



# 2015-2019 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)



Adopted: October 16, 2014  
Amended: December 18, 2014

#### Funding Note:

This report was funded in part through grant[s] from the Federal Highway Administration [and Federal Transit Administration], U.S. Department of Transportation. The views and opinions of the authors [or agency] expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U. S. Department of Transportation.

#### Title VI Note:

The L-DC MPO hereby gives public notice that it is the policy of the agency to assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the L-DC MPO receives federal financial assistance. Any person who believes they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI has a right to file a formal complaint with the L-DC MPO. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed with the L-DC MPO's Title VI Coordinator within one hundred and eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Discriminatory Complaint Form, please see our website at [www.lawrenceks.org/MPO](http://www.lawrenceks.org/MPO).

## 2015-2019 TIP– Amendment #1

### Project Additions

MPO#: 502

KDOT#: U-0464-01

Lawrence Safe Routes to School Master Plan

Project Sponsor: Lawrence

MPO#: 502

KDOT#: U-0464-01

☐ Advanced Construction

Grand Total: \$15

Date added: 11/2014

Project Name: Lawrence Safe Routes to School Master Plan

Project Scope:

Comments:

Last Revised: 11/2014

Route (to/from location): Lawrence

Preliminary Engineering to develop Safe Routes to School Master Plan.

Project Type: SRTS

Project -  
Work Type: Special Work

Length:

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
TA	PE	\$15																	

MPO#: 215

KDOT#: U-0318-01

Lawrence KLINK: Selected Portions of US-59

Project Sponsor: Lawrence

MPO#: 215

KDOT#: U-0318-01

☐ Advanced Construction

Grand Total: \$617

Date added: 11/2014

Project Name: Lawrence KLINK: Selected portions of US-59

Project Scope:

Comments:

Last Revised: 11/2014

Route (to/from location): US-59 from 6th St to Harvard Rd and from Irving Hill Rd to 21st St

Mill and Overlay

Project Type: Road

Project -  
Work Type: Surfacing

Length: 1.01

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
				Local	CE	\$40													
				State	Const	\$200													
				Local	Const	\$377													

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21).....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>TIP Definition .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Public Participation Process.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND SELECTION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Planning Factors .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Engineering Factors .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Role of the MPO in Planning and Project Selection .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Defining Regionally Significant Planning and Projects .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<b>III. PROJECT LOCATIONS and the ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Project Locations .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Environmental Justice Review.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>IV. AMENDMENTS AND REVISIONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Administrative Revisions.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Amendments .....</i>	<i>12</i>
<b>V. FISCAL CONSTRAINT.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<i>Funding for Locally Sponsored Projects .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>State of Kansas Funding .....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Federal Funding.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Fiscal Analysis .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT LISTING.....</b>	<b>22</b>
Appendix 1 - Latest Federal Fiscal Year - List of Obligated Projects	
Appendix 2 - TIP Project Submission Form	
Appendix 3 - MPO Self-Certification	
Appendix 4 - Major Projects and Significant Delay – Definitions	
Appendix 5 - Explanation of TIP Project Listings	

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) documents how the Lawrence - Douglas County region prioritizes the limited transportation resources available among the various needs of the region. The TIP is developed as part of the Continuing, Comprehensive, and Cooperative (3-C) regional transportation planning process. The TIP is a multi-year listing of federally funded and/or regionally significant projects selected to improve the transportation network for the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). The TIP includes projects that are part of the multimodal transportation system which includes roadways and networks for motor vehicle travel, transit, bicycle, freight, and pedestrian related travel improvements. Projects listed in the TIP are designed to implement the region's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and are consistent with the region's comprehensive plans, and plans approved by the area's local governments. This TIP document identifies projects to be implemented over the next five years in accordance with funding allocations and the region's project selection criteria.

*The TIP covers all of Douglas County including the four cities in the area:*

- *Baldwin City*
- *Eudora*
- *Lawrence*
- *Lecompton*

### Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)

MAP-21 is the current federal surface transportation legislation and the latest one to make major changes to the way federally aided projects are planned and built. This replaced the previous transportation legislation referred to as SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users). MAP-21 is a two year (FFY 2013-14) transportation program, signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012.

With uncertainty in MAP-21's future replacement, MPO's need to be aware of the frequent changes in funding and also planning requirements to help assure that the most beneficial transportation improvements for their regions occurs. The current federal transportation law, MAP-21 (P.L. 112-141), maintains the requirement established under SAFETEA-LU - to consider the following eight factors in the transportation planning process:

#### Transportation Planning Factors

**The metropolitan planning process for a metropolitan planning area shall provide for consideration of projects and strategies that will:**

- Ø Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency
- Ø Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users
- Ø Increase the **security** of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users
- Ø Increase the **accessibility and mobility** of people and for freight
- Ø **protect and enhance the environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns
- Ø Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes for people and freight
- Ø Promote efficient system **management and operation**
- Ø Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.

MAP-21 will change the federal aid program for highway and transit projects in the following ways:

MAP-21 consolidated and restructured the many programs into a smaller number of broader core programs. The consolidation of programs under SAFETEA-LU into fewer programs under MAP-21 makes the comparison of MAP-21 funding levels to past federal funding levels somewhat difficult and imprecise. However, with just two years (FFY 2013 and 2014) of authorizations included in MAP-21 and a review of what federal aid was recently used for in our

region, it appears that overall the level of federal aid for roadway and transit projects in our region will be about the same under MAP-21 as it was in FFY 2012 under SAFETEA-LU.

MAP-21 established a streamlined, performance and outcome based, multimodal program. The objective of this performance and outcome based program is to invest resources in projects that collectively will make progress toward the achievement of the national goals. The legislation requires the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), in consultation with states, MPOs and other stakeholders, to establish performance measures in these areas: safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement & economic vitality, environmental sustainability and reduced project delivery delays. The TIP, along with other plans, is required to include information regarding these performance measures. However, the regulations and guidance regarding the establishment and use of these performance measures have not yet been developed and implemented; therefore, they are not included in the 2015–19 TIP. Future versions of the TIP will address these requirements.

*MAP-21 will change the ways KDOT, the MPO, and local governments in the region use federal funding for projects and the ways they monitor and report the performance characteristics of the multimodal transportation system.*

### TIP Definition

The TIP is a multi-year listing of federally funded and/or regionally significant improvements to the region's multimodal transportation system. The TIP must be updated at least once every four years, on a schedule compatible with the STIP, and projects included must be consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Additionally, the TIP must be financially constrained and include only projects for which funding has been identified using existing or reasonably available revenue sources.

In accordance with United States Code Titles 23 and 49, the TIP document must outline at least a four-year program of:

- 1) All federally funded priority transportation projects, and
- 2) All regionally significant priority projects, regardless of funding source.

The TIP is one of several management tools that planners and engineers use to better manage transportation programs and make needed improvements to the region's multimodal transportation system. It is a short-range scheduling and budgeting program that relates the present transportation system improvement needs to the longer range MTP goals. The TIP strengthens the connections between the area's long-range transportation and land use plans, the operation and maintenance of the existing transportation system with its management for future improvements, and all of the various financial processes related to funding major transportation projects.


### Statewide Transportation

**Improvement Program** - The STIP is the State's equivalent of an MPO's TIP. It includes all federally funded transportation projects in the state. Projects in the metropolitan areas are included by reference to the relevant TIP.

### Public Participation Process

Public participation, project selection, and project prioritization activities are part of the development of the TIP but also part of the local government processes to develop the Lawrence Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the Douglas County CIP. The public involvement goal of the MPO is to ensure early and continuous public notification about and public participation opportunities in all major actions and decisions made by the MPO, and this includes opportunities for the public to review the draft TIP and comment on it before it is approved.

The MPO's Public Participation Plan (PPP) requires a new TIP to undergo a 30-day comment period and amendments require a 15-day public comment period. The draft TIP is available on the MPO website ([www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/tip](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/tip)) and a printed copy is available at Lawrence City Hall and the Lawrence Public Library. The public is notified of the opportunities to review the draft TIP through a local newspaper advertisement, notification by email and, by staff announcements at the draft TIP is available for comment MPO meetings. Comments are reviewed by MPO staff and if found applicable, those public comments are incorporated into the final draft document sent to the MPO Policy Board for approval. Details about the public participation process for the approval and amendment of the TIP and other MPO documents are found in the current version of the PPP which is also posted on the MPO website at [www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/public\\_participation](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/public_participation).



## II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND SELECTION PROCESS

The projects included in the TIP are drawn from the area's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) from County and City governments in the region as well as the State's transportation Program known as T-WORKS. Project Sponsors, MPO staff and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) use the following factors to determine if a project is regionally significant and whether it needs federal funding and whether it addresses issues noted in the MTP. In most cases the project information that the project sponsor provides to the MPO staff indicates how the project relates to these factors and why it is important and in need of inclusion in the TIP. Additional discussion of submitted TIP projects at TAC meetings also contains discussion about projects and the factors listed below.

### Planning Factors

- Ø Is the project consistent with the goals and objectives found in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)?
- Ø Is the project listed as a recommended transportation system improvement in the MTP?
- Ø Is the project regionally significant as defined by federal regulations and the latest Regionally Significant Policy approved by the MPO?
- Ø Is the project consistent with the latest MPO and FHWA approved Functional Classification Map for Roadways?
- Ø Is the project consistent with the latest locally approved comprehensive plan (including the land use plan, area plans, and other comprehensive plan elements/chapters) covering the project location?
- Ø Does the project include provisions for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian movements as needed to provide a regional multimodal transportation system?
- Ø Has the project sponsor considered Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) impacts in the planning for this project, and if the project is in a minority and/or low-income area has the project sponsor considered and addressed the Title VI and EJ issues related to the project?
- Ø Has the project sponsor received public comments about this project and if received considered those public comments in the planning and design of the project?
- Ø Is the project eligible for the type of federal and/or state funding being proposed for it, and is there adequate funding available for the project in the year it is proposed?

### Engineering Factors

- Ø Does the Project address a facility that has (existing or projected) a high volume to capacity ratio indicating it or will experience significant congestion and lower levels of service?



- Ø Does the project location have a traffic accident history marked by a higher than expected accident rate which, along with other accident attributes, indicates that an engineering change could reduce the number and/or severity of crashes?
- Ø Does the project location have pavement conditions noting a deteriorated state showing that the facility is in need of improvements to maintain its function and/or that those improvements can be made economically now before more costly reconstruction is needed?
- Ø Does the project site include geometric design that is inadequate by current standards and does the project sponsor have documentation that this design is hampering the facility's ability to handle the traffic loads and/or vehicle sizes using the facility in a safe and efficient manner, and does the project sponsor plan to address those geometric deficiencies as part of this project?
- Ø Does the project site or facility have structural deficiencies indicating that the facility is near the end of its projected lifespan and that it will need frequent maintenance to function adequately, and does the project sponsor plan to address these structural deficiencies as part of this project?
- Ø Have safety concerns involving motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and/or transit users and transit operations been identified at the project location and does the project sponsor plan to address those concerns as part of this project?
- Ø Has the project location met minimum engineering standards set by the project sponsor that indicate the facility is in need of improvement, rehabilitation or replacement?

\*This list is not exhaustive and may be changed in the future.

The transit and paratransit projects programmed in the TIP also go through a project selection process. The Lawrence Transit System staff works with the MPO, FTA, and KDOT, University of Kansas - KU On Wheels (KUOW) staff to plan and program projects in the TIP that address transit needs and issues identified in the MTP. The KDOT-Office of Public Transportation in consultation with the Kansas City Regional Coordinated Transit District #1 (CTD #1) makes the selection of paratransit projects to include in the TIP.

This TIP document contains projects for the Lawrence Transit System that collectively constitutes the Program of Projects (POP) for Lawrence Transit. This list of transit items is a prioritized list of projects used by the Lawrence Transit staff and reviewed by FTA officials. The TIP project listings are the POP for Lawrence, and approval of the TIP includes the approval of the POP for Lawrence Transit. The public involvement procedures used for TIP development and amendments are used to satisfy the POP requirements for FTA Section 5307 funding.

### Role of the MPO in Planning and Project Selection

The MPO's role of approving the MTP and the TIP gives the MPO a significant voice in how transportation funds are directed in Douglas County, and it encourages a more need-based system-building approach to project selection. The MPO as the regional transportation planning body needs to look objectively at the area's transportation facilities and services to determine if there are mobility issues that need to be addressed through the planning process. The basic idea is that projects listed in the TIP should "flow out" of the region's Continuing, Comprehensive and Cooperative (3-C) transportation planning process and the recommendations found in the MPO's long range plans, especially the MTP. Of course, the process is a cooperative one and the MPO does not do all of this work alone. It has help from its partners in the federal, state and local governments. Details about the composition and roles of the MPO and its planning partners are found in documents that are available for review on the MPO website at [www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/designation\\_and\\_organization](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/designation_and_organization).

### Defining Regionally Significant Planning and Projects

Planning processes and projects that are part of our area's mobility system and have impacts outside of the part of town they are located in are thought to be "regionally significant." People throughout the metropolitan area use these regionally significant facilities, and people living in various parts of the region are impacted by these facilities. In the case of roadways it seems simple enough to say that all roads that have mobility rather than property access as their primary function are "regionally significant." If this definition is used then all arterial and

higher classification roads are “regionally significant” and everything below that in the roadway classification system is not “regionally significant.” However, collector streets are supposed to do both of these functions equally well, and it may be unclear as to which collectors do a little more mobility duty and which ones do more property access work. An explanation of what roads are and are not regionally significant as defined by the MPO can be found on the MPO website ([www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/significant](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/significant)).


### III. PROJECT LOCATIONS and the ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE REVIEW

#### Project Locations

The 2015-2018 TIP projects are mapped below. This map makes it easy to see that projects throughout the Metropolitan Planning Area are programmed in this TIP. The map shows only projects in years one through four of this five-year TIP. Projects identified by project sponsors for implementation in the fifth year of this TIP are not shown on the map but their locations are noted in the project table. Projects in year five are considered to represent the future planning list of projects, and typically those projects are not yet set in local budgets.

A quick look at the map shows that the projects programmed in this TIP are located along state, county and city roads. The project selection processes both at the local government and the MPO levels stress the need to pick projects for funding based on objective factors such as the condition of pavements, deterioration of bridges, need for greater connectivity in the system, and other factors related to transportation planning and engineering.

The maps show a good healthy spread of project locations and projects along different classes of roads (i.e., interstate, other freeways and expressways, principal arterials, minor arterials, collectors, minor collectors). These roadway functional classifications are displayed on the MPO Roadway Functional Classification Map for Lawrence-Douglas County Region which can be found online at [www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/maps\\_handouts](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/maps_handouts).





## Environmental Justice Review

Environmental Justice (EJ) is a federal requirement that projects using federal funds be selected and distributed fairly to all people regardless of income or race and that all people have equal access to the benefits afforded by federally funded projects as well as equal access to the decision-making process for the selection of those federal projects. This policy is defined in Executive Order 12898 that was signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines Environmental Justice as the "fair treatment for people of all races, cultures, and incomes, regarding the development of environmental laws, regulations, and policies."

The FHWA considers three fundamental environmental justice principles:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

More Environmental Justice information related to programs, including MPO operations which are funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), can be found at the following web site: [www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/overview/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/overview/).

In order for the MPO to consider the EJ aspects of the projects listed in this TIP the MPO staff mapped the location of the roadway, bridge and transportation enhancement projects and the areas of the region that have a significantly larger than average percentage of low-income and/or minority populations. These areas with high percentages of minority and/or low-income populations are called EJ zones for this discussion. The definition of how EJ zones were delineated for this analysis and the map depicting the EJ zones in Douglas County and their spatial relationships to TIP project locations are shown on the following pages. Those maps include only the projects in years one through four of this TIP since that period contains the agreed upon and committed projects that are in local and/or state capital improvement plans/budgets and contains projects for which federal funds are being programmed under the fiscal constraint limits.

For the case of federally supported transit services both the fixed route system and paratransit service areas cover parts of Douglas County with low-income and/or minority populations. There is no one point or segment location for these services. They can cover all parts of Lawrence or all of Douglas County. Therefore, the TIP projects associated with these transit and paratransit services are all considered to serve EJ populations and to be located in EJ zones for the purpose of this analysis. The joint coordinated fixed route transit services operated by Lawrence and KU are shown on the following maps to depict the fact that the fixed urban route structure serves both populations inside and outside of EJ zones.

## 2015-2018 TIP Projects – Environmental Justice Maps

### Low/Moderate Household Income Population, by Census 2010 Block Groups

The following maps depict selected Census block groups from the 2010 Decennial Census Tiger Maps of Douglas County, Kansas where 60 percent or more of the population residing in households earning less than 80 percent of the area's median income. The City of Lawrence Neighborhood Resources Division of the Planning and Development Services Department currently uses this information to identify areas within the community that have higher concentrations of low and moderate income residents. Various housing rehabilitation program funds and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are targeted toward these

areas. This same dataset is used to illustrate areas in Douglas County that have higher concentrations of low and moderate income population for this environmental justice review.


Areas with 150 Percent Higher than Average Minority Population, by Census 2010 Block Groups in Douglas County, Kansas

The 2010 Census questionnaire gave people the opportunity to select multiple races if that best described their ethnicity. For this environmental justice map, staff used only one race data attribute to depict areas within Douglas County that have a minority population equaling approximately 150 percent or more of the average minority population residing in Lawrence and Douglas County. The majority race in this region is White/Caucasian and the other races collectively are considered as the minority group population for this EJ analysis. The 2010 Census data indicates the minority population within Douglas County represents 12.2% of the total population, and in Lawrence the minority population is slightly higher representing 14.5% percent of the total population. Using these figures, the 150 percent of average would be 18.3% for Douglas County and 21.3% for Lawrence. In order to simplify the delineation of high minority percent areas, the EJ maps depict the 2010 Census block groups with 20% percent or higher proportions of minority populations.


2015-2018 TIP Projects for the Lawrence - Douglas County MPO in Relation to Environmental Justice Areas

The following maps combine the census block group environmental justice zones with the locations of the proposed transportation improvement projects included in the 2015—2018 fiscally constrained TIP period. The maps show where the roadway projects, transportation enhancement projects, and fixed route urban transit services required to be in the TIP are located in relationship to where higher than average levels of minority persons live and/or where higher than average low-moderate income households exist, and where both of those attributes are found.

# MPO Programmed Roadway Projects in Relation to Title VI Areas



### MPO Fixed Route Transit Service in Relation to Title VI Areas



A review of the preceding maps shows that TIP projects are spread throughout Douglas County. The map also shows that EJ zones are not, but are instead concentrated in the urban parts of the region, especially in Lawrence. However, EJ analysis is more than just the location of the projects and how many are (or aren't) in EJ areas. All of the projects in this TIP have impacts and benefits both during construction and long term after they are built as part of the network.

Projects which are completely, partially or on a road that is an EJ zone border are considered EJ projects for the purpose of this analysis. The following 2015-2018 TIP projects are identified as EJ Zone Projects: 200 - South Lawrence Trafficway; 203 - 19<sup>th</sup> Street: Naismith to Iowa Reconstruction, 205 - K-10 Access Point Consolidation, 212 - 9<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction, 300 - 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Traffic Signal Coordination, 500 - Santa Fe Depot Restoration. Of these projects: 200, 203 and 212 include multimodal infrastructure amenities.

There are several types of projects throughout the region; a majority of the roadway projects also have multimodal elements to improve the network conditions for walking and biking. When people choose to get out of their car and walk, bike, or take transit; they make a

positive environmental impact and improve air quality. People choose to walk rather than drive they are typically replacing short automobile trips, which contribute disproportionately high amounts of pollutant emissions. These emission reductions benefit all residents whether they choose a walking trip or not. There is an overall reduction in vehicles miles traveled, reducing traffic, congestion and the volume of pollutants in the air. Other environmental impacts can be a reduction in overall neighborhood noise levels and improvements in local water quality as fewer automobile related discharges wide up in local wetlands, streams, rivers and lakes. Pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel is a more equitable than other forms of transportation, so building multimodal improvements as part of projects increases the access to non-motorized trip options.

There are several types of projects located in EJ zones and serving EJ populations. This list and the preceding maps also indicate that because the EJ zones are concentrated in the urban core of the region and that is where most of the transit service is located that the EJ areas get more transit service than other more rural parts of the region. The maps also indicate that because the EJ zones are urban and in the urban area the street density is higher that the EJ populations are served by more roadway choices than populations in the more rural parts of the region. Overall, the EJ populations in the region's urban core have better access to more transport options (e.g., transit or car mode, wider choice of streets to use for most trips) than people living in the less densely developed rural parts of the region. On the other hand, the EJ populations in the urban areas have more impacts from the transportation system (e.g., traffic congestion, noise, air pollution) and those impacts need to be reviewed to determine if any of them are disproportional to the EJ populations compared to other non-EJ populations living in the urban area of the region.

A review of the MPO's urban area indicates that all residents in the urban part of the region regardless of race or income experience the impacts of the urban transport system in similar fashion. The benefits and impacts of that urban transportation network are not concentrated in any particular EJ zones. The region's transportation projects appear to be selected based on the merit of the project and the need for improvements to the transport system without any intended bias towards impacting EJ areas any more than any other area in the region. If there is any difference with EJ zones it seems to be that some EJ areas receive greater choice and frequency of transit services due to the fact that those areas coincide with the parts of the region with population densities high enough to support frequent fixed route transit. For the roads there are busy congested intersections all around the urban area in both high and low income areas, and regardless of your racial group you are likely to encounter one of those intersections near your home no matter where you live in Lawrence. The impacts from the transportation system (congestion, noise, pollutant emissions, etc.) appear to be more related to whether you live in the Lawrence Urbanized Area or not more than related to whether you live in a minority or low income area or not. Disproportionate impacts from federally funded transportation projects on low income or minority population clusters were not observed in this EJ analysis.

The table makes comparisons between the number of roadway and transportation enhancement TIP projects (projects that have specific locations) and the number of TIP projects in EJ zones as well as the cost comparisons for those projects located inside and outside of EJ areas. This table also compares the proportion of projects and expenditures in EJ areas to the proportion of the Douglas County population that is low-income and/or minority. This comparison indicates that even though many TIP projects are located in developing parts of the region that are now outside of EJ zones, there are still several important and needed TIP projects located in the urban core of Lawrence where these low-income and minority populations are centered.

**Projects in EJ Zones Compared to All Projects  
(roadways, bridges, and transportation enhancements)**

	Number of Projects	Total Cost of Projects in 1000's	Number of Projects in EJ Zones	Percent of Projects in EJ Zones	Total Cost of Projects in EJ Zones in 1000's	Percent of Cost in EJ Zones
2015	11	\$ 9,367	4	36.4%	\$ 2,892	30.9%
2016	4	\$ 8,750	1	25.0%	\$ 3,300	37.7%
2017	3	\$ 4,600	0	0.0%	\$ -	0.0%
2018	2	\$ 2,700	1	50.0%	\$ 200	7.4%

\*This table does not include projects not mapped for environmental justice analysis. This table does not include transit allocations, planning studies, SRTS allocations and projects that are not limited to a specific point on a map.

\*\*Advanced Construction Conversion funds are not calculated in the total project costs.



Reviewing the maps, tables and lists in this chapter along with the project listings at the end of this document indicates that there are no significant EJ issues related to the selection of projects for this TIP. This TIP includes projects inside and outside of EJ zones, and projects for this TIP are selected based on objective planning and engineering criteria (e.g., bridge deterioration, pavement condition, transit demand, etc.). The MPO believes there are no significant EJ issues with the selection of federally funded roadway, bridge, transportation enhancement, or transit projects in Douglas County.

More information about how the MPO is addressing Title VI Civil Rights and Environmental Justice Non-Discrimination issues can be found in the MPO's Title VI Program Manual and the Public Participation Plan. Those documents can be viewed online at [www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/public\\_participation](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/public_participation).

## **IV. AMENDMENTS AND REVISIONS**

Project cost and funding levels are put into the TIP based on the best available estimates, and even though the schedules set for projects are the result of careful planning, there are times when changes to the information about projects needs to be adjusted. Minor changes to project information are called revisions and are administrative actions with no public involvement required. Major changes are called amendments and require some public involvement.

### **Administrative Revisions**

Administrative revisions include all revisions that are not formal amendments. These revisions usually involve, but are not limited to:

- Obvious minor data entry errors or editing corrections to text and/or graphics
- Splitting or combining projects (project scopes and costs cannot change)
- Changes or clarifying elements of a project description (with no major changes in funding or scope)
- Change in federal funding source
- Shifting funds between years within the four-year fiscally constrained period
- Minor change of less than 20% of total project cost

In processing administrative revisions MPO staff will:

- Enter the requested revision into the project database and map as necessary.
- Prepare and publish an updated TIP project listing and post it on the web.
- Notify the Kansas Department of Transportation of the modifications and request their inclusion in the respective Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.
- Prepare a summary of the revision to be presented at the next scheduled MPO Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Board meetings.

### **Amendments**

Amendments to the TIP often consist of major changes to project cost and/or funding levels. Those types of fiscal changes may have impacts on the ability of the TIP and/or the MTP to remain fiscally constrained. Amendments to the TIP may involve a change in project scope that alters the original intent of the project by adding or deleting a phase or making major cost or funding changes. Amendments to the TIP may also consist of major text and/or graphics changes that add, delete or change policy or processing information in the document. A significant change in the scope or a change in the location of a project also warrants a TIP amendment. Adding or deleting projects from the TIP are handled by an amendment.

Amendments to the TIP will be drafted by the MPO staff in cooperation with KDOT staff and TAC members as needed. The draft TIP amendment will then be presented to the TAC for review and approval before sending the amendment to the MPO Policy Board for approval.

Amendments will consist of a MPO resolution and any needed attachments to describe the proposed changes to the TIP document and their impacts on the ability of the TIP to comply with federal MPO planning regulations and remain fiscally constrained. The MPO staff will work with KDOT staff and the project sponsor during the course of the TAC review and the drafting of the amendment to make sure that ample funds are available for the project cost changes. The MPO staff must verify from KDOT and the local sponsor that needed funds are available for the changes if the changes are not offset by project cost reductions.

After the MPO Policy Board approves the amendment the MPO staff will forward the amendment to KDOT for their review and transmission to the FHWA and FTA. The MPO staff is responsible for notification to KDOT and FHWA/FTA of action taken on the TIP amendment and assuring that the amendment process and public notification procedure has been followed. KDOT staff will then update the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) with this TIP amendment information. The TIP is included in the STIP by reference so an amendment to the TIP also becomes an amendment to the STIP.

Unlike the TIP revisions, the TIP amendments must be posted for public review and comment, the MPO staff must collect and review any public comments and share those comments with MPO and TAC members, and a formal vote by the MPO needs to take place to approve TIP amendments. An appropriate level of public involvement activities as outlined in the latest MPO-approved Public Participation Plan (PPP -found online at [www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/public\\_participation](http://www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/public_participation)) is required for all TIP amendments. That public review process includes a minimum 15-day public comment period and posting the proposed amendment on the MPO web page. The MPO staff also places a paper copy of all TIP amendments in a binder kept at the front counter of the MPO Office for public review and comments. In addition, all TIP amendment announcements including the printed advertisement in the newspaper have the phone number, mailing address, and email address of the MPO staff listed on them so that anyone with questions or comments about the amendment can contact the staff to discuss it. Following the required 15-day public comment period, all comments will receive a response, either individually or in a summary form, and the MPO staff will present these public comments and the staff response to the MPO Policy Board before they approve the amendment. There is no requirement for a public hearing.

The following types of project changes are always handled as TIP amendments:

- Addition or deletion of a project within the first four (4) years of the TIP (federal regulations require this part of the TIP to show fiscal constraint)
- Total costs and/or funding amounts for a project listed in the TIP increase by more than 20% of the original project amounts put in the TIP
- Change to the project scope and/or location
- Major schedule changes for a project (see explanation below).

### **Major Schedule Changes for Projects**

Projects that are scheduled for the first year of the TIP are considered to have all needed funding in place and to be underway or ready for implementation very soon. Those first year projects are the "agreed upon" list of projects. Projects that are in the second, third and fourth year of the TIP are considered to have most, if not all, of its funding identified and to be nearing the end of the planning stage and beginning the design and implementation stage. These projects constitute the "committed" list of transportation improvements. Projects that are in the fifth (last) year of the TIP are outside of the period which must show fiscal constraint to meet federal regulations, and the projects in that year are listed for planning and informational purposes only.

Since the TIP is required to be fiscally constrained for four years, it is possible to move the schedules for the projects in years 1-4 around within this period and maintain a fiscally constrained TIP. One year schedule changes to projects in the first four years of the TIP should be simple and may be made through revisions. Moving projects in the TIP project listings by

more than one year constitute a more significant change so schedule changes of more than one year for projects in the fiscally constrained period will be handled by amendments. The table below shows all the possible project schedule changes for the fiscally constrained four-year period covered by this TIP and how each change is to be handled.

Movement of a project in the fifth year of this TIP document forward into the four-year period required to be fiscally constrained will cause the MPO staff and TAC to review the TIP project listings and be handled as an amendment.

Year				
From/To	1	2	3	4
1		Revision	Amendment	Amendment
2	Revision		Revision	Amendment
3	Amendment	Revision		Revision
4	Amendment	Amendment	Revision	

### Amendment Schedule

In order to facilitate the process of making TIP amendments, the MPO has decided to routinely put a TIP amendment item on their meeting agenda once each quarter. These dates to consider TIP amendments will be coordinated with the KDOT calendar for making changes

to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). A similar schedule will be followed for the other years covered by this TIP.

FFY 2015 Quarterly Schedule for TIP Amendments				
TIP Amendment Request Made to MPO Staff	TAC Approval	Public Review Period	MPO Approval	STIP Approval
September-19	October-07	9/30/14 to 10/15/14	October-16	November
January-16	February-03	1/28/15 to 2/12/15	February-19	March
March-20	April-07	3/31/15 to 4/15/15	April-16	May
July-17	August-04	7/28/15 to 8/12/15	August-20	August

Public review is scheduled to begin when the TAC agenda is sent out, one week prior to TAC meeting dates. These dates are approximate and subject to change following discussions between MPO and KDOT staffs and/or discussions at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings.

## V. FISCAL CONSTRAINT

Project funding depends on the availability of funds, on criteria established by State and Federal laws and related regulations, and policies established by the local governments on the use of funds. Street and highway projects can be financed entirely by State and/or local funds or by any combination of federal, state and local funds. The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) Act provides federal-aid to state and local units of government for surface transportation projects.

The use of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds are allocated to transit operators by formulas through the FTA Region 7 Office in Kansas City and through the KDOT Public Transportation Programs Office in Topeka. Those funds are utilized for the operations of the Lawrence Transit System and various paratransit operations in the region. State transit funds from the T-WORKS Program flows through KDOT to both urban transit and paratransit providers.

Local sources of funding for transit projects are provided through a variety of sources including local government general funds, local sales taxes, and farebox revenues.

The use of FHWA funds and state highway and bridge funding supplied through the T-WORKS Program are all administered by KDOT. Those federal funds come in various forms from several different FHWA programs, but all of that federal money flows through KDOT to local governments.

### Funding for Locally Sponsored Projects

In November 2008 Lawrence voters approved three increases in sales taxes to support the improvement of roads and transit services. A 0.3% increase was dedicated to roads and infrastructure, a 0.2% increase was dedicated to funding transit service, and a 0.05% increase was dedicated to expanding transit services in Lawrence. In 2013 these taxes produced \$4,518,860 million, \$3,025,578 million, and \$753,144 million dollars of additional revenue for the City. However, all three of those taxes will expire in 2019. With the addition of those taxes the City has a local dedicated funding source for road and transit improvements that has made

funding more predictable. With those new sales taxes the City is now designing and programming some large road projects that were not financially feasible in the recent past. Some projects are now funded with this sales tax revenue and some are still funded with a combination of federal aid and local matching funds.

The National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), and Transportation Alternatives (TA) categories are the main federal sources of funding that cities receive through KDOT. For Lawrence most of that federal funding has come recently in the form of STP and has remained about the same each year at about \$1 million. In 2013 the City of Lawrence received \$.9 million in federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds through the KDOT sub-allocation process of sharing federal funds with local governments. All of the road and bridge projects sponsored by Lawrence are listed in the Lawrence budget documents, and the regionally significant and/or federal aid road and bridge projects sponsored by the City are also listed in the TIP.

Lawrence also receives Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds from time to time as the City submits discretionary grant applications and they are selected by KDOT. Those TE funds help the City build pathways, do historic preservation projects, and other projects outside the scope of traditional road and bridge improvements. The TE program is now under MAP-21 and is part of the Transportation Alternatives (TA) program that also includes the Recreational Trails and the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs. KDOT administers the TE and SRTS programs and has elected to use separate grant application cycles for each of those types of grants so the funding process for TE and SRTS projects looks the same as it did under SAFETEA-LU when both of these grants were from separate federal funding categories. The Recreational Trails program is administered by the Kansas Wildlife and Parks Department.

The City of Lawrence receives federal transit funding (capital and operating assistance) from the FTA to operate the transit system. Transit capital funding for buses and related facilities used to be a varied mix of formula and discretionary grant funding along with local funds. However, under MAP-21 the use of discretionary capital programs (ex: Section 5309 program) is greatly diminished and a new more predictable funding source called the Bus and Bus Facilities (5339) Program is now the federal source for fleet replacements and other capital needs. Transit operating assistance has typically been based on formulas and been more predictable than capital funding. This has allowed Lawrence Transit to use a relatively constant mix of federal and local funds for operations. Under the State T-WORKS Program some state operating assistance is also received by Lawrence each year.

Douglas County has a similar funding situation for road and bridge projects in that the County receives obligation authority for STP funds from KDOT. KDOT allows counties to exchange their available obligation authority of federal funds for state funds at an exchange rate of \$0.90 in state funds for every \$1.00 in federal obligation authority. Alternatively, the County may "bank" the federal obligation authority for a later project. The County can also apply for TE funds if it chooses to do so. The County does not operate transit service and does not receive federal or state transit funding. Douglas County has a CIP that is updated on a regular basis. The annual CIP allocation in Douglas County in recent years has been approximately \$4 million. This allocation is reviewed and adjusted annually by the Board of County Commissioners. The County programs its projects in their CIP and as needed the County staff coordinates its capital planning with the MPO staff for TIP development and changes. In 2013 the County received approximately \$335,000 in federal STP funds obligation authority through KDOT. The County elected to bank that federal obligation authority for a later project rather than exchange it for state funds.

With the publication of the 2010 Census data the City of Eudora demonstrated continued growth and became a second class city under Kansas statutes. With that designation Eudora now receives an annual sub-allocation of STP funding through KDOT. This amount of federal funding is expected to be small (less than \$100,000). In the past the three small cities in

Douglas County (Baldwin City, Eudora and Lecompton) have used federal funding sporadically and worked with Douglas County staff to administer major road and bridge projects using federal aid. This cooperation between the small cities and the County for the use of federal aid is expected to continue through the life of this TIP.

The paratransit providers in the region provide all or most of their own funds to operate their services, and in some cases they use FTA grants for vehicle purchases. KDOT also funds paratransit vehicles in the region. As part of these vehicle purchases the agency requesting the federal funds is required to provide a local match, and those vehicles are programmed in the TIP.

The MPO staff discusses project additions to the TIP at TAC meetings, and the project sponsor is asked to explain where the project funding is coming from and give details about the project scope and schedule. KDOT staff also has an opportunity to review projects at TAC meetings and to check to see if the level of state and federal aid for the project is reasonable. With this two-tiered process of projects being debated at the local budget and the TIP budget levels, the road, bridge, transit and transportation enhancement projects receive an appropriate review for fiscal constraint. This ensures that the TIP will not become a "wish list" of projects that cannot be afforded with reasonably available funding levels.

### State of Kansas Funding

State funds used in Douglas County for road and bridge projects are mostly limited to KDOT facilities and projects. The level of KDOT funding expended in the region varies greatly by year due largely to how much work KDOT does on the area's major highways. Recently KDOT has spent large amounts of money to widen and improve US-59 south of Lawrence, to replace the K-10/23<sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge over the BNSF railway line in Lawrence, to build the South Lawrence Trafficway (new K-10 alignment), and to build a new interchange along K-10 at Bob Billing Parkway/N 1500 Road. All of those projects are KDOT administered projects on KDOT routes. Those projects typically do not significantly impact the local governments' budgets for transportation improvements. Some other smaller amounts of State funding are used for local projects, such as the occasional purchase of a paratransit van with state money or a state contribution to a local bridge project.

For most local governments in the region the main KDOT funding role has been to provide federal aid to local projects, not to provide large amounts of state aid to local transportation improvements. However, the one example in the region where the state funding of a local project does make a routine and significant difference in the local budget process is state transit operating assistance. The Lawrence Transit operation receives about \$1 million in state operating assistance annually, and that is an important part of their budget.

KDOT does not program projects in their budget documents or ask for projects to be added to the TIP unless a specific identified and reasonable funding source is identified. Therefore, the KDOT requests for TIP actions represent a fiscally constrained condition for state funded and/or managed projects.

### Federal Funding

The federal funding for road and bridge projects in the region is generally limited to formula funding levels set by the USDOT and KDOT. Those levels have been relatively steady over the last few years with Douglas County receiving about \$500,000 and the City of Lawrence receiving about \$1 million annually in federal aid for roads and bridges. The three smaller cities in Douglas County (Lecompton, Eudora, and Baldwin City) have small public works departments, and if they do large road or bridge projects those are often managed by Douglas County or KDOT.

The public transit operations in Lawrence are composed of a mix of services operated by the Lawrence Transit and the University of Kansas. The KU On Wheels transit operations are primarily supported by student fees. The City transit service uses state operating assistance



and both federal capital assistance and federal operating assistance to keep buses running. Lawrence also uses local sales taxes to pay for transit. In recent years Lawrence has used about \$2 million annually in flexible federal formula Section 5307 subsidies to provide transit services. This annually allocated funding can be used for capital projects (e.g., buying new buses), but most of it has been used for operations.

Capital assistance levels are typically much more unpredictable than operating assistance, but when the transit capital funding will be needed is fairly predictable because it is based on the life span of buses. That creates a dilemma for transit operators who in the past relied heavily on large discretionary grants (e.g., Section 5309) from the FTA for bus fleet replacements. Now those large grants are gone and our transit operators are adjusting to buying just a few new buses at a time when funding is available instead of buying several buses on one large grant funded order. The transit operations in Douglas County are now adjusting to the new MAP-21 capital program called Bus and Bus Facilities (Section 5339).

Discretionary funding for Transportation Enhancements (TE), safety improvements, Safe Routes To School (SRTS), and other special projects is also available on a more sporadic competitive grant basis. That funding is not guaranteed in any given year, but our region has received some funding from these sources and expects to receive more in the foreseeable future. However, because of the uncertainty of the annual funding levels for these competitive grant and specialty programs, most of these funding sources are not included in the fiscal constraint amounts included in this TIP. If and when local governments in Douglas County are awarded funding from these discretionary programs the MPO will amend the TIP to add that funding and those projects in a timely manner.

All of the estimated amounts of transportation project funds are included in the Estimated Revenues and Expenditures Tables. The estimates of reasonably expected funding levels based on recent experience are compared to the levels of federal, state and local funding for transportation facilities and services that are requested by KDOT and local governments for inclusion in the TIP. Comparing these expected funding levels and funding request levels allows the MPO to determine if the TIP is fiscally constrained as called for in the federal regulations. The fiscal constraint analysis looks primarily at capital projects (e.g., building roads and bridges, buying buses, etc.), however, that is not a complete picture of funding for the region's multimodal transportation system. The funds needed for operating and maintaining transport facilities and services also has to be reviewed. Federal regulations state that an adequate level of Operations & Maintenance (O&M) funding needs to be budgeted to maintain the federal-aid highways in the region. Shortchanging the O&M budgets to make the road improvement projects fiscally feasible is not allowed.

## **Operation and Maintenance Funding**

### **Road and Bridge Operations and Maintenance Funding Estimates**

The operation and maintenance of the roadway network throughout Douglas County consists of routine things such as pothole patching, minor repairs to pavements and curbs, snow removal, striping and marking, utility work and patching, electrical repairs, tree trimming, mowing, signal repairs, sign replacement, and other minor work tasks. The expenses for these work items are usually paid for by the local government that owns and operates the road and the utility providers that use the road rights-of-ways. In the case of major highways, KDOT is the owner of the road and maintains those facilities. The major exception to this is the Kansas Turnpike/I-70 which is owned and operated by the Kansas Turnpike Authority. Some of the state highway mileage in Lawrence is provided on City streets through a connecting link agreement between KDOT and the City. That agreement includes annual payments from KDOT to the City to pay a share of the maintenance costs for those route segments carrying a state highway. KDOT plays a role in the maintenance of some major roads in the region, but major highway mileage comprises a small percentage of total roadway mileage. Most of the road

mileage in Douglas County is owned by the County, City or Township Governments that levy local property taxes and sometimes other taxes to pay for road maintenance and operations.

The cities and county also receive a portion of the state gas tax collected in Douglas County. The City of Lawrence received approximately \$2.5 million in gas tax funds during 2013 while Douglas County received approximately \$2.1 million. This amount of funding is anticipated to continue during the years covered by this TIP. The state supplied pass through gas tax funding is supplemented by local government funds to make up the bulk of Lawrence and Douglas County roadway O&M budgets.

For 2013 the City of Lawrence had an O&M budget for its road system of approximately \$8.0 million. Those costs were paid for with \$2.5 million of state gas tax funds and \$5.0 million of local tax sources including the 2008 approved sales tax increase dedicated to infrastructure improvements. For 2013 the roadway O&M budget for Douglas County was approximately \$5.8 million with approximately \$2.1 million of that total coming from the state gas tax funds and the other \$3.7 million from County tax sources. It is expected that the local governments in the region will continue to fund their O&M budgets in order to adequately maintain their transportation infrastructure during this TIP period.

The O&M Funding Summary Table indicates that the expected level of funding for O&M of the region's roadways and bridges over the four-year fiscally constrained period covered by this TIP is steady and adequate to handle the normal O&M needs each year. Continued support exists locally for maintenance and preservation of the existing transportation infrastructure. This table also displays that the O&M funding is not planned for drastic cuts or diversions to pay the local shares of capital projects. This is in keeping with federal regulations and good transportation planning practice.

<b>2015- 2018 Total Road and Bridge Funds Operations &amp; Maintenance</b>		
(in \$1,000s)		
FY	City	* County
2015	8,000	5,800
2016	8,000	5,800
2017	8,000	5,800
2018	8,000	5,800
4-year Total	32,000	23,200
Note: O & M calculations include state gas tax funds and local tax sources. *Does not include Township road maintenance funds.		

### **Transit Operations and Maintenance Funding Estimates**

Transit operations are funded with a mix of local, state and federal funds. The transit system in Douglas County is a coordination of services owned and operated by the City of Lawrence, the University of Kansas, social service agencies that run paratransit vehicles, and Johnson County Transit that runs a commuter bus service between Lawrence and locations in Johnson County. This commuter service run by Johnson County is called the JO and its funding is programmed in the TIP produced by the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) which is the MPO for the Kansas City Area. In June 2014 the Lawrence City Commission approved \$120,000 of City funding for the JO operations. Lawrence Transit service uses some federal and state and local funds for operating and routine maintenance expenses.

Because a transit system is service based rather than facility based like road networks there can be differences in how local funding for transit and roads is raised. Lawrence Transit needs to pay for its services when they are rendered (i.e., when the buses are rolling burning fuel and labor costs are incurred). Lawrence Transit needs to maintain a cash flow to pay for its vendors and staff as they work. Unlike a road or a bridge that can be bonded for twenty years and paid for over time, transit operations are typically not paid for with debt service. For road projects if costs go up then a project might be delayed for a year, but with transit service you cannot do that since vendors and drivers will not wait a year to get paid. For 2013 the Lawrence Transit had an O&M budget of approximately \$5 million which was funded with \$2.3 million of federal aid, \$.25 million of state aid, and \$2.5 million of local funds. Those levels of O&M expenses and revenues are anticipated to continue through the four-year fiscally constrained period (2015-2018). Operations and maintenance funding for the Lawrence Transit system is shown in the Estimated Revenues and Expenditures Tables.

The paratransit providers in the region for the most part provide their own funds to operate their services, but in some cases receive a small amount of state operating subsidy from KDOT. Typically, this state operating assistance is only a few thousand dollars per year for each operator. Most of the federal and state aid to paratransit is for vehicle purchases. The MPO staff works closely with the KDOT transit staff, the Regional Transit Advisory Committee (RTAC), and the Coordinated Transit District #1 (CTD) members to keep informed about the status of paratransit operations and funding issues in Douglas County. Those paratransit issues are discussed in more detail in the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP).

### University of Kansas (KU on Wheels) Transit Funding

The University of Kansas also provides transit services that are available to the general population as well as KU students and staff. Funding for the KU On Wheels system includes, a considerable amount of funding that supports fixed route transit in Lawrence. The KU transit funding information is listed below to give a more complete and realistic account of the size and costs of the transit system in Lawrence.

The KU On Wheels (KUOW) and the Lawrence Transit services are now integrated into one route and schedule system, and both of these operations accept each other's bus passes. Even though these two services are coordinated into one route map and schedule book, only the Lawrence Transit System receives FTA funding. The KUOW operations are expected to maintain the KUOW transit service at current levels through the years covered by this TIP. The KUOW part of the public transit system in Lawrence is fiscally constrained by the revenues provided by fees that support it.

Funding Programmed in the KU Parking & Transit Budget				
Year	KU Parking Funds	KU Student Fee Funds	Other Funds	Total Funds
2015	\$ 1,233	\$ 3,285	\$ 133	\$ 4,651
2016	\$ 1,196	\$ 3,285	\$ 133	\$ 4,614
2017	\$ 1,220	\$ 3,285	\$ 133	\$ 4,638
2018	\$ 1,239	\$ 3,285	\$ 133	\$ 4,657
2019	\$ 1,239	\$ 3,285	\$ 133	\$ 4,657
Totals	\$ 6,130	\$ 16,425	\$ 665	\$ 23,220

Note: KUOW projects undergo fiscal constraint analysis prior to submission to the MPO for TIP inclusion so that all KUOW projects are presumed to be fiscally constrained.

### Fiscal Analysis

Federal law requires that the first four years of the TIP be financially constrained. The definition of financially constrained is having enough financial resources to fund projects listed in the TIP. Fiscal constraint also makes good sense. If we put all of the desired projects in the TIP then we come up with a list of needs that doesn't reflect the projects that can be completed with existing and planned financial resources. The MPO desires to have a credible TIP that represents what can and should happen in the near-term to improve our region's multimodal transport system. The fiscal constraint requirement and analysis helps the MPO do that.

This TIP document provides realistic cost and funding estimates for improvement projects in the first two years of the fiscal constraint period (2015 and 2016). Predicting the revenues that will be available and costs for projects in the second half of that period (2017 and 2018) are a more speculative exercise, however, even rough estimates of available funds and costs are helpful in showing the required four years of fiscally constrained project tables. In this uncertain time of federal funding (MAP-21 expiring soon and the future act to replace it being debated) it is difficult to estimate the funding levels two years from now. The MPO has assumed that 2014 levels for federal funding will remain in place for funding through 2018. These estimates are rough but still valuable in assessing the local government ability to obtain federal and state aid and to meet matching requirements for projects that those governments want to put in the TIP.

Projects that are under the jurisdiction of KDOT are subject to statewide KDOT financial constraints and reviews that are beyond the purview of the MPO and done by KDOT before the project information is sent to the MPO. KDOT projects are considered to be fiscally constrained when submitted to the MPO for inclusion in the TIP.

Projects submitted by the local governments in the region or other local agencies are reviewed by the TAC and the project sponsor is asked to describe the funding which is committed to each project. That process includes the review of TIP project listings at TAC meetings. If any source of funding for TIP projects, including KDOT sources, later becomes unavailable or significantly reduced then the MPO staff and TAC will review that situation and process an amendment to the TIP to reflect those changes and maintain a fiscally constrained TIP. Likewise, if new funding sources and/or increased funding levels occur then the MPO will amend the TIP to reflect those changes.

The projects and the funding in the TIP are also included in the area's local government capital improvement plans and budgets. Locally-sponsored projects in the TIP are based on the best available cost estimates and reasonable projections of revenues made by the region's local governments in conjunction with the MPO, KDOT, and public transit providers in Douglas County. For federal aid projects the local government sponsors work closely with the KDOT-Bureau of Local Projects to track their levels of federal funding. KDOT does not allow the local governments to program more projects than the federal funding will allow. Both KDOT and MPO staffs work together to see that the TIP tables and the KDOT spending plans are fiscally constrained. A similar arrangement for transit projects exists with the MPO and the FTA working together to ensure that the TIP projects listed for the Lawrence Transit match the reasonable expectations of federal funding. Projects must have a clearly stated funding source that matches local budgets, capital improvement plans, and KDOT-MPO estimates of available federal and state aid.

In addition to having a clearly identified source of funding for each roadway, bridge, transit, and enhancement project listed in the TIP, the project sponsor must also present their project costs in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. This allows the project estimates to take into account inflation and should make them more realistic than using constant dollars. In order to comply with federal regulations, this fiscal analysis uses an annual inflation factor of 1.5% (this matches the T2040 Inflation Factor) for all TIP projects to determine the estimated costs in the year of expenditure. This inflation factor was developed by KDOT in 2012 for use with federal aid projects. This inflation factor was discussed at TAC meetings including representatives from KDOT, the public transit provider, and local governments in the region. TAC members agreed to use this KDOT inflation rate in the draft TIP that was sent to the MPO for approval. That discussion and TAC approval and subsequent MPO approval of this TIP satisfies the federal requirement to have a YOE inflation rate cooperatively developed by the area's MPO planning partners.

The first year (2015) in this TIP, lists projects currently being implemented (i.e., currently in preliminary engineering/design, in right-of-way acquisition, underway with utility relocations, or under construction) or planned for implementation soon. The next three years (2016, 2017 & 2018) complete the four-year period required to be fiscally constrained. The Estimated Revenues and Expenditures Tables shows that the level of projected funding from reasonable sources and the total level of project funding programmed in this TIP for the required four year period (2015-2018) is balanced and this TIP is fiscally constrained. This TIP is a financially constrained document, and in accordance with USC Titles 23 and 49 it provides an account of funding sources for transportation improvements.

### Estimated Revenues and Expenditures Tables For TIP Projects by Year and Funding Source

The table below displays the fiscal breakdown by funding source for all roadway and transit projects listed in the first four years (2015-2018) of this five-year TIP.

Estimated Expenditures by Year and Funding Source (in thousands)						
Funding Source		FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018	Total
Federal Funds	FTA 5307	\$ 2,122	\$ 2,122	\$ 2,122	\$ 2,122	\$ 8,488
	FTA 5309	\$ 699	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 699
	FTA 5311	\$ 48	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48
	FTA 5317	\$ 39	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39
	JARC	\$ 248	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 248
	NHPP	\$ 35,038	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,038
	HRRR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	HSIP	\$ 1,025	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 2,525
	STP	\$ 24,405	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,405
	TE/TA	\$ 1,381	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,381
	Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
State		\$ 2,726	\$ 700	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 4,426
State AC Conversion*		\$ (59,943)	\$ (500)	\$ (500)	\$ (500)	\$ (61,443)
Local		\$ 8,208	\$ 10,783	\$ 6,216	\$ 4,316	\$ 29,523
<b>Total</b>		\$ 15,996	\$ 13,605	\$ 8,838	\$ 6,938	\$ 45,377

\*State AC Conversions are negative because the State is receiving federal reimbursement for funds spent in previous years (as noted in the project listing).

Estimated Revenues by Year and Funding Source (in thousands)						
Funding Source		FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2018	Total
Federal Funds	FTA 5307	\$ 2,122	\$ 2,122	\$ 2,122	\$ 2,122	\$ 8,488
	FTA 5309	\$ 699	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 699
	FTA 5311	\$ 48	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48
	FTA 5317	\$ 39	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39
	JARC	\$ 248	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 248
	NHPP	\$ 35,038	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,038
	HRRR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	HSIP	\$ 1,025	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 2,525
	STP	\$ 24,405	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,405
	TE/TA	\$ 1,381	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,381
	Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
State		\$ 2,726	\$ 700	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 4,426
State AC Conversion*		\$ (59,943)	\$ (500)	\$ (500)	\$ (500)	\$ (61,443)
Local		\$ 8,208	\$ 10,783	\$ 6,216	\$ 4,316	\$ 29,523
<b>Total</b>		\$ 15,996	\$ 13,605	\$ 8,838	\$ 6,938	\$ 45,377

\*State AC Conversions are negative because the State is receiving federal reimbursement for funds spent in previous years (as noted in the project listing).

\*\*KDOT is currently allocating JARC, 5309, 5317 and HRRR funds which are old SAFETEA-LU funds, they will be depleted soon



**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT  
LISTING**

**(Includes the Program of Projects for the  
Lawrence Transit System)**

## Appendix 1 - Latest Federal Fiscal Year - List of Obligated Projects

The purpose of this listing is to illustrate the progress of federal aid transportation projects in the region as they move through the years in the TIP projects table and onto the recently obligated projects list. Projects are listed based on the year the federal funds were obligated, not necessarily the year the construction of the project began. The federal amount represents the federal funds spent on the project.

The table below describes projects listed in the TIP that were obligated in the previous Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). A listing of projects with federal aid obligated in the previous FFY are presented to the MPO each year for review either as part of a TIP approval or amendment or as a separate memo.

The listing will be made available on the MPO website and sent to the Kansas Department of Transportation who will then distribute the listing to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes.

Lawrence-Douglas County MPO Area - List of Project for Which Federal Funds Were Obligated to in FFY 2014 (Cost in \$1,000's)														
MPO #	KDOT #	Project Name	Responsible Party	Route or Service Area	Project Description	Project Location	Work Description	Federal Funding Source	Federal Funds Requested in TIP	Federal Funds Obligated in FFY 2014	Federal Funds Obligated to Date	Federal Funds Remaining	Bike &/or Ped Elements	Project Status
400		Operating Assistance	Douglas County Senior Services, Inc.	Douglas County & nearby counties as	Paratransit Service for DG Co senior citizens	Based in Lawrence-Douglas County	Paratransit services for seniors & various trip types/purposes	FTA Section 5317 - New Freedom	38	38	38	0	No	Active
402	KS-90-X143	Transit - Operating Assistance	Lawrence	Citywide	Transit - Operating Assistance	Lawrence	Urban Fixed Route & Paratransit	FTA Section 5307 - Operating Assistance, Preventive Maintenance, Program Administration, & Security	1,858	2	1,806	52	No	Active
402	KS-90-X152	Transit - Operating Assistance	Lawrence	Citywide	Transit - Operating Assistance	Lawrence	Urban Fixed Route & Paratransit	FTA Section 5307 - Operating Assistance, Preventive Maintenance, Program Administration, & Security	2,122	1,164	1,164	958	No	Active
409	KS-03-0022	Bus Shelters & Amenities	Lawrence	Citywide	Bus Shelters & Amenities	Lawrence	Transit Amenities	FTA Section 5309 - Discretionary Funds for Capital	495	9	495	0	Yes	Closed
203	C-0059-01	CR 6 Curve Reconstruction	Douglas County/KDOT	County Route 6	Curve Reconstruction	CR 6 - N1150 Road to E 550 Road	Curve Reconstruction	High Risk Rural Roads	271	(6)	265	0	No	Closed
62	K-7888-02	US-59 Surfacing	KDOT	US Highway 59	Concrete Surfacing	US-59 from Douglas/Franklin Co Line north for 7.3 miles	Concrete Surfacing	Surface Transportation Program	16,720	316	####	5,746	No	Complete
200	K-8392-04	South Lawrence Trafficway	KDOT	K-10 Highway	Construct new 4-lane freeway with interchanges at US-59 and Haskell	K-10 and US-59 junction on south side of Lawrence to existing K-10 on the east side	Right-of-Way, New Road Construction, Special Work	National Highway Performance Program	121,781	85,743	####	####	Yes	Active
103	KA-0033-01	US-56 Taury Creek Drainage Bridge	KDOT	US-56	US-56 Bridge over Taury Creek	US-56 bridges 1.95 miles east of US-59 and 2.7 miles east of US-66	Bridge Replacements	Surface Transportation Program	2,622	2,122	2,122	500	No	Active
220	KA-1826-01	K-10/Bob Billings Parkway Interchange	KDOT	K-10 Highway	New K-10 Interchange at Bob Billings Parkway	K-10 and Bob Billings Parkway junction	Construction of a New Interchange	Surface Transportation Program	17,144	10,711	####	6,433	Yes	Active
222	KA-2611-01	23rd and Iowa Geometric Improvements	Lawrence	US-59/Iowa Street	Geometric/Intersection Improvements	23rd and Iowa Street Intersection	Geometric Improvements	Highway Safety Improvement Program	200	200	200	0	Yes	Active
502	TE-0390-01	Haskell Rail Trail	Lawrence	Rail Trail	Shared Use Path	Between 23rd and 29th Streets	Construction of a Shared Use Pathway	Transportation Enhancement	182	182	182	0	Yes	Active
221	U-0161-01	9th and Kentucky Intersection Improvements	Lawrence	9th and Kentucky Streets	Signal and Intersection Improvements	9th and Kentucky Intersection	Replace Signal, Widen Intersection to Add Turn Lanes	Highway Safety Improvement Program	190	144	144	46	Yes	Complete
228	U-0162-01	9th Street - Avalon to Arkansas	Lawrence	9th Street	Signal, Intersection and Bike-Ped Improvements	9th Street between Avalon and Arkansas	mill and overlay, restripe for two-way left turn lane, traffic signal replacement at Emery, bike lanes and sidewalk	Highway Safety Improvement Program	325	253	253	72	Yes	Active

## Appendix 2 - TIP Project Submission Form

Project Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Route (to/from location): \_\_\_\_\_

Length: \_\_\_\_\_ KDOT #: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Type (choose from available options on TIP Appendix 5): \_\_\_\_\_

Work Type (choose from available options on TIP Appendix 5): \_\_\_\_\_

Project Scope:

Comments:

Does this project use Advanced Construction?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Will the project occur in more than one year?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Is the project in the Current MTP's Fiscally Constrained List of Recommended Projects?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Is the project listed in the MTP as an Illustrative Project?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Does the project address a transport system issue discussed or noted in the MTP?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

If so, please list the issue(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Is the project regionally significant as defined by the L-DC MPO?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Is the project identified as a TCM in the SIP?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Does this project have any ITS elements?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

If yes, are the elements consistent with the approved ITS Plan?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Is the project listed and/or described in other documents or plans?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

If so, list the documents:

---

Total Project Cost (all years, all phases in \$1,000's): \_\_\_\_\_



### Appendix 3 - MPO Self-Certification

The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) and the Lawrence - Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) certify that the metropolitan transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with all applicable requirements including the following:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134, 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this subpart; All core documents are current:
  - ü MTP
  - ü TIP
  - ü UPWP
  - ü PPP
2. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 USC 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR Part 93;
3. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 USC 2000d-1) and 49 CFR Part 21;
  - ü Title VI Plan
  - ü LEP Plan
4. 49 USC 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
  - ü Title VI Plan
  - ü LEP Plan
5. Section 1101(b) of the SAFETEA-LU (Pub. L. 109-59) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;
  - ü DBE Payment Information submitted to KDOT
6. 23 CFR Part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts,
  - ü Title VI Plan
  - ü EJ Analysis Completed (as part of the MTP or TIP)
7. The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC 12101 et seq.) and 49 CFR Parts 27, 37, and 38;
  - ü Title VI Plan
8. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 USC 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
  - ü Title VI Plan
9. Section 324 of Title 23 USC regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and
  - ü Title VI Plan
10. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC 794) and 49 CFR Part 27 regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities.
  - ü Title VI Plan

---

Bryan Culver, Chair  
Lawrence-Douglas County MPO

---

Jerry Younger, Deputy Secretary/State Transportation Engineer  
Kansas Department of Transportation



## **Appendix 4 - Major Projects and Significant Delay - Definitions**

### **Roadways (including intersections and bridges)**

The major roadway projects include projects located on a roadway classified by the MPO as a Major Collector or higher, with construction costs of at least \$2.0 million, and that have at least one of the following attributes:

- Designed to increase roadway capacity and/or decrease traffic congestion
- Designed to improve safety
- Designed to replace aging infrastructure and bring it up to current standards
- Results in significant delay and/or detours during construction

Major projects do not include the following types of projects that are considered to be routine maintenance projects: mill & overlay, micro-abrasion, micro-surfacing, crack sealing, concrete rehabilitation, curb repairs, sweeping, mowing, spot repairs, and interim measures on detour routes.

### **Transit Facilities and Services**

The major transit projects include projects that need to be listed in the TIP because they use federal funding and/or are regionally significant, have a total cost of at least \$1.0 million, and meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Acquisition of three or more new transit vehicles
- Addition or expansion operations and/or maintenance buildings
- Initiation of new transit service or expansion of transit services into territory not previously served

Major transit projects do not include the following types of projects that are considered to be routine: preventive maintenance on transit vehicles; purchase of spare parts, shop supplies and fuel; annually received formula based operating assistance; purchase of bus stop signs, shelters and related items; scheduled purchases of one or two transit vehicles; staff training and recruitment; and other routine operational activities.

### **Bikeway and Pedestrian Facilities**

The major bikeway and pedestrian projects includes projects that need to be listed in the TIP because of federal funding and/or regional significance, and meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Total project cost of at least \$ 500,000
- Construction of bikeway or pedestrian facility (or extension of existing facility) into a location where a bicycle/pedestrian facility did not exist before

Major bikeway/pedestrian projects do not include the following types of projects that are considered to be routine maintenance projects: patching, crack sealing, curb repairs, sweeping, mowing, spot repairs, landscaping maintenance, sign replacements, and other routine operational activities.

### **Significant Delay**

The term significant delay will be defined as two years or more from the year first listed for the project in the previous TIP.

## Major Projects from the Previous 2012-2015 TIP

Using the definitions listed above the following major projects from the previous 2012-2015 TIP were implemented between the start of 2012 and the approval date for this new 2015-2019 TIP. This current TIP covers 2015 to 2019 so some 2015 projects could be listed in both the previous and current TIP documents.

### Roadway Projects (including intersections and bridges)

- K-10 Highway/23<sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge Project #100 - 23<sup>rd</sup> street over the BNSF Railroad, 2012-13, \$6.72 million
- US-59 Turnback Improvements Project #102 - Franklin-Douglas County Line north to 4-lane section, 2013, \$2.49 million
- US-56 Taury Creek Drainage Bridge Project #103 - 1.95 miles east of US-59/US-56 junction, 2012-14, \$3.32 million
- US-56 Taury Creek Drainage Bridge Project – East Fork #104 - 2.7 miles east of US-59/US-56 junction, 2012-13, \$2.17 million
- CR 1057 Bridge over Wakarusa River Project #105 - Route 1057 over Wakarusa River, 2012, \$3.05 million
- South Lawrence Trafficway Project #200 - US-59 to K-10, 2012-15, \$175.33 million
- US-59 Road Improvements Project #202 - Franklin/Douglas County Line north to 4-lane section, 2012, \$23.67 million
- CR 1055/6<sup>th</sup> Street Reconstruction Project #204 - US-56 north to CR 12, 2012, \$4.31 million
- CR 1055 Reconstruction Project #207 - E 1700 Road north to CR 458, 2012-15, \$ 4.78 million
- CR 458 Improvements Project #208 - E 800 Road to N 1175 Road, 2014-15, \$5.02 million
- Iowa Street Reconstruction Project #210 - Yale to Irving Hill Road, 2013, \$7.24 million
- 19th Street Reconstruction Project #211 - Naismith to Iowa Street, 2013-14, \$3.86 million
- Kasold Drive Reconstruction Project #212 - Bob Billings Parkway to Harvard Road, 2014-15, \$5.00 million
- 31st Street Construction Project #214 - Haskell to O'Connell, 2013, \$6.21 million
- K-10/Bob Billings Parkway Interchange Project #220 - K-10 Highway and Bob Billings Parkway, 2013-15, \$20.7 million
- 23rd Street/Iowa Intersection Project #222 - 23rd/K-10 and Iowa/US-59, 2014, \$4.93 million
- 6th Street/Iowa Intersection Project #223- 6th Street/US-40 and Iowa/US-59, 2013-14, \$2.51 million
- Bob Billings Parkway Reconstruction Project #235 - Wakarusa Drive to Foxfire Road, 2013, \$3.5 million
- South Lawrence Trafficway – Environmental Mitigation Project #602 - US-59 to K-10, 2012, \$12.0 million

### Transit Facilities and Services Projects

- Lawrence Transit – Bus Replacements –#407 - Citywide urban transit services, 2012, \$1.15 million
- Lawrence Transit – Bus Replacements #408 - Citywide urban transit services, 2012, \$1.00 million
- Lawrence Transit Vehicle Replacement Project #403 - Paratransit vehicles, 2012-15, \$2.55 million

### Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Projects - None

## Major Projects from the 2012-2015 TIP That Were Significantly Delayed

The following major projects from the previous TIP were significantly delayed.

### Roadway Projects (including intersections and bridges)

- South Lawrence Trafficway Project #200 – construction delayed from the 2013 construction completion listed in the original TIP entry in October 2011 to the amended 2016 construction completion date listed in the TIP in July 2014 - US-59 to K-10, 2012-13, \$175.33 million

### Transit Facilities and Services Projects - None

### Bikeway and Pedestrian Facilities Projects - None

## Appendix 5 - Explanation of TIP Project Listings

The project listings in the TIP list each project as a single entry with yearly allocations defined for larger and/or more complex projects that cover more than one year. The graphic shown below is a blank project listing template that details the layout of how project information is shown in the TIP. The following notes list the possible entries for each cell in that project listing template and may define and/or clarify what information is needed to complete a TIP project entry.

Project Sponsor:

MPO#:

KDOT#:

☐ Advanced Construction

Grand Total:

Project Name:

Project Scope:

Comments:

Route (to/from location):

Project Type:

Work Type:

Length:

FY 2015					FY 2016					FY 2017					FY 2018					FY 2019				
Fund	Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund	Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund	Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund	Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund	Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion

### Project Sponsors:

KDOT	Douglas County	Lawrence
Eudora	Baldwin City	Lecompton
Lawrence Transit	Cottonwood Inc.	Independence Inc.
Douglas County Senior	Services Inc. (DCSS)	Bert Nash Community Mental Health Center
USD 497	Douglas County Community Health	Improvement Project (CHIP)

**Project Name:** The project name is the general name given to identify the project.

**MPO #:** The MPO number is assigned by the MPO staff; it indicates the category of the project and is solely for MPO identification purposes.

**KDOT #:** The KDOT number is assigned by KDOT to a project. These numbers are provided to the MPO by KDOT for each state administered and/or funded project (including projects for which KDOT provides federal money to the local government).

**Route (to/from location):** The route identifies the starting and ending point of a project.

**Length:** The length measures the length or distance of the project in miles.

### Project Types:

Road	Bridge	Interchange	Intersection	ITS
Transit/Paratransit	Enhancement	Safe Routes To Schools (SRTS)		
Traffic Signal	Safety	Other		

### Work Types:

Access Management	Bridge Rehabilitation
Bridge Replacement	Fabrication
Geometric Improvement	Grading
Interchange	Pavement Milling
Other	Overlay
Operating	Pedestrian & Bicycle Work
Pavement Markings	Reconstruction
Redeck Bridge	Seeding
Safety	Signage
Signal	Special Work
Surfacing	Vehicle Replacement

**Advanced Construction (AC):** Advance Construction provides KDOT with flexibility in managing federal highway funds. The primary benefit of AC is that it allows the state to accelerate transportation projects using non-federal funds while maintaining eligibility to be reimbursed with federal funds at a later date. Projects that use AC will be indicated by a check in the AC box.

**AC Conversion:** AC Conversion values are project funds planned for conversion from local or state funds to federal funds; they are allocated the year the conversion is to take place.

**Grand Total:** A total cost allocated for the project from start to finish. This number may not equal the total project costs listed in the detailed yearly data because it could include allocations before or after the TIP years programmed in the current version of the TIP.

**Fund Sources:**

Major USDOT Highway Programs under MAP-21

- § National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)
- § Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- § Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
- § Railway-Highway Crossings (set-aside from HSIP)
- § Transportation Alternatives (TA) – includes Transportation Enhancement and Safe Routes To School funding
- § Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

Major USDOT Transit Programs under MAP-21

- § Urban Area Formula Grants (5307)
- § Rural Area Formula Grants (5311)
- § Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310)
- § Bus and Bus Facilities (5339) Program

State of Kansas Funding Programs (State)

- § KDOT funding of roadway and bridge project on and off the State system, and funding of transit through the T-Works Program and other approved sources

Local Government Funding Programs (Local)

- § County and City funds from various sources including local property and sales taxes

**Phases:**

PE	Preliminary Engineering
ROW	Right of Way
CE	Construction Engineering
CONST	Construction
CAP	Capital
OPRT	Operating
Utilities	Utilities

**Project Scope:** Project Scope is a brief definition of the range of the project's work and tasks included.

**Comments:** Comments include notes or observations about the project, not included in the other detailed categories.

## FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** KDOT      **MPO#:** 200      **KDOT#:** K-8392-04      ☒ **Advanced Construction**      **Grand Total:** \$186,100      **Date added:** 10/2014  
**Project Name:** South Lawrence Trafficway      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
Route (to/from location): SO Junct US 59/K10 E to K10      Linked to Project L-8392-01.      2009 PE-State funds converted to NHPP in 2014.  
2012 Utilites-State funds converted to NHPP in 2014. 2013 CE/Construction-State funds converted to NHPP in in 2014/2015.  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Special Work, Right of Way  
**Length:** 5.96

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
NHPP	Const		\$27,600																
NHPP	CE		\$7,438																
STP	Const		\$17,973																

**Project Sponsor:** Douglas County      **MPO#:** 201      **KDOT#:**      ☐ **Advanced Construction**      **Grand Total:** \$5,020      **Date added:** 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Route 458 3-R Improvements      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
Route (to/from location): Route 458 between E 800 Rd & N 1175 Rd Douglas County      3-R Improvements (restoration, resurfacing, reconstruction).      Const in 2017.  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Surfacing, Reconstruction  
**Length:** 4.3

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	ROW	\$300																	
Local	Utilities	\$200																	

**Project Sponsor:** Douglas County      **MPO#:** 202      **KDOT#:** C-4640-01      ☐ **Advanced Construction**      **Grand Total:** \$1,622      **Date added:** 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Route 1055 from Route 12 to Vinland      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
Route (to/from location): Route 1055 from Route 12 (N 400 Rd.) to Route 460 (N 700 Rd.)      Culvert replacements/extensions, pavement rehabilitation  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Reconstruction  
**Length:** 3.0

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	Const	\$900																	
HSIP	Const	\$525																	

# FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 203      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$2,000      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** 19th Street: Naismith to Iowa Reconstruction      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
Reconstruction of street will include subgrade treatment, surfacing, storm sewer, geometric improvements and multimodal facilities.  
**Route (to/from location):** 19th St from Iowa to Naismith  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Grading, Surfacing  
**Length:** .5

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
												Local	PE	\$200		Local	Const	\$1,800	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 204      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$5,920      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Kasold Reconstruction      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
Reconstruction of street will include subgrade treatment, concrete pavement and multi-modal facilities.  
**Route (to/from location):** Kasold Drive: Harvard Road to Bob Billings Pkwy  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Grading, Surfacing  
**Length:** .5

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	Utilities	\$500		Local	Const	\$5,000													
Local	Const	\$420																	

**Project Sponsor:** KDOT      **MPO#:** 205      **KDOT#:** K-9667-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$20,695      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** K-10 Access Point Consolidation      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
Consolidation of Access Points  
**Route (to/from location):** K-10 from US9 (Iowa St.) E to O'Connell Rd.  
2014 Local funding for PE(\$67,000) & ROW(\$123,000)  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:**      **Length:** 3

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	Utilities	\$25																	
Local	CE	\$101																	
State	Const	\$228																	
Local	Const	\$525																	



Date added: 10/2014

**Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
2010 PE State funds(\$669) converted to 2014 STP.  
2013 Utilities State funds(\$699) converted to 2014 STP. 2014 CE/Construction State funds(\$344/\$9,000) converted to 2014 STP.

**Work Type:**

<u>FY 2015</u>				<u>FY 2016</u>				<u>FY 2017</u>				<u>FY 2018</u>				<u>FY 2019</u>			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
STP	CE		\$1,066																
STP	Const		\$5,366																

Date added: 10/2014

**Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014

Realign High Street in intersect at 90 degrees with US 56 and add left turn lanes.

**Work Type:** Improvements

<u>FY 2015</u>				<u>FY 2016</u>				<u>FY 2017</u>				<u>FY 2018</u>				<u>FY 2019</u>			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
State	Const	\$773																	

Date added: 10/2014

**Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014

Reconstruct curve, replace two bridges and one culvert

**Work Type:** Replacement

<u>FY 2015</u>				<u>FY 2016</u>				<u>FY 2017</u>				<u>FY 2018</u>				<u>FY 2019</u>			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	PE	\$140		Local	ROW	\$300		Local	Const	\$1,000									

## FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** KDOT      **MPO#:** 209      **KDOT#:** KA-2841-02      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$600      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** US-40/K-10 Junction      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** US-40/K-10 Junction      Construction of a Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) -This project is a placeholder for future phases.      Project authorized for PE ONLY. 2013 PE(\$600,000) State funding. The total project cost, including all work phases is estimated at \$9,339,000. This estimate should be used for planning purposes only.  
**Project Type:** Interchange      **Project - Work Type:** Interchange  
**Length:** .55

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 210      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$530      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Bob Billings Pkwy & George Williams Way Intersection Signal      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Bob Billings Pkwy & George Williams Way Intersection      New Traffic Signal      FY14 PE \$30,000  
**Project Type:** Intersection      **Project - Work Type:** Intersection, Signal  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	Const	\$500																	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 211      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$2,080      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Bob Billings Pkwy: Wakarusa to Foxfire Dr Reconstruction      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Wakarusa to Foxfire Road      FY14 PE \$80,000  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Reconstruction  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	Const	\$2,000																	

## FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 212      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$3,600      **Date added:** 10/2014  
**Project Name:** 9th Street Reconstruction      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:**      **Last Revised:** 10/2014  
Reconstruction of street will include subgrade treatment, surfacing, storm sewer, geometric improvements and multimodal facilities.  
**Route (to/from location):** Massachusetts St to Delaware St  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Grading, Surfacing  
**Length:** .45

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	PE	\$300		Local	Const	\$3,000													
				Local	Util	\$300													

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 213      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$3,650      **Date added:** 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Wakarusa Reconstruction (North)      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:**      **Last Revised:** 10/2014  
Reconstruction of street will include subgrade treatment, surfacing, storm sewer, geometric improvements and multimodal facilities.  
**Route (to/from location):** North of Inverness/Legends to 6th St  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Grading, Surfacing  
**Length:** .5

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
				Local	PE	\$150		Local	Const	\$3,500									

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 214      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$2,600      **Date added:** 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Wakarusa Reconstruction (South)      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:**      **Last Revised:** 10/2014  
Reconstruction of street will include subgrade treatment, surfacing, storm sewer, geometric improvements and multimodal facilities.  
**Route (to/from location):** Research Parkway to 18th Street  
**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Grading, Surfacing  
**Length:** .22

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
								Local	PE	\$100		Local	Const	\$2,500					

# FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 215      **KDOT#:** U-0318-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$617      Date added: 11/2014  
**Project Name:** Lawrence KLINK: Selected portions of US-59      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 11/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** US-59 from 6th St to Harvard Rd and from Irving Hill Rd to 21st St      Mill and Overlay

**Project Type:** Road      **Project - Work Type:** Surfacing  
**Length:** 1.01

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
				Local	CE	\$40													
				State	Const	\$200													
				Local	Const	\$377													

**Project Sponsor:** KDOT      **MPO#:** 300      **KDOT#:** KA-2394-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$180      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** 23rd Street Traffic Signal Coordination      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence      Install fiber optic cables & video detection systems

**Project Type:** ITS      **Project - Work Type:** ITS  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
State	PE	\$150																	
Local	PE	\$30																	

**Project Sponsor:** DCSS Inc.      **MPO#:** 400      **KDOT#:**      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$78      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Douglas County Senior Services Inc: FTA 5317 Operating      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Operating  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
5317	OPRT	\$39																	
Local	OPRT	\$39																	

# FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Independence Inc.      **MPO#:** 401      **KDOT#:** ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$92      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Independence Inc.: FTA 5311 Operating & Capital      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence      2015 - 5311 Fed Admin - \$4,338; Local Admin \$1,084

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Operating  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
5311	OPRT	\$48																	
State	OPRT	\$17																	
Local	OPRT	\$27																	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence Transit      **MPO#:** 402      **KDOT#:** 5307-KS-90      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$13,618      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Operating Funds      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence      Operating and Preventative Maintenance activities.      Federal Transit 5307 Funds. 2013-2015 amounts based on 2011 levels projected.

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Operating  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
5307	OPRT	\$2,122		5307	OPRT	\$2,122		5307	OPRT	\$2,122		5307	OPRT	\$2,122		5307	OPRT	\$2,122	
Local	OPRT	\$1,616		Local	OPRT	\$1,616		Local	OPRT	\$1,616		Local	OPRT	\$1,616		Local	OPRT	\$1,616	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence Transit      **MPO#:** 403      **KDOT#:** PT-0701      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$2,547      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Transit Capital Assistance      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence      Comprehensive Transportation Program. Purchase of replacement paratransit vehicles.

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Special Work  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
State-C	CAP	\$500																	
State-C	OPRT	\$558																	

# FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence Transit      **MPO#:** 404      **KDOT#:** KS-90-X139      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$310      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** JARC Small Urban Funds      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
 FFY 2009 Small Urban JARC funds passed thru from Purchase vehicles.  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence      KDOT. 80/20 split.

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Capital  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
JARC	CAP	\$248																	
Local	CAP	\$62																	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence Transit      **MPO#:** 405      **KDOT#:** KS-03-0044      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$631      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Transit 5309 Funds      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
 FFY 2008 Capital 83% Fixed Route Bus Replacement

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Capital  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
5309	CAP	\$527																	
Local	CAP	\$104																	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence Transit      **MPO#:** 406      **KDOT#:** KS-04-0010      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$107      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Transit 5309 Funds      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
 FFY 2008 Capital- Bus & Bus Facilities -- Fleet Replacement 83%

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Capital  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
5309	CAP	\$147																	
Local	CAP	\$30																	



# FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence Transit      **MPO#:** 407      **KDOT#:** KS-04-0044      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$1,145      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Transit 5309 Funds      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
 Route (to/from location): Lawrence      FFY 2009 Capital 83% Fixed Route Bus Replacement

**Project Type:** Transit/Paratransit      **Project - Work Type:** Capital  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
5309	CAP	\$25																	
Local	CAP	\$5																	

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 500      **KDOT#:** 23TE-0373-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$1,556      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Santa Fe Depot Restoration      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
 Route (to/from location): 413 East 7th Street, Lawrence, KS      Revitalize the Santa Fe Depot site and building      TE funding to pay 80% of eligible costs. Local PE in 2014, \$1,000.

**Project Type:** Enhancement      **Project - Work Type:** Special Work  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	Const	\$258																	
TE	Const	\$1,031																	
Local	CE	\$49																	
TE	CE	\$195																	

**Project Sponsor:** Baldwin City      **MPO#:** 501      **KDOT#:** TE-0424-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$217      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Baldwin City Depot Railscape      **Project Scope:**      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
 Route (to/from location):      Extend the length of the brick boarding platform, cover the platform and install lighting, install native prairie landscaping and three additional ADA parking spaces to complete the Depot Railscape      2014 KDOT Transportation Alternatives Project

**Project Type:** Enhancement      **Project - Work Type:** Other  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
Local	PE	\$7																	
Local	Const	\$70																	
TA	Const	\$140																	

# FY 2015 to FY 2019 L-DC MPO TIP Projects (Cost in 1000's)

**Project Sponsor:** Lawrence      **MPO#:** 502      **KDOT#:** U-0464-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$15      Date added: 11/2014  
**Project Name:** Lawrence Safe Routes to School Master Plan      **Project Scope:** Preliminary Engineering to develop Safe Routes to School Master Plan.      **Comments:** Last Revised: 11/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** Lawrence

**Project Type:** SRTS      **Project - Work Type:** Special Work  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
TA	PE	\$15																	

**Project Sponsor:** KDOT      **MPO#:** 600      **KDOT#:**      ☒ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$2,500      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** Various Railroad Safety Projects in the Region      **Project Scope:** Safety improvements along railroads in region as identified by KDOT. These funds may be used to benefit the region by working to correct or improve identified safety hazards at public railway-highway crossing in a proactive manner.      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** This is a master project that would include any safety projects selected in region. State funds (SF) Conversions: 2015 SF to 2016 HISP, 2016 SF to 2017 HSIP, 2017 SF to 2018 HSIP, 2018 SF to 2019 HSIP, 2019 SF to 2020 HSIP.  
**Project Type:** Safety      **Project - Work Type:**  
**Length:**

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion
StateAC	Const	\$500		StateAC	Const	\$500		StateAC	Const	\$500		StateAC	Const	\$500		StateAC	Const	\$500	
HSIP	Const		\$500	HSIP	Const		\$500	HSIP	Const		\$500	HSIP	Const		\$500	HSIP	Const		\$500

**Project Sponsor:** KDOT      **MPO#:** 700      **KDOT#:** KA-3634-01      ☐ Advanced Construction      **Grand Total:** \$1,500      Date added: 10/2014  
**Project Name:** South Lawrence Trafficway Widening Study      **Project Scope:** Study to provide a 4-lane freeway section, review area issues, current transport needs, impacts on current projects, interchange configurations, reevaluate the evrn docs for preferred improvements,      **Comments:** Last Revised: 10/2014  
**Route (to/from location):** K-10 West Leg in Douglas County US 59/K10/Iowa to I70/KTA/K10 Junction      Project is authorized for PE ONLY. Project started in 2014 and is ongoing into 2015.  
**Project Type:** Other      **Project - Work Type:** Road Widening  
**Length:** 8.43

FY 2015				FY 2016				FY 2017				FY 2018				FY 2019			
Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion	Fund Source	Phase	Obligation	AC Conversion