

<b>Factor: <u>Safety</u> [43%]</b>	<b><u>Evaluation Criteria</u></b>	<b><u>Points</u></b>		<b><u>Comments/Things to Consider</u></b>
<b>1. Incident evaluation</b>	SPIS Ranking, TVF&R cross referencing, Fire District #2	SPIS Top 1/3 (High) or 3+ TVF&R (High)	6	Taken directly from most recent SPIS rankings as published by Wash. County Traffic Engineering & data provided by TVF&R
		SPIS Middle 1/3 or 2 TVF&R (Med.)	3	
		SPIS Bottom 1/3 or 1 TVF&R (Low)	1.5	
		None Identified	0	
<b>2. Separation of modes</b> (bike/ped/auto) - candidate will reduce number of conflicts	Improvement results in separation of modes	Distinct (High)	6	Subjective determination performed initially by Technical Lead
		Moderate (Medium)	3	
		None/Low (Low)	1.5	
<b>3. Traffic speed:</b> Priority given to candidates with hazards associated with higher speeds	Posted speed	45 mph+ (High)	6	posted speeds
		26-44 mph (Medium)	3	
		25 mph (Low)	1.5	
<b>4. Functional Class/Volume:</b> Priority given to candidates with hazards associated with capacity and volume	Arterials, Collectors and Urban Local/Neighborhood Route	Arterial (High)	6	
		Collector (Medium)	3	
		UL/NR (Low)	1.5	
<b>5. Geometry</b> - Priority given to candidates with little to no refuge or clear zone for pedestrians	Determine refuges for pedestrians in emergency situations - ditch, embankment, etc.	Narrow ( $\leq$ 1 foot) (High)	6	
		Moderate (1-2 feet) (Medium)	3	
		Wide (2+ feet) (Low)	1.5	
<b>Factor: <u>Connectivity</u> [28%]</b>	<b><u>Evaluation Criteria</u></b>	<b><u>Points</u></b>		<b><u>Comments/Things to Consider</u></b>
<b>1a. Facility connection: <u>School</u></b>	Proximity to a school	< 2 blocks (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 2 blocks (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
<b>1b. Facility connection: <u>Transit</u></b>	Proximity to a bus stop, park and ride, transit center, etc.	< 2 blocks (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 2 blocks (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
<b>1c. Facility connection: <u>Business</u></b>	Proximity to a business	< 2 blocks (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 2 blocks (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
<b>1d. Facility connection: <u>Park</u></b>	Proximity to a park	< 2 blocks (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 2 blocks (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
<b>1e. Facility connection: <u>Point of Interest</u></b> - Examples: Shopping center, library, community center, grange, sports facility, movie theater, church	Proximity to a point of interest	< 2 blocks (High)	5	
		.5 mi to > 2 blocks (Medium)	2.5	
		> .5 mi (Low)	1.25	
<b>2. Walkability/Connectivity:</b> How does it fit with what's already there? Does it connect a gap?	Determine nearby facilities. Example: does a sidewalk exist across the street?	None (High)	5	Higher value given to areas with no facilities nearby
		Near/half block (Medium)	2.5	
		Adjacent (Low)	1.25	

<b>Factor: Cost [15%]</b>		<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		<b>Points</b>		<b>Comments/Things to Consider</b>	
1. Estimated Cost to Road Fund		< \$50k (High)		15	Higher value given to less expensive (more cost-efficient) candidates		
		\$50k-100k (Medium)		7.5			
		\$100k+ (Low)		3.75			
2. Partnership opportunities	Safe Routes to Schools, Grants, CDBG, HOA participation, CWS, etc.	2+ (High)		15	Only tangible, measurable commitments considered for scoring		
		1 (Medium)		7.5			
		0 (Low)		3.75			
<b>Factor: Community [14%]</b>		<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		<b>Points</b>		<b>Comments/Things to Consider</b>	
1. Communication in support of project received by LUT	Source = individual email or letter. Org. = HOA, CPO, etc.	1 org. (High)		10			
		2+ source (Medium)		5			
		1 source (Low)		2.33			
2. Population Density	Metro "Population Density" census data. Unit of measure is "people per acre".	15+ (High)		10	Updated to match Metro's definitions 8/15/2012		
		6-15 (Medium)		5			
		0-6 (Low)		2.33			
3. Demographics	Metro "Environmental Justice and underserved" data.	Significantly Above Average (High)		10			
		Above Average (Medium)		5			
		Average and Below (Low)		2.33			

**Factors that will not differentiate projects but should be taken into consideration:**

- Project location: strive to achieve geographic diversity
- Involve the public in a defensible process

Reviewed at June 6, 2013 meeting