

# TELEPHONE SURVEY OF DALLAS NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY USERS

by Katie N. Womack

Study Supervisor, Dock Burke

September 1989 Final Report

Technical Study Number 2-16-89-1242

Sponsored by Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation

Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, TX 77843

TEXAS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE

THE TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY SYSTEM COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

.

. .

.

TECHNICAL REPORT STANDARD TITLE PAGE

Katie N. Womack and Dock Burke       Technical Report 1242-1         Performing Organization Name and Address       19. Work Unit No.         Texas Transportation Institute       11. Centract or Grant No.         College Station, Texas 77843-3135       11. Centract or Grant No.         12. Sponsering Agency Neme and Address       13. Type of Report and Parinad Coursed         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       Final - September 1988         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       P.         P. O. Box 5051       Austin, Texas 78763         15. Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstreet       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4. Trik and Submit:       5. Reser Date September 1989         7. Author's:       6. Performing Organization Code         7. Author's:       8. Performing Organization Code         7. Author's:       8. Performing Organization Code         9. Performing Organization Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas Add University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       10. Work Unit No.         12. Seconsering Agency Neme and Address College Station, Texas 77843-3135       11. Connect or Grant No.         12. Seconsering Agency Neme and Address Research performed for the State of Texas.       Final - September         13. Supplementary Memory       Seconsering Agency Code         14. Abstract       Seconsering Agency Memory         15. Supplementary Memory       Seconsering Agency Code         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Image: State			
4. Trite and Submite Telephone Survey of Dallas North.Central Expressway Users       5. Resert Date September 1989         7. Author's: Author's: Author's: Performing Organization Expert Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       10. Work Univ No. Technical Report 1242-1         12. Spensoning Agency Name and Address Transportation, Texas 77843-3135       10. Work Univ No. September 1988         12. Spensoning Agency Name and Address Transportation, Transportation Planning Division P. O. Box 5051 Austin, Texas 78763       11. Centres or Grant Na. September 1988         13. Type of Report and Paint Courter Austin, Texas 78763       September 1989         14. Spensoning Agency Code Austin, Austing, Texas 78763       September 1989         15. Supplementary News Research performed for the State of Texas.       14. Spensoning Agency Code         16. Additioner       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         September 10	4. Trike and Subfile       5. Bear Date: September 1989         7. Author's:       6. Performing Organization Code         7. Author's:       8. Performing Organization Code         8. Performing Organization Nome and Address       10. Work Unit No.         7. Performing Organization Nome and Address       10. Work Unit No.         7. Author's:       8. Performing Organization Report 1         8. Performing Organization Nome and Address       10. Work Unit No.         7. Author's:       10. Work Unit No.         7. Author's:       11. Contract or Grant No.         7. Author's:       Station, Texas 77843-3135         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address:       11. Contract or Grant No.         7. O. Box 5051       Transportation Planning Division         9. O. Box 5051       Austin, Texas 78763         13. Supplementary Mate:       Research performed for the State of Texas.         14. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         No restrictions. This document available to the public through Statement, available to thenouth Sta			
Telephone Survey of Dallas North Central Expressway Users       September 1989         * Performing Organization Reservice Katie N. Womack and Dock Burke       Performing Organization Reservice Technical Report 1242-1         * Performing Organization Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       10. Work Univ Ne.         12. Spearcing Agency Name and Address Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. O. Box 5051       11. Centrest or Grant Ne. Study No. 2-16-89-1242         13. Supplementer Work Research performed for the State of Texas.       14. Spearcing Agency Code         16. Advincet       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         16. Advincet       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Key Words Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, non-users.       18. Distributes Stetement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 525 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Cleast, (of this report)       20. Security Cleast, (of this peget)       21. No of Peget 22. Price	Telephone Survey of Dallas North Central       September 1989         ExpressWay Users       Performing Organization Cod         7. Author's:       8. Performing Organization Report 1         8. Performing Organization News and Address       Texas Transportation Institute         The Texas A&M University System       10. Work University System         College Station, Texas 77843-3135       11. Contract or Grant No.         12. Spensoing Agency News and Address       September         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       September         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       Prinal - September         7. Austin, Texas 78763       September         13. Supplementary Mates       Research performed for the State of Texas.         14. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         No restrictions. This document available to the public through specific through Statement, available to the public through specific	d Subtitle		
17. Kry Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Abstract       19. Distributes Statement         19. Referming Organization Name and Address       10. Work Unit Ne.         Texas Transportation Name and Address       10. Work Unit Ne.         Texas Transportation, Texas 77843-3135       10. Work Unit Ne.         12. Security Approx Name and Address       10. Work Unit Ne.         12. Security Approx Name and Address       11. Convector of Grant Ne.         13. September of Highways and Public       11. September 1988         14. September 1988       Final - September 1988         15. Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Kry Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Septem	17. Key Words       Expressively Users         17. Key Words       Expressively Users, North Central         17. Key Words       Expressively Users, North Central         17. Key Words       Expressively Users, North Central         18. Absinger       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         19. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         10. Key Words       September         10. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			September 1989
Katie N. Womack and Dock Burke     Technical Report 1242-1       9. Performing Orgenisation Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135     10. Work Univ No.       12. Security Agency Name and Address Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. O. Box 5051 Austin, Texas. 78763     11. Centract or Grant No. September 1988 Final - September 1988 Final - September 1988       13. September News Research performed for the State of Texas.     14. Seconsoring Agency Code       14. Abstract     14. Seconsoring Agency Code       15. Abstract     SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY       IB. Directedules Statement: No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Pork Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161       19. Security Cleast, (of this sege)	Katie N. Womack and Dock Burke     Technical Report 1       9. Performing Organization Name and Address Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&W University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135     10. Work Unit No.       12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. 0. Box So51 Austin, Texas 78763     11. Contract or Grant No. Suplementary Nets       13. Supplementary Nets     Research performed for the State of Texas.     14. Spensoring Agency Code       14. Abstract     See THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY     14. Spensoring Agency Code       16. Abstract     SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY     18. Distribution Stetement' No restrictions. This document available to the public through in Austional Technical Information Se 5285 Port Royal Road		NorthScentral	·
17. Key Words       10. Users of Address         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       11. Centract or Grant No.         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       11. Centract or Grant No.         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       11. Centract or Grant No.         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       11. Centract or Grant No.         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address         13. Supplementary Notes       Final - September 1988         13. Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         14. Abstract       Seen the State of Texas.         15. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         16. Abstract       18. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       18. Distribution State or State o	7. Key Words       10. Distribution Name and Address         9. Performing Organization Name and Address       10. Work Unit No.         Texas Transportation Institute       11. Contract of Grant No.         College Station, Texas       77843-3135         12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Period         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       13. Type of Report and Period         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       14. Spensoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas, 78763       15. Supplementary Mente         13. Supplementary Mente       See The EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Image: State Department of Control         Image: State Department of Highways and Public         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division         P. O. Box 5051       Austin, Texas, 78763         13. Supplementary Mente       See The EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         No restrictions. This document available to the public through the available to the publi	,)		8. Performing Organization Report N
Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       11. Centrect or Grant No. Study No. 2-16-89-1242         12. Seensering Agency Nees and Address Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. 0. Box 5051 Austin, Texas 78763       13. September 1988 Final - September 1989         13. Supplementary Notes Research performed for the State of Texas.       14. Seensering Agency Code         14. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         15. Abstract       No restrictions. The Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, non-users.         17. Key Words Expressway Users, non-users.       18. Dustibuting Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Clessif. (of this repert)       20. Security Clessif. (of this repert)       21. No. of Feget 22. Price	Texas Transportation Institute The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       11. Contract or Grant No. Study No. 2-16-89- 12. Spread Report and Period ( Final - September Final - September Final - September Final - September 14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas 78763       15. Supplementary Mores Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Key Words Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, non-users.       18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document available to the public through in National Technical Information Setson	N. Womack and Dock Bu	rke	Technical Report 1242
The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       I. Center or Gran No.         12. Sponsoring Agency News and Address Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. 0. Box 5051 Austin, Texas 78763.       I. Center of Gran No.         13. Supplementary Notes Research performed for the State of Texas.       I. Sponsoring Agency Code         14. Abstract       See THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         It E EXPERSIVE Summa Suma Su	The Texas A&M University System College Station, Texas 77843-3135       11. Contract or Grant No. Study No. 2-16-89- 13. Type of Report and Parice (Final - September Final - September Final - September Masser (September Noise Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Key Words Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.       18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document for available to the public through to National Technical Information Set	ing Organization Name and Address		10. Work Unit No.
111. The Texas Address       Study No. 2-16-89-1242         12. Spensoing Agency News and Address       13. Type of Report and Period Covered         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       Transportation; Transportation Planning Division         P. O. Box 5051       Austin, Texas 78763         13. Supplementary News       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Abstract       No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service (S28 Fort Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Cleastif. (of this report)       20. Security Cleastif. (of this page)       21. No. of Paget 22. Price	17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Abstract       19. Distribution Statement         17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY			
12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       13. Type of Report and Penide Covered         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       Final - September 1988         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       14. Spensoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas 78763       September 1988         Ts. Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Distribution Stetment         Notes         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Distribution Stetment         Notes         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Distribution Stetment         No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service S285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         20. Security Cleastif. (of this report)         20. Security Cleastif. (of this report)	12. Sponsoring Agency Neme and Address       13. Type of Report and Period (         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       Final - September         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas 78763       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Key Worde       IB, Distribution Statement         18. Abstract       IB, Distribution Statement         17. Key Worde       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         IP: Key Worde         IB, Distribution Statement         IP: Key Worde         IB, Distribution Statement         No restrictions. This document in available to the public through in restrictional Technical Information Set			
12. Spensoring Agency Name and Address       Final - September 1988         Texas State Department of Highways and Public       Final - September 1989         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       P. 0. Box 5051         Austin, Texas 78763       September 1988         Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Distribution Stetement         17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 528 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         20. Security Cleastif. (of this report)         20. Security Cleastif. (of this report)	12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address       Final - September         Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       If. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas 78763       If. Sponsoring Agency Code         15. Supplementary Motes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         18. Abstract       No restrictions. This document in the public through in the public th	ge Station, Texas 77	843-3135	Study No. 2-16-89-124
Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. 0. Box 5051 Austin, Texas 78763       Final - September 1989         13. Supplementary Motes Research performed for the State of Texas.       Image: September 1989         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Image: September 1989         Image: September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         Itemperature for the State of Texas.         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         Itemperature for the State of Texas.         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1089         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 1989         September 10000         September 10000	Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation; Transportation Planning Division P. 0. Box 5051 Austin, Texas 78763       Final - September         18. Supplementary Notes Research performed for the State of Texas.       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         18. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         19. Key Words Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.       18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document available to the public through is National Technical Information Set 2825 Port Royal Road	ring Agency Name and Address	······································	Sontombon 100
Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas       78763         15. Supplementary Notes       Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         It is pressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.         17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service S285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Cleaself. (of this report)       20. Security Cleaself. (of this page)       21. No. of Paget 22. Price	Transportation; Transportation Planning Division       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas, 78763       15. Supplementary Notes         Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Absurger         16. Absurger         17. Key Worde         Expressway Users, North Central         Expressway Users, non-users.         18. Distribution Statement: National Technical Information Set		ighways and Public	Final - September 198
P. O. Box 5051       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas, 78763       15. Supermentary Mores         Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Ite EXECUTIVE SUMMARY <td< td=""><td>P. 0. Box 5051       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas, 78763       15. Supplementary Notes         Research performed for the State of Texas.       16. Abstract         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         It Key Words         It Key Words         17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         It Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.</td><td>portation; Transporta</td><td>tion Planning Division</td><td></td></td<>	P. 0. Box 5051       14. Sponsoring Agency Code         Austin, Texas, 78763       15. Supplementary Notes         Research performed for the State of Texas.       16. Abstract         16. Abstract       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         It Key Words         It Key Words         17. Key Words       SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         It Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.	portation; Transporta	tion Planning Division	
15. Supplementary Notes         Research performed for the State of Texas.         16. Abstract         17. Key Worde         EXPRESSWAY Users, North Central         Expressway Users, North Central         Expressway, Expressway Usage,         respondents, non-users.         18. Distribution Statement         No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Classif. (of this report)         20. Security Classif. (of this report)         20. Security Classif. (of this report)	<ul> <li><sup>15.</sup> Supplementary Notes</li> <li>Research performed for the State of Texas.</li> <li>16. Abstract</li> <li>SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</li> <li>SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</li> <li><sup>17.</sup> Key Words</li> <li>Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.</li> <li><sup>18.</sup> Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document available to the public through the National Technical Information Se 5285 Port Royal Road</li> </ul>		J =	14. Sponsoring Agency Code
16. Abstract         16. Abstract         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Its Distribution Sectoment' Set THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY         Its Distribution Sectoment' No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service S285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         Its Security Cleaself. (of this page)         17. Key Words       20. Security Cleaself. (of this page)         Its document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service S285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161	Research performed for the State of Texas. 16. Abstract SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 17. Key Words Expressway Users, North Central Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users. 18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document in available to the public through the National Technical Information Se 5285 Port Royal Road	n, Texas 78763		1
16. Abstract         17. Key Words         Expressive Users, North Central         Expressway Users, North Central         Expressway, Expressway Usage,         respondents, non-users.         18. Distribution Statement         This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road         Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Clessif. (of this report)         20. Security Clessif. (of this page)         21. No. of Pages         22. Price	<ul> <li>16. Abstract</li> <li>SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</li> <li>17. Key Words</li> <li>Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.</li> <li>18. Distribution Statement' No restrictions. This document available to the public through the National Information Statement Statement' National Information Statement Statement'</li> </ul>			
17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Clessif. (of this report)       20. Security Clessif. (of this page)         19. Security Clessif. (of this report)       20. Security Clessif. (of this page)	<ul> <li>SEE THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</li> <li>17. Key Words         <ul> <li>Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.</li> <li>18. Distribution Statement To restrictions. This document for available to the public through to available to the public through to state the public through the public through to state the public through to state the public through the publi</li></ul></li></ul>	ren pertormed for the	STATE OT LEXAS.	
17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Clessif. (of this report)       20. Security Clessif. (of this page)         19. Security Clessif. (of this report)       20. Security Clessif. (of this page)	17. Key Worde       18. Disvibution Stetement         Expressway Users, North Central       No restrictions. This document is available to the public through it available to the public through it stricted information Set 5285 Port Royal Road			
17. Key Words       18. Distribution Statement         Expressway Users, North Central       No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service         Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.       No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service         19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price	<ul> <li>17. Key Words</li> <li>Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.</li> <li>18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document available to the public through the National Technical Information Second</li> </ul>	:1		
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.	SEE THE	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 2216119. Security Classif. (of this report)20. Security Classif. (of this page)21. No. of Pages22. Price	Expressway Users, North Central Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.			
Expressway, Expressway Usage, respondents, non-users.       National Technical Information Service 5285 Port Royal Road Springfield, Virginia 22161         19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price	respondents, non-users.   National Technical Information Se	rda	18. Distribution Ste	em en 1
19. Security Classif. (of this report)       20. Security Classif. (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22. Price		essway Users, North Cer	itral   No restricti	ons. This document is
19. Security Classif, (of this report)       20. Security Classif, (of this page)       21- No. of Pages       22. Price	Springfield, Virginia 22161	essway Users, North Cer essway, Expressway Usag	ntral   No restricti available to	ons. This document is the public through the
		essway Users, North Cer essway, Expressway Usag	ntral   No restricti available to National Teo 5285 Port Ro	ons. This document is the public through the chnical Information Serv yal Road
Unclassified 40	19. Security Classif, (of this report)       20. Security Classif, (of this page)       21. No. of Pages       22.	essway Users, North Cer essway, Expressway Usag	ntral   No restricti available to National Teo 5285 Port Ro	ons. This document is the public through the chnical Information Serv yal Road
	Unclassified 40	essway Users, North Cer essway, Expressway Usag ondents, non-users.	ntral Je, National Tec S285 Port Ro Springfield	ons. This document is the public through the chnical Information Serv yal Road Virginia 22161

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-69)

\_ ·

.

.

. \_\_\_\_.

# **METRIC (SI\*) CONVERSION FACTORS**



\* SI is the symbol for the International System of Measurements

. .

# DISCLAIMER

The contents of this report reflect the view of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official view or policy of the Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, a specification, or a regulation.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY DALLAS NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY USER SURVEY

The Texas Transportation Institute, in conjunction with the Public Policy Resources Laboratory at Texas A&M University, conducted a telephone survey of Dallas and suburban Dallas residents to determine North Central Expressway user opinions, travel behaviors, and transportation preferences.

Of the 1356 Dallas and Collin County residents surveyed, 81 percent used the expressway to some extent. A distinction was made between users and non-users with non-users defined as those who traveled on North Central Expressway less than once a week, and users defined as those who traveled on North Central Expressway at least once a week. Using this definition, 31 percent of the survey respondents were North Central Expressway users. Eleven percent of those surveyed reported they traveled on North Central Expressway every day.

Forty-one percent of the North Central Expressway users traveled on the expressway to get to work. Of this group, 41 percent traveled to or through the downtown area to get to work. These commuters typically resided in the North Central Expressway corridor, traveled from the West side of the corridor, drove to work alone, and had more than one vehicle in their household.

Overall, users of North Central Expressway differed from nonusers with regard to the following:

- Larger number of public transportation users
- More who take the bus to work
- Public transportation issues more important
- More apt to use rail
- Younger
- More males than females
- Higher incomes

questions concerning transportation response to In alternatives, 15.5 percent of the sample reported that they have ever ridden a city bus (39 percent of this group reported being frequent bus riders). Sixty-one percent of the survey respondents said they would use rail to some extent, if provided on North Central Expressway, and 12 percent of this group predicted they would use it every day. Fifty-two percent of the respondents said they would use a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane on North Central Expressway, if provided, and 13 percent of this group predicted they would use it every day. Predicted use of the HOV lane had a negative association with income--the higher the income, the lower Predicted rail transportation users were more the expected use. likely to be young (20 to 39 years) and male.

When provided a list of transportation issues related to North Central Expressway use, survey respondents rated **safety** as the number one issue. A similar question pertaining to public transportation also revealed safety as the most important issue.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

# PAGE 1 2 5 North Central Expressway Usage . . . . . . . 5 8 11 Use of Public Transportation . . . . . . . . 13 Transportation Preferences . . . . . . . . . . . 15 21

.

# LIST OF TABLES

# PAGE

.

TABLE 1	Characteristics of Survey Sample Sample Size = 1356	6
TABLE 2	Frequency of Use for Respondents Located Inside and Outside the North Central Corridor	7
TABLE 3	Trip Purpose of Users by Location $\ldots$	8
TABLE 4	Trip Purpose by Gender	11
TABLE 5	Average Number of Trips Alone, Shared, and by Bus During Previous Two-Week Period	12
TABLE 6	Usual Distance Traveled on North Central Expressway	13
TABLE 7	Bus Use by Location and North Central Expressway Use	14
TABLE 8	Ratings of Transportation Issues by North Central Expressway Users	16
TABLE 9	North Central Expressway Users and	17
	Non-Users	17
TABLE 1	0 Likelihood of Using HOV Lane by Location .	18
TABLE 1	1 Likelihood of Using Rail by Location	19
TABLE 1	2 Predicted HOV Lane Use and Rail Use $\ldots$	20
TABLE 1	3 Comparison of Willingness to Pay for Rail and Bus Trips	21

vi

# LIST OF FIGURES

× 1

			PAGE
FIGURE	1	North Central Expressway Corridor	3
FIGURE	2	North Central Expressway Usage by Gender	8
FIGURE	3	North Central Expressway Usage by Age	9
FIGURE	4	North Central Expressway Usage by Age and Location	9
FIGURE	5	North Central Expressway Usage by Income	10
FIGURE	6	North Central Expressway Usage by Income and Location	10

## TELEPHONE SURVEY OF DALLAS NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY USERS

#### INTRODUCTION

For several years, the Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation (SDHPT) has been working toward a design for the reconstruction of the North Central Expressway in Dallas. Changing political issues and transportation priorities have complicated the decision-making process. Currently, the Dallas Area Rapid Transit authority and SDHPT are seeking solutions to accommodate the transportation needs for travel in the North Central Corridor.

In seeking solutions, the SDHPT put into action recommendations that were summarized in the <u>Transportation 2020</u> study conducted in 1988. The role of planning as determined by the <u>Transportation 2020</u> study should include all governmental entities <u>and</u> the private sector in the planning process as early as possible. "Accurate information about needs and pitfalls is best identified this way" (SDHPT, 1988, p. 30). The report continues with the charge:

> Practice strategic planning, which enables the public sector to establish broad direction. Strategic planning envisions long-term needs and resources while evaluating external concerns and expectations. It allows better evaluation of competitive transportation initiatives for allocation of limited monetary resources (SDHPT, 1988, p.31).

To enhance involvement of the public in the planning process, a telephone survey was conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI). This telephone survey was designed to provide current information that would assist SDHPT in documenting the public's use of the corridor, expectations of its future use, and preferences for transportation choices within the corridor.

Information was sought regarding the transportation habits of users of the North Central Expressway corridor as well as expectations of future use. Four specific objectives were addressed with the telephone survey:

- 1. Determine the number of users and potential users.
- Determine the origins and destinations of users who live in (a) the North Central corridor and (b) other Metroplex areas.
- 3. Determine the purpose of user trips on North Central Expressway.
- Determine public attitudes and preferences for type and intended use of transportation systems on North Central Expressway.

# SURVEY METHOD

The sample was drawn from Dallas and Collin County, south of US Highway 380. A sampling plan was developed in which 600 users of North Central Expressway would be randomly selected from households with telephones, with 300 from an area designated as the North Central Expressway corridor and 300 from outside the designated corridor. Users were defined as those who traveled on North Central Expressway at least once a week.

It was anticipated that the process of screening for North Central Expressway users would yield a much larger proportion of non-users. For comparison purposes, and to take advantage of the opportunity provided by the telephone contact, these non-user respondents were asked an abbreviated set of questions.

As shown in Figure 1, the North Central Expressway corridor was defined as the area adjacent to North Central Expressway bordered by State Highway 78 on the East, Spur 366 and Interstate 30 on the South, the Dallas North Tollway on the West, and U.S. Highway 380 and State Highway 121 on the North. The corridor sample was drawn from telephone prefixes within these boundaries,



North Central Expressway Corridor 3 FIGURE 1.

although telephone prefix areas do not necessarily correspond with roadway boundaries. Eligible respondents from outside the corridor were defined as Dallas or Collin County residents not included in the above defined corridor. Using the first 500 random calls, it was estimated that approximately 45 percent of the population was within the corridor boundaries and 55 percent was outside the corridor.

The sample size was determined to be sufficient to produce a sampling error of plus or minus four percent with a confidence interval of 95 percent. In other words, in 95 out of 100 such samples, the results should differ by no more than four percent in either direction from what would have been obtained if every telephone household in the Dallas and Collin County study area had been surveyed.

The telephone survey was conducted from May 25 through June 14, 1989. A total of 2,226 households were contacted that agreed to be interviewed. There were 411 refusals, for a cooperation rate of 84 percent. Three percent of the interviews were conducted in Spanish.

Of the 2,226 cooperating households, 585 were from within the corridor boundaries. Of these 585 households, 299 respondents were classified as users of the expressway and 286 were non-users. A total of 296 expressway users and 476 non-users outside the corridor were interviewed. The remaining 869 respondents were identified as non-users that were contacted in an effort to obtain the desired number of users for the sample. These households were not interviewed; however, their contribution to the non-user category was applied to the weighting scheme described below.

The sample was divided into four strata based on use or nonuse of North Central Expressway and location inside or outside of the corridor area. Each strata was then weighted according to its proportional contribution to the sample, as compared to its relative contribution in the general population under consideration. The weights for each strata were as follows:

<u>Strata</u>	<u>Corridor</u>	<u>User</u>	<u>Weight</u>
1	In	Yes	.934
2	In	No	1.155
3	Out	Yes	.494
4	Out	No	1.264

The telephone interviews were conducted by the Public Policy Resources Laboratory at Texas A&M University. Calls were made between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. Monday through Friday and on weekends between 1 p.m. and 9 p.m.

Once a household was reached, the respondent was selected using the "last birthday" method. The interviewer asked to speak to the person 18 years of age or older who had the most recent birthday. This technique randomizes within household, which is necessary to minimize the potential presented by a tendency for females within households to answer the phone more often than males. A description of the survey sample is provided in Table 1.

# RESULTS

### North Central Expressway Usage

For the sample as a whole, over 11 percent of the respondents reported that they traveled on North Central Expressway every day. An additional twenty percent were frequent users of the expressway (at least once a week), and 27 percent were infrequent users (less than once a month). The percent that reported they never traveled on North Central Expressway was 18.6 for the total sample surveyed.

As expected, the frequency of use of North Central Expressway was greater for people who lived within the corridor. Table 2 gives the percentages of each category. Over half (55 percent) of those living in the corridor use the expressway on a frequent basis. Of those living outside the corridor, approximately 20 percent use the expressway on a frequent basis.

# Table 1. Characteristics of Survey Sample Sample Size = 1356

# <u>Gender</u>

	8	N
Male	43	581
Female	57	770

# <u>Age</u>

Under 20	3	41
20-29	22	298
30-39	28	379
40-49	17	234
50-59	12	168
60+	17	228

# Income

< \$15,000	12	168
\$15,000-\$25,000	19	258
\$26,000-\$50,000	35	468
> \$50,000	25	334
Don't Know/Refused	9	128

# Expressway Users

Users Inside Corridor	21	279
Users Outside Corridor	11	146
Non-Users Inside Corridor	24	330
Non-Users Outside Corridor	44	600

# Table 2. Frequency of Use For Respondents Located Inside and Outside the North Central Corridor

	<u>Inside</u>	<u>Outside</u>
	Perc	cent
Every day	18.2	6.2
Several times/week	12.9	5.9
Once/week	15.4	7.8
Once/month	20.0	22.3
Less than once/month	19.0	35.1
Never	14.4	22.6

Twenty-two percent of all the respondents who infrequently or never traveled on North Central Expressway said they avoided this expressway. Most residents who did not travel on North Central Expressway on a regular basis indicated the reason was that travel on North Central simply was not necessary to get to their desired destination. Overall, this response was given by 64 percent of the respondents. Respondents were twice as likely to cite this as a reason for not using North Central Expressway if they were located outside the corridor. "Outside" respondents also were twice as likely to report that the use of other routes was a reason for not using North Central Expressway.

Analysis of the demographic characteristics of the expressway users revealed that males tended to be more frequent North Central Expressway users than females (see Figure 2). The use of the freeway was also significantly related to the age of the respondent. The age group that represented the highest usage percentage was 18 Fifty-two percent in this age group reported that they to 20. traveled on North Central Expressway at least once a week, compared to 44 percent in the 20 to 29 age group, 30 percent in the 30 to 60 age group, and 17 percent in the over 60 age group (Figure 3). The location of the respondent (inside or outside the corridor) had a significant effect on use of the expressway by age. A higher percentage of each age group residing inside the corridor were expressway users, except the under 20 group (see Figure 4).

A third demographic variable, income, was also associated with use of the expressway. The results showed that as income



North Central Expressway Usage By GENDER

Figure 2

increased, expressway use also increased for all respondents (Figure 5). Further analysis, however, revealed that the positive relationship between North Central Expressway use and income was true only for those residing inside the corridor (Figure 6).

## <u>Trip Purpose</u>

A series of questions addressed the purposes for which North Central Expressway is used. As shown in Table 3, the more discretionary type trips (i.e., shopping, medical, and personal) were made by a greater percentage of those residing inside the

## Table 3. Trip Purpose of Users by Location

	<u>Inside</u>	<u>Outside</u>
	Perce	ent
Work	41.5	44.9
School	6.9	9.5
Shopping	59.6	47.8
Medical appointments	35.1	30.7
Personal trips	80.5	68.0



Figure 3 North Central Expressway Usage By AGE



Figure 5 North Central Expressway Usage By INCOME

Figure 6 North Central Expressway Usage By INCOME and LOCATION



corridor. A slightly larger (although non-statistically different) percentage of respondents residing outside the corridor said they used the expressway for work and school trips. Statistically significant differences were found by location (inside and outside the corridor) for shopping and personal trips. As shown in Table 4, females used the freeway a greater percentage of the time than males for shopping and medical appointments, whereas males were more inclined to make work and school trips in greater percentages than females.

### Table 4. Trip Purpose by Gender

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
	Perc	ent
Work	48.5	35.9
School	9.1	6.1
Shopping	51.7	59.9
Medical appointments	29.3	38.9
Personal trips	77.6	74.7

# **Travel Behavior**

Several aspects of travel behavior were of interest regarding users of North Central Expressway. Specific items of interest were: (1) percentage of carpoolers; (2) downtown trips; (3) number of trip interruptions; and (4) distance and time traveled. Travel behavior related to public transportation (city bus) was also examined for North Central Expressway users and non-users.

The question was posed to regular users of North Central Expressway: "Thinking of the trips that you took to work on the North Central Expressway during the last two weeks, how many times did you drive in the car alone, drive or ride in the car with someone else, or take the bus?" The mean response was 10.2 times for driving alone, 1.9 times for sharing a ride, and .8 times for taking the bus. For trips other than work trips, the mean number of times respondents drove alone was 3.7. Respondents shared rides an average of 2.4 times during the two week interval, and took the bus an average of .14 times for non-work trips during the two week

period (see Table 5). No significant differences were found be-

# Table 5. Average Number of Trips Alone, Shared, and by Bus During Previous Two-Week Period

	Work Trips	Non-Work Trips
Driven alone	10.2	3.7
Shared ride	1.9	2.4
Bus	.8	0.1

tween males and females, income levels, or by location inside or outside the corridor for the three methods of transportation.

Forty-one percent of the working commuters who used North Central Expressway traveled to or through the downtown area on their way to work. They were predominantly from inside the North Central corridor, with the highest percentage coming from the west side of the corridor. Downtown commuters were also more likely than others to a) drive to work alone, b) have more than one vehicle in their household, c) report they would use an HOV lane frequently, and d) report that they would use a rail system regularly. There were no significant differences for downtown commuters in a) income, b) frequency of stops made while commuting to work, or c) gender.

Expressway users typically do not get on and off the freeway more than once during a single trip. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents reported they did not make any stops on the way to work. Twenty-nine percent said they stop two or three times during non-work related trips, and five percent said they stop four or more times during a non-work related trip.

Respondents were queried as to their reasons for making stops as they commute to work. The most prevalent reason was to make a grocery stop (given by 76 percent of the respondents who made commuting stops). The pattern of work trip interruptions was no different for those who lived outside the corridor from those who lived inside the corridor.

The respondents were provided with categories for estimating distance normally traveled on North Central Expressway. The miles traveled on North Central Expressway for those located inside and outside the corridor are provided in Table 6. As evidenced by the Table, users who lived outside the corridor were traveling the

# Table 6. Usual Distance Traveled on North Central Expressway

	<u>Inside</u>	<u>Outside</u>
	Perce	nt
Less than one mile	2.0	0.7
One to three miles	14.4	8.8
Three to five miles	29.4	24.3
More than five miles	52.2	64.2
Don't know/No answer	2.0	2.0

longest distances on North Central Expressway. According to zip codes of home and work, where the two were different (i.e., a respondent lived and worked in two different zip code areas), the most frequently traveled trip was from home inside the corridor on the east side to work inside the corridor on the east side of Dallas.

Related to distance traveled was the duration of travel. Respondents were asked to estimate the time it usually took them to travel the distance they reported as usual for them. The average across all trips was 23 minutes. Respondents were also asked how long they thought the same trip <u>should</u> take. The desired duration was an average of eight minutes less than the estimated time for usual trips.

## Use Of Public Transportation

Public transportation usage was measured by the percent who reported they currently ride the city bus. The majority (84 percent) of respondents did not ride city buses. Bus use for each strata is shown in Table 7. Fifteen percent said they rode the bus

at least occasionally. Most (61 percent) of the bus riders were infrequent riders (once per month or less). The trip purposes given most often for riding the city bus were for work (44 percent) and for personal trips (54 percent).

# Table 7. Bus Use By Location and North Central Expressway Use

	Percent Yes	Percent No
Expressway User	18.5	81.5
Expressway Non-User	14.1	85.9
Inside Corridor	17.1	82.9
Outside Corridor	14.2	85.8

Those who did not take public transportation cited the availability of personal transportation as the primary reason for not taking the bus. However, 15 percent said their reason for nonuse was due to the unavailability of service in their area. An additional 12 percent said the routes were not feasible, and five percent said the schedule was not feasible.

When asked if they thought the current bus system on North Central Expressway is adequate, the majority (59 percent) said they did not know. Persons living outside the corridor were more likely than persons within the corridor to believe the bus system on North Central was adequate.

The respondents were asked what they were willing to pay for a one-way bus trip in Dallas. Between \$.50 and \$1.00 was the most frequent response (41 percent). Twenty-two percent said they would pay more than \$1.00, and six percent said they would pay more than \$2.00. Two percent of the respondents said they would not be willing to pay anything for a city bus ride.

#### **Transportation Preferences**

The fourth objective of the survey was to determine public attitudes about several transportation options for the North Central corridor. Users of the North Central Expressway were asked to rate the importance of six characteristics of travel on North Central Expressway. Table 8 provides the ratings of these six characteristics according to location of the respondent.

As indicated in Table 8, safety was rated as the most important issue to users on North Central Expressway both inside and outside the corridor. In a follow-up question, the respondent was asked to name from the list the most important issue to them. Safety was most often named by users of the expressway residing inside and outside of the corridor. Thirty-three percent of the former and 37.5 percent of the latter gave this response. Reasonable time for travel was very close in importance for users inside the corridor (32.4 percent). Twenty-six percent of users outside said this was the most important item on the list.

There were significant differences between males and females on the importance of safety. Ninety-four percent of the female respondents, compared to 86 percent of the male respondents labeled safety as important. Additionally, a significantly greater percentage of females than males rated the ability to make stops for errands as important (61 percent compared to 42 percent, respectively).

Users and non-users of North Central Expressway were asked a similar set of questions with regard to public transportation. The ability to get to your destination in a reasonable time was rated as important by the largest percentage of users, and safety was the highest rated issue for non-users of North Central Expressway (Table 9). Safety was listed most often for both groups in response to the follow-up question -- "which, if any of the list is most important." Convenient parking, frequent trips, and cost were least important. However, cost and frequent trips were significantly more important for younger respondents and respondents with lower incomes. Further, there were significant

	Important			tral	Not Important	
	Inside	Outside	Inside	Outside	Inside	Outside
The ability to get on and off the freeway frequently	64.9	61.8	18.7	21.0	16.1	15.9
The ability to get to your destination in a reasonable time	90.0	82.8	7.7	10.8	1.7	5.4
Safety	91.0	85.1	6.7	8.8	2.0	4.7
Driving your own car	66.9	67.6	24.7	22.6	7.7	8.5
The ability to make stops for errands	51.8	45.2	26.4	32.8	19.7	19.3
The ability to travel at the time you choose	88.0	81.4	9.4	11.1	2.3	6.4

Table 8.	Ratings of	Transportation	Issues	by	North	Central
	Expressway	Users				

	Impo Users	rtant Non-Users	Neu Users	tral Non-Users	Not Im Users	portant Non-Users
Cost	52.5	46.2	30.8	30.3	16.7	23.6
Convenient Schedule	83.9	72.7	8.9	12.1	7.1	15.1
Safety	86.9	78.6	8.1	12.9	5.0	8.6
The ability to get to your destination in a reasonable time.	88.8	80.9	5.8	9.6	5.4	9.5
Frequent Trips	56.7	44.3	30.9	36.1	12.4	19.6
Convenient Parking	75.7	66.5	15.9	19.3	8.5	14.3
Secure Parking	81.3	75.7	10.9	12.8	7.8	11.5

# Table 9. Ratings of Public Transportation Issues byNorth Central Expressway Users and Non-Users

differences between males and females on all of the public transportation issues except the frequency of trips.

Several questions addressed transportation alternatives for the North Central Expressway. Current users of the expressway were asked if they would use a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane described as a special lane for buses, carpools, and vans, if available. The responses are provided in Table 10. Of those who said they would use an HOV lane, if available, 24 percent said they would use it every day, 36 percent said they would use it at least once a week, 21 percent said they would use it at least once a month, and the remainder said they would use it less than once a month or they did not know how often they would use it.

# Table 10. Likelihood of Using HOV Lane By Location

	Percent Inside	Percent Outside
Definitely use	16.0	14.2
Probably use	12.4	20.6
Might use	21.4	19.9
Would not use	48.5	43.2

When the combined 47 percent who said they would not use an HOV lane were asked the reasons why not, the most common reason given was that they drive alone, not in carpools, and therefore would not be eligible. For most of the 200 respondents who would not use the HOV lane, the indication was that this option was just not a practical one for their transportation needs. The likelihood for using the HOV lane was not associated with gender or age; however, respondents with higher incomes were more likely to report that they would not use an HOV lane.

Users and non-users of North Central Expressway were also asked the likelihood that they would use a rail system, if provided. Sixty percent of the respondents indicated they would use rail to some degree. Thirteen percent said they would

definitely use it and 19 percent said they would probably use it. Thirty-nine percent said they would <u>not</u> use rail, if provided.

	Percent Inside	Percent Outside	Percent Users	Percent Non-users
Definitely use	14.4	11.9	17.3	11.0
Probably use	20.4	18.7	26.9	16.0
Might use	29.3	27.3	28.8	27.9
Would not use	35.9	42.1	27.0	45.0

# Table 11.Likelihood of Using RailBy Location

Respondents (both inside and outside the corridor) who were not currently using North Central Expressway were less likely than expressway users to predict they would use a rail system if provided. There was no significant difference among the respondents living inside and outside the corridor as to whether or not they believed they would use a rail system. Potential users tended to be young (20 to 39 years) and male.

Of those who said they would use rail, 19 percent said they would use it every day, 25 percent said they would use it at least once a week, 26 percent said at least once a month, and 19 percent said less than once a month. For comparison purposes, Table 12 shows the percentage breakdowns for predicted use of both the HOV lane option and the rail option. Note that only current North Central users were asked the HOV question.

Respondents were asked what they would be willing to pay for a one way trip they would usually be making by rail. Thirty-eight percent said between \$.50 and \$1.00. Twenty-eight percent said they would pay between \$1.00 and \$1.50. And 14 percent said they would pay between \$1.50 and \$2.00. Another nine percent said they would be willing to pay more than \$2.00 for a one-way trip. In general, current expressway non-users were willing to pay more for a rail trip, if offered, than expressway users. A comparison of the amounts respondents were willing to pay for bus and rail is provided in Table 13.

	Inside Corridor		Outside (	Corridor
	HOV	Rail	HOV	Rail
Definitely Use	16.0	14.4	14.2	11.9
Probably Use	12.4	20.4	20.6	18.7
Might Use	21.4	29.3	19.9	27.3
Would Not Use	48.5	35.9	43.2	42.1

# Table 13. Comparison of Willingness to Payfor Rail and Bus Trips

	F	Percent
	Bus	Rail
None	2.1	1.4
Up to \$.50	18.8	7.9
\$.51 to \$1.00	41.1	33.7
\$1.01 to \$1.50	17.0	24.9
\$1.51 to \$2.00	4.8	12.6
More than \$2.00	6.4	8.1
Don't know/No answer	9.8	11.5

The response given most often for those who would not use rail was inaccessibility to the corridor. This response was by 39 percent of those who would not ride on a rail system, and was given by respondents located inside as well as outside the North Central corridor.

### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The Texas Transportation Institute, in conjunction with the Public Policy Resources Laboratory at Texas A&M University, conducted a telephone survey of Dallas and suburban Dallas residents to determine North Central Expressway user opinions, travel behaviors, and transportation preferences.

Of the 1356 Dallas and Collin County residents surveyed, 81 percent used the expressway to some extent. A division was made between users and non-users with non-users defined as those who traveled on North Central Expressway less than once a week, and users defined as those who traveled on North Central Expressway at least once a week. There were 425 expressway users and 906 nonusers in the sample. Results were analyzed by location inside or outside the corridor and by user and non-user where appropriate. Response frequencies for each of the questions are included as an Appendix. The following synopsis of the survey results is intended to highlight the differences and similarities among the four groups. North Central Expressway users originate primarily from within the corridor delineated for this study. Over 50 percent of this group usually traveled more than five miles per trip. Users from within the corridor had higher incomes than users from outside the corridor. Expressway users from inside the corridor traveled by bus more often than expressway users from outside the corridor, and convenient bus schedules were significantly more important to them.

Approximately 20 percent of the users who lived <u>outside</u> the North Central corridor traveled on the expressway at least once a week. Over 64 percent of this group usually traveled more than five miles per trip. Expressway users who lived outside the corridor were more likely than users from inside the corridor to own a pickup truck and less likely to use the expressway for shopping trips, medical, and other personal trips.

North Central Expressway users from inside and outside the corridor were not significantly different in their opinions of the bus system on North Central. They also did not differ in their projected use of an HOV lane or a rail system. The number and purpose of stops or trip deviations while traveling on North Central was not significantly different for these two groups.

There was no difference in opinion regarding the adequacy of the bus system on North Central Expressway between the users of the expressway and non-users of the expressway. The two groups were also statistically similar with regard to the number of vehicles per family.

Users of North Central Expressway differed from non-users with regard to the following:

- Larger number of public transportation users
- More who take the bus to work
- Public transportation issues more important
- More apt to use rail
- Younger
- More males than females
- Higher incomes
APPENDIX



#### DALLAS NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY SURVEY RESULTS

1. What form of transportation do you use most of the time in Dallas?

	% Total N=1356
Drive a car Ride as a car passenger Take the bus Drive or ride motorcycle Walk	5.9 5.2 .4 .6
Other Dont' know/No answer	1.3 .5

#### 2. Do you ever take the city bus?

	•	% Out N=712	% Total N=1284
Yes/Sometimes	17.1	14.2	15.5
No	82.9	85.8	84.5

\* "In" refers to respondents residing inside the North Central Expressway corridor. "Out" refers to respondents residing outside the corridor.

#### 3. For what purpose do you ride the bus?

	% Yes N=269
Work School Shopping Medical trips Personal	10.3 27.1 24.2

4. How often do you ride on a city bus?

	% N=269
Every day	16.9
Several times a week	11.1
Once a week	10.4
Once a month	19.9
Less than once a month	40.9
Don't know/No Answer	.9

## 5. What is the main reason you don't ride the bus?

	N	00
Service not available	162	14.9
Own transportation	386	35.5
Routes not feasible	130	12.0
Schedule not feasible	56	5.2
Other	333	30.6
Don't know/No answer	20	1.8

# 6. How often do you travel on North Central Expressway?

	% In N=600	% Out N=731	% Total N=1331
Every day	18.2	6.2	11.6
Several times a week	12.9	6.0	9.1
At least once/week	15.4	7.8	11.2
At least once/month	20.0	22.3	21.3
Less than once/month	19.1	35.1	27.9
Never	14.4	22.6	18.9

# 7. Is the reason that you don't travel more on North Central Expressway because...

	% In N=289	% Out N=523	% Total N=812
It is not necessary to get where you normally			
go You avoid this express-	58.4	66.9	63.9
way Other routes are more	32.0	21.7	25.4
convenient	9.6	11.4	10.7

8. Do you travel on North Central Expressway to go to work?

	% In N=279		% Total N=425
Yes/Sometimes		45.1	42.7
No		54.9	57.3

9. Of the trips that you took to work on the North Central Expressway during the last two weeks, how many times did you...

	Mean Response	N
Drive in the car alone Drive or ride with	10	181
someone else	2	181
Take the bus	1	181

10. Going to and from work, do you travel to or through downtown Dallas?

	N	8
Yes	66	36.2
No	107	59.0
Sometimes	8	4.5

11. On your way to or from work, do you usually make any stops along the way?

	N	%
Yes	42	23.1
No	123	67.8
Sometimes	16	8.8

## 12. What kind of stops do you make?

	% Yes N=58
School or day care	14.7
Grocery store	74.6
Dry cleaners	40.5
Auto related Pick up or drop off	31.7
someone	27.7
Other	37.5

13. Which of the following kinds of trips do you make on the North Central Expressway?

	% Yes N=425
School Shopping Medical trips	7.6 54.4 32.9
Personal	52.9 75.9

14. If a special traffic lane for buses, carpools, and vans were now available on North Central Expressway, what is the likelihood that you would use it?

% Total N=425 Definitely use it..... 15.4 Probably use it..... 15.2 Might use it..... 20.9 Would not use it..... 46.7 Don't know/No answer.... 1.8

15. How often do you think you would use the special lane?

	% Total N=227
Every day Once/week Once/month Less than once/month Never Don't know/No answer	36.0

16. When you drive on North Central, how many times do you usually get on and off the expressway during one trip?

	N	8
Only once	273	64.3
2 or 3 times	120	28.2
4 or more times	20	4.7
Don't know/No answer	12	2.8

17. How far do you usually travel on North Central Expressway?

	N	00
Less than 1 mile	7	1.5
1 to 3 miles	53	12.5
3 to 5 miles	118	27.7
More than 5 miles	240	56.3
Don't know/No answer	9	2.0

18. How long does it usually take you to travel this distance? Average response: 23 minutes

19. How long do you think that trip should take?

Average response: 15 minutes

20. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not important at all, and 5 being most important, and using 3 as neutral, how important are the following to you when you travel on North Central Expressway?

	% Response					
	1	2	3	4	5	DK/NA
The ability to get on and off the freeway frequently	10.1	5.9	19.5	16.5	47.3	.7
The ability to get to your destination in a reasonable time	1.7	1.3	8.8	14.1	73.4	.8
Safety	1.9	1.0	7.4	10.3	78.7	.7
Driving your own car	4.4	3.6	24.0	17.0	50.1	.9
The ability to make stops for errands	11.0	8.6	28.6	19.8	29.8	2.2
The ability to travel at the time you choose	2.3	1.5	10.0	17.2	68.5	.6

.

## 21. Which of these issues is most important?

	N	8
The ability to get on and off the freeway frequently	42	10.0
The ability to get to your destination in a reasonable time	129	30.3
Safety	146	34.4
Driving your own car	16	3.8
The ability to make stops for errands	20	4.7
The ability to travel at the time you choose	47	11.2
Don't know/No answer	24	5.6

. .

22. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not important at all, and 5 being most important, and using 3 as neutral, how important are the following to you when it comes to public transportation (either bus or rail)?

	1	2	% Re: 3	sponse 4	5	DK/NA
Cost	15.5	4.2	28.1	12.2	32.3	7.6
Convenient schedule	9.9	1.7	10.2	12.5	57.7	8.1
Safety	6.0	0.9	10.6	10.2	65.7	6.5
The ability to get to destination in a reasonable time	6.8	.9	7.9	15.1	63.2	6.2
Frequent trips	11.0	4.4	30.7	16.2	27.0	10.6
Convenient parking	8.9	2.5	16.7	19.6	44.2	8.0
Secure parking	7.8	1.7	11.2	12.5	58.8	7.9

## 23. Which of these issues is most important?

	N	%
Cost	73	5.4
Convenient schedule	191	14.1
Safety	376	27.7
The ability to get to destination in a		
reasonable time	292	21.6
Frequent trips	63	4.6
Convenient parking	47	3.5
Secure parking	110	8.1
Don't know/No answer	203	15.0

# 24. Do you think that the bus system now available on North Central is adequate?

	N	8
Yes	242	17.8
No	289	21.4
Other	29	2.2
Don't know/No answer	795	58.6

## 25. What is the most you would pay for a city bus trip (one way)?

	N	8
Up to \$.50	255	18.8
\$.51 to \$1.00	557	41.1
\$1.01 to \$1.50	230	17.0
\$1.51 to \$2.00	65	4.8
More than \$2.00	87	6.4
None	29	2.1
Don't know/No answer	133	9.8

26. If a rail system were operating now in the North Central Expressway Corridor, what is the likelihood that you would use it?

	% In	% Out	% Total
	N=600	N=730	N=1330
Definitely use it	14.4	11.9	13.0
Probably use it	20.4	18.7	19.0
Might use it	29.3	27.3	28.2
Would not use it	35.9		
42.1 39.3			

27. Assuming the cost was reasonable to you, how often do you think you would use the rail system?

% Total
N=833

Every day	19.2
Once/week	24.6
Once/month	25.9
Less than once/month	19.0
Never	2.4
Don't know/No answer	8.9

28. For the usual trip you would be taking, what is the most you would pay for a rail system trip (one way)?

	N	%
Up to \$.50	66	7.9
\$.51 to \$1.00	281	33.7
\$1.01 to \$1.50	207	24.9
\$1.51 to \$2.00	105	12.6
More than \$2.00	67	8.1
None	11	1.4
Don't know/No answer	96	11.5

- -----
  - 29. Is there anything you would like to add about North Central Expressway?

Responses given by 69 percent of the respondents were categorized as follows:

Positive comments of a general nature (examples: "not that bad," "not really a problem," "it's the best thing in this area," and "it gets you to different places quicker") were given by 3.4 percent of the respondents.

Generally negative comments were given by 10.2 percent of the respondents (examples: "don't like it", "hate it," "avoid it," "it's a pain," "it's horrible," "it stinks," "it's hopeless").

15.4 percent of the comments were related to the design of the system in some way (examples: "needs to be widened," "more lanes," "out-dated," "inadequate"). Another 1.0 percent were comments specifically regarding ramp related problems.

Maintenance and construction issues were mentioned by 4.5 percent of those commenting.

Safety related comments were made by 3.8 percent of the respondents.

Comments referring to congestion were made by 8.7 percent.

Various requests and statements of preferences for different forms of public transportation and improvements to public transportation were made by 5.8 percent of the respondents.

## SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

## Age groups:

	N	80
Under 20	41	3.0
20's	298	22.0
30's	379	28.0
40's	234	17.2
50's	168	12.4
60's or over	228	16.8
Don't know/No answer	8	0.6

## Income:

	N	\$
Less than \$15,000	168	12.4
\$15,000 - \$25,000	258	19.1
\$26,000 - \$50,000	468	34.5
More than \$50,000	334	24.6
Don't know/No answer/Ref	128	9.4

### Gender:

	N	<b>o</b> {o
Male	581	43.0
Female	770	57.0

# Vehicles:

,

	Average	number	of	cars	1.81		
	Average	number	of	pickups	.37	(owned by 31.4 percent of the respondents)	:
-	Average	number	of	vans	.13	(owned by 10.9 percent of the respondents)	;
	Average motoro				.12	(owned by 7.8 percent of the respondents)	:

# Special transportation needs:

	N	90
Yes No No answer	1292	4.1 95.3 .6