CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA

DATE: Tuesday September 5, 2017
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal St. Winooski

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA:

1. Action on Consent agenda – 9:00 – 9:05
   N/A this month.
   See attached.
3. Public Comment Period (Information item) 9:10 - 9:15
   Members of the public are invited to raise issues of interest or concern to the TAC on items not on the agenda.
4. GMT’s NextGEN Transit Plan (Information Item) 9:15 – 9:45
   This past winter GMT began this ambitious planning effort to reevaluate all their routes and services and analyze their fare structure. GMT staff will provide the TAC an update on progress and seek member input.
5. MTP Update (Information Item) 9:45 – 10:30
   Staff will give updates on several MTP related items:
   1. Development schedule
   2. Financial plan
   3. Selected model results
   See attached memo for more information.
   Jim Ryan of ANR will attend to give an update on the draft MGRP permit expected for release soon.
7. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports (Information Item) 10:50 – 10:55
   See bulleted list on the reverse for current CCRPC projects. TAC members are encouraged to ask staff for more information on the status of any of these on-going or recently completed projects.
8. CCRPC July Board Meeting Report (Information Item) 10:55 – 10:55
   The Board met on July 19th holding a public hearing and approving the TIP.
9. Chairman’s/Members’ Items (Information Item) 10:55 – 11:00

Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 3, 2017

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *17 or bdavis@ccrpevt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
Project list:
- Title VI program participation and Public Participation Plan implementation
- Participation in the Vermont Highway Safety Alliance
- Participation in the State’s Rail Council
- Regional Transportation Model Update
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update
- Coordination with United Way on the Neighbor Rides Program
- Exit 14 Areas Signal System Assessment Study (Burlington/South Burlington)
- VT Route 15 Signal System Assessment Study
- Advanced Traffic Monitoring System through FHWA AID grant – Pilot Corridor Implementation
- Countwide NHS Review and Update
- LPM services for Underhill sidewalk construction on VT 15 – Construction postponed
- LPM services for Shelburne sidewalk construction on US 7 – Final construction walkover
- LPM services for South Burlington sidewalk construction on VT 116 – Construction Completed pending minor backfill and pavement markings
- LPM services for Hinesburg – Village South Area Sidewalk on VT 116 – Conceptual Design Plans
- Winooski Avenue Corridor Study (Burlington)
- Amtrak Train Overnight Storage Study (Greater Burlington Area)
- Coordination with GMT on ADA and Elders & Disabled advisory committees
- Railyard Enterprise Supplemental Scoping of Alternative 1B (Burlington)
- Winooski River Bridge Scoping Study (Burlington/Winooski)
- South Burlington Bike Ped Gaps scoping
- Intervale Ave. Scoping (Burlington)
- Colchester Ave/Riverside Ave/Barrett St Intersection Scoping (Burlington)
- US 7 Southern Gateway Scoping (Shelburne)
- North Williston Road Scoping Study (Williston)
- Traffic calming studies for Blair Park Road, Brennon Woods/Chamberlain Lane (Williston)
- So. Burlington Williston Road Area Transportation and Land Use Network Analysis
- So. Burlington VT116-Kimball-Tilley Land Use and Transportation Plan
- Williston Exit 12 Transportation Improvement District (TID) Pilot Project
- Jericho Riverside Future Street Network Study
- I-89 Exit 14 Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Study (South Burlington)
- Essex Path/Sidewalk Impact Policies
- Shelburne Phase 2 of Form Based Zoning to Improve Walkability
- Overhaul of South Burlington’s Traffic Overlay District
- Update to South Burlington’s Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance
- ADA Evaluation of Pedestrian Facilities (Essex/Essex Junction)
- Malletts Bay Stormwater and Transportation Management Plan (Colchester)
- Regional Transportation Energy Planning
- Transportation Hazard Mitigation Planning
- Municipal Road General Permit (MRGP) Work
- Grants-In-Aid Coordination with Municipalities.
DATE: Wednesday July 5, 2017
TIME: 9:00 a.m.
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal St. Winooski, VT

Peter Keating called the meeting to order at 9:00AM and asked for a round of introductions.

1. Consent Agenda
A minor TIP amendment for an I-89 paving project was unanimously approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
The June 6th minutes were approved without changes.

3. Public Comments
There were none.

4. Consultant Selection Approval
Christine referred members to the memo on this in the meeting packet and went over some of the details.
We had issued an RFQ for a variety of consulting services including planning, engineering and environmental. We had received qualifications from 16 separate firm, in five different topic areas, in response. A selection committee of staff, TAC, PAC and CWAC reviewed the qualifications and came to concurrence of which firms to select. The topic areas and the recommended firms for each:

Project Development (Scoping) & Technical Assistance Studies:
- DuBois & King, Inc
- McFarland Johnson, Inc
- Resource Systems Group, Inc
- Stantec Consulting Services, Inc
- Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc

Transportation Planning/Corridor/Area Wide Studies:
- Resource Systems Group, Inc
- Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc
- WSP USA, Inc

Bicycle and Pedestrian Feasibility Studies:
- DuBois & King, Inc
The program under which these consultants will be hired will commence in July 2017 and extend through June 30, 2019, with possible extensions to June 30, 2020 and June 30, 2021.

BARBARA ELLIOT MADE A MOTION THE TAC APPROVE THE LIST OF CONSULTANTS AS RECOMMENDED. AMY BELL SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Status of RPC’s Role in Water Quality
Chris reported on the CCRPC’s role in water quality issues with a focus on updates to our road erosion inventory work and available funding sources to address water quality planning and construction. He addressed the inventory work begun last summer and continuing this, with all communities expected to be completed later this summer. This work is from funding from CCRPC and Better Roads. Additional funding for other water quality work is coming from the CCRPC as well as the Department of Environmental Conservation - DEC. Chris mentioned that Better Roads grants in FY18 will not cover conceptual designs and cost estimates but CCRPC funding will cover these. Chris also presented a draft application for CCRPC funds and sought comment. Dennis Lutz suggested including some idea of the funding limitations to prevent one applicant seeking all the money. He also suggested getting this out soon so that work could be done before winter. An August 15th due date was offered. The DEC grants drew more discussion and some concern. Having to provide certification was cited as a reason Essex wouldn’t apply for these. There are also concerns that projects can be funded and built so quickly. The legislature wants to see a progress report of what’s accomplished with DEC funds this November but that kind of quick turnaround from grant award to construction seems impractical.

6. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Schedule and Content Update
Peter, noting a number of new attendees, decided to give a short primer on the responsibilities of MPOs. He briefly described their three main responsibilities: UPWP, TIP and MTP. He then went into the schedule to update the latest MTP, noting that it had been revised to reflect more recent developments and to identify which elements should be ready when and which committees would be reviewing them at which meetings. He mentioned that the Current Conditions report presented last month is being revised and the financial plan, needed to determine fiscal constraint limits, was in draft form and being reviewed by staff. The MTP project list with fiscal limits shown will be available soon and by September the analysis of future conditions based on running several scenarios through our transportation model, will be complete. The schedule still sees a draft of the MTP ready this coming fall with an anticipated adoption date of next spring.

7. Certification of MPO Planning Process
Christine explained that this item had not previously come before the TAC but was something the Board acted on each year and that essentially states that the CCRPC is abiding by all federal regulations in its MPO related planning process. She noted that the CCRPC submits the certification each year when
forwarding its TIP to FHWA and FTA. She noted more detail on all of this in the documents in the TAC meeting packet.

8. Status of Projects and Subcommittee Reports
Peter referred members to the project list on the back of the agenda and encouraged members to inquire on project status if interested.

9. CCRPC June Board Meeting Report
Peter mentioned that the Board approved warning the FY18 TIP for public hearing.

10. Chairman’s/Members’ Items
Peter reported the need for an August TAC meeting as we now have two items to discuss: The MGRP permit and GMT’s NextGEN Transit Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Peter Keating
**CCRPC Transportation Advisory Committee**  
**September 5, 2017**  
**Agenda Item 5: Information Item**

**Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update**

**Background:** As we move toward a complete draft MTP in December, the TAC will be reviewing considerable draft content and process steps over the coming months. The September meeting will consider three aspects:

1. The development schedule and the TAC’s anticipated role – See table below.
2. The Financial Plan – details on determining the funding expected to be available (that part of the financial plan is attached), the costs to maintain and operate the existing system, and the funding balance for new projects/strategies. Staff will present what’s been done and what’s left to do.
3. Transportation model results – See attached maps and charts staff has put together of initial scenario modeling results. More on how to interpret these and how they will be used in evaluating further scenarios at the TAC meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Content/Comment for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Sep-17</td>
<td>Review MTP: financial plan, 2015 &amp; 2050 base/no build scenario results (volume to capacity, delay and safety), and schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use FPF to publicize ECOS Plan update process, and methods for input.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Oct-17</td>
<td>Review scenario results and discuss potential MTP scenario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Begin outreach to Municipal Managers, Planners &amp; Public Works Directors, SLBs, PCs, Resource Agencies for environmental consultations, etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nov-17</td>
<td>Review scenario results; draft chapters on Future Transportation Conditions, MTP Corridors and Environmental Mitigation; ECOS components (key issues, indicators and actions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use FPF to solicit feedback on MTP scenario/project list.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Dec-17</td>
<td>Review full final MTP draft (and ECOS Plan components), and make recommendation to Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Mar-18</td>
<td>Review comments and revisions to the ECOS Plan if needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff contact:** Peter Keating, pkeating@ccrpcvt.org 861-0124
4.3.4 FINANCIAL PLAN

Introduction
The CCRPC’s long range transportation plan must incorporate a financial section that estimates how much funding over the life of the plan will be needed, how much will be available for the recommended transportation investments, and the costs to maintain and operate the existing system. The financial section must outline how the CCRPC can reasonably expect to fund all included projects and programs within a fiscally constrained environment, drawing on all anticipated revenues from the federal and state governments, regional or local sources, the private sector and user charges.

Federal regulations establish the requirement for the financial plan in 23 CFR 450.324(g)(11). The operative requirements of that regulation are summarized here. The adopted MTP shall include:

(11) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented. Key components of this plan to include:

(i) System-level estimates of costs and revenues to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation.

(ii) Agreed upon estimates of funds that will be available to support plan implementation.

(iii) Recommendations on any additional financing strategies with strategies for ensuring their continued availability.

(iv) Funding to include all federally funded projects, both highway and transit. Projected funds to reflect “Year of Expenditure dollars.” (YoE)

The financial projections extend 35 years to the MTP planning horizon of 2050.

The completed financial plan will contain three parts:

1. The overall level of fiscal constraint including projection of future transportation funding in Chittenden County and factors that are anticipated to affect this.
2. The base level of investment required for system operations and maintenance as called for under 23 CFR 450.324(g)(11)(i).
3. An estimate and analysis of the costs associated with MTP recommended improvements themselves.

\[1\] For more details on federal regulations regarding MPO long range planning, see

https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?c=ecfr;sid=e2662fc63c225d496d1fa6ce22ea6cb8;rgn=div5;view=text;node=23%3A1.0.1.5.11;idno=23;cc=ecfr#sp23.1.450.c
FINANCIAL PLAN PART 1: OVERALL CONSTRAINT

CCRPC MTP funds, guided by the contents of the 2050 MTP, are limited to federal transportation funds allocated to the Chittenden County metropolitan area under federal transportation acts. The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or "FAST Act" is the current law governing the use of federal transportation funds. FAST Act was signed into law on December 4, 2015 and largely maintains previous program structures and funding shares between highways and transit.

The Chittenden County region does not currently access other sources of transportation funding such as tolls or private contributions. The primary funding source for significant transportation projects on highways, and transit eligible for federal aid, is expected to be federal funds plus state and local match.

The single most critical issue for establishing how much MTP funding will be available between 2015 and 2050 is therefore the future availability of federal funds. For the purposes of this plan, an estimate of available future funding has been developed based on the history of statewide federal funding and CCRPC’s historic share of that funding. This methodology represents the most reasonable estimate of funding availability for two reasons:

- Actual funding available to the CCRPC over the past ten plus years is variable and has depended on the timing of specific projects. Statewide spending patterns exhibit a more consistent trend, and
- The FAST Act will continue funding programs at levels similar to what its predecessors MAP-21 and SAFETEA-LU previously provided.

![VTrans Obligations in 2016 $](chart)

VERMONT FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING HISTORY FY2010 - 2016

Total statewide federal funding was projected for future years based on historical funding levels as depicted on the chart above. NOTE: The estimates began in FY2010 because FY2009 was distorted with the infusion of additional funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)
Over the last seven years there was no discernable increasing or decreasing trend in constant dollar funding to Vermont. Therefore, the MTP assumes flat statewide funding over the 25-year planning horizon at the level of $211,609,103 per year in 2016 dollars. See table below for recent history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTP Fiscal Constraint, VTrans Obligations by Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Of Expenditure (YOE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step is to calculate CCRPC’s estimated share of the statewide federal funds. As shown in the table below, CCRPC’s share of the total statewide funds has fluctuated significantly between 7.5% (FY14) and 40.6% (FY05) between 1999 and 2016.

<p>| Federal Transportation Funds* Obligated in Vermont and Chittenden County |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FHWA and FTA Formula Funds</th>
<th>Chittenden County Obligations</th>
<th>CC as Percentage of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY1999</td>
<td>$141,644,879</td>
<td>$20,716,152</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>$137,475,720</td>
<td>$34,124,215</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>$141,162,474</td>
<td>$26,574,888</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>$153,992,216</td>
<td>$37,213,939</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>$149,892,007</td>
<td>$42,359,853</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>$161,396,138</td>
<td>$55,511,396</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$147,008,522</td>
<td>$59,717,025</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$149,970,687</td>
<td>$32,022,092</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$156,335,139</td>
<td>$24,053,735</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>$157,949,734</td>
<td>$25,990,323</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$156,442,879</td>
<td>$27,373,347</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>$222,152,066</td>
<td>$27,663,934</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>$212,335,621</td>
<td>$26,643,026</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>$206,423,453</td>
<td>$32,458,183</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>$205,791,234</td>
<td>$43,519,161</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$206,428,095</td>
<td>$15,517,128</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$210,705,770</td>
<td>$18,450,521</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$217,427,482</td>
<td>$31,321,866</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funds are in 2016 dollars calculated from http://www.usinflationcalculator.com/
The average proportion of statewide federal funding going to CCRPC projects over the 1999-2016 period was 19.4\%\textsuperscript{2}. This is a bit lower than Chittenden County’s proportion of statewide population at 25.8\% (US Census, 2016 estimate) and Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) at 20.3\% (VTrans, 2016) and appears to represent a reasonable estimator of available funding in the County. As a result, CCRPC’s annual funding is estimated to be 19.4\% of the total federally supported transportation funding coming to Vermont. This nearly one fifth share results in $41,052,166 (in 2016 dollars) for Chittenden County projects annually.

The table below presents CCRPC’s estimated annual funding at five-year intervals. This is based on the projected flat statewide funding and the County’s 19.4\% historic share of statewide funds. In constant year 2016 dollars the annual 5-year increments accumulate over the 35 years to $1.437 billion. The year-of-expenditure (YoE) row applies an annual inflation rate of 3\%\textsuperscript{3}. Adjusting for inflation, and compounding over 25 years, results in significantly higher annual amounts – particularly closer to 2050 when the compounding effect is more pronounced.

### Projected Annual and Cumulative Funding Available for Chittenden County Projects (millions) at 3\% annual inflation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2045</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant 2016 $</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$47.59</td>
<td>$55.17</td>
<td>$63.96</td>
<td>$74.14</td>
<td>$85.95</td>
<td>$99.64</td>
<td>$115.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant 2016 $</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$205.26</td>
<td>$410.52</td>
<td>$615.78</td>
<td>$821.04</td>
<td>$1,026.30</td>
<td>$1,231.56</td>
<td>$1,436.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$41.05</td>
<td>$224.49</td>
<td>$484.74</td>
<td>$786.43</td>
<td>$1,136.18</td>
<td>$1,541.63</td>
<td>$2,011.67</td>
<td>$2,556.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Adjustments to Projected Funding

While there are a number of factors that could change the projected level of funding detailed in the table above, the likelihood of significant changes is low. Looking back over the past 20 years, there have been efforts, discussions, and other initiatives to increase the funding for transportation. These have occurred on the regional, state, and national levels. For example, the CCRPC established a Blue-Ribbon Commission in 2007 to identify alternative and/or innovative funding, especially to boost transit funding and reduce its reliance on the property tax. That work concluded without any firm implementation measures, therefore new potential funding sources were deemed too uncertain to include in this estimation of future available funds. The Vermont Legislature has also tinkered with transportation finance, allowing limited bonding and modest fuel tax increases for transportation uses and, while these funding sources could lead to an increase in funding for the MPO region, they are too small or inconsistent to reliably count on for a 35-year planning horizon.

At the federal level, given the passing of the FAST Act in late 2015, it appears that funding from this source should remain stable for the near future. However, we shouldn’t ignore the long-term

\textsuperscript{2} This percentage is intended to represent a best estimate of available funding, and is in no way intended to be construed as a CCRPC “entitlement” or “rightful share” of statewide funds.

\textsuperscript{3} 3\% is the most recent 10-year average inflation construction cost increase from the Engineering News Record (ENR)
health of the national transportation trust funds that are currently subsidized from the general fund. Any long-term solution will likely need new revenues from some other source in the future.

In general, the above factors related to funding adjustments and potential uncertainty are too questionable or short lived to significantly impact the quantitative estimates of future transportation funding for Chittenden County. The discussion is intended to highlight some of the uncertainties which may affect CCRPC’s ability to fund transportation projects into the future.

**Overall Funding Constraint Conclusion**

Funding for CCRPC transportation projects is presently dependent on federal funding, which is generally matched on an 80% federal / 20% non-federal basis at the state and local levels. Historically, CCRPC has accounted for 19.4% of the annual federal transportation funds available statewide. A review of funding levels over the past seven years reveals that funding is essentially flat in constant dollar terms. Total funding available, over the coming 35 years, is estimated to be $1,436.83 million in constant 2016 dollars, however budget decisions in Washington DC could impact future funding levels. Additional funding sources, especially for transit operating, will be critical for the preservation and future expansion of transit services in the region.
Chittenden County Daily Travel - Scenario Modeling Results

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**

- **Miles**
  - 2015: 4000000
  - 2025: 4200000
  - 2025 w/TIP: 4400000
  - 2050: 4600000
  - 2050 w/TIP: 4800000

**VMT per Capita**

- **Miles**
  - 2015: 2025
  - 2025 w/TIP: 2025
  - 2050: 2050
  - 2050 w/TIP: 2050

**Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT)**

- **Hours**
  - 2015: 25.0
  - 2025: 26.0
  - 2025 w/TIP: 27.0
  - 2050: 28.0
  - 2050 w/TIP: 29.0

**Delay per Capita**

- **Minutes**
  - 2015: 15.2
  - 2025: 15.4
  - 2025 w/TIP: 15.6
  - 2050: 15.8
  - 2050 w/TIP: 16.0

**Transit, Walking & Biking Mode Split**

- **Percent**
  - 2015: 11.0%
  - 2025: 11.2%
  - 2025 w/TIP: 11.4%
  - 2050: 11.6%
  - 2050 w/TIP: 11.8%

**Average Length of Trip**

- **Minutes**
  - 2015: 100000
  - 2025: 110000
  - 2025 w/TIP: 120000
  - 2050: 130000
  - 2050 w/TIP: 140000
Figure X-X: 2015 AM & PM Peak Hour Congestion (No Build)
See Inset Above Right

Figure X-X: 2015 AM & PM Peak Hour Delay (No Build)
Figure X-X: 2050 AM & PM Peak Hour Congestion with TIP Projects
Figure X-X: 2050 AM & PM Peak Hour Delay with TIP Projects