

Action Plans and SS4A: Aligning Planning Efforts to Implementation

2023 Transportation Engineering and Safety Conference



December 6, 2023

Agenda

- Funding Considerations
- Cumberland County Bike-Ped Safety Action Plan (case study)
 - What was accomplished
 - How it complied with funding requirements
 - Concepts
 - Lessons Learned
- Q&A



Safety Funding

Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A)

- Competitive FHWA grants for safety improvements on public roads
- Available to governing bodies below the state government level (township, county, BID, MPO)
- \$5 billion made available in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) over 5 years
- \$1 billion of funding per year
 - 40% of awards must go toward planning activities each year
- 20% local match



- Annual federal program distributed to state DOTs
- PennDOT receives ~\$126M annually and distributes about \$74M to its planning regions based on crash data
- Purpose is to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on state roads by...
- Implementing systemic safety countermeasures



Safe Streets & Roads for All (SS4A)

The Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program supports the USDOT's National Roadway Safety Strategy, which is centered around the Safe System Approach:

- Funds local initiatives to prevent fatalities and serious injury (FSI)
- Supports "Vision Zero" or "Toward Zero Deaths" initiatives





The Two Types of Grants



Action Plan Grants

- Create a comprehensive safety action plan
- Conduct supplemental planning activities in support of an existing action plan
- Estimated funding per grant:
 - \$200,000 to \$1 million for a single applicant
 - \$200,000 to \$5 million for a joint or regional applicant

Implementation Grants

- Implement projects and strategies outlined in a qualifying comprehensive safety action plan
- Conduct supplemental planning activities in support of an existing action plan
- Estimated funding per grant:
 - \$5 million to \$30 million for a single applicant
 - \$3 million to \$30 million for a rural or tribal applicant
 - \$5 million to \$50 million for a joint or regional applicant





Info Source: Federal Highway Administration

Grant Type Examples



Action Plan/ Supplemental Plan Grant





Supplemental/ Demonstration Grant



Implementation Grant

National Summary



SS4A Funding Allocation by Award Type (FY22) Total Allocation: \$1 billion

	Funded	Non-Funded
Safety Action Planning	\$192.2 million	\$0
Supplemental Planning	20.4 million	0
Implementation	590.0 million	1.98 billion
Total	\$802.6 million	\$1.98 billion

Data: Federal Highway Administration

SS4A Eligibility

Worksheet Purpose: To determine whether an applicant's plan is eligible for applying for..

- 1. Implementation Grant
 - Design and Construction funding
- 2. Supplemental Planning/Demonstration Grant
 - Funding for additional planning work
 - Low cost/Quick-build demonstration project funding

If conditions **<u>not met</u>**? -> apply for Action Plan Grant



Safe Streets and Roads for All

Self-Certification Eligibility Worksheet

Applicants should follow the instructions in the NOFO to correctly apply for a grant. See the <u>SS4A website</u> for more information.

Instructions: The purpose of this worksheet is to determine whether an applicant's existing plan(s) is substantially similar to an Action Plan for purposes of applying for an Implementation Grant or to conduct Supplemental Planning/Demonstration Activities only. Use of this worksheet is required. Applicants should not adjust the formatting or headings of the worksheet.

For each question below, answer "yes" or "no." If "yes," cite the specific page in your existing Action Plan or other plan(s) that corroborate your response, or cite and provide other supporting documentation separately.

An applicant is eligible to apply for an Action Plan Grant that funds supplemental action plan activities, or an Implementation Grant, only if the following two conditions are met:

Answer "yes" to Questions 3 7 9



If both conditions are *not met*, an applicant is still eligible to apply for an Action Plan Grant that funds creation of a new Action Plan.

Are both of the following true?	
 Did a high-ranking official and/or governing body in the jurisdiction publicly commit to an eventual goal of zero roadway fatalities and serious injuries? 	If yes, provide documentation:
 Did the commitment include either setting a target date to reach ze OR setting one or more targets to achieve significant declines in roadway fatalities and serious injuries by a specific date? 	ero,
To develop the Action Plan, was a committee, task force, implemen group, or similar body established and charged with the plan's development, implementation, and monitoring?	tation YES N If yes, provide documentation:
Does the Action Plan include all of the following?	YES
 Does the Action Plan include all of the following? Analysis of existing conditions and historical trends to baseline the of crashes involving fatalities and serious injuries across a jurisdicti locality, Tribe, or region; 	level If yes, provide documentation: on,
 Does the Action Plan include all of the following? Analysis of existing conditions and historical trends to baseline the of crashes involving fatallities and serious injuries across a jurisdicti locality, Tribe, or region; Analysis of the location where there are crashes, the severity, as we contributing factors and crash types; 	level If yes, provide documentation: on,
 Does the Action Plan include all of the following? Analysis of existing conditions and historical trends to baseline the of crashes involving fatallities and serious injuries across a jurisdicti locality, Tribe, or region; Analysis of the location where there are crashes, the severity, as we contributing factors and crash types; Analysis of systemic and specific safety needs is also performed, as needed (e.g., high risk road features, specific safety needs of relevance of users; and, 	level If yes, provide documentation: on, all as
 Does the Action Plan include all of the following? Analysis of existing conditions and historical trends to baseline the of crashes involving fatallities and serious injuries across a jurisdicti locality, Tribe, or region; Analysis of the location where there are crashes, the severity, as we contributing factors and crash types; Analysis of systemic and specific safety needs is also performed, as needed (e.g., high risk road features, specific safety needs of relevance road users; and, A geospatial identification (geographic or locational data using more of higher risk locations. 	level If yes, provide documentation: on, ell as s int apps)
 Does the Action Plan include all of the following? Analysis of existing conditions and historical trends to baseline the of crashes involving fatalities and serious injuries across a jurisdicti locality, Tribe, or region; Analysis of the location where there are crashes, the severity, as we contributing factors and crash types; Analysis of systemic and specific safety needs is also performed, as needed (e.g., high risk road features, specific safety needs of relevation of higher risk locations. 	level If yes, provide documentation: on, ell as s int apps)



SS4A and HSIP

SS4A

- Equity focus
- Demonstration/Quick-Build
- <u>Not</u> for DOTs
- Nationally competitive

- Data Driven Analysis
- Systemic
- Safety Focused
- Public Involvement
- Federal money
- Planning
- Design/Construction

HSIP

- DOT managed
- Locally competitive
- Design/Construction focus



Case Study

Purpose

- Prioritizes locations with the greatest bicycle and pedestrian safety needs
- Develops crash and speed reduction strategies
- Prepares bicycle and pedestrian projects for New Jersey's Local Safety Program

With an inclusive/equitable public outreach program





Overview of SJTPO

Our Vision: A transportation system, based on regional collaboration that moves people and goods in a <u>safe</u> and efficient manner, <u>inclusive</u> of all modes and users

- Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, and Salem Counties
- A regional approach to transportation
- State and Federal Planning Priorities
- Serves as a technical resource







- Population of around **150,000**
- 33% of Hispanic or Latino descent
- Median Household income 35% below State average
- About 77% of the County lives in Bridgeton, Millville, or Vineland
- Zero-Internet Households above State and National average







- Population of around **150,000**
- 33% of Hispanic or Latino descent
- Median Household income 35% below State average
- About 77% of the County lives in Bridgeton, Millville, or Vineland
- Zero-Internet Households above State and National average





- Population of around **150,000**
- 33% of Hispanic or Latino descent
- Median Household income 35% below State average
- About 77% of the County lives in Bridgeton, Millville, or Vineland
- Zero-Internet Households above State and National average







- Population of around **150,000**
- 33% of Hispanic or Latino descent
- Median Household income 35% below State average
- About 77% of the County lives in Bridgeton, Millville, or Vineland
- Zero-Internet Households above State and National average

Equity part of every phase of project



17



- Population of around **150,000**
- 33% of Hispanic or Latino descent
- Median Household income 35% below State average
- About 77% of the County lives in Bridgeton, Millville, or Vineland
- Zero-Internet Households above State and National average





Local Safety Program (LSP) -> HSIP



Network Screening

- Crash Data Safety Voyager
 - **5-year** period (2012 2016)
 - **18,422** Total Crashes
 - **536** Bicycle & Pedestrian Crashes





Bicycle & Pedestrian Crashes





Bicycle & Pedestrian Crash Characteristics

Location	Crashes		Road System	Crashes			
Vineland	<mark>235 (43.8%)</mark>		State	131 (24.4%)			
Millville	139 (25.9%)		County	129 (24.1%)			
Bridgeton	114 <mark>(</mark> 21.3%)		Municipal	218 (40.7%)			
Other 48 (9.0%)			Other	58 (10.8%)			
91% of all hike-pedestrian crashes							





Bicycle and pedestrian represented 2.9% of all crashes in Cumberland County but <u>21.6%</u> of all fatal and serious injury crashes.



Prioritization

- Ranking Criteria:
 - 1. Crash Severity for bicycle and pedestrian crashes
 - 2. Crash Severity for all crashes
- State Routes were removed from screening:
 - Not eligible for Local Safety Program funding through this project
- List of high-ranking locations presented to public during the Public Outreach program









	1. WHERE (Select locations)		(Select all that apply to your locations)						
	Location	Missing ADA Ramp	Missing Pedestrian Signal	Missing Crosswalk	Missing Sidevalk	Poor Sidewalk Condition	No Bike Lane or Shoulder	Vehicles Do Not Yield	Road Too Wide
-	1. Irving Avenue (Laural Street to Rogers Avenue)								
ridor	2. Atlantic Street Dirverd Avenue to Vine Street								
້ອ	3. Grove Street Micris Avenue to Eagle Street)								
	4. Laurel Street BreatStreat to bring Avenue								
	5. Commerce Street (Past Struit to Bred Street)								
	6. North Laurel Street Oving Avenue to north of Bridgeten Avenue)								

Screening Results

	Selected Locations	Location Type	City	Ownership	City Rank from Crash Data and Public Votes	City Rank from Crash Data	Crash Data (Weight)	City Rank from Public Votes	Public Votes (# of red dots)
1	Chestnut Ave (Uses 2 Project Location Slots)	Combined Corridor	Vineland	Municipal	1	1	123.62	1	20
	Chestnut Ave (2nd St to Myrtle St)	Corridor	Vineland	Municipal	3	2	97.38	5	7
	Chestnut Av & East Av	Intersection	Vineland	Municipal	4	5	46.9	3	9
	Chestnut Ave (State St to Holmes Av)	Corridor	Vineland	Municipal	7	7	26.24	7	4
2	East Ave (Florence St to Plum St)	Combined Corridor	Vineland	Municipal	2	3	80.36	2	15
	East Ave (Florence St to Plum St)	Corridor	Vineland	Municipal	6	3	80.36	6	6
	Chestnut Av & East Av	Intersection	Vineland	Municipal	4	5	46.9	3	9
3	High St (Main St to Harrison Av)	Combined Corridor	Millville	Municipal	1	1	95.61	1	17
	High St (Main St to Harrison Av)	Corridor	Millville	Municipal	2	1	95.61	2	9
	High St & Broad St	Intersection	Millville	Municipal	6	7	23.79	5	4
	High St & Mcneal St	Intersection	Millville	Municipal	7	8	22.79	5	4
4	3rd St / Wheaton Av (Main St to N of G St)	Corridor	Millville	Municipal	4	5	50.51	3	6
5	Irving Ave (Laurel St to Rogers Av)	Corridor	Bridgeton	County	1	1	46.58	1	14
6	Atlantic St (Harvard Av to Vine St)	Corridor	Bridgeton	Municipal	2	2	39.52	2	13

✓ All location ranked <u>high</u> from both crash data AND public votes







Pedestrian Road Safety Audits (PRSAs)





Pedestrian Road Safety Audits (PRSAs)









Equity/Public Outreach



Estás invitado a asistir un taller público virtual

iVen a aprender sobre proyectos potenciales que podrían hacer el ciclismo y caminando en Vineland, Millville, y Bridgeton sea más seguro!

La Organización de Planificación del Transporte de South Jersey (SJTPO, por sus siglas en inglés) está organizando tres (3) talleres públicos virtuales para presentar y obtener comentarios públicos sobre posibles mejoras en la seguridad de ciclistas y peatones en Vineland, Bridgeton y Millville. Por favor, asista y comparte sus pensamientos sobre la seguridad de los ciclistas y los peatones en su comunidad!

DESCRIPCIÓN DE PROYECTO SJTPO, en asociación con el Departamento de Transporte de Nueva Jersey (NJDOT) y la Administración Federal de Carreteras (FHWA), está creando un Plan de Acción de Seguridad para Bicicletas y Peatones para el Condado de Cumberland. La naturaleza rural del condado tiende a concentrar los viajes a pie y en bicicleta dentro de las tres ciudades

El objetivo de este estudio es avanzar múltiples proyectos de seguridad para bicicletas y peatones dentro de Vineland, Millville y Bridgeton.

de Vineland, Millville, y Bridgeton.

FECHAS Y HORAS DE LOS TALLERES PÚBLICOS VIRTUALES

Utilice la siguiente información de llamada para acceder a la reunión solo con audio. RSVP con el enlace o código QR a continuación, si está utilizando su computadora, celular, o tableta para unirse a el taller. Después de registrarse, recibirá un correo electrónico de confirmación con información sobre cómo unirse al seminario web.

ESPAÑOL (ESTA REUNIÓN CUBRIRÁ LOS TRES CORREDORES)							
Jueves, 10 de diciembre de 2020 6:00 P.M. a 8:00 P.M.	Información RSVP: https://bit.ly/32Gzkvn	Información de Llamada a el Taller Toll Free: 1 (866) 952-8437 Attendee Access Code: 763-756-649					







For more information, please visit our project website at www.sjtpo. org/CumberlandSAP and connect with us on Facebook and Twitter by searching @SJTPO.

Para más información, por favor visite nuestro sitio web del proyecto en www.sjtpo.org/CumberlandSAP y conéctese con nosotros en <u>Facebook</u> y <u>Twitter</u> buscando a @SJTPO.



South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization February 24 at 3:39 AM · 🔇

Did you know that between 2012 & 2016, 536 bicycle & pedestrian crashes occurred in Bridgeton, Millville & Vineland? One crash is too many! @SJTPO is proposing ... See More



Vineland - Take Survey Learn More

Millville - Take Survey

>



Safe System Approach

URBAN ENGINEERS

SJTPO



Source: Federal Highway Administration

Managing Speeds





Proven Safety Countermeasures

- Collection of 28 countermeasures and strategies
- Proven to be effective in reducing roadway fatalities and serious injuries
- May be new/unfamiliar to some communities





Proven Safety Countermeasures

- Collection of 28 countermeasures and strategies
- Proven to be effective in reducing roadway fatalities and serious injuries
- May be new/unfamiliar to some communities





due to the significant improvement in visibility.

www.youtube.com/@sjtpo1161/videos



35



Irving Avenue

- 7 Pedestrian/Cyclist crashes
- 180 total crashes
- 25 MPH/35 MPH
- 7,000 ADT







SJTPO

Characteristics

- 7,000 ADT
- 2-Lanes (w/parking)
- 25 MPH
- Gateway into urban area

Issues Identified

- Parked cars being struck in spot locations
- Speeding
- Drainage
- ADA compliance
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings



Characteristics

- 7,000 ADT
- 2-Lanes (w/parking)
- 25 MPH
- Gateway into urban area

Issues Identified

- Poor delineation
- Speeding
- Drainage
- ADA compliance
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings

38





Characteristics

- 7,000 ADT
- 2-Lanes (w/parking)
- 25 MPH
- Hospital located to the left

Issues Identified

- Speeding
- Sightline obstructions
- Driver anticipation





Characteristics

- 7,000 ADT
- 2-Lanes (w/parking)
- 35 MPH
- Edge of City leading to rural area

Issues Identified

- ADA compliance
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings
- Gaps in sidewalk network



Conceptual Design

IRRAL



Irving Avenue

Concept includes...

- ✓ Leading Pedestrian Intervals
- ✓ Sidewalk/ADA Improvements
- ✓ Pedestrian crossing island
- ✓ Edge Lines
- Enhanced delineation at curves
- Crosswalk-visibility enhancements
- ✓ Curb extensions
- ✓ RRFB
- ✓ Access Management

8

3rd Street (CR 555)

- 4 Pedestrian/Cyclist crashes
- 154 total crashes
- 1 FSI crash
- 25 MPH
- 3,500 ADT





3rd Street (CR 555) – City of Millville



Characteristics

- 3,500 ADT
- 2-Lanes (w/parking)
- 25 MPH
- Used primarily as a cut-through

Issues Identified

- Used primarily as a cut-through
- Speeding
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings
- Lane delineation

3rd Street/Wheaton Ave

3rd Street (CR 555) – City of Millville



Characteristics

- 3,500 ADT
- 2-Lanes (w/parking)
- 25 MPH
- Used primarily as a cut-through

Issues Identified

- Narrow roadway
- Problematic intersection geometry
- Used primarily as a cut-through
- Speeding
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings
- Lane delineation



3rd Street/Wheaton Ave

Wheaton Avenue (CR 555) – City of Millville



Characteristics

- 3,500 ADT
- 2-Lanes (no shoulder)
- 22' wide
- 25 MPH

Issues Identified

- Narrow roadway
- Used primarily as a cut-through
- Speeding
- Sightlines
- Poor ADA compliance
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings
- No shoulders





3rd Street/Wheaton Ave

Existing Conditions





Reducing Conflicts

FIGURE 1: EXISTING CONFLICT POINTS



3rd Street

• **Existing** – 149 conflict points







3rd Street

Reducing Conflicts

FIGURE 2: PROPOSED CONFLICT POINTS



3rd Street

- **Existing** 149 conflict points
- **<u>Proposed</u>** 40 conflict points

Conceptual Design



3rd Street/Wheaton Ave

Concept includes...

- ✓ Leading Pedestrian Intervals
- ✓ Edge Lines
- ✓ Sidewalk/ADA Improvements
- ✓ Circulation changes
- Crosswalk-visibility enhancements
- ✓ Curb extensions
- ✓ RRFB







- 27 Pedestrian/Cyclist crashes
- 663 total crashes
- 6 FSI crashes

Chestnut Avenue – City of Vineland



SJTPO

Characteristics

- 15,000 ADT
- 4-Lanes (no shoulder)
- 40 MPH

Issues Identified

- Separates residential areas from destinations/downtown
- No shoulders
- Speeding
- Poor ADA compliance
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings
- Access management
- Uncontrolled intersections
- Dated traffic signals

52

Chestnut Avenue – City of Vineland



URBAD

SJTPO

Characteristics

- 15,000 ADT
- 4-Lanes (no shoulder)
- 40 MPH

Issues Identified

- Separates residential areas from destinations/downtown
- No shoulders
- Speeding
- Poor ADA compliance
- Pedestrian accessibility/crossings
- Access management
- Uncontrolled intersections
- Dated traffic signals

53

Chestnut Avenue – City of Vineland

• 15,000 ADT

- 4-Lanes (no shoulder)
- 40 MPH
- Bisects neighborhoods in City of Vineland





Three-Lane



19 - 47% Reduction in total crashes





Applicants should follow the instructions in the NOFO to correctly apply for a grant. See the <u>SS4A website</u> for more information.

Instructions: The purpose of this worksheet is to determine whether an applicant's existing plan(s) is substantially similar to an Action Plan for purposes of applying for an Implementation Grant or to conduct Supplemental Planning/Demonstration Activities only. Use of this worksheet is required. Applicants should not adjust the formatting or headings of the worksheet.

For each question below, answer "yes" or "no." If "yes," cite the specific page in your existing Action Plan or other plan(s) that corroborate your response, or cite and provide other supporting documentation separately.

An applicant is eligible to apply for an Action Plan Grant that funds supplemental action plan activities, or an Implementation Grant, only if the following two conditions are met:

Answer "yes" to Questions 3 7 9

Answer "yes" to at least four of the six remaining Questions 1 2 4 5 6 8

If both conditions are *not met*, an applicant is still eligible to apply for an Action Plan Grant that funds creation of a new Action Plan.



Safety Action Plan **was compliant** with SS4A Implementation Grant criteria because...

- ✓ Data-Driven
- ✓ Steering Committee
- ✓ Public Involvement & Equity Analysis
- ✓ Proven Safety Countermeasures
- List of Projects based on Network Screening Analysis
- ✓ Project Readiness with Concepts Developed
- ✓ Completed between 2018 2023
- ✓ Performance Measures
- ✓ Recommendations
- ✓ Resolutions of Support
- ✓ Timeline to Implement

Vineland gets \$20 million, greenlighting avenue redesign

 Joseph P. Smith Vineland Daily Journal Published 5:07 a.m. ET Feb. 6, 2023 | Updated 10:44 a.m. ET Feb. 6, 2023
 ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓
 ✓ ✓

Safety Action Plan <u>was compliant</u> with SS4A Implementation Grant criteria because...

- ✓ Data-Driven
- ✓ Steering Committee
- ✓ Public Involvement & Equity Analysis
- ✓ Proven Safety Countermeasures
- ✓ List of Projects based on Network Screening Analysis
- ✓ Project Readiness with Concepts Developed
- ✓ Completed between 2018 2023
- ✓ Performance Measures
- ✓ Recommendations
- ✓ Resolutions of Support
- ✓ Timeline to Implement











Key Lessons Learned from FY22







All submitted Safety Action Plan Grant applications were awarded Implementation Grants were *very* competitive Clear concept plans made applications more competitive

Equity, engagement, and demonstrated need were top considerations



Project Website ->



Scott Diehl, PE, PTOE, AICP, RSP2i

Traffic and Planning Practice Leader sjdiehl@urbanengineers.com



Dan Hutton, AICP, PP, RSP1 Senior Planner drhutton@urbanengineers.com



