

Urban Congestion Report (UCR)

A Snapshot of Congestion Trends in the U.S. for July 2010 through September 2010



Federal Highway Administration

<p>Monthly Trends -- Congested Hours</p>	<p><u>Congested Hours</u> Average duration of weekday congestion</p> <p>+13 minutes from last year</p> <p>↑</p> <p>Jul-Sep 2010: 4:27 Jul-Sep 2009: 4:14</p>
<p>Monthly Trends -- Travel Time Index</p>	<p><u>Travel Time Index</u> Peak period travel times vs. off-peak travel times</p> <p>+3 point from last year</p> <p>↑</p> <p>Jul-Sep 2010: 1.21 Jul-Sep 2009: 1.18</p>
<p>Monthly Trends -- Planning Time Index</p>	<p><u>Planning Time Index</u> Unreliability (variability) of travel</p> <p>+7 points from last year</p> <p>↑</p> <p>Jul-Sep 2010: 1.49 Jul-Sep 2009: 1.42</p>

Summary of Nationwide Trends

- All three nationwide measures in 2010 showed worsening conditions when compared to the same three months in 2009.
- One of the 21 cities showed improvements in all three measures.
- Eleven of the 21 cities showed worsening conditions in all three measures.
- Nine of the 21 cities had mixed results among the three measures.

More UCR on page 2: Congestion and reliability trends for each UCR City.

Urban Congestion Report (UCR)

A Snapshot of City Congestion Trends for July 2010 through September 2010



Federal Highway Administration

City	Congested Hours		Travel Time Index		Planning Time Index		% Change in VMT	% Usable Data
	2010	Change from 2009	2010	Change from 2009	2010	Change from 2009		
Atlanta, GA	3:54	-1:23	1.19	<i>+1</i>	1.52	<i>-4</i>	0%	78%
Boston, MA	5:32	<i>+0:27</i>	1.27	<i>+5</i>	1.63	<i>+7</i>	1%	99%
Chicago, IL	6:47	-1:49	1.33	<i>+3</i>	1.69	<i>+6</i>	5%	75%
Detroit, MI	1:56	-1:40	1.11	<i>+4</i>	1.36	<i>+15</i>	-6%	62%
Houston, TX	3:41	<i>+0:18</i>	1.26	<i>+4</i>	1.61	<i>+9</i>	0%	82%
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	4:26	<i>+1:11</i>	1.19	<i>+4</i>	1.48	<i>+10</i>	0%	99%
Oklahoma City, OK	1:32	-0:05	1.05	<i>+1</i>	1.18	<i>+5</i>	0%	100%
Orange County, CA	4:02	<i>+0:33</i>	1.22	<i>+5</i>	1.48	<i>+9</i>	-1%	100%
Los Angeles, CA	6:47	<i>+0:40</i>	1.29	<i>+3</i>	1.56	<i>+3</i>	1%	100%
Philadelphia, PA	6:10	<i>+1:16</i>	1.24	<i>+4</i>	1.63	<i>+9</i>	0%	95%
Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Pittsburgh, PA	6:53	<i>+1:19</i>	1.20	<i>+4</i>	1.47	<i>+10</i>	4%	98%
Portland, OR	1:50	<i>+0:13</i>	1.25	<i>+3</i>	1.67	<i>+8</i>	0%	33%
Providence, RI	2:27	-0:11	1.09	<i>+1</i>	1.28	<i>+3</i>	1%	99%
Riverside – San Bernardino, CA	2:43	-0:03	1.10	<i>+2</i>	1.28	<i>+7</i>	-1%	100%
Sacramento, CA	2:00	<i>+0:12</i>	1.10	<i>+2</i>	1.23	<i>+3</i>	1%	100%
St. Louis, MO	1:44	-0:38	1.09	<i>+2</i>	1.26	<i>+6</i>	0%	98%
Salt Lake City, UT	1:07	-3:37	1.03	-3	1.10	-9	1%	94%
San Antonio, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
San Diego, CA	2:26	<i>+0:31</i>	1.11	<i>+4</i>	1.33	<i>+12</i>	0%	100%
San Francisco, CA	3:15	<i>+0:26</i>	1.15	<i>+3</i>	1.33	<i>+4</i>	0%	100%
Seattle, WA	5:44	-0:10	1.31	<i>+2</i>	1.71	<i>+4</i>	0%	98%
Tampa, FL	2:18	-0:04	1.11	<i>+3</i>	1.31	<i>+7</i>	-3%	99%

Notes: Green bolded values indicate improving conditions; red italics indicate worsening conditions. "n.a." indicates that data was not available or was of insufficient quality. Comparison of 2010 to 2009 is for the same three-month period (July – September).

For more information on the UCR, contact Rich Taylor (Rich.Taylor@dot.gov).