

## SULTAN CITY COUNCIL

### AGENDA ITEM COVER SHEET

---

ITEM NO: D-3  
DATE: April 12, 2007  
SUBJECT: 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan Evaluation Criteria  
CONTACT PERSON: Deborah Knight, City Administrator

#### SUMMARY:

The City of Sultan is in the process of developing a set of evaluation criteria to prioritize capital project investments (roads, trails, parks, water, sewer and stormwater system improvements, and public facilities). A draft set of criteria, proposed by City staff, are included as Attachment A.

Staff proposes the City use a process which results in a numerical ranking of projects using twelve (12) criteria in six categories:

1. Protection of Public Health and Safety
2. Cost Effectiveness
3. Benefit to the City and/or Region
4. Economic Development
5. Sharing or Reuse of Facilities, Timing and Opportunity
6. Sultan Vision

City staff is seeking feedback from the City Council on the proposed criteria.

The Planning Board reviewed the proposed evaluation criteria at its March 20, 2007 meeting. The Board suggested changing the Environmental Quality criterion so the words "key habitat value" have been replaced with "environmental quality" so the criterion reads: "The project protects environmental quality". This change has been incorporated into the draft presented to the City Council in this report.

#### BACKGROUND:

The Growth Management Act requires that communities prepare and adopt a Capital Facilities Element in their Comprehensive plans (Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070). Revisions to the City's Capital Improvement Plan should be reassessed annually to confirm that long-term financial capacity exists to provide adequate capital facilities pursuant to Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(3)(e).

Preparation of a capital improvement plan initially proceeds from a set of goals and priorities. Governments adopt policies covering a wide array of community development and services

issues. It is often the case that more capital projects can be justified than there is available funding to pay for them during the six year planning period.

Evaluation criteria are used by many governments to identify the highest priority projects and to balance diverse and sometimes competing community values and needs.

Evaluation criteria support the policy goals adopted by the City Council in its planning documents and provide a means to measure the relative value of each proposed project.

### 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan

The CIP is one of the most important annual planning documents of the City Council. The CIP is the "master plan" level of detail for the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) should not be confused with the capital budget. The capital budget represents the first year of the capital improvement plan. The capital budget is a city's annual appropriation for capital spending and is the legally adopted city budget.

The capital budget authorizes specific projects and appropriates specific funding for those projects. The capital budget is usually adopted in conjunction with the City's operating budget and provides the legal authority to proceed with specific projects. The City needs to begin the process of preparing the 2008-2013 Six-Year CIP in order to have capital project expenses and funding sources identified for the 2008 budget.

### 2008-2013 Adoption Strategy and Timeline

On February 22, 2007, the City Council directed staff to begin the annual CIP adoption process outlined in Attachment B. Since the meeting in February, City staff has completed a number of steps in the CIP process:

- Step 1 - City staff prepared a draft set of evaluation criteria.
- Step 2 – Presentations to Council subcommittees delayed to May pending Council approval of subcommittee structure in March.
- Step 3 - The CIP was included in the Open House on March 13, 2007.  
Unfortunately there were no comments from the public on the Capital Improvement Plan. **A second open house is scheduled for Tuesday, May 15, 2007 from 4:00pm to 7:00pm.** The City will seek additional input from the public on the proposed projects.
- Step 4 - A press release asking for public input on proposed projects was sent to local newspapers, posted on the City's website, and Channel 21 (Attachment C).

This staff report addresses Step 6 – Council reviews and approves evaluation criteria

## DISCUSSION:

### Public vs. Private Capital Investment Decision Making Tools

Private sector capital budgeting decisions are determined by measuring the incremental cash flows associated with the project - the present value of cash outflows and cash inflows. If the net present value of a project is greater than or equal to zero, a company should invest in the capital project.

The costs of government projects can be expressed in dollars, but the benefits cannot always be expressed in dollars. For example, what is the dollar value of clean air, landscaped roadways, or a community center? While all of these consequences have value, not all of these values have a market price or monetary equivalent.

Governments use evaluation criteria as a tool to more objectively rank capital projects and establish capital project priorities. Evaluation criteria must be carefully developed to be workable and lead to meaningful results. Above all, the rating process should result in a selection of projects that reflect the community's highest priority needs; otherwise, the process should be revised.

### Why Evaluation Criteria are Used

There are several advantages to developing and using evaluation criteria

- Encourage agreement on priorities – Developing criteria encourages decision makers to focus on the goals they have set and to reach consensus on which of these goals are priorities.
- Provide an objective basis for assessing capital projects – A clearly defined set of evaluation criteria can help to make the process for prioritizing capital projects more rational.
- Facilitate comparisons among diverse types of projects – Governments compare a wide variety of capital projects. As the list of projects gets longer, the ability of decision makers to compare different projects in light of stated policy objectives becomes more difficult. Evaluation criteria can make these comparisons easier.

Criteria are based on and support the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is the starting point for developing the evaluation criteria and determining community priorities.

### Developing Evaluation Criteria

There are some generally acceptable principles for developing evaluation criteria:

1. Criteria should clearly articulate the community's priorities. Council, community members and staff should understand how projects will be rated.
2. Criteria should result in a selection of projects that meet critical needs and rejection of projects which do not meet critical needs.
3. Criteria should be practical in terms of cost, time and available personnel. The types of data or information needed to assess projects should be readily available. Subjective judgment may be needed to estimate certain impacts.

The types of evaluation criteria that are used by local governments depend on the specific goals and policies. Harry Hatry and Annie Miller identified a number of criteria categories that are frequently used to evaluate capital projects in their *Guide to Setting Priorities for Capital Investment*. These are summarized as follows:

1. Legal mandates – Is the project needed to meet federal or state mandates?
2. Fiscal and budget impacts - What is the total capital costs, impact on the operating budget, and availability of federal/state assistance to fund the project?
3. Health and safety impacts – does the project reduce the number of deaths, injuries, or illnesses in the community?
4. Economic Development Impacts – Does the project promote the economic vitality of the community?
5. Environmental, aesthetic, and social effects – Does the project reduce noise or pollution levels, improve the appearance of the community or ensure community values are achieved?
6. Project feasibility – Does the project demonstrate that it can be implemented as planned? Is the timing, phasing and proposed funding reasonable?
7. Distribution effects – Do proposed projects contribute to balance in the program?
8. Disruption/inconvenience – How much disruption is caused by the project?
9. Impacts of deferral – What are the implications of deferring the project?
10. Uncertainty/risk – What is the degree of risk or uncertainty inherent in the project?
11. Interjurisdictional effects – What are the effects of the project on regional relationships?
12. Relationship to other projects – Are there advantages of the project accruing from its relationship to other projects?

#### Examples of Evaluation Criteria

Some governments use a process which results in numerical ranking of projects. Projects are scored with respect to each criterion, and these scores are summed and used to rank projects. The types of evaluation criteria that are used will depend on the government's specific goals and policies.

The City of Bellevue has developed separate criteria for transportation, Parks, general government, public safety, neighborhood enhancement (annually adopted areas of focus), and surface water. Attachment D

The City of Kirkland has 11 criteria divided into six categories: fiscal, plan consistency, neighborhood integrity, transportation connections, multimodal and safety. A separate set of criteria are used for parks and surface water projects to prioritize projects within dedicated funding sources. Attachment E

The City of Minneapolis uses five criteria: project priority, adopted 5-year plan, contribution to city goals and qualitative criteria (quality of life, public benefit, environmental quality, collaboration, job creation, and cultural impacts).

**ANALYSIS:**

Staff proposes the City use a process which results in a numerical ranking of projects using twelve (12) criteria in six categories:

1. Protection of Public Health and Safety
2. Cost Effectiveness
3. Benefit to the City and/or Region
4. Economic Development
5. Sharing or Reuse of Facilities, Timing and Opportunity
6. Sultan Vision

Each criterion, within each category, is scored on a scale from 0 to 3. Since specific types of projects (roads, non-motorized, parks, water, sewer, etc.) do not compete for the same funding sources, each project type (e.g. parks) only "compete" against similar project types. In other words, park projects compete against other park projects. Roads projects compete against other roads projects using the same evaluation criteria.

It is possible to develop a system where a separate set of criteria are used for each project type. This is the system used by the City's of Bellevue and Kirkland. The downside to such a system is that it requires additional staff time and effort to manage. A single set of criteria is often used by small agencies such as Sultan with limited staff time and resources.

City staff has tested the proposed criteria on a number of projects and are satisfied that the criteria identify the City's highest priority projects. The City Council will have an opportunity in May to review and approve the proposed list of capital projects for the 20-year capital facilities plan.

The list of potential capital projects over the 20-year planning period exceeds available funding over the six-year life of the Capital Improvement Plan. Since capital projects are proposed to support different community goals a methodology is needed both to pare down the list of projects to an affordable level and to balance diverse and sometimes competing community values. Capital project evaluation criteria support the policy goals adopted by the City and provide a means to measure the relative value of each proposed project.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None at this time

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Discuss the proposed capital improvement plan evaluation criteria and give direction to staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Proposed evaluation criteria
  - B. 2008-2013 CIP Adoption Strategy and Timeline
  - C. Press Release
  - D. City of Bellevue Evaluation Criteria
  - E. City of Kirkland Evaluation Criteria
-

City of Sultan  
Capital Improvement Plan  
Evaluation Criteria

Prioritization	3	2	1	0
	<b>Protection of Public Health and Safety</b>			
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY</b>	Project needed to alleviate existing health or safety hazard.	Project needed to alleviate potential health or safety hazard.	Project would maintain current health or safety status.	No health or safety impact associated with project.
	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>			
<b>OPERATING BUDGET</b>	Project is a viable alternative, which will result in decreased operating costs or contribute to revenues.	Funding is available for long-term maintenance and stewardship.	Project will have some additional operating costs and/or personnel additions, which might impact programs and services.	Funding this project would have negative impacts on other City projects, programs, or service delivery.
<b>AVAILABILITY OF FINANCING</b>	Project revenues will support project expenses and/or grants, partnerships, and mitigation are available to reduce City share.	Non-city revenues have been identified or applied for. Reduction in proportion of City revenues likely.	Potential for non-city revenue is marginal.	The project is not a candidate for private funding, grants, or partnerships.
<b>COST TO BENEFIT RATIO</b>	Return on investment for the project can be computed and is positive.	There may be some potential for return on investment.	Return on investment is unlikely.	Return on investment is negative.
	<b>Benefit to the City and/or Region</b>			
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</b>	The project protects key environmental quality.	The project will improve environmental quality of the city.	Project may improve environmental quality of the city.	Project will have no effect on the environmental quality of the city.
<b>EXTERNAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	Project is required by law, regulation or mandate or is required to provide concurrency per GMA.	Project is required by agreement with other jurisdictions.	Project to be conducted in conjunction with other jurisdictions.	Project has no components which need to be coordinated with other jurisdictions or regulators.
<b>RELATION TO ADOPTED PLANS</b>	Project is identified as a priority in a formal plan which Council has approved and/ or is required to provide concurrency per GMA.	Project can be shown to meet goals and objectives listed in adopted plans.	Overall project is marginal with regard to meeting adopted goals and objectives.	Project has few components which meet goals and objectives of planning documents.
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>				

**City of Sultan  
Capital Improvement Plan  
Evaluation Criteria**

Prioritization	3	2	1	0
	<b>Consistency With and Support of Economic Development Goals</b>			
<b>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b>	Project will support the vitality of the existing tax base and encourage capital investment, increase tax base, improve job opportunities, attract customers, or produce public or private revenues.	Project will encourage three or four of the following: capital investment, increase tax base, improve job opportunities, attract customers, or produce public or private revenues.	Project will encourage one or two of the following: capital investment, increase tax base, improve job opportunities, attract customers, or produce public or private revenues.	Project will not encourage any of the following: capital investment, increase tax base, improve job opportunities, attract customers, or produce public or private revenues.
<b>OPPORTUNITY</b>	<b>Sharing or Re-use of Facilities, Timing, and Opportunity</b>			
	Deferred action will eliminate future opportunities to meet project objectives or significantly increase the project costs.	Deferred action may eliminate the opportunity to meet some project objectives.	Minor aspects of the project may require alteration if the project is deferred.	The project can be deferred without negative consequences.
<b>TIMELINESS</b>	The project has significant scheduling requirements; i.e. grant eligibility, mitigation availability, dependence on timely sharing or re-use of other facilities, and/or coordination with other projects.	Project will allow the city to take advantage of sharing or reusing available facilities or benefit from the timing of other projects.	Minor efficiencies would be realized by timely re-use or sharing of facilities and/or coordination with other projects.	Use of available facilities or coordination with other projects is not available on this project.
<b>Sultan Vision</b>				
<b>VISION STATEMENTS</b>	The project will achieve nearly all of the following items: 1) maintain Sultan's small town feeling 2) emphasize recreation opportunities 3) enhance the natural environment 4) improve the City's visual image 5) diversify retail services 6) encourage small business 7) improve employment opportunities	This project will achieve some of the following items: 1) maintain Sultan's small town feeling 2) emphasize recreation opportunities 3) enhance the natural environment 4) improve the City's visual image 5) diversify retail services 6) encourage small business 7) improve employment opportunities	This project will achieve a few of the following items: 1) maintain Sultan's small town feeling 2) emphasize recreation opportunities 3) enhance the natural environment 4) improve the City's visual image 5) diversify retail services 6) encourage small business 7) improve employment opportunities	This project is in conflict with or does not achieve any of the following items: 1) maintain Sultan's small town feeling 2) emphasize recreation opportunities 3) enhance the natural environment 4) improve the City's visual image 5) diversify retail services 6) encourage small business 7) improve employment opportunities
<b>QUALITY OF LIFE</b>	The purpose of the project is to improve the appearance of neighborhoods (residential/commercial), meet a community obligation to serve a special need population, and/or provide for stewardship of natural resources.	Project components will improve the appearance of neighborhoods (residential/commercial), meet a community obligation to serve a special need population, and/or provide for stewardship of natural resources.	Project components may improve the appearance of neighborhoods (residential/commercial), meet a community obligation to serve a special need population, and/or provide for stewardship of natural resources.	Project will not improve the appearance of neighborhoods (residential/commercial), meet a community obligation to serve a special need population, and/or provide for stewardship of natural resources.

2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan  
Adoption Strategy and Timeline

1. CIP Staff Committee reviews evaluation criteria options – February
2. Evaluation criteria reviewed by public works committee – March
3. Open House showcasing CIP projects, distribute comment sheets – March 13, 2007
4. Press release with community “call-for-projects” – Friday, March 30, 2007
5. CIP Staff Committee prepares inventory of proposed projects – February/March
  - Capital Facilities Element
  - Transportation Element
  - Parks and Recreation Element
  - Water/Sewer Plan
  - Water Quality Plan
6. Council reviews and approves evaluation criteria – March/April
7. Staff presents proposed project list for evaluation to council committees – April/May
  - Get feedback on proposed project list for evaluation
8. Staff presents proposed project list to City Council - May/June
9. CIP team begins evaluation process – Team meetings
  - Motorized Transportation Evaluation
  - Non-Motorized and Parks
  - Water and Sewer
  - Surface Water and Facilities
10. Report back to council committees– June
  - Get feedback on preliminary CIP
11. Staff report to Council - July
  - Release Preliminary CIP for public comment - July/August
12. Open House – September
13. Presentations to Planning Board
  - Introduction of Preliminary CIP – July
  - Return to prepare for recommendation to City Council – August
  - Recommendation to City Council – September
14. Report back to council committees – September
  - Update on public process and feedback from Community
15. Council Presentations
  - Recommendation from Planning Commission – September
  - Discussion – October, November
  - Adoption - December

# CITY OF SULTAN NEWS RELEASE

Date: March 30, 2007

For Immediate Release

## **SULTAN SEEKS INPUT ON CAPITAL INVESTMENTS**

The City of Sultan is asking citizens to submit public comment on projects proposed for evaluation in the 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Projects under consideration for funding include new roads to connect the Sultan Basin to downtown Sultan, new community and neighborhood parks, water and sewer upgrades and extensions. The City reviews and updates the CIP annually, which allows new projects to be added to the list and changes in priority for previously listed projects, based on current needs.

"This is the first year the City of Sultan has prepared a comprehensive list of capital investments the City has identified for possible construction over the next 20 years", notes Mayor Ben Tolson. "We are asking Sultan citizens to read and comment on proposed projects, and suggest additional projects for consideration."

The City will provide several opportunities for public comment: the Council will discuss the CIP evaluation criteria at its April 12, 2007 Council meeting; an open house is planned at City Hall on Tuesday, May 15, 2007 from 4:00pm to 7:00pm to present proposed projects and answer questions from the public; the Planning Commission will discuss the proposed CIP in May and June. A draft CIP with estimated costs, revenue sources, and funding for each project will be published for comment in June. The CIP will be adopted with the City's 2008 Budget in December.

The public can view a sample list of proposed CIP projects at the city's website, Public comments are welcome by e-mailing City Administrator Deborah Knight at [deborah.knight@ci.sultan.wa.us](mailto:deborah.knight@ci.sultan.wa.us), faxing to her at 360-793-3344, or mailing to her at City Hall. Exact times and dates of the CIP hearings and events will be posted on the city's website and in the *Everett Herald*.

-END-

Attachment D

City of Bellevue Capital Improvement Evaluation Criteria

**2005-2014 General Obligation Bond Program / Decade Plan**  
**Criteria for Project Evaluation**

**Department of Municipal Development [Streets & Storm Drainage]**

**Criteria**

Range

Weight

**Rehabilitation, and/or Protection of Existing Assets or Areas of the City**

25%

Highest

Supports maintenance, and/or rehabilitation of streets or storm drainage facilities within the 1980 City boundaries, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals/1-Year Objectives.

Supports implementation of centers & corridors, and/or is located in an activity center, as defined in the adopted Centers & Corridor Plan, R-01-344.

Replaces a critical facility or system, or component thereof, that has failed or is near failure.

Supports / supplements an adequately functioning facility.

Supports facilities that are not contiguous with the existing City.

Lowest

Initiates a new system or facility to deliver services not previously provided.

**Operating Budget Impact**

25%

Highest

Reduces the City's long term operations / maintenance costs.

Leverages non-City revenues.

Retrofits capital facility with energy efficient systems, or makes use of alternative energy sources.

Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development.

Uses operating resources shared by multiple City departments or agencies, and/or is projected to have exceptionally efficient life-cycle costs.

Has no impact on general fund costs.

Increases the City's general fund costs, but uses some participating funds from other agencies or sources to diminish the cost impact, and demonstrably improves service to the public.

Lowest

Increases the City's general fund costs.

**Enhancement and/or Deficiency Correction of Existing Assets or Areas of the City**

20%

Highest

Serves an infill area, and/or will stimulate infill development, and/or will support community revitalization, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives.

Supports correction of deficient facility anywhere in the City.

Supports improved appearance of major unlandscaped arterial roadways.

Supports bicycle transportation.

Improves pedestrian mobility and/or the quality of the pedestrian environment.

Lowest

Supports development that is not contiguous with the existing City.

Department of Municipal Development [Streets & Storm cont']

**Economic Development / Community Revitalization**

15%

Highest

Helps to create jobs or to promote economic opportunity, or helps local business, especially within an Activity Center, Federally designated Enterprise Community area, or State Enterprise Zone.

Supports job creation in areas of the City annexed between 1960 and the present in order to create a better balance of jobs and housing.

Encourages neighborhood revitalization, or addresses disinvestment in blighted areas, or improves the tax base.

Supports neighborhood-based economic development.

Lowest

Has little potential to promote economic development

**Implementation of Legal Mandates / Adopted Plans**

15%

Highest

Is required by a legal mandate defined as a City ordinance, Joint Powers Agreement, Court ruling, and/or Federal or State regulation.

Implements departmental facility plan and/or completes an on-going phased project.

Supports and/or fulfills City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives and program strategies.

Implements an adopted plan.

Lowest

Begins or implements a new project, not part of an adopted plan or the departmental facility plan, and/or does not help to fulfill the City's adopted Goals and Objectives.

		Attachment 1	Page -3-
		<b>Transit Department</b>	
Range	<b>Criteria</b>		Weight
<b>Highest</b>	<b><u>Rehabilitation, and/or Protection of Existing Assets or Areas of the City</u></b>		<b>25%</b>
	Rehabilitates and/or maintains Transit vehicles, facilities or systems for use within the 1980 City boundaries, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives.		
	Supports implementation of centers & corridors, and/or is located in an activity center, as defined in the adopted Centers & Corridor Plan, R-01-344.		
	Replaces a critical facility or system, or component thereof, that has failed or is near failure.		
	Supports / supplements an adequately functioning facility.		
	Supports facilities that are not contiguous with the existing City.		
<b>Lowest</b>	Initiates a new system or facility to deliver services not previously provided		
<b>Highest</b>	<b><u>Operating Budget Impact</u></b>		<b>25%</b>
	Reduces the City's long term operations / maintenance costs.		
	Leverages non-City revenues.		
	Retrofits capital facility with energy efficient systems, or makes use of alternative energy sources.		
	Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development.		
	Uses operating resources shared by multiple City departments or agencies, and/or is projected to have exceptionally efficient life-cycle costs.		
	Has no impact on general fund costs.		
	Increases the City's general fund costs, but uses some participating funds from other agencies or sources to diminish the cost impact, and <u>demonstrably</u> improves service to the public.		
<b>Lowest</b>	Increases the City's general fund costs.		
<b>Highest</b>	<b><u>Enhancement and/or Deficiency Correction of existing assets or areas of the City</u></b>		<b>20%</b>
	Increases headways on critical, high density routes, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives.		
	Serves an infill area, and/or will stimulate infill development, and/or will support community revitalization.		
	Supports bicycle transportation.		
	Improves pedestrian mobility and/or the quality of the pedestrian experience.		
<b>Lowest</b>	Supports development that is not contiguous with the existing City.		

<p><b>Highest</b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Economic Development / Community Revitalization</u></b></p> <p>Helps to create jobs or to promote economic opportunity, or helps local business, especially within an Activity Center, Federally designated Enterprise Community area, or State Enterprise Zone.</p>	<p align="center"><b>15%</b></p>
	<p>Supports job creation in areas of the City annexed between 1960 and the present in order to create a better balance of jobs and housing.</p>	
	<p>Encourages neighborhood revitalization, or addresses disinvestment in blighted areas, or improves the tax base.</p>	
	<p>Supports neighborhood-based economic development.</p>	
<p><b>Lowest</b></p>	<p>Has little potential to promote economic development</p>	
<p><b>Highest</b></p>	<p align="center"><b><u>Implementation of Legal Mandates / Adopted Plans</u></b></p> <p>Is required by a legal mandate defined as a City Ordinance, Joint Powers Agreement, Court ruling, and/or Federal or State regulation.</p>	<p align="center"><b>15%</b></p>
	<p>Implements departmental facility plan and/or completes an on-going phased project</p>	
	<p>Supports and/or fulfills City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives and program strategies.</p>	
	<p>Implements an adopted plan.</p>	
<p><b>Lowest</b></p>	<p>Begins or implements a new project, not part of an adopted plan or the departmental facility plan, and/or does not help to fulfill the City's adopted Goals and Objectives.</p>	

**Department of Municipal Development [Park Planning & Design]**  
**Parks & Recreation Services**  
 [Recreation, Open Space, Park Management, Balloon Fiesta Park]

Range	Criteria	Weight
<b>Highest</b>	<p align="center"><b><u>Rehabilitation, and/or Protection of Existing Assets or Areas of the City</u></b></p> <p>Supports maintenance and/or rehabilitation of trail, park, recreation, and/or open space facilities within the 1980 City boundaries, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals/1-Year Objectives. <i>[Open Space is not subject to geographic boundaries.]</i></p>	<b>25%</b>
	<p>Supports implementation of centers &amp; corridors, and/or is located in an activity center, as defined in the adopted Centers &amp; Corridor Plan, R-01-344.</p> <p>Replaces a critical component of a trail, park, recreation, and/or open space facility that has failed or is near failure.</p> <p>Supports / supplements an adequately functioning trail, park, recreation, and/or open space facility.</p> <p>Supports facilities that are not contiguous with the existing City.</p>	
<b>Lowest</b>	<p>Initiates a new trail, park, recreation, and/or open space facility, in order to deliver services not previously provided.</p>	
<b>Highest</b>	<p align="center"><b><u>Operating Budget Impact</u></b></p> <p>Reduces the City's long term operations / maintenance costs.</p> <p>Leverages non-City revenues.</p> <p>Reduces water use and/or retrofits capital facility with energy efficient systems, and/or makes use of alternative energy sources.</p> <p>Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development.</p> <p>Uses operating resources shared by multiple City departments or agencies, and/or is projected to have exceptionally efficient life-cycle costs.</p> <p>Has no impact on general fund costs.</p> <p>Increases the City's general fund costs, but uses some participating funds from other agencies or sources to diminish the cost impact, and demonstrably improves service to the public.</p>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Lowest</b>	<p>Increases the City's general fund costs.</p>	
<b>Highest</b>	<p align="center"><b><u>Enhancement and/or Deficiency Correction of existing assets or areas of the City</u></b></p> <p>Serves an infill area, and/or will stimulate infill development, and/or will support community revitalization, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives</p> <p>Supports correction of a deficient park, trail, recreation, or open space facility anywhere in the City.</p> <p>Promotes / supports recreational opportunities for young people, and is consistent with program strategies developed for the 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives.</p> <p>Supports bicycle transportation and/or improves the quality of the pedestrian experience.</p>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Lowest</b>	<p>Supports development that is not contiguous with the existing City.</p>	

Department of Municipal Development [Park Planning & Design cont']

Parks and Recreation Services [Recreation, Open Space, Park Management, Balloon Fiesta Park cont']

**Economic Development / Community Revitalization**

15%

**Highest**

Helps to create jobs or to promote economic opportunity, or helps local business, especially within an Activity Center, Federally designated Enterprise Community area or State Enterprise Zone.

Supports job creation in areas of the City annexed between 1960 and the present in order to create a better balance of jobs and housing.

Encourages neighborhood revitalization, or addresses disinvestment in blighted areas, or improves the tax base.

Supports neighborhood-based economic development.

**Lowest**

Has little potential to promote economic development

**Highest**

**Implementation of Legal Mandates / Adopted Plans**

15%

Is required by a legal mandate defined as a City Ordinance, Joint Powers Agreement, Court ruling, and/or Federal or State regulation.

Completes an on-going or phased project and/or implements departmental facility plan.

Supports and/or fulfills City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives and program strategies.

Implements an adopted plan.

**Lowest**

Begins or implements a new project, not part of an adopted plan or the departmental facility plan, and/or does not help to fulfill the City's adopted Goals and Objectives.

Range	Criteria	Weight
Highest	<b><u>Rehabilitation, and/or Protection of Existing Assets or Areas of the City</u></b>	25%
	Supports maintenance and/or rehabilitation of critical public safety systems and facilities primarily serving areas within the 1980 City boundaries, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals/1-Year Objectives.	
	Supports implementation of centers & corridors, and/or is located in an activity center, as defined in the adopted Centers & Corridor Plan, R-01-344.	
	Replaces a critical facility or system, or component thereof, that has failed or is near failure.	
	Supports / supplements an adequately functioning facility.	
Lowest	Supports facilities that are not contiguous with the existing City.	
Highest	<b><u>Operating Budget Impact</u></b>	25%
	Reduces the City's long term operations/maintenance costs.	
	Leverages non-City revenues.	
	Retrofits capital facility with energy efficient systems, or makes use of alternative energy sources.	
	Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development.	
	Uses operating resources shared by multiple City departments or agencies, and/or is projected to have exceptionally efficient life-cycle costs.	
	Has no impact on general fund costs.	
Lowest	Increases the City's general fund costs, but uses some participating funds from other agencies or sources to diminish the cost impact, and <u>demonstrably</u> improves services to the public.	
Highest	<b><u>Enhancement and/or Deficiency Correction of existing assets or areas of the City</u></b>	20%
	Eliminates or greatly reduces the number of life threatening incidents that may occur, if the proposed project were not implemented, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals / 1 Year Objectives.	
	Significantly improves public safety (e.g. essential police or fire facilities / systems) or improvements will facilitate gang intervention and enhance activities for young people.	
	Supports correction of deficient systems / facilities anywhere in the City.	
	Responds to a public safety issue (e.g. graffiti eradication, traffic safety concern.)	
Lowest	Moderately improves citizen safety.	
	Has no clear relationship to public safety.	

## Public Safety [Fire and Police Departments]

**Economic Development / Community Revitalization**

15%

**Highest**

Helps to create jobs or to promote economic opportunity, or helps local business, especially within an Activity Center, Federally designated Enterprise Community area or State Enterprise Zone.

Supports job creation in areas of the City annexed between 1960 and the present, in order to create a better balance of jobs and housing.

Encourages neighborhood revitalization, or addresses disinvestment in blighted areas, or improves the tax base.

Supports neighborhood-based economic development.

**Lowest**

Has little potential to promote economic development

**Implementation of Legal Mandates / Adopted Plans**

15%

**Highest**

Is required by a legal mandate defined as a City Ordinance, Joint Powers Agreement, Court ruling, and/or Federal or State regulation.

Implements departmental facility plan and/or completes an on-going phased project.

Supports and/or fulfills City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives and program strategies.

Implements an adopted plan.

**Lowest**

Begins or implements a new project, not part of an adopted plan or the departmental facility plan, and/or does not help to fulfill the City's adopted Goals and Objectives.

**Community Facilities** [Cultural Services; Environmental Health; Family & community Services; Finance & Administration; Planning; and Senior Affairs]

Range	Criteria	Weight
Highest	<p align="center"><b><u>Rehabilitation, and/or Protection of Existing Assets or Areas of the City</u></b></p> <p>Supports maintenance and/or rehabilitation of community facilities and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals/1 Year Objectives.</p>	<b>25%</b>
	<p>Supports implementation of centers &amp; corridors, and/or is located in an activity center, as defined in the adopted Centers &amp; Corridor Plan, R-01-344. <i>[This criteria is not applicable to existing cultural facilities.]</i></p> <p>Replaces a critical facility or system, or component thereof, that has failed or is near failure.</p> <p>Supports / supplements an adequately functioning facility.</p> <p>Supports facilities that are not contiguous with the existing City.</p>	
Lowest	Initiates a new community facility to deliver services not previously provided	
Highest	<p align="center"><b><u>Operating Budget Impact</u></b></p> <p>Reduces the City's long term operations/maintenance costs.</p> <p>Leverages non-City revenues.</p> <p>Retrofits capital facility with energy efficient systems, or makes use of alternative energy sources.</p> <p>Partners with non-City public or private sector organization in support of joint development.</p> <p>Uses operating resources shared by multiple City departments or agencies, and/or is projected to have exceptionally efficient life-cycle costs.</p> <p>Has no impact on general fund costs.</p> <p>Increases the City's general fund costs, but uses some participating funds from other agencies or sources to diminish the cost impact, and <u>demonstrably</u> improves services to the public.</p>	<b>25%</b>
Lowest	Increases the City's general fund costs.	
Highest	<p align="center"><b><u>Enhancement and/or Deficiency Correction of existing assets or areas of the City</u></b></p> <p>A new or existing community/cultural facility that serves an infill area, and/or will stimulate infill development, and/or will support community revitalization.</p> <p>Supports correction of a deficient system or facility anywhere in the City.</p> <p>Promotes / supports educational, recreational or social opportunities for City residents, especially young people, seniors and/or the handicapped, and is consistent with the City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives.</p> <p>Is a definitive action to protect physical / natural environment, or conserve energy, or measurably increases employee productivity [e.g. air quality control efforts, energy improvements in City owned building, or major long term computer systems enhancem</p> <p>Improves social / cultural environment, or encourages citizen involvement in community revitalization, or promotes tourism.</p>	<b>20%</b>
Lowest	Supports or initiates a new project that is not contiguous with the existing City.	

**Economic Development / Community Revitalization**

15%

Highest

Helps to create jobs or to promote economic opportunity, or helps local business, especially within an Activity Center, Federally designated Enterprise Community area, or State Enterprise Zone.

Supports job creation in areas of the City annexed between 1960 and the present in order to create a better balance of jobs and housing.

Encourages neighborhood revitalization, or addresses disinvestment in blighted areas, or improves the tax base.

Supports neighborhood-based economic development.

Lowest

Has little potential to promote economic development

Highest

**Implementation of Legal Mandates / Adopted Plans**

15%

Is required by a legal mandate defined as a City Ordinance, Joint Powers Agreement, Court ruling, and/or Federal or State regulation.

Implements departmental facility plan and/or completes an on-going phased project.

Supports and/or fulfills City's 5-Year Goals / 1-Year Objectives and program strategies.

Implements an adopted plan.

Lowest

Begins or implements a new project, not part of an adopted plan or the departmental facility plan, and/or does not help to fulfill the City's adopted Goals and Objectives.

## Attachment E

# City of Kirkland Capital Improvement Evaluation Criteria

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)**

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
(100 max)      VALUE SCORE

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**

<u>      </u>	(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
<u>      </u>	(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
<u>      </u>	(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
<u>      </u>	(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 <sup>(1)</sup>	12 points		6 points	
Business District <sup>(2)</sup>	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center <sup>(3)</sup>	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 <sup>(1)</sup>	12 points		6 points	
Business District <sup>(2)</sup>	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center <sup>(3)</sup>	6 points		3 points	
<b>Improves a Connection within a Business District</b>				
			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 <sup>(1)</sup>	12 points		6 points	
Business District <sup>(2)</sup>	12 points		6 points	
Transit/HOV Facility	Facility 12	Route 6	Facility 6	Route 3
Regional Center <sup>(3)</sup>	6 points		3 points	
<b>Improves a Connection within a Business District</b>				
			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

            
(100 max)

VALUE SCORE

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

<u>      </u>	VALUE SCORE
(100 max)	
<u>  x .20  </u>	VALUE WEIGHT
<u>      </u>	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)		<b><u>Bicycle:</u></b>	
		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)		<b><u>Pedestrian</u></b>	
_____ (25)		<b><u>Pathway:</u></b>	
		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)		<b><u>Sidewalk:</u></b>	
		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)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(100 max) VALUE SCORE

x .20 VALUE WEIGHT

===== VALUE TOTAL

STEIGER\98TPÉ.DOC:RTS\ln

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

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

# 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		<b>30</b>

- **ENVIRONMENTAL:**

Water Quality	10	
Fish Habitat	10	
Other Benefits	10	
Subtotal		<b>30</b>

- **FISCAL:**

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

- **Public Support and Plan Consistency:**

Public Support/Opposition	5	
Plan Consistency	10	
Subtotal		<b>15</b>

**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.**
- Constructed Facility
- |   |    |
|---|----|
| 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 |
- Natural Environment
- |   |    |
|---|----|
| 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)
<b>TOTAL PROJECT POINTS</b>	<b>=====</b>	<b>(100)</b>