Criteria Scoring Range

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Streets and Thoroughfare Improvements	Min	Max
1	Alley Reconstruction Criteria	0	100
2	Barrier-Free-Ramp Project Criteria	0	100
3	Alley, Sidewalk and Street Petition Project Criteria	Based on Petition	
4	Sidewalk Safety Project Criteria	0	100
5	Street Reconstruction Criteria	0	100
6	Street Resurfacing Criteria	0	100
7	Thoroughfares and Street Modifications (Bottlenecks)	0	100
8	CBD Roadway Lighting	0	100
9	Freeway Lighting	0	100
10	Enhanced Fixtures	0	100
11	CBD Traffic Signal Upgrades	0	100
12	City-Wide Traffic Signal Upgrades	0	100
13	Warranted Signals / Warranted School Flashers	0	100
14	Traffic Safety Improvements	0	100
15	Traffic Sign Upgrades	0	100
16	Bridge Repair and Modification	0	100

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Flood Protection and Storm Drainage	Min	Max
1	Erosion Control	0	115
2	Flood Management	0	Unlimited
3	Strom Drainage Relief Systems	0	Unlimited

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Library Facilities	Min	Max
1	New Construction of Library Facilities	0	60
2	Renovation / Replacement of Library Facilities	0	60

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Cultural Facilities	Min	Max
1	New Construction of Cultural Facilities	0	60
2	Renovation of Cultural Facilities	0	60

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Fire Protection Facilities	Min	Max
1	New Construction of Fire Protection	0	60
2	Renovation / Replacement of Fire Protection Facilities	0	60
3	Outdoors Siren Site Selection	0	100

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Police Facilities	Min	Max
1	New Construction of Police Facilities	0	60
2	Renovation / Replacement of Police Facilities	0	60

Program	Name	Score Range	
Category	Major Renovation/Maintenance Program	Min	Max
1	Major Maintenance Program Project	0	200

2006 Capital Bond Program Criteria Sheets

ALLEY RECONSTRUCTION CRITERIA

Revision No. 1

This category would provide reconstruction for improved alleys that have exceeded their structural life expectancy.

Step 1: **Preliminary Screening**
Review Citywide Alley Inventory and sort out all alleys which have over 50% pavement defect.

Step 2: **Prioritization Criteria**

Project: _____		Date _____	
#	Criteria	Maximum Points	Score
1	Percentage of Defect	30	
2	Time in Unsatisfactory Condition	20	
3	Alley used for Rear Entry	20	
4	Alley used for Garbage Pickup	15	
5	Availability of Existing Right-of-Way	10	
6	Drainage Issues	5	
Items 1-6 Total Score			

1. Percentage of Defect

(___ % x 0.3)

2. Time in Unsatisfactory Condition

2 point per year up to 20 points for 10 or more years.

3. Alley used for Rear Entry

20 - Yes
0 - No

4. Alley used for Garbage Pickup

15 - Yes current pickup
10 - Potential pickup
0 - Not used for pickup

5. Availability of Existing Right-of-Way

10 - 15 ft. existing ROW or citizens are willing to dedicate all necessary ROW
5 - Inadequate ROW but some citizens are willing to dedicate necessary ROW
0 - Inadequate ROW throughout

6. Drainage Issues

5 - Alley & property flooding
3 - Additional drainage capacities needed
0 - No drainage concern

BARRIER-FREE-RAMPS

This program provides for the construction of new barrier-free ramps (BFRs) at street intersections where BFRs do not exist.

Barrier-free-ramp projects are requested by the general public. The priority is given to walkways serving government offices and facilities, Health cares facilities (hospitals, clinics, retirement facilities, etc.), bus stops and transportation centers (DART), Commercial Districts (private businesses offering goods and services to the public), Schools, followed by walkways serving residential areas.

Following are the factors and the associated scores. Priority will be given to projects with highest total score using various factors. The maximum total score for each project is 100.

	Project:		**Date:**
#	**Factors**	**Maximum Point**	**Score**
1	Places of Public Accommodation	70	
2	Posted Speeds	10	
3	Date of Request	10	
4	Number of Users	10	
	Total Score	100	

1. Places of Public Accommodation (Maximum Score: 70 points)

a.	Governmental Facilities (City Hall, Court House, Tax Offices, Recreation Centers, Libraries, etc.)	15
b.	Major Health Care Facilities (Baylor, Parkland, Methodist, etc.)	15
c.	Retirement Centers	10
d.	Minor Health Care Facilities (Clinics, Doctor offices, etc.)	4
e.	Commercial Districts	10
f.	Bus Stops & Transportation Centers	10
g.	Schools	5
h.	Residential District	1

2. Posted Traffic Speed

0 to 30 MPH	0
30 to 45 MPH	5
Over 45 MPH	10

3. Date of Request

1 year	1
2 years	2
.	.
.	.
10 years or longer	10

4. Number of physically challenged users (provided by requestor)

1 user	1
2 users	2
.	.
.	.
9 users	9
10 or more users	10

ALLEY, SIDEWALK, AND STREET PETITION PROJECT CRITERIA

Alley, sidewalk and street petition projects are initiated by citizen requests. Petition are issued for unimproved alleys (gravel or dirt; asphalt alleys are not eligible) and unimproved street without curbs and gutters.

Alley, sidewalk and street petition projects are validated by meeting the following requirement:

- Signatures or 2/3 majority of the abutting property owners and ½ of the property frontage, or
- Signatures of ½ of the abutting property owners and 2/3 of the property frontage

Alley, sidewalk and street petition projects are prioritized by date of petition validation.

SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT PROJECT CRITERIA

Sidewalk Replacement Program is a cost share program between the City and the citizens. This program was created to assist property owners with the cost of replacing sidewalks. Under this program, the City will pay 50% and the property owners will pay 50% for the sidewalk replacement cost.

Sidewalk replacements are prioritized by the date order of validated request.

SIDEWALK SAFETY PROJECT CRITERIA
Revision No 1

Sidewalk Safety projects are requested by parents, teachers, school administrators and general public.

The authority to recommend a sidewalk safety project to be added to the needs inventory is vested in the Citizen Safety Advisory Committee (CSAC). Sidewalk safety projects are recommended based on construction feasibility, traffic, and pedestrian analysis. The following factors will be used by staff to determine the project priority. Priority will be given to projects with the highest total score. The maximum score is 100.

Project: _____ **Date:** _____

#	Factors	Maximum Points	Score
1	Construction Feasibility	60	
2	Type of Pedestrian	15	
3	Pedestrian Count	10	
4	Traffic Volumes	10	
5	Date of Request	5	
	ITEMS 1-5 TOTAL SCORE		

1. Construction Feasibility: Score:

< $30 per linear foot	60
$30 to $80 per linear foot	30
$80 to $150 per linear foot	10
> $150 per linear foot	1

2. Type of Pedestrian:

Elementary/Preschool Student	15
Middle School Student, Senior Citizens	11
High School Student, Parent with Strollers	8
Other	5

3. Pedestrian Count: (School children will be counted before and after school hours: other – peak hours)

1	1
2	2
3	3
.	.
	.

9	9
10 or more	10

4. Posted Traffic Speed:

0 to 30 MPH	0
30 to 45 MPH	5
> 45 MPH	10

5. Date of Request:

1 Year	1
2 Years	2
3 Years	3
4 Years	4
5 Years or Longer	5

STREET RECONSTRUCTION CRITERIA
(Revised 11/05)

This category would provide reconstruction for streets that have exceeded their structural life expectancy.

Step 1: Preliminary Screening

Use the Pavement Management Program (PMP) to determine the street blocks in need of reconstruction. The PMP assigns a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) to each street block and recommends treatment type to improve the condition to or maintain the block in a satisfactory condition.

Step 2: Field Inspection/Evaluation

Step 3: Prioritization

Use the factors below to score and prioritize projects.

Project: _____ Date: _____

#	Criteria	Maximum Point	Score
1	Pavement Condition Index	50	
2	Time in Unsatisfactory Condition	10	
3	Zoning	10	
4	Street Classification	15	
5	Economic Development	10	
6	DWU Work Plan Project	5	

1. **Pavement Condition Index**
   (100-PCI) x 0.5

2. **Time in Unsatisfactory Condition**
   1 point per year up to 10 points for 10 or more years.

3. **Zoning**
   10 - Commercial
   8 - General Retail & Offices
   6 - Multifamily Residential
   2 - Residential

4. **Street Classification**
   15 - Major Thoroughfare
   10 - Secondary Thoroughfare
   5 - Collector
   0 - Residential

5. **Economic Development**
   10 - Yes
   0 - No

6. **DWU Work Plan Project**
   5 - Yes
   0 - No

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM
Street Resurfacing Criteria 2006 Bond Program

Step 1: Use the Street Services Department's Pavement Management Program (PMP) to determine the street blocks in most need of improvement. The PMP assigns a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) to each street block in the city and recommends a form of treatment to improve or maintain the block to a satisfactory rating.

Step 2: Build street segments from the blocks determined to be in need of resurfacing. This process will also take place and be refined during step 3.

Step 3: Field inspect to evaluate the worst approximately 1000 lane miles of street segments. Field evaluation provides a more accurate determination of treatment needed to improve the street, determines final segment limits, and provides the basis for a cost estimate.

Step 4: Rate the field evaluated street segments using the factors below.

Project: _____			Date:_____
#	Criteria	Max Score	Score
1	Pavement Condition Index	50	
2	Time in Unsatisfactory Condition	20	
3	Use Classification	15	
4	Economic Development	10	
5	DWU Work Plan Project	5	
		Total Score	

1. Pavement Condition Index

   (100 – PCI) X 0.50

2. Time in Unsatisfactory Condition

   1 - 1 year
   2 - 2 years
   3 - 3 years
   .
   .
   20 - 20 years and over

3. Use Classification

   15 - Principal Arterial (Freeway, Thoroughfare, Major Couplet, and Divided Secondary)
   10 - Minor Arterial/Community Collector (non-divided Secondary and Commercial/Collector)
   5 - Local (Residential)

4. Economic Development

   10 - Yes
   0 - No

5. DWU Work Plan Project

   5 - Yes
   0 - No

The Street Resurfacing inventory of needs will be comprised of the approximately 1000 lane miles of field evaluated and rated street segments plus the remaining blocks of streets recommended for resurfacing by the PMP. **NOTE: Street blocks recommended for resurfacing by the PMP have not been field evaluated. Before they are recommended for resurfacing, they should be field inspected, evaluated, an accurate cost estimate completed, and a rating performed using the criteria above.**

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM
THOROUGHFARES AND STREET MODIFICATIONS (BOTTLENECKS)

Proposed Revision / December 2005

Project:_____		Date_____	
#	Criteria	Score	Total
Mobility (30 points)			
1	Capacity Deficiency	10	
2	System Continuity	10	
3	Intermodal/Multimodal	10	
Safety (30 points)			
4	Accident Rate	10	
5	Proximity to Schools and Parks	10	
6	Existing Street Condition	10	
Economic Development (40 points)			
7	Economic Development Support	15	
8	Distressed/Underutilized Area Support	15	
9	Previous Project Commitment/Coordination	10	
Total Score (maximum 100 points) =			

Thoroughfares and Street Modifications (Bottlenecks)
Maximum total score: 100 points

MOBILITY (30 points)

1. Capacity Deficiency (current volume to capacity ratio)
   Maximum score: 10 points

   A project will receive up to 10 points based on the ratio of existing daily traffic volume to existing roadway capacity (V/C ratio).

Capacity Deficiency Criteria	Points
V/C ratio less than 0.7	0
V/C ratio 0.7 to 0.8	3
V/C ratio 0.8 to 0.9	6
V/C ratio 0.9 to 1.0	9
V/C ratio greater than 1.0	10

99

2. System Continuity
   Maximum score: 10 points

   A project will receive 10 points if it provides lane continuity across an intersection or provides lane balance for a section of roadway connecting to existing roadway sections.

3. Intermodal / Multimodal
   Maximum score: 10 points

Intermodal / Multimodal Criteria	Points
Bus Route / Rail Station	3
Bicycle Route	3
Truck Route	3
No Existing Sidewalks*	1

*The project will add sidewalks.

SAFETY (30 points)

4. Accident Rate
   Maximum score: 10 points

   A project will receive up to 10 points based on an assessment by District Engineering staff that takes into consideration field observations, geometric deficiencies, reported accidents, and citizen complaints.

Accident Rate Criteria	Points
Low Risk	0
Medium Risk	5
High Risk	10

5. Proximity to Schools and Parks
   Maximum score: 10 points

   A project will receive 10 points if it provides direct access to a park or school.

6. Existing Street Condition
   Maximum score: 10 points

   A project will receive 5 points for a street surface condition rating of “D” and 10 points for a rating of “E.”

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (40 points)

7. Economic Development Support
   Maximum score: 15 points

   A project will receive up to 15 points based on an assessment by Economic Development that identifies whether a project supports Council-endorsed economic development projects/programs.

Economic Development Support Criteria	Points
No Initiatives	0
Low Priority	5
Medium Priority	10
High Priority	15

8. Distressed/Underutilized Area Support
   Maximum score: 15 points

   A project will receive up to 15 points based on the percentage of the project located within census blocks classified as “distressed” or “underutilized” as defined by the Dallas County Tax Abatement Policy.

9. Previous Project Commitment / Coordination
   Maximum score: 10 points

   A project will receive 10 points based on a prior Council action supporting the project for funding through a partnership program and/or existing funding commitment in a prior bond program.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Street Lighting--CBD Roadway Lighting**	Date:_____

Description: Funds would be used to install approximately 300 “shoe-box-style” 1000-watt metal halide street lights in the Central Business District in order to complete the 1981 CBD Roadway Lighting Master Plan.

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Traffic Volumes		40	
2	Pedestrian Volumes		30	
3	DART Access		30	
	Items 1-3 RATING/3 =	TOTAL WEIGHTED		

1. Traffic Volumes

   0 Street has low traffic volumes (under 5,000 vehicles/day)
   2 Street has moderate traffic volumes (between 5,000 and 10,000 vehicles/day)
   3 Street has high traffic volumes (more than 10,000 vehicles/day)

2. Pedestrian Volumes

   0 Street has low pedestrian volumes (under 25 pedestrians during any one hour)
   2 Street has moderate pedestrian volumes (between 25 and 100 pedestrians during any one hour)
   3 Street has high pedestrian volumes (more than 100 pedestrians during any one hour)

3. DART Access

   0 Street lies more than 1/2 mile from DART Transit Mall and/or has no bus stops
   1 Street lies between 1/4 and 1/2 mile from DART Transit Mall and/or has one bus stop
   2 Street lies between one and two blocks from DART Transit Mall and/or has 2-3 bus stops
   3 Street intersects DART Transit Mall and/or has more than 3 bus stops

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Street Lighting–Freeway Lighting**	Date:_____
Description: Funds would be used to pay the City's share of the installation cost of lighting along approximately 40 miles of freeway within the City of Dallas that are currently not illuminated.	

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	TxDOT's Construction Schedule		90	
2	Traffic Volumes		10	
	Items 1-2 RATING/3 =	TOTAL WEIGHTED		

1. TxDOT's Construction Schedule

   0 Freeway is scheduled for reconstruction beyond 5 years or not scheduled for reconstruction
   1 Freeway is scheduled for reconstruction within 3 to 5 years
   3 Freeway is scheduled for reconstruction within next 3 years

2. Traffic Volumes

   0 Freeway has low traffic volumes (under 50,000 vehicles per day)
   2 Freeway has moderate traffic volumes (between 50,000 and 150,000 vehicles per day)
   3 Freeway has high traffic volumes (more than 150,000 vehicles per day)

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Street Lighting–Enhanced Fixtures**	Date:_____

Description: Funds would be used to install historic-style street lights in lieu of conventional street lights in 5 designated historic districts.

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Availability of Other Funding		80	
2	Community Involvement		20	
	Items 1-2 RATING/3 =	TOTAL WEIGHTED		

1. Availability of Other Funding

   0 There is no other funding available
   1 Less than 20% of the funding is available from other sources (Community Development Block Grants, private funding, etc.)
   2 Between 20% and 80% of the funding is available from other sources
   3 More than 80% of the funding is available from other sources

2. Community Involvement

   0 There has been no citizen requests received
   1 There has been one citizen request received
   2 Two to three citizen requests have been received
   3 More than 3 citizen requests have been received

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Traffic Signal Upgrades–CBD**	Date:_____

Description: Funds would be used to replace traffic signal hardware in the Central Business District that is structurally-deficient and/or that include signal displays that are difficult to see. Signal poles would be replaced by "streetscape-style" hardware which have higher signal display mounting heights providing better visibility.

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Availability of Other Funding		70	
2	Visibility of Signal Heads		20	
3	Age of Hardware		10	
	Items 1-3 RATING/3 =	TOTAL WEIGHTED		

1. Availability of Other Funding

   0 There is no other funding available
   3 Funding is available from other sources (Community Development Block Grants, private funding, etc.)

2. Visibility of Signal Heads

   0 All signal heads are within the 20? cone of vision and are clearly visible
   1 One signal head lies outside the 20? cone of vision and/or is not clearly visible
   2 Two signal heads lie outside the 20? cone of vision and/or are not clearly visible
   3 More than 2 signal heads lie outside the 20? cone of vision and/or are not clearly visible

3. Age of Hardware

   0 Hardware is less than 10 years old
   1 Hardware is 10 to 20 years old
   2 Hardware is 20 to 30 years old
   3 Hardware is over 30 years old

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Traffic Signal Upgrades–City-Wide**	Date:_____

Description: Funds would be used to replace traffic signal hardware outside the Central Business District that is structurally-deficient and/or prone to being damaged by vehicles, and/or requires operational improvement such as the addition of left turn signals or pedestrian signals.

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Age of Hardware		30	
2	Number of Times Hardware Damaged		30	
3	Need for Operational Improvements		30	
4	Proximity to Other Upgraded Signals		10	
	Items 1-4 RATING/3 =	TOTAL WEIGHTED		

1. Age of Hardware

   0 Hardware is less than 10 years old
   1 Hardware is 10 to 20 years old
   2 Hardware is 20 to 30 years old
   3 Hardware is over 30 years old

2. Number of Times Hardware Damaged

   0 No records of any hardware damage
   1 Hardware has been damaged once in the last 5 years
   2 Hardware has been damaged 2-3 times in the last 5 years
   3 Hardware has been damaged more than 3 times in the last 5 years

3. Need for Operational Improvements

   0 There are no operational improvements to the signal required
   1 There is one operational improvement required (left turn signals, pedestrian signal heads, louvers, etc.)
   2 There are 2 operational improvements required
   3 There are 3 or more operational improvements required

4. Proximity to Other Upgraded Signals

   0 Intersection is not near any upgraded signal hardware location
   1 Intersection is near several upgraded signal hardware locations
   2 Intersection is near many upgraded signal hardware locations
   3 Intersection has the only signal in the area whose hardware has not been upgraded

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Warranted Signals/School Flashers**	Date:_____

Description: Funds would be used to construct traffic signals at approximately 12 unsignalized intersections per year that meet the criteria (warrants) for traffic signal installations. In addition, funds would be used for the installation of approximately 10 to 15 new school zones with flashers per year.

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Traffic Volumes		50	
2	Pedestrian Volumes/Age of Pedestrians		10	
3	Number of Accidents		10	
4	Number of Warrants Met		10	
5	How Long Signal has been Justified		20	
	Items 1-5 RATING/3 =	TOTAL WEIGHTED		

Traffic Volumes
- 0 Minor street has low traffic volumes and major street has sufficient gaps
- 1 Minor street has low traffic volumes and major street has few sufficient gaps
- 2 Minor street has moderate traffic volumes and major street has few sufficient gaps
- 3 Minor street has high traffic volumes and major street has few sufficient gaps

Pedestrian Volumes
- 0 Intersection has low pedestrian volumes and/or less than 10% of pedestrians are under 12 years old
- 2 Intersection has moderate pedestrian volumes and/or between 10% and 50% of pedestrians are under 12 years old
- 3 Intersection has high pedestrian volumes and/or over 50% of pedestrians are under 12 years old

Number of Accidents
- 0 Intersection has had no reported accidents in the last year that were susceptible to correction by signal control
- 1 Intersection has had 1-2 reported accidents in the last year that were susceptible to correction by signal control
- 2 Intersection has had 3-4 reported accidents in the last year that were susceptible to correction by signal control
- 3 Intersection has had 5 or more reported accidents in the last year that were susceptible to correction by signal control

Number of Warrants Met
- 0 Intersection meets only one signal warrant
- 1 Intersection meets 2 signal warrants
- 2 Intersection meets 3 signal warrants
- 3 Intersection meets 4 or more signal warrants

How Long Signal has been Justified
- 0 Signal has been justified for less than 1 month
- 1 Signal has been justified for 1 to 3 months
- 2 Signal has been justified for 3 to 6 months
- 3 Signal has been justified for more than 6 months

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Traffic Safety Improvements**	Date:_____

Description: Funds would be used to upgrade the Police Department's traffic accident database software to automate the preparation of accident diagrams, to analyze these diagrams to determine locations with accident trends and high accident rates and identify countermeasures to improve safety. Funds would also be used to implement identified countermeasures such as guardrails, warning flashers, traffic signs, traffic signal hardware or timing improvements, street lighting and minor geometric improvements (such as left turn lanes).

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Accident Trend Type		50	
2	Number of Accidents per Trend		30	
3	Traffic Volumes		20	
	Items 1-3 RATING/3 =		TOTAL WEIGHTED	

1. Accident Trend Type

   0 No accident trend type can be determined
   1 Left turn versus opposing through traffic accident trend/rear-end accident trend
   2 Right angle accident trend
   3 Multiple accident trends are occurring

2. Number of Accidents per Trend

   0 No accident trend type can be determined
   1 3 to 5 accidents per accident trend type occurred at the site in a one-year period
   2 6 to 9 accidents per accident trend type occurred at the site in a one-year period
   3 10 or more accidents per accident trend type occurred at the site in a one-year period

3. Traffic Volumes

   0 Site has low traffic volumes (under 5,000 vehicles/day)
   2 Site has moderate traffic volumes (between 5,000 and 20,000 vehicles/day)
   3 Site has high traffic volumes (more than 20,000 vehicles/day)

Outdoor Sirens Site Selection Criteria

This category would provide **Replacement and Installation Outdoor Warning Sirens.**

Step: 1 **Preliminary Screening**

Review all sirens and identify top 60% for prioritization

Step: 2 **Prioritization Criteria**

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Coverage	
2	Population Covered	
3	Risk Assessment Criteria	
4	Siren Condition	
5	Location Characteristics	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Improve overall coverage and increase the number of citizens that receive the warning

Provides early warning of imminent hazards to the citizens of Dallas

1 Current Coverage (30)

0-30 In accordance to siren system survey (provided by contractor)

2 Population Covered (25)

0-10 Total population

0-5 Single family homes

0-5 Multiple family units

0-5 Businesses

3 Risk Assessment Criteria (25)

6 Indoor/Outdoor Entertainment Venues (Stadiums, Concert halls, etc.)

5 School

4 Hazardous Material Facilities

4 Medical Facilities

2 Parks in area

2 Flood prone areas

2 Business District / Large Business Building Complex

4 Siren Condition (10)

0-6 Functionality (higher points awarded for non-functional units)

0-2 Number of service calls

0-2 Date purchased (higher points awarded to older units)

5 Location Characteristics (10)

2 Power transmitter in area

2 Right-of-way space available

2 Clear of overhead utilities

2 Clear of underground utilities

2 Current siren location available for use

Step 3 **Follow recommendation of Master Plan for installation or replacement, or**
Evaluate how new siren will improve overall coverage

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM

Project Category: **Traffic Sign Upgrades-City-Wide**	Date:_____

Description: Currently there are over 500,000 traffic signs Citywide. Approximately 80% of these signs are over 20 years old and no longer meet national sign standards for visibility. Funds would be used to replace signs in a phased implementation strategy that focuses on school zones, traffic signals, arterials, and collector streets. Stop signs and street name blades on residential streets would also be replaced. Funds would also be used to purchase systems design and sign inventory software.

#	Criteria	Rating (0-3)	Weight	Weighted Total
1	Sign Location		70	
2	Traffic Volumes		30	
Items 1-2 RATING/3 =			TOTAL WEIGHTED	

1. Sign Location

   0 Residential street
   1 Minor arterial or collector
   2 Principal arterial
   3 School zone or traffic signal

2. Traffic Volumes

   0 Street has low traffic volumes (under 5,000 vehicles/day)
   2 Street has moderate traffic volumes (between 5,000 and 20,000 vehicles/day)
   3 Street has high traffic volumes (more than 20,000 vehicles/day)

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT RATING FORM
CATEGORY: EROSION CONTROL[1]

This category would provide armoring of natural creek banks to protect soil against further erosion loss. Potential projects are classified by type as follows:
Type I: Threat to houses, garages, streets, alleys and bridges.
Type II: Threat to pools and other permanent structures not included in Type I.
Type III: Threat to fences, yards and private retaining walls.

Project:		Date:
No.	Criteria	Points
1	Ratio of (distance creek bank to structure/depth of creek)	
2	Rate of creek bank loss	
3	Ratio of (cost/number of structures protected)	
4	Type of threat	
	TOTAL POINTS:	

SCORE = (TOTAL POINTS X 0.8696) + (3 – Ratio Value)

SCORE = _____

Criteria:

1. Ratio of (distance to structure)/(depth)

Ratio value	Points
0 to 0.25	40
0.26 to 0.59	35
0.60 to 1.00	30
1.01 to 1.25	20
1.26 to 1.50	10
1.51 to 2.00	5
Greater than 2.00	0

2. Rate of creek bank loss

Rate	Points
Rapid	40
Moderately fast	30
Moderate	25
Moderately slow	20
Slow	10
Very slow	5

3. Ratio of (cost)/(number of structures protected)

Ratio	Points
0 to 50,000	20
50,001 to 150,000	15
Greater than 150,000	5

4. Type of threat

Type	Points
I	15
II	5
III	0

[1] Revised 10/28/05

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT RATING FORM
CATEGORY: FLOOD MANAGEMENT[1]

This category includes sites for which channel improvements, levees, detention basins, or bridge or culvert replacements are necessary to reduce flooding; also included is the voluntary purchase of homes in the flood plain when no other viable alternative exists.

Project:		Date:
No.	Criteria	Points
1	Frequency of flooding	
2	Depth of flooding	
3	Depth X velocity over bridges	
4	Number of affected structures X 3	
5	Ratio of (cost/affected structures)	
	TOTAL POINTS:	

Criteria: 1. Frequency of flooding

Frequency	Points
2-year or less	25
5-year	20
10-year	18
25-year	15
100-year	10

SCORE = _____

2. Depth of flooding (100-year)

Depth	Points
4 feet or more	30
2 to 4 feet	25
1 to 2 feet	15
Less than 1 foot	5

3. Depth and velocity of flow over bridges (100-year)

   (depth of flow on roadway in feet) X (velocity in fps) = points

4. Number of affected structures

   3 points per affected structure

5. Ratio of cost per affected structure

Value	Points
Less than 100,000	10
100,000 to 500,000	5
Greater than 500,000	1

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT RATING FORM
CATEGORY: STORM DRAINAGE RELIEF SYSTEMS[1]

This category includes additional drainage inlets and storm sewer pipe systems to optimize existing inadequate drainage systems in developed areas.

Project:		Date:
No.	Criteria	Points
1	Type/effect of flooding	
2	Frequency of flooding	
3	Depth of flooding	
4	Number of affected structures X 3	
5	Ratio of (cost/affected structure)	
	TOTAL POINTS:	

Criteria:

1. Type/effect of flooding

Type/effect	Points
Multiple structures	20
Single structure	10
Street only	5

SCORE = _____

2. Frequency of flooding

Frequency	Points
2-year or less	25
5-year	20
10-year	18
25-year	15
100-year	10

3. Depth of flooding (100-year)

Depth	Points
3 feet or more	30
1 to 3 feet	20
Less than 1 foot	5

2. Number of affected structures

3 points per affected structure

3. Ratio of cost per affected structure

Value	Points
Less than 50,000	10
50,000 to 500,000	5
Greater than 500,000	1

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT RATING FORM
CATEGORY: BRIDGE REPAIR AND MODIFICATION[1]

This category includes needs for repair and modification of bridges due to structural deficiencies identified in the biannual Bridge Inspection and Appraisal Program (BRINSAP) performed by Texas Department of Transportation.

Project:		Date:
No.	Criteria	Points
1	Sum of (9-*n*) - condition of components	
2	Critical structural element evaluation	
3	Existing capacity vs. traffic volume	
4	Whether project leverages funding	
	TOTAL POINTS:	

SCORE = TOTAL POINTS X 1.25

SCORE = _____

Criteria:

Component	(9-*n*)
Deck:	
Superstructure:	
Substructure:	
Channel:	
Culverts:	
Approaches:	
Misc.:	
TOTAL:	

(*n* is lowest element rating)

1. Condition of components: deck, superstructure, substructure, channel, culverts, approaches

   Points for this factor are the sum of (9 – *n*), where *n* is the rating for the worst element of each component and has a value of 5 or less (maximum points are 48, for a bridge with six components rated "1")

2. Critical structural element evaluation

   Points for this factor range from 0 to 20 based on severity of the condition of a particular component

3. Existing capacity compared to current traffic volume

Comparison	Points
capacity exceeded	10
at capacity	5
under capacity	0

4. Whether project leverages other funds

Leverages	Points
yes	10
no	0

[1] Revised 10/28/05

CULTURAL FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide for **New Construction** of Cultural Facilities.

Step: 1 Preliminary Screening
Review all Cultural facilities and identify top 50% for prioritization.

Step: 2 Prioritization Criteria

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Service Demand	
3	Site Status	
4	Design Status	
5	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically Centralized
Provides unique cultural services to neighborhoods.

1 Current Master Plan
0-20 Current Master Plan existing

2 Service Demand
10-25 Centrally located for service delivery
0-10 Service delivery criteria to be met in next 5 years

0-5 Economic development stimulus

3 Site Acquisition Status
20 Acquired
15 In negotiation
10 Site(s) identified
0 No Site

4 Design Status
20 Project ready for bids
15 Project in design
10 Consultant selected
0 No consultant selected

5 Leverage Funding
10 Project leverages other funds
0 Project does not leverage other funds

CULTURAL FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide **Renovation/Replacement** of Cultural Facilities

Step: 1 **Preliminary Screening**

Review all Cultural facilities and identify top 30% for prioritization

Step: 2 **Prioritization Criteria**

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Location Characteristics	
3	Functionality of Facility	
4	Facility Condition	
5	Systems Condition	
6	Design Status	
7	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically centralized

Provides unique cultural services to neighborhoods

1 Current Master Plan

0-20 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Location Characteristics

0-10 Centrally located for service delivery

0-4 Compatible land use

0-3 Adequate site for expansion/parking

0-3 Economic development stimulus

3 Functionality of Facility

0 Meets facility service delivery criteria

2 Facility can be modified to meet service delivery needs

4 Facility cannot be modified to meet service delivery needs

4 Capacity exceeded

2 At capacity

0 Under capacity

0 Meets accessibility standards

2 Does not meet accessibility standards

4 Facility Condition

0-3 Exterior envelope - roof

0-3 Exterior envelope - walls

0-3 Exterior envelope - glazing systems

0-3 Structural system

0-3 Interior Condition

0-3 Site

5 Systems Condition

0-3 Mechanical

0-3 Electrical

0-3 Plumbing

0-3 Fire Protection

6 Design Status

10 Project ready for bids

8 Project in design

5 Consultant selected

0 No consultant selected

7 Leverage Funding

10 Project leverages other funds

0 Project does not leverage other funds

Step 3 **Follow recommendation of Master Plan for renovation or replacement, or**

Evaluate effectiveness of renovation vs. replacement

If renovation cost is equal to or exceeds 75% of the replacement cost, it should be replaced

(Historic Exception)

FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide for **New Construction** of Fire Protection Facilities

Step: 1 Preliminary Screening
Review all fire protection facilities and identify top 50% for prioritization

Step: 2 Prioritization Criteria

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Service Demand	
3	Site Status	
4	Design Status	
5	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically Centralized for emergency response

1 Current Master Plan
0-20 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Service Demand
10-25 Centrally located for service delivery including ISO recommendations
0-10 Service delivery criteria to be met in next 5 years
0-5 Economic development stimulus

3 Site Acquisition Status
20 Acquired
15 In negotiation
10 Site(s) identified
0 No Site

4 Design Status
20 Project ready for bids
15 Project in design
10 Consultant selected
0 No consultant selected

5 Leverage Funding
10 Project leverages other funds
0 Project does not leverage other funds

FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide **Renovation/Replacement** of Fire Protection Facilities

Step: 1 Preliminary Screening

Review all fire protection facilities and identify top 20% for prioritization

Step: 2 Prioritization Criteria

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Location Characteristics	
3	Functionality of Facility	
4	Facility Condition	
5	Systems Condition	
6	Design Status	
7	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically centralized for emergency response

1 Current Master Plan

0-10 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Location Characteristics

0-20 Centrally located for service delivery including ISO recommendations
0-4 Compatible land use
0-3 Adequate site for expansion/parking
0-3 Economic development stimulus

3 Functionality of Facility

0 Meets facility service delivery criteria
2 Facility can be modified to meet service delivery needs
4 Facility cannot be modified to meet service delivery needs
4 Capacity exceeded
2 At capacity
0 Under capacity
0 Meets accessibility standards
2 Does not meet accessibility standards

4 Facility Condition

0-3 Exterior envelope - roof
0-3 Exterior envelope - walls
0-3 Exterior envelope - glazing systems
0-3 Structural system
0-3 Interior Condition
0-3 Site

5 Systems Condition

0-3 Mechanical
0-3 Electrical
0-3 Plumbing
0-3 Fire Protection

6 Design Status

10 Project ready for bids
8 Project in design
5 Consultant selected
0 No consultant selected

7 Leverage Funding

10 Project leverages other funds
0 Project does not leverage other funds

Step 3 Follow recommendation of Master Plan for renovation or replacement, or Evaluate effectiveness of renovation vs. replacement

If renovation cost is equal to or exceeds 75% of the replacement cost, it should be replaced (Historic Exception)

LIBRARY FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide for **New Construction** of Library Facilities

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Service Demand	
3	Site Status	
4	Design Status	
5	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically Centralized

1 Current Master Plan

0-20 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Service Demand

15-25 Centrally located for service delivery

0-10 Service delivery criteria to be met in next 5 years

0-5 Economic development stimulus

3 Site Acquisition Status

20 Acquired

15 In negotiation

10 Site(s) identified

0 No Site

4 Design Status

20 Project ready for bids

15 Project in design

10 Consultant selected

0 No consultant selected

5 Leverage Funding

10 Project leverages other funds

0 Project does not leverage other funds

LIBRARY FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide **Renovation/Replacement** of Library Facilities

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Location Characteristics	
3	Functionality of Facility	
4	Facility Condition	
5	Systems Condition	
6	Design Status	
7	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically Centralized

1 **Current Master Plan**

0-20 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Location Characteristics

0-10 Centrally located for service delivery
0-4 Compatible land use
0-3 Adequate site for expansion/parking
0-3 Economic development stimulus

3 Functionality of Facility

0 Meets facility service delivery criteria
2 Facility can be modified to meet service delivery needs
4 Facility cannot be modified to meet service delivery needs
4 Capacity exceeded
2 At capacity
0 Under capacity
0 Meets accessibility standards
2 Does not meet accessibility standards

4 Facility Condition

0-3 Exterior envelope - roof
0-3 Exterior envelope - walls
0-3 Exterior envelope - glazing systems
0-3 Structural system
0-3 Interior Condition
0-3 Site

5 Systems Condition

0-3 Mechanical
0-3 Electrical
0-3 Plumbing
0-3 Fire Protection

6 Design Status

10 Project ready for bids
8 Project in design
5 Consultant selected
0 No consultant selected

7 Leverage Funding

10 Project leverages other funds
0 Project does not leverage other funds

Step 3 Follow recommendation of Master Plan for renovation or replacement, or evaluate effectiveness of renovation vs. replacement

If renovation cost is equal to or exceeds 75% of the replacement cost, it should be replaced (Historic Exception)

POLICE FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide for **New Construction** of Police Facilities

Step: 1 Preliminary Screening

Review all police facilities in the Needs Inventory. Identify top 50% for prioritization

Step: 2 Prioritization Criteria

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Service Demand	
3	Site Status	
4	Design Status	
5	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically Centralized

1 **Current Master Plan**

0-20 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Service Demand

10-25 Centrally located for service delivery

0-10 Service delivery criteria to be met in next 5 years

0-5 Economic development stimulus

3 Site Acquisition Status

20 Acquired

15 In negotiation

10 Site(s) identified

0 No Site

4 **Design Status**

20 Project ready for bids

15 Project in design

10 Consultant selected

0 No consultant selected

5 **Leverage Funding**

10 Project leverages other funds

0 Project does not leverage other funds

POLICE FACILITIES CRITERIA

This category would provide **Renovation/Replacement** of Police Facilities

Step: 1 Preliminary Screening

Review all police facilities and identify top 20% for prioritization.

Step: 2 Prioritization Criteria

	CRITERIA SUMMARY	POINTS
1	Current Master Plan	
2	Location Characteristics	
3	Functionality of Facility	
4	Facility Condition	
5	Systems Condition	
6	Design Status	
7	Leverage Funding	
	TOTAL POINTS	0

SERVICE DELIVERY OUTLINE:

Geographically Centralized

1 **Current Master Plan**

0-20 Compliance with Master Plan

2 Location Characteristics

0-10 Centrally located for service delivery
0-4 Compatible land use
0-3 Adequate site for expansion/parking
0-3 Economic development stimulus

3 Functionality of Facility

0 Meets facility service delivery criteria
2 Facility can be modified to meet service delivery needs
4 Facility cannot be modified to meet service delivery needs
4 Capacity exceeded
2 At capacity
0 Under capacity
0 Meets accessibility standards
2 Does not meet accessibility standards

4 Facility Condition

0-3 Exterior envelope - roof
0-3 Exterior envelope - walls
0-3 Exterior envelope - glazing systems
0-3 Structural system
0-3 Interior Condition
0-3 Site

5 Systems Condition

0-3 Mechanical
0-3 Electrical
0-3 Plumbing
0-3 Fire Protection

6 Design Status

10 Project ready for bids
8 Project in design
5 Consultant selected
0 No consultant selected

7 Leverage Funding

10 Project leverages other funds
0 Project does not leverage other funds

Step 3 Follow recommendation of Master Plan for renovation or replacement, or evaluate effectiveness of renovation vs. replacement

If renovation cost is equal to or exceeds 75% of the replacement cost, it should be replaced (Historic Exception)

Equipment and Building Services

Technical Scoring Criteria for Major Renovation/Maintenance Program (Building Components)

Name of facility: _____

Address of facility: _____

Council District location: _____

Name of project: _____

Customer departments: _____

Identify the type of project (points for only one building component)

Envelope - Roof	30	
Envelope - Non-Roof (walls, windows, glazing systems, doors, expansion joints, sealant joints)	30	
Structure (structural frame of the building, foundation, piers)	20	
Systems (mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire protection)	20	
Access (TAS/ADA: disabled building access)	10	
Finish (paint, flooring)	5	
Parking/Paving (includes concrete flatwork and sidewalks)	5	
Addition/Improvement (addition to existing building/upgrade of existing building component)	5	

Answer the following questions for the one building component specified above:

A What is level of risk or threat to health and safety of the facility occupants? 0-25

No threat=0 Low threat(allergy exposures)=5 Medium threat(mold/mildew exposure)=10 Moderate threat(potential asbestos exposure)=15 Medium high threat(trip hazard/risk of falling)=20 High threat(danger of serious bodily injury)=25

B Is the facility in an unplanned closing due to the condition of the component? 0/15

No=0 Yes=15

C Is the component in compliance with codes and regulations (except grand-fathered)? 0-20

In compliance=0 Minor code issues cited by Fire Marshal=5 ADA plan, some compliance work done=10 ADA plan, no work done=15 No ADA plan, no work done=20

D What is level of risk or potential damage for other building components? 0-15

Low=0 ranging up to High=15

E Does the facility have other components identified as needing improvement/repair? 0-10

No other components=0 A few components(1-3)=4 Several components(4-5)=8 Many components (Should all repairs/replacements on the property be done concurrently?)=10

F	What is level of risk or potential damage for contents of facility? *No Damage=0 Low (minimal damage anticipated, readily repairable)=5 Moderate(considerable damage, requires replacement of building components to repair)=10 High(substantial damage anticipated, major building component will require replacement-like*	0-15	
G	Will repair/improvement further a facility master plan? *No=0 Yes=5*	0/5	
H	Is facility funded in current or recommended Bond Program for replacement or major renovation? *No=0 Yes=(-100)*	(-100)	
I	What level of funding is available from non-General Fund sources or through warranty? *0=None 10=Some 15=50/50 split 20=60/40 split 25=70/30 split 30=full funding*	0-30	
J	Is there a current design already in place for the repair/improvement? *No=0 Yes=5*	0/5	
K	What is the age of the component? *0=New 1=>50%EUL 3=>75%EUL 5=>100% EUL; EUL=Expected Useful Life*	0-5	
L	Has facility received other major maintenance funding over last 5 years for other components? *Yes=0 No=5*	0-5	
M	How many work orders has the component had over the last 2 years? *1=None 3=up to 25 5=more than 25*	0-5	
N	What has been the cost of the work orders over the last 2 years? *1= 1.00 to 500. 3=501.-2500. 5=2500>*	0-5	
O	Will improvement/repair result in savings or cost avoidance (i.e. save on utility cost)? *No=0 Yes=5*	0/5	
P	Does improvement/repair further a City Council Key Focus Area? *1=supports Economic Development 1=supports Staff Accountability 1=supports Neighborhood Quality 1=supports Public Safety 1=supports Trinity River Project; add points for all which apply*	0-5	

Total	200	0