

at \$21 billion, the Surface Transportation Program, authorized at \$23.9 billion, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program, authorized at \$6 billion. Funding from those programs is potentially available for both highway and transit projects.

I would like to use the Pittsburgh Airport HOV/busway project as an example to demonstrate how the ISTEA may work in actual practice. The project is a proposed two-lane, eight-mile HOV/busway from downtown Pittsburgh to the airport. Eight stations are proposed, along with a new HOV bridge into the downtown area, and the conversion of the Wabash Tunnel into an HOV facility.

The Port Authority of Allegheny County (PAT) has been the lead agency on the project. The initial concept focused on a busway to be funded out of the transit program. Following the passage of the ISTEA, PAT contacted the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) concerning the availability of flexible funding through the Surface Transportation Program (STP). PennDOT indicated an interest in exploring possible funding, but suggested that HOV use of the busway be considered. As a result, a carpool/vanpool alternative was added to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is currently being circulated for review and comment, and a decision is expected soon regarding the locally-preferred alternative.

The institutional relationships that developed on this project are interesting. Although PAT took the initial lead, and is still the lead agency, they are working closely with PennDOT. Further, FTA and FHWA are working together on the federal EIS. The financing plan being developed includes a package of highway and transit funds. Funding sources include Section 3, STP/CMAQ, ISTEA earmarks, local bonding, and other local sources.

I would like to close by discussing some of the administrative aspects of the ISTEA flexible funds. In general, FTA will manage projects that are clearly transit, while FHWA will manage projects that are clearly highway-oriented. Decisions concerning intermodal projects will be made on a case-by-case basis. HOV facilities may fall within those projects that will be determined on an individual basis.

In conclusion, the ISTEA represents a major milestone in the partnership between federal, state, and local transportation agencies. New procedures, new relationships, and new roles will be needed to take advantage of the flexible funding and other requirements of the ISTEA. It will take time to determine the appropriate approaches and to fully understand the opportunities offered by the act. The Pittsburgh project is one example of an approach that can be used to develop busway/HOV projects.

#### Federal Highway Administration Perspective

*Sheldon G. Strickland*

*Federal Highway Administration*



It is a pleasure to be able to participate in the Sixth National Conference on HOV Systems. The Federal Highway Administration is pleased to help sponsor the conference along with the Federal Transit Administration. I would like to thank the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Transit Commission and the Ontario Ministry of Transportation for their sponsorship of the conference as well.

I am very optimistic about the future of HOV facilities as a result of provisions of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. I would like to cover three topics this morning. First, I want to discuss the provisions of the ISTEA that clearly support the potential of HOV facilities. Second, I would like to provide you with an overview of HOV-related activities by federal regions. Finally, I would like to discuss the potential of other ISTEA provisions to greatly expand the inventory of HOV facilities.

As you are aware, the number of miles of operating HOV lanes has greatly increased in the United States since 1969. Currently, slightly over 350 center-line miles are in operation. The increased popularity and demonstrated effectiveness of HOV facilities may have influenced Congress to include the HOV provisions in the ISTEA. There are four primary provisions in the ISTEA that address HOV facilities. These are Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (Section 1008), Interstate Maintenance (Section 1009), Metropolitan Planning (Section 1024), and Statewide Planning (Section 1025). I would like to briefly discuss the aspects of each of these provisions as they relate to HOV projects.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program (Section 1008) states that, "No funds may be provided under this section for a project which will result in the construction of new capacity available to single-occupant vehicles unless the project consists of a high-occupancy facility available to single-occupant vehicles only at other than peak travel times." The CMAQ program is a \$6 billion, six-year effort aimed at congestion mitigation and improving air quality. The program is focused only on metropolitan areas that have been designated as air quality non-attainment areas.

Currently, over 60 percent of the U.S. population lives in metropolitan areas classified as non-attainment areas. Further, 61 of the 75 metropolitan areas with populations of over one-half million people are classified as non-attainment areas. Of these, only about 28 currently have any type of HOV facility in operation. If any of the non-attainment metropolitan areas plan to use CMAQ funds to increase capacity, they must consider HOV facilities.

In addition, under ISTEA the only projects eligible for 90 percent federal funding through the Interstate Maintenance Program are HOV facilities. The Interstate Maintenance Program (Section 1009) provides that the "activities authorized shall not include the construction of new travel lanes other than high-occupancy vehicle lanes or auxiliary lanes."

Metropolitan Planning (Section 1024) also addresses HOV facilities. Although this section does not say anything specifically about HOV projects, the wording very clearly reflects HOV facilities. The section indicates that funds should be used "to make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the mobility of people and goods." The section states that in non-attainment metropolitan areas with populations over 200,000, "federal funds may not be programmed for any highway project that would result in a significant increase in the carrying capacity for single-occupant vehicles, unless the project is part of an approved Congestion Management System." Additional rule-making currently underway at FHWA and FTA will further support these requirements.

Statewide Planning (Section 1025) further supports these efforts at the state level. This section states that "each state shall undertake a continuous transportation planning process which shall reduce traffic congestion including methods which reduce motor vehicle travel, particularly single-occupant motor vehicle travel." You can see that the focus here continues to be on moving people, rather than vehicles. Thus, state departments of transportation must deal with congestion on a statewide level, they must cooperate with the metropolitan planning organization (MPOs), and in non-attainment areas with

populations over 200,000 consideration must be given to HOV facilities in planning and programming activities.

So how are we doing? Are the states using ISTEA funds for HOV projects? Table 1 shows that the amount of funding obligated from the ISTEA, including CMAQ, in FY 1992 for HOV projects was about \$212 million. This was obligated in a nine-month period. The \$2.8 million in CMAQ funding went to just two projects. Thus, funding through CMAQ has not really been maximized for HOV projects yet. Most of the ISTEA funding for HOV facilities is being used in federal regions 3 and 10. However, there are a large number of HOV projects in other regions, especially 4 and 9. Thus, there currently does not appear to be a balance between HOV projects and ISTEA funding.

There is more to the ISTEA than just these four elements, however. Other sections of the ISTEA further support the development of HOV facilities. For example, the ISTEA requires the development of a number of management systems in metropolitan areas. Three of these are directly related to HOV projects. States and metropolitan areas with populations over 50,000 are required to have management systems for congestion management, intermodal transportation facilities and systems, and public transportation facilities and equipment. All of these management systems should incorporate HOV facilities in their plans. The Clean Air Act Amendments further require that transportation planning and operations in the future must link the movement of people and goods to the management of congestion. The language in the ISTEA makes it clear that the MPOs must confront congestion, address it where it exists, and prevent congestion from occurring where it does not currently exist. The planning process must develop a long-range plan in which congestion management, intermodalism, and public transportation are linked together to reduce congestion and improve air quality levels. The funding provided by the ISTEA carefully links the planning and transportation improvement plan (TIP) processes. Therefore, eventually HOV facilities will appear on more TIPs as a result of the management systems.

In conclusion, the provisions of the ISTEA are very generous toward HOV facilities. The trends relating to both planning and constructing HOV facilities are also very positive. New projects are being developed and existing ones are being expanded. In addition, many non-attainment areas will need to consider HOV projects. Finally, the management system requirements of the ISTEA support HOV facilities and should lead to expansion of HOV projects.

TABLE 1 U.S. HOV FACILITIES AND ISTE A FUNDING BY FHWA REGION (OCTOBER 1992)

Region	HOV facilities (lane-miles)			ISTEA funds (\$ thousands)	
	Planned	Construction	Operational	Total	CMAQ
1	141	37	27	1,200	300
3	134	54	127	90,500	0
4	306	29	140	0	2,458
5	96	0	22	1,770	0
6	21	30	46	8,546	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	9	9	13	2,000	0
9	1,064	12	263	0	0
10	124	39	70	107,731	0
Total	1,895	210	708	211,747	2,758

**The Emerging Role of  
Metropolitan Planning Organizations**

*Jon Williams*

*Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments*

I would like to discuss the impact of the ISTE A on the metropolitan planning process and the implications for HOV facility development. I would like to start by providing an overview of metropolitan and regional planning in the United States.

In 1990, the U.S. population was approximately 240 million people, with some 78 percent residing in metropolitan areas. The number of people living in metropolitan areas has increased from approximately 40 million in 1920 to 190 million in 1990. Over the same time period, the population in non-metropolitan areas has declined.

Metropolitan areas in the U.S. are characterized by a complex and often overlapping structure of county, municipal, sub-regional, and state governments. This often makes it difficult to find metropolitan solutions to metropolitan problems. In the area of transportation, the federal government has recognized the need for regional coordination, and since 1962 has required an urban transportation planning process in each metropolitan area. The agencies that coordinate this regional planning process are known as metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). I am going to assume that we all share the belief that some form of metropolitan coordination is desirable for transportation planning and that we share the same primary goal to find cost-effective solutions to our transportation problems.

The ISTE A has transformed the practice of transportation planning in the United States. There are a number of key features of the ISTE A from an MPO perspective. First, there is additional federal funding available from the

Transportation Trust Fund. About 30 percent more funding is available from previous years and a higher percentage of these funds are allocated to MPO planning activities. The overall level of funding available to MPOs has increased by about 75 percent. It appears that the work load for MPOs has increased by some 125 percent, however, so I am not sure how well MPOs really come out with the new legislation.

A second significant feature of the ISTE A is the addition of flexible funding categories. These have changed the entire character of the metropolitan transportation program. Whereas previously the Interstate Program had a relatively inflexible character, there is now far more flexibility in the types of solutions metropolitan areas can use to address transportation problems.

Third, the ISTE A has given project selection responsibilities in many funding categories to the MPOs in consultation with the states. This is a big change from the past, when MPOs were often viewed as just rubber-stamping state plans. This responsibility is somewhat controversial with the implementing agencies. In the final analysis, it appears that the ISTE A gives local governments a greater opportunity to influence which projects are built and operated through the MPO process.

Several of the new planning and program requirements are especially important. One is the need to have a realistic financial program for how the regional plan will be implemented. This constraint was not imposed previously, and thus many plans were often unrealistic. Second, the public participation requirement ensures that the public will be provided with direct participation in the entire planning process. Third, the congestion management system requirement directs the MPO, in consultation with the state, to incorporate demand reduction and operational management strategies into the regional plan.