



## Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting notice

Monday, March 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)
<b>1. Welcome</b>	
<b>2. Regular Business</b>	
A. Approval of March 22, 2021 Agenda	Page 1
B. <a href="#">Approval of February 22, 2021 Minutes</a>	Pages 2 to 4
C. Director's Report	
i. <a href="#">Overview</a>	
<b>3. Public Comments</b>	Pages 5 to 5
<b>4. New Business</b>	
A. <a href="#">Discussion: Projects Evaluation Methodology &amp; Scoring Criteria</a>	
Methodology 1 --- Nick Flanders, WAMPO	
Methodology 2 --- Chad Parasa, WAMPO	Page 6 to 26
<b>5. Committee Reports/Updates</b>	
A. Regional Freight Committee update	
B. Safety & Health Committee update, Elizabeth Ablah	
C. Active Transportation Committee, Alan Kailer & Jack Brown	
<b>6. Other Business</b>	
<b>7. Adjournment</b>	

Chad Parasa, TAC Secretary  
March 15, 2021



## Meeting Summary

Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Summary  
Monday, February 22, 2021  
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

Tonja Howard, Wichita Transit  
Shawn Mellies, City of Wichita  
Dan Squires, SCAC  
Raven Alexander, Wichita Transit  
Annette Graham, Coordinated Transit  
District #9  
Laura Rainwater, REAP

Ronald Colbert, SCAC  
Mike Armour, City of Wichita  
Elizabeth Ablah, Public Health  
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

Greg Allison, MKEC  
Becky Tuttle, City of Wichita  
James Wagner, City of Wichita  
Matt Messina, KDOT  
Kristen Zimmerman, PEC  
Deanne Winkelmann, TranSystems  
Sara Clark, TranSystems

Brett Letkowski, TranSystems  
Jane Byrnes, Public  
Jesse Madsen  
Barbara Maley  
Lynn Packer  
Lizzie Welch, Cambridge Systematics

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

## 2. Regular Business

### A. Approval of February 22, 2021 Agenda

**Discussion:** None

**Action:** Moved to approve agenda as presented. Motion passed (18-0).

**Motion:** J. Weber

**Second:** R. Alexander

### B. Approval of January 25, 2021 Minutes

**Discussion:** None

**Action:** Moved to approve minutes as presented. Motion passed (18-0).

**Motion:** J. Weber

**Second:** L. Rainwater

### 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, May 19<sup>th</sup>. The Active Transportation Committee meets Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>. The Regional Freight Committee meets on Wednesday, March 31<sup>st</sup>. Lizzie Welch with Cambridge Systematics, gave a quick update technology update to the board regarding the Regional Freight Plan. Currently the team is reviewing different types of NPO technology that could be helpful, as well as conduct a study of problem areas. All findings will be presented at the Freight Committee Meeting on March 31<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Tabor asked that all board members to share their input with WAMPO prior to the March committee meeting.

### 3. Public Comment

Jane Byrnes advocated for a need of transportation funding to go towards updating pedestrian walkways and crosswalks. J. Byrnes noted that physical activity is vital to maintaining your health and wellness. Pedestrians need to feel protected and safe when being physically active.

### 4. New Business

#### A. Action: TIP Funding Suballocated Programs Management Procedure

WAMPO made the recommended edits to the sub-allocated funding management document. The board agreed to approve with a specific change in wording from “the fee is between 1% and 2% of the total Federal Funding Award” to “as agreed upon by the TPB”.

**Action:** Move to approve with the specific change as described above.  
**Motion Passed (18-0)**

#### B. Discussion: Projects Evaluation Methodology & Scoring Criteria

Mr. Parasa introduced new “Evaluation Methodology & Scoring Criteria” that WAMPO staff developed. Mr. Squires recommended that WAMPO send out previous methodology, as well as present the new methodology in sections, in order to approach discussion in sequence of steps. Mrs. Hart mentioned that she would like one change made to the scoring criteria. The bike, ped and transit projects to tie to the planning walkable places plans.

#### C. Discussion: Traffic Data and Regional Data

WAMPO currently has a contract with HDR consulting firm. Staff was able to save \$90,000 that needs to be used by December 2021. Mr. Parasa opened up the floor for ideas on how to utilize the funds appropriately, such as compiling and storing traffic counts. Mr. Brown agreed that data is important, he noted that he would like to see actionable data, rather than raw data. If board members have ideas on other ways to use funding, please contact Chad Parasa.

### 5. Committee Reports/Updates

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

Next Regional Freight Committee meeting will be on March 31<sup>st</sup>.

#### B. **Active Transportation Committee update, Jack Brown**

Mr. Kailer reminded TAC members that the next committee meeting is on Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>. The committee will be discussing the status of the active transportation plans within the region. Jack Brown has spoken to many jurisdictions within the WAMPO region and have received feedback on how to assist them in improving their communities.

#### C. **Safety & Health Committee update, Elizabeth Ablah**

Mrs. Ablah gave a brief update on the Safety & Health Committee. E. Ablah stated that the committee have mapped out general plan for the next two years. Chad Parasa will be focusing on safety and Dr. Ablah focused on health. 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**

**Meeting was adjourned at 11:03 AM**

**Next Meeting will be held March 22, 2021 at 10:00 AM**



**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.



## Background

Project selection for the development of the TIP and the MTP occurs periodically at WAMPO.

### **Methodology 1:**

The evaluation criteria most recently used in 2020, during the development of the MTP, to determine eligibility for WAMPO suballocated federal funds:

Scoring utilized	Dimensions projects are scored on (all weighted equally; maximum total score is 32)
N/A = 0 Acceptable = 1 Good = 2 Excellent = 4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quality of Place</li> <li>2. Land-Use Transportation Connection</li> <li>3. Multimodal Connectivity</li> <li>4. Economic Development</li> <li>5. Financial Sustainability</li> <li>6. Regionalism</li> <li>7. Safety</li> <li>8. Technology</li> </ol>

### **Methodology 2:**

Attached “Project Evaluation Methodology & Scoring Criteria” that has following project types.

Types of transportation projects (each has a unique evaluation methodology)	Weighted scoring criteria
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement</li> <li>2. Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Mgmt.)</li> <li>3. Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization/Automation</li> <li>4. Roadway Expansion</li> <li>5. Multiuse Trails &amp; Bicycle Facilities</li> <li>6. Pedestrian Facilities/Safe Routes To School</li> <li>7. Transit Expansion/Transit Modernization</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</li> <li>• Usage (number of users)</li> <li>• Equity and Housing Performance</li> <li>• Infrastructure Condition</li> <li>• Congestion/Air Quality</li> <li>• Connecting Communities/Regionalism</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</li> <li>• Consistency with Regional Plans</li> <li>• Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</li> <li>• Cost Effectiveness</li> </ul>

### Attachment:

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

MTP projects Scoring Methodology

Name	Project Sponsor	Project ID	Mode	Quality of Place	Land-Use Transportation Connection	Multimodal Connectivity	Economic Development	Financial Sustainability	Regionalism	Safety	Technology	Scoring	Funds Requested
Major Regional Priority Planning	WAMPO	15.05	Planning										\$800,000
13th St N, McLean to Zoo Blvd	Wichita	16.18	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	23	\$4,800,000
Douglas, Seneca to Meridian	Wichita	16.06	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	23	\$3,360,000
Mt Vernon, SE Blvd to Oliver	Wichita	16.23	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	23	\$2,400,000
Webb Rd, Central to 13th St N	Wichita	16.4	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	23	\$3,200,000
17th St N, I-135 to Hillside	Wichita	16.19	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	22	\$1,200,000
E 45th St N: N Oliver Ave to N Woodlawn St	Bel Aire	2.07	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Good	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	21	\$5,120,000
31st St S Bikeway	Wichita	16.33	Bike/Ped	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Good	N/A	21	\$320,000
Wichita State Bikeway Connections	Wichita	16.21	Bike/Ped	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Acceptable	N/A	20	\$440,000
143rd St E, Harry to Pawnee	Wichita	16.38	Road	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	19	\$3,200,000
Intelligent Transportation System - Central Business District	Wichita	16.02	Technology	Excellent	Excellent	N/A	Excellent	N/A	Good	Acceptable	Excellent	19	\$2,000,000
Intelligent Transportation System	Wichita	16.05	Technology	Excellent	Excellent	N/A	Excellent	N/A	Good	Acceptable	Excellent	19	\$1,600,000
119th St Improvements from 29th St to 53rd St	Maize	10.03	Road	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	17	\$13,598,080
Arkansas River to Haysville Bikeway	Wichita	16.27	Bike/Ped	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	N/A	Good	Acceptable	N/A	17	\$2,400,000
Pawnee, Greenwich to 127th St E	Wichita	16.35	Road	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	Acceptable	Acceptable	Excellent	Good	N/A	17	\$2,800,000
Maize, 31st St S to Pawnee	Wichita	16.32	Road	Good	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	Good	N/A	16	\$3,400,000
Maize, 31st St to MacArthur	Wichita	16.31	Road	Good	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	15	\$4,550,000
SW Butler Road Improvements from SW 155th St to SW 170th St	Butler County	3.01	Road	N/A	N/A	Good	Good	Excellent	Good	Excellent	N/A	14	\$7,840,000
Oliver Ave and 45th St N Intersection Improvements	Bel Aire	2.03	Road	Excellent	N/A	Excellent	Acceptable	Good	Acceptable	Good	N/A	14	\$1,262,400
Redbud Path, Woodlawn to Rock	Wichita	16.13	Bike/Ped	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	N/A	Good	Acceptable	N/A	14	\$4,000,000
Santa Fe St: Main St to 391st St West	Cheney	4.01	Road	Excellent	Good	N/A	Good	Good	Acceptable	Good	N/A	13	\$1,158,525
Rock Road Corridor Improvements from 55th St to Freedom St	Derby	5.02	Road	Excellent	N/A	Excellent	Acceptable	N/A	Good	Good	N/A	13	\$3,382,400
Hillside, 37th to 45th	Wichita	16.3	Road	N/A	Good	N/A	Good	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	13	\$2,400,000
10' Path on Maple St from S 135th St W to 183rd St W and 167th sou	Sedgwick County	13.02	Bike/Ped	Excellent	Acceptable	Excellent	Acceptable	N/A	Good	Acceptable	N/A	13	\$2,022,316
183rd St Corridor Improvements from Maple St to US-54/400	Goddard	6.02	Road	Good	N/A	Good	Good	N/A	Acceptable	Excellent	N/A	11	\$5,201,120
Multi-Use Path along Seneca and 63rd Sts	Haysville	7.01	Bike/Ped	Excellent	N/A	Good	Good	N/A	Acceptable	Acceptable	N/A	10	\$955,700
Sedgwick County Replacement Vehicles	Sedgwick County	13.04	Transit	N/A	N/A	Acceptable	N/A	Excellent	Good	N/A	N/A	7	\$64,075
Scoring Criteria	N/A = 0	Acceptable = 1	Good = 2			Excellent = 4							



## Projects Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation of regional transportation projects is specialized for the following types of transportation improvements:

1. Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement (pages 2-3)
2. Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Mgmt.) (pages 4-5)
3. Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization/Automation (pages 6-7)
4. Roadway Expansion (pages 8-11)
5. Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities (pages 12-13)
6. Pedestrian Facilities/Safe Routes To School (pages 14-17)
7. Transit Expansion/Transit Modernization (pages 18-19)

Evaluation criteria for regional transportation projects are based on federal 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 U.S. surface transportation system more streamlined, performance-based, and multimodal, and to address challenges facing the transportation system, including safety, infrastructure condition, traffic congestion, efficiency of freight movement, environmental impacts, and 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.

The federal-aid highway program primarily focuses on the following 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 types of transportation projects and evaluation criteria are described further 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.

<b>Bridge Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>20</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Usage</b>		<b>10</b>
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>		<b>10</b>
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
<b>4</b>	<b>Infrastructure Condition</b>		<b>20</b>
4a	Measure – Bridge Rating		10
4b	Measure – Load-Posting		10
<b>5</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>7</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>8</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	

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

<b>Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>15</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Usage</b>		<b>10</b>
2a	Measure - Current daily person throughput		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>		<b>10</b>
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
<b>4</b>	<b>Infrastructure Condition/Age</b>		<b>10</b>
4a	Measure - Upgrades to obsolete equipment		10
<b>5</b>	<b>Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Measure - Congested corridor		5
5b	Measure - Emissions and congestion benefits of project		5
<b>6</b>	<b>Safety</b>		<b>15</b>
6a	Measure - Crashes reduced		7.5
6b	Measure - Safety issues in project area (e.g. signage, facility geometry)		7.5
<b>7</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		<b>10</b>
7a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
<b>8</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>9</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>5</b>
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
<b>10</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>5</b>
10a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	

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

<b>Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>15</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Usage</b>		<b>10</b>
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity</b>		<b>10</b>
3	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation.		10
<b>4</b>	<b>Infrastructure Condition/Age</b>		<b>15</b>
4a	Measure - Date of construction		7.5
4b	Measure - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure improvements		7.5
<b>5</b>	<b>Congestion Reduction</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Measure - Vehicle delay reduced		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Safety</b>		<b>10</b>
6a	Measure - Crash history		5
6b	Measure - Safety issues in project area (e.g. signage, facility geometry)		5
<b>7</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		<b>10</b>
7a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
<b>8</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>9</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>5</b>
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
<b>10</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>5</b>
10a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	

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

<b>Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>15</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Usage</b>		<b>10</b>
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity</b>		<b>10</b>
3	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		10
<b>4</b>	<b>Infrastructure Condition/Age</b>		<b>15</b>
4a	Measure - Date of construction		7.5
4b	Measure - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure improvements		7.5
<b>5</b>	<b>Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Measure - Vehicle delay reduced		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Safety</b>		<b>10</b>
6a	Measure - Crash history		5
6b	Measure - Safety issues in project area (e.g. signage, facility geometry)		5
<b>7</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		<b>10</b>
7a	Measure - Transit Routes, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
<b>8</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>9</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>5</b>
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
<b>10</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>5</b>
10a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	

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

<b>Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>20</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Usage</b>		<b>10</b>
2	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		10
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity</b>		<b>10</b>
3	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		10
<b>4</b>	<b>Connecting Communities in the region</b>		<b>10</b>
4	Promotes regional roadway connections		10
<b>5</b>	<b>Congestion Reduction</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Measure - Vehicle delay reduced		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Safety</b>		<b>10</b>
6	Is the project addressing safety concerns		10
<b>7</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		<b>10</b>
7a	Measure – Transit Routes, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
<b>8</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>9</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>5</b>
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
<b>10</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>5</b>
10a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		5
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	

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

<b>Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>15</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Potential Usage</b>		<b>15</b>
2a	Measure - Existing population and employment within 1 mile (potential usage), population density and employment density		10
2b	Measure - Snow and ice control		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>		<b>10</b>
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
<b>4</b>	<b>Deficiencies and Safety</b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>5</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		<b>20</b>
5a	Measure - Transit or pedestrian/bicycle elements of the project and connections, level of traffic stress		20
<b>6</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>7</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>8</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	<b>TOTAL</b>		

## 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.

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

<b>Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) Prioritizing</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>25</b>
1a	Measure - Project location relative to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network, Bicycle Commuting Corridors (BCC), and 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
<b>2</b>	<b>Potential Usage</b>		<b>15</b>
2a	Measure - Existing population and employment within 1/2 mile (potential usage)		10
2b	Measure - Snow and ice control		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>		<b>15</b>
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		7.5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		7.5
<b>4</b>	<b>Deficiencies and Safety</b>		<b>15</b>
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
<b>5</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>7</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>10</b>
7a	Measure - Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>		

## 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.

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

<b>Safe Routes To School Infrastructure – Prioritizing</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements</b>		<b>20</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b>Potential Usage</b>		<b>20</b>
2a	Measure - Average share of student population that bikes or walks; or student registrations		15
2b	Measure - Student population within school's walkshed		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>		<b>10</b>
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
<b>4</b>	<b>Deficiencies and Safety</b>		<b>20</b>
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
<b>5</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		<b>10</b>
5a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment</b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>7</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		<b>10</b>
7a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>		

## 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:

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

<b>Transit Expansion and Modernization Projects Scoring</b>			
<b>Criteria and Measures</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1</b>	<b><i>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</i></b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Usage – Demonstration of Need</i></b>		<b>20</b>
2a	Measure - New Annual Riders (for Expansion Projects)		10
2b	Measure - Total existing annual riders (for Modernization Projects)		10
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Equity and Housing Performance</i></b>		<b>10</b>
3a	Measure - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
3b	Measure - Housing Performance		5
<b>4</b>	<b><i>Air Quality Emissions Reduction</i></b>		<b>15</b>
4a	Measure - Emissions and congestion benefits of project, Kg of emissions reduced		15
<b>5</b>	<b><i>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</i></b>		<b>15</b>
5a	Measure - Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections		15
<b>6</b>	<b><i>Consistency with Regional Plans – Accessibility &amp; Collaboration of MPO's Transit coordinated plan</i></b>		<b>10</b>
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>7</b>	<b><i>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</i></b>		<b>10</b>
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
<b>8</b>	<b><i>Cost Effectiveness</i></b>		<b>10</b>
8a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	