



**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	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 100 <hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> <hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>

(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

_____ (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

_____ (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

_____ VALUE SCORE
(100 max)

x .10 VALUE WEIGHT

===== 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

(100 max)

VALUE SCORE

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) (1)	No impact neutral (0)	Negative Impact inhibits/reduces	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 (1/2 to 1 mile) 5
- Facility within 4 to 8 blocks (1/4 to 1/2 mile) 10
- Facility within 4 blocks (1/4 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

STEIGER98TPE.DOC:RTS\ln