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Implementing Mobility 2040
Active Transportation Policies and Programs

Policy BP3-001:
Support the planning and design of a multimodal transportation network with seamless interconnected active transportation facilities that promotes walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes.

BP2-001: Active Transportation Planning and Design
A. Multimodal Transportation Plans
B. Complete Streets
C. Context-Sensitive Design
D. Corridor Studies
E. American with Disabilities Act Transition Plans
F. Local Regulations
G. Data Collection and Analysis
H. Technical Support/Resources/Research
Active Transportation Policies and Programs

Policy BP3-002:
Implement pedestrian and bicycle facilities that meet accessibility requirements and provide safe, convenient, and interconnected transportation for people of all ages and abilities.

BP2-002: Active Transportation Network Implementation
A. Complete the Regional Active Transportation Network
   1. Close Gaps and Improve Connectivity in the Regional Veloweb, On-Street Bikeway Network, and the Pedestrian Network
   2. Linkages to Transit and Major Destinations
   3. Improve Accommodations in Environmental Justice Areas and for Transit-Dependent Populations
   4. Regional Pedestrian Network
   5. Safe Routes to School
B. Safety Improvements
C. ADA Compliance
Priority Areas to Improve Facilities and Accessibility

**Excerpt from the Mobility Options Chapter:**

“Mobility 2040 recommends prioritizing improvements to active transportation facilities to **close gaps within the larger network, increase the use of facilities, improve safety and comfort for pedestrians and bicyclists, and create easier access to destinations** including:

- Public transportation facilities (bus stops and rail stations)
- Mixed-use/transit-oriented development areas
- Central business districts and major employment centers
- Educational institutions
- Neighborhood services (e.g. grocery stores, medical centers, and libraries)
- Neighborhoods with transit-dependent populations
- Areas with pedestrian and bicycle safety concerns and high rates of crashes”
Facility recommendations indicate transportation need. Corridors specific alignment, design, and operational characteristics for the Regional Veloweb system will be determined through ongoing project development.
*The Community Shared-Use Paths supplement the Regional VeloWeb network. These paths do not include recreational paths/loops, private paths, equestrian or nature trails, or wide sidewalks less than 10-feet in width.

Facility recommendations indicate transportation need. Corridors specific alignment, design, and operational characteristics for these paths will be determined through ongoing project development.
*On-street bikeways in the urbanized area include: separated or protected bike lanes/cycle tracks, bike lanes, marked shared lanes, and marked bicycle boulevards.

On-street bikeways in the urbanized area do not include: signed bike "routes", signed "share the road", unmarked wide outside lanes, or signed wide shoulders. The use of wide shoulders are included on various roadways linking rural communities outside of the urbanized area.

Facility recommendations indicate transportation need. Corridors specific alignment, design, and operational characteristics for the network will be determined through ongoing project development.
Combined Regional Veloweb, Community Paths and On-Street Bikeway Network

Existing/Funded*
1,482 Miles

Planned*
5,556 Miles

Total 7,038 Miles

Major Roads

---

Dallas CBD

Fort Worth CBD

---

*The Regional Veloweb and Community Shared Use Path network does not include recreational paths/loops, private paths, equestrian or nature trails, or wide sidewalks less than 10-feet in width.

On-street bikeways in the urbanized area include: separated or protected bike lanes / cycle tracks, bike lanes, marked shared lanes, and marked bicycle boulevards. On-street bikeways in the urbanized area do not include signed bike "routes", signed "share the road", unmarked wide outside lanes, or signed wide shoulders.

The use of wide shoulders are included on various roadways linking rural communities outside of the urbanized area.

Facility recommendations indicate transportation need. Corridors specific alignment, design, and operational characteristics for the network will be determined through ongoing project development.
Highlighted Regional Trail Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Existing/Funded</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Belt Regional Trail Corridor</td>
<td>11 miles</td>
<td>34 miles</td>
<td>45 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth to Dallas Regional Trail Corridor</td>
<td>53 miles</td>
<td>11 miles</td>
<td>64 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas to McKinney Regional Trail Corridor</td>
<td>67 miles</td>
<td>15 miles</td>
<td>82 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton to Dallas Regional Trail Corridor</td>
<td>41 miles</td>
<td>13 miles</td>
<td>54 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no singular design prescription for Complete Streets; each one is unique and responds to its community context.

Complete Streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities.

Source: City of Dallas

Source: Smart Growth America
Pedestrian and Bicycle Routes to Rail Stations

- Rail Station
- Destination

- Half-mile walk distance
- Beyond half-mile actual walk distance
- Barriers and Gaps in the Network
- Disconnected pedestrian facility

Beyond half-mile actual walk distance
Pedestrian Routes to Rail – Hampton Station

Project Overview

The Pedestrian Routes to Rail study identifies all existing pedestrian facilities within a half-mile radius of existing light rail and commuter rail stations in the Dallas-Fort Worth region based on 2014 data. ArcGIS Network Analyst tool was used to identify continuous facilities that are less than or greater than a half-mile actual walking distance to a station. The maps also reflect existing facilities that are disconnected due to gaps or other barriers not allowing a continuous pedestrian route to a station. The maps do not reflect the condition of ADA compliance of the existing infrastructure. More information on the Routes to Rail study and methodology can be found at:

nctcog.org/RoutesToRail
Safety Focus
States and Cities

States and Cities with the Highest Pedestrian Fatalities and/or Fatality Rates

Pedestrian Fatality Rates*
(Per 10k walking commuters)

#41: Texas


Top 50 Cities*
#26 Austin
#37 Houston
#44 San Antonio
#47: Dallas
#50: Fort Worth
Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Density (2010-2014)
All Ages and Abilities (AAA)  
(Designing for Ages 8 to 80)
2017 Call for Projects Program (Proposed)
What is the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program?

FAST Act: Fixing America’s Surface Transportation

(Current transportation funding and authorization bill)

Includes the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program (TA Set-Aside).
  • Similar to the previous Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

Requires states to suballocate to areas based on population.

MPO’s serving urbanized areas with populations over 200,000 are responsible for selecting projects through a competitive process.
Eligible Project Area
Eligible Project Areas Under the NCTCOG and the State Call for Projects

State CFP Anticipated Opening: Jan. 2017
State CFP Anticipated Deadline: May 2017
2017 Call for Projects (North Central Texas)

Eligible Project Activities (Proposed)

Active Transportation
- Shared-Use Paths
- On-Street Bikeways
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Signalization
- Sidewalks, Crosswalks, Curb Ramps
- Traffic Controls and Calming Measures
- Signage
- Road Diets

Safe Routes to School
- Shared-Use Paths
- On-Street Bikeways
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Signalization
- Sidewalks, Crosswalks, Curb Ramps
- Traffic Controls and Calming Measures
- Signage
### Funding Allocation for FY16*, 17, 18, and 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Subregion</th>
<th>Eastern Subregion</th>
<th>Total TA Set-Aside Funding Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>Dallas and Paris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34%)</td>
<td>District Share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,038,519</td>
<td>$15,407,560</td>
<td>$23,446,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maximum Federal Funding Award per Project (PROPOSED)
- $5,000,000

#### Minimum Federal Funding Award per Project (PROPOSED)
- $250,000

* Includes $238,079 of FY16 funds carried over from the 2014 TAP Call for Projects.
Twenty Percent (minimum) Local Match

Local Match Must be Cash

A Resolution of Local Cash-match Commitment is Required for Each Application

Note:
The TA Set-Aside Program is not a grant. The funds provided are on a cost reimbursement basis.
Local Governments

Regional Transportation Authorities

Transit Agencies

School Districts, Local Education Agencies, or Schools

Tribal Governments

Other Local or Regional Governmental Entity with Responsibility for Oversight of Transportation or Recreational Trails
# Minimum Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way / Easement</td>
<td>Project must have all necessary ROW or Easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Funding Resolution</td>
<td>Application must include documentation approved by the Governing Body to confirm the availability of the local match contribution if the project is awarded funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Checklist</td>
<td>Application must include a completed environmental review checklist identifying the project readiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>For all Safe Routes to School (SRTS) applications, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or resolution of support between the ISD and local government is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Program Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Agreement</strong></td>
<td>Applicant must commit to executing an Advanced Funding Agreement (AFA) with TxDOT within <strong>one year</strong> of project selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Obligation</strong></td>
<td>Applicant must commit to advance to construction within <strong>three years</strong> from selection or risk the loss of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Overruns</strong></td>
<td>Solely the responsibility of the nominating entity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation and Scoring
(Proposed)
**PROPOSED Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for Active Transportation Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring (pts)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Network Connectivity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Improves connectivity of Mobility 2040 regional paths and bikeways between cities and counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Improves connections and access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Improves safety and provides facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists with a high level of comfort and suitability for users of all ages and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Barriers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provides safe crossing of existing travel obstacles such as major roadways, interchanges, railroads, and bodies of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Reduction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provides alternative travel options in lieu of motor vehicle trips in areas with greater opportunity for walking and bicycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Density</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provides access to areas with a high density of major employers and destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improves air quality by supporting non-motorized facility usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improves access to disadvantaged populations and underserved communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Network Connectivity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implements locally planned priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for Safe Routes to School Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring (pts)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implements a Local Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Implements a project identified as a priority in a local Safe Routes to School plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Improves the safety of students walking and bicycling to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Reduction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strong potential for the project to increase walking and bicycling by students in lieu of motor vehicle trips to and from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Improves school access for disadvantaged populations and underserved communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support and Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Builds upon demonstrated community support for walking and bicycling to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improves air quality by supporting non-motorized facility usage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Considerations (Proposed)
### Additional Considerations

#### Active Transportation Applications and Safe Routes to School Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring (pts)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness and Other Factors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Project readiness/ability to obligate funds and initiate construction quickly. Other factors related to project impact upon the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Innovation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project implements innovative or new treatments and technology that can serve as a model for the region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Separated Bike Lanes and Protected Intersections

Source: NCTCOG

Source: Flickr: John Greenfield
Separated Pedestrian and Bike Facilities

Source: NCTCOG

Source: landscapevoice.com
Bicycle Facilities with Interim Approval by FHWA

- Color Pavement for Bike Lanes
- Bicycle Signal Faces
- Intersection Bicycle Boxes

Source: NCTCOG

Source: NCTCOG

Source: NACTO
Bicycle and Pedestrian Traffic Controls and Count Equipment

Inductive Loop

Bicycle Detector signalized intersections
(Including inductive loop, video detection and microwave radar).

Source: NACTO

Source: NCTCOG
Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB) and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons

Source: City of Flagstaff

Source: Lane Light

Source: City of Austin
Median Crossing Islands and Z Crossings

www.pedbikeimages.org - Dan Burden

Source: NACTO
Road Retrofit or Road Diet

Examples of Potentially Eligible Elements for Funding as part of a Street Project

Retrofit / Road Diet

- New sidewalks
- New pedestrian lighting
- Adding pedestrian and bike controls at traffic signals
- Pedestrian crossings
- Bicycle pavement markings and intersection bike boxes
- Protected intersection
- Installation of separated bikeways
- Measures to improve on-street bicycle crash hazards (replacement of storm water grates, utility covers, etc.)

*Incidental costs should be kept to a minimum.

Not Eligible for Reimbursement

- Street repaving or reconstruction
- Drainage
- Street lighting
- Traffic signals (vehicles)
- Other general maintenance activities (e.g. cracked or heaving sidewalks, potholes)

Source: NYC DOT
Schedule (Proposed)
## Proposed Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPAC / Transportation Alternatives Call for Projects Public Meeting</td>
<td>11/16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTC Action (CFP Guidelines)</td>
<td>12/2/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Action (CFP Guidelines)</td>
<td>12/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for Projects <em>Opens</em></td>
<td>12/12/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Workshop</td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Meetings to Review Applications for Completeness</td>
<td>2/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for Projects <em>Closes</em></td>
<td>2/24/17; 5:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Projects / Scoring by NCTCOG</td>
<td>March – April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td>Early May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTC Action (Selected Projects)</td>
<td>5/26/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Action (Selected Projects)</td>
<td>6/8/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop for Selected Projects</td>
<td>6/21/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submittal Deadline for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>7/28/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>Nov/Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions

1. The 2014 Call for Projects had a limited number of SRTS applications. Were there issues impacting the ability to submit such applications?

2. Should a funding pool be designated to specifically award to SRTS projects (e.g. $5 million)?

3. Is it feasible to require a MOU or Resolution from the partnering agency for SRTS project applications (e.g. Resolution of support by the School Board) in order to encourage coordination between the local government and the ISD?
Questions?

Contact Information

Karla Weaver, AICP
Sustainable Development Program Manager
kweaver@nctcog.org
817-608-2376

Kevin Kokes, AICP
Principal Transportation Planner
kkokes@nctcog.org
817-695-9275

Daniel Snyder
Transportation Planner II
dsnyder@nctcog.org
817-608-2394

Kathryn Rush
Transportation Planner I
krush@nctcog.org
817-701-5601

www.nctcog.org/TAP
Deadline for Submitting Feedback:

Friday, November 18\textsuperscript{th}

STTC Action: December 2\textsuperscript{nd}
RTC Action: December 8\textsuperscript{th}

Call Opens: December 12\textsuperscript{th}
App. Workshop: December 14\textsuperscript{th}