An APBP Webinar “Return on Investment for Active Transportation” is hosted from 1:00-2:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:10</td>
<td><strong>1. Welcome – Introductions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of Committee and leadership, and discussion of the August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21, 2019 BPAC Meeting Summary as necessary, APBP Webinar discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 – 2:20</td>
<td>**2. TxDOT Memorandum: Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHBs)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TxDOT guidance of RRFBs and PHBs, including criteria, speeds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 – 2:55</td>
<td><strong>3. Local Community Updates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Earn-a-Bike Program – Stan Hart, Bike Friendly South Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Southwest Blvd Construction Update – Julia Ryan, City of Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Main/Columbia/Abram Project Update – Jared White, City of Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Katy Trail Connection – Philip Hiatt-Haigh, Circuit Trail Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Upcoming Events and Training – Jessica Shutt, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:55 – 3:10</td>
<td><strong>4. City of McKinney Safety Committee Coordination</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An overview of how the City of McKinney coordinates with their school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>district to promote safer routes to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10 – 3:15</td>
<td><strong>5. Statewide TxDOT Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) Update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An update on recent developments from the October 2019 TxDOT Bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Committee Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 3:40</td>
<td><strong>6. NCTCOG Updates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Regional Pedestrian Safety Survey Results – Matt Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Trail of the Month Videos – Matt Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Walk to School Day Results – Kathryn Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Transportation Alternatives 2020 Call for Projects – Daniel Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40 – 3:45</td>
<td><strong>7. Other Business/Open Discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item provides an opportunity to bring items of interest before the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee or propose future agenda items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:00</td>
<td>**8. Review of Regional Veloweb, Community paths and On-Street Bikeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Maps**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and mark-up draft maps and provide feedback regarding updates to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the regional trails and bikeway geodatabase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next BPAC Meeting
The next meeting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee is scheduled for **February 19, 2020**, at 2:00 p.m. in the Transportation Council Room of the North Central Texas Council of Governments. Preceding the BPAC meeting, a pre-recorded webinar by the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals will be presented beginning at 1:00 p.m. The topic is to be determined.
## 2019 BPAC Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>Janna Tidwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Allen</td>
<td>Chris Flanigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Arlington</td>
<td>Anthony Cisneros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bedford</td>
<td>Michele Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Carrollton</td>
<td>Marcos Fernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cedar Hill</td>
<td>Shawn Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cleburne</td>
<td>Aaron Dobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colleyville</td>
<td>Lisa Escobedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Coppell</td>
<td>John Elias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dallas</td>
<td>Jared White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Denton</td>
<td>Marc Oliphant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of DeSoto</td>
<td>Tony Irvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Duncanville</td>
<td>Chasidy Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Euless</td>
<td>Ray McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Farmers Branch</td>
<td>Mitzi Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Flower Mound</td>
<td>Kari Biddix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Worth</td>
<td>Jeremy Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Frisco</td>
<td>Robert Caskey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Garland</td>
<td>Josue De la Vega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grand Prairie</td>
<td>Brett Huntsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grapevine</td>
<td>Kathy Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Haltom City</td>
<td>William Wiegand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hurst</td>
<td>Kristie Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Irving</td>
<td>Cody Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Keller</td>
<td>Cody Maberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lancaster</td>
<td>Bester Munyaradzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lewisville</td>
<td>Stacie Anaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mansfield</td>
<td>Chris Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McKinney</td>
<td>Robyn Root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mesquite</td>
<td>Wes McClure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Richland Hills</td>
<td>Joe Pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Plano</td>
<td>Christina Sebastian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richardson</td>
<td>Jessica Shutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rowlett</td>
<td>Kameka Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Southlake</td>
<td>Madeline Oujesky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of The Colony</td>
<td>Eve Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waxahachie</td>
<td>Colby Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Weatherford</td>
<td>Chad Marbut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wylie</td>
<td>Robert Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas County</td>
<td>Micah Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis County</td>
<td>Joseph Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood County</td>
<td>Scott Sopchak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt County</td>
<td>Kevin St. Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall County</td>
<td>Lee Gilbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County</td>
<td>Mike Galizio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise County</td>
<td>Chad Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Area Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Dan Dickerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Tim Palermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas Tollway Authority</td>
<td>Lori Shelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Metro</td>
<td>Sandip Sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT, Dallas District</td>
<td>Melissa Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT, Fort Worth District</td>
<td>Phillip Hays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following cities/counties/agencies currently have vacant BPAC seats: City of Greenville; Collin County, Denton County; Kaufman County; and DFW International Airport.
• Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFBs) and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHBs) TRF Memo, dated September 11, 2018. Attached.

• TxDOT Traffic Signals Manual, revised March 2019
  o Chapter 5, Section 7 – Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon
  o Incorporates the September 11, 2018, memo revisions above for PHB’s.
  o Applies to all TxDOT on system roadways

• Texas MUTCD
  o Chapter 4F – Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons
  o Applies to all roads in Texas

• FHWA Interim Approval 21 – Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons at Crosswalks
  o [https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interim_approval/ia21/index.htm](https://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/resources/interim_approval/ia21/index.htm)
  o Not located in any published manual due to the interim approval
  o Applies to all roads in Texas, however the September 11, 2018, memo lists requirements when requested to be placed on TxDOT on system roadways

Any questions can be directed to:
Heather L. Lott, P.E.
Traffic Engineering Section Director, Traffic Safety Division
Heather.lott@txdot.gov
512-416-3344
MEMO

September 11, 2018

To: District Engineers

From: Michael A. Chacon, P.E.
Director, Traffic Safety Division

Subject: Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFBs) and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHBs)

This memo supersedes the January 2, 2018, issued guidance prohibiting the use of Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFBs) due to FHWA terminating the Interim Approval (IA-11) that allowed the device to be used. FHWA has since issued a new Interim Approval for RRFBs (IA-21) allowing use of the device. IA-21 contains revised provisions and modifications to the flash pattern. Attached is the criteria for the use of RRFBs. Approval from TRF is necessary prior to the installation of RRFBs on state highways.

Interim approvals allow interim use of a new or revised traffic control device based on experimentation, studies, or research with the intention to place the new or revised device into a future rulemaking process for MUTCD revisions. While FHWA approval is required to use an Interim Approval device, FHWA has granted blanket statewide approval to use RRFBs in Texas. A municipality that wishes to use RRFBs on roads under their jurisdiction off the state highway system may do so without contacting FHWA. TRF must be notified so a list of locations can be maintained as part of the provisions for IA-21.

Existing RRFBs that were installed under the terms and conditions of the terminated Interim Approval (IA-11) may remain in operations until they reach the end of their useful service life. Existing RRFBs should be reprogrammed to the new flash pattern specified in IA-21 as part of a systematic upgrading process, such as when maintenance is performed or when signs are replaced.

Additionally, the attached criteria for Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHBs), another pedestrian crossing safety measure, remains unchanged and may be used on state highways with approval from TRF. FHWA has offered additional guidance to assist practitioners in selecting compliant pedestrian crossing treatments in an Information Brief: Treatments for Uncontrolled Marked Crosswalks.

If you have any further questions please contact Doug Skowronek at (512) 416-3120 or me at (512) 416-3200.

Attachments

cc: ADM District Traffic Engineers
CST District Maintenance Engineers
DES Stephen Ratke, FHWA
MNT Ed Burgos-Gomez, FHWA
PTN Amelia Hayes, FHWA
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) granted TxDOT interim approval for the use of Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) at marked crosswalks where the crossing is not controlled by a traffic control device such as a traffic signal or stop signs.

RRFB are user-actuated amber LEDs that supplement warning signs. A RRFB consist of two rapidly and alternately flashed rectangular yellow indications having LED-array based pulsing light sources.

This device provides an additional tool for improving the safety of crosswalks when traffic signals do not meet warrants. RRFB should be used in conjunction with signs and pavement markings to warn and control traffic at locations where pedestrians enter or cross a street or highway.

All of the following conditions must be met before RRFB can be considered on our highways:

- an established crosswalk with adequate visibility, markings and signs
- a posted speed limit of 40 mph or less (does not include school speed zones)
- 20 pedestrians or more crossing in one hour
- location deemed as a high risk area (e.g. schools, shopping centers, etc.)
- crosswalk is more than 300 ft. from an existing, traffic controlled pedestrian crossing

Districts must submit and receive Traffic Safety Division approval for installation of a RRFB for each location.

If the above criteria are met, and you have received approval from the Traffic Safety Division to install a RRFB at a location, the following conditions must be met to be in compliance with the FHWA Interim Approval that TxDOT has been granted:

1. General Conditions:
   a. Each RRFB shall consist of two rapidly flashed rectangular-shaped yellow indications with an LED-array-based light source, and shall be designed, located, and operated in accordance with the detailed requirements specified below.
   b. The use of RRFBs is optional. However, if an agency opts to use an RRFB under this Interim Approval, the following design and operational requirements shall apply, and shall take precedence over any conflicting provisions of the TMUTCD for the approach on which RRFBs are used:

2. Allowable Uses:
   a. An RRFB shall only be installed to function as a Warning Beacon (see 2011 TMUTCD Section 4L.03).
   b. An RRFB shall only be used to supplement a W11-2 (Pedestrian) warning sign with a diagonal downward arrow (W16-7p) plaque or S1-1 (School) crossing warning sign with a diagonal downward arrow (SW16-7p) plaque, located at or immediately adjacent to a marked crosswalk.
   c. An RRFB shall not be used for crosswalks across approaches controlled by YIELD signs, STOP signs, or traffic control signals.
3. Sign/Beacon Assembly Locations:
   a. For any approach on which RRFB are used, two W11-2 or S1-1 crossing warning signs (each with RRFB and W16-7p or SW16-7p plaque) shall be installed at the crosswalk, one on the right-hand side of the roadway and one on the left-hand side of the roadway. On a divided highway, the left-hand side assembly should be installed on the median, if practical, rather than on the far left side of the highway.
   b. An RRFB shall not be installed independent of the crossing signs for the approach that the RRFB faces. The RRFB shall be installed on the same support as the associated W11-2 (Pedestrian) or S1-1 (School) crossing warning sign and plaque.

4. Beacon Dimensions and Placement in the Sign Assembly
   a. Each RRFB shall consist of two rectangular-shaped yellow indications, each with an LED-array-based light source. The size of each RRFB indication shall be at least 5 inches wide by at least 2 inches high.
   b. The two RRFB indications for each RRFB unit shall be aligned horizontally, with the longer dimension horizontal and with a minimum space between the two indications of at least 7 inches, measured from the nearest edge of one indication to the nearest edge of the other indication.
   c. The outside edges of the RRFB indications, including any housings, shall not project beyond the outside edges of the W11-2, S1-1, or W11-15 sign that it supplements.
   d. As a specific exception to Paragraph 5 of Section 4L.01 of the 2011 TMUTCD, the RRFB unit associated with a post-mounted sign and plaque may be located between and immediately adjacent to the bottom of the crossing warning sign and the top of the supplemental downward diagonal arrow plaque (or, in the case of a supplemental advance signs, the AHEAD or distance plaque) or within 12 inches above the crossing warning sign, rather than the recommended minimum of 12 inches above or below the sign assembly. (See the example photo that is shown below.)

5. Beacon Flashing Requirements
   a. When actuated, the two yellow indications in each RRFB unit shall flash in a rapidly flashing sequence.
   b. As a specific exception to the requirements for the flash rate of beacons provided in Paragraph 3 of Section 4L.01 of the 2011 TMUTCD, RRFBs shall use a much faster flash rate and shall provide 75 flashing sequences per minute. Except as provided in Condition 5f below, during each 800-millisecond flashing sequence, the left and right RRFB indications shall operate using the following sequence:

      **The RRFB indication on the left-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.**
      Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

      **The RRFB indication on the right-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds.**
      Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.
The RRFB indication on the left-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds. Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

The RRFB indication on the right-hand side shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds. Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

Both RRFB indications shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds. Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 50 milliseconds.

Both RRFB indications shall be illuminated for approximately 50 milliseconds. Both RRFB indications shall be dark for approximately 250 milliseconds.

c. The flash rate of each individual RRFB indication, as applied over the full flashing sequence, shall not be between 5 and 30 flashes per second to avoid frequencies that might cause seizures.

d. The light intensity of the yellow indications during daytime conditions shall meet the minimum specifications for Class 1 yellow peak luminous intensity in the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) Standard J595 (Directional Flashing Optical Warning Devices for Authorized Emergency, Maintenance, and Service Vehicles) dated January 2005.

e. To minimize excessive glare during nighttime conditions, an automatic signal dimming device should be used to reduce the brilliance of the RRFB indications during nighttime conditions.

f. Existing RRFB units that use the flashing sequence that was specified in the Interim Approval 11 memorandum and a subsequent interpretation (the RRFB indication on the left-hand side emits two slow pulses of light after which the RRFB indication on the right-hand side emits four rapid pulses of light followed by one long pulse of light) should be reprogrammed to the flash pattern specified above in Condition 5b as part of a systematic upgrading process, such as when the units are serviced or when the existing signs are replaced.

6. Beacon Operation:

a. The RRFB shall be normally dark, shall initiate operation only upon pedestrian actuation, and shall cease operation at a predetermined time after the pedestrian actuation or, with passive detection, after the pedestrian clears the crosswalk.

b. All RRFBs associated with a given crosswalk (including those with an advance crossing sign, if used) shall, when activated, simultaneously commence operation of their alternating rapid flashing indications and shall cease operation simultaneously.

c. If pedestrian pushbuttons (rather than passive detection) are used to actuate the RRFB indications, a PUSH BUTTON TO TURN ON WARNING LIGHTS should be mounted adjacent to or integral with each pedestrian pushbutton.

d. The duration of a predetermined period of operation of the RRFB following each actuation should be based on the TMUTCD procedures for timing of pedestrian clearance times for pedestrian signals.
e. A small light directed at and visible to pedestrians in the crosswalk may be installed integral to the RRFB or push button to give confirmation that the RRFB is in operation.

7. Accessible Pedestrian Features
   a. If a speech pushbutton information message is used in conjunction with an RRFB, a locator tone shall be provided.
   b. If a speech pushbutton information message is used in conjunction with an RRFB, the audible information device shall not use vibrotactile indications or percussive indications.
   c. If a speech pushbutton information message is used in conjunction with an RRFB, the message should say, “Yellow lights are flashing.” The message should be spoken twice.

8. Other:
   a. Except as otherwise provided above, all other provisions of the TMUTCD applicable to Warning Beacons shall apply to RRFB.

For locations that have met the criteria, submit to the Traffic Safety Division for approval.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding RRFB, please contact Doug Skowronek at (512) 416-3120.
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons

The 2011 Texas Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (TMUTCD) included the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (PHB) for use at marked crosswalks which are not managed by a traffic control device such as a traffic signal or stop signs.

A PHB is a pedestrian-activated warning device located on the roadside or on mast arms over midblock pedestrian crossings. The beacon head consists of two red lenses above a single yellow lens. The beacon head is "dark" until the pedestrian wanting to cross the roadway presses the button and activates the beacons.

This device provides an additional tool for improving the safety of crosswalks when traffic signals do not meet warrants. PHB’s should be used in conjunction with signs and pavement markings to warn and control traffic at locations where pedestrians enter or cross a street or highway.

All of the following conditions must be met before PHB can be considered on our roadways:

- an engineering study must be performed and meet the guidelines detailed in Chapter 4F of the TMUTCD
- an established crosswalk with adequate visibility, markings and signs
- a posted speed limit of 40 mph or less (does not include school speed zones)
- 20 pedestrians or more crossing in one hour
- location deemed as a high risk area (e.g. schools, shopping centers, etc.)
- crosswalk is more than 300 ft. from an existing, traffic controlled pedestrian crossing

Districts must receive Traffic Safety Division (TRF) approval for installation of a PHB for each location.

You can reference Appendix A of the NCHRP 562 Report for additional information on PHB at the following web address:

http://www.trb.org/Publications/Blurbs/157723.aspx

If the proposed location meets the criteria listed above for a PHB, please submit to the Traffic Safety Division for approval.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding PHB, please contact Doug Skowronek at (512) 416-3120.
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon

Sequence for a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon

1. Dark Until Activated
2. Flashing Yellow Upon Activation
3. Steady Yellow
4. Steady Red During Pedestrian Walk Interval
5. Alternating Flashing Red During Pedestrian Clearance Interval
6. Dark Again Until Activated

Legend
- SY Steady yellow
- FY Flashing yellow
- SR Steady red
- FR Flashing red
BIKE FRIENDLY
SOUTH DALLAS

WE-CYCLE

Our Mission:
Bike Friendly South Dallas is dedicated to promoting wellness, mobility and mentoring. By providing community bike rides, bicycle maintenance, cycling safety and awareness in our community through advocacy, education and outreach.
Who we are:

Like minded individuals from all backgrounds with a passion for cycling, education and community service

- Founded in 2012 by Ashly Fletcher
- Received 501c3 non-profit status and incorporated as LLC in 2017
- ALL Volunteer Board of Directors
What we do:

- Community wide Pop-Up Bike Shops since 7/17
- We-Cycle Resource Center opened 8/19
- Earn-a-Bike program
- Monthly community & social bike rides
- Bike Safety & Minor Maintenance Classes
- Volunteer at Community Cycling & Health events
How we do it, Earn-A-Bike:

- Receive donated bikes
- Wrench, leave as-is or part out
- Participants choose a bike (5-10-15)
  - Alternate $25, $50 or $75 donation
- Participant does volunteer hours before or after
- Learning proper maintenance & safety along the way
- Finish volunteer hours and bike project
- Mobility is freedom!
Give a child a bike and watch them ride for the day.
Teach a child to fix their bike and watch them ride for a lifetime.

Ashly Fletcher, Founder
hello@bikefriendlysouthdallas.org
bikefriendlysouthdallas.org

BikeFriendlySouthDallas is an official 501c3 non-profit organization and proud member of Bicycle Friendly America & The League of American Bicyclists
Briefing on the Southwest Boulevard Mobility Project
Presented to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
November 2019

Julia Ryan, AICP
Transportation and Public Works
Purpose of Presentation

• Overview of mobility improvements under construction
• Review upcoming project additions
• Update on next steps
Project Overview

• Council District: 3
• Scope: Construct sidewalk, trail, and bike lane
• Funding: 2018 Bond Program
  • Project Cost Phase 1: $471,356
  • Project Cost Phase 2: $550,000
• TxDOT Permit Issued: May 17, 2019
• Construction Began: July 2019
• Phase 1 Construction Complete: December 2019
Bomber Spur Regional Trail

• The Southwest Blvd project is a critical portion of the regional Bomber Spur Trail project
• Regional project led by Park & Recreation and supported by North Central Texas Council of Governments and Streams and Valleys
Project Status
Off Street Trail Connection to Trinity Trails

Connection into trailhead
Sidewalk Connections

Before

After
Trail/Road Connections
On-Road Trail

TxDOT Drainage Facility - Before
On-Road Trail Barrier

Cost: $108/LF

https://rubberform.com/product/engineered-rubber-curb/
Path Connection to River Bend
Sidewalk Connection at River Bend
Signage
Vickery at River Bend

- Remaining Work: Connect sidewalk on River Bend to Southwest Blvd
- Phase 2: Working with Union Pacific Railroad to better serve people walking (including persons with disabilities) and biking to Walmart and along Vickery
- 2018 Bond funded
Lessons Learned

• Plan enough time and money to work with railroad and get to know your agency’s railroad coordinator

• When digging more than standard sidewalk depth, pay for a Subsurface Utility Exploration (SUE)

• Strongly consider constructing under a TxDOT permit if option exists
Next Steps

• Construction on Phase 1 expected to conclude by December/January
• Design work to begin on sidewalk access to Vickery and River Bend Intersection
Main/Columbia/Abrams

Complete Street Project

November 20, 2019

Jared White
Manager
Park and Recreation Department
City of Dallas
Project Overview

• Project Description: Complete Street improvements including bike lanes

• Limits: Main Street/Columbia Avenue/Abrams Road from Exposition Avenue to Richmond Avenue

• 2017 Capital Bond funding amount: $8,000,000
Project Purpose

- Initiated by the community with the goals to:
  - Improve walkability and bikeability
  - Improve safety for all transportation modes
  - Calm traffic
  - Connect the neighborhoods

Main Street

Columbia Avenue

Abrams Road
Map Overview
Main-Columbia-Abrams

Segment A: Main Street

Segment B: Columbia Avenue

Segment C: Abrams Road
Main Street from Santa Fe Trail to Peak

Main Street from Peak to Carroll

DRAFT: Design Subject to Change
Main/Elm Street from Carroll Avenue to Peak Street

DRAFT: Design Subject to Change
Main/Elm Street from Santa Fe Trail to Haskell Avenue

CONNECT TO SANTA FE

ELM STREET

STRIPED ONE WAY BIKE LANE

DRAFT: Design Subject to Change
Columbia Avenue/Abrams Road: Mid-block

Columbia Avenue/Abrams Road: At Intersections

DRAFT: Design Subject to Change
“Floating” Bus Stops

BUS STOP ISLAND DETAIL - FAR SIDE

PROPOSED BUS STOP ISLAND

SECTION A-A

 existing concrete paving

 existing concrete paving shall be drilled and #4
 dowel bars shall be grooved
 in place on a 24" x 24" grid

NOTES
1. reinforcing bars shall be #4 unless otherwise specified.
2. exposed sharp edges shall be rounded to a minimum radius of 1/4".
3. all existing sidewalks and curbs to be removed shall be sawed or removed at existing joints.
4. expansion and control joints shall be constructed to match pavement joints in all bus stop islands.
5. concrete summer curing, curbs and curbs and gutter alignment to jointed concrete pavement.
6. bus stop island ramps see sheet 30.
Project Schedule

Estimated Schedule: Santa Fe Trail to Beacon
- Design: January 2019 to December 2019
- Construction: July 2020 to September 2021

Estimated Schedule: Beacon to Richmond
- Design: Complete
- Construction: February 2020 to October 2020
Main/Columbia/Abrams
Complete Street Project
November 20, 2019

Jared White
Manager
Park and Recreation Department
City of Dallas
214-670-4090
jared.white@dallascityhall.com
CTC HI LINE CONNECTOR
KATY TRAIL TO TRINITY STRAND TRAIL

THE HI LINE CONNECTOR OVERCOMES THE PEDESTRIAN BARRIER OF INTERSTATE 35 BY BRIDGING DALLAS' MOST ICONIC TRAIL RESOURCE, THE KATY TRAIL, TO THE DESIGN DISTRICT'S TRINITY STRAND TRAIL.
THE LOOP DALLAS

THE LOOP IS A 50-MILE URBAN ACTIVE TRAIL NETWORK AROUND THE CORE OF DALLAS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS TO TRANSPORTATION HUBS AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES. TO CREATE THIS NETWORK, THE CIRCUIT TRAIL CONSERVANCY (CTC), THE NON-PROFIT PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE CITY OF DALLAS, IS CONNECTING EXISTING TRAILS AND BRINGING NEW TRAIL RESOURCES TO PARTS OF THE CITY THAT DO NOT CURRENTLY HAVE TRAIL ACCESS.

A. HI LINE CONNECTOR
1 MILE TRAIL THAT CONNECTS THE KATY TRAIL TO THE TRINITY STRAND TRAIL

B. TRINITY GATEWAY
CONNECTS THE TRINITY STRAND TRAIL TO THE TRINITY RIVER SKYLINE TRAIL

C. TRINITY SKYLINE TRAIL LINK
CONNECTS THE SKYLINE TRAIL TO SOUTH DALLAS / AUDUBON CENTER AND TRINITY FOREST

D. TRINITY FOREST SPINE TRAIL
8.7 MILE DEDICATED TRAIL CONNECTING WHITE ROCK LAKE AND EAST DALLAS TO SOUTH DALLAS AND THE TRINITY FOREST TRAIL SYSTEM
N. HOUSTON - AT KATY TRAIL
TYPICAL STREET SECTIONS AT VICTORY WEST

PROPOSED CONDITION

EXISTING CONDITION

PROPOSED CONDITION

EXISTING CONDITION
HI LINE - SB I-35E
INTERSECTION OF OAK LAWN AND HI LINE
HI LINE MEDIAN TO TRINITY STRAND TRAIL
UPCOMING EVENTS AND TRAINING

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

November 20, 2019
National Conference on Highway Safety Priorities

March 15-17, 2020
Tampa, Florida

lifesaversconference.org
March 25-27, 2020
San Antonio, Texas

texastrailsandactivetransportation.org
April 25-28, 2020
Houston, Texas

Member-only registration opens December 11, 2019

planning.org/conference/
National Association of Regional Councils (NARC)

Annual Conference & Exhibition

June 7-10, 2020
Detroit, Michigan

narc.org/events/conferences/annual-conference-and-exhibition/
America's largest active transportation and placemaking conference

For information and registration:
www.walkbikeplaces.org
Initiative for Bicycle and Pedestrian Innovation (IBPI) Workshop
Portland, Oregon
2020 Dates To Be Announced

For Information:
trec.pdx.edu
Any events or training opportunities to add?

Any suggestions/topics for future training opportunities that NCTCOG could coordinate?

Contact:

Kevin Kokes, AICP
kkokes@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9275

OR

Matt Fall
mfall@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9207
Plans and Projects Underway

- Keller Parks and Trails Master Plan
- Flower Mound Parks & Trails Master Plan
- Grand Prairie Parks and Trails Master Plan Update
- Dallas County Mobility Plan
- Northlake Comprehensive Plan
- McKinney Parks and Trails Master Plan
- Plano Parks and Recreation Master Plan
- Weatherford Bicycle Master Plan
- Weatherford Thoroughfare Plan
- Rowlett Hike and Bike Trail Plan
- Rowlette Trails and Open Space Master Plan Update
- Lancaster Trails Master Plan Update
- Cedar Hill Trails Master Plan Update
- DeSoto Trails Master Plan Citywide Master Plan
- Wylie Citywide Master Plan
- Carrollton Trails Master Plan (early 2020)
Regional Projects

- **Regional Trail Connection**: Midlothian to Waxahachie Regional Veloweb (Preliminary Eng.)

- **Regional Trail Connections to Transit**: Lewisville to Irving (Lewisville, Carrollton, Coppell, Dallas County, Denton County, DCTA, DART, and NCTCOG)
The ISDs

- McKinney ISD
- Allen ISD
- Celina ISD
- Frisco ISD
- Lovejoy ISD
- Melissa ISD
- Prosper ISD
What is the Safety Committee?

The Safety Committee was formed through a joint agreement to improve traffic, crossing guard locations and other safety issues.

City of McKinney

McKinney ISD

Safety Committee
Who is involved?

Safety Committee

- Engineering
- Public Works
- Police
- Fire
- Emergency Management
- Collin County
- Durham Bus
- MISD
What Do We Do?

- Crossing Guard Requests
- Sidewalk Requests
- Crossings / Crosswalk Requests
- Traffic Signal Timing
- Signage Requests
- Construction along School Routes
- Ideas to improve school traffic flow
- New Schools
- Anything and everything related to safety of students
Projects that We’ve Done: Crossing Improvements

Goal:
- Improve motorist compliance
- Enhance crosswalk safety and visibility
- Compliance with TMUTCD

What we did:
- Added In-Street Crosswalk Signs

Cones Used Before
Projects that We’ve Done: Crossing Improvements

Goal:
- Improve motorist compliance
- Enhance crosswalk safety and visibility
- Compliance with TMUTCD

What we Did:
- Added Driver Feedback Sign
Projects that We’ve Done: School Zone Revisions

Goal:
Reduce school zone speeding
Improve motorist compliance
Not violating driver expectations
Projects that We’ve Done: School Zone Revisions

Goal:
“Put the school zone where the kids are”
Update signage, meet TMUTCD
Reduce school zone speeding
Improve motorist compliance
Not violating driver expectations
Projects that We’ve Done: Safe Routes to School
Projects that We’ve Done: Safe Routes to School

Goal:
- Improve student accessibility
- Remove obstacles
Projects that We’ve Done: Signal Improvements

Goal:
Reduce Right Turn Conflicts with students and peds in crosswalk

What we did:
• Added near- and far-side signing
• Prohibited right turns on red departing school
• Implemented leading pedestrian intervals
• Modified signal timing
Contact Information

Robyn Root, P.E., P.T.O.E.
Traffic Engineer
rroot@mckinneytexas.org
972-547-7425
Governor’s Highway Safety Association and FHWA Data

*2018 is projected to have the largest number of pedestrian fatalities in the U.S. since 1990.

From 2008-2017, pedestrian fatalities increased by 35%. When combined, all other traffic deaths decreased 6% over the same period.

Source: NHTSA Fatality Analysis Reporting System
46% of Pedestrian Deaths Occurred in just 5 states

Jan-June 2018

- State Highway Safety Offices
We want your opinion about walking in DFW!

Walking is a mode of transportation. What can TxDOT and NCTCOG do to improve walking as a transportation option in the Metroplex?

A pedestrian should be able to enjoy a safe and connected network as a transportation option. This clean mode of travel improves health, reduces stress and helps reduce traffic congestion. And walking plays a unique role in meeting local transportation challenges.
Overview

- The survey was live for two months between May 6 - July 5, 2019
- Used online tool, MetroQuest, facilitated by TxDOT
- Five sections: 5-7 minutes total time to complete
- 1,045 participants (Gave out two $100 gift cards as incentives)
- Gender of Respondents: 56% Female, 44% Male
- Age of respondents was evenly distributed from ages 25-64
Overview

56% Female
44% Male

Age Demographics of Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers
Respondents were asked to rank the “Top 3” pedestrian barriers they would most like to see addressed.
Barriers

Total number of times each barrier was indicated as a "Top 3" selection as a type of barrier they would like to see addressed by transportation professionals.

- No Sidewalks/Trails: 702
- Bad driver behaviors: 467
- Sidewalk/Trail Conditions: 500
- Disconnected Facilities: 463
- Lack of ADA Facilities: 126
- Limited access: 265
Barriers

Total number of times each barrier was indicated as a "Top 3" selection as a type of barrier they would like to see addressed by transportation professionals.
Respondents were asked to drag/drop markers of four categories onto a regional map to locate:

**Safety Concerns, Destinations, areas with No Facility, and Pedestrian Barriers**
Respondents were asked to drag/drop markers of four categories onto a regional map, to ID Safety Concerns, Destinations, areas with No Facility, and Pedestrian Barriers.

Respondents could also use a dropdown menu to “tag” the marker with a specific concern or leave a comment of their own on the marker after dragging/dropping it onto the map.
The map below shows the location of markers (2,596 red Xs) dropped on the map to ID pedestrian barriers.
Total number of markers dragged/dropped onto the map categorized by group and the number of tags added within those grouped markers.

- Safety Concerns: 1166 (Total Number of Markers Dropped), 712 (Total Number of Comments Added)
- Destinations: 284 (Markers Dropped), 128 (Comments Added)
- No Facility: 676 (Markers Dropped), 361 (Comments Added)
- Pedestrian Barriers: 470 (Markers Dropped), 268 (Comments Added)
Top Tags Noted Within Each Marker (Category) Dropped on the Map

**PEDESTRIAN BARRIERS**
- No Sidewalk Across Highway: 38 Tags
- Total Number of Comments Added to Markers Dropped: 268

**NO FACILITY**
- No Sidewalk Along Roadway: 297 Tags
- Total Number of Comments Added to Markers Dropped: 361

**DESTINATIONS**
- Shopping Centers: 43 Tags
- Total Number of Comments Added to Markers Dropped: 128

**SAFETY CONCERNS**
- Speeding Cars Along Routes: 252 Tags
- Total Number of Comments Added to Markers Dropped: 712
Priorities

Respondents were asked to rate pedestrian issues and concerns.

1 being the least preferred and 5 being the most preferred
## Accommodations:
Which pedestrian facilities do you feel comfortable using?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Least Preferred</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Most Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved Shoulders</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Use Paths</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks 3-4 Feet Wide</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks 5-10 Feet Wide</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREFERENCE**

- **1**: Least Preferred
- **2**: Preferred
- **3**: Most Preferred

### Total Responses:
- Paved Shoulders: 440
- Shared-Use Paths: 435
- Sidewalks 3-4 Feet Wide: 461
- Sidewalks 5-10 Feet Wide: 461
Safety: How valuable are these safety measures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCE TOP</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Most Preferred</th>
<th>Least Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CROSSWALK STRIPING</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID BLOCK PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS SOUNDS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPARATION BY SPACE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERTICAL SEPARATION</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall: What are your opinions on the following?

- I would walk more if there were sidewalks/trails near my house that connect to destinations.
- If I had a child, I would let them walk to a nearby school or store.
- I would like to travel more by foot than I do now.

**FACILITY NEEDS**
- Least Preferred: 14
- 2: 28
- 3: 71
- 4: 130
- Most Preferred: 464

**PERCEPTION OF SAFETY**
- Least Preferred: 171
- 2: 150
- 3: 171
- 4: 117
- 5: 93
- Most Preferred: 448

**WALKING**
- Least Preferred: 188
- 2: 24
- 3: 88
- 4: 168
- Most Preferred: 448
Education: Where should our focus be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCE</th>
<th>Least Preferred</th>
<th>Most Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BICYCLIST EDUCATION
- DRIVER EDUCATION
- PEDESTRIAN EDUCATION
Recently Released Bicycle Facility & Design Resources

- **FHWA Bikeway Selection Guide (2019)**
- **NACTO: Don’t Give Up at the Intersection (2019)**
Thank You!

Contacts:

Kevin Kokes, AICP  
Program Manager  
kkokes@nctcog.org

Matt Fall  
Senior Planner  
mfall@nctcog.org

Check out the project website!  
NCTCOG.org/ PedSafetyPlan
TRAIL OF THE MONTH

Highlighted Regional Trails

Matt Fall
Senior Planner, Bike/Ped
Sustainable Development
North Central Texas Council of Governments
BPAC Meeting, November 20, 2019
OUTREACH INITIATIVE

- Make the public aware of the many great trail systems in the Dallas-Fort Worth region
- Over 773 miles built and 3,869 miles planned
- Highlight current and future investment by cities and the Regional Transportation Council (RTC)
Videos highlight the benefits of our trail system, such as:

- Transportation
- Regional connectivity
- Access to job centers and schools
- Community enhancement
- History of the trails
Videos include interviews with:

- Local government leaders and staff
- Trail users
- Organizations, such as Friends of the Trail groups
SCHEDULE/CALENDAR OF TRAIL VIDEOS

- Santa Fe (August 2019)
- Cottonwood Creek (September 2019)
- River Legacy Trail (October 2019)
- Cotton Belt Trail (November 2019)
- Preston Ridge Trail (December 2019)
- DCTA Rail to Trail (January 2020)
- Trinity Trails – Ft. Worth – Benbrook – Westworth Village (Feb 2020)
- SoPac Trail (March 2020)
- Lone Star/Campion/Delaware Creek to Downtown Irving (April 2020)
- Central Trail (May 2020)
- Regional Trails Overview (June 2020)
THANK YOU!

Karla Weaver  
Senior Program Manager  
kweaver@nctcog.org

Kevin Kokes  
Program Manager  
kkokes@nctcog.org

Matt Fall  
Senior Planner  
mfall@nctcog.org

Trail of the Month Videos:  
nctcog.org/bikeweb
First Regional Walk to School Day Promotional Effort

October 2, 2019
nctcog.org/walktoschool

North Texas schools that register will receive FREE promotional materials and student giveaways!
Why Walk to School Day?

• Easy and fun way to encourage students to walk to school.

• WTSD events lead to more walking and bicycling throughout the year.

• Events can encourage communities to implement policy or engineering changes that make it safer to walk and bike to school.

• Promote life-long healthy habits, improve air quality, reduce congestion.

• Positive community outreach opportunity.

Pictures courtesy City of Fort Worth
The results are in!

Number of schools that participated (in region):

2017: 96  
2018: 98  
2019: 98  
No change.

City with the most schools registered:  
Frisco (16)

Honorable mention for dedication to WTSD and elected official involvement:  
Fort Worth (11)

Shout-out to newcomers on the scene:  
Southlake (5)  
Sunnyvale (3)
## School Participation, by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frisco</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southlake</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Mound</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## School Participation, by School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frisco ISD</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen ISD</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson ISD</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisville ISD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth ISD</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano ISD</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll ISD</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington ISD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS ISD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale ISD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th># of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irving ISD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite ISD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapevine ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving ISD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite ISD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFB ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wylie ISD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How can we grow this number?

• Increase name/brand recognition of WTSD by continuing regional promotion in future years.

• More enticing incentive to encourage schools to participate (e.g., schools that register get entered into drawing for a $500 gift certificate).
  • Need to identify funding partners (e.g., health agencies).

• Expand outreach to schools and school districts.

• Other ideas?

Picture courtesy City of Fort Worth
Thank you!

Kathryn Rush, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
krush@nctcog.org
817-704-5601
Transportation Alternatives

2020 Call for Projects for the North Central Texas Region

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
November 20, 2019
Daniel Snyder
Eligible Project Activities

- Shared-Use Paths (Trails)
- On-Street Bikeways
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Signalization
- Protected Intersections
- Sidewalks, Crosswalks, Curb Ramps
- Traffic Controls and Calming Measures
- Signage
- Road Diets
Call for Projects Overview

- Approximately $20 million in conditional federal funding available
- Minimum 20% local match is required
- Qualified agencies may request the use of Transportation Development Credits (TDCs) in lieu of a local cash match
- Engineering/design is **100% local**
- TA funding for **construction only** (min. 20% local match or TDCs)
Project Categories / Eligible Areas

Active Transportation
• Projects located in the Urbanized Area

Safe Routes to School
• Projects located in the 12-county metropolitan area
• Projects must be within two miles of a K-8 school
Eligible Areas

• Active Transportation: Urbanized area

• Safe Routes to School: 12-county region
### Active Transportation Evaluation and Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Network Connectivity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Improves connectivity of Mobility 2045 regional paths and bikeways between cities and counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Accessibility</td>
<td>15</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>Congestion Reduction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Provides alternative travel options as an option to motor vehicle trips in areas with greater opportunity for walking and bicycling, thus improving air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Improves access to disadvantaged populations and underserved communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Barriers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provides safe crossing of existing travel obstacles such as major roadways, interchanges, railroads, and bodies of water.</td>
</tr>
<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 and local match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>The extent to which the project addresses an identified problem, and the severity of that problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to Increase Walking and Bicycling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The impact that the project is likely to have on the number of students that walk or bicycle to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The project is supported by a Safe Routes to School plan, safety audit, or other local planning effort. The municipality has adopted a Complete Streets Policy and an ADA Transition Plan for sidewalks and curb ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Community support for the project and walking and bicycling to school is demonstrated through letters of support, past participation in education or encouragement events, and a public meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The project serves a school with a high percentage of economically disadvantaged students.</td>
</tr>
<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 and local match.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) – Info on CFP</td>
<td>November 20, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for Projects Public Workshop</td>
<td>January 21, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Technical Committee (STTC) – Info on CFP</td>
<td>January 24, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Council (RTC) – Info on CFP</td>
<td>February 13, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Call for Projects Opens</strong></td>
<td><strong>February 17, 2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Meetings to Review Applications for Completeness</td>
<td>April 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Call for Projects Closes</strong></td>
<td><strong>May 15, 2020, 5 PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Projects / Scoring by NCTCOG</td>
<td>May-July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Technical Committee (STTC) – Action on Selected Projects</td>
<td>August 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Council (RTC) – Action on Selected Projects</td>
<td>September 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Meetings with TxDOT District Staff</td>
<td>September - October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submittal Deadline for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Modifications (November 2019 Cycle)</td>
<td>October 23, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>March / April 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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