



# THE BRT STANDARD 2013

---



## **The BRT Standard 2013**

Cover Photo: Gold-standard TransOeste,  
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Cover Photo Credit: Leonardo Miguel Silva Martins  
February 14, 2013



9 East 19th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY, 10003  
TEL +1 212 629 8001  
[www.itdp.org](http://www.itdp.org)



ClimateWorks Foundation  
235 Montgomery St  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
+1 415 433 0500  
[www.climateworks.org](http://www.climateworks.org)



Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH  
Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5, 65760 Eschborn, Germany  
TEL +49 6196 79-0 [www.gtz.de](http://www.gtz.de)



ICCT  
1225 I Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington DC 20005  
+1 202 534 1600  
[www.theicct.org](http://www.theicct.org)

With Support From



Rockefeller Foundation  
420 5th Ave  
New York, NY 10018  
+1 212 869 8500  
[www.rockefellerfoundation.org](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org)

<u>Foreword</u>	4
<u>Introduction</u>	5
<u>BRT Standard Scorecard</u>	12
<u>Scoring in Detail</u>	16

# Foreword

---

Despite the increasing popularity of bus rapid transit in the United States, many communities remain unaware of key characteristics of the world's best BRT systems. In Chicago, *The BRT Standard* helped us guide design on two planned signature BRT corridors and include measures we otherwise would not have considered. It has been a great tool for reassuring stakeholder groups and the Chicago public that what we are doing is consistent with best practice.

I am convinced that a high-quality BRT design can have a huge impact on our city. Cities around the world have seen BRT not only improve urban mobility, but also stimulate urban redevelopment, improve livability, and transform ordinary citizens into transit advocates.

As BRT becomes more prevalent across the United States and across the world, *The BRT Standard 2013* can help cities achieve the best quality of service for their riders. By highlighting the essential features of BRT design and best practices from systems in the United States and abroad, *The BRT Standard 2013* provides a clear roadmap to high-quality BRT.

I look forward to using *The BRT Standard 2013* which improves upon the 2012 pilot *BRT Standard* Version 1.0, by better balancing the design needs of BRTs across different cities, countries, and continents. In just two years, it has become a well-recognized tool used by more and more cities, quickly becoming a key piece of the global urban renaissance.

Sincerely,



Commissioner Gabe Klein

Chicago Department of Transportation

# Introduction

---

*The BRT Standard* is the centerpiece of a global effort by leaders in bus transportation design to establish a common definition of bus rapid transit (BRT) and ensure that BRT systems more uniformly deliver world-class passenger experiences, significant economic benefits, and positive environmental impacts.

Despite the increasing prevalence, prominence, and success of BRT, many people remain unaware of the characteristics of the best BRT corridors and their ability to provide levels of service more typically associated with metro and subway systems. This lack of awareness frequently results in desire for rail when BRT is a comparable, more cost-effective, and equally elegant solution. The lack of awareness stems partly from the lack of a common definition for BRT. Without a definition, oftentimes, modest improvements to standard bus service are inaccurately labeled as BRT.

*The BRT Standard* functions as a means of achieving a common definition, as a scoring system, and as a planning tool. By laying out the essential elements of BRT corridors, it provides a framework for system designers, decision-makers, and the sustainable transport community to identify and implement top-quality BRT corridors. *The BRT Standard* celebrates cities that are leading the way on BRT excellence and offers best practice-based guidance to those in the process of planning a system.

Certifying a BRT corridor as basic BRT, bronze, silver, or gold places it within the hierarchy of international best practice; however, all standard levels represent excellence in BRT.

The certified cities are beacons of progress that have adopted a cutting-edge form of mass transit, elevating urban transport to a new level of excellence while making communities more livable, competitive, and sustainable. From Guadalajara, Mexico to Guangzhou, China, cities that have built gold-standard BRT have seen significant benefits to commuters, increased revitalization of city centers, and better air quality.

As we continue to clarify and elevate the standards to which all BRT systems are built, more people will experience the convenience and comfort of this cutting-edge mode of transport, and more cities will experience the benefits of an efficient and cost-effective mass-transit system. Our hope is that this will bring about the fundamental change needed to shift people out of their cars towards modern and sustainable BRT.



## Why was *The BRT Standard* created?

---

*The BRT Standard* was developed to create a common definition of bus rapid transit and recognize high-quality BRT systems around the world. It also functions as a technical tool to guide and encourage municipalities to consider the key features of the best BRT systems as they move through the design process.

Historically, there has been no common understanding of precisely what constitutes BRT. The lack of a common definition has caused confusion about the concept. The absence of an agreement among planners and engineers has meant that for every new BRT corridor that is world class, dozens of bus corridors opened that were incorrectly labeled BRT. The lack of any sort of quality control has made it possible for modest bus system improvements to be branded as BRT, leading to some backlash about BRT. Modest incremental improvements, while beneficial to bus passengers, are often not the most cost-effective solution, and they certainly do not add up to the fundamental change needed to shift the travel paradigm from a disbursed pattern of private automobile travel to bus-based mass transit.

BRT also plays an important role in the global effort to reduce transport-sector emissions. As emissions from private motor-vehicle use grow, shifting these trips onto public transit by improving the quality and reach of BRT becomes critical. Establishing a quality standard for BRT not only ensures that better projects are built, but that transport sector emissions are reduced.

Certifying a BRT corridor as gold, silver, bronze, or basic sets an internationally-recognized standard for what is BRT and what is best practice in BRT. The elements that receive points in *The BRT Standard* have been evaluated in a wide variety of contexts. When present, they result in consistently improved system performance and have a positive impact on ridership.

## What's new in 2013?

---

*The BRT Standard 2013* is the culmination of a review of Version 1.0 of *The BRT Standard* (launched in 2012) by *The BRT Standard* Technical Committee and practitioners around the world. Revisions were made collectively by the Technical Committee—a group comprised of the world's leading BRT engineers, designers, and planners. Descriptions of the most significant changes follow in the sections below.

### Definition of Corridor & Demand Profile

---

*The BRT Standard* scores BRT corridors and, as such, requires that those be clearly defined. In the pilot version, a corridor was defined as: “A section of a road or contiguous roads served by a bus route or multiple bus routes, including the section(s) where the majority of transit trips in the area pass.” The primary reason for defining the corridor in this way was to ensure that BRT infrastructure was built in locations with the highest demand instead of stopping right before those areas.

However, through testing over the course of the year, the Technical Committee concluded that this definition does not capture the essence of a BRT corridor: dedicated lanes. Additionally, the committee determined that questions relating to whether the corridor operates in the highest demand segments were better handled in the scoring system itself. Thus, it revised the definition of corridor as follows:

*“A section of a road or contiguous roads served by a bus route or multiple bus routes that have dedicated lanes with a minimum length of 4 kilometers.”*

The Committee created a new element in the scoring system called “Demand Profile” that awards three points for corridors that include

the highest demand segment and zero points otherwise.

This new element awards points to systems where the dedicated lanes extend into the most congested areas with the highest passenger demand (downtowns, for example), but are often the most difficult to achieve politically.

## BRT Basics & Basic BRT

---

The definition of BRT—including which corridors qualify and which do not—has been long debated but has not found international consensus. The debate has largely centered on a set of qualitative definitions which provide no clear way of determining whether a corridor is BRT.

Unlike Version 1.0, *The BRT Standard 2013* creates a concrete “minimum definition,” prioritizing the most critical design elements in the scoring system and requiring a minimum point value for those elements in order for a corridor to qualify as BRT. These “BRT Basics” are a set of elements that the Technical Committee has deemed essential for the operational performance of the service—keeping the “r” in bus rapid transit—and the experience of the passenger. This minimum qualification is a pre-condition to receiving a gold, silver, or bronze ranking. Systems that do not achieve gold, silver, or bronze may still be BRT using this definition. The BRT Basics aim to establish a baseline for what defines BRT, recognizing all systems that have made design and investment decisions that distinguish them as BRT.

The five essential BRT elements for which points are awarded include:

- **Busway alignment:** 7 points
- **Dedicated right-of-way:** 7 points
- **Off-board fare collection:** 7 points
- **Intersection treatments:** 6 points
- **Platform-level boarding:** 6 points

The total possible number of points achievable with the BRT Basics is 33. However, a corridor must score a minimum of 4 for both busway alignment and dedicated right-of-way to be defined as BRT. Additionally, the corridor must meet a minimum score of 18 (50 percent of the total points) on all of the BRT Basics to qualify as “Basic BRT”.

## A Better Balance for Context

---

*The BRT Standard* is intended to score all BRT corridors according to a single set of criteria rather than relative to a corridor’s demand or a city’s population. It does not differentiate between high-, medium-, and low-demand BRT corridors. The purpose of *The BRT Standard* is to create one definition of international best practice in BRT design that can be built to different sizes depending on demand. However, there were some elements in Version 1.0 that gave slightly more preference to design elements most appropriate to only the highest demand corridors, such as those in Guangzhou and Bogotá.

For the 2013 version of *The BRT Standard*, the Technical Committee reduced the number of points associated with elements more appropriate in higher demand contexts (e.g., docking bays and sub-stops), and added new elements appropriate in any context (e.g., distances between stations). In the 2013 version, the Technical Committee agrees, however, that the points associated with elements more appropriate in higher demand contexts are still considered good practice to include on lower-demand corridors, as they can improve the overall quality of any system.

Corridors with very low demand, however, probably cannot justify BRT investments of any kind, just as they probably cannot justify LRT (light-rail transit) or other mass transit investments.

## ***The BRT Standard Governance***

---

Two committees govern *The BRT Standard*: the Technical Committee and the Institutional Endorsers. The Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP) currently convenes both committees.

The Technical Committee of *The BRT Standard* comprises globally-renowned experts on BRT. This committee serves as a consistent source of sound technical advice with respect to BRT and is the basis for establishing the credibility of *The BRT Standard*. The Technical Committee certifies corridors and recommends revisions to *The BRT Standard* as needed.

*The BRT Standard* Technical Committee members include:

Manfred Breithaupt, *GIZ*

Wagner Colombini Martins, *Logit Consultoria*

Paulo Custodio, *Consultant*

Walter Hook, *ITDP*

Colleen McCaul, *Consultant*

Gerhard Menckhoff, *World Bank (retired)\**

Carlos Felipe Pardo, *Slow Research*

Scott Rutherford, *University of Washington\**

Pedro Szasz, *Consultant*

Lloyd Wright, *Asian Development Bank\**

Unless indicated by an asterisk (\*), each committee member also represents his or her institution.

The emissions scoring detail for buses was recommended by the International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT), a member of the Best Practice Network of the ClimateWorks Foundation.

The Institutional Endorsers are an integrated group of highly respected institutions in the fields of city building, public transport systems, and climate change, with decision-making abilities over *The BRT Standard* certification process. All have a commitment to high-quality public transport and a dedication to its contribution for social and economic development.

They establish the strategic direction, ensure that BRT projects ranked by the scoring system uphold the goals of *The BRT Standard*, and promote *The BRT Standard* as a quality check for BRT projects globally.

The Institutional Endorsers include:

- ClimateWorks Foundation
- Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
- Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (convener)
- International Council on Clean Transportation (ICCT)
- Rockefeller Foundation

## ***What is The BRT Standard***

---

*The BRT Standard* scoring system was created as a way of protecting the BRT brand and offering recognition to high-quality BRT systems around the world. Certifying a BRT corridor as gold, silver, bronze, or basic sets an internationally recognized standard for the current best practice for BRT.

## ***Awarding Points***

---

Points are only awarded for those elements of corridor design that most significantly improve operational performance and quality of service. The full point system is shown on page 12 and described in detail throughout the rest of this document. The criteria used to determine the point system are as follows:

- *The points should act as proxies for a higher quality of customer service (speed, comfort, capacity, etc).*
- *The points should be awarded based on a general consensus among BRT experts on what constitutes best practice in*



*system planning and design, and their relative importance.*

- *The points should reward good, often politically-challenging design decisions made by the project team that will result in superior performance, rather than rewarding characteristics that may be innate to the corridor.*
- *The metrics and weightings should be easily and equitably applicable and scalable to a wide range of BRT corridors in different contexts—from lower-ridership, smaller corridors to larger, high-volume corridors.*
- *The basis for the score should be reasonably transparent and independently verifiable without recourse to information that is not readily obtained.*

The maximum number of points a system can earn is 100. Below is an overview of the four *BRT Standard* point categories. Bronze, silver, and gold all reflect well-designed corridors that have achieved excellence. A lower score could reflect that more significant measures were not justified in a particular case.

### ***BRT Standard 2013* Rankings**

---

#### **Gold-standard BRT: 85–100 points**

*Gold-standard BRT is consistent in almost all respects with international best practice. These systems achieve the highest in operational performance and efficiency, while providing a high quality of service. It is achievable on any corridor with sufficient demand to justify any BRT investments, but may cost a little more to achieve. These systems have the greatest ability to inspire the public, as well as other cities.*

#### **Silver-standard BRT: 70–84 points**

*Silver-standard BRT includes most of the elements of international best practice and is likely to be cost effective on any corridor with sufficient demand to justify BRT investment. These systems achieve high operational performance and quality of service.*

#### **Bronze-standard BRT: 55–69 points**

*Bronze-standard BRT solidly meets the definition of BRT and is mostly consistent with international best practice. Bronze standard BRT has some characteristics that elevate it above the BRT Basics, achieving higher operational efficiencies or quality of service than basic BRT.*

#### **Basic BRT: 18–55 Points**

*Basic BRT refers to a core set of elements that the Technical Committee has deemed essential to the definition of BRT. This minimum qualification is a pre-condition to receiving a gold, silver, or bronze ranking.*

### **Design versus Performance**

---

*The BRT Standard* relies on observable corridor characteristics that are associated with high performance, rather than on performance measurements. This is currently the most reliable and equitable mechanism for recognizing quality in different corridors. The main reasons for this approach include:

- **The ability to assess both planned and existing corridors:** *The BRT Standard is intended to help guide planning and design decisions prior to corridor implementation. The scoring tool is usable both for planned and built corridors, whereas performance standards are only applicable when assessing existing corridors.*

- **Good data is rare and expensive:**  
*While the effect of the BRT corridor on a passenger's door-to-door travel time is the ideal performance-appraisal metric, this data is extremely difficult, expensive, and time-consuming to collect, and nearly impossible to independently corroborate.*

## Other Project Appraisal Tools

---

*The BRT Standard* is intended to complement cost-effectiveness measurements and system-performance evaluations. Using only cost-effectiveness appraisal tools without *The BRT Standard* could lead to either under-spending on capital investments, which would actually decrease operating cost, or it could result in overspending on measures that cannot really be justified under certain circumstances. For these reasons, *The BRT Standard* should be used in tandem with cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit evaluation.

Similarly, *The BRT Standard* may be a useful element of project appraisal as a way of testing the credibility of claimed speed improvements or other performance claims made as part of a more systematic “performance-based” appraisal, such as the U.S. Federal Transit Administration’s cost-effectiveness analysis or the internal rate-of-return analysis required by the development banks during project appraisal.

## Process

---

*The BRT Standard* is reviewed and updated annually by the Technical Committee. Corridors will be evaluated by members of the Technical Committee over the course of the year and their scores will be submitted to *The BRT Standard* Technical Committee to certify at the end of each year. Only corridors that have not previously been scored will be eligible for scoring; those corridors previously scored may request to be re-scored.

Scores will be released in the first quarter of the following year and used as a means to compare and celebrate those that have implemented true BRT, making the politically courageous and technically difficult decisions necessary to get there.

*The BRT Standard* Technical Committee and the Institutional Endorsers look forward to making this an even stronger tool for creating better BRT systems and encouraging better public transport that benefits cities and citizens alike.

For any questions on the scoring process, please contact us at [brtstandard@itdp.org](mailto:brtstandard@itdp.org).



# BRT Standard Scorecard

This scorecard shows the criteria and point values that make up *The BRT Standard*, followed by a detailed description for each.

CATEGORY	MAX SCORE		MAX SCORE
<b>BRT BASICS</b> (pp. 15–21)		<b>STATION DESIGN AND STATION-BUS INTERFACE</b> (pp. 33–36)	
Busway alignment	7	Distance between stations	2
Dedicated right-of-way	7	Safe and comfortable stations	3
Off-board fare collection	7	Number of doors on bus	3
Intersection treatments	6	Docking bays and sub-stops	1
Platform-level boarding	6	Sliding doors in BRT stations	1
<b>SERVICE PLANNING</b> (pp. 22–27)		<b>QUALITY OF SERVICE AND PASSENGER-INFORMATION SYSTEMS</b> (pp. 37–38)	
Multiple routes	4	Branding	3
Peak frequency	3	Passenger information	2
Off-peak frequency	2	<b>INTEGRATION AND ACCESS</b> (pp. 39–44)	
Express, limited, and local services	3	Universal access	3
Control center	3	Integration with other public transport	3
Located in top-ten corridors	2	Pedestrian access	3
Hours of operations	2	Secure bicycle parking	2
Demand profile	3	Bicycle lanes	2
Multi-corridor network	2	Bicycle-sharing integration	1
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b> (pp. 28–32)		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>
Passing lanes at stations	4	<b>BRT BASICS</b> (Minimum Needed: 18)	<b>33</b>
Minimizing bus emissions	3		
Stations set back from intersections	3		
Center stations	2		
Pavement quality	2		

**POINT DEDUCTIONS** (pp. 46–48)

Commercial speeds	-10
Peak passengers per hour per direction (pphd) below 1,000	-5
Lack of enforcement of right-of-way	-5
Significant gap between bus floor and station platform	-5
Overcrowding	-3
Poorly maintained busway, buses, stations and technology systems	-8



**Gold: 85 points or above**



**Silver: 70–84 points**



**Bronze: 55–69 points**

# Scoring in Detail

---

## Definition of a BRT Trunk Corridor

---

*The BRT Standard* is to be applied to specific BRT trunk corridors rather than to a BRT system as a whole. This is because the quality of BRT in cities with multiple corridors can vary significantly. For the purposes of *The BRT Standard*, a BRT trunk corridor is defined as follows:

*“A section of a road or contiguous roads served by a bus route or multiple bus routes that have dedicated lanes with a minimum length of 4 kilometers.”*

The primary reason for defining the corridor in this way is that in some cities, BRT is not prioritized over automobile traffic, an essential element in rapid transit that improves both efficiency and cost. In order to avoid rewarding systems that don't make this political choice, the corridor needs to be defined as including dedicated bus lanes.



# The BRT Basics

---

The “BRT Basics” are a set of elements that the Technical Committee has deemed essential to defining a corridor as BRT. The five essential elements of BRT are:

**Busway alignment:** 7 points\*

**Dedicated right-of-way:** 7 points\*

**Off-board fare collection:** 7 points

**Intersection treatments:** 6 points

**Platform-level boarding:** 6 points

Of the five essential elements, a corridor must score at least four (4) on both busway alignment and dedicated right-of-way to be identified as BRT, and proceed with the rest of the scoring. These two elements eliminate sources of delay from congestion or other vehicles thus increasing efficiency and lowering operating cost. They are of critical importance in differentiating BRT from standard bus service.

## Busway Alignment

### 7 POINTS MAXIMUM

The busway is best located where conflicts with other traffic can be minimized, especially from turning movements from mixed-traffic lanes. In most cases, the central verge of a roadway encounters fewer conflicts with turning vehicles than those closer to the curb due to alleys, parking lots, etc. Additionally, while delivery vehicles and taxis generally require access to the curb, the central verge of the road usually remains free of such obstructions. All of the design configuration recommendations detailed below are related to minimizing the risk of delays caused by turning conflicts and obstructions.

✔ **BRT Basics:** This is an element of BRT deemed as essential to true BRT corridors. A minimum score of 4 must be achieved on this element to be defined as BRT.


**Scoring Guidelines:** This scoring is weighted using the percentage of the trunk corridor of a particular configuration multiplied by the points associated with that configuration and then adding those numbers together. Segments including bridges, tunnels, expressways, or non-built-up areas, which don't impede the efficiency of the system, are not factored into the corridor score.

TRUNK CORRIDOR CONFIGURATIONS	POINTS
Two-way median-aligned busways that are in the central verge of a two-way road	7
Bus-only corridors where there is a fully exclusive right-of-way and no parallel mixed traffic, such as transit malls (e.g. Bogotá, Curitiba, Quito, and Pereira), and converted rail corridors (e.g. Cape Town and Los Angeles)	7
Busways that run adjacent to an edge condition like a waterfront or park where there are few intersections to cause conflicts	7
Busways that run two-way on the side of a one-way street	7
Busways that are split into two one-way pairs but are centrally aligned in the roadway	4
Busways that are split into two one-way pairs but aligned to the curb	4
Busways that operate through virtual lanes produced by a series of bus queue-jump lanes at intersections	1
Curb-aligned busway that is adjacent to the curb	0




### Possible configurations


These sections are only meant to show an example and are not meant to be inclusive of all possible configurations per type.




EXAMPLE OF A  
BUS-ONLY  
CORRIDOR WHERE  
THERE IS  
EXCLUSIVE  
RIGHT-OF-WAY  
AND NO PARALLEL  
MIXED TRAFFIC  
7 POINTS




EXAMPLE OF BUSWAY  
THAT RUNS TWO-WAY  
ON THE SIDE OF A  
ONE-WAY STREET  
7 POINTS



EXAMPLE OF A BUS-ONLY CORRIDOR  
WHERE THERE IS EXCLUSIVE RIGHT-OF-WAY  
AND NO PARALLEL MIXED TRAFFIC  
4 POINTS



EXAMPLE OF  
CURB-ALIGNED BUSWAY  
THAT IS ADJACENT  
TO THE CURB AND  
PROTECTED BY PARKING  
1 POINT





Megabus, Pereira, Colombia illustrates full segregation.

## Dedicated Right-of-way

### 7 POINTS MAXIMUM

A dedicated right-of-way is vital to ensuring that buses can move quickly and unimpeded by congestion. Physical design is critical to the self-enforcement of the right-of-way. Dedicated lanes matter the most in heavily congested areas where it is harder to take a lane away from mixed traffic to dedicate it as a busway.

Enforcement of the dedicated lanes can be handled in different ways and can have varying degrees of permeability (e.g. delineators, electronic bollards, car traps, colorized pavement, and camera enforcement). In some designs the bus stations themselves can act as a barrier. Some permeability is generally advised as buses occasionally break down and block the busway or otherwise need to leave the corridor.

Delineators are road markers that define the busway, and need enforcement to be effective.

✓ **BRT Basics:** This is an element of BRT deemed as essential to true BRT corridors. A minimum score of 4 must be achieved on this element to be defined as BRT.

**Scoring Guidelines:** The scoring system is based on the amount of corridor that has dedicated right-of-way, and the placement of that dedication in relation to observed peak-hour congestion.

TYPE OF DEDICATED RIGHT-OF-WAY	POINTS
Dedicated lanes and full enforcement or physical segregation applied to over 90% of the busway corridor length	7
Dedicated lanes and full enforcement or physical segregation applied to over 75% of the busway corridor length	6
Delineators only or colorized pavement only without other enforcement measures applied to over 75% of the busway corridor length	4
Delineators only or colorized pavement only without other enforcement measures applied to over 40% of the busway corridor length	2
Camera-enforcement with signs only	1


## Off-board Fare Collection

### 7 POINTS MAXIMUM

Off-board fare collection is one the most important factors in reducing travel time and improving the customer experience.

There are two basic approaches to off-board fare collection: "Barrier-controlled," where passengers pass through a gate, turnstile, or checkpoint upon entering the station where their ticket is verified or fare is deducted, or "proof-of-payment," where passengers pay at a kiosk and collect a paper ticket which is then checked on board the vehicle by an inspector. Both approaches can significantly reduce delay. However, barrier-controlled is slightly preferred because:

- *It is somewhat easier to accommodate multiple routes using the same BRT infrastructure;*
- *It minimizes fare evasion, as every passenger must have his/her ticket scanned in order to enter the system, versus proof-of-payment which requires random checks;*
- *Proof-of-payment can cause anxiety for passengers who may have misplaced lost tickets;*



Kiosk to buy a ticket for proof-of-payment system, Las Vegas, USA



Turnstiles in Guatemala City's BRT

- *The data collected by barrier-controlled systems upon boarding, and sometimes upon alighting, can be useful in future system planning.*

On the other hand, proof-of-payment systems on bus routes that extend beyond trunk BRT corridors extend the benefits of time savings to those sections of the bus routes that lie beyond the BRT trunk corridor.

✓ **BRT Basics:** This is an element of BRT deemed as essential to true BRT corridors.

OFF-BOARD FARE COLLECTION	POINTS
100% of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	7
75% + of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	6
Proof-of-payment on all routes that touch the trunk corridor	6
60–75% of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	5
45–60% of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	4
Proof-of-payment on some routes that run on the trunk corridor	3
30–45% of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	2
15–30% of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	1
< 15% of trunk stations have barrier-controlled, off-vehicle fare collection	0

## Intersection Treatments

### 6 POINTS MAXIMUM

There are several ways to increase bus speeds at intersections, all of which are aimed at increasing the green signal time for the bus lane. Forbidding turns across the bus lane and minimizing the number of traffic-signal phases where possible are the most important. Traffic-signal priority when activated by an approaching BRT vehicle is useful in lower-frequency systems.

✓ **BRT Basics:** This is an element of BRT deemed as essential to true BRT corridors.

INTERSECTION TREATMENTS	POINTS
All turns prohibited across the busway	6
Most turns prohibited across the busway	5
Approximately half of the turns prohibited across the busway and some signal priority	4
Some turns prohibited across the busway and some signal priority	3
No turns prohibited across the busway but signal priority at most or all intersections	2
No turns prohibited across the busway but some intersections have signal priority	1
No intersection treatments	0



## Platform-level Boarding

### 6 POINTS MAXIMUM

Having the bus-station platform level with the bus floor is one of the most important ways of reducing boarding and alighting times per passenger. Passengers climbing steps, even relatively minor steps, can mean significant delay, particularly for the elderly, disabled, or people with suitcases or strollers. The reduction or elimination of the vehicle-to-platform gap is also key to customer safety and comfort. There is a range of measures to achieve gaps of less than 5 cm (2 in.), including guided busways at stations, alignment markers, Kassel curbs, and boarding bridges. This does not take into account which technique is chosen, just so long as the gap is minimized.

✓ **BRT Basics:** This is an element of BRT deemed as essential to true BRT corridors.

**Scoring Guidelines:** Station platforms should be at the same height as bus floors, regardless of the height chosen.

PERCENTAGE OF BUSES WITH AT-LEVEL BOARDING	POINTS
100% of buses are platform level; system-wide measures for reducing the gap in place	6
80% of buses; system-wide measures for reducing the gap in place	5
60% of buses; system-wide measures for reducing the gap in place	4
100% of buses are platform level with no other measures for reducing the gap in place	
40% of buses	3
20% of buses	2
10% of buses	1
No platform-level boarding	0



Platform-level boarding speeds boarding and alighting in Ahmedabad, India.

# SERVICE PLANNING

## Multiple Routes

### 4 POINTS MAXIMUM


Having multiple routes operate on a single corridor is a good proxy for reduced door-to-door travel times by reducing transfer penalties.

This flexibility of bus-based systems is one of the primary advantages of BRT that is frequently not well used or understood.

This can include:

- *Routes that operate over multiple corridors, as exists with TransMilenio in Bogotá or Metrobús in Mexico City;*
- *Multiple routes operating in a single corridor that go to different destinations once they leave the trunk line, as exists with the Guangzhou, Cali, and Johannesburg BRT systems.*

MULTIPLE ROUTES	POINTS
Two or more routes exist on the corridor, servicing at least two stations	4
No multiple routes	0



Mexico City's Metrobús, for instance, added an additional 20,000 daily passengers just by eliminating the transfer penalty with a direct route connecting Corridor I (Insurgentes) with Corridor II (Eje 4).



Guangzhou has multiple routes, as seen in the passenger information sign, that run on the same corridor.





### Peak Frequency

#### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

How often the bus comes during peak travel times such as rush hour is a good proxy for quality of service and corridor selection. A higher frequency usually means higher ridership, although the scoring of peak frequencies have been set at levels that still allow systems in lower-demand environments to receive some points. Additionally, in order for BRT to be truly competitive with alternative modes, like the private automobile, passengers need to be confident that their wait times will be short and the next bus will arrive soon.

**Scoring Guidelines:** Peak frequency is measured by the number of buses per hour for each route that passes the highest-demand segment on the corridor during the peak period. The peak frequency score is then determined based on the percentage of routes that have a frequency of at least eight buses per hour in the peak period.

% ROUTES WITH AT LEAST 8 BUSES PER HOUR	POINTS
100% have at least 8 buses per hour	3
75% have at least 8 buses per hour	2
50% have at least 8 buses per hour	1
< 25% have at least 8 buses per hour	0

### Off-peak Frequency

#### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

As with peak frequency, how often the bus comes during off-peak travel times is a good proxy for quality of service and corridor selection.

**Scoring Guidelines:** Off-peak frequency here is measured by the buses per hour of each passing the highest-demand segment on the corridor during the off-peak (mid-day) period. The off-peak frequency score is then determined based on the percentage of all routes that have a frequency of at least four buses per hour during the off-peak period.

% ROUTES WITH AT LEAST 4 BUSES PER HOUR	POINTS
100% of all routes have at least 4 buses per hour	2
60% of all routes have at least 4 buses per hour	1
< 35% of all routes have at least 4 buses per hour	0





## Express, Limited, and Local Services

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

One of the most important ways that mass-transit systems increase operating speeds and reduce passenger travel times, is by providing limited and express services. While local services stop at every station, limited services skip lower-demand stations and stop only at major stations that have higher passenger demand. Express services often collect passengers at stops at one end of the corridor, travel along much of the corridor without stopping, and drop passengers off at the other end.

Infrastructure necessary for the inclusion of express, limited, and local BRT services is captured in other scoring metrics.

SERVICE TYPES	POINTS
Local services and multiple types of limited and/or express services	3
At least one local <i>and</i> one limited or express service option	2
No limited or express services	0

## Control Center

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

Control centers for BRT systems are increasingly becoming a requirement for a host of service improvements, such as avoiding bus bunching, monitoring bus operations, identifying problems, and rapidly responding to them.

A full-service control center monitors the locations of all buses with GPS or similar technology and can:

- Respond to incidents in real-time
- Control the spacing of buses
- Determine and respond to the maintenance status of all buses in the fleet
- Record passenger boardings and alightings for future service adjustments
- Use Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD)/ Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) for bus tracking and performance monitoring.

A full-service center should be integrated with a public transport system's existing control center, if it exists, as well as the traffic signal system.


CONTROL CENTER	POINTS
Full-service control center	3
Control center with most services	2
Control center with some services	1
No control center	0

## Located In Top-Ten Corridors

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

If the BRT corridor is located along one of the top-ten corridors, in terms of aggregate bus ridership, this will help ensure a significant proportion of passengers benefit from the improvements. Points are awarded to systems that have made a good choice for the BRT corridor, regardless of the level of total demand.

**Scoring Guidelines:** If all top-ten demand corridors have already benefited from public-transport infrastructure improvements and the corridor, thus, lies outside the top ten, all points are awarded.



This map showing the demand from road-based transit highlights that the first corridor of Johannesburg’s BRT (in red) is one of the top corridors. The higher the demand the wider the green and red lines.

CORRIDOR LOCATION	POINTS
Corridor is one of top-ten demand corridors	2
Corridor is outside top-ten demand corridors	0

## Hours of Operations

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

A viable transit service must be available to passengers for as many hours throughout the day and week as possible. Otherwise, passengers could end up stranded or may simply seek another mode.

**Scoring Guidelines:** Late-night service refers to service until midnight and weekend service refers to both weekend days.

OPERATING HOURS	POINTS
Both late-night and weekend service	2
Late-night service, no weekends OR weekend service, no late-nights	1
No late-night or weekend service	0


## Demand Profile

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

Building highest-quality BRT infrastructure in the highest-demand segments of a road ensures that the greatest number of passengers benefit from the improvements. This is most significant when the decision is made whether or not to build a corridor through a downtown; however, it can also be an issue outside of a downtown on a road segment that has a variable demand profile.

**Scoring Guidelines:** The corridor must include, either exclusively or by extension, the road segment with the highest demand within a 2-km distance from either end of the corridor. This segment must not only have exclusive lanes but must also meet the minimum requirements of the BRT Basics.

DEMAND PROFILE	POINTS
Corridor includes highest-demand segment	3
Corridor does not include highest-demand segment	0



### Multi-corridor Network

#### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

Ideally, BRT should include multiple corridors that intersect and form a network as this expands travel options for passengers and makes the system more viable as a whole. When designing a new system, some anticipation of future corridors is useful to ensure the designs will be compatible with later developments. For this reason, a long-term plan is recognized.

MULTI-CORRIDOR NETWORK	POINTS
Intersecting or connecting to an existing or planned BRT network	2
Part of, but not connected to, an existing or planned BRT network	1
No BRT network planned or built	0



TransMilenio, Bogotá, Colombia was the first to introduce passing lanes at stations, increasing the system's capacity.

## INFRASTRUCTURE

### Passing Lanes at Stations

#### 4 POINTS MAXIMUM

Passing lanes at station stops are critical to allow both express and local services. They also allow stations to accommodate a high volume of buses without getting congested with buses backed up waiting to enter. While more difficult to justify in low-demand systems, passing lanes are a good investment, yielding considerable passenger travel time savings and allowing for flexibility as the system grows.

PASSING LANES	POINTS
Physical, dedicated passing lanes	4
Buses overtake in on-coming dedicated lanes	2
No passing lanes	0

## Minimizing Bus Emissions

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

Bus tailpipe emissions are typically a large source of urban air pollution. Especially at risk are bus passengers and people living or working near roadsides. In general, the pollutant emissions of highest concern from urban buses are particulate matter (PM) and nitrogen oxides (NOx). Minimizing these emissions is critical to the health of both passengers and the general urban population.

The primary determinant of tailpipe emission levels is the stringency of governments' emissions' standards. While some fuels tend to produce lower emissions, like natural gas, new emission controls have enabled even diesel buses to meet extremely clean standards. Moreover, "clean" fuels do not guarantee low emissions of all pollutants. As a result, our scoring is based on certified emissions standards rather than fuel type.

Over the last two decades, the European Union and the United States have adopted a series of progressively tighter emissions standards that are being used for this scoring system. Buses must be in compliance with Euro VI and U.S. 2010 emission standards to receive 3 points. These standards result in extremely low emissions of both PM and NOx. For diesel vehicles, these standards require the use of PM traps, ultra-low-sulfur diesel fuel, and selective catalytic reduction. To receive two points, buses need to be certified to Euro IV or V with PM traps (note: 50 ppm sulfur diesel fuel or lower required for PM traps to function effectively).

Vehicles certified to the Euro IV and V standards that do not require traps emit twice as much PM as vehicles meeting more recent standards. Therefore, these vehicles are awarded one point. Ideally, buses will include contractually stipulated requirements in the purchase order to control real-world NOx emissions from buses in use, because the actual NOx emissions from urban buses certified to Euro IV and V have been tested at levels substantially higher than certified levels.

EMISSIONS STANDARDS	POINTS
Euro VI or U.S. 2010	3
Euro IV or V with PM traps or US 2007	2
Euro IV or V or Euro III CNG or using verified PM trap retrofit	1
Below Euro IV or V	0

Because that is hard to verify, it is included as a recommendation, but not as a requirement, for receiving the two points.

Zero points are awarded for U.S. 2004 and Euro III standards, because these standards allow ten times as much PM emissions as the U.S. 2010 and Euro VI standards. Buses certified to emission standards less stringent than Euro III receive zero points.

Buses also generate greenhouse gas emissions. Since no clear regulatory framework exists that requires bus manufacturers to meet specific greenhouse gas emission targets or fuel-efficiency standards, there is no obvious way to identify a fuel-efficient bus by vehicle type. For CO<sub>2</sub> impacts, we recommend the use of the TEEMP model which incorporates *The BRT Standard* into a broader assessment of project-specific CO<sub>2</sub> impacts.



## Stations Set Back from Intersections

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

Stations should be located at least forty meters from intersections to avoid delays. When stations are located just beyond the intersection, delays can be caused when passengers take a long time to board or alight and the docked bus blocks others from pulling through the intersection. If stations are located just before an intersection, the traffic signal can delay buses from moving from the station and thus not allow other buses to pull in. The risk of conflict remains acute, particularly as frequency increases. Separating the stations from the intersections is critical to mitigating these problems.

**Scoring Guidelines:** The distance from the intersection is defined as the stop line at the intersection to the front of a bus at the forward-most docking bay.

STATION LOCATION	POINTS
100% of trunk stations are at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set back at least 40 m (120 ft.) from intersection</li> <li>• Fully exclusive busways with no intersections</li> <li>• Grade-separated stations where stations are at-grade</li> <li>• Stations located near intersection due to block length (such as downtowns where blocks are relatively short)</li> </ul>	3
65% of trunk stations meet above criteria	2
35% of trunk stations meet above criteria	1
< 35% of trunk stations meet above criteria	0



Janmarg, Ahmedabad, India has stations that are not immediately adjacent to the intersection.



A center platform station in Quito, Ecuador is eligible.

## Center Stations

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

Having a single station serving both directions of the BRT system makes transfers between the two directions easier and more convenient—something that becomes more important as the BRT network expands. It also tends to reduce construction costs and minimize the necessary right-of-way. In some cases, stations may be centrally aligned but split into two—called split stations—in which each station houses a particular direction of the BRT system. If a connection between the two directions is not provided, fewer points are awarded.

Bi-lateral stations (those that, while in the central verge, are curb aligned) get no points.

CENTER STATIONS	POINTS
80% and above of trunk stations have center platforms serving both directions of service	2
50% of trunk stations	1
< 20% of trunk stations	0



Side platform stations in Quito, Ecuador are not eligible.



## Pavement Quality

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

Good-quality pavement ensures better service and operations for a longer period by minimizing the need for maintenance on the busway. Roadways with poor-quality pavement will need to be shut down more frequently for repairs. Buses will also have to slow down to drive carefully over damaged pavement. Reinforced concrete is particularly important at stations where the force of frequent bus braking can quickly deteriorate more standard pavements. Continuously reinforced concrete (CRC) is particularly advantageous as it avoids deterioration at joints and reduces noise levels.

PAVEMENT MATERIALS	POINTS
New reinforced concrete designed to fifteen-year life or higher over entire corridor	2
New reinforced concrete designed to fifteen-year life only at stations	1
Projected pavement duration is less than fifteen years	0



## STATION DESIGN & STATION–BUS INTERFACE



### Distances Between Stations

#### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

In a consistently built-up area, the distance between station stops optimizes at around 450 meters (1,476 ft.) between stations. Beyond this, more time is imposed on customers walking to stations than is saved by higher bus speeds. Below this distance, bus speeds will be reduced by more than the time saved with shorter walking distances. Thus, in keeping reasonably consistent with optimal station spacing, average distances between stations should not exceed 0.8 km (0.5 mi.), and should not be below 0.3 km (0.2 mi.).

**Scoring Guidelines:** 2 points should be awarded if stations are spaced, on average, less than 0.8 km (0.5 mi.) and more than 0.3 km (0.2 mi.) apart.

DISTANCE BETWEEN STATIONS	POINTS
Stations are spaced, on average, between 0.8 km (0.5 mi.) to 0.3 km (0.2 mi.) apart	2

### Safe and Comfortable Stations

#### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

One of the main distinguishing features of a BRT system as opposed to standard bus service is a safe and comfortable station environment. Stations should have an internal width of at least 3 meters. Stations should be weather protected, including from shade, wind, rain, snow, heat and/or cold, as appropriate to the conditions in a specific location. Safe stations that are well-lit, transparent, and have security—whether in-person security guards or cameras—are essential to maintaining ridership. A clear intention to create attractive stations is also important to the image of the system.

**Scoring Guidelines:** Stations should have at least 3 m (10.5 ft.) of internal width. This is the definition for “wide” in the scoring chart below.

STATIONS	POINTS
All trunk corridor stations are wide, attractive, weather-protected	3
Most trunk corridor stations are wide, attractive, weather-protected	2
Some trunk corridor stations are wide, attractive, weather-protected	1
No trunk corridor stations wide, attractive, weather-protected	0



Nantes, France

## Number of Doors on Bus

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

The speed of boarding and alighting is partially a function of the number of bus doors. Much like a subway in which a car has multiple wide doors, buses need the same in order to let higher volumes of people on and off the buses. One door or narrow doorways become bottlenecks that delay the bus.

PERCENTAGE OF BUSES WITH 3+ DOORS OR 2 WIDE DOORS	POINTS
100%	3
65%	2
35%	1
< 35%	0

**Scoring Guidelines:** Buses need to have 3 or more doors for articulated buses or two wide doors for regular buses to qualify for the below points.



Lima, Peru

## Docking Bays and Sub-stops

### 1 POINT MAXIMUM

Multiple docking bays and sub-stops not only increase the capacity of a station, they help stations provide multiple services at the station as well.

A station is composed of sub-stops that can connect to one another, but should be separated by a walkway long enough to allow buses to pass one sub-stop to dock at another. This reduces the risk of congestion by allowing a bus to pass a full sub-stop where buses can let passengers on and off. They are usually adjacent to each other and allow a second bus to pull up behind another bus already at the station. A station may be composed of only one sub-stop.

At minimum a station needs one sub-stop and two docking bays. It is usually recommended that one sub-stop not have more than two docking bays, but at that point another sub-stop can be added. Multiple docking bays and sub stops are important regardless of the level of ridership.

<b>DOCKING BAYS AND SUB-STOPS</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
At least two sub-stops or docking bays at the highest-demand stations	1
Less than two sub-stops or docking bays at the highest-demand stations	0



Lima, Peru has sliding doors where the bus docks at the station.

## Sliding Doors in BRT Stations

### 1 POINT MAXIMUM

Sliding doors where passengers get on and off the buses inside the stations improve the quality of the station environment, reduce the risk of accidents, and prevent pedestrians from entering the station in unauthorized locations.

SLIDING DOORS	POINTS
All stations have sliding doors	1
Otherwise	0



Guangzhou, China's BRT has sliding doors at the gates.

# QUALITY OF SERVICE & PASSENGER- INFORMATION SYSTEMS



Las Vegas, USA has a good brand and strong identity that appeals to its customers—from the stations to the buses.

## Branding

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

BRT promises a high quality of service, which is reinforced by having a unique brand and identity.

BRANDING	POINTS
All buses, routes, and stations in corridor follow single unifying brand of entire BRT system	3
All buses, routes, and stations in corridor follow single unifying brand, but different from rest of the system	2
Some buses, routes, and stations in corridor follow single unifying brand, regardless of rest of the system	1
No corridor brand	0



Las Vegas, USA, used old casino signs at stations, which reinforced the city's identity.



Guangzhou, China has real-time passenger-information systems.

## Passenger Information

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

Numerous studies have shown that passenger satisfaction is linked to knowing when the next bus will arrive. Giving passengers information is critical to a positive overall experience.

Real-time passenger information includes electronic panels, digital audio messaging (“Next bus” at stations, “Next stop” on buses), and/or dynamic information on handheld devices.

Static passenger information refers to station and vehicle signage, including network maps, route maps, local area maps, emergency indications, and other user information.

PASSENGER INFORMATION	POINTS
Real-time and static passenger information corridor-wide (at stations and on vehicles)	2
Moderate passenger information (real-time or static)	1
Very poor or no passenger information	0

# INTEGRATION AND ACCESS

## Universal Access

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

A BRT system should be accessible to all special-needs customers, including those who are physically-, visually-, and/or hearing-impaired, as well as those with temporary disabilities, the elderly, children, parents with strollers, and other load-carrying passengers.

**Scoring Guidelines:** Full accessibility means that all trunk stations, vehicles, and fare gates are universally accessible for wheelchairs. System includes drop curbs at all immediate intersections, Braille readers at all stations, and Tactile Ground Surface Indicators leading to all stations.

UNIVERSAL ACCESSIBILITY	POINTS
Full accessibility at <i>all</i> stations and vehicles	3
Partial accessibility at <i>all</i> stations and vehicles	2
Full or partial accessibility at <i>some</i> stations and vehicles	1
Corridor not universally accessible	0



Eugene, USA



Guangzhou, China has physical integration, like this tunnel connecting the BRT to the Metro.

## Integration with Other Public Transport

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

Often, when a BRT system is built in a city, a functioning public transport network already exists, be it rail, bus, or minibus. The BRT system should integrate into the rest of the public transport network. There are three components to BRT integration:

- **Physical transfer points:** *Physical transfer points should minimize walking between modes, be well-sized, and not require passengers to exit one system and enter another;*
- **Fare payment:** *The fare system should be integrated so that one fare card may be used for all modes;*
- **Information:** *All public transport modes, including BRT, should appear in a single set of information. Thus, the BRT system should be integrated into existing public transport maps, and schedules should be available from a single source.*

**Scoring Guidelines:** The BRT corridor should integrate physically with other public transport modes where lines cross. If no lines cross, points may still be awarded for physical integration. If no other formal public transport modes exist in the city, full points may be awarded for all aspects of integration.

INTEGRATION WITH OTHER PUBLIC TRANSPORT	POINTS
Integration of physical design, fare payment, and informational systems	3
Integration of two of the following: physical design, fare payment, and informational systems	2
Integration of one of the following: physical design, fare payment, and informational systems	1
No integration	0





Metrobus,  
Mexico City, Mexico

## Pedestrian Access

### 3 POINTS MAXIMUM

A BRT system could be extremely well-designed and functioning but if passengers cannot access it safely, it cannot achieve its goals. Good pedestrian access is imperative in BRT system design. Additionally, as a new BRT system is a good opportunity for street and public-space redesign, existing pedestrian environments along the corridor should be improved.

Good pedestrian access is defined as:

- *At-grade pedestrian crossings where pedestrians cross a maximum of two lanes before reaching a pedestrian refuge (sidewalk, median);*
- *If crossing more than two lanes at once, a signalized crosswalk is provided;*
- *A well-lit crosswalk where the footpath remains level and continuous;*

- *While at-grade crossings are preferred, pedestrian bridges or underpasses with working escalators or elevators can also be considered;*
- *Sidewalks along corridor are at least 3 meters wide.*

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS	POINTS
Good, safe pedestrian access at every station and for a 500-meter catchment area surrounding the corridor	3
Good, safe pedestrian access at every station and many improvements along corridor	2
Good, safe pedestrian access at every station and modest improvements along corridor	1
Not every station has good, safe pedestrian access and little improvement along corridor	0



Secure bike parking in a terminal, TransMilenio, Bogotá, Colombia

## Secure Bicycle Parking

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

The provision of bicycle parking at stations is necessary for passengers who wish to use bicycles as feeders to the BRT system. Formal bicycle parking facilities that are secure (either by an attendant or observed by security camera) and weather protected are more likely to be used by passengers.

BICYCLE PARKING	POINTS
Secure bicycle parking at least in terminal stations and standard bicycle racks elsewhere	2
Standard bicycle racks in most stations	1
Little or no bicycle parking	0



Bike locker, Orange Line, Los Angeles, USA



Parallel bikeway to MyCITI, Cape Town, South Africa

## Bicycle Lanes

### 2 POINTS MAXIMUM

Bicycle-lane networks integrated with the BRT corridor improve customer access, provide a full set of sustainable travel options, and enhance road safety.

Bicycle lanes should ideally connect major residential areas, commercial centers, schools, and business centers to nearby BRT stations in order to provide the widest access. All such major destinations within at least two kilometers of a trunk corridor should be connected by a formal cycle way.

Moreover, in most cities, the best BRT corridors are also the most desirable bicycle routes, as they are often the routes with the greatest travel demand. Yet there is a shortage

of safe cycling infrastructure on those same corridors. If some accommodation for cyclists is not made, it is possible that cyclists may use the busway. If the busway has not been designed for dual bike and bus use, it is a safety risk for bicycles. Bicycle lanes should be built either within the same corridor or on a nearby parallel street and are at least 2 m, for each direction, of unimpeded width.

BICYCLE LANES	POINTS
Bicycle lanes on or parallel to entire corridor	2
Bicycle lanes do not span entire corridor	1
No bicycle infrastructure	0

## Bicycle-sharing Integration

### 1 POINT MAXIMUM

Having the option to make short trips from the BRT corridor by a shared bike is important to providing connectivity to some destinations. Operating costs of providing bus service to the last mile are often the highest cost of maintaining a BRT network (i.e., feeder buses), thus providing a low-cost bicycle-sharing alternative to feeders is generally seen as best practice.

BICYCLE-SHARING INTEGRATION	POINTS
Bicycle sharing at 50% of trunk stations minimum	1
Bicycle sharing at less than 50% of trunk stations	0



Bike-share station along BRT corridor in Nantes, France

# Point Deductions

Point deductions are only relevant to systems already in operation. They have been introduced as a way of mitigating the risk of recognizing a system as high quality that has made significant design errors or has significant management and performance weaknesses not readily observable during the design phase.

The penalties for improperly sizing the infrastructure and operations or for poor system management are as follows .....➤



## Commercial Speeds

### -10 POINTS MAXIMUM

Most of the design features included in the scoring system will always result in higher speeds. However, there is an exception: higher demand systems in which too many buses carrying too many passengers have been concentrated into a single lane. In this case, bus speeds could be lower than in mixed traffic conditions. To mitigate the risk of rewarding such a system with a quality standard, this penalty was imposed.

**Scoring Guidelines:** The minimum average commercial speed refers to the system-wide average speed and not the average speed at the slowest link. Where commercial speed is not readily available, the full penalty should be imposed if buses are backing up at many BRT stations or junctions.

COMMERCIAL SPEEDS	POINTS
Minimum average commercial speed is 20 kph and above	0
Minimum average commercial speed is between 16–19 kph	-3
Minimum average commercial speed is between 14–16 kph	-6
Minimum average commercial speed is 14 kph and below	-10

## Minimum Peak Passengers per Hour per Direction (pphpd) Below 1,000

### -5 POINTS

BRT systems with ridership levels below 1,000 passengers per peak hour per direction (pphpd) are carrying fewer passengers than a normal mixed-traffic lane. Very low ridership can be an indication that other bus services continue to operate in the corridor along side, and competing with, the BRT system. Alternatively, it indicates that a corridor was poorly selected.

Almost all cities have corridors carrying at least 1,000 pphpd. Many cities, however, have corridors where transit demand is very low, even below this level. While many gold-standard BRT features would still bring benefits in these conditions, it is unlikely that such levels would justify the cost and dedicated right-of-way intrinsic to BRT. This penalty has been created to penalize systems which have done a poor job of service planning or corridor selection, while not overly penalizing smaller, car-oriented cities with low transit demand.

**Scoring Guidelines:** All five points should be deducted if the ridership on the link in the corridor with maximum peak-hour ridership is under 1,000 pphpd in the peak hour. Otherwise, no deduction is necessary.

PEAK PASSENGERS PER HOUR PER DIRECTION (PPHPD)	POINTS
PPHPD below 1,000	-5

## Lack of Enforcement of Right-of-Way

### -5 POINTS MAXIMUM

Enforcing the exclusive right-of-way of the busway is critical to achieving higher bus speeds, but the means by which it is enforced are multiple and somewhat context specific. The committee generally recommends on-board camera enforcement and regular policing at points of frequent encroachment, coupled with high fines for violators, to minimize invasions of the lanes by non-authorized vehicles. Camera enforcement at high-risk locations is somewhat less effective, however, the selection of appropriate enforcement is determined by local conditions.

LACK OF ENFORCEMENT	POINTS
Regular encroachment on BRT right-of-way	-5
Some encroachment on BRT right-of-way	-3
Occasional encroachment on BRT right-of-way	-1

## Significant Gap Between Bus Floor and Station Platform

### -5 POINTS MAXIMUM

Even systems that have been designed to accommodate platform-level boarding could have gaps if the buses do not dock properly. A significant gap between the platform and the bus floor undermines the time-savings benefits of platform-level boarding and introduces a significant safety risk for passengers. Such gaps could occur for a variety of reasons, from poor basic design to poor driver training. Technical opinion varies on the best way to minimize the gap. Most experts feel that optical guidance systems are more expensive and less effective

than measures such as the use of simple painted alignment markers and special curbs at station platforms where the drivers are able to feel the wheel touching the curb, yet the curb does not damage the wheel. Boarding bridges are used successfully in many systems and would tend to eliminate gap problems.

**Note:** If a system does not have platform-level boarding by design, no penalty points should be given.

GAP MINIMIZATION	POINTS
Large gaps everywhere or kneeling buses required to minimize gaps	-5
Slight gap remaining at some stations, large gap at remaining stations	-4
Slight gap at most stations	-3
No gap at some stations, slight gap at remaining stations	-2
No gap at most stations, slight gap at remaining stations	-1
No gap at all stations	0

## Overcrowding

**-3 POINTS**

This was included because many systems which are generally well-designed are so overcrowded that they become alienating to passengers. While average “passenger standing density” is a reasonable indicator, getting this information is not easy so we have allowed a more subjective measure to be used in cases of obvious overcrowding.

**Scoring Guidelines:** The full penalty should be imposed if the average passenger density during the peak hour is greater than five passengers per square meter (0.46 per square ft.) on buses or greater than three passengers per square meter (.28 per square ft) at stations. If this metric is not available, then clearly visible signs of overcrowding on buses or in stations should be used, such as doors on the buses regularly being unable to close, stations overcrowded with passengers because they are unable to board full buses, etc.

OVERCROWDING	POINTS
Passenger density on maximum load during peak hour in bus is > 5 m <sup>2</sup> or at station is > 3 m <sup>2</sup> . If there are visible signs of passengers unable to board buses or enter stations, then an automatic deduction is taken.	-3

## Poorly maintained busway, buses, stations, and technology systems

**-8 POINTS MAXIMUM**

Even a BRT system that is well built and attractive can fall into disrepair. It is important that the busway, buses, stations and technology systems be regularly maintained.

MAINTENANCE OF BUSES AND STATIONS	POINTS
Busway has significant wear, including potholes, warping, trash, debris, snow	-2
Buses have graffiti, litter, seats in disrepair	-2
Stations have graffiti, litter, occupancy by vagrants or vendors, or have structural damage	-2
Technology systems, including fare collection machines, are not functional	-2





9 East 19th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY, 10003

TEL +1 212 629 8001

[www.itdp.org](http://www.itdp.org)



Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5, 65760 Eschborn, Germany

TEL +49 6196 79-0



ClimateWorks Foundation

235 Montgomery St

San Francisco, CA 94104

+1 415 433 0500

[www.climateworks.org](http://www.climateworks.org)



ICCT

1225 I Street NW, Suite 900

Washington DC 20005

+1 202 534 1600

[www.theicct.org](http://www.theicct.org)



Rockefeller Foundation

Innovation for the Next 100 Years

Rockefeller Foundation

420 5th Ave

New York, NY 10018

+1 212 869 8500

[www.rockefellerfoundation.org](http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org)

# BRT Standard Scorecard 2013

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

City, Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Corridor Description (length, ridership, characteristics, location, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_

CATEGORY	MAX SCORE, SCORE		MAX SCORE, SCORE
<b>BRT BASICS</b>		<b>STATION DESIGN AND STATION-BUS INTERFACE</b>	
Busway alignment	7, _____	Distance between stations	2, _____
Dedicated right-of-way	7, _____	Safe and comfortable stations	3, _____
Off-board fare collection	7, _____	Number of doors on bus	3, _____
Intersection treatments	6, _____	Docking bays and sub-stops	1, _____
Platform-level boarding	6, _____	Sliding doors in BRT stations	1, _____
<b>SERVICE PLANNING</b>		<b>QUALITY OF SERVICE AND PASSENGER-INFORMATION SYSTEMS</b>	
Multiple routes	4, _____	Branding	3, _____
Peak frequency	3, _____	Passenger information	2, _____
Off-peak frequency	2, _____	<b>INTEGRATION AND ACCESS</b>	
Express, limited, and local services	3, _____	Universal access	3, _____
Control center	3, _____	Integration with other public transport	3, _____
Located in top-ten corridors	2, _____	Pedestrian access	3, _____
Hours of operations	2, _____	Secure bicycle parking	2, _____
Demand profile	3, _____	Bicycle lanes	2, _____
Multi-corridor network	2, _____	Bicycle-sharing integration	1, _____
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100, _____</b>
Passing lanes at stations	4, _____	<b>BRT BASICS (Minimum Needed: 18)</b>	<b>33, _____</b>
Minimizing bus emissions	3, _____	<b>POINT DEDUCTIONS</b>	
Stations set back from intersections	3, _____	Commercial speeds	-10, _____
Center stations	2, _____	Peak passengers per hour per direction (pphd) below 1,000	-5, _____
Pavement quality	2, _____	Lack of enforcement of right-of-way	-5, _____
		Significant gap between bus floor and station platform	-5, _____
		Overcrowding	-3, _____
		Poorly-maintained busway, buses, stations, and technology systems	-8, _____