

Sustainable Transportation Plan | Evaluation Criteria (7/12/2021)

Goals	Climate Action and Resilience		Natural Systems and Rural Character	
Objectives and Descriptions	Climate Change: Investment will reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and/or single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips	Electrification: Investment supports the use of electric mobility options	Canopy Protection: Investment minimizes impact to the island's tree canopy and to the green and scenic character of the Island's roadways	Natural and Rural Character: Investment includes opportunities for native species and tree plantings, habitat enhancements, and/or green stormwater infrastructure
Criteria	Reduces VMT and/or SOV trips	Supports electrification	Minimizes impact to the Island's tree canopy and green and scenic character	Improves natural amenities and/or green stormwater infrastructure
Score	PROJECTS: Transit (3) Bike (2) Walk/Trail (1) PROGRAMS/POLICIES: High (3) Medium (2) Low (1)	Yes (2) No (0)	Yes (2) No (0)	High (2) Medium (1) Low (0)
Project Example	<i>**The project team will provide these scores for projects based on the transportation mode the project improves or supports.</i>	A mobility hub project-- which would include electric vehicle (EV) charging and electric shared-mobility options (like scooters or e-bikes)--would receive 2 points.	A project that improves an existing bike facility or creates a new transit route would score 2 points because the project would not impact the Island's tree canopy. Conversely, a project that builds a new trail through a forested area could potentially require tree removal and may impact the Island's tree canopy; this project would score 0 points.	A trail project presents an opportunity to create a planted buffer or to restore habitat along the trail and would rank high (scoring 2 points) for its potential to support the Island's natural and rural character.
Program/Policy Example	Programs that support sustainable student travel to school or expand shuttle services between BI destinations have the potential to significantly decrease VMT. These programs would score high and receive 3 points.	An islandwide shared e-bike program would score 2 points because it would increase access to electric mobility options.	A policy that incentivizes increased density and a mix of destinations in the Island's designated centers would score 2 points, as this type of policy could minimize the impacts of development on the Island's green and scenic character.	A program that closes streets to auto traffic could provide some additional space for native plantings and green stormwater infrastructure; this program would score medium (1 point) because of its moderate potential to enhance the Island's natural and rural character.

Sustainable Transportation Plan | Evaluation Criteria (7/12/2021)

Goals	Safety and Comfort				
Objectives and Descriptions	Crash Reduction: Investment is located at or within ¼ mile of a bike/pedestrian-involved crash location	Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety: Investment will improve bicycle/pedestrian safety or reduce level of stress within 1/4 mile of a high-stress corridor or intersection	Access to School: Investment is within 1/2 mile of or provides direct access to a school	Access to Senior Housing: Investment is within 1/2 mile of or provides direct access to existing or planned senior housing	Improves Existing Facility: Investment is on a corridor with existing walking or biking facilities, presenting an opportunity to improve the facility
Criteria	Is within 1/4 mile of a bike/ped-involved crash location	Is within 1/4 mile of a high-stress corridor or intersection (BLTS 3+ = high stress)	Is within 1/2 mile walkshed of a school	Is within 1/2 mile walkshed of existing or planned senior housing	Is on a corridor with an existing walking or biking facility
Score	Within 1/4 mile of multiple crashes (2) Within 1/4 mile of 1 crash (1)	At or on = 500 ft (3) Within 1/4 mile (2)	Yes (3) No (0)	Yes (1) No (0)	Yes (1) No (0)
Project Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>
Program/Policy Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>

Sustainable Transportation Plan | Evaluation Criteria (7/12/2021)

Goals	Equity and Accessibility			
Objectives and Descriptions	Equity: Investment is in an area with a high concentration of younger or older people, low-income people, people of color, or people with disabilities	Affordability: Investment is in an area with a high concentration of rent burdened households or low-income residents	Accessibility: Investment helps to create an ADA-accessible connection or facility	Address Systemic Inequities: Investment addresses existing disparities--including systemic racism and sexism--and specifically serves underrepresented populations, women, and/or interested but concerned cyclists
Criteria	Is partially or fully within a highest quartile equity Census tract	Is partially or fully located within a rent-burdened and/or high poverty status (50%+ of households) Census tracts	Creates ADA accessible connection or facility and/or supports access for people with disabilities	Includes low-stress facility to serve AAA needs and/or provides support for interested but concerned riders
Score	Yes (2) No (0)	Yes (2) No (0)	Yes (2) No (0)	Yes (2) No (0)
Project Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	A sidewalk would likely create an ADA-accessible facility and receive 2 points.	An all ages and abilities bicycle facility would serve "interested, but concerned" bicycle riders who need greater separation from traffic to feel comfortable bicycling and would receive 2 points. Bus stop improvements, which could include lighting, have the potential to create a more comfortable and supportive environment for people who may rely on walking, bicycling, and taking the bus, including historically underserved populations, and would receive 2 points.
Program/Policy Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	A Safe Routes for Seniors program would identify and enhance walking and rolling routes near destinations that serve older adults, likely increasing accessibility for people with mobility challenges and receiving a score of 2 points.	Education and encouragement programs designed for women, people of color, or English language learners could support these populations in using sustainable modes and would receive 2 points. A transportation subsidy program for low-income residents would provide greater access to sustainable transportation options and address disparities; it would receive 2 points.

Sustainable Transportation Plan | Evaluation Criteria (7/12/2021)

Goals	Connected and Convenient			
Objectives and Descriptions	Transit Access: Investment closes a gap, removes a barrier, or improves transit operations within 1/2 mile of a Kitsap Transit stop or the ferry terminal	Sustainable Growth: Investment is located within or provides direct access to a designated center	Access to Destinations: Investment provides multimodal access within 1/4 mile of or expands multimodal access to an essential service, childcare facility, park, trail, health provider, key employer, or school	Phase 1 AAA Network: Investment implements a Phase 1 segment of the AAA bike network
Criteria	Is located within 1/2 mile of a transit route, stop, or the ferry terminal	Is partially or fully located within 1/2 mile of a Neighborhood Center	Is partially or fully located within 1/4 mile of a destination listed above	Is part of the Phase 1 AAA Network (regardless of facility type)
Score	At or on = 500 ft (2) Within 1/2 mile (1)	Yes (3) No (0)	Employer/school (3) Non-park destination (2) Park (1) No (0)	Yes (3) No (0)
Project Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>
Program/Policy Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>

Sustainable Transportation Plan | Evaluation Criteria (7/12/2021)

Goals	Connected and Convenient		
Objectives and Descriptions	Link-Node Ratio: Investment increases street connectivity and intersection density	Modal Density: Investment improves mobility options and increases availability of sustainable transportation options	Ease of Access: Investment removes a barrier to and/or enhances the experience of accessing and using sustainable transportation
Criteria	Creates new crossings for any mode	Increases availability of 2 or more non-auto modes (walk/roll, bike, transit/shared mobility)	Connects to trail or bike network, improves access to transit, or removes barriers to sustainable modes
Score	SR305 Crossing (3) Other Crossing (2) No (0)	Yes to 2+ modes (3) No (0)	Yes (3) No (0)
Project Example	<p>A project that improves a crossing of SR 305--such as creating a new signalized intersection--for people walking, bicycling, or taking the bus would receive 3 points.</p> <p>A project that adds a new crosswalk in Lynwood Center would receive 2 points.</p>	<p>A multi-use trail, such as the Sound to Olympics trail, provides opportunities for people to walk/roll and bike and would receive 3 points.</p> <p>A sidewalk that connects to a bus stop would also receive 3 points, as it improves more than one sustainable transportation mode (walk/roll and transit).</p> <p>A new bike lane would receive 0 points, as it improves only one mode of sustainable transportation.</p>	<p>An intra-Island circulator shuttle would improve access to transit and would receive 3 points.</p> <p>A new all ages and abilities bikeway would connect to the bike network and remove a barrier to sustainable transportation; it would receive 3 points.</p>
Program/Policy Example	<p>A neighborhood greenways program that prioritizes people walking, rolling, and bicycling on low-volume, slow speed streets would enhance connections and crossings for sustainable modes and would receive 2 points.</p>	<p>A wayfinding program program that connects trails, bicycle routes, and transit stops would receive 3 points for improving access and connections to more than two modes.</p> <p>A policy that requires new development to provide EV charging, bicycle parking, and other sustainable transportation amenities would also receive 3 points, as the policy would increase the availability of more than two sustainable</p>	<p>A program to provide reduced transit fares to low-income people or students would improve access to transit and would receive 3 points.</p> <p>An educational program to help people prepare to ride a bicycle in the winter would remove a barrier to sustainable transportation and would receive 3 points.</p>

Sustainable Transportation Plan | Evaluation Criteria (7/12/2021)

Goals	Implementation and Funding				
Objectives and Descriptions	Leverage Planned Investments: Investment connects to or is near a planned capital project, presenting opportunities for combining project scopes	State of Good Repair: Investment improves pavement or a transit facility with a fair or poor condition rating	Feasibility: Investment is feasible and not overly complex	Interagency Partnership: Investment leverages interagency resources	Cost Effectiveness: Investment is cost effective and/or is expected to generate a positive return on investment
Criteria	Connects to or is within 1/4 mile of a planned capital project	Is located on a facility with fair or poor pavement condition (using Pavement Condition Index)	Is feasible and not overly complex (e.g., does not require significant purchase of right-of-way)	Presents opportunity to tap into existing funding sources, complement partner projects, or provide other synergies	Is cost effective or likely to generate a positive return on investment
Score	Yes (2) No (0)	Poor (2) Fair (1)	High (2) Medium (1) Low (0)	Yes (2) No (0)	Yes (2) No (0)
Project Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	A project that enhances an existing bus stop would be very feasible and relatively simple and would receive a high score of 2 points. A project that improves an existing bike facility by adding separation from traffic could require reconfiguring lanes and might be somewhat complex. This project would receive a medium score of 1 point. A project, such as a new bridge over SR 305, would require a significant structure, coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation, and acquiring property would be very complex and would receive a low score of 0 points.	A project that creates a mobility hub at the Ferry Terminal would be an opportunity to partner with Washington State Ferries and leverage state funds to improve the terminal; it would receive 2 points. A project to improve crossings of SR 305 would offer an opportunity to leverage WSDOT resources and would receive 2 points.	A sidewalk that connects multiple destinations in one of the Island's designated centers is a relatively cost-effective improvement and would serve many people, yielding a high return on investment and receiving 2 points. A sidewalk project that is far away from key Island destinations, disconnected from the existing transit network, and would require the purchase of new right-of-way would be less cost-effective and unlikely to serve many people; it would receive 0 points.
Program/Policy Example	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	<i>Quantitative (geographic) evaluation measure. No qualitative scoring needed.</i>	A congestion management program, such as tolling the Agate Pass Bridge, would require new state legislation and would be very complex; this program would receive a low score of 0 points. A pilot-to-permanent program that uses low-cost materials to test new street designs would be relatively simple to try and would receive a high score of 2 points.	A program that encourages sustainable student travel modes would be an opportunity to partner with Bainbridge Island School District and would receive 2 points.	A policy to enhance land use and transportation connections on Bainbridge Island--such as through land use code updates--is a relatively cost-effective solution that could yield a very high return on investment; it would receive 2 points.