REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

2026–2050

DRAFT

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE REPORT

December 2025

Puget Sound Regional Council

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information
Individuals requiring reasonable accommodations may request written materials in alternate formats, sign language interpreters, physical accessibility accommodations, or other reasonable accommodations by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le, at 206-464-6175, with two weeks' advance notice. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact the ADA Coordinator, Thu Le, through TTY Relay 711.

Title VI Notice
PSRC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, visit https://www.psrc.org/about-us/title-vi.

Language Assistance
عربي Arabic | 中文 Chinese | Deutsch German | Français French | 한국어 Korean | Русский Russian | Español Spanish | Tagalog | Tiếng việt Vietnamese

Visit https://www.psrc.org/contact-center/language-assistance

Funding for this document provided in part by member jurisdictions, grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration and Washington State Department of Transportation.

Additional copies of this document may be obtained by contacting:

Puget Sound Regional Council
Information Center
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98101-3055
206-464-7090 | info@psrc.org | psrc.org

Contents

Introduction 5

Section 1: PSRC Models and Tools 9

- Section 1A: Regional Macroeconomic Model and Forecast 9
- Section 1B: UrbanSim Land Use Model 10
- Section 1C: SoundCast Activity-Based Travel Demand Model 10
- Section 1D: EPA's Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES) 11
- Section 1E: Updated Travel Behavior 11

Section 2: Population and Households 13

- Section 2A: Population 13
- Section 2B: Households 17

Section 3: Vehicle Based Performance Metrics 20

- Section 3A: Vehicle Miles Traveled 21
- Section 3B: Vehicle Hours of Delay 25
- Section 3C: Roadway Congestion and Travel Time 29

Section 4: Transit Based Performance Metrics 31

- Section 4A: Transit Trips, Boardings & Service Hours 32
- Section 4B: Households & Jobs near High-Capacity Transit 35
- Section 4C: Transit Gaps 43

Section 5: Freight Performance Metrics 59

Section 6: Mode Share, Active Transportation & Health 63

- Section 6A: Trips by Mode 63
- Section 6B: Proximity to Grocery Stores 112
- Section 6C: Proximity to Healthcare 115
- Section 6D: Proximity to Open Space 117
- Section 6E: Proximity to High Volume Truck Routes 119
- Section 6F: Proximity to the High Injury Network 121
- Section 6G: Proximity to the At-Grade Rail Crossings 123
- Section 6H: Time Spent Walking and Biking 126

Section 7: Air Quality and Climate 131

Section 8: Regional Capacity Projects Proximity Analysis 131

Section 9: Congestion Management Process and Federal Performance Targets 138

Regional FTA Performance Targets 138
Regional FHWA Performance Targets 140

Introduction

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is guided by and builds from the policy direction and goals identified in VISION 2050. PSRC has a robust data and analysis program that applies state-of-the-art practices to evaluate plan performance against these priority policy objectives. In addition to the performance metrics themselves, the analysis is further delineated across multiple geographies. These include the entire four-county region; each of the four counties; designated centers and regional geographies as identified in VISION 2050; and areas of the region containing higher numbers of specific population groups – people of color, people with low income, older adults, youth, people with disabilities and people with limited English proficiency.

Key metrics that demonstrate the performance of the RTP in meeting the priorities and policies contained in VISION 2050 are illustrated below.

Table 1: Performance Metrics

Indicator	Definition	Unit	Reporting Geography
Population	Total population, including people who live in group quarters (military barracks, college dorm rooms, nursing homes, etc.)	People	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Vehicle Miles Traveled	Average total daily weekday vehicle miles traveled and per resident; excludes truck, visitor, and airport trips	Miles per day	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Vehicle Hours of Delay	Average total annual hours of delay and per resident; excludes truck, visitor, and airport trips	Hours	County, Regional Geography, Regional Centers
Miles of Travel in Heavy or Severe Congestion	Miles traveled on facilities operating at or below 50% of the posted speed during peak periods	Share of total miles traveled	County

Indicator	Definition	Unit	Reporting Geography
Travel Time for Major Corridors	Average weekday travel times for general purpose travel for select locations	Minutes	Major Corridors
Transit Trips	Daily trips by transit mode	Daily trips	Total and by transit mode
Transit Boardings	Annual PSRC region transit network boardings by operator	Annual boardings	Region, Operator
Transit Service Hours	Annual PSRC region transit network service hours by operator	Annual hours	Region, Operator
Transit Boardings per Service Hour	PSRC region transit boardings by service hour by operator	Boardings per Hour	Region, Operator
Household Proximity to High-Capacity Transit	Percentage of total households in a geography within ¼ mile and ½ mile of High-Capacity Transit	Percentage of Households	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Job Proximity to High-Capacity Transit	Percentage of total jobs in a geography within ¼ mile and ½ mile of High-Capacity Transit	Percentage of Jobs	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Gaps in Transit Service	Percentage and total population in a geography with a transit supportive density without a corresponding transit stop within ¼ mile and ½ mile	Total and Percentage of Population	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area
Truck Trips and Average Distance	Daily truck trips and miles driven per day	Totals	Region and by type
Truck Miles Traveled	Truck miles share of total miles traveled on roadways	Share of total miles traveled	T-1, T-2 facilities, Region, County
Congestion on the Freight Network	Truck Miles traveled on facilities operating at or below 50% of the posted speed limit during peak	Share of total miles traveled	T-1, T-2 facilities

Indicator	Definition	Unit	Reporting Geography
	morning (AM) and afternoon (PM) periods		
Daily Delay per Truck	Daily truck delay and annual delay per driver	Totals	Region and by type
Households near T-1 & T-2 Routes	Households within 500' of a T-1 or T-2 routes	Total Households	Equity Focus Area
Mode Share for All Trip Purposes	Average weekday resident home to anywhere mode share (Drove Alone, Shared Ride, Transit, Walk & Bike)	Share of total trips	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Mode Share for Work Purposes	Average weekday resident home to work commute mode share (Drove Alone, Shared Ride, Transit, Walk & Bike)	Share of total work-related trips	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Mode Share for Non-Work Purposes	Average weekday resident non-work mode share (Drove Alone, Shared Ride, Transit, Walk & Bike)	Share of total non-work-related trips	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Proximity to Grocery Stores	% of Households within ¼ mile of a grocery store	Share of total households	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Proximity to Medical Facilities	% of Households within ¼ mile of a medical facility including dental, vision and health care	Share of total households	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Proximity to Open Space	% of Households within 1000' of a park, trail or other open space amenity	Share of total households	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Proximity to the Freight Network	% of Households within 1000' of a T-1 or T-2 freight route	Share of total households	County, Regional Geography, Equity

Indicator	Definition	Unit	Reporting Geography
			Focus Area, Regional Centers
Proximity to the High-Injury Network	% of Households within 1000' of the arterial High-Injury Network (does not include limited access facilities)	Share of total households	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Proximity to At-Grade Rail Crossings	% of Households within 1000' of an at-grade rail crossing	Share of total households	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Time Spent Walking and Biking	The median time (in minutes) that residents in a geography spend walking and biking for transportation purposes	Minutes per day	County, Regional Geography, Equity Focus Area, Regional Centers
Daily Tons of Air Pollutants	Daily Tons based on model speeds and volumes and MOVES4 emission rates	Tons per day	PSRC Region

Section 1: PSRC Models and Tools

PSRC has a set of forecasting tools that are used to model the RTP and generate the metrics used to evaluate outcomes. These tools include the forecasting of regional level population and employment estimates, detailed land use allocation models, detailed travel demand forecasting tools using the latest generation of activity-based models and air quality analysis tools developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Figure 1. PSRC Model Suite

Section 1A: Regional Macroeconomic Model and Forecast

PSRC produces a Regional Macroeconomic Forecast which establishes long-range regional growth assumptions for population, households, and employment out to the year 2050. The regional forecast values serve as control totals for developing the population and employment growth allocations by county and regional geography that define the VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy. The regional forecast and subregional growth assumptions then serve as key inputs to the UrbanSim land use model.

The regional model is structured in a top-down manner, with productivity, aggregate employment, income, and inflation forecast initially, followed by subsequent modules for demographic composition and industry detail. The model equations are estimated with over four decades of historical data. It also utilizes two key exogenous elements: a) an extension of results from the national macroeconomic model developed and maintained by Yale University professor Ray Fair, and b) an Aerospace employment forecast based on global demand projections and labor productivity trends. This model was originally developed for PSRC in 2018.

For the 2026 RTP, PSRC purchased access to the REMI Insights model to understand possible changes in long-term forecasts of population and jobs out to 2050. These forecasts were within a few percentage points of overall growth out to 2050 and as such the RTP relied upon the previously established regional forecasts of 5.8 million people and 3.1 million jobs in 2050.

Section 1B: UrbanSim Land Use Model

PSRC used its UrbanSim model as a tool for modeling the Regional Growth Strategy at a disaggregate level. The UrbanSim output also serves as inputs to the regional travel demand model and other supplemental analyses.

UrbanSim is an agent-based microsimulation model that predicts land development and the location choices of households and jobs over time at the parcel level. Land development is a function of zoned land uses, allowable densities, and market forces (e.g., demand, real estate prices, profitability of new development). Location choice decisions are simulated based on various factors that households/persons and firms/jobs consider when moving to or relocating within the region (e.g., price, building size, proximity to other types of land use, commute times).

Subregional population and employment growth allocations that define the Regional Growth Strategy are disaggregated to individual jurisdictions and serve as UrbanSim's control totals. The model then simulates how the jurisdiction-level growth assumptions are likely to unfold at the parcel level based on the model dynamics described above.

UrbanSim is run parallel to the SoundCast travel model (described below) within an integrated model framework that incorporates feedback loops from SoundCast at selected intervals (years). The feedback loop is comprised of accessibility factors from SoundCast that are used by various UrbanSim sub-models. To learn more, visit: UrbanSim (Parcel-Based Land Use Model) | Puget Sound Regional Council.

The current UrbanSim model operates on a 2023 base year and the population and household allocations from UrbanSim used in the RTP are consistent with the jurisdiction level control totals used in the latest round of Comprehensive Plan updates that were developed for all the region's jurisdictions in 2025.

Section 1C: SoundCast Activity-Based Travel Demand Model

PSRC has developed a customized set of software programs and mathematical procedures to simulate current and future travel patterns and conditions within the central Puget Sound region. These programs and procedures are collectively referred to as the "SoundCast regional travel demand forecasting model" or simply as the "SoundCast travel model." The travel model produces detailed spatial and network data that are used to analyze how the region's transportation infrastructure and environment are likely to be impacted by future growth and development as represented by the VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy. Selected travel model outputs serve as inputs to both UrbanSim and the regional air quality model and analysis.

PSRC used its SoundCast travel model to analyze the transportation-related impacts of the RTP. SoundCast is an activity-based model which represents how individual people travel to conduct their daily activities. As an activity-based model, SoundCast allows for improved

representation of travel behavior as well as greater temporal and spatial resolution to better evaluate the impacts of the RTP. As such, modeled performance of the transportation system is the result of complex interactions over time produced by assumptions about the location and nature of development, and the cost and accessibility of transportation choices. To learn more, visit: Activity-Based Travel Model: SoundCast | Puget Sound Regional Council.

The current SoundCast model operates on a 2023 base year, with key variables validated against PSRC's most recent Regional Household Travel Survey from the Spring of 2023. This updated model is the first regional analysis performed that reflects post-pandemic travel behavior. The validation targets for roadway and transit volumes were based on the latest available data from late 2023 and early 2024. Travel behavior continues to evolve post-pandemic and future RTPs will reflect continued changes in observed travel behavior.

Section 1D: EPA's Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES)

The air quality model estimates future regional motor vehicle emissions of criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases. The analysis combines mobile source emission factors from the EPA's latest MOVES software and output from the travel demand model, including link-specific vehicle miles traveled and vehicle speed.

PSRC used the most recent version of the MOVES software, MOVES4, to develop emission factors used to conduct the air quality analysis of the RTP. The MOVES4 software represents EPA's most up-to-date assessment of on-road mobile source emissions, including incorporation of the most current vehicle, fuel, and emissions standards and new and updated emissions data from a variety of test programs and other resources. Metropolitan planning organizations are required to use the most current tool for regional emissions analyses for transportation conformity determinations.

PSRC also utilized the latest estimates and future forecasts of the region's on-road vehicle fleet, including the transition to zero emission, using current trends, state and federal regulations and the latest guidance from the Washington State Department of Ecology.

Section 1E: Updated Travel Behavior

The modeling and analysis for each Regional Transportation Plan is based on calibrated and validated base year models. These validation efforts are based on both observed roadway and transit counts but also the latest observed travel behavior from the most recent Regional Household Travel Survey. The models used in this RTP were estimated using travel behavior from the Spring 2023 Regional Household Travel Survey, the first survey that reflected post-pandemic travel behavior. It should be noted that although the survey was the first post-pandemic survey, a lot has happened since the spring of 2023 that is not captured in the 2023 survey. This includes the extension of light rail to Lynnwood, the opening of service east of Lake Washington, rail top Federal Way as well as the continued growth in transit ridership overall post-pandemic.

As shown in Figure 2, transit usage has continued to rebound from pandemic lows and were approximately 80% of 2019 ridership levels through the first half of 2025. This compared to 68% of 2019 ridership in the first half of 2023, the period covered in the Regional Household Travel Survey that is the basis for travel behavior in the latest RTP. It is important to keep this information in mind as we review the results of the latest modeling and analysis for the RTP. It is likely that the modeling and analysis is conservatively estimating the ridership and mode share potential of the investments in the RTP.

Figure 2. Year to Date Transit Ridership



Source: USDOT Federal Transit Administration National Transit Database

Section 2: Population and Households

The number of people who live and work in the region is a key input to the travel forecasting and analysis in the RTP. As noted in Section 1, detailed population allocations are an output of the UrbanSim land use model. These population allocations are generated at the parcel level with overall jurisdiction level control totals that align with the latest planning for updated Comprehensive Plans across the region.

This section summarizes the population and households by the geographic and demographic areas used in the RTP analysis. These analysis areas include:

- Counties
- Regional Geographies
- Regional Growth Centers
- Equity Focus Areas (EFAs)

For Counties, Regional Geographies and Regional Growth Centers, the estimates are for the total population living in those specific geographies. For EFAs, the values are reflective of all people that live within a Census Tract that is either above the regional average for the specific focus area or more than 1 standard deviation above the regional average (referred to as significantly above the regional average). As noted, the EFA population values shown are for all people or households within those Census tracts and the same Census tract can be within various EFA categories.

Section 2A: Population

Table 2: Total Population by County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	2,303,900	2,610,100	2,990,400
Kitsap County	275,100	310,400	354,200
Pierce County	925,600	1,067,000	1,238,300
Snohomish County	851,500	1,010,200	1,205,700
Region	**4,356,100**	**4,997,700**	**5,788,600**

Table 3: Total Population by Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	1,278,700	1,529,000	1,837,800
Core Cities	1,001,800	1,171,900	1,376,400
High-Capacity Transit Communities	957,300	1,110,100	1,295,600
Cities & Towns	387,200	419,500	464,700
Urban Unincorporated Areas	180,000	202,200	231,800
Rural Areas	551,100	565,000	582,300
Region	**4,356,100**	**4,997,700**	**5,788,600**

Table 4: Total Population by Regional Growth Center

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Auburn	2,200	7,300	14,700
Bellevue	16,500	39,800	66,700
Bothell Canyon Park	700	6,200	12,100
Bremerton	3,200	6,100	10,000
Burien	3,900	10,600	18,000
Everett	6,700	23,600	47,100
Federal Way	600	5,200	13,200
Issaquah	0	2,200	4,600
Kent	2,200	4,400	6,200
Kirkland Greater Downtown	8,200	10,800	11,900
Kirkland Totem Lake	8,200	10,800	14,100
Lakewood	600	6,200	14,300
Lynnwood	4,900	14,400	27,900
Puyallup Downtown	1,200	3,700	6,100

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Puyallup South Hill	2,700	5,400	9,700
Redmond Downtown	9,700	18,100	25,200
Redmond Overlake	4,900	10,200	20,400
Renton	5,500	15,400	28,800
SeaTac	11,500	16,300	22,600
Seattle Downtown	44,100	74,600	99,400
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	52,400	80,100	103,300
Seattle Northgate	8,500	11,700	15,700
Seattle South Lake Union	14,700	24,600	33,900
Seattle University Community	22,500	30,900	37,500
Seattle Uptown	12,100	20,200	25,300
Silverdale	2,000	3,400	5,000
Tacoma Downtown	15,700	55,600	94,400
Tacoma Mall	6,200	11,200	27,100
Tukwila	600	6,600	13,800
University Place	7,000	11,200	15,500
Region	**4,356,100**	**4,997,700**	**5,788,600**

Table 5: Total Population by Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	279,200	546,700	844,500
Not in a Regional Growth Center	4,076,900	4,451,000	4,944,100
Region	**4,356,100**	**4,997,700**	**5,788,600**

Table 6: Total Population by Equity Focus Area

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	2,010,700	757,300	2,377,300	888,300	2,813,000	1,033,800
People with Low Incomes	1,719,400	607,500	2,074,800	773,000	2,491,500	978,400
People with Limited English	1,669,300	755,600	1,960,300	872,700	2,315,000	1,022,300
People with Disabilities	1,942,600	627,600	2,322,200	804,700	2,768,600	1,026,200
Older Adults	2,043,700	556,700	2,309,200	654,000	2,632,000	765,400
Youth	2,170,000	639,500	2,378,300	693,100	2,648,700	757,400
Region	**4,356,100**		**4,997,700**		**5,788,600**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for population growth between 2023 and 2050 include:

- The population is forecasted to increase 33% between 2023 and 2050.
- Snohomish County's % population change of 41% between 2023 and 2050 is the highest for any of the four counties.
- 89% of the total growth is estimated to occur in Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities and High-Capacity Transit Communities, places with the greatest concentration of transit investments in the RTP.
- Census tracts with the highest shares of people with low incomes are estimated to increase in population by 45%, the most of any EFA.

Section 2B: Households

The number of households in the region is also a key input to the travel forecasting and analysis in the RTP as household dynamics affect everything from mode of travel to the number of trips taken per day. As noted in Section 1, detailed household allocations are an output of the UrbanSim land use model. These allocations are generated at the parcel level with overall jurisdiction level control totals that align with the latest planning for updated Comprehensive Plans across the region.

The average household size in the region is forecasted to decline from approximately 2.51 people per household today to approximately 2.39 people per household in 2050.

Table 7: Total Households by County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	957,500	1,104,600	1,288,300
Kitsap County	108,900	127,400	150,100
Pierce County	350,100	418,000	500,700
Snohomish County	319,600	392,500	482,000
Region	**1,736,100**	**2,042,500**	**2,421,100**

Table 8: Total Households by Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	589,700	707,100	854,000
Core Cities	386,800	467,100	564,600
High-Capacity Transit Communities	359,700	429,700	515,200
Cities & Towns	136,200	153,700	176,000
Urban Unincorporated Areas	61,900	71,200	83,300
Rural Areas	201,800	213,600	227,900
Region	**1,736,100**	**2,042,400**	**2,421,000**

Table 9: Total Households by Regional Growth Center

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Auburn	1,000	3,100	6,300
Bellevue	9,800	19,900	31,600
Bothell Canyon Park	300	2,700	5,300
Bremerton	1,700	3,100	5,100
Burien	2,000	5,000	8,500
Everett	3,800	12,100	23,400
Federal Way	200	2,300	6,200
Issaquah	0	1,300	2,700
Kent	1,000	2,000	2,900
Kirkland Greater Downtown	4,500	5,600	6,300
Kirkland Totem Lake	4,100	5,500	7,400
Lakewood	300	3,200	7,400
Lynnwood	2,300	7,000	13,400
Puyallup Downtown	600	1,800	3,000
Puyallup South Hill	1,300	2,600	4,800
Redmond Downtown	5,300	9,100	12,400
Redmond Overlake	2,600	5,200	10,000
Renton	3,100	7,900	14,600
SeaTac	4,700	6,800	9,600
Seattle Downtown	29,900	44,600	56,900
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	35,500	47,800	58,300
Seattle Northgate	4,800	6,500	8,500
Seattle South Lake Union	10,000	14,700	19,200
Seattle University Community	12,800	17,300	20,900
Seattle Uptown	8,000	11,800	14,300

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Silverdale	1,100	2,000	3,000
Tacoma Downtown	9,400	28,900	48,000
Tacoma Mall	3,000	5,400	13,500
Tukwila	400	2,900	5,900
University Place	3,400	5,500	7,700
Region	**1,736,100**	**2,042,500**	**2,421,100**

Table 10: Total Households by Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	166,600	293,800	437,100
Not in a Regional Growth Center	1,569,500	1,748,600	1,983,900
Region	**1,736,100**	**2,042,400**	**2,421,000**

Table 11: Total Households by Equity Focus Area

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	793,800	292,700	967,300	355,000	1,175,000	424,900
People with Low Incomes	695,700	249,300	864,400	329,800	1,064,800	430,400
People with Limited English	643,600	286,700	779,500	342,200	946,500	412,700
People with Disabilities	793,700	265,700	972,600	350,100	1,185,800	457,100

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
Older Adults	824,600	235,500	953,300	281,500	1,110,600	335,700
Youth	782,100	216,300	886,000	244,000	1,019,200	276,600
Region	**1,736,100**		**2,042,400**		**2,421,000**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for households growth between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Households are forecasted to increase 39% between 2023 and 2050, higher than the population growth due to smaller household sizes.
- Snohomish County's % household change of 51% between 2023 and 2050 is the highest for any of the four counties.
- 87% of the total growth is estimated to occur in Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities and High-Capacity Transit Communities, places with the greatest concentration of transit investments in the RTP.
- Census tracts with the highest shares of people with low incomes are estimated to see an increase in households of 53%, the most of any EFA.
- Census tracts with the highest shares of youth are estimated to see an increase in households of 30%, the fewest of any EFA followed by Older Adults at 35%.

Section 3: Vehicle Based Performance Metrics

Many of the detailed performance metrics for the RTP are generated using the suite of analytical tools and models that were identified in Section 1 of this report. As noted above, PSRC generates output at many levels of geographic and demographic resolution. PSRC strives to provide detailed performance metrics at as many summarization levels as possible with the tools available for analysis, however some metrics are only available on the County and Regional scale.

Most metrics include total values at the regional and county scales whereas the comparisons across geographies and demographic characteristics are generally reported on a per-capita basis for more relevant comparisons.

Section 3A: Vehicle Miles Traveled

Vehicle miles traveled vary across the region, by regional geography and in some case by different communities. Overall, the miles driven per day per person is forecast to decline with the RTP. Detailed metrics by various geographies of interest are included below:

Table 12: Total Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled by County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	43,325,000	46,697,000	50,592,000
Kitsap County	4,265,000	4,824,000	5,391,000
Pierce County	18,391,000	20,163,000	22,341,000
Snohomish County	16,098,000	18,245,000	20,298,000
Region	**82,079,000**	**89,929,000**	**98,622,000**

Table 13: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita by County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	13.4	12.5	11.7
Kitsap County	14.0	13.4	13.1
Pierce County	15.1	14.3	13.6
Snohomish County	16.4	15.4	14.4
Region	**14.4**	**13.5**	**12.7**

Table 14: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita by Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	10.0	8.8	7.8
Core Cities	13.9	13.0	12.2
High-Capacity Transit Communities	14.7	14.0	13.5
Cities & Towns	17.5	17.6	17.6

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Urban Unincorporated Areas	16.1	16.0	15.6
Rural Areas	22.1	22.6	22.8
Region	**14.4**	**13.5**	**12.7**

Table 15: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita by Regional Growth Center

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Auburn	11.2	8.3	7.1
Bellevue	7.2	3.5	2.4
Bothell Canyon Park	15.4	13.7	12.4
Bremerton	7.2	4.9	3.8
Burien	12.5	10.7	9
Everett	9	5.3	3.6
Federal Way	11.3	9.1	7.8
Issaquah	-	13.6	12.0
Kent	9.4	6.4	5.3
Kirkland Greater Downtown	11.9	10.8	10.2
Kirkland Totem Lake	12.8	11.3	10.3
Lakewood	9.7	7.7	7.5
Lynnwood	11.4	8.9	7.2
Puyallup Downtown	8.7	9.8	8.1
Puyallup South Hill	12.6	11.5	11.3
Redmond Downtown	10.2	7.8	7.3
Redmond Overlake	8.9	6.6	5.9
Renton	11.9	9.7	8.7
SeaTac	10.7	10.2	10.0
Seattle Downtown	1.8	1.2	1.1

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	3.1	2.3	1.9
Seattle Northgate	9.5	8.1	7.8
Seattle South Lake Union	3.3	2.1	1.8
Seattle University Community	5.2	4.8	4.3
Seattle Uptown	5.1	3.5	2.9
Silverdale	7.6	6.9	6.2
Tacoma Downtown	7.3	4.5	3.0
Tacoma Mall	7.8	6.9	6.8
Tukwila	11.7	10.2	8.6
University Place	10.9	10.0	10.0
Region	**14.4**	**13.5**	**12.7**

Table 16: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita by Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	6.3	5.2	4.7
Not in a Regional Growth Center	14.9	14.6	14.1
Region	**14.4**	**13.5**	**12.7**

Table 17: Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita by Equity Focus Area

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	13.2	12.8	12.0	11.7	11.0	10.9
People with Low Incomes	13.7	11.7	12.8	10.4	12.1	9.4
People with Limited English	14.2	13.2	13.1	12.1	12.2	11.2
People with Disabilities	14.5	13.3	13.7	11.8	13.1	10.5
Older Adults	15.1	15.5	14.4	14.6	13.8	13.8
Youth	15.7	16.2	15.2	16.1	14.8	15.8
Region	**14.4**		**13.5**		**12.7**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for VMT changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Total miles driven are forecasted to increase 20% between 2023 and 2050, noticeably slower than the 33% estimated growth in population.
- Kitsap County's % VMT change of 26% between 2023 and 2050 is the highest for any of the four counties.
- Metropolitan Cities, Core Cities and High-Capacity Transit Communities that are forecasted to accommodate 89% of population growth have the lowest miles driven per capita of all regional geographies.
- Census tracts with the highest shares of people with low incomes are estimated to drive the least while places with more youth tend to drive the most.
- People living in Regional Growth Centers are forecasted to drive less than 5 miles per person per day, 63% lower than the regional average.

Section 3B: Vehicle Hours of Delay

Vehicle hours of delay are calculated by comparing the travel time on roadways at the model speed by time-period and comparing it to travel on those same roadways at the posted speed limit. The model currently forecasts travel demand by 12 distinct time periods and the daily delay is the summation of delay across all 12 periods. It should be noted that the model does not allow a vehicle to travel faster than the posted speed limit and as such the delay from the model is never less than 0.

Table 18 shows the total delay as observed on the roadway links in a specific county, regardless of where the driver of that vehicle lives. It also includes delays for medium and heavy trucks in addition to passenger vehicles. For tables 19 through 23, these values represent the amount of delay accrued by residents of the four counties across their day, no matter what roadways they travel on. They also only include delays for residents, truck and external trips are not included in those estimates of delay.

Table 18: Total Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay by County (includes trucks and external trips)

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	149,900	166,300	212,400
Kitsap County	2,500	4,700	7,200
Pierce County	30,300	39,800	51,600
Snohomish County	29,700	41,100	61,000
Region	**212,400**	**251,900**	**332,200**

Table 19: Annual Hours of Delay per Capita for PSRC Residents by County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	14.2	13.4	14.2
Kitsap County	6.3	7.0	7.5
Pierce County	12.2	13.6	15.1
Snohomish County	17.2	17.2	19.0
Region	**13.9**	**13.8**	**15.0**

Table 20: Annual Hours of Delay per Capita for PSRC Residents by Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	10.2	8.8	8.4
Core Cities	15.0	14.9	16.2
High-Capacity Transit Communities	16.7	16.9	18.8
Cities & Towns	15.0	16.5	19.6
Urban Unincorporated Areas	15.5	17.7	20.8
Rural Areas	14.1	15.9	18.4
Region	**13.9**	**13.8**	**15.0**

Table 21: Annual Hours of Delay per Capita for PSRC Residents by Regional Growth Center

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Auburn	8.0	7.5	7.5
Bellevue	8.9	3.9	3.2
Bothell Canyon Park	27.0	21.5	22.8
Bremerton	6.4	3.7	2.4
Burien	10.5	10.8	11.0
Everett	6.5	3.4	3.0
Federal Way	6.4	8.5	7.8
Issaquah	-	13.8	14.5
Kent	8.4	7.0	6.1
Kirkland Greater Downtown	17.6	14.7	16.5
Kirkland Totem Lake	20.2	17.8	19.3
Lakewood	5.3	6.1	6.6

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Lynnwood	15.3	12.8	11.7
Puyallup Downtown	5.3	9.6	8.8
Puyallup South Hill	11.3	12.9	15.6
Redmond Downtown	9.7	7.8	8.4
Redmond Overlake	10.9	7.0	6.9
Renton	15.4	12.5	12.5
SeaTac	10.1	10.1	11.4
Seattle Downtown	0.0	0.0	0.2
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	1.8	1.2	1.3
Seattle Northgate	11.9	10.7	11.5
Seattle South Lake Union	1.8	1.3	0.6
Seattle University Community	8.0	7.0	6.5
Seattle Uptown	3.2	2.0	0.9
Silverdale	0.0	0.9	1.2
Tacoma Downtown	3.5	2.9	2.3
Tacoma Mall	6.2	5.5	7.8
Tukwila	11.7	10.3	10.4
University Place	8.7	8.9	10.9
Region	**13.9**	**13.8**	**15.0**

Table 22: Annual Hours of Delay per Capita for PSRC Residents by Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	6.0	5.2	5.5
Not in a Regional Growth Center	14.4	14.9	16.6
Region	**13.9**	**13.8**	**15.0**

Table 23: Annual Hours of Delay per Capita for PSRC Residents by Equity Focus Area

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	9.0	13.5	8.6	12.8	9.2	13.7
People with Low Incomes	8.1	10.6	8.0	10.3	8.5	10.8
People with Limited English	8.7	14.6	8.5	14.0	9.3	14.9
People with Disabilities	8.7	10.2	8.6	10.1	9.2	10.6
Older Adults	9.9	12.3	9.9	12.5	10.7	13.3
Youth	10.4	15.7	10.8	16.9	12.1	19.7
Region	**13.9**		**13.8**		**15.0**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for delay changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Total delay is forecasted to increase 56% between 2023 and 2050 with the largest increases of delays on roadways in Kitsap and Snohomish Counties.
- Metropolitan Cities are the only regional geography that is not forecasted to have an increase in delay per capita.
- Census tracts with the highest shares of people with limited English proficiency and youth are estimated to have the most delay per capita in 2050.
- People living in Regional Growth Centers are forecasted to experience 1/3 of the regional per-capita annual hours of delay.

Section 3C: Roadway Congestion and Travel Time

Roadway congestion levels are defined by the ratio of the congested model speed compared to the posted speed limit on the roadway. The levels of congestion are defined as:

Table 24: Roadway Congestion Thresholds

Congestion Level	Threshold
Minimal Congestion	More than 70% of posted speed
Moderate Congestion	50% to 70% of posted speed
Heavy Congestion	25% to 50% of posted speed
Severe Congestion	Less than 25% of posted speed

The RTP focuses on heavy & severe congestion during the AM and PM peak periods – traditionally the times of day with the most traffic congestion. It should be noted that since the pandemic the middle of the day experiences congestion at similar levels as the AM Peak.

Table 25: Share of VMT traveled in Heavy & Severe Congestion – AM Peak Period

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	14.8%	14.9%	17.1%
Kitsap County	3.2%	3.5%	3.5%
Pierce County	5.7%	6.9%	7.9%
Snohomish County	7.6%	9.1%	11.0%
Region	**11.1%**	**11.6%**	**13.4%**

Table 26: Share of VMT traveled in Heavy & Severe Congestion – PM Peak Period

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King County	10.7%	11.2%	12.8%
Kitsap County	2.9%	3.1%	3.1%
Pierce County	4.6%	4.8%	6.2%
Snohomish County	5.3%	5.2%	7.5%
Region	**8.0%**	**8.3%**	**9.9%**

Travel times on the highest volume routes in the region – as tracked by the Washington State Department of Transportation – are also tracked as part of the performance of the RTP. These corridors offer key connections between major employment centers across the region and typically serve the largest travel market in the region.

Table 27: Average Corridor Travel Time – AM Peak Period

Corridor	2023	2035	2050
Everett to Seattle	60.3	61.0	65.2
Tacoma to Seattle	65.1	67.6	72.4
Lynnwood to Bellevue	37.1	37.8	41.2
Tukwila to Bellevue	30.2	28.0	29.5
Auburn to Renton	24.8	26.1	28
Redmond to Seattle	30.1	28.5	30.2
Redmond to Bellevue	12.6	13.2	14.1
Issaquah to Bellevue	13.7	14.2	14.7
Bellevue to Seattle via 520	24.4	22.6	23.6
Bellevue to Seattle via 90	27.2	25.1	25.9
Everett to Seattle	60.3	61.0	65.2
Tacoma to Seattle	65.1	67.6	72.4

Table 28: Average Corridor Travel Time – PM Peak Period

Corridor	2023	2035	2050
Seattle to Everett	52.7	53.7	57.7
Seattle to Tacoma	56.1	57.2	61.6
Bellevue to Lynnwood	31.4	32.3	35.1
Bellevue to Tukwila	27.6	26.2	27.2
Renton to Auburn	21.3	22.1	24
Seattle to Redmond	24.3	22.4	24
Bellevue to Redmond	10.8	10.9	11.3
Bellevue to Issaquah	12.0	12.7	13.1
Seattle to Bellevue via 520	18.3	18.0	19.1
Seattle to Bellevue via I-90	24.7	22.6	24.5

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for congestion changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Travel times along major interstates increase modestly between 2023 and 2050 despite a 33% increase in population across the region.
- King County has the highest share of congested roadways during the peak period of travel where about 17% of all VMT traveled in the AM Peak period is in heavy and severe congestion.
- Kitsap County has the lowest share of travel spent in heavy and severe congestion and is around 3.5% in the AM Peak period by 2050.

Section 4: Transit Based Performance Metrics

By 2050, significant expansion of regional and local transit service is planned. The future transit system will include 116 miles of light rail, extending its reach from Everett to Tacoma, Ballard and West Seattle communities within Seattle, and connecting South Kirkland to Issaquah. It will double the number of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes from 11 to 22, adding service along the I-405 and SR-522 corridors, connecting communities in King and

Snohomish counties from as far north as Arlington and as far south as Auburn, and extending east to Totem Lake. In addition, Sounder commuter rail will be extended south to DuPont.

Section 4A: Transit Trips, Boardings & Service Hours

Transit trips are a direct output of the SoundCast model. Transit trips by mode are categorized by the highest order mode utilized based on this hierarchy:

- Light Rail, Streetcar or Monorail
- Commuter Rail
- Ferry
- Bus

Using this hierarchy, a trip that utilizes a bus to light rail transfer counts as one transit trip, but that trip is counted in the Light Rail category.

Table 29: Daily Transit Trips by Transit Mode

Agency	2023	2035	2050
Total Daily Transit Trips	361,000	693,000	1,048,000
Share of Daily Trips by Transit Mode			
Bus	70%	54%	53%
Commuter Rail	2%	2%	1%
Ferry	4%	4%	3%
Light Rail, Streetcar & Monorail	24%	40%	43%

Annual boardings are calculated by applying the model growth rates in boardings by operator to the existing observed boardings by operator from the National Transit Database.

Table 30: Annual Transit Boardings by Operator

Agency	2023	2035	2050
Community Transit	7,146,000	18,599,000	26,722,000
Everett Transit	1,405,000	2,537,000	4,990,000
King County Metro	78,887,000	132,714,000	212,130,000
Kitsap Transit	2,739,000	4,158,000	5,144,000
Pierce Transit	6,792,000	15,697,000	21,090,000
Sound Transit	37,572,000	96,726,000	143,165,000
City of Seattle	2,135,000	2,374,000	2,673,000
Washington Ferries	18,241,000	29,016,000	38,696,000
Pierce County Ferries	447,000	524,000	621,000
Region	**155,364,000**	**302,345,000**	**455,231,000**

Table 31: Annual Transit Service Hours by Operator

Agency	2023	2035	2050
Community Transit	617,000	990,000	1,090,000
Everett Transit	133,000	165,000	190,000
King County Metro	4,110,000	4,185,000	8,206,000
Kitsap Transit	235,000	486,000	489,000
Pierce Transit	644,000	1,016,000	976,000
Sound Transit	992,000	1,171,000	1,553,000
City of Seattle	21,000	21,000	21,000
Washington Ferries	108,000	142,000	152,000
Pierce County Ferries	5,000	5,000	5,000
Region	6,865,000	8,181,000	12,682,000

Boardings by service hour is a metric that illustrates the overall utilization of transit service and is a standard performance measure used by the region's transit agencies. The calculation is the total annual boardings by operator divided by the annual transit service hours.

Table 32: Boardings per Service Hour by Operator

Agency	2023	2035	2050
Community Transit	11.6	18.8	24.5
Everett Transit	10.6	15.4	26.3
King County Metro	19.2	31.7	25.9
Kitsap Transit	11.7	8.6	10.5
Pierce Transit	10.5	15.4	21.6
Sound Transit	37.9	82.6	92.2
City of Seattle	101.7	113.0	127.3
Washington Ferries	168.9	204.3	254.6
Pierce County Ferries	89.4	104.8	124.2
Region	**22.6**	**37.0**	**35.9**

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- The substantial expansion of transit networks and service hours described above will result in an 85% increase in service hours compared to today.
- This investment will result in a tripling of transit boardings across the region, compared to today's levels.
- The boardings growth eclipses the hours growth, resulting in a noticeable increase in the number of boardings per hour provided across all transit operators.
- Sound Transit ridership growth is the highest of any agency followed very closely by Community Transit.
- King County Metro continues to operate the most service and move the most passengers of any operator in the region in all analysis years.

Section 4B: Households & Jobs near High-Capacity Transit

High-Capacity transit is defined as the following transit modes:

- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Commuter Rail
- Ferry (Passenger Only and Auto Ferry)
- Light Rail
- Monorail
- Streetcar

The metrics in these tables are based on a straight-line distance from the centroid of a parcel and the nearest transit stop for a High-Capacity transit mode.

Table 33: % of Households near High-Capacity Transit by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
King County	17%	31%	30%	47%	48%	64%
Kitsap County	0.2%	1.5%	0.3%	2%	12%	23%
Pierce County	1%	3%	6%	10%	9%	16%
Snohomish County	6%	17%	14%	32%	22%	42%
Region	**11%**	**21%**	**20%**	**34%**	**32%**	**47%**

Table 34: % of Jobs near High-Capacity Transit by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
King County	37%	53%	51%	66%	64%	79%
Kitsap County	1%	12%	1%	12%	28%	48%
Pierce County	6%	11%	18%	25%	22%	32%
Snohomish County	15%	32%	27%	49%	33%	57%
Region	**28%**	**42%**	**40%**	**54%**	**51%**	**67%**

Table 35: Households near High-Capacity Transit by Regional Geography

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
Metropolitan Cities	131,800	250,100	265,800	410,700	484,000	644,800
Core Cities	32,200	63,800	91,800	165,500	188,600	293,800
High-Capacity Transit Communities	21,400	46,400	56,700	110,100	106,500	185,500
Cities & Towns	0	200	0	400	500	2,100
Urban Unincorporated Areas	600	2,400	800	2,900	3,400	10,100
Rural Areas	100	600	400	1,300	1,300	3,400
Region	**186,000**	**363,000**	**415,000**	**691,000**	**784,000**	**1,140,000**

Table 36: Jobs near High-Capacity Transit by Regional Geography

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
Metropolitan Cities	419,000	635,300	703,400	904,700	1,038,500	1,259,900
Core Cities	153,500	226,400	276,800	416,600	469,300	676,300
High-Capacity Transit Communities	25,700	45,900	60,000	99,500	104,700	163,000
Cities & Towns	0	100	0	300	800	2,400
Urban Unincorporated Areas	500	2,300	900	4,700	6,800	12,400
Rural Areas	1,300	2,500	1,700	3,500	4,500	7,400
Region	**600,000**	**912,000**	**1,043,000**	**1,429,000**	**1,625,000**	**2,121,000**

Table 37: Households near High-Capacity Transit by Regional Growth Center

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
Auburn	700	1,000	2,900	3,100	6,000	6,300
Bellevue	3,000	8,800	19,400	19,900	30,900	31,600
Bothell Canyon Park	0	200	200	1,600	600	2,700
Bremerton	100	600	200	1,400	5,100	5,100
Burien	1,800	2,000	4,800	5,000	8,300	8,500
Everett	1,400	3,200	5,600	11,200	12,500	22,100
Federal Way	200	200	2,300	2,300	6,200	6,200
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	400	2,100
Kent	300	1,000	900	2,000	2,700	2,900
Kirkland Greater Downtown	0	0	2,000	4,400	5,600	6,300
Kirkland Totem Lake	0	0	2,400	4,900	4,400	7,000
Lakewood	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lynnwood	0	0	3,300	5,800	6,600	12,200
Puyallup Downtown	300	500	1,000	1,700	1,900	2,900
Puyallup South Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redmond Downtown	2,900	4,600	6,800	9,100	10,200	12,400
Redmond Overlake	2,400	2,600	4,100	5,200	7,700	10,000
Renton	2,800	3,100	7,400	7,900	13,800	14,600
SeaTac	2,500	4,700	4,200	6,800	6,800	9,600
Seattle Downtown	26,700	29,700	44,100	44,600	51,500	56,900
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	6,000	30,500	27,700	47,700	54,700	58,300
Seattle Northgate	700	3,400	1,000	4,700	7,200	8,500
Seattle South Lake Union	8,200	10,000	14,500	14,700	19,200	19,200
Seattle University Community	4,400	10,000	10,300	14,300	20,400	20,900

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
Seattle Uptown	7,000	8,000	10,200	11,800	13,100	14,300
Silverdale	0	0	0	0	0	500
Tacoma Downtown	2,200	4,600	21,700	28,800	36,000	47,800
Tacoma Mall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tukwila	300	400	2,500	2,800	5,000	5,900
University Place	0	0	0	0	0	1,200
Region	**186,000**	**363,000**	**415,000**	**691,000**	**784,000**	**1,140,000**

Table 38: % of Households near High-Capacity Transit by Centers

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
In a Regional Growth Center	44%	77%	74%	88%	81%	92%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	7%	15%	19%	34%	33%	51%
Region	**11%**	**21%**	**20%**	**34%**	**32%**	**47%**

Table 39: Jobs near High-Capacity Transit by Regional Growth Center

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
Auburn	2,300	3,800	7,200	7,800	10,700	11,100
Bellevue	33,000	51,200	81,700	81,900	95,100	96,700
Bothell Canyon Park	4,200	7,800	3,100	8,500	4,400	10,700
Bremerton	700	10,900	800	12,400	8,300	17,500
Burien	3,600	3,800	6,000	6,200	8,900	9,100
Everett	8,900	13,600	20,900	29,400	36,500	50,700
Federal Way	1,200	2,400	4,100	5,500	11,400	11,500
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	3,800	14,100
Kent	3,100	6,100	13,100	19,300	32,900	37,200
Kirkland Greater Downtown	0	0	5,800	9,800	18,400	19,800
Kirkland Totem Lake	0	0	11,900	17,800	18,100	28,800
Lakewood	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lynnwood	0	0	7,600	17,400	12,300	26,800
Puyallup Downtown	1,800	3,100	2,200	4,200	3,400	7,100
Puyallup South Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0
Redmond Downtown	3,500	6,900	11,900	13,300	14,500	15,800
Redmond Overlake	26,700	34,200	30,200	37,700	32,400	40,500
Renton	14,500	16,600	21,700	23,200	26,900	29,000
SeaTac	26,100	27,000	28,900	30,000	32,800	33,900
Seattle Downtown	211,200	227,400	268,100	273,900	289,000	303,100
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	7,700	29,200	45,500	55,400	58,600	60,000
Seattle Northgate	2,200	8,300	2,600	8,700	9,500	11,500
Seattle South Lake Union	49,200	54,100	69,800	71,100	88,500	88,500

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
Seattle University Community	3,100	32,700	6,200	35,900	41,500	41,500
Seattle Uptown	12,800	14,100	18,600	20,200	24,100	25,500
Silverdale	0	0	0	0	700	5,200
Tacoma Downtown	13,500	24,000	60,200	69,300	81,000	95,800
Tacoma Mall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tukwila	7,500	11,600	10,000	15,000	26,200	36,100
University Place	0	0	0	0	300	900
Region	**600,000**	**912,000**	**1,043,000**	**1,429,000**	**1,625,000**	**2,121,000**

Table 40: % of Jobs near High-Capacity Transit by Centers

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi	¼ mi	½ mi
In a Regional Growth Center	58%	78%	74%	88%	81%	92%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	12%	23%	19%	34%	33%	51%
Region	**28%**	**42%**	**40%**	**54%**	**51%**	**67%**

Table 41: Households near High-Capacity Transit by Equity Focus Area

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
1/4 mile						
People of Color	73,400	51,900	165,100	122,700	284,500	210,900
People with Low Incomes	47,400	41,000	110,900	109,800	211,500	208,500
People with Limited English	44,700	47,800	115,700	107,600	197,600	202,600
People with Disabilities	55,000	29,500	121,200	90,400	224,000	167,400
Older Adults	39,000	18,600	97,700	49,800	183,700	96,500
Youth	24,000	5,300	57,400	14,800	125,000	34,400
Region	**186,000**		**415,000**		**784,000**	
1/2 mile						
People of Color	135,100	96,700	264,000	183,100	410,600	288,300
People with Low Incomes	98,200	81,200	189,300	170,700	308,600	283,600
People with Limited English	80,600	97,100	183,000	177,800	287,500	294,300
People with Disabilities	107,000	56,200	203,700	136,400	335,900	232,000
Older Adults	81,000	34,500	167,000	76,900	283,700	136,800
Youth	53,900	14,100	115,500	28,200	215,800	55,500
Region	**363,000**		**691,000**		**1,140,000**	

Table 42: Jobs near High-Capacity Transit by Equity Focus Area

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
1/4 mile						
People of Color	323,000	185,000	509,000	311,000	692,000	495,000
People with Low Incomes	183,000	129,000	309,000	255,000	452,000	443,000
People with Limited English	173,000	161,000	297,000	267,000	455,000	434,000
People with Disabilities	135,000	194,000	263,000	330,000	446,000	447,000
Older Adults	155,000	58,000	267,000	112,000	406,000	173,000
Youth	38,000	24,000	81,000	33,000	185,000	55,000
Region	**600,000**		**1,043,000**		**1,625,000**	
1/2 mile						
People of Color	421,000	303,000	631,000	433,000	851,000	638,000
People with Low Incomes	265,000	206,000	408,000	358,000	597,000	549,000
People with Limited English	279,000	236,000	421,000	363,000	579,000	572,000
People with Disabilities	195,000	252,000	357,000	400,000	585,000	556,000
Older Adults	216,000	98,000	344,000	162,000	530,000	239,000
Youth	74,000	31,000	157,000	43,000	292,000	75,000
Region	**912,000**		**1,429,000**		**2,121,000**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- The share of households within ½ mile of high-capacity transit is forecasted to grow from 21% today to over 47% in 2050, more than doubling the number of households near high-capacity transit.
- Households in Regional Growth Centers have significantly higher shares of access to high-capacity transit than the region as a whole.
- Census tracts with higher shares of people of color have the highest number of households near high-capacity transit while those with higher shares of youth have the least.
- More than half of the households living near high-capacity transit live in the region's five metropolitan cities.

Section 4C: Transit Gaps

This section focuses on the match between transit supportive densities and corresponding frequency and span of transit service. Transit services around the region have been categorized into transit service definitions as shown in the table below.

Table 43: Transit Service and Transit-Supportive Densities

Density	Frequency & Span	Transit Service
At least 7 people + jobs per acre	Service with at least 2 trips per hour between 6am and 8pm	Local Transit
At least 15 people + jobs per acre	Service with at least 3 trips per hour between 5am and 10pm	All Day Service
At least 25 people + jobs per acre	Service with at least 4 trips per hour between 6am and 6pm	Frequent Service
At least 40 people + jobs per acre	BRT, Light Rail, Commuter Rail or Ferry at varying frequencies and spans	High-Capacity Transit

A transit gap is defined as an area that has a supportive density but no transit service at the same corresponding level. Gaps by various geographies are shown below.

Table 44: Gaps in Local Transit Service by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
King County	291,300	17%	244,100	12%	137,300	5%
Kitsap County	43,900	54%	28,600	26%	45,200	31%
Pierce County	340,300	66%	218,500	34%	255,100	31%
Snohomish County	294,200	55%	246,500	35%	217,800	23%
Region	**947,700**	**33%**	**724,700**	**21%**	**638,700**	**15%**
1/2 mile						
King County	194,000	11%	142,800	7%	71,700	3%
Kitsap County	32,200	40%	16,600	15%	28,600	19%
Pierce County	278,500	54%	166,900	26%	199,100	24%
Snohomish County	225,700	42%	176,000	25%	150,500	16%
Region	**712,000**	**25%**	**490,300**	**14%**	**438,400**	**10%**

Table 45: Gaps in All Day Transit Service by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
King County	273,700	30%	261,700	21%	104,200	6%
Kitsap County	12,900	100%	3,500	13%	17,300	36%
Pierce County	95,800	83%	248,400	99%	407,300	98%
Snohomish County	69,100	40%	98,200	31%	125,500	26%
Region	**443,500**	**36%**	**606,100**	**33%**	**650,600**	**25%**
1/2 mile						
King County	218,300	24%	185,800	15%	67,800	4%
Kitsap County	12,900	100%	2,400	9%	10,300	21%
Pierce County	90,000	78%	230,300	92%	379,700	92%
Snohomish County	35,200	21%	46,800	15%	60,700	12%
Region	**353,000**	**29%**	**462,100**	**25%**	**517,500**	**20%**

Table 46: Gaps in Frequent Transit Service by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
King County	28,700	6%	23,600	3%	12,400	1%
Kitsap County	3,000	100%	200	1%	6,000	25%
Pierce County	24,000	100%	31,800	25%	47,100	21%
Snohomish County	3,800	12%	8,800	6%	39,500	12%
Region	**59,600**	**11%**	**64,400**	**6%**	**104,900**	**6%**
1/2 mile						
King County	22,000	5%	13,100	2%	10,800	1%
Kitsap County	3,000	100%	200	1%	4,000	17%
Pierce County	24,000	100%	31,800	25%	44,400	19%
Snohomish County	2,700	8%	4,800	3%	10,400	3%
Region	**51,700**	**10%**	**50,000**	**5%**	**69,600**	**4%**

Table 47: Gaps in High-Capacity Transit Service by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
King County	39,700	15%	29,100	5%	62,000	7%
Kitsap County	0	0%	0	0%	6,600	49%
Pierce County	4,700	39%	11,000	17%	52,300	31%
Snohomish County	1,000	45%	600	1%	9,200	5%
Region	**45,400**	**16%**	**40,700**	**6%**	**130,000**	**10%**
1/2 mile						
King County	15,300	6%	9,700	2%	23,600	3%
Kitsap County	0	0%	0	0%	3,100	23%
Pierce County	4,700	39%	11,000	17%	52,300	31%
Snohomish County	1,000	45%	0	0%	0	0%
Region	**21,100**	**8%**	**20,800**	**3%**	**79,000**	**6%**

Table 48: Gaps in Local Transit Service by Regional Geography

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	201,000	16%	108,000	7%	70,700	4%
Core Cities	289,500	32%	230,300	21%	156,900	12%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	401,300	50%	303,600	31%	291,200	23%
Cities & Towns	163,100	76%	144,700	57%	146,000	47%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	146,400	71%	133,700	54%	147,000	46%
Rural Areas	6,400	100%	7,400	100%	7,200	92%
Region	**947,700**	**33%**	**724,700**	**21%**	**638,700**	**15%**
1/2 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	98,200	8%	38,200	3%	25,800	1%
Core Cities	196,500	22%	137,300	13%	86,100	6%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	324,100	41%	214,600	22%	205,300	16%
Cities & Towns	147,900	69%	124,200	49%	111,900	36%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	134,200	65%	115,100	47%	128,700	40%
Rural Areas	6,400	100%	7,400	100%	7,200	92%
Region	**712,000**	**25%**	**490,300**	**14%**	**438,400**	**10%**

Table 49: Gaps in All Day Transit Service by Regional Geography

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	145,900	19%	215,400	21%	231,400	17%
Core Cities	220,000	65%	249,000	45%	212,400	27%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	103,600	49%	174,600	46%	219,200	36%
Cities & Towns	22,000	95%	39,700	97%	61,200	89%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	27,200	67%	52,200	67%	59,600	56%
Rural Areas	500	100%	400	100%	1,300	100%
Region	**443,500**	**36%**	**606,100**	**33%**	**650,600**	**25%**
1/2 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	90,400	12%	154,600	15%	185,000	13%
Core Cities	198,300	59%	199,400	36%	155,700	20%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	76,700	36%	125,100	33%	168,800	28%
Cities & Towns	19,600	85%	37,400	92%	58,200	85%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	21,700	53%	43,000	55%	49,600	47%
Rural Areas	500	100%	400	100%	1,300	100%
Region	**353,000**	**29%**	**462,100**	**25%**	**517,500**	**20%**

Table 50: Gaps in Frequent Transit Service by Regional Geography

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	28,000	7%	11,600	2%	12,200	1%
Core Cities	21,100	21%	25,600	9%	48,400	10%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,700	6%	25,800	16%	53,300	16%
Cities & Towns	1,600	100%	4,700	100%	7,400	71%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	7,300	58%	9,800	34%	13,900	27%
Rural Areas	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Region	**59,600**	**11%**	**64,400**	**6%**	**104,900**	**6%**
1/2 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	23,800	6%	5,700	1%	300	0%
Core Cities	17,400	18%	21,700	8%	33,100	7%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,700	6%	21,300	14%	37,500	11%
Cities & Towns	1,600	100%	4,700	100%	2,800	27%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	7,300	58%	9,800	34%	10,800	21%
Rural Areas	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Region	**51,700**	**10%**	**50,000**	**5%**	**69,600**	**4%**

Table 51: Gaps in High-Capacity Transit Service by Regional Geography

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	34,700	13%	30,000	6%	71,100	8%
Core Cities	6,100	23%	6,200	4%	51,400	16%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	0	0%	0	0%	8,500	5%
Cities & Towns	0	0%	0	0%	3,000	100%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	4,700	100%	4,500	51%	8,200	24%
Rural Areas	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Region	**45,400**	**16%**	**40,700**	**6%**	**130,000**	**11%**
1/2 mile						
Metropolitan Cities	10,300	4%	13,700	3%	32,700	4%
Core Cities	6,100	23%	2,600	2%	36,300	12%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	0	0%	0	0%	8,500	5%
Cities & Towns	0	0%	0	0%	3,000	100%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	4,700	100%	4,500	51%	8,200	24%
Rural Areas	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Region	**21,100**	**8%**	**20,800**	**3%**	**79,000**	**6%**

Table 52: Gaps in Local Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	581,900	29%	409,200	17%	302,600	10%
People with Low Incomes	532,900	29%	353,500	15%	338,000	12%
People with Limited English	490,300	28%	340,300	16%	226,600	9%
People with Disabilities	600,200	32%	407,700	17%	394,900	13%
Older Adults	582,900	31%	423,100	18%	375,500	13%
Youth	734,600	41%	578,600	27%	503,800	20%
Region	**947,700**	**33%**	**724,700**	**21%**	**638,700**	**15%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	397,700	20%	248,900	10%	183,300	6%
People with Low Incomes	371,500	20%	214,200	9%	217,200	7%
People with Limited English	328,500	19%	197,000	9%	120,000	5%
People with Disabilities	431,100	23%	262,800	11%	260,400	9%
Older Adults	417,300	22%	263,600	11%	240,100	8%
Youth	571,900	32%	402,700	19%	353,900	14%
Region	**712,000**	**25%**	**490,300**	**14%**	**438,400**	**10%**

Table 53: Gaps in Local Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Significantly Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	205,900	21%	126,400	10%	81,300	5%
People with Low Incomes	212,600	23%	118,300	10%	126,600	8%
People with Limited English	201,600	21%	124,100	11%	65,000	5%
People with Disabilities	244,900	32%	151,300	14%	161,500	11%
Older Adults	172,200	29%	122,600	15%	114,900	11%
Youth	321,200	52%	268,200	38%	223,300	27%
Region	**947,700**	**33%**	**724,700**	**21%**	**638,700**	**15%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	139,300	14%	69,700	6%	42,000	3%
People with Low Incomes	148,200	16%	69,200	6%	82,900	5%
People with Limited English	105,600	11%	45,800	4%	24,000	2%
People with Disabilities	166,500	22%	84,700	8%	96,500	7%
Older Adults	125,800	21%	69,800	9%	68,300	7%
Youth	260,100	42%	199,700	28%	163,600	20%
Region	**712,000**	**25%**	**490,300**	**14%**	**438,400**	**10%**

Table 54: Gaps in All Day Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	321,700	37%	440,600	32%	455,400	24%
People with Low Incomes	322,400	38%	449,400	33%	519,600	27%
People with Limited English	286,800	38%	351,800	29%	314,300	19%
People with Disabilities	320,400	39%	458,700	34%	545,100	28%
Older Adults	286,100	36%	409,900	33%	453,300	26%
Youth	327,100	53%	442,400	50%	448,500	35%
Region	**443,500**	**36%**	**606,100**	**33%**	**650,600**	**25%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	262,800	30%	334,700	24%	345,600	18%
People with Low Incomes	256,100	30%	353,600	26%	419,100	22%
People with Limited English	229,800	31%	245,500	20%	207,200	12%
People with Disabilities	249,800	30%	359,700	26%	436,900	23%
Older Adults	212,700	27%	303,500	25%	364,200	21%
Youth	260,000	43%	343,600	39%	372,200	29%
Region	**353,000**	**29%**	**462,100**	**25%**	**517,500**	**20%**

Table 55: Gaps in All Day Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Significantly Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	191,400	37%	193,400	25%	132,800	13%
People with Low Incomes	201,100	40%	273,000	34%	346,300	30%
People with Limited English	198,600	43%	182,600	28%	92,800	10%
People with Disabilities	134,500	37%	253,400	37%	358,200	35%
Older Adults	87,200	34%	140,800	31%	178,600	26%
Youth	97,400	58%	124,500	49%	133,700	36%
Region	**443,500**	**36%**	**606,100**	**33%**	**650,600**	**25%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	157,800	30%	145,500	19%	90,400	9%
People with Low Incomes	172,700	34%	219,000	27%	280,300	24%
People with Limited English	158,800	34%	121,300	18%	37,300	4%
People with Disabilities	117,100	32%	214,100	31%	303,600	30%
Older Adults	65,500	26%	102,100	22%	149,000	22%
Youth	86,900	52%	104,400	41%	112,300	30%
Region	**353,000**	**29%**	**462,100**	**25%**	**517,500**	**20%**

Table 56: Gaps in Frequent Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	45,000	11%	33,900	4%	51,500	4%
People with Low Incomes	41,300	11%	41,000	5%	83,300	6%
People with Limited English	26,300	9%	24,000	3%	44,200	4%
People with Disabilities	34,600	10%	37,200	4%	79,800	6%
Older Adults	29,500	9%	49,900	6%	67,700	6%
Youth	43,300	27%	48,900	12%	69,100	10%
Region	**59,600**	**11%**	**64,400**	**6%**	**104,900**	**6%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	40,600	10%	26,000	3%	27,200	2%
People with Low Incomes	36,900	10%	36,200	4%	59,600	4%
People with Limited English	21,800	7%	16,300	2%	21,400	2%
People with Disabilities	33,600	9%	33,600	4%	52,700	4%
Older Adults	22,100	6%	36,200	5%	45,700	4%
Youth	36,400	23%	35,600	9%	51,100	7%
Region	**51,700**	**10%**	**50,000**	**5%**	**69,600**	**4%**

Table 57: Gaps in Frequent Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Significantly Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	14,700	6%	10,100	2%	10,300	1%
People with Low Incomes	40,900	18%	25,600	5%	44,500	5%
People with Limited English	20,900	13%	13,000	3%	19,800	3%
People with Disabilities	20,800	13%	18,500	4%	37,400	5%
Older Adults	15,900	13%	14,500	5%	32,000	6%
Youth	14,900	38%	12,100	11%	20,900	11%
Region	**59,600**	**11%**	**64,400**	**6%**	**104,900**	**6%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	11,200	5%	5,800	1%	6,800	1%
People with Low Incomes	36,600	16%	21,300	4%	33,000	4%
People with Limited English	16,600	11%	5,800	2%	7,100	1%
People with Disabilities	20,800	13%	18,500	4%	21,100	3%
Older Adults	15,900	13%	10,000	3%	19,100	4%
Youth	11,500	30%	8,300	8%	13,800	8%
Region	**51,700**	**10%**	**50,000**	**5%**	**69,600**	**4%**

Table 58: Gaps in High-Capacity Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	29,600	13%	28,700	5%	94,100	9%
People with Low Incomes	28,600	13%	27,600	5%	108,700	11%
People with Limited English	20,700	12%	16,100	3%	62,900	7%
People with Disabilities	27,000	12%	24,300	4%	93,100	9%
Older Adults	28,100	14%	20,600	4%	68,900	8%
Youth	14,800	29%	15,700	9%	79,900	19%
Region	**45,400**	**16%**	**40,700**	**6%**	**130,000**	**11%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	15,100	6%	18,600	3%	62,900	6%
People with Lower Incomes	14,100	7%	19,700	4%	72,700	7%
People with Limited English	10,400	6%	10,100	2%	36,400	4%
People with a Disability	10,000	5%	13,900	2%	62,200	6%
People over 65	15,500	8%	11,200	2%	48,200	5%
People under 18	6,800	13%	11,200	7%	61,700	15%
Region	**21,100**	**8%**	**20,800**	**3%**	**79,000**	**6%**

Table 59: Gaps in High-Capacity Transit Service by Equity Focus Area – Significantly Above Regional Average

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Population	Share	Population	Share	Population	Share
1/4 mile						
People of Color	11,800	7%	8,600	2%	37,400	6%
People with Low Incomes	16,100	12%	20,300	6%	74,500	11%
People with Limited English	7,600	11%	1,300	1%	28,600	7%
People with Disabilities	3,500	3%	9,000	3%	62,700	11%
Older Adults	12,800	19%	10,300	5%	31,200	8%
Youth	1,000	33%	600	1%	10,300	10%
Region	**45,400**	**16%**	**40,700**	**6%**	**130,000**	**11%**
1/2 mile						
People of Color	1,500	1%	4,100	1%	13,500	2%
People with Low Incomes	7,200	6%	12,300	3%	50,600	8%
People with Limited English	1,900	3%	1,300	1%	12,100	3%
People with Disabilities	1,100	1%	6,600	2%	52,300	9%
Older Adults	10,400	16%	6,300	3%	23,200	6%
Youth	1,000	33%	0	0%	6,800	6%
Region	**21,100**	**8%**	**20,800**	**3%**	**79,000**	**6%**

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for gaps in transit service changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Local transit service gaps (within ¼ mile) are cut more than half regionwide between 2023 and 2050 – reducing from 33% today to around 15% in 2050
- Gaps for Frequent and High-Capacity Transit are reduced significantly by 2050.
- Census tracts with the highest shares of youth tend to have the highest gaps across the transit service types.
- The smallest gaps by transit service type are for frequent transit types – service that runs at least four times per hour between 6:00am to 8:00pm. This type of service is planned in all four counties by 2050.

Section 5: Freight Performance Metrics

The PSRC model uses a combination of population and employment to generate truck activity across the region. The truck model is validated in the base year using observed truck flow data provided by a private vendor. Trucks trips are categorized in two categories:

- Medium Trucks: single unit, six or more tires, two to four axles and 16,000 to 52,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight
- Heavy Trucks: double or triple unit, combinations, five or more axles, and greater than 52,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight

Table 60: Truck Trips and Average Trip Distance by Type

Vehicle Type	2023		2035		2050	
	Trips	Average Distance	Trips	Average Distance	Trips	Average Distance
Medium Trucks	319,000	14.9	384,000	13.5	441,000	12.1
Heavy Trucks	135,000	38.8	159,000	38.7	183,000	38.9
All Trucks	**453,000**	**22.0**	**543,000**	**20.8**	**624,000**	**19.9**

Table 61: Truck Miles Traveled by County

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks
King	1,955,000	1,417,000	2,102,000	1,664,000	2,133,000	1,922,000
Kitsap	145,000	90,000	153,000	108,000	153,000	120,000
Pierce	550,000	540,000	593,000	649,000	612,000	750,000
Snohomish	552,000	534,000	641,000	619,000	680,000	719,000
Region	**3,201,000**	**2,582,000**	**3,490,000**	**3,039,000**	**3,578,000**	**3,511,000**

PSRC also reports performance on the Washington State Freight & Goods Transportation System (FGTS) network. The FGTS categorizes roadways into five distinct classifications based on the annual tonnage of freight moved.

Table 62: Washington State Freight & Goods Transportation System Classification

FGTS Classification	Annual Tonnage
T-1	More than 10 million tons per year
T-2	4 million to 10 million tons per year
T-3	300,000 to 4 million tons per year
T-4	100,000 to 300,000 tons per year
T-5	Less than 100,000 tons per year and more than 20,000 in 60 days

For purposes of the RTP, PSRC focuses metrics on the two highest volume truck categories, T-1 and T-2. Heavy trucks account for about 3% of the total VMT in the region but close to 7% on T-1 routes.

Table 63: Share of Miles Traveled by Vehicle Type by FGTS Class

Roadway Classification	2023			2035			2050		
	Passenger Vehicles	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks	Passenger Vehicles	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks	Passenger Vehicles	Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks
T-1	89%	5%	6%	89%	5%	6%	89%	4%	7%
T-2	95%	4%	1%	94%	4%	1%	94%	4%	2%
Non-Truck Routes	96%	3%	1%	96%	3%	1%	96%	3%	1%
Region	**93%**	**4%**	**3%**	**93%**	**4%**	**3%**	**93%**	**4%**	**4%**

Table 64: Daily and Annual Delay for Medium & Heavy Trucks

Vehicle Type	2023		2035		2050	
	Daily Total Delay	Annual Delay per driver	Daily Total Delay	Annual Delay per driver	Daily Total Delay	Annual Delay per driver
Medium Trucks	9,400	9.4	11,100	9.2	13,500	9.8
Heavy Trucks	6,800	16.2	9,400	19.0	13,600	23.8
Passenger Vehicles	189,000	13.9	216,000	13.8	271,000	15.0

Table 65: % of Network Congested by Congestion Level – AM Peak Period

Congestion	2023			2035			2050		
	T-1	T-2	Other Routes	T-1	T-2	Other Routes	T-1	T-2	Other Routes
Light	69%	65%	59%	65%	65%	59%	62%	63%	58%
Moderate	19%	16%	18%	22%	15%	18%	21%	16%	19%
Heavy	11%	14%	16%	12%	14%	16%	15%	16%	16%
Severe	1%	5%	7%	1%	5%	7%	2%	6%	7%

Table 66: % of Network Congested by Congestion Level – PM Peak Period

Congestion	2023			2035			2050		
	T-1	T-2	Other Routes	T-1	T-2	Other Routes	T-1	T-2	Other Routes
Light	69%	68%	61%	66%	70%	60%	60%	69%	60%
Moderate	21%	14%	17%	23%	13%	18%	25%	13%	17%
Heavy	9%	12%	16%	11%	12%	16%	13%	13%	16%
Severe	1%	6%	7%	1%	5%	7%	1%	6%	7%

Table 67: Households within 500' of a T-1 or T-2 Route by Equity Focus Area

Equity Focus Area	2023		2035		2050	
	Total	Share	Total	Share	Total	Share
Above Regional Average						
People of Color	65,900	13%	94,800	16%	135,900	18%
People with Low Incomes	56,900	13%	79,300	15%	111,900	18%
People with Limited English	41,600	12%	62,200	14%	89,300	17%
People with Disabilities	56,900	11%	81,600	13%	112,600	16%
Older Adults	53,800	9%	73,100	11%	96,700	13%
Youth	45,700	8%	60,800	10%	83,400	11%
Region	**186,900**	**11%**	**259,800**	**13%**	**364,000**	**15%**
Significantly Above Regional Average						
People of Color	45,900	16%	65,200	18%	90,600	21%
People with Low Incomes	38,800	16%	63,600	19%	98,100	23%
People with Limited English	39,700	14%	54,500	16%	80,200	19%
People with Disabilities	33,300	13%	54,700	16%	87,300	19%
Older Adults	14,800	6%	23,900	9%	37,900	11%
Youth	16,600	8%	22,900	9%	31,600	11%
Region	**186,900**	**11%**	**259,800**	**13%**	**364,000**	**15%**

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for freight changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Freight routes have similar levels of congestion as the rest of the network.
- Heavy trucks have the longest average trip lengths and delay of all truck vehicles.
- People of color and people with low income EFAs have the highest percentage of households living close to T-1 and T-2 routes.

Section 6: Mode Share, Active Transportation & Health

One of the goals of the RTP is to increase transportation options for people that can lead to more active transportation choices. This section includes metrics associated with the details of trip making and the intersection of various geographies with where people travel.

Section 6A: Trips by Mode

Trip activity across the region varies. Overall, the number of trips taken in active transportation modes is forecasted to increase both in total as well as share with the RTP. Detailed metrics by various geographies of interest are included below. The metrics reported are based on people living in the geography identified in the table. For instance, the mode share for the Seattle Downtown Center is reflective of people who live in that center, not those who travel to it for work and other purposes.:

Table 68: Daily Trips by Mode by County – All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
King	3,833,400	2,955,300	283,500	145,900	1,451,700
Kitsap	452,700	366,300	16,100	12,500	143,900
Pierce	1,482,300	1,271,200	25,300	45,400	398,500
Snohomish	1,476,800	1,188,300	26,300	40,700	360,700
Region	**7,245,200**	**5,781,100**	**351,100**	**244,600**	**2,354,800**
2035					
King	3,994,800	3,258,200	523,800	185,600	2,016,500
Kitsap	510,300	400,700	21,800	15,400	178,300
Pierce	1,638,200	1,431,200	58,500	59,900	571,700
Snohomish	1,697,800	1,387,700	74,900	53,000	506,000
Region	**7,841,200**	**6,477,800**	**679,000**	**313,900**	**3,272,600**
2050					
King	4,333,100	3,553,600	777,400	223,100	2,597,800
Kitsap	582,000	445,100	26,500	17,700	219,300
Pierce	1,834,800	1,611,600	81,100	75,600	792,000

Snohomish	1,965,200	1,594,300	137,800	69,400	703,800
Region	**8,715,300**	**7,204,700**	**1,022,800**	**385,800**	**4,312,900**

Table 69: Mode Share by County – All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
King	44%	34%	3%	2%	17%
Kitsap	46%	37%	2%	1%	15%
Pierce	46%	39%	1%	1%	12%
Snohomish	48%	38%	1%	1%	12%
Region	**45%**	**36%**	**2%**	**2%**	**15%**
2035					
King	40%	33%	5%	2%	20%
Kitsap	45%	36%	2%	1%	16%
Pierce	44%	38%	2%	2%	15%
Snohomish	46%	37%	2%	1%	14%
Region	**42%**	**35%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
King	38%	31%	7%	2%	23%
Kitsap	45%	35%	2%	1%	17%
Pierce	42%	37%	2%	2%	18%
Snohomish	44%	36%	3%	2%	16%
Region	**40%**	**33%**	**5%**	**2%**	**20%**

Table 70: Daily Trips by Mode by County – Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
King	852,900	182,400	35,400	21,100	142,800
Kitsap	82,800	17,500	5,600	1,100	8,500
Pierce	294,200	62,300	4,900	4,000	20,800
Snohomish	310,800	66,200	2,600	3,900	19,900
Region	**1,540,700**	**328,400**	**48,600**	**30,100**	**192,000**
2035					
King	891,800	204,400	70,900	26,900	227,900
Kitsap	94,500	19,600	7,700	1,500	11,900
Pierce	325,200	72,300	11,500	6,300	37,900
Snohomish	357,500	79,600	12,700	5,900	32,800
Region	**1,669,000**	**376,000**	**102,700**	**40,700**	**310,400**
2050					
King	974,100	228,300	108,700	32,800	312,000
Kitsap	107,900	22,500	9,200	2,000	15,600
Pierce	360,500	80,700	13,600	8,800	63,400
Snohomish	416,400	92,200	21,300	8,700	50,900
Region	**1,858,900**	**423,600**	**152,700**	**52,300**	**441,900**

Table 71: Mode Share by County – Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
King	69%	15%	3%	2%	12%
Kitsap	72%	15%	5%	1%	7%
Pierce	76%	16%	1%	1%	5%
Snohomish	77%	16%	1%	1%	5%
Region	**72%**	**15%**	**2%**	**1%**	**9%**
2035					
King	63%	14%	5%	2%	16%
Kitsap	70%	15%	6%	1%	9%
Pierce	72%	16%	3%	1%	8%
Snohomish	73%	16%	3%	1%	7%
Region	**67%**	**15%**	**4%**	**2%**	**12%**
2050					
King	59%	14%	7%	2%	19%
Kitsap	69%	14%	6%	1%	10%
Pierce	68%	15%	3%	2%	12%
Snohomish	71%	16%	4%	2%	9%
Region	**64%**	**15%**	**5%**	**2%**	**15%**

Table 72: Daily Trips by Mode by County – Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
King	2,980,500	2,773,000	248,100	124,900	1,308,900
Kitsap	369,900	348,900	10,400	11,400	135,400
Pierce	1,188,100	1,208,800	20,400	41,400	377,700
Snohomish	1,166,000	1,122,100	23,700	36,800	340,800
Region	**5,704,500**	**5,452,700**	**302,500**	**214,400**	**2,162,800**
2035					
King	3,103,100	3,053,700	452,900	158,600	1,788,600
Kitsap	415,800	381,100	14,100	13,900	166,500
Pierce	1,313,000	1,358,900	47,000	53,500	533,900
Snohomish	1,340,300	1,308,100	62,300	47,100	473,200
Region	**6,172,200**	**6,101,800**	**576,300**	**273,200**	**2,962,200**
2050					
King	3,359,100	3,325,400	668,800	190,200	2,285,900
Kitsap	474,100	422,700	17,200	15,700	203,700
Pierce	1,474,400	1,530,900	67,500	66,800	728,600
Snohomish	1,548,800	1,502,200	116,600	60,700	652,900
Region	**6,856,300**	**6,781,100**	**870,100**	**333,500**	**3,871,000**

Table 73: Mode Share by County – Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
King	40%	37%	3%	2%	18%
Kitsap	42%	40%	1%	1%	16%
Pierce	42%	43%	1%	2%	13%
Snohomish	43%	42%	1%	1%	13%
Region	**41%**	**39%**	**2%**	**2%**	**16%**
2035					
King	36%	36%	5%	2%	21%
Kitsap	42%	38%	1%	1%	17%
Pierce	40%	41%	1%	2%	16%
Snohomish	42%	41%	2%	2%	15%
Region	**38%**	**38%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
King	34%	34%	7%	2%	23%
Kitsap	42%	37%	2%	1%	18%
Pierce	38%	40%	2%	2%	19%
Snohomish	40%	39%	3%	2%	17%
Region	**37%**	**36%**	**5%**	**2%**	**21%**

Table 74: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Geography– All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Metropolitan Cities	1,996,600	1,418,400	212,600	103,100	1,154,200
Core Cities	1,716,400	1,394,500	68,900	53,200	455,300
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,637,500	1,346,500	50,100	46,600	402,500
Cities and Towns	639,900	557,600	8,200	16,600	166,500
Urban Unincorporated Areas	289,700	270,400	3,100	7,700	59,700
Rural Areas	965,000	793,700	8,200	17,400	116,800
Region	**7,245,200**	**5,781,100**	**351,100**	**244,600**	**2,354,800**
2035					
Metropolitan Cities	2,062,100	1,611,500	371,100	138,800	1,718,300
Core Cities	1,892,300	1,613,000	150,300	71,900	667,200
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,852,700	1,542,800	122,300	58,000	512,900
Cities and Towns	701,600	597,600	17,400	18,400	185,500
Urban Unincorporated Areas	325,100	307,700	6,200	8,800	67,700
Rural Areas	1,007,500	805,100	11,600	17,900	120,900
Region	**7,841,200**	**6,477,800**	**679,000**	**313,900**	**3,272,600**
2050					
Metropolitan Cities	2,214,600	1,799,000	570,100	175,300	2,367,100
Core Cities	2,156,800	1,817,600	217,700	91,300	894,100
High-Capacity Transit Communities	2,139,800	1,760,300	180,300	70,700	639,400
Cities and Towns	785,300	648,300	29,100	20,400	209,200
Urban Unincorporated Areas	360,600	365,400	9,500	9,900	78,800
Rural Areas	1,058,100	814,100	16,100	18,200	124,300
Region	**8,715,300**	**7,204,700**	**1,022,800**	**385,800**	**4,312,900**

Table 75: Mode Share by Regional Geography– All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Metropolitan Cities	41%	29%	4%	2%	24%
Core Cities	47%	38%	2%	1%	12%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	47%	39%	1%	1%	12%
Cities and Towns	46%	40%	1%	1%	12%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	46%	43%	1%	1%	10%
Rural Areas	51%	42%	0%	1%	6%
Region	**45%**	**36%**	**2%**	**2%**	**15%**
2035					
Metropolitan Cities	35%	27%	6%	2%	29%
Core Cities	43%	37%	3%	2%	15%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	45%	38%	3%	1%	13%
Cities and Towns	46%	39%	1%	1%	12%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	45%	43%	1%	1%	10%
Rural Areas	51%	41%	1%	1%	6%
Region	**42%**	**35%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
Metropolitan Cities	31%	25%	8%	3%	33%
Core Cities	42%	35%	4%	2%	17%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	45%	37%	4%	2%	13%
Cities and Towns	46%	38%	2%	1%	12%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	44%	44%	1%	1%	10%
Rural Areas	52%	40%	1%	1%	6%
Region	**40%**	**33%**	**5%**	**2%**	**20%**

Table 76: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Geography– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Metropolitan Cities	462,800	94,300	26,400	16,800	121,100
Core Cities	365,600	80,100	9,500	6,200	28,400
High-Capacity Transit Communities	341,200	73,900	8,000	4,500	22,600
Cities and Towns	135,300	30,400	1,500	1,200	8,600
Urban Unincorporated Areas	58,700	12,900	700	500	2,800
Rural Areas	177,200	36,700	2,500	1,000	8,500
Region	**1,540,700**	**328,400**	**48,600**	**30,100**	**192,000**
2035					
Metropolitan Cities	482,500	108,800	48,200	22,300	207,900
Core Cities	406,800	94,200	24,000	9,000	46,100
High-Capacity Transit Communities	384,500	87,600	22,200	6,200	32,600
Cities and Towns	146,300	33,700	3,600	1,400	10,400
Urban Unincorporated Areas	63,200	13,900	1,400	600	3,600
Rural Areas	185,700	37,900	3,400	1,200	9,800
Region	**1,669,000**	**376,000**	**102,700**	**40,700**	**310,400**
2050					
Metropolitan Cities	521,400	124,700	80,500	27,900	309,600
Core Cities	470,500	108,400	30,500	12,500	64,600
High-Capacity Transit Communities	446,300	100,800	30,400	8,200	40,300
Cities and Towns	162,900	36,900	5,100	1,700	12,300
Urban Unincorporated Areas	61,800	13,900	1,900	700	4,100
Rural Areas	196,000	39,000	4,400	1,200	11,000
Region	**1,858,900**	**423,600**	**152,700**	**52,300**	**441,900**

Table 77: Mode Share by Regional Geography– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Metropolitan Cities	64%	13%	4%	2%	17%
Core Cities	75%	16%	2%	1%	6%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	76%	16%	2%	1%	5%
Cities and Towns	77%	17%	1%	1%	5%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	78%	17%	1%	1%	4%
Rural Areas	78%	16%	1%	0%	4%
Region	**72%**	**15%**	**2%**	**1%**	**9%**
2035					
Metropolitan Cities	56%	13%	6%	3%	24%
Core Cities	70%	16%	4%	2%	8%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	72%	16%	4%	1%	6%
Cities and Towns	75%	17%	2%	1%	5%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	76%	17%	2%	1%	4%
Rural Areas	78%	16%	1%	1%	4%
Region	**67%**	**15%**	**4%**	**2%**	**12%**
2050					
Metropolitan Cities	49%	12%	8%	3%	29%
Core Cities	69%	16%	4%	2%	9%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	71%	16%	5%	1%	6%
Cities and Towns	74%	17%	2%	1%	6%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	75%	17%	2%	1%	5%
Rural Areas	78%	16%	2%	1%	4%
Region	**64%**	**15%**	**5%**	**2%**	**15%**

Table 78: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Geography– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Metropolitan Cities	1,533,900	1,324,100	186,200	86,200	1,033,100
Core Cities	1,350,900	1,314,400	59,400	47,100	426,900
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,296,300	1,272,600	42,000	42,100	379,800
Cities and Towns	504,700	527,200	6,800	15,400	157,900
Urban Unincorporated Areas	231,000	257,500	2,400	7,200	56,900
Rural Areas	787,800	757,000	5,800	16,400	108,200
Region	**5,704,500**	**5,452,800**	**302,500**	**214,400**	**2,162,800**
2035					
Metropolitan Cities	1,579,600	1,502,800	322,900	116,500	1,510,400
Core Cities	1,485,500	1,518,900	126,300	62,900	621,100
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,468,200	1,455,200	100,200	51,800	480,300
Cities and Towns	555,300	564,000	13,900	17,000	175,100
Urban Unincorporated Areas	261,900	293,800	4,800	8,200	64,100
Rural Areas	821,700	767,300	8,300	16,700	111,200
Region	**6,172,200**	**6,101,800**	**576,300**	**273,200**	**2,962,200**
2050					
Metropolitan Cities	1,693,200	1,674,300	489,600	147,400	2,057,500
Core Cities	1,686,400	1,709,200	187,200	78,700	829,500
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1,693,500	1,659,500	149,900	62,400	599,100
Cities and Towns	622,400	611,400	24,000	18,800	196,800
Urban Unincorporated Areas	298,800	351,600	7,700	9,300	74,700
Rural Areas	862,100	775,200	11,700	16,900	113,400
Region	**6,856,400**	**6,781,100**	**870,100**	**333,500**	**3,871,000**

Table 79: Mode Share by Regional Geography– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Metropolitan Cities	37%	32%	5%	2%	25%
Core Cities	42%	41%	2%	2%	13%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	43%	42%	1%	1%	13%
Cities and Towns	42%	44%	1%	1%	13%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	42%	46%	0%	1%	10%
Rural Areas	47%	45%	0%	1%	7%
Region	**41%**	**39%**	**2%**	**2%**	**16%**
2035					
Metropolitan Cities	31%	30%	6%	2%	30%
Core Cities	39%	40%	3%	2%	16%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	41%	41%	3%	2%	14%
Cities and Towns	42%	43%	1%	1%	13%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	41%	46%	1%	1%	10%
Rural Areas	48%	45%	1%	1%	6%
Region	**38%**	**38%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
Metropolitan Cities	28%	28%	8%	2%	34%
Core Cities	38%	38%	4%	2%	19%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	41%	40%	4%	2%	14%
Cities and Towns	42%	42%	2%	1%	13%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	40%	47%	1%	1%	10%
Rural Areas	49%	44%	1%	1%	6%
Region	**37%**	**36%**	**5%**	**2%**	**21%**

Table 80: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Center– All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Auburn	3,240	2,550	300	200	2,210
Bellevue	21,210	11,240	2,440	1,810	29,390
Bothell Canyon Park	1,350	860	10	30	340
Bremerton	4,590	2,830	350	320	4,700
Burien	6,720	4,100	510	260	3,470
Everett	10,270	5,310	530	480	9,460
Federal Way	880	810	50	40	530
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2,910	2,400	360	190	2,140
Greater Downtown Kirkland	14,710	8,310	1,350	580	6,560
Kirkland Totem Lake	15,730	9,300	550	590	5,010
Lakewood	830	680	20	40	570
Lynnwood	8,200	5,780	420	370	3,960
Puyallup Downtown	1,540	1,100	90	80	1,060
Puyallup South Hill	4,420	2,930	120	160	2,030
Redmond Downtown	16,250	8,970	690	970	10,110
Redmond-Overlake	7,910	4,660	410	510	5,010
Renton	9,570	5,410	690	460	4,760
SeaTac	17,330	14,450	2,790	900	7,320
Seattle Downtown	23,810	12,590	12,930	6,070	127,280
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	41,230	18,830	19,610	8,300	125,870
Seattle Northgate	13,780	7,510	3,490	740	7,480

Seattle South Lake Union	13,030	5,400	3,320	2,250	35,540
Seattle University Community	24,700	9,910	12,780	4,090	28,410
Seattle Uptown	14,350	5,930	3,050	2,040	23,150
Silverdale	3,300	1,650	60	130	2,210
Tacoma Downtown	21,850	11,590	1,890	1,600	23,650
Tacoma Mall	8,130	6,120	530	630	5,900
Tukwila	1,260	450	100	60	570
University Place	12,080	7,860	310	500	4,770
2035					
Auburn	8,500	7,460	1,490	680	9,410
Bellevue	24,940	24,020	12,410	4,770	93,500
Bothell Canyon Park	10,330	8,470	440	380	3,900
Bremerton	6,170	4,780	720	640	11,330
Burien	15,370	10,960	2,000	710	11,260
Everett	22,510	17,400	2,780	2,410	45,130
Federal Way	6,070	5,770	1,330	410	5,810
Issaquah	3,610	1,840	280	180	2,410
Kent	4,280	4,170	850	490	7,380
Greater Downtown Kirkland	17,810	11,300	2,330	880	9,550
Kirkland Totem Lake	18,030	12,050	1,550	1,000	9,490
Lakewood	7,440	5,460	600	600	8,020
Lynnwood	18,170	14,730	3,890	1,300	16,360
Puyallup Downtown	4,750	3,460	400	320	4,260
Puyallup South Hill	8,630	5,700	350	320	4,660
Redmond Downtown	21,680	16,690	4,590	2,410	25,340

Redmond-Overlake	11,140	9,120	3,860	1,380	13,950
Renton	20,300	15,400	3,030	1,450	18,970
SeaTac	22,250	20,460	5,150	1,410	12,320
Seattle Downtown	24,230	21,360	23,740	10,150	234,000
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	44,880	31,210	37,720	11,800	203,360
Seattle Northgate	13,960	9,980	7,570	1,270	12,650
Seattle South Lake Union	13,530	9,580	6,780	3,760	67,130
Seattle University Community	26,930	16,150	20,900	5,340	47,290
Seattle Uptown	16,220	10,700	6,450	3,400	44,640
Silverdale	5,430	2,520	130	210	4,590
Tacoma Downtown	45,390	36,770	11,190	7,180	113,260
Tacoma Mall	12,890	10,860	1,370	1,210	13,740
Tukwila	9,860	7,760	1,350	720	5,930
University Place	17,060	12,240	950	1,000	9,990
2050					
Auburn	14,800	13,590	3,020	1,700	22,790
Bellevue	29,140	34,460	24,900	8,120	171,570
Bothell Canyon Park	18,460	15,810	1,160	860	8,890
Bremerton	8,240	6,620	1,160	990	21,330
Burien	22,450	16,230	4,090	1,460	23,430
Everett	32,760	28,800	7,310	5,480	107,360
Federal Way	14,200	12,210	4,030	1,180	18,380
Issaquah	7,300	3,710	1,450	440	4,820
Kent	5,830	4,960	980	640	12,380
Greater Downtown Kirkland	18,640	11,420	4,070	1,010	10,960

Kirkland Totem Lake	21,860	14,380	2,920	1,460	14,230
Lakewood	16,700	11,900	1,230	1,550	21,030
Lynnwood	29,050	25,030	11,290	2,940	37,000
Puyallup Downtown	7,150	5,530	790	530	8,130
Puyallup South Hill	14,460	10,230	850	650	8,870
Redmond Downtown	28,090	22,740	7,800	3,190	36,030
Redmond-Overlake	19,800	17,860	9,070	2,760	29,120
Renton	34,780	26,580	6,320	2,980	39,910
SeaTac	30,660	27,910	8,090	2,110	16,910
Seattle Downtown	26,430	25,800	34,280	13,740	313,140
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	46,920	39,280	48,700	14,780	276,780
Seattle Northgate	18,320	13,120	10,630	1,600	17,050
Seattle South Lake Union	14,780	12,310	11,310	4,950	95,920
Seattle University Community	29,030	19,470	25,600	5,800	63,740
Seattle Uptown	16,260	12,390	11,600	3,880	57,330
Silverdale	8,080	3,620	190	360	6,990
Tacoma Downtown	55,180	50,400	17,890	13,310	229,590
Tacoma Mall	30,850	25,440	3,350	3,290	37,080
Tukwila	17,560	16,030	3,970	1,570	13,970
University Place	23,220	16,870	1,710	1,440	14,560

Table 81: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Center– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Auburn	600	140	60	30	120
Bellevue	5,380	880	200	350	3,830
Bothell Canyon Park	290	60	0	10	20
Bremerton	1,030	180	130	50	310
Burien	1,570	350	50	50	150
Everett	2,400	350	30	70	680
Federal Way	180	40	0	0	30
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	620	140	60	50	130
Greater Downtown Kirkland	3,340	580	200	100	450
Kirkland Totem Lake	3,580	600	50	90	360
Lakewood	170	40	0	0	40
Lynnwood	1,820	400	40	60	310
Puyallup Downtown	290	60	20	10	60
Puyallup South Hill	1,010	220	30	20	110
Redmond Downtown	4,330	700	80	200	840
Redmond-Overlake	2,060	420	40	100	500
Renton	2,170	350	40	80	360
SeaTac	3,530	880	320	130	640
Seattle Downtown	7,050	1,550	1,040	1,190	25,110
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	12,220	2,340	2,420	1,650	22,190
Seattle Northgate	3,330	550	560	140	640

Seattle South Lake Union	3,810	600	360	450	6,760
Seattle University Community	7,140	1,120	1,710	540	2,290
Seattle Uptown	4,030	640	300	450	3,760
Silverdale	720	120	20	20	180
Tacoma Downtown	4,910	770	200	240	2,100
Tacoma Mall	1,720	360	100	90	310
Tukwila	350	40	20	20	40
University Place	2,510	420	50	70	250
2035					
Auburn	1,840	480	340	110	610
Bellevue	6,760	1,970	1,440	900	15,240
Bothell Canyon Park	2,130	510	60	50	260
Bremerton	1,450	340	250	110	970
Burien	3,830	840	170	120	500
Everett	5,790	1,380	320	450	4,590
Federal Way	1,430	410	150	60	320
Issaquah	860	150	50	30	170
Kent	1,050	310	180	100	620
Greater Downtown Kirkland	4,090	730	390	170	800
Kirkland Totem Lake	4,340	770	180	180	750
Lakewood	1,650	300	140	70	440
Lynnwood	4,100	1,000	620	180	1,060
Puyallup Downtown	1,030	240	120	60	200
Puyallup South Hill	1,940	400	90	50	280
Redmond Downtown	5,830	1,310	810	450	2,190

Redmond-Overlake	3,020	800	510	250	1,370
Renton	5,060	1,170	280	270	1,690
SeaTac	4,990	1,290	520	210	1,000
Seattle Downtown	7,190	2,340	2,040	1,500	47,710
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	13,110	3,380	4,780	2,060	37,150
Seattle Northgate	3,560	740	1,250	210	940
Seattle South Lake Union	3,850	1,010	640	580	13,090
Seattle University Community	7,940	1,840	3,360	780	3,920
Seattle Uptown	4,800	1,120	650	690	7,110
Silverdale	1,120	170	40	20	380
Tacoma Downtown	11,340	2,910	1,750	1,260	12,530
Tacoma Mall	2,930	670	280	170	750
Tukwila	2,460	540	220	140	450
University Place	3,780	810	140	150	530
2050					
Auburn	3,500	1,000	610	260	1,760
Bellevue	8,070	2,970	2,920	1,270	30,330
Bothell Canyon Park	3,570	780	130	90	540
Bremerton	2,030	490	350	180	1,990
Burien	5,970	1,370	470	240	1,090
Everett	8,790	2,350	830	1,040	13,190
Federal Way	3,330	910	470	210	1,370
Issaquah	1,760	280	270	50	320
Kent	1,600	400	180	150	1,330
Greater Downtown Kirkland	4,480	870	520	200	930

Kirkland Totem Lake	5,220	1,030	410	250	1,130
Lakewood	3,760	820	210	200	1,320
Lynnwood	6,920	1,880	1,730	420	2,670
Puyallup Downtown	1,560	380	220	80	490
Puyallup South Hill	3,210	740	220	80	450
Redmond Downtown	7,610	1,820	1,370	570	2,900
Redmond-Overlake	5,450	1,510	1,260	460	2,890
Renton	9,040	2,010	440	580	3,470
SeaTac	6,890	1,790	760	350	1,410
Seattle Downtown	8,100	2,940	3,220	1,590	64,040
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	13,570	4,190	6,410	2,190	51,290
Seattle Northgate	4,660	1,010	1,760	280	1,430
Seattle South Lake Union	4,320	1,220	1,070	680	18,760
Seattle University Community	8,420	2,070	4,540	970	6,270
Seattle Uptown	4,800	1,260	1,200	710	9,080
Silverdale	1,610	260	50	60	600
Tacoma Downtown	14,680	4,290	2,760	2,170	30,500
Tacoma Mall	7,270	1,690	630	570	2,540
Tukwila	4,460	1,130	760	320	1,220
University Place	5,190	960	230	190	820

Table 82: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Center– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Auburn	2,640	2,410	240	170	2,100
Bellevue	15,820	10,360	2,240	1,460	25,560
Bothell Canyon Park	1,060	800	10	20	320
Bremerton	3,560	2,650	210	270	4,390
Burien	5,150	3,740	470	210	3,320
Everett	7,870	4,970	500	420	8,780
Federal Way	700	770	50	40	500
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	2,290	2,260	300	140	2,010
Greater Downtown Kirkland	11,370	7,730	1,150	480	6,100
Kirkland Totem Lake	12,160	8,700	500	500	4,650
Lakewood	660	650	20	40	530
Lynnwood	6,380	5,380	380	310	3,650
Puyallup Downtown	1,250	1,050	70	70	1,000
Puyallup South Hill	3,410	2,710	90	140	1,920
Redmond Downtown	11,920	8,260	610	770	9,270
Redmond-Overlake	5,840	4,240	370	410	4,500
Renton	7,410	5,070	660	380	4,400
SeaTac	13,800	13,570	2,470	780	6,680
Seattle Downtown	16,770	11,050	11,890	4,880	102,170
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	29,010	16,490	17,200	6,650	103,670
Seattle Northgate	10,450	6,960	2,930	600	6,850

Seattle South Lake Union	9,220	4,810	2,960	1,800	28,780
Seattle University Community	17,560	8,800	11,070	3,550	26,130
Seattle Uptown	10,320	5,280	2,760	1,590	19,390
Silverdale	2,570	1,530	40	110	2,030
Tacoma Downtown	16,950	10,820	1,690	1,360	21,550
Tacoma Mall	6,410	5,760	440	540	5,590
Tukwila	910	410	80	50	520
University Place	9,570	7,440	270	430	4,520
2035					
Auburn	6,660	6,980	1,150	560	8,810
Bellevue	18,180	22,050	10,970	3,870	78,260
Bothell Canyon Park	8,200	7,970	380	340	3,630
Bremerton	4,720	4,440	470	530	10,360
Burien	11,540	10,110	1,830	590	10,760
Everett	16,730	16,030	2,460	1,960	40,540
Federal Way	4,640	5,360	1,180	340	5,490
Issaquah	13,720	10,560	1,940	710	8,750
Kent	2,750	1,690	230	150	2,240
Greater Downtown Kirkland	3,230	3,860	670	390	6,750
Kirkland Totem Lake	13,690	11,280	1,370	820	8,740
Lakewood	5,790	5,160	470	530	7,580
Lynnwood	14,080	13,720	3,270	1,120	15,290
Puyallup Downtown	3,720	3,220	280	260	4,060
Puyallup South Hill	6,690	5,300	260	260	4,380

Redmond Downtown	15,850	15,380	3,780	1,960	23,150
Redmond-Overlake	8,120	8,320	3,350	1,140	12,580
Renton	15,240	14,230	2,750	1,180	17,290
SeaTac	17,260	19,180	4,630	1,200	11,320
Seattle Downtown	17,040	19,020	21,700	8,650	186,290
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	31,770	27,830	32,940	9,740	166,210
Seattle Northgate	10,400	9,240	6,320	1,060	11,720
Seattle South Lake Union	9,680	8,570	6,140	3,180	54,050
Seattle University Community	18,980	14,310	17,540	4,560	43,370
Seattle Uptown	11,420	9,580	5,800	2,700	37,540
Silverdale	4,310	2,350	90	190	4,210
Tacoma Downtown	34,040	33,860	9,440	5,920	100,740
Tacoma Mall	9,960	10,200	1,090	1,040	12,990
Tukwila	7,400	7,220	1,130	580	5,490
University Place	13,280	11,430	810	860	9,460
2050					
Auburn	11,300	12,600	2,420	1,440	21,040
Bellevue	21,070	31,490	21,980	6,850	141,240
Bothell Canyon Park	14,890	15,020	1,030	770	8,350
Bremerton	6,210	6,130	800	810	19,340
Burien	16,490	14,860	3,620	1,210	22,340
Everett	23,970	26,450	6,480	4,440	94,160
Federal Way	10,870	11,310	3,560	970	17,020
Issaquah	5,550	3,430	1,170	390	4,500

Kent	4,240	4,560	800	490	11,050
Greater Downtown Kirkland	14,160	10,550	3,550	820	10,040
Kirkland Totem Lake	16,640	13,350	2,510	1,210	13,100
Lakewood	12,940	11,080	1,020	1,350	19,710
Lynnwood	22,130	23,150	9,560	2,520	34,330
Puyallup Downtown	5,590	5,150	570	450	7,640
Puyallup South Hill	11,250	9,490	630	570	8,430
Redmond Downtown	20,480	20,920	6,430	2,620	33,130
Redmond-Overlake	14,350	16,350	7,810	2,300	26,230
Renton	25,750	24,570	5,880	2,400	36,440
SeaTac	23,770	26,120	7,340	1,770	15,500
Seattle Downtown	18,330	22,860	31,060	12,150	249,100
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	33,350	35,100	42,290	12,590	225,490
Seattle Northgate	13,660	12,110	8,870	1,320	15,620
Seattle South Lake Union	10,460	11,090	10,240	4,270	77,170
Seattle University Community	20,610	17,400	21,060	4,840	57,470
Seattle Uptown	11,460	11,130	10,400	3,160	48,260
Silverdale	6,460	3,370	140	300	6,390
Tacoma Downtown	40,510	46,110	15,130	11,140	199,090
Tacoma Mall	23,580	23,750	2,720	2,720	34,540
Tukwila	13,100	14,910	3,210	1,250	12,750
University Place	18,030	15,910	1,480	1,250	13,740

Table 82: Mode Share by Regional Center– All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Auburn	38%	30%	4%	2%	26%
Bellevue	32%	17%	4%	3%	44%
Bothell Canyon Park	52%	33%	0%	1%	13%
Bremerton	36%	22%	3%	3%	37%
Burien	45%	27%	3%	2%	23%
Everett	39%	20%	2%	2%	36%
Federal Way	38%	35%	2%	2%	23%
Issaquah	-	-	-	-	-
Kent	36%	30%	5%	2%	27%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	47%	26%	4%	2%	21%
Kirkland Totem Lake	50%	30%	2%	2%	16%
Lakewood	39%	32%	1%	2%	27%
Lynnwood	44%	31%	2%	2%	21%
Puyallup Downtown	40%	28%	2%	2%	27%
Puyallup South Hill	46%	30%	1%	2%	21%
Redmond Downtown	44%	24%	2%	3%	27%
Redmond-Overlake	43%	25%	2%	3%	27%
Renton	46%	26%	3%	2%	23%
SeaTac	41%	34%	7%	2%	17%
Seattle Downtown	13%	7%	7%	3%	70%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	19%	9%	9%	4%	59%
Seattle Northgate	42%	23%	11%	2%	23%

Seattle South Lake Union	22%	9%	6%	4%	60%
Seattle University Community	31%	12%	16%	5%	36%
Seattle Uptown	30%	12%	6%	4%	48%
Silverdale	45%	22%	1%	2%	30%
Tacoma Downtown	36%	19%	3%	3%	39%
Tacoma Mall	38%	29%	2%	3%	28%
Tukwila	52%	18%	4%	2%	23%
University Place	47%	31%	1%	2%	19%
2035					
Auburn	31%	27%	5%	2%	34%
Bellevue	16%	15%	8%	3%	59%
Bothell Canyon Park	44%	36%	2%	2%	17%
Bremerton	26%	20%	3%	3%	48%
Burien	38%	27%	5%	2%	28%
Everett	25%	19%	3%	3%	50%
Federal Way	31%	30%	7%	2%	30%
Issaquah	43%	22%	3%	2%	29%
Kent	25%	24%	5%	3%	43%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	43%	27%	6%	2%	23%
Kirkland Totem Lake	43%	29%	4%	2%	23%
Lakewood	34%	25%	3%	3%	36%
Lynnwood	33%	27%	7%	2%	30%
Puyallup Downtown	36%	26%	3%	2%	32%
Puyallup South Hill	44%	29%	2%	2%	24%
Redmond Downtown	31%	24%	6%	3%	36%

Redmond-Overlake	28%	23%	10%	3%	35%
Renton	34%	26%	5%	2%	32%
SeaTac	36%	33%	8%	2%	20%
Seattle Downtown	8%	7%	8%	3%	75%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	14%	9%	11%	4%	62%
Seattle Northgate	31%	22%	17%	3%	28%
Seattle South Lake Union	13%	10%	7%	4%	67%
Seattle University Community	23%	14%	18%	5%	41%
Seattle Uptown	20%	13%	8%	4%	55%
Silverdale	42%	20%	1%	2%	36%
Tacoma Downtown	21%	17%	5%	3%	53%
Tacoma Mall	32%	27%	3%	3%	34%
Tukwila	38%	30%	5%	3%	23%
University Place	41%	30%	2%	2%	24%
2050					
Auburn	26%	24%	5%	3%	41%
Bellevue	11%	13%	9%	3%	64%
Bothell Canyon Park	41%	35%	3%	2%	20%
Bremerton	21%	17%	3%	3%	56%
Burien	33%	24%	6%	2%	35%
Everett	18%	16%	4%	3%	59%
Federal Way	28%	24%	8%	2%	37%
Issaquah	41%	21%	8%	2%	27%
Kent	24%	20%	4%	3%	50%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	40%	25%	9%	2%	24%

Kirkland Totem Lake	40%	26%	5%	3%	26%
Lakewood	32%	23%	2%	3%	40%
Lynnwood	28%	24%	11%	3%	35%
Puyallup Downtown	32%	25%	4%	2%	37%
Puyallup South Hill	41%	29%	2%	2%	25%
Redmond Downtown	29%	23%	8%	3%	37%
Redmond-Overlake	25%	23%	12%	4%	37%
Renton	31%	24%	6%	3%	36%
SeaTac	36%	33%	9%	2%	20%
Seattle Downtown	6%	6%	8%	3%	76%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	11%	9%	11%	3%	65%
Seattle Northgate	30%	22%	18%	3%	28%
Seattle South Lake Union	11%	9%	8%	4%	69%
Seattle University Community	20%	14%	18%	4%	44%
Seattle Uptown	16%	12%	11%	4%	57%
Silverdale	42%	19%	1%	2%	36%
Tacoma Downtown	15%	14%	5%	4%	63%
Tacoma Mall	31%	25%	3%	3%	37%
Tukwila	33%	30%	7%	3%	26%
University Place	40%	29%	3%	2%	25%

Table 83: Mode Share by Regional Center– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Auburn	63%	15%	6%	3%	13%
Bellevue	51%	8%	2%	3%	36%
Bothell Canyon Park	76%	16%	0%	3%	5%
Bremerton	61%	11%	8%	3%	18%
Burien	72%	16%	2%	2%	7%
Everett	68%	10%	1%	2%	19%
Federal Way	72%	16%	0%	0%	12%
Issaquah	-	-	-	-	-
Kent	62%	14%	6%	5%	13%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	72%	12%	4%	2%	10%
Kirkland Totem Lake	76%	13%	1%	2%	8%
Lakewood	68%	16%	0%	0%	16%
Lynnwood	69%	15%	2%	2%	12%
Puyallup Downtown	66%	14%	5%	2%	14%
Puyallup South Hill	73%	16%	2%	1%	8%
Redmond Downtown	70%	11%	1%	3%	14%
Redmond-Overlake	66%	13%	1%	3%	16%
Renton	72%	12%	1%	3%	12%
SeaTac	64%	16%	6%	2%	12%
Seattle Downtown	20%	4%	3%	3%	70%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	30%	6%	6%	4%	54%
Seattle Northgate	64%	11%	11%	3%	12%

Seattle South Lake Union	32%	5%	3%	4%	56%
Seattle University Community	56%	9%	13%	4%	18%
Seattle Uptown	44%	7%	3%	5%	41%
Silverdale	68%	11%	2%	2%	17%
Tacoma Downtown	60%	9%	2%	3%	26%
Tacoma Mall	67%	14%	4%	3%	12%
Tukwila	74%	9%	4%	4%	9%
University Place	76%	13%	2%	2%	8%
2035					
Auburn	54%	14%	10%	3%	18%
Bellevue	26%	7%	5%	3%	58%
Bothell Canyon Park	71%	17%	2%	2%	9%
Bremerton	46%	11%	8%	4%	31%
Burien	70%	15%	3%	2%	9%
Everett	46%	11%	3%	4%	37%
Federal Way	60%	17%	6%	3%	14%
Issaquah	68%	12%	4%	2%	13%
Kent	46%	14%	8%	4%	27%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	66%	12%	6%	3%	13%
Kirkland Totem Lake	70%	12%	3%	3%	12%
Lakewood	63%	12%	5%	3%	17%
Lynnwood	59%	14%	9%	3%	15%
Puyallup Downtown	62%	15%	7%	4%	12%
Puyallup South Hill	70%	14%	3%	2%	10%
Redmond Downtown	55%	12%	8%	4%	21%

Redmond-Overlake	51%	13%	9%	4%	23%
Renton	60%	14%	3%	3%	20%
SeaTac	62%	16%	6%	3%	12%
Seattle Downtown	12%	4%	3%	2%	78%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	22%	6%	8%	3%	61%
Seattle Northgate	53%	11%	19%	3%	14%
Seattle South Lake Union	20%	5%	3%	3%	68%
Seattle University Community	45%	10%	19%	4%	22%
Seattle Uptown	33%	8%	5%	5%	49%
Silverdale	65%	10%	2%	1%	22%
Tacoma Downtown	38%	10%	6%	4%	42%
Tacoma Mall	61%	14%	6%	4%	16%
Tukwila	65%	14%	6%	4%	12%
University Place	70%	15%	3%	3%	10%
2050					
Auburn	49%	14%	9%	4%	25%
Bellevue	18%	7%	6%	3%	67%
Bothell Canyon Park	70%	15%	3%	2%	11%
Bremerton	40%	10%	7%	4%	39%
Burien	65%	15%	5%	3%	12%
Everett	34%	9%	3%	4%	50%
Federal Way	53%	14%	7%	3%	22%
Issaquah	66%	10%	10%	2%	12%
Kent	44%	11%	5%	4%	36%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	64%	12%	7%	3%	13%

Kirkland Totem Lake	65%	13%	5%	3%	14%
Lakewood	60%	13%	3%	3%	21%
Lynnwood	51%	14%	13%	3%	20%
Puyallup Downtown	57%	14%	8%	3%	18%
Puyallup South Hill	68%	16%	5%	2%	10%
Redmond Downtown	53%	13%	10%	4%	20%
Redmond-Overlake	47%	13%	11%	4%	25%
Renton	58%	13%	3%	4%	22%
SeaTac	62%	16%	7%	3%	13%
Seattle Downtown	10%	4%	4%	2%	80%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	17%	5%	8%	3%	66%
Seattle Northgate	51%	11%	19%	3%	16%
Seattle South Lake Union	17%	5%	4%	3%	72%
Seattle University Community	38%	9%	20%	4%	28%
Seattle Uptown	28%	7%	7%	4%	53%
Silverdale	62%	10%	2%	2%	23%
Tacoma Downtown	27%	8%	5%	4%	56%
Tacoma Mall	57%	13%	5%	4%	20%
Tukwila	57%	14%	10%	4%	15%
University Place	70%	13%	3%	3%	11%

Table 84: Mode Share by Regional Center– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
Auburn	35%	32%	3%	2%	28%
Bellevue	29%	19%	4%	3%	46%
Bothell Canyon Park	48%	36%	0%	1%	14%
Bremerton	32%	24%	2%	2%	40%
Burien	40%	29%	4%	2%	26%
Everett	35%	22%	2%	2%	39%
Federal Way	34%	37%	2%	2%	24%
Issaquah	-	-	-	-	-
Kent	33%	32%	4%	2%	29%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	42%	29%	4%	2%	23%
Kirkland Totem Lake	46%	33%	2%	2%	18%
Lakewood	35%	34%	1%	2%	28%
Lynnwood	40%	33%	2%	2%	23%
Puyallup Downtown	36%	31%	2%	2%	29%
Puyallup South Hill	41%	33%	1%	2%	23%
Redmond Downtown	39%	27%	2%	2%	30%
Redmond-Overlake	38%	28%	2%	3%	29%
Renton	41%	28%	4%	2%	25%
SeaTac	37%	36%	7%	2%	18%
Seattle Downtown	11%	8%	8%	3%	70%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	17%	10%	10%	4%	60%
Seattle Northgate	38%	25%	11%	2%	25%

Seattle South Lake Union	19%	10%	6%	4%	61%
Seattle University Community	26%	13%	16%	5%	39%
Seattle Uptown	26%	13%	7%	4%	49%
Silverdale	41%	24%	1%	2%	32%
Tacoma Downtown	32%	21%	3%	3%	41%
Tacoma Mall	34%	31%	2%	3%	30%
Tukwila	46%	21%	4%	3%	26%
University Place	43%	33%	1%	2%	20%
2035					
Auburn	28%	29%	5%	2%	36%
Bellevue	14%	17%	8%	3%	59%
Bothell Canyon Park	40%	39%	2%	2%	18%
Bremerton	23%	22%	2%	3%	50%
Burien	33%	29%	5%	2%	31%
Everett	22%	21%	3%	3%	52%
Federal Way	27%	32%	7%	2%	32%
Issaquah	38%	30%	5%	2%	25%
Kent	39%	24%	3%	2%	32%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	22%	26%	4%	3%	45%
Kirkland Totem Lake	38%	31%	4%	2%	24%
Lakewood	30%	26%	2%	3%	39%
Lynnwood	30%	29%	7%	2%	32%
Puyallup Downtown	32%	28%	2%	2%	35%
Puyallup South Hill	40%	31%	2%	2%	26%

Redmond Downtown	26%	26%	6%	3%	39%
Redmond-Overlake	24%	25%	10%	3%	38%
Renton	30%	28%	5%	2%	34%
SeaTac	32%	36%	9%	2%	21%
Seattle Downtown	7%	8%	9%	3%	74%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	12%	10%	12%	4%	62%
Seattle Northgate	27%	24%	16%	3%	30%
Seattle South Lake Union	12%	10%	8%	4%	66%
Seattle University Community	19%	14%	18%	5%	44%
Seattle Uptown	17%	14%	9%	4%	56%
Silverdale	39%	21%	1%	2%	38%
Tacoma Downtown	19%	18%	5%	3%	55%
Tacoma Mall	28%	29%	3%	3%	37%
Tukwila	34%	33%	5%	3%	25%
University Place	37%	32%	2%	2%	26%
2050					
Auburn	23%	26%	5%	3%	43%
Bellevue	9%	14%	10%	3%	63%
Bothell Canyon Park	37%	37%	3%	2%	21%
Bremerton	19%	18%	2%	2%	58%
Burien	28%	25%	6%	2%	38%
Everett	15%	17%	4%	3%	61%
Federal Way	25%	26%	8%	2%	39%

Issaquah	37%	23%	8%	3%	30%
Kent	20%	22%	4%	2%	52%
Greater Downtown Kirkland	36%	27%	9%	2%	26%
Kirkland Totem Lake	36%	29%	5%	3%	28%
Lakewood	28%	24%	2%	3%	43%
Lynnwood	24%	25%	10%	3%	37%
Puyallup Downtown	29%	27%	3%	2%	39%
Puyallup South Hill	37%	31%	2%	2%	28%
Redmond Downtown	25%	25%	8%	3%	40%
Redmond-Overlake	21%	24%	12%	3%	39%
Renton	27%	26%	6%	3%	38%
SeaTac	32%	35%	10%	2%	21%
Seattle Downtown	5%	7%	9%	4%	75%
Seattle First Hill/Capitol Hill	10%	10%	12%	4%	65%
Seattle Northgate	26%	23%	17%	3%	30%
Seattle South Lake Union	9%	10%	9%	4%	68%
Seattle University Community	17%	14%	17%	4%	47%
Seattle Uptown	14%	13%	12%	4%	57%
Silverdale	39%	20%	1%	2%	38%
Tacoma Downtown	13%	15%	5%	4%	64%

Tacoma Mall	27%	27%	3%	3%	40%
Tukwila	29%	33%	7%	3%	28%
University Place	36%	32%	3%	2%	27%

Table 85: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Center– All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
In a Regional Growth Center	325,200	179,500	69,700	34,400	483,400
Not in a Regional Growth Center	6,920,100	5,601,600	281,400	210,200	1,871,300
Region	**7,245,200**	**5,781,100**	**351,100**	**244,600**	**2,354,800**
2035					
In a Regional Growth Center	482,300	368,400	166,200	67,800	1,069,600
Not in a Regional Growth Center	7,358,900	6,109,500	512,800	246,100	2,203,000
Region	**7,841,200**	**6,477,800**	**679,000**	**313,900**	**3,272,600**
2050					
In a Regional Growth Center	661,000	544,700	269,700	104,800	1,739,300
Not in a Regional Growth Center	8,054,300	6,660,100	753,000	281,000	2,573,600
Region	**8,715,300**	**7,204,700**	**1,022,800**	**385,800**	**4,312,900**

Table 86: Mode Share by Regional Center– All Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
In a Regional Growth Center	30%	16%	6%	3%	44%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	47%	38%	2%	1%	13%
Region	**45%**	**36%**	**2%**	**2%**	**15%**
2035					
In a Regional Growth Center	22%	17%	8%	3%	50%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	45%	37%	3%	2%	13%
Region	**42%**	**35%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
In a Regional Growth Center	20%	16%	8%	3%	52%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	44%	36%	4%	2%	14%
Region	**40%**	**33%**	**5%**	**2%**	**20%**

Table 87: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Center– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
In a Regional Growth Center	82,200	14,900	8,100	6,200	72,500
Not in a Regional Growth Center	1,458,500	313,500	40,500	23,900	119,400
Region	**1,540,700**	**328,400**	**48,600**	**30,100**	**192,000**
2035					
In a Regional Growth Center	123,300	29,900	21,800	11,400	157,600
Not in a Regional Growth Center	1,545,800	346,100	81,000	29,300	152,800
Region	**1,669,000**	**376,000**	**102,700**	**40,700**	**310,400**
2050					
In a Regional Growth Center	169,800	44,400	36,000	16,400	256,100
Not in a Regional Growth Center	1,689,100	379,200	116,700	35,900	185,800
Region	**1,858,900**	**423,600**	**152,700**	**52,300**	**441,900**

Table 88: Mode Share by Regional Center– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
In a Regional Growth Center	45%	8%	4%	3%	39%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	75%	16%	2%	1%	6%
Region	**72%**	**15%**	**2%**	**1%**	**9%**
2035					
In a Regional Growth Center	36%	9%	6%	3%	46%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	72%	16%	4%	1%	7%
Region	**67%**	**15%**	**4%**	**2%**	**12%**
2050					
In a Regional Growth Center	33%	9%	7%	3%	49%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	70%	16%	5%	2%	8%
Region	**64%**	**15%**	**5%**	**2%**	**15%**

Table 89: Daily Trips by Mode by Regional Center– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
In a Regional Growth Center	243,000	164,700	61,600	28,200	410,900
Not in a Regional Growth Center	5,461,500	5,288,100	240,900	186,300	1,751,900
Region	**5,704,500**	**5,452,800**	**302,500**	**214,400**	**2,162,800**
2035					
In a Regional Growth Center	359,100	338,400	144,400	56,400	912,000
Not in a Regional Growth Center	5,813,100	5,763,400	431,900	216,800	2,050,200
Region	**6,172,200**	**6,101,800**	**576,300**	**273,200**	**2,962,200**
2050					
In a Regional Growth Center	491,200	500,300	233,700	88,300	1,483,200
Not in a Regional Growth Center	6,365,200	6,280,800	636,300	245,200	2,387,800
Region	**6,856,400**	**6,781,100**	**870,100**	**333,500**	**3,871,000**

Table 90: Mode Share by Regional Center– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpooled	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
In a Regional Growth Center	27%	18%	7%	3%	45%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	42%	41%	2%	1%	14%
Region	**41%**	**39%**	**2%**	**2%**	**16%**
2035					
In a Regional Growth Center	20%	19%	8%	3%	50%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	41%	40%	3%	2%	14%
Region	**38%**	**38%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
In a Regional Growth Center	18%	18%	8%	3%	53%
Not in a Regional Growth Center	40%	40%	4%	2%	15%
Region	**37%**	**36%**	**5%**	**2%**	**21%**

Table 91: Mode Share by Equity Focus Area– All Trips - Above Regional Average

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
People of Color	44%	36%	2%	2%	16%
People with Low Incomes	45%	36%	2%	2%	16%
People with Limited English	46%	37%	2%	2%	14%
People with Disabilities	45%	36%	2%	2%	15%
Older Adults	46%	37%	2%	1%	14%
Youth	47%	39%	1%	1%	11%
Region	**45%**	**36%**	**2%**	**2%**	**15%**
2035					
People of Color	40%	34%	4%	2%	20%
People with Low Incomes	42%	35%	4%	2%	19%
People with Limited English	42%	35%	4%	2%	18%
People with Disabilities	43%	35%	4%	2%	17%
Older Adults	44%	36%	3%	2%	16%
Youth	45%	39%	3%	1%	12%
Region	**42%**	**35%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
People of Color	37%	32%	5%	2%	24%
People with Low Incomes	40%	33%	5%	2%	21%
People with Limited English	39%	34%	5%	2%	20%
People with Disabilities	41%	34%	5%	2%	19%
Older Adults	43%	34%	4%	2%	18%
Youth	45%	37%	3%	2%	13%
Region	**40%**	**33%**	**5%**	**2%**	**20%**

Table 92: Mode Share by Equity Focus Area– All Trips - Significantly Above Regional Average

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
People of Color	43%	37%	3%	2%	15%
People with Low Incomes	42%	35%	3%	2%	18%
People with Limited English	45%	38%	3%	2%	14%
People with Disabilities	44%	35%	2%	2%	18%
Older Adults	47%	36%	2%	1%	14%
Youth	45%	43%	1%	1%	10%
Region	**45%**	**36%**	**2%**	**2%**	**15%**
2035					
People of Color	39%	35%	5%	2%	19%
People with Low Incomes	37%	33%	5%	2%	24%
People with Limited English	41%	36%	5%	2%	17%
People with Disabilities	39%	32%	4%	2%	24%
Older Adults	44%	34%	4%	2%	16%
Youth	45%	42%	2%	1%	11%
Region	**42%**	**35%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
People of Color	37%	33%	6%	2%	22%
People with Low Incomes	34%	30%	5%	2%	28%
People with Limited English	39%	34%	6%	2%	19%
People with Disabilities	36%	29%	4%	2%	28%
Older Adults	42%	33%	5%	2%	19%
Youth	45%	41%	2%	1%	11%
Region	**40%**	**33%**	**5%**	**2%**	**20%**

Table 93: Mode Share by Equity Focus Area - Above Regional Average– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
People of Color	70%	15%	2%	2%	11%
People with Low Incomes	71%	15%	2%	2%	10%
People with Limited English	72%	16%	2%	1%	9%
People with Disabilities	72%	16%	2%	1%	9%
Older Adults	73%	16%	2%	1%	8%
Youth	76%	17%	2%	1%	5%
Region	**72%**	**15%**	**2%**	**1%**	**9%**
2035					
People of Color	63%	15%	4%	2%	16%
People with Low Incomes	66%	15%	4%	2%	13%
People with Limited English	66%	15%	4%	2%	14%
People with Disabilities	67%	15%	4%	2%	12%
Older Adults	69%	15%	4%	1%	11%
Youth	73%	17%	3%	1%	6%
Region	**67%**	**15%**	**4%**	**2%**	**12%**
2050					
People of Color	59%	14%	5%	2%	20%
People with Low Incomes	63%	15%	5%	2%	15%
People with Limited English	62%	15%	5%	2%	17%
People with Disabilities	65%	15%	5%	2%	14%
Older Adults	66%	15%	4%	2%	13%
Youth	72%	16%	4%	1%	7%
Region	**64%**	**15%**	**5%**	**2%**	**15%**

Table 94: Mode Share by Equity Focus Area- Significantly Above Regional Average– Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
People of Color	70%	16%	2%	2%	10%
People with Low Incomes	70%	15%	3%	2%	10%
People with Limited English	73%	17%	2%	2%	7%
People with Disabilities	70%	15%	2%	2%	11%
Older Adults	73%	15%	3%	1%	8%
Youth	76%	18%	1%	1%	4%
Region	**72%**	**15%**	**2%**	**1%**	**9%**
2035					
People of Color	63%	15%	4%	2%	15%
People with Low Incomes	62%	15%	5%	2%	16%
People with Limited English	67%	16%	4%	2%	10%
People with Disabilities	62%	14%	4%	2%	17%
Older Adults	68%	15%	5%	1%	11%
Youth	75%	17%	2%	1%	5%
Region	**67%**	**15%**	**4%**	**2%**	**12%**
2050					
People of Color	60%	15%	5%	2%	18%
People with Low Incomes	57%	14%	5%	3%	22%
People with Limited English	64%	15%	5%	2%	13%
People with Disabilities	58%	13%	4%	2%	23%
Older Adults	65%	14%	6%	2%	13%
Youth	74%	17%	3%	1%	6%
Region	**64%**	**15%**	**5%**	**2%**	**15%**

Table 95: Mode Share by Equity Focus Area-Above Regional Average– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
People of Color	40%	39%	2%	2%	17%
People with Low Incomes	41%	39%	2%	2%	17%
People with Limited English	41%	40%	2%	2%	15%
People with Disabilities	41%	39%	2%	2%	16%
Older Adults	42%	40%	2%	1%	14%
Youth	43%	43%	1%	1%	12%
Region	**41%**	**39%**	**2%**	**2%**	**16%**
2035					
People of Color	36%	37%	4%	2%	21%
People with Low Incomes	38%	38%	4%	2%	19%
People with Limited English	38%	38%	4%	2%	18%
People with Disabilities	39%	38%	4%	2%	18%
Older Adults	40%	39%	3%	2%	17%
Youth	41%	42%	2%	1%	13%
Region	**38%**	**38%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
People of Color	34%	35%	5%	2%	24%
People with Low Incomes	36%	36%	5%	2%	22%
People with Limited English	36%	37%	5%	2%	21%
People with Disabilities	37%	37%	4%	2%	20%
Older Adults	39%	37%	4%	2%	18%
Youth	41%	41%	3%	2%	14%
Region	**37%**	**36%**	**5%**	**2%**	**21%**

Table 96: Mode Share by Equity Focus Area - Significantly Above Regional Average– Non-Work Trips

Geography	Drove Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk
2023					
People of Color	39%	40%	3%	2%	16%
People with Low Incomes	38%	38%	3%	2%	19%
People with Limited English	40%	41%	3%	2%	15%
People with Disabilities	40%	37%	2%	2%	19%
Older Adults	44%	38%	2%	1%	15%
Youth	41%	46%	1%	1%	11%
Region	**41%**	**39%**	**2%**	**2%**	**16%**
2035					
People of Color	35%	38%	5%	2%	20%
People with Low Incomes	33%	35%	5%	2%	25%
People with Limited English	37%	39%	5%	2%	18%
People with Disabilities	36%	35%	4%	2%	25%
Older Adults	41%	37%	4%	2%	17%
Youth	41%	45%	2%	1%	11%
Region	**38%**	**38%**	**4%**	**2%**	**18%**
2050					
People of Color	33%	36%	6%	2%	23%
People with Low Incomes	31%	32%	5%	2%	29%
People with Limited English	35%	37%	6%	2%	20%
People with Disabilities	33%	32%	4%	2%	29%
Older Adults	39%	35%	5%	2%	20%
Youth	40%	44%	2%	1%	12%
Region	**37%**	**36%**	**5%**	**2%**	**21%**

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for mode choice changes between 2023 and 2050 include:

- Carpooling is a noticeably higher used mode for non-work trips compared to work trips across all geographies as families are likely to share rides for most trips beyond going to work.
- People who live in Regional Growth Centers are far more likely to walk for transportation purposes.

Section 6B: Proximity to Grocery Stores

Access to healthy food is a key to long term health. For this measure, PSRC obtained grocery store points of interest from Open Street Map and buffered the point locations of the stores by ¼ mile. It should be noted that PSRC does not forecast the location of grocery stores so the same store layer is used in all years of analysis and compared with the household distributions for future years.

Table 97: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Grocery store - County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King	25%	29%	31%
Kitsap	6%	7%	8%
Pierce	8%	9%	11%
Snohomish	10%	13%	15%
Region	**18%**	**20%**	**22%**

Table 98: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Grocery store – Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	31%	34%	35%
Core Cities	17%	21%	24%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	11%	13%	15%
Cities and Towns	10%	11%	12%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	4%	4%	4%
Rural Areas	1%	1%	1%
Region	**18%**	**20%**	**22%**

Table 99: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Grocery store – Regional Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	58%	56%	52%
Not in RGC	13%	14%	16%
Region	**18%**	**20%**	**22%**

Table 100: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Grocery store – Equity Focus Areas

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	21%	23%	25%	28%	27%	30%
People with Low Incomes	21%	24%	24%	27%	25%	28%
People with Limited English	20%	22%	24%	26%	27%	30%
People with Disabilities	18%	17%	21%	20%	23%	22%
Older Adults	14%	15%	16%	18%	18%	20%
Youth	9%	8%	11%	9%	13%	11%
Region	**18%**		**20%**		**22%**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for proximity to grocery stores include:

- People living in the five largest cities in the region have the greatest access to grocery stores with 35% of households being within ¼ mile of a store in 2050.
- More than half of the households in Regional Growth Centers are within ¼ mile of a grocery store.
- King County residents have the highest share of proximity to a grocery store and Kitsap County, with fewer than 1 in 10 households within a ¼ mile of a grocery store, has the lowest.
- While access to grocery stores will improve by 2050 for all EFAs, older adults and youth EFAs have some of the lowest proximity to close grocery options.

Section 6C: Proximity to Healthcare

For this measure, PSRC obtained health care points of interest from OpenStreetMap and buffered the point locations by ¼ mile. These facilities include hospitals, medical clinics and dental offices. It should be noted that PSRC does not forecast the location of healthcare facilities, so the same layer is used in all years of analysis and compared with the household distributions for future years.

Table 101: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Healthcare Facility - County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King	4%	5%	6%
Kitsap	1%	1%	1%
Pierce	3%	4%	5%
Snohomish	2%	2%	3%
Region	**3%**	**4%**	**5%**

Table 102: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Healthcare Facility – Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	7%	8%	9%
Core Cities	4%	4%	4%
High-Capacity Transit Communities	1%	1%	1%
Cities and Towns	2%	2%	2%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	0%	0%	0%
Rural Areas	0%	0%	0%
Region	**3%**	**4%**	**5%**

Table 103: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Healthcare Facility – Regional Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	17%	17%	15%
Not in RGC	2%	2%	2%
Region	**3%**	**4%**	**5%**

Table 104: Percentage of Households within ¼ mile of a Healthcare Facility – Equity Focus Areas

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	4%	2%	5%	3%	5%	3%
People with Low Incomes	4%	5%	6%	7%	6%	7%
People with Limited English	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	2%
People with Disabilities	5%	7%	6%	10%	6%	10%
Older Adults	3%	2%	4%	3%	5%	3%
Youth	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Region	**3%**		**4%**		**5%**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for proximity to health care facilities include:

- Around 1 in 20 households in the region are within ¼ mile of a health care facility in 2050.
- People with disabilities and people with low income EFAs have higher percentages of households within ¼ mile of a health care facility compared to the region as a whole.
- The share of households in Regional Centers close to medical facilities is more than 3 times the regional average.
- Rural and unincorporated households are not close to medical facilities.

Section 6D: Proximity to Open Space

For this measure, PSRC buffered the regional open space data by 1000'. It should be noted that PSRC does not forecast the location of new open space facilities , so the same layer is used in all years of analysis and compared with the household distributions for future years.

Table 105: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Park - County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King	63%	64%	65%
Kitsap	25%	26%	27%
Pierce	28%	28%	29%
Snohomish	34%	33%	34%
Region	**48%**	**48%**	**49%**

Table 106: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Park – Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	68%	67%	66%
Core Cities	52%	52%	52%
High Capacity Transit Communities	38%	38%	38%
Cities and Towns	47%	47%	47%

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Urban Unincorporated Areas	14%	13%	13%
Rural Areas	14%	14%	14%
Region	**48%**	**48%**	**49%**

Table 107: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Park – Regional Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	82%	78%	73%
Not in RGC	45%	43%	43%
Region	**48%**	**48%**	**49%**

Table 108: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Park – Equity Focus Areas

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	52%	54%	53%	54%	53%	54%
People with Low Incomes	47%	48%	47%	47%	48%	48%
People with Limited English	51%	53%	52%	51%	53%	51%
People with Disabilities	44%	42%	45%	45%	46%	46%
Older Adults	46%	45%	47%	47%	47%	50%
Youth	38%	34%	37%	33%	36%	32%
Region	**48%**		**48%**		**49%**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for proximity to parks and open space include:

- Almost half of the region lives within 1000' of a park, trail or open space.
- King County residents have the highest share of households near parks while Kitsap and Pierce counties have the lowest, less than half the rate of King County households.
- People of color and people with limited English proficiency EFAs have some of the highest shares of households located near parks, both of which are over 50%.
- Households in Rural areas tend to live farther from regional open space amenities which makes it less likely for them to be able to access them without a vehicle.

Section 6E: Proximity to High Volume Truck Routes

For this measure, PSRC buffered the region's FGTS T-1 and T-2 routes by 1000'. It should be noted that the FGTS definition does not change into the future , so the same layer is used in all years of analysis and compared with the household distributions for future years.

Table 109: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Freight Route - County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King	28%	32%	34%
Kitsap	8%	8%	9%
Pierce	19%	22%	25%
Snohomish	19%	24%	28%
Region	**23%**	**27%**	**29%**

Table 110: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Freight Route – Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	34%	39%	41%
Core Cities	26%	29%	33%
High Capacity Transit Communities	18%	22%	25%
Cities and Towns	12%	13%	14%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	16%	14%	13%

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Rural Areas	7%	7%	7%
Region	**23%**	**27%**	**29%**

Table 111: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Freight Route – Regional Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	56%	59%	57%
Not in RGC	20%	21%	23%
Region	**23%**	**27%**	**29%**

Table 112: Percentage of Households within 1000' of a Freight Route – Equity Focus Areas

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	31%	35%	35%	40%	38%	42%
People with Low Incomes	30%	36%	35%	41%	38%	44%
People with Limited English	29%	31%	33%	34%	37%	37%
People with Disabilities	24%	28%	29%	34%	32%	37%
Older Adults	18%	16%	21%	20%	23%	23%
Youth	18%	18%	20%	20%	22%	22%
Region	**23%**		**27%**		**29%**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for proximity to freight routes include:

- About 29% of households in 2050 will be near a T-1 or T-2 freight route, up from 23% today.
- King County residents have the highest share of households near major freight routes with Snohomish County the second highest in 2050 at 28%.
- Areas with a significantly higher share of people of color, people with low incomes and people with limited English proficiency than the regional average have some of the highest shares of households located near freight routes, all of which are over 30%. This rate is expected to further increase by 2050.
- Households in Rural areas are located farther from major freight routes
- Over half of all households in Regional Growth Centers are near a major freight facility.

Section 6F: Proximity to the High Injury Network

For this measure, PSRC buffered the regional high-injury network routes by 1000' and filtered out limited access facilities. It should be noted that the HIN definition does not change into the future, so the same layer is used in all years of analysis and compared with the household distributions for future years.

Table 113: Percentage of Households within 1000' of the High Injury Network - County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King	44%	48%	51%
Kitsap	15%	16%	18%
Pierce	31%	36%	40%
Snohomish	30%	33%	37%
Region	**37%**	**41%**	**44%**

Table 114: Percentage of Households within 1000' of the High Injury Network – Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	58%	64%	67%
Core Cities	41%	44%	47%
High Capacity Transit Communities	31%	34%	36%
Cities and Towns	8%	8%	9%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	18%	16%	15%
Rural Areas	5%	5%	5%
Region	**37%**	**41%**	**44%**

Table 115: Percentage of Households within 1000' of the High Injury Network – Regional Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	82%	88%	85%
Not in RGC	32%	33%	35%
Region	**37%**	**41%**	**44%**

Table 116: Percentage of Households within 1000' of the High Injury Network – Equity Focus Areas

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	52%	60%	57%	64%	60%	67%
People with Low Incomes	52%	66%	57%	71%	60%	74%
People with Limited English	50%	58%	55%	61%	58%	66%
People with Disabilities	44%	47%	48%	55%	51%	57%
Older Adults	30%	26%	34%	31%	37%	36%
Youth	26%	22%	28%	24%	30%	26%
Region	**37%**		**41%**		**44%**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for proximity to the high-injury network include:

- About 44% of households in 2050 will be near the HIN, up from 37% today.
- King County residents have the highest share of households near the HIN with Pierce County the second highest in 2050 at 40%.
- EFAs of people of color, people with low ncomes and people with limited English proficiency have some of the highest shares of households located near the high injury network, all of which are over 50%.
- Over 80% of all households in Regional Growth Centers are near the HIN.

Section 6G: Proximity to the At-Grade Rail Crossings

For this measure, PSRC buffered the latest set of at-grade rail crossings by 1000'. It should be

noted that the location of the at-grade crossings does not change in the future, so the same layer is used in all years of analysis and compared with the household distributions for future years.

Table 117: Percentage of Households within 1000' of an At-Grade Rail Crossing - County

Geography	2023	2035	2050
King	2%	3%	3%
Kitsap	0%	1%	1%
Pierce	3%	5%	7%
Snohomish	2%	3%	4%
Region	**2%**	**3%**	**4%**

Table 118: Percentage of Households within 1000' of an At-Grade Rail Crossing – Regional Geography

Geography	2023	2035	2050
Metropolitan Cities	3%	5%	6%
Core Cities	3%	4%	6%
High Capacity Transit Communities	2%	2%	2%
Cities and Towns	3%	3%	3%
Urban Unincorporated Areas	0%	1%	1%
Rural Areas	1%	1%	1%
Region	**2%**	**3%**	**4%**

Table 119: Percentage of Households within 1000' of an At-Grade Rail Crossing – Regional Centers

Geography	2023	2035	2050
In a Regional Growth Center	8%	11%	12%
Not in RGC	2%	2%	2%
Region	**2%**	**3%**	**4%**

Table 120: Percentage of Households within 1000' of an At-Grade Rail Crossing – Equity Focus Areas

Geography	2023		2035		2050	
	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average	Above Regional Average	Significantly Above Regional Average
People of Color	2%	1%	3%	2%	4%	2%
People with Low Incomes	3%	4%	5%	7%	7%	9%
People with Limited English	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%
People with Disabilities	3%	4%	5%	7%	6%	9%
Older Adults	3%	3%	3%	5%	4%	5%
Youth	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Region	**2%**		**3%**		**4%**	

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for proximity to at-grade rail crossings include:

- Less than 5% of households in 2050 will be near an at-grade rail crossing, up from 2% today.
- Pierce County residents have the highest share of households near an at-grade rail crossing.
- Over 8% of all households in Regional Growth Centers are near an at-grade rail crossing today, which is four times higher than households outside of RGCs.
- Areas with significantly higher shares of people with low incomes and people with disabilities compared to the regional average have the highest percentages of households near at-grade rail crossings, double the regional average. This rate is expected to further increase by 2050.

Section 6H: Time Spent Walking and Biking

For this measure, PSRC measured the time and distance that people spend walking and biking to complete transportation activities throughout the day. These metrics do not include the time spent walking and biking for exercise / recreation purposes.

Table 121: Minutes per Day a Person Spends Walking and Biking - County

Geography	Bike	Walk	Total
2023			
King	10	11	21
Kitsap	11	13	23
Pierce	11	12	23
Snohomish	11	13	25
Region	**11**	**12**	**22**
2035			
King	11	12	22
Kitsap	11	14	25
Pierce	12	14	26
Snohomish	12	15	27
Region	**11**	**13**	**24**
2050			
King	11	13	24

Kitsap	11	14	26
Pierce	12	16	29
Snohomish	12	17	29
Region	**12**	**14**	**26**

Table 122: Minutes per Day a Person Spends Walking and Biking – Regional Geography

Geography	Bike	Walk	Total
2023			
Metropolitan Cities	9	10	18
Core Cities	12	13	24
High Capacity Transit Communities	13	16	29
Cities and Towns	11	15	26
Urban Unincorporated Areas	14	20	34
Rural Areas	20	18	38
Region	**11**	**12**	**22**
2035			
Metropolitan Cities	9	11	20
Core Cities	12	15	27
High Capacity Transit Communities	13	17	29
Cities and Towns	11	15	26
Urban Unincorporated Areas	14	20	34
Rural Areas	20	19	39
Region	**11**	**13**	**24**
2050			
Metropolitan Cities	10	12	22
Core Cities	13	16	29
High Capacity Transit Communities	13	17	30
Cities and Towns	10	15	26

Urban Unincorporated Areas	13	20	33
Rural Areas	20	19	39
Region	**12**	**14**	**26**

Table 123: Minutes per Day a Person Spends Walking and Biking – Regional Centers

Geography	Bike	Walk	Total
2023			
In a Regional Growth Center	7	8	14
Not in a Regional Growth Center	13	15	28
Region	**11**	**12**	**22**
2035			
In a Regional Growth Center	7	8	15
Not in a Regional Growth Center	13	16	28
Region	**11**	**13**	**24**
2050			
In a Regional Growth Center	7	9	16
Not in a Regional Growth Center	13	16	29
Region	**12**	**14**	**26**

Table 124: Minutes per Day a Person Spends Walking and Biking – Equity Focus Areas Above Region Average

Geography	Walk	Bike	Total
2023			
People of Color	10	11	21
People with Low Incomes	10	12	22
People with Limited English	11	11	22
People with Disabilities	11	12	23
Older Adults	11	12	23
Youth	13	15	28
Region	**11**	**12**	**22**
2035			
People of Color	10	12	22
People with Low Incomes	11	13	24
People with Limited English	11	12	24
People with Disabilities	11	13	24
Older Adults	12	13	24
Youth	13	16	29
Region	**11**	**13**	**24**
2050			
People of Color	11	14	25
People with Low Incomes	11	14	25
People with Limited English	12	15	27
People with Disabilities	12	14	26
Older Adults	12	14	26
Youth	13	17	30
Region	**12**	**14**	**26**

Table 125: Minutes per Day a Person Spends Walking and Biking – Equity Focus Areas Significantly Above Region Average

Geography	Walk	Bike	Total
2023			
People of Color	10	11	21
People with Low Incomes	9	10	19
People with Limited English	11	12	23
People with Disabilities	9	10	18
Older Adults	11	11	22
Youth	13	17	30
Region	**11**	**12**	**22**
2035			
People of Color	11	12	23
People with Low Incomes	10	12	22
People with Limited English	12	14	26
People with Disabilities	10	11	21
Older Adults	12	13	24
Youth	13	18	30
Region	**11**	**13**	**24**
2050			
People of Color	12	14	26
People with Low Incomes	11	14	25
People with Limited English	12	16	28
People with Disabilities	11	13	24
Older Adults	13	14	27
Youth	13	18	31
Region	**12**	**14**	**26**

Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for time spent walking and biking:

- Snohomish County residents spend the most time walking and biking for transportation.
- People outside centers spend more time walking than those in centers.
- Youth (age 5-17) spend the most time biking of all equity focus areas.

Section 7: Air Quality and Climate

As noted in Section 1, the outputs in the table below are generated using a combination of vehicle speeds and volumes from the regional travel demand model and emission factors from MOVES4 based on the latest estimates and future forecasts of the region's on-road vehicle fleet, including the transition to zero emission, using current trends, state and federal regulations and the latest guidance from the Washington State Department of Ecology.

Table 126: Daily Tons of Pollutants – PSRC Region

	Total Daily Tons		
Pollutant	2023	2035	2050
Carbon Monoxide	358.2	158.5	29.5
Nitrogen Oxides	44.6	12.1	4.2
Fine Particulates	1.7	1.0	0.8
Carbon Dioxide Equivalent	39,062	22,174	6,668
Volatile Organic Compounds	11.8	4.0	0.9

Section 8: Regional Capacity Projects Proximity Analysis

The Regional Capacity Projects List provides comprehensive information on the transportation projects included in the RTP planned for implementation through 2050. Specific thresholds are used to determine whether an investment is considered a Regional Capacity Project or is captured programmatically in the plan. The draft projects list includes 278 planned investments within the region, covering improvements for all modes of travel.

In order to better understand how these transportation projects may benefit or burden communities, this section evaluates the distribution of the Regional Capacity Projects located within or near EFAs. Of the 278 total projects, 266 could be assigned to a geographic location, while the remaining 12 projects could not be mapped because their scope of work is not tied to a specific location. These tend to be area-wide improvements or projects where the exact site has not yet been determined. While these efforts may provide meaningful benefits to communities, their impacts cannot be localized for this analysis due to insufficient information about their accurate locations.

Projects were further classified by the outcomes they are intended to achieve. Many transportation projects include multiple scope elements and anticipated outcomes. For example, a project adding a vehicle lane might also include sidewalks, a bike lane and signal improvements. Below is the list of scope categories represented in the projects:

- Transit/Ferry Expansion
- Other Transit/Ferry
- Bridge
- General Purpose Lane
- HOV/Bus Lane
- Other Roadway
- Pedestrian/Bicycle
- Interchange/Intersection
- Grade Separation
- ITS/Safety

The geographic location of projects can be viewed through PSRC's RTP Future System Visualization Tool. This interactive map allows projects to be displayed at a range of scales and includes descriptions and cost information for each project, and includes the locations in relation to EFAs addressed in this report.

The analysis summarizes EFA tracts that intersect with or fall within 100 feet of one or more Regional Capacity Projects. For this regional-level assessment, proximity is used as a proxy for potential impact on EFAs. If a project is located near EFA, the analysis assumes the project may serve or affect that community. This approach does not evaluate project- or site-specific impacts—either positive or negative—which are more appropriately addressed during the implementation of individual projects.

The Project Outcomes Distribution in the tables below illustrates how many EFA tracts are located near projects that contain specific types of improvements. As noted earlier, many projects include a combination of multiple project outcomes. As a result, the totals in the distribution are not equivalent to the overall count of 266 mappable projects.

Proximity analysis results for each EFA are presented in the following tables:

Table 127: Regional Capacity Projects Locations Intersected with People of Color EFAs

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Total Number of Tracts	919		417		158	
Number/Percent of Tracts Near Projects	580	63%	291	70%	118	75%
Project Outcomes Distribution						
Transit/Ferry Expansion	298	51%	172	60%	81	69%
Other Transit/Ferry	378	65%	205	71%	92	78%
Bridge	98	17%	97	34%	43	36%
General Purpose Lane	192	33%	105	36%	47	40%
HOV/Bus Lane	279	48%	147	51%	61	52%
Other Roadway	281	48%	138	48%	61	52%
Pedestrian/Bicycle	498	86%	258	90%	112	95%
Interchange/Intersection	396	68%	198	69%	89	75%
Grade Separation	43	7%	28	10%	13	11%
ITS/Safety	200	34%	117	41%	58	49%

Table 128: Regional Capacity Projects Locations Intersected with People with Low Incomes EFAs

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Total Number of Tracts	919		372		137	
Number/Percent of Tracts Near Projects	580	63%	275	74%	109	80%
Project Outcomes						
Transit/Ferry Expansion	298	51%	140	51%	67	61%
Other Transit/Ferry	378	65%	197	72%	87	80%
Bridge	98	17%	43	16%	16	15%
General Purpose Lane	192	33%	93	34%	35	32%
HOV/Bus Lane	279	48%	133	48%	61	56%
Other Roadway	281	48%	133	48%	58	53%
Pedestrian/Bicycle	498	86%	238	87%	95	87%
Interchange/Intersection	396	68%	191	69%	77	71%
Grade Separation	43	7%	18	7%	6	6%
ITS/Safety	200	34%	89	32%	39	36%

Table 129: Regional Capacity Projects Locations Intersected with People with Limited English Proficiency EFAs

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Total Number of Tracts	919		341		154	
Number/Percent of Tracts Near Projects	580	63%	233	68%	108	70%
Project Outcomes						
Transit/Ferry Expansion	298	51%	151	65%	74	69%
Other Transit/Ferry	378	65%	166	71%	80	74%
Bridge	98	17%	57	24%	30	28%
General Purpose Lane	192	33%	94	40%	50	46%

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
HOV/Bus Lane	279	48%	114	49%	52	48%
Other Roadway	281	48%	96	41%	42	39%
Pedestrian/Bicycle	498	86%	213	91%	101	94%
Interchange/Intersection	396	68%	154	66%	69	64%
Grade Separation	43	7%	28	12%	12	11%
ITS/Safety	200	34%	98	42%	50	46%

Table 130: Regional Capacity Projects Locations Intersected with People with Disabilities EFAs

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Total Number of Tracts	919		416		142	
Number/Percent of Tracts Near Projects	580	63%	280	67%	100	70%
Project Outcomes						
Transit/Ferry Expansion	298	51%	136	49%	52	52%
Other Transit/Ferry	378	65%	190	68%	72	72%
Bridge	98	17%	41	15%	11	11%
General Purpose Lane	192	33%	94	34%	31	31%
HOV/Bus Lane	279	48%	120	43%	49	49%
Other Roadway	281	48%	125	45%	45	45%
Pedestrian/Bicycle	498	86%	230	82%	80	80%
Interchange/Intersection	396	68%	199	71%	79	79%
Grade Separation	43	7%	16	6%	7	7%
ITS/Safety	200	34%	73	26%	23	23%

Table 131: Regional Capacity Projects Locations Intersected with Older Adults EFAs

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Total Number of Tracts	919		440		129	
Number/Percent of Tracts Near Projects	580	63%	247	56%	68	53%
Project Outcomes						
Transit/Ferry Expansion	298	51%	120	49%	27	40%
Other Transit/Ferry	378	65%	155	63%	38	56%
Bridge	98	17%	40	16%	12	18%
General Purpose Lane	192	33%	82	33%	22	32%
HOV/Bus Lane	279	48%	108	44%	30	44%
Other Roadway	281	48%	114	46%	37	54%
Pedestrian/Bicycle	498	86%	199	81%	54	79%
Interchange/Intersection	396	68%	170	69%	51	75%
Grade Separation	43	7%	17	7%	4	6%
ITS/Safety	200	34%	74	30%	20	29%

Table 132: Regional Capacity Projects Locations Intersected with Youth EFAs

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Total Number of Tracts	919		436		124	
Number/Percent of Tracts Near Projects	580	63%	224	51%	54	44%
Project Outcomes						
Transit/Ferry Expansion	298	51%	106	47%	22	41%
Other Transit/Ferry	378	65%	123	55%	29	54%
Bridge	98	17%	40	18%	9	17%
General Purpose Lane	192	33%	94	42%	24	44%
HOV/Bus Lane	279	48%	82	37%	17	31%

	Region		Above Regional Average		Significantly Above Regional Average	
Other Roadway	281	48%	64	29%	16	30%
Pedestrian/Bicycle	498	86%	175	78%	42	78%
Interchange/Intersection	396	68%	140	63%	27	50%
Grade Separation	43	7%	19	8%	3	6%
ITS/Safety	200	34%	51	23%	11	20%

Figure 3: Percent EFAs Near Regional Capacity Projects



Key Trends and Findings

Some key highlights for the regional capacity project proximity analysis:

- Across the region, 580 of 919 census tracts (63%) are located near one or more Regional Capacity Projects.
- Four of the six EFAs have higher levels of proximity to Regional Capacity Projects than the region as a whole: people of color, people with low incomes, people with limited English proficiency and people with disabilities.
- Compared to the regional average (63%), a larger share of tracts with significantly high shares of people of color (75%), people with low incomes (80%), people with LEP (70%), and people with disabilities (70%) are in proximity to Regional Capacity Projects.
- Older adults and youth EFAs tend to be located farther from Regional Capacity Projects.

Section 9: Congestion Management Process and Federal Performance Targets

Each Metropolitan Planning Organization the size of PSRC is federally mandated to develop and implement a Congestion Management Process (CMP) consistent with the requirements established in 23 CFR 450.320. FHWA defines the CMP as "a systematic and regionally accepted approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management that meets state and local needs."

In the central Puget Sound region, the CMP is integrated throughout all planning stages rather than conducted as a stand-alone process. PSRC uses an interactive Transportation System Visualization Tool to inform the CMP, by providing users with the ability to view regional performance data according to parameters that are adaptable to other regional corridor and sketch planning efforts. This approach allows regional performance data not only to be considered throughout the PSRC planning process, but also to be integrated into other efforts throughout the region.

Under federal law, Metropolitan Planning Organizations like PSRC are also required to establish regional performance targets related to an array of topic areas. These targets were developed in coordination with WSDOT and the region's transit agencies. Provided below are the most recent targets under each category.

Regional FTA Performance Targets

All transit agencies that receive FTA funds are required to set and report annual performance targets for Transit Asset Management and Safety. The targets are reported to FTA through the National Transit Database and are also required to be sent to state DOTs and MPOs.

PSRC aggregates the individual transit agency targets into regional targets and tracks progress annually. PSRC is also required to include these targets in planning documents such as the Regional Transportation Plan.

Table 133: Regional FTA Transit Asset Management Performance Targets, 2025

Rolling Stock	Maximum % that will exceed Useful Life Benchmark
Buses	23.3%
Vans / Mini-Vans	38.9%
Ferries	2.8%

Light Rail Vehicles	0.0%
Commuter Rail Locomotives & Coaches	0.0%
Streetcars	0.0%
Monorail Cars	0.0%
Equipment	**Maximum % that will exceed Useful Life Benchmark**
Non-Revenue Service Vehicles	21.7%
Facilities	**Maximum % that will have a Rating of less than 3 on the Condition Assessment Scale**
Support Facilities	2.9%
Passenger Facilities	3.7%
Parking Facilities	5.3%
Infrastructure	**Maximum % that will have Performance Restrictions**
Fixed Guideways	2.4%
Power Segments	0.0%
Structures	0.0%

Table 134: Regional FTA Transit Safety Performance Targets, 2025

FTA Safety Performance Measure	Fixed Route Bus	Non-Fixed Route Bus	Rail
Fatalities	3	1	0
Fatality Rate	0.004	0.004	0.000
Injuries	265	15	39
Injury Rate	0.39	0.06	0.31
Safety Events	245	12	143
Safety Event Rate	0.36	0.05	1.13
System Reliability (Mean Distance Between Failures)	7,298	17,252	36,534

NOTE: The FTA issued an update to the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans Regulation (49 CFR part 673) in November 2024 to address requirements in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58). When PSRC collected 2025 target data, some transit agencies in the region had already updated their safety plans, and a few were still finalizing their updates. PSRC anticipates regional safety targets for 2026 will include targets for the new measures, as all agencies will have updated PTASPs by that time.

Regional FHWA Performance Targets

State DOTs are required to establish statewide targets at the beginning of each reporting period. MPOs are then required to establish regional performance targets within 180 days after State DOTs set their targets.

PSRC reports regional targets to WSDOT by the appropriate deadlines, and WSDOT then incorporates this information into their own reports submitted to FHWA, per federal guidelines. PSRC is also required to include the latest FHWA targets in planning documents such as the Regional Transportation Plan.

Table 135: Regional FHWA Performance Targets

Regional Bridge Performance Targets	4-year State Targets (2022-2025)
% of bridges (weighted by deck area) classified in poor condition	Less than 10%
% of bridges (weighted by deck area) classified in good condition	More than 30%
Regional Pavement Performance Targets	**4-year State Targets (2022-2025)**
% of interstate pavement in good condition	More than 30%
% of interstate pavement in poor condition	Less than 4%
% of non-interstate NHS pavement in good condition	More than 45%
% of non-interstate NHS pavement in poor condition	Less than 5%
Regional Reliability Targets	**4-year State Targets (2022-2025)**
Interstate Travel Time Reliability	72.5%
Non-Interstate Travel Time Reliability	88.4%
Regional Freight Reliability Targets	**4-year State Target (2022-2025)**
Freight Reliability Index	1.53

Regional Delay Per Person	4-year Target (2022-2025)
Annual Hours of Delay per Capita	28
Regional % of non-SOV Commute Trips	**4-year Target (2022-2025)**
% of non-SOV Commute Trips	36.8
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program	**4-year Target (2022-2025)**
Particulate Matter less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5) (kg/day)	5.31
Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) (kg/day)	84.12
Particulate Matter less than 10 microns (PM10) (kg/day)	447.676
Carbon Monoxide (CO) (kg/day)>	34.928
Regional Safety Performance Targets	**2026 Target**
Number of Fatalities	204.9
Fatality Rate per 100 Million VMT	0.700
Number of Serious Injuries	1014.0
Serious Injury Rate per 100 Million VMT	3.477
Number of Bike/Ped Fatalities and Serious Injuries	285.1