MINUTES

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING

Mobility 2050: Draft Plan Recommendations and Transportation Conformity Analysis

Fort Worth 76104 Transit Needs Assessment: Initial Study Recommendations

Regional Bicycle Safety Action Plan

Strategic Selection of Safety Corridors

Proposed Modifications to the List of Funded Projects

Meeting Date and Location

The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) held a hybrid public meeting on Monday, May 12, 2025 at noon in Arlington. Patrons could attend in person, via phone or view the live stream at www.publicinput.com/nctcogMay25. Karla Windsor, Senior Program Manager, moderated the meeting attended by 116 people.

Public Meeting Purpose and Topics

The public meeting was held in accordance with the NCTCOG Transportation Department Public Participation Plan, which became effective June 1, 1994, as approved by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the transportation policy board for the metropolitan planning organization, and amended on Nov. 10, 2022. Staff presented information about:

- Mobility 2050: Draft Plan Recommendations and Transportation Conformity Analysis – **presented by Gwen Dorko and Chris Klaus**
- Fort Worth 76104 Transit Needs Assessment – Initial Study Recommendations – **presented by Margarita Zollo**
- Regional Bicycle Safety Action Plan – **presented by Daniel Snyder**
- Strategic Selection of Safety Corridors – **presented by Francisco Torres**

The public meeting was held to educate, inform and seek comments from the public. Comments were solicited from those attending who wished to speak for the record. The presentations made during the meeting as well as a video recording were posted online at: www.publicinput.com/nctcogMay25.

Summary of Presentations

Mobility 2050: Draft Plan Recommendations and Transportation Conformity Analysis presentation: https://www.nctcog.org/getmedia/594315b8-2eec-47c4-8ca3-d27cf1bf8254/Mobility-2050-AQ-Conformity.pdf

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) defines a long-term vision for the region's transportation system and guides spending of federal and State transportation funds. This

includes funding for highways, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and other programs that reduce congestion and improve air quality.

Mobility 2050 replaces the current MTP, Mobility 2045-2022 Update, and includes population and employment forecasts, goals, a financial plan and an air quality analysis. The financial plan will include new financial forecasts, comprehensive updates to policies and will build on the performance measures framework from the current plan. The Plan will also undergo a baseline analysis, financial assessment and non-discrimination analysis to ensure it meets air quality and equal access targets.

To assist planning staff in understanding how the transportation system works for the public, visit: www.publicinput.com/Mobility2050. To view the draft plan, visit: www.nctcog.org/PlanInProgress. The RTC will take action on Mobility 2050 in June 2025.

As the region is classified as nonattainment for ozone under EPA standards, a transportation conformity analysis is federally mandated before project implementation. The analysis covers a 10-county nonattainment area and compares projected motor vehicle emissions against State-defined emission budgets established in the State Implementation Plan. Approval by the U.S. Department of Transportation is necessary before any projects can proceed, with local approval targeted for June and federal approval anticipated by year-end.

Fort Worth 76104 Transit Needs Assessment: Initial Study Recommendations presentation:
https://www.nctcog.org/getmedia/38111086-3e67-42ab-943b-305b695bae58/Fort-Worth-76104-Transit-Needs-Assessment.pdf

The Fort Worth 76104 Transit Needs Assessment is a federally funded transit needs assessment focused on the Fort Worth ZIP code area, 76104, which is identified as having persistent poverty. The project aims to improve access to food, healthcare, housing and jobs via enhanced transit solutions.

After multiple rounds of community engagement, including public meetings and surveys, limited sidewalk infrastructure, infrequent bus service, and safety at transit stops were identified as key concerns. Recommended solutions include continuing Trinity Metro's fare reduction efforts, increasing public outreach and service awareness, enhancing pedestrian access and transit stop safety and evaluating service hours and frequency.

The Fort Worth 76104 Transit Needs Assessment is in its final phase, with a completed report expected in Fall 2025. Coordination with the City of Fort Worth and Trinity Metro is ongoing to support funding and implementation of recommendations. For more information, visit www.nctcog.org/76104.

Regional Bicycle Safety Action Plan presentation:
https://www.nctcog.org/getmedia/7bb3d14b-cf4b-48cb-a09d-31d836e2bf2e/Regional-Bicycle-Safety-Action-Plan.pdf
The Bicycle Safety Action Plan (BSAP) is a regional planning effort aimed at improving safety for bicyclists as part of a broader initiative on active transportation. This builds on the previously adopted Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (2022) and seeks to address vulnerabilities faced by bicyclists, the most unprotected road users.

The BSAP includes extensive data analysis of crashes from 2019–2023. The planning process includes stakeholder engagement, a public survey and the development of policy frameworks and strategic investment zones based on crash severity and density. Key goals include eliminating serious injuries and fatalities by 2050 and promoting bicycle use across all ages and abilities. Final plan adoption is expected in early 2026.

Participants are encouraged to take the survey at www.publicinput.com/bikesafety.

Strategic Selection of Safety Corridors presentation:
https://www.nctcog.org/getmedia/bd52b61d-28d6-4932-8625-03f1542567a9/Strategic-Selection-of-Safety-Corridors.pdf

The Strategic Selection of Safety Corridors is a freeway safety enforcement program aimed at reducing crashes and fatalities across the region by using detailed speed data collected from major freeway corridors. The initiative will leverage real-time traffic speed data from sites and the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System to identify high-risk segments and timeframes. Based on these insights, a pilot test will be conducted in October involving selected east and west agencies, followed by broader multi-agency implementation in fiscal years 2025 and 2026. The goal is to measurably reduce speeding-related fatalities on the freeway system, with results tracked before and after implementation.

The RTC is expected to take action on the Strategic Selection of Safety Corridors in October 2025.

Summary of Online Review and Comment Topics

Proposed Modifications to the List of Funded Projects handout:
https://www.nctcog.org/getmedia/7040b3f1-41c7-4864-a359-9cb10039d5e8/Proposed-Modifications-to-the-List-of-Funded-Projects.pdf

A comprehensive list of funded transportation projects through 2026 is maintained in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), with committed funds from federal, State and local sources. To maintain an accurate project listing, this document is updated on a regular basis.

The current modification cycle includes project updates and funding adjustments for transportation initiatives in Dallas, Denton, Tarrant and Wise Counties. Additionally, financial adjustments related to public transportation services managed by the Denton County Transportation Authority (DCTA) are also included.

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE MEETING

Transportation Conformity Analysis

Isaiah Shepard, Mecca Capital

A. Emission solutions

Question: Are there any specific programs that are happening right now that are addressing heavy-duty vehicle emissions considering how big the issue is? Are there any grants or partnership

opportunities? Are there any strategic discussions I or others can be a part of to help with this problem?

Summary of response by Chris Klaus: As you indicated, a significant portion of our emissions come from heavy-duty trucks. Slower traffic speeds due to population growth are contributing to increasing emissions from that sector. Our current emissions model, developed under the previous administration, does not reflect recent changes. However, the current administration has introduced ambitious emissions standards set to begin in 2027, targeting both climate and NOx reductions. Engine manufacturers are working to meet these near-zero standards, which could bring emissions close to those of electric vehicles. If these regulations remain in place, we expect to begin seeing benefits in the coming years, including a reduction in the projected increase in truck-related emissions as cleaner technologies are adopted.

Additionally, another major ongoing issue is tampering. We're seeing widespread illegal modifications to engines, both in light- and heavy-duty vehicles. We're working with local law enforcement, including commercial vehicle enforcement teams, who conduct on-site weight and safety checks. Starting later this year or early next year, the Regional Transportation Council has funded equipment that will allow us to scan vehicle emissions in real time and identify tampering by accessing engine control unit data.

There is currently no emissions inspection program for heavy-duty trucks. We continue to pursue federal funding opportunities to support emissions reduction. Two current funding calls are listed on our website, including the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Diesel Emission Reduction Act program and another for heavy-duty engine replacement or upgrades. Lastly, we host an international Heavy-Duty Vehicle Inspection Coalition that brings together global stakeholders to share strategies for reducing truck emissions. The goal is to develop effective, non-intrusive approaches without unnecessary regulatory burdens. I'm happy to discuss any of these topics further at your convenience.

Other

Robert Rose, Citizen

A. Impact of budget cuts on Safe Street programs

Question: What is the anticipated impact of the federal budget cuts and the efforts by some Texas lawmakers for safe street programs in our area?

Summary of response by Karla Windsor: That's an ongoing assessment within our department. We conducted a risk analysis on all federally funded projects to evaluate potential exposure. We determined that approximately 95–96 percent of our projects and programs are secure. A few raised questions, and for one federal grant program, we returned to the RTC, our policy board, to seek backfill or contingency support in case a contract wasn't executed.

The Safe Streets program remains active under the federal government. We have two planning grants, one for $4 million and another for $5 million, which are focused on roadway safety audits, school crossing guard programs and related policies. These efforts are moving forward. Currently, a call for projects under Safe Streets for All is open and includes funding for safety initiatives and some implementation projects. Additionally, NCTCOG can provide letters of support for grant

applicants. Although fewer in number, implementation grants are also available. About two years ago, the RTC approved a $50 million regional safety initiative, independent of State or federal funding. These funds support roadway safety analysis, public education, engineering solutions and targeted safety improvements. We continue to pursue these initiatives using a diverse mix of funding and resources.

COMMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE COMMENT PERIOD VIA EMAIL, SOCIAL MEDIA, WEBSITE & MAIL

Regional Bicycle Safety Action Plan

Website

Dorsey Plunk, Citizen

Many of the roads in the DFW area are maintained by TxDOT. TxDOT has published best practices and guiding principles that are supposed to govern how TxDOT handles road maintenance and construction on roads frequently used by cyclists (see Exhibits A and B). Currently, TxDOT has a poor record of following their own rules, specifically the seal coating of Spur 580 and the frontage roads of IH 20 and IH 30 between Walsh Ranch Parkway and Mikus Road. For a regional bicycle safety plan to be effective, it must include a commitment from TxDOT to follow their own rules. In the case of the roads mentioned above, TxDOT seal coated the roads with an unnecessarily large aggregate. This turned the main direct cycling route between Fort Worth and Weatherford from a safe, frequently used route to one that is hazardous and mostly avoided by cyclists. My complaints to TxDOT that they violated their own best practices and guiding principles were met with indifference. I can provide more details if needed. Going forward I suggest that NCTCOG consider setting up a Regional Bicycle Safety Ombudsman. This would be a central point of contact for cyclists to report safety issues to the appropriate jurisdiction.

See Attachments 1 and 2 for documents referenced in comments.

> **Response by NCTCOG Transportation**
> Thank you for your comments. We have provided your suggestions to the team for further review and consideration.

Other

Mail

Phyllis Silver, Citizen

Please see Attachment 3 for comments submitted via postal mail.

Texas Department of Transportation

DEWITT C. GREER STATE HIGHWAY BLDG. • 125 E. 11TH STREET • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-2483 • (512) 463-8585

May 8, 2009

Mr. Robin Stallings
Executive Director
Texas Bicycle Coalition
Post Office Box 1121
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Mr. Stallings:

As per my letter dated, September 25, 2008, the Texas Department of Transportation has completed its research into current seal coat design and construction practices. Our research has indicated that certain practices may reduce the impact to the bicycling community. To that end, we have issued a memorandum to our district engineers (attached). This memorandum also stresses the importance of sweeping travel lanes and shoulders after rock application.

We look forward to working with bicyclists across Texas to improve shoulders for use by the cycling community. If you have any further comment or questions, please contact Paul Douglas at 486-5112 or by email at pdouglas@dot.state.tx.us.

Sincerely,

John A. Barton, P.E.
Assistant Executive Director
Engineering Operations

Attachment

cc: James L. Randall, P.E., Director, Transportation Planning and Programming Division, TxDOT
Jennifer Moczygemba, P.E., Transportation Planning and Programming Division, TxDOT
Paul Douglas, Transportation Planning and Programming Division, TxDOT

MEMORANDUM

Texas Department of Transportation

TO: District Engineers **DATE:** April 13, 2009

FROM: John A. Barton, P.E. John A. Barton P.E.

SUBJECT: Accommodating Bicycles in Seal Coat Construction

Seal coating is a cost effective and widely used maintenance technique. However, seal coats may not always be ideal for modes of transportation other than automobiles. In particular, seal coats can, in some cases, present difficulties for bicyclists. To promote the accommodation of bicycle traffic, in accordance with the TxDOT mission, I am providing guidance to address the needs of the bicycle-riding public while supporting the use of seal coats for low cost preventive maintenance.

We should consider bicyclists' needs as we develop our PS&E and contracts. In particular, we should give a high priority to planning for bicycle traffic for routes with high numbers of either commuter or recreational bicyclists. You are encouraged to also work with local bicycle groups to identify the safest routes in your district. It is important to consider the availability of shoulders, horizontal alignments, intersection traffic, and traffic volumes in the selection of these routes. You can use this planning to create specific corridors for bicyclists to use. Road signs may be installed to mark these routes and maps may be placed on the TxDOT website to apprise bicyclists of these corridors and of impending roadwork.

Past research has shown that smoother surfaces are desirable for bicyclists. When placing a seal coat as a final driving surface, consider one of the following low cost options to provide an improved riding surface for bicycles:

- use a smaller seal coat aggregate,
- use a smaller seal coat aggregate on the shoulders,
- use fog seal on existing seal coated shoulders rather than a new seal coat, or
- use smaller aggregate for the top course of multiple course seal coats.

For high bicycle traffic areas, consider installing advanced signage and notices of construction activities that could affect bicycling activities. Coordinate construction and maintenance work that could affect bicycle events with local sponsors and bicycle groups. We should be diligent about sweeping excess aggregate from seal coat projects one to two weeks after completing the work, and performing additional sweeping of shoulders if necessary to remove loose aggregate or debris after the job is completed.

In addition, signing and pavement markings for bicycle lanes or designated bicycle routes should follow Part 9 of the Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Bicycle routes and lanes that are affected due to construction, should be treated the same as pedestrian walkways or roadways that are under construction. Accommodations should be made to provide alternative routes if any of these routes are disrupted or closed due to construction. A black on orange detour plaque should be installed on bike route signs when providing a detour as shown on the attachment.

Attachment
cc: District Directors of Construction
District Directors of Maintenance
District Directors of Transportation Planning and Development
Thomas R. Bohuslav, P.E., Director, Construction Division
Mark A. Marek, P.E., Director, Design Division
Toribio Garza, Jr., P.E., Director, Maintenance Division
Carlos A. Lopez, P.E., Director, Traffic Operations Division

Example of detour sign placed on a bike route sign.

Bikeway Design Guiding Principles

Guiding Principles were grouped into the following four topic categories. The bullets below indicate the main content areas under each topic category. The following pages present ALL guiding principles.

Bikeway Selection

- Design user
- Facility types
- Land use context
- Design flexibility
- Lane width reduction and lane removal
- Bicycle Tourism Trails Network
- Exemptions

Linear Bikeway Design

- Rumble strips
- Separated bike lanes
- Separating bike and ped modes

Intersection & conflict points

- Intersection treatments
- Pavement markings
- Signs and signals
- Transit and rail conflicts

Maintenance

- Seal coats
- Sweeping
- Coordinating maintenance responsibilities with local partners

1

Bikeway Selection

General Principles

1. Safe bikeway accommodations will be considered on all transportation projects.
2. The design user of new bikeways should be bicycle-dependent commuters and other bicyclists who are interested in riding but concerned about safety.
3. To the extent practical, bikeway width and separation from vehicular travel lanes should be maximized to accommodate the greatest diversity of riders with the maximum margin of safety.
4. Reducing frequency and severity of crashes and conflicts between all users should be the priority in project design when capacity is being added.
5. Wide outside lanes increase vehicle speeds and are not adequate accommodation for the design user. Any new wide outside lanes for bicycle use should be considered only after exhausting all other options and carefully evaluating specific parameters for safety, anticipated use, and context.
6. Design flexibility is important. Scoping tools should be created and maintained, and District planning consulted when selecting bikeway type. Every project should consider all existing and potential roadway users. Additional considerations should include: land use context, bikeway connectivity, roadway characteristics (ROW width, motor vehicle speed, motor vehicle volume, design life of the project), and other project constraints.

Selection Principles

7. Bikeways on TxDOT roads should be direct and convenient and offer access to and connectivity between destinations on the transportation network. Transitions between land use contexts and bikeway types should be clear or intuitive.
8. Where locally maintained and state-maintained roadways intersect, TxDOT should collaborate with local jurisdictions to design safe, low-stress bikeways **across** TxDOT facilities where indicated by local planning documents. TxDOT bikeway improvements should integrate with local bicycle investments and transportation plans to complete low-stress bicycle networks for all-ages-and-abilities.
9. When attempting to incorporate separated bike lanes during edge-to-edge roadway reconstruction projects, raised separated bike lanes placed behind the curb are preferred, reduce maintenance and construction costs, and easier to maintain. Raised separated bicycle lanes should have visual and tactile separation between bicyclists and pedestrians.

2

Bikeway Selection

10. "Right-sizing" projects, commonly known as "road diets", are roadway reconstruction projects involving travel lane reductions. When implementing right-sizing projects for the purpose of adding bicycle accommodations, consider public involvement, safety evaluation, and vehicle traffic flows. Road diets are a FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasure. Road diets can improve safety, calm traffic, and provide better mobility and access for all road users. See FHWA's website for more information.
11. If a rural roadway is on the Bicycle Tourism Trail Example Network, then transportation improvements should consider an appropriate bikeway.
12. Bikeway considerations are **not** necessary when one of the following conditions is met:
    - Bikeways are prohibited by law or Commission order on this roadway
    - Distance between population centers indicate an absence of need for both current **and future** conditions of the anticipated life of the project

Linear Bikeway Design

Rumble Strips

13. On rural roadway segments where existing or future bicycle demand is anticipated during the life of the project:
    a) Placement of shoulder rumble strips on or immediately adjacent to the edgeline is preferred. Profile Pavement Markings (PPM) and milled-in rumble strip are the preferred treatment types. Exceptions for edgeline placement include along evacuation routes and routes with significant volumes of heavy truck traffic.
    b) Bicycle gaps should be included in rumble strips to accommodate bicyclists' turning movements and avoidance maneuvers.
    c) Where shoulder rumble strips are installed, 6 feet or more of clear space to the right of rumble strip is desirable to accommodate bicyclists.

Separated bike lane barrier types

14. Where separated bike lanes (SBLs) are proposed:
    a) Barrier selection for SBLs should be context-sensitive, suitable for roadway characteristics (e.g., speed, volume, etc.), and allow for appropriate drainage.
    b) Street-level SBLs with curb separation (grade-separated barriers) or raised SBLs are the preferred types of separated bike lanes dependent on context.
    c) To facilitate maintenance on street-level SBLs, facility widths and/or removable barriers should be considered in coordination with the entity responsible for maintenance.

3

Linear Bikeway Design

Separating Modes

15. When deciding between shared or separated bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, designers should consider the following:
    a) Shared use path design criteria should meet the needs of all intended users (e.g. bicyclists, pedestrians).
    b) Criteria for separating modes should consider existing and anticipated bicycle and pedestrian volumes expected over the life of the project, including latent demand and land use changes.
    c) Consider the life of the project and plan for the ultimate/future bikeway type and width even if constructing an interim/provisional facility in the short-term. Plan for the ultimate facility on culvert and bridge improvements.

Bikeway Conflict Points

Pavement Markings

16. Where bicycle lanes meet intersections, TxDOT should consider the application of bicycle lane extensions (dashed pavement markings) through the intersection to identify where bicyclists are expected to operate and to recognize potentially unexpected conflict points, especially where buffered or separated bike lanes are present. Where right-turn lanes cross over bicycle lanes, dashed pavement markings should be applied to indicate a merge condition.
17. Where shared use paths meet signalized intersections, TxDOT should consider applying separate pavement markings to identify crosswalks (for pedestrians) and bicycle lane extensions (for bicycles). Shared use paths should be signed at major conflict points to clearly communicate pedestrian and bicyclist priority.
18. Future research on green pavement markings should focus on durability, skid resistance, and application technologies and should include recommendations for TxDOT standard specifications for green pavement application types and procedures.
19. Based on research, TxDOT should use green pavement markings to increase bicyclist conspicuity and predictability, especially where separated bikeways meet signalized intersections, slip lanes, exit ramps, and other conflict points where safety issues are identified.
20. When using green pavement markings to emphasize on-street bikeway conflict points, limit green pavement marking footprints (i.e., square footage) to reduce maintenance issues and maximize marking durability.

4

Bikeway Conflict Points

21. Until the TMUTCD is updated to include green pavement markings, TxDOT should consider partnering with local governments to install green pavement markings at intersections with low-stress bikeways (e.g., Shared Use Paths or Separated Bike Lanes) or where bicycle safety issues are documented. Maintenance of bicycle pavement markings should be incorporated into TxDOT's standard municipal maintenance agreements (MMAs).
22. Training on proper green pavement marking application for a variety of marking technologies will foster proper installation. Training should focus on surface preparation and contractor monitoring. Additional training and guidelines should include maintenance practices to maintain durability, retroreflectivity, color intensity, and skid-resistance.

Signs and Signals

23. Where separated bikeways conflict with motor vehicle phasing and turning movements at signalized intersections, TxDOT should consider the application of bicycle signal faces and dashed intersection crossing pavement markings.
24. On shared roadways that provide key bicycle route connections or where safety concerns are documented, it is recommended that TxDOT use "Bicycles may use full lane" sign as the standard bicycle regulatory sign instead of "Share the Road".
25. Roadway design engineers should consider sight lines of all users; landscaping, signage, and parked cars can hinder visibility for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
26. Mid-block crossing signals, such as Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, should provide feedback after actuator button is pressed and should be timed to balance pedestrian priority with arterial signal timing. PHBs and RRFBs should be applied where appropriate in accordance with TxDOT TRF memo.

Transit and railroad conflict points

27. Where transit and bikeway facilities exist within roadway right-of-way, roadway designers should consider transit stop designs that separate and protect bicyclists from transit ingress and egress, such as an island bus stop which moves bikeway facilities behind a transit stop.
28. Where bicycle lanes meet railroads at angles other than 90 degrees, on-street bikeways should be transitioned to off-road shared use paths, wrapping behind rail crossing arms, allowing bicyclists to cross as close to a 90-degree angle as possible (e.g. a jug-handle design) similar to TxDOT standard (RCD (1)-16). Maintenance of off-street railroad crossings should be included in MMAs, where applicable.

5

Bikeway Maintenance

29. To leverage on-going asset preservation and roadway maintenance dollars, encourage early coordination between District Seal Coat Coordinators and District Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinators. Frequent engagement between these staff members across the state can lead to cost efficiencies, increased awareness of bicyclist needs, higher quality pavement markings for bicycle accommodation, safer roadways, and better-connected bikeway networks.
30. The content of the 2009 TxDOT Chief Engineer Memo entitled "Accommodating Bicycles in Seal Coat Construction" should be incorporated into TxDOT's Pavement Manual and communicated with TxDOT District Maintenance staff. This memo emphasizes opportunities to improve riding surfaces for bicyclists including using smaller seal coat aggregates across the roadway or on the shoulder. Additionally, shoulders should be swept during and after seal coat projects to ensure shoulders used by bicyclists are clear of debris.
31. Shoulder maintenance: Where bicycle demand has been identified through coordination with District Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinators, proactively sweep and clear debris from on-system roadway shoulders. Where municipal maintenance agreements (MMA) are in place, TxDOT Districts should coordinate with municipal partners who are responsible for sweeping the roadway under the terms of an MMA.
32. Separated bike lane maintenance: Where on-system, on-street separated bicycle lanes exist, coordinate sweeping and maintenance efforts with municipal partners who may have suitable equipment or resources for these facilities. Clearly delineate the entity responsible for maintenance when installing separated bike lanes.
33. District Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinators with Area Office and Maintenance Office staff should communicate with local jurisdictions on upcoming maintenance projects (e.g., restriping) to evaluate the need, type, and location of bicycle facilities to complete local bikeway networks.

North Central Texas Council of Governments
Transportation Division
Public Meeting - Monday, May 12, 2025
Comments + Questions

Mobility 2050: Draft Plan Recommendations + Transportation Conformity Analysis

Pg. 21 - Question - why is a large spike in NO_x expected in 2050?

Fort Worth 76104 Transit Needs Assessment - Initial Study Recommendations

Overall Comment - The issues addressed in both surveys are excellent.

Comment - pages 13, 16, and 22 - it would have been helpful to have parallel comparisons - in other words, sometimes the percentage of survey respondents on an issue is mentioned and sometimes only a ranking is mentioned. In the case of rankings, we don't know what percentage of the respondents ranked it the way it is described. I would have liked more specifics.

Regional Bicycle Safety Action Plan

Comments -

I agree that bicyclists need safe passage. It is important that the safety of everyone - bicyclists, motorists, and pedestrians - on the shared road be considered.

I visited a shared computer to view and respond to your bicycle survey. I was surprised that the survey did not solicit input from non-bicyclists. We all share the road, so it would be beneficial to receive input from motorists, pedestrians, and businesses/residents along the bicycle route. I encourage COG to include all stakeholders in further bicycle surveys.

Strategic Selection of Safety Corridors

(Note: Pages with graphs were not numbered, however I determined these page numbers by looking at the page numbers before & after the graphs.)

Questions - Page 6 - Why are there so many more fatalities in October?

- Page 8 - Is 3PM more prone to fatalities because school lets out around that time?

Supplementary:

- Administrative Revisions to Mobility 2045

Comment - It is good that more lanes will be added on some roads in the future. I am familiar with some of these roads, especially along Preston Road.

- Draft August 2025 TIP Modifications

Comment - Page 46 of 54 - I am pleased that funding is going to DART for TRE platform improvements at Victory Station.

Phyllis Hilmer
5/27/2025