



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 its 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. Only construction phase funding is available through the CFP. Project sponsors are responsible for funding pre-construction activities (for example, feasibility studies and preliminary engineering).

If a project receives a sufficient score and fulfills a demonstrated need within the 25-year planning horizon of the MTP, the project may be included in the fiscally constrained MTP. Projects included in the fiscally constrained MTP may 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, and other FAST ACT programs. In early screening, each project will be assigned to a preliminary funding category that aligns with the project scope, purpose and need. The preliminary funding categories will be used to perform a financial analysis of the proposed MTP program of projects.

A listing of funding categories used in the Texas Unified Transportation Program (UTP) and Texas Metropolitan Planning Programs is provided in Appendix A of this document. Although there are twelve funding categories, not all funding categories are available for use in developing the MTP. The categories available to fund the MTP in a given cycle depend on current national and state funding guidelines and the collaborative dialogue between the State and the MPO. The planned funding allocation is then documented in the Texas UTP, which guides the allocation of available funding resources for the upcoming 10 years.

This CFP describes a detailed process for submission of a project. The projects will be evaluated and scored by the KTMPO Staff or designee (using objective criteria) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) (using 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 [James McGill](mailto:James.McGill@ctcog.org) at james.mcgill@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 **October 30, 2020**.

All submittals must be received by KTMPO by 12:00 PM on **November 13, 2020** via physical electronic media or email. For large files, contact KTMPO 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

By Mail

Central Texas Council of
Governments Attention: James
McGill
P.O. Box 729
Belton, Texas
76513

By Email: james.mcgill@ctcog.org

Hand Delivery

Central Texas Council of
Governments Attention: James
McGill
2180 North Main
Belton, Texas 76513

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; and
- 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 UTP projected funding available during that 10-year period. The planned KTMPO UTP funding allocation by category is provided in Appendix B. These funding allocations are subject to change over time as the UTP is amended to address new National or State programs, or fiscal circumstances change with the economy.

Projects programmed for implementation in the long-range component of the plan must also be fiscally constrained based upon the projected future categorical funding levels. Projects that are advanced to the four-year TIP have received dedicated funding. Because of the limited resources available, not all projects that are submitted to the CFP can be included in the fiscally constrained MTP. Therefore, 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, the projects 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 12:00 PM on **November 13, 2020**.

All projects submitted to KTMPO will be reviewed by staff to ensure that the submittals are responsive to all required scoring criteria as well as to identify any fatal flaws in project feasibility or eligibility. Sponsors are encouraged to contact KTMPO for guidance or interpretation as early as possible in the application process for advice and feedback. KTMPO staff may call upon TxDOT or other subject matter experts for support in examining feasibility or eligibility.

Projects which are non-responsive, or with identified feasibility or eligibility defects, will be returned to the submitting member with notes to enable the member to cure any defects, update their application and re-submit their project. All projects without defects which are evaluated as responsive and containing all the required information will be assigned to a funding category and proceed to the scoring process.

Projects that are currently in the 2045 MTP project list will not be automatically carried forward during the 2020 Reprioritization of the MTP. All projects not in the TIP must be resubmitted to be included in this reprioritization. Legacy projects may use the same narrative as used during the 2018 Reprioritization, but all projects will be rescored, so an updated application packet that is reflective of the revised scoring criteria may be beneficial to the project scoring.

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. The submittal must also 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. In addition, the submittal must include 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 describe the following:

- The primary issue which requires correction or enhancement and describe how the

project will address the issue.

- 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 the project addresses the overall vision of developing a fully integrated, multimodal transportation system for people and freight, and how the project addresses KTMPO long-range goals adopted in the MTP. This narrative is a critical component of the application because it serves as a guide to understanding project value in addressing each of the subjective scoring criteria. Topics to be included in this section may include the following:
 - Connectivity
 - Local Support
 - Scope of Benefit
 - Environmental Justice
 - Environmental Mitigation
 - Multi-Modal Support
 - Security & Reliability
 - Transportation Enhancements and Livability
 - Sustainability
 - Complete-Streets design elements inherent in the project
 - Economic Development Travel and Tourism
 - Freight
- **Exhibit C:** The project submittal must include a map of the 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 criterion. 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 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 respective 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 5 points given for a project's linkage to current planning documents.
- Local Priority and Support, with a maximum of 5 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: KTMP Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation

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

Step 1: All projects will receive scores for the objective criteria through a third-party consultant. KTMP staff will deliver objective scores to each entity on **December 31, 2020**. TAC members may question any project's objective score for any criteria. KTMP 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 KTMP Staff, a dispute still exists.

Step 2: All projects will receive scores for the subjective criteria. Subjective scoring will be conducted by the TAC. TAC subjective scores will need to be submitted to KTMP by **February 3, 2021**.

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 criterion.
- The characteristic must have a regional benefit.

KTMPO Project Scoring Process

- 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, i.e., 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 track. To break ties, the highest subjective score of the tied projects will be used as the first tiebreaker. If projects remain 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. The TAC will be given the opportunity to develop a funding order based on 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 5 points each; 10 points maximum—Objective

Scoring is based on existing LOS and the expected 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, travel demand model (TDM) based criteria.

Existing LOS		2045 Build vs No Build Change in LOS	
A	0 points	F to E	2 points*
B	1 point	E to D	2 points
C	2 point	D to C	1 point
D	3 points	C to B	1 point
E	4 points	B to A	0 points
F	5 points	A	0 points
*Scores are cumulative as LOS descends to a maximum of 5 points			

2 Traffic

0 to 10 points

This criterion considers the current and forecasted traffic volume in two parts: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), and connections to major activity centers that support peak hour traffic flow.

Part A: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) 0 to 5 points each total 10 points—Objective

The scoring criterion 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 criterion 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. Roadways with high traffic growth are responding to regional travel patterns and will score better. This is an objective criterion based on model-based estimates of AADT.

Current AADT		Change in AADT
40,000+	5 points	5 points
20,000 to 39,999	4 points	5 points
10,000 to 19,499	3 points	3 points
5,000 to 9,999	2 points	2 points
2,500 to 4,999	1 point	1 point
<2,500	0 point	0 points

Part B: Connections to Major Activity Centers

0 to 5 points—Objective

This criterion 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 (malls, hospitals, colleges, airports, Fort Hood, large commercial developments, and schools), 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 criterion.

	Points
2 or more activity centers within 0.5 miles	5 points
1 activity center within 0.5 miles	3 points
Does not connect to a special generator	0 points

3 Safety

0 to 5 points; 10 points maximum

This criterion 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 criterion: the five-year rolling average fatality rate, and the five-year rolling average serious injury rate.

Part A: Fatality Rate

0 to 5 points—Objective

This criterion 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 2.5 points for this criterion for meeting the statewide average rates. This criterion is objective.

	Points
More than 10% worse than statewide fatality rate	4 points
0 to 10% worse than statewide fatality rate	3 point
0 to 10% better than the statewide fatality rate	2 points
More than 10% better than statewide fatality rate	1 point
Has experienced non-vehicular fatalities	+1 point

Part B: Serious Injury Rate

0 to 5 points—Objective

This criterion 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 2.5 points for this criterion for meeting the statewide average rates. This criterion is objective.

	Points
More than 10% worse than statewide serious injury rate	4 points
0 to 10% worse than statewide serious injury rate	3 point
0 to 10% better than statewide serious injury rate	2 points
More than 10% better than statewide serious injury rate	1 point
Has experienced non-vehicular serious injuries	+1 point

4 Asset Management

0 to 5 points—Objective

This criterion references the project’s connection to the strategic and systemic management of physical assets within the transportation system. This measures an agency’s ability to operate, maintain, and improve physical assets with a focus on engineering and economic analysis, to identify a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired ‘state of good repair’ over the lifecycle of the assets. The categories of assets are evaluated in similar but different ways, for example:

- Bridges are rated on a structural sufficiency rating with a scale of 0 to 100 with 100 being excellent.
- Roadways are rated using a pavement condition index (PCI) on a scale from 0 to 100
- Transit assets such as rolling stock (revenue and non-revenue vehicles) are rated using a useful life benchmark (ULB) and facilities are rated using a Transit Economic Requirements (TERM) Scale).

The criterion is an objective measure.

	Points
100% improvement in benchmark criteria	4 points
75% improvement	3 points
50% improvement	2 points
25% improvement	1 point
<25% improvement	0 points
Facility on the Interstate or NHS System	+1 point

5 Resiliency

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

Resiliency is the ability of a transportation facility to survive or, in the alternative, recover from natural disasters such as floods, fires, and other major weather events. Resiliency is a hybrid category that has two points. The roadway or other transportation facility receives a vulnerability assessment score using available GIS data (e.g. flood insurance rate maps (FIRM)) and the FHWA vulnerability assessment tool to provide a vulnerability score. The TAC project evaluation team then scores the project based on its anticipated ability to address or mitigate this vulnerability. The two factors are combined to calculate the final score.

	Points
Project does not reduce vulnerability	0 points
Project has some features likely to contribute to a moderate/general reduction in vulnerability	up to 2.5 points
Project provides specific resiliency enhancements targeted to significantly reduce vulnerability	up to 5.0 points

6 Linkage to MTP or Other Plan

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

This criterion references the project’s inclusion in the current MTP or other plans. This criterion 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 criterion is both objective and subjective.

	Points
In the current MTP funded project list	2 points
In the current MTP regionally significant/unfunded List	1 point
In current Regional Multimodal Plan	2 point
On a segment of the current Congestion Management Process network	1 point

7 Local Priority & Support

0 to 5 points each; 20 points maximum

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

Part A: Local Priority

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

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 within each respective evaluation track are listed in order by the member.** KTMPO staff will use the preference list as an objective criterion 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	1 point
Preference #6 and lower	0 points

Part B: Future Growth Area

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

This criterion references the project’s proximity to anticipated future growth areas and the ability to provide a direct benefit to mobility and/or access of that area. This criterion measures whether the project serves the community by ensuring the project investment is in line with the anticipated growth of the region. Future growth areas are defined by KTMPO approved future population and employment estimations for the region. Mobility and access can be analyzed as positive changes in anticipated congestion or travel time savings. This criterion is both objective and subjective.

	Points
Located in a future growth area and provides direct benefit	4 to 5 points
Located in a future growth area and does not provide direct benefit	2 to 3 points
Located outside of a future growth area and does not provide direct benefit	0 to 1 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 criterion measures how well the project improves that connectivity or closes a gap in the overall network. Scores are subjective and cumulative. A project receives 2 points for closing a gap in the roadway network and additional points for closing gaps in the pedestrian/bike or transit network. A project receives an additional point if it serves a role in promoting overall regional multimodal connectivity. This is a subjective criterion.

	Points
Closes a gap in the roadway network	2 points
Closes a gap in the bike – pedestrian	+1 point
Closes a gap in the transit network	+1 point
Supports regional system connectivity	+1 point

Part D: 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 criterion 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

8 Project Scope

0 to 5 points each; 50 points maximum

Part A: Scope of Benefit

0 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 criterion.

	Points
Regional Benefit	4 to 5 points
Benefit within KTMP	2 to 3 points
Local Benefit	0 to 2 points

Part B: Environmental Justice (EJ)

0 to 5 points—Subjective

The purpose of Environmental Justice (EJ) is to ensure that all communities, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, live in a safe and healthful environment and receive fair treatment. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.

Environmental Justice Communities of Concern (EJCOC) are defined by KTMP. The criterion 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.

This is a subjective criterion that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation. If a project positively impacts an EJ area it will score higher, but if it has no benefit to an EJ area it will score 0 points. If during the preliminary screening by staff, a project is identified as having a potentially negative impact on an EJ area, the project may not be scored until the project sponsor identifies and adds project components designed to eliminate or mitigate the negative impacts.

	Points
Provides specific benefits directed to an EJ area	3 to 5 points
Provides general benefit to region including EJ Areas	1 to 2 points
Provides no benefit to an EJ Area	0 points

Part C: Environmental Mitigation

0 to 5 points—Subjective

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 2045 MTP to include natural or recreational areas, archaeological sites, historic structures, landfills, watersheds, aquifers, and endangered species.

Actions that are defined as acts of environmental mitigation include avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing over time, and compensating for impacts. 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 criterion. This is a subjective criterion that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation. If a project is not in an environmentally sensitive area and has no negative impacts on the environment (including regional air quality impacts) and no mitigation is needed, then the project scores 5 points. If a project is in a sensitive area or has negative environmental impacts the project scores between 0 and 4 points depending on the level of the environmental impacts and the level and effectiveness of mitigation proposed to off-set those impacts.

	Points
No negative environmental impacts (including AQ)	5 points
Minor negative impacts with substantial mitigation / elimination of impacts	3-4 points
Moderate negative impacts / adequate offsetting mitigation	2-3 points
Substantial negative impacts / adequate offsetting mitigation	1-2 points
Substantial negative impacts / little or no mitigation	0 points*
* Sponsor may be asked to revise and strengthen mitigation plan before the project is scored	

Part D: Economic Development including Travel/Tourism

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 travel and tourism through providing access to all modes of transportation, allowing all types of tourists to easily navigate throughout the area. 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 travel/tourism	0 to 2 points
Supports economic activity	0 to 1 point

Part E: 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 criterion that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Supports additional modes	1 to 5 points
Supports only the highway mode	0 points

Part F: Security + Reliability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

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

Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) projects, which often use intelligent transportation system (ITS) strategies such as variable message signs and active lane control are key components of most security and reliability strategies and would be expected to score high in this category.

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 criterion to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

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

	Points
Lies on a designated evacuation corridor	0 to 1 point
Enhances access for emergency services and other first responders	0 to 2 points
Provides or promotes use of alternate or bypass routes	0 to 1 point
Promotes communication / management of traffic	0 to 1 point

Part G: 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 criterion 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 criterion.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criterion 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 H: Sustainability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

This criterion 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, 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 subjective criterion 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

Part I: Complete Streets

0 to 5 points—Subjective

A Complete Streets approach integrates people and place in the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the transportation network. The Complete-Streets approach helps to ensure streets are safe for people of all ages and abilities, balance the needs of different modes, and support local land uses, economies, cultures, and natural environments.

This criterion measures how a project takes into account access for all modes of transportation. The Complete-Streets Streets approach promotes designs that provide for everyone, regardless of age, ability, income, race, or ethnicity, to have safe, comfortable, and convenient access to community destinations and public places—whether walking, driving, bicycling, or taking public transportation. Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is subjective criterion to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Project incorporates a Complete-Streets approach	0 to 5 points

Part J: Freight

0 to 5 points—Subjective

This criterion measures how a project contributes to the investment in freight infrastructure and operational improvements, that as a result, strengthen economic stability, reduce congestion, lower costs of freight movement, improve reliability, increase productivity, improve safety (for example, truck safety rest areas), and reduce the number of environmental impacts as a result of freight activity. Consideration should be given to how well the project reduces overall freight delay as well as providing first mile/last mile solutions to improve access to major freight generators.

	Points
Increases reliability	1 point
Strengthens economic stability	1 point
Reduces congestion	1 point
Improves safety	1 point
Reduces environmental impacts	1 point

Transportation Choices and Livability Evaluation Track

1 Connectivity & Service Gaps

0 to 5 points each; 35 points maximum

Part A: Connections to Major Activity Centers

0 to 5 points—Objective

This criterion 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 (malls, hospitals, colleges, airports, Fort Hood, large commercial developments, and schools), 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. This is an objective criterion.

	Points
2 or more activity centers within 0.5 miles	5 points
1 activity center within 0.5 miles	3 points
Does not connect to a major activity center	0 points

Part B: Eliminates Barriers

0 to 5 points each; 15 points maximum—Subjective

This criterion 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. Categories relate to benefit to specific users, communities, or active transportation trip generators. This is a subjective criterion.

	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 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 criterion measures how well the project improves that connectivity or closes a gap in the overall network. Scores are subjective and cumulative. A project receives 2 points for closing a gap in the roadway network that supports transit

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

This criterion rates a project on how it enhances the safety of pedestrians or bicyclists on the active transportation network. This criterion 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 an active transportation connection to a school	0 to 5 points
Mitigates or eliminates identified hazards	0 to 5 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 by providing active transportation facilities which directly connect to or serve a school.

Part C: Mitigates or Eliminates 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 could trap bicycle tires. Scoring is based on project potential to remove or reduce the hazard with design improvements. Such as new pedestrian signals, mid-block crossings, or pedestrian refuge islands.

Part D: Fatality / Serious Injury Rate 0 to 5 points—Objective

This criterion measures the project location’s number of fatalities and serious injuries 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 2.5 points for this criterion for meeting the statewide average rates. This criterion is objective.

	Points
More than 10% higher than statewide fatality rate	4 points
0 to 10% higher than statewide fatality rate	3 point
0 to 10% lower than the statewide fatality rate	2 points
More than 10% lower than statewide fatality rate	1 point
Non-vehicular fatalities	+1 point

4 Linkage to MTP or Other Plan

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

This criterion references the project’s inclusion in the current MTP or other plans. This criterion 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 criterion is both objective and subjective.

	Points
In the current MTP funded project list	2 points
In the current MTP regionally significant/unfunded List	1 point
In current Regional Multimodal Plan	1 point
On a segment of the current Congestion Management Process network	1 point

5 Local Priority & Support

0 to 5 points each; 10 points maximum

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

Part A: Local Priority

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

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 within each respective evaluation track are listed in order by the member. KTMPO staff will use the preference list as an objective criterion 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	1 point
Preference #6 and lower	0 points

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 criterion 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; 45 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 criterion.

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

Part B: Environmental Justice

0 to 5 points—Subjective

The purpose of Environmental Justice (EJ) is to ensure that all communities, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, live in a safe and healthful environment and receive fair treatment. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic group should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.

Environmental Justice Communities of Concern (EJCOC) are defined by KTMPPO. The criterion 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.

This is a subjective criterion that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation. If a project positively impacts an EJ area it will score higher, but if it has no benefit to an EJ area it will score 0 points. If during the preliminary screening by staff, a project is identified as having a potentially negative impact on an EJ area, the project may not be scored until the project sponsor identifies and adds project components designed to eliminate or mitigate the negative impacts.

	Points
Provides specific benefits directed to an EJ area	3 to 5 points
Provides general benefit to region including EJ Areas	1 to 2 points
provides no benefit to an EJ Area	0 points

Part C: Environmental Mitigation

0 to 5 points—Subjective

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 2045 MTP to include natural or recreational areas, archaeological sites, historic structures, landfills, watersheds, aquifers, and endangered species. Actions that are defined as acts of environmental mitigation include avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing over time, and compensating for impacts. 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 criterion. This is a subjective criterion that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation. If a project is not in an environmentally sensitive area and has no negative impacts on the environment (including regional air quality impacts) and no mitigation is needed, then the project scores 5 points. If a project is in a sensitive area or has negative environmental impacts the project scores between 0 and 4 points depending on the level of the environmental impacts and the level and effectiveness of mitigation proposed to off-set those impacts.

	Points
No negative environmental impacts (including AQ)	5 points
Minor negative impacts with substantial mitigation / elimination of impacts	3-4 points
Moderate negative impacts / adequate offsetting mitigation	2-3 points
Substantial negative impacts / adequate offsetting mitigation	1-2 points
Substantial negative impacts / little or no mitigation	0 points*
* Sponsor may be asked to revise and strengthen mitigation plan before the project is scored	

Part D: Economic Development including Travel/Tourism

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 travel and tourism through providing access to all modes of transportation, allowing all types of tourists to easily navigate throughout the area. 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 travel/tourism	0 to 2 points
Supports economic activity	0 to 1 point

Part E: 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 criterion that will be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Supports additional modes	1 to 5 points
Supports only the highway mode	0 points

Part F: Security + Reliability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

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

Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) projects, which often use intelligent transportation system (ITS) strategies such as variable message signs and active lane control are key components of most security and reliability strategies and would be expected to score high in this category.

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 criterion to be scored based on the submitting member’s documentation.

	Points
Lies on a designated evacuation corridor	0 to 1 point
Enhances access for emergency services and other first responders	0 to 2 points
Provides or promotes use of alternate or bypass routes	0 to 1 point
Promotes communication / management of traffic	0 to 1 point

Part G: Resiliency

0 to 5 points—Objective/Subjective

Resiliency is the ability of a transportation facility to survive or, in the alternative, recover from natural disasters such as floods, fires, and other major weather events. Resiliency is a hybrid category that has two points. The roadway or other transportation facility receives a vulnerability assessment score using available GIS data (e.g. flood insurance rate maps (FIRM)) and the FHWA vulnerability assessment tool to provide a vulnerability score. The TAC project evaluation team then scores the project based on its anticipated ability to address or mitigate this vulnerability. The two factors are combined to calculate the final score.

	Points
Project does not reduce vulnerability	0 points
Project has some features likely to contribute to a moderate/general reduction in vulnerability	up to 2.5 points
Project provides specific resiliency enhancements targeted to significantly reduce vulnerability	up to 5.0 points

Part H: 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 criterion 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 criterion.

Scoring is cumulative to a maximum of 5 points. This is a subjective criterion 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 I: Sustainability

0 to 5 points—Subjective

This criterion 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, 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 subjective criterion 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

Appendix A

Texas Funding Program Categories

In Texas, transportation funding is apportioned through 12 funding categories. Categories 1-9 combine formula funding from both federal (FAHP) and state programs. Categories 10, 11, and 12 are strategic and discretionary funding categories. The following lists and provides a general overview of each funding category.

- **Category 1 - Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation:** Preventive maintenance and rehabilitation on the existing state highway system, including minor roadway modifications to improve operations and safety; and the installation, rehabilitation, replacement, and maintenance of pavement, bridges, traffic control devices, traffic management systems, and ancillary traffic devices.
- **Category 2 - Metropolitan and Urban Area Corridor Projects:** Mobility and added capacity projects along a corridor that improve transportation facilities in order to decrease travel time and the level or duration of traffic congestion, and safety, maintenance, or rehabilitation projects that increase the safe and efficient movement of people and freight in metropolitan and urbanized areas.
- **Category 3 - Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Projects:** Transportation-related projects that qualify for funding from sources not traditionally part of the state highway fund including state bond financing under programs such as Proposition 12 (General Obligation Bonds), Texas Mobility Fund, pass through toll financing, unique federal funding, regional toll revenue, and local participation funding. For KTMP roadways, funding for any project with Category 3 funds is determined by state legislation, Texas Transportation Commission approved minute order, or local government commitments.
- **Category 4 - Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects:** Mobility and added capacity projects on major state highway system corridors which provide statewide connectivity between urban areas and corridors, to create a highway connectivity network composed of the Texas Highway Trunk System, National Highway System, and connections from those two systems to major ports of entry on international borders and Texas water ports.
- **Category 5 - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement:** Congestion mitigation and air quality improvement area projects to address attainment of a national ambient air quality standard in nonattainment areas of the state. KTMP is in attainment status as of 2019; projects in the MTP are not eligible for Category 5 funds at this time.
- **Category 6 - Structures Replacement and Rehabilitation Bridge Program; Railroad Grade Separation Program:** Replacement and rehabilitation of deficient existing bridges located on public highways, roads, and streets in the state; construction of grade separations at existing highway and railroad grade crossings; and rehabilitation of deficient railroad underpasses on the state highway system. Bridge projects in the MTP may be eligible for Category 6 funding if they meet established criteria.
- **Category 7 - Metropolitan Mobility/Rehabilitation:** Transportation needs within the boundaries of designated metropolitan planning areas of metropolitan planning organizations located in a transportation management area (TMA). The KTMP study area was designated a TMA based on the 2010 US Census, and therefore projects in the

MTP are eligible for Category 7 funds.

- Category 8 – Safety: Safety-related projects both on and off the state highway system including the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program, Railway-Highway Crossing Program, Safety Bond Program, and High-Risk Rural Roads Program. Projects in the MTP may be eligible for Category 8 funding if they improve safety.
- Category 9 - Transportation Alternatives Program: Transportation-related activities as described in the Transportation Alternatives Set -Aside Program, such as on and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and infrastructure projects for improving access to public transportation.
- Category 10 – Supplemental Transportation Projects: Transportation-related projects that do not qualify for funding in other categories, including landscape and aesthetic improvement, erosion control and environmental mitigation, construction and rehabilitation of roadways within or adjacent to state parks, fish hatcheries, and similar facilities, replacement of railroad crossing surfaces, maintenance of railroad signals, construction or replacement of curb ramps for accessibility to pedestrians with disabilities, and miscellaneous federal programs. No projects in the MTP qualify for Category 10 funding.
- Category 11 – District Discretionary: Projects eligible for federal or state funding selected at the district engineer’s discretion. TxDOT districts select projects using a performance-based prioritization process that assesses district-wide maintenance, safety, or mobility needs. Projects in the MTP may be considered for funding under the Cat 11 District Discretionary program.
- Category 12 – Strategic Priority: Projects with specific importance to the state including those that generally promote economic opportunity, increase efficiency on military deployment routes or retain military assets in response to the federal military base realignment and closure reports, and maintain the ability to respond to both man made and natural emergencies.

Appendix B

Unified Transportation Program (UTP) Funding Allocation

The following table shows the 2020 UTP funding targets for the KTMPO region for fiscal years 2020 through 2029. The cost of projects included in the 10-year short range plan component of the 2045 MTP must come from the allocated categories and cannot exceed UTP projected funding available during that 10-year period. These designated funding allocations are subject to change over time as the UTP is amended to address new National or State programs, or fiscal circumstances change with the economy.

KTMPO 2020 UTP Planning Targets Fiscal Years 2020 to 2029											
Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3	Cat 4	Cat 5	Cat 6	Cat 7	Cat 8	Cat 9	Cat 10	Cat 11	Cat 12
	\$ 227,380,000					\$ 60,440,000		\$ 3,900,000			

Projects programmed for implementation in the long-range component of the 2045 MTP must also be fiscally constrained based upon the projected future categorical funding levels. Those long-range funds (for years 11 through 25) would be in addition to the planned allocations presented above.

Note: The following is the DRAFT planned allocation for the 2021 UTP covering the period 2021 to 2030

KTMPO DRAFT 2021 UTP Planning Targets Fiscal Years 2021 to 2030											
Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3	Cat 4	Cat 5	Cat 6	Cat 7	Cat 8	Cat 9	Cat 10	Cat 11	Cat 12
	189,232,732					61,317,870		3,940,100			