate public priorities through a Public Demand Index. Weighting may be reduced depending on the extent of public interest.
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 0.5-1.0
- 5. Constraints** Tally physical constraints such as right of way, on-street parking, and other “chokepoints”. Fewer constraints results in a higher score as the corridor will be easier to implement.
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 0.5
- 6. Completes the Corridor** Proportion of the corridor that is already built to at least minimum Caltrans standard for the bikeway type that is proposed – this helps to prioritize corridors which are already partially built. This factor is also part of the LTS Index (criterion 2).
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 0.5
- 7. Completes the Network** Regional corridors which link to other regional and local bikeways help complete the network – measured by number of intersections with other existing and proposed bikeways. Existing bikeways would be weighted more heavily. Proximity to the bikeway network is also included in the BPI (criterion 1).
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 0.5
- 8. Economic Efficiency** Measure the financial benefits associated with the corridor, normalized by the number of anticipated users (in turn a product of the facility type and length), and divided by the rough order construction cost estimates.
PROPOSED WEIGHT: 1.0

