Metropolitan Planning Area
209 cities
13 cities > 100,000 population
127 School Districts

Metropolitan Planning Area Population
2018 Estimate = 7.4 million
2045 Forecast = 11.2 million
AGENDA

Welcome and Introductions

Regional Overview
- Pedestrian Safety Public Survey Results
- TxDOT Research Project: North Texas Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Analysis

Local Analysis and Initiatives Currently Underway
- Understanding Dallas District Pedestrian Safety Issues
- Vision Zero Policy: Dallas

Draft Goals and Policies

Project Schedule and Upcoming Events
- PSAP Document Timeline
- TxDOT Grant to Train Law Enforcement
- 2020 Virtual Traffic Safety Conference
IN ATTENDANCE

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)
Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART)
Trinity Metro
Parkland Hospital
Children's Health
Cook Children’s Health Care System
Texas Health Resources
JPS Health Network
Downtown Dallas Improvement District
Downtown Fort Worth, Inc.
American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
MedStar Mobile Healthcare
Urban Strategies

Denton County Transportation Authority (DCTA)
Blue Zones Project
Tarrant County
Dallas County
Fort Worth ISD
Dallas ISD
I Have a Dream Foundation Dallas
City of Dallas
City of Fort Worth
Donna Mack, Disability Diplomat
City of Plano
City of Richardson

The Texas Municipal Police Association (TMPA)
Texas Transportation Institute (TTI)
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.
MOBILITY 2045 GOALS & POLICIES

Themes of the Mobility Plan (Excerpt)

Providing Traveler Choice

- All urban trips less than 2 miles should have non-motorized or transit modes of travel
- All urban roadways should be designed & constructed to accommodate at least 3 modes
- Roadway projects should implement context-sensitive design compatible with surrounding land uses
### MOBILITY 2045 PLAN POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTP Reference #</th>
<th>Active Transportation Policies</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP3-001</td>
<td>Support planning and design of a multimodal transportation network with seamless interconnected active transportation facilities that promotes walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes.</td>
<td>Complete Streets, Context Sensitive Design, ADA Transition Plans, Local Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP3-002</td>
<td>Implement pedestrian &amp; bicycle facilities that meet accessibility requirements &amp; provide safe, convenient, &amp; interconnected transportation for people of all ages and abilities.</td>
<td>Regional Pedestrian Network, Safe Routes To School, Safety Improvements, Americans with Disabilities Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP3-003</td>
<td>Support programs and activities that promote pedestrian and bicycle safety, health, &amp; education.</td>
<td>Safety Education Programs &amp; Campaigns, Healthy &amp; Livable Communities, Enforcement, Technical Training &amp; education, Mapping Facilities &amp; plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT IS A PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ACTION PLAN? (PSAP)

“A Pedestrian Safety Action Plan is a plan developed by community stakeholders that is intended to improve pedestrian safety in the community. An objective of the guide is to help state and local officials know where to begin to address pedestrian safety issues. It is also intended to assist agencies in further enhancing their existing pedestrian safety programs and activities, including identifying safety problems and selecting optimal solutions.”

How To Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (FHWA 2009)
PLAN OVERVIEW

Purpose, Goals & Policies

Identify Prioritized Pedestrian Safety Corridors

Recommended Countermeasures, Programs, Project Types and Performance Measures

Policy Recommendations

Action Plan (Actionable Items)
ROLE OF THIS COMMITTEE

What can you and your agency contribute?
KEY PLAN ELEMENT: OUTREACH THROUGHOUT

- **Ongoing**
  - Committee Meetings (3 total)
  - Inform us of Public Outreach Events / Community Meetings

- **Ended**
  - Regional public safety survey
REGIONAL PEDESTRIAN SAFETY SURVEY

Source: NCTCOG
We want your opinion about walking in DFW!

Walking is a mode of transportation. What can TxDOT and NCTCOG do to improve walking as a transportation option in the Metroplex?

A pedestrian should be able to enjoy a safe and connected network as a transportation option. This clean mode of travel improves health, reduces stress and helps reduce traffic congestion. And walking plays a unique role in meeting local transportation challenges.
Overview

- The survey was live for two months between **May 6 – July 5, 2019**
- Used online tool, MetroQuest, facilitated by TxDOT
- Five sections: **5-7 minutes** total time to complete
- **1,045 participants** (Gave out two $100 gift cards as incentives)
- Gender of Respondents: **56% Female, 44% Male**
- Age of respondents was evenly distributed from **ages 25-64**
Overview

56% Female
44% Male

Age Demographics of Survey Respondents

- 18 and under: 2
- 19-24: 18
- 25-34: 152
- 35-44: 188
- 45-54: 145
- 55-64: 150
- 65+: 72
Barriers
Respondents were asked to rank the “Top 3” pedestrian barriers they would most like to see addressed.
Barriers

Total number of times each barrier was indicated as a "Top 3" selection as a type of barrier they would like to see addressed by transportation professionals.

- No Sidewalks/Trails: 702
- Bad driver behaviors: 467
- Sidewalk/Trail Conditions: 500
- Disconnected Facilities: 463
- Lack of ADA Facilities: 126
- Limited access: 265
Respondents were asked to drag/drop markers of four categories onto a regional map to locate:

**Safety Concerns, Destinations, areas with No Facility, and Pedestrian Barriers**
Respondents were asked to drag/drop markers of four categories onto a regional map, to ID Safety Concerns, Destinations, areas with No Facility, and Pedestrian Barriers.

Respondents could also use a dropdown menu within the marker to “tag” the marker with a specific concern, or to leave a comment of their own on the marker after dragging/dropping it onto the map.
The map below shows the location of markers (2,596 red Xs) dropped on the map to ID pedestrian barriers.
Total Number of Markers Dragged/Dropped Onto the Map Categorized by Group

- Safety Concerns: 1,166
- No Facility: 676
- Pedestrian Barriers: 470
- Destinations: 284

Total Number of Markers
Total Number of Markers Dragged/Dropped Onto the Map by Category and Total Comments in Each Section

- **SAFETY CONCERNS**: 1,166 markers, 712 comments
- **NO FACILITY**: 676 markers, 361 comments
- **PEDESTRIAN BARRIERS**: 470 markers, 268 comments
- **DESTINATIONS**: 284 markers, 128 comments

Legend:
- Blue: Total Number of Markers
- Red: Total Number of Comments Per Category
Top Comments in Each Mapped Category

- **Safety Concerns**
  - Speeding Cars Along Routes: 252 Tags
  - No Sidewalk Along Roadway: 297 Tags
  - No Sidewalk Across Highway: 38 Tags
  - Shopping Centers: 43 Tags

- **Total Number of Comments Per Category**: 712
- **No Sidewalk Along Roadway**: 361 Tags
- **No Sidewalk Across Highway**: 268 Tags
- **Shopping Centers**: 128 Tags
Priorities

Respondents were asked to rate pedestrian issues and concerns.

1 being the least preferred and
5 being the most preferred
Accommodations:
Which pedestrian facilities do you feel comfortable using?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>PAVED SHOULDERS</th>
<th>SHARED-USE PATHS</th>
<th>SIDEWALKS 3-4 FEET WIDE</th>
<th>SIDEWALKS 5-10 FEET WIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least Preferred</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Preferred</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety: How valuable are these safety measures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREference</th>
<th>Most Preferred</th>
<th>Least Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREFERENCE</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROSSWALK STRI PING</strong></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MI DBLOCK PEDESTRI AN SI GNAL</strong></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDESTRI AN SI GNALS SOUNDS</strong></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPARATION BY SPACE</strong></td>
<td>417</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDESTRI AN LI GHTING</strong></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERTI CAL SEPARATION</strong></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall: What are your opinions on the following?

FACILITY NEEDS

I would walk more if there were sidewalks/trails near my house that connect to destinations.

PERCEPTION OF SAFETY

If I had a child, I would let them walk to a nearby school or store.

WALKING

I would like to travel more by foot than I do now.

**PREFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Most Preferred</th>
<th>Least Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education: Where should our focus be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Most Preferred</th>
<th>Least Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLIST EDUCATION</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER EDUCATION</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN EDUCATION</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREFERENCE:

- 1: Least Preferred
- 2: Preferred
- 3: Preferred
- 4: Preferred
- 5: Most Preferred

Values represent the number of responses for each category.
RESULTS ONLINE

NCTCOG.org/PedSafetyPlan
• Code 5 years of pedestrian / bicycle crash reports for 12-county region (2014-2018) using methodology developed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)

• Review the crash narrative/diagram during the coding process to understand the cause of each crash

• Analysis of identified corridors with high concentrations of pedestrian / bicycle crashes

• Provide safety countermeasures and recommendations for further study for these corridors
OVERVIEW OF CRASH TYPING RESULTS
REGIONAL DATA
6,926 Total Pedestrian Crashes in MPA from 2014-2018

679 Total Pedestrian Fatalities Regionwide from 2014-2018

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
1 in 5 of all fatalities for all modes of travel is a pedestrian.

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
95% of Fatal & Serious Crashes are Happening IN URBAN AREAS

Source: TxDOT's Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
More than \(\frac{2}{3}\) of fatal and serious injury pedestrian crashes are happening at non-intersections.

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
67% of all fatal & serious injury pedestrian crashes involve MALES.

Source: TxDOT's Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
AGES 23–27:
Age range with the highest number of fatal and serious pedestrian crashes for MALES

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
AGES 23–24

Age range with the highest number of fatal and serious pedestrian crashes for FEMALES

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
The #1 reported contributing factor in all fatal & serious injury pedestrian crashes is **ATTENTION DIVERTED FROM DRIVING**

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICANS comprise 16% of total population in MPA & 30% of fatalities & serious injury pedestrian crashes.

Source: TxDOT’s Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
80% of All Fatal & Serious Injury Pedestrian Crashes happen in DARK LIGHTING CONDITIONS

Source: TxDOT's Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
THE HIGHEST NUMBER of FATAL & SERIOUS INJURY pedestrian crashes for men and women occur on FRIDAYS.

Source: TxDOT's Crash Records Information System (CRIS) for MPA region from 2014-2018
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

- Reviewed crash density (1-mile grid)
- Identified with crash clusters
- Manual review of crash clusters to identify high-incidence crash corridors
- Ranked corridors by crash density (ratio # of crashes per distance (miles))
- Provide an overview of each high-incidence corridor
IDENTIFIED HIGH-INCIDENCE (HIGH-RISK) CRASH CORRIDORS
High-Incidence Corridor

- 15 Crashes
- 10 Fatal/Serious
- 5 Hit & Run
- Off-System
- 2-4 Travel Lanes
- Urban
- 13% Alcohol/Drug Involvement

High-incidence corridor: Maple Avenue, Dallas
High-Incidence Corridor

- 16 Crashes
- 7 Fatal/Serious
- 6 Hit & Run
- On-System
- 2–4, 4+ Travel Lanes
- Urban
- 13% Alcohol/Drug Involvement
High-Incidence Hot Spot

- 7 Crashes
- 5 Fatal/Serious
- 3 Hit & Run
- Off System
- 2-4, 4+ Travel Lanes
- Urban
- 14% Alcohol/Drug Involvement

High-incidence hot spot: Lemmon Avenue, Dallas
Regional Priority Pedestrian Safety Corridors

Methodology
*Under Development*

- **Regional Framework (e.g. Mobility Plan)**
  - Locations of Crash Clusters
  - Review Corridor Context: Land Use, Roadway Characteristics
  - Use a Systemic Approach to Identify “Regional” Priority Safety Corridors

- **Local Planning (Examples)**
  - Local Safety Action Plans
  - Active Transportation Plans
  - Vision Zero Plans
  - Road Safety Audits
  - Other local “high incidence corridors” may be designated through local plans / detailed planning
Proven Safety Countermeasures
Examples of Local Analysis and Initiatives

Fort Worth
Dallas
Dallas County
Understanding Dallas District Pedestrian Safety Issues

PSAP Committee Meeting #2
NCTCOG
May 29, 2020
• Nationally, pedestrian fatalities increased 27% while all other traffic fatalities decreased 14% (2007-2016)
• 2016 Texas had 9th highest pedestrian fatality rate of 2.44 per 100k population
• 2016 Dallas County had 4th highest pedestrian fatalities with 84 (FARS)
Dallas District Pedestrian Crashes 2008-2017 (KABC)
Fatal Crashes vs. Pedestrian Fatal Crashes 2008-2017
Population and Pedestrian Crashes by County

- Harris: 243 crashes/100k pop
- Dallas: 267 crashes/100k pop
- Bexar: 328 crashes/100k pop
Dallas County Ped. Crashes

[Graph showing percentages of male and female pedestrian crashes compared to population percentages.]

[Graph showing percentages of crashes for different racial groups: White, Hispanic, Black, Others.]
Population and Pedestrian Crashes by City

- Houston: 340 crashes/100k pop
- San Antonio: 365 crashes/100k pop
- Dallas: 350 crashes/100k pop
- Austin: 319 crashes/100k pop
- Fort Worth: 226 crashes/100k pop

2008-2017 Ped Crash (KABC) vs 2017 Population
City of Dallas Ped. Crashes
Dallas District

Collin 685 (8%)
Dallas 6707 (80%)
Denton 620 (7%)
Ellis 136 (2%)
Kaufman 74 (1%)
Navarro 63 (1%)
Rockwall 47 (1%)

County

City

Dallas 4696 (70%)
Garland 430 (6%)
Grand Prairie 174 (3%)
Irving 412 (6%)
Mesquite 216 (3%)
Richardson 160 (2%)
Others 619 (9%)

Roadway

Freeway 328 (7%)
Non-Freeway 4368 (93%)

On/Off-System

On-System 699 (16%)
Off-System 3669 (84%)

KABCrashes
8332

K – 680 (8%)
A – 1841 (22%)
B – 3539 (43%)
C – 2272 (27%)

PDO and Unknown severity not used

TXDOT reportable crashes only
Period: 2008-2017

Texas A&M Transportation Institute
Freeway Pedestrian Crashes

• 328 crashes on Dallas Freeways
• Clusters were formed if crashes were within 600 ft. each other
• 59 clusters
• Clusters were ranked by crash frequency and crashes per MVMT
Freeway Pedestrian Crashes

- IH30, St. Francis-Dilido
  - #1 by Frequency (1 crash/year)
  - #6 by Crash Rate
- Constructed Projects
  - Glare Screens
  - St. Francis Pedestrian Bridge
DAL Pedestrian Counts

- 54 signals
- 142 stop-controlled
- Extrapolated counts to 24 hr. estimates
Est. Pedestrian Exposure

- LRT Stops
- Speed Limits
- Land Use
- Sidewalks
- Traffic signals
- Bus/LRT Stops
- Schools
Exposure: Proximity to Schools
Estimated Intersection Daily Pedestrian Volumes, City of Dallas
### High Risk Dallas Signals (on system)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street1</th>
<th>Street2</th>
<th>Risk Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBJ WBSR</td>
<td>Skillman</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>Morrell</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner</td>
<td>John West</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Trinity Forest</td>
<td>Jim Miller</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scyene</td>
<td>St Augustine</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie View</td>
<td>Great Trinity Forest</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central SBSR</td>
<td>Lemmon</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie View</td>
<td>LBJ EBSR</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Trinity Forest</td>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central NBSR</td>
<td>Mockingbird</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie View</td>
<td>Ledbetter</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coit RD</td>
<td>IH 635 WB FR</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKNER</td>
<td>GROVECREST/MATTISON</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner</td>
<td>Chenault</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREST LN</td>
<td>CENTRAL SBSR</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckner</td>
<td>Poppy</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANN ARBOR</td>
<td>R L THORNTON NBSR</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Dallas Traffic Signal Pedestrian Crashes by Risk Category](image)
### High Risk Dallas Stops (on system)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street1</th>
<th>Street2</th>
<th>Risk Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E LEDBETTER DR</td>
<td>CORRIGAN DR</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W NORTHWEST HWY</td>
<td>STARLIGHT RD</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E LEDBETTER DR</td>
<td>CORRIGAN AVE</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S BUCKNER BLVD</td>
<td>NORVELL DR</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT TRINITY FOREST WAY</td>
<td>STONEPORT DR</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S LANCASTER RD</td>
<td>ARDEN RD</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT TRINITY FOREST WAY</td>
<td>CRANFILL DR</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY HINES BLVD</td>
<td>STOREY LN</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT TRINITY FOREST WAY</td>
<td>S MURDEAUX LN</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S CENTRAL SERV NB</td>
<td>JORDAN ST</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N CENTRAL SERV NB</td>
<td>BONNER DR</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W NORTHWEST HWY</td>
<td>KENDALE DR</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT TRINITY FOREST WAY</td>
<td>HILLBURN DR</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT TRINITY FOREST WAY</td>
<td>HILLBURN DR</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON RD</td>
<td>BERRY TRL</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST GRAND AVE</td>
<td>CORONADO AVE</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W NORTHWEST HWY</td>
<td>STARLIGHT RD</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E LEDBETTER DR</td>
<td>KILDARE AVE</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S WALTON WALKER SERV NB</td>
<td>PREAKNESS LN</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST GRAND AVE</td>
<td>PHILIP AVE</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARVIN D LOVE SERV SB</td>
<td>GLENNLYONS DR</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT TRINITY FOREST WAY</td>
<td>SATINWOOD DR</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S BUCKNER BLVD</td>
<td>TILLMAN ST</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S R L THORNTON SERV NB</td>
<td>E PAGE AVE</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions (Dallas District)

- Pedestrian crashes have been increasing since 2010
- Percent of all fatal crashes that are pedestrian related has also been increasing since 2010
- Males are overrepresented in pedestrian crashes
- African American (Blacks) are overrepresented in Dallas County
- Hispanics are overrepresented in City of Dallas
- Most pedestrian crashes are on non-freeways
- Most pedestrian crashes are off system (cities/counties)
Conclusions Cont’d

• Pedestrian Exposure (volume) Variables
  - CBD, schools within 1 mile, comm. + multifamily land use, speed limit, bus stops, special generator

• Pedestrian Crash Safety Performance Function Variables
  - AADT, Minor_{\text{AADT}}/Major_{\text{AADT}}, pedestrian volume, comm. + multifamily land use, bus stops

• 18 High-Risk Signalized Dallas Intersections (On-System)
• 24 High-Risk Stop-Controlled Dallas Intersections (On-System)
Minh Le, P.E., PMP
Dallas Program Manager
Associate Research Engineer
Research & Implementation Division
m-le@tti.tamu.edu

https://tti.tamu.edu/publications/catalog/record/?id=45809
Overview

• State of Traffic Safety in Dallas
• Vision Zero City Council Resolution
• Dallas High Injury Network
• Connect Dallas integration
• Next Steps
Dallas in Comparison to Top 25 Largest U.S. Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Traffic Fatality Rate (Per 100,000 Citizens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>15.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>13.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dallas has 5th highest traffic fatality rate

Source: NHTSA, 2017
Dallas in Comparison to Top 25 Largest U.S. Cities

Pedestrian Fatality Rates of 25 Largest U.S. Cities
(Per 100,000 Population)

Dallas has 5th highest pedestrian traffic fatality rate

Source: NHTSA, 2017
How Many People Die on Dallas Roadways Each Year?

Traffic-Fatalities in Dallas 2006-2018
Source: TxDOT
From 2014 to 2018 there were 4,403 fatal and severe injury crashes in Dallas.
Contributing Factors & Locations

- 86% of fatal crashes occurred on roads with posted speeds of 30-45 mph
- Nearly 70% of all pedestrian fatalities happened between 6:00 PM & 6:00 AM
- While crashes for all modes are typically intersection-related (86%), most pedestrian crashes (66%) are not intersection-related.

Fatal and Severe Injury Crashes by Race and Ethnicity

African Americans are disproportionately overrepresented in fatal and severe injury crashes, making equity a major focus of Vision Zero in Dallas.

Crash data source: TxDOT (2013-2017); Demographic Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Council Action

In December 2019, City Council adopted a resolution that:

1) Commits the City to a Vision Zero goal of zero traffic fatalities and a 50 percent reduction in severe injuries by 2030.

2) Directs the City Manager to develop a Vision Zero Action Plan by December 2021.

3) Directs the City Manager to develop a Vision Zero Task Force that will collaborate with City Departments on development of a Vision Zero Action Plan.

4) Directs key City Departments to participate in Vision Zero Action Plan development, implementation, and evaluation.
City of Dallas High Injury Network: Corridor Approach

- 50% of Fatal and Severe Injury crashes in Dallas occurred on 8% of the road network
- Significant Focus on the Core of Dallas road network
- Focus on entire corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Fatal and Severe Injury Crashes</th>
<th>Street Length (Center-line Miles)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Roadway Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Dallas High Injury Network: Segment Approach

- **50%** of Fatal and Severe Injury crashes in Dallas occurred on 6% of the road network
- Equity in addressing entirety of road network
- Addresses more crashes-prone areas with less expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Fatal and Severe Injury Crashes</th>
<th>Street Length (Center-line Miles)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Roadway Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Dallas High Injury Network: Modal Approach

- Non-freeway crashes occurring within City Limits from (2014-2018)
- Analyzed exclusively by mode and includes only crashes ending in fatality or injury
- Calculated by number of crashes occurring per centerline mile of streets
TxDOT Research Project: High Incidence Corridors

- High incidence corridors were identified through collaboration of NCTCOG and TxDOT Research and Technology Implementation Division (RTI)

- City of Dallas Pedestrian High Injury Network overlapped on nearly every segment identified
Connect Dallas (Strategic Mobility Plan)

- **Purpose:**
  - Modernize how we prioritize transportation resources
  - Align transportation efforts with the City’s goals
- **Anticipated Council adoption: Summer/Fall 2020**
- **Plan Deliverables:**
  - Project Evaluation Tool
  - Enhanced Prioritization Process
  - 5-Year Capital Projects List
  - Policy Modernization

  ![Diagram](Safety_Vision_Zero.png)
Next Steps

• **Develop a Vision Zero Action Plan:**
  A foundational document that establishes the strategies that Dallas will employ to achieve the goal of zero traffic fatalities and a 50% reduction in severe injuries by 2030. Deadline to develop plan: December 2021.

• **Establish a Vision Zero Task Force.**

• **Finalize crash data dashboard.**
Thank You
PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ACTION PLAN:
DRAFT PURPOSE, GOALS AND POLICIES

Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Committee – Meeting #2
North Central Texas Council of Governments
Matt Fall – May 29, 2020
PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

A guide for state, regional and local agencies

To identify current conditions and targeted areas for action

To serve as the framework for NCTCOG, local agencies and TxDOT in enhancing existing pedestrian facilities and programming for new projects, programs and policies
GOALS

Eliminate

Eliminate all fatal & serious injury pedestrian crashes across the region by 2050

Balance

Balance the safety and needs of all users and abilities, with priority given to the most vulnerable users

Design, Construct, Maintain

Design, construct and maintain facilities so pedestrians can travel safely & with a high level of comfort

Integrate

Integrate roadway design to provide most direct alignments, while prioritizing pedestrians

Double

Double regionwide pedestrian commute mode share for pedestrians by 2045
Proven pedestrian FHWA safety countermeasures will be integrated as part of all future roadway projects and a data-driven approach with countermeasure selection.

Priority will be given to implement safety countermeasures and other actions in the regional Priority Pedestrian Safety Corridors.

Multimodal Level of Service (MMLOS) analysis will be used by NCTCOG, local agencies, and TxDOT as part of the roadway design process.

Law enforcement personnel will be provided information and training in the enforcement of laws concerning the rights and responsibilities of the most vulnerable roadway users.

Educational programs and resources will be developed and made available for communities, schools, and driver’s education programs, which emphasize responsible roadway sharing for all modes. (Enhancement of existing Mobility Plan policy)
Proven Safety Countermeasures
## ACTION ITEMS

### RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
<th>5 E’s</th>
<th>Implementors</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Costs ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-intersections pedestrian fatal and serious injuries</td>
<td>Examples: Mid-block crossing treatments to be considered along high-risk corridors. Outreach to schools and businesses adjacent corridors with high numbers of reported mid-block crashes.</td>
<td>Examples: Engineering; Education; Encouragement; Enforcement; Evaluation</td>
<td>Examples: City; County; Transportation Agency; TxDOT; NCTCOG; School District; Non-Profit Organization</td>
<td>Examples: Ongoing; Short Term (1-5 years); Long Term (5-10+ years)</td>
<td>Examples: High $$$; Medium $$; Low $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION OF PURPOSE, GOALS AND POLICIES
NEXT STEPS

1. Send NCTCOG feedback regarding the purpose, goals and policies

2. PSAP Committee meeting #3 on September 3, 2020 (DRAFT Plan)

3. Presenting final DRAFT PSAP at November 18, 2020 BPAC meeting

4. Presenting final DRAFT PSAP at December 10, 2020 RTC meeting
PROJECT SCHEDULE

1. Finalize Prioritized Pedestrian Safety Corridors

2. Draft document completed July 2020 and reviewed by stakeholders (August – September 2020)

3. Final Draft PSAP presented to BPAC, STTC and RTC

4. Potential Road Safety Audits

5. Integration into Mobility Plan – MTP 2050
Training Workshops online or in-person TBD future dates

Course includes:
- Detailed look at Texas Transportation Code
- Review of right-of-way laws
- Different bicycle and pedestrian crash scenarios
- Importance of enforcement

Additional Resources:
- Roll-call video
- Educational handout to use during enforcement (coming this spring)
- City-level training including local ordinances not covered by state law (available by request)

For more information please visit: https://groups.tti.tamu.edu/cts/lepedbike/
LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING ON PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE LAWS

May also be Hosted by an Area Law Enforcement Agency

CONTACT to schedule future online or in-person training:

neal-johnson@tti.tamu.edu
graber@tti.tamu.edu
2020 VIRTUAL Traffic Safety Conference

Originally scheduled for June 10-12 in College Station, Texas

groups.tti.tamu.edu/cts/2020-traffic-safety-conference/
DISCUSSION

OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?
THANK YOU!

CONTACT:

Kevin Kokes, AICP
kkokes@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9275

Matt Fall
mfall@nctcog.org
(817) 695-9207