



# **MTP 2050**

## **Appendix D**

# **Project Scoring Model**

Credit: Derby



## Project Scoring Model

From September 15, 2023, through February 2, 2024, a Call for Projects was issued for WAMPO member jurisdictions and planning partners to submit projects for Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2050 (MTP 2050). On October 3, 2024, the WAMPO Project Selection Committee (PSC) convened to make recommendations of which of the submitted projects to include in the MTP 2050 Fiscally Constrained Project List (see Chapter 7). On October 28, 2024, the WAMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended that the WAMPO Transportation Policy Body (TPB) approve the Fiscally Constrained Project List, as recommended by the PSC. On November 12, 2024, the TPB voted to approve the PSC- and TAC-recommended Fiscally Constrained Project List.

When the PSC convened to make its recommendations, they were provided with a variety of information from the project submitters (e.g., project scope, project location, project cost) on the basis of which to make decisions. In addition, the PSC was provided with relative scores for the various

projects under consideration, calculated according to project evaluation criteria adopted by the TPB (see below), to serve as one of the factors in their recommendations. WAMPO staff and the consulting firm PEC developed a Project Scoring Model to apply the adopted evaluation criteria to the submitted projects. Having such a model was intended to serve two purposes: Speeding up the process of project-scoring and making scoring more consistent across projects.

The benefits and disbenefits of improvements to a given piece of transportation infrastructure are highly dependent on its location relative to the rest of the transportation system, to where traffic congestion occurs, to where crashes occur, to where people live, work, shop, and recreate, and to natural resources and hazards. In light of that, the Project Scoring Model included a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) component, using as inputs the intended location of the project and the locations of homes, employers, schools, institutions, disadvantaged communities, infrastructure, transit routes, and natural features that may be affected by it. Another input to the Project Scoring Model is the relevant facility's estimated current and future traffic volumes, as output by the WAMPO Travel Demand Model (TDM, discussed further in Appendix F).

### Project Evaluation Criteria

The WAMPO Transportation Policy Body approved the following Project Evaluation Criteria on October 12, 2021 ([www.wampo.org/files/ugd/bbf89d\\_b7a5a86343144a75905c92db52d24391.pdf](http://www.wampo.org/files/ugd/bbf89d_b7a5a86343144a75905c92db52d24391.pdf)). They were developed to evaluate regional transportation projects based on federal and regional goals. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), enacted in 2012, included provisions to make the

US 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 built on the changes made by MAP-21, including providing a dedicated source of federal dollars for freight projects.

Project Evaluation Criteria were developed for seven (7) project types:

1. Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement
2. Traffic Management Technologies (Roadways System Mgmt.)
3. Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization/Automation
4. Roadway Expansion
5. Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities
6. Pedestrian Facilities/Safe Routes to School
7. Transit Expansion/Transit Modernization

Projects were scored using the Project Evaluation Criteria shown on the following pages. These scores were provided to the Project Selection Committee (PSC) to help them start their selection discussions.

## 1. BRIDGE PROJECTS SCORING

**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.

**Table D.1: Bridge Projects Scoring**

Bridge Projects Scoring Criteria and Measures		Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		25
1a	Measure - Distance to the nearest alternate crossing bridge		10
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>		10
2a	Measure - Current daily traffic		5
2b	Measure - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume		5
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity</b>		5
3a	Measure – No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
<b>4</b>	<b>Infrastructure Condition</b>		20
4a	Measure – Bridge Rating		10
4b	Measure – Load-Posting		10
<b>5</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		10
5a	Measure - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections		10
<b>6</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans</b>		10
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>7</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		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
<b>8</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		10
8a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
	<b>TOTAL</b>	0	

**Table D.2: Bridge Projects Scoring Breakdown**

<b>1.a.</b>	<b>Role in Regional Transportation System (Max 10 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Greater than 2 miles to nearest alternate bridge.	10 Pts.
	Within 2 miles of nearest alternate bridge.	8 Pts.
	Within 1.5 miles of nearest alternate bridge.	6 Pts.
	Within 1 mile of nearest alternate bridge.	4 Pts.
	Within ½ miles of nearest alternate bridge.	2 Pts.
	¼ mile or less to nearest alternate bridge.	0 Pts.

<b>1.b.</b>	<b>Role in Regional Transportation System (Max 10 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of employment, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of manufacturing facilities, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of transit routes, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of educational facilities, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	If 2 of the above categories are present, add one additional point.	1 Pt.
	If 3 of the above categories are present, add 1.5 additional points.	1.5 Pts.
	If 4 of the above categories are present, add two additional points.	2 Pts.

<b>1.c.</b>	<b>Role in Regional Transportation System (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Is the project along or does it intersect any transit routes?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any freight corridors?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any multi-use trails?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any bicycle/pedestrian networks?	1 Pt.
	Does the project connect to or facilitate the use of one of more of these features/locations?	1 Pt.



**Table D.2: Bridge Projects Scoring Breakdown**

2.a.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall <i>increase</i> in average daily traffic volumes.	5 Pts.
	Project has no overall effect on average daily traffic volumes in either positive or negative manner.	2.5 Pts.
	Project results in an overall <i>decrease</i> in average daily traffic volumes.	0 Pts.

2.b.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall <i>increase</i> in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	5 Pts.
	Project results in no change to the forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes.	2.5 Pts.
	Project results in an overall <i>decrease</i> in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Infrastructure Condition (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Existing bridge structure is rated structurally deficient and has a sufficiency rating of 50 or less.	10 Pts.
	Existing bridge structure is rated functionally obsolete and has a sufficiency rating of 80 or less.	5 Pts.
	Existing bridge structure has a sufficiency rating of 80 or greater.	0 Pts.

4.b.	Infrastructure Condition (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Bridge has a posted load rating restriction for 10 tons or less.	10 Pts.
	Bridge has a posted load rating restriction for 25 tons or less.	7.5 Pts.
	Bridge has a posted load rating restriction for 40 tons or less.	5 Pts.
	Bridge has a posted load weight limit.	2.5 Pts.
	Bridge does NOT have a posted load weight limit.	0 Pts.

5.a.	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes transit features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a transit route.	2.5 Pts.
	Project includes bicycle or pedestrian features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a bicycle or pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.

6.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

**Table D.2: Bridge Projects Scoring Breakdown**

<b>7.a.</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	5 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	2.5 Pts.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

<b>7.b.</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	2.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	2.5 Pts.

<b>8.a.</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness (Max 10 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	10 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

## 2. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGIES SCORING

**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:

- 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
- New/replacement traffic mgmt. centers
- New/replacement traffic communication
- New/replacement CCTV cameras
- New/replacement variable message signs & other info improvements
- Incident management coordination

**Table D.3: Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring**

Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring			
	Criteria and Measures	Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>20</b>
1a	Measure - Functional classification of project, movement of people and goods		7
1b	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped. Network		6
1c	Measure - Integration within existing traffic management systems		7
<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</b>		<b>5</b>
3a	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		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>	

**Table D.4: Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is located on the Interstate Roadway system.	3 Pts.
	Project is located on an "Arterial" roadway.	2 Pts.
	Project is located on a "Collector" roadway.	1 Pt.
	Project is located within the WAMPO freight network and will eliminate barriers to use for freight carriers.	2 Pts.
	Project provides or improves connectivity to the road network for freight shippers, receivers, or intermodal transfer facilities.	2 Pts.
	Project is located on a "local" roadway and has no effect on freight networks.	0 Pts.

1.b.	Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 6 Pts.)	Point Value
	Is the project along or does it intersect any transit routes?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any freight corridors?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any multi-use trails?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any bicycle/pedestrian networks?	1 Pt.
	Does the project connect to or facilitate the use of one of more of these features/locations?	2 Pts.

1.c.	Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project will be fully integrated into the existing traffic management systems at the project location.	7 Pts.
	Project will be partially integrated into or accentuate the existing traffic management systems at the project location.	3.5 Pts.
	Project will <i>NOT</i> be integrated into the existing traffic management systems at the project location.	0 Pts.

2.a.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall <i>increase</i> in average daily traffic volumes.	5 Pts.
	Project has no overall effect on average daily traffic volumes in either positive or negative manner.	2.5 Pts.
	Project results in an overall <i>decrease</i> in average daily traffic volumes.	0 Pts.

2.b.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall increase in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	5 Pts.
	Project results in no change to the forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes.	2.5 Pts.
	Project results in an overall decrease in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.



**Table D.4: Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring Breakdown**

4.a.	Infrastructure Condition/Age (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 25 years ago.	10 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 20 years ago.	7 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 10 years ago.	3 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built less than 10 years ago.	0 Pts.

5.a.	Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	5 Pts.
	Project results in some reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	2.5 Pts.
	Project results in no reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	0 Pts.

5.b.	Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project will result in a lowering of traffic congestion and vehicle emissions within the project area.	5 Pts.
	Project will have no result on congestion or emission levels.	0 Pts.

6.a.	Safety (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is at a location where 30 or more crashes occurred since 2017.	7.5 Pts.
	Project is at a location where 15 or more crashes occurred since 2017.	4 Pts.
	Project is at a location with no significant history of crashes having occurred since 2017.	0 Pts.

6.b.	Safety (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements and is at a location with a significant history of crashes (more than 25 in any 3-year period).	7.5 Pts.
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements.	4 Pts.
	Project does not include any defined safety improvements.	0 Pts.

7.a.	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes transit features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a transit route.	2.5 Pts.
	Project includes bicycle or pedestrian features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a bicycle or pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.

8.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts. Total)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

**Table D.4: Traffic Management Technology Projects Scoring Breakdown**

9.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 2 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	2 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	1 Pt.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

9.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 3 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	1.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	1.5 Pts.

10.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	2.5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

### 3. ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION/ MODERNIZATION & SPOT MOBILITY PROJECT SCORING

**Definition:** A roadway project that does not add thru-lane capacity (except for roundabouts), but reconstructs, reclaims, modernizes, or adds new spot mobility elements (e.g., new turn lanes, traffic signals, or roundabouts). 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:

- 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
- 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

**Table D.5: Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects Scoring**

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects Scoring			
	Criteria and Measures	Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>20</b>
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, movement of people and goods		7
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, and Education		7
1c	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		6
<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>5</b>
3	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation.		5
<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>	

**Table D.6: Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in the level of congestion and accentuates the movement of people and goods.	7 Pts.
	Project results in some level of reduction in level of congestion and may improve the movement of people and goods.	3.5 Pts.
	Project results in no appreciable reduction in level of congestion nor facilitates the movement of people or goods.	0 Pts.

1.b.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of employment, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of manufacturing facilities, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of transit routes, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of educational facilities, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	If 2 of the above categories are present, add one additional point.	1 Pt.
	If 3 of the above categories are present, add 1.5 additional points.	1.5 Pts.
	If 4 of the above categories are present, add two additional points.	2 Pts.

1.c.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 6 Pts.)	Point Value
	Is the project along or does it intersect any transit routes?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any freight corridors?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any multi-use trails?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any bicycle/pedestrian networks?	1 Pt.
	Does the project connect to or facilitate the use of one of more of these features/locations?	2 Pts.

2.a.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project average daily traffic volumes are greater than 8,500.	5 Pts.
	Project average daily traffic volumes are between 5,000 and 8,500.	2.5 Pts.
	Project average daily traffic volumes are less than 5,000.	0 Pts.

2.b.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes are greater than 14,000.	5 Pts.
	Project forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes are between 7,600 and 14,000.	2.5 Pts.
	Project forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes are less than 7,600.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Infrastructure Condition/Age (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 25 years ago.	7.5 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 20 years ago.	5 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 10 years ago.	2.5 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built less than 10 years ago.	0 Pts.

4.b.	Infrastructure Condition/Age (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes improvements in <u>all</u> of the following types of improvements, which results in improved comfort and safety of the users: Geometric, Structural, and Infrastructure improvements.	7.5 Pts.
	Project includes improvements in at least two of the following types of improvements, which results in improved comfort and safety of the users: Geometric, Structural, and Infrastructure improvements.	5.0 Pts.
	Project includes improvements in at least one of the following types of improvements, which results in improved comfort and safety of the users: Geometric, Structural, and Infrastructure improvements.	2.5 Pts.
	Project doesn't include any Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure improvements.	0 Pts.



**Table D.6: Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects Scoring Breakdown**

5.a.	Congestion Reduction (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	10 Pts.
	Project results in some reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	5 Pts.
	Project results in no reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	0 Pts.

6.a.	Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is at a location where 30 or more crashes occurred since 2017.	5 Pts.
	Project is at a location where 15 or more crashes occurred since 2017.	2.5 Pts.
	Project is at a location with no significant history of crashes having occurred since 2017.	0 Pts.

6.b.	Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements and is at a location with a significant history of crashes (more than 25 in any 3 year period).	5 Pts.
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements.	2.5 Pts.
	Project does not include any defined safety improvements.	0 Pts.

7.a.	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes transit features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a transit route.	2.5 Pts.
	Project includes bicycle or pedestrian features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a bicycle or pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.

8.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional/local plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional/local plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional/local plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional/local plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

9.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 2 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	2 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	1 Pt.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

9.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 3 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	1.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	1.5 Pts.

10.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	2.5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

## 4.A. ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECTS SCORING (EXISTING ROAD)

**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:

- Two-lane to four-lane expansions
- Other thru-lane expansions (excludes additions of a continuous center turn lane)
- Four-lane to six-lane expansions
- New interchanges with or without associated frontage roads
- Expanded interchanges with either new ramp movements or added thru lanes
- New bridges, overpasses and underpasses

**Table D.7: Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring (Existing Road)**

Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring (Existing Road)			
	Criteria and Measures	Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>20</b>
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, movement of people and goods		7
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Jobs, Manufacturing, Transit Routes, and Education		7
1c	Measure - Transit Routes, Freight, Bike and Trail Corridors, and Bike/Ped Network		6
<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>5</b>
3	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
<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>	

**Table D.8: Roadway Expansion Projects (Existing Road) Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in the level of congestion and accentuates the movement of people and goods.	7 Pts.
	Project results in some level of reduction in level of congestion and may improve the movement of people and goods.	3.5 Pts.
	Project results in no appreciable reduction in level of congestion nor facilitates the movement of people or goods.	0 Pts.

1.b.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of employment, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of manufacturing facilities, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of transit routes, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of educational facilities, add 1.25 points.	1.25 Pts.
	If 2 of the above categories are present, add one additional point.	1 Pt.
	If 3 of the above categories are present, add 1.5 additional points.	1.5 Pts.
	If 4 of the above categories are present, add two additional points.	2 Pts.

1.c.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 6 Pts.)	Point Value
	Is the project along or does it intersect any transit routes?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any freight corridors?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any multi-use trails?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any bicycle/pedestrian networks?	1 Pt.
	Does the project connect to or facilitate the use of one of more of these features/locations?	2 Pts.

2.a.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall <i>increase</i> in average daily traffic volumes.	5 Pts.
	Project has no overall effect on average daily traffic volumes in either positive or negative manner.	2.5 Pts.

2.b.	Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall <i>increase</i> in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	5 Pts.
	Project results in no change to the forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes.	2.5 Pts.
	Project results in an overall <i>decrease</i> in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Infrastructure Condition/Age (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 25 years ago.	7.5 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 20 years ago.	5 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built more than 10 years ago.	2.5 Pts.
	Existing infrastructure was built less than 10 years ago.	0 Pts.

4.b.	Infrastructure Condition/Age (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes improvements in <u>all</u> of the following types of improvements, which results in improved comfort and safety of the users: Geometric, Structural, and Infrastructure improvements.	7.5 Pts.
	Project includes improvements in at least two of the following types of improvements, which results in improved comfort and safety of the users: Geometric, Structural, and Infrastructure improvements.	5.0 Pts.
	Project includes improvements in at least one of the following types of improvements, which results in improved comfort and safety of the users: Geometric, Structural, and Infrastructure improvements.	2.5 Pts.
	Project doesn't include any Geometric, Structural, or Infrastructure improvements.	0 Pts.

**Table D.8: Roadway Expansion Projects (Existing Road) Scoring Breakdown**

5.a.	Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	10 Pts.
	Project results in some reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	5 Pts.
	Project results in no reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	0 Pts.

6.a.	Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is at a location where 30 or more crashes occurred since 2017.	5 Pts.
	Project is at a location where 15 or more crashes occurred since 2017.	2.5 Pts.
	Project is at a location with no significant history of crashes having occurred since 2017.	0 Pts.

6.b.	Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements and is at a location with a significant history of crashes (more than 25 in any 3 years).	5 Pts.
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements.	2.5 Pts.
	Project does not include any defined safety improvements.	0 Pts.

7.a.	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes transit features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a transit route.	2.5 Pts.
	Project includes bicycle or pedestrian features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a bicycle or pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.

8.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

9.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 2 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	2 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	1 Pt.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

9.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 3 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	1.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	1.5 Pts.

10.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a <u>fairly high</u> score in this rubric.	2.5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.



## 4.B. ROADWAY EXPANSION PROJECTS SCORING (NEW ROAD)

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

**Examples** of New Roadway Expansion Projects:

- New roadways connecting communities
- New Bridge connections providing tripconnectivity between two or more communities

**Table D.9: Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring (New Road)**

Roadway Expansion Projects Scoring (New Road)			
	Criteria and Measures	Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>25</b>
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, movement of people and goods		8
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		7
<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>5</b>
3	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
<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>	

**Table D.10: Roadway Expansion Projects (New Road) Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 8 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in the level of congestion and accentuates the movement of people and goods.	8 Pts.
	Project results in some level of reduction in level of congestion and may improve the movement of people and goods.	4 Pts.
	Project results in no appreciable reduction in level of congestion nor facilitates the movement of people or goods.	0 Pts.

1.b.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of employment, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of manufacturing facilities, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of transit routes, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of educational facilities, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	If 2 of the above categories are present, add one additional point.	1 Pt.
	If 3 of the above categories are present, add 1.5 additional points.	1.5 Pts.
	If 4 of the above categories are present, add two additional points.	2 Pts.

1.c.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 7 Pts.)	Point Value
	Is the project along or does it intersect any transit routes?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any freight corridors?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any multi-use trails?	1 Pt.
	Is the project along or does it intersect any bicycle/pedestrian networks?	1 Pt.
	Does the project connect to or facilitate the use of one of more of these features/locations?	2 Pts.

2.a.	Usage (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in an overall <i>increase</i> in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	10 Pts.
	Project results in no change to the forecast 2040 average daily traffic volumes.	5 Pts.
	Project results in an overall <i>decrease</i> in forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Connecting Communities in the Region (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project connects two separate pieces of the regional roadway network that weren't previously connected or facilitates the movement of people and goods in a way not available without the project present.	10 Pts.
	Project adds at least one connection to the regional roadway network.	5 Pts.
	Project makes no connections to the existing roadway network.	0 Pts.

5.a.	Congestion Reduction (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	10 Pts.
	Project results in some reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	5 Pts.
	Project results in no reduction in vehicle delays for the project area.	0 Pts.

6.a.	Safety (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements and is at a location with a significant history of crashes (more than 25 since 2017).	10 Pts.
	Project incorporates tangible safety improvements.	5 Pts.
	Project does not include any defined safety improvements.	0 Pts.

**Table D.10: Roadway Expansion Projects (New Road) Scoring Breakdown**

7.a.	Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes transit features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a transit line.	2.5 Pts.
	Project includes bicycle or pedestrian features or connections.	2.5 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a bicycle or pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.

8.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

9.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 2 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	2 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	1 Pt.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

9.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 3 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	1.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	1.5 Pts.

10.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	2.5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

## 5. MULTIUSE TRAILS & BICYCLE FACILITIES SCORING

**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 are eligible in this category.

**Examples** of Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facility Projects:

- Multiuse trails
- Trail Bridges/underpasses
- On-street bike lanes, improved signalization detectors for bicycles
- Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a trail corridor

**Table D.11: Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Projects Scoring**

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Projects Scoring			
	Criteria and Measures	Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>20</b>
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas		5
1b	Measure - Project location relative to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network, Bicycle commuting corridors		5
1c	Measure - Connection to Jobs, Transit Routes and Educational Institutions		5
1d	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped. Network connectivity		5
<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</b>		<b>5</b>
3a	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		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
			<b>100</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>		



**Table D.12: Multiluse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Projects Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project in highly congested areas	5 Pts.
	Project in medium congested areas	3 Pts.
	Project in low congested areas	1 Pt.

1.b.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project connects two separate pieces of the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network or other Bicycle commuting corridor(s) that weren't previously connected.	5 Pts.
	Project adds at least one connection to existing bicycle network.	2.5 Pts.
	Project makes no connections to existing bicycle network.	0 Pts.

1.c.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within 0.5 miles of a transit route, add 1 point.	1 Pt.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of educational facilities, add 2 points.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of employment, add 2 points.	2 Pts.

1.d.	Role in the Regional Trans. System & Economy (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project adds connectivity to existing trails/trail networks.	1.25 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bike corridor.	1.25 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bicycle/pedestrian network.	1.25 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing transit routes.	1.25 Pts.

2.a.	Potential Usage (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within one mile of existing employment opportunities.	5 Pts.
	Project is within one mile of existing population centers.	5 Pts.
	Project is more than one mile from existing employment sources and population centers.	0 Pts.

2.b.	Potential Usage (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes provisions for snow & ice removal from project facilities.	5 Pts.
	Project does not include provisions for snow & ice removal from project facilities.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Deficiencies & Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project closes a gap or removes a barrier present in the existing trail/bike/ped network.	2.5 Pts.
	Project closes a gap, removes a barrier, or adds a connection to the existing trail/bike/ped network that adds connectivity to the network or between jurisdictions.	2.5 Pts.

4.b.	Deficiencies & Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project makes meaningful safety improvements or deficiency corrections in a location having had at least one Bike/Ped fatality or serious injury and/or 15 of more Bike/Ped crashes since 2017.	5 Pts.
	Project makes meaningful safety improvements or deficiency corrections in a location having had at least 10 of more Bike/Ped crashes or serious injury crashes since 2017.	3 Pts.
	Project does not address any safety concerns or deficiencies.	0 Pts.

**Table D.12: Multiruse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Projects Scoring Breakdown**

5.a.	Multimodal Elements and Existing Conditions (Max 20 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project connects with a transit route.	5 Pts.
	Project is on a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) of 4 (larger numbers indicate more stress).	15 Pts.
	Project is on a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) of 3.	10 Pts.
	Project is on a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) of 2.	5 Pts.
	Project is on a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) of 1.	0 Pts.

6.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

7.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	5 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	2.5 Pts.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

7.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	2.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	2.5 Pts.

8.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	10 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

## 6.A. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES SCORING

**Definition:** 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:

- Sidewalks
- Streetscaping
- Americans with Disability Act (ADA) improvements
- Making similar improvements in a concentrated geographic area, such as sidewalk gap closure throughout a defined neighborhood or downtown area

**Table D.13: Pedestrian Facilities Scoring**

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		<b>30</b>
1a	Measure - Project location relative to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network, Bicycle Commuting Corridors (BCC), and Pedestrian Areas (PA)		10
1b	Measure - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		10
1c	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped. Network connectivity		10
<b>2</b>	<b>Potential Usage</b>		<b>20</b>
2a	Measure - Existing population and employment within 1/2 mile (potential usage)		10
2b	Measure - Snow and ice control		10
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity</b>		<b>5</b>
3a	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		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>			

**Table D.14: Pedestrian Facilities Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Regional Transportation System & Economy (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project connects two separate pieces of the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network or other Bicycle commuting corridors that weren't previously connected.	10 Pts.
	Project adds at least one connection to existing bicycle network.	5 Pts.
	Project makes no connections to existing bicycle network.	0 Pts.

1.b.	Regional Transportation System & Economy (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of educational facilities, add 5 points.	5 Pts.
	Project is within 0.5 miles of sources of employment, add 5 points.	5 Pts.

1.c.	Regional Transportation System & Economy (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project adds connectivity to existing trails/trail networks.	2.5 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bike corridor.	2.5 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bicycle/pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing transit routes.	2.5 Pts.

2.a.	Potential Usage (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is within 1/2 mile of existing employment opportunities.	5 Pts.
	Project is within 1/2 mile of existing population centers.	5 Pts.
	Project is more than 1/2 mile from existing employment sources and population centers.	0 Pts.

2.b.	Potential Usage (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project includes provisions for snow & ice removal from project facilities.	10 Pts.
	Project does not include provisions for snow & ice removal from project facilities.	0 Pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Deficiencies & Safety (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project closes a gap, removes a barrier, or adds a connection to the existing trail/bike/Ped network that adds connectivity to the network or between jurisdictions.	7.5 Pts.
	Project closes a gap or removes a barrier present in the existing trail/bike/Ped network.	4 Pts.

4.b.	Deficiencies & Safety (Max 7.5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project makes meaningful safety improvements or deficiency corrections in a location having had at least one Bike/Ped fatality or serious injury and/or 15 of more Bike/Ped crashes since 2017.	7.5 Pts.
	Project makes meaningful safety improvements or deficiency corrections in a location having had at least 10 of more Bike/Ped crashes or serious injury crashes since 2017.	4 Pts.
	Project does not address any safety concerns or deficiencies.	0 Pts.

5.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into said plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.



**Table D.14: Pedestrian Facilities Scoring Breakdown**

6.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	5 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	2.5 Pts.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

6.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	2.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	2.5 Pts.

7.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	10 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

## 6.B. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECT SCORING

**Definition:** 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:

- Sidewalks benefiting people going to the school
- Multiuse trails benefiting people going to the school
- Improved crossings benefiting people going to the school
- Multiple improvements

**Table D.15: Safe Routes to School Project Scoring**

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Scoring			
	Criteria and Measures	Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements</b>		<b>25</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		10
<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</b>		<b>5</b>
3a	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		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>		

**Table D.16: Safe Routes to School Project Scoring Breakdown**

1.a.	Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements (Max 15 Pts.)	Point Value
	Addressed all 5 E's (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement)	15 pts.
	Addressed 4 E's (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement)	12 pts
	Addressed 3 E's (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement)	8 pts
	Addressed 2 E's (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement)	5 pts
	Addressed 1 E's (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement)	2 pts
	Addressed zero E's (Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement)	0 pts.

1.b.	Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements (Max 15 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project adds connectivity to existing trails/trail networks.	2.5 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bike corridor.	2.5 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bicycle/pedestrian network.	2.5 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing transit routes.	2.5 Pts.

2.a.	Potential Usage (Max 15 Pts.)	Point Value
	Average share of student population that bikes or walks; or student registration is between 75 and 100 percent	15 pts.
	Average share of student population that bikes or walks; or student registration is between 50 and 75 percent	10 pts.
	Average share of student population that bikes or walks; or student registration is between 25 and 50 percent	5 pts.
	Average share of student population that bikes or walks; or student registration is between 0 and 25 percent	0 pts.

2.b.	Potential Usage (Max 15 Pts.)	Point Value
	Average share of student population that is within school's walkshed is between 75 and 100 percent	15 pts.
	Average share of student population that is within school's walkshed is between 50 and 75 percent	10 pts.
	Average share of student population that is within school's walkshed is between 25 and 50 percent	5 pts.
	Average share of student population that is within school's walkshed is between 0 and 25 percent	0 pts.

3.a.	Equity (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

4.a.	Deficiencies & Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project closes a gap or removes a barrier present in the existing trail/bike/ped network.	2.5 Pts.
	Project closes a gap, removes a barrier, or adds a connection to the existing trail/bike/ped network that adds connectivity to the network or between jurisdictions.	2.5 Pts.

4.b.	Deficiencies & Safety (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project makes meaningful safety improvements or deficiency corrections in a location having had at least one Bike/Ped fatality or serious injury and/or 15 of more Bike/Ped crashes since 2017.	5 Pts.
	Project makes meaningful safety improvements or deficiency corrections in a location having had at least 10 of more Bike/Ped crashes or serious injury crashes since 2017.	3 Pts.
	Project does not address any safety concerns or deficiencies.	0 Pts.

**Table D.16: Safe Routes to School Project Scoring Breakdown**

5.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

6.a.	Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

7.a.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	5 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	2.5 Pts.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

7.b.	Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	2.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	2.5 Pts.

8.a.	Cost Effectiveness (Max 10 Pts.)	Point Value
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	10 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't result in most efficient use of funding.	0 Pts.

## 7. TRANSIT EXPANSION/MODERNIZATION SCORING

**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 criterion.

**Examples** of Transit Expansion and Modernization Projects:

Transit Expansion Projects:

- 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

Transit Modernization Projects:

- 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

**Table D.17: Transit Expansion/Modernization Project Scoring**

Transit Expansion and Modernization Projects Scoring			
Criteria and Measures		Points	%
<b>1</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>		15
1a	Measure - Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas		5
1b	Measure - Project Location Relative to Population Density, Jobs, Manufacturing, Transit Routes, and Education		5
1c	Measure - connectivity to Transit Routes, trail connectivity, bike corridor connectivity, Bike/Ped. Network connectivity		5
<b>2</b>	<b>Usage &amp; Demonstration of Need</b>		20
2a	Measure - New Annual Riders (for Expansion Projects)		10
2b	Measure - Total existing annual riders (for Modernization Projects)		10
<b>3</b>	<b>Equity</b>		5
3a	Measure - No disproportionate impacts & connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation		5
<b>4</b>	<b>Air Quality Emissions Reduction</b>		15
4a	Measure - Emissions and congestion benefits of project, Kg of emissions reduced		15
<b>5</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>		15
5a	Measure - Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections		15
<b>6</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans – Accessibility &amp; Collaboration of MPO's Transit coordinated plan</b>		10
6a	Consistent with Plans, Studies, Goals, Policies, Strategies		10
<b>7</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (ROW acquisition, proximity to historic properties)</b>		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
<b>8</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>		10
8a	Measure – Cost effectiveness (total points/total project cost)		10
			100
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>	



**Table D.18: Transit Expansion/Modernization Project Scoring Breakdown**

<b>1.a.</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Trans. System &amp; Economy (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project in highly congested areas.	5 Pts.
	Project in medium congested areas.	3 Pts.
	Project in low congested areas.	1 Pt.

<b>1.b.</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Trans. System &amp; Economy (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project is within 1 mile of existing employment opportunities.	2 Pts.
	Project is within 1 mile of existing population centers.	1.5 Pts
	Project is within 1 mile of existing educational institutions.	1.5 Pts

<b>1.c.</b>	<b>Role in the Regional Trans. System &amp; Economy (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project adds connectivity to existing trails/trail networks.	1.25 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bike corridor.	1.25 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing bicycle/pedestrian network.	1.25 Pts.
	Project adds connectivity to existing transit routes.	1.25 Pts.

<b>2.a.</b>	<b>Usage-Demonstration of Need (Max 10 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Expansion project results in a 1% increase in potential new annual users.	10 Pts.
	Expansion project results in a measurable increase in potential new annual users.	5 Pts.
	Project does not result in a measurable change in potential new users.	0 Pts.

<b>2.b.</b>	<b>Usage-Demonstration of Need (Max 10 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project results in a 1% increase in total ridership.	10 Pts.
	Project results in a measurable increase in total ridership.	5 Pts.
	Project does not result in a measurable change in total ridership.	0 Pts.

<b>3.a.</b>	<b>Equity (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to minority populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to low-income populations within designated E.J. locations.	2 Pts.
	Project creates no disproportionate impacts to L.E.P. populations within designated E.J. locations.	1 Pt.

<b>4.a.</b>	<b>Air Quality Emissions Reduction (Max 15 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project provides a high emissions reduction.	15 Pts.
	Project provides a medium emissions reduction	10 Pts.
	Project provides a low emissions reduction.	5 Pts.

<b>5.a.</b>	<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (Max 15 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project includes bicycle features or connections.	3.75 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a bicycle network.	3.75 Pts.
	Project includes pedestrian features or connections.	3.75 Pts.
	Project increases the population of potential users within a 1/2 mile of a pedestrian network.	3.75 Pts.

<b>6.a.</b>	<b>Consistency with Regional Plans (Max 10 Pts. Total)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project is part of established regional plans & goals or has been designed to integrate with it.	10 Pts.
	Regional plans have been considered & steps taken to integrate the project into plans, but some issues or conflicts may exist.	7 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider or integrate with regional plans, but it also doesn't conflict with or affect any existing regional plans or goals.	5 Pts.
	Project doesn't consider regional plans or goals and/or conflicts with established plans/goals.	0 Pts.

**Table D.18: Transit Expansion/Modernization Project Scoring Breakdown**

<b>7.a.</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project has been presented to and has support/sign-off by all interested & relevant parties/groups/stakeholders and is ready to begin if selected for inclusion to the TIP.	5 Pts.
	Some or most affected parties/groups/stakeholders have been included/consulted on the project discussions and potential problem resolutions, but some issues remain to be addressed before the project can begin.	2.5 Pts.
	No engagement with parties/groups/stakeholders. Significant work remains to be completed before the project can commence.	0 Pts.

<b>7.b.</b>	<b>Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (Max 5 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project has no elements falling under the National Environmental Protection Act.	2.5 Pts.
	Project has no elements falling under the Historic Preservation Acts.	2.5 Pts.

<b>8.a.</b>	<b>Cost Effectiveness (Max 10 Pts.)</b>	<b>Point Value</b>
	Project results in maximum efficiency of use of funding and has a high score in this rubric.	10 Pts.
	Project results in elevated efficiency of use of funding and has a fairly high score in this rubric.	5 Pts.