## MEETING AGENDA

**TxDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Meeting**  
April 9, 2021 - 9:30 A.M.  
**Note:** This meeting will be held remotely via Zoom  
Teleconference instructions below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Call to Order.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Safety briefing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Approval of minutes from January 15, 2021 BAC meeting. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Report from TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division (PTN) Director regarding statewide bicycle and pedestrian matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Discussion on Bikeway Design Effort interim guiding principles for bikeway conflict points. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Discussion on next BPAC effort. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Update on TxDOT’s 2021 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA) Call for Projects evaluation criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Updates from committee members on local and statewide issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Public comment – Due to the virtual format of the meeting, public comments may be submitted by email to <a href="mailto:BikePed@txdot.gov">BikePed@txdot.gov</a> by April 19, 2021, to be included as part of the meeting record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Discussion of agenda items for future BAC meetings. (Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Adjourn. (Action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BPAC meeting will be conducted in English. If you need an interpreter or document translator because English is not your primary language or you have difficulty communicating effectively in English, one will be provided to you. If you have a disability and need assistance, special arrangements can be made to accommodate most needs. If you need interpretation or translation services or you are a person with a disability who requires an accommodation to attend and participate in the BPAC meeting, please contact Noah Heath, PTN, at (361) 876-7184 no later than 4 p.m. CT, March 30, 2021. Please be aware that advance notice is required as some services and accommodations may require time for the Texas Department of Transportation to arrange.
BPAC Members

Karla Weaver, Chair, Dallas/Ft. Worth
Bobby Gonzales, Vice Chair, El Paso
Chelsea Phlegar, Waco
Clint McManus, Houston
Eddie Church, Cedar Park
Eva Garcia, Brownsville
Frank Rotnofsky, Laredo
Jeff Pollack, Corpus Christi
Mike Schofield, Austin
Rick Ogan, San Angelo
Trent Brookshire, Tyler

TxDOT Technical Staff

Eric Gleason, Director, Public Transportation Division (PTN)
Donna Roberts, Program Services Section Director, PTN
Bonnie Sherman, Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Manager, PTN
Noah Heath, Bicycle & Pedestrian Planner, PTN
Carl Seifert, Transportation Planner (Contractor), Jacobs

* * *

Teleconference instructions:

Event address for attendees:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84762519649?pwd=NTg2Sk5qb1pTSDVFUC9jckJoJcIUT09

Passcode: 123456
Or iPhone one-tap :
    US: +13462487799,,84762519649#,,,,,*123456#  or
    +16699006833,,84762519649#,,,,,*123456#
Or Telephone:
    Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
    US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or
    +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799
Webinar ID: 847 6251 9649
Passcode: 123456
* * *
AGENDA ITEM 1: Call to Order.

Karla Weaver, calls the meeting to order at 9:30 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Remarks from Texas Transportation Commissioner Robert C. Vaughn.

Commissioner Vaughn made comments beginning at 9:32 AM expressing TxDOT’s appreciation of the work the Committee Members have completed on the BAC, and the importance of integrating bicycles and pedestrians into the state transportation network.

Comments: Karla Weaver, and Eric Gleason

AGENDA ITEM 5: Report from TxDOT’s Public Transportation Division (PTN) Director regarding statewide bicycle and pedestrian matters.

Eric Gleason delivered the Director’s report beginning at 9:40 A.M.

Eric Gleason gave an update on Bicycle and Pedestrian Program activities including; status of rule revisions which expand the scope of the committee to include pedestrians and the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program.

Comments: No comments or questions
AGENDA ITEM 7: Update on Bikeway Design Effort and discussion on next BAC effort.

Carl Seifert and Bonnie Sherman presented beginning at 9:47 A.M.

Questions/Comments: Karla Weaver, Eva Garcia, Frank Rotnofsky, Clint McManus, Chelsea Phlegar, Bobby Gonzales, Rick Ogan, Eddie Church, Jeff Pollack, Trent Brookshire, and Mike Schofield.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Safety briefing.

Bonnie Sherman presented beginning at 10:31 A.M.

Comments: No Comments

AGENDA ITEM 3: Approval of minutes from October 9, 2020 BAC meeting. (Action)

Karla Weaver introduced this item at 10:35 A.M.

MOTION Bobby Gonzales moved to approve the October 9, 2020 BAC meeting minutes.

SECOND Trent Brookshire seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously at 10:35 A.M.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Discussion on TxDOT’s 2021 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA) Call for Projects. (Action)

Noah Heath presented this item at 10:36 A.M.

MOTION Eva Garcia made a motion in support of the process laid out in the presentation for administering TxDOT’s 2021 TA Call for Projects and collecting feedback from the BAC related to TxDOT’s 2021 TA Call for Projects criteria category weights.

SECOND Frank Rotnofsky

The motion passes unanimously at 10:55 A.M.

Questions/Comments: Clint McManus, Karla Weaver, and Eva Garcia

AGENDA ITEM 8: Presentation on Rio Grande Valley active transportation efforts.

Eva Garcia presented this item at 10:56 A.M.

Questions/Comments: Karla Weaver, Mike Schofield, and Bonnie Sherman.

AGENDA ITEM 9: Updates from committee members on local and statewide issues.

Committee members provided updates from their regions at 11:15 A.M.
Questions/Comments: Bobby Gonzales, Chelsea Phlegar, Clint McManus, Eddie Church, Eva Garcia, Frank Rotnofsky, Jeff Pollack, Mike Schofield, Rick Ogan, Karla Weaver, and Trent Brookshire.

AGENDA ITEM 10: Public comment – Due to the virtual format of the meeting, public comments may be submitted by email to BikePed@txdot.gov by January 25, 2021, to be included as part of the meeting record.

Karla Weaver introduced this item at 11:38 A.M.

Three public comments were submitted via email and provided to BAC members.

Neal Ehardt, Houston, TX

Supported BAC efforts to “expand the bikeway network, to build safer bike/ped accommodations, to train engineers and planners, to manage bike/ped data, and to fund these projects.” Recommended “a policy of creating safe bike/ped access with every resurfacing project.” Recommended the BAC focus on safe infrastructure and safe traffic operations laws rather than educating cyclists.

Lauren Baldwin, El Paso, TX

Requested additional information related to the Bicycle Tourism Trails and expressed interest in how a pilot project could be organized in El Paso to show the value of bicycle tourism.

Molly Cook, Houston, TX representing STOP TxDOT I-45

Recommended the BAC focus on policies that alter infrastructure to reduce crashes over efforts that the reader deems less effective like education but suggests supporting existing local education efforts as a way to address this interest.

AGENDA ITEM 11: Discussion of agenda items for future BAC meetings. (Action)

Karla Weaver introduced this item at 11:59 A.M.

Comments: Eddie Church, Frank Rotnofsky, Karl Weaver, Clint McManus, Jeff Pollack, Mike Schofield, Bonnie Sherman, and Eva Garcia.

AGENDA ITEM 11: Adjourn. (Action)

MOTION

Frank Rotnofsky

SECOND

Eddie Church

Meeting adjourned at 11:49 A.M.

Prepared by:     Approved by:
Noah Heath     Karla Weaver
Public Transportation Division     Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee
Bikeway Design Effort

*Update*

April 9, 2021

---

**Presentation agenda**

1. Phase 2 Working Group Content Overview
2. Phase 2 Interim Recommendations:
   
   *Guiding Principles for Bikeway Conflict Points*
3. Discussion
4. Next Steps
### Relationship of Phase 2 topic categories to Guiding Principles

#### Design Topic Categories
- Bikeway Selection
- Linear Bikeway Design
- Intersections & conflict points
- Maintenance

#### Monthly discussions at Working Group meetings
- Bikeway Selection
- Linear Bikeway Design

#### Interim Guiding Principles
- APPROVED
- TODAY
- July 2021

### Bikeway Design Effort remaining topics and schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Content Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>BAC approval of guiding principles for conflict points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April (date TBD)</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td>Discuss <strong>reducing lane widths to add bike lanes AND maintenance of green pavement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (date TBD)</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td>Develop guiding principles for maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June (date TBD)</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td>Review ALL guiding principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Final BAC approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Phase 2 topics overview

### Design Topic Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bikeway Selection</th>
<th>Preliminary Discussion Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Land Use Context/Design user</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuum of facility types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding constraints/trade-offs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When wide outside lanes are appropriate/necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible endorsement of FHWA Bikeway Selection Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linear Bikeway Design</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum vs preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preferred barrier types for SUPs and SBLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 way vs 2 way; 1 side vs both sides for SUPs/SBLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rumble strip standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersections &amp; conflict points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Protected intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bike signals, signage, &amp; pavement markings for safer intersections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Driveways and RRD crossings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pavement markings and driveway conflict points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance of barrier separated bikeways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seal coats (aggregate size)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing lane widths to add bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance of green pavement materials (thermos, MMA, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Guiding Principles for Bikeway Conflict Points – page 1

1. 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.

2. 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.

---

![Figure 1. Dashed Pavement markings*](source:DRAFT MUTCD, 2021. *Figure 9E-2; **Figure 9E-14.)

![Figure 2. Separate crossing markings for bicyclists and pedestrians**](source:DRAFT MUTCD, 2021. *Figure 9E-2; **Figure 9E-14.)
3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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).

6. 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.

7. 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".

8. Roadway design engineers should consider sight lines of all users; landscaping, signage, and parked cars can hinder visibility for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.


Fig 8 Island bus stop
Fig 9: Skewed railroad crossing

Draft Guiding Principles for Bikeway Conflict Points

Signs, Signals, and Pavement Markings

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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).

6. 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.

7. 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".

8. Roadway design engineers should consider sight lines of all users; landscaping, signage, and parked cars can hinder visibility for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

9. 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 RRBs should be applied where appropriate in accordance with TxDOT TRF memo.
### Transit and railroad conflict points

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action

- To support Guiding Principles for Bikeway Conflict Points
### Phase 2 schedule overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration, Coordination, and Stakeholder Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT Internal, Division and District coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT Bikeway Design Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bikeway Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Corridor/Linear Bikeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Intersections/Conflict points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC Final Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ○ BAC Working Group Meeting
- ■ BAC Meeting

---

### Questions

Please send additional questions and comments to:

**Bonnie Sherman, AICP**  
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division  
Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator  
Bonnie.Sherman@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5972

**Noah Heath, AICP**  
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner  
Noah.Heath@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5973

**Carl Seifert, AICP**  
Carl.Seifert@Jacobs.com  
(512) 486-5974  
Jacobs
BPAC Future Work

Strategic Direction and other efforts

April 9, 2021

Presentation agenda

1. Approach overview
2. Brainstorm results
3. Idea categorization
4. Prioritization and engagement
BPAC Purpose and Duties (43 §TAC 1.85(a)(3))

Purpose of BPAC is to advise the Commission on:
- Bicycle and pedestrian issues
- Matters related to Transportation Alternatives Program

“By involving representatives of the public, including bicyclists, pedestrians, and other interested parties, the department helps ensure effective communication with the bicycle and pedestrian communities, and that the bicyclist’s and pedestrian’s perspectives will be considered in the development of departmental policies affecting bicycle use and pedestrian activity, including the design, construction, and maintenance of highways.”

Duties:
- review and make recommendations on items of mutual concern between the department and the bicycling and pedestrian communities;
- provide recommendations on the selection criteria for Transportation Alternatives
- advise and make recommendations to the commission on the development of bicycle tourism trails
- review and consider how personal mobility, or micromobility, devices relate to bicycling and pedestrian issues and to other road users.

Approach overview

Foundation
- Committee scope has expanded to include pedestrians
- TxDOT/BPAC have made substantial progress on SDR
- Bikeway Design Effort is expected to conclude July 2021
- New BPAC members will join October 2021

Objective
- Need to update the SDR
- Potential for parallel effort:
  - Quick turn-around report,
  - Elements needed to inform the SDR, or
  - Item of Commission interest
Brainstorm results – word cloud

Brainstorm results tree chart

Infrastructure design

Infrastructure Implementation

Quick-turn around ideas

Preparation ideas

Safe systems analysis

Policy improvements

SDR Approach & Coordination
Ideas for improving SDR development

**SDR approach ideas**
- Revise SDR to focus/reduce activities
- Revise SDR to identify responsible parties
- Add coordination/interaction section focused on new modal types

**SDR outreach and coordination ideas**
- Coordinate with regional BPACs to identify action items
- Organize listening session with local BPACs
- Coordinate BPAC member networks for outreach
- Create additional working groups to support SDR work activities

Ideas that may be incorporated into an updated SDR – Page 1

**Education/Training**
- Training engineers
- Develop/implement training modules for TxDOT and local gov’ts on using federal funds for b/p projects
- Childhood bicyclist education
- Adult bicyclist education
- Driver education
- Educate Texans on bicycle friendly policies by partnering with BikeTexas and League of American Bicyclists
**B/P Design**
- Create chip seal best practices
- Create design standards to prevent unsafe and illegal crossings
- Create island refuge guidance
- Create typical sections for bikeways
- Require SUPs along frontage roads
- Update rumble strip standards
- Update signal and lighting standards
- Consistently implement new Roadway Design Manual guidance
- Evaluate bikeway design implementation to ensure minimum standard of safety/performance
- Use BPAC Bikeway Design Effort recommendations to build segments of BTT Example Network

**Implementation**
- Review and explore b/p infrastructure funding mechanisms/criteria; how locals can better utilize available funding
- Improve interagency coordination on bike/ped projects
- Develop/implement training modules for TxDOT and local gov'ts
- Branding/marketing/creating inertia for BTT & USBRS development

**Policy improvements**
- Develop safe crossing TxDOT policies
- Develop TxDOT Complete Streets Policy
- Support long-distance bikeways along underutilized ROW
- Develop policy to better incorporate ADA transition plans
**System safety analysis**
- Develop system safety policies to reduce bicycle/ped fatalities
- Identify system safety hot spots and unsafe patterns
- Review CRIS data collection and reporting processes
- Review system safety for bicycle and pedestrian users
- Review and improve speed limit setting policies

**Other ideas**

**Quick turn-around ideas**
- Report on TxDOT funded BP research projects
- Statewide deep-dive into coronavirus pandemic
- Summarize work accomplished during SDR. Include LAB rankings, recommendations report card, and studies completed.
- Create a repository for all the education campaigns completed around the state (state and local gov’t)
- Update on interactive bikeway map
- Visualize bikeway design effort results

**Commission interest**
- Document best practices for adopting Vision Zero (Laredo, Austin, Houston)

**Outside of the committee scope**
- Change law/policy to make bicyclists vulnerable users
- BPAC becomes reviewer of TxDOT B/P standards/specifications
- Support harsher penalties for drivers
Mentimeter exercise – Question 1

What are the most important activities for the BPAC and TxDOT’s bicycle program over the next 2 years?

Multiple responses encouraged!

Mentimeter exercise – Question 2

How would you rank these categories in importance?
**Mentimeter exercise – Question 3**

Which quick turn-around ideas are most important?

**Anticipated schedule and next steps**

- **July 2021**
  - Bikeway Design Effort concludes (GP approval sought)

- **October 2021**
  - New BPAC members join, and either
    - Begin quick-turn around activity
    - Begin updating SDR

AND/OR
Please send additional questions and comments to:

Bonnie Sherman, AICP  
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division  
Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator  
Bonnie.Sherman@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5972

Noah Heath, AICP  
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner  
Noah.Heath@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5973

Carl Seifert, AICP  
Carl.Seifert@Jacobs.com  
(512) 486-5974  
Jacobs
TxDOT 2021 Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program: Evaluation Criteria Update

April 9, 2021

Presentation agenda

1. 2021 TA Call for Projects
2. BAC Action and Criteria Category Weights Input
3. Results
**TxDOT 2021 TA Call for Projects: Timeline**

**Step 1**
- TA Call for Projects opens 1/15/2021
- Preliminary Application deadline 3/1/2021
- TxDOT Review
- District Meetings

**Step 2**
- TxDOT notifies project sponsors of application pool 4/12/2021
- Detailed Application deadline All Project Sponsors 6/14/2021
- TxDOT Review
- Commission Award
- FY 23/24 Nonurban TA Projects
- Small Urban TA Projects
  - October 2021

**TxDOT 2021 TA Criteria Development Process**

**Development of 2021 TA Evaluation Tool**
- 2019 TA criteria
- TxDOT mission, vision, and goals
- Identified best practices at State DOTs, MPOs

**Workshop with District TA Coordinators and Small MPOs**
- Identified criteria & measures
- Weighted based on local priorities

**Refined TA Evaluation Tool**
- Based on available data and measures
- Identified interim weights

**BAC prioritization**
- Averaged BAC input with interim weights
- Increased Project Readiness to address limited funding availability
BAC January Meeting Results

- **BAC Action:**
  - In support of PTN’s approach to administering the TxDOT 2021 TA Call for Projects

- **BAC Survey:**
  - Prioritized 2021 TA evaluation criteria categories
  - Received eight survey responses

- BAC’s survey results were averaged with workshop participants’ weights and adjusted to reflect limited availability of TA funds

**TxDOT 2021 TA Evaluation Criteria**

- Safety
  - Bike & Pedestrian Crash Count/Rate
  - Safety Hazards
  - Countermeasures
  - Design Elements

- Connectivity & Accessibility
  - Modal connectivity
  - Destinations
  - Barrier Elimination
  - Bicycle Tourism Trails

- Equity, Community Support, Demand*
  - Underserved populations
  - Support & planning
  - Employment & population density

- Project Readiness
  - Status of project development
  - Project timeline
  - Constructability

*Demand is evaluated for Small Urban projects only
Please send additional questions and comments to:

Bonnie Sherman, AICP  
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division  
Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator  
Bonnie.Sherman@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5972

Noah Heath, AICP  
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner  
Noah.Heath@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5973

Carl Seifert, AICP  
Carl.Seifert@Jacobs.com  
(512) 486-5974  
Jacobs