

Threshold and Prioritization Criteria for Mobility Projects

Threshold Criteria

Question 1: Does the County have an obligation to complete the project (TXDoT minute order, interlocal agreement, liability/litigation)? If yes, continue to Question 5. If no, continue to Question 2.

Question 2: Is the candidate project consistent with prior Court actions? If yes, continue to Question 5. If no, go to Question 3.

Question 3: Is the candidate project's purpose to increase mobility or improve traffic safety through one of the following project types?

- a) A safety improvement project,
- or
- b) a project on an existing County road that functions as a collector,
- or
- c) a project consistent with the CAMPO Mobility 2035 Plan (including bike/pedestrian projects).

If yes, for either a), b), or c), go to Question 4. If no, re-scope project or seek alternative funding source.

Question 4: Is the candidate project completely within the unincorporated area of Travis County (see project location map)? If yes, continue to Question 5. If no, is there a commitment from another jurisdiction to pay for its share? If yes, continue to Question 5. If no, discuss opportunities for funding with jurisdiction.

Question 5: Does the project have a design life of 20 years or better and result in a minimum viable segment? If yes, the project is eligible to be included in preliminary list for Bond Program Prioritization. If no, project is not eligible for 2011 bond funding.

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Mobility Prioritization Criteria

Added Capacity Projects (100 points maximum score)

Criteria 1: Project Readiness

▪ **Preliminary Project Development**

Projects that currently have received partial funding, have completed phases of project development, and/or have partial or all right-of-way acquired are viewed as priority candidate projects.

Scoring Method: Points are awarded to projects that have completed preliminary phases of project development. Maximum points are received for projects that have completed design work, received environmental clearance and have all right-of-way acquired.

- Project has no preliminary engineering, environmental or design work completed. (0 points)
- Project has completed preliminary engineering. (2 points)
- Project has design complete. (7 points)
- Project has environmental clearance and design complete. (10 points)
- Project has environmental clearance and design complete with partial right-of-way acquired. (12 points)
- Project has environmental clearance and design complete with all right-of-way acquired. (15 points)

Criteria 2: Existing Need

▪ **Measure of Existing Need**

A measure of the severity of congestion provides a manner in which to evaluate the need for a proposed mobility project. Projects exhibiting high levels of congestion are considered a priority for improvement.

Scoring Method: Points are awarded for varying degrees of congestion. Increased levels of congestion are identified through Volume/Capacity ratios (V/C ratios); the higher the ratio, the more congestion. The calculation is determined by taking TXDoT's 2005 traffic counts (ADT) and dividing by a roadway's existing design capacity. For new roadways, a parallel facility is used to determine the V/C ratio. After determining the existing V/C ratio, the projects are ranked and divided by quarters into point ranges, the top quarter receiving maximum points, followed by fewer points for the remaining quarters. Higher V/C ratios are more congested and receive higher points.

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Measure of Existing Need (2005 ADT/Typical Design Capacity)

- 2005 Volume/Capacity ratio ranks in bottom quarter of projects (0 points)
- 2005 Volume/Capacity ratio ranks in 3rd quarter of projects (6 points)
- 2005 Volume/Capacity ratio ranks in 2nd quarter of projects (13 points)
- 2005 Volume/Capacity ratio ranks in top quarter of projects (20 points)

Criteria 3: Future Need

- **Measure of Future Need**

The greatest impact on increasing mobility will be to concentrate improvement projects in the areas of existing and forecasted growth. Projects located in these growth areas will show increased traffic volumes to serve the associated increases in traffic.

Scoring Method: To evaluate these areas, a “Do-Nothing Ratio” was calculated using future 2035 traffic volumes derived from the CAMPO 2035 travel demand model “Do Nothing Scenario” divided by 2011 design capacity. After determining the “Do-Nothing Ratio”, the projects are ranked and divided by quarters into point ranges, the top quarter receiving maximum points, followed by fewer points for the remaining quarters. Higher ratios show more need and receive higher points.

- “Do-Nothing Ratio” ranks in bottom quarter of projects (0 points)
- “Do-Nothing Ratio” ranks in 3rd quarter of projects (6 points)
- “Do-Nothing Ratio” ranks in 2nd quarter of projects (13 points)
- “Do-Nothing Ratio” ranks in top quarter of projects (20 points)

Criteria 4: Cost Effectiveness Criteria/Leveraging

- **Measure of Cost Effectiveness**

Cost effectiveness is important when determining which projects provide the most improvement in mobility for the least cost. Projects that increase mobility with the best use of financial resources are a priority in identifying good candidate projects. Cost effectiveness is measured by dividing the total County cost per mile of a project by the estimated increase in traffic volume between 2005 and 2035. This calculation produces a cost per trip value.

If the project is to be a phased project (i.e., MAD 4 built of a future MAD 6), an estimated future traffic volume is derived from the forecasted 2035 volume.

Note: Financial participation from private and/or other public sources (including grant funds) that lowers the County’s contribution will improve a project’s cost effectiveness score.

Scoring Method: Cost Effectiveness = County Project Cost per mile/Traffic Volume increase from 2005 to 2035. After determining the cost effectiveness value, the projects are ranked and divided by quarters into point ranges, the top quarter

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

receiving maximum points, followed by fewer points for the remaining quarters. Lower ratios show more cost effectiveness and receive higher points.

- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in bottom quarter of projects (0 points)
- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in 3rd quarter of projects (8 points)
- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in 2nd quarter of projects (16 points)
- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in top quarter of projects (25 points)

Criteria 5: Centers Concept and Travis County’s “Targeted Growth Area” Compatibility

▪ Measure of Compatibility

Higher density, mixed use development oriented around public transportation is an initiative adopted by the CAMPO Policy Board to reduce the investment in regional infrastructure that supports single occupant vehicle trips. Known as the “Centers concept”, this growth plan helps reduce trips on the arterial roadway system. Connectivity and access to “Centers” are important components that support the Centers concept initiative.

Significant investments in mobility have been made by Travis County, CTRMA and TXDoT within Travis County’s “Targeted Growth Area”. Travis County has targeted improved connectivity in the unincorporated areas east of IH 35 by making connections to the SH 130 corridor through the planning and implementation of arterial public/private partnerships in the County’s 2001 and 2005 voter approved bond elections. For planning purposes, the Targeted Growth Area is defined as the unincorporated area east of IH 35.

Scoring Method:

Compatibility with the CAMPO “Centers” concept is measured through proximity of a project to a “Center” identified in CAMPO 2035 Plan or recognized by TNR staff as having elements of a “Center”. Additionally, continuation of providing for connectivity in the “Targeted Growth Area” is a priority.

- Projects outside of “Target Growth Area” and outside a 1 mile radius of a “Center” (0 points)
- Projects located in “Targeted Growth Area”, outside 1 mile radius of Center (4 points)
- Projects located in 1 mile radius of Center, outside “Targeted Growth Area” (6 points)
- Projects are located outside “Targeted Growth Area” and whole or partially in Center or that connect a Center to another Center or Center to a Transit Center or Center to an existing major arterial. (8 points)
- Projects are located in “Targeted Growth Area” and whole or partially in Center or that connect a Center to another Center or Center to a Transit Center or Center to an existing major arterial. (10 points)

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Criteria 6: Project Effectiveness (Significant Outcome)

- **Measure of Effectiveness**

Another impact on increasing mobility can be related to type of facility improvement proposed. Staff has identified gap completion projects as the highest priority for added capacity projects followed by adding capacity to existing arterials and collectors.

Scoring Method:

- Added capacity on existing collector (3 points)
- Gap completion between collectors (5 points)
- Added capacity on existing arterials (7 points)
- Gap completion between existing arterials (10 points)

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Safety/Intersection Improvement Projects (70 points maximum score)

Criteria 1: Project Readiness

Projects that currently have received partial funding, have completed phases of project development, and/or have partial or all right-of-way acquired are viewed as priority candidate projects.

Scoring Method: Points are awarded to projects that have completed preliminary phases of project development. Maximum points are received for projects that have completed design work, received environmental clearance and have all right-of-way acquired.

- Project has no preliminary engineering, environmental or design work completed. (0 points)
- Project has completed preliminary engineering. (2 points)
- Project has design complete. (7 points)
- Project has environmental clearance and design complete. (10 points)
- Project has environmental clearance and design complete with partial right-of-way acquired. (12 points)
- Project has environmental clearance and design complete with all right-of-way acquired. (15 points)

Criteria 2: Project Need

Number and accident severity have been identified as important in determining project need. Projects that have related property damage or serious injuries and/or fatalities will have an increased priority.

Scoring Method:

- 0 to 3 crashes occurred within project limits (2 points)
- 4 to 20 crashes occurred within project limits (4 points)
- 21 to 35 crashes occurred within project limits (6 points)
- 36 to 50 crashes occurred within project limits (8 points)
- More than 50 crashes occurred within project limits (10 points)

And

- No injury occurred within project limits (5 points)
- Minor injuries occur within project limits (10 points)
- Serious injuries occur within project limits (15 points)
- Fatalities have occurred within project limits (20 points)

Criteria 3: Cost Effectiveness/Leveraging

▪ Measure of Cost Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness is important when determining which projects provide the most improvement in safety for the least cost. Projects that increase safety and mobility with the best use of financial resources are a priority in identifying good candidate projects. Cost effectiveness is measured by dividing the total County cost per mile of a project by the estimated increase in traffic volume between 2005 and 2035. This calculation produces a cost per trip value.

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Note: Financial participation from private and/or other public sources (including grant funds) that lowers the County's contribution will improve a project's cost effectiveness score.

Scoring Method: Cost Effectiveness = County Project Cost per mile/Traffic Volume increase from 2005 to 2035. After determining the cost effectiveness value, the projects are ranked and divided by quarters into point ranges, the top quarter receiving maximum points, followed by fewer points for the remaining quarters. Lower ratios show more cost effectiveness and receive higher points.

- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in bottom quarter of projects (0 points)
- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in 3rd quarter of projects (8 points)
- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in 2nd quarter of projects (16 points)
- Cost Effectiveness value ranks in top quarter of projects (25 points)

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvement Projects (65 points maximum score)

Criteria 1: Project Need

- Project need is shown through the ability of the trail to provide multi-modal connections for public facilities and other modes of transportation. Completion of gaps has been identified as a priority.

Scoring Method:

- Project located on or connects school route, public facility or high activity center. (5 points)
- Project provides linkage/connection to other modes of transportation (arterials, collectors, transit, sidewalks, other trails) (10 points)

Additional points if:

- Project provides a gap completion. (10 points)

Criteria 2: Significant Outcome Criteria

Location in Growth Area

The greatest impact on increasing mobility will be to concentrate improvement projects in the areas of existing and forecasted growth. Significant investments in mobility have been made by Travis County, CTRMA and TXDoT within Travis County's "Targeted Growth Area". Travis County has targeted improved connectivity in the unincorporated areas east of IH 35 by making connections to the SH 130 corridor through the planning and implementation of arterial public/private partnerships in the County's 2001 and 2005 voter approved bond elections. For planning purposes, the Targeted Growth Area is defined as the unincorporated area east of IH 35.

Scoring Method: Compatibility with the CAMPO "Centers" concept is measured through proximity of a project to a "Center" identified in CAMPO 2035 Plan or recognized by TNR staff as having elements of a "Center". Additionally, continuation of providing for connectivity in the "Targeted Growth Area" is a priority.

- Projects outside of "Target Growth Area" and outside a 1 mile radius of a "Center" (0 points)
- Projects located in "Targeted Growth Area", outside 1 mile radius of Center (4 points)
- Projects located in 1 mile radius of Center, outside "Targeted Growth Area" (6 points)
- Projects are located outside "Targeted Growth Area" and whole or partially in Center or that connect a Center to another Center or Center to a Transit Center or Center to an existing major arterial. (8 points)
- Projects are located in "Targeted Growth Area" and whole or partially in Center or that connect a Center to another Center or Center to a Transit Center or Center to an existing major arterial. (10 points)

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.

Criteria 3: Impact on Future O&M Budget

- Future impact on TNR's operations and maintenance budget is determined by evaluating the cost of maintaining the project. To evaluate O and M budget impact, a project's length is calculated and ranked among other candidate projects. Projects are then divided into those projects that will provide a moderate O and M impact (scored in the top half of projects, shorter trail length) and those that will have a more extensive impact (projects scored in the bottom half of projects with longer trail lengths).

Scoring Method:

- Extensive Impact (Ranks in bottom 50% of ranked projects) (more costly to maintain by Road Maintenance or Park Services) (0 points)
- Moderate Impact (Ranks in top 50% of ranked projects) (least costly to maintain by Road Maintenance or Park Services) (5 points)

Criteria 4: Jurisdiction/Agency or Private Sector Participation

- Points are awarded to projects that have financial contributions from other jurisdictions/agencies and/or the private sector that allow for completion of a project. Projects where a partnership with the County to complete a project has occurred through an interlocal or signed agreement are a priority since the financial responsibility of the project is shared.

Scoring Method:

Jurisdiction/Agency Participation

- County required to fund outside County's jurisdiction to complete project (0 points)
- No participation needed from another jurisdiction or agency (10 points)
- All required jurisdiction/agency are fully participating in project (10 points)

Private Sector Participation

- No right of
- Partial right-of-way donations throughout project (3 points)
- No funding private funding potential identified by County staff (5 points)
- Private sector participation 100% along roadway (Donation of all of required right-of way) (7 points)
- Participation of more than 50% of private sector along roadway (50 % of engineering/design costs with a donation of all of required right-of way) (10 points)
- Private sector participation 100% along roadway (50 % of engineering/design costs with donation of all of required right-of-way) (13 points)
- Private sector participation 100% (50 % of engineering/design and construction costs with donation of all of right-of-way) (20 points)

The information contained on these pages is considered public information and may be distributed and/or copied. With respect to the information, neither Travis County nor the Transportation and Natural Resources Department nor any employees of either of the foregoing, make any representation or warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, usefulness, timeliness, or fitness for any particular purpose of any information contained herein. In addition, Travis County and its officials and employees accept no liability, however arising, for any loss or injury resulting in whole or in part from the use of any information contained herein or from any reliance placed thereon.