AGENDA

1. Approval of January 22, 2021 Meeting Summary – Alonzo Linan, RSAC Chair

2. TxDOT’s Methods of Crash Data Dissemination – Larbi Hanni, TxDOT

3. TxDOT’s Every Day Counts (EDC) 6 CAD Integration – David McDonald, TxDOT


5. Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Target Setting Development – Shawn Dintino, NCTCOG

6. 2021 Transportation Safety Performance Report – Camille Fountain, NCTCOG

7. Update Items
   a) Traffic Incident Management Call for Projects Status Update – Camille Fountain, NCTCOG
   b) Commercial Motor Vehicle Violations Training for Judges and Prosecutors – Kevin Kroll, NCTCOG
   c) Mobility Assistance Patrol Program Update – Kevin Kroll, NCTCOG
   d) Drive Aware North Texas Safety Initiative – Sonya Landrum, NCTCOG
   e) 2021-2022 RSAC Membership Appointments and Vice Chair Opportunity Reminder – Sonya Landrum, NCTCOG

8. Safety-Related Reference Items, Topics or Training Courses Website

9. Upcoming Safety-Related Events and Training Announcements
   a) National Work Zone Awareness Week, April 26-30, 2021
   b) 2021 Virtual Lifesavers on Highway Safety Conference, April 26-28, 2021
   c) Traffic Incident Management Executive Level Course, May 6, 2021, Virtual
   d) Commercial Motor Vehicle Violations Training for Judges and Prosecutors
      o May 18, 2021, 8:30 am – 10:30 am, Virtual
      o May 19, 2021, 8:30 am – 10:30 am, Virtual
   e) Traffic Incident Management First Responder and Manager Course:
      o May 20 – 21, 2021, NCTCOG
      o July 22 – 23, 2021, NCTCOG
f) 2021 Virtual Traffic Safety Conference, July 14-16, 2021

10. Other Business (Old or New): This item provides an opportunity for members to bring items of interest before the group

11. Next RSAC Meeting: July 23, 2021 at 10 am
TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TIM Training Classroom and in the Field</th>
<th>3-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TIM Technology and Innovations</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TIM Data</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Data Gaps</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAD Data</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIM Training in the classroom and the field
TIM Training in the classroom and the field
Technology and TIM

- Many agencies are now using UAS to assist in scene reconstruction and significantly reducing Crash Investigation clearance times.
Responder agencies realize the dangers their employees face when working crashes and other incidents on our roadways. Some have repurposed vehicles that were to be removed from service.
TIM Data Collection and Performance Measurement is a Critical Element in Advancing TIM.

- **Data can improve TIM programs by helping agencies:**
  - Understand current performance.
  - Identify improvement opportunities.
  - Estimate program or improvement benefits.

- **Data can also increase TIM program transparency and accountability by helping agencies:**
  - Demonstrate program effectiveness to the public.
  - Justify future funding and planning.
  - Support reporting requirements.
Key Data Elements to Collect

- FHWA Advises Collection of Key PMs:
  - Roadway Clearance Time
  - Incident Clearance Time
  - Secondary Crashes
  - Responder Struck By

- Many Agencies go Beyond to Include:
  - Incident Response Time
  - Return to Normal Traffic Flow
  - Secondary Crash Type
  - Number of Lanes closed
  - Response resource allocation to incidents
TIM Timeline

First recordable awareness by any responsible responding agency (including 911, PSAP, law enforcement, TMC, freeway service patrol)

Time when all lanes are available for traffic flow.

Time when the last responder (police, fire, towing, transportation, etc.) has left the incident scene.
Data Gaps

Texas Peace Officers Crash Report (CR-3) does not capture:

1. T0-Incident Occurs
2. T2-Incident Verified
3. T5-Roadway Cleared
4. T6-incident Cleared
5. T-7Normal Traffic Flow Returns

TMC Operators often times detect the incident via CCTV and Incident Occurs-T0 and Incident Reported-T1, are not captured accurately in LoneStar
Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) Data for TIM Operations

- CAD data also provides a complete FHWA-identified TIM timeline information to track incident response performance (Detection, Verification, Dispatch, Response Arrival, Clearance)

- Citizens generally call 9-1-1 when in a crash as first action

- Law Enforcement Dispatch often aware of crashes before TMC (15 min. avg.)

- If Dispatch can inform TMC of an incident – TMC staff can begin response assessment before PD arrival via CCTV
  - PD calling/e-mailing TMC time-consuming; distracts dispatcher from duties
  - TMCs monitor roadways within multiple jurisdictions
  - Can TMC automatically and effectively be informed of 9-1-1 calls from PD CAD systems?

- PROPOSED: Develop a process to bring in 9-1-1 data from multiple law enforcement agencies and transmit data to TMCs in multiple districts in a secure and cost-effective manner
Challenges with CAD Integration

- Over 100 law enforcement agencies within six metro areas to integrate
- At least 15 identified CAD systems currently utilized by PDs
- Center-to-Center Integration (current approach) is complex to implement among so many platforms and agencies
- Mixed reactions to sharing CAD – partially due to understanding of Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Standards
- Proposed solution will allow for simpler transmission of CAD information to TMCs while maintaining security.
Proposed CAD Integration Solution

- Work with CAD reporting feature to create specific report available from any system
  - Agency
  - Incident Report ID (correlates with Report ID on CR3/Crash Form)
  - Incident Location
  - Timestamps (Reported, Dispatched, En-route, Arrival, Travel lanes cleared, Incident cleared)

- CAD Data to be shared **SHALL NOT** contain personally identifiable information (PII) (names, addresses, phone numbers, DL number, etc.)

- Routine to be developed to process/deliver information from CAD to TMC
  - CAD will create a flat-file report of all open traffic incidents at a set interval (every 1-5 minutes)
  - Report will be sent to a secure FTP site
  - A separate program will read received data in FTP file and send event info to respective TMCs
  - Timestamp updates for each event will also be sent to respective TMCs
  - Initially, info displayed on a secure website accessible by TMCs – potential for Lonestar integration

- Data to be archived for future TIM use/analysis
Questions/Comments Contact Information

Questions/Comments?
Contact Information:

David McDonald
David.mcdonald@txdot.gov
512-965-2515

Amelia Hayes
Amelia.hayes@dot.gov
512-536-5972
Congestion Management Process Strategy Review
CMP Overview

One of 5 federally-mandated planning documents (MTP, TIP, UPWP, Public Participation Plan, CMP)

Required for urbanized areas with populations exceeding 200,000 (also known as Transportation Management Areas “TMA”)

First enacted under ISTEA (1991) as Congestion Management System (CMS)
1994: First regional CMS adopted by Regional Transportation Council
2005: CMS amended via MTP Update
2013: Most recent update of CMP for NCTCOG
Why Do We Need Such a Process?

- Manage Travel Demands
- Reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle Travel
- Improve Efficiency of Transportation System
- Improve Safety for all Using System
- Maximize Transportation Funds
- Justify Additional Capacity is Needed
- Coordinate with Regional Partners
Congestion Management Process Flow

Performance Criteria (Sufficient/Deficient):
- Crash Rate
- TTI
- LOS/ITR
- Bridge/Pavement

Roadway Infrastructure:
- Parallel Arterials
- Frontage Roads
- Parallel Freeway

Model Options:
- Park and Ride
- Commuter Rail
- Light Rail
- Bus Routes

Operational Strategies:
- Shoulders
- ITS
- HOV/Managed Lane
- Truck Lane Restrictions

Performance Statement Table

Asset Statement Table

Corridor Statement

Construction Status (Full/Partial/None)

CMP Output

Sufficient

Construction

CMP Strategy Candidate

Corridor Study Candidate
Crash Rate Analysis Methodology

- Reflects crash rate from 2014-2018
- Normalized to segment length, reported as number of crashes per 100 Million Vehicle Miles Traveled
- Top 25 corridors highlighted as being “insufficient”
- Analysis to be repeated as data is updated
Crash Rate

Crash Rate Per 100 Million VMT
- <102 (101)
- >102 (25)
Travel Time Index

Travel Time Index
- <1.38 (98)
- >1.38 (28)
Level of Travel Time Reliability

LOTTR

- <1.38 (100)
- >1.38 (26)
Bridge Condition

Percentage of Bridge Deck in Poor Condition
- <10% (122)
- >10% (4)
Pavement Condition

Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition
- <10% (109)
- >10% (17)
Asset Scoring

Performance Criteria (Sufficient/Deficient)
- Crash Rate
- TTI
- LOD TR
- Bridge/Pavement

Roadway Infrastructure
- Parallel Arterials
- Frontage Roads
- Parallel Freeway

Model Options
- Park and Ride
- Commuter Rail
- Light Rail
- Bus Routes

Operational Strategies
- Shoulders
- ITS
- HOV/Managed Lane
- Truck Lane Restrictions

Performance Statement Table

Asset Statement Table

Corridor Statement

Construction Status (Full/Partial/None)

CMP Output

Sufficient

Construction

CMP Strategy Candidate

Corridor Study Candidate
Modal Options

Modal Options Aggregate Score
- High (21)
- Medium (29)
- Low (76)

Dallas CBD
Fort Worth CBD
Operations

Operations Aggregate Score
- High (22)
- Medium (39)
- Low (65)

Dallas CBD

Fort Worth CBD

CMP

North Central Texas Council of Governments

January 2021
Process Outputs

- Construction (Recent or Planned) (61)
- Continue to Monitor (44)
- Corridor Study (1)
- CMP Strategy (16)
- Rehab (4)
CMP Strategy Selection (cont.)

- Review Possible Strategies
- Evaluate Smaller Segments
- Select Strategies
- Add to TIP

Expert Review Process
Congestion Management Strategies - Safety

- **Primary Safety Strategies**
  - Shoulder Utilization Program
  - Speed Harmonization and Monitoring
  - ITS Devices
  - Mobility Assistance Patrol / Courtesy Patrol
  - Strategic Incident Response and Clearance Time Program
  - Traffic Incident Management Training
  - Regional Traffic Control
  - Bottleneck Removal
  - Intersection Improvements
  - Bus Loading Bays

- **Secondary Safety Strategies**
  - 511 DFW
  - Reversible Lane Management
  - HOV/Managed Lane Management
  - Truck Lane Restrictions
  - Freight Grade Railroad Crossing
  - Transit Signal Priority
  - Traffic Signal Improvements
Project Performance Evaluation

• Develop a set of Baseline Performance Measures to Evaluate Strategies for Effectiveness
• Look to Existing Before/After Studies for Relevant Measures
• Focus on “Initial Criteria” Performance Measures (Crash Rate, Reliability, etc.)
• Use Process to Track Federal Performance Measures as Necessary
Example Project Performance Measures

- Before/After Speeds
- Before/After Volumes
- Before/After Crash Rate
- Transit Ridership/Mode Split
- Changes in Asset Inventory
- Changes in Asset Condition
- Changes in Criteria Performance Measures, Peak Hour LOS, Crash Rate, Travel Time Reliability
## CMP Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTC Workshop and STTC (Info)</td>
<td>May 28, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Info</td>
<td>June 10, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTC - Action</td>
<td>June 25, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC – Action</td>
<td>July 8, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contacts

Michael Bils  
Transportation Planner  
817-695-9294  
mbils@nctcog.org

Eric Quintana  
Transportation Planner  
(817)608-2381  
equintana@nctcog.org

Natalie Bettger  
Senior Program Manager  
(817)614-8083  
nbettger@nctcog.org
WHAT IS PTASP?

Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan

Improves public transportation safety by guiding transit agencies to more effectively and proactively manage safety risks in their systems

- Agencies receiving FTA Section 5307 funding that operate transit systems must create a plan that includes:
  - Designation of Chief Safety Officer
  - Employee Reporting Program
  - Comprehensive Safety Management System
  - Seven Performance Targets for Each of Three Different Modes
    - Up to 21 Targets, Depending on Provider
  - Must be Adopted by July 21, 2021 (was extended from July 20, 2020 due to COVID)

- PTASP Final Rule 49 CFR Part 673
# Modes of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Route</strong></td>
<td>Services provided on a repetitive, fixed schedule basis along a specific route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand Response</strong></td>
<td>Passenger cars, vans or small buses operating in response to calls from passengers to the transit operator, who then dispatches a vehicle to pick up and transport them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail</strong></td>
<td>Transit modes whose vehicles travel along fixed rails - bars of rolled steel - forming a track.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Definitions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fatality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Injury</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety Event</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Mechanical Failure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Modes for Each Target:

- Fixed Route
- Demand Response
- Rail
PTASP PROVIDER TARGETS

• Providers averaged the past 4-5 years of data to get a baseline average
• Most providers set targets equal to the baseline average, an acceptable strategy to FTA
• Must revisit targets annually
PTASP REGIONAL TARGETS

- NCTCOG as Metropolitan Planning Organization is required to create regional targets, and may establish the process and methodology for setting transit targets
- Obtained individual provider PTASPs and compiled underlying performance data for region, averaging Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 – FY 2019 data to determine baseline
- Analyzed data and optimal approach for regional safety targets, comparing multiple methods and varying levels of improvement over baseline data
- Coordinated with partners including the Texas Department of Transportation, the Houston-Galveston Area Council, and the FTA PTASP Technical Assistance Center
- Engaged stakeholders, including regional transit providers
- Held internal Peer Review seeking feedback on methodology
REGIONAL TARGET CONSIDERATIONS

- **Number of Regional Targets**
  - 21 targets or rolled up into 7

- **Interval for Rate Targets**
  - Per 100k miles or per 1 million miles

- **Target-setting Method**
  - Improvement from baseline average
  - Improvement from projected trendline

- **Target Timeframe**
  - 2 years or 4 years

- **Reduction Level**
  - 5%, 7%, or 10%

- **Fatalities**
  - Is anything above zero acceptable?
POTENTIAL TARGET-SETTING METHOD
PROJECTED TRENDLINE

Safety Events-Total Number
Trendline Projection

-200  -100  0  100  200  300  400

Safety Events
Demand Response  Fixed Route  Rail
POTENTIAL TARGET-SETTING METHOD
BASELINE AVERAGE

Safety Events-Total Number
Demand Response

Baseline Average

Baseline Avg 2020 2021 2022 2023

Safety Events

5% Reduction
7% Reduction
10% Reduction

Baseline Average

160 165 170 175 180 185 190 195

Safety Events

Baseline Avg 2020 2021 2022 2023

Baseline Average

5% Reduction
7% Reduction
10% Reduction
## Proposed Regional Transit Safety Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Baseline Average</th>
<th>Proposed Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fatalities - Total Number</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fatalities - Rate per 100k Miles</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Injuries - Total Number</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>142.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Injuries - Rate per 100k Miles</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Safety Events - Total Number</td>
<td>516.00</td>
<td>490.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Safety Events - Rate per 100k Miles</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. System Reliability - Miles Between Major Mechanical Failures</td>
<td>18,896.00</td>
<td>19,841.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recommending improvement over baseline average of FY 2016 – 2019 data, to be achieved by FY 2023
- Recommending zero fatality targets in line with established regional safety position:
  - Even one death in the transportation system is unacceptable. Staff will work with our partners to develop projects, programs, and policies that assist in eliminating fatalities across all modes of travel.
- Recommending 5% improvement in other measures to be achieved by FY 2023
TRANSIT SAFETY EFFORTS

CURRENT/EXISTING

• Cooperative camera procurement
• Grade crossing improvements
• Employee safety training
• Vehicle inspections
• Between-car barriers for light rail vehicles
• Solar-powered bus stop lighting

POSSIBLE FUTURE EFFORTS

• Enhanced vehicle lighting
• Light rail vehicle rooftop cameras to identify infrastructure failure
• Cameras at grade crossings
• Sidewalk improvements
## Regional Performance Measures Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 26</td>
<td>Regional Transit Safety Targets Provider Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26</td>
<td>STTC Info on PTASP and TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Propose PTASP Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update Regional TAM Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>RTC Info on PTASP and TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23</td>
<td>STTC Action on PTASP to Adopt Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>RTC Action on PTASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shawn Dintino
Transportation Planner III
Transit Management and Planning
sdintino@nctcog.org

Shannon Stevenson
Senior Program Manager
Transit Management and Planning
sstevenson@nctcog.org
2020 TRANSPORTATION SAFETY PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES REPORT

Regional Safety Advisory Committee

Camille Fountain
April 23, 2021

North Central Texas Council of Governments
2020 Safety Performance Measures

- NCTCOG Crash and Fatality Statistics
- Contributing Factors for Serious Injury and Fatality Crashes
- Crash Rates by County
- COVID Crash Rate Analysis
- Traffic Incident Management Course Attendance
- Responder Struck-By Statistics
- HazMat Statistics
- Roadside Assistance Program Performance
## 2016-2020 Crash Statistics: 12-County MPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>13,905</td>
<td>13,102</td>
<td>13,209</td>
<td>13,940</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>-26.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>55,680</td>
<td>50,556</td>
<td>49,754</td>
<td>55,254</td>
<td>48,291</td>
<td>-12.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>12,232</td>
<td>11,965</td>
<td>11,762</td>
<td>12,192</td>
<td>9,551</td>
<td>-21.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>-11.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>-8.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>-3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>-7.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>-10.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>34,732</td>
<td>34,312</td>
<td>33,049</td>
<td>32,458</td>
<td>27,428</td>
<td>-15.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>-3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130,185</td>
<td>123,718</td>
<td>121,876</td>
<td>127,935</td>
<td>108,948</td>
<td>-14.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>% Change 2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>22.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-48.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>9.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>755</strong></td>
<td><strong>758</strong></td>
<td><strong>699</strong></td>
<td><strong>724</strong></td>
<td><strong>820</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.26%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Ten Contributing Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Description</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Speeding - (Overlimit / Unsafe Speed / Failed to Control Speed)</td>
<td>32.37%</td>
<td>32.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Driver Related (Distraction in Vehicle / Driver Inattention / Road Rage / Drove Without Headlights, Cell/Mobile Device Use - (Talking / Texting / Other / Unknown-[0.35%]))</td>
<td>10.01%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Changed Lane When Unsafe</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Faulty Evasive Action</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Failed to Drive in Single Lane</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Followed Too Closely</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Under Influence – (Had Been Drinking / Alcohol / Drug)</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Disabled in Traffic Lane</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Fatigued or Asleep</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Pedestrian Failed to Yield Right of Way to Vehicle</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

*Contributing Factor Analysis includes Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Contributing Factors on limited access facilities.*
2020 Crash Rates By County

Note:
Crash Rates calculated for limited access facilities: IH, SH, and US mainlanes.
2020 COVID Crash Rate Analysis - Limited Access Facilities
Traffic Incident Management Attendance Overview

- First Responders Training (2003-2021): **3,266 Attendees**

  - Police, 1,587
  - Fire, 518
  - Courtesy Patrol, 545
  - Tow, 121
  - EMS/ME, 30
  - DPS, 263
  - Other, 187

- Executive Level Training (2005-2021): **936 Attendees**
# Responder Struck-By Statistics

## 1st Responder Struck-By “Fatality” Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Police</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Fire/EMS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Towing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Roadside Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responder Fatality</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NCTCOG Roadside Assistance Patrol Struck-By “Non-Fatality” Stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadside Assistance Patrol</th>
<th>Dallas County</th>
<th>LBJ Express</th>
<th>NTE Express</th>
<th>NTTA</th>
<th>Tarrant County</th>
<th>NCTCOG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
The regional Roadside Assistance Patrol Program struck-by data is collected directly from regional mobility assistance patrol providers.

**Notes:**
1. 2020 non-fatality stats are preliminary, waiting to receive final stats
2. *Information Pending from reporting agency
2020 HazMat Incidents: 16 Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erath</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Pinto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somervell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Response Center
Data current as of January 21, 2021
Regional Roadside Assistance Patrol Program

Note: Operational Routes as of April 15, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrol</th>
<th>2019 Assists</th>
<th>2020 Assists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCSO</td>
<td>68,649</td>
<td>67,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSO</td>
<td>27,135</td>
<td>23,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTTA</td>
<td>44,702</td>
<td>43,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTE</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>3,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBJ</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>4,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Roadside Assistance Patrol Program

In 2020, Dallas/Fort Worth Area Roadside Assistance Patrols provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Assists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver Assistance / Stalled Vehicle</td>
<td>65,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy Check / Directions</td>
<td>26,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Assistance</td>
<td>2,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debris Removal</td>
<td>17,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection to First Responders</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vehicle Check</td>
<td>7,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Combined Assists: 128,849

Note: 2,467 assists were either not found, cancelled before a patrol vehicle arrived, or did not specify the service provided.
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