TRAVEL BEHAVIOR BY MODE

Bicycle/Pedestrian (+36%, December)

Freeway Volumes (-9%, November)
Toll Road (-19%, November)
Airport Passengers (-46%, November)
Transit Ridership (-49%, December)
ROADWAY TRENDS

Average Weekday Freeway Volumes

Traffic Decrease vs 2019

-10%  -19%  -12%  -10%  -9%  -8%  -7%  -9%

March  April  May  June  July  August  September  October  November

Source: TxDOT Dallas/TxDOT Fort Worth Radar Traffic Counters. As of October 2020 growth calculations are based on Fort Worth locations.
## Transit Impacts

### Weekday Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership Decrease vs 2019</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
<td>-55%</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>-55%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DART, DCTA, and Trinity Metro
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

+ Transit Sales Tax Allocations (0.34%, September)

- Sales Tax (-0.3%, January)
  Motor Fuel Tax (-4.7%, January)
  Motor Vehicle Sales and Rental Tax (-13.4%, January)
FUNDING IMPACT

NTTA Transactions, Including SH 360

Change in Tollway Transactions: 2019 vs 2020

Source: NTTA
Note: Change for NTTA includes 360 Tollway
Additional Note: Despite decline in transactions, the revenues are sufficient to meet debt service for SH 360. No current impact to RTC backstop expected.
Construction Cost Changes
October 2019 to January 2021

Monthly Average Construction Cost Changes
(Letting Low Bid vs. Sealed Engineer's Est.)

COVID-19 Avg. Cost Change: -12.30%

Sources: TxDOT Connect and Monthly TxDOT Letting Reports
Notes: Does not include CSI 2266-02-151; Includes grouped and non-grouped projects; Includes Dallas and Fort Worth District data
CANDIDATE PROJECTS

- High Speed Rail: Dallas to Houston
- High Speed Rail: Dallas to Fort Worth
- Autonomous Transit (Tarrant, Midtown)
- Technology (Freeway Induction Loops)
- State Highway 183 (Section 2E+)
- Y Connector (IH820/IH20)
- COVID-19 #00X Program
Newly launched online dashboard to display Changing Mobility information to the public

Replicates material presented to committees with enhanced interactivity

Separate dashboard for each metric tracked

Clean layout to help the public understand the story of the metrics at a glance
UPDATE ON THE 2021-2024 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

FEBRUARY 11, 2021
DELAYS TO APPROVAL OF THE NEW TIP/STIP

• The 2021-2024 TIP/Statewide TIP (STIP) was submitted to the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) in June 2020.

• Approval of the 2021-2024 STIP was delayed due to issues balancing project programming to available revenues statewide.

• In order to resolve this issue, the TxDOT Transportation Planning and Programming Division requested several changes to project fiscal years for selected projects.

• Until this issue can be resolved, the 2019-2022 TIP/STIP will remain in effect.
IMPACTS OF TIP/STIP APPROVAL DELAY

• The delay in approval will primarily impact projects that were newly added or changed substantially in the 2021-2024 TIP, as funding agreements or new federal/State actions for these projects will not be executed until the STIP is approved.

• Due to delays in TIP/STIP approval, changes requested through the November 2020 TIP modification cycle have also been delayed, and therefore have not been processed and approved by TxDOT or the US DOT.

• The February 2021 TIP modification cycle will also be impacted.
RESOLUTION AND UPDATED TIMELINE FOR TIP/STIP APPROVAL

• November 2020 and February 2021 TIP revisions are being incorporated into the original 2021-2024 TIP/STIP submission for TxDOT and FHWA in January/February 2021.

• Additional changes recommended by TxDOT to balance statewide fiscal constraints will also be incorporated into the listings in February 2021.

• TxDOT approval of the updated 2021-2024 TIP/STIP document is anticipated in late March 2021.

• The document will then be forwarded to the US DOT with approval anticipated in May 2021.
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS OF THE APPROVAL DELAY

• As the US DOT will likely still be reviewing the new TIP/STIP concurrently, TxDOT anticipates cancelling the May 2021 STIP Revision Cycle (which would normally start in January)

• Assuming this plan holds, the next deadline for TIP modifications to be submitted to TxDOT would be the August 2021 cycle
  • Modification requests for that cycle are due April 26, 2021, to NCTCOG staff
  • Resulting STIP revisions would be submitted to the State in late July 2021
  • US DOT approval is anticipated in late September or early October 2021

• This timeline means that new projects in FY 2021 are extremely limited and most new funding would not be available until FY 2022.
IDENTIFIED UPDATES TO THE TIP/STIP

• 13 projects TxDOT identified as needing to be moved due to financial constraints are not yet approved by the RTC.

• Since the 2021-2024 TIP/STIP project listing was approved by the RTC, 34 projects have obligated and no longer need to be “double listed” in the new TIP.

• 7 revisions from the November cycle and 1 revision from the February cycle were initially processed administratively but have been amended and now require RTC approval.

• 1 change to the original listing needs RTC approval.
REQUESTED ACTION

• Recommend RTC approval of:
  • The changes to projects in the 2021-2024 TIP/STIP requiring RTC action
  • Administratively amending other planning and administrative documents, as needed.
CONTACT/QUESTIONS?

Christie J. Gotti  
Senior Program Manager  
Ph: (817) 608-2338 
cgotti@nctcog.org

Ken Bunkley  
Principal Transportation Planner  
Ph: (817) 695-9288 
kbunkley@nctcog.org

Rylea Roderick  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Ph: (817) 608-2353 
rrroderick@nctcog.org
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)
MILESTONE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION (ROUND 2)

Regional Transportation Council
February 11, 2021
The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) has been selecting projects since 1992.

The first round of the MPO Milestone Policy was adopted by the RTC in June 2015, and it reviewed projects selected from 1992 to 2005 that had not yet gone to construction.

That initiative was successful in getting 51 out of 57 projects to construction.

A second round of the Milestone Policy was initiated to review projects currently over 10 years old that have not been implemented.

In November 2019, the second round of Milestone Policy Projects was introduced.
INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE MILESTONE POLICY

- Providing a realistic assessment of project status for decision-making
- Balancing project construction schedule capacity within the current financial constraints
- Increasing the amount of available funds for priority, “ready-to-go” projects, rather than long delayed projects
- Getting old projects to construction/implementation
MILESTONE POLICY ROUND 2
OVERVIEW

- **Affected projects:**
  - Funded between 2006 and 2010 that had not let or obligated as of December 2019
  - Funded prior to 2006 that had let, but have had implementation issues (e.g., re-bid, utility delays)
  - Funded with RTC-selected sources
  - Locally funded and added to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) prior to 2010
  - Funded with Congressional Earmarks that are subject to rescission

- 41 projects needed to be reconfirmed or cancelled
THE REAPPROVAL PROCESS

- Agencies with projects on the Milestone Policy Project List were notified via letter (in addition to STTC & RTC agenda items in 2019)

- Agencies were required to reconfirm the projects as a priority by:
  - Providing a realistic and achievable schedule, which must receive NCTCOG & TxDOT concurrence
  - Providing documentation of policy board support
    - If projects are advancing imminently or have policy board approval within the last six months, new action was not needed (just submit latest approval documentation)
    - If policy support documentation is greater than six months old, new action was requested
  - Documenting the availability of local matching funds
### PROJECTS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDING OF PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed for Cancellation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$23,782,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction or Complete</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$246,173,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Letting FY 2021</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,486,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Letting FY 2022</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$121,639,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Letting FY 2023</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$93,552,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Letting FY 2024 or Beyond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$117,892,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>$610,527,034</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some projects have let but actual construction has not begun. Staff will continue to monitor those projects.
In the Round 1 effort, the action included a one-year grace period after the fiscal year in which each agency indicated their project would be ready. 

- Now that the program is established and agencies understand the implications of setting their schedules, staff suggests that this grace period is no longer needed.

Also, when NCTCOG staff briefed STTC and RTC about the status of projects in Round 1, further extensions were offered to projects that had missed their deadlines.

- Staff's original recommendation was that failure to meet the schedules set forth will result in automatic removal of funding from a project.
- Based on feedback received from STTC members, staff is proposing a compromise position to enable reconsideration of individual project details prior to cancellation (vs. facing automatic cancellation when deadlines are not met).
PROPOSED MILESTONE POLICY TRACKING PROCESS

- Quarterly status reports will be required on all projects on the Milestone Policy list until they go to letting.

- Reports would detail steps that the project sponsor is taking to advance the project (e.g., executing funding or railroad agreements, engaging property owners or utility companies, etc.)

- NCTCOG staff will evaluate the reports and “rate” the projects based on how well the project sponsor is implementing the project(s). The rating system will be as follows:
  - Green – Low risk of project delays
  - Yellow – Medium risk of project delays
  - Red – High risk of project delays

- If the committed schedule is missed and the project has been graded as red/high risk, the project will likely be recommended for cancelation.
TIMELINE

- January 2020 – Notification to project sponsors
- July 31, 2020 – Formal responses due to NCTCOG staff
- December 4, 2020 – STTC Information Item
- December 10, 2020 – RTC Information Item
- December 2020 – Public Meeting
- January 22, 2021 – STTC Action Item
- February 11, 2021 – RTC Action Item
ACTION REQUESTED

- RTC approval of:
  - The proposed recommendations outlined in the electronic item including:
    - Cancellation of certain projects
    - Established timeframes for each project (i.e., the fiscal year in which projects are scheduled to let)
  - Revised Milestone Policy procedures
  - Administratively amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and other administrative/planning documents as needed
QUESTIONS?

Christie J. Gotti  
Senior Program Manager  
Ph: (817) 608-2338  
cgotti@nctcog.org

Brian Dell  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Ph: (817) 704-5694  
bdell@nctcog.org

James Adkins  
Transportation Planner  
Ph: (682) 433-0482  
jadkins@nctcog.org
Regional Transportation Council
February 11, 2021
Ernest Huffman
Aviation Planning and Education Program Manager
Proposed Regional Transportation Council Resolution

A Resolution Supporting the Safe and Efficient Integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems into the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area’s Existing Transportation Ecosystem
Draft Resolution

Section 1. The RTC supports a continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process to integrate land-based and aerial-based transportation systems in a safe and cost-effective fashion to maximize economies of scale and improve mobility.

Section 2. The RTC supports safe and responsible Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) activity within the region including, but not limited to, medical supplies and package delivery, air taxi, public safety use, accident reconstruction, surveying, and other activities as identified in the future.

Section 3. The RTC encourages agencies to support their public safety services use of UAS.

Section 4. The RTC encourages agencies to work with the UAS industry to adopt “pilot” programs to demonstrate the technologies properly operated in and around a metropolitan area.

Section 5. The RTC encourages educational institutions in North Texas to provide UAS-oriented educational offerings to help prepare the transportation workforce of the future.
Draft Resolution (cont’d)

**Section 6.** The RTC supports the development of UAS aircraft pilot certification standards and efforts to position North Texas as a center for UAS aircraft pilot training.

**Section 7.** The RTC encourages agencies to participate in the North Texas UAS Safety and Integration Task Force “Community Integration Working Group.” This working group provides a forum that will allow cities to share their current use cases and policies, and also learn about other UAS use cases that can be employed by cities.
Community Integration Working Group

- Characterize community concerns
- Inventory available applications for city use
- Inventory funding mechanism for city use
- Inventory training available to cities
- Identify how small UAS and UAS operations can supplement existing transportation methods
- Identify how UAS can replace existing transportation methods in emergency situations
Contact Information

Ernest Huffman, Aviation Planning and Education Program Manager
ehuffman@nctcog.org, (817) 704-5612
LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Rebekah Hernandez, Communications Manager
NCTCOG
Regional Transportation Council
February 11, 2021
Biden Administration Actions

Pete Buttigieg confirmed as Secretary of Transportation by US Senate
COVID-19 relief plan proposal includes $57.5 billion for transportation
• Funding for transit, Amtrak, airline payroll support, aviation sector support

Executive Orders
• One Federal Decision Rule repealed
• White House Office of Domestic Climate Policy and National Climate Task Force established
• Face mask requirement on public transportation systems
• Environmental justice prioritized
Committee Chairs and Ranking Members for 117th US Congress

 Senate Transportation  
Maria Cantwell (D-WA) & Roger Wicker (R-MS)

 Senate Env. & Pub. Works  
Tom Carper (D-DE) & Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV)

 Senate Appropriations  
Patrick Leahy (D-VT) & Richard Shelby (R-AL)

 House Science  
Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) & Frank Lucas (R-OK)

 House Appropriations  
Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) & Kay Granger (R-TX)

 House Transportation  
Peter DeFazio (D-OR) & Sam Graves (R-MO)

North Texas members include Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX), Collin Allred (D-TX), and Beth Van Duyne (R-TX)
House and Senate Committee Assignments

Senate Transportation
- No change to Chair, Senator Robert Nichols
- North Texas Members – Senators Hancock, West

House Transportation
- No change to Chair, Representative Terry Canales
- North Texas Members – Representatives Yvonne Davis, Glenn Rogers

Other Notable Changes
- New House Appropriations Chair, New Senate Committee on Local Government
Proposed FY22-23 State Budget

**SB 1**
- Total: $251.2B in All Funds and $119.7B in General Revenue

**HB 1**
- Total: $251.4B in All Funds and $119.7B in General Revenue

*Transportation in SB 1 and HB 1*
- $30.4B, 7.5% decrease from FY20-21, includes Prop 1 and Prop 7 transfers
Bill Tracking
  • Fewer transportation bills currently

Committee Hearings
  • Senate Finance and Redistricting

Governor’s Emergency Items
  • Broadband
  • Laws to prevent cities from defunding the police
  • Bail system reform
  • Election integrity
  • Pandemic liability protections for businesses
CONTACT INFORMATION

Amanda Wilson
Program Manager
(817) 695-9284
awilson@nctcog.org

Nicholas Allen
Communications Coordinator
(817) 704-5699
nallen@nctcog.org

Rebekah Hernandez
Communications Manager
(682) 433-0477
rhernandez@nctcog.org

Kyle Roy
Communications Coordinator
(817) 704-5610
kroy@nctcog.org

www.nctcog.org/legislative
DFW Clean Cities Impacts – Results from 2019 Survey

42 Fleets Reporting
9,871 Alternative Fuel Vehicles and Equipment

*Impacts Over Calendar Year 2019

~26.03 Million Gasoline Gallon Equivalent (GGE) Reduced*
~420.104 Tons Ozone-Forming Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) Reduced*
72,094 Tons Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduced*

~1.6 Tons/Day
For Comparison: RTC Initiatives Credited in Conformity = ~2.12 Tons/Day

Equivalent to Eliminating 3,059 Tanker Trucks of Gasoline
Trends in Annual Energy Impact

Goal per Department of Energy: Increase Reductions 15% Year Over Year

2019 Target: 26.73 GGE Reduced
2019 Reported: 26.03 GGE Reduced

RNG-Renewable Natural Gas; CNG-Compressed Natural Gas; LNG-Liquified Natural Gas; LPG-Liquified Propane Gas; EV-Electric Vehicle; PHEV-Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle
Fleet Recognition Awards

Based on 2019 Report
## Bronze Fleet Winners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Arlington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Frisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Richland Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Flower Mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Metro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Silver Fleet Winners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Bedford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Coppell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Irving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mesquite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosper ISD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gold Fleet Winners

| City of Carrollton | City of Dallas | City of Denton | City of Euless | City of Lewisville | City of Southlake | Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) | DFW Airport | CARROLLTON TEXAS | City of Dallas | DART | THE CITY OF EULESS | LEWISVILLE | CITY OF SOUTH LAKE |
Greatest Progress in NO$_x$ Reduction

- **DFW Airport**: 27.5 tons of NO$_x$ Reduced
- **North Richland Hills**: 93% Increase in Reductions

Greatest Progress in GGE Reduction

- **City of Denton**: 698,000 GGE Reduced
- **SPAN Transit**: 97% Increase in Reductions

Greatest Progress in Transitioning to Alternative Fuels

- **Trinity Metro**: 79% Alternative Fuel Vehicles
- **Denton ISD**: +36 LPG Vehicles
25th Anniversary in 2020
dfwcleancities.org
Lori Clark  
Program Manager & DFW Clean Cities Coordinator  
lclark@nctcog.org

Jared Wright  
Air Quality Planner  
jwright@nctcog.org

Amy Hodges  
Senior Air Quality Planner  
ahodges@nctcog.org

cleancities@nctcog.org  
www.dfwcleancities.org
DART RED AND BLUE LINES
TOD SURVEY 2019 RESULTS

Regional Transportation Council
Karla Weaver, AICP
February 11, 2021
Background

Are TODs influencing travel behavior, demographics, and location choice preferences?

Three populations
- Residents
- Businesses
- Employees

Report and data online: www.nctcog.org/TOD (FTA Pilot)
Part of Federal Transit Administration TOD Planning Pilot Grant

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)
Higher density with a mix of uses designed for convenient walk and bike access from a high-frequency transit station.
Survey Area

28 DART Stations on Red and Blue Lines (FTA TOD Planning Pilot Grant)

Cities of Dallas, Richardson, Garland, and Plano

One-mile radius around stations

Data collected August 2019 – February 2020
# Sampling and Response

## Random Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Source: 146,196 addresses from USPS database</td>
<td>Sample: 15,198 mailed packets (online option) and 51,877 calls</td>
<td>1,540 complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>Source: 16,596 addresses InfoUSA database</td>
<td>Sample: 12,853 Mailed packets (online option) and called 10,231 w/ valid phone numbers</td>
<td>1,039 complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Source: Subset of business data</td>
<td>Sample: 389 businesses distributed to employees by email or paper</td>
<td>550 completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Content

Today’s focus:

- Travel and Transit Use
- Location Impacts
- TOD Challenges and Opportunities

Survey Topics
- Travel patterns and behaviors
- Travel preferences and hypothetical improvements
- Location preferences
- Housing characteristics
- Demographics
- Parking perceptions and availability
- Travel Demand Management programs
- Business characteristics
TOD Residents’ Transit Use

Respondents who live closer to DART rail stations are more likely to commute by transit

Percent who commute using a train or bus

- 7% within 0.25 mile
- 17% within 0.5 mile from station
- 23% within 1 mile

North Central Texas Council of Governments
Resident Travel Mode Split

Thinking about last week, how did you get to and from work or school each day?

**DFW Urbanized Area (Census ACS 2018 5-yr)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoled</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxicab, Motorcycle, other</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 13% commute by transit

Driving alone: 81.4%
Train/light rail: 9.4%
Walking: 6.8%
Car/vanpooling: 5.8%
Bus: 4.4%
Teleworking: 3.0%
Biking: 2.6%
Taxi/Uber/Lyft: 2.6%
Motorbike/scooter: 0.6%
Locations for Active Transportation

Employers within a half-mile of DART stations are more likely to report customer foot traffic as an influence on their location decision.

16% of high-density station areas (57 - 305 people per acre) residents report commuting by walking or bicycling while only 6% report the same at lower densities.

Likelihood of a walk or bicycle commute by housing type:
- 12% for majority multi-family housing areas
- 9% for mixed housing areas
- 4% for majority single-family housing areas
Factors in Home Choice

What were the factors most important to you when you were looking for a home?

*15 out of 36 factors shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of housing</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low crime rate within neighborhood</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks throughout the neighborhood</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet neighborhood</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces nearby</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to the freeway</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of car traffic on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants, etc. w/i walking distance</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby theaters, libraries, music venues etc.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to workplace</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/grocery shopping within walking distance</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood character and architecture</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More living space</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of parking</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to DART service</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Central Texas Council of Governments
TOD Challenges

TOD residents still use cars more than transit

- 81% of residents commute by driving alone
- 23% of residents stated their place of employment was within walking distance but only 6% reported a walk commute

Residents cite need for frequent stops, long trips, too many transfers as barriers to transit use

Business and Employees see transit as less influential

- 70% of businesses said easy parking and access by car was a strong or somewhat strong influence in location versus only 34% saying the same for DART access
Employees Unlikely to Change Commute

If you usually drive to work now, what might lead you to switch your commute to DART?

3% wrote in that their job makes DART use unlikely
TOD Opportunities

Understanding of demographic impacts

27% of residents age 18-34 report typically walking or biking to restaurants/bars/coffee shops whereas only 18% of older groups report the same.

Residents prefer walkability and being close to daily activities

Average of 52% would prefer walk/bike or transit to non-commute destinations like restaurants, recreation, and theaters, libraries, music venues.

Businesses have capacity to be smarter about parking

87% said they have enough or more than enough parking.
How to increase walking or biking?

What street improvements in your neighborhood might better encourage or enable you to walk or bike more?

- Better lighting at night: 61%
- More/better sidewalks: 47%
- Reduced speed/volume of traffic: 41%
- More bike lanes/separate bike…: 40%
- More safe road crossings: 40%
- More shade/street trees: 37%
- None: 8%
- Street quality*: 2%
- Safety/security*: 1%
- Other*: 12%

* Classified from “other” write-in responses
Summary

• Better understanding of challenges and opportunities for TOD in the region

• Insight on general topics of walking, biking, and relationship to land use

• Detailed data set: future analysis in interest areas

Full report online: www.nctcog.org/TOD (FTA Pilot)
Contact

Karla Weaver, AICP
Senior Program Manager
kweaver@nctcog.org

Travis Liska, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
tliska@nctcog.org
SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS UPDATE

Regional Transportation Council
February 11, 2021

Sonya J. Landrum
Program Manager
## 2020-2021 Federal Measures Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rulemaking</th>
<th>Upcoming RTC Action</th>
<th>Next Anticipated RTC Action</th>
<th>Target-Setting Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM3 – System Performance, Freight, and CMAQ</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>Late 2022</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2 – Pavement and Bridge</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
<td>Late 2022</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM1 – Roadway Safety</td>
<td>February 2021 (Information)</td>
<td>Early 2022</td>
<td>Annual (Targets established as reductions over 5-year period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Asset Management (TAM)</td>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>Early 2022</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Safety (PTASP)</td>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>Early 2022</td>
<td>Annually/With MTP Updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

- Federal legislation specifies quantitative performance measures that must be tracked and reported annually.
- 2018 Safety Performance Targets approved by Regional Transportation Council (RTC) in December 2017.
- 2018 – 2022 Safety Performance Targets reduction schedule affirmed by RTC in February 2019
- Established Regional Safety Position: Even one death on the transportation system is unacceptable. Staff will work with our partners to develop projects, programs, and policies that assist in eliminating serious injuries and fatalities across all modes of travel.
- Targets updated annually.
- In May of 2019, the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) adopted Minute Order 115481, directing TxDOT to work toward the goal of reducing the number of deaths on Texas roadways by half by the year 2035 and to zero by the year 2050.
Roadway Safety Performance Targets

- Target: Number of Fatalities
- Target: Rate of Fatalities
- Target: Number of Serious Injuries
- Target: Rate of Serious Injuries
- Target: Number of Non-motorized Fatalities plus Serious Injuries

(Targets based on a five-year rolling average)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of Texas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No. of Fatalities</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fatality Rate</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No. of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serious Injury Rate</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No. of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central Texas (NCTCOG) Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No. of Fatalities</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fatality Rate</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No. of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Made Significant Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serious Injury Rate</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Made Significant Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No. of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>![down arrow]</td>
<td>![up arrow]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current trend using data from the previous five years of available data (2015-2019)

**Preliminary results for NCTCOG. FHWA expected to release state results in March 2021.

Observed safety performance is compared to targets on a two-year delay.
## NCTCOG Actual Safety Performance 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>599.2</td>
<td>557.2</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>3,999.6</td>
<td>3,692</td>
<td>3,754</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>5.568</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td>5.807</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>582.4</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TxDOT Safety Performance Targets and Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Performance Targets</th>
<th>2020 TxDOT Targets</th>
<th>2020 NCTCOG Targets</th>
<th>2021 TxDOT Targets</th>
<th>2021 NCTCOG Targets</th>
<th>2022 TxDOT Targets</th>
<th>2022 NCTCOG Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Fatalities</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>589.3</td>
<td>3,687*</td>
<td>572.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>1.33*</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>18,602</td>
<td>3,514.7</td>
<td>17,151</td>
<td>3,375.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>4.768</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>4.485</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>595.0</td>
<td>2,316.4</td>
<td>592.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets are based on a five-year rolling average (ex. 2017 – 2021) for 2021. Proposed reduction from original trend line projections.

*2021 Targets for TxDOT include new 50% reduction by 2035 targets for fatalities and fatality rate only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Program Area</th>
<th>Bike and Pedestrian</th>
<th>Freight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Regional Roadway Safety Plan</td>
<td>Education and Outreach - Look Out Texans</td>
<td>FT Worth Rail Crossing Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Behavior Social Marketing Campaign - Drive Aware North Texas</td>
<td>Regional Pedestrian Safety Plan</td>
<td>Truck Lane Restrictions Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Safety Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Technical Training/Workshops</td>
<td>Freight Safety Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWD Mitigation Pilot Project</td>
<td>Safety Spot Improvement Program</td>
<td>Canyon Falls/US 377 and UPRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Incident Management Training Program</td>
<td>Transportation Alternative Funding CFPs</td>
<td>Linfield Closing/Ped Crossing over UPRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Reconstruction Software/Equipment Training Program</td>
<td>Routes to Rail Stations” Study</td>
<td>Prairie Creek Road Grade Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Management Equipment Call for Projects</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Streamlined Project Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Training for Judges &amp; Prosecutors</td>
<td>Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Denton County East-West Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicle Enforcement RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Assistance Patrol Program</td>
<td>Congestion Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Safety Information System - Crash Database</td>
<td>Emerging Technology Investment Programs</td>
<td>Automated Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vehicle Working Group / Regional Policy Development</td>
<td>Freeway Management &amp; HOV Enforcement Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Safety Performance Targets</td>
<td>Peak Hour Lane Implementation</td>
<td>AV Truck Data Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Safety Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Vision Zero Program Development Workshop</td>
<td>Transportation System Management / ITS</td>
<td>Waze/511DFW Data Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Vision Zero Regional Policy Resolution Development</td>
<td>Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program</td>
<td>DSTOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* NCTCOG Systemic Safety Improvements Program</td>
<td>Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Signal Cloud Data</td>
<td>Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW Clean Cities</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>UAS Safety and Integration Initiative/Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions Enforcement</td>
<td>Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Future Effort - Initial Planning Stage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>NCTCOG Safety Performance Targets Actions to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2017</td>
<td>STTC/RTC (Action) - Presented 2018 Safety Performance Targets. * Affirmed support of 2018 TxDOT Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2020</td>
<td>RSAC/STTC (Information) - Presented 2020 Safety Performance Targets Update and 2018 preliminary safety targets vs. actual performance update to STTC. Item pulled from RTC due to special agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24, 2020</td>
<td>RSAC – Presented final safety targets vs. actual performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February 2021</td>
<td>RSAC/STTC/RTC (Information) - Present 2021 Safety Performance Targets Update and 2019 preliminary safety targets vs. actual performance update to STTC and RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February 2022</td>
<td>STTC/RTC (Action) - Present proposed 2022 Safety Performance Targets and 2020 preliminary safety targets vs. actual performance update to STTC and RTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions, Comments, Contacts

Sonya J. Landrum  
Program Manager  
slandrum@nctcog.org

Natalie Bettger  
Senior Program Manager  
NBettger@nctcog.org

www.nctcog.org/pm/fed