

24<sup>th</sup> EDITION



# STATUS OF THE NATION'S Highways, Bridges, and Transit

Conditions and Performance

Executive Summary



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REPORT TO CONGRESS



24<sup>th</sup> EDITION



# STATUS OF THE NATION'S Highways, Bridges, and Transit

## Conditions and Performance

### Executive Summary



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Highway  
Administration**  
**Federal Transit  
Administration**

REPORT TO CONGRESS

**Recommended Citation:** U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, Executive Summary - Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions & Performance Report to Congress, 24<sup>th</sup> Edition (Washington, DC: 2021). <https://doi.org/10.21949/1521795>.

# Introduction

This document is a summary of the 24th edition of the *Status of the Nation's Highway, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance Report to Congress* (C&P Report). The C&P Report is intended to provide decision makers with an objective appraisal of the physical conditions, operational performance, and financing mechanisms of highways, bridges, and transit systems based on both their current state and their projected future state under a set of alternative future investment scenarios. This report offers a comprehensive, data-driven background context to support the development and evaluation of legislative, program, and budget options at all levels of government. It also serves as a primary source of information for national and international news media, transportation associations, and industry.

This 24th C&P Report is the 50th anniversary edition in the report series. To mark the occasion, Chapter 8 includes a special look back to the findings and projections of the inaugural edition of this report series, the 1968 National Highway Needs Report.

The main body of the report is organized into five major sections and draws primarily on 2016 data. Part I, *Moving a Nation*, contains the core retrospective analyses of the report and includes chapters on infrastructure assets, revenue sources and expenditure patterns, personal travel, mobility and access, safety, and physical conditions.

Part II, *Investing for the Future*, contains the core prospective analyses of the report, including 20-year future capital investment scenarios. Chapters in this section relate a set of selected capital investment scenarios to the current levels of capital investment, provide supplemental analysis comparing the findings of the future investment scenarios to findings in previous reports and discussing scenario implications, discuss how changing some of the underlying technical assumptions would affect the future investment scenarios, and project the potential impacts of additional alternative levels of future capital investment on the future performance of various components of the system.

The highway investment scenarios are developed in part from the Highway Economic Requirements System (HERS), which models highway investment using benefit-cost analysis. The HERS model quantifies user, agency, and societal costs for various types and combinations of capital improvements. HERS considers costs associated with travel time, vehicle operation, safety, routine maintenance, and emissions. Bridge investment scenario estimates are developed from the National Bridge Investment Analysis System (NBIAS) model, which also incorporates benefit-cost analysis principles. The transit investment analysis is based on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM). TERM consolidates older engineering-based evaluation tools and uses benefit-cost analysis to ensure that investment benefits exceed investment costs. TERM identifies the investments needed to replace and rehabilitate existing assets, improve operating performance, and expand transit systems to address the growth in travel demand.

Part III, *Highway Freight Conditions and Performance*, explores issues pertaining specifically to freight movement, including an examination of the conditions and performance of the National Highway Freight Network. Part IV, *Additional Information*, includes chapters that discuss emerging transportation technologies and examine issues relating to rural transportation.

Part V, *Recommendations for HPMS Changes*, provides information on the status and planned direction of the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). The report also contains three technical appendices that describe the investment/performance methodologies used in the report for highways, for bridges, and for transit. A fourth appendix describes an ongoing research effort called *Reimagining the C&P Report in a Performance Management-Based World*. Two additional appendices provide supporting material for the freight analysis presented in Part III.

This page intentionally left blank.

# Highlights


This edition of the C&P Report is based primarily on data through 2016. In assessing recent trends, it generally focuses on the 10-year period from 2006 to 2016. The prospective analyses generally cover the 20-year period from 2016 to 2036; the investment levels associated with these scenarios are stated in constant 2016 dollars. This section presents key findings for the overall report. Key findings for individual chapters are presented in the Executive Summary.

## Highlights: Highways and Bridges

### Extent of the System

- The Nation's road network included 4,157,292 miles of public roadways and 614,387 bridges in 2016. This network carried 3.189 trillion vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and 5.458 trillion person miles traveled, up from 3.034 trillion VMT and up from 4.961 trillion person miles traveled in 2006.
- The 1,026,319 miles of Federal-aid highways (25 percent of total mileage) carried 2.710 trillion VMT (85 percent of total travel) in 2016.
- Although the 222,331 miles on the National Highway System (NHS) comprise only 5 percent of total mileage, the NHS carried 1.749 trillion VMT in 2016, approximately 55 percent of total travel.
- The 48,474 miles on the Interstate System carried 0.811 trillion VMT in 2016, slightly more than 1 percent of total mileage and close to 25 percent of total VMT. The Interstate System has grown since 2006, when it consisted of 46,836 miles that carried 0.727 trillion VMT.

## 2016 Highway System Statistics



The Interstate System accounts for **1%** of road mileage, but carries **25%** of highway travel.



## Highway Funding – 2016


- All levels of government spent a combined \$223.2 billion for highway-related purposes in 2016. More than half (50.6 percent) of total highway spending (\$112.9 billion) was for capital improvements to highways and bridges; the remainder included expenditures for physical maintenance, highway and traffic services, administration, highway safety, bond interest, and bond retirement.
- Of the \$112.9 billion spent on highway capital improvements in 2016, \$26.4 billion (23 percent) was spent on the Interstate System, \$59.2 billion (52 percent) was spent on the NHS, and \$84.1 billion (74 percent) was spent on Federal-aid highways (including the NHS).

### Highway System Terminology

“Federal-aid highways” are roads that generally are eligible for Federal funding assistance under current law. (Note that certain Federal programs do allow the use of Federal funds on other roadways.)

The NHS includes those roads that are most important to Interstate travel, economic expansion, and national defense. It includes the entire Interstate System. The NHS was expanded under the Moving Ahead for

## 2016 Highway Revenues and Expenditures



- Revenues raised for use on highways, by all levels of government combined, totaled \$272.1 billion in 2016. The \$49.0 billion difference between highway revenues and highway expenditures (\$223.2 billion) identified as “funds placed in reserves” represents the net increase during 2016 of the cash balances of the Federal Highway Trust Fund and comparable dedicated accounts at the State and local level. This single-year increase in cash balances is by far the largest ever recorded, and is due entirely to a \$51.9 billion one-time transfer of general funds to the Federal Highway Trust Fund required under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act).



- Of the total \$272.1 billion of revenues raised in 2016 for use on highways, \$117.7 billion (43 percent) was collected from various forms of user charges, including fuel taxes (\$65.5 billion), tolls (\$14.5 billion), and vehicle taxes and fees (\$37.7 billion).
- During 2016, \$154.5 billion was raised from nonuser sources for use on highways, including general fund appropriations (\$82.8 billion), bond issue proceeds (\$20.7 billion), investment income and other receipts (\$18.8 billion), property taxes (\$12.7 billion), and other taxes and fees (\$19.4 billion). The amount of general funds directed toward highway purposes in 2016 was nearly double the highest amount recorded in any previous year due to a \$51.9-billion transfer of general funds to the Federal Highway Trust Fund in 2016.

## Highway Spending Trends

- In nominal dollar terms, highway spending increased by 36.5 percent (3.2 percent per year) from 2006 to 2016; after adjusting for inflation this equates to a 20.0-percent increase (1.8 percent per year).
- Highway capital expenditures rose from \$80.2 billion in 2006 to \$112.9 billion in 2016, a 40.7-percent increase (3.5 percent per year) in nominal dollar terms; after adjusting for inflation this equates to a 30.1-percent (2.7 percent per year) increase.
- The portion of total highway capital spending funded by the Federal government decreased from 43.1 percent in 2006 to 39.7 percent in 2016. Federally funded highway capital outlay grew by 2.6 percent per year over this period, compared with a 4.1-percent annual increase in capital spending funded by State and local governments.
- The composition of highway capital spending shifted during the 2006–2016 period. The percentage of highway capital spending directed toward system rehabilitation rose from 51.5 percent in 2006 to 62.0 percent in 2016. Over the same period, the percentage of spending directed toward system enhancement rose from 10.6 percent to 13.6 percent, whereas the percentage of spending directed toward system expansion fell from 37.9 percent to 24.4 percent.

### Constant-dollar Conversions for Highway Expenditures

This report uses the Federal Highway Administration’s National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI) 2.0 for inflation adjustments to highway capital expenditures, and the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for adjustments to other types of highway expenditures.

### Highway Capital Spending Terminology

This report splits highway capital spending into three broad categories. “System rehabilitation” includes resurfacing, rehabilitation, or reconstruction of existing highway lanes and bridges. “System expansion” includes the construction of new highways and bridges and the addition of lanes to existing highways. “System enhancement” includes safety enhancements, traffic operation improvements such as the installation of intelligent transportation systems, environmental enhancements, and other enhancements such as construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

## Conditions and Performance of the System

### Bridge Conditions Have Improved

- Based directly on bridge counts the share of bridges classified as poor has improved, dropping from 10.4 percent in 2006 to 7.9 percent in 2016. The share of NHS bridges classified as poor also improved over this period, dropping from 5.4 percent to 3.5 percent. (More recent data show that from 2017 to 2020, the number of bridges in poor condition decreased by 5 percent, from 47,619 to 45,031.)
- Weighted by deck area the share of bridges classified as poor also improved, declining from 9.0 percent in 2006 to 5.9 percent in 2016. The deck area-weighted share of poor NHS bridges dropped from 8.3 percent to 5.2 percent over this period.
- The decline over the past decade in the percentage of bridges classified as poor was accompanied by an increase in the share of bridges classified as good. Weighted by deck area, the share of bridges classified as good improved slightly, increasing from 46.1 percent in 2006 to 46.5 percent in 2016. The deck area-weighted share of good NHS bridges improved from 43.9 percent to 44.5 percent over this period.

#### Bridge Condition Terminology

Bridges are given an overall rating of “good” if the deck, substructure, and superstructure are all found to be in good condition.

Bridges receive a rating of “poor” if any of these three bridge components is found to be in poor condition. All other bridges are classified as “fair.”

These classifications are often weighted by bridge deck area, recognizing that bridges are not all the same size and, in general, larger bridges are costlier to rehabilitate or replace to address deficiencies. The classifications are also sometimes weighted by annual daily traffic because more heavily traveled bridges have a greater effect on total highway user costs.

The classification of a bridge as poor does not mean it is unsafe; bridges that are considered to be unsafe are closed to traffic.

### Highway Safety Improved Overall, but Pedestrian and Bicyclist Fatalities Rose

- The annual number of highway fatalities decreased by 12.3 percent from 2006 to 2016, dropping from 42,708 to 37,461. However, fatalities increased after 2014, by 8.4 percent from 2014 to 2015, and by 5.6 percent from 2015 to 2016. (More recent data show a 3.3-percent decrease in fatalities between 2016 and 2018).
- From 2006 to 2016 the number of nonmotorists (pedestrians, bicyclists, etc.) killed by motor vehicles increased by 22.6 percent, from 5,722 to 7,013 (18.7 percent of all fatalities). From 2006 to 2009 nonmotorist fatalities showed a steady decline of 15.0 percent, but beginning in 2009 that trend began to shift and resulted in a 44.2-percent increase up to 2016. (More recent data show that from 2017 to 2018, fatalities involving pedestrians increased by 3.4 percent and bicyclist fatalities increased by 6.3 percent.)
- Fatalities related to roadway departure decreased by 20.2 percent from 2006 to 2016, but roadway departure remains a factor in close to half (48.3 percent) of all highway fatalities. Intersection-related fatalities remained virtually flat from 2006 to 2016, but more than one-fourth (27.4 percent) of highway fatalities in 2016 occurred at intersections. (More recent data show that roadway departure and intersection fatalities accounted for 51 percent and 27 percent, respectively, of total fatalities.)
- The fatality rate per 100 million VMT declined from 1.42 in 2006 to 1.18 in 2016, but has increased since reaching a low of 1.08 in 2014. (More recent data show that the fatality rate per 100 million VMT declined to 1.13 in 2018.)

# 2006–2016 Highway System Trends



Poor ride quality data are affected by changes in reporting instructions beginning in 2010.

## Pavement Condition Trends Have Been Mixed

- In general, pavement condition trends over the past decade have been better on the NHS (the 5 percent of total system mileage that carries 55 percent of total system VMT) than on Federal-aid highways (the 25 percent of system mileage that carries 85 percent of total system VMT, including the NHS).
- The share of Federal-aid highway VMT on pavements with “good” ride quality rose from 47.0 percent in 2006 to 48.9 percent in 2016. Over this same period, the trend based on highway mileage was different, with the share of mileage that had good ride quality declining from 41.5 percent to 40.2 percent and the lane mile-weighted share declining from 41.1 percent to 38.2 percent. This divergence may be due to States focusing improvements on those roads that are most heavily traveled.

### Pavement Condition Terminology

This report uses the International Roughness Index (IRI) as a proxy for overall pavement condition. Pavements with an IRI value of less than 95 inches per mile are considered to have “good” ride quality. Pavements with an IRI value greater than 170 inches per mile are considered to have “poor” ride quality. Pavements that fall between these two ranges are considered “fair.”

- The share of Federal-aid highway pavements with “poor” ride quality rose during the 2006–2016 period, as measured on both a VMT-weighted basis (rising from 14.0 percent to 17.1 percent) and a mileage basis (rising from 15.8 percent to 22.0 percent). However, weighted by lane miles, the share of pavements with poor ride quality decreased from 19.9 to 17.4 over this period.
- The share of VMT on NHS pavements with good ride quality rose from 57.0 percent in 2006 to 59.6 percent in 2016. This gain is especially impressive considering MAP-21 expanded the NHS by 60,292 miles (37 percent), as pavement conditions on the additions to the NHS were not as good as those on the pre-expansion NHS. The share rose from 57.0 percent in 2006 to 60 percent in 2010 based on the pre-expansion NHS, and from an estimated 54.7 percent in 2010 to 59.6 percent in 2016 based on the post-expansion NHS.
- The share of VMT on NHS pavements with poor ride quality stayed the same at 7 percent from 2006 to 2010; since the expansion of the NHS under MAP-21 this share has remained relatively constant at approximately 11 percent.

### Pavement Data Reporting Change

A change in data reporting instructions beginning in 2010 led States to split roadways into shorter segments for purposes of evaluating pavement conditions. This more refined approach captured more of the variation in pavement conditions, which tended to increase the share of sections considered “good” or “poor” and to reduce the share considered “fair.” For example, the share of mileage rated “poor” rose from 15.8 percent in 2008 to 20.0 percent in 2010.

### Operational Performance Has Worsened

- Based on the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS), the Travel Time Index (TTI) for Interstate highways averaged 1.34 in 2016 in the Nation’s 52 largest metropolitan areas. This means that the average peak-period trip took 34 percent longer than did the same trip under free-flow traffic conditions. The comparable TTI value for 2012 was 1.24.
- For the same 52 metropolitan areas, the Planning Time Index (PTI) averaged 2.49 for Interstate highways in 2016, meaning that ensuring on-time arrival 95 percent of the time required planning for 2.49 times the travel time under free-flow traffic conditions. The comparable PTI value for 2012 was 2.17. On average, urban Interstate highways in these areas were congested for 4.4 hours per day in 2016, up from 3.6 hours in 2012.
- The Texas Transportation Institute 2019 Urban Mobility Report estimates that the average commuter in 494 urbanized areas experienced a total of 53 hours of delay resulting from congestion in 2016, up from 43 hours in 2006. Total delay reached 8.6 billion hours and fuel waste reached 3.3 billion gallons in 2016, leading to a total cost of \$171

### Operational Performance Terminology

The TTI measures the average intensity of congestion, calculated as the ratio of the peak-period travel time to the free-flow travel time for the peak period on weekdays. The value of the TTI is always greater than or equal to 1, with a higher value indicating more severe congestion. For example, a value of 1.30 indicates that a 60-minute trip on a road that is not congested would typically take 78 minutes (30 percent longer) during the period of peak congestion.

The PTI measures travel time reliability and the severity of delay, defined as the ratio of the 95th percentile of travel time during the peak periods to the free-flow travel time. For example, a PTI of 1.60 means that, for a trip that takes 60 minutes in light traffic, a traveler should budget a total of 96 (60 × 1.60) minutes to ensure on-time arrival for 19 out of 20 trips (95 percent of the trips).

billion. (More recent data show that in 2017, these commuters experienced an estimated average of 54 hours of congestion delay.)

## Future Capital Investment Scenarios

The scenarios that follow pertain to spending by all levels of government combined for the 20-year period from 2016 to 2036 (reflecting the impacts of spending from 2017 through 2036); the funding levels associated with these analyses are stated in constant 2016 dollars. The results discussed in this section apply to the overall road system; separate analyses for the Interstate System, the NHS, and Federal-aid highways are presented in the body of this report.

### Improve Conditions and Performance Scenario

- The Improve Conditions and Performance scenario seeks to identify the level of capital investment needed to address all potential investments estimated to be cost-beneficial. The average annual level of systemwide capital investment associated with this scenario is \$165.9 billion, 55.2 percent higher than the level of the Sustain Recent Spending scenario.
- Approximately 30.5 percent of the capital investment under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario would go toward addressing an existing backlog of cost-beneficial investments of \$1.01 trillion. The rest would address new needs arising from 2017 through 2036. The backlog includes \$556 billion related to the pavement component of system rehabilitation investments, \$132 billion related to the bridge component of system rehabilitation investments, \$181 billion related to system expansion, and \$143 billion related to system enhancement.
- The State of Good Repair benchmark represents the subset of the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario spending level that is directed toward addressing deficiencies in the physical condition of existing highway and bridge assets. The average annual investment level associated with this benchmark is \$104.7 billion, 63.1 percent of the \$165.9 billion cost of the overall scenario.
- The Improve Conditions and Performance scenario also includes average annual spending of \$37.8 billion (22.8 percent) directed toward system expansion, and \$23.5 billion (14.1 percent) directed toward system enhancement.

### Highway Investment/ Performance Analyses

To provide an estimate of the costs that might be required to maintain or improve system performance, this report includes a series of investment/performance analyses that examine the potential impacts of alternative levels of future combined investment by all levels of government on highways and bridges for different subsets of the overall system.

Drawing on these investment/performance analyses, a series of illustrative scenarios was selected for more detailed exploration and presentation.

The Sustain Recent Spending scenario and the Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario each assume a fixed level of highway capital spending in each year in constant-dollar terms (i.e., spending keeps pace with inflation each year). These scenarios also assume that spending would be directed toward projects with the largest benefit-cost ratios.

Spending under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario varies by year, depending on the set of potential cost-beneficial investments available at that time. Because an existing backlog of cost-beneficial investments has not previously been addressed, investment under this scenario is frontloaded, with higher levels of investment in the early years of the analysis and lower levels in the latter years.




- Under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario, average pavement roughness on Federal-aid highways is projected to improve by 16.4 percent. The share of bridges classified as poor is also projected to improve, declining from 6.0 percent in 2016 to 0.7 percent in 2036. This scenario would not eliminate all poor pavements and bridges because in some cases it only becomes cost-beneficial to improve assets after they have declined into poor condition, and in others it is cost-beneficial to proactively improve assets before they become poor. Therefore, at the end of any given year, some portion of the pavement and bridge population would remain in poor condition.

### Scenario Impacts on Delay

Congestion-related delay is projected to decrease sharply under all three of the highway scenarios presented in this report. For example, average delay per VMT is projected to improve by 24.8 percent over 20 years under the Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario.

These results can be explained in part by assumptions regarding a slowdown in future travel growth and the future adoption rate for various highway management and operational strategies. However, it also appears that there are issues with the State-supplied data for some highway sections that are skewing upward the national-level estimates of base-year delay. This issue will be addressed in future editions of this report.

## 2016–2036 Future Highway Capital Investment Scenarios



Billions of 2016 dollars. Includes all public and private investment.

### Modeled vs. Nonmodeled Investment

Each highway investment scenario includes projections for system conditions and performance based on simulations using the Highway Economic Requirements System (HERS) and the National Bridge Investment Analysis System (NBIAS). Each scenario scales up the total amount of simulated investment to account for capital improvements that are outside the scopes of the models, or for which no data are available to analyze. Of recent (2012 to 2016) average annual capital spending on all U.S. roads, 14.1 percent was used for system enhancements (safety enhancements, traffic control facilities, and environmental enhancements) that neither model analyzes directly. An additional 15.5 percent was used for pavement and capacity improvements on non-Federal-aid highways; FHWA does not collect the detailed information for such roadways that would be necessary to support analysis using HERS. (FHWA does collect sufficient data for all of the Nation's bridges to support analysis using NBIAS.)

Combining these two percentages yields a total of approximately 29.6 percent; each scenario for the overall road system was scaled up so that nonmodeled investment would comprise this share of its total investment level. For example, of the \$165.9 billion average annual investment level under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario, \$49.2 billion represents nonmodeled investment.

### Sustain Recent Spending Scenario

- The Sustain Recent Spending scenario assumes that capital spending by all levels of government is sustained through 2036 at the average annual level from 2012 to 2016 (\$106.9 billion), and that all spending supports only cost-beneficial projects. Under these assumptions, average pavement roughness on Federal-aid highways would be projected to improve (i.e., be reduced) by 3.2 percent, and the share of bridges classified as poor would also be projected to improve, declining from 6.0 percent in 2016 to 4.5 percent in 2036.

### Maintain Conditions and Performance Scenario

- The Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario seeks to identify a level of capital investment at which, if only cost-beneficial projects are chosen, selected measures of future conditions and performance in 2036 are maintained at 2016 levels. The average annual level of investment associated with this scenario is \$98.0 billion, 8.3 percent lower than the level of the Sustain Recent Spending scenario.

### Changes in Improve Scenario and Backlog Estimates

The average annual investment level for the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario increased from \$135.7 billion (in 2014 dollars) in the 23rd C&P to \$165.9 billion (in 2016 dollars) between the 23rd and 24th C&P reports. (The subset of this scenario that represents the existing investment backlog similarly increased from \$786.4 billion to \$1.01 trillion.)

As explained in the "Comparison with the 23rd C&P Report" section in Chapter 8, the estimates in the 23rd C&P were likely an underestimate, mostly because the data available for processing in HERS were less comprehensive, causing some existing deficiencies to go undetected, but also because of other factors such as improved HERS analysis procedures.



- Under this scenario, \$60.9 billion per year would be directed to system rehabilitation, \$23.2 billion to system expansion, and \$13.9 billion to system enhancement. Average pavement roughness on Federal-aid highways and the share of bridges classified as poor in 2036 would match their 2016 levels.

## Highlights: Transit


### Operating and Capital Funds

- All levels of government spent a combined \$66.9 billion to provide public transportation and to maintain and expand transit infrastructure in 2016.
- Operating funding totaled \$48.7 billion in 2016, a 36.8-percent increase from 2006. Of this total, 36.8 percent was system-generated revenue, of which most came from passenger fares. Federal funding comprised 7.2 percent of revenues for operations; the remaining funds (54.0 percent) came from State and local sources.
- Capital funding totaled \$18.2 billion in 2016, a 29.7-percent increase from 2006. Federal funding made up 42.3 percent of revenues for capital spending. Remaining funds from the Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided another 1.1 percent, and the rest (56.6 percent) came from State and local sources.
- In 2016, \$14.4 billion, or 72.4 percent of total transit capital expenditures, was invested in rail modes and \$5.3 billion, or 27.1 percent, was invested in non-rail modes. Guideway investments, including at-grade rail, elevated structures, tunnels, bridges, track, and power systems, totaled \$7.7 billion or 53.7 percent of the total capital expenditure in 2016. Investments in vehicles, stations, and maintenance facilities totaled \$8.5 billion.
- Between 2006 and 2016, public funding for transit increased at an average annual rate of 2.7 percent, Federal funding increased at an average annual rate of 1.7 percent, and State and local funding increased at an average annual rate of 3.1 percent after adjusting for inflation (constant dollars).
- Farebox recovery ratios, representing the share of operating expenses that come from passenger fares, were about 31.7 percent for the top 10 transit agencies. The 2016 average recovery ratio reflects a total 5.8-percent decrease and an average annual 0.6-percent decrease since 2006.

### Transit Agencies, Service Supply, and Ridership

- Of the 2,270 transit systems in the United States that report to FTA's National Transit Database (NTD), 949 provided service primarily to urbanized areas and 1,321 provided service primarily to rural areas in 2016.
- Transit ridership was 10.1 billion unlinked passenger trips on 4.3 billion vehicle revenue miles (VRM) supplied in 2016.

# 2016 Transit System Extent and Spending



## Service Supply and Consumption by Mode






- Urban and rural agencies operated 1,138 bus systems (including regular local bus service, commuter service, trolleybus, bus rapid transit, and the Puerto Rico público) and 1,894 demand-response systems. There were also 15 heavy rail systems, 23 light rail systems, 18 streetcar systems, 27 commuter rail systems, and six hybrid rail systems that mixed the characteristics of light rail and commuter rail. Also, there were 13 smaller rail systems including monorail, automated guideway, inclined planes, aerial tramways, and the San Francisco Cable Car, along with 104 transit vanpool systems and 30 ferryboat systems.
- Fixed-route bus is the most common mode of public transportation in the United States. It accounts for nearly 50 percent of all vehicle revenue miles and unlinked passenger trips, and is provided by transit agencies of all sizes in virtually all urbanized areas and in many rural areas of the country.
- Heavy rail, by contrast, is provided solely in the largest, most densely populated areas of the country by 15 agencies in cities such as New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Miami, and others. Heavy rail accounts for 38 percent of all public transportation trips, but only 16 percent of all miles and hours of service.
- Light rail (including streetcars), like heavy rail, exhibits a relatively higher share of passenger trips than vehicle revenue miles but accounts for a smaller share of the overall transit market. Of all modes, light rail has increased the most in the last 10 years; the number of agencies operating light rail grew from 28 in 2006 to 39 in 2016 (39 percent).

- Commuter rail, like light rail, has also expanded significantly as suburban areas have continued to grow in population. Commuter rail trips have a small share of total transit passenger trips but have long average passenger trip lengths (APTL) of approximately 30 miles.
- The demand-response mode specifically targets the needs of persons with disabilities and persons in special conditions; its provision is required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. A large share of the demand-response market consists of people living below the poverty level and who lack other options for transportation. Demand-response service usually generates large operating deficits and requires higher public subsidies due to both the nature of the service (on-demand, limited capacity, and commonly serving areas of low population density) and to its generally serving a market with transportation needs that often cannot be met by fixed-route transit service.

### **Federal Transit Funding Urban and Rural**

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Funds are apportioned to urbanized areas (UZAs) as defined by the Census Bureau. Each UZA has a designated recipient—a metropolitan planning organization or large transit agency—that sub-allocates FTA funds according to local policy. In small urban and rural areas, FTA apportions funds to the State, which allocates them according to State policy. Indian tribes are apportioned their formula funds directly. Once obligated (i.e., awarded in a grant), all funds then become available on a reimbursement basis and cash payments are disbursed.

# Transit Service Supplied and Consumed

	No. of Transit Systems	% of Vehicle Revenue Miles (Supply)	% of Unlinked Passenger Trips (Consumption)
 <b>Fixed-route Bus Systems</b>	1,659	47.0%	48.5%
 <b>Heavy Rail Systems</b>	15	15.7%	37.6%
 <b>Light Rail Systems</b> (includes street cars)	45	2.7%	5.4%
 <b>Commuter Rail Systems</b>	29	8.0%	4.9%
 <b>Demand-response Systems</b> (includes taxi cabs)	2,240	20.1%	1.1%
<b>Other Systems (Rail)</b>	19	0.2%	0.4%
<b>Other Systems (Nonrail)</b>	167	6.3%	2.2%

- Fixed-route Bus Systems includes local service bus, commuter bus, and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Other Systems (Rail) includes inclined plane, cable car, hybrid rail, automated guideway/monorail
- Other Systems (Nonrail) includes vanpools, tramway, jitney, públicos, trolleybus, ferryboat

## Fatalities, VRM, Cost, and Average Fleet Age

- Transit fatalities rose from 220 in 2006 to 354 in 2016, an increase of 61 percent. This sharp increase was driven mainly by an increased rate of suicides. In 2006, suicides accounted for 7 percent of all fatalities; in 2016, the share was 31 percent.
- Two measures of service supplied by transit agencies are vehicle revenue miles (VRM) and fleet (vehicles available for maximum service). Light rail and commuter rail had the largest number of new systems installed between 2006 and 2016 relative to all modes. From a fleet perspective, commuter rail and light rail increased at an average rate lower than that of VRM. This is explained by the fact that a marginal increase of one passenger car results in a higher marginal increase in VRM.

## Some Aspects of System Performance Have Improved

- Between 2006 and 2016, the service offered by transit agencies grew substantially. The annual rate of growth in VRM ranged from 0.2 percent per year for heavy rail to 7.9 percent per year for light rail. This has resulted in 42 percent more route miles available to the public.
- In 2016, agencies reported 212,668 transit vehicles serving urban and rural areas, 3,449 rail passenger stations, and 2,424 maintenance facilities. Rail systems operated on 13,094 miles of track and fixed-route buses operated on over 233,000 mixed traffic route miles.
- Rail systems are more cost-efficient in providing service than are nonrail systems, once investment in rail infrastructure has been completed. (Indeed, this is one of the explicit tradeoffs that agencies consider when deciding whether to construct or expand an urban rail system.) Based on operating costs alone, heavy rail is the most efficient at providing transit service and demand-response systems are the least efficient.

- The average age and condition of the Nation's bus fleet remained unchanged between 2006 and 2016; however, the percentage of vehicles below the replacement threshold increased from 13.2 percent in 2006 to 21.4 percent in 2016.
- Between 2006 and 2016, the number of annual service miles per vehicle (vehicle productivity) remained unchanged and the average number of miles between breakdowns (mean distance between failures) increased by 11 percent.
- Growth in service offered was nearly equal to growth in service consumed. Despite steady growth in route miles and revenue miles, average vehicle occupancy levels did not decrease. Passenger Miles Traveled (PMT) grew at a 2.0-percent annual pace, whereas the number of trips grew by 1.6 percent annually. This is significantly faster than the annual growth rate in the U.S. population during this period (0.93 percent), suggesting that transit has been able to attract riders who previously used other modes of travel. Increased availability of transit service has likely been a factor in this outcome.

### Transit Modes

Public transportation is provided by several different types of vehicles that are used in different operational *modes*.

*Fixed-route bus* service uses rubber-tired buses that run on scheduled routes.

*Commuter bus* service is similar, but runs longer distances between stops.

*Bus rapid transit* is high-frequency bus service similar to light rail service.





*Públicos and jitneys* are small owner-operated buses or vans that operate on less-formal schedules along regular routes.

Larger urban areas are often served by one or more varieties of *fixed-guideway* (rail) service. These include:

- ▶ *Heavy rail* (often running in subway tunnels), characterized primarily by third-rail electric power and exclusive dedicated guideway.
- ▶ *Commuter rail*, which often shares track with freight trains and usually uses overhead electric power (but may also use diesel power or third rail); typically found in extended urban areas.
- ▶ *Light rail* systems, which are common in large- and medium-sized urban areas, feature overhead electric power and run on track that is generally or in part on city streets with pedestrian and automobile traffic.
- ▶ *Streetcars* are small light rail systems, usually with only one or two cars per train that often run in mixed traffic.
- ▶ *Hybrid rail*, previously reported as light rail and commuter rail, is a mode with shared characteristics of these two modes. It has higher average station density (stations per track mileage) than commuter rail and lower station density than light rail; it has a smaller peak-to-base ratio than that of commuter rail.
- ▶ Cable cars, trolley buses, monorail, and automated guideway systems are less common fixed-guideway systems.

*Demand-response* transit service is usually provided by vans, taxicabs, or small buses that are dispatched to pick up passengers on request. This mode is mostly used to provide *paratransit* service as required by the ADA, but in some cases is used to provide service to the general public in low ridership areas or at off-peak service times. These vehicles do not follow a fixed schedule or route.

# 2006–2016 Transit Trends in Urban Area





## Future Transit Capital Investment Scenarios and the State of Good Repair Benchmark

As in the highway discussion, the transit investment scenarios discussed in this section pertain to spending by all levels of government combined for the 20-year period from 2016 to 2036; the funding levels associated with all of these analyses are stated in constant 2016 dollars. Unlike the highway scenarios, these transit scenarios assume an immediate jump to a higher (or lower) investment level that is maintained in constant-dollar terms throughout the analysis period.

Included in this section for comparison purposes is an assessment of the investment level needed to replace all assets that are currently past their useful life or that will reach that state over the forecast period. This level of investment would be necessary to achieve and maintain a state of good repair (SGR), but would not address any increases in demand during that period. Although not a realistic scenario, it provides a benchmark for infrastructure preservation. All other capital investment scenarios are subjected to cost-benefit constraints.

### State of Good Repair – Expansion vs. Preservation

State of Good Repair (SGR) is defined in this report as all transit capital assets being within their average service life. This is a general construct that allows FTA to estimate *system preservation* needs. The analysis looks at the age of all transit assets and adds the value of those that are past the age at which that type of asset is usually replaced to a total reinvestment needs estimate. Some assets may continue to provide reliable service well past the average replacement age and others will not; over the large number of assets nationally, the differences average out. Some assets will need to be replaced, some will just get refurbished. Both types of cost are included in the reinvestment total. SGR is a measure of system preservation needs, and failure to meet these needs results in increased operating costs and poor service.

*Expansion needs* are treated separately in this analysis. They result from the need to add vehicles and route miles to accommodate more riders. Estimates of future demand are, by their nature, speculative. Failure to meet this type of need results in crowded vehicles and represents a lost opportunity to provide the benefits of transit to a wider customer base.


### Sustain Recent Spending Scenario

- The **Sustain Recent Spending** scenario assumes that capital spending by all levels of government is sustained in constant-dollar terms at recent levels (average from 2012–2016) through 2036. Unlike the growth scenarios, which estimate the levels of investment required to meet ridership growth and eliminate the backlog at year 20, the Sustain Recent Spending scenario assumes continued spending at the actual average investment levels for rehabilitation/replacement and expansion during 2012–2016. It then estimates the size of the backlog at year 20 and the ridership level supported by the average recent expansion investment.
- The average recent (2012–2016) capital invested stood at \$18.9 billion, of which \$11.6 billion was devoted to rehabilitation/replacement and \$7.2 billion to expansion. At this level, this scenario results in a backlog of \$102.3 billion in 2036, 3 percent less than the \$105.1 billion in 2016. It is the first time in the last three editions of the C&P Report that the backlog did not grow over the 20-year timeframe.
- The Sustain Recent Spending scenario addresses 61 percent of the required level to eliminate the backlog in 2036.



- It supports a ridership level increase of 4.1 million trips on average per year, which is higher than that of the Low-Growth scenario (3 million per year), but lower than that of the High-Growth (4.5 million per year).

## 2016–2036 Future Transit Capital Investment Scenarios



\*Billions of 2016 Dollars

### Growth Scenarios

The growth scenarios estimate capital investment levels required to meet two primary objectives: (1) eliminate the backlog at year 20 (2036) by investing in preservation and replacement of legacy and new assets past their useful lives subjected to a cost-benefit test, and (2) invest in the acquisition of new assets to meet a forecasted ridership growth based on 15-year historical trends analysis at the UZA and mode levels.

- The **Low-Growth scenario** assumes that transit ridership will grow at an average rate of 3 billion trips per year, corresponding to an average annual rate of 1.28 percent. It also eliminates the backlog of legacy assets, estimated at \$105.1 billion, plus the backlog of new assets past their useful lives. Only new assets with relatively short useful lives, such as buses (12-year average) and smaller vehicles, affect the size of the backlog. The average annualized cost of this scenario is \$23.2 billion, of which \$17.0 billion is to eliminate the backlog in 2036 and \$6.3 billion is for service expansion.
- The Low-Growth scenario requires a level of investment in system expansion of \$6.3 billion, which is less than the recent spending on expansion at \$7.2 billion.

- The **High-Growth scenario** is similar to the Low-Growth scenario but assumes that transit ridership will grow at an average rate of 4.5 billion trips per year, corresponding to an annual rate of 1.82 percent between 2016 and 2036. The annualized cost of this scenario is \$24.7 billion, of which \$17.1 billion is to eliminate the backlog in 2036 and \$7.6 billion is for service expansion.

The small difference in average annual preservation investment between the High-Growth and Low-Growth scenarios (\$100 million per year) is proportional to the actual difference in ridership growth forecasted for the two scenarios. A higher rate requires more assets, which require more rehabilitation and replacement investment.

### State of Good Repair Benchmark

- The State of Good Repair (SGR) benchmark estimates, on an unconstrained basis, the annual investment in preservation of existing assets at year 1 (2016) that are required to eliminate the backlog in year 20 (2036). FTA estimates that \$18.1 billion annually will reduce the backlog of \$105.1 billion to zero in 2036.

# Executive Summary

## PART I: Moving a Nation

---

Part I includes six chapters, each of which describes the current system from a different perspective:

- Chapter 1, **System Assets**, describes the existing extent of the highways, bridges, and transit systems.
- Chapter 2, **Funding**, provides data on the revenue collected and expended by different levels of governments and transit operators to fund transportation construction and operations.
- Chapter 3, **Travel Behavior**, explores the 2017 National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), including data on internet-based and phone-based mobility solutions.
- Chapter 4, **Mobility and Access**, covers highway congestion and reliability in the Nation's urban areas. The transit section explores ridership, average speed, vehicle utilization, and maintenance reliability.
- Chapter 5, **Safety**, presents statistics on highway safety performance, focusing on the most common roadway factors that contribute to fatalities and injuries. The transit section summarizes safety and security data by mode and type of transit service.
- Chapter 6, **Infrastructure Conditions**, presents data on the current physical conditions of the Nation's highways, bridges, and transit assets.

### Transportation Performance Management

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) defines Transportation Performance Management (TPM) as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decisions that contribute to national performance goals. FHWA has finalized six related rulemakings to implement the TPM framework established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st

Century (MAP-21) Act and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act:

- Statewide and Metropolitan / Nonmetropolitan Planning Rule (implements a performance-based planning process at the State and metropolitan levels; defines coordination in the selection of targets, linking planning and programming to performance targets).
- Safety Performance Measures Rule (PM-1) (establishes five safety performance measures to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, a process to assess progress toward meeting safety targets, and a national definition for reporting serious injuries).
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Rule (integrates performance measures, targets, and reporting requirements into the HSIP).
- Pavement and Bridge Performance Measures Rule (PM-2) (defines pavement and bridge condition performance measures, along with target establishment, progress assessment, and reporting requirements).
- Asset Management Plan Rule (defines the contents and development process for an asset management plan; also defines minimum standards for pavement and bridge management systems).
- System Performance Measures Rule (PM-3) (defines performance measures to assess performance of the Interstate System, non-Interstate National Highway System, freight movement on the Interstate System, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program traffic congestion, and on-road mobile emissions).

All 50 State DOTs, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reported performance data and targets for each of 17 performance measures. These data are available at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/reporting/state/index.cfm>


# CHAPTER 1: System Assets – Highways

Based on data collected from States through the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS), in 2016 local governments owned 79.1 percent of the Nation’s 4,157,292 public road route miles and 75.8 percent of its lane miles (computed as roadway length times number of lanes). However, State-owned roads carried a disproportionate share of the Nation’s travel in motorized vehicles, accounting for 73.6 percent of the 3.189 trillion vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in 2016.

Based on 2016 data collected from States through the National Bridge Inventory (NBI), ownership of bridges is more evenly split, as local governments owned slightly more (49.9 percent) of the Nation’s 614,387 bridges in 2016 than did State governments (48.2 percent). State-owned bridges made up 76.6 percent of the Nation’s bridge deck area, and carried 87.3 percent of total bridge traffic.

Although the Federal government provides significant financial support for the Nation’s highways and bridges, it owns only 3.7 percent of public road route miles and 1.7 percent of bridges.

## Highway and Bridge Ownership by Level of Government, 2016



Sources: HPMS and NBI.

Roadways are categorized by functional classifications, based on the degree to which they provide access relative to the degree to which they provide mobility. Arterials serve the longest distances with the fewest access points. Roads classified as local (which are not all owned by local governments) are greatest in number and provide the most

access to adjacent land. Collectors funnel traffic from local roads to arterials.

Nearly half the Nation’s route mileage was classified as rural local in 2016, part of the 70.7 percent of route mileage located in rural areas. Almost one-third of the Nation’s bridges were classified as rural local.

## Highway Mileage and Bridges, by Functional System, 2016

Functional System	Route Miles	Bridges
<b>Rural Areas (less than 5,000 in population)</b>		
Interstate	0.7%	4.1%
Other Principal Arterial	2.3%	6.1%
Minor Arterial	3.2%	6.2%
Collector	16.1%	22.8%
Local	48.4%	33.1%
<b>Subtotal Rural Areas</b>	<b>70.7%</b>	<b>72.2%</b>
<b>Urban Areas (5,000 or more in population)</b>		
Interstate	0.5%	5.2%
Other Principal Arterial	1.9%	8.2%
Minor Arterial	2.7%	5.1%
Collector	3.5%	3.7%
Local	20.7%	5.5%
<b>Subtotal Urban Areas</b>	<b>29.3%</b>	<b>27.8%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: Other Freeway and Expressway is shown within Other Principal Arterial. Collector includes Major Collector and Minor Collector.

Source: HPMS and NBI.

In general, the 1,026,319 route miles of public roads that were functionally classified as arterials, urban collectors, or rural major collectors in 2016 are eligible for Federal-aid highway funding (and are described as “Federal-aid highways”).

MAP-21 expanded the National Highway System (NHS) to include almost all principal arterials; the NHS also includes collector and local mileage that connects principal arterials to other transportation modes and defense installations. The total length of the NHS was 222,331 miles in 2016, including 48,474 miles on the Interstate Highway System. State highway agencies own 89.2 percent of the NHS and 94.4 percent of Interstate highways. A combination of local governments and other State agencies own most of the remaining NHS mileage.

# CHAPTER 1: System Assets – Transit

Most transit systems in the United States report to the National Transit Database (NTD). In 2016, 949 systems served 486 urbanized areas that have populations greater than 50,000. In rural areas, about 1,301 systems were operating, of which 718 were located in urban clusters (urban areas with population of less than 50,000 and over 2,500), 395 were located in Census-designated rural areas, and the remaining 188 were tribes and agencies that could not be geocoded.

**Modes.** Transit is provided through 18 distinct modes in two major categories: rail and nonrail. Rail modes include heavy rail, light rail, streetcar, commuter rail, and other less common modes that run on fixed tracks, such as hybrid rail, inclined plane, monorail, and cable car. Nonrail modes include bus, trolleybus, commuter bus, bus rapid transit, demand response, vanpools, other less common rubber-tire modes such as jitney and público, ferryboats, and aerial tramways.


**Urbanized Areas, Population Density, and Demand.** Based on the 2010 census, the average population density of the United States is 82.4 people per square mile. The average population density of all 497 urbanized areas combined is 2,548 people per square mile. The exhibit shows the relationship between ridership and urbanized area density for the top 50 areas in 2016. Areas with higher population density are able to attract more discretionary transit riders.

**Organizational Structure of Urban and Rural Agencies.** Approximately 50 percent of transit agencies in the United States are transportation units or departments of cities, counties, and local government units. Independent public authorities or agencies account for 21 percent; 19 percent are private operators and the remaining 9 percent are other organizational structures such as State governments, area agencies on aging, municipal planning organizations, planning agencies, Tribes, and universities.

## National Transit Assets

- Of the 212,668 vehicles in urban and rural areas, 191,064 are nonrail vehicles (buses, demand response, and vanpool), whereas 21,604 rail vehicles are rail passenger cars.
- Demand response is the most common mode in rural areas, with over 79 percent of the 21,331 vehicles in the rural fleet.
- Rail systems operate on 13,094 miles of track and bus systems operate over 233,000 directional route miles.
- Urban and rural areas have 3,449 stations and 2,424 maintenance facilities, of which 70 are heavy facilities.

## Urbanized Area Density vs. Ridership, 2016 (Top 50 Areas in Population)




Source: U.S. Census and National Transit Database.

**ADA Compliance.** The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) ensures equal opportunity and access for persons with disabilities. The ADA requires transit agencies to provide accessible vehicles (e.g., with lifts) and accessibility enhancements to key rail stations, such as barriers on platforms, ramps, elevators, and other elements. Nearly 95 percent of vehicles are ADA-compliant. Most key rail stations are compliant, but many non-key rail stations are not fully accessible.

## CHAPTER 2: Funding – Highways

Total expenditures for highways and bridges by all levels of government combined reached \$223.2 billion in 2016. Slightly more than half of that amount (50.6 percent or \$112.9 billion) was for capital outlays. Noncapital expenditures such as maintenance and traffic services, administration, and highway patrol and safety totaled \$95.9 billion (43.0 percent) and another \$14.3 billion (6.4 percent) was used for bond retirement.

### Highway Expenditures by Type, 2016



Source: FHWA Bulletin: Highway Funding 2013–2016.

Of the \$112.9 billion in capital outlays, \$70.0 billion was used for system rehabilitation, \$27.6 billion for system expansion, and \$15.3 billion for system enhancement.

All levels of government raised a combined \$272.1 billion for highways and bridges in 2016, of which \$49.0 billion was put in reserves for future use.


State governments raised \$122.4 billion for highways in 2016, and directly spent \$144.6 billion on highways. Local governments raised \$60.1 billion for highways and directly spent \$75.6 billion.

The Federal government raised \$89.6 billion for highways in 2016, including a one-time transfer of \$51.9 billion from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund required under the FAST Act. These revenues supported a large \$42.4 billion increase in the cash balance of the Federal Highway Trust Fund to support highway spending over the duration of the FAST Act; the Federal government funded \$47.2 billion of highway expenditures in 2016.

Most of this (\$44.2 billion) took the form of transfers to State and local governments; direct spending by Federal agencies on roads and bridges totaled \$3.0 billion in 2016.

Although federally funded highway capital outlay grew nominally from 2006 to 2016, the federally funded share of highway capital decreased from 43.1 percent to 39.7 percent, as capital outlay funded by non-Federal sources grew even faster.

### Highway Capital Outlay Funded by Level of Government, 2006–2016



Sources: FHWA Bulletin: Highway Funding 2013–2016, Table HF-10B; Highway Statistics, various years, Table HF-10A.

User charges (tolls, vehicle and fuel taxes) accounted for 43.2 percent (\$117.7 billion of the \$272.1 billion raised). General fund appropriations accounted for another 30.4 percent (\$82.8 billion), bolstered by the large one-time Federal general fund transfer. The rest came from property taxes, other taxes and fees, investment income and other receipts, and bond issue proceeds.

### Alternative Funding Mechanisms

Many jurisdictions are using alternative methods to raise additional transportation funds, including public-private partnerships (P3), value capture techniques, Federal credit assistance, and other debt-financing tools. Of the 74 loans issued through FY 2017 under the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program, 16 were for Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain highway projects where the financing responsibility was given to private partners.




# CHAPTER 2: Funding – Transit

## Funding Sources

In 2016, \$68.4 billion was generated from all sources to fund urban and rural transit. Transit funding comes from public funds that Federal, State, and local governments allocate and from system-generated revenues that transit agencies earn from the provision of transit services. Of the funds generated in 2016, 70 percent came from public sources and 30 percent came from system-generated funds (passenger fares and other system-generated revenue sources). The Federal share was \$12.0 billion (25 percent of total public funding and 17.5 percent of all funding).

Between 2006 and 2016, all sources of public funding for transit increased by 3.6 percent per year. The Federal share remained relatively stable, varying in the range of 17 to 20 percent.

### Funding for Urban Transit by Government Jurisdiction, 2006–2016




Source: NTD.

## Expenditures

In 2016, operating expenses consumed \$48.7 billion of all funding while capital expenditures consumed \$18.2 billion of all funding devoted to transit (\$68.4 billion).

Capital investment consumed \$18.1 billion. The largest share of capital expenditures—39.5 percent (\$7.7 billion)—was used for expansion or rehabilitation of guideway assets.

### Urban Capital Expenditures by Asset Type, 2016




Source: NTD.

## Salaries and Fringe Benefits

From 2006 to 2016, for the top 10 transit agencies, fringe benefits increased at the highest rate of any operating cost category on a per-mile basis. Over this period, the cost of fringe benefits increased at an annual compound average rate of 1.6 percent with a total accumulated increase of 16.8 percent. Fringe benefits can include many components, but the cost of medical insurance is usually a key element. Meanwhile, salaries and wages decreased by nearly 1 percent over the 10-year period.

### Salaries/Wages and Fringe Benefits, Average Cost per Mile, Top 10 Transit Agencies, 2006–2016



Sources: NTD and Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index.




## CHAPTER 3: Travel Behavior

Household travel behavior depends heavily on demographic distribution and geographic location. Many of these characteristics can be found in the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS) data.

The 2017 NHTS also captures information on household technology use. New technologies and internet access have opened the door to a growing number of mobility options for many Americans. The most recent NHTS has revealed the ubiquity of internet use—more than 80 percent of households use the internet on a daily basis and more than 90 percent use it at least a few times a month. Wireless connectivity is more prevalent in urban households with 81 percent of urban and 73 percent of rural households using the internet via smartphone at least a few times a week. Despite these high levels of connectivity, only 9 percent of Americans at or above 16 years old indicated that they hailed a ride with a ridehail smartphone app in the last 30 days.

The share of households reporting having received a delivery from an online purchase in the last 30 days grew from 42.9 percent in 2009 to 54.9 percent in 2017. The share of households with frequent deliveries has increased considerably; households receiving four or more monthly deliveries almost doubled from 12.2 percent in 2009 to 23.8 percent nationally in 2017.

### Online Monthly Purchase Deliveries, 2009–2017



Source: NHTS.


Telework has also seen growth with eligibility increasing from 11 percent in 2001 to 14 percent in 2017. Ineligibility to telework is more pronounced in rural areas where 90 percent of workers are not eligible to work from home compared with their urban counterparts at 85 percent.

### Travel Patterns Associated with Household Characteristics

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) has consistently shown a strong relationship with labor force participation over time. The most recent NHTS data show that an average worker drove 13,733 miles annually, almost double the miles driven by nonworkers at 7,600 miles. Workers travel more regardless of whether it is in a vehicle with almost 60 percent more passenger miles traveled than those of nonworkers in 2017.

Baby boomers are working longer, and they are driving more miles than their cohorts of the past with women moving closer to parity and closing the VMT gap. Although men 65+ drove 56 percent more annual average miles than did their female counterparts in 2017, women have lessened the gap by 21 percentage points from 2009 when men 65+ drove 77 percent more annual average miles than did women 65+.

### Percent Difference in Average Annual VMT Between Male and Female Drivers, by Age




Source: NHTS.

Households with children have higher than average annual household VMT whereas retirees and households with no children have lower than average household VMT. More than 80 percent of households without a car have no children present.

Household minors create many additional drop-off and pick-up trips with school and extracurricular activities, adding more miles to the household log that likely already contains regular work trips.

### 2017 Average Household Annual VMT



Source: NHTS.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. women are waiting longer to have their first child. In 1970, the mean age of a first-time mother was 24.6 years compared with 28 years in 2016. This growing delay in parenthood may also result in pushing back the need for vehicle purchases and higher VMT levels for older age groups.


### Travel Behavior Characteristics

Since 2009, the United States has seen an uptick in both vehicle and nonmotorized trips. Households living in areas with a population density greater than 10,000 people per square mile consistently have higher household person trips across all vehicle ownership levels, likely due to higher average income levels and the larger variety of mobility options.

When NHTS respondents were asked how many walking or bicycling trips taken in the past seven days, the data showed a 7.7 percentage point increase (from 65.4 percent in 2001 to 73.1 percent in 2017) in individuals who took at least one walking trip, and a 5.1 percentage point increase in individuals who took at least one bicycling trip in the 2017 survey compared with the 2001 survey.

The number and type of vehicles in U.S. households vary by region. Pickup trucks and motorcycles are more prevalent in rural areas (28.7 percent vs. 12.1 percent and 4.3 percent vs. 3.0 percent, respectively) whereas automobiles and sport utility vehicles (SUV) are more common in urban areas (53.5 percent vs. 36.2 percent and 24.1 percent vs. 22.1 percent, respectively).

### 2017 Vehicle Types, Rural vs. Urban



Source: NHTS.

The total mileage-weighted average vehicle occupancy is 1.67. This varies by mode with vans at the top at 2.44 and motorcycles and pickup trucks at the bottom with 1.20 and 1.49, respectively.

The median age of the household vehicle fleet has been growing over the last 40 years. The average U.S. vehicle is almost 4 years older than in 1977 with rural households holding their vehicles longer than urban households. This pattern of vehicle ownership leads to a slower turnover of the U.S. vehicle fleet and delays in the penetration of safety and fuel-efficient technologies.

## CHAPTER 4: Mobility and Access – Highways

The Texas Transportation Institute's 2019 Urban Mobility Study indicates that congestion grew worse from 2006 to 2016. The average delay experienced by an individual commuter rose from 42 hours in 2006 to 53 hours in 2016. Total delay rose from 6.7 billion hours to 8.6 billion hours during this 10-year period, while fuel wasted rose from 3.1 billion gallons to 3.3 billion gallons. Expressed in constant 2017 dollars, the estimated total cost of congestion rose from \$115 billion in 2006 to \$171 billion in 2016.

### NPMRDS

The National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS) is a compilation of vehicle probe-based data in both rural and urban areas on the National Highway System, as well as over 25 key Canadian and Mexican border crossings. It includes observed travel times, date/time, direction, and location for freight, passenger, and other traffic.


Based on the NPMRDS, the Travel Time Index (TTI) was 1.34 in 2016 for Interstate highways in the 52 largest metropolitan areas, meaning that the average peak-period trip took 34 percent longer than the same trip under free-flow traffic conditions.

The Planning Time Index (PTI) is a measure of travel time reliability. In 2016, the PTI of Interstate highways in the NPMRDS was 2.49 in the 52 largest metropolitan areas, meaning that drivers making a trip would need to leave early enough each day to account for it taking 2.49 times longer than it would under free-flow traffic conditions, if they wanted to get to their destination on time 19 days out of 20.

On average, Interstate highways were congested 4.4 hours per weekday in 2016.

Average travel time delays represented by the TTI increased from 2012 (the first year that data are available) to 2016. However, travel reliability and the length of road congestion have improved since 2014 when the values of PTI (2.56) and congested hours (4.6) peaked and then tapered off. A similar congestion trend is also observed on the limited-access non-Interstate highways.

### Mobility on Interstate Highways in 52 Urban Areas, 2012–2016



Source: FHWA staff calculation from the NPMRDS.

Congestion occurs in urban areas of all sizes. Residents in large metropolitan areas tend to experience more severe congestion. Average values of TTI, PTI, and congested hours were consistently higher in larger urban areas than in medium and small ones.

In 2016, the average TTI was 1.47, 1.27, and 1.19 on Interstate Highways in metropolitan areas with populations over 5 million, between 2 and 5 million, and between 1 and 2 million, respectively. For the same sized areas, the average PTI was 2.89, 2.28, and 2.02 respectively in 2016.

### Interstate Mobility

Combined with a detailed geospatial network, FHWA uses NPMRDS to examine speeds on Interstate highways for the entire Nation. The average observed vehicle speed on the entire Interstate Highway System in 2016 was 56.8 mph including peak and off-peak travel, compared to an average speed limit of 67.0 mph. The average observed speed was 60.3 mph on rural Interstates, and 53.8 mph on urban Interstates.


On rural Interstates, average speeds were relatively uniform and constant during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, varying within a small range between 59 and 62 mph. Average urban Interstate speed dropped substantially during weekday morning and afternoon peak hours, with the most noticeable reductions during the p.m. peak hours. Average speed fell to 47 mph between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m.

# CHAPTER 4: Mobility and Access – Transit

## Transit Ridership and Employment

Transit ridership increased significantly from July 2006 to January 2009, then plummeted following the economic crisis in 2009. Between 2010 and 2015, growth in ridership tracked employment levels. Ridership declined roughly 5 percent between January 2015 and the end of 2016. This decline coincided with a drop in gas prices, despite ongoing growth in employment.

### Transit Ridership vs. Employment, 2006–2016




Source: NTD, EIA Gas Pump Data History, and BLS Employment Data.

## Maintenance Reliability

The mean distance between failures is an important performance measure for analysis of replacement and rehabilitation needs of the national transit fleet. Between 2006 and 2016, the number of miles between failures increased by an average of 1.0 percent annually. Miles between failures for all modes combined increased in 2007, decreased until 2009, then increased steadily until 2016. The overall increase between 2006 and 2016 was 10.5 percent. The trend for fixed-route bus is nearly identical to that of all modes combined, with miles between failures increasing by 12 percent between 2006 and 2016. Bus replacement was an important factor for the increase.

## Mean Distance Between Urban Vehicle Failures, 2006–2016




Notes: Only directly operated vehicle data were used to calculate mean distance between failures. Data from 2014 to 2016 do not include agencies that qualified for and opted to use the small systems waiver of the National Transit Database.

Source: NTD.

## Market Share of Public Transportation

The share of public transportation users increased from 1.9 percent of person trips in 2009 to 2.5 percent in 2017.

### Market Share Change of Public Transportation, Private Vehicles, and Taxi Trips, 2009 and 2017



Note: NHTS is National Household Travel Survey. Vertical axis is portrayed using a logarithmic scale.

Source: NHTS, FHWA, 2017.

## CHAPTER 5: Safety – Highways

DOT's top priority is to make the U.S. transportation system the safest in the world. Three operating administrations within DOT—FHWA, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA)—have specific responsibilities for addressing highway safety. This balance of coordinated efforts, coupled with a comprehensive focus on shared, reliable safety data, enables these DOT administrations to concentrate on their areas of expertise and responsibility while working toward the Nation's safety goal.

Great progress has been made in reducing overall roadway-related fatalities and injuries over time despite increases in population, travel, and some types of crashes. The figures below come from NHTSA's Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS).


- From 2006 to 2016, highway fatalities decreased by nearly 12 percent.
- In 2006, 42,708 motor vehicle fatalities occurred. By 2011, that count declined by 24 percent, to 32,479. Fatalities changed little from 2011 through 2014, but increased in 2015 and 2016. The 2016 fatality count of 37,461 was more than 14 percent higher than the 32,744 fatalities in 2014.
- From 2006 to 2016, fatality rates per 100 million vehicle miles traveled decreased by 17 percent.
- From 2006 to 2010, the fatality rate per 100 million VMT dropped significantly from 1.42 down to 1.11 and varied little from 2010 through 2014. The rate rose in 2015 and 2016, from 1.08 in 2014 up to 1.15 in 2015 and 1.18 in 2016.

FHWA has established three focus areas based on the most common crash types relating to roadway characteristics. In 2016, roadway departure, intersection, and pedestrian/pedalcyclist fatalities accounted for 48 percent, 27 percent, and 19 percent, respectively, of the 37,461 fatalities. Note that these three categories overlap, and 11 percent of fatalities involve more than one

of these three focus areas; 13 percent do not involve a focus area.

- From 2006 to 2016, roadway departure fatalities decreased by 20.2 percent.
- From 2006 to 2016, intersection-related fatalities increased by 0.5 percent. Estimates indicate that the United States has more than 3 million intersections, most of which are nonsignalized (controlled by stop signs or yield signs, or without any traffic control devices), and a small portion of which are signalized (controlled by traffic signals). In 2016, 34.8 percent of fatalities related to intersections occurred in rural areas and 65.2 percent occurred in urban areas.
- From 2006 to 2016, pedestrian/bicyclist fatalities increased by 22.6 percent.
- From 2006 to 2009, nonmotorist fatalities showed a steady decline of 15.0 percent, but beginning in 2009 that trend began to shift and resulted in a 44.2-percent increase by 2016. Pedestrian fatalities rose from 4,120 in 2009 to 6,000 in 2016, an increase of 45.6 percent. Pedalcyclist (primarily bicyclist) fatalities rose from 630 in 2009 to 838 in 2016, an increase of 33 percent.

**Pedestrian, Pedalcyclist, and Other Nonmotorist Traffic Fatalities, 2006–2016**



Source: FARS Final File for 2006 to 2015; FARS Annual Report File (ARF) for 2016.




# CHAPTER 5: Safety – Transit

Rates of injuries and fatalities on public transportation generally are lower than for other types of transportation. Nonetheless, serious incidents do occur and the potential for catastrophic events remains.

Most victims of injuries and fatalities in rail transit are not passengers or patrons but are members of the general public such as pedestrians, automobile drivers, bicyclists, or trespassers. Patrons are individuals in stations who are waiting to board or just got off transit vehicles. Passengers are individuals boarding, traveling, or alighting a transit vehicle.

Fatality measures exhibited a general increasing trend between 2006 and 2016 (rising from 230 in 2006 to 353 in 2016), but were essentially flat between 2012 and 2016. One significant contributor to the 10-year increase was growth in the number of suicides in transit, from 12 in 2006 to 81 in 2016.


### Annual Fatalities, for All Modes, 2006–2016 (Including Commuter Rail)



Source: NTD, Transit Safety and Security Statistics and Analysis Reporting.

Of the 256 transit-related fatalities in 2016 (excluding commuter rail), 13 were passengers, 42 were patrons, 8 were workers, and 112 (44 percent) were members of the public. The remaining 81 were suicides. The number of fatalities per 100 million passenger miles travelled increased from 0.4 in 2006 to 0.6 in 2016.

### Annual Transit Fatalities, by Victim Type, 2006–2016 (Excluding Commuter Rail)




Notes: The right Y-axis displays total fatalities per 100 million passenger miles traveled (PMT), including suicides. Fatality totals include both directly operated (DO) and purchased transportation (PT) service types.

Source: NTD, Transit Safety and Security Statistics and Analysis Reporting.

Collisions are the most common type of fatal incident in rail transit. In 2016, 203 people, or 60 percent of all fatalities (excluding commuter rail), died in collision incidents. Most victims were not passengers or patrons but individuals in the general public. Suicides were the second most common type with 81 fatalities in 2016, down from 74 in 2015.

### Transit Fatality Event Types, 2016 (Excluding Commuter Rail)



Notes: Exhibit includes data for both rail and nonrail transit modes, excluding commuter rail. Two NTD event type categories were updated in 2016.

Source: NTD.

Commuter rail fatalities have risen by 42 percent since 2006, from 68 fatalities to 97 in 2016.




## CHAPTER 6: Infrastructure Conditions – Highways

FHWA is transitioning to a new set of condition measures based on categorical ratings of good, fair, and poor for pavements and bridges. HPMS contains data on multiple types of pavement distresses, including pavement roughness (used to assess the quality of the ride that highway users experience), pavement cracking, pavement rutting (surface depressions in the vehicle wheel path, generally relevant only to asphalt surface pavements), and pavement faulting (the vertical displacement between adjacent jointed sections on concrete surface pavements).

Weighted by lane miles, 10.9 percent of pavements on Federal-aid highways for which data were available had poor ride quality in 2016; the comparable shares for cracking, rutting, and faulting were 10.8 percent, 2.5 percent, and 13.3 percent, respectively.


### Federal-aid Highway Pavement Condition, Weighted by Lane Miles, 2016



Source: HPMS.

FHWA currently uses the share of VMT on NHS pavements with good ride quality as a metric for performance planning purposes; this metric was affected by the expansion of the NHS under MAP-21, as pavement conditions on the additions to the NHS were not as good as those on the pre-expansion NHS. The share of pavements with good ride quality rose from 57 percent in 2006 to 60 percent in 2010 on the pre-expansion NHS, and from an estimated (italicized in chart) 54.7 percent in 2010 to 59.6 percent in 2016 on the expanded NHS.

### NHS Pavement Ride Quality, Weighted by VMT, 2006–2016



Notes: Data for odd-numbered years are omitted.

Source: HPMS.

The NBI contains data on bridge decks, superstructures, substructures, and culverts that can be combined to form an overall bridge condition rating. The share of bridges rated poor was reduced from 10.4 percent in 2006 to 7.9 percent in 2016. Larger bridges carrying more traffic fared even better, with the deck-area weighted share rated poor reduced from 9.0 percent to 5.9 percent and the traffic-weighted share reduced from 7.1 percent to 3.9 percent over this period. It should be noted that a poor condition rating does not mean that a bridge is unsafe.

### Systemwide Bridge Conditions, 2006–2016

Category	2006	2016
<b>Percent Good</b>		
By Bridge Count	48.2%	47.4%
Weighted by Deck Area	46.1%	46.5%
Weighted by Traffic	45.6%	48.1%
<b>Percent Fair</b>		
By Bridge Count	41.2%	44.6%
Weighted by Deck Area	44.7%	47.6%
Weighted by Traffic	47.1%	47.9%
<b>Percent Poor</b>		
By Bridge Count	10.4%	7.9%
Weighted by Deck Area	9.0%	5.9%
Weighted by Traffic	7.1%	3.9%
<b>Percent Structurally Deficient</b>		

Source: NBI.

# CHAPTER 6: Infrastructure Conditions – Transit

Transit asset infrastructure in the C&P Report includes five major asset groups: guideway elements, maintenance facilities, stations, systems, and vehicles.

### Major Asset Categories

Asset Category	Components
Guideway Elements	Tracks, ties, switches, ballasts, tunnels, elevated structures, bus guideways
Maintenance Facilities	Bus and rail maintenance buildings, bus and rail maintenance equipment, storage yards
Stations	Rail and bus stations, platforms, walkways, shelters
Systems	Train control, electrification, communications, revenue collection, utilities, signals and train stops, centralized vehicle/train control, substations
Vehicles	Large buses, heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail passenger cars, nonrevenue vehicles, vehicle replacement parts

Source: TERM.

Assets belong to two other categories: replaceable and non-replaceable assets. Non-replaceable assets are assets such as tunnels, bridges, and certain stations and facilities.

### Condition Rating

FTA uses a capital investment needs tool, the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM), to measure the condition of transit assets. The model uses a numeric scale that ranges from 1 to 5.

### Definition of Transit Asset Conditions

Rating	Condition	Description
Excellent	4.8–5.0	No visible defects, near-new condition
Good	4.0–4.7	Some slightly defective or deteriorated components
Adequate	3.0–3.9	Moderately defective or deteriorated components
Marginal	2.0–2.9	Defective or deteriorated components in need of replacement
Poor	1.0–1.9	Seriously damaged components in need of immediate repair

Source: TERM.

The replacement value of the Nation’s transit assets was \$850 billion in 2016. Nonreplaceable assets accounted for 39 percent of this total.

The relatively substantial proportion of facilities elements and systems assets that are rated below 2.5, or a state of good repair (SGR), and the magnitude of the \$174-billion investment required to replace them, represent major challenges to the rail transit industry.

### Asset Categories Rated Below SGR, 2016

Asset Category	Percentage Below SGR
Guideway Elements	43.2
Systems	23.8
Facilities	14.7
Stations	53.7
Vehicles	19.7

Source: TERM.

**SGR.** An asset is deemed in SGR if its condition rating is 2.5 or higher. An agency mode is in SGR if all its assets are rated 2.5 or higher.

### Average Age and Trends in Urban Bus and Rail Transit

The average condition rating for bus and rail fleets did not change much between 2006 and 2016, ranging between 3.3 and 3.5 for buses and remaining relatively constant for rail, ranging between 3.5 and 3.7. The percentage of the bus fleet not in SGR rose from a value of 13.2 percent in 2006 to 21.4 percent in 2016. For rail, the percentage not in SGR increased from 3.6 percent to 9.9 percent. Heavy rail contributed the most, with an increase from 5.5 percent in 2006 to 16 percent in 2016. However, for modes such as light rail, the share decreased from 6.4 percent in 2006 to 2 percent in 2016.

The average age of rail assets varies by category. For instance, for rail facilities the average age is 39 years, for stations it is 61, and for guideway elements it is 73.

## PART II: Investing for the Future

Within this report, the term “investment” refers to capital spending, which includes the construction or acquisition of new assets and the rehabilitation of existing pavement, bridge, and transit assets, but does not include routine maintenance expenditures. Chapters 7 through 10 present and analyze general scenarios for future capital investment in highways, bridges, and transit. In each of these 20-year scenarios, the investment level is an estimate of the spending that would be required to achieve a certain level of infrastructure performance. **These scenarios are illustrative, and DOT does not endorse any of them as a target level of investment.** Where practical, supplemental information is included to describe the impacts of other possible investment levels.

The system conditions and performance projections in this report’s capital investment scenarios represent what **could** be achievable assuming a particular level of investment, rather than what **would** be achieved. The analytical models used to develop the projections assume that, when funding is constrained, the benefit-cost ratio (BCR) establishes the order of precedence among potential capital projects, with projects having higher BCRs selected first. In actual practice, the BCR generally omits some types of benefits and costs because of difficulties in quantifying them and valuing them monetarily, and these other benefits and costs can and do affect project selection. In addition, actual project selection can be guided by other considerations outside benefit-cost analysis (BCA).

The capital investment scenarios shown in this report reflect complex technical analyses that attempt to predict the potential impacts of capital investment on the future conditions and performance of the transportation system. The combination of engineering and economic analysis in this part of the C&P Report is consistent with the movement of transportation agencies toward asset and performance management, value engineering, and greater consideration of cost-effectiveness in decision-making.

### Sustain Recent Spending Scenario

Although some earlier C&P editions included analyses showing the impacts of sustaining spending at base-year levels, the 2008 C&P Report was the first to include a full-fledged scenario projecting the impact of sustaining investment at base-year levels in constant-dollar terms over 20 years. This approach was retained in subsequent editions; most recently, the 23rd C&P Report included a Sustain 2014 Spending scenario. Although this scenario has proven useful in providing a frame of reference to readers, one issue with this approach was that spending levels in a single base year could be influenced by one-time events, and might not be representative of typical annual spending. This edition replaces this scenario with a Sustain Recent Spending scenario based on average annual spending over 5 years (2012–2016) converted to base-year (2016) constant dollars. This approach is expected to smooth out annual variations and make the scenarios more consistent between editions of this report.

Constant-dollar conversions for the Highway Sustain Recent Spending scenario were performed using the National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI), resulting in an average annual capital spending level from 2012 to 2016 of \$106.9 billion.

#### Derivation of Highway Sustain Recent Spending Scenario

Year	National Highway Construction Cost Index	Total Highway Capital Spending (Billions of Dollars)	
		Current Dollars	Constant 2016 Dollars
2012	1.6016	\$105.3	\$109.2
2013	1.6130	\$98.7	\$101.6
2014	1.6816	\$105.4	\$104.1
2015	1.6984	\$109.3	\$106.9
2016	1.6606	\$112.9	\$112.9
5-Year Average		\$106.3	\$106.9

Sources: FHWA Bulletin: Highway Funding 2013–2016, Table HF-10B; Highway Statistics, Various Years, Tables HF-10A and PT-1.

Constant-dollar conversions for the Transit Sustain Recent Spending scenario were performed using the RS Means Construction Index, resulting in an average annual capital spending level from 2012 to 2016 of \$18.9 billion.

**Derivation of Transit Sustain Recent Spending Scenario**

Year	RS Means Construction Index (2016 = 100)	Total Transit Capital Spending (Billions of Dollars)	
		Current Dollars	Constant 2016 Dollars
2012	92.73	\$16.8	\$18.4
2013	94.37	\$17.1	\$18.4
2014	97.58	\$17.4	\$18.1
2015	99.37	\$19.3	\$19.7
2016	100.00	\$19.4	\$19.4
5-Year Average		\$18.0	\$18.9

Sources: National Transit Database; Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Part II Chapters**

The four investment-related chapters in Part II measure investment levels in constant 2016 dollars, except where noted otherwise. The chapters consider scenarios for investment from 2017 through 2036 that are geared toward maintaining some indicator of physical condition or operational performance at its 2016 level, sustaining investment at recent levels, or achieving some objective linked to benefits vs. costs. The average annual investment level over the 20 years from 2017 through 2036 is presented for each scenario.

**This report does not attempt to address issues of cost responsibility.** The scenarios do not address how much different levels of government might contribute to funding the investment, nor do they address the potential contributions of different public or private revenue sources.

Chapter 7, Capital Investment Scenarios, defines the core scenarios and examines the associated projections for condition and performance. It also explains how the projections are derived by supplementing the modeling results with assumptions about nonmodeled investment.

Chapter 8, Supplemental Analysis, explores some implications of the scenarios presented in Chapter 7 and discusses potential alternative methodologies. It includes a comparison of highway projections from previous editions of the C&P Report with current findings. This edition includes a special section that looks back at the 1968 Highway Needs report, in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the report series.

Chapter 9, Sensitivity Analysis, explores the impacts on scenario projections of changes to several key assumptions that are relatively arguable, such as the discount rate and the future rate of growth in travel demand.

Lastly, Chapter 10, Impacts of Investment, explores the impacts of alternative levels of possible future investment on various indicators of conditions and performance.

**Analytical Tools**

Applying an economic approach to transportation investment modeling entails analysis and comparison of benefits and costs. Investments that yield benefits for which the values exceed their costs increase societal welfare and are thus considered “economically efficient,” or “cost-beneficial.” The Highway Economic Requirements System (HERS) was first used in the production of the 1995 C&P Report. The Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) was introduced in the 1997 C&P Report, and the National Bridge Investment Analysis System (NBIAS) was first used in the 2002 C&P Report. Each of these tools has subsequently undergone several rounds of updates and refinements to expand its accuracy and coverage.

As in any modeling process, simplifying assumptions have been used to make analysis practical and to report within the limitations of available data. Each of the models used in this report—HERS, NBIAS, and TERM—omits various types of investment impacts from its BCAs. To some extent, these omissions reflect the national coverage of the models’ primary databases. Although consistent with this report’s national focus, such broad geographic coverage requires some sacrifice of detail to stay within feasible budgets for data collection.

## CHAPTER 7: Capital Investment Scenarios – Highways

This report presents a set of illustrative 20-year highway capital investment scenarios based on simulations developed using HERS and NBIAS, with scaling factors applied to account for types of capital spending that are not currently modeled. All scenario investment levels are stated in constant 2016 dollars.


The Sustain Recent Spending scenario assumes that annual capital spending is sustained over the next 20 years at the average level from 2012–2016 (\$106.9 billion), in constant-dollar terms. In other words, spending would rise by exactly the rate of inflation during that period. The model results suggest that it would be economically advantageous to slightly increase the share of total capital spending directed to system rehabilitation (improvements to the physical condition of existing infrastructure assets) from the recent (2012–2016) 60.8 percent average to 62.2 percent (\$66.5 billion per year) under this scenario.

The Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario seeks to identify the level of investment needed to keep selected measures of overall system conditions and performance unchanged after 20 years. The average annual investment level associated with this scenario is \$98.0 billion; this suggests that sustaining spending at the 2012–2016 average level of \$106.9 billion should result in improved overall conditions and performance in 2036 relative to 2016.

The Improve Conditions and Performance scenario seeks to identify the level of investment needed to implement all potential investments estimated to be cost-beneficial. The investment estimate includes projects off the Federal-aid highway system and enhancement projects regardless of whether they are cost-beneficial, due to data limitations. This scenario can be viewed as an “investment ceiling,” above which it would not be cost-beneficial to invest. Of the \$165.9 billion average annual investment level under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario, \$104.7 billion would be directed toward system rehabilitation; this

portion is identified as the State of Good Repair benchmark. This scenario also includes \$37.8 billion directed toward system expansion and \$23.5 billion for system enhancement.


### Highway Capital Investment Scenarios



Sources: HERS and NBIAS.

Cumulative 20-year investment under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario would total more than \$3.3 trillion. This includes an estimated \$1.0 trillion (30.5 percent), as of 2016, needed to address an existing backlog of cost-beneficial highway and bridge investments. The remainder would address future highway and bridge needs as they arise over the next 20 years.

### Composition of 20-year Spending under the Improve Conditions and Performance Scenario, Backlog vs. Emerging Needs



Source: HERS and NBIAS.



# CHAPTER 7: Capital Investment Scenarios – Transit

Chapter 7 presents a reference benchmark focused solely on preservation spending and three transit investment scenarios covering both preservation and expansion capital spending, along with the impact of these expenditures on asset conditions and future ridership capacity.



**SGR Benchmark:** This benchmark depicts the level of preservation expenditures required to eliminate the SGR backlog over 20 years (by 2036). The benchmark does not include investment in expansion assets. Unlike the three scenarios, the benchmark is not subject to a benefit-cost screen.

- **Expenditures:** An estimated \$18.1 billion in annual reinvestment is required to fully eliminate the SGR backlog by 2036. This is 42 percent higher than the actual 2016 reinvestment of \$11.6 billion.
- **Asset Conditions:** Despite elimination of the backlog, average asset conditions are projected to decrease slightly from a 2016 rating of 3.0 to 2.9 in 2036.

**Sustain 2016 Spending Scenario:** Under this scenario, 2016 spending on transit asset preservation and expansion (\$11.6 billion and \$7.2 billion, respectively) is sustained for the next 20 years.

- **Backlog:** Given that the current rate of capital reinvestment is insufficient to fully address the replacement needs of the existing stock of transit assets, the size of that backlog is projected to decrease only marginally from the current estimated level of \$105.1 billion to roughly \$102.3 billion by 2036.
- **Asset Conditions:** Under this scenario, the average condition rating of physical assets is expected to decline from 3.0 in 2016 to 2.7 in 2036 due in part to the ongoing aging of rail systems built since 1980.
- **Ridership:** The \$7.2 billion annual rate of investment in expansion assets is estimated to support a 1.7-percent annual increase in ridership, or 0.2 percent above the annual 1.5-percent rate of growth experienced since 2001—potentially resulting in decreased vehicle crowding.

## Scenario Investment Summary



Source: TERM.

## Low-Growth and High-Growth Scenarios:

These scenarios model the level of investment required both to eliminate the backlog by 2036 and to support ridership growth within  $\pm 0.3$  percent of the 1.5-percent average annual rate experienced since 2001.

- **Preservation Expenditures:** The reinvestment need of the Low-Growth scenario is \$17.0 billion; the reinvestment need of the High-Growth scenario is not significantly higher, at \$17.1 billion
- **Ridership:** The estimated annual rate of expansion investment ranges from \$6.3 billion to \$7.6 billion under the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios respectively. This range encompasses the \$6.7 billion expended on expansion in 2016. These investments support an additional 2.9 to 4.5 billion annual boardings by 2036.



## CHAPTER 8: Supplemental Analysis – Highways


### 1968 C&P Report

The C&P Report series dates back to the 1968 *National Highway Needs Report*. Looking back to that report on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the series sheds light on what has changed over time and what perennial challenges remain.

The 1968 edition was written during a period of high travel growth and it underestimated future growth for the 1965 to 1985 period. It forecast that highway travel would grow by 2.7 percent annually to reach 1.5 trillion VMT in 1985. The actual average annual growth rate over this period was 3.5 percent, resulting in 1.7 trillion VMT in 1985. The 1968 edition similarly underestimated the wide adoption of motor vehicle ownership. National motor vehicle registrations reached 172 million in 1985, higher than the forecast 144 million.

The 1968 edition projected capital spending by all levels of government for the 1965 to 1972 period and estimated annual capital investment needs for 1973 to 1985.

### 1968 C&P Forecasts Compared to Actual Highway Capital Spending



Sources: 1968 C&P Report; FHWA Construction Bid Price Index and National Highway Construction Cost Index 2.0; FHWA Bulletin: Highway Funding 2013-2016; Highway Statistics, various years, Table HF-10A.

Converted to constant 2016 dollars, actual spending averaged \$83.3 billion per year from 1965 to 1972, aligning well with the forecast (\$86.1 billion). During the 1973 to 1985 period, highway spending did not keep pace with inflation, averaging only \$56.9 billion in constant 2016 dollars, well short of the

estimated investment needs for this period (\$110.4 billion).

Although the investment needs presented in the 1968 edition were determined by engineering criteria alone, the report referenced the importance of a broader assessment of costs and benefits (foreshadowing the benefit-cost modeling approach used in more recent reports). Needs in the 1968 edition were based on an aggregation of State estimates of capital investment needed to raise the highway system to predetermined design standards (such as lane width and number, maximum grades, minimum curvature, and a capacity adequate to accommodate the level of traffic forecast for 20 years ahead). The 1968 Report notes that States were given only a few months to prepare their needs estimates, and they did not provide any measure of monetized benefits derived from reduction in accidents, gains in travel time and pavement quality, or vehicle operation savings; these factors are all considered in current C&P reports.

### 24th Edition vs. Recent Editions


The 23rd C&P report estimated scenario investment levels in 2014 dollars. Converting these amounts to 2016 dollars facilitates more direct comparisons to results from this 24th C&P report. The annual investment level for the Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario and the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario were 3.0 percent lower and 23.8 percent higher, respectively, in this 24th C&P Report relative to inflation-adjusted values based on the 23rd C&P Report. Among the last 11 C&P reports, the gap between base-year spending and the average annual investment level for the primary "Improve" and "Maintain" scenarios has varied, reaching the highest level in the 2008 C&P Report (121.9 percent and 34.2 percent, respectively). The gap between the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario and base-year spending was 55.2 percent in this 24th edition. Base-year spending has been higher than the Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario since the 2013 edition.

# CHAPTER 8: Supplemental Analysis – Transit

Chapter 8 analyzes assumptions underlying the scenarios presented in Chapter 7, along with implications of their outcomes.

**Impact of scenario assumptions on asset conditions.** The Chapter 7 scenarios use differing assumptions regarding the rate at which assets are replaced, and that result in different impacts on asset conditions. Specifically, the Sustain Spending scenario assumes a constant annual reinvestment rate resulting in a steady change in asset conditions from the current 2.96 average. In contrast, the State of Good Repair (SGR) benchmark and the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios are fully unconstrained. Here, all backlog needs are fully addressed in the first year of the model run, resulting in a spike in asset conditions. For the growth scenarios, investment in expansion assets ultimately results in average conditions above the current level.

### Scenario Impacts on Conditions




Source: TERM.

**Effect of new technologies on transit investment needs.** TERM does not consider the impact of technological improvements on reinvestment needs. These improvements typically come at a higher cost, driving up the cost of replacement and, in the absence of additional funding, the size of the SGR backlog. As an example, alternative fuel

propulsion buses add an additional cost, as depicted in the following figure. This is just one of many technological trends that could affect transit reinvestment needs through 2036.

### Impact of Technological Change on Backlog




Source: TERM.

**Investment in expansion assets.** Chapter 8 assesses the increase in transit assets required to support the additional 2.8 to 4.0 billion annual boardings by 2036 projected by the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios. This increase includes:

- **Fleet:** 51,800 to 72,900 additional vehicles (29- to 40-percent increase from 2016)
- **Rail Guideway:** 1,700 to 1,900 additional route miles (12- to 14-percent increase)
- **Stations:** 2,600 to 4,000 additional stations (76- to 120-percent increase)

### Growth Scenario Investment in Stations



Note: Data through 2016 are actual; data after 2016 are estimated based on trends.


Source: TERM.

## CHAPTER 9: Sensitivity Analysis – Highways

Sound practice in modeling includes analyzing the sensitivity of key results to changes in assumptions. This section analyzes how changing key assumptions regarding the value of travel time savings, the discount rate, and traffic growth projections would affect the investment levels for two of the future capital investment scenarios presented in Chapter 7.

The Improve Conditions and Performance scenario is highly sensitive to the real discount rate, a value used in benefit-cost analyses to scale down benefits and costs arising later in the future relative to those arising sooner. Substituting a 3-percent discount rate for the 7-percent discount rate assumed in the baseline would increase its average annual investment requirements by 16.5 percent (from \$165.9 billion to \$193.2 billion). The Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario would be reduced by 2.8 percent assuming a 3-percent discount rate. Substituting in a 10-percent discount rate would reduce the Improve scenario by 12.0 percent and increase the Maintain scenario by 0.6 percent.

### Sensitivity of Highway Scenarios to Alternative Assumptions, Percent Change in Investment Levels from Baseline




Sources: Highway Economic Requirements System; National Bridge Investment Analysis System.

The overall impact of different estimates of growth in VMT was similar for both scenarios. Applying a forecast of 1.3-percent growth per year (linked to an optimistic economic growth

forecast), instead of 1.2 percent, increases the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario funding level by 2.1 percent and the Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario by 1.9 percent. Applying a forecast of 0.9-percent growth in VMT per year (linked to a pessimistic economic growth forecast) reduces the Improve scenario by 8.1 percent and the Maintain scenario by 7.2 percent.

Different assumptions about the value of time have similar effects on both the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario and the Maintain Conditions and Performance scenario. Assuming lower values of time for personal travel (35 percent of median hourly household income instead of 50 percent) reduces the average annual investment level for the Improve scenario by 3.8 percent and for the Maintain scenario by 4.2 percent. Conversely, assuming higher values of time for personal travel (60 percent of median hourly household income) increases the average annual investment level for the Improve scenario by 2.4 percent and for the Maintain scenario by 2.2 percent.

### Impact of Alternative Assumptions on Highway Scenario Investment Levels



Sources: Highway Economic Requirements System; National Bridge Investment Analysis System.


# CHAPTER 9: Sensitivity Analysis – Transit

TERM relies on several key input parameters, variations of which can significantly influence the model’s projected investment needs and backlog estimates.

## Alternative Replacement Thresholds

TERM uses a “replacement threshold” to specify the condition at which aging assets are replaced. The benchmark threshold value is 2.5 on a scale of 1 to 5. A 0.5-point change in the threshold yields a roughly ±30-percent change in replacement investment needs for the SGR benchmark. The same change in threshold results in approximately ±18-percent change in replacement investment needs for the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios.

### Sensitivity to Replacement Threshold



Source: TERM.

## Increase in Capital Costs Impact

The sensitivity of estimated scenario investment needs to changes in capital costs is dependent on whether TERM’s benefit-cost test is applied for that scenario. Under the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios, both of which apply the test, a 25-percent increase in asset costs yields 20.3-percent to 18.5-percent increases in needs, as the cost


<sup>1</sup> Although the analyses performed elsewhere in this report used a value of time of \$12.80, the most recent value of time as stated by DOT is \$13.60. This discrepancy in time valuation translates to a less than 1-percent difference in TERM’s estimates of 20-year transit

increase forces some reinvestment actions to fail the benefit-cost test.

## Value of Time

The per-hour value of travel time for transit riders is a key model input, and a key driver of total investment benefits. The current hourly rate based on U.S. Department of Transportation guidance is \$13.60.<sup>1</sup> Increasing this rate results in greater benefits, allowing more projects to pass the benefit-cost test, leading to higher needs estimates. Decreasing the rate has the opposite effect. Doubling the rate (to \$27.20) results in increases of 6.0 percent in needs for both the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios. Reducing the rate by half (to \$6.80) results in decreases of 12 percent and 13 percent, respectively.

### Sensitivity to Value of Time



Source: TERM.

## Impact of Discount Rate

TERM’s benefit-cost test is sensitive to the discount rate used to calculate the present value of investment costs and benefits. TERM’s analysis uses a rate of 7.0 percent in accordance with Office of Management and Budget guidance. The analysis using a rate of 3 percent (57 percent smaller) leads to an increase of 1.2 percent in investment needs in the High-Growth scenario, and a 0.9-percent increase in the Low-Growth scenario.


reinvestment needs for those scenarios that employ TERM’s benefit-cost analysis.  
Source: DOT, Revised Departmental Guidance on Valuation of Travel Time in Economic Analysis.

## CHAPTER 10: Impacts of Investment – Highways

Of the \$165.9 billion average annual investment level for all public roads under the Improve Conditions and Performance scenario presented in Chapter 7, 15.1 percent (\$25.1 billion) was derived from NBIAS estimates of rehabilitation and replacement needs for all bridges. HERS evaluates needs on Federal-aid highways associated with pavement resurfacing or reconstruction and widening, including those associated with bridges; 55.2 percent (\$91.7 billion) of this scenario was derived from HERS. The remaining 29.7 percent was nonmodeled; this includes estimates for system enhancements on all public roads plus pavement resurfacing or reconstruction and widening not on Federal-aid highways. Nonmodeled spending was scaled so that its share of the total scenario investment level would match its share of recent (2012 to 2016) spending.

Sustaining NBIAS-modeled investment at \$15.4 billion (the portion of recent spending directed toward implementation types modeled in NBIAS) in constant-dollar terms over 20 years is projected to result in deck area-weighted bridge conditions of 57.2 percent good, 38.3 percent fair, and 4.5 percent poor. Increasing annual investment to \$25.1 billion would increase the deck area-weighted share rated as good to 57.6 percent and reduce the share rated as poor to 0.7 percent.


### Projected Impact of Future Investment Levels on 2036 Bridge Condition Indicators for All Bridges



Source: NBIAS.

Sustaining HERS-modeled investment at \$59.8 billion (the portion of recent spending directed toward improvement types modeled in HERS) in constant-dollar terms over 20 years is projected to result in 50.9 percent of VMT in 2036 occurring on Federal-aid highway pavements with good ride quality, 36.9 percent on pavements with fair ride quality, and 12.3 percent on pavements with poor ride quality. Increasing annual investment to \$91.7 billion would increase the VMT-weighted share rated as good to 61.7 percent and reduce the share rated as poor to 6.2 percent.

### Projected Impact of Alternative Investment Levels on 2036 Pavement Ride Quality Indicators for Federal-aid Highways



Source: HERS.

Other projected impacts of investing at the Improve scenario level include reducing VMT-weighted average pavement roughness on Federal-aid highways by 15.4 percent in 2036 relative to 2016 and reducing average delay per VMT by 28.8 percent. Average total user costs (including travel time costs, vehicle operating costs, and crash costs) are projected to decrease by 4.8 percent, from \$1.355 per VMT in 2016 to \$1.289 per VMT in 2036.


HERS computes the average benefit-cost ratio over 20 years for the HERS-modeled portion of the Improve scenario to be 2.15, suggesting that total benefits would be more than double the total capital costs associated with this scenario.



## CHAPTER 10: Impacts of Investment – Transit

**The current level of investment in transit asset preservation is insufficient to materially reduce the size of the SGR backlog.** Assuming preservation expenditures are sustained at the 2016 level (\$11.6 billion annually), the State of Good Repair (SGR) backlog is projected to decline marginally from \$105.1 billion to \$102.3 billion by 2036. Based on current estimates, \$18.9 billion in annual investment is required to fully eliminate the SGR backlog in 20 years (by 2036).

### Investment Funding Scenarios



Source: TERM.


**A much higher rate of reinvestment is required to maintain the current average condition rating of all transit assets nationwide than is required to maintain the size of the current SGR backlog.** If the current rate of reinvestment is sustained at the recent 5-year average (\$11.6 billion), overall average asset conditions are projected to decline from a condition rating of 3.0 in 2016 to 2.7 by 2036 (near the upper bound of the “marginal” range). Much of this decline is due to the ongoing aging of newer rail systems developed within the last 20- to 30-year period. In contrast, annual preservation expenditures of \$18.9 billion are required to sustain an overall average condition rating of 2.9, with higher rates of annual investment required to attain significant improvements in overall asset conditions.

**The 2016 level of expansion investment supports ridership growth that is marginally above the historical rate.**

Investment in transit expansion investments was \$7.2 billion in 2016. If maintained into the future, this annual investment amount is estimated to support roughly 1.7 percent in annual ridership growth, which is above the 1.5 percent average rate experienced since 2001.

Assuming this trend continues, the limited overinvestment could result in a decrease in vehicle occupancy rates through 2036, with reduced vehicle crowding and dwell times. Expenditures in 2016 are within the \$6.2 billion to \$7.6 billion range covered by the Low-Growth and High-Growth scenarios (supporting ridership growth rates of 1.3 to 1.8 percent).

### Growth Scenarios: Expansion Expenditures vs. Increase in Annual Boardings



Source: TERM.

**Introducing a cost-effectiveness prioritization criterion reduces the projected size of the backlog in model run year 20.** Introduction of the cost-effectiveness criterion, defined as an asset’s reinvestment cost divided by the number of riders benefiting from the investment, results in a more cost-efficient selection of investments that reduces the rate of backlog growth.



## PART III: Freight

---

Pursuant to the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) prepared this section to serve as the second edition of the biennial report on the conditions and performance of the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN), referred to hereafter as the *Highway Freight C&P Report* to Congress.

The FAST Act required FHWA to establish an NHFN to strategically direct Federal resources and policies toward improved performance of that network. The NHFN is composed of four component subsystems: the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS), other Interstate portions not on the PHFS, Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs), and Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs).

The Nation's freight transportation system—a complex network of millions of miles of public roads, railways, navigable waterways, pipelines, and airways—is an extraordinary asset to our wellbeing and our country's economic health. Significant investments, however, are required to sustain the conditions and performance of that system and accommodate expected growing demand. In analyzing the NHFN conditions and performance, this section supports improved freight decision-making.

This edition includes many of the same NHFN conditions and performance indicators reported in the previous edition. It also updates the analysis to 2016 (primary data sources are the Highway Performance Monitoring System and the National Bridge Inventory, although additional sources with dates other than 2016 are used).

This edition includes several new conditions and performance indicators and analyses:

- NHFN pavement condition: overall ride quality, individual pavement distresses, and overall ride quality by roadway functional class; and
- NHFN bridges: overall condition rating and condition rating by roadway functional class.

Notably, this edition includes CRFCs/CUFCs (submitted as of May 1, 2018) as part of the NHFN conditions and performance analysis. The CRFCs/CUFCs had not yet been designated when the first edition was developed.

As of May 1, 2018, the NHFN consists of an estimated 54,310 miles, including 41,308 miles of Interstate and 9,541 miles of non-Interstate roads. The CRFCs and CUFCs represent a total of 3,461 miles (about six percent) of this total NHFN mileage. More recent data show that, as of April 2021, the NHFN had grown to 57,943 miles, of which CRFCs/CUFCs represented 6,720 miles (about 12 percent of the total).

This edition provides:

- An overview of the freight transportation network;
- An examination of trends that characterize freight movement on the NHFN;
- An analysis for NHFN conditions and performance indicators; and
- A series of "spotlight topics," which are initiatives or issues that affect freight transportation management and provide context for understanding NHFN conditions and performance analysis.

Between 2014 and 2016, NHFN pavement and bridge condition largely stayed the same. Many portions of the NHFN experience congestion. Between 2011 and 2016, travel reliability decreased for the majority (72 percent) of the Nation's top 25 domestic freight corridors. Average travel speeds slightly increased or remained the same for just over half (52 percent) of these corridors.

The first edition of the *Highway Freight C&P Report* to Congress (included as Part III of the 23rd C&P Report) provided a baseline understanding of NHFN conditions and performance. This edition improves this baseline by including additional indicators and examining new data not previously available. Furthermore, this edition benefitted from the implementation of data improvements identified in the previous edition.

This page intentionally left blank.

## CHAPTER 11: Rural America – Highways


Rural communities provide most of the Nation's food and energy and encompass more than 70 percent of the Nation's roadways. Although the rural population has declined overall during the last quarter century, rural areas have experienced rising net population growth since 2011.

Rural America is diverse: some areas are commuting sheds for large metropolitan areas, others are remote communities with limited access to major cities; some thrive on agriculture or mining, others rely on tourism or manufacturing. Rural area transportation must provide the means to access employment, education, and goods and services while also providing connections to other communities and commerce.

### Rural Economics

The economy in rural counties is not entirely dependent on agriculture or manufacturing: in fact, the largest segment of the workforce is employed in professional, managerial, or technical occupations.

#### Rural Employment by Type of Industry



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2011–2015, 5-year estimates (<http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>).

Due to the longer distances traveled in rural areas, rural households on average spend more on transportation than their urban counterparts.

Transportation is the second largest household expenditure category after housing, and in 2017 rural households devoted almost 20 percent of their total budget to transport, four percentage points more than urban households.

### Modal Availability and Travel Behavior

Travel patterns for urban and rural households are distinctly different, with options varying by geography, population size, and density. Households in high-density areas typically have fewer vehicles and are more likely to use public transit, rideshare, bikeshare, and pedestrian facilities, which are costly to operate in less-dense areas such as suburbs, small towns, and rural communities, resulting in a dependency on personal vehicles.

According to the 2017 National Household Travel Survey, rural households account for 24 percent of all passenger vehicle miles traveled (VMT), with an average annual household VMT of 24,465—about 50 percent higher than that of urban households.

The proportion of Americans with access to broadband internet continues to increase, creating an alternative to travel for employment, education, entertainment, and the purchase of goods and services.

### Freight Movement in Rural Areas

Although rural transportation is an important resource for people living in rural areas, it is also an important asset for the movement of goods. Trucks continue to move the bulk of freight in the United States, and over half of all truck VMT occurs on rural roads. In 2018, combination trucks on rural roads logged 95.13 billion VMT for goods movement, significantly more than the 89.04 billion VMT by combination trucks in urban areas. Maintaining the condition of rural roadways and bridges is critical to the safe, secure, and efficient transport of freight by trucks.

# CHAPTER 11: Rural America – Transit

In 2018, rural transit in the United States accounted for 55 percent of transit agencies, 14 percent of the National fleet, 10 percent of revenue vehicle miles, and 1.3 percent of unlinked trips.

Bus and demand response are the most common modes of rural transit and account for more than 95 percent of total service supply and consumed.

There were 1,301 rural transit systems that reported to the NTD in 2018, of which 1,167 were rural agencies and 134 were Tribes. In addition, X systems in urbanized areas also served rural areas.

Of the 1,167 rural agencies reporting to NTD, 718 were located in urban clusters and 395 were in Census-designated rural areas; the remaining 54 could not be geocoded.


The State with the largest number of systems in 2018 was Georgia, with 79 systems, followed by Kansas with 77. The number of systems by State is not necessarily driven only by demand, but also by local decisions.

## Number of Systems by State

Bus and demand response systems serve distinct markets. Bus ridership is driven by the demand for recreational destinations during winter and summer months, such as ski resorts, National and state parks, beaches, and others. Service is seasonal and concentrated around destinations.

Demand response systems, which provide service to persons with disabilities and other conditions, are offered in all urban and rural areas of the country.

## Rural Systems by State/Territory, 2018




Source: National Transit Database.

## Operating Funding

In 2018, public funds of \$1.4 billion were spent in rural transit operations. Of this amount, Federal funding provided \$474.0 million or 33 percent of total funding.

## Operating Funding Sources, 2018




Source: National Transit Database, 2018.

## Capital Funding

Capital funding in 2018 was \$229.0 million, of which Federal sources accounted for 66 percent.

## Capital Funding Sources, 2018



Source: National Transit Database, 2018.

## CHAPTER 12: Transformative Technologies – Highways

Trends of the past decade in technology and innovation are reshaping our options in surface transportation.

### Information Technology

Smartphone technology has spurred the creation of countless “on-the-go” traveler mobile apps that offer travelers and service providers key information such as work zone, traffic incident, and inclement road weather locations, as well as predicted travel times, cost of travel, alternative routes, and parking availability.

Traveler information has evolved at a rapid rate over the past decade and is expected to continue evolving as the public becomes increasingly dependent on real-time, easily accessible information.

### Innovation in Transportation Services

Recent technology innovations have expanded beyond traditional transportation and ownership models of personal vehicles, transit, walking, biking, and taxis. Through innovations in transportation, service travelers can request a ride (ride hailing); access a shared car, bicycle, or scooter for a short trip (micromobility); ride a private shuttle on demand; and have groceries, packages, or take-out food delivered, all using internet-enabled smartphones and tablets.

Since 2010, the proportion of Americans with access to broadband internet has increased from about 74.5 percent to 93.5 percent, and one-third of workers now say they can work from home, making broadband an emerging trend as a travel alternative.

### Emerging Trends

In addition to the deployment of micromobility and the widespread use of broadband, testing of vehicle automation and the use of drones have become commonplace in the transportation sector, providing new opportunities and challenges

for improved transportation safety, accessibility, and mobility.

Supported by advances in artificial intelligence, rapid progress is being made in automated vehicle development and deployment. Automation is categorized in six levels: from Level 0, which has no automation, to Level 5, which is fully automated. Levels 1 and 2 control some aspects of steering, braking, or acceleration (e.g., adaptive cruise control or parallel parking assist), and currently operate on public roadways. Level 3, 4, and 5 technologies are still in development and are being tested on public roads.

### Infrastructure and Technology

Infrastructure and technology, often via intelligent transportation systems, improve transportation safety and mobility through the integration of advanced communications technologies for payment systems (user fees and tolls), connected vehicles, construction work zones, and traffic incident response.

Modern communication technology is becoming more embedded within vehicles or roadway infrastructure, allowing for continuous communication and data exchange between individual vehicles or between vehicles and infrastructure. Connected vehicle applications include safety, navigation, and diagnostics, which could reduce crash rates, increase transportation options, and reduce travel times.

Work zones play a key role in maintaining and upgrading the Nation's roadways, but often create a combination of factors resulting in crashes, injuries, and fatalities.

Transportation agencies across the country are using technology to keep transportation workers safe and make travel through and around work zones safer and more efficient. This includes efforts toward creating universal access to data on work zone activity.

# CHAPTER 12: Transformative Technologies – Transit

FTA’s research mission is to advance public transportation by accelerating innovation that improves peoples’ mobility, enhances public transportation operations, and ensures everyone’s safety.

In recent years, FTA has invested more than \$40 million in grants for programs such as Mobility on Demand, Integrated Mobility Innovation, and Accelerating Innovative Mobility. Through these grants, transit agencies across the United States are experimenting and demonstrating new technologies and approaches that integrate public and private mobility services to increase service hours, geographic coverage, and accessibility.


Public transportation is one of the safest modes of travel. However, certain types of safety events continue to pose challenges, such as bus collisions at intersections with vehicles and pedestrians, track worker injuries and fatalities, and suicides at rail stations. FTA is addressing these issues by investing in new technologies to enhance vehicle components, collision avoidance, and worker communication and alerts.

FTA’s research and demonstration projects use technology to enhance public transportation operations across all aspects of system services, from the design of buses to the maintenance and management of important transit assets and ensuring a state of good repair. Key areas of focus include enhancing public transit operational effectiveness and efficiency through new technologies such as unmanned aerial systems, artificial intelligence, and robotics. FTA is also exploring new energy technologies and innovative bus designs in partnership with the Department of Energy.


Over the next decade, emergent technologies such as artificial intelligence, machine learning, and autonomous vehicles will continue to provide transit agencies with opportunities to improve their infrastructure and operations. As more data become available and accessible through applications, travelers can make informed decisions about ride sources and agencies can optimize travel

through transit routing and scheduling. Strategies to improve data governance, standardization, and interoperability are increasingly important as the transit industry operates in a more data-driven environment.

### Infrastructure Technology Categories



### Infrastructure Technology Deployment Status, March 2020



Tomorrow’s public transportation may look very different from today’s, as transit agencies transform themselves and their operations to meet the changing needs and expectations of their customers. Emerging technologies provide the fuel for this transformation. Whether disruptive or complementary, technology is the yin to new transportation modes’ yang.



This page intentionally left blank.

# Contacts for Additional Information

## General Information

Mr. E. Ross Crichton, Team Leader  
Economic Investment Strategies Team  
Office of Transportation Policy Studies, FHWA  
Phone: (202) 366-5027  
E-Mail: [ross.crichton@dot.gov](mailto:ross.crichton@dot.gov)

Mr. Sergio Maia, Program Analyst  
Office of Budget and Policy, FTA  
Phone: (202) 366-1479  
E-Mail: [sergio.maia@dot.gov](mailto:sergio.maia@dot.gov)

Ms. Khadija Ngozi-Bullock, Research Analyst  
Economic Investment Strategies Team  
Office of Transportation Policy Studies, FHWA  
Phone: (202) 366-3094  
E-Mail: [khadija.ngozibullock@dot.gov](mailto:khadija.ngozibullock@dot.gov)

Ms. Melanie Becker, Transportation Data Analyst  
Office of Budget and Policy, FTA  
Phone: (202) 366-7602  
E-Mail: [melanie.becker@dot.gov](mailto:melanie.becker@dot.gov)

Mr. Stephen Sissel, Highway Engineer  
Economic Investment Strategies Team  
Office of Transportation Policy Studies, FHWA  
Phone: (202) 366-5764  
E-Mail: [stephen.sissel@dot.gov](mailto:stephen.sissel@dot.gov)

Dr. Bingxin Yu, Economist  
Economic Investment Strategies Team  
Office of Transportation Policy Studies, FHWA  
Phone: (202) 366-6021  
E-Mail: [bingxin.yu@dot.gov](mailto:bingxin.yu@dot.gov)

Mr. Valentin Vulov, Economist  
Economic Investment Strategies Team  
Office of Transportation Policy Studies, FHWA  
Phone: (202) 366-9474  
E-Mail: [valentin.vulov@dot.gov](mailto:valentin.vulov@dot.gov)

Ms. Chandra Bondzie, Transportation Specialist  
Office of Freight Management and Operations,  
FHWA  
Phone: (202) 366-9083  
E-Mail: [chandra.bondzie@dot.gov](mailto:chandra.bondzie@dot.gov)

## Specific Topics

Part I Intro	Vicki Miller, FHWA, (202) 366-2173, <a href="mailto:vicki.miller@dot.gov">vicki.miller@dot.gov</a>
Chapter 1	Stephen Sissel, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 2	Valentin Vulov, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 3	Jasmy Methipara, FHWA (202) 366-4073, <a href="mailto:jasmy.methipara@dot.gov">jasmy.methipara@dot.gov</a>
Chapter 4	Bingxin Yu, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 5	Marc Starnes, FHWA, (202) 366-2186, <a href="mailto:marc.starnes@dot.gov">marc.starnes@dot.gov</a> ; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 6	Stephen Sissel, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Part II Intro	Ross Crichton, FHWA*
Chapter 7	Stephen Sissel, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 8	Bingxin Yu, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 9	Ross Crichton, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 10	Valentin Vulov, FHWA*; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Part III	Chandra Bondzie, FHWA*
Chapter 11	Heather Rose, FHWA, (202) 366-5060, <a href="mailto:heather.rose@dot.gov">heather.rose@dot.gov</a> ; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Chapter 12	Heather Rose, FHWA, (202) 366-5060, <a href="mailto:heather.rose@dot.gov">heather.rose@dot.gov</a> ; Sergio Maia, FTA*
Part V	Thomas Roff, FHWA, (202) 366-5035, <a href="mailto:thomas.roff@dot.gov">thomas.roff@dot.gov</a>
Appendices	A- Ross Crichton, FHWA*; B- Khadija Ngozi-Bullock, FHWA*; C- Sergio Maia, FTA*; D- Bingxin Yu, FHWA*

\* See **General Information** for contact information.

# Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit Conditions and Performance

24<sup>th</sup> Edition

REPORT TO CONGRESS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Highway  
Administration**

**Federal Transit  
Administration**

Publication No. FHWA-PL-2022-002

<https://doi.org/10.21949/1521795>