Project Submission Instruction Sheet for NHFP Program

Submission Instructions

Please read this entire instruction sheet before completing your project submission form. These instructions will help you complete the submission form.

Please attach supporting data, documentation, and other information with your submission. This information will be used to assist in project validation.

For further assistance, please contact Wenjuan Zhao at zhaow@wsdot.wa.gov or 360-763-8070.

Part 1 – Project Information

The purpose of Part 1 is to collect background information on the location, scope, schedule, and expected budget of the project.

Contact Information

Please provide a staff contact for questions and communications regarding this application.

Project Scope

The following item must be included in your submission:

- A detailed project vicinity map in PDF format, with clearly marked project limits that shows the project's location and its significant features
- A cross-jurisdictional letter of concurrence, if applicable (required for projects involving roadways/facilities owned or managed by other jurisdictions)

Please also include a GIS shapefile showing the actual alignment of the project, if available.

Project Budget

Please provide information on the amount of funding that is requested, secured, and unsecured for this project.

Project Schedule

Please provide planned project milestone dates by month and year (MM/YYYY).

PART 2 - FREIGHT PROJECT BENEFITS

The freight project benefits section of the submission form presents a series of criteria and questions that reflect the six transportation policy goals under the Revised Code of Washington. The criteria were developed in conjunction with MPOs and RTPOs through a Technical Working Group between October and December 2021.

For written responses, you are encouraged to provide clear, succinct statements. Please use this **NHFP data map** to identify available data sources relevant to your projects. When statewide data is not available, you may supply your own data.

Goal 1: Preservation

The preservation goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on the condition of freight infrastructure. This goal area has two evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with instructions.

Improve the State of Good Repair of Freight Infrastructure

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing how a project will improve infrastructure conditions. The rationale here is simple: if a project improves infrastructure conditions, then it will have a positive impact on the preservation of infrastructure.

How to report: You should describe if and how your project will improve the condition of freight infrastructure. Please keep responses to 200 words or fewer.

Scoring: If your project will improve infrastructure conditions it will be scored on the criterion below.

Assessment of Existing Infrastructure Condition in Project Boundary

This evaluation criterion is measured using data on the project's existing infrastructure condition. The rationale here is that a project will have a greater impact on preservation if it improves the condition of infrastructure that is already in poor condition.

How to report: Using one of the sources below as evidence, you should provide data on existing pavement or bridge conditions observed within the project boundary.

The data: Multiple datasets are available through NHFP data map for use, depending on the network elements associated with the project. Please note that you do not need to report all the metric examples provided here; only one metric should be submitted.

- State routes: use Pavement Structural Condition (PSC) or Reconstruction Index (RCN) values from WSDOT Pavement Management System
- County Roads: use Pavement Structural Condition (PSC) values from County Road Administration Board's 2020 County Road Log
- City streets: statewide pavement database is not available and please report Pavement Condition Index (PCI) values collected by local jurisdiction
- Bridge-related projects: use the overall bridge condition rating from Washington State Bridge Inventory System (WSBIS)

If you are submitting a project focused on rail or maritime infrastructure, please state the condition of your infrastructure (good, fair, poor) and provide supporting information about asset conditions.

Scoring: Projects will be scored based on the **worst** observed infrastructure condition within the project boundary. Scoring for various condition rating systems is shown in the table below.

Score Category	State Routes	County Roads	City Streets	Bridges	Points Awarded
	PSC or RCN	PSC	PCI	WSBIS Condition State	
Poor	0 - 39	0 - 39	0 - 55	Poor	100% of points
Fair	40 - 59	40 - 59	56 - 70	Fair	66% of points
Good	60 - 100	60 - 100	71 - 100	Good	33% of points

Goal 2: Safety

The safety goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on the safety of freight transportation. This goal area has three evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with instructions.

Prevent or Reduce Injuries or Fatalities

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing the project's expected safety benefits. The rationale here is simple: if a project has safety benefits, then it will have a positive impact on freight system safety.

How to report: You should describe your project's expected safety benefits in 200 words or fewer.

Scoring: If your project has elements intended to improve transportation safety, then it will be scored on the second evaluation criterion below.

Count of Serious Injury or Fatality Crashes within the Project Boundary

This evaluation criterion is measured using WSDOT crash data from 2016 to 2020. The rationale here is that a project will have a greater impact on safety if it makes improvements where safety is currently poor.

How to report: Please provide a count of the number of serious injury and fatal crashes within your project boundary and a list of the corresponding Collision Report Number for these crashes. If your project is located off the roadway network, please provide either information on the history of crashes or accidents within the project boundary or a narrative description of outstanding safety issues that the project may address.

The data: Using the NHFP program crash data request form provided on the NHFP program website, you may request serious injury and fatal crash records from 2016 to 2020 for your jurisdiction.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into six scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Percentile of Crash Count	Points Awarded
Top 20% (80-100th percentile)	100% of points
60-80th percentile	80% of points
40-60th percentile	60% of points
20-40th percentile	40% of points
Bottom 20% (0-20th percentile)	20% of points
No crash data provided	0 points

Reduce Conflict with Vulnerable Transportation Users

This evaluation criterion first identifies whether there is either (1) a history of conflict or (2) a potential for conflict with vulnerable transportation users within the project boundary. If there is either a history of conflict or a potential for conflict, you should provide a written statement describing how the project will reduce or mitigate this conflict. This statement will be used to measure how effective the project is at reducing conflict between transportation users. The rationale here is that if a project is situated in an area with a history of conflict or a potential for conflict, then a project that more effectively addresses this conflict will have a greater impact on safety.

How to report: To report a history of conflict or potential for conflict, you should provide the information listed in the table below.

Type of Conflict	Information to Provide	Example
History of Observed Conflicts	List the count of truck-involved bicycle or pedestrian crashes within the project boundary.	"Between 2016 and 2020, there were X truck-involved bicycle crashes and Y truck-involved crashes with pedestrians within the project boundary."
Potential for Conflict	List the number and characteristics of pedestrian or bicycle facilities within the project boundary. If available, provide data on the level of bicycle or pedestrian traffic within the project boundary, especially if these users are not using designated sidewalks or bicycle facilities. Additional supporting information may include information about the location or characteristics of facilities generating bicycle and pedestrian trips, such as schools, bus stops, malls, employment centers, etc. If the project intersects a State Route within a population center, you may use WSDOT's Level of Traffic Stress for Bicyclists and Pedestrians as supporting information.	"There are 2 crosswalks within the project boundary, and Main Street is a designated bike route with painted bike lane markers." "An estimated 100 cyclists per day ride on County Road 1, even though it is not a designated bike route." "This project is adjacent to a high school that generates pedestrian and bicycle traffic."

If there is either a history of conflict or a potential for conflict identified, then you should also provide a written

statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project will reduce or mitigate conflict with vulnerable transportation users. You should explain whether the project makes use of a separation or a mitigation strategy. The table below provides more details about these two types of strategies.

Strategy to address conflict	Description	Examples
Separation	This strategy involves physical barriers or spatial separation between roadways and bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	A dedicated curb-protected bicycle lane.
Mitigation	This strategy involves signage, markers, operational changes, or other "soft" changes to improve safety awareness but does not physically separate users.	A flashing bicycle crossing warning sign.

The data: Using the provided NHFP program crash data request form, you may request truck-involved pedestrian/bicycle crash records from 2016 to 2020 for your jurisdiction. You may use your own data to support descriptions of the potential for conflict. You can also use the Level of Traffic Stress data layer for state highways from the NHFP data map if it is relevant to your project.

Scoring: If your project has evidence of a potential conflict then you will also be scored on the type of strategy your project uses to address the conflict with vulnerable transportation users. Projects will be sorted into three scoring categories according to the strategy used, as shown in the table below.

Strategy to address conflict	Points Awarded
Separation	100% of points
Mitigation	50% of points
No solution considered	0 points

Goal 3: Stewardship
The stewardship goal area is intended to measure the degree to which a project is supported by additional sources of funding and whether innovative low-cost approaches were considered or implemented. This goal area has two evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with further instructions.

Percent of Project Cost with a Funding Match
This evaluation criterion is measured using the percent of a project's total cost that has secured a non-federal funding match.

How to report: You should identify the percentage of the project's total cost that has secured a non-federal funding match.

Scoring: You will be scored based on the level of the project's secured funding match, with a high match being awarded more points. For example, a project with a 50% match will get 50% of available points, and a project with a 25% match will get 25% of available points.

Prioritize Lowest-Cost Solutions for the Specific Freight Need
This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement about your consideration and/or implementation of low-cost solutions. The rationale here is that both the consideration of low-cost solutions' feasibility and the implementation of such solutions demonstrate good stewardship of limited financial resources.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing two items:

1. Whether you considered low-cost solutions for your specific freight need, and
2. Whether you implemented these solutions

If you are not implementing the solution considered, you should explain why you determined that these low-cost solutions were infeasible. Examples of low-cost solutions might include:

- Operations and management changes such as changes to traffic light timings to reduce truck-related congestion or mitigate conflict between trucks and bicyclists

- Alteration of existing infrastructure as opposed to the construction new infrastructure

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Were low-cost solutions considered?	Does the project implement low-cost solutions?	Points Awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
Yes	No, determined to be infeasible	50% of points
No	No	0 points

Goal 4: Mobility

The mobility goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on freight transportation-related congestion and bottlenecks. This goal area has two evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with instructions.

Reduce Congestion and Improve Reliability

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing how the project will support a freight transportation-related delay reduction or reliability improvement.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing if and how the project will support a delay reduction or reliability improvement. The focus of this statement should be on the project's anticipated benefits for freight mobility.

Scoring: If your project supports a freight-related delay reduction or reliability improvement, then it will be scored on the second evaluation criterion below.

Analysis to Determine if a Project is on a Congested Infrastructure Segment

This evaluation criterion is measured using data to determine the existing level of congestion within the project boundary. The rationale here is that a project will have a greater impact on mobility if it improves reliability on infrastructure that currently suffers from high congestion or unreliable travel times.

How to report: You should provide data on existing congestion levels within the project boundary.

The data: If possible, you should report Level of Travel Time Reliability data for the roadway segment of your project location (2019 data is available for NHS routes and provided through the NHFP data map). If your project is off the NHS network, you may provide your own data. This might include:

- Level of Service (LOS) based on local data collection. If LOS is provided, please provide supporting documentation showing how your LOS estimate was calculated (ex: traffic volume, traffic density, service flow rate, etc.)

- Peak Period vs. Free Flow Speed (or Posted Speed Limit) ratio as collected or documented in other data or plans
- V/C ratio estimates from travel demand model outputs

If your project is a freight rail or intermodal project, please provide an assessment of congestion problems expected to be solved by the project and evidence supporting the assessment of the severity of congestion. This evidence might include container dwell time at railroad intermodal yards, vessel time at berths, etc.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three scoring categories, as shown in the table below. Please note, you only need to provide data for one metric, not all the potential metrics listed above and shown in the table below.

Level of congestion	Level of travel time reliability	Level of service	Peak Period vs. Free Flow (or Posted) Speed	Volume to capacity ratio	Points awarded
High	TTR > 1.5	E - F	0.5 or lower	V/C > 1.0	100% of points
Medium	1.49 > TTR > 1.11	C - D	0.5 – 0.8	1.0 > VC > 0.8	66% of points
Low	TTR < 1.10	A - B	0.8 – 1.0	VC < 0.8	33% of points

Goal 5: Economic Vitality

The economic vitality goal area is intended to measure a project's relevance to the local, regional, and state economies. This goal area has three evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with instructions.

Support the Economy and Promote Employment

This evaluation criterion is measured using a project's proximity to an identified freight business cluster. The rationale here is that the closer a project is to a freight cluster, the greater the impact it will have supporting freight movement for these industries.

How to report: You should list two pieces of information:

1. The location of your project (in an urbanized area or *not* in an urbanized area), and
2. The distance to the closest freight cluster.

The data: You should use the provided freight business cluster layer in the [NHFP data map](#) to gather information on urbanized areas and the distance to the closest freight cluster.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four scoring categories based on their distance from a cluster.

Project's distance from the nearest freight cluster		Points Awarded
Project in Urbanized Area	**Project not in Urbanized Area**	
0 - 1 miles	0 - 5 miles	100% of points
1 - 5 miles	5 - 10 miles	66% of points
5 - 10 miles	10 - 15 miles	33% of points
10+ miles	15+ miles	No points

Location on the Freight and Goods Transportation System

This evaluation criterion is measured using the highest Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) designation for the transportation network segments within the project boundary. The rationale here is that higher FGTS designations indicate greater relative importance for economic activity.

How to report: You should report the *highest* FGTS classification or truck count associated with any truck routes (T-1 through T-5), railroad corridors (R-1 through R-5), or waterway segments (W-1 through W-5) within the project boundary. If a project does not contain a designated FGTS route, you should provide information of your own regarding truck, rail, or vessel traffic volumes within the project boundary.

The data: You should use the Washington Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) layer in the NHFP data map. If a project is not on a designated FGTS route, you should supply your own traffic volume data, which might include local supplemental truck counts, rail traffic volumes from Federal Railroad Administration crossing reports, counts of vessel port calls from the US Army Corps of Engineers, or local transportation demand model estimates.

If you are providing traffic count information to support this application, this traffic count information must have been collected no earlier than January 2017. Data collected before January 2017 will not be considered for scoring.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into six scoring categories. The table below shows potential point assignments for projects based on FGTS or truck traffic volumes. Please note, only one data source is required. FGTS information is preferred. You do not need to submit traffic volume information if your project is located on an FGTS network element.

FGTS Designation	Average Daily Truck Traffic Volume	Points Awarded
T-1 / R-1 / W-1	2,500 or more	100% of points
T-2 / R-2 / W-2	1,000 – 2,500	80% of points
T-3 / R-3 / W-3	500 – 1,000	60% of points
T-4 / R-4 / W-4	100 - 500	40% of points
T-5 / R-5 / W-5	0 - 100	20% of points
No designation	No truck volume information	No points

Intermodal Connectivity Between Modes

This evaluation criterion is assessed using a narrative statement about a project's "degree of connection" to an intermodal facility. The rationale here is that the projects proximate to intermodal facilities will improve access to multiple modes of freight transportation and improve economic vitality.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing a project's "degree of connection" to an intermodal facility. Applicable facilities are not limited to intermodal container facilities and could include any facility that facilitates the movement of goods between two different modes, including bulk or break-bulk cargo port infrastructure, railyard transload, and air cargo transload infrastructure. If the project has some form of connection to those facilities, you should explain whether it is direct, secondary, or tertiary. The table below provides more details about these three degrees of connection.

Degree of Connection	Description	Examples
Direct	All or some of the project is located within an intermodal facility.	• Improvements to the gate of a facility or internal roads • Dock wall improvements • On-site rail improvements
Secondary	The project directly connects to an intermodal facility but does not enter the facility.	• Rebuilding or improving an access road to a facility gate • Rehabilitating or improving rail siding to facility boundary • Installation of fleeting or mooring infrastructure outside of a port
Tertiary	The project improves a connection between an intermodal facility and an FGTS T-1 or T-2 roadway or R-1 or R-2 railroad but does not touch the intermodal facility.	• Improving signal timing on routes connecting ports with interstate highways • Improving off-ramp geometry to improve truck safety and mobility on a route to an intermodal facility • Offsite railcar staging space for a rail terminal

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Project's "Degree of Connection" to an Intermodal Facility	Points Awarded
Primary	100% of points
Secondary	66% of points
Tertiary	33% of points
No demonstration of connections to an intermodal facility	No points

Goal 6: Environment and Communities

The environment and communities goal area is intended to measure a project's impacts on both the natural and human environment. This goal area has three evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with further instructions.

Reduce Freight Transportation's Impacts on Stormwater

The 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act calls for state freight plans to develop strategies and goals to decrease the impacts of freight movement on flooding and stormwater runoff. Consequently, this criterion asks for a written statement describing the degree to which a project demonstrates a strategy to address potential stormwater impacts.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words that addresses three items:
1. The stormwater management requirements relevant to the project
2. Whether or not the project meets *or exceeds* these stormwater management requirements, and
3. Information or evidence to support your submission.

The data: Your statement should include information to support your submission.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Does the project implement a strategy to address stormwater above minimum requirements?	Points Awarded
Exceeds minimum requirements	100% of points
Meets minimum requirements	50% of points
Falls short of minimum requirements (noncompliant)	0 Points

Reduce Freight Transportation's Impacts on Wildlife Habitat

The 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act calls for state freight plans to develop strategies and goals to decrease the impacts of freight movement on wildlife habitats. This evaluation criterion is measured in two parts. First, it identifies whether a project intersects with a designated Priority Habitat. Then, this criterion asks for a written statement describing the project's strategy to address potential wildlife habitat impacts. This metric favors projects that do not disrupt priority habitat areas, as avoiding disruption is preferable to investing in habitat restoration to mitigate disruption. Therefore, when possible, projects should be located outside of designated priority habitats.

How to report: You should identify if the project boundary intersects an area designated as a Priority Habitat. If it does, then you should then provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project incorporates strategies to address wildlife impacts.

The data: You should use data from the [Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat Map](#) to identify if the project boundary intersects a Priority Habitat.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Is the project in priority habitat?	Does the project implement a strategy to address wildlife impacts?	Points Awarded
No	N/A	100% of points
Yes	Yes	50% of points
Yes	No	0% of points

Analysis of Projects Near Vulnerable Communities
This evaluation criterion is measured in two parts. First, it identifies whether a project boundary intersects an area designated as a vulnerable community. Then, this criterion asks for a written statement describing how the project will mitigate potential negative community impacts.

How to report: You should identify whether the project boundary intersects an area designated as a vulnerable community. You should then provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project incorporates strategies to address community impacts such as noise, light, vibration, or air emissions. If a project will impact a vulnerable community, mitigation strategies must be demonstrated, or you must provide evidence that transportation impact mitigation is not feasible or relevant for the project. Note that all projects that implement strategies to mitigate impacts on nearby residents will receive some recognition, even if the project is not located in a vulnerable community.

The data: You should use the Environmental Health Disparity overall ranking layer in the [NHFP data map](#) to identify whether the project intersects a vulnerable community. A score of 8, 9, or 10 on this map qualifies an area as a vulnerable community, which is potentially hit hardest by incremental environmental injustices and cumulative impacts. To get additional data on Environmental Health Disparity ranking by themes and by specific measures, please see [Environmental Health Disparity Map.](#)

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into five scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Is the project in an environmental justice community (rank 8, 9, or 10)?	Does the project implement a strategy to address community impacts?	Points Awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
No	Yes	66% of points
Yes	Transportation impact mitigation determined not feasible or not relevant	33% of points
No	No	0 points
Yes	No	-50% of points

Additional Benefit 1: Truck Parking

The truck parking additional benefit functions like a bonus point category and is intended to measure a project's impact on truck parking. This topic will not be relevant to all projects.

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing the expected truck parking investments included in the project. The rationale here is simple: a project that includes new or improved truck parking facilities or amenities will have a positive impact on truck parking.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing the expected truck parking investments included in the project. Amenity improvements might include:

- Quality of life improvements such as restrooms, vending machines, and showers
- Tools to collect and communicate information about truck parking availability
- Driver safety and cargo security improvements such as lighting, fencing, cameras, and on-site security

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Does the project improve truck parking supply?	Does the project improve truck parking amenities?	Points awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
Yes	No	66% of points
No	Yes	33% of points
No	No	0 points

Additional Benefit 2: Freight System Resiliency

The freight system resiliency additional benefit functions like a bonus point category and is intended to measure a project's impact on freight system resiliency. This topic may not be relevant to all projects.

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing how the project considered and/or implemented improvements to freight transportation resiliency.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing the resiliency concerns present for the project. You should then address two items:

1. If you considered resiliency improvements, and
2. If you implemented any of these improvements

If you are not implementing the improvement considered, you should explain why you determined that it was infeasible. Potential improvements include any project strategy or investment to reduce the likelihood of failure or closure due to severe weather, natural disaster, climate change, terrorism, market disruptions, or other unexpected events. It may also include strategies to rapidly re-open or restore service after closures.

The data: You should use existing risk studies whenever possible to support your written statements. Such studies might include, but are not limited to:

- Washington State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Resiliency Assessment: Washington State Transportation Systems (Cascadia Subduction Zone)
- The Washington State Highway Seismic Screening Tool (HSST)
- NOAA's Sea Level Rise Viewer
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources' Geologic Hazards information
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources' Tsunamis information
- Additional Resources at UW Climate Impacts Group

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four scoring groups, as shown in the table below.

Level of Resiliency Consideration	Description	Points Awarded
High	The project improves resiliency by promoting continuous transportation operations or by providing redundancy. Example design elements could include hardening, securing, or relocating infrastructure. Other approaches could include investments in emergency response, resiliency planning, or resiliency preparation.	100 % of points
Medium	The project improves system resiliency by improving the ability to rapidly restore operations after a closure.	66% of points
Low	Investments to address an identified resiliency concern are considered but are determined to be infeasible.	33% of points
None	No consideration of resiliency improvements.	0 points

Additional Benefit 3: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

The greenhouse gas emissions additional benefit functions like a bonus point category and is intended to evaluate a project's impact on GHG emissions. This topic may not be relevant to all projects.

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing whether you implemented strategies

intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The rationale here is that the implementation of such strategies will reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with freight transportation.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing two items:

1. Strategies implemented that are intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., congestion mitigation, reduction of VMT, electrification, alternative fuel infrastructure or corridors, idle reduction for trucks, service to reduce empty vehicle movements, etc.)

2. Information about the extent of emissions reduction (e.g., estimated VMT reduction, number of vehicles affected, etc.).

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into two scoring categories, as shown in the table below.

Emissions Reduction Measure Implemented	Points Awarded
Yes	100% of points
No	0 points