

ITEM 8 – Action

October 19, 2011

Approval of Amendments to the
FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the
Budget, Respond to the Federal Transportation Planning
Certification Review, and Incorporate the Scope and Process to
Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Staff Recommendation:

- Receive briefing on amendments to the FY 2012 UPWP.
- Adopt Resolution R4-2012 to amend the FY 2012 UPWP to revise the budget and certain work tasks, as described in the attached materials.

Issues:

None

Background:

At the July 20 meeting, the TPB was briefed on an amendment to the FY 2012 UPWP budget to reflect changes in new FY 2012 federal funding and adjustments in the unobligated FY 2010 funding provided by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT. The TPB was also briefed on amendments to the FY 2012 UPWP to implement the recommendations and corrective actions included in the federal certification report on the transportation planning process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area. At

the July 20 meeting, the TPB approved the scope and process to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan for incorporation into the FY 2012 UPWP.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FY 2012 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) TO REVISE THE BUDGET, RESPOND TO THE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING CERTIFICATION REVIEW, AND INCORPORATE THE SCOPE AND PROCESS TO DEVELOP A TPB REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES PLAN

WHEREAS, the Joint Planning Regulations issued in February 2007 by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) require a Unified Planning Work Program for Transportation Planning (UPWP); and

WHEREAS, the UPWP is required as a basis and condition for all funding assistance for transportation planning to state, local, and regional agencies by the FHWA and FTA; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2012 UPWP for the Washington Metropolitan Area was approved by the TPB on March 16, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the approved budget for the FY 2012 UPWP was based upon funding allocations of FTA Section 5303 and FHWA funding by the DOTs that were assumed would be similar to the previous year; and

WHEREAS, the final federal FHWA funding allocations provided by the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT) and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) were determined in April, and the final FTA and FHWA allocations provided by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) were determined in September; and

WHEREAS, the commitments are shown in bold for each "New FY 2012" row in the attached Table 1 from the FY 2012 UPWP that was approved by the TPB in March, and these allocations provide a **net increase of \$199,502** (including state and local matching funds) in new FY 2012 funding for the UPWP relative to the totals included in the 2012 UPWP approved in March; and

WHEREAS, discrepancies indentified in the FY 2010 FTA and FHWA funding balances have been identified, and the adjustments to the FTA and FHWA totals shown in bold for each "unobligated FY 2010" row in the attached Table 1 provide a **net decrease of \$416,830** in the total unobligated funding; and

WHEREAS, the net result is a **reduction of \$217,328** for the total FY 2012 budget as shown in bold in the attached Table 1 from the FY 2012 UPWP; and

WHEREAS, because the technical assistance funding level for each state is an agreed percentage of the total new FY 2012 funding provided through the respective state, and the technical assistance funding level for WMATA is an agreed percentage of the new FTA FY 2012 funding, the technical assistance funding for the District and WMATA increase by \$55,593 and \$763, respectively, while in Maryland and Virginia they decrease by \$23,149 and \$5,511, respectively as shown in bold in the attached Table 2 from the FY 2012 UPWP; and

WHEREAS, since the technical assistance funding increases by a net of \$27,696 and the core program funding is reduced by \$245,024 to produce the reduction of \$217,328 for the total FY 2012 budget, as shown in bold in the attached Table 2 from the FY 2012 UPWP; and

WHEREAS, to address the core program budget reduction, the budget of the 4.C Models Development work activity is reduced by \$245,000 by deferring hiring a consultant to design a framework for applying a tour-based and/or activity based model (ABM), and funding for this framework design of an ABM will be considered in the FY 2013 UPWP; and

WHEREAS, text shown in bold has been added to the task descriptions and budgets shown on pages 12-14 in the attached memorandum for the 3.C Regional Studies work activity to incorporate the scope and process to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and \$100,000 has been transferred from this work activity to work activity 1.E Public Participation shown on pages 9-11 to support outreach for the priorities plan and to implement enhanced outreach activities pursuant to the federal certification report recommendations; and

WHEREAS, in April 2010, FHWA and FTA conducted a certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington, DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area (TMA), which included the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) because a small portion of the TMA extends into part of Stafford County which is in the FAMPO planning area; and

WHEREAS, the federal certification review, which is documented in a May 5, 2011 report includes 11 TPB recommendations, 3 FAMPO recommendations and 4 FAMPO corrective actions, and Table 1 as the appendix in the attached memorandum presents the TPB implementation actions for its 11 recommendations; and

WHEREAS, text shown in bold has been added to the task descriptions shown on pages 18-29 in the attached memorandum for Section 1 in the Introduction of the FY 2012 UPWP to fully document how the TPB and FAMPO meet their TMA planning responsibilities under their 2004 agreement, and for work activities 1.E Public Participation, 1.B Transportation Improvement Program, and 1.D Financial Plan to provide additional documentation, and to work activities 1.C Constrained Long-Range Plan and 2.B Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Planning to address adaptation for climate change effects;

WHEREAS, at its September 9 and October 7 meetings, the TPB Technical Committee was briefed on the proposed amendments to the budget and work activities in the FY 2012 UPWP;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD amends the FY 2012 UPWP to include the budget revisions and work activity text amendments, as shown on the attached Table 1 and Table 2, and to work activity narratives as presented in Appendix I.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEMORANDUM

October 12, 2011

TO: Transportation Planning Board

FROM: Gerald Miller
Director, Program Coordination
Department of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Briefing on Amendments to the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and to Respond to the Federal Certification Review of the Transportation Planning Process for the Washington, DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area (TMA)

Overview of Amendments

Since the FY 2012 UPWP was approved in March, the funding allocations provided by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT have been revised to reflect changes in new FY 2012 funding and adjustments in the unobligated FY 2010 funding. Part A of this memorandum describes an amendment to revise the budget and work activities to reflect the funding changes and to incorporate the TPB approved scope and process to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

At its May 18 meeting, the TPB was briefed on the recent FTA and FHWA certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area. Part B beginning on page 6 describes proposed amendments to the FY 2012 UPWP to implement the recommendations and corrective actions included in the federal certification report. The TPB will be asked to approve these amendments at its meeting on October 19.

Proposed FY 2012 UPWP Budget Revisions

On March 16, 2011, the TPB approved the budget for the FY 2012 UPWP which includes “new FY 2012 funds” that come from the federal FY 2011 budget and “unobligated FY 2010 funds” that are unexpended funds from the completed FY 2010 UPWP. As described below, the new funding total needs to be increased by \$199,500 and the unobligated FY 2010 total needs to be decreased by about \$417,000. **The net result is a decrease of \$217,300 for the total FY 2012 UPWP budget.**

Changes to the New FY 2012 Funding Totals

Because the federal FY 2011 budget had not been approved in February in time for the FY 2012 UPWP to be approved by the TPB in March, we assumed the allocations of new FY 2012 FTA Section 5303 and FHWA PL funding to be provided by the DOTs would be similar to the previous year. In April, the final FHWA PL funding allocations provided by the DDOT, VDOT and VDRPT were determined. In September, the final FTA and FHWA PL allocations provided by MDOT were determined. The commitments are shown in bold for each “New FY

2012” row in the attached Table 1 from the FY 2012 UPWP that was approved by the TPB in March. These allocations provide a **net increase of \$199,502** (including state and local matching funds) in new FY 2012 funding for the UPWP relative to the totals included in the FY 2012 UPWP approved in March.

Changes to the Unobligated FY 2010 Funding Totals

In the Spring of 2011, COG Accounting staff discovered discrepancies in COG reports showing the FTA and FHWA balances for the DOTs dating back to the FY 2008 report. The correct FY 2010 funding balances have been confirmed with DDOT, MDOT, VDRPT and VDOT. The adjustments to the FTA and FHWA totals are shown in bold for each “unobligated FY 2010” row in the attached Table 1 from the FY2012 UPWP. These adjustments result in a **net decrease of \$416,830** in the total unobligated FY2010 funding.

Changes to the Technical Assistance and Core Program Budgets

As shown in Table 1, the FY 2012 UPWP budget is **decreased by a total of \$217,328** relative to the total approved by the TPB in March.

The technical assistance funding level for each state is an agreed percentage of the total new FY 2012 funding provided through the respective state. The technical assistance funding level for WMATA is an agreed percentage of the new FTA 2012 funding. Therefore, the budgets for the technical assistance programs in the District and WMATA will increase by \$55,593, and \$763 respectively, while the Maryland and Virginia programs will decrease by \$23,149 and \$5,511 respectively.

Because the total for all of the **technical assistance programs increases by \$27,696, the net total funding for the core work program decreases by \$245,024.** To account for the core program budget reduction of \$245,024, the budget for **work activity 4.C Models Development** will be reduced by \$245,000 for the work element set aside to provide consultant assistance to design a framework for applying a tour-based and/or activity-based travel demand model (ABM) for the Washington region. \$250,000 has been carried over from previous years for this work element, with the hope that research efforts, such as the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organization (AMPO) study of MPOs’ experiences with advanced travel models, would shed light on whether ABMs represent a good use of resources for updating the current travel model and on how best to proceed with deploying such an effort.

The May 2011 final report of Phase 1 of the AMPO study on the experience of MPOs that have developed and applied ABMs concluded that there was insufficient documentation to permit an assessment of the benefits and costs of ABMs. Phase 2 of the AMPO study, which will be completed by January 2012, is examining the experience at two MPOs that have applied both a trip based model and an ABM. It is recommended that the Models Development work activity budget for FY 2012 be reduced by \$245,000. After the Phase 2 AMPO report is completed, consideration can be given to including new funding in the FY 2013 UPWP to pursue ABM development.

TABLE 1 Draft 9.28.11
FY 2012 TPB PROPOSED FUNDING BY FEDERAL STATE AND LOCAL SOURCES
(July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012)

CHANGE IN FTA FUNDING	FTA SECT 5303 80% FED & 20% STA/ LOC	FHWA SECT 112 80% FED & 20% STA/ LOC	CHANGE IN FHWA FUNDING	TOTALS	CHANGE IN TOTAL FUNDING
ALLOTMENTS PROVIDED BY DDOT					
NEW FY 2012	441,149	1,899,791	+411,800	2,340,940	+ 411,800
UNOBLIGATED FY 2010 +34,961	47,686	271,323	-309,402	319,009	- 274,441
CARRYOVER FY 2011	36,366	156,611		192,977	
SUBTOTAL +34,961	525,201	2,327,725	102,398	2,852,926	+ 137,359
ALLOTMENTS PROVIDED BY MDOT					
NEW FY 2012 +9,538	1,077,700	3,708,490	-181,013	4,786,190	- 171,475
UNOBLIGATED FY 2010 -195,109	75,922	375,544	+ 35,669	451,466	- 159,440
CARRYOVER FY 2011	171,902	591,536		763,438	
SUBTOTAL -185,571	1,325,524	4,675,570	-145,344	6,001,094	- 330,915
ALLOTMENTS PROVIDED BY VDRPT & VDOT					
NEW FY 2012	912,243	2,900,449	-40,823	3,812,692	- 40,823
UNOBLIGATED FY 2010 -126	78,291	271,940	+17,177	350,231	+ 17,051
CARRYOVER FY 2011	129,965	413,219		543,184	
SUBTOTAL -126	1,120,499	3,585,608	-23,646	4,706,107	- 23,772
TPB BASIC PROGRAM					
TOTAL NEW FY 2012 +9,538	2,431,092	8,508,730	+189,964	10,939,822	+ 199,502
UNOBLIGATED FY 2010 -160,274	201,899	918,807	-256,556	1,120,706	- 416,830
SUBTOTAL -150,736	2,632,991	9,427,537	-66,592	12,060,528	-217,328
TOTAL CARRYOVER FY 2011	338,233	1,161,366		1,499,599	
TOTAL BASIC PROGRAM-150,736	2,971,224	10,588,903	-66,592	13,560,127	-217,328
GRAND TOTAL -150,736	2,971,224	10,588,903	-66,592	13,560,127	-217,328

"New FY2012 funds" are newly authorized funds for the FY2012 UPWP

"Unobligated FY2010 funds" are unexpended funds from the completed FY2010 UPWP

"Carryover FY2011 funds" are programmed from the FY2011UPWP to complete specific work tasks in the FY2012 UPWP

For **work activity 3.C Regional Studies**, text shown in bold on pages 12-14 has been added to incorporate the TPB approved scope and process to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. In addition, \$100,000 will be transferred from this work activity to **work activity 1.E Public Participation** to support outreach for the priorities plan and to implement enhanced outreach activities pursuant to the federal certification report recommendations.

The proposed budget changes for the Technical Assistance Program and for the work activities in the core work program are shown in bold on the attached Table 2 from the FY 2012 UPWP approved in March.

TABLE 2
TPB FY 2012 WORK PROGRAM BY FUNDING SOURCES

WORK ACTIVITY	TOTAL COST	FTA/STATE/ LOCAL	FHWA/STATE/ LOCAL	OTHER FUND
1. PLAN SUPPORT				
A. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	70,700	15,491	55,209	
B. Transp Improvement Program (TIP)	240,600	52,719	187,881	
C. Constrained Long-Range Plan	588,400	128,927	459,473	
D. Financial Plan	64,000	14,023	49,977	
E. Public Participation +100,000	371,900	81,489	290,411	
F. Private Enterprise Participation	18,300	18,300		
G. Annual Report	80,100	17,551	62,549	
H. Transportation/Land Use Connection Progr	395,000	86,550	308,450	
I. DTP Management	452,100	99,062	353,038	
Subtotal	2,281,100	514,113	1,766,987	
2. COORDINATION and PROGRAMS				
A. Congestion Management Process (CMP)	205,000	44,919	160,081	
B. Management, Operations, and ITS Planning	340,300	74,565	265,735	
C. Emergency Preparedness Planning	75,400	16,521	58,879	
D. Transportation Safety Planning	125,000	27,389	97,611	
E. Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning	108,700	23,818	84,882	
F. Regional Bus Planning	100,000	21,911	78,089	
G. Human Service Transportation Coordination	134,828	29,543	105,285	
H. Freight Planning	150,000	32,867	117,133	
I. MATOC Program Planning Support	120,000	26,294	93,706	
Subtotal	1,359,228	297,827	1,061,401	
3. FORECASTING APPLICATIONS				
A. Air Quality Conformity	563,200	123,405	439,795	
B. Mobile Emissions Analysis	640,100	140,255	499,845	
C. Regional Studies -100,000	566,300	124,085	442,215	
D. Coord Coop Forecasting & Transp Planning	806,800	176,782	630,018	
Subtotal	2,576,400	564,527	2,011,873	
4. DEVELOPMENT OF NETWORKS/MODELS				
A. Network Development	769,700	168,653	601,047	
B. GIS Technical Support	548,800	120,250	428,550	
C. Models Development -245,024	1,321,200	289,494	1,031,706	
D. Software Support	178,900	39,200	139,700	
Subtotal	2,818,600	617,597	2,201,003	
5. TRAVEL MONITORING				
A. Cordon Counts	250,800	54,954	195,846	
B. Congestion Monitoring and Analysis	350,000	76,690	273,310	
C. Travel Surveys and Analysis				
Household Travel Survey	1,136,300	248,980	887,320	
D. Regional Trans Data Clearinghouse	317,900	69,657	248,243	
Subtotal	2,055,000	450,281	1,604,719	
Core Program Total (I to V) -245,024	11,090,328	2,444,345	8,645,983	
6. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE				
A. District of Columbia + 55,593	341,000	38,514	302,486	
B. Maryland -23,149	1,066,100	120,409	945,691	
C. Virginia - 5,511	783,200	88,457	694,743	
D. WMATA +763	279,500	279,500		
Subtotal + 27,696	2,469,800	526,879	1,942,921	
Total, Basic Program -217,328	13,560,128	2,971,224	10,588,904	
7. CONTINUOUS AIRPORT SYSTEM PLANNING				
A. Ground Access Travel Time Study - Phase 2	85,000			85,000
B. Update Ground Access Forecasts - Phase 2	100,000			100,000
C. Ground Access Element Update - Phase 1	40,000			40,000
D. Conduct 2011 Regional Air Passenger Survey	300,000			300,000
E. Process 2011 Air Passenger Survey - Phase 1	85,000			85,000
Subtotal	610,000			610,000
GRAND TOTAL - 217,328	14,170,128	2,971,224	10,588,904	610,000

Proposed Responses to the Federal Certification Review

TPB staff and FAMPO staff have reviewed the recommendations of the federal certification review and will work cooperatively to implement them by the compliance deadlines. At the July 20 meeting, the TPB was briefed on proposed amendments to the FY 2012 UPWP to implement the TPB staff recommendations. At the October 19 meeting, the TPB will be asked to amend the FY 2012 UPWP to include text for work activities that will be undertaken by the end of FY 2012 (June 30, 2012) to implement the recommendations. The revisions for the affected work activities in the FY 2012 are included in the appendix.

Any additional implementation actions beyond June 30, 2012 will be specified in the FY 2013 UPWP which the TPB is scheduled to adopt in March 2012. By June 30, 2012, TPB staff will produce a report documenting the TPB and FAMPO implementation of the recommendations and corrective actions.

Background on the Federal Certification Review Recommendations and Corrective Actions

In April 2010, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducted a certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington, DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area (TMA). The review included the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) because a small portion of the TMA extends into part of Stafford County which is in the FAMPO planning area.

The federal certification review is documented in a May 5, 2011 report. FTA staff briefed the Technical Committee and the TPB on this report at their May meetings. Seven TPB planning elements received commendations and four FAMPO planning elements were commended. The report includes 11 TPB recommendations and 3 FAMPO recommendations.

The report also has 4 corrective actions that FAMPO must address. The first action requires that FAMPO and the Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board submit a joint letter by August 5, 2011 confirming the FAMPO project selection process for RSTP and CMAQ projects. The next two actions require that FAMPO staff receive Title VI training and that FAMPO establish a Title VI/Nondiscrimination Plan by May 5, 2012. The final action requires that FAMPO establish a process for assessing the impacts of the investments in its plan and TIP on different socio-economic groups by six months following the adoption of the Title VI Plan.

The certification statement in the report is as follows:

The FHWA and FTA have determined that the metropolitan planning process of the Washington, DC-VA-MD TMA, conducted by the MWCOG Transportation Planning Board and the Fredericksburg Metropolitan Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, conditionally meets the requirements of the Metropolitan Planning Rule at 23 CFR Part 450 Subpart C and 49 CFR Part 613. The FHWA and the FTA are, therefore, jointly certifying the transportation planning process, subject to implementation of the Recommendations and Corrective Actions within the next 18 months.

Proposed FY 2012 UPWP Amendments to Implement the Recommendations and Corrective Actions

Pursuant to the federal certification report recommendations, new text shown in bold beginning on page 18 has been added to **Section 1** to fully document how the TPB and FAMPO meet their TMA planning responsibilities under their 2004 agreement. New text has also been added to **work activities 1.E Public Participation, 1.B Transportation Improvement Program, and 1.D Financial Plan** to provide additional documentation.

Adaptation for climate change effects is a topic receiving increased attention by federal and state transportation agencies. Text to address this new emphasis has been added to **work activities 1.C Constrained Long-Range Plan and 2.B Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Planning**.

The Appendix beginning on page 29 includes tables summarizing the proposed actions to implement the recommendations and corrective actions. Recommendations 1 for TPB and 12 for FAMPO are essentially the same concerning FAMPO and TPB planning processes and call for a review of the TPB/FAMPO 2004 planning agreement for the TMA. Table 1 presents the TPB implementation actions for its 11 recommendations.

Table 2 presents the FAMPO actions responding to its 3 recommendations and 4 corrective actions. The first and second corrective actions have been implemented. As required by the first action, FAMPO and the Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board submitted a joint letter to FHWA confirming the FAMPO project selection process for RSTP and CMAQ projects. As required by the second action, FAMPO staff received Title VI training along with VDOT and TPB staff in July. As required by the third action, FAMPO has produced a Title VI plan which will be considered for adoption by the FAMPO Board in October. As required by the fourth action, FAMPO staff are working to establish a process for assessing the impacts of the investments in its plan and TIP on different socio-economic groups.

Appendix I: Amendments to FY 2012 UPWP

Part A. Amendments with budget changes:

1. E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, pages 9-11
3. C REGIONAL STUDIES, pages 12-14
4. C. MODELS DEVELOPMENT pages 15-17

Part B. Amendments with text changes to implement federal certification recommendations:

Section I. Responsibilities for Transportation, excerpt pages 18-20

1. B. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, pages 21-22
1. C CONSTRAINED LONG RANGE PLAN, pages 23-25
1. D. FINANCIAL PLAN pages 25-26
2. B. MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (MOITS) PLANNING pages 27-28

Deletions to text is shown in ~~strikeout~~ and additions in **bold**.

From the FY 2012 UPWP

E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Participation Plan, which was adopted in December 2007, will guide all public involvement activities to support the development of the new TIP and CLRP as well as all other TPB planning activities. Much of the TPB's public participation work in FY 2012 will focus on developing and implementing tools and activities that explain to the public how transportation decisions are made in the Washington region.

Work activities include:

- Support implementation of the TPB Participation Plan.
- **Provide public outreach support for the development of the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. Through a variety of public outreach activities, citizens will discuss the benefits, desirability and feasibility of potential projects and plan components. This public involvement process will incorporate the following features:**
 - Use a variety of tools and media, ranging from social media to public forums. The TPB will consider using innovative visualization techniques to allow the public to better understand the concepts under consideration.
 - Reach out to a variety of constituencies, including community leaders and ordinary citizens not normally involved in the TPB process, as well as citizen partners such as members of the Citizen Advisory Committee and Access for All Advisory Committee.
 - Ensure public involvement is woven into the entire process for developing the Priorities Plan, especially at key milestones in the plan's development.
- **Outreach for the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, will include, but will not be restricted to, the following activities and approaches:**
 - The TPB will convene at least one large meeting of stakeholders in the TPB process, including TPB members, the CAC, AFA and Technical Committee.
 - The TPB will seek to engage the public by participating in community events and attending community meetings. The outreach for the priorities plan will seek to connect regional transportation issues with broader interests of affected communities.
 - Staff will use a variety of media to inform citizens about key milestones and activities, including public input opportunities for the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

- Develop and conduct workshops or events to engage the public and community leaders on key regional transportation issues, including challenges reflected in the CLRP and TIP.
- Ensure that the TPB's website, publications and official documents are timely, thorough and user-friendly.
- Develop new materials, tools and visualization techniques to better explain to the public how the planning process works at the local, regional and state levels.
 - **Develop an online clearinghouse with information on public involvement activities among its member jurisdictions. Drawing from the TPB Citizens guide, this clearinghouse will provide an explanation of how decisions are made at the state, local and regional levels and will provide information and links regarding various planning activities that effect the decisions that are reflected in the Constrained Long-Range Plan. In developing this clearinghouse, TPB staff will coordinate with public information officers from its member jurisdictions.**
- Conduct at least one session of the Community Leadership Institute, a two-day workshop designed to help community activists learn how to get more actively involved in transportation decision making in the Washington region.
 - Seek to conduct a session of the Community Leadership Institute for high school students.
- Provide staff support for the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), including organizing monthly meetings and outreach sessions, and drafting written materials for the committee.
 - **At least one meeting in FY2012 will bring together members of the CAC, AFA and the WMATA Riders Advisory Council to discuss a topic of common interest.**
 - **Seek to include student representation on the CAC, including potentially identifying an alternate member slot specifically for a student.**
- **Effective use of technology will include, but will not be restricted to, the following methods:**
 - **Conduct webinars and use other web-based tools, as appropriate, to share information among stakeholders and the public.**
 - **Make available a webcast of the TPB's monthly meeting on the COG website.**
 - **Use social media, develop a blog or use some other form of web communication to provide information to the public about regional**

transportation issues and engage the public in a dialogue about key topics.

- Provide staff support for the TPB Access For All Advisory (AFA) Committee that includes leaders of low-income, minority and disabled community groups.
- Prepare AFA Committee memo to the TPB with comments on the CLRP related to projects, programs, services and issues that are important to community groups, such as providing better transit information for limited English speaking populations, improved transit services for people with disabilities, pedestrian and bike access and safety, and potential impacts of transit-oriented development and gentrification.
- Implement public involvement procedures, including public comment sessions at the beginning of each TPB meeting and official public comment periods prior to the adoption of key TPB documents.
- **Identify and implement methods for regular evaluation of the TPB’s public involvement activities.**
- **Amend the TPB Participation Plan to include the following:**
 - **Identify procedures, strategies and desired outcomes for how visualization techniques will be used in various public involvement activities. Visualization may range from simple techniques such as using pictures and graphics more frequently to more sophisticated approaches such as the use of computer simulation programs.**
 - **Establish a process to explicitly and deliberately determine what types of information sharing should be used for different types of public involvement and outreach requirements. For example, this system will specify the desired targets and potential methods that might be used to announce public comment periods. A different approach would be used to seek input for the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.**
 - **Establish a multi-faceted and easily replicable system for evaluating the effectiveness of the TPB’s public involvement activities.**

Oversight:		Transportation Planning Board
Cost	Estimate:	\$371,900 \$471,900
Products:		TPB Participation Plan with a proactive public involvement process; CAC and AFA Committee Reports
Schedule:		On-going, with forums and meetings linked to preparation of CLRP and TIP

3.C. REGIONAL STUDIES

Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

In September 2010, the TPB Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force was established to determine a scope and process for developing a regional transportation priorities plan (RTPP) that will enhance the implementation of regional priorities. The task force met in October and December 2010 and in February and April 2011. **During May, June and July, the TPB reviewed and approved the scope and process for developing the plan. The plan development process is scheduled for a two-year period, beginning in July 1, 2011 and concluding by July 1, 2013.**

The purpose of the RTPP is to identify those transportation strategies that offer the greatest potential contributions to addressing continuing regional challenges, and to provide support for efforts to incorporate those strategies into future updates of the CLRP in the form of specific programs and projects. The plan will articulate regional priorities for enhancing the performance of the CLRP in advancing regional goals for economic opportunity, environmental stewardship and quality of life. The plan will include near (next few years) term and long-range strategies, and focus on identifying a limited number of regional priorities, perhaps ten to fifteen in total at any one time.

The priority planning process will use a set of performance measures to quantify progress toward the TPB Vision Goals and to identify the near and long term challenges and potential actions or strategies needed to meet each regional goal. A comprehensive benefit-cost analysis will be used to identify the high payoff strategies and projects for inclusion in the CLRP. Three tasks are proposed for FY 2012:

Task 1: Reaffirm Regional Goals and Agree Upon Performance Measures

Task 1 will review the *TPB Vision* goals, the goals in *COG's Region Forward Planning Guide*, and the relationship between them. It will identify a set of performance measures that quantify near and long term progress toward these regional goals

Task 2: Determine Regional Challenges and Strategies to Address Them

Task 2 will use the performance measures to identify challenges and actions the region needs to take in order to meet regional goals. It will identify potential near and long term regional strategies to address the challenges.

Task 3: Develop Regional Priorities, Both Funded and Unfunded

Task 3 will identify those strategies with the greatest potential to address the regional challenges as demonstrated through benefit-cost analysis. Candidate priorities will be obtained from the various planning studies that have been conducted at the state, regional, sub-regional, and local levels, and the CLRP Aspirations Scenario. Several TPB Technical Subcommittees have also developed priorities for their areas of responsibility, including bicycle and pedestrian, regional bus, airport

access, freight, and management, operations and intelligent transportation systems (MOITS). Candidate priorities may be suggested from comments and ideas generated through the public involvement activities to be conducted throughout the process.

Recognizing that improving regional performance will require combining transportation and land use strategies in a synergistic manner, candidate long term priorities will be incorporated into variations on the TPB Aspirations Scenario alternative land use / transportation scenario for comparison to the adopted CLRP baseline with respect to individual regional performance measures as well as in terms of a comprehensive assessment of regional benefits and costs. The new TPB Version 2.3 travel demand model and the latest version of the EPA Motor Vehicle Emissions Model (MOVES) will be used to quantify the performance of these variations on the TPB Aspirations Scenarios.

Public Involvement

Public participation will be sought at each stage of the two-year process, including the development of performance measures, strategies, and priorities. \$100,000 of the original funding for this work activity was transferred to work activity 1.E Public Participation, to conduct the various public outreach activities needed to involve a variety of constituencies, including community leaders and ordinary citizens not normally involved in the TPB process, as well as citizen partners such as members of the Citizen Advisory Committee and Access for All Advisory Committee.

~~By the end of FY 2011, the 2010 CLRP baseline will be compared to the TPB Vision and Region Forward goals to assess major regional challenges and review current regional priorities identified to date.~~

~~The following activities are proposed for FY 2012:~~

- ~~• Specify and evaluate with respect to regional goals an initial land use/transportation scenario that incorporates proposed priorities.~~
- ~~• Using the 2.3 Travel Demand model and the latest version of the EPA Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulation Model (MOVES), analyze the benefits and costs of the scenario relative to the Vision goals.~~
- ~~• Specify and evaluate a variation or variations on this scenario that might improve its performance or increase its feasibility.~~
- ~~• Conduct outreach and public involvement activities to support the development of the new transportation priorities plan.~~

Support for COG's Region Forward

In 2010, the TPB collaborated with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) Department of Community Planning and Services on a competitive grant submission to the HUD Sustainable Communities Planning Grant program. This grant submission outlined the strategy COG would employ to establish a regional plan

for sustainable development. Though the grant was not awarded, COG continued to work on developing a regional plan for sustainable development as an extension of its existing efforts to solve key challenges in the region through its Region Forward program. Region Forward is supported by a voluntary compact signed by all of the COG member jurisdictions, and outlines a series of targets and indicators that measure progress towards creating and attaining a more accessible, sustainable, prosperous, and livable future. In FY 2011, TPB staff provided support for COG's Region Forward regional planning efforts involving transportation. In FY 2012, TPB staff will continue to provide support for these efforts.

Prepare Grant Applications for US DOT Grant Funding Programs

In FY2010 and 2011, the TPB approved the submission of TIGER I and II competitive grant applications in response to US DOT funding program opportunities. In February 2010, the TPB was awarded \$58.8 million for a regional priority bus network under the TIGER I program. In August 2010, the TPB applied for funding towards a regional bike-sharing project under TIGER II. Although this application was not awarded, it was named in the top ten percent of projects that were recommended to be advanced for funding by DOT staff. In FY 2012, TPB staff will respond to promising opportunities for submitting project grant applications for USDOT grant funding programs, as approved by the TPB.

Oversight: TPB

Cost Estimate: ~~\$566,300~~ **466,300**

Products: **Task 1 interim report on the performance measures by December 2011**

Task 2 interim report on the near term regional challenges and strategies by December 2011

Task 2 interim report on the long term regional challenges and strategies by June 2012

Task 3 interim report on near-term regional priority strategies, programs and projects by June 2012

~~Documentation of major regional challenges and proposed regional priorities; comprehensive benefit/cost analysis of initial scenario; project grant applications for USDOT grant funding programs as approved by the TPB~~

From FY 2012 UPWP

4. C. MODELS DEVELOPMENT

The role of the TPB's models development program is to maintain and improve technical procedures used to forecast travel demand in the Washington, D.C. region. The program has been designed to manage uncertainty by structuring model improvement activities among five concurrent tracks: 1) application, or short-term improvements to the model; 2) methods development, or long-term improvements to the model; 3) research; 4) data collection; and 5) maintenance activities. These tracks are established to occur over a multi-year period, allowing for longer-term improvements to proceed off-line while the application model is maintained to support immediate planning needs.

During FY 2011, TPB staff culminated a two-year effort to calibrate the Version 2.3 travel model on the newly developed 3,722-TAZ area system using the 2007/2008 COG/TPB Household Travel Survey and several other data sources. During FY-2012, models development activities will focus on the ongoing refinement of the Version 2.3 model, in cooperation with the TPB's Travel Forecasting Subcommittee (TFS). The refinement will include possible updates to existing modeling steps, procedures to facilitate the development of modeling inputs, and the collection and analysis of new data. Staff will also support the application of Version 2.3 for regularly scheduled regional air quality planning purposes. This support will include training in the use of the Version 2.3 travel model. TPB staff may also support a consultant contract to explore advanced modeling paradigms, such as activity-based models, as described below.

The models development program has benefited in recent years by allocating resources for consultant assistance supporting both short-term and long-term updates to the regional travel model. Beginning in FY2006, an annual task-order contract was established and budgeted for \$150,000 a year. Entitled "Assistance on Travel Demand Model Development and Application," this contract supports focused research on modeling practices across the U.S. and provides input into various elements of the models development work program. The contract was designed to be renewable on an annual basis, for up to three years with a given consultant. In late FY 2011, this contract will be rebid for the third time, ensuring the continuation of this work into FY 2012.

Beginning in FY 2005, the UPWP has alluded to a work element for consultant assistance on longer-term modeling improvements, specifically "to develop a framework for tour-based and/or activity-based models in the future."¹ In fact, a growing number of MPOs have been developing tour-based and/or activity-based models (ABMs). However, despite the growing interest in these advance models, there is much debate in the modeling community about the costs and benefits of these newer techniques. Consequently, although TPB staff has set aside some funds for investigating ABMs, up to this point, none of these funds have been spent. Instead, they have been carried over for several years, with the hope that current research efforts, such as the Association of

¹ National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board, *FY 2005 Unified Planning Work Program for Transportation Planning for the Washington Metropolitan Region* (Washington, D.C., March 17, 2004), 2-34.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (AMPO) study of advanced travel models, might shed some light on whether ABMs represent the best use of scarce resources for updating the travel model and on how best to proceed with deploying such an effort. The AMPO study, which is funded by about ten MPOs, has resulted in a final report. ~~The sum of \$250,000 in carryover from FY 2011 will be available for consultant assistance to design a framework for applying a tour-based and/or activity-based travel demand model for the Washington region. TPB staff resources will also be devoted to supporting this effort.~~ **After Phase 2 of the AMPO study is completed in January 2012, staff will consider including new funding in FY 2013 UPWP for consultant assistance to design a framework for applying an ABM for the region.**

A list of short-term models development activities and maintenance activities planned for FY 2012 are shown below. The short-term models development activities are focused on the recently released Version 2.3 travel model on the 3,722-TAZ area system. This list was developed assuming that the ABM project would not take place in FY 2012. However, the current working assumption is that the ABM contract will go forward in FY 2012, and, under this scenario, TPB staff will likely not be able to complete all of the short-term models development work tasks listed below.

Short-term models development activities:

- Depending on the findings from the scan of best modeling practice, there may be new data collection efforts that need to be planned or carried out. Examples could include: 1) Continued analysis of travel time data on freeways (from INRIX), with possible use in model calibration and validation; 2) Gathering data about special markets in the region to adjust trip rates in the model.
- Continue with sensitivity testing with the Version 2.3 model and possibly implement ongoing refinements to the Version 2.3 mode in cooperation with the TFS. Support the production use of the Version 2.3 model for regional studies and possibly for project planning needs.
- Continue the ongoing use of INRIX highway speed data for informing parametric changes to the Version 2.3 model.
- Supporting the integration of the travel demand model with the new EPA MOVES model for estimating mobile emissions.
- Investigate the development of an airport model that includes a mode choice model component. The existing airport access forecasting process addresses auto driver travel only.
- Investigate the availability of data that could potentially be used for modeling a home-based university and/or home-based school trip purpose.
- Begin an evaluation of the exogenously generated visitor/tourist auto driver trip data, to see if the data fully account for trips made by visitors within the region. If enhanced funding were to become available, begin planning a visitor travel survey and a special events survey, for use in developing a visitor model and a special events model.
- Representation of fares in the model: Consider developing an explicit representation of transit fares by provider and mode.

- Investigate statistically estimating the time and cost coefficients used in the mode choice model.
- Consider establishing an explicit relationship between bus speed and highway speed.

Maintenance activities

- Promoting guidance of the model application through information sharing, documentation, and training
- Staff the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee (TFS)
- Keep abreast of new developments in travel demand forecasting, both short-term developments (such as for trip-based, four-step models) and long-term developments (such as ABMs and airport choice and ground access mode choice models). Activities will include: 1) Managing and supporting the consultant contract to perform a scan of best modeling practice; 2) Continuing participation on a national MPO panel, the AMPO Travel Modeling Work Group, established to recommend practices in travel demand modeling; 3) Participating in relevant organizations and activities, such as the Transportation Research Board (TRB), the Travel Modeling Improvement Program (TMIP), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on modeling for New Starts, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Citilabs and other vendors of travel demand forecasting software.
- Support computer software and hardware used to do travel demand forecasting
- Training users in the use of the Version 2.3 travel model
- Provide support for data requests

Oversight: Travel Forecasting Subcommittee

Cost Estimate: \$1,071,200
 \$250,000 carryover from FY 2011
~~\$1,321,200~~ **1,076,200** total

Products: Updated travel models; documentation of models development activities; and recommendations for continued updating of the travel demand modeling process. ~~Possible work plan and/or initial model component for an activity based model~~

Schedule: June 2012

From FY 2012 UPWP

funding sources. As an example of the TPB's ability to incorporate policy themes into its planning activities, the TPB in 2010 was awarded a grant from the Federal Highway Administration to study public acceptability of road-use pricing. Working jointly with The Brookings Institution, the TPB will in FY2011 evaluate public acceptance of value-pricing through analyzing survey data, scenario planning, and conducting focus groups and deliberative forms.

In addition to the changing federal context, other factors that influence activities in this work plan are regional in scope. In response to a request from the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee, the TPB in May 2010 held a forum that engaged over 80 elected officials, technical staff, and members of the public in an interactive conversation on setting regional transportation priorities. In September 2010, the TPB established a task force to determine a scope and process for developing a regional transportation priorities plan that will enhance the implementation of regional priorities. In Spring 2011, the TPB will approve the scope that will guide this plan development process as specified in FY2012 and FY2013 UPWPs.

Regional and federal factors that are non-regulatory may evolve from one year to the next, but are nonetheless influential in the planning activities that are conducted and described in this work program. As these factors continue to evolve, the UPWP is adjusted annually to focus on new and emerging priorities. This UPWP builds upon the previous UPWP, and is the result of close cooperation among the transportation agencies in the region. This UPWP was prepared with the involvement of these agencies, acting through the TPB, the TPB Technical Committee and its subcommittees. This UPWP details the planning activities that must be accomplished to address the annual planning requirements such as preparing the TIP and a Congestion Management System. It also describes the tasks required to meet the approval dates for the region's CLRP and the TIPs, and outlines the activities for the subsequent years.

Responsibilities for Transportation Planning

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is the organization responsible for conducting the continuing, cooperative, comprehensive (3-C) transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Washington Region in accordance with requirements of Section 134 (Title 23 U.S.C) of the Federal Highway Act of 1962, and Section 8 of the Federal Transit Act. The TPB is the official Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for transportation planning for the Washington metropolitan region, designated by the Governors of Maryland and Virginia and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, under Section 134 of the Federal Aid Highway Act, and the Joint Planning regulations of FTA and FHWA.

The TPB is composed of representatives from the 19 cities and counties, including the District of Columbia, that are members of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments(COG), the City of Manassas, the St. Charles Urbanized Area of Charles County, the two state and the District transportation agencies, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA), four federal agencies, the General Assemblies of Maryland and Virginia, and private transportation service providers. When matters of particular importance are before the TPB,

a special voting procedure may be invoked that weights the votes of local jurisdiction members according to population.

Figure 1 lists the organizations represented on the TPB and its Technical Committees. Figure 2 shows the geographical location of each of the participating local jurisdictions. The TPB also serves as the transportation policy committee of COG. This relationship serves to ensure that transportation planning is integrated with comprehensive metropolitan planning and development, and is responsive to the needs of the local governments in the area.

Policy coordination of regional highway, transit, bicycle, pedestrian and intermodal planning is the responsibility of the TPB. This coordinated planning is supported by the three departments of transportation (DOTs), FTA, FHWA, and the member governments of COG. The TPB coordinates, reviews, and approves work programs for all proposed federally assisted technical studies as part of the UPWP. The relationship among land use, environmental and transportation planning for the area is established through the continuing, coordinated land-use, environmental and transportation planning work programs of COG and TPB. Policy coordination of land use and transportation planning is the responsibility of COG, through its Metropolitan Development Policy Committee (MDPC) and the Transportation Planning Board. COG's regional land use cooperative forecasts are consistent with the adopted regional Long Range Transportation Plan.

The chairman of the TPB and the state transportation directors are members of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC), which was formed under the authority of the governors of Maryland and Virginia, and the mayor of the District of Columbia to recommend the region's air quality plans. These recommendations will be forwarded to the governors and mayor for inclusion in the State Implementation Plans (SIPs) they submit to EPA.

In the Washington Metropolitan region, the roles and responsibilities involving the TPB, the three state DOTs, the local government transportation agencies, WMATA, and the local government public transportation operators for cooperatively carrying out state transportation planning and programming have been established over several years. As required under the final planning regulations, the TPB, the state DOTs and the public transportation operators have documented their transportation planning roles and responsibilities in the Washington Metropolitan Region in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that was executed by all parties on January 16, 2008. The MOU is included in the Appendix and the responsibilities for the primary planning and programming activities are indicated in Figure 3.

Also in the Appendix is an agreement involving the TPB and Charles and Calvert counties in Maryland regarding consistency and conformity of their plans, programs and projects is included in the UPWP.

Included in the Appendix is **the 2004** an agreement between the TPB and the Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO) in Virginia in which **FAMPO committed to be responsible for meeting the TMA responsibilities for the transportation planning and programming requirements within the Metropolitan Washington Urbanized Area portion of Stafford County and producing the required planning documents on the TPB's current planning cycle.** ~~identifies the roles and responsibilities for cooperatively conducting the planning and programming process in the FAMPO portion of the Metropolitan Washington Urbanized Area.~~

Each year, TPB sends its Call for Projects document to FAMPO requesting new and updated information on the projects located in the portion of Stafford County in the Washington DC TMA to be included in the update of the CLRP. It also requests updated information on the Congestion Management System (CMS) for this portion of Stafford County. FAMPO transmits this information to TPB on the schedule included in the TPB Call for Projects document.

FY 2012 Regional Planning Priorities

During FY 2012, a regional planning priority will be to continue to focus on the coordination between land use and transportation planning and to complete the first year of a two-year process to develop a regional transportation priorities plan that will enhance the implementation of regional priorities. Planning activities will continue for bus priority corridor improvements to complement those being implemented under the TIGER grant. The TPB public participation process and technical planning procedures will also continue to be strengthened. In addition to these activities directly involving the TPB, a number of corridor studies and other planning studies and programs are underway throughout the region (see Figure 4).

B. THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Metropolitan Washington Area is a six year program of highway, transit, bicycle and pedestrian, congestion mitigation/air quality, safety and transportation enhancement projects. The TIP will be updated every two years and amended as necessary between updates. Up-to-date information on project amendments and modifications in the TIP is available in the on-line TIP database. An annual TIP document will now be produced every two years. The TIP must be approved by the TPB and the governors of Maryland and Virginia and the mayor of the District of Columbia, and is required as a condition for all federal funding assistance for transportation improvements within the Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area. TIP documentation will describe major projects from the previous TIP that were implemented and identify significant delays in the implementation of major projects. The air quality conformity report will describe progress in implementing transportation emission reduction measures (TERMs) required for improving air quality.

As recommended in the federal transportation planning certification review, TPB staff will meet with the DOT's staff to review documentation of states' project selection processes. The TIP web site will be updated to provide linkages to the project selection and prioritization processes at the DOTs and transit agencies. The Program Development Process and Project Development Process sections of the TIP describe the processes at the DOTs and WMATA and then move on to discussing "Addressing Federal Requirements". This portion for the next TIP will be restructured to explicitly discuss TPB actions in the project selection process:

Reviewing project inputs for consistency with the Air Quality Conformity Analysis

- **Producing a financial summary of all funding sources proposed by an agency**
- **Bicycle and Pedestrian, Freight, and Regional Bus Subcommittees have developed priority project lists for inclusion on the TIP**
- **TIGER, JARC and New Freedom project development**

Citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, private providers of transportation, freight shippers, users of public transit, and all other interested parties will be given an opportunity to review and comment on all amendments to the FY 2011-2016 TIP and the proposed FY 2013-2018 TIP as described under the TPB's public participation plan which was adopted in December 2007. A public forum will be conducted during the development of the FY 2013-2018 TIP. To facilitate public review, project information from the TIP and CLRP will be made accessible through an online, searchable database. Visual representation of the projects will be enhanced with a GIS system for displaying projects. The database application for submitting TIP project data, CLRP projects, and air quality conformity data will continue to be improved to facilitate reviewing the TIP and CLRP information. Interactive means of sharing the information in the TIP and CLRP such as querying capabilities and specialized maps or graphs will be available. A brochure highlighting the CLRP/TIP projects and financial plan will be prepared.

The TIP Schedule and Project Selection

The FY2011-2016 TIP and 2010 CLRP were adopted by the TPB in November 2010. Also in November 2010, the TPB issued a call for projects document requesting project submissions for the 2011 CLRP.

Amendments to the FY 2011-2016 TIP that accompany updates to the 2011 CLRP will be prepared for review by the TPB Technical Committee, the TPB, and the public between January and October 2011. These TIP amendments will be prepared with the assistance of and in cooperation with the transportation implementing agencies in the region, including the state departments of transportation, the District of Columbia Department of Transportation, the National Park Service, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and other public transit operators, and local government agencies.

Projects included in the TIP amendments will be reviewed for consistency with the policies and facilities delineated in the adopted financially-constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) for the region. Only projects, or phases of projects, that have full funding anticipated to be available within the time period contemplated for completion are included in the TIP. A financial plan will be prepared to demonstrate how the TIP can be implemented, and indicate the sources of public, private and innovative funding. This financial plan will be expanded with additional analysis and visual aids such as graphs and charts, online documentation and an accompanying summary brochure for the CLRP and TIP as amended.

During the year several administrative modifications and amendments will be needed in the FY 2011-2016 TIP to revise funding information or reflect changes in priorities or the introduction of new project elements. Such modifications and amendments will follow the procedures adopted by the TPB on January 16, 2008.

In November 2011, the TPB will issued a call for projects document requesting project submissions for the new FY 2013-2018TIP and 2012 CLRP. Draft FY 2013-2017 TIP and the 2012 CLRP amendments will be prepared for review by the TPB Technical Committee, the TPB, and the public between January and October 2012.

Annual Listing of TIP Projects that Have Federal Funding Obligated

SAFETEA-LU requires 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, TPB will prepare a listing of projects for which federal funds have been obligated in FY 2011.

Oversight:	Technical Committee
Cost	Estimate: \$240,600

Products:	FY 2011-2016 TIP amendments, administrative
modifications:	modifications to the FY 2011-2016 TIP
Draft	FY 2013-2017 TIP and the 2012 CLRP amendments
Schedule:	November 2011
October	2012

C. CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CLRP)

The Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) must be updated every four years as required by the final SAFETEA-LU planning regulations issued February 14, 2007. The CLRP is updated annually with amendments that include new projects or adjust the phasing or other aspects of some of the projects or actions in the plan, or change specific projects as new information on them becomes available. The 2010 CLRP was the last major update of the plan and includes an expanded financial analysis of transportation revenues expected to be available. The planning horizon for CLRP extends to 2040.

The Transportation Vision which was adopted by the TPB in October 1998, contains a vision statement, long-range goals, objectives, and strategies to guide transportation planning and implementation in the region. It addresses the eight planning factors in SAFETEA-LU. The Vision is the TPB Policy Element of the CLRP. The CLRP website (www.mwcog.org/clrp) documents how the plan addresses the SAFETEA-LU planning factors as reflected by the goals of the TPB Vision. The goals from COG’s Region Forward efforts are reflected in the TPB Vision, which includes a broader set of policy goals for transportation than Region Forward.

The CLRP will be documented in several ways and public materials will be provided during plan development and after plan approval. The CLRP website will be utilized to document the plan update by describing the development process, related planning activities, major projects, performance of the plan and how the public can get involved. The website also makes CLRP-related process and technical documentation readily accessible. The TPB will continue to make the plan information more accessible and visual. Projects in the plan will be accessible through an online database that the public can easily search. Projects will be mapped using GIS where possible and displayed along with project descriptions and in an interactive map. These maps will also be used in printed media, such as the CLRP and TIP summary brochure. The TPB will also continue to improve the quality of public materials about the plan during its development and after approval so that the materials are more useful to a wide variety of audiences, using less technical jargon and more "public friendly" language.

The 2011 CLRP

In November 2010, the TPB issued a "Call for Projects" document requesting projects, programs or strategies for inclusion in the 2011 CLRP. Project updates were due in February 2011. Materials describing the draft 2011 CLRP were developed in the spring of

2010, including maps, major project descriptions, and analysis from the previous year's CLRP.

Documentation of the plan will include an analysis of how the plan performs in regard to transit and auto trips made, vehicle miles of travel, lane miles of congestion and accessibility to jobs. The performance analysis is done after every CLRP update and is documented on the CLRP website. The analysis will be used to describe how the CLRP performs based on regional goals and federal planning factors and will also examine connectivity between the Regional Activity Centers. The CLRP will also be evaluated to see if low-income and minority populations are disproportionately impacted by adverse effects of the plan as new demographic data from the 2010 Census becomes available. The development of the 2011 CLRP will include two opportunities for the public to comment on the Plan.

In October 2011, the 2011 update to the CLRP will be released for a final public comment period and the accompanying air quality conformity analysis. The TPB is scheduled to adopt the 2011 CLRP in November 2011.

The 2012 CLRP

In October 2011, the TPB will issue its "Call for Projects" document again requesting new and updated information on projects, programs and strategies to be included in the 2012 CLRP update. Draft materials describing the CLRP will be prepared for review by the TPB Technical Committee, the TPB and the public between February and June 2012. The TPB is scheduled to adopt the 2012 CLRP in November 2012.

Environmental Consultation

During the development of the CLRP the TPB consults with federal, state and local agencies responsible for natural resources, airport operations, freight movements, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia.

To build on these consultation efforts, potential additional products and coordination will be researched on how to best facilitate the further integration of natural resource, land use, historic and cultural resource considerations into the long-range transportation planning process.

An on-going forum for environmental and transportation planning coordination will be explored, such as an Environmental Consultation Subcommittee or Task Force. Membership could include representatives from Environmental Resource agencies, State and D.C. Departments of Transportation (DOT's), local transportation agencies, jurisdictional land use planning agencies, and historic and cultural resource agencies. Meetings could be held quarterly. New and/or innovative mitigation strategies will be researched and used to develop a mitigation toolkit for DOT's and environmental resource agencies highlighting best practices in the region and beyond. The natural and historic resource maps will be updated, and include areas for potential restoration that can be used to guide advanced mitigation efforts.

Climate Change Adaptation

Adaptation for climate change effects is a topic receiving increased attention by federal and state transportation agencies. While the environmental consultation activities described above strive to meet specific requirements in the Federal regulations, these activities may also provide an opportunity to engage environmental and transportation agencies on the topic of climate change adaptation. Local and national practices will be monitored for potential applicability to the region. Coordination with COG's Department of Environmental Programs (DEP) will occur on the development of a COG Regional Climate Adaptation Plan. This plan is anticipated to be complete in January 2012 and will provide an overview of adaptation issues in four sectors, one of which is transportation. The final COG Regional Adaptation Plan may identify potential climate change adaptation activities for the region's transportation agencies to consider.

Oversight:	Technical Committee
Cost Estimate:	\$588,400
Products:	Documentation of the 2011 CLRP and draft 2012 CLRP on website with interactive maps, searchable database, accompanying summary brochure, other printed materials and an environmental mitigation toolkit
Schedule:	2011 CLRP Documentation – December 2011 Draft 2012 CLRP – June 2012 Environmental mitigation toolkit- June 2012

D. FINANCIAL PLAN

As required under federal planning regulations, both the TIP and the CLRP must have a financial plan that demonstrates how they can be implemented and show the sources of funding expected to be made available to carry them out. A new financial analysis by the consultant and plan for the 2010 CLRP was completed in October 2010, including new federal and state revenue projections, revised cost estimates for new system expansion projects, and revised cost estimates for system maintenance and rehabilitation. All revenue and cost estimates are in year of expenditure dollars as well as constant dollars through 2040. The financial plan will be updated by the implementing agencies as they prepare the inputs for the 2012 CLRP.

As recommended in the federal transportation planning certification review, the transparency of financial planning and fiscal constraint will be enhanced through improved documentation on the CLRP web site of the financial analysis for the 2010 CLRP which was completed in October 2010. The financial information will be organized to facilitate comparisons of capital costs and revenues for major projects and on-going expenditures for operations, maintenance and system preservation.

The key analysis parameters and estimating assumptions, including inflation rates and population growth, that affect project costs and revenue forecasts will be documented and referenced. The strategies and estimation methods for addressing projected financial shortfalls will be documented and referenced.

The Transportation Improvement Program

A financial plan for the FY 2011-2016 TIP amendments will be prepared. Since SAFETEA-LU funding is apportioned to states, financial summaries for all TIP projects from agencies in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia as well as WMATA and other transit agencies will be prepared. All projects submitted by these agencies will be grouped by the proposed SAFETEA-LU program funding categories under Surface Transportation (Title I) and Transit (Title III).

The funds programmed in the TIP for each state by SAFETEA-LU program category will be compared with the information provided by the states and transit operators on the estimated available Federal and State funds for the program period. The funds programmed in the TIP for each state by SAFETEA-LU program category in the first and second years will be compared with the trends of the annual funding programmed in previous TIPs and with the funding reported in the annual listings of TIP projects that have federal funding obligated. Comparisons that indicate significant changes from past trends will be reviewed with the implementing agency to clarify the change. Implementing agencies will ensure that only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available will be included in the TIP. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability will be identified by the implementing agency and included in the TIP. The product will be a financial summary that focuses on the first two years of the six-year period of the TIP, and it will be incorporated as a main section of the TIP for review by the public and approval by the Technical Committee and the TPB. The TIP will also summarize funding that the implementing agencies have programmed specifically for bicycle and pedestrian projects and identify projects that include bicycle and/or pedestrian accommodations.

Oversight:	Technical Committee
Cost Estimate:	\$64,000
Products: amendm	Financial summaries for the FY 2011-2016 TIP ents and inputs for the draft 2012 CLRP
Schedule:	On-going as TIP amendments are submitted

2. B. MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS, AND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) PLANNING

Under this work task, TPB will provide opportunities for coordination and collaborative enhancement of transportation technology and operations in the region, advised by its Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Policy Task Force and MOITS Technical Subcommittee. A key focus of MOITS planning is the region's non-recurring congestion, due to incidents or other day-to-day factors. A MOITS Strategic Plan was completed in FY2010 and provided updated guidance and direction to the program. The MOITS program includes planning activities to support the following major topics:

- ITS Data: The collection/compilation, processing, warehousing, and sharing of transportation systems usage and condition data from Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) sources, particularly in conjunction with the University of Maryland's Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS)
- Regional Transportation Management: Regional traffic management planning and coordination activities, particularly in conjunction with the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program (see also Task 2.I, which was established as a separate task from MOITS in FY2010); MATOC focuses on short-range planning issues for traffic management, and MOITS focuses on mid-to-long-range planning for traffic management
- Multi-modal Coordination: Examination of traffic and transit management interactions in daily operations, including a focus on improvements that could increase average bus speed and on-time performance
- Emergency Preparedness: Examination of technologies and operating procedures for daily operations that can provide a basis for emergency transportation operations, in conjunction with the COG Regional Emergency Support Function 1 – Emergency Transportation Committee (see also Task 2.C.)
- Traveler Information: Real-time traveler information made available to the public
- Congestion Management Process: Technology and operations strategies to address non-recurring congestion aspects of the regional Congestion Management Process (see also Task 2.A.)
- Maintenance and Construction Coordination: Regional sharing of available maintenance and construction information for coordination purposes
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture: Maintain the regional ITS architecture in accordance with federal law and regulations; help provide coordination of the use of the regional ITS architecture as guidance to the region's MOITS-related projects

- Traffic Signals: Assist member agencies in the exchange and coordination of inter-jurisdictional traffic signal operations information and activities
- Member Agency Activities: Work as needed with the MOITS activities of the state and D.C. departments of transportation, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and other member agencies
- Coordinate with supra-regional management and operations activities of the Federal Highway Administration, the I-95 Corridor Coalition, and other relevant stakeholders; monitor national emerging MOITS activities for potential application in the region
- Provide staff support to the MOITS Policy Task Force, MOITS Technical Subcommittee, MOITS Regional ITS Architecture Subcommittee, and MOITS Traffic Signals Subcommittee, supporting these regional forums for coordination and information exchange among member agency staffs and other stakeholders.
- **Climate Change Adaptation: Monitor local and national practices regarding transportation operational procedures to adapt to climate change effects. Review the COG Regional Climate Adaption Plan to identify transportation operations-related potential climate change adaptation activities for the region’s transportation agencies to consider.**

Oversight: TPB MOITS Policy Task Force; MOITS Technical Subcommittee; MOITS Regional ITS Architecture Subcommittee; MOITS Traffic Signals Subcommittee

Cost Estimate: \$340,300

Products: Agendas, minutes, summaries, outreach materials as needed; white paper(s) on technical issues as needed; revised regional ITS architecture; MOITS input to the CLRP as necessary; review and advice to MOITS planning activities around the region

Schedule: Monthly

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 1: TPB Recommendations

Recommendation	Status	Action
Agreement		
<p>1 TPB should coordinate the planning process and products for the metropolitan area in accordance with the terms of the 2004 agreement with FAMPO and update the agreement if necessary to clearly define the agencies' respective planning process roles and responsibilities, as described in the Agreements/ Certification discussion in the FAMPO section of this report. (See #12 recommendation.)</p>	Being implemented	<p>Add text on page 5 in FY 2012 UPWP in section on Responsibilities for Transportation Planning:</p> <p>In early FY 2012, the TPB and FAMPO processes and products will be reviewed for coordination as specified in the 2004 agreement. TPB staff will meet with FAMPO staff to review the CMP, UPWP, TIP and CLRP planning cycles and products to identify any necessary coordination clarifications or updates. Any necessary clarifications or updates to the agreement that are mutually agreed to by TPB and FAMPO staff will be presented to their respective boards for approval by written agreement. Any amended agreement will be presented to FTA and FHWA for review.</p>
Self Certification		
<p>2 The State DOTs should revisit their procedures for certifying the Federal metropolitan planning process to ensure their review and approval of the certifications are clearly defined and the DOT's basis for the certification is documented: for example, that Title VI and ADA requirements are being executed.</p>	Being implemented	<p>DOTs document their procedures for certifying TPB planning self- certification.</p>

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 1: TPB Recommendations

Recommendation	Status	Action
Transportation Improvement Program		
<p>3 The TPB TIP should further clarify project selection and prioritization – citing instances for which the TPB actually does prioritization and selection. In addition, a narrative should be included to explain how TPB’s role in the CLRP and TIP selected projects improves the transportation system’s performance and meets regional air quality goals and needs. The states should work with TPB to create high standards of transparency and accountability for State project selection and prioritization processes conducted as part of the metropolitan planning process, including DOT decisions that are incorporated in the TIP.</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>	<p>Add text on page 29 in FY 2012 UPWP in activity <u>B. Transportation Improvement Program</u>:</p> <p>TPB staff will meet with the DOT’s staff to review documentation of states’ project selection processes. The TIP web site will be updated to provide linkages to the project selection and prioritization processes at the DOTs and transit agencies.</p> <p>The Program Development Process and Project Development Process sections of the TIP describe the processes at the DOTs and WMATA and then move on to discussing “Addressing Federal Requirements”. This portion for the next TIP will be restructured to explicitly discuss TPB actions in the project selection process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing project inputs for consistency with the Air Quality Conformity Analysis • Producing a financial summary of all funding sources proposed by an agency • Bicycle and Pedestrian, Freight, and Regional Bus Subcommittees development of priority project lists for inclusion on the TIP • TIGER, JARC and New Freedom project development

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 1: TPB Recommendations

Recommendation	Status	Action
Transportation Improvement Program (continued)		
<p>4 The states should work with TPB to enhance verification of the reasonableness of funding sources for TIP amendments, including a process to define “reasonableness” for different types of project amendments. TPB also should ensure that each jurisdiction provides adequate documentation to justify funding availability when requesting amendments.</p>	Being implemented	<p>All letters from DOTs or WMATA requesting an amendment will include language stating that the proposed funding is available and committed. This language will clarify if the funds are from additional, “new” monies, or if the funds are being diverted from another project.</p> <p>The Financial Plan for the TIP will be expanded to include a table for each DOT and WMATA, showing estimated revenues from federal, state, and local sources, and proposed commitments.</p>
<p>The TIP should demonstrate that estimates of system level revenues and costs are adequate for the DOTs to operate and maintain Federal-aid routes and public transportation systems. This documentation of available funding resources and O&M estimates can be amended into the TIP as soon as this information is available.</p>		<p>The DOTs will provide documentation of system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain federal-aid routes and WMATA to be amended into the FY 2013-2018 TIP.</p>
Financial Planning/Fiscal Constraint		
<p>5 TPB should increase the transparency of financial planning and fiscal constraint through improved documentation to make analysis and results more comprehensible to the public. Areas to address include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization of financial data and estimates to facilitate direct comparison of costs and revenues for projects and continuing and recurrent expenditures on operations, maintenance, and asset rehabilitation; • Key assumptions (e.g., inflation, increases or shifts in allocations, fare increases, and population growth) affecting all projects, cost categories, and revenue sources; and • Estimation methods and strategies for addressing projected financial shortfalls and policy trade-offs. 	Being implemented	<p>Add text on page 32 in FY 2012 UPWP in activity <u>1 D Financial Plan:</u></p> <p>Clear and concise descriptions of the financial analysis for the 2010 CLRP which was completed in October 2010 and the fiscal constraint will be prepared for the CLRP web site. The financial information will be organized to facilitate comparisons of capital costs and revenues for major projects and on-going expenditures for operations, maintenance and system preservation. The key analysis parameters and estimating assumptions, including inflation rates and population growth will be documented. The strategies and estimation methods for addressing projected financial shortfalls will be documented and referenced.</p>

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 1: TPB Recommendations

Recommendation	Status	Action
Outreach/Public Participation		
<p>6... The Federal team recommends several actions that could enhance the TPB Public Participation Plan and practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convene the CAC, AFA, and the WMATA Riders Advisory Council together at reasonable intervals to share ideas, concerns, and ask questions of one another. Continue to convene all TPB and Committee members, similar to the May 26th, 2010 Conversation on Regional Transportation Priorities. 	Being implemented	<p>See proposed text to add on page 33 in FY 2012 UPWP to activity <u>1 E Public Participation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one meeting in FY2012 will bring together members of the CAC, AFA and the WMATA Riders Advisory Council to discuss a topic of common interest. • As part of the development of the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, the TPB will convene at least one large meeting of stakeholders in the TPB process, including TPB members, the CAC, AFA and Technical Committee.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the time that each AFA meeting spends discussing quality of service, to allow for time to provide productive feedback regarding transportation planning. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider conducting meetings at locations and times that may be more convenient to the general public. Seek opportunities to participate in community events, such as local fairs or open houses, to educate and inform the public of TPB activities as well as look for opportunities to link transportation issues to other prevalent issues (education, housing, employment, etc.). 		As part of the development of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, the TPB will seek to engage the public by participating in community events and attending community meetings. The outreach for the priorities plan will seek to connect regional transportation issues with broader interests of affected communities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore other methods and media to provide information to the public other than email. 		Staff will use a variety of media to inform citizens about key milestones and activities, including public input opportunities for the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider recording meetings and making them available over a public cable channel, and on websites, or hold online (Web 2.0) public meetings to allow folks to ‘attend’ the meeting within a specified period of time of the actual meeting. TPB could also increase its use of newspaper columns, such as “Doctor Gridlock.” 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TPB will be asked to make available a webcast of its monthly meeting on the COG website. • The TPB will conduct webinars and use other web-based tools to share information among its stakeholders and the public.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a Public-Involvement Management Team with Public Information Officers from each jurisdiction that coordinates among their agencies for transportation planning, programming, and operations activities. This would help to harmonize the individual public outreach efforts and increase media coverage of TPB’s work. 		The TPB will develop an online clearinghouse with information on public involvement activities among its member jurisdictions. Drawing from the TPB Citizens guide, this clearinghouse will provide an explanation of how decisions are made at the state, local and regional levels and will provide information and links regarding various planning activities that affect the decisions that are reflected in the Constrained Long-Range Plan. In developing this clearinghouse, TPB staff will coordinate with public information officers from its member jurisdictions.

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 1: TPB Recommendations

Recommendation	Status	Action
Outreach/Public Participation (continued)		
<p>...6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather information to evaluate the effectiveness of public outreach strategies. This could include: adding a column to public-speaking sign-in sheets that asks each commenter how they learned about the meeting, posting a small survey on the website each month, or sending a postcard survey asking about the process. 		<p>TPB staff will investigate methods to gather information to evaluate the effectiveness of public outreach strategies and then test and implement the effective ones.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider opportunities to involve college or high school students in the planning process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop a CLI for students that could be held during the summer months, and perhaps be eligible for academic credit or recognition. ○ Consider expanding the CAC and AFA membership to include a student interested in transportation or urban planning. ○ Create an outreach program to young students using surveys, games, puzzles, and safety tips, or hold an annual poster contest for the cover page of a particular document, or as the screensaver of the TPB transportation webpage. ○ Engage high-school and/or college students interested in a career in communications by coordinating a Public Service Announcement Contest. The purpose would be to educate students about the role of the TPB and have them utilize their creativity to promote a specific transportation project or topic in 30-second TV spots. ○ Develop a blog to inform the public of current issues, discussions, and decisions. 		<p>Add to the FY 2012 UPWP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TPB will conduct a session of the Community Leadership Institute for high school students. • The TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) will add at least one alternate member who is either a college or high school student. • The TPB will use social media, develop a blog or use some other form of web communication to provide information to the public about regional transportation issues and engage the public in a dialogue about key topics.
<p>The tasks for meeting this recommendation should be included for review and approval in the next UPWP.</p>		<p>Propose to transfer \$100,000 from the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan in activity in 3.C Regional Studies to activity 1.E to support implementation of enhanced outreach activities pursuant to the recommendations. The budget for the FY 2013 UPWP will be developed to support these enhanced activities.</p>
<p>7 TPB should develop and amend the Plan to include procedures, strategies and desired outcomes for the use of visualization techniques.</p>	<p>Being implemented</p>	<p>The TPB Participation Plan will be amended to show how visualization techniques will be used in various public involvement activities. Visualization may range from simple techniques such as using pictures and graphics more frequently to more sophisticated approaches such as the use of computer simulation programs.</p>

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 1: TPB Recommendations

Recommendation	Status	Action
Outreach/Public Participation (continued)		
8 TPB should develop a formal process for selecting an information delivery method that is appropriate to the needs of a project, activity, or audience, and the desired type of public engagement.	Being implemented	The TPB Participation Plan will be amended to indicate that staff will establish a system to explicitly and deliberately determine what types of information sharing should be used for different types of public involvement and outreach requirements. For example, this system will specify the desired targets and potential methods that might be used to announce public comment periods. A different approach would be used to seek input for the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.
9 TPB should develop a formal process to review, evaluate, and improve current public engagement techniques and activities regularly or at certain intervals of time.	Being implemented	The TPB Participation Plan will be amended to establish a multi-faceted and easily replicable system for evaluating the effectiveness of the TPB's public involvement activities.
Title VI and Environmental Justice		
10 TPB should provide a signed Standard Title VI Assurance, Title VI Plan/program/ method of administration with implementation, compliance, monitoring, enforcement and review procedures. Provide documented procedures regarding how Title VI training will be provided to or obtained by employees, recipients, sub recipients and other stakeholders.	Implemented	The signed assurance and plan have been provided. The procedures for training will be documented.
11 TPB should seek and receive, and its affiliated Federal aid recipients must endeavor to provide, Title VI training and appropriate technical assistance pursuant to 23 CFR 200.9(b)(9). It is further recommended that VDOT especially, checks its Title VI questionnaire to TPB to make sure that the date they are sent out and the due date are sequential.	Implemented	TPB and VDOT staff received this training in July.

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 2: FAMPO Recommendations & Corrective Actions

Recommendation	Status	Action
Agreement (FAMPO)		
<p>12 TPB and FAMPO should coordinate their planning processes and planning products to align with the current agreement, or revise the agreement to clearly define and reaffirm their respective planning process roles and responsibilities. In addition, TPB and FAMPO should consider an addendum to the existing agreement that would provide clarification (where needed) of the roles and responsibilities of each MPO per CFR 450.314(f). (See #1 recommendation.)</p>	Being implemented	Review process and products in 2004 agreement; meet with FAMPO staff to review CMP, UPWP, TIP & CLRP planning cycles and agreement; update agreement if necessary
Outreach/Public Participation (FAMPO)		
<p>13 The Federal Team strongly recommends that FAMPO conduct a thorough review and update of the PPP, including all advisory committee structures and responsibilities. The update should include an evaluation of the PPP and TAG to determine their effectiveness in meeting the needs of the intended audiences (including low-income and minority populations). The tasks for meeting this recommendation should be included for review and approval in the next UPWP.</p>	Being implemented	Consult with FAMPO staff on public participation plan and receive documentation for inclusion in June 2012 report.
Certification (FAMPO)		
<p>14 As part of the MPO Self-Certification process, the Federal Team recommends that FAMPO establish procedural guidance for verifying the process and implementation of self-certification.</p>	Being implemented	Consult with FAMAP staff on self-certification and receive documentation for inclusion in June 2012 report.

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 2: FAMPO Recommendations & Corrective Actions

Corrective Action	Status	Action
Agreements (FAMPO)		
<p>1 FHWA and FTA request that the FAMPO's RSTP and CMAQ project selection process be consistent with 23 U.S.C. section 134(j)(3)(5)(a) and 23 CFR 450.330(b). Please submit a joint letter signed by the FAMPO (MPO Chairperson/ representative) and State (CTB Chairperson/representative) confirming that the FAMPO project selection process for RSTP and CMAQ projects to be implemented utilizing 23 U.S.C. funds and/or funds under 49 U.S.C Chapter 53 is consistent with federal regulation for the non-TMA MPO. If the State delegated RSTP and/or CMAQ project selection responsibilities to the FAMPO, please provide clarification in the letter. The compliance deadline for this request is within 3 months following the release of the certification report.</p>	Implemented	CTB and FAMPO letter provided by August 5, 2011
Title VI and Environmental Justice (FAMPO)		
<p>2 The MPO Title VI coordinator must acquire needed Title VI training and knowledge in implementing Title VI obligations.</p>	Implemented	FAMPO, TPB and VDOT staff received training in July.
<p>3 The MPO must establish a Title VI/Nondiscrimination Plan. The Plan must include a public outreach and education plan; staff training plan; procedures for processing complaints; procedures for identifying and addressing Title VI/ Nondiscrimination issues; process for identifying and eliminating discrimination; process for review of programs and grant applications; and a process for collecting and analyzing statistical data (including LEP and EJ populations). <u>The compliance deadline for this request is one year following the release of the certification report.</u></p>	Being implemented	Draft Title VI plan prepared in September.

Appendix II: TPB Responses to the Recommendations in the Transportation Planning Certification Review

Table 2: FAMPO Recommendations & Corrective Actions

Corrective Action	Status	Action
Title VI and Environmental Justice (FAMPO) (continued)		
4 Within the Title VI/Nondiscrimination Plan, the Federal Team requests that the MPO have a documented process for assessing the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for the investments identified in the transportation plan and TIP. <u>The compliance deadline is six months following the establishment and adoption of the MPO Title VI Plan.</u>	Being implemented	Consult with FAMAP staff on process for assessing distribution of impacts and receive documentation for inclusion in June 2012 report.