

**City of Lawrence, Kansas
Transportation Commission
Non-motorized Projects Prioritization Policy**

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| SUBJECT Non-motorized Projects Prioritization Policy | | APPLIES TO Infrastructure | |
| EFFECTIVE DATE Feb 5, 2018 | REVISED DATE None | NEXT REVIEW DATE TBD | |
| APPROVED BY Transportation Commission date: Feb 5, 2018 | | TOTAL PAGES 5 | POLICY NO. TC18-001 |

1.0 Purpose

In order to improve the built environment for people who walk, bicycle, or wheel, this policy implements recommendations of the Regional Pedestrian Plan, the Countywide Bikeway Plan, and the Pedestrian-Bicycle Issues Taskforce Report, and establishes a data-driven ranking procedure for prioritizing non-motorized projects that confer the greatest benefit to the community.

2.0 Scope

This policy applies to all non-motorized projects, including but not limited to the following: ADA curb ramps, sidewalks, curb extensions, shared-use paths, bike lanes, protected bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, signage, crossing improvements, and other projects that improve the built environment for people who walk, bicycle or wheel. This policy does not apply to non-motorized aspects of larger roadway projects that are not funded with pedestrian and bicycle funds (although such non-motorized projects may be ranked) or to sidewalk maintenance, which is the responsibility of abutting landowners.

3.0 Development of Project Lists

- 3.1** Non-motorized projects will be sorted into three lists: ADA ramps, pedestrian gaps, and bikeways.
- 3.2** Non-motorized projects identified in specific non-motorized plans will be placed on the appropriate list.
- 3.3** Additional non-motorized projects requested by the public during formal calls for projects, concurrent with the development of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), may also be listed. Before a proposed project is placed on a list, it will be reviewed by City Staff to determine its appropriateness and feasibility.
- 3.4** Annually, all non-motorized projects appearing on the lists will be scored in accordance with Section 4.0 and ranked in accordance with Section 5.0. If new non-motorized projects are added, those new projects will also be scored and ranked. It must be noted that inclusion on a project list does not guarantee funding or implementation for a particular project.

4.0 Project Scoring

Non-motorized projects appearing on the Project Lists will be scored annually according to the following criteria:

4.1 ADA Ramp Prioritization Criteria

(a) Priority Networks- 5 points max

Projects that improve accessibility along priority networks recognized in adopted plans are accorded the highest weight. This criterion follows the Regional Pedestrian Plan Priority network: Safe Routes to School Routes are accorded the highest priority, followed by Arterial Streets, then Collector Streets, and finally Local streets.

(b) Pedestrian Access to Priority Destinations – 5 points max

Projects within closer proximity to priority destinations are given higher priority in order to promote access to high-demand pedestrian destinations. This score is symbolized on a map produced by creating buffers (based on the pedestrian network routing) of identified locations.

(c) Crossing Type – 5 points max

Projects that are located at signalized intersections are accorded the highest weight. Stop signs or beacon controlled crossings compose the next highest weight. Next are other marked crossings and then, lastly, unmarked crossings. The type of crossing is used as a priority because the highest volume of pedestrian demand is anticipated at controlled intersections.

(d) User Request for Improved Route Accessibility – 10 points max

This involves ramp requests made by citizens, or in their behalf, who use mobility devices, to provide specific accessible routes based on their location and travel needs and that are received through the ADA Transition Plan Coordinator. Such requests can be made at any time.

| ADA Ramp Prioritization Criteria | | Points |
|----------------------------------|--|--------|
| 1 | Priority Network (select one, max 5 pts) | |
| | Safe Routes to School Route | 5 |
| | Arterial Street Classification of Roadway | 4 |
| | Collector Street Classification of Roadway | 3 |
| | Local Street Classification of Roadway | 1 |
| 2 | Pedestrian Access to Priority Destinations (select one, max 5 pts) | |
| | Within ¼ mi of school or 1/8 mi of public transit stop | 5 |
| | Within ½ mi of school, ¼ mi of transit stop, ¼ mi of neighborhood or community retail (includes medical facilities, grocery store, farmers market and retail food outlets), 1/8 mi of park, 1/8 mi of library, or 1/8 of post office | 3 |
| | Farther than ½ mi of school, ¼ mi of transit stop, ¼ of neighborhood or community retail, 1/8 mi of park, 1/8 mi of library, or 1/8 mi of public institutions (ex: post office, city hall) | 1 |
| 3 | Crossing Type (select one, max 5 pts) | |
| | Signalized Controlled Intersections | 5 |
| | Stop Sign or Beacon Controlled Crossings | 4 |
| | Other Marked Crossings | 2 |
| | Unmarked Crossings | 1 |
| 4 | User Request for Improved Route Accessibility(max 10 pts) | 10 |

Max Points -25

4.2 Pedestrian Gap Prioritization Criteria

(a) *Priority Networks- 5 points max*

Projects that improve connectivity along priority networks recognized in adopted plans are accorded the highest weight. This criterion follows the Regional Pedestrian Plan Priority network: Safe Routes to School Routes are accorded the highest priority, followed by Arterial and Collector Streets without sidewalks on either side followed by Arterial Streets, Collector Streets and finally Local streets.

(b) *Pedestrian Access to Priority Destinations – 5 points max*

Projects within closer proximity to priority destinations are given higher priority in order to promote access to high-demand pedestrian destinations. This score is symbolized on a map produced by creating buffers (based on the pedestrian network routing) of identified locations.

(c) *Safety – 10 points max*

Higher volume roadways are granted greater priority, as well as projects that improve crossing on roadways over 15,000 AADT. While crash history is not necessarily considered in project scoring, project design will consider crash history.

| Pedestrian Gap Prioritization Criteria | | Points |
|---|--|--------|
| Priority Network (select one, max 5 pts) | | |
| 1 | Safe Routes to School Route | 5 |
| | Arterial/Collector Street Classification of Roadway with no sidewalks on either side | 4 |
| | Arterial Street Classification of Roadway | 3 |
| | Collector Street Classification of Roadway | 2 |
| | Local Street Classification of Roadway | 1 |
| Pedestrian Access to Priority Destinations (select one, max 5 pts) | | |
| 2 | Within ¼ mi of school or 1/8 mi of public transit stop | 5 |
| | Within ½ mi of school, ¼ mi of transit stop, ¼ mi of neighborhood or community retail (includes medical facilities, grocery store, farmers market and retail food outlets), 1/8 mi of park, 1/8 mi of library, or 1/8 of post office | 3 |
| | Farther than ½ mi of school, ¼ mi of transit stop, ¼ of neighborhood or community retail, 1/8 mi of park, 1/8 mi of library, or 1/8 mi of public institutions (ex: post office, city hall) | 1 |
| Safety - Roadway Volume (select one, max 5 pts) | | |
| 3 | Project on a road that has over 25,000 AADT on roadway | 5 |
| | Project on a road that has over 20,000 AADT on roadway | 3 |
| | Project on a road that has over 15,000 AADT on roadway | 1 |
| Safety - Crossing (max 5 pts) | | |
| | Project adds crossing improvements on a road over 15,000 AADT | 5 |
| Max Points -20 | | |

4.3 Bikeway Prioritization Criteria

(a) *Adopted Plan Priorities- 5 points max*

Projects that improve connectivity along networks recognized in adopted plans are accorded the highest weight. This criterion recognizes the priority network established by the [Ped Bike Issues Taskforce Report](#) and the [Countywide Bikeway Plan](#).

(b) Bicycle Demand Model – 5 points max

Bicycle demand is calculated based on a scoring system that ranks areas based on 5 proximity factors: High density housing, medium density, K-12 schools, college/university, existing bike infrastructure. Those factors affect the demand for bicycle transportation throughout the community. Areas of higher demand are prioritized.

- Proximity Factors (max points for bicycle demand model score is 81)
 - *High-Density Housing*
A buffer of high-density housing. High-density housing, as defined in the updated comprehensive plan, is greater than or equal to 16 people per acre.
 - *Medium-Density Housing*
A buffer of medium-density housing. Medium density housing, as defined in the updated comprehensive plan, is greater than or equal to 7 people per acre and less than 16 people per acre.
 - *Schools K-12*
A buffer distance from the property boundaries of public and private schools, kindergarten through 12th grade.
 - *College / University*
A buffer distance from college/university boundaries.
 - *Existing Shared Use Path or Bike Lane*
A buffer distance from existing shared use paths/bike lanes.

Proximity Factors and Scores

| High Density Housing | | Schools K-12 (public & private) | | Existing Shared Use Path/Bike Lane | |
|-----------------------------|----|--|----|---|----|
| within 1/4 mile | 16 | within 1/4 mile | 18 | within 1/4 mile | 18 |
| within 1/2 mile | 12 | within 1/2 mile | 14 | within 1/2 mile | 14 |
| within 1 mile | 8 | within 1 mile | 6 | within 1 mile | 6 |
| within 2 miles | 4 | within 2 miles | 2 | within 2 miles | 2 |

| Medium Density Housing | | College/University | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----|
| within 1/4 mile | 9 | within 1/4 mile | 20 |
| within 1/2 mile | 7 | within 1/2 mile | 18 |
| within 1 mile | 3 | within 1 mile | 15 |
| within 2 miles | 2 | within 2 miles | 7 |

(c) Safety – 10 points max

Higher volume roadways are granted greater priority, as well as projects that improve crossing on roadways over 15,000 AADT. While crash history is not necessarily considered in project scoring, project design will consider crash history.

| Bikeway Prioritization Criteria | | Points |
|---|--|---------------|
| 1 | Adopted Plan Priorities (select one, max 5 pts) | |
| | Along the Ped/Bike Issues Taskforce Report Long Term Bikeway Priority Network | 5 |
| | Along network identified in approved Countywide Bikeway Plan | 4 |
| | Arterial/Collector with no Shared Use Path | 3 |
| 2 | Bicycle Demand (select one, max 5 pts) | |
| | <i>Bicycle demand is calculated on the bicycle demand heat map which is a prioritization score based on proximity to housing density, K-12 private/public schools, college/university and existing bikeway infrastructure.</i> | |
| | score greater than 66 up to 81 | 5 |
| | score greater than 49 up to 65 | 4 |
| | score greater than 33 up to 49 | 3 |
| | score greater than 17 up to 33 | 2 |
| score greater than 0 up to 17 | 1 | |
| 3 | Safety - Roadway Volume (select one, max 5 pts) | |
| | Project on a road that has over 25,000 AADT on roadway | 5 |
| | Project on a road that has over 20,000 AADT on roadway | 3 |
| | Project on a road that has over 15,000 AADT on roadway | 1 |
| | Safety - Crossing (max 5 pts) | |
| Project adds crossing improvements on a road over 15,000 AADT | 5 | |

Max Points - 20

5.0 **Project Ranking and Selection**

- 5.1** The scoring procedure outlined above provides the first step in identifying corridors that should be considered for non-motorized improvements. There are also many other, non-exclusive factors that should be considered in the final selection of non-motorized projects and, ultimately, in project design. Those non-exclusive factors are as follow:
- Equity in project distribution (environmental justice areas)
 - Opportunities for parallel routes
 - Grant funding opportunities
 - Economies of scale
 - Cost sharing opportunities
 - Available funding
 - Other relevant factors
- 5.2** The following procedure will be used to determine a final project ranking:
- (a) The available funding for non-motorized infrastructure will be distributed between the three category areas (ADA ramps, pedestrian gaps, and bikeways) by recommendation of the Transportation Commission.
 - (b) City Staff will review the projects with the highest scores in each category. Project feasibility will be evaluated and planning-level cost estimates will be prepared.
 - (c) City Staff will present to the Transportation Commission for consideration, a list of projects ranked, using the established criteria and other factors as outlined above, for pedestrian gap and bikeway projects. City Staff will recommend Ramp projects, based not on specific locations but on recommended areas of focus.
 - (d) The Transportation Commission will recommend to the City Commission for approval, a final ranked project list for each category.