RESOLUTION NO. 4025

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KIRKLAND ADOPTING THE 1996 TRANSPORTATION PROJECT CRITERIA AS DEVELOPED BY THE AD-HOC TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE AND LOS GUIDELINE DERIVED FROM THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

WHEREAS, the City Council establish an Ad-Hoc Transportation Committee to review the selection criteria for the transportation element of the Capital Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the criteria developed reflect the goals and policies as set forth in the 1996 Comprehensive Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, in this context it is in the public interest to have an established process for prioritizing transportation projects for their review and selection of Capital Improvements in the City of Kirkland;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Kirkland as follows:

Section 1. The City Council hereby adopts the Ad-Hoc Transportation Committee's selection criteria as set forth in Exhibit A to this Resolution. Said criteria to be the basis for the annual prioritization of Transportation Projects in the City's Capital Improvement Program.

Section 2. The City Council hereby adopts the Level of Service (LOS) guideline noted as Exhibit B and attached to this document. Said document is to be used as a guideline in the selection of Transportation Projects.

PASSED by majority vote of the Kirkland City Council in regular, open meeting the 20th day of August, 1996.

SIGNED IN AUTHENTICATION THEREOF on the 20th day of August, 1996.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

SUND\COUNC-2.DOC:JAA\gs\ln

EXHIBIT A

August 15, 1996

TRANSPORTATION PROJECT CRITERIA

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

• FISCAL	.20
• SAFETY	.20
• MULTIMODAL	.20
• NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRITY	.15
• TRANSPORTATION CONNECTIONS	.15
• PLAN CONSISTENCY	.10
TOTAL	1.00

August 15, 1996

FISCAL VALUES

_____ (50) 1. What is the City's ability to leverage funds from all non-City sources?

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

(a) Chance to leverage		x	(b) Amount leveraged	
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			

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

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

August 15, 1996

FISCAL VALUES (Continued)

_____ (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 (VS)
(100 max)

x .20 VALUE WEIGHT (VW)

_____ VALUE TOTAL (VT)

August 15, 1996

PLAN CONSISTENCY

_____ (50) 1. Is the project generally consistent with or generated from adopted regional plans, such as Eastside Transportation Plan, Metro SIX-Year Plan.

Maximum Score: 50 Points

No	0
Project is not inconsistent	25
Project is generated from a regional plan	50

_____ (50) 2. Is the project identified in the 20 year project list of the Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element or the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan?

Maximum Score: 50 Points

Project is not in either plan	0
Project is identified as Priority 2 in the Non-Motorized Plan	25
Project is in the Comprehensive Plan or listed as a Priority 1 Route in NMP	50

_____ VALUE SCORE (VS)
(100 max)

x .10 VALUE WEIGHT (VW)

_____ VALUE TOTAL (VT)

August 15, 1996

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	40

_____ (20) 2. Is the project generally compatible with the neighborhood in regard 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 (VS)
(100 max)

x .15 VALUE WEIGHT (VW)

_____ VALUE TOTAL (VT)

August 15, 1996

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 or Non-Motorized Transportation Plan?

No 0

Pedestrian Network
- Yes for a priority 2 network 14
- Yes for a priority 1 network 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	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center	6 points		3 points	
Improves a Connection within a Business District			12 points	

August 15, 1996

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	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center	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	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center	6 points		3 points	
Improves a Connection within a Business District			12 points	

Footnote: 1 - Community Facility includes parks, libraries, hospitals, fire stations, city hall, community centers, the Boys and Girls club and similar facilities.

(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.

August 15, 1996

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 (VS)
(100 max)

x .15 VALUE WEIGHT (VW)

_____ VALUE TOTAL (VT)

August 15, 1996

MULTIMODAL (NON-SOV)

_____ (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

_____ (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

_____ (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 (VS)
(100 max)

x .20 VALUE WEIGHT (VW)

_____ VALUE TOTAL (VT)

August 15, 1996

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) Bicycle:

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) Pedestrian

_____ (25) **Pathway**:

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) **Sidewalk**:

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

August 15, 1996

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

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

August 15, 1996

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)?

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

August 15, 1996

SAFETY (Continued)

_____ (100 max)	VALUE SCORE (VS)
x .20	VALUE WEIGHT (VW)
_____	VALUE TOTAL (VT)

August 15, 1996

PROJECT SCORING SUMMARY

VALUE TOTALS (VT)

Project Type	(20) Fiscal	(20) Safety	(20) MM	(15) NI	(15) TN	(10) PL	(100 Max) Total
Non-motorized							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
Traffic Signal							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
Etc.							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							

ARNDT\ADHOC4.DOC:JAA|ln

EXHIBIT B

LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)

Adopted LOS

Sidewalks/Pathways: 2.75 miles of sidewalks & paths/1000 people by 2012 = 2.6 miles/year.

Bike Paths: 1.04 miles of bike paths/1000 people by 2012 = 1.0 miles/year.

Roads: 1) Average peak hour volume to capacity (V/C) of signalized intersections; and
2) Maximum number of intersections exceeding subarea average peak hour V/C

Subarea	2001 Average V/C	2001 Intersections Exceeding Average	2012 Average V/C	2012 Intersections Exceeding Average
SW	0.97	4	1.05	4
NW	1.05	2	1.20	2
NE	0.87	7	1.05	7
E	1.09	2	1.25	2

Transit/HOV: 70% SOV/30% HOV mode split in NW, SW and NE subareas.
80% SOV/30% HOV mode split in E subarea.

Project Ranking to Meet LOS

Sidewalks/ Pathways

List top ranked projects in the order of their ranking from first six values.
List sufficient projects to meet following LOS targets:

	Miles per year required to meet LOS:	2.60
Minus	Miles provided by development:	1.50 (projected)
Equals	Target miles per year for CIP:	**1.10**

Bicycle Paths

List top ranked projects in the order of their ranking from first six values.
List sufficient projects to meet following LOS targets:

	Miles per year required to meet LOS:	1.0
Minus	Miles provided by development:	0.0 (projected)
Equals	Target miles per year for CIP:	**1.0**

Roads/Signals/ Intersections

List top ranked projects.

Transit/HOV

List top ranked projects.