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Purpose

To provide E2S2 participants with a basic understanding of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning process, and reasons why Defense facility planners in metropolitan areas should integrate into it.

Context:

• **EO 13514 §2(f)** - advance regional and local integrated (transportation) planning

• Department of Defense Strategic Sustainability Plan, Sub-Goal 8.2.
Outline

• Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) 101
• Examples
  – BRAC 133 Ft Belvoir-Mark Center
  – Beauregard Area Plan
  – Joint Base San Antonio
• The Way Ahead
  – A message from USDOT Secretary LaHood
  – A Challenge to the Defense Installation Planning Community
• What is an MPO?
• MPO requirements
• How MPOs and military communities can help each other
What is an MPO?

• A transportation policy-making and planning body with representatives from local, state, and federal government and independent authorities

• Required by federal law (23 USC) in urbanized areas of 50,000+. There are 384 MPOs in the US.

• Ensures federal spending on transportation occurs through a comprehensive, cooperative, and continuing (3-C) process (as set forth in 23 USC)
What does an MPO do?

Core Functions:

• Establish a venue for regional decision-making
• Evaluate transportation alternatives that are realistic and context sensitive
• Involve the public
• Develop transportation plans and programs
  – 20 year (min.) Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP)
  – 4 year (min.) budgeted Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
• Assure transportation plans and programs conform to Clean Air Act attainment requirements (42 USC 7506(c))
A little more about Transportation CAA Conformity

Key Elements of a Metropolitan Transportation Plan/TIP Conformity Determination

- Interagency Consultation
- Public Involvement
- Latest Planning Assumptions and Emissions Model
- Regional Emissions Analysis
  - Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget
- Timely Implementation of Transportation Control Measures
- Fiscal Constraint
MPO 101


Defense Partnering with Metropolitan Planning Organizations
So, why should Defense installation planners get involved?

- Personnel live in the affected communities
- EO 13514 §2(f) requires it
- Potential Clean Air conformity issues for failure to integrate
Example – BRAC 133

- New home to the Washington Headquarters Service (WHS) – about 6,000 employees
-Moved from transit accessible Pentagon
- The new Mark Center location is not transit accessible
One example of consistent, negative press surrounding BRAC-133.

Local media/bloggers commonly refer to it as “The 1/4 Pentagon Boondoggle”
Concerns about poor planning raised by:

- Virginia Congressional Delegation
- DoD Inspector General
BRAC 133 – IG Findings

• Project introduced ‘after the fact,’ and not vetted or processed through the regional transportation planning process.

• MPO had no input or involvement in the development of the BRAC 133 - Mark Center project.

• Stakeholders within the region also reported no input or involvement:
  
  Fairfax County
  City of Alexandria (where BRAC 133-Mark Center is located)
  Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)
  Virginia Railway Express (VRE)
  Virginia Department of Transportation
  Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
BRAC 133 – IG Findings

- Traffic data collected near holidays when volumes are 25% lower
- Travel behavior assumptions based on Pentagon which has access to transit
- Study limited to 7 intersections (about 10% of that recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers)
- Failed to consider impact on the nearby Interstate
- Failed to consider impacts on nearby high-accident intersections
- Transportation capital projects recommended 4 or 5 years after occupancy
- No mitigation to on-site traffic congestion offered
Comparison - Beauregard Area Plan

- Developer led, 30-year vision for the area surrounding the Mark Center.
- 9.9MM S.F. development
- 3-year, open, transparent and collaborative planning process.
Comparison - Beauregard Area Plan

LEGEND
- Proposed Buildings
- Existing Buildings
- Dedicated Transit
- Shared Transit Traffic

Note: Proposed building footprints for illustrative purposes only.
• Planners looking well beyond development site
• Considering influence of/on regionally approved and conforming planned transportation projects
Comparison - Beauregard Area Plan

• Through partnering, and participation in the MPO process, the developer has:
  – Influenced the MPO to amend the CLRP and TIP to add projects supportive to the site
  – Influenced the MPO and City of Alexandria to Support a winning $1MM TIGER II Grant application to further Transit Corridor project development
  – Influenced the City of Alexandria to lead the project development and implementation

• Defense Installation Planners can achieve similar results
Example – Joint Base San Antonio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ft Sam</th>
<th>Lackland</th>
<th>Randolph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>31,454</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>9,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Value</td>
<td>$3.87B</td>
<td>$4.9B</td>
<td>$1.48B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>23,437</td>
<td>24,702</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>11,928</td>
<td>10,131</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>46,000 Annually</td>
<td>86,000 Annually</td>
<td>6,600 Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-BRAC / growth

**TOTAL**

- Permanent Party personnel = 84,488
- Rotational / Training = 138,600/12mo = 11,550

**Total Number Supported Daily = 96,000**
Example - Joint Base San Antonio

Defense Partnering with Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Example - Joint Base San Antonio

To maximize “Strong Transportation and Transit Connections” JBSA should:

• Participate in the MPO process
  – Influence (or at least be aware of) the CLRP
  – Ensure relevant projects are listed in the TIP

• Be transparent and collaborative regarding transportation needs and data.

Through partnering JBSA can improve the quality of life and work experience for its personnel.
The Way Ahead

Secretary LaHood's Invitation to Join the Online...
The Way Ahead

• Join the dialogue
• Participate in the MPO process
• Understand ways to influence transportation funding
DoD Facility Planning and Metropolitan Planning Organizations
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