Agenda

- Updates from TAC Members
- Route 7 Study Updates
  - Overall project progress
  - Coordination schedule
  - Outreach efforts discussion
  - Economic analysis results (PES)
  - Employee / resident survey results
  - Alternative evaluation framework
- Next Steps
- Discussion
## Overview of Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAC MEETING</th>
<th>MEETING PURPOSE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Project Kick-Off</td>
<td>November 7, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Project Updates:</td>
<td>April 3, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Background information on study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Outreach efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Economic development/redevelopment overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Study goals and objectives (draft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Project Updates:</td>
<td>July 2, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Economic development report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Employee/resident survey report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Finalize study goals and opportunities &amp; measures of effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Discuss alternatives evaluation framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Alternatives Evaluation</td>
<td>Mid-September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Project Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Survey and Market Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Stakeholder Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Project Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Project Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understanding of the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Review past Studies and Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Define Preliminary Project Area Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Develop Preliminary Needs Assessment and Problem Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Describe the Need for Alternatives Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Describe Study Area Setting and Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Environmental Features of the Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.1</td>
<td>Conduct Field Review and Prepare GIS Analysis Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.2</td>
<td>Estimate Development Potential Generally for the Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop the Problem Statement and Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Establish Transit Goals and Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Define Study Area Issues and Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Finalize Project Purpose &amp; Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Describe the Proposed Screening Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Establish the Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Provide an Overview of Analysis Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Ensure Consistency with Local, State, and Federal Planning Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definition of Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Establish a No-Build Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Establish the Transportation System Management (TSM) Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Develop an Initial List of Possible Build Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Screen the Conceptual Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Detailed Definition of Build Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Final Presentation to Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Outreach

- Website is active and updated: http://route7corridorstudy.com/

Updates To be Posted After Public Meeting
Public Outreach

- Survey of residents and employees in the corridor (web only) completed.
- Participation at Seven Corners Task Force meetings
- Public meeting date of July 25th scheduled
- Further coordination with NVTC board upcoming
- And…
Market Analysis Approach

❖ Route 7 Corridor and Close-In Northern Virginia
  – Demographic characteristics
  – Employment trends
  – MWCOG projections
  – Development trends

❖ Individual Land Uses
  – Demand – demographics and trends
  – Competitive supply
  – Corridor’s ability to compete
Demographics

- Growing corridor
- Slowed over the last decade
- Relatively affluent with pockets of lower-income households
- 58% homeowners
- Less than 8% have no cars
Household Types – National Trends

Households
- Families with children
- Households with no children
- Persons living alone

1990s
- 34% with own children
- 66% no children
- 25% living alone

2000
- 31% with own children
- 69% no children
- 26% living alone

2010
- 26% with own children
- 74% no children
- 27% living alone

Increase in people choosing to live alone – 36 percent in Route 7 corridor
Growing households/families with no children
Shifting Households

New generation Y households *unable to pay* for housing in hip urban neighborhoods

Generation Y- Born 1982 to 2001- 70 million
Forming households now but slowed by recession
Desire more walkable neighborhood/ easy access to jobs, services and recreation

Generation Y moves in with roommates, rents instead of owns
Employment

- Strong economic engine
- Close-in Northern Virginia added 73,400 jobs from 2002 to 2011
- Despite major job losses in the recession, employment has rebounded and slightly exceeds the 2007 level
- Professional, scientific and technical services and management of companies represent 26% of all jobs
Route 7 Corridor Submarkets
Tysons Corner Submarket

- Median household income of $150,750
- 81% owner households
- Only 12% of housing units built since 2000

Tysons Corner Households by Income, 2010
- Less than $25,000: 6%
- $25,000 to $34,999: 2%
- $35,000 to $49,999: 4%
- $50,000 to $74,999: 8%
- $75,000 to $99,999: 9%
- $100,000 to $149,999: 19%
- $150,000 or More: 52%

Tysons Corner Housing Units by Number in Structure, 2010
- 1, Detached: 68%
- 1, Attached: 9%
- 2 to 4: 1%
- 5 or more: 21%
- Mobile Home: 1%
Pimmit Hills Submarket

- Median household income of $123,300
- 72% owner households
- 75% of housing stock built before 1980
- Double the Tysons Corner transit usage at 13.6%

### Population and Household Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>56,183</td>
<td>59,044</td>
<td>65,551</td>
<td>6,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households</strong></td>
<td>22,820</td>
<td>24,420</td>
<td>25,030</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
- Population: 11.0%
- Households: 2.5%
Falls Church/Seven Corners Submarket

- Median household income of $86,983
- 29% earning less than $50,000
- 39% renter households
- 80% of housing stock built before 1980
Bailey’s Crossroads/Beauregard Submarket

- Median household income of $72,821
- 30% with incomes below $50,000
- 54% renter households
- 3/4 of housing units are multi-family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Transport to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk or bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bailey's Crossroads/Beauregard Blvd. Housing Units by Number in Structure, 2010

- 5 or more: 69%
- 2 to 4: 6%
- 1, Attached: 13%
- 1, Detached: 12%
- Mobile Home: 0%
West Alexandria/ Eisenhower Valley Submarket

- Median household income of $79,968
- 29% with incomes below $50,000
- Almost one-third of units built since 1990
- One-quarter of residents use transit
Braddock Road/ Del Ray Submarket

- Median household income of $105,134
- 84% of housing units built before 1970
- More than 37% of the households are persons living alone
- 16% use public transit
Old Town Alexandria Submarket

- Median household income of $108,178
- One-quarter of housing units built since 1990
- Almost even split among single-family and multi-family structures
- 14% use public transit

### Population and Household Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>17,764</td>
<td>19,712</td>
<td>21,398</td>
<td>1,686, 8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>9,451</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td>10,877</td>
<td>(330), -2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shifting Household Growth by Submarket

- **Infill Development**
  - Old Town Alexandria
  - Falls Church/ Seven Corners
  - Pimmit Hills

- **Major New Development**
  - Tysons Corner
  - Baileys Crossroads/ Beauregard Boulevard
  - Braddock Road/ Del Ray
  - West Alexandria/ Eisenhower Valley

49,200 new housing units by 2040
75 % in multi-family
Commercial Market Shifts - Office

- Office locations compete based on access, proximity to executive housing, visibility, quality of the environment and rents
- Not every location can meet these needs
- Significant new construction has exceeded absorption
- Major impact of BRAC decisions to move Defense operations out of leased space
Commercial - Office Market
Shifting Employment Growth by Submarket

Major New Office
- Tysons Corner
- West Alexandria/ Eisenhower Valley
- Baileys Crossroads/ Beauregard Boulevard
- Old Town Alexandria

Infill/ Neighborhood Office
- Falls Church/ Seven Corners
- Braddock Road/ Del Ray

New office construction may total 17.9 million square feet by 2040
Retail Market

- Shoppers goods
- Neighborhood goods and services
- Food and beverage
Major Shoppers Goods Competition
## Retail Opportunities by Submarket

### Grocery Store
- Tysons Corner
- Pimmit Hills
- Falls Church/ Seven Corners
- Baileys Crossroads/ Beauregard Boulevard
- Braddock Road/ Del Ray
- Old Town Alexandria

### Restaurants/ Services
- Tysons Corner
- Pimmit Hills
- Falls Church/ Seven Corners
- Baileys Crossroads/ Beauregard Boulevard
- West Alexandria/ Eisenhower Valley
- Braddock Road/ Del Ray
- Old Town Alexandria
Lodging Development

- Major hotel clusters
  - Tysons Corner
  - Old Town Alexandria

- Smaller clusters
  - Falls Church
  - Along I-395
Lodging Performance

- 66.3% occupancy in 2012
- $145.33 average daily rate in 2012
- Serving multiple markets
  - Business travelers
  - Conference attendees
  - Tourists and other visitors
- Tysons remake and Metro access should support additional hotels
Development Opportunities

- Multiple projects in the pipeline
- Underutilized properties
  - Aging strip shopping centers
  - Parking lots in higher value locations
- Not enough to be underutilized
- Difficult to justify demolition and rebuilding of well-leased residential or commercial development
  - Need much higher density and rents
Near-Term Redevelopment

- Likely to focus in regional centers with good Metro and roadway access
  - Tysons Corner
  - Old Town/King Street Metro station area

- Also renovation of existing buildings to be more competitive and achieve higher rents
Discussion
EMPLOYMENT / RESIDENT SURVEY
Survey Activity

- Survey of residents in March
- Survey of employees in the corridor (web only) ran March-May
Survey Content

- Current travel habits within the greater region, including travel mode choices;
- Concerns about transportation within the corridor;
- Desired travel destinations;
- Perceptions of public transportation;
- Interest in a possible new rapid transit system.
Methodology

Zone of residence, zone of work, other desired destinations
Residents Survey

Current Travel – Most Common Work Locations

- 17% Residents Survey
- 34% Other
- 17% Other
Residents Survey

Current Travel – Most Common Destinations (Work & Non-Work Trips)

[Map showing travel destinations with percentages: 42%, 40%, 42%]
Residents Survey

Current Travel – Most Common Zone-to-Zone Trips

- Tysons & Vienna: 92%
- Falls Church area including Seven Corners & East Falls Church: 66%
- Bailey’s Crossroads & Skyline: 67%
- Shirlington, Fairlington, and Alexandria West of Quaker Lane: 67%
- Alexandria East of Quaker Lane: 67%
- Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor: 67%
- Arlington South of Route 50: 67%
- McLean & North Arlington selection: 67%
- Silver Line Corridor: 67%
- All other parts of Northern Virginia: 67%
- DC: 67%
- Maryland: 67%
Residents Survey

Modes of Travel

- **Work Trips:**
  - Automobile: 74%
  - Transit: 37%
  - Transit usage highest for those who work in DC/MD (55%) and Falls Church/Seven Corners (42%)

- **Non-Work Trips**
  - Automobile: 92%
  - Transit: 32%

- 46% report using transit for either work or non-work trips
Residents Survey

Desired Destinations

- 47% of respondents
- 45% of respondents
Residents Survey

Perceptions of Rapid Transit

- 57% said they would be interested in the hypothetical new rapid transit system, with current public transportation users being more likely to express interest (70% vs. 43%).

- Reasons for interest in rapid transit:
  - Frequent service (35% of those interested)
  - Travel speed (33%)

- Reasons for lack of interest:
  - Flexibility of driving themselves (25% of those not interested)
  - Do not think the system would be close to their home (21%).
Employee Survey

Current Travel – Most Common Destinations

- 60%
- 69%
- 39%
- 36%
Distribution of Responses

Where Employed

- Falls Church and Seven Corners: 61%
- Tysons-Dulles Corridor: 33%
- Alexandria: 4%
- Arlington and McLean: 1%

Q1. Please tell me in which zone you work.
Base = Total Sample (n=67)
Employee Survey

Modes of Travel

❖ **Work Trips:**
  – Automobile: 97%
  – Transit: 9%

❖ **Non-Work Trips**
  – Automobile: 97%
  – Transit: 37%

❖ 93% report availability of free or subsidized parking at work, 67% report availability of transit fare reimbursement.
Employee Survey

Desired Destinations

66%
57% said they would be interested in the hypothetical new rapid transit system, with current public transportation users being more likely to express interest (72% vs. 45%).

Most interested in finding more convenient ways to travel to
- Tysons/Vienna (68%)
- Washington, DC (68%)
- Alexandria East (42%)
Key observations:

- Strong interest in rapid transit, based on reliability and travel time improvement.
- Desire better access to Tysons & DC.
- Corridor residents’ use of transit for commute trips is in line with region, employees in corridor well below it.
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK
Evaluation Perspectives

- **Effectiveness** – how alternatives address needs of corridor
- **Impacts** – how alternatives support local policy goals, potential environmental or traffic impact fatal flaws
- **Cost-Effectiveness** - are costs of alternatives in line with anticipated benefits
- **Feasibility** – financial and technical feasibility of alternatives
- **Equity** – how impacts and benefits of alternatives are distributed fairly across population groups
Evaluation Process

Tier 1

- **Pre-Screening (Phase 1)**
  - Has it previously been eliminated?
  - Is it clearly ill-suited to address the need?
  - Does it have an obvious fatal flaw?

Tier 2

- **Initial Screening (Phase 1)**
  - Develop evaluation measures that reflect goals and objectives.
  - Identify available data to use as screening measures.
  - Test mode and routing alternatives using evaluation measures.
  - Select “best performing” mode and routing alternatives for detailed evaluation.

Tier 3

- **Refined Alternatives Analysis (Phase 2)**
  - Develop additional, more rigorous evaluation measures.
  - Identify costs, ridership and benefits of alternatives.
  - Test refined alternatives using additional evaluation criteria.
  - Recommend preferred alternative to community.
  - Community makes decision to select Locally Preferred Alternative.
Pre-Screening Considerations

- Fatal flaw evaluation
- Input from several sources
  - Previous studies
  - Feedback from stakeholder interviews and public surveys
  - Initial project team observations
- Output – Reasonable modes and routings to advance to Tier 1 screening
Tier 1 Screening Considerations

- Initial application of measures
- Input from several sources
  - Demographic and GIS data
  - Local planning studies and documents
  - Field reconnaissance
  - Stakeholder and public feedback
  - Limited demand forecasting
- 3-tiered rating scheme – High, Medium, Low
- Summary matrix of data and ratings for each measure for each mode/route combination
- No weighing or measures or total numerical scores
Tier 2 Screening Considerations

- Focus of Phase 2 study
- Evaluate short list of combined mode/route alternatives
- Detail sufficient to select LPA
  - Conceptual corridor layouts
  - Conceptual station plans
  - Operating plans
  - O&M costs
  - Environmental scan
  - Ridership projections
  - Financial analysis
  - Cost-benefit assessment
- Comparison to No-Build alternative
- Weighing of measures and scoring of alternatives possible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>TIER 1 SCREENING MEASURES</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>N3</th>
<th>N4</th>
<th>N5</th>
<th>N6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Expand the existing IndyGo bus service network to provide more direct, more frequent and faster travel options throughout the region.</strong></td>
<td>Daily transit VH (six hours peak 10 minute service, 10 hours off-peak 15 minute service)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily transit vehicle miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5: Leverage public investment in transit by providing improved service to established activity centers and areas with economic development potential, thereby replacing a “vicious” cycle of disinvestment with a “virtuous” cycle of investment in support of broader community goals.</strong></td>
<td>Peak HBW trips – zonal based</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to IUPUI (miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Ivy Tech (miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Butler University (miles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7: Increase the average speed of transit vehicles in revenue service</td>
<td>Ratio of transit travel time to auto travel time</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 6: Leverage public investment in transit by providing improved service to established activity centers and areas with economic development potential, thereby replacing a “vicious” cycle of disinvestment with a “virtuous” cycle of investment in support of broader community goals.</strong></td>
<td># of sports venues within ¼ mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of libraries within ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of hospitals within ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of high schools within ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of universities/colleges in ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel/Performing Arts Center – ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of retail employment clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention center within ¼ mile?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government center within ¼ mile&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-county building within ¼ mile?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 9: Provide convenient and accessible transit service to areas with economic development potential.</td>
<td>TOTAL Summed TOD Score from Greensheet (certain alignment segments missing from analysis)</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>3,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear miles within economic development areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4 miles</td>
<td>7.7 miles</td>
<td>11.6 miles</td>
<td>8.6 miles</td>
<td>7.3 miles</td>
<td>11.3 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRE-SCREENING CONSIDERATIONS
## Minimum Development Thresholds Related to Transit Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Mode</th>
<th>Population Density (Households Per Gross Acre)</th>
<th>Employment Density (Jobs Per Gross Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Transit Service</td>
<td>&lt; 3.0</td>
<td>&lt; 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus (60 min.)</td>
<td>=&gt;3.0</td>
<td>=&gt;4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus (30 min.)</td>
<td>=&gt;4.7</td>
<td>=&gt;6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus (10 min.) – Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>=&gt;5.3</td>
<td>=&gt;7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>=&gt;6.0</td>
<td>=&gt;7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Rail</td>
<td>=&gt;8.0</td>
<td>=&gt;10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route 7 Study Area Development Density Related to Minimum Transit Mode

Household Density per Acre
2010
Route 7 Study Area Development Density Related to Minimum Transit Mode

Household Density per Acre 2035

- 0.0 - 2.0: No Transit Service
- 3.0 - 6.0: Hourly Bus Service
- 6.1 - 12.2: Limited Bus Service
- 12.3 - 25.0: BRT (10 min) Service
- 25.1 - 70.0: LRT Service
- ≥: Rapid Transit Service
Route 7 Study Area Development Density Related to Minimum Transit Mode
Route 7 Study Area Development Density Related to Minimum Transit Mode