

**NYSMPO Director's Meeting
Teleconference Agenda
November 2, 2007 at 10:00 AM
Call in Number: 1-712-580-1800
Access Code: 697676**

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Introductions | All |
| 2. 10/12 Meeting Summary (Attachment A) | All |
| 3. 2008-2009 SCI Program (Attachment B) | Siwek |
| 4. 2007-2008 SCI Update | |
| a. Training | Zwahlen |
| b. Innovative App. to Planning Implementation | Morse |
| c. Transit Supportive Development | McAuliffe |
| d. Safety Audit Process | Schissell |
| e. Joint Contract for Speed Studies | Bager/Siwek |
| f. Fiscal Constraint RFP (Attachment C) | Siwek |
| g. MPO Self Assessment Draft (Attachment D) | Gayle |
| 5. Washington, D. C. Updates | Gayle |
| 6. NYS MPO AQ Group Recommendations to ICG (Att. E) | Siwek |
| 7. NYSDOT Update | Hayes |
| 8. Other Business | All |
| 9. Next Meeting Date/Time | |

**December 7, 2007
In Person Meeting
CDTC 10:30-3:00
One Park Place, Albany NY**

**NYSMPO Director's Meeting
Meeting Summary
October 12, 2007 at 1:00PM**

Participants

Steve Gayle, BMTS	Aaron Frankenfeld, AGFTC
John Czamanske, OCTC	Jay Schissell, ECTC
Larry McAuliffe, NYSDOT	Marty Neveu, NYSDOT
Rich Perrin, GTC	Janine Simonson, NYSDOT
Fernando de Aragon, ITCTC	Dave Kimmel, NYSDOT
Hal Morse, GBNRTC	Dick Beers, FHWA
Harry Miller, HOCTS	Jim Levy, Wilbur Smith
Jim D'Agostino, SMTC	Tanya Zwahlen, SSA
Dave Jukins, CDTC	Sarah Siwek, SSA

1) Introductions

2) NYSMPO Staff Services Contract

Jim D'Agostino put together a description of consultant staff services for review by NYSMPO. The group suggested adding a discussion of management of the Association finances and coordination with organizations like ITE. Both will be added to the list. The new consultant, Jim Levy will attend the November 8 Safety Meeting in Syracuse.

3) Appointment of Executive Committee

NYSMPO appointed an Executive Committee of Aaron Frankenfeld, Jim D'Agostino and Gerry Bogacz to manage the new consultant and transition process.

4) 2008-2009 SCI Program

The group discussed each concept and directed the staff consultant to refine or expand concepts as needed. An edited list will be reviewed on the 11/2 teleconference.

5) Resolution of Third Pilot Site TSD Project

It was agreed that Nassau Hub would be the third pilot. In addition, the Directors agreed to fund the Harriman as a fourth pilot project and would use \$25,000 in unobligated balance funds. Sarah will work with Dave Kimmel to understand what needs to be done to do this programming.

6) Next Meeting Date/Time - PLEASE NOTE 10:00 a.m. meeting time.

November 2, 2007
Teleconference at 10:00 a.m.
1-712-580-1800
Participant Access Code 697676

Preliminary Concepts for FY08-09 Shared Cost Initiatives Program

1. Joint Contracts

The following proposals are for joint contracts to be established that: 1) all MPOs would use for certain tasks, and/or 2) individual MPOs could draw upon for MPO-specific assistance. This is the concept behind the FY07-08 Speed Studies contract which has not yet gone out to bid.

1. a. Local Land Use-Transportation Planning – This project would provide professional services to MPOs through one contractor to help them educate and encourage local jurisdictions to consider land uses that would be more compatible with the transportation system. Products could include: basic educational information for distribution, workshops within MPO regions to meet with local communities on ways to improve integration of transportation and land use, 3) conduct of visualization exercises, 4) presentations at local community council meetings, etc.

1.b. Project Data System – This project would be for all MPOs to develop a consistent project data system, including safety data that could meet various MPO needs. Examples of how a consistent project data system could benefit all MPOs would be types of project data included in TIPs, project data needed for conformity purposes (impacts 9 MPOs), etc. There are many examples of consistent project data systems that could be investigated. This project would need to be closely coordinated with NYSDOT and with the Interagency Consultation Group for conformity.

1.c. Integrating statewide and regional goal setting – The NYSDOT is developing a state program update by March 1, 2008. It would be beneficial for the MPOs and NYSDOT to work to harmonize their transportation plan goals and implementation strategies. A contractor would be hired to review the statewide goals and individual MPOs goals and work with MPOs and NYSDOT to strive for consistency/compatibility between NYSDOT and MPOs plan goals.

1.d. Practices in Pricing Programs – This project would identify and develop a synthesis of best practices in transportation pricing programs. There are a number of pricing projects underway in the United States and much can be learned from these examples. Additionally, there are many projects in the discussion and development phases, including in NYC. The benefits of having this work completed would be to draw upon the experience of others (both within and outside of the region) in implementing pricing programs.

Estimated Cost:

MPO Subgroup: Gerry Bogacz, others?

Host MPO:

2. Mitigation Cost Sharing

Communities outside of New York State have used impact fees, (typically charged to a developer on a per-square-foot basis) to fund various public projects, including transportation improvements. However, impact fees are not permitted in New York State. Some communities in New York State successfully use mitigation cost sharing. Generally, this involved the completion of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) and creation of an area-specific formula relating capacity consumption to new development. Many planners talk about using this sort of mechanism to promote integrated transportation and land use planning;

however, there is little guidance on how to implement this in a community, especially if there is initial resistance to this idea.

Products could include: compilation of examples of good GEIS processes, development of funding formulas that could then be adopted to individual communities, identification of the benefits this provided in communities where it is in place; and a training program that includes the following courses. Differences between impact fees and mitigation cost sharing; the GEIS process, the players involved and how to get a mitigation cost sharing initiative adopted by a municipality; and, legal issues and how to develop a successful formula.

Estimated Cost:

Project Subgroup: John Czmanske, Steve Gayle, Aaron Frankenfeld, Dave Jukins

Host MPO:

3. Visioning Techniques/Software – This project would help the MPOs in implementing the federal visualization requirement. It would review available software such as Community Viz, which allows the user to compare land use scenarios side-by-side (2D or 3D) as well as the impacts associated with them including economic, social and environmental impacts. A scenario's assumed inputs and variables can be easily altered and the changes placed on a time scale to view changes over time. The ArcGIS extension is beneficial for communities to evaluate potential impacts of their land use decision, including impacts to the transportation system. This project would 1) review most appropriate visioning software based on compatibility with ArcGIS; 2) purchase and distribute software to each MPO; and 3) hold training for all MPOs in the use of the software.

Estimated Cost:

Project Subgroup: Dave Jukins, Eoin Wrafter, Steve Gayle, Aaron Frankenfeld

Host MPO:

4. Software Standardization on Desktop Publishing/Design Software- There are tools on the market that combine functions like In-Design, PhotoShop, Illustrator, etc. into one software package. Using and acquiring this tool may be beyond the capabilities of some MPOs without SCI assistance. This tool can be used to enhance public outreach, project visualization, etc. By standardizing with a software platform, MPOs can share ideas and resources effectively similar to how the MPOs currently share GIS and modeling efforts. The project would 1) identify best practices; 2) make recommendations on suggested standards; 3) provide training to MPOs once software is in place.

Estimated Cost:

Project subgroup: Eoin Wrafter, Jim D'Agostino, Dave Jukins

Host:

5. Transportation Improvement Revenue Enhancement – As traditional federal and state funding sources for transportation become increasingly strained, the ability of MPOs to effectively carry-out a program of projects becomes significantly more difficult. Alternate revenue sources and financing possibilities currently exist or are conceptually developed that may help bridge the gap between regional expectations and availability of resources to carryout the program.

This project would: 1) Detail potential revenue expansion possibilities, including but not limited to tax and tolling, private revenue sources, Public-Private-Partnerships (PPP), advertising, value capture, long term bonding, etc.; 2) Describe needed organizational arrangements in terms of

legal/institutional capacity to deliver on the various possibilities; and, 3) Analyze gaps between current structure of New York State MPOs and the requirements described in 2). This project would be carried out with close involvement of NYSDOT.

A possible second element of this project would be to update the NYSMPO Needs Study that was completed a few years ago.

Estimated Cost:

Project Subgroup: Hal Morse, Dave Jukins, Jeanine Simonsen

Host MPO:

6. Training – This project is a continuation of the NYSMPO training program. Specific courses requested include:

- **Public Meeting Facilitation** – Practical, hands-on training. Should include techniques and methods that can be used in real life planning meetings to help educate and inform the public. The goal is a real world class on use of real world methods.
- **Planning and Pedestrian training**
- **Presenting Data Course** – Customized for helping MPOs facilitate transportation and land use integration in their regions.
- **Emergency Preparedness Planning** – a course is needed that is appropriate to MPOs (e.g. how can MPOs be sure to include emergency preparedness planning in their processes effectively and realistically?) This would be in the form of a class with materials that the MPOs could then use to assist them at the individual MPO level.
- **Micro-Simulation Training**
- **Introduction to GIS/Advanced GIS/Other courses** to be offered every year

Estimated Cost:

Project subgroup: Dave Jukins, Jim D'Agostino, Jay Schissell

Host MPO: GTC?

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
MEETING FHWA/FTA FINANCIAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS
REVISED OCTOBER 10, 2007**

Background

In 1991 with the enactment of ISTEA, Congress included language that requires a financial plan to be included as part of the metropolitan area long-range transportation plan, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The purpose of the financial plan requirement is to demonstrate how the Long Range Transportation Plan and TIP/STIP will be implemented, to ensure that these documents are not a wish list of projects with no reconciliation with revenues likely to be available and to ensure that public involvement in the planning process is meaningful.

In June 2005, FHWA/FTA issued planning regulations that direct MPOs to identify revenues that are “reasonably expected to be available.” Revenues must be “available or committed” for the first two years of a TIP in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas.
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/fcindex.htm>.

In February 2007, FHWA/FTA issued final statewide and metropolitan planning regulations that include all changes to the planning process made in SAFETEA-LU, including the financial plan requirements for the LRP, TIP, and STIP. The regulation can be found at:
<http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20071800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2007/07-493.htm>.

Objectives of this Project

The financial plan and associated fiscal constraint requirements are implemented in various ways by MPOs throughout the state and the nation. The NYSMPOs are interested in what actions other MPOs in New York State and elsewhere are taking to meet these requirements. This SCI project would: 1) research how NY State MPOs are meeting these requirements and what tools, analysis, and processes are being used in financial planning, and, 2) identify good practices within NY State and elsewhere that could be useful to NY State MPOs. It would also explore specifically how the nine MPOs in nonattainment or maintenance areas are addressing the requirement for all funds to be identified for the first two years of the TIP. The project will document best practices from selected MPOs and create a guide including examples of best practices for how a financial plan should be developed and updated as needed.

Given a number of new requirements in the February 2007 Metropolitan and Statewide Planning Regulation, this project should specifically look at the new requirements including, but not limited to: including inflation rates to reflect year of expenditure dollars, developing cost estimates for proposals where the level of project detail varies, showing financial information to demonstrate adequate operation and maintenance of federally supported activities, and the process for cooperative development of revenue assumptions to be used in metropolitan plans and TIPs. This project will investigate what types of analysis being done to develop financially constrained plans in New York State and, with input from AMPO and FHWA/FTA, will identify other areas where good practices can be identified that could be transferable to New York State MPOs.

Task #1: Conduct a Preliminary Survey of NYS MPOs and Other Possible Candidate MPOs

A survey will be conducted to help select candidate MPOs for more in-depth analysis. All MPOs are working with the financial planning and fiscal constraint requirements and possible best models could be identified in this task. While the survey will focus on MPOs in New York State, other MPOs that are identified by New York State MPOs, the contractor, and AMPO and FHWA/FTA might be candidates for further analysis.

Deliverable: List of Candidate MPOs for Possible Further Analysis

Task #2: Identify MPOs to be Interviewed Concerning Financial Planning Requirements

This task would entail working with a Steering Committee of the NYSMPOs to select candidate MPOs from New York State to be interviewed for this research. The contractor will review the work from Task #1 and will consult with NYSMPOs, NYSDOT and FHWA/FTA for suggestions on candidate MPOs. The current NYMTC RTP financial plan development activities will be one of the processes investigated due to the change in methodology and in the level of participation from various agencies. This process offers a fresh look at estimating available resources as well as addressing the federal requirements. As a result, the process, methodology, and level of participation would provide valuable insights for the other NYSMPOs.

Deliverable: An agreed upon list of up to four MPOs to be interviewed in New York State and at least three MPOs from outside of New York State.

Task #2: Development an Interview Guide to be used in Interviewing MPOs

The contractor will develop an interview instrument that would be presented to the Steering Committee for approval. This will include the questions and approach to interviews to be followed. It is expected these interviews would be done over the telephone (for out of state MPOs) or in person.

Deliverable: An interview guide and approach to this research to be approved by the Steering Committee.

Task #3: Conduct Interviews with Selected MPOs

The contractor will conduct interviews with up to four New York State MPOs and at least three non-New York State MPOs that were selected in Task #1. It is anticipated that the interviews can be completed in a two to four week timeframe. Results of interviews will be documented. As the contractor interviews MPOs, there may be examples of good practices presented and the contractor should be looking for practices that would be helpful to the NYSMPOs. There also may be good examples of analyses used to develop financially constrained plans and TIPs and these examples should be documented. This includes consideration of the very different sizes of MPO regions and their respective transportation plans and TIPs. Best practices must be relevant and helpful to the full range of MPO sizes in New York State.

Deliverables: Documentation of interviews and approaches to analysis used in financial planning with up to seven MPOs (four in-state, three out-of-state) that can be used in selecting best practices among those interviewed.

Task #4: Review Available Information on Financial Planning from non-New York State MPOs.

As noted above, this project will focus on New York State MPOs. However, the contractor will investigate at least three non-New York State MPOs to identify best practices in financial analysis and financial planning that might be useful to New York State MPOs. This task will entail discussions with AMPO/FTA/FHWA and the review of readily available information on FHWA/FTA and other agency or association websites that provide information on best practices in other states. Particular focus should be on those examples that could be transferable to New York State MPOs.

Deliverable: A written memorandum on any interesting practices and tools being used in financial planning outside of New York State that could readily be transferable to NYS MPOs.

Task #5: Document Best Practices in a Guide to Meeting Financial Planning Requirements

The contractor should identify best practices from the MPOs surveyed and present the suggested best practices to the Steering Committee for approval. It is expected that three to six Best Practices will be documented and included in the Guide. The draft Guide will be presented to the Steering Committee for approval prior to development of the final product.

Deliverables: Recommendations on best practices to the Steering Committee and draft of guide that discusses how MPOs are meeting financial planning requirements. These will be presented to the Steering Committee for review and comment prior to development of the final product. The final product will include 20 copies of the Guide, an electronic copy of the Guide, and a web-ready document that can be posted on the NYSMPO website. The Guide will include information from non-New York State MPOs if best practices that are transferable are identified in Task #4.

Budget: The budget for this project is \$85,000.

Schedule: The schedule for this project will be a total of six months from the notice to proceed to project completion.

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE NEW YORK STATE MPOs:
WHAT HAVE WE ACCOMPLISHED SINCE THE PASSAGE OF ISTEA?****DISCUSSION DRAFT**

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 made significant changes in how metropolitan transportation planning was done, including specific guidance for long range plans in terms of planning factors, funding flexibility coupled with fiscal constraint, and management systems that were intended to rationalize investments. While modifications were made in subsequent authorizations, TEA-21 and SAFETEA-LU, the planning framework of ISTEA still stands. Facing the possibility of a new direction in the next Federal transportation authorization in 2009, the New York State MPOs believe it is prudent to assess what we have accomplished in the past fifteen years, and the extent to which we can attribute those accomplishments to ISTEA's planning framework.

Task 1: Self Inventory

NYSMPO members will assemble a listing of accomplishments, changes, milestones, major studies completed and major investments programmed since ISTEA was enacted in 1991. Significant changes in MPO organization, charters and/or operating procedures during this period will also be compiled as well all policy board resolutions passed since 1991 and all UPWP studies undertaken in that time period.

Task 2: Evaluation Criteria

NYSMPO will review the provisions of the ISTEA legislation that related to the mission and performance of MPOs and then decide the parameters to be used to evaluate MPO performance since 1991.

Task 3: Performance Assessment

The performance of NYSMPO members since ISTEA will be analyzed using the information collected in Task 1 and the evaluation criteria established in Task 2. The assessment will include both a quantitative and qualitative analysis of performance and will seek to answer several overarching questions, including:

- ♦ How have the operations and policies of the MPOs changed since the passage of ISTEA?
- ♦ How much did the relevance of the MPOs' planning processes change since the passage of ISTEA?
- ♦ What proportion of the MPOs' actions taken and planning activities undertaken since ISTEA were a direct result of the changes in MPO responsibilities and mandates that began under ISTEA?
- ♦ How has the effectiveness of the MPOs' planning processes changed since the passage of ISTEA in terms of funding and the types of improvements planned? What is the impact on the metropolitan transportation system?
- ♦ How much has the relevance of the MPOs' in their respective regions changed since the passage of ISTEA?

Task 4 - Assessment Report

The results of the quantitative and qualitative assessments will be summarized in a written report which will be organized around the key questions stated above. A stand alone Executive Summary will also be developed. All documentation will be provided in hard copy and web-ready formats.

SARAH J. SIWEK & Associates*Transportation & Environmental Consulting*

TO: NYSMPO Air Quality Group
NYSMPO Directors

FROM: Sarah Siwek

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Improvements to ICG Process

DATE: October 30, 2007

On the Air Quality Subgroup September 21 conference call related to a host of air quality issues, the group reviewed draft recommendations for improvements to the Interagency Consultation Process (ICG) in New York State. This memo provides a summary of the recommendations discussed and includes the revisions requested at that meeting. Subsequent to the Air Quality Group discussions, the FHWA issued its Process Review of the ICG. The recommendations in this memo are consistent with the spirit of, (if not the exact wording), of those recommendations. Since the ICG is going to discuss the FHWA recommendations at its next meeting, it is recommended that the MPO recommendations also be forwarded to the ICG for discussion at that meeting.

Action Requested of Directors on November 2, 2007
Approval of these recommendations for forwarding to the ICG.

1) ICG Meetings, Agendas, and Summaries

- a. ICG meetings should be scheduled at a set day and time each month with the calendar for the next year distributed at the beginning of each year. The calendar should also include the due dates for meeting agenda items to be submitted to the ICG coordinator at NYSDOT.
- b. Agendas and all attachments should be distributed to all MPOs and other ICG members at least 48 hours in advance of meetings.
- c. Emergency Meetings – Any member of the ICG, including MPOs, should be able to call an emergency meeting if an item needs to be discussed in order not to delay a project, program or decision.
- d. Meeting summaries should be prepared and distributed via email within one week of an ICG meeting.
- e. Meeting summaries should be adopted by the ICG at the beginning of the next ICG meeting and posted on a website. The NYSMPO website could be modified with a conformity section and could be the repository for the meeting agendas, attachments, and summaries. This conformity section of the NYSMPO website

could also be used to post other important transportation conformity information as it becomes available.

2) Standard Project Information Sheet

- a. A standard project information sheet should be developed by the MPOs in consultation with other ICG members. A standard project information sheet would facilitate project review and would ensure that consistent information is collected once. The project information sheet should be automated so as to facilitate distribution to project sponsors, etc.

3) Exempt/Non-Exempt Classifications for Projects

- a. Once the exempt/non-exempt classification is agreed to by the ICG and MPOs that classification should remain in effect unless the MPO identifies a change in the project that warrants revisiting the project classification.

4) Latest Planning Assumptions and Modeling Assumptions

- a. Latest planning assumptions and modeling assumptions for transportation conformity regional emissions analysis and for SIPs should be agreed to and documented at the start of the regional emissions analysis process or start of the SIP development process, respectively. This could be accomplished through pre-conformity consensus plans or through other mechanisms to be decided by the ICG and MPOs.
- b. Analysis Years – Agreement on analysis years and required analysis tests should be made at the start of the conformity process and documented in meeting summaries. These analysis years would not change unless in exceptional circumstances (e.g., EPA litigation on 1-hour vs. 8-hour ozone requirements).

5) SIP Development Process

- a. An overview of the SIP development process and schedule should be an ICG agenda item at the beginning of the SIP development process.
- b. Transportation control measures and other transportation measures for consideration in SIPs should first be discussed and documented in the ICG process prior to inclusion in a draft SIP.

6) Conformity SIP- Part 240 Revisions

- a. The Conformity SIP (Part 240) needs to be updated pursuant to the conformity rule. The MPOs should work in concert with the other ICG members to draft revisions to Part 240. Since the requirements for the Conformity SIP have been streamlined in SAFETEA-LU, consideration should be given by the ICG and MPOs, to simply have the Conformity SIP (Part 240) adopt the federal requirements. This would enable the New York State MPOs to benefit from SAFETEA-LU provisions on conformity SIPs. There is precedence in this as shown in the attached Federal Register Direct and Final Rule for the State of Ohio, which was recently adopted.

Attachment – Ohio Conformity SIP Revision
See attached PDF file.