

**2006 Briefing
Attachments for Part B**

1. Alley Reconstruction Criteria	B-1
2. Barrier-Free-Ramp Project Criteria	B-2
3. Alley, Sidewalk and Street Petition Project Criteria	B-3
4. Sidewalk Safety Project Criteria	B-4-B-5
5. Street Reconstruction Criteria (Old) *	B-6
6. Street Reconstruction Criteria (New)	B-6A
7. Street Resurfacing Criteria (Old)*	B-7
8. Street Resurfacing Criteria (New)	B-7A
9. Thoroughfares and Street Modifications (Bottlenecks) (Old)*	B-8-B-10
10. Thoroughfares and Street Modifications (Bottlenecks) (New)	B-8A-B-10A
11. Alternative Mode Transportation Trails	B-11-B-12
12. CBD Roadway Lighting	B-13
13. Freeway Lighting	B-14
14. Enhanced Fixtures	B-15
15. CBD Traffic Signal Upgrades	B-16
16. City-Wide Traffic Signal Upgrades	B-17
17. Warranted Signals / Warranted School Flashers	B-18
18. Traffic Safety Improvements **	B-19
19. Neighborhood Traffic Management **	B-20-B21
20. Outdoors Siren Site Selection **	B-22
21. Traffic Sign Upgrades **	B-23
22. Erosion Control	B-24
23. Flood Management	B-25
24. Storm Drainage Relief Systems	B-26
25. Bridge Repair and Modification	B-27
26. New Construction of Cultural Facilities	B-28
27. Renovation of Cultural Facilities	B-29
28. New Construction of Fire Protection	B-30
29. Renovation / Replacement of Fire Protection Facilities	B-31
30. New Construction of Library Facilities	B-32
31. Renovation / Replacement of Library Facilities	B-33
32. New Construction of Police Facilities	B-34
33. Renovation / Replacement of Police Facilities	B-35
34. Major Maintenance Program Project	B-36-B-38

* - Modified since last bond program

** - New category since last bond program

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 1/2 of the property frontage, or
- Signatures of 1/2 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

SIDEWALK SAFETY PROJECT CRITERIA
Revision No 1

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

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

Step 1: Preliminary Screening

Review Citywide Street Inventory and sort out all streets recommended for reconstruction with a minimum pavement condition index of < 20

Step 2: Prioritization Criteria

Project: _____		Date: _____	
#	Criteria	Maximum Point	Score
1	Pavement Condition Index	40	
2	Traffic Volume	20	
3	Multimodal	20	
4	Time in Unsatisfactory Condition	10	
5	Zoning	10	
Items 1-5		Total Score	

1. Pavement Condition Index

(100-PCI) x 0.4

2. Traffic Volume

20 - > 10,000 VPD

10 - > 2,000 < 10,000 VPD

5 - > 500 < 2,000 VPD

0 - < 500 VPD

**3. Multimodal (bus route, bike route, truck route, emergency route)
(Maximum score: 20 points)**

5 - Bus Route

5 - Truck Route

5 - Bike Route

5 - Emergency Route

4. Time in Unsatisfactory Condition

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

5. Zoning

10 - Commercial

8 - General Retail & Offices

6 - Multifamily Residential

2 - Residential

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

- 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 500 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	45	
2	Time in Unsatisfactory Condition	20	
3	Multimodal	20	
4	Traffic Volume	15	
Total Score			

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Pavement Condition Index</p> <p>(100 - PCI) X 0.45</p> | <p>4. Traffic Volume T > 0</p> <p>15 - High (>10,000 VPD)</p> <p>10 - Moderate/High (>2,000>10,000)</p> <p>5 - Moderate (>500>2,000)</p> <p>0 - Low (<500)</p> |
|--|---|
2. Time in "C" & "D" Condition
- 1 - 1 year
- 2 - 2 years
- 3 - 3 years
- 20 - 20 years and over
3. Multimodal
- 5 - Bus Route
- 5 - Bike Route
- 5 - Emergency Route
- 5 - Truck Route

The Street Resurfacing inventory of needs will be comprised of the approximately 500 lane miles of field evaluated and rated street segments plus the remaining blocks of streets recommended for resurfacing by the PMP

**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)**

Revision No. 1

Project: _____		Date: _____	
#	Criteria	Score	Total
Mobility (50 points)			
1	Current Cost Effectiveness	15	
2	Future Cost Effectiveness	15	
3	System Continuity	10	
4	Intermodal / Multimodal	10	
Safety (35 points)			
5	Accident Rate	15	
6	Proximity to Schools and Parks	10	
7	Existing Street Condition	10	
Economic Development (15 points)			
8	Economic Development Support	5	
9	Distressed/Underutilized Area Support	10	
Total Score (maximum 100 points) =			

Thoroughfares and Street Modifications (Bottlenecks)

Maximum total score: 100 points

The total list of project needs will be screened based on the ratio of existing volume to existing capacity – all streets operating at a v/c ratio higher than 0.7 will be evaluated in detail. All unconstructed roadways will be evaluated in detail.

MOBILITY (50 points)

1. Current Cost Effectiveness (current volume delay reduction / cost)
Maximum score: 15 points

The current congestion relief of a project is ratio of the value of the delay reduction that would result from implementation of the project based on existing traffic volumes to the cost of the project.

**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).

Benefit/Cost Ratio	Points
less than 0.5	0
0.5 to 1.0	0 to 3
1.0 to 2.0	3 to 6
2.0 to 3.0	6 to 9
3.0 to 5.0	9 to 12
5.0 to 10.0	12 to 15
more than 10.0	15

2. Future Cost Effectiveness (future volume delay reduction / cost)
Maximum score: 15 points

The future cost effectiveness of a project is a ratio of the value of the delay reduction that would result from implementation of the project based on 2025 traffic volumes to the cost of the project.

Benefit/Cost Ratio	Points
less than 0.5	0
0.5 to 1.0	0 to 3
1.0 to 2.0	3 to 6
2.0 to 3.0	6 to 9
3.0 to 5.0	9 to 12
5.0 to 10.0	12 to 15
more than 10.0	15

3. System Continuity
Maximum score: 10 points

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

4. 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.

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

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.

SAFETY (35 points)

5. Accident Rate

Maximum score: 15 points

A project will receive up to 15 points based on the reported accident rate (number of accidents per million vehicle miles travelled) within a 12 month period in a street segment or within 200 feet of an intersection.

6. 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.

7. 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 (15 points)

8. Economic Development Support

Maximum score: 5 points

A project that provides direct access to undeveloped property will receive up to 5 points based on the percentage of undeveloped frontage.

% Undeveloped Frontage	Residential Zoning Points	Commercial Zoning Points
25 to 50%	1	3
50 to 75%	2	4
75 to 100%	3	5

9. Distressed/Underutilized Area Support

Maximum score: 10 points

A project will receive up to 10 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.

(B-10 OLD CRITERIA)

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
ALTERNATIVE MODE TRANSPORTATION TRAILS**

Project: _____		Date: _____	
#	Criteria	Score	Total
1	Approved Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan	15	
2	Projected Non-Recreational Volume	15	
3	Projected Cost Per User	15	
4	System Continuity	15	
5	Safety (proximity to schools and parks)	10	
6	Support for Regional Bicycle	10	
7	Intermodal (transit centers, bus routes)	10	
8	Distressed/Underutilized Area Support	10	
Total Score (maximum 100 points) =			

Alternative Mode Transportation Trails

Maximum total score: 100 points

1. Approved Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Plan
Maximum score: 15 points

A project will receive 15 points if it is approved as part of the Regional Mobility 2025 Plan or Dallas Bicycle Plan.

2. Projected Non-Recreational Volume
Maximum score: 15 points

A project will receive up to 15 points based on the number of daily non-recreational users projected to use the facility in 2025.

Non-Recreational Users	Points
less than 500	0
500 to 1000	5
1000 to 2000	10
greater than 2000	15

3. Projected Cost Per User
Maximum score: 15 points

A project will receive up to 15 points based on the ratio of the number of annual users to the annualized cost of the project.

Cost Per User	Points
less than \$10	15
\$10 to \$200	10
\$20 to \$400	5
greater than \$40	0

4. System Continuity
Maximum score: 15 points

A project will receive 10 points if it extends an existing transportation trail or 15 points if it connects two existing sections of trail.

5. Safety (proximity to schools and parks)
Maximum score: 10 points

A project will receive up to 10 points based on the number of schools or parks that are within 500 feet of the trail.

6. Support for Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Districts
Maximum score: 10 points

A project will receive up to 10 points based on the percentage of the project that serves pedestrian and bicycle districts as defined in the Regional Mobility 2025 Transportation Plan.

7. Intermodal (transit centers, bus routes, bicycle routes)
Maximum score: 10 points

A project will receive up to 10 points based on the number of transit centers, bus routes and bicycle routes that it serves.

8. Distressed/Underutilized Area Support
Maximum score: 10 points

A project will receive up to 10 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.

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 =				

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: <u>Street Lighting-Freeway Lighting</u>			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 TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING/3 =				

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: <u>Street Lighting-Enhanced Fixtures</u>				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				TOTAL WEIGHTED	
RATING/3 =					

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: <u>Traffic Signal Upgrades-CBD</u>				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				TOTAL WEIGHTED	
RATING/3 =					

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: <u>Traffic Signal Upgrades—City-Wide</u>			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			TOTAL WEIGHTED	
RATING/3 =				

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: <u>Warranted Signals/School Flashers</u>				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 TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING/3 =				

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 | 2 | Signal has been |
| justified for 3 to 6 months | | |
| 1 Signal has been justified for 1 to 3 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 =				

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)

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION AND RATING FORM
NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

New Category / December 2005

This category provides annual funding for the City share of road hump installations, and funds to implement Council-approved Neighborhood Traffic Management plans (context sensitive design plans) on residential streets. The following criteria will be used to rank streets that qualify for road hump installation. These criteria were established in the original Road Hump Policy adopted by City Council in 1991. Funding needs for context sensitive design plans will be on a first-come, first-served basis based on when the plan was adopted.

Project: _____		Date: _____	
#	Criteria	Score	Total
1	Speeding Vehicles	55	
2	Proximity to Public Institutions	15	
3	Community Support	15	
4	Accidents	15	
Total Score (maximum 100 points) =			

Neighborhood Traffic Management

Maximum total score: 100 points

1. Speeding Vehicles
Maximum score: 55 points

A street will receive up to 55 points based on the daily number of vehicles exceeding 30 mph.

Speeding Vehicles Criteria	Points
Less than 100 vehicles	5
100 to 250 vehicles	15
250 to 500 vehicles	25
500 to 1500 vehicles	35
1500 to 2500 vehicles	45
Over 2500 vehicles	55

2. Proximity to Public Institutions

Maximum score: 15 points

A street will receive 5 points for each school, park, church or other public institution that is adjacent to the roadway, up to 15 points.

3. Community Support

Maximum score: 15 points

A street will receive up to 15 points based on the percentage of households supporting the installation of road humps thorough the petition process.

Community Support Criteria	Points
Less than 70%	2
70% to 80%	5
80% to 90%	10
90% to 100%	15

4. Accidents

Maximum score: 15 points

A street will receive up to 15 points based on the number of reported accidents in the previous 12 month period.

Accidents Criteria	Points
None	0
1 accident	5
2 accidents	10
3 accidents	15

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: <u>Traffic Sign Upgrades-City-Wide</u>			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 CONTROL¹**

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)

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

<u>Ratio value</u>	<u>Points</u>
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

<u>Rate</u>	<u>Points</u>
Rapid	40
Moderately fast	30
Moderate	25
Moderately slow	20
Slow	10
Very slow	5

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

<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Points</u>
0 to 50,000	20
50,001 to 150,000	15
Greater than 150,000	5

4. Type of threat

<u>Type</u>	<u>Points</u>
I	15
II	5
III	0

SCORE = _____

¹ Revised 10/28/05

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROJECT RATING FORM
CATEGORY: FLOOD MANAGEMENT¹**

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

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Points</u>
2-year or less	25
5-year	20
10-year	18
25-year	15
100-year	10

SCORE = _____

2. Depth of flooding (100-year)

<u>Depth</u>	<u>Points</u>
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

<u>Value</u>	<u>Points</u>
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 SYSTEMS¹**

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

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

SCORE = _____

2. Frequency of flooding

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Points</u>
2-year or less	25
5-year	20
10-year	18
25-year	15
100-year	10

3. Depth of flooding (100-year)

<u>Depth</u>	<u>Points</u>
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

<u>Value</u>	<u>Points</u>
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 MODIFICATION¹

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:

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

<u>Comparison</u>	<u>Points</u>
capacity exceeded	10
at capacity	5
under capacity	0

4. Whether project leverages other funds

<u>Leverages</u>	<u>Points</u>
yes	10
no	0

Component (9-n)

Deck:
Superstructure:
Substructure:
Channel:
Culverts:
Approaches:
Misc.:

TOTAL:

(n is lowest element rating)

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)

EBS Major Maintenance Project Rating Criteria

	Ranking Factors	Score
Operational Status:		
Is facility in an unplanned closing due to building conditions?	Yes=Emergency	
Does the building have any major maintenance issues requiring immediate action to protect the life safety of the occupants, for example-structural failure?	Yes=Emergency	
If yes, notify EBS at 214-670-XXXX. Repairs are to be made on an emergency basis to re-open the building and resume delivery of City services.	NA	NA
If no, proceed with preparation of Project Justification.	No=Proceed	
Does the building have any major maintenance issues causing collateral damage to other building components, for example-is the roof leaking and damaging gym floor or walls?	Yes=20 points	
Do the elevators and escalators in the facility operate reliably?	Yes=0 No=10	
Is the facility or site a part of a City Master Plan? Explain.	Yes or No	
Is this facility a critical use facility (police, fire, 24 hour City operations, data center, etc.)?	Yes or No	
	Sub-total 1	
Other Funding Sources		
Is funding from other sources (private, CDBG, grants, etc.) available to leverage City funding for this project?	Yes=10 No=0	
	Sub-total 2	
Facility History:		
Facility Constructed:	Age>20 years=10	
Addition(s):	Age>20 years=10	
Square Footage (by Phase, if applicable):	NA	NA
Previous Major Maintenance History: (attach project summary, if applicable or summarize scope, budget, and year of repairs)	Time Since Last MM Project: Age<7 years=3 Age 8-12 years=5 Age 13-20 years=8 Age>20 years=10	
Work Order history indicates Major Maintenance / Renovation issue exists at the property. Identify cost of MM workorders in last FY.	Number of MM Work Orders in FY preceding: 0-5 workorders=3 5-10 workorders=5 10-15 workorders=8 >15 workorders=10	
	Sub-total 3	
Public Health and Safety:		
ADA Assessment: Is there an existing ADA Compliance Plan for the facility, or for new facilities a report of passing TDLR inspection? (Attach a copy)	Yes=0 No=10	
ADA Compliance: Have all non-complying elements of the facility as assessed been brought into compliance? Has the property been reinspected by TDLR for compliance?	Yes=0 No=10	
If no, is there a record of the ADA improvements which have been completed at the facility to date?	Yes=0 No=10	

Yes, project is more likely to get done if \$ can be leveraged.

EBS Major Maintenance Project Rating Criteria

Code Compliance: Is the facility in compliance with applicable building, fire, elevator, other code requirements?	Yes=0 No=10			
If no, has the facility been cited by state or local officials for non-compliance?	Yes=0 No=10			
What is the non-compliant issue? (attach copies of correspondence or citations)	NA		NA	
	Subtotal 4			
Architectural/Structural:				
Has a building condition assessment been prepared for the facility? If so, when and by whom was it prepared?	Yes=0 No=10			
If so, when and by whom was it prepared? (Attach a copy).	NA		NA	
Is the building envelope (roof, walls, floor) leaking? If so, where and under what circumstances	Yes=10 No=0			Yes, building is leaking, so greater need to act. Greater chance of action with higher score.
If so, where and under what circumstances?	NA		NA	
What is the age of the roof?	Age<7 years=3 Age 8-12 years=5 Age 13-20 years=8 Age>20 years=10			
Has preventative maintenance been performed?	Yes=0 No=10			If no, then greater chance of needing action.
Is a warranty in effect for the current roofing system?	Yes=0 No=10			If no, then greater potential cost to City
If so, when is the end of the warranty period?	NA		NA	
Have previous repairs been made?	Yes=0 No=10			If no, then greater potential cost to City
How, when, where, and by whom?	NA		NA	
Are there signs of structural failure?	Yes=10 No=0			If yes, then greater potential cost to the City
Does the building have cracks in walls, visible misalignment of structure, deterioration of structure, or movement in floor slab?	Yes=10 No=0			If yes, then greater potential cost to the City
Are the interior finishes (walls/flooring/ceilings) in the facility in good condition? If no, where is damage or deterioration/wear noticed?	Yes=0 No=10			If no, then work required and greater potential cost to City
	Sub-total 5			
Environmental Impact:				
Has a Phase I environmental assessment been done for the property? (Check with Tim Fortner, EBS 214-670-5392 tim.fortner@dallascityhall.com)	Yes=0 No=10			
Has asbestos testing been performed at the building? (Check with Tim Fortner, EBS 214-670-5392 tim.fortner@dallascityhall.com)	Yes=0 No=10			
If yes, did the testing report recommend abatement	Yes=0 No=10			
Has abatement been done? If so, where and when?	Yes=0 No=10			
Is there any government mandated requirement that the recommended abatement take place?	Yes=10 No=0			
Ongoing environmental operations and maintenance (O&M) plan recommended and in place?	Yes=0 No=10			
	Sub-total 6			
Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems:				
Any identified problems with any system? If yes, where and when does the problem occur?	Yes=10 No=0			
Does the building electrical service have a UPS/generator system?	Yes=0 No=10			

EBS Major Maintenance Project Rating Criteria

If so, when did the system last receive preventative maintenance?	Last PM: 1 year=3 2years=5 3years=8 >3years=10		
When was the system last load tested?	Last load test: 1 year=3 2years=5 3years=8 >3years=10		
	Sub-total 7		

SCORING SUMMARY

Subtotal 1
Subtotal 2
Subtotal 3
Subtotal 4
Subtotal 5
Subtotal 6
Subtotal 7
TOTAL
