



Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

**April 4, 2018
9:30 a.m.**

Agenda



**Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Wednesday, April 4, 2018
Central Texas Council of Governments Building
2180 North Main Street, Belton, Texas 76513**

**Regular Meeting: 9:30 A.M.
AGENDA**

1. Call to Order.
2. Opportunity for Public Comment.(1)
3. Staff Update: Advisory Committees; Air Quality; Administrative Amendments.
4. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from March 7, 2018 meeting.
5. **Action Item:** Recommend approval of Resolution for May 2018 as National Bike Month.
6. **Discussion Item:** Regarding project funding scenarios for Unified Transportation Program funding to include Categories 2, 7 and 9 for projects from the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
7. **Discussion and Action Item:** Recommend approval of 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) project selection and scoring process.
8. **Discussion and Action Item:** Recommend approval of 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) fiscal constraints.
9. **Discussion Item:** Regarding 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) public workshops.
10. **Discussion Item:** Public input received through February 28, 2018.
11. Member comments.
12. Adjourn.

**Workshop - To Follow Regular Scheduled Meeting if Needed
AGENDA**

1. Call to order.
2. Discussion on any of the following topics (if needed):
 - a. Current or past KTMPO documents and plans to include Unified Planning Work Program, Transportation Improvement Program, By-Laws, Public Participation Plan, Regional Thoroughfare/Bicycle Pedestrian Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Congestion Management Process, Annual Performance Expenditure Report, Annual Project Listing, Texas Urban Mobility Plan, Unified Transportation Plan, Federal Certification Process;
 - b. Past or Future KTMPO Meeting processes or happenings;
 - c. KTMPO Current, Past or Future MPO Boundary Studies;
 - d. KTMPO Past or Future Annual Meetings;
 - e. Current, Past or Future KTMPO Budgets and funding conditions;
 - f. Rural Planning Organizations and/or Regional Mobility Authorities;
 - g. Special Funding for Projects;
 - h. Legislative Changes;
 - i. Status of MPO Projects;
 - j. Staff, TxDOT, Consultant, Guest presentations relating to transportation;
 - k. Meetings pertaining to any transportation related items/topics.
3. Adjourn.

KTMPO Administrative Amendments

March 20, 2018

KTMPO ID: B40-05

CSJ: 0909-36-163

Administrative Amendment: TIP

- Project date revised from FY2021 to FY2020.
- Local In-Kind Participation in the amount of \$194,325 added to the Local Authorized Funding of the Authorized Funding by Category/Share section.

Item 4:

Meeting Minutes



**KILLEEN-TEMPLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (KTMPO)
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

Wednesday March 7, 2018
9:30 AM

Central Texas Council of Governments (CTCOG)
2180 North Main Street
Belton, TX 76513

Technical Advisory Committee Voting Members

Cheryl Maxwell—City of Belton	Judge John Firth—Coryell County
Councilmember Dan Yancey for Ryan Haverlah—City of Copperas Cove	Carole Warlick—Hill Country Transit District (HCTD)
David Mitchell—City of Harker Heights	Victor Goebel—Texas Dept. of Transportation (TxDOT) Waco District
David Olson for Ron Olson—City of Killeen	Jason Scantling—TxDOT Brownwood District
Brian Chandler—City of Temple	

Technical Advisory Committee Non-Voting Members

Solomon A. Thomas—TxDOT Bell County
Area Engineer

Additional Attendees

Mayor Frank Seffrood—City of Copperas Cove	Brynn Myers—City of Temple
Liz Bullock—TxDOT Waco District	Jim Reed—CTCOG/KTMPO
Katelyn Kasberg—TxDOT Waco District	Kendra Coufal—CTCOG/KTMPO
Erika Karlik—TxDOT Waco District	John Weber—CTCOG/KTMPO

Meeting Minutes

- 1. Call to Order:** Jim Reed called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. and introductions were made.
- 2. Public Comment:** No comments were made from the public.
- 3. Staff Update:** KTMPO staff provided the following updates:

John Weber stated that a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) administrative amendment is needed for Belton project B40-05. The administrative amendment includes funding category was clarified from Category 9 to Category 9 TAP, project date was revised from FY2020 to FY2021 and the local In-Kind

Participation in the amount of \$194,325 was added to the Preliminary Engineering section of the project cost.

The next Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting will be held on March 13, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. The next Freight Advisory Committee meeting will be held on May 22, 2018 at 11:30 a.m.

Ozone readings for the month of February were 46 parts per billion (ppb) at the Killeen station and 43 ppb at the Temple station.

4. Action Item: Approve minutes from February 7, 2018 meeting.

David Olson made a motion to approve February 7, 2018 meeting minutes, seconded by Brian Chandler; the motion passed unanimously.

5. Action Item: Regarding recommendation to approve amendments to the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and FY17-20 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) regarding Belton project, B40-04, Chisholm Trail Corridor Hike and Bike Facility Phase II.

Jim Reed stated that the 15 day public comment period started February 24, 2018 and a public hearing occurred on February 27, 2018 at the CTCOG offices in Belton. Since the public comment period will conclude on March 10, 2018, Mr. Reed explained that TAC can make a recommendation to approve the proposed amendments, pending any public comments received.

Carole Warlick made a motion to recommend approval of proposed 2040 MTP and FY 17-20 TIP amendments, pending any public comments received, seconded by David Mitchell; the motion passed unanimously.

6. Discussion and Action Item: Regarding recommendation to approve updated plans to include:

- a) Public Participation Plan;
- b) Title VI Plan; and
- c) Limited English Proficiency Plan.

Jim Reed stated that a 45 day public comment period occurred for the updated Public Participation Plan (PPP) from January 20, 2018 to March 6, 2018. Two public hearings occurred on January 25, 2018 at the City of Killeen City Council Chambers and at the CTCOG offices in Belton. KTMPO did not receive any comments for the updated PPP.

Mr. Reed explained that the Title VI Plan and Limited English Proficiency Plan (LEP) have been updated as well. For the LEP Plan, KTMPO plans to adopt HCTD's LEP Plan which was updated in July 2017. Carole Warlick wanted to remind KTMPO of the importance of putting the HCTD Note of Basic Requirement on public notices.

David Olson made a motion to recommend approval of the PPP, Title VI Plan and LEP Plan, seconded by Cheryl Maxwell; the motion passed unanimously.

7. Discussion and Action Item: Regarding recommendation to approve FT19-22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and to recommend invitation of the public involvement process.

Jim Reed stated that the FY19-22 TIP will need to be submitted to TxDOT on June 1, 2018. To adhere to the June 1 due date, the public involvement process will need to occur. Mr. Reed stated that a 30-day public comment period will occur with two public hearings. The 30 day public comment period will occur from March 17, 2018 to April 15, 2018 with two public hearings schedule on April 10 at the Copperas Cove Police Station and at the CTCOG offices in Belton.

Carole Warlick made a motion to recommend approval of draft FY19-22 TIP and to initiate the public comment period, seconded by Brian Chandler; the motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion Item: 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) project selection and scoring process.

Jim Reed stated that the MTP is required to be updated every 5 years, with the next update to occur May 2019. To adhere to this schedule, staff would like to finalize the scoring criteria, project submission, and project scoring process in April. Therefore, KTMPO staff would like feedback on the scoring criteria, project submission, and project scoring.

Mr. Reed stated that staff recommends the following scenario for the scoring criteria. Staff recommends using the same scoring criteria from the 2016 MTP Reprioritization, Keep legacy projects and submit new projects only and use subjective scores from 2016 Reprioritization and score new projects only. Entities may revise legacy projects, however, that would require a new submission packet. Entities that wishes to withdraw a legacy project may do so in writing. Mr. Reed explained that if TAC desires to revise the scoring criteria, this will result in all projects being rescored including legacy projects.

KTMPO staff is also requesting feedback on whether TAC prefers to conduct subjective scoring on their own or during a meeting, should legacy projects receive bonus points, and how long is the project call.

The floor opened to discussion. Brian Chandler stated that they reviewed the scoring criteria and have some suggestions regarding some of the weights for the objective criteria. Any proposed changes to the objective scores can be sent to KTMPO staff for review. TAC consensus was to keep the subjective scoring criteria and that 8 weeks is enough time for the project call. Staff plans to bring this back to TAC at the April meeting.

9. Discussion Item: 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) fiscal constraints.

Jim Reed explained that the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan has to be fiscally constrained. Therefore, staff prepared two options using the TRENDS model to calculate estimated transportation funds. Option #1 uses the same inputs as decided for the 2040 MTP update. Option #2 uses the same inputs as decided for the 2040 MTP update in addition to new inputs developed since the previous MTP update. Staff requested feedback on which funding scenario under Option #1 or Option #2 is most desirable.

The floor opened to discussion. TAC consensus was to use the Option #1 baseline scenario for the Short Range Plan and Option #1 medium scenario for the Long Range Plan. Staff plans to bring this back to TAC at the April meeting.

10. Discussion Item: 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) public workshops.

Jim Reed stated that KTMPO has schedule 5 public workshops for the 2045 MTP update in April. Workshops are scheduled for April 10th at the Copperas Cove Police Station and CTCOG offices, April 16

at the Temple Public Library, April 17 at the Killeen Community Center and at the Harker Heights Activity Center.

11. Discussion Item: Public input received through February 28, 2018.

KTMPO did not receive any public comments at this time.

12. Member Comments.

David Olson stated that the contract for the Rosewood Project has been awarded.

David Mitchell stated the contract for the Harker Heights Roundabout Project is getting close.

Jim Reed stated that KTMPO is planning to work with the City of Belton and U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer to conduct a regional study regarding the Lake to Lake Rd. project.

Cheryl Maxwell thanked TxDOT and the KTMPO for their support for the Chisholm Trail Hike and Bike Facility Phase II and construction on Charter Oak will begin in a few weeks.

13. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

**Item 5:
National Bike Month**

National Bike Month

Summary:

Since 1956, the League of American Bicyclists have dedicated the month of May as National Bike Month to promote bicycling as a healthy, safe and environmentally-friendly form of transportation.

National Bike Month also includes:

- Bike to School Day on May 9,
- National Bike to Work Week on May 14-18, and
- Bike to Work Day on May 18.

Attached to this meeting packet is a resolution that will be presented to KTMPPO Transportation Planning Policy Board in April for supporting National Bike Month and associated events and dates. KTMPPO encourages area cities to also support and promote National Bike Month.

Action Needed: Recommend approval of Resolution for May 2018 as National Bike Month.



RESOLUTION NO. 2018-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE KILLEEN-TEMPLE METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION SUPPORTING NATIONAL BIKE MONTH (MAY 2018) AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS AND DATES

WHEREAS; The League of American Bicyclists has declared the month of May 2018 as National Bike Month, May 9, 2018 as Bike to School Day; May 14 through May 18, 2018 as Bike to Work Week; and May 18, 2018 as Bike to Work Day; and

WHEREAS; biking is a healthy, safe, and environmentally-friendly form of transportation and an excellent form of recreation; and

WHEREAS; bicycle commuting is an effective means to reduce air pollution, conserve energy, and promotes the "livability" of communities by reducing traffic, noise, and congestion; and

WHEREAS; bicycle transportation is an integral part of the "multi-modal" transportation system planned by federal, state, regional, and local transportation agencies; and

WHEREAS; National Bike Month promotions, such as Bike to Work Week/Day and Bike to School Day encourage citizens to ride their bicycles, thereby reducing vehicular emissions in Central Texas;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization hereby recognizes and supports the month of May 2018 as National Bike Month, May 9, 2018 as Bike to School Day; May 14 through May 18, 2018 as Bike to Work Week; and May 18, 2018 as Bike to Work Day;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization urges all who support bicycling to participate in the events planned and urges all road users to share the road safely with bicyclists.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on this 9th day of May, 2018 at a regular meeting of the Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Planning Policy Board, which meeting was held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, 511.001, *et seq.*, at which meeting a quorum was present and voting.

ATTEST:

Mayor Marion Grayson, Chair

Jim Reed, KTMO Director

Item 6:

**Project funding scenarios for
Unified Transportation
Program for Cat 2, 7 & 9**

Project Funding Scenarios for Unified Transportation Program for Categories 2, 7, and 9

TxDOT's 2018 Unified Transportation Program is a 10-year plan to guide transportation project development and authorizes projects for construction, development and planning activities, including projects for highways, aviation, public transportation, and state and coastal waterways.

Funding is distributed through Categories 2 (metropolitan corridors), 7 (metropolitan mobility), and 9 (transportation alternatives). It is possible we may also receive funds through Category 4 (statewide connectivity), but those projects are selected by TxDOT.

In May 2017, the Policy Board approved 15 projects for funding for FY18-20 to include 1 Transit project, 6 Roadway projects and 8 Livability projects totaling \$73,420,000.

KTMPPO, with the support of TxDOT, recommends allocating funds for Category 2 for FY's 2021-2027 and Categories 7 and 9 for FY's 2021-2022. Future years of funding for Categories 7 and 9 will be programmed after the 2045 MTP Update. The table below summarizes anticipated funding:

<u>Funding Category</u>	<u>FY21</u>	<u>FY22</u>	<u>FY23</u>	<u>FY24</u>	<u>FY 25</u>	<u>FY26</u>	<u>FY27</u>	<u>7 Year Subtotal</u>
2- Metropolitan Corridors								\$177,530,000
Total								\$177,530,000

<u>Funding Category</u>	<u>FY21</u>	<u>FY22</u>	<u>2 Year Subtotal</u>
7- Metropolitan Mobility and Rehabilitation (STP-MM)			
	\$ 5,690,000	\$ 5,760,000	\$ 11,450,000
Less 10% allocated to Transit Projects	\$ 5,121,000	\$ 5,184,000	\$ 10,305,000
9- Transportation Alternatives Program	\$ 390,000	\$ 390,000	\$ 780,000
Total	\$ 5,511,000	\$ 5,574,000	\$ 11,085,000

Staff have prepared 3 funding scenarios based upon the figures shown in the above table and with a 10% reservation of Category 7 funds for transit projects (bus replacement) as historically preferred. With these assumptions, Staff took the prioritized list of roadway and livability projects and distributed the anticipated funds for Categories 2, 7, and 9 to maximize the number of projects funded while remaining mindful of the stated priority number. Due to local match

requirements, Category 2 and 7 funds were primarily reserved for on-system projects, while Category 9 funds were primarily reserved for off-system projects.

Match requirements for Categories 2, 7 & 9 are presented below.

For **Category 2**, 80% of the funds are federal; a 20% match is required with either local dollars or state dollars. OR, the state funds 100% (Prop1/Prop 7 dollars).

- Off the state system, 80% federal/**20% local**
- On the state system, 80% federal/20% state; or 100% state

For **Category 7**, 80% of the funds are federal; a 20% match is required with either local dollars or state dollars.

- Off the state system, 80% federal/**20% local**
- On the state system, 80% federal/20% state, but overruns local responsibility.

In May 2017, Policy Board approved the 80% Federal/20% State, but overruns are local responsibility. Staff recommends utilizing the same match requirements for FY21 and FY22.

For **Category 9**, 80% of the funds are federal; a **20% match** is required with **local** dollars.

- Off the state system and on the state system

Included in this packet is the 2040 MTP project list showing both roadway and livability projects. Please ensure that if your entity's project is selected for funding, that your local entity is prepared to provide required matching funds.

KTMPO's goal is to have the selection process and all amendments completed by the end of July as shown in the following schedule.

- **April 4, 2018—TAC review/discussion of various funding scenarios, match requirements and proposed schedule.**
- April 18, 2018— TPPB review/discussion of various funding scenarios, match requirements and proposed schedule.
- May 2, 2018- TAC review/discussion of various funding scenarios, match requirements and proposed schedule.
- May 9, 2018- TPPB review/discussion of various funding scenarios, match requirements and proposed schedule.
- June 6, 2018—TAC recommendation of projects for funding and initiation of public involvement process.

Agenda Item #6

- June 20, 2018—TPPB approval of projects for funding and initiation of public involvement process.
- June 23- July 7, 2018 – Public Involvement for MTP and TIP amendments.
- July 11, 2018—TAC recommendation for approval of MTP and TIP amendments.
- July 18, 2018—TPPB approval of MTP and TIP amendments.

Discussion Item: Review and discussion of various funding scenarios, match requirements, and proposed schedule.

Scenario A												
MPO ID	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	On/Off-System	Estimated Cost	Funding Category	Programmed Amount	Programmed Fiscal Year	Beginning Balance			Match Requirements
									Remaining Category 2	Remaining Category 7	Remaining Category 9	
W40-04a	Loop 121 Phase 1	FM 439 to IH 35	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bike/ped improvements	On-System	\$27,000,000	Category 2	\$27,000,000	2021	\$177,530,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or-100% State
W40-05	US 190	FM 2410 in W Belton to IH 35	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	On-System	\$35,000,000	Category 2	\$35,000,000	2022	\$115,530,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or-100% State
W35-01	US 190 Bypass	E of Copperas Cove to 0.5 mi W of Lampasas County Line	Phase 2. Construct final 2 lanes of ultimate 4 lane divided roadway	On-System	\$48,150,000	Category 2	\$48,150,000	2022	\$67,380,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or-100% State
K30-13	Chaparral Rd	SH 195 to FM 3481	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane, curb and gutter	Off-System	\$18,666,900	Category 2	\$18,666,900	2022	\$48,713,100	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
H30-05	Warriors Path	FM 2410 (Knights Way) to Old Nolanville Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with curb & gutter, medians, and access controls	Off-System	\$8,969,950	Category 2	\$8,969,950	2023	\$39,743,150	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
W35-05	US 190	At SH 195	Upgrade Interchange	On-System	\$52,450,000	Category 2	\$37,950,128	2024	\$1,793,022	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or-100% State
H30-01	Business 190/Veterans Memorial Blvd.	Roy Reynolds Dr to US 190	Reduce roadway profile, install curb & gutter, access management/driveway control, drainage improvements, sidewalks, medians, and other context sensitive solutions	On-System	\$5,000,000	Category 2	\$1,793,022	2022	\$0	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or-100% State
T40-13	Georgetown RR Trail	S 5th St to Leon River	Construct 10 ft wide trail	Off-System	\$2,000,000	Category 7	\$3,206,978	2022	\$0	\$7,098,022	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; 100% Local Overruns
B40-12	Belton Southwest Trail Expansion	Confederate Park to Nolan Creek Pedestrian Bridge	Construct 10 ft hike/bike trail	Off-System	\$3,252,480	Category 7	\$3,252,480	2022	\$0	\$1,845,542	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
N40-05	Spur 439 Connectivity	Main St to North St.	Construct 10' wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, improve shoulders at Main St.	On-System	\$593,230	Category 7	\$593,230	2022	\$0	\$1,252,312	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; 100% Local Overruns
N40-04	Park Connectivity	City Park along Mesquite St. and Ave H to 10th St	Construct 10 ft wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, widen pavement by 32" with curb and gutter	Off-System	\$1,558,802	Category 7	\$1,252,312	2021	\$0	\$0	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
B40-06	Belton North Trail Extension	Confederate Park to Nolan Creek	Construct 10' hike/bike trail	Off-System	\$473,510	Category 9	\$306,490	2021	\$0	\$0	\$473,510	80% Federal/20% Local

Scenario A includes the 10% Category 7 allocation to transit (\$1,145,000). This scenario funds 7 roadway projects and 5 livability projects with funding from Category 2, 4, 7 and 9. Scenario A skips project C35-02b (Railroad Underpass Sidewalks, \$920,000).

Scenario B												
MPO ID	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	On/Off-System	Estimated Cost	Funding Category	Programmed Amount	Programmed Fiscal Year	Beginning Balances			Match Requirements
									Remaining Category 2	Remaining Category 7	Remaining Category 9	
W40-04a	Loop 121 Phase 1	FM 439 to IH 35	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bike/ped improvements	On-System	\$27,000,000	Category 2	\$27,000,000	2021	\$177,530,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State
W40-05	US 190	FM 2410 in W Bellon to IH 35	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	On-System	\$35,000,000	Category 2	\$35,000,000	2022	\$150,530,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State
W35-01	US 190 Bypass	E of Copperas Cove to 0.5 mi W of Lampasas County Line	Phase 2, Construct final 2 lanes of ultimate 4 lane divided roadway	On-System	\$48,150,000	Category 2	\$44,877,136	2022	\$70,652,864	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State
						Category 4	\$3,272,864	2022	\$70,652,854	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	
K30-13	Chaparal Rd	SH 195 to FM 3481	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane, curb and gutter	Off-System	\$18,666,900	Category 2	\$16,984,921	2022	\$53,667,943	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
H30-05	Warriors Path	FM 2410 (Knights Way) to Old Nolanville Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with curb & gutter, medians, and access controls	Off-System	\$8,969,950	Category 2	\$1,681,979	2022	\$53,667,943	\$8,623,021	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
			Reduce roadway profile, install curb & gutter, access management/driveway control, drainage improvements, sidewalks, medians, and other context sensitive solutions	Off-System	\$8,969,950	Category 2	\$8,969,950	2024	\$44,697,993	\$8,623,021	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
H30-01	Business 190/Veterans Memorial Blvd.	Roy Reynolds Dr to US 190	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	On-System	\$5,000,000	Category 2	\$5,000,000	2024	\$39,697,993	\$8,623,021	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State
W30-17	FM 93	SH 317 to Wheat Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with divided roadway and curb and gutter, includes hike & bike trail and bike dedicated lanes to incorporate multimodal transportation	On-System	\$8,794,843	Category 2	\$8,794,843	2025	\$30,903,150	\$8,623,021	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State
			Construct 8 lane overpass with pedestrian improvements with turnarounds	Off-System	\$24,628,150	Category 2	\$24,628,150	2026	\$0	\$0	\$0	80% Federal/20% Local
I40-23	Jasper Bridge Expansion	S Florence Rd to Jasper Dr	Construct 10 ft wide trail	Off-System	\$2,000,000	Category 7	\$2,000,000	2021	\$0	\$6,623,021	\$780,000	80% Federal/ 20% Local
T40-13	Georgetown RR Trail	S 5th St to Leon River	Construct 10 ft hike/bike trail	Off-System	\$3,252,480	Category 7	\$3,145,989	2021	\$0	\$3,477,032	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local
B40-12	Belton Southwest Trail Expansion	Nolan Creek Pedestrian Bridge	Construct 10 ft wide wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, widen pavement by 32" with curb and gutter	Off-System	\$1,558,802	Category 7	\$1,558,802	2021	\$0	\$1,918,230	\$673,509	80% Federal/20% Local
I40-04	Park Connectivity	City Park along Mesquite St and Ave H to 10th St	Construct 10' wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, improve shoulders at Main St.	On-System	\$593,230	Category 7	\$593,230	2022	\$0	\$1,325,000	\$673,509	80% Federal/20% State; 100% Local Overruns
I40-05	Spur 439 Connectivity	Main St to North St.	Construct 8 ft wide trail	Off-System	\$375,000	Category 7	\$375,000	2022	\$0	\$950,000	\$673,509	80% Federal/20% Local
T40-25	Bird Creek Interceptor Trail	Community Park to Midway Dr (Near Bonham Middle School)	Construct 8 ft wide trail	On-System	\$950,000	Category 7	\$950,000	2022	\$0	\$0	\$673,509	80% Federal/20% State; 100% Local Overruns
T25-05	FM 2271 Trail	Spring Park	Construct 10' hike/bike trail	Off-System	\$473,510	Category 9	\$473,510	2022	\$0	\$0	\$199,999	80% Federal/20% Local
B40-06	Belton North Trail Extension	Confederate Park to Nolan Creek	Construct 10' wide trail	Off-System	\$199,999	Category 9	\$199,999	2022	\$0	\$0	\$0	80% Federal/20% Local
S40-02	Pace Park Trail	Pace Park along Pace Park Rd	Construct 10' wide trail	Off-System	\$199,999	Category 9	\$199,999	2022	\$0	\$0	\$0	80% Federal/20% Local

Scenario B includes the 10% Category 7 allocation for transit (\$1,145,000). This scenario funds 9 roadway projects and 8 livability projects with funding from Category 2, 4, 7 and 9. Scenario B skips roadway projects W35-05 (US 190 at SH 195, \$52,450,000) and B40-11 (FM 2271, Lake to Lake Rd, \$49,700,000) and livability projects C35-02B (Railroad Underpass Sidewalks, \$920,000) and B40-02 (North Waco Rd/Old 81 Sidewalks, \$1,700,000).

Roadway (9)

Livability (8)

Scenario C											Beginning Balances		
MPO ID	Project Name	Project Limits	Project Description	On/Off-System	Estimated Cost	Funding Category	Programmed Amount	Programmed Fiscal Year	Remaining Category 2	Remaining Category 7	Remaining Category 9	Match Requirements	
Roadway (5)	W40-04a	Loop 121 Phase 1	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bike/ped improvements	On-System	\$27,000,000	Category 2	\$27,000,000	2021	\$150,530,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State	
	W40-05	FM 439 to IH 35	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	On-System	\$35,000,000	Category 2	\$35,000,000	2022	\$115,530,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State	
	W35-01	US 190	Phase 2. Construct to 0.5 mi W of final 2 lanes of ultimate 4 lane divided roadway	On-System	\$48,150,000	Category 2	\$48,150,000	2022	\$67,380,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State	
	W35-05	US 190 Bypass	E of Copperas Cove to 0.5 mi W of Lampasas County Line	On-System	\$52,450,000	Category 2	\$52,450,000	2023	\$14,930,000	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; Or 100% State	
	K30-13	Chaparral Rd	Upgrade Interchange	Off-System	\$18,666,600	Category 2	\$14,930,000	2022	\$0	\$10,305,000	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local	
	T40-13	Georgetown RR Trail	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane, curb and gutter	Off-System	\$3,736,900	Category 7	\$3,736,900	2022	\$0	\$6,568,100	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local	
	B40-12	Belton Southwest Trail Expansion	Construct 10 ft wide trail	Off-System	\$2,000,000	Category 7	\$2,000,000	2021	\$0	\$4,568,100	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local	
	N40-05	Spur 439 Connectivity	Construct 10' wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, improve shoulders at Main St.	Off-System	\$3,252,480	Category 7	\$3,252,480	2022	\$0	\$1,315,620	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local	
	T40-25	Bird Creek Interceptor Trail	Construct 8 ft wide trail	Off-System	\$593,230	Category 7	\$593,230	2022	\$0	\$722,390	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% State; 100% Local Overruns	
	S40-02	Pace Park Trail	Construct 10' wide trail	Off-System	\$199,999	Category 9	\$199,999	2022	\$0	\$453,881	\$780,000	80% Federal/20% Local	
	B40-06	Belton North Trail Extension	Construct 10' hike/bike trail	Off-System	\$473,510	Category 9	\$473,510	2021	\$0	\$453,881	\$0	80% Federal/20% Local	
	T25-05	FM 2271 Trail	Construct 8 ft wide trail	On-System	\$950,000	Category 7	\$453,881	2022	\$0	\$0	\$0	80% Federal/20% State; 100% Local Overruns	

Scenario C includes the 10% Category 7 allocation to transit (\$1,145,000). This scenario funds 5 roadway and 7 livability projects with funding from Category 2, 4, 7 and 9. Six livability projects are fully funded and one project (T25-05) is partially funded. Scenario C skips livability projects C35-02b (Railroad Underpass Sidewalks, \$920,000), N40-04 (Park Connectivity, \$1,558,802), and D40-02 (North Waco Rd/Old 81 Sidewalks, \$1,700,000).



2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Project Listing

Short Range Funded (2014-2023) Projects with Allocated Funding as of November 2016 and Listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

CATEGORY 7 PROJECTS

KTMP ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
A40-03	Bus Replacement FY 15/16/17	Killeen/Temple UZA	Purchase of Fixed Route Service (FRS) buses and/or Special Transit Service buses	\$1,214,606.00	N/A	
B40-03	Main St Sidewalk Expansion	Ave C to Ave J	Repair and installation of sidewalks along eastern side of Main St	\$405,292.00	Yes	
C40-02a	Ave D Sidewalk	S Main St to S 2nd St	Construct multi-terraced pedestrian walkway to include ramps, railings, crosswalk	\$273,777.00	Yes	
H40-02	Traffic Circle at Commercial Dr	Intersection of Commercial Dr and Heights Dr	Construct traffic circle at intersection of Commercial Dr and Heights Dr	\$489,249.00	No	FY15-FY17 Category 7 Funds: \$17,398,375
R30-02	Rosewood Dr Extension	Riverstone Dr to Chaparral Dr	Construction of a 4 lane roadway with center median with an off-system bridge	\$7,965,049.00	No	
H40-01	Main St Connectivity	Ave I to US 190 Frontage Rd	Construct ADA bicycle/pedestrian pathways along Main St and under US 190	\$596,386.00	No	
T35-24	Prairie View Road Enhancements	W of SH 317 to N Pea Ridge	Construction of a 4 lane roadway, aligning FM 2483 to Prairie View Rd with signalized intersection	\$6,480,000.00	Yes	
R40-27 ¹	SH 195	0.1 MI N of FM 3470 to 0.1 MI S of FM 3470 ⁵	Turnaround underpass for northbound and southbound traffic on SH 195 Frontage roads and FM 3470 (Stan Schlueter) ⁵	\$800,000	Yes	
H35-01	US 190 at FM 2410	East Central TX Expy W to East Central TX Expy East	Construction of a west to east turnaround at FM 24105	\$5,000,000	Yes	
T40-12	31st St Sidewalks (FM1741)	Marlandwood Rd to Canyon Creek Rd	Installation of 6 sidewalks on both sides of FM1741	\$500,000	Yes	
T40-15	Adams Ave/Central Ave. Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements	IH 35 to M.K. Jr Blvd (Spur 290)	Installation of on-street bike lane and ADA compliant sidewalks travelling east on Central Avenue and west on Adams Avenue ⁵	\$1,913,044	Yes	
C40-05	FM 116 E 3046 Sidewalks	Business 190 to Dennis St. ⁵	Construct ADA compliant sidewalks and bike lanes ⁵	\$975,000	No	FY 17-20 Category 7 Funds: \$13,890,000
R40-21b	Heritage Oaks Hike and Bike Trail, Segment ⁵	Chaparral Rd to USACE Property	Construct shared use path for pedestrian and bicyclists	\$1,300,000	No	
C40-04c	The Narrows (Charles Tillman Way)	Charles Tillman Way from Constitution Dr to Charles Tillman Way @ RG III Blvd ⁵	Construct sidewalks for pedestrian/bicycle use ⁵	\$170,000	No	
S40-04a	Main St Sidewalks Phase 1	Salado Plaza Dr to College Hill Dr (North End)	Main St. Improvements to include lighting, sidewalks, B. striping for bicycles	\$1,616,956	No	
A40-15	Fleet Replacement Project	Killeen UZA	Purchase buses ⁶	\$1,615,000*	N/A	

CATEGORY 9 STATEWIDE TAP/TASA (TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM) PROJECTS

KTMP ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
B40-04	Chisholm Trail Corridor Hike and Bike Facility Phase II	University Blvd. 0.25 mile south of Crusader Way to Tiger Drive 0.10 mi north of Sparta Rd.	Construct sidewalks and shared use path--widths vary from 8 ft to 10 ft; includes landscaping and lighting.	\$2,670,615.00	No	
R40-21a	Killeen Heritage Oaks Hike and Bike Trail, Segment 4	Platinum Dr to Chaparral Rd	Construct shared use path for pedestrians and bicyclist	\$3,448,284.00	No	FY 13-16 Statewide TAP Funds: \$6,720,450
H40-02	Old Nolanville Rd Elementary Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Improvements	Old Nolanville Rd at Warriors Path to Shaw Branch Creek	Construct alternate transportation route consisting of shared-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists	\$601,587.00	No	
B40-05	Beltline Hike and Bike Trail Extension South (South Beltline Shared Use Path)	IH 35 from FM 436 to Confederate Park Drive	Construct 12 ft wide hike and bike trail. Project will extend along FM 436, IH 35 northbound frontage road and Confederate Park Drive.	\$1,790,570	No	FY 17 TASA Funds: \$1,790,570

MPO CATEGORY 9 TAP (TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM) PROJECTS

KTMPD ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
K40-23 ¹	Heritage Oaks Hike and Bike Trail Segment 3A	Rosewood Dr from Nickelback Dr to Pyrite Dr	Construction of a hike and bike trail with lighting	\$800,000.00	No	FY15-FY17 Category 9 Funds: \$1,151,642
C40-03b	Ave D Streetscape Phase III	S 1st St to S 3rd St	Construction of multi-terraced concrete walkways, curb ramps, handicapped ramps, pedestrian railings, crosswalk striping and necessary signage	\$351,642.00	No	
C40-04b	The Narrows (RG III at Old Copperas Cove Rd)	RG III Blvd from Constitution Dr to Old Copperas Cove Rd at Constitution Dr. ⁵	Construct sidewalks for pedestrian/bicycle use ⁵	\$680,000	No	FY18-20 Category 9 Funds: \$680,000

COMBINED CATEGORY 7 AND MPO CATEGORY 9 PROJECTS

KTMPD ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
C40-04a	The Narrows (Constitution Drive)	Constitution Dr from Bowen Ave to 0.2 MI S Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd ⁵	Construction of sidewalks for pedestrian/bicycle use ⁵	\$850,000	No	FY 18-20 Category 7 (\$360,000) and Category 9 (\$490,000): \$850,000

MPO PROPOSITION 1/CATEGORY 2 PROJECTS

KTMPD ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
W40-01	SH 317	FM 2305 to FM 439	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with raised median	\$16,000,000.00	Yes	
H15-02b	FM 2410	Roy Reynolds Dr to Commercial Dr	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with sidewalks, median, and turn lanes incorporating context sensitive design	\$8,800,000.00	Yes	FY15-FY17 MPO Proposition 1 Projects: \$3,600,000
W40-02	US 190	1.0 mi W of FM 2410 to Knights Way	Widen from 4 to 6 lane roadway	\$9,000,000.00	Yes	
W40-06 ¹	US 190	FM 3423 (Indian Trail) to FM 2410 in W Belton ⁵	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	\$39,000,000	Yes	
C30-03b	Business US 190 Phase I	FM 1113 (Avenue D) to Constitution Dr. ⁵	Construction of a raised median and conversion of one travel lane in each direction to a sidewalk/bicycle lane ⁵	\$10,000,000	Yes	FY18-20 Category 2 Projects: \$49,000,000

COMBINED CATEGORY 2 AND CATEGORY 7 FUNDS

KTMPD ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
W40-03 ¹	US 190 Turnaround	At Clear Creek Rd ⁵	Roadway reconfiguration to improve turning movements (Turnaround) ⁵	\$4,000,000	No	FY18-20 Category 2 (\$2,100,000) and Category 7 (\$1,900,000): \$4,000,000

Miscellaneous Projects

KTMPD ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Funding
T25-06	Loop 363	Loop 363 at Spur 290	Phase 1 of interchange construction	\$9,984,000.00	Yes	Category 1 & local
A35-01	Bus Replacement	HCTD service in Killeen UZA	Replacement of ADA-accessible paratransit buses	\$77,993.00	N/A	FTA 5339

PREVENTATIVE AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

KTMPD ID	Project Name	Description	FY2015-FY2018 TIP	FY2017-FY2020 TIP
G01-FE	Preventative Projects	Various Locations	\$8,523,944.00	\$12,579,008.00
G03-MT	Maintenance Projects	Various Locations	\$20,679,230.00	\$37,602,002.00
G04-BR	Bridge Projects	Various Locations	\$6,355,929.00	\$3,125,284.00
G06-SA	Safety Projects	Various Locations	\$1,811,997.00	\$497,599.00
Total:			\$37,371,100.00	\$53,803,893.00

¹Administrative Amendment on July 5, 2017

Proposed Roadway, Transportation Choices/Livability, and Preventative Maintenance Projects

ROADWAY PROJECTS

KTRPO ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Project Score	Project Ranking	Funding Order	Estimated Cost	CMP Network	Flagged ⁴	Funding Sources ³	Funding
W40-05 ¹	US 190	FM 2410 in W Belton to IH 35	Widen main lanes from 4 to 6 lane divided freeway and ramp alignments	83.79	2	2	\$35,000,000	Yes	EJ		Short Range Funding: \$225,721,674
W40-04a ¹	Loop 121 Phase 1	FM 439 to IH 35	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bike/ped improvements	56.45	13	4	\$27,000,000	Yes	EJ, H, P	Partially funded using \$5,000,000 of Category 2.	
W35-01	US 190 Bypass	E of Copperas Cove to 0.5 mi W of Lampasas County Line	Phase 2, Construct final 2 lanes of ultimate 4 lane divided roadway	64.00	6	8	\$48,150,000	Yes	EJ, L, H,		
K30-13	Chaparral Rd	SH 195 to FM 3481	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane, curb and gutter	61.44	8	9	\$18,666,900	No	EJ, H		
W35-05	US 190	At SH 195	Upgrade interchange	63.34	7	10	\$52,450,000	Yes	EJ		
H30-05	Warriors Path	FM 2410 (Knights Way) to Old Holanville Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with curb & gutter, medians and access controls	59.77	9	11	\$8,969,950	No	EJ, H		
H30-01	Business 190/Veterans Memorial Blvd	Roy Reynolds Dr to US 190	Reduce roadway profile, install curb & gutter, access management/driveway control, drainage improvements, sidewalks, medians and other context sensitive solutions	59.44	10	12	\$5,000,000	No	L, H		
W30-17	FM 93	SH 317 to Wheat Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	53.55	19	13	\$8,794,843	Yes	EJ, H, P		
B40-11	FM 2271	FM 439 to US 190	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	58.33	12	14	\$49,700,000	No	EJ, H, P		
T40-07	Outer Loop/Old Waco Rd	Drainage Channel (south of FM 2305 and Walmart) to S of Jupiter Drive/Harver Dr	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with divided roadway and curb and gutter; includes hike & bike trail and bike dedicated lanes to incorporate multimodal transportation	55.88	14	15	\$6,275,000	No	P		
K30-23	Jasper Bridge Expansion	S Florence Rd to Jasper Dr	Construct 8 lane overpass with pedestrian improvements with turnarounds	55.44	15	16	\$24,628,150	No	EJ		
T15-06k	IH 35	S Loop 363 to US 190	Reconstruct and widen to 8 lanes	76.14	4	17	\$129,700,000	Yes	EJ, H		
C30-03a	Business 190 Phase II	FM 116 S to Ave D	Change the center turn to a raised center turn and convert one travel lane in each direction to 6' sidewalk, 5' bicycle lane and 1.5' curb and gutter	55.00	16	18	\$7,400,000	Yes	—		
K40-16	Exkt Trimmer Rd Improvements	Stagecoach Rd to Chaparral Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane, curb and gutter	54.02	17	19	\$6,047,000	No	EJ		
K40-24	Featherline Dr	Stagecoach Rd to Chaparral Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane with roundabouts	53.99	18	20	\$7,886,382	No	—		
B40-10	FM 1670	US 190 to Three Creeks Boulevard	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with a 10' hike and bike trail	58.77	11	21	\$5,643,360	No	EJ, H		
W35-08	FM 93	FM 1741 (S 3151) to SH 95	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes, provide for a raised median and construct grade separation at JP RR	52.87	20	22	\$12,588,000	No	EJ, H		
W35-07	NW Loop 363	Lucius McClevey to Industrial Blvd	Construct main lanes to provide a four lane freeway	52.45	21	23	\$45,000,000	Yes	H		
K25-04	SH 195	At Business 190	Construct grade separation over Business 190 and BHSF RR	52.01	22	24	\$20,000,000	Yes	EJ		
K40-11	WS Young	Wall Dr to A J Hall Blvd	Add turn lane and relocate traffic signal at Wall Dr to A J Hall Blvd	51.90	23	25	\$4,889,546	Yes	EJ		
K40-06	FM 2484	SH 195 to IH 35	Widen to 4 lane roadway	51.88	24	26	\$35,000,000	No	H, ARZ, P		
W30-23	Loop 363	SP 290 to SH 95	Upgrade to 4 lane freeway with continuous frontage roads and grade separation at MLK Blvd	51.44	25	27	\$16,784,000	Yes	EJ		
K40-26	Cunningham Rd	US 190 to Little Holan Rd	Construct and widen from 2 to 4 lane road with shoulder, median turn lane, with bike/ped facilities	51.22	26	28	\$7,817,350	No	EJ		
H15-01	FM 3423/Indian Trail	Business 190 to US 190	Construct an urban cross-section roadway with sidewalks, median and pedestrian enhancements within the appropriate context sensitive cross section	50.11	27	29	\$3,391,800	No	—		
B40-08	Sparta Rd	Loop 121 to Dunn's Canyon Rd	Construct protected turn lane with 10' wide hike and bike trail	50.11	28	30	\$2,080,000	No	H, P		
T35-36a	1st Street	SE Loop 363 to Ave M	Widen from 4 lane undivided to 4 lane divided roadway with curb and gutter, hike and bike trails and will incorporate multimodal design	49.88	29	31	\$8,500,000	Yes	EJ		
H30-07	FM 3481	Prospector Drive to FM 2484	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	49.45	30	32	\$13,109,435	No	EJ, H, ARZ, P		
W35-03	SH 195	FM 3470 to Chaparral Rd	Reconstruct to 4 lane freeway with frontage roads	48.45	31	33	\$39,862,000	Yes	EJ, H		
C35-02a	FM 116	S Main (through existing parking facility) to Ave B	Create an underpass of the existing BHSF railroad	48.13	32	34	\$12,550,000	Yes	—		

Unfunded List

Project ID	Project Name	Location	Description	47-47	33	35	Cost	No	P
K40-17	Trimmer Rd Improvements	Stagcoach Rd to Chaparral Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane roadway with center turn lane, curb and gutter	47.47	33	35	\$6,873,825	No	P
W30-13	FM 2484	FM 1670 to IH 35	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	46.88	34	36	\$3,147,000	No	ARZ
W35-12	US 190	2 mi S of FM 436 to Wilam County Line	Widen to 4 lane divided rural highway	45.56	35	37	\$62,800,000	Yes	H
T15-02	Kegley Rd	856 E S of FM 2305 to 480 E S of Wildflower Lane	Widen and add middle turn lane, curb and gutter, includes 12' shared use path and will incorporate multimodal design	45.33	36	38	\$3,800,000	No	H
W30-11	NW Loop 363	At FM 2305 and S Loop 363	Reconstruct interchange at FM 2305 and LP 363	45.22	37	39	\$18,000,000	Yes	—
H30-03	FM 3719	Veterans Memorial Blvd/Business 190 to FM 439	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	44.56	38	40	\$6,000,000	No	L, H
K25-05	Old Florence Rd	Elms Rd to Jasper Dr	Widen from 2 to 5 lane section with curb and gutter	42.77	39	41	\$6,232,450	No	EJ
B30-03	Beltan Outer Loop East	IH 35 at Shanklin Rd to FM 436	Construct 2 lane roadway with shoulder	42.00	42	42	\$12,060,000	No	EJ
H40-07	Warriors Path	Old Nolanville Rd to US 190	Extend Warriors Path to US 190	41.32	43	43	\$5,703,255	No	H
H40-06	Nolanville Railroad Crossing Safety	Pleasant Hill Cemetery Rd to Jack Rabbit Road (4 RR Crossings)	Upgrade crossings for better connections and safety	41.22	44	44	\$500,000	No	—
T25-09	Outer Loop	IH 35 to Central Point Pkwy	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with divided roadway and curb and gutter with sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes to incorporate multimodal design	39.68	45	45	\$25,000,000	No	H
B30-02	Shanklin Road West, Outer Loop	IH 35 to east end of Three Creeks Subdivision	Construct 4 lane roadway	39.55	46	46	\$10,820,000	No	EJ
W35-02	SH 195	At FM 3470 and SH 195	Upgrade interchange	39.44	47	47	\$52,450,000	Yes	EJ
W25-02	SH 36	SH 317 to Lake Belton Rd	Widen from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway	38.88	48	48	\$36,715,000	No	H, P
B40-07	Connell Street	US 190 to Loop 121	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with divided roadway and 5' wide sidewalks	38.78	49	49	\$5,244,000	No	EJ
T40-09	Outer Loop/Old Waco Rd	S of Jupiter to Floodplain	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with divided roadway and curb and gutter; includes bike & bike trail and bike dedicated lanes to incorporate multimodal transportation	38.33	51	51	\$9,700,000	No	—
K40-03	FM 3470 (Evan Schlueter Loop)	SH 281 to US 190 Bypass	Construct 4 lane FM Road with continuous turn lane and shoulders	37.79	52	52	\$15,000,000	No	EJ, H
H40-03	Old Nolanville Rd	Bridge on Old Nolanville Rd to US 190	Improve roadway surface, widen existing lanes and stripe along shoulder	37.44	53	53	\$793,770	No	—
B30-01	George Wilson Extension	FM 93 at George Wilson Rd to FM 439	Construct 2 lane roadway with shoulder	35.78	54	54	\$1,386,984	No	EJ
P40-01	Huey Drive	Washington Dr to IH 35 Frontage Rd	Construct 2 lane roadway with center turn lane	35.45	55	55	\$2,645,000	No	EJ
B40-09	West Avenue D	Loop 121 to Wheat Rd	Construct 2 lane roadway with sidewalks and bike lanes	33.67	56	56	\$4,918,500	No	EJ
T40-10	Outer Loop	Floodplain to IH 35	Extend divided roadway with curb and gutter, includes sidewalks and trail and incorporate multimodal design	32.77	57	57	\$13,000,000	No	—
S40-03	West Village Rd	Thomas Arnold Rd to IH 35	Widening roadway, add turn lanes and bike/ped facilities	32.33	58	58	\$300,500	No	H, ARZ, ES
T40-04	Hogan Road	SH 317 to S Pea Ridge	Widen from 2 lane to 3 lane with curb and gutter, includes sidewalks and trail and will incorporate multimodal design	31.90	59	59	\$3,500,000	No	—
K40-25	Bunny Trail Signals	At Clear Creek Rd	Install traffic signal	31.90	60	60	\$190,000	No	EJ
W35-09	FM 93	SH 95 to SH 36	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes, provide for a raised median	31.76	61	61	\$5,245,000	No	EJ, H
B40-02	Southwest Parkway	Loop 121 to W Ave O	Construct 2 lane roadway with center turn lane	30.56	62	62	\$4,200,500	No	EJ
D40-01	North Waco Road (Old 81) Roadway North	West Main St to West Big Elm	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes, with curb and gutter, bridge improvements	23.93	63	63	\$4,600,000	No	—
T40-05	Westfield Blvd	Prairie View Rd to Airport Rd/ SH 36	Extend 4 lane divided roadway with curb and gutter; includes sidewalk and bike & bike path to incorporate multimodal transportation options	28.67	64	64	\$3,100,000	No	—
B40-03	Old 81 Roadway South	FM 1237 to Loves Overpass	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with bicycle lanes and curb and gutter	28.45	65	65	\$3,500,000	No	H

Unscored Projects										
Project ID	Project Name	Signal Light at FM 116/Ave B to Summers Rd	Widens from 2 to 4 lanes with ADA-Compliant sidewalks	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cost	No	H, P
C25-02	FM 1113	Signal Light at FM 116/Ave B to Summers Rd	Widens from 2 to 4 lanes with ADA-Compliant sidewalks	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$17,149,700	No	H, P
C25-03	Big Divide Loop	US 190 to FM 1113	Construct raised median, curb and gutter with enclosed storm drainage	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$10,200,000	No	H
C25-04	North Side Loop	FM 1113 to FM 116	Widens from 2 to 4 lanes with raised median curb and gutter with enclosed storm drainage	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$8,280,000	No	—
C40-01	FM 116 South	Copperas Cove City limits to SH 201	Upgrade Ivy Gap Rd and Ivy Mountain Rd to FM status, widen roadway from 2 to 5 lanes with curb and gutter	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$24,960,000	No	EJ, L, H, ARZ
H40-03	Chaparral Road	FM 3481 to Killen City Limits on Chaparral Rd	Widens and straighten roadway and construct hike/bike trail	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	EJ, H
H40-04	E FM 2410	East side from FM 2410 Limits on Chaparral Rd	Expand roadway to include curb & gutter, access management control, turning lanes, drainage improvements, and context sensitive solutions	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	EJ, L, H
H40-08	Warrior's Path Extension Phase II	US 190 to FM 439	Construct 2 lane roadway	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$8,000,000	No	—
H40-10	FM 439 Safety Improvements	FM 439 at Lonesome Oak Dr	Add turning lane, shoulder expansion and possible traffic signals/signs	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	—
W30-06	SH 201 @ Killen Airport	Killen Airport Entrance	Construct interchange	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$7,343,000	No	EJ, H
W35-04 ²	FM 439	Roy Reynolds Dr to FM 3219	Widens from 4 to 6 lanes	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$11,539,000	No	EJ
W40-04b ¹	Loop 121 Phase 2	IH 35 to FM 436	Widens from 2 to 4 lane divided roadway with bike/ped improvements	UNIS	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$6,000,000	Yes	EJ, H, P

¹Projects received funds through TxDOT Project Development.

²W35-04 original project score was 68.77

³Funding includes Categories 2, 4, 7, 11 & others as appropriate.

⁴Flagged

Symbol	Environmental Justice Community of Concern
L	Landfill
H	Corneities, Archaeological Sites, Historical Markers
ARZ	Aquifer Recharge Zone
ES	Endangered Species
P	Park

⁵Administrative Amendment on August 25, 2017

TRANSPORTATION CHOICES AND LIVABILITY PROJECTS

KTPO ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Project Score	Project Ranking	Funding Order	Estimated Cost	CAP Network	Flagged ³	Funding Sources ²	Funding
C35-02b	Railroad Underpass Sidewalks	S Main through existing parking facility to Ave B	Construct 10' wide sidewalk in conjunction with the FM 116 underpass project	80.90	4	3	\$920,000	Yes	—		Short Range Funding: \$5,929,889
B40-06	Belton North Trail Extension	Confederate Park to Nolan Creek	Construct 10' hike/bike trail	73.33	7	8	\$473,510	No	E, P		Long Range Funding: \$15,544,430
T40-13	Georgetown RR Trail	S 5th St to Leon River	Construct 10 ft wide trail	70.68	10	11	\$2,000,000	No	E, H, P		
B40-12	Belton Southwest Trail Expansion	Confederate Park to Nolan Creek Pedestrian Bridge	Construct 10' hike/bike trail	69.78	13	13	\$3,252,480	No	E, H, P		
H40-04	Park Connectivity	City Park along Mesquite St and Ave H to 10th St	Construct 10' wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, widen pavement by 32" with curb and gutter	69.75	14	14	\$1,558,802	No	P		
H40-05	Spr 439 Connectivity	Main St to North Dr	Construct 10' wide sidewalk, ADA ramps and crosswalks, improve shoulders at Main St	69.55	15	15	\$593,230	No	—		
D40-02	North Waco Rd (Old 81) Sidewalk	West Main St to West Big Elm	Construct 10' wide pedestrian/bicycle facility	69.22	16	16	\$1,700,000	No	—		
T40-25	Bird Creek Interceptor	N side of Lions Community Park to Midway Dr (near Bonham Middle School)	Construct 8 ft wide trail	69.11	17	17	\$375,000	No	P		Unfunded List
T25-05	FM 2271 Trail	FM 2205 to Miller Spring Park	Construct 8 ft wide trail	67.79	18	18	\$950,000	Yes	H, P		
S40-02	Pace Park Trail	Pace Park along Pace Park Rd	Construct 10 ft wide trail	60.19	19	19	\$199,965	No	ARZ, ES, P		
H40-09	Pleasant Hill Rd	Lonsome Oak Drive to Ave I	Construct Class 2, buffered on-street bike lane	UNS	N/A	N/A	\$500,000	No	H		
H40-11	Nolan Creek Off System Trail	Bridge on Old Nolanville Rd to Levy Crossing	Construct 10 ft multi-use trail boarding Nolan Creek	UNS	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	H		
H40-12	Jack Rabbit Road Bike Thoroughfare	US 190 to FM 439 and through Park to School	Add Class 2 Bike Lanes on system	UNS	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	—		
H40-13	Wild Wood Trail	Lonsome Oak Drive to Ave I	Construct an 8 ft wide multi use trail	UNS	N/A	N/A	\$400,000	No	—		
S40-01	Enhancements along Salado Creek	Main St at College Hill Dr to 0.09 mi N of Royal St on Center Circle	Construct alternate transportation route consisting of shared-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists	UNS	N/A	N/A	\$566,959	No	ARZ, H, ES		
S40-04 ¹	Main St Sidewalks Phase 2	College Hill Dr to Salado Plaza Dr	Main St improvements to include pavement widening, bike paths, drainage improvements.	UNS	N/A	N/A	\$2,223,044	No	H, ARZ, ES		

¹Projects received funds through T3007 Project Development.

²Funding includes: Categories 2, 7, 9 and others as appropriate.

³Flagged

Symbol	Meaning
EJ	Environmental Justice Community of Concern Landfill
H	Historic, Archeological Sites, Historical Walkers Cemetery, Archeological Sites, Historical Walkers
ARZ	Aquifer Recharge Zone
ES	Endangered Species
P	Park

⁴Administrative Amendment on August 25, 2017

TRANSIT PROJECTS

KTWPO ID	Project Name	Full Extents	Description	Project Score	Project Ranking	Funding Order	Estimated Cost	CAMP Network	Flagged ³	Funding Sources ²	Funding
----------	--------------	--------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------	--------------	----------------------	------------------------------	---------

PREVENTATIVE AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

Short Range Funded (2014-2023)											
KTWPO ID	Project Name	Description	Project Score	Project Ranking	Funding Order	Estimated Cost	CAMP Network	Flagged ³	Funding Sources ²	Funding	
Short Range Funded (2014-2023)											
		Description								Funding	
G01-PE	Preventative Projects	Various Locations								Short Range Funding: \$74,629,006 ⁵	
G03-MT	Maintenance Projects	Various Locations									
G04-BR	Bridge Projects	Various Locations									
G06-SA	Safety Projects	Various Locations									
Long Range Funded (2024-2040)											
		Description								Funding	
G01-PE	Preventative Projects	Various Locations								Long Range Funding: \$295,989,993 ⁵	
G03-MT	Maintenance Projects	Various Locations									
G04-BR	Bridge Projects	Various Locations									
G06-SA	Safety Projects	Various Locations									

⁵Note:
 A) Fiscal constraint is based upon forecasted revenue reflected in the 2040 MTP that was adopted in 2014. Figures have been revised to include additional funding the MPO has received as of November 16, 2016 that were not in the original forecast. Also, figures have been revised to subtract dollars for projects that have been funded as of November 16, 2016. Therefore, the figures B) Updated figures represented in the 2017 Unified Transportation Program have only been included for Category 2 for FY2018-2026, since original projection had \$0 for Category 2 for short range.

The MTP Project Listing is periodically amended to add, remove, or modify details about our transportation projects. Formal amendments require action by our Policy Board and Public Comment Period.

MTP Amendment Dates	
January 21, 2015	November 16, 2016
November 18, 2015	June 21, 2017
January 20, 2016	July 5, 2017*
April 20, 2016	August 28, 2017*
August 17, 2016	November 16, 2017*

* Administrative Amendments

Item 7:

**2045 Metropolitan
Transportation Plan
Project Selection and Scoring
Process**

**2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Selection,
Submission and Scoring Process**

KTMPPO's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is developed through a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive regional planning process and identifies needs, financial resources, and priorities for the KTMPPO area. The MTP is required to be updated every 5 years, with the next update to occur May 2019.

In order to adhere to the 2045 MTP update schedule, staff would like to finalize the scoring criteria, project submission and project scoring process in April.

Staff recommends the following scenario for this process:

- Use the same scoring criteria from the 2016 MTP Reprioritization;
- Keep legacy projects and submit new projects only;
- Use subjective scores from 2016 Reprioritization and score new projects only.

Entities may revise past projects if desired, but would be rescored. Any entity that wishes to withdraw a legacy project may do so in writing.

The consensus on March 7, 2018, was that TAC supported the above staff recommendations regarding legacy projects and scoring criteria with minor revisions to the weighting of objective scores that would not require resubmission of legacy projects. Revisions to the objective scoring are presented in the packet. The subjective scoring process is still to be discussed as to whether TAC prefers to use subjective scores from 2016 Reprioritization and score new projects only, or use new subjective scores for all projects.

Staff requests feedback from TAC on the following topics:

- Revisions to the objective scoring as presented in the packet.
- Use subjective scores from 2016 Reprioritization and score new projects only, or use new subjective scores for all projects?
- Conduct subjective scoring for projects on your own or during a meeting?

A tentative MTP Update schedule is provided below:

February 2018	Discuss public workshops; Discuss fiscal constraint (TRENDS model), project submission forms, project scoring process, and project selection process.
March 2018	Discuss project selection, submission and scoring process; Present TRENDS scenarios for fiscal constraints; Update on public workshops schedule.
April 2018	Public Workshops; Present revised project selection, submission, scoring process from March meetings; Recommendation and approval of project

	selection, submission, and scoring process, if ready; Approval of fiscal constraint option.
May 2018	Presentation of Public Workshop Results; Prepare for Call for Projects.
May 2018	Task Order for Consultant to conduct objective scores.
June 2018	Prepare for Call for Projects.
July 1, 2018	Open Call for Projects.
August 2018	Midpoint review of draft chapters with TAC and Policy Board.
August 31, 2018	Call for Projects submission deadline.
September 28, 2018	Objective scores completed by consultant.
Late Sept/Early Oct	Project Bus Tour.
October 1, 2018	TAC conducts subjective scoring on their own (3– 4 weeks).
October 26, 2018	TAC subjective scores are due to KTMPPO.
November 2018	Presentation of scoring results; Discussion and project prioritization.
January 2019	TAC and Policy Board review of Draft 2045 MTP.
March 2019	Public involvement process for Draft 2045 MTP.
May 2019	Adoption of 2045 MTP.

Action Needed: Recommend approval of project scoring criteria, project submission and project scoring process.

Roadway Track			
	Objective Criteria	Existing Points	KTMPO Proposed Points
Congestion	Present LOS	10	10
	No Build LOS	10	10
	Build vs No Build	10	10
Traffic	Current AADT	10	10
	Forecast AADT	10	10
	Peak Period Traffic Flow	5	5
Safety	Fatality Rate	5	2
	Serious Injury Rate	5	2
Other	Linkage to MTP or Other Plans	15	6
	Local Priority	5	5
	Total Objective Points.	85	70
	Total Subjective Points	45	45
	Total Points		115

Livability Track			
	Objective Criteria	Existing Points	KTMPO Proposed Points
Traffic	Peak Period Traffic Flow	5	5
Safety	Fatality Rate	5	2
	Serious Injury Rate	5	2
Other	Linkage to MTP or Other Plans	15	6
	Local Priority	5	5
	Total Objective Points.	35	20
	Total Subjective Points	105	105
	Total Points	140	125



Mobility 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Call for Projects

General Information

The Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization, hereinafter referred to as KTMPO, serves as the planning organization for the federally designated Transportation Management Area located in the Central Texas area. The KTMPO boundary covers all of Bell County and parts of Lampasas and Coryell Counties along with portions of Fort Hood. The Central Texas Council of Governments (CTCOG) serves as the lead staffing agency for the KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board (TPPB).

KTMPO is issuing a Call for Projects (CFP) as part of the update of the Mobility 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Projects representing all modes of transportation are requested to include roadway, bike and pedestrian, transit, and other eligible activities. Projects included in the MTP will be funded through various sources at the local, state, and federal levels based on established priority and funding availability. These funding sources include Surface Transportation Metropolitan Mobility and Transportation Alternatives funding, other FAST ACT programs, etc. These projects are anticipated to be needed within the 25 year planning horizon of the MTP.

This CFP describes a detailed process for submission of a project. The projects will be evaluated and scored by the KTMPO Staff or designee (objective criteria) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) (subjective criteria). Projects will be ranked based upon the scores and the TAC will provide a recommendation to the TPPB. Final approval of the prioritized project list will be made by the KTMPO TPPB. Projects will be evaluated based on the scoring criteria provided in this project call packet.

The CFP is available on the KTMPO website at www.ktmpo.org. Any revisions or updates to the CFP will be posted on the KTMPO website. Questions about the CFP may be sent via email to John Weber at john.weber@ctcog.org. Questions will be addressed upon receipt and will be posted on the KTMPO website. Questions about the CFP must be submitted to KTMPO by Friday, August 17, 2018.

All submittals must be received by the KTMPO **by 12 noon CST on August 31, 2018**, via physical electronic media or email. For large files, contact us for options using FTP or file-sharing services. Electronic responses must be formatted for 8 ½" x 11", 8 ½" x 14" or 11" x 17" output only. Hard copies will not be accepted.

Submission of Project Proposals – Electronic Media

By Mail

Central Texas Council of Governments
Attention: John Weber
P.O. Box 729
Belton, Texas 76513

Hand Delivery

Central Texas Council of Governments
Attention: John Weber
2180 North Main
Belton, Texas 76513

By Email: john.weber@ctcog.org

KTMPO Project Scoring Process

The Project Selection Process fulfills several needs in the metropolitan planning process. In order to spend federal dollars on local transportation projects and programs, a metropolitan area must have a long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and short-range Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Federal and State regulations require both of these documents to be performance-based and financially constrained. Fiscal constraint has been a key component of transportation planning and program development since the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

The MTP is a long-range plan, normally 20 to 25 years, which outlines the long-term goals for the region's transportation system.

The long-term goals of the MTP include:

- Improve mobility;
- Reduce congestion;
- Improve access to jobs, homes, goods, and services;
- Improve safety, reliability, and efficiency in transportation system;
- Promote a healthier environment;
- Encourage a regional coordination in decision making.

The MTP includes a list of projects that, over the long term, will meet the objectives of the plan. The projects listed in the MTP are grouped into three component project lists: a short range plan, a long range plan, and a regionally significant-unfunded plan.

Fiscal constraint means that the cost of those projects selected for inclusion in the MTP's planning horizon must reasonably match the expected funding levels for that time period. The cost of those projects included in the 10 year short range plan cannot exceed projected funding available during that 10 year period. Projects that are advanced to the four-year TIP have received dedicated funding. Because of the limited resources available, a process is needed to evaluate and score projects.

Once projects have been scored according to the procedures set forth in the remainder of this document, they will be placed in the financially constrained component project lists of the MTP based on projected funding levels for the MTP planning horizon, the project's score, and the project's implementation timeline (readiness). When fiscal constraint for the MTP planning horizon is reached, the remaining projects will be placed in the regionally significant-unfunded section of the MTP.

Project Selection Process

The KTMPO Project Selection Process consists of 4 steps:

1. Call for Projects and project submission to KTMPO.
2. Project Review and Evaluation.
3. KTMPO Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation.
4. KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board Review and Approval.

The following is a detailed discussion of these steps and their processes.

Step 1: Call for Projects and Project Submission to KTMPO

As part of the updated 2045 MTP process, KTMPO, with coordination and cooperation from TxDOT, will open a call for projects for all participants in the KTMPO area. KTMPO member organizations wishing to submit projects to KTMPO can do so by completing a KTMPO 2045 MTP Project Submission Packet. Projects must be submitted to KTMPO by 12 p.m. on Friday, August 31, 2018.

All projects submitted to KTMPO will be reviewed by staff to ensure that they are responsive to all required scoring criteria. Projects which are non-responsive will be returned to the submitting member with notes to enable them to update and re-submit their project. Resubmittals must be submitted by 12:00 pm on Wednesday, September 5, 2018. All projects which are evaluated as responsive and containing all the required information will proceed to the scoring process.

Projects that are currently in the 2040 MTP project list will use the same submission packet as used during the 2016 Reprioritization and need not be resubmitted. Any changes to a project will need a new submission packet.

The criteria for evaluating a project submission as responsive or non-responsive are:

- **Exhibit A:** The project submittal must include project name, MPO ID (unless project is new), project track, project readiness status and describe any issues with timing, staging, funding, or coordination with other projects that impact whether this project is best implemented in the immediate timeframe or at some other short-term or long-term time, local priority ranking, project limits, work description, length (miles), estimated total cost, planned let year, how the project addresses the goals set out in the MTP and other local plans.

The purpose and needs statement must address the following:

- Describe the primary issue which requires correction or enhancement and describe how the project will address the issue.
- Describe reasonable alternative approaches to the issue, if any, and why the proposed project is the best alternative.

- Each member may submit an unlimited number of projects for evaluation. All projects submitted by the member must be given a preferred order of selection. Members' project preference order is given points under the Local Priority evaluation criteria.
- **Exhibit B:** The project submittal must include a brief narrative stating how it addresses the overall vision of developing a fully-integrated, multimodal transportation system for people and freight, and how it addresses KTMPO long-range goals adopted in the MTP. Topics to be included in this section may include the following:
 - Connectivity;
 - Local Support;
 - Scope of Benefit;
 - Planning & Environmental Linkages;
 - Multi-Modal Support;
 - Security & Resilience;
 - Transportation Enhancements and Livability;
 - Sustainability;
 - Economic Development & Freight Movement.
- **Exhibit C:** Map of project clearly showing the project location and limits.
- **Exhibit D:** The project submittal must include a signed assurance that any and all TxDOT/FHWA deadlines will be met and required contracts will be signed.
- **Exhibit E:** Local support for the project, both "official" support from the submitting member and "unofficial" support from other agencies and the general public, is an important evaluation criteria. The submitting member should provide brief documentation on the local support for each project.

Step 2: Project Review and Evaluation

The overall vision of KTMPO as outlined in the draft 2045 MTP is to develop a fully-integrated, multimodal transportation system for people and freight. KTMPO actively seeks to promote projects to develop and support transportation choices in the region, including transit and active transportation modes.

In evaluating eligible transportation projects, the different scopes, characters, and operating characteristics of the various modes and project types are apparent. These are so distinctly different that it would be impossible to develop a single process which would support a fair and comprehensive evaluation of all the different projects. Project evaluation and scoring therefore follows two distinct tracks:

- **Road Track**—Evaluation of projects primarily addressing roads and bridges.
- **Transportation Choices and Livability Track**—To provide a fair evaluation of bicycle and pedestrian projects and of projects dealing with environmental and quality of life issues.

Each evaluation track contains objective and subjective criteria. Each track is customized to contain the criteria and weights most appropriate to their transportation modes, but each also contains common criteria and evaluation points for the categories of:

- Linkage to the MTP or Other Relevant Regional Plans, with a maximum of 6 points given for a project's linkage to current planning documents.
- Local Priority and Support, with a maximum of 10 points given for a project's listing in the submitting member's list of preferences and documented local support.
- Project Scope, with a maximum of 35 points given for a project's contributions to local benefits and livability.

Step 3: KTMPO Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation

The KTMPO Technical Advisory Committee will review all projects which are evaluated as responsive and complete and which are forwarded to them by KTMPO staff. Their evaluation will follow the defined project review and evaluation process, which will include the following steps:

Step 1: Projects will receive scores for all objective criteria through a third-party consultant. KTMPO staff will deliver objective scores to each entity on October 1, 2018. TAC members may question any project's objective score for any criteria. KTMPO staff will provide documentation of all scores as requested. The TAC will have the final decision on any objective project score, if, after consulting with KTMPO Staff, a dispute still exists.

Step 2: Subjective criteria for all new projects and legacy projects that submit a new submission packet will be scored by the TAC. TAC subjective scores will need to be submitted to KTMPO by Friday, October 26, 2018. Subjective scores from the 2016 Reprioritization will be used for legacy projects that did not resubmit a submission packet.

Step 3: As projects are scored, the TAC may discuss individual projects' scoring together and highlight any projects for consideration of bonus points. The assignment of bonus points is intended to provide flexibility for special situations and to provide better documentation and transparency for the normal give-and-take inherent to any process involving subjective scoring. The assignment of bonus points is subject to specific criteria:

- The project must have some prominent characteristic which is not adequately covered by the selection criteria. A project to correct for unintended consequences or to fine-tune the performance of a previously constructed project would also qualify for this criteria.
- The characteristic must have a regional benefit.
- The reasoning for the assignment of bonus points must be discussed openly, and must be documented.

A bonus score of 1 to 5 points may be added to any project by the TAC with a simple majority vote.

Step 4: Each project's total score will be calculated within its particular evaluation track of Road Track or Transportation Choices and Livability Track.

Step 5: All projects will then be placed in order from the highest to the lowest score within their respective evaluation tracks. To break ties, the highest subjective score of the tied projects will be used as the first tiebreaker. If projects remained tied, the lower estimated project cost will be used as the second tiebreaker. If ties remain after two tiebreakers, the rank of the project will be determined by the TAC with a simple majority vote.

From this rank ordering, projects will be placed in one of the MTP's three project listing components. The first ten years' worth of projects, balanced to the available funding determined by the fiscal constraint component of the MTP, will comprise the short-range listing of projects to be placed in the TIP during the next ten years. The remaining fifteen years of projects, balanced to the available funding determined by the fiscal constraint component of the MTP, will be placed in the long-range listing. All other projects will be placed on the regionally significant-unfunded listing. TAC will be given the opportunity to develop a funding order based off of the project ranking and the need to fund a specific project. The funding order will be developed and recommended by the TAC with a simple majority vote.

Once the Project Review and Evaluation Process is complete, the TAC will forward a recommendation for the three project listing components of the MTP to the KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board for their review and approval.

Step 4: KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board Review and Approval

The KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board (TPPB) will review and may accept, or by consensus, revise candidate projects for inclusion in the three project listing components of the MTP. If the TPPB chooses to reject the recommendation of the TAC, the project listing may be returned to them for further review and evaluation. If the TPPB adopts the TAC recommendation and funding is available, those components will then be incorporated into the MTP.

Road Evaluation Track

1 Congestion

0 to 10 points each; 30 points maximum—Objective

Scoring is based on current and forecasted LOS and the change in LOS from the forecasted build to the forecasted no-build condition. Forecasted conditions for the year 2045 are estimated by the travel demand model, and current conditions are estimated by the 2015 model. New construction road projects are also to be input into the 2015 model to estimate their current conditions within the context of the full network and to provide a consistent basis for comparison. A forecast improvement in LOS means that the project reduces congestion, so a project which shows a greater improvement in LOS will score better. This is an objective model-based criteria.

Present LOS		No Build LOS		Build vs No Build	
A	0 points	A	0 points	No change	0 points
B	1 point	B	1 point	LOS increase by 1 letter	5 points
C	4 point	C	4 point		
D & E	7 points	D & E	7 points	LOS increase by more than 1 letter	10 points
F	10 points	F	10 points		

2 Traffic

2 to 30 points

This criteria considers the current and forecasted traffic volume in three parts: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), peak hour traffic flow, and network connectivity.

Part A: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)

2 to 20 points—Objective

The scoring criteria for AADT considers both the existing and the forecasted traffic volumes, with points adding to a cumulative total. Forecasted conditions for the year 2045 are estimated by the travel demand model, and current conditions are estimated by the 2015 model. New construction road projects are also to be input into the 2015 model to estimate their current conditions within the context of the full network and to provide a consistent basis for comparison. The score for this criteria is the cumulative value of the current and forecasted AADT points. Roads with higher traffic tend to have greater regional significance, so projects with higher traffic will score better. This is an objective criteria based on model-based estimates of AADT.

AADT	Current AADT	Forecast AADT
70000 +	10 points	10 points
60,000 - 69,999	8 points	8 points
40,000-59,999	6 points	6 points
20,000-39,999	4 points	4 points
10,000-19,999	2 points	2 points
<10,000	1 point	1 point

Part B: Peak Period Traffic Flow

0 to 5 points—Objective

This criteria considers the project’s ability to reduce peak period traffic congestion and its ability to provide connectivity to defined special traffic generators. The defined special generators are sites, typically with high concentrations of employment, which generate high levels of traffic in the peak period. Projects that are close to and connect multiple special generators would have a greater ability to reduce peak period traffic, and so would score higher.

A list of special traffic generators for the Road Track is in the Appendix.

This is an objective criteria.

(1) Number of Special Generators That Are Located Along the Proposed Project:

	Points
Connects to 3 or more special generators	3 points
Connects to 2 special generators	2 points
Connects to 1 special generator	1 point
Does not connect to a special generator	0 points

(2) Distance from any point of project to closest special generator:

	Points
Project is less than 0.5 mile from closest special generator	2 points
Project is between 0.5 mile and 1 mile from the closest special generator	1 points
Project is more than 1 mile from the closest special generator	0 point

Part C: Network Connectivity

0 to 5 points—Subjective

The connectivity of the network determines the ease of movement from origin to destination and the alternative routes available to bypass congestion. This criteria measures how well the project improves that connectivity. Scores are subjective and cumulative. A project is scored for either closing a physical gap (in two categories for collector or arterial or higher streets), or for closing a gap in the number of lanes (in two categories for collector or arterial or higher streets). In addition, a project also receives points for closing a gap in multimodal connectivity or providing support for other modes’ operations. A project closing a physical gap and closing a gap in multimodal connectivity therefore has a maximum of 5 points, and a project closing a gap in the number of lanes and closing a gap in multimodal connectivity has a maximum of 4 points. This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Closes a gap for an arterial or higher	0 to 3 points
Closes a gap for a collector street	0 to 2 points
Closes a gap in the number of arterial lanes	0 to 2 point
Closes a gap in the number of collector lanes	0 to 1 point
Closes a gap in multimodal connectivity	0 to 2 points

3 Safety

0 to 2 points; 4 points maximum

This criteria is used to identify safety problem areas and to support projects which will impact the number and severity of traffic-related crashes. There are two parts to the criteria: the five-year rolling average fatality rate, and the five-year rolling average serious injury rate.

Part A: Fatality Rate

0 to 2 points—Objective

This criteria measures the project location’s number of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles travelled against the statewide 5-year rolling average. A higher difference indicates that a location has more safety issues than the statewide average. A higher difference receives a higher score for a safety project. Proposed roads are assumed to be designed to current safety standards, and therefore will receive the neutral score of 1 point for this criteria for meeting the statewide average rates. This criteria is objective.

	Points
Higher than statewide fatality rate	2 points
Same as statewide fatality rate	1 point
Lower than statewide rate	0 points

Part B: Serious Injury Rate

0 to 2 points—Objective

This criteria flags the facility’s average serious injury rate during a rolling 5-year period. A higher difference indicates that a location has more safety issues than the statewide average. A higher difference receives a higher score for a safety project. Proposed roads are assumed to be designed to current safety standards, and therefore will receive the neutral score of 1 point for this criteria for meeting the statewide average rates. This criteria is objective.

	Points
Higher than statewide serious injury rate	2 points
Same as statewide serious injury rate	1 point
Lower than statewide serious injury rate	0 points

4 Linkage to MTP or Other Plan

0 to 6 points—Objective

This criteria references the project’s inclusion in the current MTP or other plans. This criteria demonstrates a project’s history and planning linkages. Projects with a history in the MTP are rated as having a recognized need in the community and have been vetted by the prior planning and project prioritization process, and so receive a higher score. Scores are cumulative for inclusion in one or more plans or MTP lists, and the criteria is objective.

	Points
In the current Long Range MTP Plan	2 points
In the current Regionally Significant/Unfunded List	1 point
In the 2018 Regional Multimodal Plan	2 points
Lies on a corridor from the Congestion Management Process	1 point

5 Local Priority & Support

0 to 5 points each; 10 points maximum

The local priority & support category of evaluation criteria is designed to define the extent of local commitment to a project.

Part A: Local Priority

1 to 5 points—Objective

The stated preference order for implementation is defined by the submitting member, and may consider objective and subjective factors, available funding, coordination with other projects or planning, or other factors. **Submitted projects are listed in order by the member regardless of the evaluation track.** KTMPO staff will use the preference list as an objective criteria to score each project within its appropriate evaluation track.

	Points
Preference #1	5 points
Preference #2	4 points
Preference #3	3 points
Preference #4	2 points
Preference #5 and lower	1 point

Part B: Local Support

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Local support and lack of controversy for a project are a gauge of the support that a project has from both the official submitting member and from the general public. This measure may consider local overmatch, resolutions, petitions, news articles, blog postings, or other relevant factors. This is a subjective criteria that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Significant local support	4 to 5 points
Moderate local support	2 to 3 points
Minimal local support	1 to 2 points
Significant local controversy	0 points

6 Project Scope

0 to 5 points each; 35 points maximum

Part A: Scope of Benefit

1 to 5 points—Subjective

A submitting member’s narrative, in addition to the project’s model-based traffic changes, should be used to evaluate the project’s scope of benefits. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, the project’s geographic scale, functional class of the project roadway and connecting roadways, and the roadway’s significance within the region.

This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Regional Benefit	4 to 5 points
Benefit within KTMPO	2 to 3 points
Local Benefit	1 to 2 points

Part B: Planning and Environment Linkages

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) represents a collaborative and integrated approach to transportation decision-making that considers environmental, community, and economic goals early in the transportation planning process rather than after a project has progressed to the alternatives analysis and design stages. Considering PEL factors earlier in the process promotes developing more feasible and prudent alternatives and can significantly improve the ultimate project benefits, costs, and implementation.

The purpose of the PEL criteria is to ensure that these factors are considered when developing a project. A project’s impact on PEL issues does not mean that projects in those areas are prohibited. Rather, the project should document the extent of its impacts and the search for reasonable and prudent alternatives. Federal legislation calls for projects to “avoid, minimize, or mitigate” their impacts on these areas.

When PEL issues are encountered with a project, documentation should show that the appropriate resource agencies or other public agencies have been consulted to determine impacts, approaches, and alternatives. Relevant resource agencies include agencies such as Texas Parks & Wildlife, Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission, Texas Historical Commission, TxDOT, and the KTMPO.

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 stipulates that federal funds may not be spent on projects in publicly-owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or public or private historical sites unless there are no feasible alternatives and all mitigating steps are taken, or alternatively, that the project has a minimal impact on the use of the land.

Environmentally sensitive areas in the KTMPO region are identified in the draft 2045 MTP to include natural or recreational areas, archaeological sites, historic structures, Environmental Justice Communities of Concern (EJCOC), landfills, watersheds, aquifers, and endangered species.

Historic preservation and archaeology issues include historic bridges and structures and known sites of archaeological interest.

Environmental Justice Communities of Concern (EJCOC) are defined by KTMPO. The criteria for defining an EJCOC are a Census Tract where the Low Income Index was in the 85% percentile and above, a Census Tract with at least 50% of the population self-identified as minority, or a Census Tract with at least 35% of the population self-identified as Hispanic or Latino descent.

Americans with Disability Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design for the project and its adjacent facilities should also be considered.

Projects which are expected to improve regional air quality by improving travel speeds, reducing idling, promoting ridesharing or other travel modes, or otherwise reducing the emissions of NO₂ or VOC should be considered under this criteria.

This is a subjective criteria that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation. A project scores positively if it has an impact on environmentally sensitive lands but contains some provision for adequate mitigation. It scores higher if the impact is minimal, and highest if the project has a positive impact on the sensitive land use.

	Points
Positive impact	3 to 5 points
Minimal negative impact	2 to 3 points
Negative impact with mitigation	1 to 2 points
Negative impact with no mitigation	0 points

Part C: Economic Development & Freight Movement

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Road projects can have direct impacts on economic activity, including supporting access and development for new economic activity areas, redevelopment of economically depressed regions, and access that supports activities creating new jobs. Projects can also support freight movements through providing access to industrial areas and to freight handling facilities. Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective score based in part on the submitting member’s narrative.

	Points
Supports creation of new permanent jobs	0 to 2 points
Supports freight movements	0 to 2 points
Supports economic activity	0 to 1 point

Part D: Multimodal Support

0 to 5 points—Subjective

To support an integrated multimodal transportation system and to promote intermodal linkages, a project is evaluated on whether or not it accommodates additional modes. Example linkages include connections from road projects to transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities or networks. Projects may also receive points for features which promote or accommodate other modes’ operations or facilities, or improve the safety of other modes’ interaction with the road network. This is a subjective criteria that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Supports 3 or more additional modes	5 points
Supports 2 additional modes	3 points
Supports 1 additional mode	1 point
Supports only the highway mode	0 points

Part E: Security & Resilience

0 to 5 points—Subjective

This criteria supports the ability of the transportation network to recover from emergency situations and to mitigate their effects.

The designated evacuation corridors for the region are IH 35, US 190, US 190/SH 36, SH 95, FM 93, and FM 2268.

Emergency services sites include fire stations, hospitals, police stations, designated shelters, and locations where emergency response vehicles or equipment are stored.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criteria to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Lies on a designated evacuation corridor	0 to 3 points
Enhances access for emergency services	0 to 2 points

Part F: Transportation Enhancements & Livability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Contributions of transportation projects to the overall livability of the environment has been an important consideration since the Transportation Enhancement program was established in ISTEA, continuing forward under the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) in MAP-21. This evaluation criteria continues that emphasis by scoring projects’ contributions to the overall environment, aesthetics, and livability of the region. Projects which primarily address enhancements and livability include, but are not limited to, the construction of turnouts for scenic views, preservation of historic transportation facilities, pedestrian-scaled lighting and amenities, landscaping and other scenic beautification, vegetation management, storm water management, and environmental improvements. Projects which document their steps to reduce life-cycle costs, such as landscaping with native species, xeriscaping, or integrated low-impact design (LID) storm water systems, should score higher for this criteria.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criteria to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Enhances environment, aesthetics, or livability	0 to 3 points
Documents steps to reduce life-cycle costs	0 to 2 points

Part G: Sustainability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

This criteria measures how a project contributes to social, environmental, and economic impacts in a way that meets current needs without compromising the ability to meet future needs. It credits a project for using any of the range of innovative approaches which promote sustainability or multi-modalism in transportation, such as FHWA’s Context Sensitive Solutions, Complete Streets, the FHWA’s INVEST sustainability evaluation program, the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure’s

Envision evaluation program, or the Green Roads evaluation program.

Programs and principles such as Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) support the consideration of transportation, land use, and infrastructure needs in an integrated way. Enhanced public involvement and strengthened consideration of the natural and cultural environments are key factors of CSS. Sustainability rating systems provide a framework for conceiving and planning sustainable infrastructure projects which can reduce the negative environmental impacts of a project, reduce life cycle costs, and help ensure that all aspects of a project are fully considered.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criteria to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Uses a sustainability-oriented approach	0 to 3 points
Uses a sustainability rating system	0 to 2 points

Transportation Choices and Livability Evaluation Track

1 Connectivity & Service Gaps 0 to 5 or 0 to 10 points each; 40 points maximum

Part A: Peak Period Traffic Flow 0 to 5 points—Objective

This criteria considers the project’s ability to reduce peak period traffic congestion and its ability to provide connectivity to defined special traffic generators. The defined special generators are sites, typically with high concentrations of employment, which generate high levels of traffic in the peak period. Projects that are close to and connect multiple special generators would have a greater ability to reduce peak period traffic, and so would score higher.

A list of special traffic generators for the Road Track is in the Appendix.

This is an objective criteria.

(1) Number of special generators that are located along the proposed project:

	Points
Connects to 3 or more special generators	3 points
Connects to 2 special generators	2 points
Connects to 1 special generator	1 point
Does not connect to a special generator	0 points

(2) Distance from any point of project to closest special generator:

	Points
Project is less than 0.5 mile from closest special generator	2 points
Project is between 0.5 mile and 1 mile from the closest special generator	1 points
Project is more than 1 mile from the closest special generator	0 point

Part B: Eliminates Barriers 0 to 15 points—Subjective

This criteria evaluates how a project addresses the barriers to active transportation which were identified in the KTMPO Regional Thoroughfare and Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan. Barriers are defined in terms of movements crossing a facility, not travel on it. The categories of barriers include, but are not limited to:

- Crossings of grade-separated arterials
- Crossings of multilane arterials with at-grade intersections
- Bridge crossings at overpasses and water features
- Railroad track crossings

Examples of barriers reference the Regional Thoroughfare and Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan. The Appendix also lists the special traffic generators for the Transportation Choices and Livability Track. This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Eliminates barrier in the bike/ped network	0 to 5 points
Eliminates barrier in the EJCOG	0 to 5 points
Eliminates barrier within 1 mile of a special generator	0 to 5 points

Part C: Active Transportation Network Connectivity

0 to 10 points—Subjective

The connectivity within the active transportation network and its connectivity to other modes is measured in terms of how a project can close a gap in the network or in the network’s connections to other modes. Network gaps are to be defined with reference to the KTMPO Regional Thoroughfare and Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan’s defined active transportation network. Note that new connections to other modes are a separate issue evaluated under the project scope; this criteria is to evaluate projects which address gaps in the existing network. This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Closes a gap in the active transportation network	0 to 5 points
Closes a gap in intermodal connectivity	0 to 5 points

Part D: Addresses a Documented Need

0-10 points—Subjective

As part of the narrative submitted for a project, the member should document how active transportation needs have defined the project. The narrative should describe how the submitted project will address the referenced needs. This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Documented need in EJCOG	0 to 5 points
Documented need in region	0 to 5 points

2 Access to Jobs

0 to 10 points each; 15 points maximum—Subjective

This criteria evaluates a project based on how well it supports active transportation facilities which enhance the connection to employment opportunities. Projects focused on Environmental Justice Communities of Concern can score higher. This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Provides access to jobs in EJCOG	0 to 10 points
Provides access to jobs in region	0 to 5 points

3 Safety 0 to 5 points each; 20 points maximum—Objective and Subjective

This criteria rates a project on how it enhances the safety of pedestrians or bicyclists on the active transportation network. This criteria is scored cumulatively with four different criteria of up to 5 points each. The first three criteria are subjective, and the fatality and serious injury rates scoring is objective.

	Points
Provides an exclusive path on an arterial	0 to 5 points
Provides a connection to a school	0 to 5 points
Enhances areas with identified hazards	0 to 5 points
Fatality & serious injury rate	0 to 4 points

Part A: Exclusive Path 0 to 5 points—Subjective

An exclusive path is defined as being separated from vehicular traffic with a physical barrier such as bollards, curbs, landscaped areas, or on-street parking. Projects on roads with a functional class of minor arterial or higher in the KTMPO Regional Thoroughfare Plan are eligible for these points.

Part B: Connection to a School 0 to 5 points—Subjective

Projects which enhance safety on facilities which directly connect to a school should score higher.

Part C: Enhances Areas with Identified Hazards 0 to 5 points—Subjective

Identified hazards include, but are not limited to, locations with five or more documented crashes between pedestrians or bicycles and other transportation modes within the past five-year period. Other hazards include physical and operational conditions which would contribute to safety issues, such as storm water grate designs which do not trap bicycle tires, new pedestrian signals, mid-block crossings, or pedestrian refuge islands.

Part D: Fatality and Serious Injury Rates 0 to 4 points—Objective

This criteria flags an adjacent road facility’s average fatality and serious injury rates for active transportation users during a rolling five-year period. The higher of the fatality rate or the serious injury rate should be used for comparison to the statewide rate. A higher difference indicates that a location has more safety issues than the statewide average. A higher difference receives a higher score for a safety project. Proposed roads are assumed to be designed to current safety standards, and therefore will receive the neutral score of 1 point for this criteria for meeting the statewide average rates.

	Points
Higher than statewide fatality rate	2 points
Same as statewide fatality rate	1 point
Lower than statewide rate	0 points
Higher than statewide serious injury rate	2 points
Same as statewide serious injury rate	1 point
Lower than statewide serious injury rate	0 points

4 Linkage to MTP or Other Plan 0 to 2 points each; 6 points maximum—Objective

This criteria references the project’s coordination with the current 2040 MTP, the Regional Thoroughfare Plan or other regional plans. This criteria demonstrates a project’s history and planning linkages. Projects with a history in the MTP are rated as having a recognized need in the community and have been vetted by the prior planning and project prioritization process, and so receive a higher score. Scores are cumulative for inclusion in one or more plans or MTP lists, and the criteria is objective.

	Points
In the current Long Range MTP Plan	2 points
In the current Regionally Significant/Unfunded List	1 point
In the Regional Thoroughfare Plan	2 points
Lies on a corridor from the Congestion Management Process	1 point

5 Local Priority & Support 0 to 5 points each; 10 points maximum

The local priority & support category of evaluation criteria is designed to define the extent of local commitment to a project.

Part A: Local Priority **1 to 5 points—Objective**

The stated preference order for implementation is defined by the submitting member, and may consider objective and subjective factors, available funding, coordination with other projects or planning, or other factors. **Submitted projects are listed in order by the member regardless of the evaluation track.** KTMPO staff will use the preference list as an objective criteria to score each project within its appropriate evaluation track.

	Points
Preference #1	5 points
Preference #2	4 points
Preference #3	3 points
Preference #4	2 points
Preference #5 and lower	1 point

Part B: Local Support

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Local support and lack of controversy for a project are a gauge of the support that a project has from both the official submitting member and from the general public. This measure may consider local overmatch, resolutions, petitions, news articles, blog postings, or other relevant factors. This is a subjective criteria that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Significant local support	4 to 5 points
Moderate local support	2 to 3 points
Minimal local support	1 to 2 points
Significant local controversy	0 points

6 Project Scope

0 to 5 points each; 35 points maximum

Part A: Scope of Benefit

1 to 5 points—Subjective

A submitting member’s narrative should be used to evaluate the project’s scope of benefits. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, the project’s geographic scale, functional class of the project roadway (if the active transportation project is adjacent to a roadway) and connecting roadways, and the roadway’s significance within the region.

This is a subjective criteria.

	Points
Regional Benefit	4 to 5 points
Benefit within KTMPO	2 to 3 points
Local Benefit	1 to 2 points

Part B: Planning and Environment Linkages

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) represents a collaborative and integrated approach to transportation decision-making that considers environmental, community, and economic goals early in the transportation planning process rather than after a project has progressed to the alternatives analysis and design stages. Considering PEL factors earlier in the process promotes developing more feasible and prudent alternatives and can significantly improve the ultimate project benefits, costs, and implementation.

The purpose of the PEL criteria is to ensure that these factors are considered when developing a project. A project’s impact on PEL issues does not mean that projects in those areas are prohibited. Rather, the project should document the extent of its impacts and the search for reasonable and prudent alternatives. Federal legislation calls for projects to “avoid, minimize, or mitigate” their impacts on these areas.

When PEL issues are encountered with a project, documentation should show that the appropriate resource agencies or other public agencies have been consulted to determine impacts, approaches,

and alternatives. Relevant resource agencies include agencies such as Texas Parks & Wildlife, Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission, Texas Historical Commission, TxDOT, and the KTMPO.

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 stipulates that federal funds may not be spent on projects in publicly-owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or public or private historical sites unless there are no feasible alternatives and all mitigating steps are taken, or alternatively, that the project has a minimal impact on the use of the land.

Environmentally sensitive areas in the KTMPO region are identified in the draft 2045 MTP to include natural or recreational areas, archaeological sites, historic structures, Environmental Justice Communities of Concern (EJCOC), landfills, watersheds, aquifers, and endangered species.

Historic preservation and archaeology issues includes known sites of archaeological interest.

Environmental Justice Communities of Concern (EJCOC) are defined by KTMPO. The criteria for defining an EJCOC are a Census Tract where the Low Income Index was in the 85% percentile and above, or a Census Tract with at least 50% of the population self-identified as minority, or a Census Tract with at least 35% of the population self-identified as Hispanic or Latino descent.

Americans with Disability Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design for the project and its adjacent facilities should also be considered.

Projects which are expected to improve regional air quality by improving travel speeds, reducing idling, promoting ridesharing or other travel modes, or otherwise reducing the emissions of NO₂ or VOC should be considered under this criteria.

This is a subjective criteria that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation. A project scores positively if it has an impact on environmentally sensitive lands but contains some provision for adequate mitigation. It scores higher if the impact is minimal, and highest if the project has a positive impact on the sensitive land use.

	Points
Positive impact	3 to 5 points
Minimal negative impact	2 to 3 points
Negative impact with mitigation	1 to 2 points
Negative impact with no mitigation	0 points

Part C: Economic Development

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Active transportation projects can have direct impacts on economic activity, including supporting access and development for new economic activity areas, redevelopment of economically depressed regions, and access that supports activities creating new jobs. Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective score based in part on the submitting member’s narrative.

	Points
Supports creation of new permanent jobs	0 to 3 points
Supports economic activity	0 to 2 point

Part D: Multimodal Support

0 to 5 points—Subjective

To support an integrated multimodal transportation system and to promote intermodal linkages, a project is evaluated on how it accommodates or connects to additional modes. Example linkages include connections from active transportation projects to road and transit facilities or networks. Connections may include paths connecting to transit and bike racks on buses. Projects may also receive points for features which promote or accommodate active transportation operations or facilities as they interact with other modes, or improve the safety of their interaction with other modes. This is a subjective criteria that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Supports 2 or more additional modes	5 points
Supports 1 additional mode	3 points
Supports 2 active transportation modes	2 points
Supports only one active transportation mode	1 point

Part E: Security & Resilience

0 to 5 points—Subjective

This criteria supports the ability of the transportation network to recover from emergency situations and to mitigate their effects. A project’s score under this criteria may consider facilities lying on an evacuation corridor or facilities which provide access to an evacuation corridor or emergency services site.

The designated evacuation corridors for the region are IH 35, US 190, US 190/SH 36, SH 95, FM 93, and FM 2268.

Emergency services sites relevant to active transportation modes include access to hospitals and designated shelters.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criteria to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Lies on a designated evacuation corridor	0 to 3 points
Enhances access for emergency services	0 to 2 points

Part F: Transportation Enhancements & Livability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

Contributions of transportation projects to the overall livability of the environment has been an important consideration since the Transportation Enhancement program was established in ISTEA, continuing forward under the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) in MAP-21. This evaluation criteria continues that emphasis by scoring projects’ contributions to the overall environment, aesthetics, and livability of the region. Projects which primarily address enhancements and livability include, but are not limited to, the construction of turnouts for scenic views, preservation of historic transportation facilities, pedestrian-scaled lighting and amenities, landscaping and other scenic beautification, vegetation management, storm water management, and environmental improvements. Projects which document their steps to reduce life-cycle costs, such as landscaping with native species, xeriscaping, or integrated low-impact design (LID) storm water systems, should score higher for this criteria.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criteria to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Enhances environment, aesthetics, or livability	0 to 3 points
Documents steps to reduce life-cycle costs	0 to 2 points

Part G: Sustainability

0 to 5 points--Subjective

This criteria measures how a project contributes to social, environmental, and economic impacts in a way that meets current needs without compromising the ability to meet future needs. It credits a project for using any of the range of innovative approaches which promote sustainability or multi-modalism in transportation, such as FHWA’s Context Sensitive Solutions, Complete Streets, the FHWA’s INVEST sustainability evaluation program, the Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure’s Envision evaluation program, or the Green Roads evaluation program.

Programs and principles such as Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) support the consideration of transportation, land use, and infrastructure needs in an integrated way. Enhanced public involvement and strengthened consideration of the natural and cultural environments are key factors of CSS. Sustainability rating systems provide a framework for conceiving and planning sustainable infrastructure projects which can reduce the negative environmental impacts of a project, reduce life cycle costs, and help ensure that all aspects of a project are fully considered.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criteria to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Uses a sustainability-oriented approach	0 to 3 points
Uses a sustainability rating system	0 to 2 points



**KTMPO Project
Roadway and Livability
Submission Packet
Cover Sheet**

Project Name:

Lead Agency:

* Project Contact Name

* Phone Number

Address, City, State & Zip Code

Contact Email Address

Date

**Note: Name and phone number of person who can answer questions as projects are being scored.*

Required attachments:

- Exhibit A - Project Details
- Exhibit B - Narrative - Subjective Criteria
- Exhibit C - Project location map
- Exhibit D - TxDOT Assurance Form
- Exhibit E - Local Support (Documents such as Letters, Resolutions, News articles, ROW agreements, etc.)

Optional attachments:

- Artist's Sketches / Conceptual drawings
- Cross-sections
- Photographs of Project Area
- Other Narrative Statements (as needed)

Exhibit B Topics:

Connectivity
Local Support
Scope of Benefit
Planning and Environmental Linkages
Economic Development & Freight Movement
Multi-Modal Support
Security & Resilience
Transportation Enhancements & Livability
Sustainability



Exhibit A
Project Details

Project Name:

MPO ID:
(current MPO ID or 'NEW')

Project Track (Check one)

- Roadway Project
- Transportation Choices and Livability

Local Priority:
(Preferred order, i.e. 1 of 5, 2 of 7)

Project Readiness:

	Status (%)
Preliminary Engineering	<input type="text"/>
Right of Way Acquired	<input type="text"/>
Environmental Review	<input type="text"/>
Utilities Coordination	<input type="text"/>

Project Readiness - Describe any applicable issues with timing, staging, funding, or coordination with other projects (N/A if none)

Project Attributes:

Extent From:
Extent To:
Length (miles):
Estimated Total Cost:
Planned Let Year:

Work Description:

- New Roadway
- Added Capacity
- Maintenance/Rehabilitation
- Bike/Pedestrian
- Other

KTMPO Goals - Describe how this project addresses the goals set out in the MTP. List any other local plans where this project appears.

Purpose and Needs Statement - Describe what this project will accomplish for the community.

Project Name:

Scoring Criteria - Describe how this project addresses the subjective scoring criteria:

Project Name:

Additional Narrative as needed:

Project Name:

Additional Narrative as needed:



**KTMPO Project
Transit Submission
Packet Cover Sheet**

Project Name:

Lead Agency:

* Project Contact Name

* Phone Number

Address, City, State & Zip Code

Contact Email Address

Date

**Note: Name and phone number of person who can answer questions as projects are being scored.*

Required attachments:

- Exhibit A - Project Details
- Exhibit B - Narrative - Subjective Criteria
- Exhibit E - Local Support (Documents such as Letters, Resolutions, News articles, ROW agreements, etc.)

Optional attachments:

- Artist's Sketches / Conceptual drawings
- Cross-sections
- Photographs of Project
- Other Narrative Statements (as needed)



**Exhibit A
Project Details**

Project Name:

MPO ID:

(current MPO ID or 'NEW')

Transit Project - Description:

HCTD Priority:

(Preferred order, i.e. 1 of 5, 2 of 7)

Project Readiness - Describe any applicable issues with timing, staging, funding, or coordination with other projects (N/A if none)

Project Phase:

- Operating (Oper. Activities):
- Operations (Maintenance):
- Purchasing (Rolling Stock)
- Purchasing (Other):
- Planning

Estimated Cost:

Apportionment Year:

Project Listed in Other Plans:

Purpose and Needs Statement (Continue on Exhibit B - Additional Narrative - as needed)

KTMPPO Goals - Describe how this project address the overall vision and long-range goals set out in the MTP



Exhibit B
Narrative Descriptions
(Continued)

Project Name:

Additional Narrative as needed:



Exhibit B
Narrative Description
(Continued)

Project Name:

Additional Narrative as needed:



Exhibit B
Narrative Description
(Continued)

Project Name:

Additional Narrative as needed:

**Item 8:
2045 Metropolitan
Transportation Plan
Fiscal Constraint**

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Fiscal Constraints

As a requirement, the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) has to be fiscally constrained. For the 2040 MTP update, staff used Texas Transportation Institute's (TTI) Transportation Revenue Estimator and Needs Determination or TRENDS. The TRENDS Model is designed to provide transportation planners, policy makers, and the public with a tool to forecast revenues and expenses for the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) for the period 2012 through 2050. A user can control a number of scenarios related to assumptions regarding statewide transportation needs, population growth rates, fuel efficiency, inflation rates, taxes, fees and other elements. By running different scenarios, the model provides the user with estimated future transportation funds.

Staff have prepared two options to calculate estimated transportation funds:

- Option #1 uses the same inputs as decided for the 2040 MTP update.
- Option #2 uses the same inputs as decided for the 2040 MTP update in addition to new inputs developed by TTI since the previous MTP update. These added inputs are highlighted under Option #2.

Each option is hypothetical, scenarios may not reflect actual policy-based decisions during select years, and future funding is estimated and may not reflect actual funding received.

The consensus at the March TAC and Policy Board meetings were in support of staff recommendation of utilizing Option #1 with baseline and medium scenarios for Short and Long Range Plans, respectively.

Fiscal constraint options are being presented again for final discussion and approval.

A tentative MTP Update schedule is provided below:

February 2018	Discuss public workshops; Discuss fiscal constraint (TRENDS model), project submission forms, project scoring process, and project selection process.
March 2018	Discuss project selection, submission and scoring process; Present TRENDS scenarios for fiscal constraints; Update on public workshops schedule.
April 2018	Public Workshops; Present revised project selection, submission, scoring process from March meetings; Recommendation and approval of project selection, submission, and scoring process, if ready. Approval of fiscal constraint option.
May 2018	Presentation of Public Workshop Results; Prepare for Call for Projects.
May 2018	Task Order for Consultant to conduct objective scores.

June 2018	Prepare for Call for Projects.
July 1, 2018	Open Call for Projects.
August 2018	Midpoint review of draft chapters with TAC and Policy Board.
August 31, 2018	Call for Projects submission deadline.
September 28, 2018	Objective scores completed by consultant.
Late Sept/Early Oct	Project Bus Tour.
October 1, 2018	TAC conducts subjective scoring on their own (3– 4 weeks).
October 26, 2018	TAC subjective scores are due to KTMP.
November 2018	Presentation of scoring results; Discussion and project prioritization.
January 2019	TAC and Policy Board review of Draft 2045 MTP.
March 2019	Public involvement process for Draft 2045 MTP.
May 2019	Adoption of 2045 MTP.

Action Needed: Recommend approval of fiscal constraint Option #1 with baseline and medium scenarios for Short and Long-Range Plans, respectively.

Option #1: Same Outputs as 2040 MTP Update



Baseline

Low

Medium

High (Local Option)

SCENARIO

State Population Growth Rate

Low

Low

Low

High

Fuel Efficiency

Average

High

Average

Low

TxDOT Maintenance Standards by 2035

Current TxDOT Scenario

Current TxDOT Scenario

80% good or better condition

90% good or better condition

FEDERAL AND STATE OPTIONS

State Gas Tax

No Increase

\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035

\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035

\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.

State Diesel Tax

No Increase

\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035

\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035

\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.

Federal Gas Tax

No Increase

\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035

\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035

\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.

Federal Diesel Tax

No Increase

\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035

\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035

\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.

TX Rate of Return on Federal Funds

Default (85%)

90%

95%

100%

Indexing the Gas Tax to CPI

No

No

Yes in 2035

Yes in 2025

% of State Gas Tax Increase to Transportation

Default (75%)

80%

85%

90%

Vehicle Registration Fees Increase

No Increase

\$5 in 2025

\$15 in 2025

\$25 in 2025

State Vehicle Mile Traveled Tax

No

No

No

\$0.001 per mile in 2025 and 2035 (\$1 per 1,000 mi)

Add New Capacity Dollars

No

No

No

\$5 Billion in 2035

LOCAL OPTIONS				
Local Option Gas Tax	None	None	None	\$0.10 increase in 2030
Local Option Diesel Tax	None	None	None	\$0.10 increase in 2030
Local Option Vehicle Registration Fee	None	None	None	\$10 increase in 2030
Local Option Vehicle Mile Traveled Tax	None	None	None	\$0.001 per mile in 2035 (\$1 per 1,000 mi)
Revenue (In Millions)				
Baseline Scenario				
	Short Range ¹	Long Range ²	Total	
Category 2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Category 7	\$39.20	\$71.90	\$111.10	
Category 9	\$5.00	\$9.30	\$14.30	
Category 11	\$5.30	\$10.20	\$15.50	
Total	\$49.50	\$91.40	\$140.90	
Low Scenario				
	Short Range	Long Range	Total	
Category 2	\$5.20	\$41.80	\$47.00	
Category 7	\$45.60	\$133.80	\$179.40	
Category 9	\$6.60	\$23.00	\$29.60	
Category 11	\$6.50	\$19.10	\$25.60	
Total	\$63.90	\$217.70	\$281.60	
Medium Scenario				
	Short Range	Long Range	Total	
Category 2	\$16.40	\$115.80	\$132.20	
Category 7	\$59.70	\$216.90	\$276.60	
Category 9	\$9.50	\$41.60	\$51.10	
Category 11	\$8.50	\$31.40	\$39.90	
Total	\$94.10	\$405.70	\$499.80	
High (Local Option) Scenario				
	Short Range	Long Range	Total	
Category 2	\$36.20	\$115.00	\$151.20	
Category 7	\$84.80	\$440.90	\$525.70	
Category 9	\$15.20	\$91.50	\$106.70	
Category 11	\$11.60	\$64.40	\$76.00	
Total	\$147.80	\$711.80	\$859.60	

¹Short Range: 2019-2028

²Long Range: 2029-2045


2040 MTP Update

Short Range:	Baseline	\$43,415,000
Long Range:	Medium	\$152,449,789
Total:		\$195,864,789

2045 MTP Update

Short Range:	Baseline	\$49,500,000
Long Range:	Medium	\$405,700,000
Total:		\$455,200,000

Option #2: 2040 Scenarios With New Inputs

	Baseline	Low	Medium	High (Local Option)
SCENARIO				
State Population Growth Rate	Low	Low	Low	High
Fuel Efficiency	Average	High	Average	Low
TxDOT Maintenance Standards by 2035	Current TxDOT Scenario	Current TxDOT Scenario	80% good or better condition	90% good or better condition
Annual Percent Increase in Planning Expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual Percent Increase in Build Expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual Percent Increase in Maintenance Expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual Percent Increase in Use Expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual Percent Increase in Manage Expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual Percent Increase in cost of other agencies funded by TxDOT	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in contributions from TxDOT to Comptroller and Retirement	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in Category 1 Preventative and Routine Maintenance Expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in Category 6 Bridge Maintenance	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%

Annual percent increase in Category 7 STP Metro Mobility and Maintenance	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in Category 8 Federal Safety expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in Category 9 Federal Enhancement expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in Category 10 Supplemental Transportation Project expenses	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
Annual percent increase in Category 11 District Discretionary funding	Default (1%)	5%	10%	15%
FEDERAL AND STATE OPTIONS				
State Gas Tax	No Increase	\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035	\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035	\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.
State Diesel Tax	No Increase	\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035	\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035	\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.
Federal Gas Tax	No Increase	\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035	\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035	\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.
Federal Diesel Tax	No Increase	\$0.02 increase in 2025 and \$0.05 in 2035	\$0.06 increase in 2025 and 2035	\$0.10 increase in 2025 and 2035.
TX Rate of Return on Federal Funds	Default (85%)	90%	95%	100%
Indexing the Gas Tax to CPI	No	No	Yes in 2035	Yes in 2025
% of State Gas Tax Increase to Transportation	Default (75%)	80%	85%	90%
Vehicle Registration Fees Increase	No Increase	\$5 in 2025	\$15 in 2025	\$25 in 2025

State Vehicle Mile Traveled Tax	No	No	No	\$0.001 per mile in 2025 and 2035 (\$1 per 1,000 mi)
Add New Capacity Dollars	No	No	No	\$5 Billion in 2035
Percent of Revenue Enhancements Spent Maintenance	Default (25%)	30%	35%	40%
LOCAL OPTIONS				
Local Option Gas Tax	None	None	None	\$0.10 increase in 2030
Local Option Diesel Tax	None	None	None	\$0.10 increase in 2030
Local Option Vehicle Registration Fee	None	None	None	\$10 increase in 2030
Local Option Vehicle Mile Traveled Tax	None	None	None	\$0.001 per mile in 2035 (\$1 per 1,000 mi)
Fuel Efficiency Assumption for Local Vehicles	None	None	None	Low
Bonding Options				
General Obligation Bond Amounts ¹				
Revenue Bonds ²				
Revenue (In Millions)				
Baseline				
	Short Range³	Long Range⁴	Total	
Category 2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Category 7	\$39.20	\$71.90	\$111.10	
Category 9	\$5.00	\$8.70	\$13.70	
Category 11	\$5.30	\$10.20	\$15.50	
Total	\$49.50	\$90.80	\$140.30	
Low Scenario				
	Short Range	Long Range	Total	
Category 2	\$6.00	\$45.70	\$51.70	
Category 7	\$46.90	\$166.80	\$213.70	
Category 9	\$7.00	\$27.00	\$34.00	
Category 11	\$7.40	\$23.80	\$31.20	
Total	\$67.30	\$263.30	\$330.60	

Medium Scenario				
	Short Range	Long Range	Total	
Category 2	\$17.00	\$72.50	\$89.50	
Category 7	\$61.90	\$313.30	\$375.20	
Category 9	\$10.20	\$52.30	\$62.50	
Category 11	\$8.80	\$44.90	\$53.70	
Total	\$97.90	\$483.00	\$580.90	
High (Local Option) Scenario				
	Short Range	Long Range	Total	
Category 2	\$36.20	\$294.00	\$330.20	
Category 7	\$84.80	\$440.90	\$525.70	
Category 9	\$15.20	\$91.50	\$106.70	
Category 11	\$12.10	\$64.40	\$76.50	
Total	\$148.30	\$890.80	\$1,039.10	

¹Texas voters approved Proposition 12, which authorized the issuance of \$5 billion in general obligation bonds in 2007. The first \$2 billion were dedicated in 2010 and \$3 billion were dedicated in 2011. Approximately 544 million were of Proposition 12 bonds were used to reconstruct IH-35 through Bell County.

²In 2003, the Texas Legislature and Texas voters passed House Joint Resolution (H.J.R.) 28, which granted the Commission the authority to authorize TxDOT to issue \$3 billion in bonds backed by the State Highway Fund. A minimum of \$600 million was to be spent on safety improvement projects. The 80th Texas legislature increased the bonding capacity to \$6 billion with a maximum annual issuance of \$1.5 billion. A minimum of \$1.2 billion must be dedicated to safety projects.

³Short Range: 2019-2028

⁴Long Range: 2029-2045

2045 MTP Update

Short Range:	Baseline	\$49,500,000
Long Range:	Medium	\$483,000,000

**Item 9:
2045 Metropolitan
Transportation Plan
Public Workshops**

2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Public Workshops

In preparation for the 2045 MTP update, KTMP will host a series of public workshops and comment periods to inform the public of the Plan update and to obtain the public's perspective on regional priorities. Staff have scheduled workshops in 5 different locations across the MPO region during the month of April.

Public Workshop Dates and Times:

- April 10, 2018—Copperas Cove Police Department, 302 E. Ave E. in Copperas Cove at 12:00pm.
- April 10, 2018- Central Texas Council of Governments, 2180 N. Main Street in Belton at 5:00pm.
- April 16, 2018—Temple Public Library, 100 W. Adams Ave. in Temple at 12:00pm.
- April 17, 2018—Killeen Community Center, 2201 E. Veterans Memorial Blvd. in Killeen at 12:00pm.
- April 17, 2018- Harker Heights Activity Center, 400 Indian Trail in Harker Heights at 5:00pm.

Staff plans to present results of public workshops at the May TAC and TPPB meetings.

A tentative MTP Update schedule is provided below:

February 2018	Discuss public workshops; Discuss fiscal constraint (TRENDS model), project submission forms, project scoring process, and project selection process.
March 2018	Discuss project selection, submission and scoring process; Present TRENDS scenarios for fiscal constraints; Update on public workshops schedule.
April 2018	Public Workshops; Present revised project selection, submission, scoring process from March meetings; Recommendation and approval of project selection, submission, and scoring process, if ready. Approval of fiscal constraint option.
May 2018	Presentation of Public Workshop Results; Prepare for Call for Projects.
May 2018	Task Order for Consultant to conduct objective scores.
June 2018	Prepare for Call for Projects.
July 1, 2018	Open Call for Projects.
August 2018	Midpoint review of draft chapters with TAC and Policy Board.
August 31, 2018	Call for Projects submission deadline.

Late Sept/Early Oct	Project Bus Tour.
September 28, 2018	Objective scores completed by consultant.
October 1, 2018	TAC conducts subjective scoring on their own (3– 4 weeks).
October 26, 2018	TAC subjective scores are due to KTMP.
November 2018	Presentation of scoring results; Discussion and project prioritization.
January 2019	TAC and Policy Board review of Draft 2045 MTP.
March 2019	Public involvement process for Draft 2045 MTP.
May 2019	Adoption of 2045 MTP.

Action Needed: For discussion only.

Item 10:

Public Input Received through

March 31, 2018

Public Input Received through March 31, 2018

Summary:

KTMPO has been collecting public comments received online, via emails, public hearings, meetings, social media accounts, web maps and other forms of communication. We bring these to the TAC and TPPB on a regular basis to ensure the MPO boards are aware of public concerns and have the opportunity to respond accordingly. Public input received through March 31, 2018 is included in meeting packet.

Action Needed: No action at this time; for discussion only.



KTMPO Public Comments

FY18

Date	Name	Means of Public Comment	Public Comment	Date of Responding to Public Comment	Date Comment Was Presented to TAC	Public Comment Topic
10/21/2017	Aimee Nesse	Facebook	Roundabout at Sparta Rd and Commerce St is easy to use. There should be more roundabouts in the region.	10/21/2017	11/1/2017	Roadway
3/21/2018	Ramon Alvarez	Facebook	Veterans Memorial Blvd (Bus 190) thru Killeen and Harker Heights needs to be improved. Revitalizing Veterans Memorial Blvd may increase economic development by infill and redevelopment opportunities along this corridor.	3/21/2018	4/4/2017	Roadway

KTMPO Contacts,
Acronyms, and Terms



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Judge John Firth

Coryell County Main Street Annex
800 E. Main Street, Suite A
Gatesville, TX 76528
Phone: (254) 865-5911, ext. 2221
Fax: (254) 865-2040
county_judge@corvellcounty.org
Alternate: Commissioner Don Jones

Commissioner Mark Rainwater

Lampasas County
P.O. Box 231
Lampasas, TX 76550
Phone: (512)734-0742
Fax: (512)556-8270
rainwater150@gmail.com
Alternate:

Ron Olson

Killeen City Manager
101 N. College St., Killeen, TX, 76541
Phone: (254) 501-7700
rolson@killeentexas.gov
Alternate: David Olson

Vacant

Copperas Cove
P.O. Drawer 1449
Copperas Cove, TX 76522
Phone: (254) 547-4221
Fax: (254) 547-5116
Alternate: Dan Yancey

David R. Mitchell

City Manager
City of Harker Heights
305 Miller's Crossing
Harker Heights, TX 76548
Phone: (254) 953-5600
dmitchell@ci.harker-heights.tx.us
Alternate: Mark Hyde, Joseph Molis

Cheryl Maxwell

Belton Planning Director
333 Water St., Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 933-5812
Fax: (254) 933-5822
cm Maxwell@belontexas.gov
Alternate: Sam Listi

Brian Chandler

Temple Planning Director
2 North Main, Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (254) 298-5272
bchandler@templetx.gov
Alternate: Don Bond, Nicole Torralva,
Lynn Barrett

Bryan Neaves, P.E.

Bell County Engineer
P. O. Box 264, Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 933-5275
Fax: (254) 933-5276
bryan.neaves@bellcounty.texas.gov
Alternate: Stephen Eubanks

Carole Warlick

General Manager, Hill Country Transit
District
P.O. Box 217, San Saba, TX 76877
Phone: (325) 372-4677
Fax: (325) 372-6110
cwarlick@takethehop.com
Alternate: Darrell Burtner

Victor Goebel, P.E.

Director, Transportation Planning &
Development, TxDOT Waco
100 South Loop Drive, Waco TX
76704-2858
Phone: 254-867-2865
Fax: 254-867-2738
victor.goebel@txdot.gov
Alternate: Liz Bullock, Courtney Jones

Jason Scantling, P.E.

Director, Transportation Planning &
Development, TxDOT Brownwood
2495 Hwy 183 North, Brownwood, TX
76802
jason.scantling@txdot.gov

NON VOTING MEMBERS

Keith Gogaz

Deputy to the Garrison Commander
Building 1001, Room W321, Fort
Hood, TX 76544
Phone: (254) 288-3451
Fax: (254) 286-5265
keith.gogaz.civ@mail.mil
Alternate: Brian Dosa

Justin P. Morgan

Federal Highway Administration,
Texas Division
300 East 8th Street, Rm 826
Austin, TX 75093
justin.morgan@dot.gov

Liz Bullock

TxDOT Waco District
Transportation Planner
100 South Loop Drive, Waco TX
76704-2858
Phone: (254) 867-2751
Fax: (254) 867-2738
liz.bullock@txdot.gov

Solomon A. Thomas

TxDOT Waco District/Bell County
Area Engineer
410 West Loop 121
Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 939-3778
solomon.thomas@txdot.gov

Kara Escajeda

Nolanville City Manager
101 North 5th Street
Nolanville, TX 76559
Phone: (254) 698-6335
kara.escajeda@ci.nolanville.tx.us



POLICY BOARD

Chairman:

Mayor Marion Grayson

City of Belton
333 Water Street, Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 718-7878
Fax: (254) 939-0468
mariongrayson@gmail.com
Alternate: Sam Listi, Cheryl Maxwell

Vice Chairman:

Mayor Frank Seffrood

City of Copperas Cove
PO Drawer 1449; 914 S. Main St., Ste. C
Copperas Cove, TX 76522
Phone: (254) 542-8926
fseffrood@copperascovetx.gov
Alternate: Dan Yancey

Commissioner Tim Brown

Bell County
P.O. Box 768, Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 933-5102
Fax: (254) 933-5179
tim.brown@bellcounty.texas.gov
Alternate: Bryan Neaves, P.E.,
Commissioner Bill Schumann

Mayor Tammy Cockrum

Bell County
2 W. Mesquite Ave
Rogers, TX 76569
Phone: (254) 642-3312
Fax: (254) 642-3102
Mayor@cityofrogers.us

Mayor Jose Segarra

City of Killeen
101 N. College Street
Killeen, Texas 76541
mayor@killeentexas.gov
Phone: (254) 290-0548
Alternate: Ron Olson,
Councilmember Jim Kilpatrick,
Amy Burlarley-Hyland

Judge John Firth

Coryell County Main Street Annex
800 E. Main Street, Suite A
Gatesville, TX 76528
Phone: (254) 865-5911, ext. 2221
Fax: (254) 865-2040
county_judge@coryellcounty.org
Alternate: Commissioner Don Jones

Mayor Danny Dunn

City of Temple
1400 S 31st Street
Temple, TX 76504
Phone: (254) 774-7355
ddunn@templetx.gov
Alternate: Brynn Myers, Lynn Barrett,
Nicole Torralva, Brian Chandler

Councilmember Tim Davis

City of Temple
2 North Main #103, Temple TX 76501
Phone: (254) 298-5301
Fax: (254) 298-5637
tdavis@templetx.gov
Alternate: Brynn Myers, Lynn Barrett, Nicole Torralva, Brian
Chandler

Mayor Spencer Smith

City of Harker Heights
305 Miller's Crossing, Harker Heights, TX 76548
Phone: (254) 953-5600
Fax: (254) 953-5605
shsmith@ci.harker-heights.tx.us
Alternate: David Mitchell

Councilmember Juan Rivera

City of Killeen
101 N. College Street
Killeen, TX 76541
Phone: (254) 624-0872
jrivera@killeentexas.gov
Alternate: David Olson, Amy Burlarley-Hyland



POLICY BOARD

Councilmember Gregory Johnson

City of Killeen
101 N. College Street
Killeen, TX 76541
Phone: (254) 702-5162
[gdjohnson@killeentexas.gov](mailto:gjohnson@killeentexas.gov)

Alternate: Ron Olson, Dennis Baldwin, Councilmember
Shirley Fleming, Amy Burlarley-Hyland

Commissioner Mark Rainwater

Lampasas County
P.O. Box 231
Lampasas, TX 76550
Phone: (512)734-0742
Fax: (512)556-8270
rainwater150@gmail.com

Alternate:

Carole Warlick

General Manager, Hill Country Transit District
P.O. Box 217, San Saba, TX 76877
Phone: (325) 372-4677
Fax: (325) 372-6110
cwarlick@takethehop.com

Alternate: Darrell Burtner

Stan Swiatek, P.E.

District Engineer, TxDOT Waco
100 S. Loop Drive
Waco, TX 76704
Phone: (254) 867-2700
Fax: (254) 867-2890
Stan.swiatek@txdot.gov

Alternate: Victor Goebel, Courtney Jones

Elias Rmeili, P.E.

TxDOT Brownwood District Engineer
2495 Hwy 183 North
Brownwood, TX 76802
Phone: (325) 643-0411
Fax: (325) 643-0364
elias.rmeili@txdot.gov

Alternate: Jason Scantling

NON VOTING MEMBERS

Keith Gogaz

Deputy to the Garrison Commander
Building 1001, Room W321, Fort Hood, TX 76544
Phone: (254) 288-3451
Fax: (254) 286-5265
keith.gogaz.civ@mail.mil

Alternate: Brian Dosa, Jon Burrows

Justin P. Morgan

Federal Highway Administration, Texas Division
300 East 8th Street, Rm 826
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 536-5943
Justin.morgan@dot.gov



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chair Kara Escajeda
Nolanville City Manager
101 North 5th Street
Nolanville, TX 76559
Email: kara.escajeda@ci.nolanville.tx.us

Brian Chandler
Temple Planning Director
2 North Main Street
Temple, TX 76501
Email: bchandler@templetx.gov

Matt Bates
Belton Park and Recreation Director
P.O. Box 120
401 N. Alexander
Belton, TX 76513
Email: mbates@beltontexas.gov

Joe Brown
Copperas Cove Park and Recreation Director
1408 Golf Course Road
Copperas Cove, TX 76522
Email: jbrown@copperascovetx.gov

Keith Dyer
Morgan Point Resort Council Member
8 Morgan's Point Blvd.
Morgan's Point Resort, TX 76513
Email: keithdyer82@gmail.com

Leo Mantey
Harker Height City Planner
305 Millers Crossing
Harker Heights, Texas 76548
Email: lmantey@ci.harker-heights.tx.us

Robert Ator
Director of Urban Operations, HCTD
4515 W. US 190
Belton TX 76513
Email: rator@takeethehop.com

Katelyn Kasberg
TxDOT Waco District
100 S. Loop Drive, Waco, TX 76704
Email: Katelyn.Kasberg@txdot.gov

Pamela Terry
Citizen Representative
Email: TERRYP8@nationwide.com

Chad Welch
Tri-City Bicycles/Citizen Representative
1010 Arbor Park
Belton, TX 76513
Email: welchc01@live.com
Alternate: Mike Anderson

Mike Anderson
Tri-City Bicycles/Citizen Alternate
Email: mikeande@att.net

Keller Matthews
BS&W Cycling Club/Citizen Representative
600 S 25th St
Temple, TX
Email: KMATTHEWS@sw.org

Doug Edwards
Central Texas College/Citizen Representative
6200 W. Central Texas Expy
Killeen, TX 76549
Email: doug.edwards@ctcd.edu

Marlene Maciborski
Women on Wheels/Citizen Representative
Email: mdv8ed@hotmail.com

Jimmie McCormack
Team Road Kill/Citizen Representative
Email: Jimmie.l.mccormack@gmail.com

Jay Ford
LoneStar eBikes/Citizen Representative
560 N. Main St. #1
Salado, TX 76502.
Email: Jay@LoneStarEbikes.com

John Wiist
King of the Mountain Cyclery
100 A North Main St.
Nolanville, TX 76559
Email: 1komjohn@gmail.com



FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Liz Bullock

Transportation Planner
TxDOT Waco District
100 South Loop Drive,
Waco TX 76704-2858
Phone: (254) 867-2751
Fax: (254) 867-2738
liz.bullock@txdot.gov

Raul Amado

SVP Logistics
Baylor Scott and White
2401 S. 31st St,
Temple, TX 76508
Phone: (254) 724-6605
ramado@sw.org

Tiffany Melvin

President, NASCO
4347 W. Northwest Hwy,
Suite 130-250
Dallas, TX 75220
Phone: (214) 744-1042
tiffany@nasconetwork.com

David Blackburn

President,
Temple Economic Development
Corporation
1 South 1st St.
Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (254) 773-8332
dblackburn@choosetemple.com

Kara Escajeda

City Manager
City of Nolanville
101 N. 5th St
Nolanville, TX 76559
Phone: (254) 698-6335
Kara.escajeda@ci.nolanville.tx.us

Don Bond

City Engineer
City of Temple
3210 E. Ave H, Bldg. A
Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (254) 298-5660
dbond@templetx.gov

David A. Olson

Public Works Director
City of Killeen
1901 Botanical Dr.
Killeen, TX 76541
Phone: (254) 616-3180
dolson@killeentexas.gov

Georgi Ann Jasenovec

Freight Operations and Int'l Border
FHWA—TX Division
300 E. 8th St.
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: (512) 536-5921
Georgi.jasenovec@dot.gov

Sondra D. Johnson

Transportation Planner—Freight
TxDOT
125 E. 11 St.
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: (512) 936-0922
Sondra.johnson@txdot.gov

Keith Fruge

Chief-Master Planning Branch
Ft. Hood
Bldg 4622 Engineer Dr.
Ft. Hood, TX
Phone: (254) 288-2756
keith.j.fruge.civ@mail.mil

Phil Haggerty

Asst. Superintendent of Business
Services
Belton ISD
P.O. Box 269
Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 215-2065
phil.haggerty@bisd.net

Matthew Van Valkenburgh

Executive Director of Aviation
Killeen-Ft. Hood Regional Airport
8701 S. Clear Creek Rd.
Killeen, TX 76541
Phone: (254) 501-8701
mvanvalkenburgh@killeentexas.gov

James O'Donley

Regional Manager
BNSF Railway-Temple
2100 Barker Blvd.
Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (817) 867-6137
James.odonley@bnsf.com

Michael Bolin, P.E.

Director, Transportation Planning &
Development, TxDOT Waco
100 South Loop Dr.
Waco, TX 76704
Phone: (254) 867-2865
Fax: (254) 867-2738
michael.bolin@txdot.gov

David Lutz

Operations Manager
Temple & Central Texas Railway
(Patriot Way)
3111 Eberhart Rd.
Temple, TX 76504
Phone: (254) 931-9545
David.Lutz@PatriotRail.com



FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kaylon Page

Project Manager
Wheeler Coatings Asphalt (Old
Castle Materials)
1320 Arrow Point Dr. Suite 600
Cedar Park, TX 78613
Phone: 903-348-8651
kaylon.page@oldcastlematerials.com

Barry Egbert

Operations Manager
Wheeler Coatings Asphalt (Old
Castle Materials)
1320 Arrow Point Dr. Suite 600
Cedar Park, TX 78613
Phone: (512) 694-6915
barry.egbert@oldcastlematerials.com

James Tarvin

Operations Manager
Wheeler coatings Asphalt (Old
Castle Materials)
701 S. Loop 340
Waco, TX 76706
Phone: (254) 752-7557
james.tarvin@oldcastlematerials.com

Joe Barber

Manager
Wheeler Coatings Asphalt (Old
Castle Materials)
1320 Arrow Point Dr, Suite 600
Cedar Park, TX 78613
Phone: (512) 861-7100
jbarber@oldcastlematerials.com

Rex Ross

General Manager
Miller Springs Materials
6218 N. Hwy 317
Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 780-9959
rexross@millerspringmaterials.com

Jim Boultinghouse

Quarry Manager
Miller Springs Materials
6218 N. Hwy 317
Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 780-9959
jboultinghouse@prim.com

Rick Lewis

Area Manager, Belton Operations
PSC James Construction Group
5880 W. US 190
Belton, TX 76513
Phone: (254) 939-8610
rlewis@jcqllc.com

Michael Smart

Field Service Representative
DRS Technologies
7720 Airport Blvd, Building 13
Temple, TX 76502
Phone: (254) 770-3220
mrsmart@drs-rsta.com

Brian Ranly

Manager, Logistics & Operations
Wilsonart Inc.
10535 NW HK Dodgen Loop
Temple, TX 76502
Phone: (254) 207-6372
ranlyb@wilsonart.com

Jim Butler

General Manager
Fikes Wholesale
P.O. Box 6115
2828 Industrial Blvd
Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (254) 774-1932
jbutler@gpscarrriers.com

Jim VonAchen

Director of Transportation Support
McLane Company Inc.
P.O. Box 6115
2828 Industrial Blvd
Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (254) 771-7590
jim.vonachen@mcclaneco.com

Danny Rimbart

Transportation Manager
McLane Company Inc
2828 Industrial Blvd
Temple, TX 76501
Phone: (254) 770-2893
danny.rimbart@mcclaneco.com

Ginger Watkins

Economic Development Director
Cameron Industrial Foundation
102 E. First St.
Cameron, TX 76520
Phone: (254) 697-4970
gwatkins@cameronindustrialfoundation.com

Kale Driemeier

Planner, Freight and International
Trade Section
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East 11th St., Austin, TX 78701
Phone: (512) 936-0961
Kale.Driemeier@txdot.gov

Justin Morgan

Transportation Planner
FHWA-Texas Division
J.J. Pickle Federal Building
300 E. 8th Street, Suite 826
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: (512) 536-5943
Justin.Morgan@dot.gov



FREIGHT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

James Mulheron

Traffic Management Specialist
LRC, Transportation Division
Fort Hood
Fort Hood, TX
Phone: (254)553-1921
james.a.mulheron.civ@mail.mil

Daniel Dougherty

LRC, Transportation Division
Fort Hood
Fort Hood, TX
Phone: (254) 288-4587
daniel.w.dougherty.civ@mail.mil

Collin Hill

Location Manger
Livestock Nutrition Center
713 B. Industrial Blvd
Cameron, TX 76520
Phone: (254) 605-0705
collinh@lnc-online.com



STAFF

Jim Reed, AICP

Interim Director

Phone: (254) 770-2200

Fax: (254) 770-2360

jim.reed@ctcog.org

Kendra Coufal

Senior Regional Planner

Phone: (254) 770-2363

Fax: (254) 770-2360

kendra.coufal@ctcog.org

John Weber

Regional Planner

Phone: (254) 770-2366

Fax: (254) 770-2360

john.weber@ctcog.org



Commonly Used Transportation Related Acronyms and Terms

Organizations	Terms
KTMPPO Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization	TMA Transportation Management Area
TPPB (KTMPPO) Transportation Planning Policy Board	MAP - 21 Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 st Century (legislation replaced SAFETEA-LU in July 2012)
TAC (KTMPPO) Technical Advisory Committee	SAFETEA – LU Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act
FHWA U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration	MPO Metropolitan Planning Organization
FTA U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration	UPWP Unified Planning Work Program
TxDOT Texas Department of Transportation	MTP Metropolitan Transportation Plan
TCEQ Texas Commission on Environmental Quality	TIP Transportation Improvement Program
TTI Texas A&M Transportation Institute	STIP Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
CTCOG Central Texas Council of Governments	STP-MM Surface Transportation Program – Metropolitan Mobility
HCTD or “The HOP” Hill Country Transit District	TAP Transportation Alternatives Program
CTRTAG Central Texas Regional Transportation Advisory Group	UTP Unified Transportation Program
BPAC Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee	CMAQ Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
	UA or UZA Urbanized Area
	EJ or “Title VI” Environmental Justice
	CMP Congestion Management Process
	ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems
	NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards

End of Packet