



# Kitsap County Public Works Transportation Project Evaluation System 2017



## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Four-Tier system</b> .....	4
Tier 1 - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) .....	4
Tier 2 – Prioritized Candidate Project List.....	4
Tier 3 – Priority Capacity Needs List .....	5
Tier 4 - Unconstrained Needs List .....	5
<b>Project Selection Process</b> .....	5
Step 1.    Project Identification and Review .....	5
Step 2.    Scoring of Candidate Project List .....	7
Step 3.    Ranking of Candidate Project List .....	11
Step 4.    Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation .....	12
Step 5.    County Commissioners’ Review and Approval .....	12
<b>Glossary</b> .....	13
<b>Candidate Roadway Project Evaluation Form</b> .....	16
<b>Project Scoring Sheet</b> .....	17

## **Introduction**

This document is a guide for the selection of transportation projects for funding in the Kitsap County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP by reference updates the Kitsap County Capital Facilities Plan (CFP).

The following are a list of objectives for prioritizing capital improvements:

- To avoid overlooking large, critically needed projects;
- To implement the County's comprehensive plan;
- To balance the needs of different sectors of the community with those of the County as a whole;
- To take the County's long-range needs into account each year when considering the annual capital budget;
- To allow ample time to examine alternative funding sources;
- To help make the development of major facilities consistent with the County's goals and objectives, anticipated growth, and financial capabilities;
- To encourage citizen interest and constructive participation in County affairs;
- To improve debt administration, financial management and utilization of financial resources as a result of the discipline required by capital improvement programming.

The State's "Standards of Good Practice" – Priority Programming Procedures (WAC 136-14-030) states that for the development of these plans:

Each county engineer will be required to develop a priority programming process tailored to meet the overall roadway system development policy determined by his or her county legislative authority. Items to be included and considered in the technique for roads shall include, but need not be limited to the following:

- (1) Traffic volumes;
- (2) Roadway condition;
- (3) Geometrics;
- (4) Safety and accident history; and
- (5) Matters of significant local importance.

Consistent with the 2016 Comp Plan and the Non-Motorized Facility Plan, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) adopted a policy in 2016 that scores projects based on the following criteria:

- Preservation – The goal of the preservation program is to preserve the bridge and roadway infrastructure cost effectively to protect the public investment. Preservation activities are those that serve to extend the useful life of each type of roadway, roadway structure and facility but do not increase its capacity or efficiency.
- Capacity – New or expanded facilities that reduce or eliminate deficiencies in levels of service for existing or future demand.
- Safety – The roadway safety program specifically targets corridors and intersections experiencing problems. The program is designed to maximize safety by ensuring that unsafe intersections and corridors receive adequate priority.
- Environmental Retrofit – The environmental retrofit program is in response to currently unmitigated environmental impacts caused by the existing roadway system. The program specifically targets the correction of fish barriers identified by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- Non-motorized – Maximizing the opportunity for non-motorized travel and encouraging development of roads to safely accommodate motorized and non-motorized travel.

This document describes the process that Public Works uses to determine which projects will be included in the 6-year TIP.

The TIP TAC consists of:

- Director of Public Works
- County Road Engineer
- Special Projects Coordinator – Board of County Commissioners
- Policy and Planning Manager - Community Development
- Environmental Programs Manager – Community Development
- Environmental Programs Senior Planner – Community Development
- Traffic Safety Engineer
- Transportation Planner
- Transportation Planning Manager
- Senior Program Manager - Stormwater
- Senior Program Manager – Waste Water
- Design Manager – Public Works
- Senior Program Manager – Roads
- Senior Program Manager – Traffic
- Director of Parks & Recreation
- Superintendent of Parks & Recreation
- Senior Program Manager – Engineering
- ESA Safety Coordinator - Roads
- Pavement Management / Roadway Capital Programs Coordinator

Typically, the TIP process begins in February with a review of the standards and procedures and ends in September with the adoption of the TIP by the Board of County Commissioners.

Task	Description	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
1	Review Process and make necessary changes								
2	Select carryover projects from previous year								
3	Call for projects								
4	Update of all prioritized lists								
5	Selection of projects for scoring on Tier 2								
6	Project scopes, cost estimates and reviews								
7	Staff scoring of projects								
8	Committee approval of scoring								
9	Ranking of new Tier 2 projects, budget cutoff								
10	Selection of projects for TIP								
11	Adoption of TIP by BOCC								

## **Four-Tier system**

### **Tier 1 - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

This is a short range 'implementation plan' for the County. The six-year TIP lists those transportation projects and programs that are projected to be constructed during the coming six-year period. The program is financially constrained and includes a road fund revenue and expenditure analysis for the time period, and a program listing of specific projects (WAC 136-15-030). For this document the projects included in the TIP are also referred to as Tier 1 projects.

#### Revenue and Expenditure Analysis

This includes a best estimate of future road fund revenue and expenditure over each year of the six-year program. Line items for motor vehicle fuel tax, road levy (after diversion), federal transportation fund grants (by program), and other known revenues are included in the analysis (WAC 136-15-030). The Comprehensive Plan and integrated Environmental Impact Statement detail the estimated revenue for the remaining 20-year planning cycle; however, each year (TIP cycle) a revenue forecast is made to indicate the best forecast of revenue within the six-year period based on current economic conditions and make adjustments to the TIP appropriately.

#### Program Listings of Specific Projects

The six-year TIP is a financially constrained document. This means that the cost of projects included in the listing should be approximately equal to the anticipated revenue. The projects can have funds included with them that are not certain; however the level of certainty should be indicated for the various projects. It is possible to have generic projects each year for improvements such as miscellaneous safety, culvert, and small bridge construction as well as other minor improvements (WAC 136-15-040).

### **Tier 2 – Prioritized Candidate Project List**

Tier 2 is financially unconstrained and consists of the projects on the prior year's Candidate Project List, but which were not included in the TIP.

### **Tier 3 – Priority Capacity Needs List**

Tier 3 is financially constrained and includes those capacity projects from the Comprehensive Plan not included in the TIP or Tier 2.

This portion of the financially constrained component consists of those projects that are shown to be needed but are not foreseen to be implemented during the six years of the plan (the TIP), but could be implemented during the remaining 20-year planning horizon of the Comprehensive Plan.

### **Tier 4 - Unconstrained Needs List**

Tier 4 is the unconstrained needs list and consists of those projects included in previous years Candidate Project List but which were not selected for the TIP or Tier 2. It serves as a placeholder for projects submitted either by staff or by the public, and to recognize that a need exists

## **Project Selection Process**

The Project Selection Process consists of five steps:

1. Project Identification and Review
2. Scoring of Candidate Project List
3. Ranking of Candidate Project List
4. Technical Committee Recommendation
5. County Commissioners' Review and Approval

The following outlines a detailed discussion of the four steps and how they are carried out.

### **Step 1. Project Identification and Review**

As determined by the Public Works Director, in conjunction with the Transportation Planning and Engineering Services managers, a review of existing projects and identification of new projects will occur once each year, typically between April and May.

Assembling the Candidate Project List is a multipart process. This process starts with the solicitation of new project proposals from the general public. Public Works staff advertise the TIP public submittal process through the County's website and presentations at Citizen Advisory Committees and other forums as needed.

Current TIP projects are not reevaluated; however, an examination of the current and future funding is conducted. This examination identifies potential funding shortfalls that may limit the number of new projects that may be added during the current year.

Next, projects which were evaluated during the previous year, but were not funded due to financial constraints, are added to the list. These projects will be reevaluated against the newer project submissions.

Next, new projects from various prioritized project lists that have been developed by Public Works. These lists are developed for different program areas related to the scoring. These various Lists are updated on a timeline that will assure the latest information is used for project scoring.

- 1) Roadway Capacity Deficiencies (Tier 3) – Transportation Planning
- 2) Intersection Level of Service Deficiencies – Traffic Engineering
- 3) Non-Motorized Priorities – Transportation Planning
- 4) Fish Passage Barriers – County Engineer & Stormwater
- 5) Collision Locations (Segments & Intersections) – Traffic Engineering
- 6) Bridge Inventory and Rating – Roads
- 7) Pavement Rating – Roads
- 8) Culvert Inventory and Rating – Stormwater

This combined list of old and new candidate projects are evaluated against one another, to provide a prioritized ranking of potential new TIP projects. This ranked Candidate Project List is used to assist the County Engineer in selecting new projects to be added to the six-year work program (TIP).

## Step 2. Scoring of Candidate Project List

Each candidate project will be scored by the TAC. The TAC will score projects based upon the following process.

**Primary Scoring Categories** – The prioritized lists are assigned the following values

	<u>Points</u>
<b>Preservation – Road</b>	25
<b>Preservation – Bridge / Culvert</b>	25
<b>Capacity</b>	18
<b>Safety</b>	18
<b>Environmental Retrofit</b>	8
<b>Non-motorized</b>	<u>6</u>
	100

Each of the six categories will be evaluated in a specific manner.

**Road Preservation** – Maximum Points available: 25 points

0-40 PSC Score = 25 points

41-50 PSC Score = 15 points

51-60 PSC Score – 5 points

Source of Scoring: Most recent Kitsap County Road Log PSC Score 0-100

**Bridge Preservation** - Maximum Points available: 25 points

Bridges that are Functionally Obsolete (FO) = 15 points

Bridges that are Structurally Deficient (SD) = 25 points

Source of Scoring: Most recent Annual Bridge Report (Appendix A- Bridge Listing)

**Culvert Preservation** - Maximum Points available: 25 points

Inspector Rating 1 = 25 points

Inspector Rating 2 = 15 points

Inspector Rating 3= 5 points

Inspector Rating 4 and 5 = 0 points

Source of Scoring: Most recent Kitsap County Culvert Inventory

**Capacity** - Maximum Points available: 18 points

LOS F = 18 points

LOS E = 12 points

LOS D = 12 points (rural areas)

If an intersection is deficient within six years, it will receive half of the points allocated based on the projected LOS.

Source of Scoring: Most recent Intersection and roadway LOS Deficiency Lists

\* LOS of private roads are not eligible for points.

**Safety** - Maximum Points available: 18 points

Use Final Rankings –

Top 10% = 18 points

70% - 89% = 12.6 points

50% - 69% = 9 points

30% - 49% = 5.4 points

Bottom 29% = 1.8 points

Source of Scoring: Most recent Safety Report (Segment List for road segments and intersection for road intersections)

\* Projects that receive Safety points under primary scoring are not eligible to receive safety points under secondary scoring.

**Environmental Retrofit** - Maximum Points: 8 points

Top 10% = 8 points

70% - 89% = 5.6 points

50% - 69% = 4 points

30% - 49% = 2.4 points

Bottom 29% = 0.8 points

Source of Scoring: Most recent Fish Barrier List (Number Ranking (PI Score))

**Non-Motorized** – Maximum Points: 6 points

High = 6 points

Medium = 4 points

Low = 2 points

Source of Scoring: Non-Motorized List

It is possible for a project to overlap different programs and could therefore receive points from multiple categories. In other words; a culvert replacement project could receive 15 points from receiving a 2 on the Culvert Inventory List and receive 4 points from the Fish Barrier List. If the project is not included in the latest ranking of that project type or does not address needs of that project type in its description it would not receive primary points.

In addition to primary scoring categories, all projects are eligible to receive points in secondary categories.

**Secondary Scoring Categories**

Geometric Conditions (points only available when road standard is being corrected by the project)

Vertical Standard (3 Points Possible)

- 3** Vertical Standard – More than 5% of the existing alignment deviates from the current or adopted design standard.
- 2** Vertical Standard – 2 to 5% of the existing alignment deviates from the current or adopted design standard.
- 1** Vertical Standard – Less than 2% of the existing alignment deviates from the current or adopted design standard.

Horizontal Standard (3 Points Possible)

- 3** Horizontal Standard – Existing alignment of one or more substandard curves 15 MPH below current or adopted design speed standards.
- 2** Horizontal Standard – Existing alignment of one or more substandard curves 10 MPH below current or adopted design speed standards.
- 1** Horizontal Standard – Existing alignment of one or more substandard curves 5 MPH below current or adopted design speed standards.

Traveled Way Width Standard (6 Points Possible) Non-motorized widths excluded.

- 6** Travel way width Standard – Existing roadway width is more than 4 feet under current or adopted design standards.
- 4** Travel way width Standard – Existing roadway width is between 2 and 4 feet under current or adopted design standards.
- 2** Travel way width Standard – Existing roadway width is between 0 and 2 feet under current or adopted design standards.

Non-Motorized (5 Points Possible)

- 5** Project provides non-motorized facilities within an urban area (UGA, LAMIRD...), or that provides a shared-use path or sidewalk connection to a public facility (such as; government building, school, library, park, transit facility...) or completes a segment of an identified non-motorized network.
- 3** Project includes non-motorized facilities (such as; sidewalk, bike-lane, buffered shoulders or separated path...)
- 1** Project only includes shared use facilities (such as; sharrows or 4' paved shoulders) to accommodate non-motorized users.

Transit (4 Points Possible)

- 4** Project includes or improves transit amenities along an existing transit route, such as, but not limited to bus pull-outs and shelters.
- 2** Project is located along an existing transit route and enhances the transit experience

Consistency with Comprehensive Plans/Sub areas/Corridor Study (5 Points Possible)

- 5** Project is specifically identified in County Comp Plan, adopted sub area plan, or a completed corridor study by a public entity.
- 3** Project identified in character only (not named specifically) in County Comp Plan, adopted sub area plan, or a completed corridor study

Environmental/Sensitive Area Impact (3 Points Possible)

- 3** Project exceeds adopted storm-water requirements to improve sensitive or critical areas.

Inter-jurisdictional (3 Points Possible)

- 3** There is multi-jurisdictional participation in planning, funding or implementing this project

Significance (5 Points Possible)

- 5** Regional significance - Principal Arterial or Stream type **S**
- 3** Significant at sub-area only - Minor Arterial or Stream type **F**
- 1** Only serves local and/or abutting properties - Collector or Stream type **N**

Secured Funding

Funding from grants, programs or State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) Participation. (20 Points Possible) Up to 20 points based on the percentage of project funded with secured funds (ie. a project that is funded 87% would receive 17.4 points)

Potential Safety Issue (10 Points Possible)

Projects receiving primary safety points are not eligible for additional points in the secondary safety category.

- 10** Project addresses a documented\* safety issue
- 5** Project addresses an inherently hazardous condition\*\*

\*Documented via studies or public input, not necessarily an officially recorded accident history.

\*\*For example, adds width to shoulder, not just paving an existing gravel shoulder.

Maintenance Reduction (5 Points Possible)

- 5** Project eliminates existing, and significantly reduces future maintenance costs
- 2** Project reduces existing and future maintenance costs

Economic Development (5 Points Possible)

- 5** Project is an investment of road funds which support construction or rehabilitation of transportation infrastructure, in an area designated in the Comprehensive Plan, generating sustainable higher-skill, higher-wage jobs.
- 2** Project improves access to existing commercial, industrial or manufacturing land uses.

Freight Mobility (5 Points Possible)

- 5** Project is on a designated freight route, and enhances freight mobility through improved roadway design; such as increased turning radii or addition of truck climbing lanes.

### **Step 3. Ranking of Candidate Project List**

After their initial scoring based on points from primary and secondary scoring, staff will develop a detailed cost estimate for approximately the top 50 percent of projects. The bottom 50 percent of projects will be moved to the Tire 4 list. This policy was adopted by the TAC in 2013. Staff will complete the submittal with a standardized cost estimate with appropriate construction, Preliminary Engineering and contingencies.

#### **Cost Estimates**

Cost estimates are performed for each of the projects that are in the top 50 percent of the Candidate Project List. The estimates will be performed by the members of the TAC, and reviewed by the TAC as a whole to ensure consistency. These cost estimates will include preliminary engineering and contingencies.

#### **Tabulation of Points**

The tabulation of points and their final ranking is a three step process.

Step 1 – Ranking by total points. The projects on the Candidate Project List are ranked and given a score based on that rank. The project with the highest total score is given a “Point Rank” of 1, the second highest total score is given a Point Rank of 2 and this continues until all the projects have been given a Point Rank score.

Step 2 – Ranking by cost. The cost estimate for each project is divided by the total number of points that it received in scoring. The project with the lowest total cost per point is given a “Cost per Point Rank” of 1, the second lowest total cost per point is given a Cost per Point Rank of 2 and this continues until all the projects have been given a Cost per Point Rank score.

Step 3 – Average of Point Rank and Cost per Point Rank. Once the projects have a Point Rank and Cost per Point Rank, those rank numbers are averaged. The resulting average numbers are again ranked and the project with the lowest average number is the highest priority candidate project.

Below is a sample of projects ranked by the average of the total cost per point and the point ranking.

TIP Number	Average of Total Cost Per Point and Point Ranking	Cost Per Point Rank	Point Rank	Title	Total Points	Total Cost Per Point
40	8.5	9	8	Stavis Bay Road Bridge, At Stavis Creek	34	\$23,235
4	8.5	1	16	Anderson Hill Road, Bridge at Little Anderson Creek	27	\$926
3	11	17	5	Newberry Hill Road Phase II, Dickey Rd to Provost Rd.	41.2	\$36,650
30	11	11	11	Carney Lake Road, Alta Vista Dr to JM Dickenson Rd	30.6	\$24,837
34	11.5	10	13	Seabeck-Holly Road Bridge, Anderson Creek	28.3	\$24,028
36	13	18	8	SW Old Clifton Road, Anderson and Berry Lake	34	\$39,647
42	13.5	14	13	Miami Beach Bridge, At Seabeck Creek	28.3	\$30,459
29	15	15	15	Tracyton Blvd. Allens Corner to Holland	28	\$33,750
43	16.5	5	28	Miami Beach Culvert Replacement	17.8	\$11,236
31	17	12	22	Southworth Drive, Olympiad Dr to Harper Dock	20.2	\$25,248
17	17.5	6	29	Olalla Valley Road Culvert Replacement	17.6	\$20,455
5	18.5	36	1	Bethel Road Widening Phase I, Lund to Salmonberry	65	\$128,154

The result is a prioritized Candidate Project List.

#### **Step 4. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation**

Throughout the TIP process, the TAC ensures that projects are consistently scored and evaluated. After the final scoring and ranking of the projects the TAC will forward the ranking to the County Engineer for their review and will answer questions or concerns that they may have.

Prioritized projects, based on available funding as determined by the County Engineer, will be advanced to Tier 1. The financially constrained plan is based on projected funding levels for six- and twenty-year planning horizons. Projects that are not funded from the Candidate Project List will become the new Tier 2 list.

Those projects not obligated by the comprehensive plan to be funded within the 20-year planning horizon will be placed in the 'unconstrained needs list' (Tier 4).

The Director of Public Works working with the County Engineer will review the TAC's recommendations and determine the implementation or construction year for the newly added projects. The TIP and updated Tier 2, 3 & 4 lists will be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners' for review and approval.

#### **Step 5. County Commissioners' Review and Approval**

The Board of County Commissioners review and adopt the six-year TIP, and by doing so also update the Capital Facilities Plan.

## Glossary

Bicycle Facility – Projects that facilitate the use or safety of bicycle transportation users within the right-of-way or on a separate right-of-way or easement. Examples include wide shoulders, bicycle lanes and hard surfaced bicycle paths, trails, etc.

Candidate Project List – This is the list of projects gathered annually through public input, public works prioritized lists, and those projects that remain on the previous year’s Tier 2 list. All projects on this list are competitively scored and ranked together. Projects from this list are typically selected for advancement to the TIP. After the TIP has been adopted, the remainder of the Candidate Project List becomes the new Tier 2 list.

Capacity – Projects designed to increase the automobile throughput of the roadway. This may include additional lanes, widened shoulders or access control that effectively increases the ability of the roadway to accommodate more vehicles on existing or future travel lanes.

Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) – One of the elements of Kitsap County’s comprehensive plan that is required by Washington’s Growth Management Act (GMA). The Capital Facilities Plan for transportation facilities outlines existing deficiencies and financing for projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Environmental Retrofit – Corrections to fix unmitigated environmental impacts caused by the construction of the roadway system. The programs typically target the correction of fish barriers on the current database of County owned fish passage barriers.

Environmental/Sensitive Area Impact – Project scoring category that awards points to projects that go above the “no impact” criteria, and actually improve environmentally sensitive areas.

Financially Constrained – Projects that are financially constrained are fully funded with local, grant, SEPA mitigation funds, impact fees or have a planned and reasonable expectation to find funding from these sources.

Geometric Conditions – Project scoring category that awards points to projects that correct design deficiencies in three areas as defined in the Kitsap County Road Standards. The three areas targeted in the project selection process include the:

- Horizontal Standard – Horizontal curve alignment standards allow vehicles to maintain desired speeds while overcoming forces acting on a vehicle traversing a curve.

- Roadway Width Standard –Width standards that ensure safe travel of vehicles along the roadway.
- Vertical Standard – Minimum lengths for vertical curve alignment required to provide stopping sight distance.

Grandfathered Projects – Projects that have advanced to the TIP, and will no longer be reviewed by the project selection process to determine their priority. Projects that have advanced to the construction phase will be grandfathered and exempt from the project selection process. In addition, these projects cannot be removed from the TIP without permission of the Board of County Commissioners.

Inter-jurisdictional Coordination – the project has been planned, funded or implemented through multiple governmental organizations.

Non-motorized – A facility designed primarily for the use of pedestrians, bicyclists, or equestrians. It may be designed primarily for one of these uses or it may be designed as a joint-use facility. A non-motorized facility may be part of a roadway (such as a shoulder) or it may be separated from roadway traffic for dedicated non-motorized use (such as a hard surfaced bike lane or sidewalk).

Potential Safety Issue – An issue that has high potential to become a safety problem, even though no official accident history exists. An inherently hazardous condition exists.

Preservation-Bridge – Program that identifies bridge deficiencies and capital projects to correct those deficiencies. Program also identifies maintenance needs not included in the capital facilities plan.

Preservation-Road – Program that identifies road deficiencies and capital projects to correct those deficiencies. Program also identifies maintenance needs not included in the capital facilities plan.

Project Readiness – The relative readiness of a project can be determined by its ability to go to construction. Major categories of tasks to be completed prior to construction include environmental documentation, engineering and right-of-way acquisition.

Revenue and Expenditure Analysis – Best estimate of future road fund revenue and expenditure over the planning horizon of the plan or program.

Safety – Program that identifies roadway safety areas of concern by intersection, segment and spot locations. Capital projects that occur along these locations will normally address safety issues by correcting underlying causes of the safety issue.

Secured Funds – Secured funds are already allocated to a 6-year plan, and are specifically assigned to a project that come from grants, impact fees or SEPA mitigation. Local road funds which are allocated to specific projects on the adopted TIP are considered secured. Funds from other county departments are considered secure when they are combined with a road project.

School – Any permanent learning facility which provides education for K-12 or Head-Start students, whether public or private, operates at least 4 days per week, and has a regular attendance of 20 or more students.

Significance – The relative significance of the project to the county's citizens and facility users.

- Regional Significance – Project is likely to be used by citizens from throughout the county and beyond. Typically the roadway is functionally classified as a principal arterial roadway. For projects effecting waterways, stream type is "S".
- Significant at sub-area only – Project is likely to be used by citizens of a sub-area of the county, but not the entire county. Typically the roadway is classified as a minor arterial roadway. For projects effecting waterways, stream type is "F".
- Only serves local and/or abutting properties – Project is likely to only affect local or adjacent properties. Typically the roadway is classified as a collector roadway. For projects effecting waterways, stream type is "N".

Standardized Cost Estimate – Cost estimate that has been reviewed and approved by public works as being consistent with other Kitsap County Public Works' cost estimates in the plans and programs.

State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) Participation – Mitigation funds or work that comes from a proponent to mitigate the effects of development.

Transit Amenities – Bus stops, pullouts, or other capital improvements that would encourage travel time savings or ridership increases for transit. Applies to transit amenities located on an established transit route.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – A six year program of capital improvements to be completed by the Public Works Department required to be included within the Capitol Facilities Plan. Tier 1 projects.

Unconstrained Capital Facilities Plan – Projects that are identified as needs, but do not have identified funding during the CFP planning horizon. Tier 4 projects.

## KITSAP COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS Candidate Roadway Project Evaluation Form

Project Title:

Project Description:

Project Need Statement:

Estimated Project Cost

P.E	ROW	Construction	Total

**Project Location**

From: To:

Project Length (miles):

**Number of Lanes**

Existing: Proposed:

Traffic Volume (AADT)

Current: Projected:

Does the project have a dedicated funding source?

**Contact Person for Project**

Name: Phone:

- Project Specific Studies or Reports:
- Project Location Map:
- Geometric Deficiencies that would be used for scoring:
- Accident History:

# Project Scoring Sheet

Project:

Date:

Primary Scoring Categories	
Preservation Road Rank (X of X) Max. 25 Points	
Preservation Bridge Rank (X of X) Max. 25 Points	
Safety Rank (X of X) Max. 18 Points	
Capacity Rank (X of X) Max. 18 Points	
Environmental Retrofit Rank (X of X) Max. 8 Points	
Non-motorized Rank (H = 6, M = 4, L = 2) Points	
Secondary Scoring Categories	
Geometric Conditions	
<u><i>Vertical Standard</i></u> <b>3</b> Vertical Standard – 10% of the existing alignment deviates from the design standard. <b>2</b> Vertical Standard – 5% of the existing alignment deviates from the design standard. <b>1</b> Vertical Standard – Short sections of the existing alignment deviate from the design standard.	
<u><i>Horizontal Standard</i></u> <b>3</b> Horizontal Standard – Existing alignment of one or more substandard curves 15 MPH below design standards. <b>2</b> Horizontal Standard – Existing alignment of one or more substandard curves 10 MPH below design standards. <b>1</b> Horizontal Standard – Existing alignment of one or more substandard curves 5 MPH below design standards.	
<u><i>Traveled-way Width Standard</i></u> <b>6</b> Roadway width Standard – Existing roadway width is more than 4 feet under design standards. <b>4</b> Roadway width Standard – Existing roadway width is between 2 and 4 feet under design standards. <b>2</b> Roadway width Standard – Existing roadway width is between 0 and 2 feet under design standards.	
<b>Non-Motorized</b> <b>5</b> Project provides dedicated non-motorized facilities within an urban area, connects to a public facility <b>3</b> Project includes dedicated non-motorized components (sidewalk, bike-lane, separated bike path) <b>1</b> Project includes shared use facilities to accommodate non-motorized users	

<b>Transit</b> <b>4</b> Project includes or improves transit amenities along an existing transit route <b>2</b> Project is located along an existing transit route	
<b>Consistency with Plans/Design Guidelines</b> <b>5</b> Project is specifically identified in County Comp Plan, TIP, adopted sub area plan, or a completed corridor study <b>3</b> Project identified in character only (not	
<b>Environmental/Sensitive Area Impact</b> <b>3</b> Project improves sensitive or critical areas	
<b>Inter-jurisdictional</b> <b>3</b> There is multi-jurisdictional participation in	
<b>Significance</b> <b>5</b> Principal Arterial or Stream Type S <b>3</b> Minor Arterial or Stream Type F	
<b>Secured Funding (up to 20 points)</b>	
<b>Potential Safety Issue</b> <b>10</b> Project addresses a documented safety issue	
<b>Maintenance Reduction</b> <b>5</b> Project eliminates existing, and significantly reduces future, maintenance costs <b>2</b> Project reduces existing and future	
<b>Economic Development</b> <b>5</b> Project is an investment of road funds which support construction or rehabilitation of transportation infrastructure, in an area designated in the Comp Plan, generating	
<b>Freight Mobility</b> <b>5</b> Project is on a designated freight route, and enhances freight mobility through improved roadway design; Such as increased turning radii, or addition of truck climbing lanes.	
<b>Primary Scoring Points: _____</b> <b>Secondary Scoring Points: ____</b> <b>Total Points: __</b>	
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	