

## APPENDIX C: PROJECT SOLICITATION & EVALUATION

A major component of the long-range plan is identifying regionally significant projects to improve the transportation of people and goods. This federally required project listing is intended to help the region identify and prioritize future transportation investments based on goals, strategies and expected financial resources. The list is also important in terms of future funding, as some federal programs require projects to be listed in the long-range plan. *Transportation Outlook 2040* includes roadway and transit projects, projects that support existing or planned neighborhood and activity centers, regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and projects that support management and operations programs.

### Call for Projects

In August 2009, MARC conducted a call for regionally significant transportation projects that support the long-range plan's adopted policy goals and help address challenges Greater Kansas City is facing. Nearly 50 local jurisdictions and transportation agencies within MARC's planning boundary nominated 600 projects in five categories — totaling \$18.9 billion — to be considered for the plan. Projects were submitted in the following categories:

#### 1. Roadway Projects

- Major roadway projects on facilities classified as minor arterial or higher, and of ½ mile or more in length
- New or major interchanges

#### 2. Transit Projects

- Fixed-guideway and bus-rapid-transit projects
- Regional transit facilities
- Passenger rail and high-speed rail projects

#### 3. Activity Centers/Nodes

- Projects that support existing or planned neighborhood centers
- Projects that support existing or planned activity centers

#### 4. Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

- Projects that are multijurisdictional
- Projects that cross major barriers
- Projects that connect existing facilities

#### 5. Management and Operations Programs

- Regional or multijurisdictional transportation system management or transportation demand management programs
- Regional environmental mitigation strategies

Projects listed in the existing long-range plan, *Transportation Outlook 2030 Update*, were not automatically carried forward into the new plan, except for those that are part of the *2008–2012 Transportation Improvement Program*. All other projects — new or old — had to be nominated again

due to changing federal financial and environmental integration guidelines and to support a new policy direction for *Transportation Outlook 2040*.

MARC staff hosted a workshop on Aug. 12, 2009, to explain the project nomination and evaluation process, walk through the submission database, and allow time for questions from project sponsors. Responses to commonly asked questions were posted online as a resource.

MARC created two online mapping applications that provided relevant information to jurisdictions nominating projects. Both maps displayed the functional class of roadways and the regional congestion management system. Both maps also could be used to view the proximity of nominated projects to important regional assets, like MetroGreen® corridors and activity centers. The Google viewer was strictly for viewing and let users see one map overlay at a time. In contrast, the ESRI viewer let users see multiple map overlays at a time, click on features to get more information about them, and make simple measurements.

**Layers in the ESRI viewer:**

- Street base map
- Functional class roads
- Congestion management network
- MetroGreen®
- Activity centers and nodes
- Existing land use
- Environmental justice tracts

Jurisdictions (cities, counties and states) and transportation agencies located within MARC’s metropolitan planning boundary —Johnson, Leavenworth and Wyandotte counties in Kansas, and Cass, Clay, Jackson and Platte counties in Missouri — were eligible to nominate projects for consideration.

**Summary of nominated projects**

<b>TRANSPORTATION OUTLOOK 2040 PROJECTS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>KANSAS</b>	<b>MISSOURI</b>
	<b>600</b>	256	344
<b>PRIMARY CATEGORY</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>KANSAS</b>	<b>MISSOURI</b>
Roadway	<b>442</b>	203	239
Transit	<b>30</b>	8	22
Activity Centers & Nodes	<b>35</b>	10	25
Bicycle & Pedestrian	<b>78</b>	32	46
Management & Operations	<b>15</b>	3	12

<b>TRANSPORTATION OUTLOOK 2040 PROJECTS</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>KANSAS</b>	<b>MISSOURI</b>
	<b>\$ 18,858,251,048</b>	\$ 6,554,384,865	\$ 12,303,866,184
<b>PRIMARY CATEGORY</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>KANSAS</b>	<b>MISSOURI</b>
Roadway	<b>\$ 13,234,538,046</b>	\$ 5,820,230,630	\$ 7,414,307,416
Transit	<b>\$ 4,152,765,000</b>	\$ 421,200,000	\$ 3,731,565,000
Activity Centers & Nodes	<b>\$ 552,258,068</b>	\$ 145,630,000	\$ 406,628,068
Bicycle & Pedestrian	<b>\$ 450,794,935</b>	\$ 162,449,235	\$ 288,345,700
Management & Operations	<b>\$ 467,895,000</b>	\$ 4,875,000	\$ 463,020,000

## Evaluation and Recommendation Process

### Scoring Criteria

Early in the planning process, broad policy goals were identified— major objectives to achieve in planning Greater Kansas City’s transportation system. These include supporting accessibility and economic vitality, protecting the environment, decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, creating livable communities, encouraging healthy living, improving safety and security, and making sure the transportation system is well maintained and efficient. MARC staff reviewed projects in light of the policy goals and criteria listed below:

<b>POLICY GOALS</b>	<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Accessibility</b>	The number of transportation modes directly integrated	5	10
	Improves access to or from environmental justice tracts	5	
<b>Economic Vitality</b>	Serves regional activity and employment centers	5	10
	Supports the regional freight network	5	
<b>Energy Use and Climate Change</b>	Reduces greenhouse gas emissions and/or reduces the use of carbon-based fuel	10	10
<b>Environment</b>	Preserves or restores environmentally sensitive lands, cultural resources and agricultural lands and/or includes an environmental mitigation plan	5	10
	Helps implement or connect MetroGreen® regional trails and greenways system	5	
<b>Place Making</b>	Is supported by or included in a regional plan or study and/or local land-use plan	5	10
	Supports Creating Quality Places factors (i.e., livable communities)	5	

<b>Public Health</b>	Promotes increased non-motorized travel	5	10
	Reduces ozone precursor emissions	5	
<b>Safety and Security</b>	Addresses an identified safety hot spot	10	10
<b>System Condition</b>	Increases useful life of existing facility	10	15
	Addresses a deferred maintenance or system maintenance need	5	
<b>System Performance</b>	Increases efficiency of existing system	5	15
	Reduces current congestion	5	
	Volume of travel (annual average daily traffic, passenger volume)	5	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>			<b>100</b>

During late 2009, MARC staff conducted initial technical analysis for submissions in each project category. Projects were scored based on how well they met solicitation criteria and supported the policy goals of *Transportation Outlook 2040*. These scores served as one tool to evaluate submissions and were supplemented by MARC committee review, follow-up technical analysis, and public and stakeholder input.

Beginning in October 2009 and running through early 2010, transportation modal committees — made up of elected officials and local planners and engineers — reviewed staff scores, and further evaluated and prioritized projects. While all MARC transportation committees were able to review submissions and category summaries, the designated planning and review committees are identified below. They developed prioritized recommendations for the project listing in *Transportation Outlook 2040*.

<b>PROJECT CATEGORY</b>	<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE</b>
Roadway Projects	Highway Committee
Transit Projects	Transit Committee
Activity Centers/Nodes Projects	Technical Forecast Committee
Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Projects	Bicycle–Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Management and Operations Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional TSM or TDM programs</li> <li>• Regional mitigation strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management and Operations Workgroup</li> <li>• Linking Environmental and Transportation Planning Advisory Group</li> </ul>

All projects in *Transportation Outlook 2040* were screened through the regional Congestion Management Process (CMP) network, and all applicants were asked to describe the strategies from the MARC Congestion Management Toolbox that were incorporated in the project scope. Priority was given to projects on congested segments of the CMP network and to those that incorporated multiple

congestion management strategies. Language to this effect has been added to both the Congestion Management and Streets and Highways chapters of *Transportation Outlook 2040*.

The committees built on information and scores provided, and identified gaps, assessed priorities, and considered financial capacities. Modal committees recommended projects to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Subcommittee for their consideration. The LRTP Subcommittee drafted a financially constrained listing of regionally significant projects for the Total Transportation Policy Committee and the MARC Board to consider adopting.

See modal chapters 3.0 through 13.0 for specific information. See Appendix A: Regionally Significant Project Listing for full list of projects and costs by decade.

During August and September 2009, the public was encouraged to review and offer feedback on projects nominated for *Transportation Outlook 2040*. All public feedback was posted online and was shared with regional transportation committees that evaluate and recommend projects. Project analysis information was available on the Web site.

### Financial Constraint

*Transportation Outlook 2040* included a new project solicitation and prioritization process to support the adopted policy direction, in addition to fulfilling new federal requirements for year-of-expenditure financial planning and environmental integration. MARC had to forecast how much revenue the region could reasonably expect to receive from federal, state and local sources in the next three decades, and develop a list of projects that meet stated goals and can be afforded. (See Appendix C: Financial Capacity Analysis)

This requirement of the plan presented significant challenges. In addition to the inherent complexity of forecasting, transportation funding from the federal and state governments has been in flux, and local governments do not expect their funding levels to increase much in the coming years, based on the current economic outlook. The region will have tough decisions to make about priorities.

<b>Transportation Outlook 2040 Financial Capacity Summary*</b>						
<b>PROJECT CATEGORY</b>	<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>OPERATIONS &amp; MAINTENANCE COSTS</b>	<b>FINANCIAL CAPACITY</b>	<b>NOMINATED PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>DIFFERENCE</b>	<b>PERCENT WE CAN AFFORD</b>
Roadway	\$16,855,924,542	\$8,815,291,978	\$8,040,632,564	\$14,548,723,733	-\$6,508,091,169	55%
Transit	\$4,312,460,458	\$3,796,067,798	\$516,392,659	\$3,703,705,000	-\$3,187,312,341	14%
Bicycle/Pedestrian	\$309,580,000	N/A	\$309,580,000	\$411,256,635	-\$101,676,635	75%
Activity Centers & Nodes	---	---	---	\$552,258,068	-\$552,258,068	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$21,477,965,000</b>	<b>\$12,611,359,776</b>	<b>\$8,866,605,223</b>	<b>\$19,215,943,436</b>	<b>-\$10,349,338,213</b>	<b>46%</b>

\* Summary based on historical funding allocations.