



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pro | osed Fundin |  |  |  |  | ring |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\text { ID\# }}{\substack{\text { COVID-19 }}}$ | Implementing Agency | City | Project/ Facility | Limits | Project Scope | Fiscal <br> Year | Phase | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Federal } \\ & \text { CMAQ } \\ & (\text { CAT 5) } \end{aligned}$ | Federal STBG (CAT 7) | Local | Transp. Dev. Credits (TDCs) | Total Proposed Funding | Regional Network Connectivity or Strong Context Design | Consistency with Mobility Plan | Safety | Regional Partnership | Total | Comments |
| Projects Not Recommended for Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dallas | Dallas | Lovers Lane | Dallas North Tollway to Lemmon Avenue | Reconstruct from $4 / 6$ to 4 lanes including signal improvements, shared use path, and sidewalks, and onstreet parking from Lemmon Avenue to Briarwood |  | E | \$0 | \$0 | \$982,850 |  | \$982,850 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 70 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c | \$588,000 | \$4,340,500 | \$4,900,000 |  | \$9,828,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$588,000 | \$4,340,500 | \$5,882,850 |  | \$10,811,350 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dallas County | Dallas | Denton Drive | Royal Lane to City Limits | Reconstruct 2 lane rural to 3 lanes with bicycle lane |  | E | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,420,500 |  | \$2,420,500 | 25 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 65 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 750,000$ $\$ 500,000$ |  | $\$ 750,000$ $\$ 500,000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | \$0 | \$9,054,000 | \$2,263,500 |  | \$11,317,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | so | \$9,054,000 | \$5,934,000 |  | \$14,988,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Denton | Denton | Mayhill Road | Colorado Boulevard to 0.5 miles south of Spencer Road | Reconstruct and widen 2 to 4 lane divided roadway, including new signal at Mayhill/Colorado intersection and shared use path |  | E | \$0 | \$0 | \$750,000 |  | \$750,000 | 25 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 65 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,000,000 |  | \$5,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c | \$0 | \$8,488,315 | \$9,261,685 |  | \$17,750,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S0 | \$8,488,315 | \$15,011,685 |  | \$23,500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dallas | Dallas | Ross Avenue | IH 345/US 75 to Greenville Avenue | Reconstruct from 5 to 4 lanes including shared use path |  | E | \$0 | \$0 | \$700,000 |  | \$700,000 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 60 | This project location identified as truck route, so it may not be a good candidate for a lanes reduction. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | \$0 | \$0 | \$250,000 |  | \$250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | \$0 | \$5,175,250 | \$3,500,000 |  | \$8,675,250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | So | \$5,175,250 | \$4,450,000 |  | \$9,625,250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Richardson | Richardson | Glennville Drive | Campbell Road to Arapaho Road | Reconstruct 4 to 2 lane divided roadway with bicycle lanes, widened sidewalks, and enhanced lighting |  | E | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 |  | \$1,500,000 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 55 | Current land use is not priority for complete streets implementation |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |  | \$100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c | \$0 | \$7,000,000 | \$3,900,000 |  | \$10,900,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | so | \$7,000,000 | \$5,500,000 |  | \$12,500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lewisville | Lewisville | South Mill Street | Purnell Street to Harvard Avenue | Reconstruct 4 lane to 5 lane roadway with bicycle lanes and widened sidewalks |  | E | \$0 | \$792,000 | \$198,000 |  | \$990,000 | 15 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 55 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$1,000 |  | \$5,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | U | \$0 | \$3,920,000 | \$1,000,000 |  | \$1,000,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$4,716,000 | \$2,179,000 |  | \$6,895,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Richardson | Richardson | Custer Road | Campbell Road to SH 190 | Reconstruct 2/6 to 2/6 lane roadway including reconstruction of existing bicycle lanes; Widen sidewalks and construct ADA ramp improvements |  | E | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 |  | \$1,500,000 | 15 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 55 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 |  | \$100,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c | \$0 | \$16,200,000 | \$4,050,000 |  | \$20,250,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S0 | \$16,200,000 | \$5,650,000 |  | \$21,850,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Funding Summary by Year (FY 2022-2025) |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| FY | CMAQ | STBG |
| 2022 | $\$ 400,000$ | $\$ 2,000,000$ |
| 2023 | $\$ 800,000$ | $\$ 7,824,000$ |
| 2024 | $\$ 5,600,000$ | $\$ 0$ |
| 2025 | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $\$ 9,678,300$ |
| Total | $\$ 8,800,000$ | $\$ 19,502,300$ |
| Grand <br> Total | $\$ 28,302,300$ |  |


| West/East Split (Total Recommended Funding) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | West | East | West $\%$ | East \% |
| STBG | $\$ 12,200,000$ | $\$ 7,302,300$ | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| CMAQ | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 7,800,000$ | $11 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Total | $\$ 13,200,000$ | $\$ 15,102,300$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $\$ 28,302,300$ |  |  |  |




| Funding Summary by Year (FV 2022-2025) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY | RTR | CMAQ | STBG |
| 2022 | \$0 | \$280,000 | 50 |
| 2023 | so | \$7,408,000 | \$1,350,000 |
| 2024 | so | \$3,72,000 | \$2,052,000 |
| 2025 | sa | 50 |  |
| Total | S0 | \$11,408,000 | \$3,402,00 |
| ${ }^{\text {Grand }}$ | \$14,810,000 |  |  |


| t/East Split (Total Recommended Funding) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | West | East | West \% | East\% |
| CMAQ | \$2,720,000 | \$8,688,000 | 24\% | 76\% |
| STBG | 50 | \$3,402,000 | 0\% | 100\% |
| RTR | 50 | so | \% | 0\% |
| Overall | 20,000 | \$12,090,000 | 18\% | 82\% |
| Grand Total | \$14,81 | ,000 |  |  |









|  |  | 50 | $\$ 32,955,000$ | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $100 \%$ |  |  |

COVID-19 \#00X Infrastructure Program (Round 4)
Funding Recommendations: Strategic Partnerships

| $\begin{gathered} \text { COVID-19 } \\ \text { ID\# } \end{gathered}$ |  | City |  | Limits | Project Scope | Fiscal Year | Phase | Proposed Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Implementing Agency |  | Project/Facility |  |  |  |  | Federal STBG (CAT 7) | Regional Toll Revenue (RTR) | RTC Local | State | Local | Transp. Dev. Credits (TDCs) | Total Proposed Funding |  |
| Projects Recommended for Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#078 | NCTCOG | Everman | Integrated Stormwater/ Flooding Management Study | Citywide | Conduct planning study to identify areas at risk of flooding; integration of stormwater management and transportation planning | 2022 | 1 | \$0 | \$0 | \$105,000 | \$0 | \$0 |  | \$105,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$105,000 | \$0 | \$0 |  | \$105,000 |  |
| \#079 | NCTCOG | Various | 1 H 30 | Dallas/Tarrant County Line to IH 635 | Planning study to review design elements needed to accommodate automated and electric vehicles, including dynamic inductive charging technology usable by all vehicle types | 2022 | 1 | \$1,600,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$400,000 | \$0 |  | \$2,000,000 | Funding would be in addition to the $\$ 2,000,000$ STBG already approved via the Regional 10 -Year Plan |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,600,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$400,000 | \$0 |  | \$2,000,000 |  |
| \#080 | NCTCOG | Various | 1 H 30 | IH 35W to Dallas/Tarrant County Line | Planning study to review design elements needed to accommodate automated and electric vehicles, including dynamic inductive charging technology usable by all vehicle types | 2022 | 1 | \$800,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 | \$0 |  | \$1,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$800,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 | \$0 |  | \$1,000,000 |  |
| \#081 | Dallas | Dallas | Northwest Highway | At Tulane Boulevard | Construct access point into redeveloping land use area | 2022 | c | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |  | \$250,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 |  | \$250,000 |  |
| \#082 | Dallas | Dallas | Huntington Road | East Belt Line Road to South of DART Silver Line | Construct 0 to 4 lane roadway | 2024 | c | \$1,200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$300,000 |  | \$1,500,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$300,000 |  | \$1,500,000 |  |
| \#083 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dallas/Dallas } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ | Dallas | Lake June Road | At US 175 | Replace structure and convert partial clover leaf to a conventional diamond intersection | 2023 | E | \$2,400,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$600,000 |  | \$3,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,400,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$600,000 |  | \$3,000,000 |  |
| \#084 | TxDOT Dallas | Denton | FM 407 | Gulf Avenue to West of Sage | Realign existing 2 to 2 lane roadway to address safety issue | 2022 | c | \$1,040,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$260,000 | \$0 |  | \$1,300,000 | Multiple crashes along this stretch of roadway |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,040,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$260,000 | \$0 |  | \$1,300,000 |  |
| \#085 | Grand Prairie | Grand Prairie | Jefferson | Cimarron Trail to SH 161 | Reconstruct 6 lane asphalt to 6 lane concrete roadway to withstand truck traffic | 2023 | C | \$4,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 |  | \$5,000,000 | Project needed to enable construction of Main Street project that was previously funded by the RTC |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$4,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 |  | \$5,000,000 |  |

COVID-19 \#00X Infrastructure Program (Round 4)
Funding Recommendations: Strategic Partnerships
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# Evaluation Methodology For 

## COVID-19 Infrastructure Program (Round 4)

Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

| Category | Regional Network Connectivity or Strong Context Design | Implementation of Mobility Plan | Safety | Regional Partnership and Other Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Improves connectivity of Mobility 2045 regional paths and bikeways between cities and counties. The design is suitable for the context of the location and provides high comfort for users of all ages and abilities. | Improves connectivity of Mobility 2045 regional paths and bikeways between cities and counties. Provides alternative travel options in lieu of motor vehicle trips in areas with greater opportunity for walking and bicycling, thus improving air quality. | Improves safety and provides facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists, and is located in an area with document high crash history and/or safety concerns. | NCTCOG has been actively coordinating with the implementing agency to advance planning and preliminary engineering. Project scope of work is well defined and coordinated with NCTCOG. Addresses other factors related to project impact upon the community. |
| Points (max) | 25 (max) | 25 (max) | 25 (max) | 25 (max) |
| High Criteria / Scoring Range (16-25 Points) | Project is on the Regional Veloweb (regionally significant) and provides connectivity between multiple jurisdictions. Project is identified along a regionallysignificant bikeway corridor. Project provides pedestrian connections to major designations such as employment centers, downtowns, and higher density areas with a low stress/high comfort facility ${ }^{2}$. | Project is on the Regional Veloweb designated in Mobility 2045. Project's length or resulting gap closure is long, resulting in significant continuous network mileage. Project connects to a rail station and/or is located in an area with a high density of short trips by motor vehicles. Project provides seamless connections to destinations. | Project is located in an area with high bicycle and/or pedestrian crash density, or implements safety countermeasure(s) identified in a safety report or audit. Project design addresses a documented safety issue. | Considerable design and engineering is complete and/or has been advanced by NCTCOG partnerships and funding. Project is feasible with realistic cost estimates. Project's benefits appear to justify the cost. |
| Medium Criteria / Scoring Range (515 points) | Project is on the Regional Veloweb (regionally significant), but is limited to one jurisdiction. Project's length is moderate to short. On-street bikeway facilities connect and extend an existing Regional Veloweb. Pedestrian connections are to major destinations per Mobility 2045 with a low stress/high comfort facility. ${ }^{2}$ | Project is designated as Regional Veloweb designated in Mobility 2045. Project closes a gap or extends an existing Regional Veloweb facility, and/or provides sidewalk accommodations to major destinations. Project is located in an area with a moderate density of short trips by motor vehicles. | Project includes a low stress/high comfort facility in a medium to low bicycle and/or pedestrian crash density area. ${ }^{2}$ Project is a safety countermeasure addressing a known issue but not identified in a safety report or audit. | Project has some progress in preconstruction (engineering and design). Project's benefits justify the cost. Project has moderate evidence of public support. |
| Low Criteria I Scoring Range (05 points) | Project is local in nature and provides limited benefit to the larger area (not regionally significant). Project is located in an area with no or low density of short trip by motor vehicles, but may provide direct access to local destinations. Project does not include a low stress/high comfort facility. ${ }^{2}$ | Project is not designated as a trail or bikeway facility in Mobility 2045, and/or sidewalks to do not provide access to major destinations. Pedestrian facilities are consistent with the recommendations of Mobility 2045, but do not connect to major "high density" destinations. | Project area has no documented safety issues. Project is not in a bicycle and/or pedestrian crash density area. Project provides some inherent safety benefit. | No schematic design or engineering has been completed for project. Project may not be feasible and benefits may not justify the costs. Project has no evidence of public support, or limited documentation was available to justify the project benefits. |

${ }^{2}$ A low stress / high comfort facility is considered a wide sidewalk (minimum 5 feet in width) for pedestrians or a minimum 10-14 foot wide off-street shared-use path for both pedestrians and bicyclists, or separated/protected bike lanes or on-street bike lanes with a suitable design for users of all ages and abilities based on the context of the project location (e.g. projected traffic volumes, speeds, adjoining land uses, etc.). Such project design must be consistent with relevant Design Guidelines and resources including AASHTO, NACTO, ITE, FHWA, and TxDOT.

# Evaluation Methodology For <br> COVID-19 Infrastructure Program (Round 4) <br> Complete Streets Projects 

```
Regional Network Connectivity or Strong Context Design
Lowest Score: 0; Highest Score: }2
Breakdown:*
0: No other modes beyond auto provided for
10: One additional usage added (auto + pedestrian)
15: Two or more modes, (auto, ped, bicycle, potential transit); bicycle accommodation is narrow or on-street bicycle lane
25: Adds enhanced bicycle + ped infrastructure separating the users from the roadway, enhanced transit accessibility
*Points adjusted based on land use and opportunities for redevelopment
Implementation of Mobility Plan: 0-25
Projects included in Mobility Plan or supported/were consistent with goals/policies in the Mobility Plan. Some adjustments made for other areas
of the plan affected such as freight, transportation and land use compatibility, etc.
```


## Safety

```
Lowest Score: 0 (no data); Highest Score: 25
Breakdown:**
ㅇ: No safety improvements mentioned
10: Sidewalks only
15: Bicycle path removes bicycle from roadway; enhanced pedestrian safety (wider sidewalks, lighting, ramps); and/or provides safety
infrastructure for both bikes and peds; and/or adds another element (signal redesign, traffic calming) or increased safety at intersections (bump outs, etc.)
25: Also adds additional roadway safety (median, etc.); signalized ped crossings, enhanced bicycle/ped infrastructure or traffic calming
**Points adjusted for proximity to schools with improvements for safe travel and crossings near schools
Partnership: 0 to 25
Projects coordinated with COG with advance planning and/or engineering and/or multi-jurisdictional project. Level of advance planning and stakeholder involvement evaluated. Funding partnerships with other entities evaluated as well.
```


# Evaluation Methodology For <br> COVID-19 Infrastructure Program (Round 4) <br> Intersection Projects 

Initial Screen: Is the roadway at least a Major Collector on the FFCS (or can it justifiably be added)?

| Safety (\# of crashes from 2016-2020) | Air Quality Benefits (NOx reduction in lbs/day) | Cost Effectiveness (Cost/lb of NOx reduced over project life) | Traffic Volumes | Level of Service | Equity (i.e., project is located in an EJ area) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\geq 76=20$ | $>0.5 \mathrm{lbs} /$ day $=15$ | $\leq \$ 999=15$ | $\geq 30,000=20$ | $F=20$ | 3 layers touched (no buffer)= 10 |
| $40-75=15$ | 0.26-0.5 lbs/day = 10 | \$1,000-\$4,999 = 10 | 20,000-29,999 = 15 | $D E=15$ | 1-2 layers touched (no buffer) $=8$ |
| $16-39=10$ | 0.01-0.25 lbs/day = 5 | $\geq \$ 5,000=5$ | 10,000-19,999 = 10 | $\mathrm{ABC}=5$ | 3 layers within .25 miles $=6$ |
| $\leq 15=5$ |  |  | $\leq 9,999=5$ |  | 1-2 layers within 25 miles $=4$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Any number of layers within .5 mile $=2$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | No layers within .5 mile $=0$ |

Notes:
Projects may receive a maximum possible score of 100.
NOx = Nitrogen Oxides
Source of crash data: Texas Department of Transportation
Equity score accounts for Minority, Low Income, and Limited English
Proficiency populations

## Evaluation Methodology For

## COVID-19 Infrastructure Program (Round 4)

Addition of Lanes Projects

Initial Screen: Is the roadway at least a Major Collector on the FFCS (or can it justifiably be added)? Are additional lanes warranted?

| Safety (\# of crashes) | Traffic Volumes | Level of Service | Equity (i.e., project is located in an EJ area) | Pavement Condition | Bridge Deficiency | Freight Connectivity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\geq 211=20$ | $\geq 40,000=25$ | $F=25$ | 3 layers touched (no buffer) $=10$ | $\geq 75=15$ | Poor Condition $=10$ | $Y=5$ |
| $78-210=15$ | $30,000-39,999=20$ | $D E=20$ | 1-2 layers touched (no buffer) $=8$ | $50-74=10$ | Fair Condition = 5 | $N=0$ |
| $20-77=10$ | $20,000-29,999=15$ | $A B C=5$ | 3 layers within 0.25 miles $=6$ | $25-49=5$ | Good Condition/No data available/Project does not cross a bridge $=0$ |  |
| $\leq 19=5$ | 10,000-19,999 = 10 |  | 1-2 layers within 0.25 miles $=4$ | $\leq 24$ or No data available $=0$ |  |  |
| $0=0$ | $\leq 9,999=5$ |  | Any \# of layers within 0.5 mile $=2$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | No layers within 0.5 mile $=0$ |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Projects may receive a maximum possible score of 110
Source of crash data: Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) (2016-2020)
FFCS = Federal Functional Classification System
Equity score accounts for Minority, Low Income, and Limited English Proficiency populations
EJ = Environmental Justice
Pavement Condition score derived from percentage of segments deemed to be Good, Fair, and Poor
Source of Pavement Condition data: Pavement Management Information System (PMIS)
Source of Bridge data: National Bridge Inventory and TxDOT

## Evaluation Methodology For

 COVID-19 Infrastructure Program (Round 4)New Roadways

Initial Screen: Are additional lanes warranted?

| Traffic Volumes | Level of Service | Equity (i.e., project is located in an EJ <br> area) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\geq 40,000=40$ | $\mathrm{~F}=40$ | 3 layers touched (no buffer) $=20$ |
| $30,000-39,999=30$ | $\mathrm{DE}=30$ | $1-2$ layers touched (no buffer) $=16$ |
| $20,000-29,999=25$ | $\mathrm{ABC}=15$ | 3 layers within 0.25 miles $=12$ |
| $10,000-19,999=20$ |  | $1-2$ layers within 0.25 miles $=8$ |
| $\leq 9,999=15$ |  | Any \# of layers within 0.5 mile $=4$ |
|  | No layers within 0.5 mile $=0$ |  |

## Notes:

Projects may receive a maximum possible score of 100
Equity score accounts for Minority, Low Income, and Limited English Proficiency populations

EJ = Environmental Justice

