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Presentation Overview

• East-West Gateway: Who We Are and What We Do
• East-West Gateway’s Long-Range Transportation Plan
• National and State Trends Influencing Transportation Planning
• Performance-Based Planning and Programming
• Next Steps
East-West Gateway Council of Governments

WHO WE ARE

• Membership organization for local governments in St. Louis Region
• Formed in 1965 to cooperatively solve problems across jurisdictions
• Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
• Comprehensive, Cooperative and Continuing Planning
East-West Gateway Board of Directors

- 29 Member Board of Directors
- 24 Voting Members
- Chief elected officials from 8 counties
- 12 from Missouri
- 12 from Illinois
- 20 Locally elected officials
- 5 Non-voting members
- 4 Regional citizens
8 Counties
203 Municipalities
2.6 million people
$141 billion dollar economy
150,000 businesses
10,612 miles of roads
758 miles of the federal interstate system

East-West Gateway Region

[Map of the region showing 8 counties, roads, and the federal interstate system]
Transportation Planning

Long-Range Transportation Plan

- Every 4 years
- Principles and strategies to guide transportation decisions
- Investment plan
- Air quality conformity

EWG’s 10 Guiding Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and Maintain the Existing System</td>
<td>Ensure the transportation system remains in a state of good repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Public Transportation</td>
<td>Invest in public transportation to spur economic development, protect the environment and improve quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Neighborhoods &amp; Communities</td>
<td>Connect communities to opportunities and resources across the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster a Vibrant Downtown &amp; Central Core</td>
<td>Improve access to and mobility within the central core by all modes to increase the attractiveness of St. Louis and strengthen the regional economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide More Transportation Choices</td>
<td>Create viable alternatives to automobile travel by providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Safety and Security</td>
<td>Provide a safe and secure transportation system for all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a Diverse Economy with a Reliable System</td>
<td>Reduce congestion and improve travel time reliability to support the diverse economic sectors of the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Quality Job Development</td>
<td>Support the growth of wealth producing jobs that allow residents to save and return money to the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Intermodal Connections</td>
<td>Support freight movement and connections that are critical to the efficient flow of both people and goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Air Quality and Environmental Assets</td>
<td>Encourage investments that recognize the linkages between the social, economic, and natural fabric of the region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Planning

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Updated Annually
- 4 year program
- Federally funded and Regionally Significant Projects

FY2018-2021 TIP

- 761 projects
- $2.23 billion in federal, state, local, and private funding
- 51% of program on preserving existing infrastructure
But First...
How pleased are you to be here today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Totally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your affiliation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which County do you live in?

1. St. Louis City 4%
2. St. Louis County 44%
3. St. Charles County 26%
4. Jefferson County 4%
5. Franklin County 0%
6. Monroe County 0%
7. Madison County 9%
8. St. Clair County 6%
9. Other 7%
Connected2045, East-West Gateway’s Long-Range Transportation Plan

East-West Gateway is charged with developing a performance-based long-range transportation plan

- Regional Context
- Principles and strategies to guide transportation decisions
- Investment Plan
- Air Quality Conformity
Long-Range Transportation Plan

• Updated every four years
• Identifies current and future needs based on population projections and travel demand
• Projects must be included in the long-range plan to receive federal funding
• Plan must be fiscally constrained
• Plan must be performance-based (FAST Act)
Connected2045: 10 Guiding Principles

- Derived from public engagement with citizens and regional leaders
- Used to establish policy-focused strategies
- Align with federal and state goals
- Provide more complete understanding of the transportation system and its impacts
Connected 2045 Investment Plan

- Considered 50 projects costing $9 billion
- Fiscal constraint
  - 28 priority projects
  - $4 billion
- $27 billion for ongoing operations/maintenance, transit operations
National and State Trends

Gas prices are falling fast
by Chris Isidore  @CNNMoney
June 22, 2017 - 10:12 AM ET

U.S. gasoline prices at seasonal four-year high ahead of midterm elections

Highway Trust Fund is on fumes and time is running out

Fatal e-scooter accident emerges just as California legalizes riding without a helmet

The Case Against Driverless Cars
Lax safety laws, public skepticism, and privacy concerns are among the issues that could slow the brakes on the autonomous-vehicle market.

Driverless Cars Will Dramatically Change Where And How We Live

Will Driverless Cars Make the Roads More Safe or Less Safe?
By Mike White - September 25, 2018
National Context - VMT

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis
National Context - Funding

Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure
Public spending by level of government, 1956–2014

Source: Congressional Budget Office
National Context – Highway Trust Fund

Projected Highway Trust Fund Shortfalls
($ billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall ($ billion)</td>
<td>-$140</td>
<td>-$120</td>
<td>-$100</td>
<td>-$80</td>
<td>-$60</td>
<td>-$40</td>
<td>-$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eno Center for Transportation
Global Gasoline Prices, September 2018
(in $/gallon)

Source:
www.globalpetrolprices.com
Potential Opportunities As Connected and Automated Vehicle Technology is Deployed

- Improved safety
- Increased capacity, reduced congestion
- Improved connections with transit
- New funding and financing mechanisms
- Expanded mobility for those currently unable to drive
- Increased efficiency for freight movement through improved efficiency and applications such as freight platooning
Potential Challenges As Connected and Automated Vehicle Technology is Deployed

- Safety in a mixed fleet environment during early deployment
- Cybersecurity issues
- Increased vehicle miles traveled
- Competition with public transit
- Impacts to current funding and financing mechanisms
- Potential for deployment to disadvantage some transportation system users
- Certain transportation investments may become obsolete
Missouri context - VMT

Missouri VMT Trend
(in Millions of Miles)

Source: Missouri Long-Range Transportation Plan
Missouri context - Fleet

Registered Vehicles in Missouri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Cars</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup Trucks</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUVs</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FHWA/Missouri Long-Range Transportation Plan
Missouri context - Revenue

Figure 4.2 - Gallons of Fuel Taxed in Missouri (billions)

Source: Missouri Long-Range Transportation Plan
Based on what you just heard, do you think our transportation system is currently prepared to address the challenges of the future?

1. Yes
   - 5%

2. No
   - 84%

3. Not Sure/ Don’t Know
   - 11%
Trends Impacting Transportation Planning

- Demographic Changes – Aging population, Millennials
- Increased freight movement
- New transportation technologies
- Poverty and racial disparity
- Aging and deteriorating infrastructure
- Jobs moving away from the urban core
- Climate Change/ Poor Air Quality
- Uncertain transportation funding
- Volatile energy prices
Which three trends do you think will most impact the transportation system in the future? (Choose 3)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1. Demographic Changes – Aging population, Millennials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2. Increased freight movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3. New transportation technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4. Poverty and racial disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5. Aging and deteriorating infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6. Jobs moving away from the urban core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7. Climate Change/ Poor Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8. Uncertain transportation funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9. Volatile energy prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance-Based Planning and Programming
Background

• MAP-21 (and subsequently the FAST Act) required establishment of national goals, performance measures, and accountability in planning and funding transportation investments (FAST Act §§ 1116, 1406; 23 U.S.C. 119, 148, 150, 167)

  – Safety
  – Infrastructure condition
  – Congestion reduction
  – System reliability
  – Freight movement and economic vitality
  – Environmental sustainability
  – Reduced project delivery delays

  Improved Accessibility and Mobility
Why Performance-Based Planning And Programming?

Performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) refers to the application of performance management within the planning and programming processes of transportation agencies to achieve desired performance outcomes for the multimodal transportation system.

- Improved investment decision making
- Improved return on investments and resource allocation
- Demonstrates link between funding and performance
- Improved system performance
FAST Act: Performance-Driven, Outcome-Based Planning and Programming

FAST Act §§ 1116, 1406; 23 U.S.C. 119, 148, 150, 167

- Federal → State → Metropolitan
- FAST Act identifies national goal areas
- USDOT establishes performance measures
- States set performance targets
- MPOs set performance targets
- State and metro plans describe how programs and project selection will achieve targets
- As the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the St. Louis region, East-West Gateway is charged with developing a performance-based long-range transportation plan, as well as a corresponding project evaluation structure for developing the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (23 USC 134 G).
Performance Goals and Measures

- **Safety** - To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads [23 U.S.C. 134, 135, 148, 150]
  - Number of Fatalities
  - Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
  - Number of Serious Injuries
  - Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
  - Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

*5-year rolling averages*
## Safety Data and Targets

### Missouri State Safety Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Injury Reduction</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Reduction</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Bike/Ped Fatalities &amp; Serious Injuries</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EWG Safety Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Injury Reduction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Reduction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Bike/Ped Fatalities &amp; Serious Injuries</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Roadway Safety Issues

• Distracted Driving
• Impaired Driving
• Bicycle/Pedestrian Accidents and fatalities
• Enforcement issues, e.g. speeding, red light/stop sign running
• Infrastructure, e.g. lack of shoulders, signals, rumble strips
What are the most pressing highway safety issues for the region to address (select 2)

79%  1. Distracted Driving
26%  2. Impaired Driving
11%  3. Bicycle/Pedestrian accidents/fatalities
24%  4. Enforcement issues
47%  5. Infrastructure (shoulders, signals, rumble strips, etc.)
What are the best/most effective methods to improve roadway safety (select 2)?

74% 1. Engineering solutions/infrastructure investments
54% 2. Educating the public about roadway safety issues
44% 3. Increasing enforcement
6% 4. Not sure
Is the St. Louis Region doing enough to improve safety on our roadways?

1. Yes 13%
2. No 63%
3. Not Sure 24%
Performance Goals and Measures

• **Infrastructure Condition** - To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair [23 CFR 490]
  • Pavement Condition
    • Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Good condition
    • Percentage of pavements on the Interstate System in Poor condition
    • Percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS) in Good condition
    • Percentage of pavements on the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition
  • Bridge Condition
    • Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition
    • Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets</th>
<th>MO Statewide</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>EWG Missouri Counties</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Good</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Poor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate NHS Good</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate NHS Poor</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bridges Good Condition</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Bridges Poor Condition</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How should we prioritize investments in preservation?

1. Focus primarily on interstate highways (16%)
2. Focus primarily on major arterials (14%)
3. Divide resources equally between highways and arterials (65%)
4. Not sure (5%)
How should we prioritize investments in preservation?

1. Prioritize bridges - 26%
2. Prioritize roadways - 8%
3. Divide resources equally between roadways and bridges - 61%
4. Not sure - 5%
How comfortable are you with the region setting declining targets for infrastructure preservation?

6% 1. Very comfortable
9% 2. Somewhat comfortable
3% 3. Neutral
31% 4. Somewhat uncomfortable
50% 5. Very uncomfortable
1% 6. Not sure
Performance Goals and Measures

• **System Reliability** - To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system [23 CFR 490]
  - Percent of person miles traveled on the Interstate System that are reliable
  - Percent of person miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable
  - Annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay (PHED) per capita
  - Percent of non-single-occupant vehicle travel

• **Freight Movement and Economic Vitality** - To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development [23 CFR 490]
  - Truck Travel Time Reliability Index
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Targets</th>
<th>MoDOT</th>
<th>EWG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non- Interstate NHS</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hours of PHED</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of non-SOV Travel</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reliability Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Interstate Reliability</th>
<th>Non-Interstate NHS Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td><strong>86.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How should the region address transportation system reliability (select 3)?

- **43%** 1. Add capacity
- **39%** 2. New technologies
- **41%** 3. Preservation of the existing system
- **22%** 4. Reduce incident response and clearance times
- **14%** 5. Maintain transit system on-time performance
- **2%** 6. Improve special event management
- **6%** 7. Work zone management
- **16%** 8. Expand transit
- **4%** 9. Ramp metering
How should the region prioritize investments in reliability?

51%  1. Focus primarily on interstate highways

31%  2. Focus primarily on major arterials

18%  3. Not sure
How should the region prioritize investments in reliability?

51% 1. Focus on the needs of daily commuters

39% 2. Focus on the needs of freight and economic development

11% 3. Not sure
How comfortable are you with the region setting declining targets for system reliability?

- **Very comfortable**: 5% (1)
- **Somewhat comfortable**: 8% (2)
- **Neutral**: 3% (3)
- **Somewhat uncomfortable**: 38% (4)
- **Very uncomfortable**: 43% (5)
- **Not sure**: 2% (6)

### Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MoDOT
Performance Goals and Measures

• **Environmental Sustainability/CMAQ** - To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment [23 CFR 490]
  • Total emissions reduction (on-road mobile sources)
    • Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)
    • Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)
    • Particulate Matter (PM 2.5)
    • Carbon Monoxide (CO)
CMAQ: 2018 Ozone Season

• Ozone is an irritant that damages lung tissue, aggravates heart and respiratory disease and can even cause problems for healthy individuals who spend a lot of time outdoors.

• As of September 27, 2018
  • 14 days
  • 53 exceedances
  • All monitors have recorded exceedances

• Season ends October 31, 2018
How should the region address air quality issues (select 3)?

- **23%** 1. Add capacity
- **54%** 2. New technologies
- **23%** 3. Preservation of the existing system
- **12%** 4. Incident management
- **17%** 5. Bike/ped investments
- **28%** 6. Transit investments
- **32%** 7. Intersection improvements
- **42%** 8. Traffic signal optimization
- **6%** 9. Ramp metering
Brief Recap

• Long-Range Transportation Plan
• National and State Context
• Performance Measures
  • Safety
  • Preservation
  • System Reliability
  • Freight/Economic Development
  • Air Quality
Given that even a potential increase in the motor fuel tax may not be enough to adequately fund transportation in the region, would you favor any of these additional funding strategies (select up to 5)

- Bonding (44%)
- Tolls (47%)
- VMT fee (48%)
- Sales tax (27%)
- Increased taxes and fees on electric/alternative fuel vehicles (52%)
Bonding produces benefits more quickly but reduces future revenues. Should the region rely on bonding for major projects (as was done for the I-64 reconstruction and new Mississippi River Bridge) or practice pay-as-you-go funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of these goal areas do you think is LEAST important when making transportation investment decisions for the region?

6%  1. Preserving and Maintaining the Existing Transportation System
59% 2. Improving air quality
8%  3. Promoting Economic Development and freight movement
19% 4. Reducing Congestion/Ensuring Reliability
8%  5. Improving Safety
Which of these goal areas do you think is MOST important when making transportation investment decisions for the region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Goal Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1. Preserving and Maintaining the Existing Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2. Improving air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3. Promoting Economic Development and freight movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4. Reducing Congestion/Ensuring Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5. Improving Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of these goal areas do you think is 2\textsuperscript{nd} MOST important when making transportation investment decisions for the region?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1. Preserving and Maintaining the Existing Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2. Improving air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3. Promoting Economic Development and freight movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4. Reducing Congestion/Ensuring Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5. Improving Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of these goal areas do you think is 3rd MOST important when making transportation investment decisions for the region?

1. Preserving and Maintaining the Existing Transportation System (11%)
2. Improving air quality (4%)
3. Promoting Economic Development and freight movement (24%)
4. Reducing Congestion/Ensuring Reliability (37%)
5. Improving Safety (24%)
Next Steps
Questions?

Peter Koeppel
peter@ewgateway.org
http://www.ewgateway.org/transportation-planning/long-range-planning/
314-421-4220

Take EWG’s Long-Range Plan Survey:
https://bit.do/connected2045