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Presentation Overview

- Background context
- Historical descriptions of performance under TE
- Current evaluation and performance measures
- FHWA context and research options
- Discussion
Transportation Alternatives Program
Authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21)

• **Mission:** To improve our Nation’s communities through leadership, innovation, and program delivery.

• **Vision:** The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) creates safe, accessible, attractive, and environmentally-sensitive communities where people want to live, work, and recreate.
Eligible Project Areas

- Transportation Alternatives defined
- Recreational Trails Program (RTP)
- Safe Routes to School (SRTS) activities
- Boulevards from Divided Highways

TAP projects are eligible under the Surface Transportation Program (STP).
USDOT Strategic Goals and Outcomes

- Safety
- Livable Communities
- State of Good Repair
- Economic Competitiveness
- Environmental Sustainability

DOT Strategic Plan online dialogue: [www.dot.gov/blog/fastlane](http://www.dot.gov/blog/fastlane)
FHWA Strategic Implementation Plan

• National Leadership
• System Performance
• Program Delivery
• Corporate Capacity
National Leadership

• Equip States with tools to assemble funding and financing for project delivery
• Accelerate Technology and Innovation Deployment through Every Day Counts (EDC) and Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP2) initiatives
System Performance

• Make significant improvements to critical aspects of highway system performance and condition
• Improve highway system performance while protecting and enhancing the natural environment and fostering livable communities
Program Delivery

• Continually improve program integrity through risk-based oversight
• Operational and strategic decisions
• Efficiently deliver Federal highway programs through innovation, streamlining, and value-added stewardship
• Local Public Agency process
Presentation Overview

• Background context
• **Historical descriptions of performance under TE**
  – Tracy Hadden Loh (Rails-to-Trails Conservancy)
  – Caron Whitaker and Darren Flusche (League of American Bicyclists)
• Current evaluation and performance measures
• FHWA context and research options
• Discussion
Outreach and Discussion on Program Performance

Welcome to:
Dr. Tracy Hadden Loh, Rails to Trails Conservancy
Program Performance Information:
What Do We Already Have?

http://www.ta-clearinghouse.info/index
The TE activities are created by ISTEA in 1992

RTC begins tracking TE spending through information requests to state DOTs

RTC and FHWA establish a cooperative agreement to expand and continue this tracking in 1995

Most recent iteration of the cooperative agreement expires in September 2013; RTC to continue tracking TAP implementation and spending
What Do We Track?

- Cumulative fiscal program-level data
- Mostly descriptive project-level data

http://www.ta-clearinghouse.info/spending
Data from FMIS

National Transportation Enhancements Program

- Available: Total funds available to be obligated for projects, accumulated from annual apportionment
- Rescinded: Reductions in previously apportioned funds
- Apportioned: Annual formula based on a 10 percent set aside of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds
- Obligated: Specific spending that has been authorized by the federal government and committed to projects
Data from FMIS

Kansas Transportation Enhancements Program

- Available: Total funds available to be obligated for projects, accumulated from annual apportionment
- Rescinded: Reductions in previously apportioned funds
- Apportioned: Annual formula based on a 10 percent set aside of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds
- Obligated: Specific spending that has been authorized by the federal government and committed to projects

http://www.ta-clearinghouse.info/stateprofile
Program-Level Metrics

Figure 1: Cumulative Transportation Enhancements Financial Summary, FY 1992 to FY 2012

The reimbursement rate is calculated using obligated funds as the denominator, since only obligated funds can be reimbursed. All other rates are calculated using apportionments as the denominator.
Descriptive Project-Level Data

- 1) Bike/Ped. Facilities $5,573 (51.5%)
- 2) Bike/Ped. Safety Educ. $36 (0.3%)
- 3) Acquisition of Scenic/Hist. Easements $234 (2.2%)
- 4) Scenic/Hist. Hwy Programs $563 (5.2%)
- 5) Landscaping and Scenic Beautification $1,185 (10.9%)
- 6) Historic Preservation $366 (3.4%)
- 7) Rehab. Hist. Transp. Facilities $952 (8.8%)
- 8) Rail-Trails $727 (6.7%)
- 9) Billboard Removal $40 (0.4%)
- 10) Archaeological Planning/Research $53 (0.5%)
- 11) Env. Mitigation $126 (1.2%)
- 12) Transportation Museums $158 (1.5%)

Total Programmed Funds: $10.82 billion for 27,772 projects.
Project-Level Data

• Matching funds
• Project purpose:
  – Pedestrians
  – Safety
  – Transit integration
  – Trail access
  – Historic preservation
  – Wildlife protection

Did you know? The national cumulative match rate for TE projects was 28%, which exceeds the federal requirement. That’s local and private money leveraged to public infrastructure.
Case Studies

- Crash rates
- Adjacent vacancy rates
- Adjacent property values
- Sales tax revenue
- Traffic/use
Excellence Certificate

- Use
- Boundary-movement
- Transportation benefit
- Environmental and social benefits
- Meeting needs/fulfilling a purpose
Recommendations

• Focus on safety
• Manage the rest transparently
Questions?

Tracy Hadden Loh, Ph.D.
Director of Research

2121 Ward Court, NW, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20037

direct  202.974.5110
main    202.331.9696
fax     202.223.9257
e-mail  tracy@railstotrails.org

www.railstotrails.org
Welcome to our presenters from the League of American Bicyclists:

• Caron Whitaker
• Darren Flusche
TAP Projects and MAP-21 Performance Measures

- States will prioritize delivery of projects that meet Performance Measures
- Key that TAP projects help them meet those goals
Safety

- Bicycle and Pedestrian fatalities make up almost 16% of all roadway fatalities.
- MAP-21 requires an increased focus on elements and features of an unsafe road and crash potential.
- TAP projects can address those concerns.
- Congress emphasis on infrastructure in TAP.
Congestion Mitigation

- Well placed TAP projects that create and complete network.
- When measuring benefits of Bike/Ped projects – critical to measure increase to whole network.
NHS Performance

Interstate 40 - Nashville, TN

Livable communities goal

Broadway Nashville TN
Meeting Goals

• Goals
• Project selection
Priority Areas

• Safety
• Safe Routes to School
• Transportation & Mobility
• Intermodal connection
• Quality of life
• Equity
Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

National Capital Region

- Accessibility for All Users
  - Choices
  - Safety
  - Disabilities
- Safe Routes to School
- Transit & Employment
- Project Coordination
Northwestern Indiana Regional Commission (NIRC)

**Distribution**
- 80% – Pedestrian & Bicycle Projects
- 10% – Environment & Historic Projects
- 10% – Safe Routes to School

**Ped/Bike Criteria**
- Enhances regional trail network (45 points)
- Potential trail users (25)
- Environmental Justice
- Agency partnerships
- Intermodal
- Project Readiness
Safety

Memphis Urban Area MPO, Memphis, TN

Safety and Security:

• All crashes (auto, ped, bike/length of project)
• History of crash incapacitating or killing a pedestrian or bicyclist? (List the date and location of the fatal accidents.)
• Traffic calming and design improvements?
• Incorporate any security improvements?
Safe Routes to School

- Balanced of infrastructure and non-infrastructure (Michigan)
- Data Collection (National Center)
- Potential Benefit (Florida)
- School and Neighborhood Engagement (Florida)
- Equity (Ohio)
- Community Connections (Florida)
VI
Potential Trail User Pool (25 Points Maximum) - SHOW ALL WORK VIA ATTACHMENT!

Part 1 - Draw Map
On a map, create a band at either ½ mile on either side of the proposed segment of trail corridor that the project is contained within or 1 mile on either side of the trail corridor. If the ½ mile (each side) band is chosen, the generators are worth 1 point each. If the 1 mile (each side) band is chosen, the generators are worth ½ point each. The project sponsor should look at both conditions to determine which will provide the best score.

To create the band around the trail, start with the trail as the center and add a parallel line to each side of the trail and close the ends of the bands with two perpendicular lines. For a ½ mile condition the map would look as follows:

```
1 or 1/2 mile

1 or 1/2 mile
```

Part 2 - Count Corridor Specific Generators:
Within the boxed area that you have created, count all the following traffic generators that are WHOLLY or PARTIALLY contained within the box. List each traffic generator ONCE and IN ONLY ONE CATEGORY BELOW:

1) Parks: 
2) Schools: 
3) Post Offices: 
4) Public Libraries:
Intermodal connection

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Washington, DC

- Within 3/4 of a Metrorail?
- Linkages to transit and/or employment?
Quality of life

Knoxville Regional Planning Organization
Knoxville, TN

**LAND USES WITHIN ¼ MILE OF FACILITY**
Check if within ¼ mile of your project

- Public Park
- School
- Library
- Transit Stop
- Retail
- Employment
- Residential
- Other
Equity

Serving Communities of Concern

Does the project/program serve residents of the Communities of Concern within the TPO urbanized area?

[High concentration seniors, those living in households with no motor vehicles, people with disabilities, racial minorities, and people living in poverty.]
Questions about our presentations?

Clarifying questions?
Presentation Overview

• Background context
• Historical descriptions of performance under TE
• **Current evaluation and performance measures**
  – Context and considerations
  – Best practices
  – Next steps
• FHWA context and research options
• Discussion
USDOT/FHWA Considerations for Performance

• TAP in context with the FHWA Strategic Implementation Plan
• Linkage to MAP-21 and FHWA initiatives, such as:
  – Every Day Counts (EDC)
  – Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP 2)
  – Livability Program activities
  – Bicycle and pedestrian plans and programs
Example: TIGER Grants must provide a Benefit/Cost analysis: see [www.dot.gov/tiger](http://www.dot.gov/tiger).

- Livability
- Economic Competitiveness
- Safety
- State of Good Repair
- Sustainability
- Costs
MAP-21
National Goals and Performance Management Measures

• Safety
• Congestion Reduction
• System Reliability
• Freight Movement and Economic Vitality
• Environmental Sustainability
• Reduced Project Delivery Delays
MAP-21
National Goals and Performance Management Measures

• National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)
  – Pavement, bridges, performance
• Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
  – Serious injuries and fatalities: number and per VMT
• Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
  – Traffic congestion, on-road mobile source emissions
• National Freight Movement
The Community Vision Metrics Tool
(under development)

- Accessibility
- Aesthetics/Sensory
- Community Amenities
- Community Engagement
- Economic
- Housing
- Land Use
- Mobility
- Natural Resources
- Public Health
- Safety
- Socio-Cultural
INVEST

INVEST: https://www.sustainablehighways.org/

• Sustainability
  – Environmental Benefits
  – Economic Benefits
  – Social Benefits
• System Planning
• Project Development
• Operations and Maintenance
Bicycle and Pedestrian Example

- FHWA Traffic Monitoring Guide (April 2013) has a Bicycle and Pedestrian Chapter.
  - Travel Monitoring Analysis System (TMAS) allows upload and analysis of nonmotorized count data.
  - Tools for estimating performance measures from “before and after” counts.
  - These tools will be released as they are ready over the next two years.
State Examples

- State Smart Transportation Initiative: [www.ssti.us](http://www.ssti.us)
- Maryland: [2013 Annual Attainment Report on Transportation System Performance](http://example.com)
- Minnesota DOT [Corridor Investment Management Strategy](http://example.com)
- California integrates statewide modal plans, program plans, and technology to meet climate change goals.
State Examples
Michigan DOT

• Michigan State University Study of TE-funded trails impacts
• Streetscape project surveys
• Post Project Surveys
• TE/TAP Case Studies
• TE/TAP construction economic impact study
• Information at MDOT TAP webpage
### Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Admin Efficiency</th>
<th>Environ Strmlng</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Design Innovation</th>
<th>System Perform</th>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>Environ Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pedestrian/Bicyclist/Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Safe Routes for Nondrivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rail-trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnouts/Overlooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Improve – Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outdoor Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vegetation Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Archaeological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Environ Mitigation – Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stormwater, wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wildlife habitat / connect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Recreational trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Safe Routes to School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Boulevards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TAP Innovations—Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Management Program Administration

- FHWA Financial Information
  - Apportionments, obligations, transfers, rescissions (annual and cumulative)
  - Project type (no ability to verify)
Performance Management Program Administration Gaps

• Financial Information: potential future gaps
  – National, State, or programmatic project list
  – Verify project types
  – Annual and cumulative

• TAP/TE news and related stories and events
Performance Management Research Options

• Case Studies
• State examples:
  – Highlight model websites, use a common format
  – State profiles in a common format for how TAP funds are used, to promote transparency
  – Incentive funds to drive innovation
• Good practices:
  – Webinars, targeted peer exchanges
Presentation Overview

• Background context
• Historical descriptions of performance under TE
• Current evaluation and performance measures
• FHWA context and research options
• Discussion
Questions and Discussion

• Are States, MPOs, or local agencies discussing program performance for TAP?
• Are the public, elected officials, and managers involved in developing program performance criteria?
• What data should be “rolled up” to communicate overall national program performance?
• Other?
More Information

• MAP-21 Webinars: www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/webinars.cfm

• TAP Guidance and Questions & Answers: www.fhwa.dot.gov/MAP21/
• www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/transportation_alternatives/

National TAP and RTP oversight: Christopher Douwes
Trails and Enhancements Program Manager christopher.douwes@dot.gov
202-366-5013