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Commitment to Accessibility

- Long history of commitment to safety, reliability, and accessibility
- TxDOT is improving the state infrastructure on an on-going basis
- Responsible for operation and management of:
  - 195,000 lane miles of roadways on the State Highway System
  - 55,000 bridges
  - 3,400 miles of interstate roadways
  - Estimated 5,000 miles of sidewalk and pedestrian facilities
  - Over 2,500 total buildings, travel information centers, and safety rest areas
- Updated ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan will help:
  - Prioritize locations for improvements
  - Improve education and planning
Today's Discussion

Updated ADA Self-Evaluation & Transition Plan 2022

- Background & purpose
- What we evaluated
- How we assessed compliance
- Overview of findings
- Costs & determining priorities
- Public outreach & survey
- Questions & answers
ADA Self-Evaluation & Transition Plan
Background and Purpose
### Three Laws Govern

1. **Architectural Barriers Act of 1968**
   - ABA

2. **Rehabilitation Act of 1973**
   - Section 504 - tied to Federally funded projects

3. **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**
   - ADA
The Americans with Disabilities Act

- TITLE I – Employment
- TITLE II – Public Entities (State & Local Governments)
- TITLE III – Public Accommodations & Private Entities
- TITLE IV – Telecommunications
- TITLE V – Miscellaneous
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
Why TxDOT Updated Its ADA Transition Plan

- Public agencies update plans, due to:
  - changing environments
  - population growth
  - expansion of programs and activities

- TxDOT updated its ADA self-evaluation:
  - From 2015 through 2021
  - Reviewed policies and practices
  - Inventoried public-facing areas

- TxDOT updated its ADA Transition Plan:
  - Implementation plans
  - Published full report February 2022
Public Outreach and Comment Period

- **ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan**
  - Published report in February
  - Document made available for public comment

- **Public Outreach**
  - 6 virtual public outreach sessions, by region
  - March 7 through March 9
  - Present high-level information

- **Public Comment Period**
  - March 9 through April 9
  - Online survey tool
  - Public may request special accommodations to comment
    - CivilRights@txdot.gov or by calling 512-416-4700
Purpose for Public Outreach

Our goal is to inform you:
- what we evaluated
- how we assessed compliance
- compliance issues found
- common barriers

Our goal is to receive your feedback:
- your highest priorities
- Feedback on the ADA Transition Plan

Your comments are appreciated!

What We Evaluated
What We Evaluated

- Policies & Practices
- Public Rights-of-Way
- Facilities
  - TxDOT owned buildings, open to the public
  - Safety Rest Areas
  - Travel Information Centers
  - Ferries
- Websites
Policies and Practices Evaluated

Policies reviewed included TxDOT’s:

- Public Notice Policy
- Nondiscrimination Policy
- ADA Grievance Policy
- Design Standards
- Various division practices

Policies can be found:

- On TxDOT’s website
- In the ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan report
Assessment Included:
- 4,419 miles of sidewalks
- 131,920 curb ramps
- 4,582 island curb cuts
- 6,156 bus stops
- 52,179 signal push buttons
Facilities Evaluated

Assessment Included:
- 58 Safety Rest Areas
- 86 General TxDOT Administrative Facilities
- 11 Travel Information Centers
- 2 Ferries
- 157 Total facilities with public access
- Focus was on facilities not newly constructed
Website Evaluated

Early Evaluations
- 6,000+ pages and subpages were evaluated
- Automated website testing was the predominant mechanism
- ADA defects at the template and component level were identified
- Third-party sites were included within the evaluation
- Fixes completed at the template and component level were applied to all pages

Evaluation Update - 2020-2021
- Team recognized manual testing is superior to automated testing
- Evaluated TxDOT’s internal, manual testing skills
- Selected three high-traffic sites by public for deep, manual testing
  - www.txdot.gov
  - The Southern Gateway
  - Keep it Moving Dallas
How We Collected and Assessed Compliance
Technology utilized for efficiency and effectiveness in evaluating & documenting accessibility issues:

- **Electronic data collector**
  - Surveyors captured measurements
- **Detailed sidewalk collectors**
  - Technology captured measurements
  - ULIP-ADA (Ultra-Light Inertial Profiler)
  - Lidar
- **Visual sidewalk collector**
  - Captured non-compliance visually detectable
- **Integrated photos or video of all data**
- **GIS mapping integration for all data**
- **Web Application integration – called the TCAP WebApp**
PROW (Public Rights-of-Way) Compliance Criteria

Evaluated with PROWAG

2011 Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines

Sample Criteria (but not limited to):

- Cross slopes & run slopes
- Driveway crossing slopes
- Heaves in concrete
- Gaps in connectivity
- Obstructions
- Curb ramp elements
- Clear floor space at bus stops
- Detectable Warning (truncated domes) at curb ramps
- Communication features at signalized intersections

Sidewalk discontinuity
Technology utilized for efficiency and effectiveness in evaluating & documenting accessibility issues:

- Data collectors
  - Surveyors captured measurements
- Tablet collection
  - Integrated photos
  - Site plans or floor plans
  - Aerial maps for locations
- Detailed reports per site
- Filterable data table
- Web Application integration
Facility Compliance Criteria

Evaluated with 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design

Sample Criteria (but not limited to):

- Access aisles
- Accessible routes
- Designation signage
- Handrails
- Parking spaces
- Picnic tables
- Ramps
- Toilet compartments
- Program access and potential Safe Harbor considered
Manual Testing Methodology

**Manual Testing is Superior to Automated Testing for Websites**

- Automated, technological testing was completed on over 6,000 webpages
- Manual testing provides more detailed, accurate information
- Manual testing is very time-consuming; only limited page testing is viable
- Manual testing reveals common challenges; lessons can be applied to additional webpages and templates
- Many diverse tools are utilized, for example:
  - Screen readers are used to review an entire webpage
- 25 sample URLs were manually tested 3 website – 75 pages in total
- Review included all structure and types of content
- Approach is successful at identifying critical template issues, design, and approaches that lend themselves to repeat patterns of error
Website Compliance Criteria

Evaluated with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 A/AA

Sample Criteria (but not limited to):

- Dynamic or non-standard HTML controls
- Accordion controls
- Adobe Acrobat files
- Color contrast
- Visual focus
- Headings
- Landmarks
- Alternative text present
- Alternative text properly used
- Reflow
- Template issues
ADA Self-Evaluation
Findings Overview
Findings – Overview

General Findings

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

▪ We will discuss:
  – *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
Findings – Sidewalks in Summary

- **Sidewalk Inventory Assessed – 4,419 miles**
  - 2,606 miles of detailed collection
  - 1,813 miles of visual collection

- **Compliance Criteria Reviewed:**
  - Cross slopes
  - Run slopes
  - Driveway crossings slopes
  - Heaves in concrete
  - Gaps in sidewalk connectivity
  - Obstructions
  - Vegetation

Light pole obstruction
Findings – Sidewalks (continued)

- **Sidewalks Common Issues:**
  - 1,293.2 miles have cross slopes that exceed the 2% maximum
  - 13.7% of cross slope issues fall in 2-3% range, which is generally low severity
  - 6.7% falls into 3-4% cross slope range
  - 8.9% of cross slope at 4% or higher is prioritized as higher severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Cross Slope</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>3125.8 mi</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>603.8 mi</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>ADA Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4%</td>
<td>295.0 mi</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>ADA Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7%</td>
<td>276.6 mi</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>ADA Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%+</td>
<td>65.2 mi</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>ADA Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%+ (Visual)</td>
<td>52.6 mi</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>ADA Issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sidewalks Common Issues:

- Driveways can create cross slope challenges, where the driveway acts as the connection for sidewalk
- Sidewalk Discontinuity (heaves) – 31,376 locations of 1 inch or higher
  - Detailed sidewalk contains measurement down to ¼ inch
- 48,725 obstructions identified
  - 58.2% are vegetation related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstruction Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Obstructions</td>
<td>48,725</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility/Signal/Sign</td>
<td>11,882</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>28,344</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8,499</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Connectivity Issue Driveways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectivity Issue Driveways</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Entrance (Detailed)</td>
<td>38,324 ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Entrance (Detailed)</td>
<td>6,541 ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Entrance (Visual)</td>
<td>9,392 ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Entrance (Visual)</td>
<td>3,015 ea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discontinuity Heaves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discontinuity Heaves</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity Displacement &lt;= 1”</td>
<td>59,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity Displacement &gt; 1”</td>
<td>31,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings – Sidewalks (continued)

- Excessive Cross Slope
- Heaves in Sidewalk
Findings – Curb Ramps in Summary

- Curb Ramp Inventory Assessed – 131,920
- Sample of Compliance Criteria Reviewed:
  - Run slope & cross slope
  - Ramp length & width
  - Obstructions
  - Surface conditions
  - Landing measurements
  - Transition area from ramp to pavement
  - Gutter slope & lip
  - Detectable warning surface (DWS)
  - Missing ramps

Direction of a run slope
Findings – Curb Ramps (continued)

Common Issues

- 29.8% of ramps had run slope issues
  - 20.5% of ramps fell into the 8.33 – 10% run slope range, generally considered less severe than higher ranges
  - 9.3% have severe run slopes
- 42.3% of ramps had cross slope issues
  - With 22.7% in a 2–3% cross slope range, generally considered less severe than higher ranges
- 6,971 instances of missing curb ramps
  - Only 5% of overall inventory collected
Findings – Curb Ramps (continued)

Cross Slope

Missing Curb Ramp
Findings – Bus Stop Pads

- **Stop Pad Inventory Assessed – 6,156**
- **Criteria**
  - Clear floor space at bus stops
  - Access to the stop
  - Boarding & alighting areas
  - Clear floor space next to seating area
  - Signage
- **1,000 Compliant Bus Stops**
- **Non-Compliance - Common Issues**
  - 35.1% of all bus stop pads are missing
  - 48.7% of provided bus stop pads have non-compliant length, width, or slopes.

Bus stop with no bus pad
Findings – Pedestrian Signal Pushbuttons

- Pedestrian Signal Pushbutton Inventory Assessed:
  - 36,495 locations
  - 52,179 individual pushbuttons

- Pedestrian Pushbuttons at Signalized Intersections Criteria Reviewed:
  - Evaluated using 2011 PROWAG and 2009 MUTCD and Texas MUTCD
  - Pushbutton reach range
  - Proximity of pushbutton to street crossing
  - Duration of timing
  - Communication features at signalized intersections
    - Audible tones
    - Vibro/tactile
Findings – Pedestrian Signal Pushbuttons (continued)

Common Issues:

- 71.4% of the pedestrian signal pushbuttons were non-APS signals
- 51.3% of the pedestrian pushbutton clear spaces were non-compliant or missing

Pushbutton with no clear space
Findings – Facilities

- **General Findings:**
  - Over 45,000 points of data collected
  - Majority was determined to be compliant with 2010 ADA Standards
  - Facilities constructed or altered after March 15, 2012 showed higher compliance

- **157 separate facilities**
  - Focused on public-facing sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non–Compliant Items</th>
<th>General TxDOT Administrative Review</th>
<th>Safety Rest Area</th>
<th>Travel Information Center</th>
<th>Ferry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Entry</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Services</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Restrooms</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Other</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4647</strong></td>
<td><strong>3657</strong></td>
<td><strong>881</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>9190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Program Access” Items for Administrative Review</th>
<th>General TxDOT Administrative Review</th>
<th>Safety Rest Area</th>
<th>Travel Information Center</th>
<th>Ferry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Entry</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Services</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Restrooms</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1454</strong></td>
<td><strong>985</strong></td>
<td><strong>193</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2636</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings – Facilities (continued)

- Common Findings – Priority Level 1 – Entry

- Non-compliant slopes within access routes
- No accessible route provided to amenity
- Ramps & curb ramps with non-compliant slopes
Common Findings – Priority Level 2 – Services

- Non-compliant work/dining surface
- Non-compliant sinks in non-restroom spaces
- Non-compliant sales/service counters
Findings – Facilities (continued)

- Common Findings – Priority Level 3 – Restrooms

Inaccessible toilet compartments

Inaccessible entrance doors
Findings – Facilities (continued)

- Common Findings – Priority Level 4 - Other

Non-Compliant drinking fountains
Findings – Website in Summary

General Findings:
- All three sites manually reviewed included barriers for people with disabilities

Common Issues:
- Dynamic or Non-Standard HTML Controls
- Adobe Acrobat Files
- Color Contrast
- Visual Focus
- Heading and Landmarks
- Alternative Text Not Used Correctly
- Reflow

Low color contrast
More detailed information can be found regarding the self-evaluation findings in the formal report available on TxDOT’s website.
Costs and Determining Priorities
### 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.
Cost Estimates – Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOJ Priority Level</th>
<th>General TxDOT Administrative</th>
<th>Safety Rest Area</th>
<th>Travel Information Center</th>
<th>Ferry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Entry</td>
<td>$1,404,465</td>
<td>$2,614,330</td>
<td>$690,725</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$4,710,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Services</td>
<td>$919,650</td>
<td>$445,460</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$1,408,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Restrooms</td>
<td>$3,286,935</td>
<td>$2,208,730</td>
<td>$433,240</td>
<td>$6,885</td>
<td>$5,935,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Other</td>
<td>$271,300</td>
<td>$227,850</td>
<td>$19,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$518,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,879,450</td>
<td>$5,499,270</td>
<td>$1,186,615</td>
<td>$7,935</td>
<td>$12,573,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 WebApp

- Contains all detailed data, compliance reports, photos, videos
- Micro to macro data for costs, planning, and tracking remediation
- GIS Exemption
Contains all detailed data, compliance reports, photos, videos
Geographic Information System (GIS) – Technology to Cost & Plan Project

- Contains all costs and tools to develop projects – PROW example
- Implementation Planning tools by priority of severity and activity
**Access Compliance Report for Public Rights of Way (Curb Ramps)**

**ADA ID:** 90110180918150856  
**Route 1 Name:** FM0466  
**Route 2 Name:** E CEDAR ST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ramp Type: Perpendicular Ramp</th>
<th>Overall Compliance: No</th>
<th>Total Cost: 2235.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Location In Intersection:** NW  
**TxDOT District:** San Antonio  
**County:** Guadalupe  
**City:** Seguin  
**Control Section:** 021603

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ramp Length (in)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Flare Type LT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ramp Width (in)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Flare Slope LT (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ramp Run Slope (%)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Flare Traversable LT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ramp Cross Slope (%)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Flare Type RT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Present</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Flare Slope RT (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Length (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Flare Traversable RT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Width (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DWS Provided</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Run Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DWS Contrast</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Cross Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DWS Length (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Curb (Y/N)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DWS Full Width</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Landing Shared</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DWS Offset (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gutter Ponding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Perp Joint Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gutter Lip Height (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Marked Crosswalk 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gutter Run Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 1 Direction</td>
<td>To S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Gutter Cross Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Marked Crosswalk 2 Width (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Marked Crosswalk 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ramp Inside Crosswalk 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 1 Slope (%)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 1 Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 1 Cross Slope (%)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 2 Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 2 Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Crossing 2 Cross Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Road Run Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clear Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Road Cross Slope (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clear Space To Crosswalk (in)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Overall Surface Condition: Acceptable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Any Obstructions?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Curb Slope</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Obstruction Type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Utility Inventory Item</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Utility Hazard Type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Solutions:** Remove & Replace Entire Ramp.

**Severity Score:** 15  
**Initial Validation Status:** Fail  
**Stop Condition 1:** N/A  
**Stop Condition 2:** Signal

**Overall Notes:** N/A

---

**PROW/ADA:** R304.2.2
Facility Detailed Data & Site Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DOJ Priority</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>SURVEY QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td>Doors/Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td>DRINKING FOUNTAINS</td>
<td>Side of the door, based on exception, is the minimum clearance provided? (See Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td>Doors/Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELEVATORS</td>
<td>be opened using no more than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td>Doors/Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTERNAL ENTRANCES</td>
<td>has a closer, does it take at least 5 move from a position of 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td>Sinks</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXTERNAL PATHS OF TRAVEL</td>
<td>position of 12 degrees from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td>Toilet Compartment</td>
<td></td>
<td>FITNESS CENTERS</td>
<td>edge of the sink or counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FLARED CURB RAMPS</td>
<td>(never is higher) no more than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERNAL ENTRANCES</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERNAL PATH OF TRAVEL</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERNAL SPACES</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOBBY</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARKING AND ACCESS AISLES</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PARKING LOT SCOPE</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PATHS OF TRAVEL</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PICNIC UNITS</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PICNIC/RAMADA SI</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLATFORM LIFTS</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAY AREAS</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RESTROOMS</td>
<td>Men's 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PORTABLE TOILET COMPARTMENT</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extracted sample of information with filter tables shown of facility data
Projects can be planned, approved, and tracked through construction.
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>
Implementation Schedules – Facilities 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

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>$88,400</td>
<td></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>$99,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardeman County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Zandt County WB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$73,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Zandt County EB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$88,680</td>
<td></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>$42,415</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker County SB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donley County EB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell County NB SRA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$101,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please see the full report for more information on implementation schedules on TxDOT’s ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan webpage.
Public Outreach & Survey
Report and Public Survey Information

- Four-week public involvement with survey and presentations
  - Your input is important!
  - Survey active March 9 through April 9, 2002

- Access materials and the public input survey:
  - ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan
  - Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
  - Public Survey Link


For assistance, please contact us via email at CivilRights@txdot.gov or by calling 512-416-4700
- Break -
Followed by Question & Answer
Question & Answer
Today’s Presenters and Panelists:

- Michael Bryant, Director of the Civil Rights Division
- Marc Williams, Executive Director of Texas Department of Transportation
- Brian Barth, Deputy Executive Director for Program Delivery
- Juanita Webber, ADA Compliance Program Administrator & Project Manager
- Pete Krause, Transportation Landscape Architect, Design Division & Project Manager
- Sierra Jennings, Administration & Program Support Section Director
- Debra Medellin, Civil Rights Division Compliance Analyst
- TxDOT ADA Liaisons for assisting with Question & Answers
- Belinda Banger, Vice President & Project Executive – Cole Design Group
- John Tyler, Vice President & Project Manager – Pape Dawson Engineers
- David Butkus, Project Manager – Cole Design Group
- Steve Henze, Project Manager – Cole Design Group
Thank You
For Your Time & Involvement