2017 G.O. PROGRAM
RESIDENTIAL STREET RESURFACING/REPAIR
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Resurfacing and repairing residential streets benefits the City by reducing annual maintenance costs and manpower requirements. The benefits from improved PCI's consist of improved neighborhood appearance (and possibly property values) as well as reduced vehicle operating costs.

Step 1: Review Complaints

The list of complaints maintained by the Public Works Department will serve as a basis to for the initial list, and reviewed to eliminate duplications and locations that previously were addressed. The square mile was identified in which the complaint was located. The square mile list was then edited for duplications and to eliminate areas scheduled for improvement with 2007 G.O. Bond funds.

Step 2: Determine Pavement Condition, Number of Work Orders, and Maintenance Costs

Using tools available in the GIS System, an average Pavement Condition Indices (PCI) were determined. Similarly, the number of lane miles in the square mile area along with the total cost of work orders were calculated, as were the number and cost of maintenance work orders in the area being considers. The range of values for each condition issue was determined and broken into low, middle and high ranges. Points were assigned based on an assigned scale ranging from 8 to 4, with 8 being the highest priority for PCI, number of work orders, and the calculated cost of repairs in the square mile.

PCI	Points
0-25	8
26-50	6
51-100	4

Number of Work Orders	Points
> 650	8
300-650	6
< 300	4

Repair Cost per Lane Mile	Points
> $65,000	8
$30,000-$65,000	6
< $30,000	4

Step 3: Assign Benefit Value

For purposes of evaluation, each category was assigned a weight as follows:

PCI	35%
Number of Work Orders in the Square Mile	20%
Repair Cost per Lane Mile	45%

Step 4: Estimate Costs

Estimates of costs to repair and resurface residential streets within specific boundaries are determined in order to establish the number of projects that can be addressed by the proposed bond issue. Additionally, these estimates are used as a "tie breaker" when there are proposed projects with the same benefit score. Projects with lower estimated cost are prioritized in order to maximize the number of lane miles that can be addressed by the bond issue.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
STREET WIDENING
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Widening two lane arterial streets to four or more lanes benefits the City by reducing traffic congestion and commuter times; and provides improved access to commercial/industrial developments and public institutions.

Step 1: Review Complaints

The list of complaints maintained by the Public Works Department was reviewed to eliminate duplications and locations that had previously been addressed. Individual miles were then identified and edited to eliminate street duplications and streets scheduled for improvements from other funding sources.

Step 2: Assess Existing Data

Current traffic counts and accident history were determined for each street segment under consideration. Expected area population and employment levels were also considered. The range of values for each category was determined and broken into low, middle and high ranges. Points were based on an assigned scale ranging from 8 to 0, with 8 being the highest priority.

ADT	Points
> or = 7,500	8
< 7,500	4

Development Responsiveness	Points
Highest Growth	8
No Growth	0
Taken from GIS Data	

Accident Severity	Points
Above Ave.	8
Below Ave.	4
Taken from ACOG Collision Map	

Step 3: Assign Benefit Value

For purposes of evaluation, each category was assigned a weight as follows:

ADT	50%
Accident Severity	20%
Development Responsiveness	30%

Step 4: Estimate Costs

Estimates of widening costs within specific limits are determined in order to establish the number of projects that can be addressed by the proposed bond issue. Additionally, these estimates are used as a "tie breaker" when there are proposed projects with the same benefit score. Projects with lower estimated cost are prioritized in order to maximize the number of lane miles that can be addressed by the bond issue.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
SECTION LINE (TWO LANE) STREET RESURFACING
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Resurfacing and repairing two lane arterial streets benefits the City by reducing annual maintenance costs and manpower requirements. The benefits from improved PCI's include reduced vehicle operating costs, improved operating speeds and improved safety.

Step 1: Review Complaints

The list of complaints maintained by the Public Works Department was reviewed to eliminate duplications and locations that had previously been addressed. Individual miles were identified and edited to eliminate street duplications and streets scheduled for improvements from other funding sources.

Step 2: Determine Pavement Condition, Average Daily Traffic, Maintenance History, and Accident Severity

Pavement Condition Indices (PCI); current traffic counts; projected traffic volumes; maintenance history; and accident history were determined for each street segment under consideration. The range of values for each condition issue was determined and broken into low, middle and high ranges. Points were based on an assigned scale ranging from 8 to 4, with 8 being the highest priority. The Maintenance History was calculated by combining the cost for all work orders for the last three years and divided by the number of work orders. The average is at 50%.

PCI	Points
0-40	8
40-70	4
> 70	0

ADT	Points
> or = 3,000	8
< 3,000	4
Taken from ACOG Collision Map	

Maintenance History	Points
Above Ave.	8
Below Ave.	4

Accident Severity	Points
Above Ave.	8
Below Ave.	4
Taken from ACOG Collision Map	

Step 3: Assign Benefit Value

For purposes of evaluation, each category was assigned a weight as follows:

PCI	40%
ADT	25%
Maintenance History	25%
Accident Severity	10%

Step 4: Estimate Costs

Estimates of costs to repair and resurface two lane section line roads within specific limits are determined in order to establish the number of projects that can be addressed by the proposed bond issue. Additionally, these estimates are used as a "tie breaker" when there are proposed projects with the same benefit score. Projects with lower estimated cost are prioritized in order to maximize the number of lane miles that can be addressed by the bond issue.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
SECTION LINE (FOUR LANE) STREET RESURFACING
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Resurfacing and repairing four lane section line streets benefits the City by reducing annual maintenance costs and manpower requirements. The benefits from improved PCI's include reduced vehicle operating costs and improved operating speeds.

Step 1: Review Complaints
The list of complaints maintained by the Public Works Department was reviewed to eliminate duplications and locations that had previously been addressed. Individual miles were identified and edited to eliminate streets scheduled for improvements from other funding sources.

Step 2: Determine Pavement Condition, Average Daily Traffic, and Maintenance History
Pavement Condition Indices (PCI); current traffic counts, and maintenance history were determined for each street segment under consideration. The range of values for each condition issue was determined and broken into low, middle and high ranges. Points are based on an assigned scale ranging from 8 to 4, with 8 being the highest priority. The Maintenance History was calculated by combining the cost for all work orders for the last three years and divided by the number of work orders. The average is at 50%.

PCI	Points
0-40	8
40-70	4
> 70	0

ADT	Points
> or = 3,000	8
< 3,000	4
Taken from ACOG Collision Map	

Maintenance History	Points
Above Ave.	8
Below Ave.	4

Step 3: Assign Benefit Value
For purposes of evaluation, each category was assigned a weight as follows:

PCI	40%
ADT	30%
Maintenance History	30%

Step 4: Estimate Costs

Estimates of costs to repair and resurface four lane section line roads within specific limits are determined in order to establish the number of projects that can be addressed by the proposed bond issue. Additionally, these estimates are used as a "tie breaker" when there are proposed projects with the same benefit score. Projects with lower estimated cost are prioritized in order to maximize the number of lane miles that can be addressed by the bond issue.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
STREET ENHANCEMENT PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Projects for street enhancement include a varied mix of improvements to street segments for pedestrian, transit, automobile, and bicycle users. Examples include: crosswalks and pedestrian related signals, signal improvements, access management, bus stop related improvements, lighting, landscaping, and other amenities.

Step 1. Identify Projects

Potential projects were generated through area planning work, the bicycle and pedestrian master plan process, staff analysis of need, and public input.

Step 2: Evaluate for Impact

Potential projects were evaluated by how many people (current and future) the project would impact and responsive populations (people more likely to use sidewalks, transit, or bike facilities because of economic, physical, age related, or other circumstances). Project impact was augmented by a project supporting revitalization in an area with an active city program or policy for revitalization.

- 0 to 8 points were assigned to each project based on the amount of responsive populations (people more likely to use pedestrian and bicycle facilities because of economic, physical, age related, or other circumstances) impacted, with 0 representing no responsive populations and 8 representing the highest number of responsive population.
- 0 to 8 "Network Impact" points were assigned to each project, with 0 representing no impact and 8 being the most impact. "Network Impact" reflects the number of motorists (residents, workers, and visitors) impacted by a project.
- 0 to 8 points were assigned to each project based on the level expected area population and employment growth with 0 representing no growth or negative growth and 8 representing the highest rates of growth.
- 0 or 8 "Neighborhood and Urban Commercial Revitalization" points were assigned to each project, with 8 points given to projects located in strategically important areas with City programs, policies, or plans related to revitalization or economic development. Projects not located in such areas received no points.
- 0 or 8 points were assigned to each project based on connectivity to schools, parks, bus stops, existing sidewalk network, and walking supportive land use mix as determined by the draft bicycle and pedestrian master plan.

Step 3. Evaluate Costs

Costs were evaluated based on recent observed costs of specific improvement and maintenance projects as well as the size of proposed projects.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM

Step 4. Prioritization

Projects were ranked according to how well they met the impact criteria.

Responsive Population	15%
Network Impact (current population, employment, and visitation)	40%
Development Responsiveness (expected population and employment)	15%
Neighborhood and Urban Commercial Revitalization	15%
Connectivity to Schools, Parks, Bus Stops, Existing Sidewalk Network, and walking Supportive Land Use Mix*	15%

As determined by the draft bicycle and pedestrian master plan.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
SIDEWALK PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1: Identify Projects

Potential projects were generated through the bicycle and pedestrian master plan process, area planning work, staff analysis of need, and public input.

Step 2: Evaluate for Impact

Potential projects were evaluated by how many people the project would impact including consideration of: responsive populations (people more likely to use sidewalks because of economic, physical, age related, or other circumstances), connections to schools and parks, connections to existing networks, and district and neighborhood revitalization.

- 0 to 8 points were assigned to each project based on the amount of responsive populations (people more likely to use sidewalks because of economic, physical, age related, or other circumstances) impacted, with 0 representing no responsive populations and 8 representing the highest number of responsive population.
- 0 or 8 points were assigned to each project based on connectivity to schools, parks, bus stops, existing sidewalk network, and walking supportive land use mix as determined by the draft bicycle and pedestrian master plan.
- 0 to 8 "Network Impact" points were assigned to each project, with 0 representing no impact and 8 being the most impact. "Network Impact" reflects the number of people (residents, workers, and visitors) impacted by a project.
- 0 or 8 "Neighborhood and Urban Commercial Revitalization" points were assigned to each project, with 8 points given to projects located in strategically important areas with City programs, policies, or plans related to revitalization or economic development. Projects not located in such areas received no points.

Step 3: Evaluate Costs

Costs for each project were estimated based on the amount of sidewalk needed and the average price of installing new sidewalk in developed areas.

Step 4: Priority Ranking

Projects were ranked according to how well they met the impact criteria as described in the table below.

Category	Weight
Responsive Populations	35%
Connectivity to Schools, Parks, Bus Stops, Existing Sidewalk Network, and walking Supportive Land Use Mix*	20%
Network Impact (current population, employment, and visitation)	35%
Neighborhood and Urban Commercial Revitalization	10%

*As determined by the draft bicycle and pedestrian master plan.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
BRIDGE PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Bridge replacement and repair benefits the City by reducing annual maintenance costs and manpower requirements. The benefits from improved bridges include the continuity of the street network.

Step 1. Query Existing Inspection Report Data
Data for each City bridge was selected from an existing database to identify its general condition and its potential to receive external funding. This data was transferred to an Excel spreadsheet and included the following:
1) Average Daily Traffic (ADT)
2) Sufficiency Rating
3) Rating code
4) Overall Condition Evaluation of the Bridge Deck
5) Overall Condition Evaluation of the Bridge Super Span
6) Overall Condition Evaluation of the Bridge Substructure
7) Overall Condition Evaluation of the Culverts
8) Current Level of Service
9) Waterway Adequacy

Step 2. Develop Priority Score and Sort Projects for Evaluation
The Priority Score is composed of two components which are named the ACOG (The Association of Central Oklahoma Governments) Base Score and Structural Evaluation. The ACOG Base Score is intended to help identify bridges in poor condition and projects that may be eligible to receive funding. While the Structural Evaluation component is intended to help weight issues in need of more immediate attention. The total possible points for each component are provided below:

ACOG BASE SCORE	17 Points
STRUCTURAL EVALUATION	10 Points
TOTAL POSSIBLE PRIORITY SCORE	27 Points

The bridges were then sorted based on the priority score and the first 40 bridges with the highest score along with all Structurally Deficient Rated bridges were selected to be evaluated. If deficiencies were identified during the evaluation process that required funding through the bond election process to address, a project was placed the unfunded bond list.

Step 3. Sort Projects Based on Priority Score
Once placed on the unfunded bond list, the projects are then sorted again by priority score. Projects with a larger priority score are given higher priority.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
TRAFFIC PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1. Query Average Daily Traffic Volume (ADT)

The traffic volume passing through an intersection, regardless of the classification of the intersecting roads, is an indicator of its function and importance within the City's overall transportation network. This ranking criterion correlates the greatest public need based on the roadway that carries the most traffic.

Traffic Entering Volume	Ranking Points
<= 7,000 vehicles per day (vpd)	4
7,001 vpd to 12,000 vpd	5
12,001 vpd to 20,000 vpd	8
> 20,000 vpd	10

Priority ranking points for Average Daily Traffic Volume (ADT) is based on the ADT of the most heavily travelled street.

Step 2. Collect crash severity rate from Oklahoma Department of Transportation

Collision data is an important means with which to assess the number, type and severity of reported crashes. Reviewing the causes and severity of crashes reported yields essential information to help identify potential problems and to develop appropriate safety solutions. The number of collisions reported over a three year period, along with their severity, compared to the traffic volume through an intersection, is one measure used to rank locations.

The collision severity index system used by the State of Oklahoma weights different types of accidents (fatality (FAT) accidents = 4, injury (INJ) accidents = 4, property damage only (PDO) accidents = 2). The formulas for the three year severity index and overall crash severity are as follows:

$$\text{Severity } \textit{Index} = \frac{(\text{PDO collisions X 2}) + ((\text{INJ} + \text{FAT}) \text{ collisions X4})}{3 \text{ year average}}$$

$$\textit{Crash Severity} = \frac{\text{Severity Index X One Million}}{365 \text{ X (24-hour Intersection Traffic Entering Volumes)}}$$

Priority ranking points for Crash Severity Rate is based on the Crash Severity Equation.

Step 3. Perform Site Safety Assessment

Pavement markings and signs present, the number of travel lanes and their assigned use, physical features within and in close proximity to the roadway and the condition of the pavement all have a bearing on every roadway user's ability to travel safely. An engineering on-site assessment of safety conditions, supplemented with known traffic demands and collision trends, help identify safety issues and capacity improvement needs. The assessment ranks locations based on site conditions and collision trends.

Site Assessment Criteria	Ranking Points
Meets or exceeds City decision sight distance requirements	0
Does not meet City decision sight distance requirements	3
Number of lanes present sufficient to meet demand	0
Insufficient number of lanes to meet demand	3
Current level of traffic control adequate	0
Traffic control improvements justified	3

Collision types considered correctable by traffic control and/or channelization as a percent of total collisions

Correctable collisions as a percentage of total	Ranking Points
<= 33%	1
34% to 67%	2
>67%	3

Priority ranking points for Site Safety Assessment is the sum of the site assessment criteria ranking points and the correctable collisions ranking points.

Example priority ranking point calculation:

For an intersection where:

- the ADT traffic volumes on one street is 4,755 vpd and 18,772 vpd on the other
- 13 PDO collisions, 7 INJ collisions and 2 FAT collisions appear in Oklahoma Department of Public Safety records in the previous 3 years
- all intersection approaches meet or exceed decision sight distance requirements, the number of roadway lanes is not sufficient to meet observed demand and the current level of traffic control is not sufficient to meet known traffic demand

The location receives 8 ranking points based on the greater ADT, 20.667 severity index points which, based on traffic through the intersection, 2.41 crash severity rate points, 6 site assessment criteria points along with 2 correctable collision points for a total of 8 site safety assessment points for a total of 18.41 total priority ranking points.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
DRAINAGE PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Building, repairing and maintaining a quality drainage system benefits the City by controlling runoff and minimizing pollutants draining into natural waterways. Improvements provide reduced flooding which saves lives and property .

Step 1. Project Review
The project details are reviewed one last time to determine if the project meets requirements to be considered for funding. An error may have occurred when initially assigned or policies may have changed that could affect its consideration.

Step 2. Determine the Cause of the Issue & Develop Scope of Project
The cause of an issue must first be understood before a project can be developed to help mitigate its affects. A better understanding of the cause leads to more effective solutions. Each project has a differing degree of required analysis before an effective solution may be developed. Each project was evaluated to determine if further analysis is recommend. Otherwise, a conservative approach was taken to estimate the scope of the project required to solve each issue.

Step 3. Estimate Project Cost
If a detailed project cost estimate was not available, a conservative approach was utilized to estimate construction costs for each project. Typically, the cost for all quantities required to complete a project were included in a single item (such as linear feet of storm sewer). Other non-construction costs such as design, testing, and administration were then added based on a percentage of construction.

Step 4. Assign Benefit Value to Project
A total of 13 unique benefits were identified for the current project list. These benefits were influenced by criteria which have influenced past project prioritization. A list of these benefits is provided below:
1. Structure Flooding (Four or More Feet Above Finish Floor Elevation)
2. Structure Flooding (One Feet above Finish Floor Elevation)
3. Structure Flooding (Entering Garage or Residence)
4. Yard Flooding
5. Street Flooding (Affects Traffic)
6. Ponding (Persistent water at location which common paving project not expected to resolve)
7. Channel Erosion Endangering Fence
8. Channel Erosion Endangering Building
9. Channel Erosion Endangering Public Street
10. Recurring Maintenance
11. Project Readiness
12. Council Resolution
13. Risk of Failure

Step 5. Calibrate Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

A benefit cost ratio was then developed for each project by dividing assigned benefits by estimated costs. Projects were then categorized into one of two groups based on assigned benefits. The project groups and their associated benefits are provided below.

A. **Flood Prevention** – These projects seek to provide proper drainage and help prevent damage caused by future storm events. The following benefits are associated with this project group:
- Structure Flooding
- Yard Flooding
- Street Flooding
- Ponding

B. **Cost Mitigation –** These projects seek to protect existing public infrastructure from storm runoff. The following benefits are associated with this project group:
- Channel Erosion
- Recurring Maintenance
- Risk of Failure

A calibration factor was then used to help weight these project groups. This was accomplished by comparing the average BCR for each group and applying a factor uniformly to the BCR for all projects in the group. The results are shown in the table below.

Project Group	# of Projects	Average Initial BCR	Average BCR Goal	Calibrated Average BCR
Flood Prevention	81	1.35	1.00	1.01
Cost Mitigation	10	1.28	2.00	2.03

Step 6. Sort Projects Based on Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR)

Projects with a larger BCR value are determined to be of higher priority than projects with smaller BCR values.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
SWQ PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1. **Determine if the stream is listed as an impaired waterway or is the stream segment/storm drain system within a TMDL watershed.**

This metric directly addresses any regulatory consequences the City may have with regard to State and Federal required pollutant removals. Streams identified as impaired but have no Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) should be ranked lower than those streams which have active TMDL's. A TMDL is a pollution limit placed on permitted communities, commercial or industrial operations. These permits may include wastewater treatment works, storm water discharge permits, multi-sector general permits, etc. A 303(d) listed stream is an impaired water body or waterway which water quality does not meet State Water Quality Standards for one or more of the water body's assigned beneficial uses.

Category	Score
Insufficient Info to Determine	1
No Listings	1
Does the Project Area Drain Into an TMDL area or 303(d) listed waterway?	2
Water body is 303(d) Listed	2
Active or Proposed TMDL	3

Note: Scoring for the environmental data acquisition system (Project #3) was reduced by 0.5 point as the stations may not always be located within an impaired waterway.

Insufficient information to determine means the subject project may have multiple locations which need to be prioritized by environmental conditions such as pollution levels, drainage area captured, proximity to existing storm water infrastructure, slope, etc.

Project areas draining into a TMDL or 303(d) listed streams were scored at 2 points. This scoring was provided to allow discrimination between project areas which may be relatively remote from the impaired waterway. The project may have lower level of measurable pollutant reductions to the receiving waters but would still be beneficial in meeting State and Federal requirements. Additionally those projects that are located on impaired waterways yet lack the formal TMDL to indicate the pollutant reductions necessary to meet water quality standard should not be prioritized as high as those that have active or proposed TMDL(s).

Step 2. Would the proposed project(s) address or <u>measure </u>the water quality issues identified?

Category	Score
No	1
Unknown	2
Yes	3

Note: "Measure" was added to capture the proposed data acquisition system (Project #3). Each proposed station would contribute to information needed for watershed management. Scoring for the environmental data acquisition system was reduced by 0.5 point as the project does not directly impact the water quality issue and stations may not always be located within an impaired waterway.

Step 3. Does the proposed project have historical data to provide preliminary and post control comparisons to determine project success?

Category	Score
No Data Available or Insufficient Info to Determine	0
Light (<15 months and within the last 10 years)	1
Moderate (<15 months and within the last 5 years)	2
High (>15 months and within the last 2 years)	3

Note: The months refer to the amount of monthly data that was acquired for the project area. Data may be pooled from multiple stations within a watershed. The point of this metric is the certainty of water quality issues and the historical information available to determine project success.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
PARKS & RECREATION
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

The Parks and Recreation Department submitted a prioritized list of proposed 2017 General Obligation Bond projects. This list was created using multiple methods of public input and professional standards. All of these factors were used to gather information, plan, strategize, and create the proposed 2017 General Obligation Bond project list for the Parks and Recreation Department.

Step 1. Gather public input

The Department has met with the public on multiple occasions: no less than five park specific ward meetings to discuss what the residents were interested in seeing improved or built in the park system within their ward; to-date six City-wide public GO Bond meetings; multiple neighborhood association meetings and home owner association meetings. We work closely with Neighborhood Alliance where we gain insight and better understanding on the needs for park improvements.

Step 2. Access Action Center complaints

The Department receives multiple calls from the Action Center reporting problems or issues in Parks that need to be addressed with park improvements. Residents offer suggestions and report needs in their local neighborhood parks via telephone conversations, email, social media and the City website. Meetings are held regularly with the Oklahoma City Convention and Visitors Bureau to discuss opportunities to attract visitors on a regional and national basis to park assets for potential events in the future and the infrastructure needs to host those events that will potentially have a large economic benefit for the City. An example of this type of asset is a new Fieldhouse at Wiley Post Park that would include multiple indoor courts for basketball, volleyball, wrestling or gymnastics for high school and college tournaments.

Step 3. Confirm alignment with PlanOKC

Also taken into consideration is the recently adopted *planOKC,* the Oklahoma City Master Plan and the Oklahoma City Parks Master Plan. Analyses in both plans highlight the areas of the City where future population growth is expected and what park services will need to be created and maintained to support the residents. Trail systems and amenities were identified in the plan along with the need for connectors to local and regional parks for easier access for residents to exercise and recreate.

Step 4. Review National Recreation and Park Association recommendations

The Parks and Recreation Department staff has a wealth of professional experience and knowledge and brought to the planning table ideas and information from park systems nationally. The National Recreation and Park Association produces studies and data on park trends and needs in cities across the country to help combat health and wellness issues, modern and environmentally sensitive equipment and amenities, and cultural and diversity studies to assist with unifying communities. The Department uses these national

standards and benchmarks to be sure the City of Oklahoma City residents are being provided with the best in park services.

Step 5. Gather data from City departments and stakeholders

The Department is in constant communications with partner organizations such as the American Softball Association, Boathouse Foundation, Myriad Botanical Gardens, OKC Beautiful, and CityCare so we can assist them in managing and building amenities to help better serve residents. We rely heavily on internal partners, such as Building Management, Public Works and Utilities, to help us monitor the condition of our existing buildings, park roads, parking lots and utility services so we can better plan for repairs and replacements of infrastructure. We assessed the services in the surrounding communities and identified areas where we would not want to duplicate services and looked at areas where efficiencies can be gained by consolidating services, decreasing energy consumption with better built infrastructure and updating parks amenities.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
TRAIL PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1: Identify Projects

Potential projects were generated through the bicycle and pedestrian master plan process and public input.

Step 2: Evaluate for Impact

Potential projects were evaluated by how many people the project would impact including consideration of: responsive populations (people more likely to use trails because of economic, physical, age related, or other circumstances), connections to existing networks, and district and neighborhood revitalization.

Step 3: Evaluate Costs

Costs for each project were estimated based on the length of trail proposed multiplied by the average cost of installation.

Step 4: Priority Ranking

Potential projects were evaluated by first summing responsive populations and "network impact" (current and expected population and employment). That result is then divided by total cost to arrive at "value". The value is half of a project score. The remaining half is determined by whether a project is listed in the draft bicycle and pedestrian master plan, which identified trail locations based on a variety of factors including proximity to existing trails, neighborhoods, and destinations, and feasibility of location and construction.

Component	Weight
Benefit/Cost[1]	50%
Connectivity/proximity to existing trails, neighborhoods and destinations; and feasibility[2]	50%

[1] Calculated by dividing the sum of current population, employment, visitation, and responsive population by total cost.

[2] As determined by the draft bicycle and pedestrian master plan.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
FIRE DEPARTMENT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1. Determine needs and projects
  The Fire Department provides their list of projects identified for the GO Bond program.

Step 2. Priority of projects
  The projects will be prioritized by the Director (Chief) and forwarded to Public Works.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
POLICE DEPARTMENT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1. Determine needs and projects

   The Police Department provides their list of projects identified for the GO Bond program.

Step 2. Priority of projects

   The projects will be prioritized by the Director (Chief) and forwarded to Public Works.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
LIBRARIES
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1. Determine needs and projects

The Metropolitan Library System provides their list of projects identified for the GO Bond program.

Step 2. Priority of projects

The projects will be prioritized by the director of the Metropolitan Library System and forwarded to Public Works.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
CITY FACILITIES
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

Step 1. Determine needs and projects

The following departments, Police Department, Fire Department, General Services Department and Public Works Department provides projects for the list identified for the GO Bond program.

Step 2. Priority of projects

The projects will be prioritized by the department heads and forwarded to Public Works.

2017 G.O. PROGRAM
TRANSIT
PRIORITIZATION METHOD SUMMARY

The Transit and Parking Department submitted a list of proposed 2017 General Obligation Bond projects for transit. This list was generated using community input, staff participation and analysis, and use of industry best practices.

Step 1. Garner Input and Determine Needs and Projects

The Department has met with the public on multiple occasions in recent years and taken into account their input. In addition, the Department surveys passengers as well as nonriders periodically to gauge community needs and desires, as described below. The sorts of needs identified in past local transit plans and the department's Five Year Capital Improvement program were also considered. Emerging from all of the above were several capital projects and these were placed in seven functional categories.

Noteworthy are the two survey's results. The desire for reliable and clean vehicles, park-and-ride lots, and having protection from the weather at bus stops were some of the top desires that translate into capital projects. Spokies bike share and the Oklahoma River Cruisers aspects of the transit system can also benefit from added investment.

Step 2: Evaluate for Impact

Potential projects were considered by the degree to which they are essential to safe travel, potential to reduce ongoing maintenance costs, capacity to expand or improve service, ability to improve air quality and likelihood to attract new customers. Staff was mindful of people who the project would likely impact, including the consideration of neighborhoods, multimodal connections, urban revitalization, and responsive populations (people more likely to use buses, ferries, bicycles, park-and-ride lots because of income, physical condition, geographic, or other circumstances). Projects were reviewed for conformance with Oklahoma City's comprehensive plan (PlanOKC) or selected due their ability to further the City Council's adopted priorities.

Step 3. Assess Potential for Other Funding Sources

Taken into consideration is whether an alternative funding source was possible or might be more appropriate. Other sources considered were the state funding and federal funding. In some cases a G.O. Bond might leverage federal funds by being serving as the required local match for a project.

Step 4: Evaluate Costs

Costs for each project category were estimated based on industry data, past plans and studies, and new research. The costs were multiplied by the number of likely units needed to make a substantial improvement. In the case of buses, the objective was to replace that number of buses certain to reach their Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) during the likely course of the bond offering.

Step 5. Priority of Projects

Bus Fleet Replacement, and Fleet Expansion and Bus Stop Improvements were identified as the top priority projects. Other projects included in the list are of roughly equal priority.