APPENDIX E: Half-Mile Area Improvement Prioritization – Initial Trial Methodology Details

To provide opportunities for the greatest number of additional people to walk or bike to DART stations by building sidewalk, shared use path, and crosswalk connections, the prioritization of identified improvements was structured to provide balance between estimating this objective accurately and applying the methodology to a large study area.

Initially, a prioritization scheme that attempted to track as closely as possible to potential ridership increases was tested for the Parker Road Station in Plano, with adjustments for safety, key destination access, and equity. Though some of the elements of this initial prioritization methodology were ultimately discarded for this study, they are documented here as being potentially useful for later studies on a smaller scale. Also, many of the assumptions and methodologies explained below were retained in the ultimate methodology.

For the ridership component of the initial methodology, the likelihood of land parcels around each station to contribute potential transit customers walking or biking to the station was assumed to be related to three primary factors:

1. The distance of the parcel from the station,
2. The number of people living or employed at the parcel, and
3. People’s tolerance for different levels of stress experienced along the route between the parcel and the station.

For the first input to ridership, distance, NCTCOG had previously collected appraisal district parcel data from Collin and Dallas Counties and provided a GIS shapefile containing the data. Consultants used ArcGIS Network Analyst tools to calculate the distance of each parcel to the station along the nearest available walking route, which was created by editing sidewalk shapefiles provided by NCTCOG to ensure end-to-end connectivity. The NCTCOG sidewalk files were found to require significant numbers of edits in this regard.

For the second component of ridership, population density, NCTCOG had included in the parcel-level data assumed population and employment values for individual parcels in the study area that had been calculated as part of a previous project. These values had been calculated by land use based on building square footage and assumed densities (for example 300 square feet/person for office land use).

Consultants used GIS tools to tabulate the total number of people who might use each sidewalk and crosswalk segment for first and last mile trips based on the parcel population totals and the shortest distance routes along available sidewalks and crosswalks between each parcel and the station. This collection of routes was designated as the “pedestrian tree” for the station. Figure E1 shows an example pedestrian tree for Parker Road Station, with one “branch” of the tree to a 662-resident apartment complex highlighted in purple that could be shortened by constructing new sidewalk along a path worn in the grass by pedestrians who already take the shortcut.

This technique allowed modeling of how individual travelers would collectively contribute greater ridership increases along pedestrian routes with the highest density of population and employment.

---


the station who would be willing or able to travel via sidewalks and crosswalks of varying PLTS stress levels. Absent more specific data, these percentages were aligned loosely (and admittedly speculatively) with survey data about the four types of cyclists as found in a recent NCTCOG survey illustrated in Figure E3. The assumed split for different groups of transit riders follows:

- 45% of transit riders were assumed to not walk or bike to transit regardless of the stress level, either based on ability or preference for car travel (similar to 48% No Way No How for bikes).
- Up to 35% of transit riders were assumed to walk or bike to transit if they could travel exclusively on PLTS 1 or PLTS 2 sidewalk and crosswalk facilities (similar to 36% Interested But Concerned for bikes).
- Up to 15% of transit riders were assumed willing to travel on PLTS 3 facilities (similar to 14% Enthusiastic & Confident for bikes).
- Up to 5% of transit riders were assumed willing to travel on PLTS 4 facilities (similar to 2% Strong & Fearless for bikes).

More research would be ideal to investigate actual values for these assumptions.

Note that some of the in the PLTS 3 or 4 categories might be termed transit-dependent riders who don’t have access to a car and for whom bus transfers to the station are not sufficiently convenient. Each of the above assumed percentages was reduced based on a sliding scale for the distance of the parcel in question from the station. The sliding scale was based on data from a 2015 University of Denver study illustrated in Figure E4 that explored the proximity relationship of the non-car commute share of Denver workers based on transit proximity. The study found that the average percentage of people living or working within 1 mile of the station who used a non-car commute mode was about 18.5%. Within a half-mile of the station, the percentage increased to about 24.5%.

As shown in Figure E5, plotting these two points from Figure E4 in a linear relationship allows for an extrapolated assumption that no more than 30% of people living or working immediately adjacent to a transit station (at a theoretical 0 mile walking distance) would use a non-car commute mode. It was surmised that the Denver data (as with all real-world cases) would represent non-ideal conditions constrained by imperfect sidewalks and pedestrian stress levels similar to those present in the Dallas metroplex and other cities. Therefore, since the object of the above-described analysis was to account for pedestrian stress more directly, it was surmised that a nominal value of 20% be added to the equation shown in Figure E5 to normalize the relationship for ideal conditions and adjustment using the PLTS methods instead. This adjusted relationship for a proximity factor to
provide the percentage of transit riders using non-car modes to reach the station under ideal sidewalk and crosswalk conditions based on distance from the station is shown in Figure 66.

Separate ArcGIS models were created around the Parker Road Station for two different partial pedestrian networks in addition to the full existing pedestrian network described earlier. These represented pedestrian networks that would be accepted by the segments of the transit riding population “Interested but Concerned” and “Enthused and Confident” about walking or riding to the station.

One network included only PLTS 1 and PLTS 2 links as route options (the blue lines in Figure 9) and therefore served the most limited number of parcels. Another network allowed for travel on PLTS 3 segments (the orange lines in Figure 9) in addition to PLTS 1 and PLTS 2. This network would serve a larger number of parcels. An overall estimate of existing ridership for Parker Road Station was calculated using the above-described inputs. For each parcel, a separate calculation for each PLTS group of transit riders was made as follows:

PLTS 1+2: Parcel population x Proximity Factor x 35% of transit riders in PLTS Group
PLTS 3: Parcel population x Proximity Factor x 15% of transit riders in PLTS Group
PLTS 4: Parcel population x Proximity Factor x 5% of transit riders in PLTS Group
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**Figure E6: Findings of 2015 University of Denver Study**

![Chart showing non-car commute share by transit proximity]


**Figure E5: Extrapolated Relationship from 2015 University of Denver Study**
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**Figure E6: Adjusted Relationship Assumed for Proximity Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Population Density</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance / Proximity of Improvements to the Station</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkshed Trip Length Reduction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Types and Key Destinations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash History</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Benefit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity / Transit Dependent Populations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Figure E4: Findings of 2015 University of Denver Study**

Average 24.5%

Average 18.5%

Walking Distance to Station (miles)
Note that the proximity factor was potentially different for each PLTS group, indicating that more selective travelers could only reach the station by following a longer path consistent with their tolerance for more stressful conditions. For parcels not connected to the station at all at a given PLTS (including PLTS 4) no ridership was assumed for that parcel as a simplifying assumption (despite the fact that many travelers, including those dependent on transit, can and do walk to the station without the benefit of sidewalk or crosswalk facilities).

The resulting estimate of existing non-car commuting trips to and from Parker Road Station was 631 people for existing conditions. This compared very favorably with 2015 survey data that had been provided by DART, indicating that 619 of the daily average riders either walked or biked to Parker Road Station.

Proposed sidewalk and crosswalk improvements were then added to the ArcGIS models for Parker Road Station so that an increase in ridership could be forecast. These are illustrated in Figure E7, which is an annotated screen capture from the GIS model where sidewalks and crosswalks are shown in purple or blue and parcel centroids are shown as brown circles.

With the originally proposed improvements, including a shared use path and pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB) extending east of the station across K Avenue, forecast ridership by non-car commute to the station was forecast to increase from 631 people to 1,018 people, a 61% increase.

Figure E7: Excerpt of Sidewalk Network, Including Originally Proposed Improvements near Parker Road Station