

Chapter 9: Performance Management

9.1. Introduction

Transportation performance management is a strategic approach that uses system data to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. Progress toward achieving these national performance goals is monitored by establishing performance targets for key performance measures. Decision-makers, using a performance-based approach, can apply key information and data to understand the consequences of investment decisions across transportation modes.

The development and implementation of performance measures for MPOs serve to assess how the transportation system is functioning and operating. Performance measures can inform the decision-making process and improve accountability for the efficient and effective implementation of programs and projects. Performance measures serve the following functions for EPMPO:

- During the **Plan Development** process, performance measures provide a framework to benchmark performance and the effects of alternatives. This performance data is used to define transportation projects and can help inform decision-making between trade-offs and help communicate the anticipated impacts of different investment strategies.
- Performance measures support **Plan Implementation** by emphasizing EPMPO guiding principles and integrating them into budgeting, program structure, project selection, and implementation policies.
- **System performance** relative to the vision and guiding principles of RMS 2052 can be tracked and reported to support accountability for plan implementation and results.



9.1.1. Federal Legislation

In 2012, Congress passed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), which introduced a set of performance measures to:

- Increase the accountability and transparency of federal highway and transit programs; and,
- Improve project decision-making through performance-based planning and programming.

After national performance measures are established through a rulemaking process, the state departments of transportation (DOTs) and transit providers must:

- Establish performance targets that reflect the national measures. National performance measures are shown in **Table 9-1**.
- Report on progress towards achieving those targets.
- Develop performance-based plans for safety and asset management.
- Implement a performance-based approach to planning and programming.

Three years later, Congress passed the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The FAST Act continued the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) with only minor changes. The FAST Act confirmed that the overall purpose of this program is to significantly reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads by implementing infrastructure-related highway safety improvements.

The latest piece of consequential federal legislation is the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), sometimes called the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL). The President signed this law in November 2021 continuing the HSIP with several new requirements and increased funding levels.

- BIL emphasizes the importance of safety for the population with limited access as part of the HSIP by introducing a special rule for it and requiring all states to develop a Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment.
- BIL allows states to use up to 10% of their HSIP funds on specified safety projects.
- The BIL continues the HSIP to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities & serious injuries on all public roads, including non-state-owned public roads & roads on tribal land. HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads, focusing on performance.



- The BIL establishes a new special rule, the Vulnerable Road User Safety Special Rule, which applies to each state in which vulnerable road user fatalities account for not less than 15% of all annual crash fatalities and requires a State subject to the special rule to obligate not less than 15% of its HSIP funds the following FY for highway safety improvement projects to address vulnerable road user safety.

Table 9-1: National Performance Management Goals

Performance Measure	PM Targets
Safety (PM1)	Number of Fatalities Rate of Fatalities Number of Serious Injuries Rate of Serious Injuries Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities & Serious Injuries
Pavement & Bridge Condition (PM2)	IH Pavement in Good Condition IH Pavement in Poor Condition NHS Pavement in Good Condition NHS Pavement in Poor Condition Bridge Deck in Good Condition Bridge Deck in Poor Condition
Roadway System Performance (PM3)	IH Travel Time Reliability NHS Travel Time Reliability Freight Travel Time Reliability Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel Total Emissions Reduction
Transit Asset Management (TAM)	Rolling Stock (<i>Revenue Vehicles</i>) Equipment (<i>Non-Revenue Vehicles</i>) Facilities (<i>Transit Economic Requirement Model (TERM) Rating</i>) Infrastructure (<i>Performance Restrictions</i>)
Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)	Number of Fatalities Rate of Fatalities Number of Injuries Rate of Injuries Number of Safety Events Mean Distance Between Major Mechanical Failures

9.2. Transportation Performance Measurement

FHWA defines Transportation Performance Management (TPM) as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. State DOTs and MPOs are required to set HSIP targets to meet safety performance measures. Said safety measures are component of the Safety Performance



Measures (Safety PM) that support HSIP and provide both State DOTs and MPOs with the framework to implement TPM requirements, i.e., provide directional goals for related plans and programs as well as the means to monitor the progress toward attaining federal goals. MPOs may establish HSIP targets by either:

- Option 1: Agreeing to Adopt Targets Set by the state departments of transportation (both TxDOT and NMDOT for EPMPO).
- Option 2: Setting Their Own Specific HSIP Targets

These options are further summarized in **Table 9-2**.

Table 9-2: Target Setting Options for MPOs

If an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target,	If an MPO establishes its own HSIP target, the MPO would...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the State & safety stakeholders to address areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the MPA. • Coordinate with the State & include the safety performance measures and the State’s HSIP targets for those measures in the MTP. • Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process the safety goals, objectives, performance measures & targets described in other State safety transportation plans & processes, such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP. • Include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish HSIP targets for all public roads in the MPA in coordination with the State. • Estimate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for all public roads within the MPA for rate targets. • Coordinate with the State & include the safety performance measures & the MPO’s safety targets for those measures in the MTP. • Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process the safety goals, objectives, performance measures & targets described in other State safety transportation plans & processes, such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including SHSP. • Include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets

Source: FHWA MPO Safety PM Fact Sheet

EPMPO opted to adopt the HSIP targets set by TxDOT and NMDOT and, thus, have incorporated said targets into the programming and planning process of the MTP and TIP.

If implementing performance measures requires additions or changes to the MTP and TIP, the documents will be amended in the future. The adopted targets include the following key areas:



- Safety (PM1)
- Pavement & Bridge Condition (PM2)
- Roadway System Performance (PM3)
- Transit Asset Management (TAM)
- Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)

EPMPO adopted the applicable State of Texas’ and the State of New Mexico 2025 targets for PM2 (Pavement and Bridge Conditions) and PM3 (Roadway System Performance), as detailed in Resolution No. MPO 2023-05; PM1 (Safety) targets were updated on February 20, 2026, to align with the latest State of Texas and State of New Mexico targets via Resolution No. MPO 2026-02. **Table 9-3** summarizes the federal Final Rule effective dates and corresponding requirements for inclusion of PM1, PM2, and PM3 targets in the MTP, providing context for the timing of target adopting and reporting.

Table 9-3: Federal Performance Measure Final Rule Implementation Timeline

Final Rule	Rule Effective Date	MTP Inclusion Requirement	Reporting Schedule	Anticipated Target Setting Action
PM1: Safety	4/14/2016	5/27/2018	Annually	Early 2027
PM2: Infrastructure Condition	5/20/2017	5/20/2019	Biennially (within 4-year period)	Early 2027
PM3: System Performance	5/20/2017	5/20/2019	Biennially (within 4-year period)	Mid-2026 to Early 2027
Transit Asset Management (TAM)	10/1/2016	10/1/2018	Every four (4) years	Early 2027
Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP)	7/19/2018	7/20/2021	Updated and certified by transit agency on annual basis	

9.3. Safety Performance Measures

Safety performance management ensures that safety improvements guide funding priorities to advance the national goal for safe roadways. FHWA established safety measures (PM1) to carry out the HSIP. The five safety performance measures to evaluate fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads are:

- 3 Number of Traffic-Related Fatalities.
- 4 Rate of Traffic-Related Fatalities Per 100 Million VMT.



- 5 Number of Traffic-Related Serious Injuries.
- 6 Rate of Traffic-Related Serious Injuries Per 100 Million VMT.
- 7 Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities & Serious Injuries.

The states provide safety performance targets annually to FHWA for each safety performance measure. Current statewide safety targets address the calendar year 2026 and are based on an anticipated five-year rolling average (2021-2025). Texas statewide safety performance targets for 2026 are included **Table 9-4**.

Table 9-4: Safety (PM1) Performance Conditions and Adopted Performance Targets

Performance Measure	TX Statewide Target (2026)	NM Statewide Target (2026)	Reported: Texas (2024)	Reported: New Mexico (2024)
Safety				
Number of Fatalities	≤ 4,506	≤ 445	4,152	415
Rate of Fatalities	≤ 1.44	≤ 1.644	1.47	1.448
Number of Serious Injuries	≤ 18,884	≤ 1,018.6	18,216	1,243
Rate of Serious Injuries	≤ 6.30	≤ 3.800	6.22	4.337
Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	≤ 2,802	≤ 200.0	2,726	246

9.4. Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Management

FHWA published the Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Management Final Rule, which established performance measures to evaluate the condition of pavement and bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) and the Interstate System about the State of Good Repair (SGR), effective May 20, 2017. This second FHWA performance measure rule (PM2) established six performance measures:

- 1 Percent of Interstate pavements in good condition.
- 2 Percent of Interstate pavements in poor condition.
- 3 Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in good condition.
- 4 Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in poor condition.
- 5 Percent of NHS bridges by deck area classified as in good condition.
- 6 Percent of NHS bridges by deck area classified as in poor condition.



9.4.1. Pavement Condition Measures

The pavement condition measures represent the percentage of lane miles on the Interstate or non-Interstate NHS that are in good or poor condition. FHWA established five metrics to assess pavement conditions: the International Roughness Index (IRI), cracking percent, rutting, faulting, and Present Serviceability Rating (PSR). A threshold is used for each metric to establish good, fair, or poor conditions.

Pavement condition is assessed using these metrics and thresholds. A pavement section is in good condition if three metric ratings are good and in poor condition if two or more metric ratings are poor. Pavement sections that are not good or poor are considered fair.

The pavement condition measures are expressed as a percentage of all applicable roads in good or poor condition. Pavement in good condition suggests that no significant investment is needed. Pavement in poor condition suggests major reconstruction investment is required due to either ride quality or structural deficiency.

9.4.2. Bridge Condition Measures

The bridge condition measures represent the percentage of bridges, by deck area, on the NHS that are in good condition or poor condition. The condition of each bridge is evaluated by assessing four bridge components: deck, superstructure, substructure, and culverts. FHWA created a metric rating threshold for each component to establish good, fair, or poor conditions. Every bridge on the NHS is evaluated using these component ratings. If the lowest rating of the four metrics is greater than or equal to seven, the structure is classified as good. The structure is classified as poor if the lowest rating is less than or equal to four. If the lowest rating is five or six, it is classified as fair.

To determine the percentage of bridges in good or poor condition, the sum of the total deck area of good or poor NHS bridges is divided by the total deck area of bridges on the NHS. The deck area is computed using structure length and either deck width or approach roadway width. Good condition suggests that no significant investment is needed. Bridges in poor condition are safe to drive on; however, they are nearing a point where substantial reconstruction or replacement is necessary.

9.4.3. Pavement and Bridge Targets

Pavement and bridge condition performance is assessed and reported over a four-year performance period. The PM2 rule requires states and MPOs to establish two-year and four-year performance targets for each PM2 measure. The current two-year targets represent the expected pavement and bridge condition at the end of calendar year 2024, while the current four-year targets represent the expected condition at the end of calendar year 2025.



States establish targets as follows:

- Percent of Interstate pavements in good and poor condition – four-year targets.
- Percent of non-Interstate NHS pavements in good and poor condition – two-year and four-year targets.
- Percent of NHS bridges by deck area in good and poor condition – two-year and four-year targets.

MPOs establish four-year targets for each measure by either agreeing to program projects supporting the statewide targets or setting quantifiable targets for the MPO’s planning area that differ from the state targets. The EPMPO has adopted statewide targets for TxDOT and NMDOT as shown in **Table 9-5**.

Table 9-5: Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance Targets

Performance Measure	Baseline	2-Year Target	2-Year Reported Condition	4-Year Target
	Texas			
% of Interstate Pavements in Good Condition	64.5%	63.9%	65.6%	≥ 63.6%
% of Interstate Pavements in Poor Condition	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	≤ 0.2%
% of non-Interstate Pavements in Good Condition	51.7%	45.5%	51.3%	≥ 46.0%
% of non-Interstate Pavements in Poor Condition	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	≤ 2.5%
% of NHS bridges in Good Condition	49.2%	48.5%	48.9%	≥ 47.6%
% of NHS bridges in Poor Condition	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%	≤ 1.5%
	New Mexico			
% of Interstate Pavements in Good Condition	54.0%	42.7%	57.7%	≥ 37%
% of Interstate Pavements in Poor Condition	1.7%	3.2%	1.60%	≤ 3.8%
% of non-Interstate Pavements in Good Condition	36.7%	40.6%	37.4%	≥ 37.4%
% of non-Interstate Pavements in Poor Condition	2.6%	3.2%	2.6%	≤ 3.9%
% of NHS bridges in Good Condition	36.2%	30.8%	36.2%	≥ 25.0%



Performance Measure	Baseline	2-Year Target	2-Year Reported Condition	4-Year Target
% of NHS bridges in Poor Condition	2.4%	4.1%	2.4%	≤ 5.0 %

9.5. System Performance, Freight Movement and CMAQ Performance Measures

The FHWA published the Travel Time Reliability Final Rule (PM3), which established performance measures to evaluate the performance of the NHS and freight movement on the Interstate System, effective May 20, 2017. This performance measure rule established three roadway system performance measures applicable to EPMPO:

National Highway System Performance:

- 1 Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable.
- 2 Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable.

Freight Movement on the Interstate:

- 3 Truck Travel Time Reliability Index (TTTR).

9.5.1. National Highway System Performance Measures

The two system performance measures assess the reliability of travel times on the Interstate or non-Interstate NHS system. The performance metric used to calculate reliability is the Level of Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR). LOTTR is defined as the ratio of longer travel times (80th percentile) to a normal travel time (50th percentile) over all applicable roads during four time periods (AM peak, Mid-day, PM peak, and weekends) over the hours of 6 AM to 8 PM.

The LOTTR ratio is calculated for each segment of the applicable roadway, essentially comparing it with itself for the four time periods. A segment is deemed reliable if its LOTTR is less than 1.5 during all four periods. That segment is unreliable if one or more periods have a LOTTR of 1.5 or above.

The measures are expressed as the percentage of person-miles traveled on the Interstate or non-Interstate NHS system, which is reliable and requires several data calculations to convert from LOTTR to person-miles. Person-miles consider the number of people traveling in buses, cars, and trucks over these roadway segments. To determine the total person miles traveled, each segment's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is multiplied by average vehicle occupancy. To calculate the percentage of person miles traveled that are reliable, the sum



of the number of reliable person miles traveled is divided by the sum of total person miles traveled.

9.5.2. Freight Movement Performance Measures

The Freight Movement performance measure assesses the reliability of trucks traveling on the Interstate system. A TTTR ratio is generated by dividing the 95th percentile truck travel time by an average travel time (50th percentile) for each segment of the Interstate system over five time periods throughout weekdays and weekends (AM peak, Mid-day, PM peak, weekend, and overnight) that cover all hours of the day. For each segment, the highest TTTR value among the five time periods is multiplied by the length of the segment. The sum of all length-weighted segments is then divided by the total length of the Interstate to generate the TTTR Index.

The difference in the travel time measured and the periods between the LOTTR and the TTTR reflect the differences between passenger vehicle and truck travel.

9.5.3. Roadway System Performance Management – National Highway System and Freight Reliability

Performance for the PM3 measures is assessed and reported over a four-year performance period.

The PM3 rule requires state DOTs and MPOs to establish two-year and four-year performance targets for each PM3 measure. The current two-year and four-year targets represent expected performance at the end of calendar years 2024 and 2026, respectively.

States establish targets as follows:

- Percent of person-miles on the Interstate system that are reliable – two-year and four-year targets.
- Percent of person-miles on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable – four-year targets.
- Truck Travel Time Reliability – two-year and four-year targets.

MPOs establish four-year targets for the System Performance and Freight Movement by either agreeing to programs and projects that will support the statewide targets or setting quantifiable targets for the MPO’s planning area that differ from the state targets. EPMPO adopted the NMDOT and TxDOT statewide PM3 targets on January 21, 2023 (**Table 9-6**).



Table 9-6: PM3 National Highway System and Freight Reliability Performance Targets

Performance Measure	Baseline	2-Year Target	2-Year Reported Condition	4-Year Target
Texas				
% of person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable	84.6%	70%	80.1%	70%
% of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	90.3%	70%	86.1%	70%
Truck Travel Time Reliability	1.39	1.55	1.42	1.55
New Mexico				
% of person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable	98.5%	95.1%	97.2%	90%
% of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable	97.5%	94.1%	95.5%	90%
Truck Travel Time Reliability	1.23	1.3	1.19	1.40

While PM3 focuses on system reliability and freight movement on the National Highway System, additional congestion and air quality performance measures required for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program are discussed in Section 9.5.4.

9.5.4. Congestion and Air Quality Performance Measures (CMAQ)

The CMAQ Program requires all MPOs to track congestion and on-road mobile source emissions performance using federally defined measures that complement, but also distinct from, PM3 roadway system reliability metrics, as shown in Table 9-7.

Table 9-7: PM3 CMAQ Congestion and Emission Reduction Performance Targets

Performance Measure	Baseline	2-Year Target	2-Year Reported Condition	4-Year Target
Congestion Metrics - EPMPO				
Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) per capita	8.4	9	8.9	10
% of non-SOV Travel	21.4%	20%	22.8%	22%
Air Quality Metrics - Texas				



Performance Measure	Baseline	2-Year Target	2-Year Reported Condition	4-Year Target
Total emission reduction PM-10 (kg/day)	5.42	4.54	3.56	170.05
Total emission reduction NOX (kg/day)	*	*	*	85.32
Total emission reduction VOC (kg/day)	*	*	*	64.41
Total emission reduction CO (kg/day)	219.5	175.75	154.25	1374.3
Air Quality Metrics - New Mexico				
Total emission reduction PM-10 (kg/day)	0.0099	0.0021	0.016	0.078
Total emission reduction NOX (kg/day)	0.0368	0.0032	0.151	0.043
Total emission reduction VOC (kg/day)	0.0572	0.0108	0.216	0.08

*EPMPO was not subjected to two-year targets and does not have information to report.

9.6. Transit Asset Management

Sun Metro’s Transit Asset Management Plan (TAMP) specifies activities (maintenance, replacement, etc.), resources, and timescales required for a group of assets to achieve the agency’s service and asset management objectives. The City of El Paso Mass Transit Department is the only designated recipient of FTA Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program funds under 49 U.S.C. Section 5307 in the El Paso MPO Urbanized Planning Area. Sun Metro is the primary transit provider in the El Paso region including three distinct transit services: fixed-route bus, ADA paratransit, and El Paso Streetcar.

- Sun Metro operates 161 buses.
- Sun Metro operates 67 vans for its ADA paratransit service.
- Sun Metro operates 6 streetcars.

Sun Metro employs about 647 people, has an operating expense of \$63.2 million, and an annual ridership of approximately 6.1 million passengers.

In addition to Sun Metro, the South Central Regional Transit District (SCRTD) operates within portions of the El Paso MPO region and is classified as a Tier II transit provider. SCRTD elects to participate in the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) Group Tier II Transit Asset Management Plan, rather than preparing an individual TAMP.



SCRTD is explicitly listed as a participating subrecipient in the NMDOT Group Plan. SCRTD provides fixed-route transit service across Doña Ana, Otero, and Sierra Counties, with additional service connections reaching El Paso County, Texas. The district operates regional bus routes linking communities such as Las Cruces, Anthony, Sunland Park, Hatch/Garfield, and several rural communities.

- SCRTD operates 18 buses.
- Sun Metro operates 4 vans, 2 administrative vehicles, and 2 service trucks in their fleet.

As of 2024, SCRTD has an operating expense of \$2 million, and an annual ridership of approximately 132,818 passengers.

The transit asset management performance targets are displayed in **Table 9-8**.

Table 9-8: Transit Asset Management Performance Targets

Performance Measure	TX Statewide Target (2024-2026)	NM Statewide Target (2025)	Sun Metro	ETA
% of revenue vehicles by type exceeding the useful life benchmark	<15%	<20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •<15% Buses •<10% Articulated buses, cutaway buses, and automobiles •<20% Streetcar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •5% Cutaway Buses •<0% Van
% of non-revenue vehicles by type exceeding the useful life benchmark	<15%	<20%	<15%	0%
% of facilities by group rated under 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model Scale	<15%	<20%	<15%	75%
% of track segments by mode under performance restrictions	<95%	NA	>95%	N/A



9.7. PTASP Safety Performance for Transit Services

9.7.1. PTASP Safety Performance for Sun Metro by Mode of Service

The PTASP Final Rule, 49 CFR Part 673.11(a)(3), requires that all public transportation providers must develop an Agency Safety Plan to include safety performance targets (SPTs) based on the safety performance measures established under the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP). The safety performance measures outlined in the NSP were developed to ensure that the measures can be applied to all modes of public transportation and are based on data currently being submitted to the National Transit Database. The safety performance measures included in the NSP are fatalities, injuries, safety events, and system reliability (State of Good Repair as developed and tracked in the Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan).

The City of El Paso adopted the fifth version of the Sun Metro PTASP for calendar year 2025 on October 1, 2024, as shown in Table 12-9 and Table 7-10. As per the current PTASP, Sun Metro has met the following STPs in the 2023 Calendar Year. It is important to note that there is no risk to federal funding within the metropolitan planning area if these performance targets are unmet. However, the MPO will coordinate with Sun Metro to ensure that plans and programs as part of the metropolitan planning process support achieving the targets shown in **Table 9-9** and **Table 9-10**.

Table 9-9: PTASP - Fixed Bus Route

Performance Measure	Baseline (2023)	Target (2025)
Fatalities	1	0
Rate of Fatalities per 100,000 VRM	0	0
Injuries	46	41
Rate of Injuries per 100,000 VRM	9.23	8.2
Safety Events	16	17
Rate of Safety Events per 100,000 VRM	0.28	0.31

Table 9-10: PTASP - Demand Response

Performance Measure	Baseline (2023)	Target (2025)
Fatalities	0	0
Rate of Fatalities per 100,000 VRM	0.00	0.00
Injuries	4	2
Rate of Injuries per 100,000 VRM	5.36	2.34
Safety Events	3	2
Rate of Safety Events per 100,000 VRM	0.1504	0.0795



9.7.2. PTASP Safety Performance for ETA

The February 2026 version of the ETA PTASP includes safety performance measures for the agency. The measures are included in Table 9-11. As like for Sun Metro performance measures, it should be noted that there is no risk to federal funding within the metropolitan planning area if these performance targets are unmet and the MPO will coordinate with ETA to ensure support achieving the targets.

Table 9-11: PTASP for ETA

Performance Measure		2023	2024	2025	2026
Fatalities		-	-	-	0
Injuries		-	-	-	1
Safety Events	Vehicular Collisions	-	-	-	6
	Pedestrian Collisions	-	-	-	0
	Assaults on Workers	-	-	-	0
System Reliability (Mean Distance Between Failures)		-	-	-	206,512