

situations. Second, in those cases where HOV lanes are the best solution, the public must be educated and their support should be sought for the facilities. Resources need to be allocated from project funds for this purpose. Third, HOV facilities need to be designed and operated in a safe and enforceable manner. Fourth, HOV systems should be planned that include park-and-ride lots, transit services, enforcement, and employer programs as integral components. Fifth, priority treatments may take many forms and could include ramp meter bypass lanes, congestion pricing, and bus-only lanes.

There is a danger that funds may be allocated to HOV lanes because it is the easy thing to do, rather than the right thing to do. The MPO will play a critical role in helping to identify cost-effective HOV projects. The MPO's project selection responsibility for the flexible programs is very important in this regard. This does not give them independent powers, however, as MPOs are primarily a forum for state and local discussion. Rather, it suggests two ways that MPOs can be helpful. First, MPOs provide an opportunity to involve all groups in the metropolitan area in the planning and project selection process. Second, MPOs have the potential to ensure that system planning occurs and that narrow-based unpopular projects with inadequate supporting facilities are not funded.

Currently, MPOs and others are just beginning to discover how to take advantage of many of the new programs and the flexibility offered by the ISTEA. It appears that MPOs have the potential to make the planning and design process a rigorous one that will produce successful HOV projects and programs.

Maximizing the Benefits of the ISTEA

Peter Peyser

Peyser Associates, Inc.



I would like to thank the organizers of the conference for the opportunity to provide an update on a number of elements related to the ISTEA and the HOV Coalition. The credit for many of the ISTEA provisions related to HOV facilities goes to the members of the HOV Coalition. The coalition is a public/private organization established in 1989 to advocate HOV projects at the national level. Members include Seattle Metro, Denver RTD, Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, The American Bus Association, and Greyhound Lines.

The HOV Coalition promoted several goals during the development of the ISTEA. Three critical elements stand out. The first was to provide preferential matching ratios for HOV projects. The 90 percent federal matching ratio in the Interstate Maintenance Program certainly reflects this preferential treatment for HOV projects. The set-aside provision for transportation enhancements within the act further supports the development of HOV projects. The coalition also pushed for a special category of funding for HOV projects. The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program reflects many of these concerns. Third, the coalition supported broad eligibility for HOV projects. The coalition promoted the inclusion of HOV projects in the different categories within the highway and the transit programs. I think this goal was also accomplished, as HOV projects are mentioned in many parts of the ISTEA.

As noted by other speakers, an important reason for this approach was the link to the Clean Air Act Amend-

ments of 1990. It appears that the HOV Coalition was successful in most of its efforts. However, implementing HOV projects is not always an easy process and the ISTEA itself does not guarantee that HOV facilities will be developed. We have been working with a number of large transit agencies, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and many other groups during the implementation of the ISTEA. We are finding that the experience with HOV projects may not be as positive as we had hoped it would be, although numerous opportunities exist.

There does appear to be a good deal of inertia working against HOV projects in many of the major metropolitan areas that needs to be overcome. This inertia exists at both transit agencies and state departments of transportation. Both types of agencies tend to have numerous projects of a more traditional nature in the planning and programming pipeline. Many transit agencies have bus replacement needs and plans for new bus garages or new rail systems. State highway departments always have needs for resurfacing projects or other system enhancements. It is very difficult to go to those agencies with maintenance responsibilities for the bus, rail, and roadway systems and try to get them to focus on more non-traditional types of projects like HOV facilities.

Thus, there does not appear to be any real ownership of the HOV concept at the agencies responsible for implementing these projects. The fact that HOV projects were not viewed as threatening to transit or highway agencies may have helped during the legislative process. This benefit may be somewhat of a deterrent during the implementation process, because these agencies may not feel a commitment toward HOV projects. Those of us who live in the Washington, D.C. area are also aware of the public misgivings toward HOV projects. One of the lessons I think we can learn from the Dulles Toll Road project is the need to take a systems approach to the development of HOV facilities.

Although most people think there is a positive link between HOV facilities and improving air quality levels, environmental groups in some areas do not favor HOV lanes or any project that presents an opportunity to improve the highway.

Finally, there appears to be some confusion over how MPOs will conduct the planning and project selection process for allocating funds for the different ISTEA programs. You need to look at the experience to date with many of these programs to understand this concern. Other speakers have discussed many of the issues relating to how these funds may be used. As indicated, approximately 90 percent of the funds allocated for HOV projects through the flexible highway programs have gone to just two regions. Thus, there appears to be a need to provide more

information on the availability of funding through the various highway programs.

Similar needs exist with transit programs also. According to FTA, approximately \$241 million has been programmed from the Surface Transportation Program and CMAQ for transit purposes in FY 1992. In addition, some \$58 million in FY 1993 funding has been allocated. Approximately half of this \$300 million is being spent in the New York City metropolitan area. Further, all these funds are being used for either traditional transit projects—bus garages, new buses, and other capital projects—or to a lesser extent, projects to comply with ADA and CAAA requirements. In general, these funds are not being used for HOV lanes or similar projects. The proposed airport HOV lane in Pittsburgh linking the airport and the downtown area provides one exception to this trend.

I would like to close by noting a few of the activities that I believe are necessary to take full advantage of the funding opportunities for HOV facilities. Clearly, advocates for HOV projects need to understand that the ISTEA presents the opportunity for HOV projects, but it does not guarantee that any projects will be funded or constructed. Coalitions will need to be developed in different areas to take advantage of the flexibility of the new federal programs. These coalitions will need to include environmental groups as well as transit agencies, MPOs, and state transportation departments. Further, coordination with IVHS activities and projects will be important. IVHS is currently receiving a good deal of attention and there are many natural ties with HOV facilities. Finally, businesses and major employers need to be involved in the process.

As an HOV advocate, I am very excited about the opportunities available through the ISTEA. However, there is a good deal of work to do before the benefits of this legislation will be realized in terms of new HOV projects and facilities.