

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 |

