

Ad-Hoc Committee
Transportation
Criteria





**CITY OF KIRKLAND
TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION FORM**

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project: _____

Limits: _____

Description: _____

Proposed By: _____ Date: _____

Rated By: _____ Date: _____

INITIAL PROJECT SCREENING

Does the project conflict with any specific policy provisions of the Comprehensive Plan?

- Yes: project eliminated from consideration
- No: project ranked using following criteria

PROJECT VALUES

	<u>POSSIBLE</u>	<u>THIS PROJECT</u>
• FISCAL	20	
• PLAN CONSISTENCY	10	
• NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY	15	
• TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS	15	
• MULTIMODAL (NON-SOV)	20	
• SAFETY	20	
	_____	_____
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	<u> </u>

(Note to Rater: Please address all of the following questions recording any assumptions or comments in the margin adjacent to the question. Record scores for each question and transfer each value total to this cover sheet.)

FISCAL

_____ (50) 1. What is the City’s ability to leverage funds from all non-City sources (i.e. grants, private funds)?

(a)	x	(b)
<u>Chance to leverage</u>		<u>Amount leveraged</u>
0%	0	0-25% 1
1-25%	1	26-49% 2
26-50%	2	50-74% 3
51-75%	3	75-100% 4
76-100%	4	

(Rater: Multiply (a) x (b) = leverage factor (LF))

<u>LF</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
0-1	0
2-3	15
4-6	25
7-11	35
12-16	50

_____ (30) 2. How does the project unit construction cost deviate from standard unit construction cost? (Compare like projects: i.e. paths to paths, and not paths to sidewalks.)

>25% Greater than standard unit costs	0
0-25% Greater than standard unit costs	15
Less than standard unit costs	30

_____ (10) 3. How will the maintenance costs for conceptual design of project compare with the maintenance costs for a standard project design? (Standard project design is defined as the current requirements as set forth in the street standards.)

Greater than standard maintenance cost	0
Standard maintenance cost	5
Reduce costs of existing infrastructure or less than standard maintenance cost	10

FISCAL VALUES (Continued)

<u> </u>	(10)	4.	How will the conceptual design of the project affect existing maintenance needs?	
			Greater than existing	0
			Same	5
			Less than existing	10

 VALUE SCORE
(100 max)

 x .20 VALUE WEIGHT

 VALUE TOTAL

PLAN CONSISTENCY

<u> </u>	(50)	1.	Is the project generally consistent with or generated from adopted regional plans, such as Eastside Transportation Plan, King County Transit Six-Year Plan?	
			No	0
			Project is not inconsistent	25
			Project is generated from a regional plan	50

<u> </u>	(50)	2.	Is the project identified by the 20 year project list in the Capital Facilities Element of Kirkland’s Comprehensive Plan or the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP)?	
			Project is not in either plan	0
			Project is identified as a priority 2 route in the NMTP	25
			Project is in the Comprehensive Plan, listed as a priority 1 route in the NMTP or is an approved school safe walk route.	50

<u> </u>	VALUE SCORE
(100 max)	

<u> x .10 </u>	VALUE WEIGHT
------------------	--------------

<u> </u>	VALUE TOTAL
-----------------	-------------

NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY

_____ (40)	1.	Does the project have public support?	
		Clearly opposed by the public	0
		Support/opposition of the public unknown or balanced	20
		Clearly supported by the public (i.e. Neighborhood Association, PTA letter)	40
_____ (20)	2.	Is the project generally consistent with the neighborhood in regards to street widths, landscaping, and appropriate buffers?	
		No	0
		Neutral	5
		Yes	15
		Yes & superior design	20
_____ (20)	3.	How will the project impact through traffic on neighborhood access/collector streets?	
		Will significantly divert traffic onto neighborhood access/collector streets	0
		Will have minimal impact on neighborhood access/ collector streets	10
		Will divert traffic away from neighborhood access/ collector streets	20
_____ (20)	4.	Is the project identified in a neighborhood plan or does the project support the goals of the neighborhood plan?	
		Does not support goals or conflicts	0
		No impact on goals of the plan	10
		Identified in the plan or supports the goals of the plan	20

_____ VALUE SCORE
(100 max)

x .15 VALUE WEIGHT

VALUE TOTAL

=====

TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS

- _____ (28) 1. Does the project provide a missing segment of an existing incomplete transportation network which is specifically identified in the Comprehensive Plan, the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan or is an approved school safe walk route?
- No 0
- Pedestrian Network
- Yes for a priority 2 network or a school safe walk route on a local street 14
- Yes for a priority 1 network or a school safe walk route on a collector or arterial 28
- Bicycle Network
- Yes for a priority 2 network 14
- Yes for a priority 1 network 28
- Transit/HOV Network
- Yes for a moderate improvement 14
- Yes for a substantial improvement 28
- Road Network
- Yes for a moderate improvement 14
- Yes for a substantial improvement 28

- _____ (72) 2. Does the project improve pedestrian, bicycle, transit/HOV or road connections near activity centers?

(72) Pedestrian:

Activity Centers	Project Within 1/4 Mile of a Center		Project Within 1/2 Mile of a Center	
School	18 points		12 points	
Community Facility⁽¹⁾	12 points		6 points	
Business District⁽²⁾	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center⁽³⁾	6 points		3 points	
Improves a Connection within a Business District			12 points	

TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS (Continued)

(72) Bicycle:

Activity Centers	Project Within 1/2 Mile of a Center		Project Within 1 Mile of a Center	
School	18 points		12 points	
Community Facility ⁽¹⁾	12 points		6 points	
Business District ⁽²⁾	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center ⁽³⁾	6 points		3 points	
Improves a Connection within a Business District				
			12 points	

(72) Transit/ HOV:

Activity Centers	Project Within 1/4 Mile of a Center		Project Within 1/2 Mile of a Center	
School	18 points		12 points	
Community Facility ⁽¹⁾	12 points		6 points	
Business District ⁽²⁾	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center ⁽³⁾	6 points		3 points	
Improves a Connection within a Business District				
			12 points	

Footnotes:

- (1) Community Facility includes parks, libraries, hospitals, fire stations, city hall, community centers, the Boys and Girls club and similar facilities.
- (2) Business District includes commercial or employment centers.
- (3) Regional Center includes Totem Lake area and Downtown Kirkland.

(72) Roads:

Connects To	Connects From		
	Arterial Street	Collector Street	Local Access Street
Arterial Street	72 points	72 points	0 points
Collector Street	72 points	72 points	36 points
Local Access Street	0 points	36 points	72 points

For multi-modal projects, the project will receive the same number of points as the highest rated mode.

TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS (Continued)

(72) Signals:

Warrants	<75%	>75%	Meets
1. Minimum Volume	0	6	12
2. Interruption	0	6	12
3. Ped Volume	0	6	12
9. Four Hour Volume	0	6	12
10. Peak Hour Delay	0	6	12
11. Peak Hour Volume	0	6	12

 VALUE SCORE
(100 max)

x .15 VALUE WEIGHT

 VALUE TOTAL

MULTIMODAL (NON-SOV)

<u> </u>	(45)	1.	Does the project provide non-SOV modes to the existing facility that currently do not exist?	
			Adds transit/HOV mode	15
			Adds bicycle mode	15
			Adds pedestrian mode	15
<u> </u>	(30)	2.	Will the project impact the effectiveness of any existing non-SOV modes (minimum standard)?	
			Denigrates existing non-SOV mode(s)	0
			No impact	15
			Improves existing non-SOV mode(s)	30
<u> </u>	(25)	3.	Does the project add one or more non-SOV modes to an existing regional corridor/facility or provide a new regional corridor/facility?	
			Pedestrian	5
			Bike - one way	5
			Bike - two way	10
			Transit	10

 VALUE SCORE
(100 max)

 x .20 VALUE WEIGHT

 VALUE TOTAL

SAFETY

_____ (10)	1.	Does the conceptualized design of the project meet generally accepted practices?	
		No	0
		Yes	10
_____ (25)	2.	What are the existing conditions for each mode of the project?	
_____ (25)		<u>Bicycle:</u>	
		Traffic volume is low, wide vehicular lanes	0
		Traffic volume is moderate, wide vehicular lanes which will allow cars to pass	5
		Traffic volume is high, wide vehicular lanes which will allow cars to pass	10
		Pavement is narrow, moderate volume of traffic	15
		Pavement is narrow, high volume of traffic	20
		Pavement is too narrow, to provide bicycle lane, traffic and parking demand are heavy	25
_____ (25)		<u>Pedestrian</u>	
_____ (25)		<u>Pathway:</u>	
		High parking demand on shoulder, low traffic volume, sidewalk/pathway currently available on one side	0
		High parking demand on shoulder, high traffic volume, sidewalk pathway available on one side	5
		Moderate parking demand on shoulder, low traffic volume, no existing sidewalk/pathway available	10
		Low parking demand on shoulder, high traffic volume, low turning movements, no existing sidewalk/pathway	15
		Low parking demand on shoulder, high traffic volume, high turning movements, no existing facilities	20
		Ability to prohibit or no parking demand on shoulder, high traffic volume/turning movements, no existing facilities	25
_____ (25)		<u>Sidewalk:</u>	
		Sidewalk separated pathway available, low traffic volume	0
		Wide paved shoulder or pathway both sides, low traffic volume	5
		Wide gravel/dirt shoulder four to eight feet wide one side, moderate traffic volume	10

SAFETY (Continued)

Sidewalk: (Continued)

Paved shoulder one to four feet wide present both sides, moderate traffic volume	15
No shoulder present on one side (must walk in vehicle lane), one to four feet other side, high traffic volume	20
No shoulder either side (must walk in vehicle lane), high traffic volume	25

_____ (25) **Crosswalk:**

Low pedestrian/traffic volume	0
Moderate pedestrian/traffic volume	10
Vulnerable population in proximity, moderate pedestrian/traffic volume	20
Vulnerable population in proximity, high pedestrian/traffic volume; high number of ped. accidents	25

_____ (25) **Roadway:** *(Note: Rater can substitute documented accidents along proposed project for relative ranking in this category).*

Roadway meets design standards (site distance, curves, travel lane widths, shoulders, etc.); saturated development (95 to 100% developed) feeding roadway	0
Roadway meets design standards; surrounding property mostly developed (50 to 95% developed)	5
Certain areas of the roadway below design standards, surrounding property mostly developed	10
Overall roadway is below design standards; surrounding property has significant undeveloped parcels with developable property (25 to 50% developed)	15
Certain areas of the roadway are potentially hazardous and substandard; surrounding property has significant undeveloped parcels	20
Overall roadway is potentially hazardous and substandard; high current or anticipated development (0 to 25% developed) will feed roadway	25

SAFETY (Continued)

_____ (25) Traffic Signal:

Accident Rate for Intersection

Not rated	0
0.25 accidents - 0.75 accidents/MEV	5
0.75-1.0 accidents/MEV	10
1.0 - 1.5 accidents/MEV	15
1.5 - 2.0 accidents/MEV	20
Greater than 2 accidents/MEV	25

_____ (25) Transit/HOV:

Not on an existing transit route, low need	0
Identified Transit route, high pedestrian/traffic volumes	25

_____ (15) 3. What is the degree of improvement proposed by the project compared to the existing condition(s). To determine, *After condition - Before condition = Number of points*; calculate total for all proposed project modes.

_____ (15) Bicycle:

No bike facilities available	0
Class III - no dedicated lane, but widened shoulder	5
Class II - on street, striped bike lane (5 feet wide)	10
Class I - separated trail	15

_____ (15) Pedestrian:

No pedestrian facilities available	0
Gravel shoulder (4 foot minimum)	5
Paved shoulder (4 foot minimum)	10
Sidewalk	12
Separated Trail	15

_____ (15) Crosswalk:

Unmarked crossing	0
Illuminated crossing/median island and warning signs	5
Traffic signal	10
Grade separation (under/overpass)	15

_____ (15) Roadway:

No existing roadway	0
Gravel/dirt roadway; no storm drainage	5
Existing paved roadway	10
Minimum roadway per zoning code	15

SAFETY (Continued)

_____	(15)	Traffic Signal:		
		Stop sign controlled		0
		No separate turn phases		5
		Protected/permissive turns		10
		Protected turns only		15
_____	(15)	Transit/HOV:		
		No transit facilities available		0
		Increases safety for transit		15

_____ (10) 4. Does the proposed project maintain or enhance the safety of the following modes?

	Positive impact enhances (2.5)	No impact neutral (1)	Negative Impact inhibits/reduces (0)	Total
Bicycle	_____	_____	_____	_____
Pedestrian	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vehicular	_____	_____	_____	_____
Transit/HOV	_____	_____	_____	_____

_____ (25) 5. Does the proposed project provide access for a vulnerable population (i.e. park, elementary school, mobility challenged, wheelchairs, retirement homes, hospital, Boys & Girls Club, Senior Center)?

No surrounding facilities will access	0
Facility within 8 to 15 blocks (½ to 1 mile)	5
Facility within 4 to 8 blocks (¼ to ½ mile)	10
Facility within 4 blocks (¼ mile)	15
One facility accessed directly	20
More than one facility accessed directly	25

_____ (15) 6. Does the proposed project maintain or enhance the emergency vehicle network?

Inhibits/reduces	0
Maintains or neutral	8
Enhances	15

SAFETY (Continued)

<u> </u>	VALUE SCORE
(100 max)	
<u>x .20</u>	VALUE WEIGHT
<u> </u>	VALUE TOTAL

STEIGER\98TPE.DOC:RTS\ln

Surface Water Project Criteria



STORMWATER PROJECT CRITERIA

Supporting Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Goals:

Goal NE-6: "Protect life and property from the damages of floods and erosion."

Goal NE-5: "Preserve and enhance the water quality of streams and lakes in Greater Kirkland."

Goal U-4: "Provide storm water management facilities that preserve and enhance the water quality of streams, lakes, and wetlands and protect life and property from floods and erosion."

Goal CF-1: "Contribute to the quality of life in Kirkland through the planned provision of public capital facilities and utilities."

Goal CF-5: "Provide needed public facilities that are within the ability of the City to fund or within the City's authority to require others to provide."

The Endangered Species Act:

Chinook salmon has been listed as a Threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In the near future, the National Marine Fisheries Service, which enforces ESA, will be issuing a rule defining actions that municipalities and private property owners must take to protect Chinook salmon. Depending on the content of the rule, CIP criteria may need to be refined to further address fish habitat concerns.

The Tri-County Assembly (officials from King Pierce and Snohomish Counties that have gathered to respond to the ESA listing) has recommended the following approach for management and preservation of salmon habitat:

- 1. First, do no harm: Reduce and prevent harm by abandoning, modifying, or mitigating existing programs, projects, and activities.*
- 2. Conservation: Protect key watersheds, landscapes, and habitats by acquisition, regulation or voluntary action.*
- 3. Remediation: Restore, rehabilitate and enhance damaged habitats to complement conservation actions.*
- 4. Research: Fill critical gaps in scientific and institutional information.*

STORMWATER PROJECT CRITERIA

Initial Project Screening:

Does the project conflict with any specific policy provision of the Comprehensive Plan?

- Yes: Project eliminated from consideration, list goal _____
No: Project ranked using following criteria

PROJECT VALUES

- **FACILITIES:**

Flooding Frequency	5	
Flooding Impact	10	
Condition Assessment	10	
Accessibility	5	
Subtotal		30

- **ENVIRONMENTAL:**

Water Quality	10	
Fish Habitat	10	
Other Benefits	10	
Subtotal		30

- **FISCAL:**

Coordination/Opportunity funding	10	
Cost/Benefit Index	5	
Maintenance Needs	10	
Subtotal		25

- **Public Support and Plan Consistency:**

Public Support/Opposition	5	
Plan Consistency	10	
Subtotal		15

TOTAL: 100

FACILITIES

_____ (5)	1.	What is the current flooding frequency?	
		None or not applicable	0
		Low - once every 5-10 years (>100 year event)	1
		Medium - once every 2 years (>25-100 year event)	3
		High - 3-4 times per year (> 10 year event)	5
_____ (10)	2.	What is the current flooding impact in terms of injury, private property or public infrastructure?	
		None	0
		Minimal (minor road ponding, flooding of landscaping, other inconveniences)	3
		Moderate (impact to crawl spaces, extended road flooding)	6
		Extreme (large area impacted with personal injury or heavy property damage)	10
_____ (10)	3.	What are the conditions of the existing facility? Chose either constructed facility OR natural environment.	
		<u>Constructed Facility</u>	
		No constructed system involved	0
		Existing infrastructure (pipes, manholes, catch basins, retaining walls) are in excellent state	3
		Infrastructure is in fair condition, minor defects have been observed	5
		Infrastructure is in disrepair; needs constant maintenance to insure ongoing usage. Structural failure.	10
		<u>Natural Environment</u>	
		No natural system involved	0
		Minor degradation (bank erosion, downcutting, sediment deposition, etc.)	3
		Moderate threat of bank undercutting	5
		Extreme degradation (structures threatened, undermining of banks, severe downcutting)	10
_____ (5)	4.	How accessible is the existing facility for maintenance crews?	
		Satisfactory access; personnel and equipment may access from existing public road or right of way or N/A	0
		Marginal access (set-up time greater than one hour)	1
		Limited access (inspection only)	3
		No access possible for maintenance or inspection	5

_____ (30 max)

ENVIRONMENTAL

_____ (10) 1. What is the proposed project's ability to improve existing water quality or protect/improve natural hydrology?

- N/A 0
- Low (minimal improvement, degradation may continue) 3
- Medium (maintains beneficial use, slight improvement) 6
- High (significant improvement) 10

_____ (10) 2. How will the proposed project impact fish habitat restoration/preservation or potential fish productivity in terms of habitat, stream connectivity or stream/lake characteristics? Does the project comply with the intent of the Endangered Species Act listing of Chinook salmon as a threatened species?

- N/A (Not a fish habitat project) 0
- Small Improvement 3
- Moderate improvement 5
- Significant improvement or Protects Existing 10

_____ (10) 4.. To what degree does the proposed project provide other benefits including education, recreation, open space, wildlife habitat and community livability?

- Does not include any other benefits 0
- Conflicts with one of the above existing community amenities minus 5
- Includes other benefits but of lesser value to the community, including at least one of the benefits listed above 5
- Includes benefits of substantial value to the community including at least two of the above 10

_____ (30 max)

FISCAL

_____ (10) 1. What is the possibility for coordination/opportunity funding with other projects? Would it be possible to add fish habitat features to this project?

N/A - No link to other projects, non-City funds are not available to perform improvement 0

Low development activity or potential to integrate with other projects, outside funds not probable 3

Links indirectly with other programs or projects; moderate chance of leveraging other funding 6

Link directly with other project(s) or programs, compounding their effectiveness or certain to leverage substantial amounts (percentage-wise) of other funding habitat will be lost if project not done soon 10

_____ (5) 2. Is the cost/benefit index low or high for this project?

Ranking from all except this X 100 = Cost Benefit Index
Cost of Project

N/A (grant funding) 0

0-10 1

10-20 3

> 20 5

_____ (10) 3. How will the conceptual design of the project affect existing maintenance needs?

Greater than existing 0

Same as existing 5

Less than existing 10

(25 max)

Public Support and Plan Consistency

_____ (5) 1. Have citizens within the area effected by the project expressed interest and acceptance of the project?

Public has expressed opposition	0
Public reaction is mixed	1
Moderate public support	3
Strong public support	5

_____ (10) 2. Is the project identified by the 20 year project list in the Capital Facilities Element of Kirkland’s Comprehensive Plan, or the Stormwater Master Plan?

Project is not in either plan	0
Project is identified as priority ** in the Surface Water Master Plan	5
Project is in the Comprehensive Plan, and is listed as priority ** in the Surface Water Master Plan, or is part of the City’s ESA response	10

(15 max)

SUMMARY

FACILITIES	_____	(30)
ENVIRONMENTAL	_____	(30)
FISCAL	_____	(25)
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	_____	(15)
TOTAL PROJECT POINTS	=====	(100)

Parks Project Criteria



CRITERIA FOR RANKING PARKS CIP PROJECTS

	Criteria	None 0 Points	Low 1 Point	Moderate 2 Points	High 3 Points
1	Responds to an Urgent Need or Opportunity, Conforms to Legal, Contractual or Government Mandate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No need or urgency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suspected need with no substantiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suspected need based upon visual inspection, public comment Suspected threat of development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report or other documentation has been prepared Confirmed threat of development Fills important gap in park system Significant public comment—survey, petition, public hearing Legal, contractual, gov't mandate
2	Health and Safety Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No known issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suspected health or safety issue with no substantiation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suspected need based upon visual inspection, or public comment visible deterioration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented evidence of unsanitary condition, health and safety code violations, injury
3	Fiscal Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveraging of funds through partnerships, grants, bonds or volunteers is unlikely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveraging of funds somewhat likely through partnerships, grants, bonds and volunteers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveraging of at <i>least</i> 1/2 project funding available from other sources; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveraging of <i>more</i> than 50 percent of project costs from other sources
4	Conforms to Park Open Space Plan or Other Adopted Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in any plan document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified in Comprehensive or Functional plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helps meet level of service objectives
5	Feasibility, including Public Support and Project Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project simply an idea No public input No other supporting information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some public involvement such as letters, workshops Professional report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schematic or conceptual level approval Property identified High public support Completed appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction documents complete Option or right of first refusal, willing seller
6	Implications of Deferring Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impact No imminent threat of development; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary repair measures available without significant liability or added future cost Indications of possible development Program quality limited or reduced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of possible structural failure Confirmed private development sale possible Program participation limited or reduced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imminent possible structural failure, facility closure, or other similar factor Program cancellation Unable to meet level of service Imminent sale for private development

7	Benefits to Other New Capital Projects or an existing Park/Facility/Service, or Service Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No association with or impacts to other projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal benefit to existing or other projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate benefit such as relieving overuse at another facility Corrects minor problem at adjacent facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant benefit such as providing added capacity to a facility Corrects major problem at adjoining facility
8	Number of City Residents Served	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No residents served 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one neighborhood served 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than one City neighborhood served 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project will serve a City-wide population
9	Maintenance and Operations Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires substantial new M & O, no current budgetary commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources/capacity available without additional budget commitment Requires new resources which are available or likely available in budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has minimal or no impact on existing M & O resources Resources already allocated or planned for project in budget M & O requirements absorbed with existing resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial reduction in M&O.
10	Geographic Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duplicates service, significant number of resources available in area, level of service overlap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate number of Parks are nearby, minimal level of service overlap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks nearby, no level of service overlap, and gaps in service identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underserved area. No facilities within service area.