GUIDING PRINCIPLES





2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The planning process used for the creation of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is prescribed by state and federal regulations, but the vision that drives the process is developed locally; this chapter describes that process as implemented in the development of this plan.

It also describes the process by which performance measures are used to gauge whether the recommended program of transportation projects supports the established vision and goals that were developed. Together the vision, goals, objectives, and performance measures comprise RMS 2050 MTP's "Guiding Principles."

This MTP visioning process is therefore focused on gathering locally generated plans and information, as well as the knowledge and wisdom of the local community, while following the state and federal guidelines that direct the general planning process. Development of the MTP requires the collaboration of regional stakeholders, including local, state and federal agencies and governing bodies, public and private transportation providers, the business community, and includes extensive public input. All these stakeholders must work together so that the community's vision and goals coalesce into welldefined principles that will guide transportation policy and investment decisions within the El Paso Urbanized Area. The resulting recommendations and proposed improvements will impact all users of the transportation system.

FEDERAL GUIDELINES

In 2015, the FAST Act became the fifth intermodal surface transportation bill passed by Congress since 1991, the previous four being: The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) of 1998, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) of 2009, and the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) of 2012.

The FAST Act continues the eight federal planning factors established under ISTEA and expanded under SAFETEA-LU, while adding two additional factors for consideration in the planning process. The following ten factors must be considered during the planning process:

- 1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness;
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- 4. Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
- 5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- 6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- 7. Promote efficient system management and operation; and
- 8. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.
- Improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate storm water impacts of surface transportation. *
- 10. Enhance travel and tourism. *

*New factors introduced by the FAST Act



The FAST Act also continues the requirement for a Continuing, Cooperative, and Comprehensive ("3-C") long range transportation planning process for making transportation decisions in metropolitan areas, while continuing and further defining requirements for state DOTs and MPOs to set performance measures and goals, which were set forward in MAP-21.

2050 DEMOGRAPHIC AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

A major component of identifying future transportation needs is understanding future population and employment growth trends for the region. Land use and growth patterns directly impact how people travel. In places where development is spread out and land use is separated, people are likely to take more long-distance trips in a personal vehicle throughout the day. On the other hand, in denser, mixed-use environments, people can take shorter trips and utilize other modes of transportation such as transit and walking. To better assess the transportation needs of the region, RMS 2050 MTP first considered the potential growth trends that will impact both the performance of the transportation system as well as how travelers interact with the system.

Additional factors like household size and median income are major forces behind travel behavior. The 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) data indicates that the El Paso MPO Region's median household income is roughly (\$37,069) and each household has an average size of 3.09 people. The region's median household income is lower in comparison to those of Texas (\$62,843) and New Mexico (\$51,945), with concentrations of low-income households in areas along the international border with Ciudad Juarez, downtown El Paso, the Mission Valley, and in Doña Ana and Otero Counties just north of the Texas/New Mexico state line. Since travel along a transportation system relies so heavily on where people live and work, the 2050 El Paso Travel Demand Model (TDM), a forecasting tool described in later sections, includes an estimate of population and employment distribution for current and future years. The base socioeconomic data needed as input the TDM was gathered from a mixture of sources, including public domain data sources, published commercial datasets, and stakeholder input via the Delphi Process.

For the allocation of future population and employment throughout the urbanized area, the El Paso MPO conducted a full demographic update via an interactive consensus-building process called the "Delphi Process" that uses the knowledge of local experts and community leaders to identify patterns in regional growth and development. The El Paso Delphi Process relied on the wisdom and experience of over 70 community leaders with various areas of expertise and community knowledge to identify patterns in the growth and development of the community. Panel members for the Delphi process were recruited from regional government agencies, community organizations, the real estate and development communities. area employers, financial institutions, educational institutions, transit agencies and other organizations. Invitations were sent to approximately 94 community leaders; of those invited, 74 accepted the invitation. The El Paso Delphi Process had three distinguishing features:

- Input was confidential (to the greatest extent possible) in that responses were not recorded using the name of the responder;
- The process was iterative until consensus was achieved; and
- Group responses were statistically interpretable.



The process was conducted through an initial kickoff meeting, followed by two rounds of online activities. Due to restrictions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, the initial kickoff meeting as well as the iterative consensus-building rounds were held online. The results of the Delphi Process

contributed to the development of socio-economic data forecasts for the region and were the inputs for the 2050 RMS TDM.

Additional information is provided in Appendix F.

FIGURE 2-1: DELPHI PROCESS





Based on the TDM demographic forecast, the region's population is anticipated to grow to nearly 1.1 million people by 2050, increasing roughly 25% from 2017. **Figure 2-2** shows high population growth areas in the region between 2017 and 2050 based on an annual average growth approach from estimates produced for the TDM from the full demographic update described above.

As shown on the map, the most dramatic changes are expected to occur on vacant, developable land east of the City of El Paso, particularly in and around Horizon City, and the unincorporated areas near the City of El Paso's municipal boundaries. As development has expanded eastward from the original population center of the region in downtown El Paso, these high growth rate areas, previously utilized for farming and ranching purposes, have become attractive to land developers for conversion to tract housing and accompanying commercial uses. This trend can also be seen in the high growth rates of the northwestern part of the study area, where commercial farming activity continues to decline.



FIGURE 2-2: HIGH-GROWTH POPULATION AREAS (2017-2050)

El Paso MPO - Adopted 03/25/2022



Figure 2-3 shows projected future household density. While areas at the edge of the region are projected to see the highest rate of growth, this map indicates that the population center

is expected to remain within previously welldeveloped parts of the City of El Paso, including areas around downtown.



FIGURE 2-3: HOUSEHOLD DENSITY, 2050



High employment growth areas are scattered throughout the region, according to the TDM demographic forecast (**Figure 2-4**). The largest concentration of employment growth appears near Horizon City as well as the area north of Pete

Dominici Boulevard near the Santa Teresa Airport in Doña Ana County and near the Santa Teresa Port of Entry. The forecast also shows high employment areas in the far east of El Paso County along the Montana Avenue corridor.







Figure 2-5 shows projected future employment density. It is observed that job concentrations will remain primarily within urban employment centers and corridors, extending along the IH-10 corridor from central El Paso to Horizon City, along the Montana Avenue corridor east of Zaragoza Boulevard, and on the far west side of El Paso in the vicinity of the intersection of IH-10 and Transmountain Drive. High job concentrations are also seen in the Central El Paso area at Fort Bliss and the industrial area by El Paso Airport.

As cited in *The Regional Mobility Strategy of 2019*, large concentrations of healthcare providers are

located around the Medical Center of Americas east of downtown El Paso, and in the area of Mesa Street and Schuster Avenue, adjacent to the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) campus. Two new hospitals were recently constructed; one in northwest El Paso near the Transmountain Drive/ Resler Drive intersection, and one in the far east of El Paso, near the US 62/180 (Montana Avenue) and Loop 375/Joe Battle Boulevard intersection. Apart from Fort Bliss, which plays a critical role in the regional mobility, other employment centers include the college campuses, the Central Business District of downtown El Paso, and major retail centers.



FIGURE 2-5: EMPLOYMENT DENSITY, 2050

El Paso MPO - Adopted 03/25/2022



The demographic profile presented here was later used as an input to the Needs Assessment that can be found in Chapter 3.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

In addition to future population and employment growth, environmental justice considerations are also a critical step in addressing a region's transportation needs. Environmental justice considerations minimize aim to negative externalities created bv а transportation system and ensure that harmful effects of infrastructure investments are avoided in areas with concentrations of populations that have been disproportionately impacted by past interventions, such as neighborhoods demolished for freeway construction or families living near heavy-polluting industrial development. Introduced to metropolitan scale planning in 1994 by Executive Order 12898 and stemming from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, the regulation specifically seeks to:

- Avoid or mitigate disproportionately high public health, socioeconomic, and environmental effects on low-income and minority populations;
- Locate and include all potentially impacted communities in the decision-making process;
- Prevent the denial or lack of receipt of benefits from the process by low-income and minority populations.

With SAFETEA-LU, MAP-21, and now the FAST Act further outlining these principles, RMS 2050 MTP utilized GIS analysis tools and 2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5—year estimate data detailing households below the poverty line and minority populations.

To identify these populations, the Environmental Justice Index (EJI) was determined for low-income and minority populations as part of the

demographics profile for the EPMPO Title VI Program (See EPMPO website for Title VI Program information).

EJI is a method used to identify populations vulnerable to Environmental Justice concerns using demographic data at the census block group level. A census block group is considered to have a high concentration when the block group percentage for the socio-economic indicator exceeds the regional percentage.

Figure 2-6 shows the EJI map which is meant to identify where further analysis is needed and is not meant to act as the analysis itself. Chapter 5 presents an evaluation of affected Environmental Justice Zones (EJZs) based on proximity to the proposed projects in RMS 2050.

The EJI displays high concentration census block groups for two variables combined - Total Minority and Low Income. The Total Minority population includes individuals who identify as any race other than white, or who identify their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino. The Low Income population includes individuals whose income is below the poverty percentage.

Socio-economic indicators for the EPMPO area are presented in the table below.

| | 2018 | Percent of Total |
|--|---------|------------------|
| | | Population |
| Total Population | 882,680 | |
| Total Minority Population ^a | 776,182 | 87.93% |
| Black or African American | 25,756 | 2.92% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2,266 | 0.26% |
| Asian | 9,313 | 1.06% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific | 1,022 | 0.12% |
| Islander | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 730,262 | 82.73% |
| Some Other Race Alone | 426 | 0.05% |
| Two or More Races | 7,137 | 0.81% |
| White (Non-Hispanic) | 106,498 | 12.06% |
| Total Population for Whom | 867,135 | |
| Poverty Status is determined | | |
| Low Income Population ^b | 191,863 | 22.13% |

a Minority incudes population who identify their race as any race other than white, or who identify their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino. Table B03002

b Low income population includes individuals whose income is below the poverty percentage. Table B17021

El Paso MPO - Adopted 03/25/2022



In general, the Mission Valley, the area south of IH-10 near downtown El Paso, and portions of Doña Ana County in the north of the study area show the census block groups above the regional percentage for the two variables.

The analysis of EJZs serves to identify and assess potential impacts created by proposed

transportation improvements, ultimately resulting in the development of mitigation strategies for the system. This process also explores the benefits of proposed transportation projects in terms of commute times and improvements specific to EJZs.

FIGURE 2-6: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE INDEX





REGIONAL VISIONING PROCESS

To support the development of the RMS 2050 MTP, MPO staff hosted an on-demand, online visioning workshop whereby the public was asked to provide input and feedback for the new plan.

The public comment period and the online workshop was open June 14, 2020 through July 19, 2020. The on-demand virtual workshop was made available at the El Paso MPO website. In addition to the on-demand workshop, two live virtual workshops were offered. Additionally, to cultivate more public input, the visioning workshop materials were used to develop a downloadable and printable survey version for people who preferred to complete the survey on paper and submit through postal mail.



Complemented by voice narration, the workshop was organized into five exercises:

- Exercise 1. Tell us about yourself.
- Exercise 2. Tell us your thoughts about the current state of the transportation system.
- Exercise 3. Tell us your transportation priorities.
- Exercise 4. Give us your perspective on where you think the region is growing.

• Exercise 5. Tell us what your transportation needs will be over the next several decades.

An overview of the workshop including examples of all the exercises can be found in Chapter 7. Exercise 2 allowed participants to provide comments by dropping a pin onto an interactive map.

These on-demand workshops and live virtual workshops were designed to:

- Gather information regarding transportation needs in the region;
- 2. Identify deficiencies in the current transportation system;
- 3. Develop a community vision for future growth within the region; and
- 4. Identify appropriate modes and infrastructure for supporting future growth.

During the public visioning workshops and online visioning outreach, participants identified several deficiencies with the existing transportation system, including; congested roadways and ports of entry, connectivity and cooperation throughout the region, mobility and accessibility barriers for older adults and individuals with disabilities. safety and security concerns, and a shortage of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. In addition to identifying transportation system deficiencies, participants completed activities to determine the most important focus areas for prioritizing projects in the MTP. These factors included: increasing multimodal options, improving safety and quality of life, connecting modes of travel, and improving access.









VISIONING RESULTS

The public visioning workshop and online activity results were essential to identifying a community vision, and participants provided valuable comments on the current state of the transportation system and identified specific needs and desires for the future transportation system. This public input was utilized by the El Paso MPO during the development of RMS 2050 MTP. For example, participants' ranking of the evaluation criteria for future transportation projects helped the MPO develop performance measures to guide the evaluation of transportation system alternatives in the MTP. The final ranking of evaluation criteria is shown in **Figure 2-7**. Also, the identified growth areas and areas of need help ensure limited resources are utilized to provide the most benefit to the region.

FIGURE 2-7: CRITERIA RANKINGS

| | CRITERIA | AVERAGE SCORE |
|-----|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Improve Safety | 4.2 |
| 2. | Improve Quality of Life | 4.0 |
| 3. | Protect Environment | 3.9 |
| 4. | Conserve Energy | 3.7 |
| 5. | Promote Efficiency | 3.6 |
| 6. | Improve Access | 3.6 |
| 7. | Increase Multi-Modal Options | 3.6 |
| 8. | Reduce Congestion | 3.5 |
| 9. | Connect Travel | 3.4 |
| 10. | Support Economic Development Goals | 3.4 |
| 11. | Increase Connection | 3.3 |
| 12. | Support Land Use Goals | 3.3 |
| 13. | Preserve Rights-of-Way | 3.0 |
| 14. | Improve Security | 3.0 |



STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS

To assist in the decision-making process, the MPO used Decision Lens Software as a tool to evaluate and prioritize projects using measurable information. Decision Lens had previously been used successfully in the development of RMS 2020 and provides a helpful comparison between projects. Transportation Policy Board members were asked to go over a pairwise comparison exercise of the criteria outlined for the project selection process. This exercise helps in removing the bias by repetitively comparing one criterion against the other.

Below are the criteria categories and weights adopted by the Transportation Policy Board in September 2020. The Decision Lens categories include the FAST Act National Goals, Strategies from the Congestion Management Process, Project System and Strategic Priority elements.

FIGURE 2-8: DECISION LENS CRITERIA

| CATEGORIES | | WEIGHT | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Resiliency and reliability | 16.13% | | | | |
| Strategic Priority | 35.45% | Connectivity | 11.72% | | | | |
| 21/% 992 | | Scheduling | 7.58% | | | | |
| | | Public Transportation | 7.72% | | | | |
| Congestion Management Process | 00 440/ | Traffic Operations and ITS | 7.58% | | | | |
| Strategies | 26.41% | Travel Demand Management | 6.46% | | | | |
| | | Road Capacity | 4.63% | | | | |
| | | Block System | 10.73% | | | | |
| Project System | 22.75% | Active Transportation System | 6.19% | | | | |
| | | National Highway System | 6.13% | | | | |
| | | Safety | 3.77% | | | | |
| | | Infrastructure Condition | 3.37% | | | | |
| | | Environmental Sustainability | 2.43% | | | | |
| National Goals | 15.39% | System Reliability | 1.94% | | | | |
| | | Congestion Reduction | 1.60% | | | | |
| | | Freight Movement | 1.20% | | | | |
| | | Economic Vitality | 1.07% | | | | |



REGIONAL VISION STATEMENT

After establishing priorities through the visioning process and stakeholder project priorities, MPO staff recommended retaining the vision statement laid out in the Destino 2045 MTP:

"A seamless and reliable multimodal network which enables connectivity, promotes quality of life and economic wellbeing, and preserves the human environment."

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

To meet the mandates of its charter as a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), and because a great deal of the transportation funding that will support the implementation of the RMS 2050 MTP comes from the US Department of Transportation (USDOT), the El Paso MPO must seek to address both local and national transportation needs. The El Paso MPO must address the identified transportation issues of the region both in terms of local needs and the role that the region's transportation facilities play in the national transportation network, including international ports of entry. Therefore, the goals and objectives developed for the RMS 2050 MTP address identified local priorities while also considering the region's role in the national transportation system.

Goals and objectives provide the framework for selecting and prioritizing projects that will address identified needs. Goals provide broad statements about what the MTP is trying to achieve, and objectives are specific measurable actions to achieve the stated goal. The RMS 2050 MTP goals and objectives incorporate: public input; goals and objectives identified in previous planning efforts in the region; and the US Department of Transportation's national performance goals. The RMS 2050 MTP states a set of comprehensive goals and objectives that balance local needs and national priorities.

The following sections describe these needs and priorities as established through public input and contained in local, state and national policy guidance.

NATIONAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND PLANNING FACTORS

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, in 2015, the fifth intermodal surface transportation bill, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), was signed into law, providing long-term funding from the federal government for surface transportation programs. The FAST Act requires that MPOs use performance-based planning processes and consider national performance goals, which MPOs are required to consider to be eligible for federal funding, are as follows:

- Safety Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- Infrastructure Condition Maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
- Congestion Reduction Achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
- System Reliability Improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality

 Improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development



- Environmental Sustainability Enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment
- Reduced Project Delivery Delays Reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods

To help the MPO and the public fully understand what these national performance goals are designed to achieve, the FAST Act provides background information in the form of ten (10) planning factors (presented under federal guidelines at the beginning of this chapter) that identify the primary considerations affecting the interstate and national highway systems that drove the development of the goals.

To ensure that federal funds will be available for improving the regional transportation system, it is important that these federal FAST Act national performance goals, as well as the federal planning factors, are considered and incorporated into the development of local goals, objectives and performance measures.

SAFETY AND SECURITY

Regarding Safety, the FAST Act requires that the transportation planning process address both the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users. Federal guidelines define safety as "freedom from unintentional harm," and define security as "freedom from intentional harm." Strategies to address safety and security will at times differ significantly from one another and require coordination between different agencies but will more often overlap and involve members of the same agencies. Therefore, RMS 2050 considers safety and security both simultaneously and individually.

The EPMPO is responsible for addressing safety and security through the programming of transportation improvements. The MPO's role in implementing specifics afety and security measures may be limited, but its role in coordinating regional transportation needs between the various local, state, and federal transportation agencies is vital to creating successful safety and security policies. By integrating the safety and security goals and objectives of regional stakeholders into the transportation planning process, the EPMPO can ensure that its plans and studies are consistent with and help support safety and security planning in the El Paso Region.

The following sections discuss the various agencies involved in safety and security planning in the El Paso Region and present local, regional, and state plans and programs that are currently in place.

SAFETY

"Safety" in the transportation planning context typically refers to the mitigation of traffic crashes, transit accidents, and other unintentional events resulting in fatalities, injuries, or loss of property on the transportation network. The FAST Act identifies a national goal for safety to significantly reduce fatalities and injuries on all public roadways. The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) published a related Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in March 2014 proposing that safety targets and progress towards their achievement be measured as 5-year rolling averages for fatalities and serious injuries, as well as their respective rates for every 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The final rule was published March 15, 2016, with an effective date of April 14, 2016.





Safety planning, reducing the number of crashes, and decreasing the number of fatalities and injuries on the transportation network involves several different projects and programs, ranging from improving the operational efficiency of the transportation network to influence driver behavior. TXDOT, NMDOT, and EPMPO play the lead roles in transportation safety planning, but several nontraditional stakeholders should be included in the transportation safety planning process, including:

- State agencies responsible for safety data collection and management (TXDOT and NMDOT, Texas State Police – Highway Safety Office).
- Regional and local transportation agencies.
- First responders, fire and rescue, and EMS.
- State and local law enforcement.
- Transit agencies.
- Motor vehicle departments.
- Federal agencies; and
- The non-governmental highway safety community (e.g., AAA).

REVIEW OF AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS TEXAS STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP)

Adopted in 2016, the Texas SHSP's mission is "Texans will work together on the road to zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries." The SHSP also adopts a "Towards Zero Deaths" (TZD) vision consistent with the TZD National Strategy sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA).

The plan identifies safety concerns and classifies them into seven key emphasis areas. The plan describes the trends in fatalities within each emphasis area, defines a specific target for 2022, and suggests strategies that should be undertaken to achieve the performance targets that are tailored to the unique circumstances of crashes within each emphasis area.

The strategies recommended in the SHSP should provide the basis for countermeasures that the EPMPO considers addressing crash types and locations, as well as driving behaviors, that are responsible for the greatest number of crashes in the El Paso region – particularly those resulting in serious injuries or fatalities.

NEW MEXICO STRATEGIC HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN (SHSP)

The 2016 New Mexico SHSP identifies actions and strategies to be undertaken over a five-year period to reduce traffic deaths and incapacitating injuries on the states surface transportation system, with the vision statement "Safe Mobility for Everyone." Using the "4E" approach of engaging stakeholders and participants from Engineering, Enforcement, Emergency response, and Education, the NM SHSP is intended to "coordinate traffic safety programs across the state, identify priorities and strategies, and provide a common measure and approach in

El Paso MPO - Adopted 03/25/2022



traffic safety efforts for all roadway users." The plan identifies ten high priority emphasis areas and ten priority emphasis areas based on the number and severity of crashes in New Mexico and stakeholder input for data from 2007 to 2012.

SECURITY

Planning for transportation security seeks to mitigate or avoid harm to the transportation network inflicted either intentionally by people (such as terrorist acts or criminal activities), or circumstantially through natural disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes, or other weather events. Security planning is carried out by multiple levels of government and involves all four phases of emergency management: preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation.

In support of state, regional, and local security goals and objectives, the primary role of the MPO is to facilitate coordination between agencies responsible for transportation security, including law enforcement, emergency response, transit agencies, and homeland security departments.

To ensure that federal funds will be available for improving the regional transportation system, it is important that these federal FAST Act national performance goals, as well as the federal planning factors, are considered and incorporated into the development of local goals, objectives and performance measures.

REVIEW OF AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The state emergency management program is coordinated by the Texas Division of Emergency Management (TDEM). This program is intended to ensure the state and its local governments respond to and recover from emergencies and disasters. The program also implements plans and programs to help prevent or lessen the impact of emergencies and disasters, as well as programs to increase public awareness about threats and hazards.

The TDEM also coordinates emergency planning and administers disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and homeland security grant programs in the State of Texas.



Source: U.S. Customs and Border Protection [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons

Updated in 2015, the Texas Emergency Management Plan describes how the State will mitigate the effects of, prepare for, respond to, and recover from hazards to public health and safety, including natural disasters, technological accidents, homeland security threats, and other emergency situations. The plan designates the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) as the primary State agency responsible for coordinating all transportation related emergency management activities, and designates TxDOT as a support



agency for transportation related emergency management activities which include:

- Clearing routes and temporarily restoring public facilities;
- Assisting with damage assessment of transportation infrastructure;
- Assisting state and local government entities in determining the most viable transportation networks to, from, and within disaster areas; and
- Providing assistance to other state and local government agencies in the transport of urgent supplies to impacted areas.

The plan also identifies key agencies and organizations that will support DPS's emergency management responsibilities and outlines each entity's role in or resource contribution to transportation-related emergency management activities.

NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (DHSEM NEW MEXICO)

The State of New Mexico All-Hazard Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) establishes the New Mexico Emergency Operations System. This system organizes the state's response to emergencies and disasters while providing for the safety and welfare of its citizens. The plan assigns functional emergency management responsibilities to state departments, agencies, boards, and commissions.

The EOP identifies the State Department of Transportation as the primary State agency responsible for coordinating all transportation related emergency management activities (ESF#1), with support from the General Services Department, the Environment Department, Department of Military Affairs, Department of Public Safety, State Police Division, and Motor Transportation Division. Responsibilities for transportation related emergency management activities include:

- Monitor and report status of and damage to the transportation system and infrastructure as a result of an incident.
- Identify temporary alternative transportation solutions that can be implemented by other agencies when systems or infrastructure are damaged, unavailable, or overwhelmed.
- Coordinate the restoration and recovery of the transportation systems and infrastructure.
- Coordinate the support, prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation activities among transportation stakeholders within the authorities and resource limitations of ESF #1 agencies.

The plan also identifies key agencies and organizations that will support DHSEM's emergency management responsibilities and outlines each entity's role in or resource contribution to transportation-related emergency management activities.

FEMA HAZARD MITIGATION PLANS

The purpose of FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) is to "help communities implement hazard mitigation measures following a Presidential major disaster declaration." All counties in the greater El Paso Metropolitan Planning Area have completed a FEMA-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan, and although Otero County's plan is currently expired, they are in the process of working on a new plan, as noted on the DHSEM New Mexico website.

TEXAS & NEW MEXICO CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANS (COOP)

Continuity of Operations Plans focus state energy and resources on plans that minimize the impact



of natural and man-made disasters on state operations. Texas DPS and the New Mexico DHSEM provide technical assistance to local agencies or organizations wishing to establish a COOP.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations, shown in no particular order, are designed to strengthen transportation security planning in the El Paso region and should be coupled with elements of the final rules as published by the FHWA and disseminated by TXDOT and NMDOT:

- Create a local definition of security;
- Continue to assess the most significant threats, high-potential targets, and least hardened infrastructure elements within the El Paso region;
- Work with federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions and transportation providers to develop evacuation plans for the "transportation disadvantaged;"
- When eligible, establish a FEMA-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan for Otero County;
- Collaborate with security and emergency response professionals and organizations on an ongoing basis; and
- Provide training opportunities for MPO staff to increase their knowledge related to transportation security planning

SUMMARY OF GOALS AND **OBJECTIVES WITHIN LOCAL** PLANNING DOCUMENTS

In addition to reviewing national performance goals and planning factors, MPO staff reviewed local transportation planning documents prepared by the MPO and its planning partners to ensure that the goals and objectives of RMS 2050 MTP address and are informed by local priorities and identified needs.

MPO PLANNING DOCUMENT

Building upon the goals and objectives laid out for Destino 2045 MTP, which considered primarily the FAST Act National Performance Goals and Objectives as the guiding principles for transportation decision making, the MPO incorporated the recently completed update to the Congestion Management Process (CMP) (completed November 2019), which included a revision of the goals, objectives and performance measures, including-providing mobility choices, mitigating congestion, minimizing air quality impacts, and promoting accessibility to efficient transportation. Some of the specific objectives from the CMP include increasing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, improving bus reliability, continuing investments in Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology, reducing travel delays at traffic signals, and creating shared ride programs.



CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS Nov 2019

OUTLOOK ON CONGESTION

OUTLOOK ON CONCESTION Congestion in El Paso Region was evaluated through the public involvement process for Destino 2045 MTP. The majority of the survey respondents (71%) believed that El Paso (74%) and West Valley (71%) sub-regions had the highest respondent rates prioritzing congestion needs. Most respondents (85%) agreed with maps of forecasted V/C ratios provided during the public visioning workshops. Furthermore, 61% or respondents believed that automobiles in the El Paso study area would be inadequately served in the next 28 years.

EI Paso MPO's responsibility as a non-attainment area, is to work closely with local member jurisdictions to manage congestion, either by a better distribution of travel demand, or by improving the efficiency of the transportation system.



pg. i



REGIONAL MOBILITY STRATEGY (RMS)

Developed by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) El Paso District in cooperation with the El Paso MPO, RMS began in 2018 as an exercise among various stakeholders and partner agencies to help define the future of our region mobility, livability and economic development.



Stakeholder representation during the listening sessions for the development of the RMS brought perspective to long-standing challenges and translated the abstract into tangible needs. The RMS proposed future efforts laid out in the implementation plan as a main component of the RMS 2050 MTP guiding principles.

Among the potential projects presented in the implementation plan and identified by local entities are a need for improving IH-10, completing connections between major highway corridors, eliminating choke points at POEs, adding additional international rail routes, and improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

INTERNATIONAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The purpose of the Texas-Mexico Border Transportation Master Plan (BTMP) is to facilitate coordination and collaboration between Texas-Mexico planning, programming, and the implementation of policies, programs, and projects at border crossings and support facilities and multimodal transportation system that serves the Texas-Mexico border.



Source: Texas-Mexico Border Transportation Master Plan

The integration of the different transportation modes into the BTMP analysis highlights the importance of connectivity between the border, production, and consumption centers, and multimodal transportation infrastructure to facilitate international trade.



STATEWIDE PLANNING DOCUMENTS

At the state level, TxDOT and NMDOT share many of the same goal-setting sentiments. Safety is a high priority on both agencies' lists of goals, with Texas articulating the need to "improve multimodal transportation safety" and New Mexico seeking to "improve safety for all system users." Asset management is also a high priority for both DOTs, as resource preservation efforts tie into multiple goals and rank highly for the DOTs. Identifying potential funding sources that could then be distributed to many modes of transportation and managing those resources to improve accountability is a good example of these efforts.

Increasing investment in multi-modal forms of transportation is a high priority for both DOTs, with TxDOT officially publishing their Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Strategic Plan in 2017, in which they present a comprehensive approach to implementing bicycle infrastructure.



NMDOT included coordinating transportation improvements alongside land use planning, stating that "Cooperative planning by land use and transportation agencies represents one of the most powerful and effective tools that a state can use to address its mobility needs in a mutually beneficial manner." NMDOT also lists in *New Mexico 2040 Plan* "better access to public transit, shorter travel distances for cyclists and pedestrians, improved sustainability throughout the community, and less travel time for automobile users" as major benefits to this type of planning coordination.

LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Local entities throughout the region focus their goals on responding to their jurisdictional context.

The County of El Paso FY2020-FY2024 Strategic Plan Dashboard presents the goals and plans for the year. Among these goals is to upgrade infrastructure to meet the needs of the community. Objectives include expanding the public transit system by developing interlocal agreements and identifying new bus stop/shelter locations.

Building upon previous planning in the region, the El Paso County Regional Transit Institutional Options Feasibility Study, developed in April 2019, examines the feasibility of a single, seamless, transit system in El Paso County, serving and connecting rural communities and urban areas in the county and the City of El Paso. The study identifies service, governance, and financial activities for countywide transit. At the time that the RMS 2050 MTP was adopted, coordination of necessary interlocal agreements with partner agencies related to launching the regional transit system were on their way, as well as an evaluation of the master thoroughfare plan and evaluation of roadway conditions to identify required infrastructure improvements.



Local agencies also expressed the importance of coordinated transportation and land use planning in their planning documents. For example, Plan El Paso, the City of El Paso's Comprehensive Plan, lists downtown revitalization as its top goal, with the addition that this includes "development linked with good transportation choices." In addition, the City of El Paso's objectives included adding new land uses, as well as actively working to develop homes and workplaces in closer proximity to one another. The Plan El Paso also states that: to improve mobility, the city must "Grow Up, Not Out." In this context, this means stopping urban sprawl with denser development around the core of the city and expanding the transit network - where every transfer center is an opportunity for redevelopment. The City of El Paso Sustainability Plan shares many of these sentiments, advocating for "an integrated, regional approach to transportation." While the El Paso MPO cannot statutorily regulate land use within the region, it can include goals to coordinate land use and transportation decision-making to facilities accessibility and improve transportation options.

Building on these local policy trends for sustainability and using its new TDM capabilities, the MPO has also developed test scenarios of BRT corridors with higher land-use densities, to evaluate the impact of such a scenario on the increase of transit and bicycle demand, and reduction of roadway congestion. These scenarios are presented in Chapter 5.

Active transportation consistently appeared as a priority in numerous agencies' plans. The City of El Paso has written a Bicycle Master Plan in which they promote cycling as a viable and safe everyday activity.



Source: City of El Paso Bike Plan

Numerous related goals are delineated within the document including: being awarded the designation of Silver-level Bicycle Friendly Community by the League of American Bicyclists; coordinating land use and policy planning to promote cycling infrastructure; supporting programs that educate or increase awareness about cycling as a viable form of transportation; and encouraging the consideration of bicycling at every level of civic government in their jurisdiction. This Bicycle Master Plan works in tandem with the City of El Paso's Great Streets and Corridor Plan, which aims to match the character of the streetscape to the character of the surrounding land use, form a well-connected network of complete streets that is conducive to all forms of transportation (e.g. driving, walking, biking, transit), and capitalize on opportunities to invest in transit service as well as investments in walking and bicycling infrastructure. This goal-setting within the Great Streets and Corridor Plan closely follows the TxDOT state-level Bicycle and Pedestrian Program.

RESILIENCY IN TRANSPORTATION

Updated metropolitan and statewide transportation planning regulations include a requirement that metropolitan transportation plans assess capital investment and other strategies that reduce vulnerability of the existing transportation



infrastructure to human-made and natural disasters.

Over the last three years, the City of El Paso has identified a variety of areas where substantial action is needed to build long term resiliency for our community. The City of El Paso's *Resilient El Paso* is a document that marks the culmination of intensive engagement, research and planning intended to provide a framework of actions that have the ability to make El Paso more adaptable.

The City of El Paso has identified a variety of areas where substantial action is needed to build long term resilience for our community including: Poverty, Transportation Networks, Extreme Heat, Flash Flooding, Drought, and Challenges of a Border Metroplex. Several goals are outlined within the document to provide long-term resilience including the design and implementation of infrastructure projects that maximize co-benefits, simultaneously addressing climatic and social stressors such as flooding, heat, energy and citizen mobility.

A specific action presented in this document that is intended to meet this goal is to mobilize an interagency working group to develop regional development performance metrics in the context of large scale community wide infrastructure projects. The City of El Paso will co-chair alongside the MPO task force made up of a diverse group of regional of stakeholders currently convened as the Borderplex 2020 Regional Planning Task Force. The group has over the past two years worked to identify the existing framework of plans and development initiatives from Southern New Mexico through West Texas and into Northern Chihuahua. The next goal for the group will be to leverage that information with identified regional priorities to create a dynamic performance matrix that can be utilized to maximize impact of major regional infrastructure projects.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES RECOMMENDATION

Based on review of previous planning efforts within the region, consideration of the Federal planning factors and National performance goals, stakeholder project prioritization and listening to community input through the visioning workshops, the MPO staff recommended the following goals for the RMS 2050 MTP:

| RMS 2050 MTP Goals |
|-------------------------------|
| Safety |
| Maintenance & Operations |
| Mobility |
| Accessibility & Travel Choice |
| Sustainability |
| Economic Vitality |
| Quality of Life |
| Implementation* |
| |

To achieve these goals, the MPO developed objectives that describe specific, measurable actions that decision-makers should work towards when balancing transportation investments throughout the region. **Table 2-1** lists several recommended objectives related to each overall goal.



TABLE 2-1: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

| RMS 2050 GOAL | OBJECTIVES |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Safety | Reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries related to traffic incidents. Reduce the number of crashes at high-speed intersections with an abnormal number of incidents. Reduce the number of conflict points between vehicles and active transportation users – e.g., pedestrian and cyclists. |
| Maintenance & Operations | Decrease the percentage of facilities and assets not in a state of good repair. Increase the number of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology assets. Reduce delay at traffic signals. |
| Mobility | Reduce delay on major thoroughfares. Reduce travel time to key destinations. Improve response time and clearance capabilities for first responders and emergency personnel. |
| Accessibility & Travel Choices | Increase the number of jobs and key destinations that are accessible by all transportation modes. Ensure that transportation system improvements provide equitable benefits to the region. Expand access to and improve reliability of transit services, particularly for underserved areas and areas with high transit need. Fill major connectivity gaps in the side walk, bike lane, and trail networks that support regional travel. Encourage infill development and transit-supportive land use. Expand multi-modal access at regional Ports of Entry. |
| Sustainability | Increase the attractiveness of transportation options other than single-occupancy vehicles. Reduce emissions produced by vehicles. Achieve maintenance designation from EPA from criteria pollutants. Increase percentage of transportation assets that use alternative energy sources. |
| Economic Vitality | Improve accessibility to key tourist destinations. Reduce delay on designated freight corridors and roads connecting to intermodal or freight facilities. Increase access to major employment centers. Improve operational efficiency at regional Ports of Entry. |
| Quality of Life | Preserve and enhance the natural environment, improve air quality, and promote active lifestyles. Encourage livable communities which support sustainability and economic vitality. |
| Implementation | To effectively schedule project development activities to LET the project on time (Project development schedules are monitored by the MPO thru the Project Readiness Report). Develop cost-effective projects and programs aimed at reducing the cost associated with constructing, operating and maintain the regional transportation system. |



PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Measuring and tracking the performance of the region's transportation system is a fundamental component of the RMS 2050 MTP and the performance-based planning process. Performance measurement allows planners to assess the current state of the system to develop recommendations for improvements, evaluate the effectiveness of recently implemented improvements, and forecast the effectiveness of planned improvements.

The EPMPO–monitors two kinds of performance as part of its performance-based planning efforts: Observed Performance and Forecasted or Modeled Performance.

<u>Observed Performance</u>: Performance is measured based on information from various sources

(national, state, local) and reported via a webbased application tool developed for geospatial visualization of performance of the transportation network. This webtool can be found at <u>https://</u> <u>www.elpasompo.org/Links</u> through the "EPMPO Performance Measures Tool" link.

The objectives of the Web Tool are:

- To track transportation performance over time
- To support identification of gaps in infrastructure across transportation modes
- To provide performance-based information for planning and programming decisions and
- To be a resource for local planning partners and general public.



El Paso MPO - Adopted 03/25/2022



The Multimodal Web Tool shows performance of transportation networks in the El Paso region captured by multimodal performance measures that were identified from Destino 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2018), Congestion Management Process (2013), and FHWA National Performance Measures (2017), and based on available local, state, and national data.

<u>Forecasted or Modeled Performance</u>: Using EPMPO's TDM, planners can forecast the performance of the region's transportation system, considering both planned system improvements and forecasted demographics. Performance-based planning using these measures was initiated with the development of the previous MTP (Destino 2045 MTP), and additional measures have been incorporated as part of the development of the RMS 2050 TDM and the reporting output summary has been improved.

NATIONAL PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS

Federal legislation passed in 2012 introduced a new requirement to incorporate a performancebased approach into the transportation planning process. The federal transportation bill *Moving Ahead for Progress in 21st Century Act* (MAP-21) required state Departments of Transportation, MPOs, and transit authorities to set coordinated targets, report on a required set of performance measures, and prioritize projects using a coordinated performance-based planning process. These performance requirements were continued and bolstered by the *Fixing America's Surface Transportation* (FAST) Act, which was signed into law in 2015.

The federal performance measures fall into three main categories—safety, maintenance, and performance. Safety measures track highway and transit deaths and injuries and include transit incidents like fires or crashes. Maintenance measures look at the age of transit fleets and the condition of roads and bridges. System performance measures look at highway congestion and reliability, freight movement, and environmental sustainability, including air quality.

TABLE 2-2: FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURE CATEGORIES

| Cafata | Highway Safety | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Salety | Transit Safety (Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan) | | | | |
| Maintonanco | Highway Pavement and Bridge Conditions | | | | |
| Maintenance | Transit Asset Management (TAM) | | | | |
| | National Highway System (NHS) Congestion | | | | |
| System Performance | Freight | | | | |
| | Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program | | | | |

Federal performance measure final rules establish deadlines for target setting and reporting for each of the required performance measures. For the measures identified in each final rule, MPOs are required to adopt targets and baseline performance measures, and to report progress toward achieving the targets in Regional Performance adopted two years after the effective date of the final rule. The five performance measures' final rules currently effective were established at different times, and therefore have different target-setting and implementation deadlines, as seen in **Table 2-3** below.

El Paso MPO - Adopted 03/25/2022



TABLE 2-3: SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES

| | FINIAL | TARGET SETTING DEADLINE | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| FINAL RULE | FINAL RULE EFFECTIVE DATE | STATE DOT | TRANSIT PROVIDER | МРО | TO BE INCLUDED IN MTP BY | REPORTING PERIOD | REPORTING SCHEDULE |
| PM1: Safety | 4/14/2016 | 8/31/2017 | - | 2/16/2018 | 5/27/2018 | Annually | Annually |
| <i>PM2</i> : Infrastructure | 5/20/2017 | 5/20/2018 | _ | 11/16/2018 | 5/20/2019 | 2- and 4-year performance | Biannually (2018,2020, |
| <i>PM3</i> : System Performance | | | | | | periods | 2022,etc.) |
| Transit Asset Management (TAM) | 10/1/2016 | 10/1/2017 | - | 12/27/2017 | 10/1/2018 | Complete updat Oct 2 | ed TAM Plan by 2022 |
| Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) | 7/19/2018 | - | 7/20/2020 (extended to 12/31/2020) | 1/20/2021 | 7/20/2021 | Updated and ce agency a | rtified by transit annually. |

At the adoption date of RMS 2050 MTP, all five performance measure rules are effective, and the adoption of official targets is required and must be reported.

REQUIRED PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS

A summary of the required National Performance Measures aligned with the seven National Goals is presented below in **Table 2-4**. The EPMPO has adopted targets set by the states (TxDOT and NMDOT) for all National Performance Measures. This section summarizes the adopted targets for each of the measures and provides an analysis to determine if the targets were met or not. Certain performance measures may be updated on an annual basis. See Appendix D for updated information.



TABLE 2-4: NATIONAL GOALS AND METRICS

| NATIONAL GOAL | NATIONAL PERFORMANCE MEASURE(S) | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | - Fatalities (# and rate) | | | | | | |
| Safety | - Serious Injuries (# and rate) | | | | | | |
| | - Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious inj | uries | | | | | |
| | - % of Interstate pavements in Good & Poor Condition | | | | | | |
| Infrastructure Condition | - % of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good & Poor condition | National Highway System =NHS | | | | | |
| | - % of HNS bridges classified as in Good & Poor condition | | | | | | |
| Congration Paduction | - Annual hours of PHED per capita | Dogle Hour Excessive Dolay - DUED | | | | | |
| Congestion Reduction | -% Non-SOV Travel | Peak nour excessive Delay –PheD | | | | | |
| Custom Dolinkility | - % of PMT on the Interstate that are reliable | | | | | | |
| System Reliability | - % of PMT on non- Interstate that are reliable | Passenger whies travelea=Pivit | | | | | |
| Freight Movement & - TTTR Index on the Interstate System | | Truck Travel Time Reliability Index =TTTRI | | | | | |
| Environmental Sustainability | - % Change in CO2 Emissions on NHS Compared to Calendar year 2017 | | | | | | |
| Reduced project delivery delays | - No national measures in current legislation | | | | | | |



SAFETY (PM1)

State Targets adopted by the EPMPO Transportation Policy Board for previous fiscal years and for the most recent year up to the date of completion of RMS 2050 MTP are presented in the tables below for Texas and New Mexico respectively (**Table 2-5** and **Table 2-6**).

TABLE 2-5: SAFETY - TEXAS STATE TARGETS BY CALENDAR YEAR

| PM1: SAFETY | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| Number of fatalities | 3,704 | 3,791 | 3,840 | 3,687 | 3,563 |
| Rate of fatalities | 1.43 | 1.414 | 1.406 | 1.33 | 1.27 |
| Number of serious injuries | 17,565 | 17,751 | 17,394 | 17,151 | 16,677 |
| Rate of serious injuries | 6.74 | 6.55 | 6.286 | 6.06 | 5.76 |
| Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries | 2,151 | 2,237.6 | 2,285 | 2,346.4 | 2,367 |

TABLE 2-6: SAFETY - NEW MEXICO STATE TARGETS BY CALENDAR YEAR

| PM1: SAFETY | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
| Number of fatalities | 364.1 | 375 | 401.9 | 411.6 | 421.9 |
| Rate of fatalities | 1.33 | 1.318 | 1.429 | 1.486 | 1.645 |
| Number of serious injuries | 1,219.4 | 1,100 | 1,074.2 | 1,030.5 | 1,030.5 |
| Rate of serious injuries | 4.456 | 3.825 | 3.82 | 3.722 | 3.842 |
| Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries | 228 | 220.6 | 204 | 200 | 190.6 |

Although the EPMPO has adopted the state's safety targets, eventually regional targets based on data specific to the EPMPO area will be developed. For this purpose, the EPMPO has initiated an analysis in cooperation with UTEP to calculate regional targets and performance, based on adopted targets following TxDOT and NMDOT methodology. The analysis presented below is based on available data for El Paso County and portions of Doña Ana County within the study area. The analysis aims to determine whether targets were met for the EPMPO study area and to provide information for the development of the regional targets.

Given that year 2020 was an unusual year due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on traffic volumes and congestion, crash data for year 2019 is being reported for RMS 2050 MTP. According to the 2019 performance in El Paso County, only two out of five performance targets were either met or were better than baseline as presented in **Table 2-7** for El Paso County and five out of the five performance targets were met for Doña Ana and Otero Counties as shown in **Table 2-8**.

The Final Rule allows states that do not meet a target to be considered as having made significant progress toward meeting the target if the outcome for that performance measure is better than the state's performance for the year prior to the year in which the target was established (i.e., baseline safety performance). A state DOT is determined to have met, or made significant progress toward meeting, its targets when at least four of the five required performance targets are either met or the safety outcome for the performance measure has improved.



TABLE 2-7: EL PASO COUNTY, PM1: SAFETY CALENDAR YEAR 2019

| PM1: SAFETY | BASELINE PERFORMANCE 2013-2017 | 2019 ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | 5-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE 2015-2019 | 2019 TARGET | TARGET STATUS | BETTER THAN BASELINE | MET OR MADE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Number of Fatalities | 67 | 80 | 75 | 70 | NOT MET | NO | |
| Fatality Rate | 1.299 | 1.388 | 1.383 | 1.283 | NOT MET | NO | |
| Number of Serious Injuries | 282.6 | 262 | 288.8 | 362.5 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | NO |
| Serious Injury Rate | 5.47 | 4.545 | 5.359 | 6.64 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | |
| Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries | 58.6 | 74 | 63.8 | 62.5 | NOT MET | NO | |

* N/A indicates that better than baseline analysis not applicable since the target was met

According to the 2019 performance in Doña Ana and Otero County, all five out of five performance targets were met.

TABLE 2-8: DOÑA ANA AND OTERO COUNTY, PM1: SAFETY CALENDAR YEAR 2019

| PM1: SAFETY | BASELINE PERFORMANCE 2012-2016 | 2019 ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | 5-YEAR ROLLING AVERAGE 2015-2019 | 2019 TARGET | TARGET STATUS | BETTER THAN BASELINE | MET OR MADE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Number of Fatalities | 5.6 | 7 | 5.2 | 6 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | |
| Fatality Rate | 2.778 | 2.991 | 2.364 | 2.722 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | |
| Number of Serious Injuries | 19.2 | 6 | 12.2 | 15.8 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | YES 🗸 |
| Serious Injury Rate | 9.592 | 2.6 | 5.59 | 7.194 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | |
| Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries | 1.6 | 0 | 0.8 | 1.9 | MET 🗸 | N/A* | |

* N/A indicates that better than baseline analysis not applicable since the target was met



INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION (PM2)

Texas state targets for Infrastructure Condition adopted by the EPMPO Transportation Policy Board are presented in the **Table 2-9**. 2-year and 4-year targets for FY 2022 were adopted on November 16, 2018 and 4-year targets were revised on March 26, 2021.

TABLE 2-9: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION - TEXAS STATE TARGETS

| PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION | | 2.2/54.0 | | 2022 TARGET | |
|--|----------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | BASELINE | Z-YEAR CONDITION/ | 2-YEAR TARGET | 4-YR | 4-YR ADJUSTED |
| ADOPTED BY TPB ON: | | PERIORIWANCE | | 11/16/2018 | 3/26/2021 |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the Interstate System in GOOD condition | - | 66.60% | - | 66.40% | 65.50% |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the Interstate System in POOR condition | - | 0.10% | - | 0.30% | 0.20% |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the non- Interstate NHS in GOOD condition | 54.50% | 55.20% | 52% | 52.30% | 54.10% |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the non- Interstate NHS in POOR condition | 14.00% | 13.50% | 14.30% | 14.30% | 14.20% |
| Percent of NHS <u>bridges</u> classified as in GOOD condition | 50.70% | 50.70% | 50.60% | 50.40% | - |
| Percent of NHS <u>bridges</u> classified as in POOR condition | 0.90% | 1.30% | 0.80% | 0.80% | 1.50% |

The New Mexico state 4-year targets for FY 2021 were adopted by the Transportation Policy Board on November 16, 2018 (**Table 2-10**).

TABLE 2-10: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION - NEW MEXICO STATE TARGETS

| PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION | 4 YEAR (2021) |
|---|---------------|
| ADOPTED BY TPB ON NOV, 16 2018 | |
| Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in GOOD condition | 59.10% |
| Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in POOR condition | 5.00% |
| Percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate NHS in GOOD condition | 34.20% |
| Percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate NHS in POOR condition | 12.00% |
| Percent of NHS bridges classified as in GOOD condition | 30.00% |
| Percent of NHS bridges classified as in POOR condition | 2.50% |



Similarly, the EPMPO has developed an analysis based on available regional data to determine whether the infrastructure condition targets were met for the EPMPO study area. This analysis will be used in the development of future targets specific to the region.

The latest Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) pavement condition data available at the time of development of RMS 2050 MTP was for year 2018 in El Paso, Doña Ana, and Otero Counties. The latest National Bridge Investment Analysis System (NBIAS) bridge condition data was available for year 2019 in El Paso, Doña Ana, and Otero Counties.

Since Texas targets adopted by the state were only for years 2020 and 2022, the 2018 pavement data and 2019 bridge data are compared against these targets for El Paso County. As presented below in **Table 2-11**, only two of the six performance measures for El Paso County met the target.





TABLE 2-11: EL PASO COUNTY, PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION

| | ТХ | ТХ | | EL PASO COUNTY ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | |
|---|----------|--------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|--|
| PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION | BASELINE | ADOPTED TARGETS | | | |
| | 2018 | 2020 | 2022 | 2018 HPMS, 2019 NBIAS | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the Interstate System in GOOD condition | - | - | 66.40% | 47.71% | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the Interstate System in POOR condition | - | - | 0.30% | 4.75% | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the non-Interstate NHS in GOOD condition | 54.40% | 52.00% | 52.30% | 29.28% | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the non-Interstate NHS in POOR condition | 13.80% | 14.30% | 14.30% | 25.55% | |
| Percent of NHS <u>bridges</u> classified as in GOOD condition | 50.63% | 50.58% | 50.42% | 54.37% 🗸 | |
| Percent of NHS <u>bridges</u> classified as in POOR condition | 0.88% | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.00% 🗸 | |

✓ indicates target was met

Since NM targets adopted by the state were only for years 2019 and 2021, the 2018 pavement data and 2019 bridges data are compared against these targets for Doña Ana and Otero Counties. **Table 2-12** below demonstrates that all of the measures for Doña Ana and Otero Counties were met.

TABLE 2-12: DOÑA ANA AND OTERO COUNTY, PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION

| PM2: INFRASTRUCTURE CONDITION | NM ADOPTE | D TARGETS | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|--|
| | 2019 | 2021 | 2018 HPMS | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the Interstate System in GOOD condition | 57.30% | 59.10% | 100% 🗸 | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the Interstate System in POOR condition | 4.50% | 5% | 0.00% 🗸 | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the non-Interstate NHS in GOOD condition | 35.60% | 34.2% | 72.16% 🗸 | |
| Percentage of <u>pavements</u> on the non-Interstate NHS in POOR condition | 9% | 12% | 7.58% 🗸 | |
| Percent of NHS <u>bridges</u> classified as in GOOD condition | 36% | 30% | 39.85% 🗸 | |
| Percent of NHS <u>bridges</u> classified as in POOR condition | 3.30% | 2.50% | 0.00% 🗸 | |

✓ indicates target was met



SYSTEM PERFORMANCE, FREIGHT, AND CMAQ (PM3)

Texas state targets for System Performance adopted by the EPMPO Transportation Policy Board are presented in **Table 2-13**. 2-year and 4-year targets for FY 2022 were adopted on November 16, 2018 and 4-year targets were revised on March 26, 2021.

TABLE 2-13: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE - TEXAS STATE TARGETS

| PM3: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE | | | | | ARGET |
|---|----------|-----------------------|------------------|------------|------------------|
| | BASELINE | 2-YEAR CONDITION / | 2-YEAR TARGET | 4-YR | 4-YR ADJUSTED |
| ADOPTED BY TPB ON: | | F LINI ORIVIANCE | | 11/16/2018 | 3/26/2021 |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable | 79.50% | 81.20% | 61.20% | 56.60% | 70% |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on Non-Interstate That Are Reliable | - | 83% | - | 55.0% | 70% |
| Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index | 1.40 | 1.44 | 1.7 | 1.79 | 1.78 |

The New Mexico state 4-year targets for FY 2021 were adopted by the Transportation Policy Board on November 16, 2018 (Table 2-14).

TABLE 2-14: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE - NEW MEXICO STATE TARGETS

| PM3: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE | 4 YEAR (2021) |
|--|---------------|
| ADOPTED BY TPB ON: | NOV 16,2018 |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable | 95.10% |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on Non-Interstate that are Reliable | 90.40% |
| Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index | 1.15 |



Observing the current performance of the roadway system is an important component of assessing the system's needs and planning for its future. For the regional analysis and to determine if the system performance targets were met or not for the EPMPO study area, UTEP has done a comparison of the adopted targets to actual performance based on available data.

These measures are primarily calculated using the National Performance Management Research

Dataset (NPMRDS). The latest NPMRDS travel time reliability data was available for years 2017, 2018 and 2019 in El Paso County, Doña Ana and Otero Counties.

Since Texas targets were adopted only for years 2020 and 2022, the 2017/2018/2019 travel time reliability is compared against these targets for El Paso County.

TABLE 2-15: EL PASO COUNTY, PM3: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

| | ТХ | TX ADOPTE | D TARGETS | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|---------|----------|
| PIVIS: STSTEIVI PERFORIVIAINCE | BASELINE | 2020 | 2022 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate That Are Reliable | 79.60% | 61.20% | 56.60% | 88.4% 🗸 | 88.3% 🗸 | 91.20% 🗸 |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on Non-Interstate That Are Reliable | - | - | 55.40% | 79.2% 🗸 | 76.7% 🗸 | 83.1% 🗸 |
| Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.79 | 1.54 🗸 | 1.49 🗸 | 1.47 🗸 |

✓ indicates target was met

Since New Mexico targets were adopted only for years 2019 and 2021, the 2017/2018/2019 travel time reliability is compared against these targets for roadway links that belong to the El Paso MPO area in Doña Ana and Otero Counties.

TABLE 2-16: DOÑA ANA AND OTERO COUNTY, PM3: SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

| | NM | NM ADOPTED TARGETS | | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | | |
|--|----------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| PIVIS: STSTEIVI PERFORIVIANCE | BASELINE | 2019 | 2021 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable | 97.00% | 96.10% | 95.10% | 100% 🗸 | 100% 🗸 | 100% 🗸 |
| Percent of the Person-Miles Traveled on Non-Interstate that are Reliable | 90.50% | 90.40% | 90.40% | 100% 🗸 | 100% 🗸 | 80.70% |
| Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index | 1.13 | 1.14 | 1.15 | 1.13 🗸 | 1.14 🗸 | 1.17 |

✓ indicates target was met



CMAQ/AIR QUALITY

Nonattainment MPOs are required to establish targets and report progress for the performance measures related to the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program as established in 23 CFR Part 490 (§ 490.707 and § 490.807) for onroad mobile source emissions. As of the effective date for pollutant target setting, the EPMPO was the only Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Particulate matter-10 (PM-10) nonattainment area in Texas and the only PM-10 nonattainment area in New Mexico.

Methodologies and Emission Targets for these measures have been mutually agreed upon by EPMPO, TxDOT-Transportation Planning and Programming Division and NMDOT-Planning Division. The effectiveness of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program is gauged by the following measures:

- Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive
 Delay Per Capita
- Percent of Non-SOV travel
- Total Emissions Reduction: Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM-10)
- Total Emissions Reduction: Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Note that EPMPO is not required to set targets for the annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita and the Percent of Non-SOV travel until the Second Performance Period in 2022-2025.

Mid-point-4-year target and methodology has been updated (23 CFR Part 490 Subparts A, E, F, G & H) due to more reliable data available in 2018 and 2019 for CO and PM-10. The established baseline for the updated 4-year targets, which relies on historical data from 2014-2017, will remain the same. After the first two years (2018-2019) of the first performance period were available, EPMPO updated the 4-year targets and recommended these targets to TxDOT to use for the state's on road mobile source emissions for CO and PM-10.

The Midpoint Performance Period On-road Mobile Source Emissions targets were presented to the Transportation Policy Board for approval in September 2020. The updated 4-year targets and the original 2-year and 4-year targets for Texas are presented in **Table 2-17**.





TABLE 2-17: PM3: CMAQ - TEXAS STATE TARGETS

| TEXAS | BASELINE (KG/DAY) | ORIGINAL 2-YEAR TARGETS (KG/DAY) | MID-POINT CONDITION REPORT 2-YEAR TARGETS (KG/DAY) | ORIGINAL 4-YEAR TARGETS (KG/DAY) | UPDATED MIDPOINT 4-YEAR TARGETS (KG/DAY) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Total Emissions Reduction: PM-10 | 0.97 | 4.73 | 11.37 | 13.71 | 21.96 |
| Total Emissions Reduction: CO | 580.24 | 434.93 | 490.75 | 891.11 | 841.62 |

The EPMPO worked with NMDOT to develop on-road mobile source emission targets for PM-10. A cost benefit analysis methodology was used in 2018 to develop the original 2-year and 4-year emission targets for the first performance period. The same methodology was used for the update to the 4-year emissions target at the midpoint reporting period.

The established baseline was developed with the original targets that were set in 2018 and will remain the same until the development of targets for the next performance period. Because EPMPO

updated the midpoint 4-year on-road mobile source emission target for PM-10 in Texas (based on actual, rather than projected, 2018-2019 data), and because the New Mexico methodology is tied to the Texas methodology by way of the cost benefit analysis, the New Mexico 4-year on road mobile source emission target for PM-10 has also been updated. The updated 4-year target and the original 2-year and 4-year targets for New Mexico are presented in **Table 2-18**.

TABLE 2-18: PM3: CMAQ - NEW MEXICO STATE TARGETS

| NEW MEXICO | BASELINE (KG/DAY) | ORIGINAL 2-YEAR TARGET (KG/DAY) | MID-POINT CONDITION REPORT 2-YEAR TARGET (KG/DAY) | ORIGINAL 4-YEAR TARGET (KG/DAY) | UPDATED MIDPOINT 4-YEAR TARGET (KG/DAY) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Total Emissions Reduction: PM-10 | 0.17 | 0.65 | 1.14 | 1.79 | 3.48 |

It should be noted that the EPMPO is currently working with NMDOT to develop a new target methodology based on available data and independent from Texas methodology. This will allow a better representation of New Mexico's project goals in terms of the CMAQ portion of Air Quality Benefits.



TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT (TAM)

On September 21, 2018 the Transportation Policy Board approved two new MPO Planning Memorandums of Understanding (MOU), one for Texas and one for New Mexico. The MOUs outline the roles and responsibilities of the states, the MPO, and the mass transit provider, Sun Metro, in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process and associated performance measures. Based on the federal performance measure final rule on Transit Asset Management (TAM) issued in July 2016, MPOs are required to coordinate with transit providers to set performance targets and integrate individual transit providers' performance targets and TAM plans into planning documents. El Paso MPO reached out to the transit providers in the region to include Sun Metro the mass transit provider for the region and requested targets. The El Paso MPO Transportation Project Advisory Committee (TPAC) reviewed Sun Metro targets, as well as targets for Texas and New Mexico and recommended that the El Paso MPO Transportation Policy Board (TPB) adopt the state of Texas' targets for the El Paso MPO. Sun Metro may have agency-level targets that differ from the El Paso MPO adopted targets. These agency-level targets may better meet their needs in planning for state of good repair for Sun Metro. EPMPO will continue to coordinate with Sun Metro to report, track, and adjust the targets over time to meet the El Paso MPO targets.

| TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT | 2022 TARGET |
|--|-------------|
| % revenue vehicles at or exceeding useful life benchmark | <15% |
| % service vehicles (non-revenue) at or exceeding useful life benchmark | <15% |
| % facilities rated below 3 on condition scale (TERM) | <15% |
| % track segments with performance restrictions | N/A |

TABLE 2-19: EL PASO TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT 4 YEAR TARGETS



As part of the FAST Act, performance measures were incorporated for transit agencies, primarily through the Transit Asset Management (TAM) assessment and planning requirements. Sun Metro's TAM plan was developed to meet that requirement. Sun Metro continuously seeks grants through the regional MPO in order to supplement the competitive and formula funding grants available from the FTA. Primarily Sun Metro applies for FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding through the MPO. Funding from these grants are crucial to the agency's State of Good Repair (SGR) program and the



resulting Transit Asset Management Plan (TAM). CMAQ funds provide for new and replacement bus funding, to include vehicles needed for new and extended services. Funding also allows for new or enhancements of terminals and stops to include accessibility and passenger amenities if associated with new or extended services. STP provides similar funding but without the new or extended service requirements. This grant funding not only permits Sun Metro to provide efficient and dependable service but supplements funding from other sources necessary to maintain State of Good Repair standards. In FY2019 CMAQ, the federal funding portion obtained through the regional MPO, will total approximately \$5.5M for operating assistance (Dyer and Alameda BRT's and Streetcar services) plus replacement funding for three buses. As of October 2018 Sun Metro had been awarded approximately \$7.1M of funds for new revenue vehicles that were unspent or pending, including grants obtained through the CMAQ program and other grant programs.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SAFETY PLAN (PTASP)

On September 18, 2020 the El Paso MPO adopted the mass transit provider Sun Metro's PTASP. Sun Metro developed their PTASP in compliance with the requirements on 49 CFR 673.11(a) (1-6). The performance measures adopted in this PTASP for fix route, streetcar and paratransit per every 100,000 miles are for:

- Fatalities
- Injuries
- Safety Events
 - Accidents
 - Incidents
 - Occurrences
- System Reliability



TABLE 2-20: PERFORMANCE MEASURES ADOPTED IN THE PTASP

| PERFORMANCE MEASURES-FIXED ROUTE PER | | FISCAL YEAR | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--|--|
| E\ | /ERY 100,000 MILES | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | | |
| Fatalities | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Injuries | | 50 | 45 | 40 | 35 | | |
| | Accidents | 178 | 50 | 45 | 45 | | |
| Safety Events | Incidents | - | 78 | 70 | 65 | | |
| | Occurrences | - | 50 | 45 | 45 | | |
| System Reliability (Mean Distance Between Failures) | | 82,864 miles | 90,000 miles | 95,000 miles | 100,000 miles | | |

| PERFORMANCE MEASURES-STREETCAR PER EVERY 100,000 MILES | | FISCAL YEAR | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Injuries | | 9 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Safety Events | Accidents | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Incidents | 9 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| | Occurrences | 9 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| System Reliability (Mean Distance Between Failures) | | 2,879 hrs. | 2,900 hrs. | 2,950 hrs. | 3,000 hrs. |

| PERFORMANCE MEASURES-PARATRANSIT PER EVERY 100,000 MILES | | FISCAL YEAR | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Injuries | | 8 | 8 | 6 | 5 |
| Safety Events | Accidents | 20 | 17 | 15 | 12 |
| | Incidents | 25 | 22 | 19 | 15 |
| | Occurrences | 32 | 25 | 23 | 20 |
| System Reliability (Mean Distance Between Failures) | | 87,019 miles | 88,000 miles | 90,000 miles | 91,000 miles |



ADDRESSING PERFORMANCE IN RMS 2050

RMS 2050 MTP includes performance measures beyond those that are required by the final rules. These supplemental performance measures are quantifiable indicators of whether the policies and proposed program of projects in the RMS 2050 MTP help the region achieve the desired outcomes articulated in the adopted goals and objectives. This approach provides decision makers with the ability to objectively set policies and prioritize projects based on a project's anticipated outcomes and whether those outcomes truly address the region's transportation challenges by achieving the local, state and national goals and objectives.

The use of an outcome-based process using objective measures in the planning process also allows the MPO to track transportation system performance as the RMS 2050 MTP is implemented by tracking project performance after projects are constructed. This tracking of project performance will help the MPO determine whether the project's actual, real-world performance matches the results expected during the planning process. This approach also allows the EPMPO to meet its federal mandate for a process of continuous improvement of both the transportation system and the planning process itself.

planning-level performance The measures recommended for RMS 2050 MTP (Table 2-21) combine performance measures developed in collaboration with local stakeholders based on the adopted goals and objectives with performance measures required by the USDOT through federal regulations. In general, these performance measures fall into two broad categories. The first category includes those measures (such as mobility and accessibility) that can be modeled (using the MPO travel demand model of the regional transportation system) and quantified at the project level to evaluate the specific performance outcomes of individual projects or packages of projects. The second category includes measures (such as environmental sustainability) whose outcomes are more appropriately measured at the regional transportation system level (and which cannot be discretely modeled by the El Paso travel demand model).





TABLE 2-21: GOALS AND METRICS

| GOALS | PLAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES | NATIONAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | - Crashes per 100 Million Vehicle Mile Traveled | | |
| Safety | - Number of projects that include safety enhancements located near crash | Total crashes resulting in fatality or incapacitating injury | | |
| | notspots | Total crashes involving cyclists and pedestrians | | |
| Maintenance & Operations | - Number of projects that repair or replace | - Number of deficient bridges | | |
| | deficient bridges or pavements | - Lane miles of deficient pavement | | |
| | Travel Time Index (Actual Travel Time Divided by Non-Congested Travel Time) | - Percent Miles Traveled on Network that are reliable | | |
| Mobility | - Annual hours of delay (millions) | - Peak Hours Excessive Delay Per Capita | | |
| | - Commute times from Environmental Justice zones (min) | - Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTTRI) | | |
| Accessibility & Travel Choice | Percent of jobs, key destinations, and population within ½ mile of high-quality, rapid transit | Percent non-SOV (single occupancy vehicle) trips | | |
| | - Average trip costs | ., | | |
| Sustainability | - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) | - Estimated Max Daily CO Emissions (Tons/ Day) | | |
| Sustainability | - VMT per capita (regional) | - Estimated Max Daily PM10 Emissions (Tons/Day) | | |
| | - Annual hours of delay along major freight corridors | - | | |
| Economic Vitality | - Average wait times by mode at POEs | - | | |
| | Number of projects that improve operations or multimodal access at current or future POEs | - | | |
| Quality of Life | - The indicator for this goal is a summary of performance on each goal for each alternative relative to the other alternatives | - | | |
| Implementation | - Number of projects ready for implementation based on the Project Readiness Report | - | | |