Project Evaluation Criteria
Draft evaluation criteria presented at workshop on Dec. 18.

Feedback included:
  - Shorten and simplify criteria.
  - Consolidate and clarify questions.
  - Define the weight of questions/points.

Feedback incorporated into this draft.
Review Criteria

• Sections:
  - Project Description
  - Data and Technology
  - Project Readiness & Fiscal Sustainability
  - Regional Plans, Policies and Strategies
  - Centers and Corridors Focus
  - Access to Opportunities
  - Economic Vitality
  - Transportation Choices
  - Public Health & Safety
  - Healthy Environment

Unscored
Review Criteria

- What’s your reaction to the proposed evaluation criteria? Any feedback/comments/thoughts?
Review Criteria

Please fill out RTP2050 Evaluation Criteria worksheet.

Visit pollev.com/marckc on your phone or mobile device.

We will ask a series of questions to gather your feedback.
Scenario Analysis Update
Let it ride

Trend growth scenario

Within redevelopment area:

• Population growth: 30%
  (150k out of 500k)
• Job growth: 50%
  (150k out of 300k)
Within redevelopment area:

- Population growth: 60% (300k out of 500k)
- Job growth: 80% (240k out of 300k)
Transportation scenarios

Freeze frame
• TIP only

If you build it...
• TO2040

Hop on the bus, Gus
• Focus on transit

Money DOES grow on trees
• Focus on roadway capacity
What did we learn?

- Growth scenarios = greatest impact on travel demand
- Better transit = shift from autos
- More capacity = more VMT, less VHT
- Highway system + few anticipated network changes = minor change in outcomes
- Transit system + more opportunity for network changes = more significant change in outcomes
More scenario modeling...

Consider wildcards

Impact of autonomous and connected vehicles.
Private ownership

- All cars on the road are autonomous.
- All cars are privately owned.
- Moderate performance due to fragmented ownership, privacy concerns.
- Access not dependent on mobile device.
- Low shared mobility.
- High need for parking.
- Owner maintains entire costs for maintenance, upgrades.
Fleet ownership

• All cars on the road are autonomous.
• All shared, no private ownership.
• High performance optimization (platooning, routing).
• Lots of shared mobility, including transit and carpooling.
• Access depends on owning mobile device.
• No parking required.
• Cost is subscription-based.
Modeling parameters

Private
- Double freeway capacity
- Generate 20 percent more zero occupant trips.
- Let it Ride — trend growth.
- Maintain current transit.

(Vehicle occupancy rate, parking and operation costs stay on trend.)

Fleet
- Double freeway capacity.
- Increase vehicle occupancy rate by 30 percent.
- Double parking costs.
- Double operation cost.
- Take the Wheel — focused growth.
- Implement SmartMoves.
## Travel model results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>No build</th>
<th>Let it ride + Private ownership</th>
<th>Take the wheel + Fleet ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VMT</strong></td>
<td>44,244,464</td>
<td>56,396,956</td>
<td>59,993,684 +6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,582,448</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VHT</strong></td>
<td>1,143,724</td>
<td>1,539,745</td>
<td>1,550,753 +0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,364,814</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto trips</strong></td>
<td>7,048,695</td>
<td>7,336,291 +4.1%</td>
<td>6,687,764 -5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156,384</td>
<td>+102%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit trips</strong></td>
<td>45,934</td>
<td>77,403</td>
<td>83,704 +8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156,384</td>
<td>+102%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of growth is calculated by comparing each scenario to TO2040 No Build.
## Travel model results (per capita)

Percentage of growth is calculated by comparing each scenario to 2015 baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>No build</th>
<th>Let it ride + Private ownership</th>
<th>Take the wheel + Fleet ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VMT</strong></td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>24.80 (+4.1%)</td>
<td>22.15 (-1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VHT</strong></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64 (+10.0%)</td>
<td>0.56 (-2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto trips</strong></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.03 (+1.2%)</td>
<td>2.76 (-3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit trips</strong></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03 (+37.7%)</td>
<td>0.06 (+178.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did we learn?

- Growth scenarios = greatest impact on travel demand.
- Greater relative changes in transit ridership and VHT; not much can impact VMT.
- Confirms assertion in AV policy framework: fleet-based ownership model has more desirable impacts.
- Fleet based/compact land use scenario results in per capita drop in VMT/VHT/auto trips and very large increase in transit trips. (Only scenario where we have seen this.)
What are we working toward?

Using models to evaluate and inform project selection.
Baseline project concepts
Smart Moves

- Fast and Frequent, 30 minute, and Express services
- KCATA, UG Transit, Indebus, Johnson County

www.kcsmartmoves.org
Regional Bikeway System/MetroGreen

- Build out Regional Bikeway System & MetroGreen®
- Counties, cities, MoDOT, KDOT, & levee districts
CMS Network Congested Hotspots

- Segments with high 2040 V/C ratios
- MoDOT & KDOT
Green Infrastructure/Environmental Projects

- Native landscaping in transportation rights of way.
- Stream and riparian area restoration.
- Tree planting in targeted corridors and activity centers.
- EV charging stations.

http://www.marc.org/GIFramework
Next Steps

- **Now-mid-February:**
  - Present evaluation criteria to various groups for feedback.
  - Present results to workgroup on Feb. 14.

- **Late February:**
  - Prepare for release of Call for Projects.

- **March 6:**
  - Pre-application workshop.

- **April 25:**
  - Close Call for Projects.

Continue to develop:
- Baseline project submissions
- RTP strategies

www.marc.org/2050