



Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting notice

Monday, February 22, 2021 at 10:00 am

ONLINE LINK: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/975441245>

Please call us at 316.779.1321 at least 48 hours in advance if you require special accommodations to participate in this meeting.
We make every effort to meet reasonable requests.

Meeting Agenda

[Note: Meeting agenda is subject to change during the meeting.]

	Page Numbers (in this packet)
1. Welcome	
2. Regular Business	
A. Approval of February 22, 2021 Agenda	Page 1
B. Approval of January 25, 2021 Minutes	Pages 2 to 4
C. Director's Report	
i. Overview	
3. Public Comments	Pages 5 to 5
4. New Business	
A. Action: TIP Funding Suballocated Programs Management Procedures	Page 6 to 10
Chad Parasa, WAMPO	
B. Discussion: Projects Evaluation Methodology & Scoring Criteria	Pages 11 to 30
Chad Parasa, WAMPO	
C. Discussion: Traffic Data and Regional Data	
Chad Parasa, WAMPO	
5. Committee Reports/Updates	
A. Regional Freight Committee update, Karyn Page	
B. Safety & Health Committee update, Elizabeth Ablah	
C. Active Transportation Committee, Alan Kailer & Jack Brown	
6. Other Business	
7. Adjournment	

Chad Parasa, TAC Secretary
February 17, 2021

Meeting Summary

Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Summary
Monday, January 25, 2020
Online via GoToMeeting

Meeting Duration: 59 minutes

Members in Attendance:

Troy Tabor, TAC Chair
Jim Weber, Sedgwick County
Jolene Graham, Economist
Les Mangus, Butler/Sumner
Jack Brown, Regional Pathways
Rene Hart, KDOT
Chad Parasa, WAMPO
Don Snyder, KDOT

Shawn Mellies, City of Wichita
Gary Janzen, City of Wichita
Dan Squires, SCAC
Raven Alexander, Wichita Transit
Annette Graham, Coordinated Transit District #9
Laura Rainwater, REAP
Mike Armour, City of Wichita

Elizabeth Ablah, Public Health
Dorsha Kirksey, Coordinated Transit District #9
Alejandro Arias, Air Quality Representative
Mary Hunt, Urban Land Use Planning Representative

Other Attendees:

Michelle Styles, WAMPO
Patricia Sykes, WAMPO
Nick Flanders, WAMPO
Alan Kailer, Bike Walk Wichita

Karyn Page, Kansas Global Trade Services
Eva Steinman, FTA
Becky Tuttle, City of Wichita
James Wagner, City of Wichita

Matt Messina, KDOT
Kristen Zimmerman
Shawn Mellies
Jane Byrnes, Public

1. Mr. Tabor called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM

2. Regular Business

A. Approval of January 25, 2021 Agenda

Discussion: None

Action: Moved to approve agenda as presented. Motion passed (19-0).

Motion: J. Weber

Second: R. Alexander

B. Approval of November 23, 2020 Minutes

Discussion: None

Action: Moved to approve minutes as presented. Motion passed (19-0).

Motion: J. Weber

Second: R. Alexander

C. Director's Report

i. Committee Updates –

Mr. Parasa provided the upcoming dates for WAMPO's committee meetings. The Safety and Health Committee meeting on Wednesday, February 3rd. The Active Transportation Committee meets Tuesday, March 2nd. The Regional Freight Committee meets on Wednesday, March 31st.

3. Public Comment

Jane Byrnes advocated for a need of transportation funding to go towards updating pedestrian walkways and crosswalks. J. Byrnes noted that there is an increase in pedestrian activity due to COVID and that money would be impactful to the safety of all pedestrians.

4. New Business

A. **Action: 2021 – 2024 TIP #2 (Transportation Improvement Program) Amendment**

Nick Flanders with WAMPO presented the amendment changes to the 2021 – 2024 TIP. This amendment has routine changes for 7 projects. Five of those proposed changes require formal action, the other two are considered administrative changes.

Action: Move to approve 2021 – 2024 TIP #2 (Transportation Improvement Program) Amendment

Motion: J. Weber

Second: G. Janzen

Motion Passed (19-0)

B. **Action: TIP Funding Suballocated Programs Management Procedures**

Chad Parasa spoke to the committee about WAMPO's de-obligated funds. C. Parasa introduced the available options that had been discussed by sub-committee. After reviewing all options the committee recommended some edits and changes to Advanced construction projects. This item became a discussion item on January 25. Staff will revise the document and bring to the next TAC meeting on February 22, as an action item.

C. **Action: 2021 UPWP Amendment #1**

Chad Parasa reviewed WAMPO's recommended changes for UPWP Amendment 1. There were a total of 4 edits that were made to the document by WAMPO staff.

Action: Move to adopt the UPWP Amendment 1 modifications as presented.

Motion: D. Squires

Second: J. Weber

Motion Passed (19-0)

5. Committee Reports/Updates

A. **Regional Freight Committee update, Chad Parasa**

Mr. Parasa gave a quick update on the Freight Committee. C. Parasa noted that the committee is reviewing technology based surveys that were completed by TranSystems and Cambridge Systems Consulting Firm. This committee's next meeting will be on March 31st.

B. Active Transportation Committee update, Jack Brown

Mr. Kailer reminded TAC members that the next committee meeting is on Tuesday, March 2nd. The committee is currently looking at ways to reduce admissions and constructing the group's goals and policies for WAMPO's jurisdictions.

C. Safety & Health Committee update, Elizabeth Ablah

Mrs. Ablah gave a brief update on the Safety & Health Committee. E. Ablah stated that the committee are identifying health and safety concerns s that all jurisdictions have. The committee is also looking at different tools that Mr. Parasa has sourced and could be of use in the future.

6. Other Business – None

WAMPO staff conducted surveys during the development of Metropolitan Transportation Plan in 2020. The survey summaries are documented and can be obtained on the WAMPO web site. This survey also was used to create the WAMPO vision statement for the development of Regional Metropolitan transportation plan.

Mr. Janzen mentioned that a percentage or dollar figure given towards sidewalks, alternative transportation, etc. during a project, needs to be shown in a project information document. T. Tabor tasked WAMPO staff to design project information document for future projects to seek input on cost estimates of sidewalks. Mr. Kailer agreed with recommendation, and also noted, the project percentage that goes towards alternative transportation needs to be based on actual assessments and not a standard percentage.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:59 AM

Next Meeting will be held February 22, 2021 at 10:00 AM via GoToMeeting:

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/975441245>



Agenda Item 3:
Public Comment Opportunity
Troy Tabor, Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Chair

Background

The Public Comment Opportunity is an open forum for the general public to provide comments about specific items on this month's agenda, as well as any other issues directly pertaining to WAMPO's policies, programs, or documents.

- Comments are limited to two minutes per individual.



Agenda Item 4A: Action
2021 - 2024 TIP sub-allocated funding management
Chad Parasa, WAMPO

Background

During the month of January 2021, TAC meeting, TAC members discussed and recommended edits to the 'sub-allocated funding management process document'.
This document is revised for action at this meeting on February 22, 2021.

Recommendation to the TPB the approval of “sub-allocated funding management process documented” as attached

Action Options:

- Recommend approval of the “sub-allocated funding management process documented”, as proposed
- Not Recommend approval of the “sub-allocated funding management process documented”
- Recommend approval of the “sub-allocated funding management process documented”, with specific changes

Attachment:

- [WAMPO “Sub-allocated funding management process document”](#)

WAMPO Sub-allocated Programs Management Procedures

Introduction

February 2021

Issue Background

- WAMPO awards approximately \$12 million per year in federal funding to transportation projects across the region. Collectively, these funding programs are called WAMPO funding or WAMPO sub-allocated funding.
- WAMPO's overall planning and programming processes are intended to make sure funds are awarded to the types of projects and programs that are in-line with the outcomes set by the Policy Board as defined in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
- KDOT allows up to 7% of WAMPO's annual funding (up to \$1 million) to carry over to the next year if needed, and this change provides an opportunity for WAMPO to develop a comprehensive approach to fund management.
- This document is intended to clarify WAMPO's funding management procedures. Because this is an on-going program, WAMPO must develop processes and procedures to ensure its managed appropriately, accounting for both changes on both the cost side (e.g., construction materials) and on the funding side (e.g., annual amount)
- This document accounts for de-obligated funding, advance construction, end of year balance, and many other related issues that are part of the larger sub-allocated funding management.

Highlights

- Allows all WAMPO funded projects to compete for additional funding, if additional need is demonstrated, approximately half way between initial programming and bid letting.
- Accounts for WAMPO's outstanding liability.
- Plans, Specs and Estimates (PSE) to be submitted to KDOT by May (at the latest) of year of obligation

Project Cost Estimates and WAMPO Funding Awards

Project concepts enter the WAMPO planning and programming processes up to 10 years before they are implemented, beginning with programming the project into the MTP, as noted in the WAMPO Cost Estimated Guidance at the end of this document. As the ideas and concepts move thru project development process, details about the scope of the project emerge and are refined and eventually finalized.

As projects move from ideas to final design, cost estimates can change greatly due to changes in cost of materials and changes in the project scope. As such, project sponsors are provided opportunities to update cost estimates and request additional funding, should the need be demonstrated. The WAMPO funding amount may not be adjusted after the project is obligated, so it is important to monitor cost estimate changes throughout the project development process and update accordingly.

Procedures:

- With each WAMPO funding cycle (every two years), sponsors with projects already in the TIP may compete for additional funding, in competition with other applications for new funding. Each project that is awarded WAMPO funding will have a total of two opportunities to request funding – at initial programming and again approximately half way between the initial programming and bid letting.
 - WAMPO funding can only be used on the project phase associated with it in the TIP. For capital construction projects, this is usually construction and construction engineering costs.
 - The entirety of the WAMPO funding award is in place during the entirety of the project. If the entirety of the WAMPO funding award is not used during the course of the project, it is released back (“de-obligated”) into WAMPO’s funding program, thus creating a surplus of funding that requires obligation by the end of the current fiscal year. See “Outstanding Liability” section below.
 - The WAMPO funding amount that is programmed in the TIP at the time of obligation is capped, meaning that it cannot be increased after obligation.
 - WAMPO’s commitment is for funding on the year(s) programmed in the TIP and cannot guarantee it will be available either before or after that year. The project development process can take up to three years; KDOT Bureau of Local Projects carries out this process. They have developed a comprehensive process and schedule to ensure the project development complies with applicable federal law. Given the importance of staying on schedule, WAMPO requires the Plans, Specs and Estimates (PSE) to be submitted to the KDOT Project Manager by May 1 of the scheduled year of obligation. Should the PSE be submitted after May 1, WAMPO cannot guarantee the funding and it may be reprogrammed to another eligible project.
 - WAMPO assesses a TIP fee on all WAMPO funded projects. Depending on the year of obligation, the TIP fee is between 1% and 2% of the total federal funding award, and is due the month before the start of the federal fiscal year that obligation is expected to take place.

Advance Construction (“Split Projects”)

WAMPO follows the “Advance Construction” or AC approach that was put in place by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This is the amount of funding WAMPO has committed to reimburse to the project sponsor at some point in the future. This approach allows large scale, multi-year projects to move forward without the entirety of the federal funding being in place. WAMPO uses it as a management tool to handle unanticipated increases and decreases in its annual funding amount, adjust project obligation schedules if unanticipated issues arise during project development, and give flexibility in WAMPO’s overall funding program so that we can provide an opportunity for additional funding requests.

Currently, project sponsors that have been certified by KDOT to administer (e.g., bid, and oversee the contractor) their own projects are set up as AC type projects. At this point, City of Wichita and Sedgwick County are the only project sponsors that fall into this category. WAMPO needs to increase the number of projects that are set up as AC to continue to allow this flexibility and cover its outstanding liabilities.

The only difference between AC projects and non-AC projects is that AC projects require the project sponsor to “front” a portion or the entirety of the federal funding portion of the project, and then be reimbursed the federal portion in future programmed years.

Outstanding Liability

WAMPO currently carries “Outstanding Liability.” This represents the amount of funding that WAMPO has committed to previously awarded projects, should it be needed to carry out the project. It results from project bids that come in under the amount programmed in the TIP. After the contract for these projects has been executed, the difference between the amount programmed in the TIP and the contracted amount is released or “de-obligated,” back into

WAMPO's funding account. Should additional funding (e.g., change orders) above the contracted amount be needed during the course of the project, that amount is made available, or "obligated" to the project up to the amount programmed in the TIP. Once the project closes out, WAMPO erases any outstanding liability associated with it.

Procedure: Maintain at least the same amount of AC bank as outstanding liability per funding program per year. This approach would not "take away" funding from any currently funded project, just delay reimbursement to project sponsors.

De-Obligated Funds Toolkit

If none of the outstanding liability is cashed in the funds for each fiscal year will be programmed using the following set of options:

- \$1 million may be rolled over to next fiscal year, if desired
- Existing project cost updates for the current year, if not already obligated
- Advanced construction (split projects)
- Transit and Technology that can be obligated within the same fiscal year
- *Regionally significant project expenses, if timing will allow – the TAC and TPB can allow this to trump all, if desired

WAMPO Cost Estimate Guidance

Updated: September 2019

As per federal regulations, the entirety of the project cost (not just the WAMPO funding) must be shown in the MTP and in the TIP.

MTP: (5 – 10 years prior to letting)

- Approved projects with planning level cost estimates based on a local government's experience with similar projects Estimate should take into account the following stages of project development for a capital project.
 - Refinement studies
 - Engineering design plans/preliminary engineering
 - Right of way acquisition
 - Utility relocation
 - Construction & construction engineering
 - Railroad coordination
 - Contingency

TIP: Use increasingly more refined cost estimates

Initial WAMPO Funding Cycle: (4 years prior to letting)

- First opportunity to request WAMPO funding
- Use an engineer's estimate for costs, that includes all of the items listed above
 - Include all costs in the TIP, both the items covered by WAMPO funding (e.g., participating) and the items not covered by WAMPO funding (e.g., non-participating).

Carry out refinement study (Optional)

- Opportunity to refine cost estimates based on the preferred scope and design among several alternatives.

Next WAMPO Funding Cycle (2 years prior to letting)

- Opportunity to adjust amount of WAMPO funding requested with updated cost estimate and scope developed during refinement study, existing conditions assessment, or field check.

Year of Letting

- Adjust the cost estimate shown in the TIP during regular TIP Amendments at two project development milestones:
 - office check cost estimates
 - final check cost estimate.
- The cost estimate shown in the TIP must be within 25% of the cost estimate completed just prior to obligation or FHWA will not allow KDOT to obligate the federal funding and the project will be delayed.



Agenda Item 4B: Discussion
Transportation Projects Evaluation Methodology for MTP & TIP projects
Chad Parasa, WAMPO

Background

Projects selection for the development of TIP or MTP occurs periodically at MPO.

This discussion item reviews “Evaluation methodology & Scoring Criteria” that WAMPO staff has developed.

Attachment:

- [WAMPO “Projects Evaluation Methodology & Scoring Criteria”](#)



Projects Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation of regional transportation projects is based broadly on following types of transportation improvements.

Types of transportation projects are as follows:

1. Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement, (please see pages 2, 3)
2. Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Mgmt), (please see pages 4, 5)
3. Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization/Automation, (please see pages 6, 7)
4. Roadway Expansion, (please see pages 8, 9, 10, 11)
5. Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities, (please see pages 12, 13)
6. Pedestrian Facilities/Safe Routes to Schools, (please see pages 14, 15, 16, 17)
7. Transit Expansion/Transit Modernization, (please see pages 18, 19)

Evaluation criteria, for the regional transportation projects, is based on federal national goals as well as regional goals.

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), enacted in 2012, included provisions to make the Federal surface transportation more streamlined, performance-based, and multimodal, and to address challenges facing the U.S. transportation system, including improving safety, maintaining infrastructure condition, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency of the system and freight movement, protecting the environment, and reducing delays in project delivery. The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act builds on the changes made by MAP-21, including providing a dedicated source of federal dollars for freight projects.

Federal-aid highway program primarily focuses on the following national goals:

- **Safety** - To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- **Infrastructure Condition** - To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
- **Congestion Reduction** - To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
- **System Reliability** - To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
- **Freight Movement and Economic Vitality** - To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- **Environmental Sustainability** - To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- **Reduced Project Delivery Delays** - To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices

The above 7 types of transportation projects and evaluation criteria are further described in the following sections.

1. Bridges – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A bridge rehabilitation or replacement project located on a non-freeway principal arterial or minor arterial functionally-classified roadway, consistent with the latest approved functional classification map. Bridge structures that have a separate span for each direction of travel can apply for both spans.

The bridge must carry vehicular traffic, but may also include accommodations for other modes. Bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic, are evaluated under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities categories. Completely new bridges, interchanges, or overpasses fall under the Roadway Expansion scoring evaluation category.

Examples of Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement Projects:

- Bridge rehabilitation of 20 or more feet, with a bridge condition classified as 'Poor', based on 'lowest condition rating' of the primary components of a bridge or culvert.
- Bridge replacement of 20 or more feet, with a bridge condition classified as 'Poor', based on 'lowest condition rating' of the primary components of a bridge or culvert.

Bridge Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		20
1a	Measure - Distance to the nearest alternate crossing bridge		5
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, Transit Routes, and Education		10
1c	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		5
2	Usage		10
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
3	Equity and Housing Performance		10
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
4	Infrastructure Condition		20
4a	Measure – Bridge Rating		10
4b	Measure – Load-Posting		10
5	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		10
5a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
6	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
7	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		10
7a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		5
7b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		5
8	Cost Effectiveness		10
8a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	TOTAL	0	

2. Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management) – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: An Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) or similar project that primarily benefits roadway users. Traffic Management Technology projects can include project elements along a single corridor, multiple corridors, or within a specific geographic area, such as a downtown. To be eligible, projects must make improvements to at least one minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial. Projects that are more transit-focused are in the Transit Modernization scoring evaluation category.

Examples of Traffic Management Technology Projects:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flashing yellow arrow traffic signals• Traffic signal retiming projects• Integrated corridor signal coordination• Traffic signal control system upgrades• New/replacement detectors• Passive detectors for bicyclists and pedestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New/replacement traffic mgmt. centers• New/replacement traffic communication• New/replacement CCTV cameras• New/replacement variable message signs & other info improvements• Incident management coordination
--	--

Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		15
1a	Measure - Functional classification of project, Priority Bicycle commuting corridors/trail corridors		5
1b	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		5
1c	Measure - Integration within existing traffic management systems		5
2	Usage		10
2a	Measure - Current daily person throughput		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
3	Equity and Housing Performance		10
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
4	Infrastructure Condition/Age		10
4a	Measure – Upgrades to obsolete equipment		10
5	Congestion Reduction/Air Quality		10
5a	Measure - Congested corridor		5
5b	Measure - Emissions and congestion benefits of project		5
6	Safety		15
6a	Measure - Crashes reduced		7.5
6b	Measure - Safety issues in project area (e.g. signage, facility geometry)		7.5
7	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		10
7a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
8	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
9	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		5
9a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		2
9b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		3
10	Cost Effectiveness		5
10a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			100
	TOTAL	0	

3. Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility– Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A roadway project that does not add thru-lane capacity (with the exception of roundabouts), but reconstructs, reclaims, modernizes, or adds new spot mobility elements (e.g., new turn lanes, traffic signal, or roundabout). Projects must be located on a non-freeway principal arterial or a minor arterial functionally-classified roadway, consistent with the latest functional classification map.

Examples of Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Intersection improvements or alternative intersections such as unsignalized or signalized reduced conflict intersections.• Interchange reconstructions that do not involve new ramp movements or added thru lanes• Turn lanes• Two-lane to three-lane conversions (with a continuous center turn lane)• Lane conversion to on street parking, or bike lanes addition• Four-lane to three-lane conversions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roundabouts• Addition or replacement of traffic signals• Shoulder improvements• Strengthening a non-10-ton roadway• Raised medians, frontage roads, access modifications, or other access management• Roadway improvements that add multimodal elements• New alignments that replace an existing alignment and do not expand the number of lanes• Resurfacing roadway projects
--	---

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		15
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion		5
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, and Education		5
1c	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		5
2	Usage		10
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
3	Equity		10
3	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation.		10
4	Infrastructure Condition/Age		15
4a	Measure – Date of construction		7.5
4b	Measure – Geometric, structural, or infrastructure improvements		7.5
5	Congestion Reduction		10
5a	Measure - Vehicle delay reduced		10
6	Safety		10
6a	Measure - Crash history		5
6b	Measure - Safety issues in project area (e.g. signage, facility geometry)		5
7	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		10
7a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
8	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
9	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		5
9a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		2
9b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		3
10	Cost Effectiveness		5
10a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			100
	TOTAL	0	

4. (a) Roadway Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A roadway project that adds thru-lane capacity as a primary objective. Projects must be located on a minor arterial or above, functionally-classified roadway, consistent with the latest functional classification.

Examples of Roadway Expansion Projects:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Two-lane to four-lane expansions• Other thru-lane expansions (excludes additions of a continuous center turn lane)• Four-lane to six-lane expansions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New interchanges with or without associated frontage roads• Expanded interchanges with either new ramp movements or added thru lanes• New bridges, overpasses and underpasses
--	---

Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		15
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion		5
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, Transit Routes, and Education		5
1c	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		5
2	Usage		10
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
3	Equity		10
3	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		10
4	Infrastructure Condition/Age		15
4a	Measure – Date of construction		7.5
4b	Measure – Geometric, structural, or infrastructure improvements		7.5
5	Congestion Reduction/Air Quality		10
5a	Measure - Vehicle delay reduced		10
6	Safety		10
6a	Measure - Crash history		5
6b	Measure - Safety issues in project area (e.g. signage, facility geometry)		5
7	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		10
7a	Measure – Transit Routes, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
8	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
9	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		5
9a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		2
9b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		3
10	Cost Effectiveness		5
10a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			100
	TOTAL	0	

4(b) Roadway Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: New roadways that would be classified as Minor arterial or above once the project is built.

Examples of New Roadway Expansion Projects:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New roadways connecting communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New Bridge connections providing trip connectivity between two or more communities
---	--

Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		20
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion		5
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, Transit Routes, and Education		10
1c	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		5
2	Usage		10
2	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		10
3	Equity		10
3	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		10
4	Connecting Communities in the region		10
4	Promotes regional roadway connections		10
5	Congestion Reduction		10
5a	Measure - Vehicle delay reduced		10
6	Safety		10
6	Is the project addressing safety concerns		
7	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		10
7a	Measure – Transit Routes, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
8	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
9	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		5
9a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		2
9b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		3
10	Cost Effectiveness		5
10a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			100
	TOTAL	0	

5. Multi-use Trails and Bicycle Facilities – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A project that benefits bicyclists and/or other non-motorized users. All projects must have a transportation purpose (i.e., connecting people to destinations). A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose. Multiuse trail bridges or underpasses is eligible in this category.

Examples of Multi-use Trail and Bicycle Facility Projects:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Multi-use trails• Trail Bridges/underpasses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• On-street bike lanes, improved signalization detectors for bicycles• Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a trail corridor
--	--

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		15
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas		3
1b	Measure - Project location relative to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network, Bicycle commuting corridors		4
1c	Measure - Connection to Jobs, Transit Routes and Educational Institutions		4
1d	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped Network connectivity		4
2	Potential Usage		15
2a	Measure - Existing population and employment within 1 mile (potential usage), population density and employment density		10
2b	Measure - Snow and ice control		5
3	Equity and Housing Performance		10
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
4	Deficiencies and Safety		10
4a	Measure - Gaps closed/barriers removed and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project		5
4b	Measure - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed		5
5	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		20
5a	Measure - Transit or pedestrian/bicycle elements of the project and connections, level of traffic stress		20
6	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
7	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		10
7a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		5
7b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		5
8	Cost Effectiveness		10
8a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	TOTAL		

6. Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) /Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition:

Pedestrian Facilities: A project that primarily benefits pedestrians and the mobility impaired. All projects must relate to surface transportation. A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose; a facility that connects people to recreational destinations may be considered to have a transportation purpose. Multi-use trail bridges or underpasses and bicycle facilities should be in the category of the 'Multi-use Trail and Bicycle Facilities' instead of this Pedestrian Facilities.

Examples of Pedestrian Facility Projects:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sidewalks• Streetscaping• Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Making similar improvements in a concentrated geographic area, such as sidewalk gap closure throughout a defined neighborhood or downtown area

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) Prioritizing			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		25
1a	Measure - Project location relative to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network, Bicycle commuting corridors (BCC), pedestrian areas (PA)		9
1b	Measure - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		8
1c	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped Network connectivity		8
2	Potential Usage		15
2a	Measure - Existing population and employment within 1/2 mile (potential usage)		10
2b	Measure - Snow and ice control		5
3	Equity and Housing Performance		15
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		7.5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		7.5
4	Deficiencies and Safety		15
4a	Measure - Gaps closed/barriers removed and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project		7.5
4b	Measure - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed		7.5
5	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
5a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
6	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		10
6a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		5
6b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		5
7	Cost Effectiveness		10
7a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	TOTAL		

6a. Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) /Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition:

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure: An infrastructure project that is within a two-mile radius and directly benefiting a primary, middle, or high school site.

Examples of Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Projects:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sidewalks benefiting people going to the school• Multi-use trails benefiting people going to the school	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved crossings benefiting people going to the school• Multiple improvements

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements		20
1a	Measure - Describe how project addresses 5 Es (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement) of SRTS program		15
1b	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped Network connectivity		5
2	Potential Usage		20
2a	Measure - Average share of student population that bikes or walks; or student registrations		15
2b	Measure - Student population within school's walkshed		5
3	Equity and Housing Performance		10
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
4	Deficiencies and Safety		20
4a	Measure – Gaps closed/barriers removed and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project		10
4b	Measure - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed		10
5	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
5a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
6	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment		10
6a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		5
6b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		5
7	Cost Effectiveness		10
7a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	TOTAL		

7. Transit Expansion and Modernization – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A transit project that provides new or expanded transit service/facilities with the intent of attracting new transit riders to the system. Expansion projects may also benefit existing or future riders, but the projects are evaluated primarily on the ability to attract new riders. A transit project that makes transit more attractive to existing riders by offering faster travel times between destinations or improving the customer experience. Modernization projects may also benefit new or future riders, these projects are evaluated primarily on the benefit to existing riders.

Routine facility maintenance and upkeep is not an evaluation criteria.

Examples of Transit Expansion and Modernization Projects:

Examples of Transit Expansion Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Operating funds for new or expanded transit service• Transit vehicles for new or expanded service• Customer facilities for new or expanded service, new transit centers or stations, along a route• Park-and-ride facilities or expansions• Bus/transit vehicle purchases	Examples of Transit Modernization Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improved boarding areas, lighting, or safety and security equipment, real-time signage;• Passenger waiting facilities, heated facilities or weather protection• New transit maintenance and support facilities/garages or upgrades to existing facilities• ITS measures that improve reliability and the customer experience on a specific transit route or in a specific area• Improved fare collection systems• Multiple eligible improvements along a route
--	--

Transit Expansion and Modernization Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
1	Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		10
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas		4
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Population Density, Jobs, Manufacturing, Transit Routes, and Education		3
1c	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped Network connectivity		3
2	Usage		20
2a	Measure - New Annual Riders (for Expansion Projects)		10
2b	Measure - Total existing annual riders (for Modernization Projects)		10
3	Equity and Housing Performance		10
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
4	Air Quality Emissions Reduction		15
4a	Measure - Emissions and congestion benefits of project, Kg of emissions reduced		15
5	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		15
5a	Measure - Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections		15
6	Consistency with Regional Plans		10
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
7	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)		10
7a	Measure - Public engagement/municipal support/KDOT Consult/RailRoad Involvement		5
7b	Measure - National Environmental Protection Act, National Historic Protection Act (e.g. historic resources area, ROW easements, flood risk)		5
8	Cost Effectiveness		10
8a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	TOTAL	0	