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- Costs & determining priorities
- Public outreach & survey
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What Is an ADA Self-Evaluation & Transition Plan

- **Self-Evaluation** = *a review of programs, services, and activities*
  - The purpose is to identify barriers that people with disabilities may encounter
  - The self-evaluation identifies the actual physical barriers that limit accessibility
  - This include public-facing services, policies, practices, activities, and programs which include facilities, pedestrian access (sidewalks, curb ramps, bus stops, traffic signals), and communications

- **Transition Plan** = *an action plan, which includes:*
  - A plan or methods to remediate or remove barriers
  - The name of the official(s) responsible to implement the plan
  - A schedule to get the work completed
  - Cost to remove barriers
What TxDOT Evaluated

- Policies & Practices
- Public Rights-of-Way – 100% of PROW
- Facilities – 157 public facing facilities
  - TxDOT owned buildings, open to the public
  - Safety Rest Areas
  - Travel Information Centers
  - Ferries
- Websites – 6,000 webpages; 3 manually tested (txdot.gov included)
How TxDOT Collected and Assessed Compliance
ADA Self-Evaluation Findings – Overview

General Findings

- Our presentation provided a high-level of information, to include:
  - Public Rights-of-Way
  - Facilities
  - Websites

- We discussed:
  - The summation of the total inventory collected statewide
  - The most common issues revealed
  - Detailed compliance reports were compiled for each element of inventory collected and evaluated
  - Newly constructed facilities tend to have higher compliance than older facilities
The ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan Report is available on the website, which provides more thorough information.
Cost Estimates – PROW (Public Rights-of-Way)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Preliminary Cost Barrier Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk (Detailed)</td>
<td>$913,620,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk (Visual)</td>
<td>$196,556,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Connectivity</td>
<td>$84,332,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Ramps</td>
<td>$329,588,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cuts (Medians)</td>
<td>$25,381,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stops</td>
<td>$8,339,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Planning-Level Estimate</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,557,819,252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The above table represents the cost estimates to remove barriers identified.
- The cost estimates reflect planning level estimates at the time of assessment.
- Actual costs can only be firmly determined via standard design and construction process.
The above tables depict costs of correcting non-compliant items by priority level for facilities.

The cost estimates reflect planning level estimates at the time of assessment.

Actual costs can only be firmly determined via standard design and construction process.
Hundreds of thousands of data points require technological approach

- Algorithms within Geographic Information System (GIS) assign severity score and activity score based on criteria

- Public comment and feedback on priorities are considered in prioritizing remediation
Geographic Information System (GIS) – ‘TCAP’ Web Application

- Contains all detailed data, compliance reports, photos, videos
- Micro to macro data for costs, project planning, and tracking remediation
- GIS Exemption (*not available to the public*)
ADA Transition Plan
Planning and Executing Accessibility Improvements

- With significant non-compliant issues, prioritizing inventory is essential
- TxDOT anticipates ADA improvements will be on-going for decades
- TxDOT anticipates that it may modify priorities:
  - to allow flexibility in accommodating community requests
  - petitions for reasonable modifications from persons with disabilities
  - changes in TxDOT programs
  - ongoing evaluation and changes in environment
  - funding constraints
  - funding opportunities
- Public comment and feedback on priorities are considered in prioritizing remediation
- TxDOT will use the TCAP WebApp to plan, execute, and track projects as a ‘living’ ADA Transition Plan
Implementation Schedules – PROW Example

- TxDOT Divisions and Districts create implementation schedules on a 4-year cycle to coordinate with funding sources
- TxDOT plans to invest over $500 million between FY 2022 and FY 2025
  - Below is a sample abbreviated table as seen in the ADA Transition Plan

### District (FY22-FY25) Implementation Schedule – PROW abbreviated sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSJ</th>
<th>HIGHWAY</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Letting Year</th>
<th>Proposed Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>052102041</td>
<td>SL 13</td>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$20,250</td>
<td>$101,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143301032</td>
<td>FM 2252</td>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$59,650</td>
<td>$82,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002509085</td>
<td>FM 78</td>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$59,850</td>
<td>$339,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029103076</td>
<td>SH 16</td>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$62,250</td>
<td>$306,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127201021</td>
<td>FM 1101</td>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</td>
<td>Comal</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$63,350</td>
<td>$316,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143301031</td>
<td>FM 2252</td>
<td>SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$74,724</td>
<td>$74,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TxDOT Divisions and Districts create implementation schedules on a 4-year cycle to coordinate with funding sources.

TxDOT plans to invest over $500 million between FY 2022 and FY 2025.

Below is a sample abbreviated table as seen in the ADA Transition Plan.

### Safety Rest Areas (FY22-FY26) Implementation Schedule – Facility abbreviate example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>TxDOT Asset ID</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2023</th>
<th>FY2024</th>
<th>FY2025</th>
<th>FY2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray County WB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donley County SB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donley County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardeman County SB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardeman County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Zandt County WB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$73,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Zandt County EB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarro County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell County SB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$108,235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins County WB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker County SB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donley County EB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You
For Your Time & Involvement
Strategic Direction Report Update Project

April 25, 2022
Presentation agenda

1. Review of SDR update progress

2. BPAC preference/prioritization on unstarted strategies/actions

3. Schedule and next steps
Proposed revision to SDR Update Focus Areas

- Expand the bicycle and pedestrian networks
- Build safer and better bicycle and pedestrian accommodations
- Provide training for engineers, planners, and construction staff
- “and encourage” was added to “Educate the public on safe driving, bicycling and walking”
- “Encourage people to walk and bicycle” was removed
- Develop statewide management systems for bicycle and pedestrian information
- Fund more bicycle and pedestrian projects

Discussion item:
Do BPAC members concur? Thoughts?
Summary: Combining new ideas with in-process and on-going strategies and actions

6 Focus Areas, 18 Strategies, 48 actions

Origins of SDR Update Strategies
- 45% of strategies were derived from on-going work (original SDR)
- 33% of strategies were derived from the Bikeway Modernization effort
- 22% of strategies were derived from BPAC members through this SDR Update process

Current Status of SDR Update Strategies
- 50% of strategies are in-progress
- 33% of strategies are not yet started
- 17% of strategies are on-going

Mode of SDR Update Actions
- 56% of actions are multimodal
- 27% of actions are bicycle-only
- 15% of actions are pedestrian-only
- 2% of actions are micromobility
Virtual engagement activity

**Purpose:**
- Review preferences for new/unstarted strategies

**Tool:**
- Social Pinpoint
- Links were sent directly only to BPAC members

**Details:**
- Stepping through each unstarted strategy/action, we will walk through members’ most important new strategies/actions
- Discuss, revise, and comment on strategies/actions
- Project team is taking notes and saving ideas under “parking lot”
- Facilitator will call on people as necessary
Virtual engagement activity

Switch to virtual engagement software in internet browser...
Schedule and next steps

- **April to July**
  - Compile District, BPAC, and Division stakeholder input on strategies//actions

- **July BPAC**
  - Implementation plan and draft report for BPAC action

- **Implementation (next five years)**
  - Action by action, execute strategies to continue creating a safer place for bicyclists and pedestrians in Texas.

**On-going tasks**
- Email communication with BPAC members
- Internal coordination meetings between TxDOT Divisions
- Research and data analysis
- Report development
Please send additional questions and comments to TxDOT’s Bike/Ped Group:

Bonnie Sherman, AICP  
Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coord.  
Bonnie.Sherman@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5972

Noah Heath, AICP  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner  
Noah.Heath@txdot.gov  
(512) 486-5973

Greg Reininger  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner  
Gregory.Reininger@txdot.gov  
(737) 285-6184

Carl Seifert, AICP  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner  
Cseife-c@txdot.gov

Alexandra Quintero  
Transportation Planner  
Alexandra.Quintero@jacobs.com

Stephanie Lind, AICP  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Stephanie.Lind@jacobs.com

Contact info
Micromobility Research Overview

April 25, 2022
Presentation agenda

1. Micromobility overview
2. Trends in Texas
3. Safety, Equity, and Sidewalk Access
4. Micromobility in the Texas Transportation Code
5. Micromobility at the Federal Level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micromobility Device Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>eScooter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less than 20 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less than 20 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average trip length is 1-1.5 miles/11-12 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eBike</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less than 20 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less than 20 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average trip length is highly variable depending on trip type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle (bikeshare)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 10 to 20 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less than 20 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average trip length is 1-1.5 miles/11-12 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other vehicles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Up to 8 to 15 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weight varies but less than 50 pounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average trip length varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Summary of Micromobility Operations

- Generally, operate in urban environments
- Trips tend to be short (1 – 1.5 miles) or 11 – 12 minutes
- User base not demographically diverse
- Trips are generally utilitarian
- Weather influences use
- Operations and devices are constantly evolving
Micromobility in Texas and Trends

Bikeshare and E-Scooter Systems over time

- Number of Docked Bikeshare systems 2015: 182, 2017: 103; 2019: 66
- Number of Dockless Bikeshare systems 2015: 0, 2017: 71; 2019: 60
- Number of Docked Bikeshare systems 2015: 0, 2017: 239; 2019: 214

Bikeshare & E-scooter Systems (2021)

- Industry characterized by diversification and growth
- The first bikeshare program in Texas was in San Antonio in 2011
- COVID impacted micromobility operations, but impacts varied
- Bikeshare transitioning to eBikes in some cities (ex: Bcycle)

*Dockless bikeshare and e-scooters emerged in 2017.*
Micromobility Safety – Research Findings

- E-scooter riders do not face significantly higher risk of road traffic death or injury compared to cyclists.

- A car or motorcycle trip in a dense urban area is more likely to result in the death of a road user than a micromobility trip.

- Motor vehicles are involved in 80 percent of all fatal crashes with e-scooters and bicycles.

- E-scooters
  - E-scooter riders were more often injured on sidewalk than in vehicle lanes.
  - One journal found that 1/3rd of e-scooter riders were first-time riders.

- Evidence of low helmet use for e-scooter and bikeshare users.

- Bikeshare have lower rates of collision than personal bicyclists.

Please refer to the Micromobility Research Brief for citations and additional information.
**Preliminary 2021 Texas E-scooter Crash Analysis**

- Reported 2021 e-scooter crashes in Texas = 30
- 1 E-scooter crash involved pedestrians (only 3% of total)
- 5 E-scooter crashes occurred on/along on-system roadways (only 17%)
- 17 E-scooter crashes occurred at intersections (57% of total)

**Reported e-scooter crashes: user injuries**

- 2 fatalities (7% of crashes)
- 4 suspected serious injuries (13% of crashes)
- 14 suspected minor injuries (47% of crashes)
- 10 possible injuries (33% of crashes)
- 0 not injuries (0% of crashes)

**NOTE:**
- Bikeshare, e-bike, and conventional bicycle crashes are tracked as pedalcyclists
- All other micromobility devices (one-wheels, riding lawnmowers, segways, etc.) are labeled motorized conveyances, but isolating these devices from the larger group is not yet possible

April 25, 2022
**Equity Concerns**

*Distribution equity*
- Options for users without smartphones or bank access
- Discounts for public benefits program participants

**Older adults and pedestrian advocates**
- Shared sidewalk space leads to crashes, trip hazards, parking concerns, and concerns about new technology
- Mobility/access constraints
- Vendors requiring picture of parked device
- Vendors geofencing off crowded pedestrian areas

**Urban-rural divide**
- Access for less dense areas
Dockless Micromobility Parking and Shared Space

- One 2021 five-city study found:
  - Parking non-compliance rates for e-scooters at only 1.7% and dockless bicycles at 0.3%
  - Motor vehicle non-compliance parking access at 24.7%

- Parking management
  - Parking corrals
  - Geofencing

- Sharing space with on-street bicycle infrastructure
  - Atlanta changing bicycle lanes to “light individual transportation” (LIT) lanes
# Texas Transportation Code (TTC) and Micromobility Regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is riding on the sidewalk allowed?</td>
<td>§551.352</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is riding in the bikeway allowed?</td>
<td>§551.352</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is riding on the street allowed?</td>
<td>§551.352</td>
<td>Yes, eScooters are allowed on roads where the speed limit is less than 35 mph. Crossing higher speed roads is allowed. All bicycles must follow Texas Motor Vehicle Laws while using the vehicle travel lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an age limit?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not specified in TTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are helmets required?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not specified in TTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are e-scooters motor vehicles?</td>
<td>§551.352</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other local laws seen across Texas:
  - Use of portable electronic devices are not allowed while operating
  - No other occupants/riders, and
  - Provide reasonable assistance and contact info if you cause injury or property damage
Micromobility at the Federal Level

- **IIJA (2021)**
  - Broadens “nonmotorized road user” to include scooters and personal conveyances
  - Instructs US DOT to track “personal conveyance” crash data

- **Transportation Alternative Funding**
  - TA funding can be used for bikeshare and e-scooter shared system docks, equipment and other capital costs.

- **Governmental cooperation**
  - FHWA developing research briefs and other research
  - Bureau of Transportation Statistics tracking micromobility programs
  - Other office coordinating on safety and accessibility research
Future Micromobility Research Opportunities

- The safety impacts of micromobility for pedestrians
- Successful micromobility integration strategies with transit, first/last-mile, Mobility as a Service (MaaS), Mobility on Demand (MOD) and other trip planning applications
- Effectiveness and applicability of geofencing technologies with micromobility vehicles as it relates to equity, safety, accessibility, among other issues
- Micromobility user behavior, specifically if people use the right-of-way differently on rented or owned e-scooters
- Demand and safety impacts of future micromobility modes
- In-depth analyses/surveys to determine modal shifts resulting from micromobility
- Design parameters and guidance to accommodate micromobility devices
Please send additional questions and comments to TxDOT’s Bike/Ped Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Sherman, AICP</td>
<td>Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Coord.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bonnie.Sherman@txdot.gov">Bonnie.Sherman@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td>(512) 486-5972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Heath, AICP</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Noah.Heath@txdot.gov">Noah.Heath@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td>(512) 486-5973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Reininger</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gregory.Reininger@txdot.gov">Gregory.Reininger@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td>(737) 285-6184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Seifert, AICP</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cseife-c@txdot.gov">Cseife-c@txdot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Quintero</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Alexandra.Quintero@jacobs.com">Alexandra.Quintero@jacobs.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Lind, AICP</td>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stephanie.Lind@jacobs.com">Stephanie.Lind@jacobs.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jacobs*
Update on TA Program Changes due to IIJA

April 25, 2022
Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside (TA) Program updates:

- TA Program will increase 63% above FAST Act levels in FY 22 and continue to grow another 8% over the life of the bill
- Suballocation will be 59%, a higher portion than Fast Act at 50%
- Any Area funds
  - Reduced to 41% of state TA distribution
  - May only be transferred after:
    • State DOT holds competitive call
    • Provides technical assistance and
    • Demonstrates no suitable applications remain
- New population breakout for Small Urban areas:
  - 5,000 to 49,999 (Small urban)
  - 50,000 to 200,000 (Medium Urban)
- Non-infrastructure SRTS and planning projects eligible
- New eligibilities for small MPOs and non-profits
- Allows 5% TA funds for technical and application assistance
## Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act: Transportation Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Area</th>
<th>FAST Act FY 21</th>
<th>FAST Act FY 22</th>
<th>IIJA / BIL FY 26**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT Subtotal</td>
<td>$13.3 M</td>
<td>$26.1 M</td>
<td>$28.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Subtotal</td>
<td>$25.6 M</td>
<td>$50.1 M</td>
<td>$54.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Area</td>
<td>$38.9 M</td>
<td>$53.0 M</td>
<td>$57.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77.8 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$129.2 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140.2 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Federal program totals only

** FY 26 amounts are estimated
TxDOT’s Implementation Strategy

- TxDOT Suballocated funds:
  - Continue current approach
  - Community-based projects for areas under 200,000
  - Solicit community-based project proposals from:
    - Non-urban (under 5,000)
    - Small urban (5,000 – 49,999)
    - Medium urban (50,000 - 200,000)

- TxDOT Any Area (statewide) funds:
  - *NEW* Statewide Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects
    - Add a project category to TxDOT’s biennial call for projects
      - Large scale (i.e. $10m to $25m) and/or
      - High impact projects that substantively improve mobility options
    - Open to eligible project sponsors statewide regardless of population size
Statewide Active Transportation Improvement category

- What types of projects may be eligible?
  - Long-distance active transportation routes (e.g., bicycle tourism trails)
  - Comprehensive accessibility improvements
  - Intermodal hubs
  - Shared use paths in rail or utility corridors
  - Improvements that mitigate barriers to bicycling and walking
  - Others?
Implementation Schedule and BPAC feedback

- Targeting **October 2022** Call for Projects Kick-off
- TBD 2023 Award
- Will ask for BPAC feedback at July meeting
  - Potential TAC rule changes are being proposed to:
    - Optimize timely obligation of funds
    - Add eligible funding activities
    - TA Program Evaluation Criteria
  - Potential refinement of current criteria for Community Based Projects
  - Criteria for Large Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects
Discussion

Questions?

Considerations?
Questions

Please send additional questions and comments to:

Bonnie Sherman, AICP
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division
Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Supervisor
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

Greg Reininger
TxDOT – Public Transportation Division
Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner
Gregory.Reininger@txdot.gov
(737) 285-6184

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

Jacobs