

# PROJECT PRIORITY WORKSHEET

for

## Group 1 Urban STP Projects

---

A. New Signalization	1
B. Existing Roadway Capacity Improvement	2
C. New Roadway Construction	3
D. Roadway Reconstruction/ Rehabilitation	4
E. Roadway Resurfacing	5
F. Bridge Replacement	6
G. Bridge Rehabilitation	7
H. Intersection Improvements	8
I. Bicycle Enhancements	9
J. Pedestrian Enhancement	10
K. Freight Enhancement	11
L. Transit Enhancement Capital Projects	12

**A. New Signalization (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	NEW SIGNAL WARRANTS as defined in the Indiana Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) *	3 or more Warrants Met	70	
		2 Warrants Met	55	
		1 Warrant Met	35	
2	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION (leg of intersection with highest classification)	Principal Arterial	15	
		Minor Arterial	10	
		Collector	5	
3	SIGNAL COORDINATION / INTERCONNECTION	Included in Project	15	
		Not Included	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for NEW SIGNALIZATION PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Propensity of Need
2. Roadway Hierarchy
3. Improved Corridor Efficiency

**B. Existing Roadway Capacity Improvement (100 points possible)**

	CRITERION	MEASURES	Mark appropriate SCORE	
1	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Principal Arterial	15	
		Minor Arterial	10	
		Collector	5	
2	EXISTING OPERATIONS (Level of Service - LOS)	LOS = F	25	
		LOS = E	15	
		LOS = D	8	
		LOS = C or higher	0	
3	FUTURE OPERATIONS (Year 2035 Level of Service <b>Without</b> Project)	LOS = F	25	
		LOS = E	15	
4	EXISTING AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME * (Average of Corridor Segments)	ADT x .0005	Enter score:  (Max: 25 pts.)	
5	PERMANENT NEIGHBORHOOD DISRUPTION / RELOCATION *	No acquisition of residential or business structures	10	
		No knowledge	0	
		Requires acquisition of residential or business structures	-5	

**TOTAL POINTS for EXISTING ROADWAY CAPACITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT \_\_\_\_\_**

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Roadway Hierarchy
2. Existing Congestion Level
3. Future Congestion/Need
4. Motorists Served/System Function
5. Impact/Ease of Construction

**C. New Roadway Construction (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	PROJECTED AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME * (Average of Segments for Corridors in 2035)	ADT x .0008	Enter score:	
			(Max: 40 pts)	
2	PROJECT IS REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT	YES	25	
		NO	0	
3	PROJECT ENABLES CONNECTIVITY / CONTINUITY OF THE CORRIDOR	YES	25	
		NO	0	
4	PERMANENT NEIGHBORHOOD DISRUPTION / RELOCATION *	No acquisition of residential or business structures	10	
		No knowledge	0	
		Requires acquisition of residential or business structures	-5	
<b>TOTAL POINTS for NEW ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT</b>			<hr/>	

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Motorists Served/System Function
2. Regional Context
3. Network Role
4. Impact/Ease of Construction

**D. Roadway Reconstruction/Rehabilitation - per 3R Standards**  
 (100 points possible)

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Principal Arterial	10	
		Minor Arterial or Collector	5	
2	PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX *	PCI = 0 to 10	50	
		PCI = 11 to 25	45	
		PCI = 26 to 40	35	
		PCI = 41 to 55	25	
		PCI > 55	10	
3	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT) * (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0008	Enter score:	
			(Max: 40 pts)	

**TOTAL POINTS for ROAD RECONSTRUCTION/REHABILITATION PROJECT \_\_\_\_\_**

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Physical Need for Improvement
2. Roadway Hierarchy
3. Motorists Served/System Function

**E. Resurfacing (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Principal Arterial	10	
		Minor Arterial or Collector	5	
2	PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX (PCI) *	PCI = 0 to 25	50	
		PCI = 25 to 40	45	
		PCI = 41 to 55	25	
		PCI > 55	10	
3	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT) * (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0008	Enter score:	
			(Max: 40 pts)	

**TOTAL POINTS for RESURFACING PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Roadway Hierarchy
2. Physical Need for Improvement
3. Motorists Served/System Function

**F. Bridge Replacement (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	<b>SUFFICIENCY RATING *</b>  <b>NOTE: A bridge replacement project that has a sufficiency rating of 50 or higher is not eligible for STP funding</b>	29.99 or less	40	
		30.00 to 49.99	=40 -(rating-30) Enter score:	
		50.00 or higher	0	
2	<b>STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT / FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE *</b>  <b>NOTE: A bridge replacement project that is neither structurally deficient nor functionally obsolete is not eligible for STP funding</b>	Structurally Deficient	25	
		Functionally Obsolete	15	
		Neither S.D. nor F.O.	0	
3	<b>FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION</b>	Principal Arterial	10	
		Minor Arterial	6	
		Collector	3	
		not on system	0	
4	<b>EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT) *</b> (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0005	Enter score:	
			(Max: 25 pts)	

**TOTAL POINTS for BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: The use of Urban STP funds is permitted to be used on both on-system and off-system bridges within the urbanized area only since Bridge (BR) funds are not available within the urbanized area**

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Overall Bridge Condition
2. Safety Need (structural condition/design standard)
3. Roadway Hierarchy
4. Motorists Served/System Function

**G. Bridge Rehabilitation (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	SUFFICIENCY RATING *  <b>NOTE: A bridge rehabilitation project that has a sufficiency rating of 80 or higher is not eligible for STP funding</b>	49.99 or less	40	
		50.00 to 79.99	=40 - (rating-50) Enter score:	
		80.00 or higher	0	
2	STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT / FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE *  <b>NOTE: A bridge replacement project that is neither structurally deficient nor functionally obsolete is not eligible for STP funding</b>	Structurally Deficient	25	
		Functionally Obsolete	15	
		Neither S.D. nor F.O.	0	
3	FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	Principal Arterial	10	
		Minor Arterial	6	
		Collector	3	
		not on system	0	
4	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT) * (Average of Segments for Corridors)	ADT x .0005	Enter Score:	
			(Max: 25 pts.)	

**TOTAL POINTS for BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: The use of Urban STP funds is permitted to be used on both on-system and off-system bridges within the urbanized area only since Bridge (BR) funds are not available within the urbanized area**

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Overall Bridge Condition
2. Safety Need (structural condition/design standard)
3. Roadway Hierarchy
4. Motorists Served/System Function

**H. Intersection or Intersection Groups (100 points possible)**

		<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
CRITERION	MEASURES		
<b>1</b>	EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES (ADT) * (average for groups)	ADT x .0008	Enter score:
			(Max: 40 pts)
<b>2</b>	ACCIDENT RATES  (Last 3 years; number of accidents / million vehicles; avg. of intersection groups)	Rate > 2.5	20
		Rate > = 2.0	15
		Rate > = 1.5	10
		Rate < 1.5	0
<b>3</b>	EXISTING OPERATIONS (Levels of Service) (overall for groups)	LOS = F	20
		LOS = E	15
<b>4</b>	FUTURE OPERATIONS (Improvements to peak hour LOS, e.g. LOS F to LOS C, LOS E to LOS B, LOS D to LOS A)	3 or more LOS	20
		2 LOS	15
		1 LOS	10
		no LOS improvement	0
<b>TOTAL POINTS for INTERSECTION OR INTERSECTION GROUP PROJECT</b>			_____

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Motorists Served/System Function
2. Degree of Demonstrated Hazard
3. Existing Congestion Level
4. Future Congestion/Need

**I. Bicycle Enhancement (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	CONSTRUCTS NEW EXCLUSIVE BICYCLE LANE OR MULTI-USE PATH	Adds 2.5 or more miles (Project Length)	50	
		Adds less than 2.5 miles (Project Length)	40	
2	CONSTRUCTS NEW PUBLIC BICYCLE STORAGE	Adds 8 or more bike parking spaces	10	
		Adds 1 to 7 bike parking spaces	5	
3	PROXIMITY TO PRIMARY CORRIDOR IN BICYCLE PLAN * (*primary corridors" includes all regional greenways and bike lanes, but does not include "local" corridors that serve only a local neighborhood)	On corridor	20	
		Connects to corridor	15	
4	NEW or REHABED SIDEWALK/MULTIUSE PATH CONNECTING TO a BUS STOP or RAPID TRANSIT STATION *	Existing mass transit route	20	
		Planned mass transit route	15	
		Not connected	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for BICYCLE ENHANCEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Non-motorized Travel Opportunity
2. Network Travel Function
3. Extension of Planned Network
4. Multi-Modal Travel Opportunity

**J. Pedestrian Enhancement (100 points possible)**

	<b>CRITERION</b>	<b>MEASURES</b>	<b>Mark appropriate SCORE</b>	
1	SIDEWALK EXPANSION / REHABILITATION *	Adds or rehabs 0.5 or more miles (Project Length)	20	
		Adds or rehabs 0.3 to 0.49 miles (Project Length)	15	
		Adds or rehabs less than 0.3 mi. (Project Length)	10	
2	PROJECT LOCATED ON RECOMMENDED CORRIDOR IN REGIONAL PEDESTRIAN PLAN or IDENTIFIED AS NEEDED SEGMENT in a WALKABILITY STUDY	Yes	15	
		No	0	
3	CONNECTS MISSING LINK IN SIDEWALK NETWORK * (identified in the Regional Pedestrian Plan)	Connects to a collector sidewalk	20	
		Makes another connection	10	
4	ELIMINATES PEDESTRIAN / VEHICLE HAZARD *	Yes	15	
		No	0	
5	CONNECTS MULTIPLE PEDESTRIAN DESTINATIONS * [high density (10+units/acre) residential, commercial, office districts and/or mixed use districts]	Yes	15	
		No	0	
6	NEW or REHABED SIDEWALK/MULTIUSE PATH CONNECTING TO a BUS STOP or RAPID TRANSIT STATION *	Existing mass transit route	15	
		Planned mass transit route	10	
		Not connected	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

1. Pedestrian Travel Opportunity
2. Extension of Planned Network
3. Network Travel Function
4. Improved Safety
5. Improved System Function
6. Multi-Modal Travel Opportunity

## K. Freight Enhancement (100 points possible)

Mark  
appropriate  
SCORE

	CRITERION	MEASURES		
1	<b>IMPLEMENTS RECOMMENDATION FROM FREIGHT PLAN</b> Per the list of "Priority Freight Infrastructure Projects" defined in the 1998 Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan	Yes	25	
		No	0	
2	<b>IMPROVES CONGESTION ON ESTABLISHED TRUCK ROUTE *</b> Per the list of "Priority Freight Infrastructure Projects" defined in the 1998 Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan	Intersection with LOS F	25	
		Intersection with LOS D, E	15	
		Intersection with LOS C	5	
		Intersection with LOS B, A	0	
3	<b>ALLOWS MORE DIRECT ROUTING OF TRUCKS *</b>	To Interstate interchange	15	
		To Primary arterial	10	
		None	0	
4	<b>ELIMINATES EXISTING IMPEDIMENT ON ESTABLISHED TRUCK ROUTE *</b> Per the list of "Priority Freight Infrastructure Projects" defined in the 1998 Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan	Overpass clearance	10	
		Intersection turning radius	5	
		None	0	
5	<b>IMPROVES SAFETY ON ESTABLISHED TRUCK ROUTE *</b> Per the list of "Priority Freight Infrastructure Projects" defined in the 1998 Indianapolis Intermodal Freight System Plan	Improves 2 or more safety factors	15	
		Improves 1 safety factor	10	
		None	0	
6	<b>IMPROVES ACCESS TO INTER-MODAL FREIGHT TRANSFER *</b>	Air → truck transfer	10	
		Rail → truck transfer	10	
		Air → rail transfer	5	
		None	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for FREIGHT ENHANCEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

### VALUES CAPTURED

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Extension of Planned Freight Network | 4. Bottleneck Elimination for Goods Movement |
| 2. Existing Congestion Level            | 5. Enhanced Safety (truck movements)         |
| 3. More Efficient Goods Movement        | 6. Intermodal System                         |

**L. Transit Enhancement Capital Projects (100 points possible)**

	CRITERION	MEASURES	Mark appropriate SCORE	
1	EXPAND / MAINTAIN TRANSIT SERVICE ACCESSIBILITY	Extend Sidewalk Access at Bus Stops	25	
		Maintain/upgrade access at existing bus stops - curbs/ramps/crossings	25	
		Increase Multimodal Accessibility - bike, trail	25	
		Provide Additional Bus Stops	20	
2	IMPROVES SAFETY & SECURITY (for transit service with lighting, audio and visual monitoring)	Yes	10	
		No	0	
3	IMPROVES COMFORT / AMENITIES of TRANSIT PATRONS (shelters/benches)	Yes	25	
		No	0	
4	ENHANCES COMMUNICATIONS / INFORMATION SHARING (with community/riders)	informational signage	15	
		use of electronic media	15	
		supports marketing efforts	10	
5	IMPLEMENTS THE COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS or THE REGIONAL MASS TRANSIT SERVICE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS	Yes	10	
		No	0	
6	UTILIZES TECHNOLOGY for TRANSIT SERVICE PLANNING (software, telephonic, computer, web access)	Yes	15	
		No	0	

**TOTAL POINTS for TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT PROJECT** \_\_\_\_\_

**\* Documentation is required to substantiate the scores; particularly those criteria identified by an asterisk (\*)**

**VALUES CAPTURED**

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Transit Availability         | 4. Transit Information for Users        |
| 2. Transit User Safety/Security | 5. Extension of Planned Transit Network |
| 3. Transit Patron Service Level | 6. System Operation and Efficiency      |