National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

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

ITEM 5

MEMORANDUM

July 9, 2009

TO: Transportation Planning Board

FROM: Ronald F. Kirby
Director, Department of
Transportation Planning

Re: Letters Sent/Received Since the June 17 TPB Meeting

The attached letters were sent/received since the June 17th meeting. The letters will be reviewed under Agenda Item 5 of the July 15 TPB agenda.

Attachments

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

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

MEMORANDUM

July 9, 2009

TO: Transportation Planning Board

FROM: Ronald F. Kirby
Director, Department of
Transportation Planning

Re: Letter to the Region's Congressional Delegation
& Secretary LaHood regarding concerns about the
Highway Trust Fund

As requested by the TPB at its June 17th meeting, the attached letter was e-mailed to the offices of the following members of the Congressional Delegation, along with an electronic copy of the "Policy Principles for the 2009 Authorization of Federal Surface Transportation Programs":

Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton
Congressman Roscoe Bartlett
Congressman Steny Hoyer
Congresswoman Donna Edwards
Congressman Chris Van Hollen
Congressman Gerald Connolly
Congressman James Moran
Congressman Frank Wolf
Senator Barbara Mikulski
Senator Benjamin L. Cardin
Senator James Webb
Senator Mark Warner

The letter was also sent to Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation Ray LaHood.

Atttachments

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

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

June 29, 2009

Honorable Steny Hoyer
US House of Representatives
1705 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Hoyer:

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Metropolitan Washington region, is very pleased that the Administration recently strengthened vehicle fuel efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions standards for cars and light trucks, and that a federal "cash for clunkers" program aimed at encouraging consumers to purchase more fuel-efficient vehicles was signed into law last week. The TPB is increasingly concerned, however, that inadequate funding levels are resulting in serious under-investment in the nation's transportation system, and believes in particular that the multi-billion dollar shortfalls in the Highway Trust Fund for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 must be addressed in the immediate future.

The TPB is currently completing an update to the long-range transportation plan for the Washington Region. Relative to projections prepared just a year ago, this plan update included deferrals of many significant highway and transit projects due to funding shortfalls at all levels of government. The plan update also projected that despite a drop of 2.5 percent in regional vehicle miles of travel in 2010 due in part to the economic slowdown, vehicle emissions will increase by as much as 7 percent due to a slowdown in the purchase of new, cleaner vehicles. These findings underscore the importance of accelerated production and purchase of cleaner vehicles, as well as the urgent need to address funding shortfalls.

In addition to addressing the multi-billion dollar shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund, the TPB believes that fundamental changes are needed in the structure and funding of ongoing federal surface transportation programs. The TPB has developed a set of policy principles (copy attached) to help guide the next federal authorization of surface transportation programs, following the expiration of the SAFETEA-LU authorization on September 30, 2009. These policy principles call for a substantial increase in federal transportation funding; an explicit focus on the repair and efficient operation of existing highway and transit systems; uniform evaluation procedures and criteria for assessing all new modal and intermodal capacity increases; and increased funding focused on metropolitan transportation challenges.

Thank you for considering the TPB's views on these important initiatives for the nation's economy and transportation infrastructure. For further information, please contact the Director of Transportation Planning for the TPB, Ronald Kirby, at (202) 962-3310 or rkirby@mwcog.org.

Sincerely,

David Snyder
Vice Chairman
National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Enclosure

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Policy Principles for the 2009 Authorization of
Federal Surface Transportation Programs

1. Fundamental changes are needed in the current structure and funding of federal surface transportation programs: current planning, programming, and environmental processes are overly cumbersome and inefficient, and inadequate funding levels are resulting in serious under-investment in transportation.

2. An explicit program focus is needed to put and keep the nation's transportation infrastructure in a state of good repair, and to ensure that it is operated efficiently and safely.

3. Decisions on investment in new transportation capacity should be based on a rigorous and comprehensive analysis of economic, social and environmental benefits and costs, which assesses all modal and intermodal options with uniform evaluation procedures and criteria.

4. Federal transportation policy should provide for increased federal funding focused on metropolitan congestion and other metropolitan transportation challenges, with stronger partnerships between federal, state, regional and local transportation officials.

5. A substantial increase in federal transportation funding will be needed to address the current under-investment in the nation's transportation system, and should be sought from:

    - Increases in federal fuel taxes or other user-based taxes and fees;
    - Pricing strategies enabled by emerging technology for all modes of travel, including rates that vary by time of day, type of vehicle, level of emissions, and specific infrastructure segments used;
    - Inclusion of major transportation investments in legislation to create national infrastructure banks or bonding programs; and
    - Auction of pollution emissions allowances.

Approved September 17, 2008

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL FOR STAGE I REAUTHORIZATION

This document outlines the Administration's proposal for the first stage of surface transportation reauthorization, consisting of an 18-month plan to address the Highway Trust Fund shortfall and implement discrete, leading-edge capacity-building measures that a long-term reauthorization should expand upon. The following are the Administration's core principles for this proposed 18-month reauthorization, which should be considered "Stage I" of the broader reauthorization process:

- A general fund transfer to the Highway Trust Fund is necessary to maintain its solvency.
- The general fund transfer should be paid for. The Administration will work with Congress to identify revenue-raising measures that will reimburse the general fund for the transfer over ten years.
- Stage I reauthorization should include State and MPO capacity-building measures. These measures are a "downpayment" on longer-term improvements in data-driven decision making, transparency, and accountability.
- As appropriate, the Stage I reauthorization should include measures to improve regional mobility and access and enhance the livability of all communities.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND SOLVENCY

Analysis by the Department of Transportation shows the Highway Trust Fund running short of cash in late August or early September of this year. To extend the program 18 months at the baseline funding level will require $18 billion for the highway account and $2 billion for the transit account. Legislation to address the HTF shortfall should pass before August recess to avoid disruptions to state cash management and further strain on state budgets.

The Administration believes this transfer should be repaid to the general fund over the next ten years. A revenue measure that repays the general fund contemporaneously (i.e., over the two year period) is not feasible given the economic situation and the pressing needs of the transportation system. Instead, the Administration would support a range of options, including international tax enforcement proposals the President included in his budget.

DOWNPAYMENT ON REFORM

Although an extension of the HTF is urgent, the Administration believes that this opportunity can be used to put in place a limited set of carefully thought-out reforms that can form the basis for further reforms in a full six-year reauthorization.

Investing for Performance

The Administration strongly supports improving investment decisions at the federal, state, and local levels of government. Establishing performance goals and basing project selection on merit

criteria will increase returns to transportation investment, which have fallen precipitously in recent decades. The following are concrete reform proposals with 18-month costs:

Improving state and MPO project evaluation capacity (Cost: $300 million). The Administration proposes funding to help states and localities build capacity for collection and analysis of data on transportation goals. States and MPOs that choose to participate would be given funding to establish project evaluation infrastructure, including information on usage or ridership, accidents and fatalities, average speeds and travel times, and environmental impacts. This voluntary program would provide participating entities the opportunity to integrate analysis into investment decisions and prepare for improved accountability standards and merit criteria in the long-term reauthorization.

Improving project assessment tools (Cost: $10 million). As states and localities build informational and analytic capacity, the federal government must work to refine assessment tools and develop standards for cross-modal comparisons of projects. The Administration proposes funding for USDOT to develop performance goals and establish guidelines for states and localities on project evaluation.

Increasing transparency in state and local public reporting (Cost: Low). The Administration also proposes stronger requirements for tracking and reporting on the projected and actual outcomes of transportation investments that use federal dollars. These requirements would include information on project costs, timelines, and selection process as well as expected and actual outcomes of individual projects. Improved reporting requirements would increase the transparency of transportation spending and improve state and local decision-making. These requirements would also lay the groundwork for further accountability reforms in the long-term reauthorization.

Regional Access and Livability Initiatives

The Administration supports efforts to improve regional access and mobility and enhance the livability of communities. Possible reforms in Stage I reauthorization could include:

- Regional Access: developing guidelines for multimodal regional access plans, establishing local transportation governance standards and best practices, and funding approved multimodal access plans.
- Livability: developing guidelines for community plans and providing funding for approved projects with special emphasis on convenience of transportation options, reductions in travel times, smart growth, preservation of open space, and more integrated responses to land use and transportation needs.

DESIGN OF THE NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE BANK

BACKGROUND

The current process for federal infrastructure investment stems from a time when construction of the national highway system was the nation's primary infrastructure objective. The highway system enabled the efficient movement of goods, people, and ideas across the nation. In the past half-century, however, our nation's infrastructure investment needs have changed significantly. Energy, water, and telecommunications have joined the list of pressing infrastructure priorities. Within transportation, greater demand for transportation options like transit, rail, and aviation has increased the need for projects that connect different modes. The growth of urban areas has been accompanied by increases in accident rates, congestion, freight delays, and pollution.

Several barriers hinder the ability of federal infrastructure programs to address these challenges:

- Cost effectiveness evaluations of projects are often done poorly or are limited to comparing projects of like kind.
- Federal programs fail to consider the impact of infrastructure decisions on other sectors or broader policy goals. For instance, highway construction is viewed solely as a transportation project, with little attention to the project's implications for economic development, land use and energy conservation.
- Regional projects that cross state lines are often neglected in the formula-driven allocation and decision model of infrastructure spending.
- Federal transportation funds in particular are siloed by mode, with separate programs for highways, bridges, rail, and transit. This stovepiping makes it difficult to fund intermodal transportation projects or compare projects of different modes.

BANK PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

Given the nation's diverse infrastructure needs—including energy, water, transportation, and telecommunications—the Administration proposes the establishment of a National Infrastructure Bank with an initial focus on transportation-related investments and flexibility to expand to other sectors over time. This approach will help target resources to the federal transportation funding system, which is particularly in need of bold reform at this time. In the meantime, the Recovery Act and other funding will help clarify the highest-value approaches to investing in other sectors.

The purpose of the Infrastructure Bank is to establish a new direction in federal infrastructure investment: one that supports regionally and nationally significant, high-value projects funded through a merit-based selection process. The Bank would fund relatively large and transformative projects currently underfunded by the allocation process, including:

- Projects that cross state and local jurisdictions, such as freight and passenger rail;
- Projects that integrate sectors and policy goals, such as highway projects that consider land use and economic development; and
- Projects that cross transportation silos, such as bridge construction that includes a rail line and harbor dredging.

Merit-based project selection would be a fundamental principle of the national Infrastructure Bank. The Bank would compare projects of different modes, incorporating cost effectiveness and equity considerations into its decisions.

BANK DESIGN PRINCIPLES

The budget resolution adopted by Congress includes $2 billion this year and $5 billion next year for a national Infrastructure Bank. President Obama has outlined broad design principles on the focus, governance structure, and financing mechanisms of the Infrastructure Bank. The Obama Administration will work with Congress to establish specific policies and practices for the Bank.

- **Sectors for investment: Transportation & transportation-affiliated projects.** The Infrastructure Bank should target transportation and transportation-affiliated projects that emphasize smart land use, economic development, intermodalism, energy conservation, and other priorities of our modern infrastructure system. Focusing on cross-modal transportation projects with special attention to broader economic and environmental impacts would allow for effective targeting of Infrastructure Bank dollars. It would also direct funds to high-value projects that are difficult to finance in the existing system. As the Infrastructure Bank grows over time, its scope could expand to more sectors.

- **Project size: Low minimum threshold.** The Administration proposes a $25 million minimum threshold on project size. This relatively low project threshold is consistent with the fundamental principle of merit-based selection and would allow the Bank to choose the most valuable of a broad array of projects. The low threshold would also help make Bank funding accessible to all potential applicants, whether large or small, urban or rural.

- **Governance and structure: Independent entity within DOT.** Political independence is critical to the success of an Infrastructure Bank. For this reason, the Administration proposes that the Bank be housed as an independent entity within DOT, consistent with the proposed Bank focus on transportation and transportation-affiliated projects. The Bank would be governed by a board of non-governmental advisors with proven expertise in infrastructure, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Similar to the role of the IRS Oversight Board, the Bank board would lend expertise and insight to project selection, approve final selection decisions, and protect the Bank from internal and external political pressures.

- **Financing mechanisms: Combination of grants and credit products.** A flexible set of financing tools would allow the Bank to provide the most appropriate form of financing to a given project. The Administration would allow the Bank to offer a combination of grants and credit products like direct loans and loan guarantees. The Administration does not support Bank authority to borrow independently from private capital markets, since Treasury is the sole entity that borrows on behalf of the federal government and can do so more cheaply and efficiently than any other entity.

The Washington Post

Ride-Share Work Expands Beyond the Daily Grind

Carpool Agency Targets Concerts, Games

By Brigid Schulte
Washington Post Staff Writer
Thursday, July 2, 2009

After 25 years of helping commuters find others going their way and creating carpools to ease the area's clogged roads Monday through Friday, a ride-sharing agency is helping do the same for those heading to ballgames, fireworks, parades and concerts on weekends and evenings.

Commuter Connections, the ride-sharing agency of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, is offering an online ride-matching service to events. The system enables a commuter to enter a home address and find an interactive map with others nearby who are willing to carpool to the event.

"This is a really new area for us. We've been really focused on the commute and people getting to and from work," said Nick Ramfos, director of Commuter Connections. "But the whole reasoning behind this new effort is to lessen traffic before and after special events, so people can get in and out in a less stressful manner."

The idea came from other cities, including San Francisco, he said. "If you're waiting to get in to an event, wondering if you're going to be on time to see the kickoff or the beginning of the concert, that's stressful. You want to go and have a good time, not wait to exit the facility and then get stuck in traffic."

The agency's Web site, http://www.mwcog.org/commuter2, features such events as the Fourth of July fireworks on the Mall, the National Independence Day Parade, a concert in Baltimore, an Elton John-Billy Joel concert at Nationals Park and every Nationals home game. Ramfos said he plans to add venues and events to the list.

"Some of these venues are going to have good transit services, and that would probably be the best way to go," Ramfos said. "But if that's not an option, this is a good way of meeting up with neighbors and, instead of having four vehicles on the road, having just one."

Getting cars off the road has been the primary aim of Commuter Connections since its inception in 1974 when it began promoting carpools, vanpools, teleworking, public transit, biking and walking. The idea is not only to reduce congestion but also to improve air quality.

The ride-matching service has evolved from a cumbersome process of paper forms and anonymous workers matching commuters and delivering potential carpools in the mail to an instant online interactive map experience. Nearly 30,000 commuters use the program, Ramfos said.

The Washington area has one of the largest "commutersheds" of any urban area, with workers coming into the urban core from as far away as Pennsylvania and West Virginia, Ramfos said. Every day, about 3.6 million people commute into the area, and about 71 percent drive in alone, Ramfos said. That contributes to making the area among the most congested in the nation (third by some accounts), with commuters sitting in traffic an average of 69 hours a year.

Ramfos said the problem would be worse without Commuter Connections' efforts. About 18 percent of commuters use public transit, he said, the second-highest transit use in the country, behind New York. And 8 percent carpool and

vanpool, which is the third-highest carpooling rate in the nation, after Los Angeles and Chicago. About 3 percent bike and walk. Additionally, nearly 20 percent of the workforce teleworks at least one day a week, Ramfos said.

"You're talking a pretty sizable number of people doing something differently," he said. "Because of these programs, we're able to reduce about 113,000 vehicles trips per day, which translates into 2.3 million vehicle miles of travel each day. That's a big impact."

Commuter Connections also offers commuters a guaranteed ride home if they miss their carpool in an emergency. And beginning this fall, it will pay commuters on the most congested roads $2 a day to carpool. The Web site also serves as a clearinghouse for the latest information on traffic cameras and road work. Last week, after the worst accident in Metro's history, Commuter Connections sent out messages for commuters to consider carpooling while the investigation was underway.

Commuter Connections also recognizes businesses that work to reduce the number of cars on the road, and three Northern Virginia businesses and their programs were honored last week for "going above and beyond," Ramfos said.

The Consumer Electronics Association in Crystal City not only promotes telework and encourages carpooling, but one year ago, it began offering its 135 employees $25,000 loans to buy homes in Arlington County, closer to the office. The loans are forgiven after three years, said spokeswoman Meghan Henning. So far, nine employees have taken the company up on the offer. Henning said she is looking for a home in Arlington to do so.

The association promotes teleworking one day a week, with the company reimbursing 50 percent of Internet costs, and 50 employees take advantage of that. The company gives carpoolers free parking. And it offers $120 a month to employees who take transit. The company also provides a gym and showers for those who bike to work. All together, the efforts save about 500,000 vehicle miles a year and 25,000 gallons of gas, Ramfos said.

"The association has really come up with innovative ways to deal with commuting, the environment and work-life balance," Henning said. Many of the ideas came from confidential employee surveys, she said.

When Tysons Corner Center implemented ride matching, trip tracking, a commuter calculator and trip planning services for its 5,500 employees, it had a 10 percent increase in employees who use public transit and carpools, saving 610,000 vehicle miles each year. And at Noblis, a company in Falls Church, 22 percent of the 658 employees telework part time and 26 employees telework full time.

Ramfos said he lives in Loudoun County. To get to work in the District, he drives his hybrid car to Herndon, catches the Fairfax Connector bus to Metro's West Falls Church Station and takes the Orange Line to Union Station. From there, he walks two blocks to his office. On a typical day, he commutes about an hour 15 minutes each way. On days he has to drive, he said, he always stops to pick up a "slug," a single commuter, to carpool with. "I wouldn't feel like I would be doing my civic duty if I didn't have someone sitting next to me in the HOV lane," he said.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Transportation Policy & Planning Administration

July 8, 2009

Mr. Charles Jenkins
Chair
Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street, NE – Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Mr. Jenkins,

As you are aware, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) was signed into law on February 17, 2009, and the United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) has advised the state departments of transportation and metropolitan planning organizations to take necessary actions to utilize the funds provided by it quickly and effectively.

In mid June, 2009, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) released preliminary guidance regarding applications for ARRA funding pursuant to the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) program. Pursuant to this guidance, applications are due to FRA by August 24th. Any project submitted must be included in a State or Metropolitan Area Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to be eligible for consideration. Thus, the July 15th TPB meeting is the only opportunity that DDOT has to include several rail projects in the CLRP and TIP prior to the application deadline.

DDOT requests that Transportation Planning Board add an agenda item to consider the attached CLRP and TIP amendments associated with the HSIPR program. Alternatively, these items could be considered as amendments under existing Agenda Item 9 (Approval of the 2009 CLRP) and Agenda Item 10 (Approval of the FY2010 – FY2015 TIP). All of the items are exempt from air quality conformity testing and are briefly described below:

- Union Station Escalator Replacements

  Existing escalators are at the end of their useful life and need to be replaced. These escalators connect Union Station to its parking garage and provide intermodal connections between intercity passenger rail and transit buses, sightseeing buses, intercity buses, rental cars, car-sharing vehicles, private autos and rail transit. Failure to replace these escalators imperils ability of Union Station to process existing passengers and will preclude anticipated increases in intercity passenger rail patronage.

  Existing escalators run 24 hours 7 days per week. New escalators will employ a "sleep" mode in which they slow down and consume less energy when not in use.

- Union Station Passenger Facility Enhancements

  Amtrak waiting areas are crowded. Arriving passengers seeking to exit the station are often obstructed by passengers waiting for or walking toward departing trains. Undersized and obsolete bathrooms (with a men's facility at the far west end of the waiting area and a women's facility at the far east end of the waiting area) cause poor passenger circulation and congestion.

  Underutilized areas between the existing waiting areas and the tracks will be utilized and bathrooms will be upgraded so that men's and women's facilities exist on both sides of the waiting area. This will enhance the travel experience and allow for forecasted growth in passenger rail travel.

- Union Station Access Enhancements

  Union Station and Metrorail share an entrance along First Street, NE. Intercity rail and transit patrons are often in conflict with each other because of the entrance layout and a lack of elevator and escalator capacity between the Metrorail mezzanine and the Union Station Concourse.

  Reconfiguration of the entrance and elevator areas and the expansion of the escalators should relieve existing congestion and thereby accommodate and facilitate a predicted growth in intercity passenger rail patronage.

- Study of the structural integrity and capacity of the Long Bridge over the Potomac River

  The CSX Long Bridge carries freight and passenger rail traffic over the Potomac River between Virginia and the District of Columbia. This structure is very old and needs to be thoroughly examined regarding its structural integrity. According to the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations (MAROps) Study, this two-track segment constitutes a bottleneck for both freight and passenger rail traffic along the Northeast Corridor. The study should examine the feasibility of adding a third track to the existing structure or, if the structure needs replacement, the feasibility of replacing the old structure with a three-track bridge. Adding a bike-pedestrian connection should be considered also.

The detailed CLRP and TIP project forms are attached to this letter.

I apologize for the late notice regarding consideration of these ARRA-related items. Perhaps it might be some consolation to know that if these projects move forward, residents from throughout the entire metropolitan region will be the beneficiaries.

Thank you for your assistance regarding the consideration of these important items. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at 202-671-2325.

Sincerely,

Rick Rybeck
Deputy Associate Director

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FY 2010-2015 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency: **DDOT** Agency Project ID:
2. Project Name (from CLRP Project): Union Station Escalator Replacement
3. Phase Name:

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:			Union Station	
5. From (_ at):				
6. To:				

7. Agency Phase ID:
8. Description: Existing escalators that connect Union Station to the Union Station Garage are at the end of their useful life.

   Existing escalators run 24 hours 7 days per week. New escalators will employ a "sleep" mode in which they slow down and consume less energy when not in use.

9. Conformity Information:

Improvement	Facility Type From	Facility Type To	Number of Lanes From	Number of Lanes To	Environmental Review	Status
Pedestrian					CE	proposed

10. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations: _ Not Included; _ Included; **x** Primarily a Bike/Ped Project; _ N/A
11. Total Miles: 0
12. Project Manager: David Ball, USRC 13. E-Mail: dball@usrc.com
14. Project Information URL:
15. Projected Completion Year: **2012**
16. Actual Completion Year: .
17. Project Status:

    x New Project

    _ In previous TIP, proceeding as scheduled

    _ In previous TIP, delayed or reprogrammed

    _ Project is ongoing, year refers to implementation

    _ Project is being withdrawn from TIP

18. Environmental Review

    Type: _ PCE; **x** CE; _ DEA; _ EA; _ FONSI; _ DEIS; _ FEIS; _ F4; _ N/A

    Status: **x** Proposed for preparation; _ Under preparation; _ Prepared for review; _ Under review; _ Approved

19. Capital Costs

FISCAL YEAR	AMOUNT	PHASE	SOURCE	FED	STA	LOC
2010	$8,000,000	c	High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail - ARRA	100%	0	

(use the Tab button in the bottom right cell to create more lines in the table)

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FY 2010-2015 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency: **DDOT** Agency Project ID:
2. Project Name (from CLRP Project): Union Station Passenger Facility Enhancements
3. Phase Name:

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:			Union Station	
5. From (_ at):				
6. To:				

7. Agency Phase ID:

8. Description: Amtrak waiting areas are crowded. Arriving passengers seeking to exit the station are often obstructed by passengers waiting for or walking toward departing trains. Undersized and obsolete bathrooms (with a men's facility at the far west end of the waiting area and a women's facility at the far east end of the waiting area) cause poor passenger circulation and congestion.

   Underutilized areas between the existing waiting areas and the tracks will be utilized and bathrooms will be upgraded so that men's and women's facilities exist on both sides of the waiting area. This will enhance the travel experience and allow for forecasted growth in passenger rail travel.

9. Conformity Information:

Improvement	Facility Type From	Facility Type To	Number of Lanes From	Number of Lanes To	Environmental Review	Status
Pedestrian					CE	proposed

10. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations: _ Not Included; _ Included; **x** Primarily a Bike/Ped Project; _ N/A
11. Total Miles: 0
12. Project Manager: Joan Malkowski 13. E-Mail: jmalkowski@UnionStationDC.com
14. Project Information URL:
15. Projected Completion Year: **2012**
16. Actual Completion Year: .
17. Project Status:
    - **x** New Project
    - _ In previous TIP, proceeding as scheduled
    - _ In previous TIP, delayed or reprogrammed
    - _ Project is ongoing, year refers to implementation
    - _ Project is being withdrawn from TIP
18. Environmental Review

    Type: _ PCE; **x** CE; _ DEA; _ EA; _ FONSI; _ DEIS; _ FEIS; _ F4; _ N/A

    Status: **x** Proposed for preparation; _ Under preparation; _ Prepared for review; _ Under review; _ Approved
19. Capital Costs – (USI will contribute the cost of the design)

FISCAL YEAR	AMOUNT	PHASE	SOURCE	FED	STA	PVT
2010	$ 900,000	c	USI	0	0	100%
2010	$6,000,000	c	High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail - ARRA	100%		

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FY 2010-2015 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency: **DDOT** Agency Project ID:
2. Project Name (from CLRP Project): Union Station Access Enhancements
3. Phase Name:

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:			Union Station	
5. From (_ at):				
6. To:				

7. Agency Phase ID:

8. Description: Union Station and Metrorail share an entrance along First Street, NE. Intercity rail and transit patrons are often in conflict with each other because of the entrance layout and a lack of elevator and escalator capacity between the Metrorail mezzanine and the Union Station Concourse.

   Reconfiguration of the entrance and elevator areas and the expansion of the escalators should relieve existing congestion and thereby accommodate and facilitate a predicted growth in intercity passenger rail patronage.

9. Conformity Information:

Improvement	Facility Type From	Facility Type To	Number of Lanes From	Number of Lanes To	Environmental Review	Status
Pedestrian					CE	proposed

10. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations: _ Not Included; _ Included; **x** Primarily a Bike/Ped Project; _ N/A
11. Total Miles: 0
12. Project Manager: Scott Peterson 13. E-Mail: SPeterson@wmata.com
14. Project Information URL:
15. Projected Completion Year: **2012**
16. Actual Completion Year: .
17. Project Status:
    - **x** New Project
    - _ In previous TIP, proceeding as scheduled
    - _ In previous TIP, delayed or reprogrammed
    - _ Project is ongoing, year refers to implementation
    - _ Project is being withdrawn from TIP
18. Environmental Review

    Type: _ PCE; **x** CE; _ DEA; _ EA; _ FONSI; _ DEIS; _ FEIS; _ F4; _ N/A

    Status: **x** Proposed for preparation; _ Under preparation; _ Prepared for review; _ Under review; _ Approved
19. Capital Costs – (USI will contribute the cost of the design)

FISCAL YEAR	AMOUNT	PHASE	SOURCE	FED	STA	LOC
2010	$1,800,000	a	High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail - ARRA	100%	0	0
2011	$12,200,000	c	High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail - ARRA	100%		

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FY 2010-2015 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency: **DDOT** Agency Project ID:
2. Project Name (from CLRP Project): Long Bridge Integrity & Capacity Study
3. Phase Name:

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:			Long Bridge	
5. From (_ at):			Virginia Interface	
6. To:			12th Street, SW	

7. Agency Phase ID:

8. Description: The CSX Long Bridge carries freight and passenger rail traffic over the Potomac River between Virginia and the District of Columbia. This structure is very old and needs to be thoroughly examined regarding its structural integrity. According to the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations (MAROps) study, this two-track segment constitutes a major bottleneck for both freight and passenger rail traffic along the Northeast Corridor. The study should examine the feasibility of adding a third track to the existing structure or, if the structure needs replacement, the feasibility of replacing the old structure with a three-track bridge. Adding a bike-pedestrian connection should be considered also.

9. Conformity Information:

Improvement	Facility Type From	Facility Type To	Number of Lanes From	Number of Lanes To	Environmental Review	Status
Rail Bridge			2 tracks	3 tracks	EA / EIS	proposed

10. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations: _ Not Included; **X** Included; _ Primarily a Bike/Ped Project; _ N/A
11. Total Miles: 1
12. Project Manager: 13. E-Mail:
14. Project Information URL:
15. Projected Completion Year: **2011**
16. Actual Completion Year: .
17. Project Status:
    - **x** New Project
    - _ In previous TIP, proceeding as scheduled
    - _ In previous TIP, delayed or reprogrammed
    - _ Project is ongoing, year refers to implementation
    - _ Project is being withdrawn from TIP
18. Environmental Review
    - Type: _ PCE; _ CE; _ DEA; **x** EA; _ FONSI; _ DEIS; _ FEIS; _ F4; _ N/A
    - Status: **x** Proposed for preparation; _ Under preparation; _ Prepared for review; _ Under review; _ Approved
19. Capital Costs –

FISCAL YEAR	AMOUNT	PHASE	SOURCE	FED	STA	PVT
2010	$1,000,000	d	FY09 USDOT Appropriations Act	50%	25%	25%

FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2030
PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

jmalkowski@UnionStationDC.com

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency: DDOT
2. Secondary Agency: CSX, Amtrak, VRE, VDRPT
3. Agency Project ID:
4. Project Type: _ Interstate _ Primary _ Secondary _ Urban **X** Bridge _ Bike/Ped _ Transit _ CMAQ
   _ ITS _ Enhancement _ Other _ Federal Lands Highways Program
   _ Human Service Transportation Coordination _ TERMs
5. Category: _ System Expansion; _ System Maintenance; _ Operational Program; **X** Study; _ Other

6. Project Name: Long Bridge Structural Integrity and Capacity Study

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
7. Facility:			Long Bridge	
8. From (_ at):			Virginia Interface	
9. To:			12th Street, SW	

10. Description:

The CSX Long Bridge carries freight and passenger rail traffic over the Potomac River between Virginia and the District of Columbia. This structure is very old and needs to be thoroughly examined regarding its structural integrity. According to the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations (MAROps) Study, this two-track segment constitutes a bottleneck for both freight and passenger rail traffic along the Northeast Corridor. The study should examine the feasibility of adding a third track to the existing structure or, if the structure needs replacement, the feasibility of replacing the old structure with a three-track bridge. Adding a bike-pedestrian connection should be considered also.

11. Projected Completion Date: **2011**
12. Project Manager:
13. Project Manager E-Mail:
14. Project Information URL:
15. Total Miles: 1
16. Schematic:
17. Documentation: I-95 Corridor Coalition MAROps Study
18. Bicycle or Pedestrian Accommodations: _ Not Included; **X** Included; _ Primarily a Bike/Ped Project; _ N/A
19. Jurisdictions: District of Columbia and Virginia
20. Total cost (in Thousands): $ 1,000
21. Remaining cost (in Thousands):
22. Funding Sources: **X** Federal; **X** State; _ Local; **x** Private; _ Bonds; _ Other

SAFETEA-LU PLANNING FACTORS

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

a. x Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.

b. _ Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.

i. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue? _ Yes; _ No

ii. If yes, briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:

c. _ Increase the ability of the transportation system to support **homeland security** and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

d. x Increase **accessibility and mobility** of people and freight.

e. x Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.

f. _ Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.

g. x Promote efficient system **management and operation**.

h. x Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

24. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project? _ Yes; x No

a. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?

_ Air Quality; _ Floodplains; _ Socioeconomics; _ Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;

_ Energy; _ Noise; _ Surface Water; _ Hazardous and Contaminated Materials; _ Wetlands

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

25. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project? x Yes; _ No

a. If so, is the congestion recurring or non-recurring? x Recurring; _ Non-recurring

b. If the congestion is on another facility, please identify it: Major northeast corridor interstates are congested. Failure to allow Amtrak and commuter rail services to serve their existing and potential future passengers would overwhelm these facilities with increased auto traffic. Likewise, inability to handle projected increases in freight movement via the railroad will add truck traffic to these congested highways.

c. What is the measured or estimated Level of Service on this facility? ___ ; _ Measured; _ Estimated

26. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other principal arterial? _ Yes; x No

a. If yes, does this project require a Congestion Management Documentation form under the given criteria (see page 34 of the *Call for Projects* document)? _ Yes; Click here to access a Congestion Management Documentation Form.

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

_ The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than 1 lane-mile

_ The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange

_ The project will not allow motor vehicles, such as a bicycle or pedestrian facility

X The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction

_ The project received NEPA approval on or before April 6, 1992

_ The project was already under construction on or before September 30, 1997, or construction funds

were already committed in the FY98-03 TIP.

_ The construction costs for the project are less than $5 million.

_ The project will not use any Federal funds in any phase of development or construction.

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

27. Is this an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project as defined in federal law and regulation, and therefore subject to Federal Rule 940 Requirements? _ Yes; **x** No

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

b. Under which Architecture:

_ DC, Maryland or Virginia State Architecture

_ WMATA Architecture

_ COG/TPB Regional ITS Architecture

_ Other, please specify:

28. Completed Date:
29. _ Project is being withdrawn from the CLRP.
30. Withdrawn Date:
31. Record Creator: **Rick Rybeck**
32. Created On: **July 7, 2009**
33. Last Updated by:
34. Last Updated On:
35. Comments