

ITEM 7 – Information

June 19, 2019

Transportation Planning Certification Review of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the Washington Region

Background:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducted a federally required certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area (TMA) in March and April 2019. The board will be briefed on the major findings in the summary report.



U.S. Department
of Transportation

Federal Transit Administration
Region III
1760 Market Street, Suite 500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-656-7100
215-656-7260 (fax)

Federal Highway Administration
DC Division Office (E61-205)
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590
202-493-7020 (Office)
202-493-7040 (Fax)

JUN 04 2019

The Honorable Martin Nohe, Chairman
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
c/o Mr. Kanathur Srikanth, Director of Transportation Planning
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capital Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20002-4201

Dear Chairman Nohe:

This letter notifies you that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) jointly certify the planning process for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments National Capital Transportation Planning Board (MWCOG/TPB) Transportation Management Area (TMA) and Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO). This certification is based on the findings from the Federal Certification Review conducted on April 10 and 11, 2019.

The overall conclusion of the certification review is that the planning process for the Washington, District of Columbia TMA complies with the spirit and intent of Federal metropolitan transportation planning laws and regulations under 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303. The planning process at MWCOG/TPB is a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive process and reflects a significant professional commitment to deliver quality in transportation planning.

We would like to thank Transportation Planning Director Kanathur Srikanth and his staff for their time and assistance in planning and conducting the review. Enclosed is a report that documents the results of this review and offers several recommendations for continuing quality improvements and enhancements to the planning process. Please provide your comments within 15 days on the enclosed report. If you have any questions regarding this certification action, please direct them to either Ms. Sandra Jackson, Community Planner of the FHWA, DC Division, at (202) 493-7031 or Mr. Daniel Koenig, Community Planner, of the FTA Region III DC Metro Office, at (202) 366-8224.

Sincerely,

TC
Terry Garcia Crews
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration

Joseph C. Lawson
DC Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

Enclosure

cc: Kwame Arhin, FHWA, MD
Ivan Rucker, FHWA, VA



U.S. Department
of Transportation

Federal Highway
Administration

Federal Transit
Administration

Transportation Management Area Planning Certification Review

Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Transportation Management Area



June 4, 2019

Summary Report



Table of Contents

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.1	Previous Findings and Disposition.....	3
1.2	Summary of Current Findings	3
2.0	INTRODUCTION	10
2.1	Background/Preface.....	10
2.2	Purpose and Objective	11
3.0	SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	12
3.1	Review Process.....	12
3.2	Documents Reviewed.....	13
4.0	PROGRAM REVIEW	13
4.1	Continuous, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Process	13
4.2	MPO Structure and Agreements	14
4.3	Unified Planning Work Program	17
4.4	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	18
4.5	Transportation Improvement Program.....	19
4.6	Public Participation	21
4.7	Civil Rights (Title VI, EJ, LEP, ADA)	23
4.8	List of Obligated Projects	26
4.9	Congestion Management Process / Management and Operations	27
4.10	Performance Based Planning and Programming.....	29
4.11	Financial Planning and Fiscal Constraint	32

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 36

 5.1 Commendations..... 36

 5.2 Corrective Actions 36

 5.3.1 Recommendations..... 36

APPENDIX A - PARTICIPANTS 38

APPENDIX B - STATUS OF FINDINGS FROM LAST REVIEW 45

APPENDIX C – PUBLIC COMMENTS..... 48

APPENDIX D - LIST OF ACRONYMS..... 54

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On April 10-11, 2019, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducted the certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington, DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area (TMA) area. FHWA and FTA are required to jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process for each urbanized area over 200,000 in population at least every four years to determine if the process meets the Federal planning requirements.

1.1 Previous Findings and Disposition

The first certification review for the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board's (TPB) urbanized area was conducted in 1994. Subsequent reviews were conducted in 1999, 2002, 2005, 2010 and 2014. The 2010 Certification Review was the first-time Federal officials conducted and included a formal review of the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) planning and programming process in the TPB certification review. The previous Certification Review Federal Actions and their disposition are provided in Appendix B and summarized as follows.

Finding	Action	Status
Agreements	Recommendation	Reviewed and updated most agreements with FAST ACT requirements.
Financial Planning	Recommendation	TPB has provided more collaboration and policy priorities documentation.
Public Outreach and Public Involvement	Recommendation	Evaluated the PPP effectiveness by conducting an independent evaluation.
List of Obligated Projects	Recommendation	Provided a more consistent TIP format for reports
Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization -No Federal Actions in 2014		

1.2 Summary of Current Findings

The current review found that the metropolitan transportation planning process conducted in the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board urbanized area meets Federal planning requirements. Based on this review and ongoing oversight by the FHWA and the FTA, the transportation planning process carried out by the Transportation Planning Board for the National Capital Region Transportation Management Area is certified as meeting the requirements as described in 23 Code of Federal Register Part 450, Subpart C and 49 Code of Federal Register Part 613.

Although there are no Corrective Actions from this review, there are several recommendations in this report that warrant close attention and follow-up, as well as areas commendations that the MPO is performing very well.

Review Area	Finding	Action	Corrective Actions/ Recommendations/ Commendations	Resolution Due Date
Continuous, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Process 23 CFR 450.306(a)&(b) Consultation and Coordination 23 U.S.C. 134(g)&(i) 23 CFR 450.316 & 450.324(g)	The TPB meets the requirements of the "3-C" planning process		<p>The Federal Team commends TPB efforts for enhanced and extensive coordination with agencies' partners. TPB is commended for implementing a public input survey as an early tool in gathering general attitudes and opinions about transportation in the region.</p> <p>The Federal Team commends TPB efforts in identifying and sharing opportunities to enhance the planning process.</p>	

Review Area	Finding	Action	Corrective Actions/ Recommendations/ Commendations	Resolution Due Date
<p>MPO Structure and Agreements 23 U.S.C. 134(d) 23 CFR 450.314 23CFR 450.314(f). 23CFR 450.314(g), 23CFR450.314(b)] 23 CFR 450.314(h)</p>	<p>The previous Federal recommendation to update the 2004 FAMPO agreement were not completed. Consistent with previous certification review recommendations the Federal Team strongly recommends that TPB take formal action on the FAMPO agreement. TPB needs to update and/ or revise the agreement to clarify roles and responsibilities to accomplish what is required by law and regulation. Provided a one year resolution due date.</p>	<p>The planning process for the FAMPO region outside of the TPB TMA area may be reviewed as part of a finding (23 CFR 450.220 (b)) that is part of the review and approval of the Virginia STIP update by FHWA and FTA. As necessary, FHWA and FTA may offer technical assistance or conduct a review of the transportation planning process and the UPWP with FAMPO.</p>	<p>The Federal Team requests that within one-year, the TPB, FAMPO, State, and providers of public transportation, develop agreed upon specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS.</p> <p>The Federal Team strongly recommends that, within a year, the 2004 TPB/FAMPO MOU be updated to reaffirm and validate the mutually agreed upon roles of each MPO and in consideration of the passage of multi-year Federal surface transportation legislation to ensure that ongoing roles and responsibilities are consistent with regional, State and Federal expectations.</p>	<p>06/2020*</p>

Review Area	Finding	Action	Corrective Actions/ Recommendations/ Commendations	Resolution Due Date
Previous report recommendation with a resolution due date *				
Unified Planning Work Program 23 CFR 450.308 & 420	The TPB meets the Federal requirements for the development of the Unified Planning Work Program.	The Federal Team recommends TPB include previous year's accomplishments in the current UPWP.	The Federal Team recommend TPB include the previous year's accomplishments report in each current year UPWP.	
Metropolitan Transportation Plan 23 U.S.C. 134(c), (h)&(i) 23 CFR 450.324	The TPB meets the Federal requirements for development of the long-range metropolitan transportation plan.		The Federal Team recommends continued commitment to maintenance, operations and state of good repair.	
Transportation Improvement Program 23 U.S.C. 134(c),(h)&(j) 23 CFR 450.326	The TPB meets the requirements for development of the transportation improvement program.		The Federal Team recommend TPB continue expeditiously with the efforts to implement the new e-TIP and progress in alignment of projects with each State STIPs.	
Public Participation 23 U.S.C. 134(i)(6) 23 CFR 450.316	The TPB meets the Federal requirements		The Federal Team recommends that TPB update its PPP (currently dated 2014) in consideration of the results from the recent consultant review of their public outreach activities and PPP and to reference the current legislation and planning regulations.	

Review Area	Finding	Action	Corrective Actions/ Recommendations/ Commendations	Resolution Due Date
<p>Civil Rights (Title VI, EJ, LEP, ADA) Title VI Civil Rights Act 23 U.S.C. 324, Age Discrimination Act, Sec. 504 Rehabilitation Act, Americans with Disabilities Act</p> <p>Requirements under ADA: § 35.105 Self-evaluation. a(b) (c)(1)(2) (3) (d) § 35.106 Notice § 35.107 § 35.150 (d)</p> <p>Executive Orders 12898 and 13166</p>	<p>The Federal review team could not tell what collaboration was previously done between TPB, and VDOT, DDOT and MDOT for ADA and Section 504 Transition plan development.</p> <p>Compliance with the ADA and Section 504 transition plan for the MPA cannot be determined based on the information provided.</p> <p>The desk review revealed that TPB was not using the current assurance language.</p>		<p>The Federal Team recommends TPB meet with the FHWA Civil Rights Specialist to discuss technical assistance and/or training to improve specific Title VI Plan and program areas.</p> <p>The Federal Team recommend TPB update Title VI Program Plan to include the most recent assurance - US DOT Order 1050.2A. The language of the assurance should not be altered and should be signed annually and included in contractual agreements.</p> <p>The Federal Team recommend TPB coordinate with VDOT, DDOT and MDOT to review ADA and Section 504 Transition Plan coordination and documentation.</p>	
<p>List of Obligated Projects 23 U.S.C. 134(j)(7) 23 CFR 450.334</p>	<p>The TPB meets the Federal requirements.</p>		<p>The Federal Team commends the proactive involvement of TPB in updating the obligation listings for all three States into a consistent format.</p>	

Review Area	Finding	Action	Corrective Actions/ Recommendations/ Commendations	Resolution Due Date
Congestion Management Process / Management and Operations 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(3) 23 CFR 450.322 23 CFR 450.324(f)(5)	The TPB meets the Federal requirements.		The Federal Team commends the TPB for its well documented CMP. Also, TPB is commended for the data clearing house and data delivery efforts that provide the TPB partners the ability to track and evaluate congestion methods that support system capacity expansion.	
Performance Based Planning and Programming 23 U.S.C 134(h)(2) 23 CFR 450.306(d), 450.314(h),450.324(f), 450.326(d) & 450.340.	The TPB meets the Federal requirements.		The Federal Team commends TPB, DDOT, VDOT and MDOT for its specific written procedures for all available performance measures and targets well before the May 20, 2019 implementation date for PM2 and PM3.	

Review Area	Finding	Action	Corrective Actions/ Recommendations/ Commendations	Resolution Due Date
Financial Planning (23 U.S.C. 134 (j) (2) (B)) (23 U.S.C. 135 (g)(5)(F)) [23 CFR 450.324(h) and 23 CFR 450.216(m)]	The TPB meets the requirements for Financial Planning		<p>The Federal Team recommends TPB continue to provide increased stewardship and oversight to ensure that the financial assumptions for projects are reasonable. Along these lines, without a committed, available, or reasonably expected source of funds, the suburban Maryland BRT projects, should consider being moved (some or all) to the “aspirational element” portion of the L RTP (Chapter 4) to better reflect realities associated with receiving Capital Investment Grant (CIG) funds.</p> <p>The Federal Team recommends clarification on how projected revenues and expenditures from the Visualize 2045 financial plan contribute to and are consistent with the TIP development efforts.</p>	

Details of the certification findings for the risk based areas of the above items are contained in this report.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background/Preface

Pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134(k) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(k), FHWA and FTA must jointly certify the metropolitan transportation planning process in TMAs at least every four years. A TMA is an urbanized area, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, with a population of over 200,000. After the 2010 Census, the Secretary of Transportation designated 183 TMAs – 179 urbanized areas over 200,000 in population plus four urbanized areas that received special designation. In general, the reviews consist of three primary activities: a site visit, a review of planning products (in advance of and during the site visit), and preparation of a Certification Review Report that summarizes the review and offers findings. The reviews focus on compliance with Federal law and regulations, challenges, successes, and experiences of the cooperative relationship between the MPO(s), the State DOT(s), and public transportation operator(s) in the conduct of the metropolitan transportation planning process. Joint FTA/FHWA Certification Review guidelines provide agency field reviewers with latitude and flexibility to tailor the review to reflect regional issues and needs. Therefore, the scope and depth of the Certification Review reports will vary significantly.

The Certification Review process is only one of several methods used to assess the quality of a regional metropolitan transportation planning process, compliance with applicable statutes and regulations, and the level and type of technical assistance needed to enhance the effectiveness of the planning process. Other stewardship and oversight activities provide opportunities for this type of review and comment, including Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) approval, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), metropolitan and statewide Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) findings, air-quality conformity determinations (in nonattainment and maintenance areas), as well as a range of other formal and less formal interactions provide both FHWA/FTA an opportunity to comment on the planning process. The results of these other processes are considered in the Certification Review process.

While the Certification Review report itself may not fully document those many intermediate and ongoing checkpoints, the “findings” of Certification Review are, in fact, based upon the cumulative findings of the entire review effort.

The review process is individually tailored to focus on topics of significance in each metropolitan planning area. Federal reviewers prepare Certification Reports to document the results of the review process. The reports and final actions are the joint responsibility of the appropriate FHWA and FTA field offices, and their content will vary to reflect the planning process reviewed, whether or not they relate explicitly to formal “findings” of the review. To encourage public understanding and input, FHWA/FTA will continue to improve the clarity of the Certification Review reports.

2.2 Purpose and Objective

Since the enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the FHWA and FTA are required to jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process in all urbanized areas over 200,000 population to determine if the process meets the Federal planning requirements in 23 U.S.C. 134, 49 U.S.C. 5303, and 23 CFR 450. In 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), extended the minimum allowable frequency of certification reviews to at least every four years.

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is the Federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the metropolitan area, leading the comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing planning process in cooperation with FAMPO, which is the designated MPO for a portion of the National Capital Region TMA in Virginia. Implementing agencies working in partnership with TPB and FAMPO in the planning process include the Departments of Transportation (DOTs) for the District of Columbia, the States of Maryland and Virginia, and area public transportation operators and authorities. The TPB became associated with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) in 1966. Although the TPB is an independent body, its staff is provided by COG's Department of Transportation Planning. COG was established in 1957 by local cities and counties to deal with regional concerns including growth, housing, environment, public health and safety - as well as transportation.

Established in 1992, FAMPO is the Federally-designated MPO for the Fredericksburg urbanized area. Though the northern portion of Stafford County was incorporated into the National Capital Region TMA after the 2000 census, with the concurrence of the Federal Partners, FAMPO elected to expand its planning area boundaries to include the three jurisdictions of the Counties of Caroline, Stafford and Spotsylvania in their entirety.

Although the FAMPO is an independent body, its staff is provided by the George Washington Regional Planning District Commission (GWRC). While the GWRC serves as the lead technical staff for the MPO, some aspects of the technical transportation planning process (i.e. conformity, travel demand modeling, etc.) are performed and managed by VDOT or through contracts with consultants.

The TPB's 3,558 square-mile planning area covers the District of Columbia and surrounding jurisdictions. In Maryland, these jurisdictions include Charles County, Frederick County, Montgomery County, and Prince George's County, plus the cities of Bowie, College Park, Frederick, Gaithersburg, Greenbelt, Rockville, and Takoma Park. In Virginia, the planning area includes Arlington County, Fairfax County, Fauquier County, Loudoun County, and Prince William County, plus the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park. Members of the TPB include representatives of City and County governments, State transportation agencies, the Maryland and Virginia legislatures, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), and non-voting members from the Metropolitan Washington

Airports Authority and Federal agencies. The members of the TPB and its executive and technical committees are appointed by their respective jurisdiction or agency. All jurisdictions and all modes are represented on the TPB, and its task forces, committees and subcommittees. The FHWA and the FTA are ex-officio members in a non-voting capacity.

Certification of the transportation planning process is a prerequisite to the approval of Federal funding for transportation projects in such areas. The certification review is also an opportunity to provide assistance on new programs and to enhance the ability of the metropolitan transportation planning process to provide decision makers with the knowledge they need to make well-informed capital and operating investment decisions.

3.0 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Review Process

A summary of the status of findings and Federal Actions from the last review is provided in Appendix B. This report details the seventh review, which consisted of a risk-based desk documents review, a site visit and a public involvement opportunity, conducted in April, 2019.

Participants in the review included representatives of FHWA, FTA, and District Department of Transportation (DDOT), Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), WMATA and COG and TPB staff. A full list of participants is included in Appendix A.

A desk audit of current documents and correspondence was completed prior to the site visit. In addition to the formal review, routine oversight mechanisms provide a major source of information upon which to base the certification findings.

A TMA risk-based certification review focuses on the high-risk areas, both challenges, and opportunities, and does not attempt to cover every planning topic. The FHWA and FTA provide regular stewardship and oversight to its TMA planning partners, reviewing and approving planning products, conducting Division/Region Office Risk Assessments, providing technical assistance, and promoting best practices throughout the year. The planning rule introduced transformational changes and added several new provisions. A new mandate necessitates that State DOTs and MPOs take a performance-based approach to planning and programming (PBPP). The final rule requires a transition to performance-driven, outcome-based approaches to link transportation investment priorities to the achievement of performance targets to address specific performance measures in key areas such as safety, infrastructure condition, congestion, system reliability, emissions, and freight movement. As such, MPO(s), State DOTs, and Public Transit Agencies must establish written agreements for the metropolitan area describing roles and responsibilities for PBPP, including: Coordination on target setting, data collection, data

analysis, reporting on progress toward target achievement and data collection for the NHS asset management plan.

The certification review covers the transportation planning process conducted cooperatively by the MPO, State, and public transportation operators. Background information, status, key findings, and recommendations are summarized in the body of the report for the following subject areas selected by FHWA and FTA staff for on-site review:

- Continuous, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Process
- MPO Structure and Agreements
- Unified Planning Work Program
- Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Public Participation and Access to Information
- Civil Rights (Title VI, Environmental Justice (EJ), Limited English Proficiency (LEP), Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA))
- Annual List of Obligated Projects
- Congestion Management Process (CMP)
- Performance Based Planning and Programming
- Financial Planning and Fiscal Constraint

3.2 Documents Reviewed

The following MPO documents were evaluated as part of this planning process review:

www.mwcog.org/2019federalcertification

4.0 PROGRAM REVIEW

4.1 Continuous, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Process

4.1.1 Regulatory Basis

23 CFR 450.306 (b) instructs MPOs to conduct the metropolitan planning process in a manner that is continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive, and provides for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services. This is often referred to as the “3C” planning process.

23 U.S.C. 134(e) and 23 CFR 450.312(a) state the boundaries of a Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) shall be determined by agreement between the MPO and the Governor. At a minimum, the MPA boundaries shall encompass the entire existing urbanized area (as defined by the

Bureau of the Census) plus the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period for the MTP.

4.1.2 Current Status

TPB coordination has strengthened in recent years with established relationships with the State DOTs (Maryland and Virginia), the District of Columbia DOT, and the regional transit agencies: the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC), and WMATA. For the first time in its long-range transportation plan, the TPB is highlighting aspirational ideas for transportation improvements that can help the region move closer to its transportation goals. This means that the long-range plan shifted from one that was just a compilation of projects to one that has an aspirational element to provide help and focus for local jurisdictions as they're developing their own plans, programs, and policies. TPB extensively coordinated the development of key stages of the plan, including more effective use of our subcommittees. This improved coordination helped to ensure that key pieces of information was shared with decision makers and the public well in advance of the plan's finalization. The aspirational initiatives, for example, were approved almost a year before the plan's adoption, which allowed for a robust public discussion of what they would mean to the region and how they should be reflected in the final plan document. This enhanced coordination is reflected in the new VISUALIZE 2045 plan, TIP and UPWP.

4.1.3 Findings

Commendation: The Federal Team commends TPB efforts for enhanced and extensive coordination with agencies' partners. TPB is commended for implementing a public input survey as an early tool in gathering general attitudes and opinions about transportation in the region. The outreach for Visualize 2045 was the most extensive public outreach ever conducted for the TPB long range plan.

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: None

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

4.2 MPO Structure and Agreements

4.2.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(d) and 23 CFR 450.314(a) state the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator shall cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. These responsibilities shall be clearly identified

in written agreements among the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator serving the MPA. Additionally, 23 CFR 450.314(h) states that the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator shall jointly develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plans for the National Highway System. Furthermore, 23 CFR 450.314(g) states if part of an urbanized area that has been designated as a TMA overlaps into an adjacent MPA serving an urbanized area that is not designated as a TMA, the adjacent urbanized area shall not be treated as a TMA. However, a written agreement shall be established between the MPOs with MPA boundaries, including a portion of the TMA, which clearly identifies the roles and responsibilities of each MPO in meeting specific TMA requirements (e.g., congestion management process, Surface Transportation Program funds sub-allocated to the urbanized area over 200,000 population, and project selection).

4.2.2 Current Status

The TPB has established relationships through agreements with the State DOTs (Maryland and Virginia), the District of Columbia DOT, and the regional transit agencies: DRPT) NVTC, and WMATA: There are 4 agreements signed which govern how TPB conducts planning in the region. The 3C Agreement updated in April 2018 governs the transportation planning process. The Master Funding Agreement governs TPB spending the federal and matching metropolitan planning funding and how they invoice for reimbursement for work. It is signed by the designated recipients of FHWA PL funding and FTA Section 5303 funding and by the COG Executive Director as COG is the fiscal agent. This agreement outlines legal and contracting responsibilities and the more complicated funding mechanics for all three States and the WMATA Compact.

The Calvert-St. Mary's MPO is a newer MPO and one of the first actions in 2016 was to approve an agreement with the TPB regarding the conformity analysis of transportation plans, programs, and projects in Calvert County. The agreement with Calvert-Saint Mary's MPO was to conduct the conformity analysis on behalf of C-SMMPO since Calvert County is now a member.

In 2000 the DC-MD-VA urbanized area expanded south into Stafford County, and in 2004 the TPB and FAMPO came to this agreement on how to conduct the transportation planning process for Northern Stafford County. The TPB staff reviews each other's agendas and products and the FAMPO Executive Director and TPB Transportation Director speak monthly regarding the process. Both are also officers on Virginia Area Metropolitan Planning Organizations which provides an opportunity for increased coordination. FAMPO recently approved an updated 3C Agreement, with TPB approaching the execution of MFA, and the anticipated next step will be

to update the 2004 agreement to comply with the current requirements of the planning final rule (Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning and Metropolitan Transportation Planning final rule, dated May 27, 2016). This 2004 agreement describes how FAMPO conducts transportation planning on the TPB's behalf for Northern Stafford County. TPB and FAMPO were recommended in previous certification review reports to update the 2004 agreement.

4.2.3 Findings

The previous Federal recommendation to update the 2004 FAMPO agreement were not completed. Consistent with previous certification review recommendations the Federal Team strongly recommends that TPB take formal action on the FAMPO MOU agreement. TPB should within a year update and/or revise the agreement to clarify roles and responsibilities to accomplish what is required by law and regulation. The 2004 TPB and FAMPO agreement is not consistent with 23 CFR 450.314(h).

Commendation: None

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: The Federal Team requests that within one year, the TPB, FAMPO, State, and providers of public transportation, develop agreed upon specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS.

The Federal Team strongly recommends that, within a year, the 2004 TPB/FAMPO MOU be updated to reaffirm and validate the mutually agreed upon roles of each MPO and in consideration of the passage of multi-year Federal surface transportation legislation to ensure that ongoing roles and responsibilities are consistent with regional, State and Federal expectations.

Schedule for Process Improvement: The planning process for the FAMPO region outside of the TPB TMA area may be reviewed as part of a finding (23 CFR 450.220 (b)) that is part of the review and approval of the Virginia STIP update by FHWA and FTA. As necessary, FHWA and FTA may offer technical assistance or conduct a review of the transportation planning process and the UPWP with FAMPO.

4.3 Unified Planning Work Program

4.3.1 Regulatory Basis

23 CFR 450.308 and 420 set the requirement that planning activities performed under Titles 23 and 49 U.S.C. be documented in a UPWP. The MPO, in cooperation with the State and public transportation operator, shall develop a UPWP that includes a discussion of the planning priorities facing the MPA and the work proposed for the next one- or two-year period by major activity and task in sufficient detail to indicate the agency that will perform the work, the schedule for completing the work, the resulting products, the proposed funding, and sources of funds.

4.3.2 Current Status

The TPB cooperatively develops an annual UPWP that describes all transportation planning activities utilizing Federal funding, including Title I Section 112 metropolitan planning funds, Title III Section 5303 metropolitan planning funds, and Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Airport System Planning funds. It identifies State and local matching dollars for these Federal planning programs, as well as other closely related planning projects utilizing State and local funds. In addition to the changing Federal context, other factors that influence activities in this work plan are regional in scope, and the UPWP is adjusted annually to focus on new and emerging priorities.

Each UPWP builds upon the previous UPWP, and is the result of close cooperation among the transportation agencies in the region. The UPWP is prepared with the involvement of these agencies, acting through the TPB, the TPB Technical Committee and its subcommittees. The UPWP details the planning activities that must be accomplished to address the annual planning requirements such as preparing the TIP and a CMP. The current UPWP continues efforts to develop regional performance measures in coordination with the three State DOTs, WMATA and the local government public transportation operators and utilize those measures to address the planning regulations and performance management requirements for MPOs. The TPB meets the Federal requirements for development of the UPWP.

4.3.3 Findings

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for the UPWP. The format of the UPWP is acceptable and the descriptions of the work to be undertaken is thorough.

Commendation: None

Recommendations: The Federal Team recommend TPB include the previous year's accomplishments report in each current year UPWP.

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

4.4 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

4.4.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(c), (h) & (i) and 23 CFR 450.324 set forth requirements for the development and content of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Among the requirements are that the MTP address at least a 20-year planning horizon and that it include both long and short range strategies that lead to the development of an integrated and multi-modal system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

The MTP is required to provide a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive multimodal transportation planning process. The plan needs to consider all applicable issues related to the transportation system's development, land use, employment, economic development, natural environment, and housing and community development.

23 CFR 450.324(c) requires the MPO to review and update the MTP at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas, and at least every 5 years in attainment areas, to reflect current and forecasted transportation, population, land use, employment, congestion, and economic conditions and trends.

Under 23 CFR 450.324(f), the MTP is required, at a minimum, to consider the following:

- Projected transportation demand
- Existing and proposed transportation facilities
- Operational and management strategies
- A description of the performance measures and performance targets used
- A system performance report
- Congestion management process
- Capital investment and strategies to preserve transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity
- Design concept and design scope descriptions of proposed transportation facilities
- Potential environmental mitigation activities
- Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities
- Transportation and transit enhancements
- A financial plan

4.4.2 Current Status

In 2017, TPB determined that the time was right to expand the scope of the region's next long-range transportation plan beyond the financial constraints that defined previous plans. The task force was charged with conducting a set of planning activities that would culminate in the approval of a plan that for the first time would incorporate an aspirational, unfunded component. Ultimately, the TPB determined that the new plan would highlight unfunded initiatives that the region consensually agrees are important to the future. TPB updated the Constrained Long Range Plan to the new Visualize 2045 Plan. It represents a new kind of long-range planning effort that the TPB has not engaged in before. For the first time, in addition to projects that the region's transportation agencies expect to be able to afford between now and 2045, the plan includes aspirational projects, programs and policies that go beyond financial constraints. Visualize 2045 was approved in December 2018 and has been updated to Fast Act PBPP requirements.

4.4.3 Findings

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for the Metropolitan Long Range Plan.

Commendation: None

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: The Federal Team recommends continued commitment to maintenance, operations and state of good repair.

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

4.5 Transportation Improvement Program

4.5.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(c), (h) & (j) set forth requirements for the MPO to cooperatively develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Under 23 CFR 450.326, the TIP must meet the following requirements:

- Must cover at least a four-year horizon and be updated at least every four years.
- Surface transportation projects funded under Title 23 U.S.C. or Title 49 U.S.C., except as noted in the regulations, are required to be included in the TIP.
- Make progress toward achieving the performance targets.
- A description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets (to the maximum extent practicable).

- List project description, cost, funding source, and identification of the agency responsible for carrying out each project.
- Projects need to be consistent with the adopted MTP.
- Must be fiscally constrained.
- The MPO must provide all interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed TIP.

4.5.2 Current Status

The TIP's content and structure has been redeveloped as a core document with the TIP tables included as appendices. The new technical Inputs Solicitation Project submission guide calls for the implementing agencies to submit projects for inclusion in the constrained element of the plan and TIP. The TIP emphasizes linkages to the Visualize 2045 plan with a descriptive component to the financial plan. The current TIP approved by the TPB is the first to document Performance-Based Planning and Programming measures and targets. The new PBPP section has summaries of measures and targets for Highway Safety, Pavement and Bridge Condition, Highway System Performance, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program, and Transit Asset Management. For each PBPP area, the number of projects and funding totals using relevant revenue sources have been provided in the analysis. The 2019 TIP will serve as the baseline against which progress towards these targets will be measured in the future. The TIP has expanded the "Key to Codes" section to a full glossary of Federal Title I and Title III sources with program descriptions and links for complete documentation of sources.

TPB has 100 amendments per year and 200 actions per year when including modifications and amendments. TPB plans to transition to more grouped projects. Specifically beginning next year TPB is investing in a new Project Tracker /eTIP software solution.

The eTIP platform will:

- Provide real-time access to funding levels of all sources and allow for easier comparison to projected formula fund distribution for each agency
- Include integrated access to, and nightly downloads of FMIS and TrAMS data which will enable real-time comparisons between obligations and annual element programming
- Easily enable GIS mapping of investments by projects and operational programs
- Track projects and funding sources that are tied to performance measures
- Provide access to users from multiple agencies (including federal) to review data at will
- An automated data transfer system will significantly reduce time spent on data entry on the part of 8 staff people from the three primary DOTs and WMATA, as well as TPB staff time.

4.5.3 Findings

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for the Transportation Improvement Program.

Commendation: None

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: The Federal Team recommend TPB continue expeditiously with the efforts to implement the new e-TIP and progress in alignment of projects with each State STIPs.

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: [FHWA Grouped Project Guidance](#).

4.6 Public Participation

4.6.1 Regulatory Basis

Sections 134(i)(6), 134(j)(1)(B) of Title 23 and Section 5303(i)(5) and 5303(j)(1)(B) of Title 49, United States Code, require a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to provide adequate opportunity for the public to participate in and comment on the products and planning processes of the MPO. The requirements for public involvement are detailed in 23 CFR 450.316, which requires the MPO to develop and use a documented participation plan that includes explicit procedures and strategies to include the public and other interested parties in the transportation planning process.

Specific requirements include giving adequate and timely notice of opportunities to participate in or comment on transportation issues and processes, employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs, making public information readily available in electronically accessible formats and means such as the world wide web, holding public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times, demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input, and periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the participation plan.

4.7.2 Current Status

The TPB current approved public participation plan (PPP) was adopted in September 2014. The PPP describes the TPB's policies and procedures for involving the public in the transportation planning process for the metropolitan area. The plan was developed in consultation with interested parties and various representatives of the community and the TPB ensures that

special efforts are made to involve the traditionally underserved communities, including low-income and minority communities and persons with disabilities in the planning process.

The TPB has defined three broad types of constituents (involved public, informed public, and interested public), and tailor their outreach activities to serve the needs of the above groups. TPB also created a citizen committee called Access for All Advisory Committee to advise TPB on issues and concerns of low-income, minorities, and persons with disabilities and limited English proficiency.

The Federal Team observed that there are many opportunities and ways for the public to become involved and informed throughout the transportation planning process. The TPB attempts to cast a wide net to provide public access and involvement in the development of the long-range plan and transportation improvement program through tagging onto festivals, fairs, and other community activities. TPB staff conducted multiple public comment periods including an on-line public input survey to receive comments or ideas about transportation in the region. There were over 6,000 responses to the on-line survey. TPB also conducted twelve public forums and held three open houses as part of their public outreach efforts to obtain comments on the long-range plan. TPB has made several improvements to its public outreach activities including: a bi-weekly newsletter, live-streaming of the Board meetings, established two staff positions dedicated to public involvement, development of social media presence with a Facebook page and Twitter account, use of interactive web-based surveys, and facilitated group discussions to obtain feedback on planning issues. In response to comments made by the Federal Review Team in the 2014 certification review that TPB formalized its tracking database and PPP evaluation for effectiveness, TPB has created and maintained a spreadsheet to track public participation data. TPB has also begun to produce an annual report to document the evaluation of its public participation activities.

In 2018, TPB hired a consultant to review and evaluate its' public participation activities and the PPP. TPB will update its PPP in 2019 after reviewing and analyzing the results and recommendations from the consultant-led review. The updated plan will document the enhancements and new techniques TPB is using to engage public input in the planning process.

TPB's public involvement process is very comprehensive. TPB stated that the public participation plan is a static document that does not reflect the extent of the work that is being accomplished. TPB strives to reach out to communities with face to face interaction, but has begun to extend their reach through virtual public involvement by webcasting MPO meetings and using social media. TPB has an active Citizens Advisory Committee. TPB has reactivated their Community Leadership Institute that invites members of the public to educate public participation in the metropolitan planning process.

4.6.3 Findings

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for public participation.

Commendation: None

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: The Federal Team recommends that TPB update its PPP (currently dated 2014) in consideration of the results from the recent consultant review of their public outreach activities and PPP and to reference the current legislation and planning regulations.

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

4.7 Civil Rights (Title VI, EJ, LEP, ADA)

4.7.1 Regulatory Basis

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibits discrimination based upon race, color, and national origin. Specifically, 42 U.S.C. 2000d states that “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” In addition to Title VI, there are other nondiscrimination statutes that afford legal protection. These statutes include the following: Section 162(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 (23 U.S.C. 324), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. The ADA specifies that programs and activities funded with Federal dollars are prohibited from discrimination based on disability.

Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice) directs federal agencies to develop strategies to address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs on minority and low-income populations. In compliance with this Executive Order, USDOT and FHWA issued orders to establish policies and procedures for addressing environmental justice in minority and low-income populations. The planning regulations, at 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vii), require that the needs of those “traditionally underserved” by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and/or minority households, be sought out and considered.

Executive Order 13166 (Limited-English-Proficiency) requires agencies to ensure that limited English proficiency persons can meaningfully access the services provided consistent with and without unduly burdening the fundamental mission of each federal agency.

Title 49 CFR 21.7 (Title VI Assurances) requires that recipients provide Title VI assurances as a condition to receiving Federal financial assistance. U.S. DOT Order 1050.2A, DOT Standard Title

VI Assurances and Non-Discrimination Provisions (April 2013) provide the content that the Assurances must include. Any changes to the Assurances are initiated by the USDOT operating administrations and must be coordinated by the Departmental Office of Civil Rights.

4.7.2 Current Status

TPB provided an updated copy of Title VI Program Plan during the on-site review. The Federal Team did not review the updated copy however the Title VI Program Plan on the website was reviewed. Based on the website document TPB has made improvements to their non-discrimination program requirements including adding a complaint process. TPB's Title VI Assurance was not the most current assurance (DOT Order 1050.2A) and needs to be signed annually. The assurance language may not be altered (other than inserting the entities name where indicated). The updated assurance language must be included in all contracts and service agreements. It was noted that a new LEP plan was included in the updated Title VI Plan. TPB's LEP plan provided information about TPB's four factor analysis for identifying the most prominent languages in their service area population.

Environmental Justice

The TPB's Environmental Justice program includes two phases: The identification of small areas with above average concentrations of low-income and minority populations (known as, Equity Emphasis Areas) that were created in consultation with the Access for All committee and transportation and land-use officials. This work provides TPB an equity framework that goes beyond analyzing the Long-Range Plan and to informing and influencing local and regional efforts and projects.

Using ten accessibility and commute time measures, an enhanced examination of Visualize 2045 was undertaken to identify benefits and burdens and determine if a disproportionately high and adverse impact on low-income and minority populations exists. The analysis looked at access and commute time to jobs and hospitals by various modes, including auto, transit, high capacity transit, bus, and walkable access. The results of the analysis demonstrate that Visualize 2045 does not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on EJ populations. This regional EJ evaluation leads to additional policy observations which continue promoting the full, fair and equitable treatment of all individuals, including low-income populations, racial and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and older adults.

Equity Emphasis Areas inform the household travel survey sampling strategy, and are currently considered with TPB's Enhanced Mobility and Transportation Land Community grant programs, and are used in several COG-wide planning activities.

Limited English Proficiency

The Federal Team desk review of TPB's website showed that TPB is using Google translate to translate their website and documents. TPB's Accommodation Policy provides links at the bottom of the page for non-English speakers to click on to get the policy in their language. The links are names of other languages written in those languages. This is a best practice for directing non-English speakers, so long as the translated documents have been translated accurately.

ADA/Section 504

The desk review included TPB's Accommodation policy which included both disability related and language access related accommodations. No other ADA or Section 504 compliance information was reviewed from the website or provided to the review team.

4.7.3 Findings

The Federal review team could not tell what collaboration was done between TPB, and VDOT, DDOT and MDOT for ADA and Section 504 Transition plan development. Compliance with the ADA and Section 504 transition plan for the MPA cannot be determined based on the information provided. The desk review revealed that TPB was not using the current assurance language.

Commendation: None

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: The Federal Team recommends TPB meet with the FHWA Civil Rights Specialist to discuss technical assistance and/or training to improve specific Title VI Plan and program areas.

The Federal Team recommend TPB update Title VI Program Plan to include the most recent assurance - US DOT Order 1050.2A. The language of the assurance should not be altered and should be signed annually and included in contractual agreements.

The Federal Team recommend TPB coordinate with VDOT, DDOT and MDOT to review ADA and Section 504 Transition Plan coordination and documentation.

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: Office of Civil Rights for FHWA and FTA provide TPB with policies and training.

4.8 List of Obligated Projects

4.8.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(j)(7) and 23 CFR 450.334 requires that the State, the MPO, and public transportation operators cooperatively develop a listing of projects for which Federal funds under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 have been obligated in the previous year. The listing must include all federally funded projects authorized or revised to increase obligations in the preceding program year and, at a minimum, the following for each project:

- The amount of funds requested in the TIP
- Federal funding obligated during the preceding year
- Federal funding remaining and available for subsequent years
- Sufficient description to identify the project
- Identification of the agencies responsible for carrying out the project

The listing of projects, including investments in pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, must be published or otherwise be made available in accordance with the MPO's public participation criteria for the TIP within 90 calendar days of the end of the program year. Further, cooperative procedures among the State, the MPO, and transit operators to submit the fund-obligation information necessary for this report should be set forth in the MPO Agreement [CFR 450.314(a)].

4.8.2 Current Status

The annual listing of projects was revised to present useful information in streamlined formats that combines information from each of the implementing agencies.

4.8.3 Findings

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for the list of obligated projects.

Commendation: The Federal Team commends the proactive involvement of TPB in updating the obligation listings for all three States into a consistent format.

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: None

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

4.9 Congestion Management Process / Management and Operations

4.9.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 134(k)(3) and 23 CFR 450.322 set forth requirements for the CMP in TMAs. The CMP is a systematic approach for managing congestion through a process that provides for a safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system. TMAs designated as non-attainment for ozone must also provide an analysis of the need for additional capacity for a proposed improvement over travel demand reduction, and operational management strategies.

23 CFR 450.324(f)(5) requires the MTP include Management and Operations of the transportation network as an integrated, multimodal approach to optimize the performance of the existing transportation infrastructure. Effective M&O strategies include measurable regional operations goals and objectives and specific performance measures to optimize system performance.

4.9.2 Current Status

TPB maintains a regional Congestion Management Process (CMP) in accordance with federal law (U.S.C. Titles 23 and 49) and associated regulations. FAMPO maintains a CMP for its portion of TMA urbanized area and TPB maintains the CMP for the remainder of the area. It is notable that the FAMPO and TPB CMPs differ because the agency roles in project selection differ, FAMPO by action within a single State, TPB's multi-state approach by calling attention to technical CMP information (and other technical information) in TPB's Technical Inputs Solicitation call for projects. Major components of the CMP pursuant to federal regulations and reflected in Visualize 2045 include:

- Monitoring and evaluating system performance
- Implementing and assessing strategies
- Compiling project-specific congestion management information.

There are areas to highlight where TPB's Congestion Management Process-related activities are noteworthy, perhaps beyond federal requirements.

The Commuter Connections Program is the region's keystone of congestion management. Funding provided by TPB's partner agencies supports a wide range of congestion-reducing activities, from traditional carpooling and transit outreach, to the new Incentrip app now being piloted to include episodic and gamification features. See www.incentrip.org.

TPB's use of vehicle probe data greatly enhances their congestion analysis, bringing the CMP "alive". TPB's extensive use of vehicle probe data, especially that provided through the

University of Maryland/I-95 Corridor Coalition's Probe Data Analytics Suite. TPB's use of these data allows deep dives into temporal, geographic, and episodic instances of congestion. See www.cattlab.umd.edu.

TPB's experience with probe data gives them a head-start with PBPP congestion analysis and target setting. The National Performance Management Research Data Set, or NPMRDS used in the PBPP parallels the probe data TPB has used since 2009. TPB's Vehicle Probe Data Users Group provides data analysis practitioner outreach to our member agencies, sharing its benefits. TPB's hosting of the Vehicle Probe Data Users Group since 2014, perhaps one of the few MPOs to host such a group, to help ensure that the member agencies have the technical knowledge and coordination to take advantage of this emerging data source. See www.mwcog.org/committees/vehicle-probe-data-users-group.

New emphasis on Traffic Incident Management. In calendar year 2018 TPB supported COG to convene a Traffic Incident Management Enhancement Task Force, and produced a report, which gave new regional emphasis to TIM and its role in mitigating non-recurring congestion. TIM is now explicitly included as an FY2020 UPWP sub-task.

TPB has a longstanding partnership with the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination, or MATOC Program. MATOC's regional operations coordination is a key factor in the operations management side of the region's congestion management.

4.9.3 Findings

Commendation: The Federal Team commends the TPB for its well documented CMP. Also, TPB is commended for the data clearing house and data delivery efforts that provide the TPB partners the ability to track and evaluate congestion methods that support system capacity expansion.

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: None

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

4.10 Performance Based Planning and Programming

4.10.1 Regulatory Basis

23 U.S.C. 150(b) identifies the following national goals for the focus of the Federal-aid highway program: Safety, Infrastructure Condition, Congestion Reduction, System Reliability, Freight Movement and Economic Vitality, Environmental Sustainability, and Reduced Project Delivery Delays. Under 23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2), the metropolitan planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals, including the establishment of performance targets.

23 CFR 450.306(d) states that each MPO shall establish performance targets to support the national goals and track progress towards the attainment of critical outcomes. Each MPO shall coordinate with the relevant State to ensure consistency, to the maximum extent practicable, and establish performance targets not later than 180 days after the State or provider of public transportation establishes its performance targets. The selection of performance targets that address performance measures described in 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d) shall be coordinated to the maximum extent practicable, with public transportation providers to ensure consistency with the performance targets that public transportation providers establish under 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d). Additionally, each MPO shall integrate the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets from other performance-based plans and programs integrated into the metropolitan transportation planning process.

23 CFR 450.314(h) states that the MPO, the State, and the public transportation operator shall jointly develop specific written provisions PBPP, which can either be documented as part of the metropolitan planning agreements or in some other means.

4.10.2 Current Status

TPB staff coordinated with counterparts in the State departments of transportation of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, tasked with developing performance measure targets, and members of the TPB Board, a collection of stakeholders and elected officials gave final approval to the set targets.

There are five areas considered in the performance rules, including:

1. Highway Safety
2. Highway Assets: Pavement and Bridge Condition
3. System Performance (National Highway System Congestion, Freight, CMAQ Program)
4. Transit Asset Management
5. Transit Safety – *this rulemaking not having yet had targets set*

TPB staff began coordinating with State DOT partners during the last half of CY 2015, more than three years before the first set of MPO safety targets were due. The purpose of the

coordination meetings was to understand the varied target setting approaches the partner DOTs, to share approach with DOTs, and to ensure that relevant serious injury data was provided to TPB staff in a timely fashion. The approach used to develop the first set of MPO safety targets was to apply the methodology each DOT used to develop their statewide targets to the portion of each respective State that is within the TPB planning area. This resulted in a set of three sub targets. These sub targets were then mathematically combined to determine the staff-proposed MPO target. The various State methodologies as well as the MPO methodology were vetted via three pathways: 1) at ad-hoc coordination meetings with the State DOTs, 2) through the Transportation Safety Subcommittee, and 3) through the Technical Committee. As part of the review process, each State DOT as well as TPB staff presented their respective methodologies to the Technical Committee for review and comment.

Transit Asset Management Targets

Transit Asset Management Targets, like Highway Safety Targets, have also gone through two rounds of development and target settings, most recently in February 2019. In terms of methodology, TPB staff collected data from regional public transit agencies to create an accurate inventory of revenue vehicles, maintenance vehicles, storage, and administrative facilities submitted to the National Transit Database or included in Group reports by the two statewide transit agencies: Maryland Transit Administration and DRPT. As well as this inventory data collection, TPB collected the targets set by the corresponding transit agencies. These targets were applied to the relevant assets for the region. After this process, TPB staff could create regional transit asset targets, which were then approved by the board.

Highway pavement and bridge targets

Highway Pavement and Bridge Targets were approved by the TPB in July 2018. Unlike Highway Safety and Transit Asset, this is the first round of setting targets for these measures. Also, unlike Highway Safety and Transit Assets, these targets are to be set every four years, with an opportunity to reassess the targets at the midpoint in in June 2020. TPB staff, with the coordination of regional State departments of transportation, developed regional targets concerning the condition of pavement and bridge condition. In terms of methodology TPB staff calculated the total number of lane miles and bridge surface deck area within the transportation planning region. State targets from Virginia and the District of Columbia were applied to the corresponding lane miles and deck area. With regards to Maryland, a sub-target was provided and applied to the corresponding mileage and surface deck area. After these calculations, the outputs were mathematically combined to create regional targets that were approved by the board.

System Performance - Travel Reliability Targets

TPB also adopted System Performance Travel Reliability targets for the first time in July 2018. TPB staff utilized an averaging methodology in the development of regional system performance targets. Initially, TPB staff collected data from the NPMRDS for years 2014 through 2017 concerning the travel time reliability and peak hour excessive delay on the

regional interstate and non-interstate roadways. Then, the information was extrapolated using polynomial regression through the year 2021 to cover the required four-year target timeframe. The second part of the employed methodology involved TPB staff using the 2016 TPB Travel Demand Model. This model contains outputs associated with population growth and congestion for model years 2016, 2020, 2045, etc. Forecasting was achieved by utilizing the Congested AM Peak Hour VMT estimates to project the change in congestion. This percentage of change was applied to the measured performance. The final step in this methodology involved taking the average of both the extrapolation and travel demand methods.

System Performance - CMAQ Program Targets

CMAQ Program Targets were adopted in June 2018. The CMAQ Program targets is shorthand for three separate performance measures: Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED), Mode Share, and CMAQ Project Emission Reductions.

Peak Hour Excessive Delay is a measure of per capita excessive delay on all reported segments on the National Highway System. Unlike the previous targets for which the TPB created regional targets, TPB staff developed urbanized area targets for PHED. TPB staff utilized the averaging methodology, as described earlier in the System Performance targets, in the development of regional system performance targets, for the PHED. TPB staff developed a four-year urbanized area target for PHED for board approval, which can be reassessed at the midpoint in June 2020.

The second CMAQ Program performance measure was Mode Share, which is a measure of non-single occupant vehicle mode share for commuting travel. Like PHED, this target was developed for the urbanized area. TPB staff utilized the averaging methodology by use of extrapolation from American Community Survey data and the 2016 TPB Travel Demand Model, which contains an output of anticipated future mode share in the transportation planning region. The TPB set both two and four-year targets.

The third CMAQ Program performance measure set by TPB was on-road emissions reductions. To develop this target, TPB staff obtained anticipated emissions reductions for programmed CMAQ projects from MDOT, DDOT, and VDOT in the ozone nonattainment area for the next four years. The project emissions reductions from each State were then summed to produce the emissions reduction two- and four-year targets for the ozone nonattainment area.

The TPB coordination and application of the new PBPP requirements were also developed in the long-range planning document (Visualize 2045) as well as the TIP. PBPP was also discussed and engaged with regional partners during the monthly Technical Committee and Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee meetings. These examples of coordination have assisted the TPB in making the smooth transition to a performance-driven, outcome-based program that provides a greater level of transparency and accountability, improved project decision-making, and more efficient investment of Federal transportation funds. This PBPP process ties the funding of projects and programs to improving measured performance and achieving targets set for future performance.

It is anticipated that Regional Transit Safety targets will be set for the first time at the end of 2020. TPB have set targets for all the measures except for Transit Safety, PM1 targets have been set twice. PM2 targets were set using data provided by the State departments of transportation to the federal databases. We have done some GIS for better visualization and documentation of these targets and highway and bridge conditions. There was a lot of coordination, setting up meetings, exchanging information. PM3, this area TPB took the lead for these measures, because it involves the urbanized area. TPB took the lead in terms of using forecasting to determine targets. TPB also set targets for the CMAQ measures. All of this involved having all parties involved with phone calls, meetings, and workshops.

4.10.3 Findings

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for Performance Based Approach to Planning and Programming. The Federal Review Team finds that the National Capital TPB continues to be proactive in meeting the federal performance management requirements and incorporating PBPP principles into its plan development process and coordinating with appropriate agencies to ensure that performance targets and reporting accurately reflect the regional area. TPB has a good understanding of the PBPP requirements of the MAP-21 and FAST Act and is incorporating performance-based planning and programming principles into the development of the UPWP, MTP, and TIP.

Commendation: The Federal Team commends TPB, DDOT, VDOT and MDOT for its specific written procedures for all available performance measures and targets well before the May 20, 2019 implementation date for PM2 and PM3

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations: None

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

4.11 Financial Planning and Fiscal Constraint

4.11.1 Regulatory Basis

The metropolitan planning statutes state that the long-range transportation plan and TIP (23 U.S.C. 134 (j) (2) (B)) must include a "financial plan" that "indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available to carry out the program."

(23 U.S.C. 134 (j) (2) (B)) Financial plan. --The TIP shall include a financial plan that-- (i) demonstrates how the TIP can be implemented; (ii) indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available to carry out the program; (iii) identifies innovative financing techniques to finance projects, programs, and strategies; and (iv) may include, for illustrative purposes, additional projects that would be included in the approved TIP if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available.

4.11.2 Current Status

The overall revenue forecasts for the VDOT, MDOT, DDOT, WMATA, and the local jurisdictions are prepared mostly under their own procedural requirements. The region has expended significant effort in greatly improving their financial plan, however some fiscal constraint issues appear to remain. The current financial plan was developed over an eighteen-month process, in concert with the 2045 LRTP update, that was adopted in October 2018. Anticipated revenues and expenditures estimates are in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars, and other assumptions appear to be appropriate including rates of inflation (documented at 2.4%). New sources of revenue are also included throughout the 20-year planning horizon such a new dedicated funding source for WMATA's state of good repair needs.

The financial plan is largely produced from inputs from TPB's member jurisdictions (State and District DOTs, public transportation providers and local governments) cooperatively working with TPB staff to develop reasonably available and projected sources of Federal, State local and private revenues, as well as the costs of implementing proposed transportation improvements from 2019 through 2045. This coordination is outlined in Article 9 of the 2008 Master Funding Agreement. Estimates for revenue and expenditures were developed by the TPB and reviewed by a working group and the TPB Technical Committee. WMATA develops their own forecasts with assistance from TPB. The TPB has improved their financial plan's transparency and accountability of revenue and expenditure forecasts despite the region's challenging number of planning partners, distinct fiscal products and different financial cycles

4.11.3 Findings

The fiscally constrained element of the Visualize 2045 financial plan demonstrates that projects can be implemented using committed, available or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance the federally supported transportation system is being operated and maintained (both federal-aid highways and public transportation). As demonstrated, with roughly 78% of the financial plan's expenditures going toward operations and maintenance of the region's transportation system, prioritizing the infrastructure investments for all other capacity expansions becomes even more important. With the complex nature of determining constraint, TPB appears to rely heavily on the state and transit agencies to develop revenue and cost parity. For example, several proposed suburban Maryland BRT transit projects are included

in the constrained element of the 2045 LRTP totaling over \$1B in project costs. These projects as described by TPB and the project sponsor (Montgomery County DOT) would receive discretionary Section 5309 CIG federal funds. Given the highly competitive rating process for “New Starts” or “Small Starts” funding and the high percentage of local match needed (typically around 60% to 70% which would be about \$650m) it is highly unlikely these BRT investments can be implemented simultaneously.

For the 2019-2024 TIP update, the TPB staff reviews projects costs and produces a financial summary for each agency that details funding totals by source and project type. The TIP shows priority projects in the first and second years that are to be implemented using available or committed revenues, while federally supported facilities are being adequately operated and maintained. However, the linkage or consistency between the funding programmed on projects in the Washington region's TIP and 2045 LRTP financial plan are not well explained in either document. For instance, it is not clear if each TBP member agency utilize the projected revenues and expenditures from the Visualize 2045 financial plan as a baseline to program funding accordingly. The two financial planning processes appear as separate endeavors with the TIP financial plan occurring every two years and the LRTP financial plan every four years. As public documents and planning tools, the adopted LRTP and TIP should reflect well-vetted and realistic information.

TPB satisfies the regulatory requirements for Financial Planning and Fiscal Constraint.

Commendation: None

.

Corrective Action: None

Recommendations:

1. The Federal Team recommends TPB continue to provide increased stewardship and oversight to ensure that the financial assumptions for projects are reasonable. Along these lines, without a committed, available, or reasonably expected source of funds, the suburban Maryland BRT projects, should consider being moved (some or all) to the “aspirational element” portion of the LRTP (Chapter 4) to better reflect realities associated with receiving CIG funds.
2. The Federal Team recommends clarification on how projected revenues and expenditures from the Visualize 2045 financial plan contribute to and are consistent with the TIP development efforts.

Schedule for Process Improvement: None

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: None

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The FHWA and FTA review found that the metropolitan transportation planning process conducted in the Washington, DC-VA-MD urbanized area meets Federal planning requirements as follows.

5.1 Commendations

The following are noteworthy practices that the TPB/FAMPO MPO is doing well in the transportation planning process:

- 1) The Federal Team commends TPB efforts for enhanced and extensive coordination with agencies' partners.
- 2) TPB is commended for implementing a public input survey as an early tool in gathering general attitudes and opinions about transportation in the region.
- 3) The Federal Team commends TPB efforts in identifying and sharing opportunities to enhance the planning process.
- 4) The Federal Team commends the proactive involvement of TPB in updating the obligation listings for all three States into a consistent format.
- 5) The Federal Team commends the TPB for its well documented CMP.
- 6) TPB is commended for the data clearing house and data delivery efforts that provide the TPB partners the ability to track and evaluate congestion methods that support system capacity expansion.
- 7) The Federal Team commends TPB, DDOT, VDOT and MDOT for its specific written procedures for all available performance measures and targets well before the May 20, 2019 implementation date for PM2 and PM3.

5.2 Corrective Actions

There are no corrective actions that the TPB/FAMPO MPO must take to comply with Federal Regulations.

5.3.1 Recommendations

The following are recommendations that would improve the transportation planning process:

- 1) The Federal Team requests that within one-year, the TPB, FAMPO, State, and providers of public transportation, develop agreed upon specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO, and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS.
- 2) The Federal Team strongly recommends that, within a year, the 2004 TPB/FAMPO MOU be updated

to reaffirm and validate the mutually agreed upon roles of each MPO and in consideration of the passage of multi-year Federal surface transportation legislation to ensure that ongoing roles and responsibilities are consistent with regional, State and Federal expectations.

- 3) The Federal Team recommend TPB include the previous year's accomplishments report in each current year UPWP.
- 4) The Federal Team recommends continued commitment to maintenance, operations and state of good repair.
- 5) The Federal Team recommend TPB continue expeditiously with the efforts to implement the new e-TIP and progress in alignment of projects with each State STIPs
- 6) The Federal Team recommends that TPB update its PPP (currently dated 2014) in consideration of the results from the recent consultant review of their public outreach activities and PPP and to reference the current legislation and planning regulations.
- 7) The Federal Team recommends TPB meet with the FHWA Civil Rights Specialist to discuss technical assistance and/or training to improve specific Title VI Plan and program areas.
- 8) The Federal Team recommend TPB update Title VI Program Plan to include the most recent assurance - US DOT Order 1050.2A. The language of the assurance should not be altered and should be signed annually and included in contractual agreements.
- 9) The Federal Team recommends TPB continue to provide increased stewardship and oversight to ensure that the financial assumptions for projects are reasonable. Along these lines, without a committed, available, or reasonably expected source of funds, the suburban Maryland BRT projects, should consider being moved (some or all) to the "aspirational element" portion of the LRTP (Chapter 4) to better reflect realities associated with receiving CIG funds.
- 10) The Federal Team recommends clarification on how projected revenues and expenditures from the Visualize 2045 financial plan contribute to and are consistent with the TIP development efforts.

5.3 Training/Technical Assistance

The following training and technical assistance is recommended to assist the MPO with improvements to the transportation planning process:

- 1) FHWA Grouped Project Guidance. <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/projlist.cfm>.
- 2) Office of Civil Rights for FHWA and FTA provide TPB with policies and training.

APPENDIX A - PARTICIPANTS

The following individuals were involved in the Federal Review Team:

Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Janine Ashe, FHWA
Kwame Arhin, FHWA
Jody Mccullough, FHWA
Ivan Rucker, FHWA
Mohamed Dumbuya, FHWA
Daniel Koenig, FTA
Tonya Hollard, FTA
Ryan Long, FTA
Victor Austin, FTA

Washington, D.C. District Department of Transportation (DDOT)
Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)
Maryland State Highway Administration (MSHA)
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit (WMATA)
Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) members

Sign-in sheets are attached

RISK BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Meeting Date:
April 10-11 2019

Place/Room: MWCOG Training Center

Name	Company	Email
Janine Ashe	FHWA	janine.ashe@dot.gov
John Bentley	FAMPO	bentley@gwregion.org
Lezlie Rupert	MDOT	lezlie.rupert@dc.gov
MARK RAWLINGS	DDOT	MARK.RAWLINGS@DC.GOV
Paul Agwell	FAMPO	agwell@gwregion.org
Mark Moran	COG/TPB	mmoran@mwco.org
Norman Whiteker	VDOT-NOVA	norman.whiteker@dot.virginia.gov
Michelle Dooling	GWRC	dooling@gwregion.org
Linda Millsaps	GWRC	millsaps@gwregion.org
Winstina Hughes	MDOT SHA	whughes@mdot.state.md.us
Tim Canan	COG/TPB	tcanan@mwco.org
Eric Randall	COG/TPB	erandall@mwco.org
Ciara Williams	DEPT	ciara.williams@dept.virginia.gov
Tyson Byrne	MDOT	tbyrne@mdot.maryland.gov
Lyn Ericksen	MWCOG	lericksen@mwco.org
Nicholas Ramos	COG/TPB	nramos@mwco.org
Andrew Austin	COG/TPB	aaustin@mwco.org
Mohamed Dumbuya	FHWA	mohamed.dumbuya@dot.gov

RISK BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Meeting Date:
April 10-11 2019

Place/Room: MWCOG Training Center

Name	Company	Email
RYAN LONG	FTA - REGION III	ryan.long@dot.gov
Tony Holland	FTA-HQ	Tony.Holland@dot.gov
Den Koenig	FTA - Region III	Deniel.Koenig@dot.gov
Kwame Arhin	FHWA - mid	kwame.arhin@dot.gov
Chris Bowers FHWA - VA		
Sandra Jackson	FHWA	Sandra.Jackson@dot.gov
Jay McCullough	FHWA	jay.mccullough@dot.gov
Victor Austin	FTA - HQ	victor.austin@dot.gov
Kari Snyder	MDOT-TSD	ksnyder3@mdot.maryland.gov
Andrew Meese	COG/TPB	ameese@mwcoq.org
KANTI SRIKANTH	COG/TPB	KSRIKANTH@MWCOG.ORG
Dai Damani Sivasailan	COG/TPB	Siva@mwcoq.org
Sergio Pitarco	COG/TPB	
Brandon Brown	COG/TPB	
Matthew Gaska	TPB	
Abigail Zinner	TPB	
DUSAN VUKSAN	TPB	DVUKSAN@MWCOG.ORG
JOHN SWANSON	TPB	jswanson@mwcoq.org
Kurosh Jahromi	MCAC	

RISK BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Meeting Date:
April 10-11 2019

Place/Room: MWCOG Training Center

Name	Company	Email
Mark Phillips	WMATA	mphilips@wmata.com
Brandon Brown	COG	bbrown@mwco.org
Kwame Arhin	FHWA - MD	Kwame.Arhin@dot.gov
MARK RAWINGS	DDOT	MARK.RAWINGS@dot.gov
J. Jody McLoughlin	FHWA	Jody.McLoughlin@dot.gov
Briana Hairfield	GWRC / FAMPO	hairfield@gwrcid.org
Paul Agwell	GWRC / FAMPO	agwell@gwregion.org
Matthew Gaskin	TPB	
Dan Koenig	FIA	daniel.koenig@dot.gov
Jordan Holt	WMATA	jholt@wmata.com
Mark Moran	COG / TPB staff	mmoran@mwco.org
Betsy Massie	PRTC	bmassie@mmurida.com
KANTI SRIKANTH	COG / TPB	KSRIKANTH@MWCOG.ORG
TIM CANAN	COG / TPB	tcanan@mwco.org
John Bentley ^{4/11/19}	FAMPO / GWRC	bentley@gwregion.org
Kari Barber ^{April 11}	FAMPO / GWRC	barber@gwregion.org

RISK BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Meeting Date:
April 10-11 2019

Place/Room: MWCOG Training Center

Name	Company	Email
Briana Hairfield	FAMPO	(Remote)
Kari Barber		(Remote)
Linda Lasut		(Remote)
Malcolm Watson		(Remote)
Stephen Haynes		(Remote)
Gary Evonich	Mont. Co	(Remote)

APPENDIX B - STATUS OF FINDINGS FROM LAST REVIEW

One of the priorities of each certification review is assessing how well the planning partners in the area have addressed corrective actions and recommendations from the previous certification review. This section identifies the corrective actions and recommendations from the previous certification and summarizes discussions of how they have been addressed.

Review Element	Recommendation	Implemented /Status
Agreements	The current TPB agreements meet the regulatory requirements however the planning partners are encouraged to review the agreements upon the passage of multi-year Federal surface transportation legislation to ensure that ongoing roles and responsibilities are consistent with regional, State and Federal expectations.	<p>The 3C Planning Agreement was updated to meet FAST Act standards. It was approved and executed in April 2018. As part of the 3C Agreement process, individual letters of agreement were executed by the TPB and each TPB member agency that plays a role in the implementation of Performance-Based Planning and Programming activities.</p> <p>The Master Funding Agreement, which governs how FHWA PL and FTA 5303 funds are paid to the MPO, was updated and is currently under final review for execution by the 3 States. We anticipate execution by March 2019. The new agreement reflects the latest OMB fiscal regulations. The current agreement of record was executed in October 2003 and amended in 2008.</p>
Financial Planning	The States (DC-MD-VA) should work with TPB to create high standards of transparency and accountability for State revenue and expenditure assumptions and forecasts.	In the development of the Visualize 2045 long range metropolitan transportation plan, TPB staff worked closely with staff from the State DOTs, providers of public transportation, jurisdictions, and other funding agencies to develop a thorough financial analysis for the region’s reasonably anticipated revenues and expenditures from 2019 through 2045. The financial analysis was developed in an eighteen-month-long process, from February 2017 through August 2018, via meetings, calls, and rounds of circulation of materials for comment

		among involved staff throughout the region. One major development, the legislation of new dedicated funding for WMATA's state of good repair needs, took place and was incorporated into the analysis. The process, major assumptions, and results are included in Chapter 5 of the Visualize 2045 plan and detailed in Appendix A, the financial plan, which provide the best available information on State DOT financial assumptions and forecasts.
Public Outreach and Public Involvement	TPB is recommended to formalize its PPP evaluation for effectiveness, which was a recommendation from the Federal Teams in 2002, 2005, 2010, and now 2014. The TPB could begin to compile the data it has been collecting into a formalized tracking database or tool for consistency and transparency. This tracked data can then be used to formulate Public Participation Plan effectiveness goals, objectives, indicators, and targets to better inform how to improve public involvement strategies employed by the TPB.	Over the last four years, TPB staff has been tracking public participation data, which has been maintained in a spreadsheet. A consultant-led review of the TPB's public involvement activities, conducted between October 2018 and February 2019, has developed a systemized approach for tracking and sharing this information.
List of Obligated Projects	The TPB should include the prior year's expenditures accordingly with the TIP. The report should not contain different summary reports for each State DOTs. Using the TIP category, the report should provide expenditures by project phase, fund source, geographic distribution as well as project category including maintenance, modernization and expansion. The report includes bicycle and pedestrian projects. Numerous maps and charts may be employed for illustrative purposes. Every effort should be made on an annual basis to accelerate release of the Regional	Since the 2014 review, the Federal Funding Obligation Report has been presented in a consistent format across the three DOTs, including federal FAP number, agency project ID, funding code and source, amount, obligation date, project name and corresponding TIP ID. Whereas the TIP project listings are ordered by TIP ID, the obligation listings are ordered by Agency ID, as some TIP ID data are not available. A summary table of obligations by major funding sources/project types for the three DOTs has also been provided. The latest obligation reports can be found online at https://www.mwcog.org/documents/federal-funding-obligation-report/

	Project Award and Obligation Report which commonly exceeds the regulatory timeframe for publication.	
<i>Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) No Recommendations in 2015</i>		

APPENDIX C – PUBLIC COMMENTS

Basic Requirement: FHWA and FTA shall provide opportunities for public involvement or hold a public meeting as part of the quadrennial review of large MPOs and must consider the public input received in arriving at a certification action. [23 CFR 450.336(b)(4)]

FHWA and FTA Public Meeting: TPB CAC

Measuring the Effectiveness of Public Involvement

The Citizens Advisory Committee note on April 11, 2019, during their meeting that they realize that the TPB has constraints in reaching all communities in DMV. Per one advisory committee member, the disseminating of information is challenging when reaching Latino communities in Loudon County, VA area. The following was remarked:

- During the last public involvement survey, TPB coordinated and sent out seven thousand five hundred questionnaires to the DMV communities, and only ten were completed by Latino community members.
- Disenfranchised groups may be missing from the current TPB survey method. The sampling of individual units from a population and associated techniques of survey data collection, such as questionnaire construction methods needs improving.
- The advisory member was questioning the number and accuracy of responses to surveys.
- Question: How can TPB reach the public more effectively, if they choose to use surveys?
- Suggestion: Expand TPB resources to change the survey methods and develop special outreach for certain racial groups.
- Suggestion: TPB could target employers in DMV regional area to help in disseminating TPB- COG surveys to capture hard to reach communities.

Special Note: TPB staff were present at the Citizens Advisory Committee, and mentioned that during the last survey, there was an excellent response and significant improvement in collecting data. However, TPB staff can't be sure if the low response from the Latino community is because many participants who speak Spanish and English decided to complete the survey in English. It is also possible that there were only ten people, as a sampling, from the Latino community who responded. No conclusion was determined.

Participants had a wide and varying response to the questions including the following:

- The public participation process is generally effective, but relative to the level of participation. The last 3 years during the development of "Visualize 2045" there

was a good level of participation and outreach. The aspirational initiatives were helpful for the public as well.

- One participant felt that redesign of the graphics and “brand” associated with Visualize 2045, overall helped in reaching the broader public.
- CAC participants discussed messaging at the prior CAC meeting and how best to reach ANCs and how to articulate the planning process when actions appear imminent to the public. There was a sense that the public gets involved too late when projects appear imminent so the earlier engagement is necessary.
- Many of the CAC participants discovered the CAC through local boards and then applied.
- An overall sense that more “meaningful” engagement is needed for public involvement.
- One participant mentioned that the public would like the opportunity to “umpire” and can weigh-in on certain controversial issues. An example of the outreach being conducted by SHA as part of Governor Hogan’s traffic management plan, was mentioned as an example.
- Some CAC participants felt that TPB should create more ownership/empowerment on issues, that would be more helpful for public involvement.
- There was a sense that various public involvement groups lead to some confusion or undermine one another. Perhaps collaboration and more cross-coordination between various stakeholder groups would benefit the public.
- CAC participants widely acknowledged the difficulties in participating for the public with so many other life demands, including families, work, distance to travel, etc. There was a sense that those participants on the CAC were very fortunate and privileged enough to participate while others may not be so.
- The resolution that was formed by CAC participants helps to legitimize actions and the CAC does a good job of “de-mystifying” things at the Government level. The CAC does a good job of representing areas not typically represented in planning.
- There was mention of the limitations of what the CAC can do within the confines of the transportation planning process and the TPB.
- There was recognition that representation and involvement from low-income/minority communities continues to be a challenge. Some offerings on ways to improve included involving high schools, more education opportunities, and resuming the 3-week community leadership institute.
- Different departments within the city or municipalities include involvement groups and these groups in some instances coordinate with each other and in others, they don’t. Means to enhance communication between groups was identified as a need.
- One suggestion for increasing public participation was offering more real-time video offerings.

- CAC participants continue to identify the challenges in reaching certain populations that might be limited English proficient or perhaps intimidated by the “Citizens” nomenclature within the groups’ name.
- Some CAC participants echoed the need to be more inclusive of those that are just citizens and including all residents, while one participants felt that only those that are registered voters should be eligible to participate.
- Overall, the challenge for inclusion was widespread and something that was identified by a large portion of the CAC.
- Following this discussion, the Federal Team informed the CAC of the opportunity to provide any other comments within 30-days.

RISK BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW		
Meeting Date: April 10-11 2019		
		CAC
Place/Room:		MWCOG Training Center

Name	Company	Email
DANIEL PAPIERNIK	HRTS CAC - VIRGINIA	DANIEL@PAPIERNIK.COM
Robert Jackson	CAC Chair	RJACKSON1@verizon.net
TOM BIANCOIA	Retiree ^{CAC}	tom.biancoia@comcast.com
Jacqueline Maysal	CAC	jmanapsal1@gmail.com
Tahari Johnson	CAC	taharijohnson@gmail.com
NANCY ABELES	CAC	thinkeyedead@aol.com
LORENA PUES	CAC	hypatie@angonnet.com
Meredith Howell	CAC	MLH52@cornell.edu
Katherine Kortum	CAC	kkortum@gmail.com
Beth Peralta-Reed	CAC	w.bethperalta@gmail.com
Jasmine Yang	CAC	yangjasmine@gmail.com
Jeffrey Parsons	CAC	Jeff@parnes.net
Ronit A Dancis	CAC	ronitadancis@yahoo.com
Elisa Walton	CAC	elwalton@gmail.com
Katie Behndorff	CAC	katieb@gmail.com

FHWA and FTA Public Meeting: FAMPO

First, we acknowledged and appreciate the following members of the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (FAMPO) Citizen Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG) and the public for their participation:

Dave Swan (Chair), Stafford County	Morgan Burch, Stafford County
Dave McLaughlin, City of Fredericksburg	Glenn Goldsmith, II, Stafford County
Neil Holloran, Spotsylvania County	Rupert Farley, At-Large
Stan Huie, Spotsylvania County	Larry Gross, At-Large
Josh Templeton, Spotsylvania County	Melvin Allen, Stafford County

David Cooper, Thurman Brisben Homeless Shelter

On March 13, 2019, the FHWA and FTA (via phone) met with members of the FAMPO's Citizen Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG). Members of CTAG are appointed by the Policy Board.

During the meeting, the Federal Team mentioned to the group that their past meeting minutes were reviewed and that we noticed an active participation rate that served to demonstrate and support a commitment by members to take their responsibilities as a vocal extension of their communities seriously. Additionally, the Federal Team was impressed with the group's knowledge with respect to regional issues related to transportation and the comradery and professionalism of all members. We also appreciate the MPOs efforts to ensure a diverse group. Furthermore, we were impressed with MPO staff efforts promote and engage the public through various social media avenues and strategies to monitor the effectiveness of the outreach. We did notice an absence of women on the Committee and encourage efforts to attract and appoint more women. In general, CTAG and the public shared the following comments, suggestions, and recommendations with the Federal Team with respect to the transportation and the MPO:

- Mr. David Cooper spoke and provided a written comment. Mr. Cooper spoke about the need for expanded transit and improved routes and schedules to serve the regions disadvantaged and low-income. He represented residents staying and transitioning out of temporary shelters and spoke about access to affordable housing within the MPO region and improved transit routes and schedules to King George and Caroline County to improve accessibility and quality of life experiences/opportunities.
- CTAG members expressed interest in and made the following points:

- I-95 Express lanes/extension and the project's contributions to reducing congestion. Some would like additional focus on congestion pricing and travel demand management strategies.
- Great working relationship with the MPO Policy Board. Many feel as though they are being heard.
- Some members would like to expand CTAG's to reach (i.e., opportunities to reach the public/take the meeting to the public).
- Some believe that the FAMPO region, considering its complexity and congestion issues, is being shortchanged thru the SmartScale funding process.
- Some shared concerns with Transurban Agreement
- Kudos given to MPO staff's outreach efforts thru social media (26k members on Facebook)
- CTAG members very active in VDOT meetings regarding transportation projects in the region.
- Concerned with congestion and congestion levels exceeding capacity.
- High Speed Rail is a controversial issue for the region.
- Top 5 strategies for reaching the public and keeping them informed about transportation decision impacting the region (Freelance Star, Social Media, WTOP advertising, attending meetings, Internet).

APPENDIX D - LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

CFR: Code of Federal Regulations

CIG: Capital Investment Grant

CMAQ: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality

CMP: Congestion Management Process

COG: Council of Governments

DOT: Department of Transportation

DDOT: District Department of Transportation

DRPT: Virginia Department of Rain and Transit

EJ: Environmental Justice

FAST: Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act

FAMPO: Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

FHWA: Federal Highway Administration

FTA: Federal Transit Administration

FY: Fiscal Year

HSIP: Highway Safety Improvement Program

ISTEA: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

ITS: Intelligent Transportation Systems

LEP: Limited-English-Proficiency

LRTP: Long Range Transportation Plan

M&O: Management and Operations

MDOT: Maryland Department of Transportation

MPA: Metropolitan Planning Area

MPO: Metropolitan Planning Organization

MTP: Metropolitan Transportation Plan

NVTC: Northern Virginia Transportation Commission

PBPP: Performance Based Planning and Programming

SAFETEA-LU: Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users

STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program

TBP: Transportation Planning Board

TDM: Travel Demand Management

TIP: Transportation Improvement Program

TMA: Transportation Management Area

TPM: Transportation Performance Management

U.S.C.: United States Code

UPWP: Unified Planning Work Program
USDOT: United States Department of Transportation
VDOT: Virginia Department of Transportation
WMATA: Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority



Report prepared by:

**District of Columbia FHWA
Division Office/FTA Region 3**