

# **NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD (TPB)**

**DRAFT**

## **Call for Projects**

**For the 2007 Financially Constrained Long Range  
Transportation Plan (CLRP) and Fiscal Year 2008 –  
2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**



**December 1, 2006**



Alternative formats of this publication can be made available for persons with disabilities. Phone: 202.962.3300 or 202-962.3213 (TDD) Email: [accommodations@mwkog.org](mailto:accommodations@mwkog.org). For details: [www.mwkog.org](http://www.mwkog.org).

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	5
Proposed Schedule for the 2007 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008 – 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) .....	9
SECTION 1: POLICY FRAMEWORK.....	11
THE TPB VISION.....	13
SECTION 2: FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.....	15
AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS .....	17
FINANCIAL CONSTRAINT .....	19
TITLE VI AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.....	21
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTATION .....	22
OTHER FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS .....	23
Planning Factors.....	23
Public Participation .....	24
Consultation .....	24
Environmental Mitigation Discussion.....	24
Human Service Transportation Coordination .....	25
Freight Planning.....	25
Annual Listing of Projects.....	26
SECTION 3: PROJECT SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS .....	27
INTRODUCTION .....	29
The CLRP Online Database .....	29
Project Description Forms.....	30
Project Phasing For TIP and Conformity Inputs.....	36
Sample Form .....	37

## APPENDICES

Appendix A: Transportation Emission Reduction Measure (TERM) Analysis Instructions .....	A-1
Appendix B: Transportation Emission Reduction Measure (TERM) Reporting.....	B-1

This page is intentionally blank.

## INTRODUCTION

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Washington region, has responsibilities for both long-term transportation planning covering the next two to three decades (the Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan or CLRP) and short-term programming of projects covering the next six years (the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP). The planning horizon for the plan is from 2007 to 2030. The plan identifies transportation projects, programs and strategies that can be implemented by 2030, within financial resources “reasonably expected to be available.”

### Purpose of Document

**This document is a broad solicitation for projects and programs to be included in the 2007 Plan and the FY 2008-2013 TIP.** Individual counties, municipalities and state and federal agencies with the fiscal authority to fund transportation projects, as well as public groups and individuals, are invited to submit projects in response to the solicitation. The purpose of this document is to:

- 1) Describe the policy framework and priorities that should guide project selections;
- 2) Review federal regulations related to the Plan and TIP; and
- 3) Explain the project submission process for the Plan and the TIP.

### Overview of the Policy Framework and Federal Requirements

The Plan and TIP must address the policy framework, the TPB Vision, and federal requirements, which together comprise the key criteria for the development of the Plan and TIP, summarized in Figure 1 below. The eight policy goals in the TPB Vision can be found on page 10.

The Plan and TIP must meet federal requirements involving financial constraint, air quality conformity, public participation, Title VI and environmental justice, and other requirements including a Congestion Management Process (CMP). A financial plan must show how the updated long-range plan can be implemented with expected revenues. The plan and TIP need to demonstrate conformity with national air quality standards.

### Planning Provisions in SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: Legacy for Users)

SAFETEA-LU adds several other federal requirements in addition to those mentioned above. At this time, the USDOT has not issued a final rule on metropolitan planning provisions. The TPB will rely on the proposed rule for metropolitan transportation planning published in the June 6, 2006 Federal Register<sup>1</sup>. All plans adopted after July 1, 2007 must comply with all SAFETEA-LU requirements, including:

---

<sup>1</sup> “Part II. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR Parts 450 and 500. Federal Transit Administration 49 CFR Part 613. “Statewide Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning; Proposed Rule” Federal Register, June 9, 2006. [http://www.fta.dot.gov/index\\_4696.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/index_4696.html)  
DRAFT


- The Plan and TIP must be updated every 4 years instead of 3 and 2 respectively. This means that the TPB’s next major Plan update with a new financial plan will occur in 2010 (instead of 2009).
- SAFETEA-LU includes eight planning factors to consider during Plan and TIP development (instead of seven). The TPB Vision incorporates the eight planning factors; security is addressed implicitly. The new factors are:
  - Safety;
  - Security; and
  - Consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
- During the development of the long-range plan, the TPB and state implementing agencies will have to consult with agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, historic preservation, airport operations and freight movements on projects in the Plan. Consultation may involve comparison of a map of transportation improvements to conservation plans or maps and natural or historic resources inventories.
- The Plan must include a discussion of potential environmental mitigation activities along with potential sites to carry out the activities to be included. The discussion is to be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies. Implementing agencies will be asked to identify on the project description forms “types of potential mitigation activities” for major projects.
- A participation plan has to be developed in consultation with interested parties that provides reasonable opportunities for all parties to comment.
- In 2007, all projects and programs funded with the following three programs must be derived from a TPB Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan
  - 1) Formula Program for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310);
  - 2) Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC, Section 5316); and
  - 3) New Freedom Program<sup>2</sup> (Section 5317)

---

<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The New Freedom Program provides capital and operating funding for transportation services above and beyond what is required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

**Figure 1:  
Key Criteria for Developing the Plan and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**



### **Relationship between the Plan and TIP**

Every year the TPB prepares a program for implementing the plan using federal, state, and local funds. This document, known as the TIP, provides detailed information showing what projects are eligible for funding and implementation over a six-year period. Like the Plan, the TIP needs to address the TPB Vision and federal requirements. The TIP includes portions, or phases, of projects selected for implementation from the Plan. While the entire project is described in the Plan, in many instances only a portion of the project is included in the six-year TIP. The Plan is reviewed every year and under federal requirements must be updated at least every four years. The TIP must be updated every four years as well.

This page is intentionally blank.



## **Proposed Schedule for the 2007 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008 – 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

*November 15, 2006	TPB Reviews Draft Call For Projects (formerly called the "Solicitation Document")
*December 20, 2006	TPB Releases Final Call For Projects
December 20, 2006	Transportation Agencies Begin Submitting Project Information through On-Line Database
<hr/>	
January 26, 2007	<u>DEADLINE:</u> Transportation Agencies Complete On-Line Project Submissions
February 2, 2007	Technical Committee reviews Plan and TIP Project Submissions
February 15, 2007	Plan and TIP Project Submissions and draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment Released for Public Comment at the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
*February 21, 2007	TPB Briefed on Project Submissions and draft Scope of Work
March 17, 2007	Public Comment Period Ends
*March 21, 2007	TPB Reviews Public Comments and is asked to Approve Project Submissions and draft Scope of Work
*July 18, 2007	TPB Receives Status Report on the Draft Plan, TIP and Conformity Assessment
September 13, 2007	Draft Plan, TIP and Conformity Assessment Released for Public Comment at Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
*September 19, 2007	TPB Briefed on the Draft Plan, TIP and Conformity Assessment
October 13, 2007	Public Comment Period Ends
*October 17, 2007	TPB Reviews Public Comments and Responses to Comments, and is Presented the Draft Plan, TIP and Conformity Assessment for Adoption

This page is intentionally blank.

# **SECTION 1: POLICY FRAMEWORK**

This page is intentionally blank.

## THE TPB VISION

To guide the planning and implementation of transportation strategies, actions, and projects for the National Capital Region the TPB adopted a Vision in October 1998 that is a comprehensive set of policy goals, objectives, and strategies. The TPB Vision incorporates the eight planning factors specified in SAFETEA-LU; security is addressed implicitly.

The eight planning factors are provided in Section 2.

The TPB Vision will be used to review and assess the strategies and projects under consideration for inclusion in the Plan and TIP. **In developing proposed projects and strategies in the Plan or TIP, each agency must consider their contributions to meeting the Vision's policy goals and objectives set by the TPB.** In this way, the TPB will be able to ensure and document that consideration of the required planning factors has taken place. Consideration of regional goals and objectives may also prove useful to agencies in selecting among proposed projects or actions when the desired level of investment exceeds the projected available revenues. Especially important are projects and strategies that contribute to meeting the required emission reductions and achieving air quality conformity.

The Vision policy goals, objectives, and strategies are provided in the following pages.

### *Vision Statement*

*In the 21st Century, the Washington metropolitan region remains a vibrant world capital, with a transportation system that provides efficient movement of people and goods. This system promotes the region's economy and environmental quality, and operates in an attractive and safe setting—it is a system that serves everyone. The system is fiscally sustainable, promotes areas of concentrated growth, manages both demand and capacity, employs the best technology, and joins rail, roadway, bus, air, water, pedestrian and bicycle facilities into a fully interconnected network.*

## The Vision Goals

1. The Washington metropolitan region's transportation system will provide **reasonable access at reasonable cost** to everyone in the region.
2. The Washington metropolitan region will develop, implement, and maintain an interconnected transportation system that enhances quality of life and promotes a strong and growing economy throughout the entire region, including a **healthy regional core and dynamic regional activity centers** with a mix of jobs, housing and services in a walkable environment.
3. The Washington metropolitan region's transportation system will **give priority to management, performance, maintenance, and safety** of all modes and facilities.
4. The Washington metropolitan region will use the **best available technology** to maximize system effectiveness.
5. The Washington metropolitan region will plan and develop a transportation system that enhances and **protects the region's natural environmental quality, cultural and historic resources**, and communities.
6. The Washington metropolitan region will achieve better **inter-jurisdictional coordination of transportation and land use** planning.
7. The Washington metropolitan region will achieve an **enhanced funding mechanism(s) for regional and local transportation system priorities** that cannot be implemented with current and forecasted federal, state, and local funding.
8. The Washington metropolitan region will **support options for international and interregional travel** and commerce.

# **SECTION 2: FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS**

This page is intentionally blank.

## **AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS**

The Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 require that the transportation actions and projects in the CLRP and TIP support the attainment of the federal health standards. The Washington area is currently in a nonattainment status for the 8-hour ozone standard and for fine particles standards (PM<sub>2.5</sub>, or particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 micrometers in diameter). The CLRP and the TIP have to meet air quality conformity requirements as specified in the amended Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations issued in July 2004 and in supplemental guidance issued thereafter.

### **Background**

#### *Ozone*

Since EPA designated the Washington area as nonattainment for the 1-hour ozone standard in the 1990 CAAA, the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) and the state air management agencies have developed state air quality implementation plans (SIP)s to achieve EPA's emissions reduction requirements and demonstrate attainment. These work efforts included the development and submittal to EPA of a final 'severe' area ozone attainment SIP in 2004, which, following EPA's approval in May 2005, established revised mobile source emissions budgets for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>). On April 15, 2004 EPA designated the Washington, DC – MD – VA area as 'moderate' nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, which replaced the 1-hour ozone standard. The current schedule for completion of the 8-hour ozone SIP allows for use of the new VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> mobile source emissions budgets in the conformity analysis of the 2007 CLRP and the FY2008-2013 TIP.

#### *Fine Particles Standards (PM<sub>2.5</sub>)*

On December 17, 2004 EPA designated the DC – MD – VA area (consisting of the Washington MSA, excluding Stafford County, VA, and Calvert County, MD) as nonattainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. As published in the January 5, 2005 Federal Register, these PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment designations became effective on April 5, 2005. Areas were given a 1 year grace period starting April 5, 2005 in which to demonstrate conformity of transportation plans and programs to the new standards. The primary conformity assessment criterion for PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Washington area, in this interim period until emissions budgets are set in the SIP in 2008, is to show that forecast year emissions are no greater than base year 2002 emissions. TPB staff conducted a conformity assessment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> in the Fall of 2005. It was adopted by the TPB on December 21, 2005 and received federal approval on February 21, 2006.

### **Current Status**

As part of the conformity assessment of the 2007 CLRP and FY2008-2013 TIP, projected emissions for the actions and projects expected to be completed in the 2008, 2009, 2010, 2020 and 2030 analysis years will need to be estimated. If the analysis of mobile source emissions for any of these years shows an increase in NO<sub>x</sub> or VOC above what is allowed in the emissions budgets, or if PM<sub>2.5</sub> issues arise, it will be necessary for the TPB to define and program

transportation emission reduction measures (TERMs) to mitigate the excess emissions, as has been done in the past. The TPB Technical Committee's Travel Management Subcommittee is developing a schedule for submittal and analysis of candidate TERM proposals for potential inclusion in the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP for the purpose of NO<sub>x</sub>, VOC, or PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions mitigation. Should emissions analysis for any forecast year estimate excess emissions which cannot be mitigated, TPB's programming actions would become limited to those projects which are exempt from conformity.

## FINANCIAL CONSTRAINT

### Updating the Plan

The following financial requirements for the Plan are provided in the federal planning regulations.

The long-range Plan "must include a financial plan that demonstrates the consistency of proposed transportation investments with already available and projected sources of revenues. The plan shall compare the estimated revenue from existing and proposed funding sources that can reasonably be expected to be available for transportation use, and the estimated costs of constructing, maintaining and operating the total (existing plus planned) transportation system over the period of the plan.

The estimated revenue by existing revenue source (local, State, and Federal and private) available for transportation projects shall be determined and any shortfalls shall be identified. Proposed new revenue and/or revenue sources to cover shortfalls shall be identified, including strategies for ensuring their availability for proposed investments. Existing and proposed revenues shall cover all forecasted capital, operating, and maintenance costs."

In June 2005, FHWA and FTA issued "Fiscal Constraint Guidance" which provides planning guidance and a set of questions and answers on financial plans and fiscal constraint for Plans and TIPs. The guidance recognizes that transportation planning varies across the county, the difficulty in predicting project costs and revenues, and that flexibility is needed in demonstrating fiscal constraint. The guidance is available at the FHWA website:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/index.htm>. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) published proposed planning regulations based upon SAFETEA-LU in the Federal Register on June 9, 2006, but no final regulations or guidance regarding financial constraint has been issued<sup>3</sup>.

The 2006 financial plan for the Plan and TIP was adopted by the TPB in October 2006. This financial analysis produced the same financial "big picture" as in the 2003 analysis; the majority of currently anticipated future transportation revenues will continue to be devoted to the maintenance and operation of the current transit and highway systems. Because no significant sources of new revenues are anticipated, all new expansion projects to be considered for inclusion in the Plan will require a project specific funding plan with identified revenue sources. More information about the 2006 financial plan is available at [www.regionaltransportationplan.org](http://www.regionaltransportationplan.org).

Agencies should review the timing, costs and funding for the actions and projects in the Plan, ensuring that they are consistent with the "already available and projected sources of revenues." Significant changes to the projects or actions in the current plan should be identified. New projects and strategies, specifically addressing regional air quality conformity needs also should

---

<sup>3</sup> "Part II. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR Parts 450 and 500. Federal Transit Administration 49 CFR Part 613. "Statewide Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning; Proposed Rule" Federal Register, June 9, 2006. [http://www.fta.dot.gov/index\\_4696.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/index_4696.html)  
DRAFT

be identified. If new funding sources are to be utilized for a project or action, agencies should describe the strategies for ensuring that the funding will be available.

If new funding sources are to be utilized for a project or action, agencies should describe the strategies for ensuring that the funding will be available. Other projects or actions above and beyond those for which funds are available or committed may be submitted to the Plan under illustrative status. A change in project status from illustrative to full status would require a Plan amendment. Illustrative projects will not be assumed in the air quality conformity determination of the Plan.

## **Developing Inputs for the TIP**

The following financial requirements for the TIP are provided in the federal planning regulations.

"The TIP shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained).

The financial plan shall be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State and the transit operator. The State and transit operator must provide MPOs with estimates of available Federal and State funds which the MPOs shall utilize in developing financial plans. It is expected that the State would develop this information as part of the STIP development process and that the estimates would be refined through this process.

Only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available may be included under full status in the plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. In developing the financial analysis, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies funded under Title 23, USC and the Federal Transit Act, other Federal funds, local sources, state assistance, and private participation.

In non-attainment areas, projects included for the first two years of the current TIP shall be limited to those for which funds are available or committed."

To develop a financially constrained TIP, agencies should begin with the projects and actions committed in the previous TIP. After reviewing the estimates of available state and federal funds for the period, agencies can identify the actions and projects as inputs for the TIP, ensuring that projects for the first two years are "limited to those for which funds are available or committed."

## TITLE VI AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations, dated February 11, 1994, requires Federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations.

In December of 1998 the US Department of Transportation/Federal Highway Administration released Order 6640.23 "FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice In Minority and Low-Income Populations." Order 6640.23 "establishes policies and procedures for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to use in complying with Executive Order 12898". The document states that Executive Order 12898 is "primarily a reaffirmation of the principles of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI) and related statutes, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 23 U.S.C. 109(h), and other Federal environmental laws, emphasizing the incorporation of those provisions with the environmental and transportation decision-making processes."

Furthermore, "these requirements will be administered to identify the risk of discrimination, early in the development of FHWA's programs, policies, and activities so that positive corrective action can be taken. In implementing these requirements, the following information should be obtained where relevant, appropriate, and practical:

- (1) population served and/or affected by race, or national origin, and income level;
- (2) proposed steps to guard against disproportionately high and adverse effects on persons on the basis of race, or national origin; and,
- (3) present and proposed membership by race, or national origin, in any planning or advisory body that is part of the program."

The TPB addresses these requirements in several ways. First, to ensure on-going input from transportation disadvantaged population groups, the TPB established the Access for All Advisory Committee to advise on issues, projects and programs important to low-income communities, minority communities and persons with disabilities. Second, each time the Plan is updated, the AFA committee reviews maps of proposed major projects and locations of transportation disadvantaged populations from the Census. Third, an analysis of travel characteristics and accessibility to jobs is conducted to ensure that disadvantaged groups are not disproportionately impacted by the long-range plan. The latest analysis and AFA report can be found at the TPB website: <http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/>.

## CONGESTION MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTATION

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a systematic set of actions to provide information on transportation system performance, and to consider alternative strategies to alleviate congestion, enhancing the mobility of persons and goods. The CMP impacts many aspects of the CLRP, including problem identification, analysis of possible actions, project prioritization and selection, and post-implementation monitoring. With the CMP, TPB aims to use existing and future transportation facilities efficiently and effectively, reducing the need for highway capacity increases for single-occupant vehicles (SOVs).

In accordance with federal law and regulations, the regional CMP must look a number of separate components of congestion. The CMP must identify the location, extent, and severity of congestion in the region. Within the TPB work program, the CMP considers information and trend analysis on overall regional transportation system conditions, and undertakes a number of associated travel monitoring and analysis activities. A data collection and analysis program compiles transportation systems usage information, uses that information in its travel forecasting computer models, and publishes the information in reports. TPB's periodic aerial surveys of the region's roadways show the most congested locations and associated planning or project activities occurring at that location.

The following additional CMP components should be addressed through this Call for Projects as follows.

1. The CMP must consider congestion and congestion management strategies directly associated with Plan projects. Requested in this Call for Projects is documentation of any project-specific information available on congestion that necessitates or impacts the proposed project. Submitting agencies may cite TPB-published congestion information, if applicable. Information should at least contain qualitative information, and should be quantitative if possible. TPB will compile and analyze project-specific CMP information submitted with projects in conjunction with other CMP information sources. The Call for Projects submission form has fields to be filled in for this location-specific congestion information.
2. **For any project providing a significant increase to SOV capacity, it must be documented that the implementing agency considered all appropriate systems and demand management alternatives to the SOV capacity.** This requirement and its associated questions are substantially unchanged from what has been requested in recent years. A special set of SOV congestion management documentation questions must be answered for any project to be included in the Plan or TIP that significantly increases the single occupant vehicle carrying capacity of a highway. Non-highway projects do not need a form. Certain highway projects may also be exempt from needing a form. It is recommended to complete a form in association with all submitted, non-exempt projects to ensure compliance with federal regulations and with regional goals.

## OTHER FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

SAFETEA-LU adds several other federal requirements in addition to air quality conformity and financial constraint. The new Plan must meet all the SAFETEA-LU requirements since the Feds are requiring all plans adopted after July 1, 2007 must be SAFETEA-LU compliant. The USDOT has not issued a final rule on metropolitan planning provisions. The TPB will rely on the proposed rule for metropolitan transportation planning published in the June 6, 2006 Federal Register<sup>4</sup>. Below is a list of other federal requirements the TPB must meet for the next Plan and TIP to be SAFETEA-LU compliant. A helpful summary of key modifications to the federal requirements for metropolitan planning is provided at the FHWA website: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/factsheets/mp.htm>.

### Planning Factors

SAFETEA-LU specified eight planning factors to consider while developing the Plan and TIP, listed below. **SAFETEA-LU emphasizes safety, security and consistency between transportation and economic development.** The TPB vision incorporates all of the planning factors specified in SAFETEA-LU, except for explicitly addressing security. However, the TPB and the region have been very active in addressing security since 9/11 and have incorporated security and safety into the TPB's planning framework through a series of on-going planning activities. Implementing agencies will be asked to identify how each project addresses the eight planning factors in the project submission forms.

- (1) Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- (2) Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users;
- (3) Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users;
- (4) Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
- (5) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- (6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- (7) Promote efficient system management and operation; and
- (8) Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

---

<sup>4</sup> "Part II. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR Parts 450 and 500. Federal Transit Administration 49 CFR Part 613. "Statewide Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning; Proposed Rule" Federal Register, June 9, 2006. [http://www.fta.dot.gov/index\\_4696.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/index_4696.html)  
DRAFT

## **Public Participation**

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to do the following based on SAFETEA-LU:

- Representatives of users of pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation facilities, the disabled are specifically added as parties to be provided with the opportunity to participate in the planning process;
- The MPO is to develop a participation plan in consultation with interested parties that provides reasonable opportunities for all parties to comment; and
- To carry out the participation plan, public meetings are to be: conducted at convenient and accessible locations at convenient times; employ visualization techniques to describe plans; and make public information available in an electronically accessible format, such as on the Web.

The TPB is addressing these requirements by first conducting an evaluation of the TPB public involvement process to identify strengths and weaknesses, and suggest potential improvements for the future. The consultant report will include recommendations for a public participation plan and other public involvement requirements of SAFETEA-LU. A public participation plan is expected to be drafted with input from the public by spring 2007.

## **Consultation**

During the development of the long-range plan, the TPB and state implementing agencies will have to consult with agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, historic preservation, airport operations and freight movements on projects in the Plan. Consultation may involve comparison of a map of transportation improvements to conservation plans or maps and natural or historic resources inventories.

TPB staff is currently gathering steam on the new consultation requirements of SAFETEA-LU. Currently, a database is being assembled containing the contact information of federal, state and local officials throughout the region. These officials will be requested to provide inventories of historic or natural resources, so that they may be compared with the plan. Additionally, they will be requested to provide comments on the plan.

## **Environmental Mitigation Discussion**

The Plan must include a discussion of potential environmental mitigation activities along with potential sites to carry out the activities to be included. The discussion is to be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies. Implementing agencies will be asked to identify on the project description forms “types of potential mitigation activities” for major projects. Implementing agencies will be asked to identify on the project description forms “types of potential mitigation activities” for major projects.

TBP staff reviewed current minimization and mitigation strategies being employed throughout the region to prevent or remediate environmental damage caused by transportation projects. This analysis has been used to create a draft environmental mitigation discussion which is currently under review. Using the contact database developed for the consultation requirements, a regional inventory of potential wetland and forest remediation sites will be developed.

## **Human Service Transportation Coordination**

SAFETEA-LU requires the TPB as a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to be more involved with human service transportation coordination efforts to improve transportation for low-income populations, persons with disabilities and older adults. The TPB has established a Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force to develop a Coordinated Plan for the region. As required under SAFETEA-LU, this plan will address three Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs: 1) Formula Program for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities; 2) Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program; and 3) New Freedom Program. The TPB was designated the recipient of JARC and New Freedom funds for the Washington DC-MD-VA Urbanized Area by the D.C. Mayor, the MD Governor, and the VA Governor in August 2006. A Coordinated Plan is anticipated to be adopted by the TPB in spring 2007.

## **Freight Planning**

The ability to move freight and goods is a critical element of the Washington region's economy. All businesses and residences rely on freight. The SAFETEA-LU legislation reaffirmed the federal emphasis on freight movement considerations in metropolitan transportation planning, and the TPB has agreed to look at ways to enhance considerations of freight in its processes. The Washington region features all major modes of freight movement: truck, railroad, air cargo, pipeline, and even a limited amount of maritime activity. Each mode has advantages and market niches for its commodities. Much of the freight movement in the region originates or is destined here; much of it is just passing through the region on its way from and to other locations, Washington being located centrally in the populous East Coast. Upcoming TPB freight planning activities will enhance consideration of freight in the overall regional transportation planning process:

- Development of a regional profile describing the role of freight in the region's economy, what goods are moved in the region, how they are moved (modes), where they are moved, the goods' overall impact to the region's economy, and any trends on these issues;
- Locations of major freight facilities;
- Locations of transportation facilities critical to regional freight movements;
- Identification of freight movement stakeholders and understanding of their needs, and ongoing outreach to these stakeholders;
- Safety and security considerations for freight;
- Coordination with freight planning activities by member agencies and jurisdictions; and
- Development of an overall ongoing regional freight planning process.

## **Annual Listing of Projects**

Both TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU require that the TPB must publish or otherwise make available an annual listing of projects, consistent with the categories in the TIP, for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year. With the assistance of and in cooperation with the transportation implementing agencies in the region, the TPB has prepared a listing of projects for which federal funds have been obligated each year since 2001.


# **SECTION 3: PROJECT SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**

This page is intentionally blank.

## INTRODUCTION

This section describes the process to be used by transportation implementing agencies when updating project information for the CLRP as well as the Air Quality Conformity inputs, the Transportation Improvement Program and the Congestion Management Process. The project description forms are designed to elicit information to enable policy makers, citizens and other interested parties and segments of the community affected by projects in the plan to understand and review them. Description forms must be completed for all projects to be included in the Plan and the TIP. All regionally significant projects, *regardless of funding source*, must be included in the Plan for Air Quality Conformity information purposes. A Congestion Management Process Form must be completed for all projects meeting the requirements described on page 3-3 of these instructions. The relationship between the Plan, TIP, Conformity, and CMP is shown in Figure 3. The remainder of this section describes how to update Plan, TIP and Conformity project information using an online database application. TERM analysis and reporting procedures are not addressed here; see Section 4 for those instructions.

**Figure 3: Relationship Between CLRP, TIP, CMP, and Conformity Information**



### The CLRP Online Database

An online database application will be used to gather project information from each agency. Staff from implementing agencies will be assigned an account with a user name and password. There are two levels of access to the database; editors and reviewers. Each agency should decide Once logged into the application users will have access to the most recent version of the Plan and TIP information that was approved by the TPB.

A user manual with complete instructions will be provided to agency staff when the application is complete. TPB staff will also offer multiple training sessions to assist staff with the new format. The remainder of this section will cover the purpose of the forms and changes in the new version.

## CLRP Project Description Forms

Projects should be described in sufficient detail to facilitate review by the TPB and the public. Specific information is needed on the project location and physical characteristics, purpose, projected completion date, total estimated costs, proposed sources of revenues, and other characteristics. Submissions for studies should indicate those cases where the design concept and scope (mode and alignment) have not been fully determined and will require further analysis. TERM projects or actions should also be identified. Project Description Forms should be used to describe the full scope of a facility's improvements.

### ***Basic Project Information***

1. *Project Title* .....A very brief, user-friendly description of the project; e.g. “East Market Street Widening” or “Downtown Circulator Bus System”
2. *Agency Project ID* .....Agencies can use this field to track projects with their own ID systems.
3. *Project Type*
  - a. ....Identify the functional class or category on which projects will be grouped in reports. Options include: *Interstate, Primary, Secondary, Urban, Transit, Bike/Ped, Bridge, Enhancement, ITS, Maintenance, CMAQ, Other.*
  - b. ....Identify the nature of the project: *System Expansion* (adding capacity to a road or transit system), *System Preservation* (any work on the road or transit system that does not add capacity), *Management, Operations and Maintenance, Study, Other.*
4. *Facility*.....These fields should be used to describe actual infrastructure or transit routes. Any of these fields may be left blank and there is no need for redundant entries. If a project can be described adequately in the *Project Title* field, it is not necessary to fill in these fields.
  - a. *Prefix*.....Interstate or State abbreviation for route type, e.g. I, VA, MD, US. Combinations such as VA/US are acceptable, but discouraged.
  - b. *Number*.....The route number that corresponds with the above prefix. Again, combinations are acceptable, but discouraged.
  - c. *Name* .....Full name of facility; e.g. “Capital Beltway,” “East Street” or “Red Line”. To the extent possible, this field should be limited to actual street names or transit routes.
  - d. *Modifier*.....Any term that needs to be used to further describe a facility, such as “extended”, “relocated” or “interchange”.

5. *From (At)* .....The beginning project limit or location of a spot improvement. Use the *(At)* checkbox to indicate a spot or interchange improvement. Follow the conventions above for *Prefix, Number, Name* and *Modifier*.
6. *To* .....Terminal project limit. Follow conventions above for *Prefix, Number, Name* and *Modifier*.
7. *Jurisdiction* .....Select the appropriate jurisdictions for the project. Multiple jurisdictions can be selected by pressing the **CTRL** key while clicking.
8. *Secondary Agency* .....Any other agencies working in conjunction with primary agency
9. *Description* .....Describe the project as clearly as possible. Use public-friendly phrasing and avoid technical jargon where possible.
10. *Bike/Ped Accommodations* .....Indicate using the pull-down menu whether the project is: a) *Primarily a bicycle/pedestrian project*, b) *Includes accommodations for bicycle/pedestrian users*, or c) *Does not include accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians*.
11. *Total Mileage* .....If available, enter the total length of the project to the closest tenth of a mile.
12. *Map Image* .....If available, upload an image file to assist
13. *Documentation* .....If necessary, upload any extra documentation for the project. This could include financial plans or supplemental information materials.
14. *Project Manager* .....Name of project manager or point-of-contact for information
15. *E-mail* .....E-mail address for project manager or point-of-contact for information
16. *Web Site* .....URL for further project information from implementing agency
17. *Projected Completion Year* .....Estimated year that the project will be open to traffic or implemented.
18. *Actual Completion Year* .....Use this field to indicate that the full scope of the project has been opened to traffic or implemented.

- a. *Ongoing*.....Use this checkbox to indicate that this is an ongoing program or similar action. If this box is checked, this field is interpreted as the year in which the program was implemented. This should not be checked for studies, or any construction projects unless they are non-site specific, such as “Citywide Road Surface Improvements.”
- 19. *Project Withdrawn* .....Use this checkbox to indicate that a project is being withdrawn from the Plan. Provide an approximate date for the withdrawal.
- 20. *Total Estimated Cost* .....If available, enter the cost of the project from start to finish
- 21. *Remaining Cost* .....Estimated cost remaining to be spent on project.
- 22. *Source* .....Indicate the sources of funds: Federal, State, Local, Private, Bonds, Other. Hold the **CTRL** key down to select multiple sources.
- 23. *Notes/Remarks* .....General notes for agency or TPB staff to use.

***Congestion Management Process Documentation***

The following section has been revised to address the new SAFETEA-LU component called the Congestion Management Process. Please see the discussion on Congestion Management Documentation in Section 2 of this document for more information. Questions 24 and 25 should be answered for every project. Questions 26 through 28 still apply to any new projects that propose an increase in SOV capacity. In addition, a Congestion Management Documentation Form should be completed for each project or action proposing an increase in SOV capacity.

24. *Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project or program?*

Check “Yes” if this project is being planned specifically to address congestion conditions.

25. *If the answer above is “Yes” select which of the following responses best classify those conditions:*

Use the checkboxes to identify either; a) *Recurring Congestion*; b) *Frequent Incident-Related Non-Recurring Congestion*; c) *Non-Site Specific Congestion*; d) *Other*

26. *Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other arterial highway of a functional class higher than minor arterial?*

Check “Yes” if the project will increase capacity on a SOV facility of functional class 1, 2 or 5.

27. *If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria?*

The following categories of projects require a congestion management form, except if they fall under one or more of the exemption criteria listed under Question 27:

- *New limited access or other principal arterial roadways on new rights-of-way*
- *Additional through lanes on existing limited access or other principal arterial roadways*
- *Construction of grade-separated interchanges on limited access highways where previously there had not been an interchange.*

If a Congestion Management Documentation Form is required, click “Edit” and see instructions below for use of that form.

28. *If no, please identify the criteria that exempt the project from CMP requirements:*

Use the checkboxes to identify the exemption criteria:

- *The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile*
- *The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvements, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange*
- *The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as bicycle or pedestrian facilities*
- *The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction*
- *Any project that received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992*
- *Any project that was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or for which construction funds were committed in the FY98-03 TIP. Note that funds being committed in the FY99-04 TIP does not exempt a project.*
- *Any project whose construction cost is less than \$5 million.*

### ***SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors***

The following section is new. The questions here replace the memo/text field that asked how the project supported regional goals as outlined in the TPB’s Vision. This new set of questions is intended to be easier to respond to and to show how the project is addressing the eight planning factors outlined in SAFETEA-LU. Particular attention should be paid to Question 28b as it pertains to safety.

29. *Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:*

Use the checkboxes to select all that apply:

- a. *Supports the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.*
- b. *Increases the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.*

- i. *Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?*

It is presumed that all new projects being constructed include safety considerations. Select “Yes” only if the primary reason the project is being proposed is to address a safety issue.

- ii. *If so, please indicate the safety issues identified:*

Use the checkboxes to indicate a) *High Accident Location*, b) *Pedestrian Safety*, c) *Engineer Identified Problem*, d) *Truck or Freight Safety*, e) *Other*

Briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:

- c. *Increases the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.*
- d. *Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight*
- e. *Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.*
- f. *Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.*
- g. *Promote efficient system management and operation.*
- h. *Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.*

### ***Environmental Mitigation***

The following section is new. The questions here address a new emphasis in SAFETEA-LU on environmental impacts, both short and long term and strategies for mitigating those impacts.

- 30. *Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project? If so, identify the types of activities below.*

Use the checkboxes to select “Yes” or “No” and to identify any mitigation activities being planned for this project.

- *Air Quality,*
- *Energy,*
- *Floodplains,*
- *Geology, Soils and Groundwater,*
- *Hazardous and Contaminated Materials,*
- *Noise,*
- *Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species,*
- *Socioeconomics,*
- *Surface Water,*
- *Vibrations,*
- *Visual and Aesthetic Conditions,*
- *Wetlands,*
- *Wildlife and Habitat*

### ***Intelligent Transportation Systems***

The following section is new. The questions here address a new emphasis in SAFETEA-LU on environmental impacts, both short and long term and strategies for mitigating those impacts.

31. ***Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to federal Rule 940 requirements?***

Use the checkboxes to select “Yes” or “No”.

***If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with federal Rule 940 for the project?***

Use the checkboxes to select:

- ***Not Started***
- ***Ongoing, not complete***
- ***Completed***

*Under which Architecture:*

- *DC, Maryland, or Virginia State Architecture*
- *WMATA Architecture*
- *COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture*
- *Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_*

*Comments:* Provide any additional comments which may better describe the Architecture of the project.

***Record Tracking***

This section is used to keep track of modifications to records. These fields are automated and are not editable.

- 32. Creator .....Recorded ID of the user that created the record
- 33. Created On.....Date record was originally created on (will not work for original imported data)
- 34. Last Updated On.....Recorded date and time of last modifications to record
- 35. Last Updater .....Recorded ID of last person to make modifications to record

***CMP Documentation Form for SOV Projects***

A Congestion Management Documentation Form should be completed for each project or action intended for the Plan that involves a significant increase in single-occupant vehicle (SOV) carrying capacity of a highway.

Brief and complete answers to all questions are recommended. A reference to an external document or an attachment without further explanation on the form itself is not recommended; findings of studies, Major Investment Studies, for example, should be summarized on the form itself. References to other documents can be made if desired *in addition to* the answer provided on the form.

As a rule of thumb, the scale and detail in the responses to the questions should be in proportion to the scale of the project. For example, a relatively minor project needs less information than a major, multi-lane-mile roadway construction project.

The form can summarize the results of EISs or other studies completed in association with the project, and can also summarize the impact or regional studies or programs. It allows the submitting agency to explain the context of the project in the region's already-adopted and implemented programs, such as the Commuter Connections program, and to go on to explain what new and additional strategies were considered for the project or corridor in question.

**Project Phasing For TIP and Conformity Inputs**

Each phase of the project (even if there is only one) should be described under the "Project Phases". The Air Quality Conformity Analysis is based on the information in these listings, so all regionally significant phases of all projects in the plan need to be included.

TIP funding information should be completed for each project intended for programming in the current TIP. The TIP should show all funds (federal and non-federal) that are expected to be obligated between FY 2008 and FY 2013. Previous fiscal years are shown for historical purposes only and have no bearing on the current fiscal years.

Many of the data fields for phases are very similar to those found in Questions 1 – 19. The following sections will describe the fields unique to the Air Quality Conformity Inputs and Transportation Improvement Program.

***Conformity Inputs***

- 1. Improvement ..... Pulldown field to identify type of improvement being made to the facility (e.g. construct, widen, upgrade, etc.)
- 2. Facility Type From ..... Functional class of facility before improvement
- 3. Facility Type To ..... Functional class of facility after improvement
- 4. Lanes From ..... Number of lanes on facility before improvement
- 5. Lanes To ..... Number of lanes on facility after improvement
- 6. R.O.W. Acquired ..... Right-of-way has been acquired for the facility
- 7. Under Construction ..... Construction has begun on facility
- 8. Completion/Implementation Date ..... Date the project will be completed (open to traffic) or implemented

***TIP Funding Inputs***

- 9. Environmental Review Type ..... Type of NEPA documentation required, if any
- 10. Environmental Review Status ..... Current status of any required NEPA documentation
- 11. Project Status ..... Project is delayed, reprogrammed, complete, withdrawn, or ongoing
- 12. Capital Costs
  - a. Fiscal Year ..... Fiscal year in which funds are expected to be obligated
  - b. Phase ..... Funds obligated for: a) Planning and Engineering, b) R.O.W. acquisition, c) Construction, d) Studies (non-P.E.), and e) Other (e.g. bus purchases, TERM implementation, etc.)
  - c. Source ..... Federally recognized source of funds
  - d. Fed/State/Local Share ..... Percentage distribution of federal, state and local funds
  - e. Amount ..... Funds shown in \$1,000s

**Sample Form**

The following pages are samples for the CLRP Project Description Forms.



## Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan Project Description Form

1. Project Title:  2. Agency ID:

3. Project Type a:   b:

	Prefix	Number	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

5. From: (At: <input type="checkbox"/> )	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

6. To:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
--------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

7. Jurisdiction(s):  8. Secondary Agency:

- Arlington County
- City of Alexandria
- Fairfax County
- City of Falls Church
- Loudoun County
- ....

9. Description:

10. Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodations:   11. Total Miles:

12. Map Image:   13. Documentation:

14. Project Manager:  15. E-mail:

16. URL:

17. Projected completion year:

18. Actual completion year:  a)  Project is ongoing. Year refers to implementation.

19.  Project being withdrawn from the Plan as of

20. Total cost (in \$1,000s):  22. Funding Sources:

21. Remaining cost (\$1,000s):

23. Comments:

- Federal
- State
- Local
- Private
- Bonds
- Other

### Congestion Management Information

24. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project?  Yes  No

25. If so, describe those conditions:  Recurring Congestion  Non-Site Specific Congestion  
 Frequent Incident-Related Non-Recurring Congestion  Other

26. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other arterial highway of a functional class higher than minor arterial?  Yes  No

27. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria?  Yes   No

**Congestion Management Information (continued)**

28. If not, please identify the criteria that exempt the project here:

- The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile
- The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvements, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
- The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as bicycle or pedestrian facilities
- The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
- Any project that received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992
- Any project that was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or for which construction funds were committed in the FY98-03 TIP. Note that funds being committed in the FY99-04 TIP does not exempt a project.
- Any project whose construction cost is less than \$5 million.

**SAFETEA-LU Planning Factors**

29. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project.

- Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.

Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue?  Yes  No

Please identify issue(s):

- High Accident Location
- Pedestrian Safety
- Engineer Identified Problem
- Truck or Freight Safety
- Other

Briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:

- Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.
- Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
- Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
- Promote efficient system management and operation.
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

**Environmental Mitigation**

30. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project?  Yes  No

If yes, what types of mitigation activities?

- Air Quality    Floodplains    Socioeconomics    Geology, Soils and Groundwater    Vibrations  
 Energy    Noise    Surface Water    Hazardous and Contaminated Materials    Wetlands

**Intelligent Transportation Systems**

31. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to federal Rule 940 requirements?  Yes  No

If yes, what is the status of the systems engineering analysis compliant with federal Rule 940 for the project?  Not Started    Ongoing, not complete    Complete

- Under which Architecture:  DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture  
 WMATA Architecture  
 COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture  
 Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

Save

Cancel