

<b>State DOT Transition Plan Attributes Review Guide:</b> All Elements posted conspicuously on website, for internal and external use		
Transition Plan Attribute	Review Comments	Reviewer and Changes Made
<p><b>Official responsible</b> for implementation of the TP, i.e., Executive Director, Secretary, Commissioner, Chief Engineer, etc. 28 CFR 35.150(d)(3)(iv)</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory, with recommended improvements.</b></p> <p>1.) TP indicates that the Deputy Director of Southern Nevada is the official responsible for Title II and Section 504 Compliance. The Team recommends NDOT add the official's name and contact information. Section 1.4 on page 4 does not state who this is.</p> <p>2.) TP does identify the ADA Coordinator as individual responsible for the overall tracking implementation of the TP.</p>	<p>1.) Added Tracy Larkin's contact information.</p> <p>2.) N/A</p>
<p><b>Inventory of barriers</b> (identification of physical obstacles) 28 CFR 35.150(d)(3)(i); 28 CFR 35.105 (a) – State demonstrates good faith by identifying intersection information, including curb ramps and other associated accessibility elements, as a starting point and showing movement and commitment toward developing a full inventory.</p> <p>Require an Action Plan to develop an inventory of sidewalks (slopes, obstructions, protruding objects, changes in levels, etc.), signals (APS), bus stops (bus pads), buildings, parking, rest areas (tourist areas, picnic areas, visitor centers, etc.), mixed use trails, linkages to transit.</p> <p>Best practice - have discussion of jurisdictional issues/responsibilities for sidewalks</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory, with recommended improvements.</b></p> <p>Information available in GIS is impressively comprehensive but does not appear complete.</p> <p>1.1) NDOT should clarify jurisdictional issues. P. 13 states that key accessibility features for "all state owned and maintained pedestrian access routes" are in the GIS database, while p. 14 (4.3.2) states that the GIS database includes "all required accessibility attributes for NDOT's public rights-of-way". Does NDOT own routes that it does not maintain, but that are maintained by local public entities? If so, were these routes included in the statewide accessibility data collection effort? If not, what mechanism is in place to ensure that those facilities are brought into compliance?</p> <p>1.2) There appears to be State routes missing in the GIS mapping that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>2.) Page 13 describes the self-assessment and includes a link to the GIS-based map that contains the identified right-of-way deficiencies.</p> <p>2.1) We note that NDOT states that it intends to develop a Master Plan to address deficiencies in its buildings identified through site inspections conducted in 2012 (Section 5.1, p. 15); these facilities should be included in the GIS database.</p> <p>2.2) The inventory needs to also include transit stops, parking and shared use paths.</p> <p>2.3) Why is the data compared to the 1991 ADAAG (Section 4.3.1)? Anything constructed since DOT's standards were revised in 2006 should comply with the 2004 ADAAG, as modified and adopted by DOT.</p> <p>2.4) Clarify whether signals were inventoried for APS features. P. 13 suggests they were inventoried for APS, but it is unclear whether the percent compliant statistic on page 14 means that 55% of the signals are APS compliant.</p>	<p>1.1) Updated P. 13 to state maintained only. There are no routes with state ownership which are maintained by other jurisdictions.</p> <p>1.2) Partially complete at this time. The "missing routes" are being researched and a data sheet with the various locations has been established. The ADA GIS mapping will be updated if any NDOT route with ADA features is found to be missing.</p> <p>2.) N/A</p> <p>2.1) The GIS will eventually include all of the facility data. At this time, we are developing a facilities checklist and are still determining how to integrate the data into the GIS system.</p> <p>2.2) These features are not part of NDOT's jurisdiction, so they will not be included on the public GIS at this time.</p> <p>2.3) Updated ADAAG to Draft 2011 PROWAG for our reference guide.</p> <p>2.4) Made changes to 4.3.1.1 and to 4.3.2 data so that it more clearly reflects that our pedestrian signal inventories also take APS into consideration.</p>

<p><b>Schedule</b> – Show a strong commitment toward upgrading ADA elements identified in the inventory of barriers in the short term (planned capital improvement projects) and a strong commitment over time toward prioritizing curb ramps at walkways serving entities covered by the ADA. 28 CFR 35.150(d)(2) This would also include prioritization information, planning, and investments directed at eliminating other identified barriers over time. 28 CFR 35.150(d)(3)</p> <p>Best practice - dedicate resources to eliminate identified ADA deficiencies</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory, with recommended improvements.</b></p> <p>1.) As stated above, please clarify your plans for scheduling work to address deficiencies identified through your building/facilities inspections in 2012. (pg.15)</p> <p>2.) The schedule for ROW improvements over the next 5 years can be found in the appendices, Section 6.8, beginning on page 30. Please clarify whether NDOT intends to update its ADA 5-Year Plan of Projects on an annual basis (recommended).</p> <p>3.) Technical infeasibility discussion on pp. 16-17 needs clarification. In the event it is technically infeasible to achieve (full) ADA compliance when an alteration project is being undertaken(p. 16), the project must achieve compliance to the maximum extent that is technically feasible, not simply deferred to a future project. In Section 5.2.1 (p. 17), all new construction should meet current ADA standards unless it is structurally impracticable (See 28 CFR 35.151(a)(2)). There is no technical infeasibility for new construction.</p> <p>4.) Best Practice - NDOT committed to spending between \$2 and \$5 million a year specifically on ADA improvements. This funding is in addition to the ADA improvements that will occur during the course of other construction projects.</p>	<p>1.) Addressed that the facilities ADA plan will be added to the 5 year plan of projects once all of the facilities data is collected and compiled.</p> <p>2.) Paragraph added to beginning of 6.8 explaining what the tables contain and how this list of projects will be updated at a minimum of a yearly basis.</p> <p>3.) Updated Section 5.1.4 to better clarify in the event it is technically infeasible to achieve full ADA compliance, a project shall achieve ADA compliance to the maximum extent that is technically feasible. Updated Section 5.2.1 to include “structurally impracticable” for new construction instead of technically infeasible.</p> <p>4.) N/A</p>
<p>Describe in detail the <b>Methods</b> that will be used to make the facilities accessible. 28 CFR 35.150(d)(3)(ii)</p> <p>Best practice – include the Standard that the STA is following (i.e., 2010 ADAAG, 2011 PROWAG)</p>	<p><b>Needs Improvement.</b></p> <p>1.) The TP identifies both the 2010 ADAAG and the 2011 draft PROWAG, but it does not clearly identify how NDOT is using those standards.</p> <p>2.) It’s unclear in Section 5.4 whether NDOT is following the ADAAG, PROWAG or ADAAG supplemented by PROWAG. Clarify what is used as the basis for the state’s standards. Note that USDOT modified ADAAG upon adoption in 2006 and such modifications are not included in the DOJ version (adopted in 2010), but do apply to NDOT.</p> <p>3.) Section 5.2.4 - Clarify NDOT policy with regard to APS for effective communication.</p> <p>4.) Clarify several terms in the Glossary (Section 6.2, p. 21-22):</p> <p>4.1) Accessible – should also comply with DOT standards adopted under 504.</p> <p>4.2) ADAAG – Should also refer to DOT standards adopted under 504.</p> <p>4.3) Crosswalk – Usually includes unmarked extensions of approach sidewalk per MUTCD definition. Is there a difference in Nevada law such that all legal crosswalks are marked?</p>	<p>1.) Updated the information throughout the document so that it more clearly reflects that NDOT uses the Draft 2011 PROWAG as its standard, however, it is not mentioned directly how NDOT will use the standard other than that that is what we use.</p> <p>2.) Added clarification that NDOT uses the Draft 2011 PROWAG as its primary specifications standard and that the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design is used as a secondary.</p> <p>3.) Added a note that District Traffic and the ADA Division are responsible for installing and maintaining APS features at all intersections.</p> <p>4.) N/A</p> <p>4.1) Updated the term, accessible, so it more clearly defines how NDOT uses the term.</p> <p>4.2) Updated ADAAG term so it reflects NDOT’s uses and intensions of the standard.</p> <p>4.3) Updated the term using the definition established by the MUTCD and the National Conference of State Legislators at <a href="http://www.ncsl.org/research/transportation/pedestrian-crossing-50-state-summary.aspx">http://www.ncsl.org/research/transportation/pedestrian-crossing-50-state-summary.aspx</a>.</p>

Other ADA Requirements	Review Comments	
<p><b>Public Involvement</b> – Description of process to allow public to readily access and submit comments for both self-evaluation and transition plan. 28 CFR 35.150(d)(1); 28 CFR 35.105(b)</p> <p>Best practices: a) detailed list of individuals consulted posted conspicuously on website, does not have to be in actual TP, but must be documented and available; b) have both electronic and hard copy notice. 28 CFR 35.105(c)</p>	<p><b>Needs Improvement</b> – need to clarify how the public was involved in the preparation of the TP; who was involved; what information was received; is Public involvement on-going?</p>	<p>Description of public outreach outlined on NDOT website at <a href="http://nevadadot.com/ada/">http://nevadadot.com/ada/</a>.</p>
<p><b>ADA policy statement</b> is a requirement of State Agencies, but does not have to be in the TP per se, but it is a good practice and needs to be easily accessible by the public. 28 CFR 35.106</p> <p>Best practice - post conspicuously on website, for internal and external use</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Clear identification of the <b>ADA Coordinator</b> (dedicated trained staff) with contact information (i.e., name, office address, telephone number, email address, fax number) 28 CFR 35.107(a)</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b></p> <p>ADA Coordinator contact information is in Section 2.1 on page 6, but does not include an actual ADA Coordinator (TBD)</p>	<p>Position was recently filled and staff name updated.</p>
<p>Clear <b>Complaint/Grievance Process</b> to receive and address complaints/grievances from the public (is a requirement of State Agencies, but does not have to be in the TP per se, but it is a good practice and needs to be easily accessible by the public). 28 CFR 35.107(b)</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>REVIEWER</b> <u>Team Review</u> <b>DATE:</b> <u>04/07/2016</u></p>		

**State: Nevada**