

## Jessica Mortinger

---

**From:** Michael Kelly <job4mike6@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 12, 2017 7:08 PM  
**To:** Charlie Bryan  
**Cc:** Charles Soules; David Cronin; Jessica Mortinger  
**Subject:** Feedback on Project Prioritization Rubric and Dry-Run Draft Results

Charlie-

Thank you for the invitation to the Transportation Commission Study Session on Thursday, September 14th. Accordingly, I have reviewed the Pedestrian and Bicycle Prioritization Criteria and the Draft "Dry Run" results.

At the outset of my comments I wish to state my belief that this draft document is a very good initial step but I will respectfully offer some suggestions for improvement. I also wish to thank Jessica Mortinger for her time discussing some of these items with me on the phone.

I think the following ideas need to be considered in the final prioritization methodology accepted by the Transportation Commission.

I suggest the first step is to deliberate on the relative priority of Bike, Pedestrian, and ADA-mandated infrastructure improvements. I would suggest the Commission start at budget dollar shares of 40% bike, 40% pedestrian and 20% ADA projects as a point of departure and adjust the budget percentages from there as current events and Commission experience, new information, and collective judgement dictates. I would further limit initial prioritization efforts to 1) ADA projects, 2) SRTS Projects, and 3) Arterial or Collector Projects where there no sidewalks built on either side of the roadway. I would suggest the Commission eliminate the Priority Network Scoring for the initial budget cycle.

Next I would suggest the Commission use the output of the project prioritization and see what project are within the funded band and those that fall below the line.

Finally I would adjust any projects at the margin either up or down to accommodate any perceptions of disparity. Suppose there are 10 bike projects, 10 pedestrian projects and 40 ADA projects on the projected-to-be -funded list. The Commission should compare bike projects 10 and 11, pedestrian projects 10 and 11, and ADA projects 40 and 41 to see if the projects proposed for funding are clearly superior to the best unfunded projects in the other categories.

Now I would like to turn to the specific criteria and method of scaling, weighting, and scoring those criteria into a priority list.

Regarding the weights of 1, 3, and 5 points in the Pedestrian Access to Priority Destinations, I believe the draft formulation is a flawed scale. I would use a continuous scoring scale because "distances from" are non-negative real numbers. Therefore I would score 5 points for a project that was immediately adjacent to a school or transit stop. A project 0.1 miles away would get 4.0 points, 0.2 miles away would get 3.0 points and projects more than 0.5 miles from a priority destination would get 0 points. Partial points would be allowed to the granularity limit of the GIS horizontal position data.

Within the priority destinations categories, the term "community retail" appears. I suggest the Commission ask the staff if a breakout of medical facilities (Hospital ER, Hospital, public health clinical facilities, MD offices, DDS offices, pharmacies, retail medical supply, and urgent care clinics) is available. I assert such facilities are higher in priority than general retail stores. The commission might also consider facilities of service providers to the homeless as a high priority for pedestrian, ADA, and bicycle projects.

Other than the schools, parks, post office and library, no mention is made of access to government facilities. In my view, important among these are voter registration offices, voting sites used on election days, court rooms, and licensing offices. I assert such facilities should be designated a higher priority than "community retail" facilities. In general any facility that normally requires your physical presence to conduct business should be a higher priority than typical retail establishments.

Much more could be done, provided the GIS data exists, to prioritize among Priority Destinations. Also to be considered would be the primary users such as children, senior citizens, adults with physical disabilities as having priority over facilities that primarily serve adults of normal ability.

As you may recall from our previous interactions, I am highly biased toward projects that correct public safety problems and I favor doctrine such as Vision Zero. Despite this, I find the proposed method to score Safety-Crash History far from ideal. I learned in presentations to the PBITF that Kansas and Lawrence crash history data is incomplete and may be misleading. For example, a crash site with the most modern safety features may well exist because the victims of the crash were badly impaired by alcohol, medications, street drug use, or other emergent medical problems such as a stroke or heart attack. Adding priority to a project for crash history alone—unless the crash can be attributed to design or maintenance shortcomings in the site infrastructure is not advisable. In some instances, such as the June 2009 Dr. Bob Frederick bicycle fatality near 6th and Kasold, detailed investigation and pre-litigation discovery established that the poorly repaired road surface directly contributed to loss of balance and control, and tragically his fatality. Such sites where the poor design or condition of the infrastructure was a root cause, and if they have not been rebuilt or otherwise remediated are worthy of additional priority scoring.

To address safety I would suggest for those locations where deficient infrastructure was identified by fulsome post-crash analysis, then priority should be applied. If a fatality of unimpaired individuals resulted the site should be at the top of the priority list.

Finally I would add points for project locations that serve multiple priority functions. If a project passes four building with medical clinics, then multiple points should be awarded for service to multiple priority destinations.

The drafters of this document used roadway AADT as a factor for consideration. I think this factor should only be used to rank among Arterial or Collector Projects and should not move any project above an SRTS project.

Thanks again for this opportunity to be heard.

Best wishes,

Mike Kelly  
Lawrence KS