

2018 SRTC Call for Projects Application

PROJECT TITLE: RATTLER RUN ROAD IMPROVEMENTS



AGENCY RANKING (your top 10 projects will receive bonus points; 1 = highest priority 10 = lowest): 1

REQUESTED SRTC REGIONAL FUNDS (STBG, CMAQ or STBG Set-Aside): \$799,433

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Agency or Organization	Town of Fairfield	Phone Number	509-283-2414
Contact Person	Cheryl Loeffler, Clerk/Treasurer	Email Address	fairfieldwa@gmail.com

Project Information

Project Location

Rattler Run Road, Gov. Moore to SR-27

Urbanized Area Urban Small Rural

Federal Functional Classification

Local Access (Existing), Rural Major Collector (Reclassification Request Pending)

Project Description

Project scope (include termini and length)

The proposed project will reconstruct Rattler Run Road from Gov. Moore Road to SR-27 including raising the roadbed, increasing the capacity of the stormwater drainage facilities and paving the surface. The length is approximately 2,950-feet.

Existing and proposed conditions

The existing roadway is a narrow (12'-18' wide) seasonal gravel/dirt road with inadequate storm drainage. A small portion near the north end is paved, but the condition is poor and has extensive alligator cracking. The adjacent ditches are clogged with sediment and non-native invasive plant species that severely limited the hydraulic capacity. Existing culverts under the roadway are undersized. In the spring, runoff from surrounding hills collects in the un-named tributary of Rattler Run Creek/ drainage ditches that parallel the road. The flows overwhelm the existing drainage and flood the roadway. The flooding backs up into an adjacent horse pasture and allows fecal contaminated sediment to wash downstream into Rattler's Run Creek contributing to water quality issues in the creek. The Town received emergency approval from Dept. of Fish & Wildlife in March to clear sediment from a portion of the drainage ditch and existing culvert to mitigate flooding that was in progress

The road is primarily used as a truck bypass for grain trucks travelling to and from the PNW Co-Op grain growers' facility at the center of Town. It provides an alternate route back to the highway (SR-27) that prevents heavy truck traffic from using local access roads to loop back to SR-27. It is currently only usable during dry weather as the trucks quickly cause severe rutting in during wet weather.

The road is currently classified as a Local Access Road. However, a reclassification request to a Rural Major Collector Arterial is being submitted concurrently to WSDOT and SRTC with the application.

The proposed project will reconstruct the roadway by removing and replacing unsuitable subgrade materials at critical locations, and then placing appropriate borrow material and crushed rock to elevate the roadbed and widen it to 22-feet with gravel shoulders. The drainage ditches would be regraded and enlarged as necessary to adequately accommodate runoff. Existing culverts would be upsized and replaced. The south end of the road crosses the end of a Union Pacific rail line that dead ends about ½ mile south of the crossing. During design, we will coordinate with the Railroad to verify if the rail line is still active and if the crossing will need upgraded to concrete panels or can be abandoned. No pedestrian or bike facilities are proposed due to that absence of non-vehicle traffic generators along the route.

Project purpose and outcomes

The proposed project would complete a hard surfaced, all weather roadway with adequate drainage that allows heavy truck traffic to safely loop back to SR-27 without damaging local access streets. The project helps protect the environment by eliminating a preventable source of sediment contributing to water quality issues in Rattle Run Creek. It will also improve air quality by paving an existing gravel/dirt road. The finished project will support the continued viability and functionality of the adjacent grain elevator facility.

The project sponsor must indicate that the project, once completed, will be maintained for the life of the project.

Please describe the plan, cycle, funding source and enforcement mechanisms (i.e. snow removal policy) to maintain this project for year-round/four-season use.

The completed project will be operated and maintained as a Town arterial street in accordance with Town ordinances and codes. Maintenance will be completed through Town's annual street maintenance program included snow removal

Project Delivery Tools

The project sponsor must certify that they will utilize all project delivery tools available, including eminent domain, to acquire ROW, if necessary, to meet project obligation schedules.

Attachments

- Vicinity map
- Typical Cross Sections (if changed from Eligibility Worksheet)
- Cost Estimate
- Project Endorsement form

Cost Information (in addition to the Cost Estimate)

Cost estimate notes (optional, if additional information is needed)

Project is adjacent to unnamed tributary of Rattler Run Creek. A thorough biological and cultural review is anticipated to be required.

Proposed project will function as truck bypass route for grain traffic accessing the Grain elevators. Pavement section has been estimated to accommodate high percentage of truck traffic.

Describe the commitment of secured matching funds or other funds and the status of obtaining any unsecured funds.

Note: matching funds must be available at the time of fund obligation.

Town intends to apply for TIB's Federal Matching program during upcoming application cycle in August 2018

Please indicate if there are any circumstances that could delay the obligation of funds.

Circumstances that could delay the project include possible discovery of biological or cultural resources that would require mitigation. Other potential circumstances would be a delay in securing matching funds.

Project requires coordination with Union Pacific Railroad to either abandon or upgrade old wood railroad crossing. While ROW purchasing is not anticipated, construction easements may be necessary to complete project. A delay in securing matching funds for the project could also delay obligation.

1. ECONOMIC VITALITY – 50 POINTS

Employment and Destination Accessibility

1a (15). To be scored internally by SRTC staff with the maps referenced in the table below

Project Score	Category	Criteria and Requirements
15	Provides a critical connection within or between two or more core areas. (see employment core map)	Maximizing or increasing system capacity. Increasing the efficiency of one or more modes. Reducing congestion.
10	Serves a regionally significant employment center (see employment density map)	Improving or enhancing the movement of workers. Providing new access to jobs. Improving or enhancing the movement of freight and services.
5	Serves a regionally significant transportation center (e.g. - park and rides, transit centers, etc.)	Improving access to terminals (air, transit, or multimodal)

1b (5). Please describe if the project serves other critical regional public facilities with significant activity (e.g. - Riverside State Park, Joe Albi Stadium, Avista Stadium/Fairgrounds, etc.) (High-Medium-Low)

Project improves access to grain traffic travelling to and from the PNW Co-Op Grain Facility located one block south of the project. This facility handles significant year-round truck traffic with particularly heavy truck volumes during harvest in August-September. The facility includes grain elevators for storage, a processing facility and seed plant receiving wheat, barley, lentils and other crops. The Elevators are an intermodal facility where crops are stored before being loaded onto rail car for shipping to destination ports throughout the region. The railroad spur line ends at Fairfield which increases the facility's importance within the agricultural community. Agriculture is the lifeblood and economic engine of the community. Maintaining adequate access to and from the facility contributes to the economic viability and vitality of the Town.

1c (5). Please describe if the project serves an area that is targeted for planned future growth or revitalization. (include local planning documentation as well as targeted investment details, if applicable) (High-Medium-Low)

The property adjacent to the project is mostly agricultural fields and not expected to be developed in foreseeable future.

1d (5). Does the project have another connection to economic vitality that is not captured by, or in addition to, access to activity centers (Questions 1a,1b,1c) or freight use (Question 1f)? Please explain. (High-Medium-Low)

The grain grower facility is a major employer for the Town.

Existing Development (Internal Use Only)

1e (10). Is the project located within an area of significant existing employment density?

To be scored internally by SRTC staff with 2015 ESD information

- High – 10 points
- Medium – 5 points
- Low – 1 points

Freight Network (Internal Use Only)

1f (10). Is this project located on a FGTS classified T1, T2, T3 route, or on WSDOT's Truck Freight Economic Corridor?

To be scored internally by SRTC staff using the FGTS and WSDOT Truck Freight Economic Corridor Maps

- T1 - 10 points
- T2 – 6 points
- T3 – 4 points
- Otherwise included in WSDOT's TFEC - 2 points

2. COOPERATION AND LEADERSHIP – 50 POINTS

Local Planning Alignment

2a (15). How is this project consistent with your Comprehensive Plan and is it included in your Capital Improvement Program? (please provide the excerpt or citation)

Yes, The Project is listed in the Town's most recent 6-Yr CIP, dated June 2017.

Agency Coordination

2b (20). Does the project concept advance the goals of more than one jurisdiction and/or agency (including public/private partnerships)? If so, please describe:

The project improves truck access to and from the Fairfield PNW Co-Op facility, a major regional intermodal grain storage, processing and shipping hub.

Public Involvement

2c (15). Please describe the extent to which the project has been reviewed by the public. 3 points/checkbox (15 point max)

- Public meetings
- Workshops/Open houses
- Planning study
- Environmental review
- Legislative actions
- Other (please explain) The need for improvements to Rattler Run Road has been discussed at multiple council meetings due to on-going flooding issues along road from inadequate drainage facilities and the poor condition of the road surface. This project was developed out of those discussions.

3. STEWARDSHIP – 50 POINTS

Environmental Mitigations

3a (10). Does the project improve the environment or minimize the environmental impact of the facility above and beyond current design standards? **2 points/checkbox (10 point max)**

- Green infrastructure (e.g. rain gardens, swales)
- Drought tolerant vegetation
- Air quality benefit
- Decrease in impervious area
- Use of recycled materials
- Flood damage mitigation
- Stream or wetland restoration
- LED lighting
- Other (please explain) The project will address drainage issues that cause flooding on Rattler Run Road. The flooding backs up into an adjacent horse pasture and washes fecal contaminated sediment downstream into Rattler's Run Creek and contributes to poor water quality in the creek. By addressing drainage capacity issues, the project will reduce the potential for flooding and address a preventable source of water quality issues in the creek. Rattler's Run Creek is a tributary of Hangman Creek and the Spokane River. Its water quality is of significant concern to Dept. of Ecology and local water quality/environmental advocacy groups such as RiverKeepers and Sierra Club.

Ability to Advance

3b (15). Status of the project (check all that apply):

- Environmental documentation (NEPA) is complete – 5 points
- Right-of-way acquisition is complete or not needed – 5 points
- Design is 30% or more complete – 5 points

Funding

3c (10). Has the project received partial federal funding through SRTC in the past?

- Yes No

3d (15). Does this project have additional local/state match funds above the required 13.5%? If so, please describe:
No.

- 10% over required local/state match – 10 points
- 20% over required local/state match – 15 points

4. SYSTEMS OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND PRESERVATION – 50 POINTS

Regional Priority Networks

4a (5). How does this project support the NHS system?

Please describe:

N/A - Project is located adjacent to SR-27, which is a non-NHS route

4b (5). Does the project improve bicycle facilities that are on or directly connect to the regional priority bicycle network?

Yes No

If yes, please describe:

N/A – The road is not a designated bike route

4c (5). Does the project improve transit access and/or amenities on the High Performance Transit Network?

Yes No

If yes, please describe:

N/A – the nearest transit service is about 20 miles north in Spokane Valley.

4d (10). Does the project improve pavement condition on the NHS or improve a bridge on the NHS that is in poor condition? (Additional pavement and bridge condition information will be asked in the STBG supplemental application).

Yes No

Congestion

4e (15). Does the project address congestion in any of the following areas?

- Tier 1 CMP Corridor – 15 points
- Tier 2 CMP Corridor – 10 points
- Other Roadway Bottleneck (as defined in the [CMP report](#)) – 5 points

Please describe current congested conditions and the future projected levels of congestion after project implementation. Explain the methodology used.

N/A

4f (10). If indicated in the question above, does this CMP project utilize the following CMP strategies?

- Travel Demand Management – 10 points
- Operational Improvements – 6 points
- Capacity Improvement Strategies – 3 points

5. SAFETY AND SECURITY – 50 POINTS

Addresses Existing Safety Concern

5a (25 point max). Enter crash history based on previous 5 years of available crash data* (2012-2016):

Date	Crash Type	Applicable Countermeasure implemented by project
N/A		

- Crashes with fatalities 10 points/each
- Crashes with injuries 5 points/each
- Property damage only incidences 1 points/each

5b (25). Please describe the components of the project that benefit safety, regardless of crash history? (High-Medium-Low)

The project removes heavy truck traffic from residential local access streets that are not design to accommodate large trucks. The project will widen the road to allow two-way traffic

6. QUALITY OF LIFE AND MOBILITY – 50 POINTS

6a (5). Do you have an adopted Complete Streets Policy? Yes No

If yes, how does this project comply with your Complete Streets Policy? (5)

N/A

If no, how does this project comply with SRTC's Safe & Complete Streets Policy? (3)

The focus of the road is to address truck traffic needs by removing heavy grain traffic from nearby residential local access streets which has a side benefits of helping improve the safety of the local access roads. The location of the road does not serve any pedestrian traffic generators or transit facilities. Therefore, adding sidewalk and bicycle accommodations does not appear to be appropriate.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

6b (10). Will the project enhance pedestrian transportation/mobility? (Check all that apply – 10 point max)

- Add new sidewalks (6)
 - Both sides of street (1)
 - Minimum 5-foot width (1)
 - Completes gap (1)
 - Ext. of sidewalk network (1)
 - Vegetated / protected buffer (1)
- Upgrade to existing sidewalk (6)
 - Greater width (1)
 - Add vegetated / protected buffer (1)
 - Removes barriers (1)
 - Repairs heaves (1)
- Separated shared use path
 - 10-foot min. width, not including shoulders (8)
 - 12-foot or greater in width, not including shoulders (9)
- Widen roadway shoulders in rural context (6-foot min. width)(5)
- Other (please explain) (2)
- Median Refuge (3)
- Marked Crosswalk (3)
- Crossing Enhancement (e.g. HAWK beacon, Countdown signal) (3)
- Education (2)
- Wayfinding (2)
- Enforcement (2)
- Data Collection (2)
- ADA enhancements (e.g. curb ramp upgrades) (2)

6c (10). Will the project enhance bicycle transportation? (Check all that apply – 10 point max)

- Add new striped bike lanes (6)
 - Minimum 5-foot width (2)
 - Completes gap (2)
 - Ext. of bike lane network (2)
- Upgrade to existing striped bike lanes (6)
 - Greater width (1)
 - Add protected buffer (2)
 - Surface repair (1)
- Separated shared use path
 - 10-foot min. width, not including shoulders (8)
 - 12-foot or greater in width, not including shoulders (9)
- Widen roadway shoulders in rural context (6-foot min. width) (5)
- Bike Boulevard/Neighborhood Greenway (4)
- Crossing/Intersection Enhancement (HAWK beacon, Signal detection/actuation, Bike box, etc.) (3)
- Other (please explain) (2)
- Bike Parking (2)
- Bike Lockers (2)
- Pavement Markings (2)
- Education (2)
- Wayfinding (2)
- Enforcement (2)
- Data Collection (2)

6d (5). The project is located within an area of significant existing population.

Scored internally by SRTC staff by population density based on US Census blocks:

- High – 5 points
- Medium – 3 points
- Low – 1 point

Transit Access

6e (10). Will the project enhance public transportation and/or amenities? (Check all that apply and note if you have multiples of any of the transit elements – **10 point max**)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus stop shelter/screening (3) | <input type="checkbox"/> Enhanced pedestrian crossing near bus stop (3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus stop lighting/infrastructure (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> Improved rider access/connectivity to transit (3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bench (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> New transit vehicles (4 per vehicle) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete pad/foundation for bus stop or bench (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> School bus operational improvement (2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Real time information sign (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> Education (2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Signal priority for transit vehicles (2) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus bay/pull-out (2) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boarding bulb stop (2) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Park & Ride (4) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improved transit service (e.g. higher frequency, longer operating hours, greater capacity, new route) (5) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please explain) (2) | |

N/A, No Transit service in vicinity of project

Transportation Choices

6f (5). How does the project support health-promoting transportation options for people of all abilities and ages (walking, biking, transit, safe routes to school, etc.)? If so, please describe.

The project removes heavy truck traffic from residential local access streets where it would conflict with pedestrians and bike traffic.

6g (5). Does the project include design elements that contribute to quality place making? If so, please check all that apply. **(5 point max)**

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian lighting (1) | <input type="checkbox"/> Unusual or unique surfaces (pavers or stamped) (2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic calming measures (2) | <input type="checkbox"/> Raised or uniquely treated crosswalks (2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Landscaping, pots/planters, tree grates (1) | <input type="checkbox"/> Garbage/recycling receptacles (1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other design elements, please describe (1) | <input type="checkbox"/> Bollards (1) |

STBG Capital Maintenance Supplement 2018 SRTC Call for Projects



PROJECT TITLE: RATTLER RUN ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

CAPITAL MAINTENANCE – 100 POINTS

Preservation Reconstruction

Pavement Condition

What is the structural condition of the existing facility? Please provide the Overall Condition Index (OCI) rating. Note: OCI will be reviewed by a team of representatives from Spokane, Spokane Valley, Spokane County, and WSDOT prior to project scoring.

OCI n/a

Year 2018

Preservation

- OCI: 41-55 65
- OCI: 56-65 35
- OCI: 66-85 100

Reconstruction

- OCI: 0-30 100
- OCI: 31-40 65
- OCI: 41-55 35

Please explain.

Small portion of road from Gov. Moore to Hill Top Lane had 2015 PCI of 68 (WSTIB). Existing road south of Hilltop Ln is gravel/dirt.

PROJECT NAME:
TOWN OF FAIRFIELD
Rattler Run Road - Gov. Moore to SR-27, L = 2,950-ft
Preliminary Cost Estimate
DATE: May 8, 2018

ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE

	DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	EST. QTY.	UNITS	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT
1	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 45,000
2	Field Verify Existing Utility	5	EA	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,500
3	Project Temporary Traffic Control	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000
4	Clearing and Grubbing	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000
5	Excavation and Embankment, Incl. Haul	750	CY	\$ 25.00	\$ 18,750
6	Ditch Excavation, Incl. Haul	750	CY	\$ 40.00	\$ 30,000
7	Remove & Replace Unsuitable Material	500	CY	\$ 60.00	\$ 30,000
8	Select Borrow	1,140	CY	\$ 30.00	\$ 34,200
9	Crushed Surfacing Base Course	3,560	TNS	\$ 35.00	\$ 124,600
10	Crushed Surfacing Top Course	445	TNS	\$ 35.00	\$ 15,575
11	HMA CI 1/2", PG 64-28, 0.29-Ft Depth	7,200	S.Y.	\$ 21.00	\$ 151,200
12	Schedule A Culvert Pipe, 24-Inch Dim.	75	LF	\$ 100.00	\$ 7,500
13	Landscape Restoration	1	LS	\$ 11,000.00	\$ 11,000
14	Permanent Signing	1	LS	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000
15	Pavement Striping (Painted)	1	LS	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500
16	Concrete Railroad Crossing Improvements	1	LS	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000
Construction Cost Sub Total					\$ 521,825
Contingency 20%					\$ 104,365
Inflation Factor (3%/yr) 2022 Construction Year 4 Yrs					\$ 78,592
Construction Sub-Total					\$ 704,800
Preliminary Design Engineering					\$ 105,700
Construction Engineering/Administration					\$ 105,700
WSDOT/Agency Fees					\$ 4,000
ROW - Construction Easement(s)/RR Coordination					\$ 4,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST					\$ 924,200

Funding Summary

Notes:	STBG (86.5%)	\$	799,433
2 lane Section: 22-ft Wide, 3 ft gravel shoulders	TIB Fed. Match (Proposed, 13.5%)	\$	124,767
Pavement Section: 6" Imported Borrow, 8" CSBC, 3.5" HMA			
Upgrade existing wood railroad crossing to concrete	PE	\$	107,700
	RW	\$	4,000
	CN	\$	812,500