**DESIGN DECISION**

**Complete Streets Deferral**

**[Project Title]**

**[Design Decision Number and Name]**

[State Route], MP [Begin] to MP [End]

[Enter multiple SR and MP as necessary]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Work Order Number] | Choose an item. | [Number(s)] |

[Month Day, Year]

**WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Choose an item.

[City], Washington

Under 23 U.S. Code § 409 and 23 U.S. Code § 148, safety data, reports, surveys, schedules, lists compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential crash sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings are not subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SIGNATURES** | TemplateVersion 1.5 |
| ENGINEER OF RECORD | REGION APPROVAL |
| This document has been prepared under my direct supervision.Electronic signature only (i.e., no stamp required).Name, Title, Company, & Address: | Regional Administrator or delegate approval required for deferral of CS elements. |
| *[insert title]* |
| **DESIGN DECISION METADATA** |
| PROJECT TITLE |  |
| DD NAME | Complete Streets Deferral | DD # |  |
| REPORT TYPE  | Design Decision | REGION | Choose an item. | Report Date | 3/25/2025 |
| Work Order # |  | Choose an item. |  |
| SR |  | Begin MP |  | End MP |  |
| SR |  | Begin MP |  | End MP |  |
| SR |  | Begin MP |  | End MP |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Type of Implementation/Deferral** (Check One Per Column) |
| **Baseline Need Scope** | **Complete Streets Scope** |
|  (1) [ ]  Full Implementation |  (A) [ ]  Full Implementation |
|  (2) [ ]  Partial Implementation |  (B) [ ]  Partial Implementation |
|  (3) [ ]  Full Deferral |  (C) [ ]  Full Deferral |

*Notes*

***Document to be included in the Design Decision Package (DDP) Section 2.4 Complete Streets.***

***Multiple elements or location*** *within one document: Sometimes it may make sense to “group” interrelated issues into one document. If you do this, you need to be very organized in how you do it. Also, EXPLAIN why the issues are being grouped into one document. Don’t just group unrelated issues into one document just to write one document instead of multiple documents.*

*This is* ***not a standalone document****. This is a change from how we used to write up similar documents (such as deviations) in the past. This document will be part of the DDP along with other key documentation such as the Basis of Design. Considering this, provide only a brief description of the project, and only provide that background information relevant to the decision(s) being documented.*

***Be concise:*** *for everything you enter into the template, you should be able to answer the question:” how does this relate to the specific decisions being discussed?” If you can’t answer the question, delete the text.*

*Remove the DRAFT watermark in the background and all RED TEXT when the document will be submitted for signature.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 1: Background**  |
| **Briefly describe the project:*** A sentence or two, or at most a short paragraph describing what the project is.
* For large, complicated projects, you can defer details to another document that will be in the DDP, such as the Basis of design. For example, you could say:

*“This project replaces the existing I-5 bridge over the Columbia River with a new bridge along with associated major work. See the Basis of Design for details”* |
| **Provide any background information important to understanding the decision(s):*** Provide any history that may be relevant to the issue(s) to be discussed
* You are “setting the stage” here for the discussion to follow.
* Background is NOT where you get into what the decisions that are documented will be…that comes in Section 2
* If safety is affected by the alternatives of this Design Analysis, describe the existing safety context.
 |
| **Related documents (such as a Basis of Design):*** List any signed Basis of Design or other major design documentation documents that it is important to know of.
	+ *Use Chicago style referencing, a Chicago Citation Generator is available here:* [*Free Chicago Citation Generator [Updated for 2022] (mybib.com)*](https://www.mybib.com/tools/chicago-citation-generator)
* By listing documents such as the Basis of Design, you can minimize or eliminate the need to provide that information here. You may also say “see the Basis of Design”.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 2: Options Evaluation and Decision** |
| **Location or Area:*** Sometimes this template will cover multiple locations…perhaps 3 different ramps for example. If so, it will likely make sense to separate out each major location, as it is very likely that the considerations (metrics) will be different at different locations
* If your document is only covering one location, you can get rid of this box
 |
| **Discuss the evaluation methodology. Describe the metrics/considerations from the following to assess each alternative. Describe methodology (quantitative or qualitative) and any performance targets. The performance metrics, methods and targets you choose will be part of your performance trade-offs “story”.*** This should be a SHORT, concise section
* Describe METHODS. For example, will any quantitative analysis be included for safety or mobility?
* ***Safety Performance (required)***
	+ Assess the exposure, frequency of fatalities and serious injuries, and severity of crashes for all user groups.
* ***Operational Performance (required)***
	+ Assess the network connectivity, and potential demand for all user groups.
* ***Project Cost (required)***
	+ Provide an up-to-date scoping level cost estimate for each alternative.
* ***Impacts to Delivery Schedule***
	+ Assess impacts to the project’s delivery schedule.
* ***Impacts to Existing Structure(s)***
	+ Assess impacts to existing structures (e.g., bridge structures, large walls, tunnels, etc.).
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Options**Comparison**Table* |  | **Metrics / Considerations** |
| *Safety Performance* | *Operational Performance* | *Project Cost* | *Impacts to Delivery Schedule* | *Impacts to Existing Structure(s)* |  |  |
| ***OPTION 1 – Full-Full implementation*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***OPTION 2 – Full -Partial Implementation*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***OPTION 3 – Full - Deferral*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **Detailed Description of the options evaluated as follows:*** Option 1: Short description of this option. Include enough information to understand the differences between the options considered.
* Option 2: Short description of option 2.
* Option 3: Short description of option 3.
 |
| **Discuss the performance tradeoffs shown in the table, and compare the performance of the options:** * Discuss the trade-offs without reaching a conclusion on which option is best…that comes below…
* This can be a fairly lengthy section, if necessary
* Keep the following in mind when discussing the performance tradeoff for each alternative:
	+ For “**Safety Performance”** and **“Operational Performance”**, priority should be given to full Complete Street implementation when it is anticipated to result in a significant improvement to fatal and serious crash potential, network connectivity, and/or access, with due consideration to serving vulnerable populations and overburdened communities.
	+ For “**Project Cost”,** a deferral decision may be supported if fully meeting the goals of Complete Streets would result in a significant increase to the cost of original baseline scope (e.g., greater than 50% cost increase). This could be the result of adding a significant amount of right of way, structures, storm water conveyance, utility relocations, etc. to accommodate Complete Streets elements.
	+ For “**Impacts to Delivery Schedule”**, delay may be associated with adding significant or complicated scope, difficulties in reaching agreement with local jurisdictions and communities, acquiring right of way, etc. When determining whether possible delay is unacceptable, the following issues may be relevant: speed and severity of asset deterioration with significant implications, fish passage barrier injunction due date, the potential for significant impact to fatal and serious crashes with delay in construction of mitigation, utility relocation, and/or internal and external workforce issues such as the annual contracting cycle.
	+ For “**Impacts to Existing Structure(s)**”, deferral decision may be supported if fully meeting the goals of Complete Streets significantly impacts or necessitates replacement of major existing infrastructure (e.g., bridge structures, large walls, tunnels, etc.).
 |
| **Discuss any mitigating measures added to address performance trade-offs:*** Clearly identify mitigating measures …
* It may not be possible to get the desired performance in a category, but the performance may be mitigated by doing low cost countermeasures, such as adding signing
 |
| **Preferred Option and reasoning for selecting the preferred option:*** …Considering what we’ve said above…option X is the preferred option.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 4: Attachments** |
| * **Vicinity Map**
* ***[add items as necessary]***

**A NOTE ON PLAN SHEETS: Take the time to at least TURN OFF ALL UNRELATED LEVELS….clutter may not bother someone intimately familiar with the project, but for a reviewer with limited time and limited familiarity with the project, anything on the sheet that is not directly related to the discussion in the narrative is distracting and counterproductive.** |