

# Transportation

## Regional Transportation System

Communities throughout the Thurston region have adopted comprehensive strategies to meet the mobility needs of people, goods, and services well into the future. These strategies address all aspects of the region's transportation system, including streets and roads, public transportation, rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and marine and aviation facilities. To ensure the system works seamlessly, individual efforts of local agencies are guided by principles established in the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan: Guiding Our Future (TRPC, May 2004).

## Vehicle Ownership Trends

The challenge of efficiently maintaining and operating a system comprised of almost 2,000 miles of roadway, dozens of transit routes and services, hundreds of miles of bike lanes and sidewalks, almost 90 miles of rail, a marine terminal, and a regional airport is compounded by trends in personal travel. While population in the region has increased at an average annual rate of 4 percent from 1970 to 2000, vehicle registration during the same time period increased by 6 percent per year.

This is compatible with trends in household vehicle ownership. In 1960, 67 percent of households in the region owned one or fewer vehicles, and by 2000 only 36 percent of households owned one or fewer vehicles. The changes between 1960 and 2000 are most pronounced in the households with three or more cars. A mere five percent of households had three or more vehicles in 1960. By 2000, 24 percent, or about one in four households, owned three or more vehicles.

Examining patterns in the correlation between household vehicle ownership and household size provides additional information on vehicle ownership trends. Sixty-one percent of households which do not own a vehicle are one-person households. Likewise, the majority (65.4 percent) of one-person households own only one vehicle. At the other end of the spectrum, 71.3 percent of households owning four or more vehicles are three-or-more person households. Contrary to

**Table VII-1** provides Federal functional classification for roads in Thurston County.

**Table VII-2** shows a historical comparison between population and registered vehicles.

**Table VII-3** presents driver and vehicle statistics.

**Table VII-4** shows historical trends in cars per household between 1960, 1990, and 2000.

**Table VII-5** shows data on household size by vehicles available.

this trend, the majority of three-vehicle households (35.9 percent) are actually two-person households.

**Table VII-6** provides historical and forecasted Washington State vehicle miles traveled statistics.

Vehicle ownership in the region corresponds to trends in “vehicle miles traveled” at the state level. “Vehicle Miles Traveled” (VMT) is a measure of how many miles are driven, in this case, how many miles the average driver puts on his or her vehicle in the course of a year. In Washington State in 2000, the average driver put 19 percent more miles on their car daily than they did in 1980. Since 2000, the average daily mileage of each driver has decreased by over 10 percent.

## Travel Behavior

People travel for a variety of reasons, but for most, it is a personal need to accommodate activities of daily living. People need to commute to work, run household errands, take a family member to a medical appointment, or simply recreate. Non-personal trips include the shipment of goods (freight) or the delivery of services (business, commerce, and governance). How an individual chooses to travel is influenced by many factors such as trip purpose, age, financial status, distance of the trip, or the infrastructure and transportation services available to reach one’s desired destination.

## Commuting Trends

**Table VII-7** shows information on outbound and inbound commuters.

**Tables VII-8** and **VII-9** show information on means of travel and travel time.

**Outbound commuters** are people who live in Thurston County and work in a different county, whereas **inbound commuters** work in Thurston County and live in a different county.

Census 2000 data on county-to-county commute flows indicate that increased driving trends are not only a result of trips taking place within Thurston County, but an increasing number of outbound and inbound commute trips as well.

In 1980, 18.6 percent of the total working residents of Thurston County commuted to employment located outside the County. By 2000 the share of outbound commuters had increased to a 26.6 percent share of the County’s total working residents. Conversely, inbound commuting is growing as well. In 1980, inbound commuters made up 11.2 percent of total workers with jobs in Thurston County. By 2000, the percent of total workers with jobs in Thurston County who lived outside the County had grown to 16.7 percent.

As a share of total commuters, the percent of those who drove alone dropped slightly between 1990 and 2000, from 78.7 percent to 77.2 percent. The share of commuters who carpooled increased a bit, from a 12.1 percent share to a 12.7 percent share of commuters. Those using public transportation grew from 1.4 percent to 2.2 percent.

Census data also show that overall mean travel time to work increased from 20.7 minutes in 1990 to 24.4 minutes in 2000, an increase of 3.7 minutes. Commuters who either bicycled or walked had the shortest mean travel time to work, 13.1 minutes. Those who drove alone had a mean travel time to work of 23.2 minutes, while those who carpooled had a travel time of 30.4 minutes. Mean travel time for workers using public transportation was 43.5 minutes.

## Public Transportation Services

Another important goal is to provide viable travel alternatives that help mitigate the impacts of growth in vehicular traffic, and provide higher quality transportation choices to all residents in the region. These alternatives, like public transportation, bike lanes, sidewalks, and rail, provide more people with feasible options for getting from Point A to Point B. These alternatives also improve the quality of life for neighborhoods, downtown core areas, and busy corridors linking important activity centers.

The majority of public transportation needs in Thurston County are met by Intercity Transit. The public transit system offers a mix of programs and services to meet diverse community needs, including fixed-service routes throughout the urban area, express routes providing service connections to the central Puget Sound area, vanpools serving area commuters, and demand response “Dial-a-Lift” services for qualified ADA recipients that are unable to use regular fixed-route buses. Intercity Transit complements these basic services with a variety of other programs including regional commuter ride-match services, employer based trip reduction program support, and a “Village Vans” program targeted to the needs of certified Work First clients.

A few years ago Intercity Transit experienced shifting needs in its transit service district when a 45 percent reduction in revenue occurred. This was a result of the state Legislature repealing the collection of local Motor Vehicle Excise Tax, an important source of revenue for public transit systems. This required Intercity Transit to significantly reduce service between 2000 and 2002. It also precipitated in 2002 a reduction of the system’s service boundary. The emphasis on service then shifted to serving the more populated urbanized areas of Thurston County (Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater and Yelm). In late 2002, voters within the redrawn service district approved a local sales tax increase to help sustain, re-establish and

Table VII-10 shows a summary of Intercity Transit service.

expand Intercity Transit's service within this new district. Starting in 2003, Intercity Transit implemented a phased approach for restoring routes, increasing frequency, and providing limited but new service in areas where there was market demand. By early 2006 the system had restored the final touches to many of the services previously reduced or cut. The latest increase (Phase 4) occurred in February 2008, which added frequency and service hours. Overall, fixed route service hours have increased by 50 percent over the past six years (2003–08) and average monthly boardings have increased by over 67 percent. Within the new service boundary, future service development coupled with improved service efficiency, have now become important areas of focus for the transit system.

### **National Recognition – Best Transit Service Provider in America**

In 2009, the American Public Transportation Association named Intercity Transit the best medium-sized transit service provider in America. Of the 108 medium-sized transit service providers in the U.S., Intercity Transit was recognized for its service record including safety, customer service delivery, financial management, ridership growth, operational innovations, sustainable practices, technological applications and community involvement during 2006, 2007 and 2008.

### **Fixed-Route Bus Service**

Intercity Transit provides general-purpose public transit service throughout the greater vicinity of the cities of Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater and Yelm. The public transit system offers a mix of programs and services to meet diverse community needs, including fixed-service bus routes throughout the urban area and express bus routes to the central Puget Sound area. Intercity Transit's express bus service provides connections with Pierce Transit and Sound Transit routes. Inter-county transit service is also provided by Grays Harbor Transit and Mason Transit with connections served via Intercity Transit's Downtown Olympia Bus Station.

### **Vanpools, Carpools, and Park and Ride Lots**

Intercity Transit owns and manages a fleet of 160 vans that serves groups of commuters with common origins and destinations throughout western Washington. Intercity Transit's vanpools travel into Thurston County (53 percent), out of the county (65 percent), and within the county (2 percent). Area vanpool service is also offered

by Pierce, Sound, and Metro Transit service agencies. Individual vanpoolers save, on average, \$6,653 a year over the cost of driving alone.

Intercity Transit operates and provides direct transit service at two regional park and ride lots. Area commuters may travel part of their journey to work by car and ride transit for the remainder of their trip. A new park and ride lot with approximately 300 parking stalls is planned to open at the Thurston County Hawks Prairie Waste Transfer and Recovery Center around 2011. In addition, Intercity Transit is negotiating a formal agreement with the Port of Olympia to retain a former park and ride lot on Tumwater Boulevard in the City of Tumwater. The two current park and ride facilities open to the public are as follows:

- Martin Way Park & Ride (Lacey): off of I-5 at Martin Way. Intercity Transit Routes 62A, 62B, Express Route 603, 620, and Pierce Transit Express Route 603A. Expanded from 139 to 318 stalls in 2009.
- Centennial Station Park & Ride (Thurston County), Amtrak Terminal, 6600 Yelm Highway SE. Routes 64 and 94. 110 stalls.

Area commuters also can arrange to carpool and coordinate ridesharing on their own or through services such as *RideshareOnline.com*. Carpoolers generally travel in privately owned vehicles. Carpoolers and vanpoolers in Thurston County can coordinate rides and park their vehicles at one of three park and ride lots in Thurston County:

- Grand Mound Park & Ride (Thurston County): off of I-5 at SR-12.
- Summit Lake Road at SR-8.
- Mud Bay Lot (Madrona Beach Road, Thurston County/SR101).

### **Special Needs and Rural Transportation Services**

Non-traditional providers, like social service organizations, non-profit groups, and for-profit companies meet other transportation needs. The region continues to pilot coordinated transportation models to serve rural and special needs residents. The Thurston Regional Planning Council, TOGETHER! and the Thurston County Human Services Transportation Forum developed the Rural and Tribal Transportation Program (R/T) for residents of Rochester, Tenino, and Bucoda,

Rainier, Yelm and other rural portions of the County. R/T also serves the Nisqually Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation and connects to Intercity Transit and Twin Transit. Clark County's Community Action Agency provides regular "rural" van service between Vancouver, Centralia and Tumwater with connections to local transit service.

### **International Bus Transportation**

Passenger bus service to destinations throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico is provided by Greyhound via the Downtown Olympia Greyhound Station at 7th Avenue and Capitol Way. In 2009, Intercity Transit received a \$2.23 million federal allocation to expand the Downtown Olympia Transit Center. By 2011, Greyhound's bus station will be co-located with Intercity Transit, providing more effective public transit options for the region's residents and visitors.

### **Passenger Rail Service**

Amtrak national passenger rail service is available with connections accessed through the Lacey-Olympia Centennial [train] Station on Yelm Highway in southeast Lacey. Intercity Transit provides daily bus service to the station. The Amtrak Cascades offers twice daily service with connections running from Eugene, Oregon to Vancouver, British Columbia. The Coast Starlight route provides additional connections from Seattle to Los Angeles, California.

Commuter rail service from and to Thurston County is not available. Sound Transit provides commuter rail service between Tacoma and Everett. Nine weekday trips are scheduled between the Tacoma Dome Station and the Seattle King Street Station with stops in Puyallup, Sumner, Auburn, Kent, and Tukwila. Future expansion of this route will include service to the city of Lakewood, just 20 miles north of Lacey on I-5. Sound Transit also provides commuter rail service with six weekday runs between Seattle and Everett, with stops in Mukilteo and Edmonds.

### **Non-Motorized Transportation**

#### **Walking**

High density residential development with a mix of land uses such as retail, services, business, and employment promotes shorter distance trips in urban environments that can be completed conveniently

and safely by walking. Sidewalks with street lighting, plantings, and well-marked crosswalks are essential for creating walkable environments. All new development within Thurston County and its cities include these types of pedestrian amenities. In addition, communities are striving to retrofit older suburban neighborhoods and streets with sidewalks as more people realize the personal health and environmental benefits of walking.

### **Bicycling**

Bicycling has also grown in popularity as many households find new ways to travel or save money by reducing their auto trips. There are nearly 80 miles of striped bicycle lanes and nearly 260 miles of wide shoulders throughout Thurston County that are accessible to cyclists. Bicycle lanes provide cyclists a dedicated path for traveling. Cyclists are not legally bound to remain in the bicycle lane at all times, for example while making left turns. As more cyclists use the roadway, both cyclists and motorists must adapt to sharing the roadway and operate their vehicles in a safe and courteous manner at all times.

For more information about bicycling routes pick up a copy of the “Thurston County Bicycle Map” at any area local bicycle shop, or consult the online version at: [www.trpc.org/programs/transportation/bike+map/index.htm](http://www.trpc.org/programs/transportation/bike+map/index.htm).

### **Multi-Purpose Shared-Use Trails**

There are nearly 57 miles of paved shared-use trails in Thurston County, most notably the Chehalis Western, Yelm to Tenino, and Woodland Trails. These 10 foot wide trails with marked intersections, signs, benches, restrooms, and other amenities offer people the opportunity to travel and recreate by walking, hiking, running, skating, cycling, and a variety of other uses. These trails follow former railroad lines, so their relatively flat grade offer people of all ages and abilities a method of connecting to their community.

More information about the regional trails network can be found in the “Thurston Regional Trails Plan, December 2007” online at: [www.trpc.org/programs/transportation/regional+planning/regionaltrailsplan.htm](http://www.trpc.org/programs/transportation/regional+planning/regionaltrailsplan.htm)

### **Travel Forecasting**

As the region’s population continues to grow, more people will travel state, county, and municipal roads to work, drop children off at school, go shopping, or fulfill other activities of daily living. Traffic count forecasts show the number of vehicles for each direction of travel for a given segment of road. The Regional Travel Demand Model, from which travel forecasts are derived, indicates that over time, our public roadways will continue to see an increase in the number of vehicles on all types of roads, from highways to local neighborhood streets. More information about future travel conditions is available in the 2025 Regional Transportation Plan: Guiding our Future (TRPC, May 2004).

**Maps 16 and 17** show the 2008 average weekday afternoon peak hour traffic volumes (number of cars) at selected arterials and major collectors.

## Maximizing System Performance

Because of the significant social, environmental, and financial costs associated with road building, policies in the region focus on making the existing transportation system work as well as possible before spending limited public resources on expanding it. This means reducing wasted capacity and improving operational efficiency wherever possible. This increasingly involves the use of transportation technologies, or Intelligent Transportation Systems, and travel demand management programs. Both of these efforts help communities across the region provide more transportation capacity with the same finite resources.

Travel Demand Management programs are sponsored by the Washington State Department of Transportation, Thurston Regional Planning Council, and the communities of Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, Yelm, and Thurston County. Their goal is to decrease the number of vehicles needed for commuters to get to work, which helps postpone or even eliminate the need to make costly expansions in roadway capacity.

## Commute Trip Reduction

Tables VII-11 and VII-12 show trends in mode of travel.

The cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater and Thurston County are affected under the state's Commute Trip Reduction law. This legislation requires jurisdictions to reduce vehicle miles traveled and drive-alone trips by working with major employers to encourage employees' use of biking, walking, transit, ridesharing, telework and alternative work schedules. TRPC serves as the lead agency on behalf of the jurisdictions in supporting CTR efforts, in partnership with Intercity Transit and the state Departments of General Administration and Transportation.

## Freight Transportation

Tables VII-13 and VII-14 show data on freight transportation.

Transporting and managing freight represented a 371 billion dollar Washington industry in 2002, expected to grow to 1.24 trillion dollars by 2035. Much of this traffic is managed through or near ports. Thurston County is situated on the main truck and rail corridors serving the Pacific Northwest complex of mega ports, Vancouver, B.C., Seattle, Tacoma, and Portland/Vancouver, as well as on the primary West Coast corridor additionally serving Los Angeles, Long Beach and a host of other Ports, including the Port of Olympia. Freight

shipments to, from, and within Washington State accounted for 477 million tons of goods in 2002, an amount projected to more than double to 976 million tons by 2035. Much of that freight will move through Thurston County.

The largest volumes of freight moved in Washington State include lumber/wood products, nonmetallic minerals, farm products, food/kindred products, and general freight. While volumes are projected to grow in all these categories, food/kindred products and general freight will see the largest increases, projected to more than double by 2020. The highest value products include transportation equipment, food/kindred products, general freight, machinery, and chemicals/allied products. The value of these products is expected to at least double, quadrupling in some cases by 2020. Primarily, these are products destined for domestic markets.

### **Industrial Activity**

Freight transportation is closely associated with industrial activity, especially manufacturing. A host of industries manufacture products in Thurston County and several major distribution hubs have opened here along the Interstate 5 corridor. Some of the larger manufacturing employers include bottling, box and can plants, plastic products, concrete, windows, and lumber. These and many other small- and medium-sized industries contribute to locally generated freight flows. The region has several manufacturing hubs, such as Olympia's Mottman Industrial Park, the Hawks Prairie area in Lacey, and the Port's marine terminal, airport and New Market Industrial Campus. The local freight industry itself, especially warehousing, trucking, marine and air cargo, has been growing steadily for many years. The new distribution centers have brought additional employment to Thurston County's freight sector. This, however, is balanced by the loss in recent years of some of the larger manufacturing employers, such as the brewery in Tumwater.

### **Truck**

About two thirds of all freight shipped to, from, and within Washington moves by truck, an amount that is expected to grow 105 percent between 2002 and 2035, with the value of those goods growing over 200 percent. While Interstate 90, U.S. 395, and State Route 12 will carry some of the volumes, the majority will be transported on Interstate 5 between Everett and Vancouver, WA, passing through Thurston County and the Lacey-Olympia-Tumwater

metropolitan area. The number of local freight transportation employees continues to steadily increase as well. Truck traffic will have a continuing impact on the region's transportation system. For example, in 2001, trucks accounted for 26 percent of all southbound traffic leaving Thurston County on Interstate 5 during the day (6 a.m. to 6 p.m.), and 35 percent at night (6 p.m. to 6 a.m.).

### **Rail**

Washington's main north/south rail line runs through Thurston County and the small rural jurisdictions of Tenino and Bucoda. The primary freight rail flows connect Chicago, IL and Omaha, NE with Western Washington, traveling along the Columbia River and the north/south Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) mainline to/from Puget Sound. Rail freight in Washington State is forecast to nearly double in volume by 2035 and increase in value by 43 percent. This means Thurston County will see a significant increase in train traffic moving through the region.

There are nearly 90 miles of rail lines throughout Thurston County. Active rail lines include portions of the Tacoma Rail Mountain Division, BNSF St. Clair Line, the Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad, Union Pacific and the BNSF mainline. These make important intermodal connections at the Port of Tacoma and in Centralia. The Union Pacific branch line connects the Port of Olympia with the BNSF mainline as well as connecting to another branch of BNSF serving Olympia's Mottman Industrial Area. The Port of Olympia's Marine Terminal is served by Tacoma Rail operating on Union Pacific rail. The Yelm Prairie Line, owned by the City of Yelm, connects to their industrial area, although this portion of the Prairie Line is currently inactive.

**Table VII-15** shows data on rail rights-of-way in Thurston County.

Thurston County was previously traced with a web of small logging railroads as well as now defunct lines originally owned by the national railroads. Some of these, most notably the Chehalis Western, Yelm-to-Tenino (Prairie Line), Lacey and Olympia Woodland (St. Clair), and Gate-to-Belmore, are converted to, or held for, pedestrian and bicycle trails.

### **Marine**

The citizens of Thurston County created the Port of Olympia in 1922. The Port District's boundaries are countywide and its primary holdings are located in Tumwater and Olympia with airport and marine terminals.

The marine terminal is located on the Port Peninsula in Budd Inlet. It provides a full range of services including breakbulk, roll-on/roll-off, bulk, forest products, and containerized cargo handling. This multimodal facility serves ocean-going and short-sea vessel, truck, and rail cargos. The marine terminal's focus is specialized services for its customers. The Port of Olympia plays a strategic role in serving the Puget Sound freight market. Its specialty services complement those provided on Puget Sound in Seattle and Tacoma, and will become increasingly important as mega port containerized demand grows, squeezing out specialized services for all but the super carriers at these super ports. The marine terminal can accommodate up to three vessels at one time. Historically, primary cargoes included logs, lumber, and food products. This has expanded in recent years to include a wide variety of bulk commodities and equipment. The Port's marine terminal also supports the deployment of equipment and supplies from Fort Lewis, as well as military installations from California and other states.

### Aviation

The Olympia Airport is among the first public airports in the country. It was created in 1927, with the Port of Olympia assuming ownership in 1963. Located near Interstate 5 in Tumwater, the airport's facilities include aircraft service operations, hangars, corporate offices, and a public terminal. Tower-controlled and full-instrument approach provides access on two runways for corporate, commercial and recreational users, including light freight aircraft. The 100-acre industrial aviation district at the airport supports air-oriented manufacturing and warehousing.

Near the airport, the Port's New Market Industrial Campus offers over 500 acres of commercial, corporate, mixed and warehousing, distribution and light industrial uses, with good access to Tumwater Boulevard and Interstate 5. While still developing, the area is home to a variety of distribution, manufacturing, service, lodging and commercial/retail businesses, some of which rely on aviation access.

For more information on the Port of Olympia, visit their website at [www.portolympia.com](http://www.portolympia.com). More information is included in the Economic Development section of the Economics chapter.

**Table VII-1  
Federal Functional Classification of Roads Thurston County, 2005**

| Jurisdiction          | Miles of Classified Roads or Streets |               |               |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                       | Interstate or Highway                | Arterial      | Collector     |
| Bucoda                | 0.00                                 | 0.00          | 1.18          |
| Lacey                 | 8.88                                 | 27.07         | 4.68          |
| Olympia               | 17.67                                | 38.52         | 22.30         |
| Rainier               | 0.00                                 | 1.27          | 2.02          |
| Tenino                | 0.00                                 | 1.97          | 2.71          |
| Tumwater              | 12.61                                | 15.05         | 9.80          |
| Yelm                  | 0.00                                 | 3.11          | 3.53          |
| Unincorporated County | 50.59                                | 134.22        | 311.92        |
| <b>County Total</b>   | <b>89.75</b>                         | <b>221.21</b> | <b>358.14</b> |

Source: TRPC, 2005.

**Explanations:** Federal Functional Classification of roads reflects established criteria concerning traffic volume, adjacent land uses, proximity of additional roads, etc. It includes all National Highway System routes as well as any other facilities considered part of the regional transportation system. It does not include local access streets or roads, which account for the vast majority of facilities. Numbers reflect center-line miles.

**Table VII-2  
Trends in Population Compared to Vehicle Registration  
Thurston County, 1970-2000, 2008**

| Year                    | Population     |                            | Registered Vehicles |                            |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
|                         | Count          | Avg. Annual Rate of Change | Count               | Avg. Annual Rate of Change |
| 1970                    | 76,890         | -                          | 42,948              | -                          |
| 1980                    | 124,264        | 4.9%                       | 119,479             | 10.8%                      |
| 1990                    | 161,238        | 2.6%                       | 173,118             | 3.8%                       |
| 2000                    | 207,355        | 2.5%                       | 238,830             | 3.3%                       |
| 2008                    | 245,300        | 2.1%                       | 310,168             | 3.3%                       |
| <b>1970-2000 Change</b> | <b>130,465</b> | <b>3.4%</b>                | <b>195,882</b>      | <b>5.9%</b>                |

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census; Washington State Department of Licensing; TRPC.

**Table VII-3  
Driver and Vehicle Statistics  
Thurston County, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2007, 2008**

| <b>Registered Vehicles</b>       | <b>1980</b>    | <b>1990</b>    | <b>2000</b>    | <b>2007</b>    | <b>2008</b>    |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Passenger                        | 74,054         | 104,211        | 145,860        | 177,808        | 180,156        |
| Trucks                           | 24,885         | 40,989         | 55,865         | 58,523         | 57,769         |
| Misc. (including recreation)     | 10,847         | 13,169         | 18,142         | 28,053         | 28,190         |
| Trailers                         | 9,499          | 14,721         | 18,819         | 26,377         | 27,012         |
| Other                            | 194            | 28             | 209            | 18,726         | 17,041         |
| <b>Total Registered Vehicles</b> | <b>119,479</b> | <b>173,118</b> | <b>238,895</b> | <b>309,487</b> | <b>310,168</b> |
| Licensed Drivers                 | 76,628         | 117,464        | 158,858        | 183,380        | 181,052        |
| Vehicles Per Driver              | 1.56           | 1.47           | 1.50           | 1.69           | 1.71           |

Source: Washington State Department of Licensing.

**Table VII-4  
Automobile Trends Per Household  
Thurston County, 1960, 1990, 2000**

| <b>Cars Per Household</b> | <b>1960</b> | <b>1990</b> | <b>2000</b> |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| None                      | 13.3%       | 5.6%        | 6.3%        |
| 1                         | 53.3%       | 30.0%       | 29.8%       |
| 2                         | 28.4%       | 40.8%       | 40.3%       |
| 3+                        | 5.0%        | 23.6%       | 23.6%       |
| Mean                      | --          | 1.9         | 1.9         |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

**Table VII-5  
Household Size by Vehicles Available  
Thurston County, Census 2000**

| Household Size                         | Mean vehicles per household | Vehicles available |        |        |        |       | Total households |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
|  |                             | 0                  | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4+    |                  |
| <b>1-person household</b>              | 1.1                         | 3,160              | 13,385 | 3,005  | 715    | 190   | 20,455           |
| Percent of 1-person households         | --                          | 15.4%              | 65.4%  | 14.7%  | 3.5%   | 0.9%  | 100%             |
| <b>2-person household</b>              | 2.0                         | 1,015              | 6,255  | 15,470 | 4,985  | 1,360 | 29,085           |
| Percent of 2-person households         | --                          | 3.5%               | 21.5%  | 53.2%  | 17.1%  | 4.7%  | 100%             |
| <b>3-person household</b>              | 2.3                         | 485                | 2,440  | 5,990  | 3,365  | 1,360 | 13,645           |
| Percent of 3-person households         | --                          | 3.6%               | 17.9%  | 43.9%  | 24.7%  | 10.0% | 100%             |
| <b>4-or-more-person household</b>      | 2.4                         | 485                | 2,090  | 8,570  | 4,830  | 2,505 | 18,480           |
| Percent of 4-or-more-person households | --                          | 2.6%               | 11.3%  | 46.4%  | 26.1%  | 13.6% | 100%             |
| <b>Total households</b>                | 1.9                         | 5,145              | 24,170 | 33,040 | 13,895 | 5,415 | 81,665           |
| Percent of total households            | --                          | 6.3%               | 29.6%  | 40.5%  | 17.0%  | 6.6%  | 100%             |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

**Table VII-6  
Washington State Vehicle Miles Traveled Statistics  
Fiscal Years 1980-2025**

| Washington Annual Statistics                           | Estimate  |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           | Forecast  |  |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
|  | 1980      | 1990      | 2000      | 2005      | 2006      | 2007      | 2008      | 2010      | 2025      | 2010      | 2025      |  |
| Vehicle Registrations                                  | 3,092,000 | 4,219,000 | 5,195,000 | 5,720,000 | 5,832,000 | 5,978,000 | 6,161,000 | 6,430,000 | 8,200,000 | 6,430,000 | 8,200,000 |  |
| Licensed Drivers                                       | 2,663,000 | 3,377,000 | 4,155,000 | 4,682,000 | 4,791,000 | 4,886,000 | 4,954,000 | 5,110,000 | 6,110,000 | 5,110,000 | 6,110,000 |  |
| Vehicles Per Driver                                    | 1.16      | 1.25      | 1.25      | 1.22      | 1.22      | 1.22      | 1.22      | 1.24      | 1.26      | 1.24      | 1.34      |  |
| Net Highway Use<br>in Millions of Gallons <sup>1</sup> | 2,087     | 2,568     | 3,140     | 3,237     | 3,282     | 3,284     | 3,273     | 3,348     | 4,452     | 3,348     | 4,452     |  |
| Gallons Fuel/Vehicle                                   | 675       | 609       | 604       | 566       | 563       | 549       | 531       | 520       | 543       | 520       | 543       |  |
| Gallons Fuel/Driver                                    | 784       | 761       | 756       | 691       | 685       | 672       | 661       | 655       | 728       | 655       | 728       |  |
| Avg Miles/Gallon                                       | 13.78     | 17.11     | 16.98     | 17.17     | 17.06     | 17.07     | 17.18     | 17.32     | 17.95     | 17.18     | 17.95     |  |
| Vehicle Miles (Billions)                               | 28.77     | 43.93     | 53.32     | 55.58     | 55.99     | 56.06     | 56.24     | 58.01     | 79.90     | 58.01     | 79.90     |  |
| Avg Annual Miles/Vehicle                               | 9,303     | 10,413    | 10,264    | 9,717     | 9,601     | 9,377     | 9,128     | 9,017     | 9,746     | 9,017     | 9,746     |  |
| Avg Annual Miles/Driver                                | 10,803    | 13,011    | 12,834    | 11,872    | 11,687    | 11,474    | 11,352    | 11,350    | 13,069    | 11,350    | 13,069    |  |
| Avg Daily Miles/Driver                                 | 29.52     | 35.65     | 35.07     | 32.53     | 32.02     | 31.44     | 31.10     | 31.10     | 35.81     | 31.10     | 35.81     |  |

Source: Washington State Department of Transportation, "Forecast of Fuel, Vehicles, and Related Data Through 2025, Forecast June 2008."

Explanation: Motorized vehicle registrations include privately owned passenger cars, motorhomes, motorcycles, tow trucks, trucks, busses, restored & antiques, and mopeds.  
<sup>1</sup>Net Highway Use Consumption is gross fuel consumption with non-highway refunds and transfers subtracted out.

**Table VII-7  
Outbound and Inbound Commuters, Thurston County, 1960-2000**

| County of Workplace                           | Outbound Commuters <sup>1</sup> |              |              |               |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|   | 1960                            | 1970         | 1980         | 2000          |
| Pierce  | 1,937                           | 1,975        | 3,768        | 8,526         |
| Lewis   | 331                             | 702          | 1,950        | 2,610         |
| King  | 155                             | 359          | 812          | 2,064         |
| Mason   | 127                             | 243          | 717          | 1,086         |
| Grays Harbor                                  | 102                             | 67           | 1,651        | 683           |
| Kitsap  | 12                              | 23           | 40           | 180           |
| Snohomish                                     | 22                              | 21           | 38           | 172           |
| Other   | 395                             | 326          | 776          | 974           |
| <b>Total outbound commuters</b>               | <b>3,081</b>                    | <b>3,716</b> | <b>9,752</b> | <b>16,295</b> |
| Total working residents of Thurston County    | 19,326                          | 27,107       | 52,411       | 100,986       |
| <b>Percent outbound commuters</b>             | <b>15.9%</b>                    | <b>13.7%</b> | <b>18.6%</b> | <b>21.6%</b>  |
|   |                                 |              |              |               |
| County of Residence                           | Inbound Commuters <sup>2</sup>  |              |              |               |
|   | 1960                            | 1970         | 1980         | 2000          |
| Pierce  | 379                             | 1,029        | 2,355        | 3,750         |
| Lewis   | 277                             | 530          | 842          | 1,749         |
| King  | 171                             | 288          | 864          | 1,304         |
| Mason   | 111                             | 350          | 770          | 1,438         |
| Grays Harbor                                  | 39                              | 216          | 329          | 953           |
| Kitsap  | 12                              | 8            | 54           | 109           |
| Snohomish                                     | 0                               | 0            | 13           | 108           |
| Other   | 12                              | 79           | 170          | 270           |
| <b>Total inbound commuters</b>                | <b>1,001</b>                    | <b>2,500</b> | <b>5,397</b> | <b>9,681</b>  |
| Total workers with jobs in Thurston County    | 17,246                          | 25,891       | 48,056       | 88,949        |
| <b>Percent inbound commuters</b>              | <b>5.8%</b>                     | <b>9.7%</b>  | <b>11.2%</b> | <b>14.1%</b>  |
|   |                                 |              |              |               |
| <b>Net Outbound Commuters</b>                 | <b>2,080</b>                    | <b>1,216</b> | <b>4,355</b> | <b>6,614</b>  |
| <b>Ratio of Outbound to Inbound Commuters</b> | <b>3.1</b>                      | <b>1.5</b>   | <b>1.8</b>   | <b>1.8</b>    |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000.

<sup>1</sup>“Outbound commuters” refers to people who live in Thurston County and work in a different county.

<sup>2</sup>“Inbound commuters” refers to people who work in Thurston County and live in a different county.

**Table VII-8  
Transportation to Work  
Thurston County, 1990-2000**

| Subject                                       | 1990 Census   |               | 2000 Census    |               | Change 1990 to 2000 |              |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|
|   | Number        | Percent       | Number         | Percent       | Number              | Percent      |
| <b>MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK</b>        |               |               |                |               |                     |              |
| Drove alone                                   | 59,337        | 78.7%         | 77,933         | 77.2%         | 18,596              | 31.3%        |
| Carpooled                                     | 9,116         | 12.1%         | 12,808         | 12.7%         | 3,692               | 40.5%        |
| Public transportation (including taxicab)     | 1,089         | 1.4%          | 2,184          | 2.2%          | 1,095               | 100.6%       |
| Bicycle or walked                             | 2,539         | 3.4%          | 3,521          | 3.5%          | 982                 | 38.7%        |
| Motorcycle or other means                     | 655           | 0.9%          | 653            | 0.6%          | -2                  | -0.3%        |
| Worked at home                                | 2,628         | 3.5%          | 3,887          | 3.8%          | 1,259               | 47.9%        |
| <b>Total workers 16 years and over</b>        | <b>75,364</b> | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>100,986</b> | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>25,622</b>       | <b>34.0%</b> |
| <b>TRAVEL TIME TO WORK</b>                    |               |               |                |               |                     |              |
| Less than 5 minutes                           | 2,006         | 2.8%          | 2,935          | 3.0%          | 929                 | 46.3%        |
| 5 to 9 minutes                                | 7,828         | 10.8%         | 9,736          | 10.0%         | 1,908               | 24.4%        |
| 10 to 14 minutes                              | 14,078        | 19.4%         | 16,197         | 16.7%         | 2,119               | 15.1%        |
| 15 to 19 minutes                              | 15,704        | 21.6%         | 18,443         | 19.0%         | 2,739               | 17.4%        |
| 20 to 29 minutes                              | 16,452        | 22.6%         | 21,698         | 22.3%         | 5,246               | 31.9%        |
| 30 to 44 minutes                              | 10,006        | 13.8%         | 15,240         | 15.7%         | 5,234               | 52.3%        |
| 45 or more minutes                            | 6,662         | 9.2%          | 12,850         | 13.2%         | 6,188               | 92.9%        |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes)            | 20.7          | (N/A)         | 24.4           | (N/A)         | 3.7                 | (N/A)        |
| <b>Total workers who did not work at home</b> | <b>72,736</b> | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>97,099</b>  | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>24,363</b>       | <b>33.5%</b> |
| <b>TIME LEAVING HOME TO GO TO WORK</b>        |               |               |                |               |                     |              |
| 5:00 a.m. to 6:59 a.m.                        | 18,078        | 24.9%         | 26,461         | 27.3%         | 8,383               | 46.4%        |
| 7:00 a.m. to 7:59 a.m.                        | 27,367        | 37.6%         | 32,439         | 33.4%         | 5,072               | 18.5%        |
| 8:00 a.m. to 8:59 a.m.                        | 10,839        | 14.9%         | 13,369         | 13.8%         | 2,530               | 23.3%        |
| 9:00 a.m. to 9:59 a.m.                        | 3,205         | 4.4%          | 5,118          | 5.3%          | 1,913               | 59.7%        |
| 10:00 a.m. to 11:59 a.m.                      | 2,213         | 3.0%          | 3,900          | 4.0%          | 1,687               | 76.2%        |
| 12:00 p.m. to 11:59 p.m.                      | 9,122         | 12.5%         | 12,071         | 12.4%         | 2,949               | 32.3%        |
| 12:00 a.m. to 4:59 a.m.                       | 1,912         | 2.6%          | 3,741          | 3.9%          | 1,829               | 95.7%        |
| <b>Total workers who did not work at home</b> | <b>72,736</b> | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>97,099</b>  | <b>100.0%</b> | <b>24,363</b>       | <b>33.5%</b> |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 & 2000.

**Table VII-9  
Means of Transportation to Work by Travel Time to Work  
Thurston County, 2000**

| Means of Transportation                       | Mean travel time to work (minutes) | Travel time to work (minutes) |               |               |               |               | Total workers who did not work at home |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
|   |                                    | < 10                          | 10-19         | 20-29         | 30-44         | 45+           |  |
| <b>Drove alone</b>                            | <b>23.2</b>                        | <b>9,735</b>                  | <b>29,115</b> | <b>18,200</b> | <b>11,820</b> | <b>9,060</b>  | <b>77,935</b>                          |
| Percent of workers who did not work at home   | --                                 | 12.5%                         | 37.4%         | 23.4%         | 15.2%         | 11.6%         | 100%                                   |
| <b>Carpooled</b>                              | <b>30.4</b>                        | <b>1,095</b>                  | <b>3,885</b>  | <b>2,770</b>  | <b>2,425</b>  | <b>2,630</b>  | <b>12,810</b>                          |
| Percent of workers who did not work at home   | --                                 | 8.5%                          | 30.3%         | 21.6%         | 18.9%         | 20.5%         | 100%                                   |
| <b>Public trans. (including taxicab)</b>      | <b>43.5</b>                        | <b>35</b>                     | <b>340</b>    | <b>325</b>    | <b>670</b>    | <b>815</b>    | <b>2,185</b>                           |
| Percent of workers who did not work at home   | --                                 | 1.6%                          | 15.6%         | 14.9%         | 30.7%         | 37.3%         | 100%                                   |
| <b>Bicycle or walked</b>                      | <b>13.1</b>                        | <b>1,675</b>                  | <b>1,110</b>  | <b>350</b>    | <b>260</b>    | <b>130</b>    | <b>3,520</b>                           |
| Percent of workers who did not work at home   | --                                 | 47.6%                         | 31.5%         | 9.9%          | 7.4%          | 3.7%          | 100%                                   |
| <b>Motorcycle or other means</b>              | <b>57.5</b>                        | <b>130</b>                    | <b>190</b>    | <b>55</b>     | <b>65</b>     | <b>215</b>    | <b>655</b>                             |
| Percent of workers who did not work at home   | --                                 | 19.8%                         | 29.0%         | 8.4%          | 9.9%          | 32.8%         | 100%                                   |
| <b>Total workers who did not work at home</b> | <b>24.4</b>                        | <b>12,670</b>                 | <b>34,640</b> | <b>21,700</b> | <b>15,240</b> | <b>12,850</b> | <b>97,100</b>                          |
| Percent of workers who did not work at home   | --                                 | 13.0%                         | 35.7%         | 22.3%         | 15.7%         | 13.2%         | 100%                                   |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

**Table VII-10**  
**Intercity Transit System Service Summary**  
**2000, 2005-2009**

| Service                                   | 2000 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 <sup>1</sup> |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------|
| <b>Annual Boardings (millions)</b>        |      |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Fixed Route                               | 2.78 | 2.87 | 3.26 | 3.64 | 4.30 | 4.75              |
| Vanpool                                   | 0.23 | 0.38 | 0.47 | 0.53 | 0.69 | 0.72              |
| Dial-A-Lift                               | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14              |
| <b>Boardings per Vehicle Service Hour</b> |      |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Fixed Route                               | 22.0 | 19.1 | 18.9 | 20.8 | 22.1 | 23.5              |
| Vanpool <sup>2</sup>                      | 8.9  | 9.0  | 9.1  | 9.2  | 9.3  | 9.3               |
| Dial-A-Lift                               | 2.5  | 2.6  | 2.5  | 2.3  | 2.2  | 2.2               |

**Source:** Intercity Transit

**Explanations:** Passenger trips reflect individual boardings, not people. Service reductions in 2000-2002 reflect a 45 percent decrease in revenue due to reductions in the motor vehicle excise tax.

<sup>1</sup>Estimates.

<sup>2</sup>Figures for vanpool passengers per vehicle hour are based on the number of active vanpools.

**Table VII-11**  
**Mode Share at Commute Trip Reduction Work Sites**  
**Thurston County, 1993, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007**

|                         | Travel Mode |                 |         |                  |       |       |       |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                         | Drive Alone | Car and Vanpool | Transit | CWW <sup>1</sup> | Walk  | Bike  | Other |
| <b>1993 (Base Year)</b> |             |                 |         |                  |       |       |       |
| Unincorp. County        | 78.54%      | 12.32%          | 4.76%   | 1.52%            | 1.18% | 0.98% | 0.71% |
| Lacey                   | 80.23%      | 11.24%          | 1.30%   | 2.50%            | 1.25% | 1.60% | 1.89% |
| Olympia                 | 78.97%      | 11.34%          | 2.39%   | 3.14%            | 1.91% | 1.04% | 1.21% |
| Tumwater                | 83.38%      | 11.13%          | 1.17%   | 1.89%            | 0.75% | 0.65% | 1.02% |
| Yelm                    | 76.22%      | 21.56%          | 0.00%   | 0.09%            | 0.82% | 1.32% | 0.00% |
| <b>2001</b>             |             |                 |         |                  |       |       |       |
| Unincorp. County        | 74.34%      | 14.77%          | 4.69%   | 2.40%            | 1.50% | 2.03% | 0.26% |
| Lacey                   | 75.78%      | 14.38%          | 2.15%   | 3.85%            | 0.56% | 1.77% | 1.51% |
| Olympia                 | 75.02%      | 13.13%          | 2.76%   | 4.88%            | 1.95% | 0.97% | 1.28% |
| Tumwater                | 77.89%      | 13.59%          | 1.33%   | 4.63%            | 0.78% | 0.48% | 1.30% |
| Yelm                    | 77.57%      | 19.64%          | 0.00%   | 0.12%            | 1.33% | 0.61% | 0.73% |
| <b>2003</b>             |             |                 |         |                  |       |       |       |
| Unincorp. County        | 77.15%      | 12.14%          | 4.86%   | 1.62%            | 1.00% | 2.50% | 0.72% |
| Lacey                   | 76.70%      | 12.96%          | 1.87%   | 4.42%            | 0.62% | 1.61% | 1.82% |
| Olympia                 | 76.24%      | 12.00%          | 2.51%   | 4.62%            | 2.20% | 1.19% | 1.24% |
| Tumwater                | 74.59%      | 15.61%          | 2.16%   | 4.81%            | 0.88% | 0.48% | 1.47% |
| Yelm                    | 82.23%      | 16.90%          | 0.00%   | 0.21%            | 0.55% | 0.10% | 0.00% |
| <b>2005</b>             |             |                 |         |                  |       |       |       |
| Unincorp. County        | 66.94%      | 14.49%          | 4.25%   | 4.19%            | 1.65% | 6.87% | 1.62% |
| Lacey                   | 75.61%      | 12.57%          | 2.90%   | 4.10%            | 0.65% | 2.34% | 1.81% |
| Olympia                 | 76.20%      | 11.62%          | 2.83%   | 4.53%            | 2.14% | 1.48% | 1.20% |
| Tumwater                | 74.17%      | 15.01%          | 2.44%   | 5.12%            | 0.80% | 0.60% | 1.87% |
| Yelm <sup>2</sup>       | 100.00%     | 0.00%           | 0.00%   | 0.00%            | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| <b>2007</b>             |             |                 |         |                  |       |       |       |
| Unincorp. County        | 66.76%      | 12.23%          | 6.70%   | 3.03%            | 2.11% | 5.82% | 3.35% |
| Lacey                   | 75.09%      | 13.76%          | 2.96%   | 3.05%            | 0.66% | 2.49% | 1.99% |
| Olympia                 | 74.33%      | 12.23%          | 3.64%   | 4.61%            | 2.03% | 1.63% | 1.53% |
| Tumwater                | 72.73%      | 16.69%          | 1.70%   | 5.01%            | 0.79% | 0.87% | 2.20% |
| Yelm                    | N/A         | N/A             | N/A     | N/A              | N/A   | N/A   | N/A   |

**Source:** Washington State Department of Transportation Commute Trip Reduction Office.

**Explanations:** Reported by work site location. The Washington State Commute Trip Reduction law stipulates that all employers with 100 or more employees arriving at a work site during the morning commute period must take measures to reduce the share of drive-alone trips and the number of vehicle miles traveled. Data are based on mandated employee surveys. In 2004, mode split calculations were revised to better handle the effects of compressed workweeks. This revision was applied to all past surveys.

<sup>1</sup>CWW refers to Compressed Work Week, whereby full-time employees compress their schedules into something less than the traditional 5-day work week.

<sup>2</sup>In 2005 Yelm's only CTR worksite was a voluntary worksite with few employees. It did not survey in 2007.

**Table VII-12**  
**Current Commute Practices, 2009**

| <b>Travel Mode</b>                         | <b>Percent of Commute Trips</b> |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Drive Alone, Single Adult                  | 53.1%                           |
| Single Adult with Children                 | 17.0%                           |
| Adult Carpool                              | 6.0%                            |
| Rider                                      | 5.3%                            |
| Transit                                    | 8.1%                            |
| Vanpool                                    | 3.9%                            |
| Bike                                       | 2.7%                            |
| Walk                                       | 2.6%                            |
| Mix of modes                               | 1.0%                            |
| Telecommute, compressed week, or part time | 0.3%                            |

Source: Intercity Transit 2009 Worksite Commuter Survey.

**Table VII-13**  
**Estimate and Forecast of Freight Shipments To, From, and Within Washington, 2002 and 2035**

|                    | <b>Tons (millions)</b> |             | <b>Value (billions)</b> |                |
|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|----------------|
|                    | <b>2002</b>            | <b>2035</b> | <b>2002</b>             | <b>2035</b>    |
| <b>State Total</b> | <b>477</b>             | <b>976</b>  | <b>\$371</b>            | <b>\$1,239</b> |
| <b>By Mode</b>     |                        |             |                         |                |
| Truck              | 283                    | 581         | \$238                   | \$812          |
| Rail               | 45                     | 86          | \$14                    | \$20           |
| Water              | 48                     | 124         | \$4                     | \$11           |
| Air, air & truck   | <0.4                   | <0.7        | \$10                    | \$50           |
| Truck & rail       | <1.7                   | 3           | \$2                     | \$4            |
| Other intermodal   | 3                      | 7           | \$37                    | \$152          |
| Pipeline & unknown | 98                     | 176         | \$67                    | \$190          |

Source: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Freight Management and Operations Freight Transportation Profile - Washington Freight Analysis Framework, November 2002.

Explanations: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

**Table VII-14  
Top Five Commodities Shipped To, From, and Within  
Washington by All Modes: Weight and Value, 2002**

| <b>Commodity</b>            | <b>Tons (millions)</b> |                             | <b>Value (billions)</b> |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Within State Total</b>   | <b>243.5</b>           | <b>Within State Total</b>   | <b>\$141.5</b>          |
| Gravel                      | 67.9                   | Unknown                     | \$44.1                  |
| Gasoline                    | 24.8                   | Mixed Freight               | \$19.3                  |
| Waste/scrap                 | 20.8                   | Machinery                   | \$9.7                   |
| Logs                        | 18.5                   | Gasoline                    | \$6.4                   |
| Cereal Grains               | 11.1                   | Electronics                 | \$5.8                   |
| <b>From State Total</b>     | <b>104.3</b>           | <b>From State Total</b>     | <b>\$77.0</b>           |
| Coal, n.e.c. <sup>1</sup>   | 23.7                   | Electronics                 | \$8.7                   |
| Gravel                      | 15.8                   | Coal, n.e.c. <sup>1</sup>   | \$7.2                   |
| Wood Products               | 10.5                   | Machinery                   | \$5.4                   |
| Cereal Grains               | 9.4                    | Mixed Freight               | \$4.8                   |
| Other Agricultural Products | 6.5                    | Misc. mfg. products         | \$4.1                   |
| <b>To State Total</b>       | <b>129.5</b>           | <b>To State Total</b>       | <b>\$152.7</b>          |
| Coal, n.e.c. <sup>1</sup>   | 31.4                   | Machinery                   | \$45.5                  |
| Crude Petroleum             | 27.3                   | Electronics                 | \$19.5                  |
| Cereal Grains               | 7.6                    | Mixed Freight               | \$12.1                  |
| Coal                        | 6.0                    | Coal, n.e.c. <sup>1</sup>   | \$8.8                   |
| Machinery                   | 4.8                    | Motor Vehicles <sup>2</sup> | \$6.6                   |

**Source:** U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Freight Management and Operations, [Freight Transportation Profile - Washington Freight Analysis Framework](#), November 2002.

**Explanation:** <sup>1</sup>Coal and petroleum products, not elsewhere classified.

<sup>2</sup>Motorized and other vehicles (including parts).

**Table VII-15**  
**Rail Lines in Thurston County, 2008**

|  | <b>Miles<br/>(Approx.)</b> |
|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Rail Lines</b>  |                            |
| Burlington Northern Santa Fe                             | 36.0                       |
| Port of Olympia  | 1.0                        |
| Puget Sound and Pacific                                  | 10.0                       |
| Tacoma Rail  | 31.5                       |
| Union Pacific  | 8.0                        |
| City of Yelm (inactive)                                  | 2.5                        |
| <b>Total Rail Lines<sup>1</sup></b>                      | <b>89.0</b>                |
| <b>Trails Along Former Rail Right-of-Way<sup>2</sup></b> |                            |
| Chehalis Western Trail                                   | 24.5                       |
| Gate-to-Belmore Trail                                    | 12.5                       |
| Lacey St. Clair Trail                                    | 3.0                        |
| Olympia Woodland Trail                                   | 2.0                        |
| Yelm-to-Tenino Trail                                     | 13.5                       |
| <b>Total Trails along former Rail ROW<sup>1</sup></b>    | <b>55.5</b>                |

**Source:** TRPC and information provided by local jurisdictions.

**Explanation:** See Map 15 for rail lines and Map 16 (in Chapter VIII) for trails.

<sup>1</sup>Numbers may not add due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup>For trail status, see the map or Tables VIII-8 and VIII-9 (in Chapter VIII).