



U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration  
Administration  
Kentucky Division  
330 W. Broadway  
Frankfort, KY 40601

Federal Transit

Region IV  
61 Forsyth St., SW, Suite 17T50  
Atlanta, GA 30303

May 1, 2003

Mr. Jack Scriber  
Kentuckiana Regional Planning  
and Development Agency  
11520 Commonwealth Drive  
Louisville, Kentucky 40299

Dear Mr. Scriber:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have completed a certification review of the transportation planning process for the Louisville urbanized area. We appreciate the cooperation given to us by your staff in conducting this review.

These reviews are made in accordance with 23 USC 134, which requires a review of the transportation process for all metropolitan areas of 200,000 or more population. The objective of such a certification review is to determine whether the transportation planning process meets or substantially meets the Federal transportation planning requirements outlined in 23 CFR 450.300.

The review found that the transportation planning process for Louisville, as conducted by the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency, meets the planning requirements with one exception. As such, the FTA and FHWA jointly certify the transportation planning process with one corrective action.

The enclosed report documents the results of this review and offers recommendations for continuing quality improvements and enhancement to the KIPDA planning process.

If you have any questions regarding the certification action, please call either Brent A. Sweger of FHWA at (502) 223-6743 or Henrika Buchanan of FTA at (404) 562-3513.

Jose Sepulveda  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration

Jerry Franklin  
Regional Administrator  
Federal Transit Administration

Enclosure

<b>RECEIVED</b>	
MAY 27 2003	
TO	
HDA	
ADA	
HFA	
HPD	
HPE	
HTS	

*Franklin, Sepulveda, Jellison, Sweger*  
510



U.S. Department of Transportation

**Federal Highway Administration  
Administration**

Kentucky Division  
330 W. Broadway  
Frankfort, KY 40601

**Federal Transit**

Region IV  
61 Forsyth St., SW, Suite 17T50  
Atlanta, GA 30303

May 1, 2003

Mr. Jack Scriber  
Kentuckiana Regional Planning  
and Development Agency  
11520 Commonwealth Drive  
Louisville, Kentucky 40299

Dear Mr. Scriber:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have completed a certification review of the transportation planning process for the Louisville urbanized area. We appreciate the cooperation given to us by your staff in conducting this review.

These reviews are made in accordance with 23 USC 134, which requires a review of the transportation process for all metropolitan areas of 200,000 or more population. The objective of such a certification review is to determine whether the transportation planning process meets or substantially meets the Federal transportation planning requirements outlined in 23 CFR 450.300.

The review found that the transportation planning process for Louisville, as conducted by the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency, meets the planning requirements with one exception. As such, the FTA and FHWA jointly certify the transportation planning process with one corrective action.

The enclosed report documents the results of this review and offers recommendations for continuing quality improvements and enhancement to the KIPDA planning process.

If you have any questions regarding the certification action, please call either Brent A. Sweger of FHWA at (502) 223-6743 or Henrika Buchanan of FTA at (404) 562-3513.

/s/ J. Sepulveda

---

Jose Sepulveda  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration

/s/ J. Franklin

---

Jerry Franklin  
Regional Administrator  
Federal Transit Administration

Enclosure

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
CERTIFICATION REVIEW**

for the

**LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA  
TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREA**

**FEBRUARY 2003**

# Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b>	2
<b>Certification Statement</b>	2
<b>Summary of Findings</b>	3
<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Follow-up from Year 2000 Review</b>	5
<b>MPO Organization</b>	6
<b>Unified Planning Work Program</b>	6
<b>Public Involvement and Title VI</b>	7
<b>Planning Process &amp; Project Prioritization</b>	9
<b>Financial Planning</b>	11
<b>Transit Planning</b>	12
<b>Air Quality Conformity</b>	12
<b>Public Meeting</b>	13
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>A. Federal Reviewers</b>	
<b>B. Certification Participants</b>	
<b>C. Certification Review Agenda</b>	

## Preface

Section 450.334 of Title 23 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* requires that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) jointly certify compliance of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in each Transportation Management Area (TMA) with the transportation planning requirements every three years. A TMA is defined as an urbanized area with a population of at least 200,000. The planning process for the Louisville-Southern Indiana urbanized area was last certified on May 2, 2000. A Federal review team consisting of representatives from the FHWA and FTA (1) conducted this review on February 4, 5 and 6, 2003.

The primary purpose of the Certification Review is to ensure that the planning requirements of Title 23 of the *United States Code* (USC) Section 134 (23 USC 134) and 49 USC 1607 are being satisfactorily implemented. In addition, recommendations from the review team may lead to a more effective and efficient planning process. Finally, innovative practices identified during the review may be shared with others around the country.

The federal review team would like to wholeheartedly thank KIPDA for their cooperation and hospitality during the review. We would also like to thank members of the Transportation Policy Committee, Transportation Technical Coordinating Committee and the general public that took the time to participate and provide input into this review.

## Certification Statement

Subject to adequate implementation of the included **corrective actions** and consideration of the included **recommendations**, the planning process in the Louisville-Southern Indiana urbanized area as carried out by the MPO, KIPDA, is certified for a three year period beginning on the date of the certification letter transmitting this report.

The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration find that the MPO, in cooperation with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the Indiana Department of Transportation and the Transit Authority of River City, are conducting a transportation planning process that results in the development of many quality transportation planning products using the planning tools currently available.

Based on this certification review, the KIPDA transportation planning process is found to substantially comply with Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code, Section 8 of the Federal Transit Act, Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act.

A **corrective action** is defined as a measure that must be taken to correct a deficiency of a process or product so that it will comply with federal regulations. The review team also made numerous **recommendations** that we believe will improve the planning processes for the Louisville region. We hope that these recommendations be seriously considered for implementation in the near future. Finally, we noted several **commendations** of products or processes that were worthy of recognition. Some members of the federal review will periodically meet with the planning partners to gauge the progress in implementing the corrective actions and recommendations.

---

1 For a full listing of review team members, please see Appendix A.

# Summary of Findings

## Corrective Actions

1. A summary, analysis and report on the disposition of comments shall be made part of the final plan and TIP when significant written and oral comments are received on the draft plan or TIP. Also, demonstration of explicit consideration and response to public input received should be included. (23CFR450.316(b)(v) (23CFR450.316(b)(1)(vii))
2. Identify the criteria and process for prioritizing implementation of transportation plan elements for inclusion in the TIP and any changes in priorities from previous TIPs. This should include the specific process in which projects were selected to be included into both the TIP as well as the interface with statewide processes (KYTC UNL and INDOT PDP) that are used to develop statewide programs and projects. (23CFR450.324(n)(1))
3. The MPO shall consider and analyze the enhancement of the efficient movement of freight within and through the region as part of the planning process. Major freight distribution routes shall be one of the factors explicitly considered, analyzed as appropriate, and reflected in the planning process products. Supporting technical efforts should provide an analysis of goods and services movement problem areas, as determined in cooperation with appropriate private sector involvement. (23CFR450.316(a)(11))
4. The connection between land use and transportation shall be explicitly considered, analyzed and reflected in the planning process products. This shall include a) the likely effect of transportation policy decisions on land use and development and b) the consistency of transportation plans and programs with the provisions of land use and development plans. (23CFR450.316(a)(4))
5. To assure sufficient financial resources (state and federal funds) are available for projects identified in the TIP, KYTC and KIPDA should develop a process to ensure that KYTC communicate accurate funding projections to KIPDA for the development of the TIP. (23CFR450.324(e))

## Recommendations

Recommendations that the review team felt were most important for consideration in future planning efforts are included in the list below. These, along with additional recommendations, are included with additional detail in subsequent sections of this report.

- Develop a mechanism in which KIPDA documents responses to and consideration of public inquiries and comments received on regional planning issues and documents (Plan, TIP).
- KIPDA staff should consider revisiting the Vision, Goals and balance of transportation investment for the region as part of the next plan update.
- Develop specific and measurable goals and criteria as a means to measure and assess the effectiveness of the public involvement process. Continue to regularly perform and

document an evaluation of the public involvement process, as required by regulation.

- KIPDA should add project maps into the Plan and TIP so readers can visually understand the geographic areas slated for transportation investment.
- Expand the opportunities for citizens to communicate with the TTCC and TPC. In addition, KIPDA should explore additional, alternative meeting locations of TTCC and TPC that are more easily accessible. The composition of the TTCC should be reexamined to add additional voting members so as to diversify the membership beyond government and institutional representation
- The KIPDA organization should designate a MPO staff member as a Title VI liaison that is familiar with the KIPDA procedures for handling a Title VI complaint. The UPWP should support relevant staff training needs in order to carry out this activity.
- KIPDA should reconsider using quantitative methods for the development of project lists to be included in the plan and TIP. This may be used as a cursory ranking method (that includes consideration and relevant weighting of factors, such as safety, congestion, air quality, mode-choice, land-use – consistent with federal regulations and the stated Vision, goals, and objectives contained in the plan) before the final list is developed and approved.
- Recognizing that many people benefit from visual depictions, KIPDA should add project maps into the Plan and TIP so readers can visually understand the geographic areas slated for transportation investment.
- In order to provide the most reliable estimates for polluting emissions, we recommend that KIPDA, APCD, DAQ, IDEM, KYTC, INDOT and FHWA work toward improving the procedures for speed estimation and updating the postprocessor of the TDM
- Given emerging, new conditions following City-County consolidation, it is timely and prudent to conduct a review and make necessary changes to the committee compositions and representation, the TPC bylaws, the MOA and prospectus along We encourage KIPDA to include the responsible party, methodology and schedule for completion for each work item within the UPWP.
- Develop a mechanism in which KIPDA documents responses to and consideration of public inquiries and comments received on regional planning issues and documents (Plan, TIP):.
- Augment the current CMS so that it will identify the areas within the region most in need of congestion relief and consequently, transportation investment.
- Continue the effort in developing thoroughfare plans in Bullitt, Floyd and Clark Counties that are balanced with the land-use planning for those areas
- KIPDA staff should find ways to promote on a continuous basis the use of technology (ITS) as potential tools in transportation solutions.
- We encourage KIPDA to improve the coordination with motor carriers and associations

in the region, railroads, riverports and airports to solicit their input during the development of transportation plans

## Introduction

On February 4, 5 and 6, 2003, a team of federal representatives conducted a Transportation Planning Certification Review of the metropolitan transportation planning process for the Louisville, Kentucky and Southern Indiana Urbanized Area. A list of the review team and participants are included as Appendix A and B, respectively.

The review was conducted at the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA) boardroom. A lunchtime meeting was held on February 5 to solicit input from members of both the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) and Transportation Technical Coordinating Committee (TTCC). Then, in the evening of February 5, a separate public meeting was held at TARC to solicit public comments on the planning process. The agenda for the site visit can be found as Appendix C.

As part of our joint stewardship responsibilities, the FHWA and FTA must ensure that both the statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes meet the requirements of the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) and Title 23 Part 450 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*. The task of reviewing the activities of the metropolitan planning process extends beyond the triennial certification review. The federal efforts include, but are not limited to, the following major activities:

- Annual review and approval of Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWP)
- Annual review of metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP)
- Review and approval of Statewide TIP
- Consultation during the review and determination of air quality conformity for plans in non-attainment and maintenance areas
- Periodic process reviews
- Participation in MPO meetings

## Follow-Up from Previous Certification Review

In 2000, the planning process by the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA), the MPO for the Louisville-Southern Indiana urbanized area, was certified subject to certain corrective actions. Listed below are the corrective actions from the 2000 review, along with an updated status of those issues.

**Corrective Action:** In accordance with 23 CFR 450.310, an air quality MOU shall be executed, defining roles and responsibilities for air quality planning.

Action Taken: A consultation MOU was developed and signature process completed in February 2002

**Corrective Action:** In accordance with 23 CFR 450.310, a planning MOU shall be executed, defining roles and responsibilities for air quality planning.

Action Taken: A planning MOU was developed and signature process completed in April 2000.

## Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Overview

Currently, all positions within KIPDA are fully staffed. Most of the employees of KIPDA (the MPO) have worked there for a long period of time and have extensive experience. Since the last Certification Review, the MPO has added a new Community Outreach position. The review team thought that the staff change was a very positive management decision.

The MPO committee structure has remained the same, but there has been a recent major change in the structure of local government. The City of Louisville and Jefferson County merged into a single Metro Government in January 2002. Many review participants felt that ultimately this reorganization would benefit the entire urbanized area through a more efficient operation however, given this change, the MPO should revisit the committee structures. We were told that personnel changes within the merged government had not yet been finalized. Subsequent to Jefferson County reorganization, KIPDA will review and if warranted, change the committees accordingly.

KIPDA has both a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for planning and a Prospectus to outline planning responsibilities in the urbanized area. These documents may need to be changed due to the above-mentioned merger. The team emphasized that special attention be given in the documents to the new Radcliff-Elizabethtown MPO adjacent to KIPDA in order to promote coordination between the two MPOs, and to the new Metro government for the purpose of coordination and to avoid potential duplicative planning activities. The signatory agencies should review this MOA on an annual basis.

There are no major boundary changes in the MPO area due to the 2000 Census with the exception of a small area in Harrison County, Indiana, which was added. The INDOT representative will work with KIPDA and local officials to resolve this issue.

**Recommendation 1:** Given emerging, new conditions following City-County consolidation, it is timely and prudent to conduct a review and make necessary changes to the committee compositions and representation, the TPC bylaws, the MOA and prospectus. The TPC, with the assistance of KIPDA staff, should develop a process and means to conduct such a review to include appropriate public involvement opportunities.

## Unified Planning Work Program

With input from KYTC, INDOT, TARC, other agencies and the public, KIPDA produces an annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This UPWP contains the elements of work that the staff of KIPDA will complete and the budget and source of funding in which will make it possible. We found that the work included in the last three UPWP was closely aligned with the objectives and goals set out in the Transportation Plan. The review team found the UPWPs to be in conformance with regulations and generally adhere to the planning emphasis areas, as defined by FHWA Headquarters. We found that there were some changes to the format of the document that could be improved to make it more usable and understandable.

**Recommendation 2:** We encourage KIPDA to include the responsible party, methodology and schedule for completion for each work item within the UPWP.

## Public Involvement and Title VI

Federal regulations require that transportation planning processes include a proactive public involvement process that provides complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and supports early and continuing involvement of the public in developing plans and TIPs (23CFR450.316(b)(1)). Over the last three years, KIPDA has increased its public involvement activities. They have successfully used public involvement tools such as a newsletter, contact database, placards in buses, website and the sharing of comments with TTCC and TPC members. The review team recognizes the need to have an informed public to participate actively in transportation planning activities but suggests that KIPDA focus equal effort toward engaging the public in participatory manner, consistent with the intent of the regulation.

KIPDA has also created and filled a Community Outreach Planner position (Nov 2002). Currently, KIPDA is in the process of updating the public involvement plan (PIP). There is a requirement that the MPO review the effectiveness of the public involvement processes periodically to assure that the process provides full and open access (23CFR450.316(b)(x)). The review team encourages KIPDA to develop quantifiable, objective evaluation measures or criteria for public involvement as part of the PIP update.

Timely information about both transportation issues and processes must be provided to citizens, affected agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, private providers of transportation, other interested parties and segments of the community affected by transportation plans, programs and projects (23CFR 450.316(b)(ii)). Using the tools mentioned previously, KIPDA has provided information about transportation issues. Additionally, TARC has done a commendable level of outreach to its passengers, including those that do not speak English, in planning for expanded and improved transit services for the region. The review team suggests that KIPDA develop and distribute a citizen guide to clearly describe the transportation planning process and ways for citizens to get involved and provide input. This product may help clarify, for such a large region, how the process works and where citizens can play a role in shaping transportation decisions. Communities across the nation have benefited from such information and the team can refer KIPDA to best practices and example products if they choose to undertake this recommendation.

Reasonable public access to technical and policy information used in the development of plans and TIPs and open public meetings, where matters related to the Federal-aid highway and transit programs are being considered, must be provided. Adequate public notice of public involvement activities and time for public review and comment at key decision point is also required (23CFR 450.316(b)(iii and iv)). As previously mentioned, KIPDA utilizes a variety of tools to inform the public; however KIPDA offices are not easily accessible to members of the public using either transit or non-motorized modes of travel. To address these issues, the review team encourages KIPDA to explore regular, alternative meeting locations of TTCC and TPC that are more easily accessible (regional location, transit and pedestrian accessible).

KIPDA is obligated to demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received

during the planning and program development processes. KIPDA currently manages inquiries by either directly addressing them or forwarding them to the appropriate agency. No system has been developed and no documentation exists to ensure public inquiries and comments forwarded have received adequate response. The team recommends that KIPDA develop such a mechanism.

KIPDA is required to seek out and consider the needs of citizens traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, including but not limited to low-income and minority households (23CFR450.316(b)(vi)). KIPDA translates materials in several foreign languages. They have also provided materials verbally on tape upon request to those with visual impairments. They are willing to employ the services of American Sign Language interpreters upon request. The review team suggests that the availability of materials in other formats be made generally known where possible (on agendas and public notices). Some members of the public expressed frustration in being able to communicate their transportation concerns with the TTCC and TPC since the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee was disbanded in 2002. The composition of the TTCC should be reexamined to consider additional voting members so as to diversify the membership beyond government and institutional representation. This may include representation from the disabled, low-income, and/or non-motorized transportation users and environmental advocacy and groups or organizations. Finally, KIPDA staff should be aware of the Title VI complaint filed with the USDOT alleging discrimination towards predominantly minority communities in the west end of Louisville during the regional transportation planning and Ohio River Bridges project design processes.

The review team found that KIPDA had not summarized significant comments received during the planning process as required under 23 CFR 450.316(b)(vii). KIPDA did include copies of the comments received in the plan, however they will need to summarize such comments in subsequent plan and TIP updates. The review team notes that if the final plan or TIP differs significantly from the one made available for comment then additional public opportunities must then be provided pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(viii).

**Corrective Action 1:** A summary, analysis and report on the disposition of comments shall be made part of the final plan and TIP when significant written and oral comments are received on the draft plan or TIP (23CFR450.316(b)(1)(vii)). Also, demonstration of explicit consideration and response to public input received should be included. (23 CFR 450.316(b)(v)). These should be included in the next updates of the plan and TIP. In addition to providing copies of the original correspondence, this provides the benefit to the reader of the document to read an abbreviated summary of the general types of comments received and how they were considered into the final version of the plan and TIP.

**Recommendation 3:** Develop a mechanism in which KIPDA documents responses to and consideration of public inquiries and comments received on regional planning issues and documents (Plan, TIP).

**Recommendation 4:** The KIPDA organization should designate a MPO staff member as a Title VI liaison that is familiar with the KIPDA procedures for handling a Title VI complaint. The UPWP should support relevant staff training needs in order to carry out this activity. The selected staff should also develop relationships with the State representative ultimately responsible for Title VI complaints.

**Recommendation 5:** Recognizing that many people benefit from visual depictions, KIPDA should

add project maps into the Plan and TIP so readers can visually understand the geographic areas slated for transportation investment.

**Recommendation 6:** Expand the opportunities for citizens to communicate with the TTCC and TPC. In addition, KIPDA should explore additional, alternative meeting locations of TTCC and TPC that are more easily accessible (regional location, transit and pedestrian accessible). The composition of the TTCC should be reexamined to add additional voting members so as to diversify the membership beyond government and institutional representation. This may include representation from the disabled, low-income, and/or non-motorized transportation users and environmental advocacy and groups or organizations.

**Recommendation 7:** Develop specific and measurable goals and criteria as a means to measure and assess the effectiveness of the public involvement process. Continue to regularly perform and document an evaluation of the public involvement process, as required by regulation.

**Recommendation 8:** Develop and distribute a citizen guide to clearly describe the transportation planning process and ways for citizens to get involved and provide input. This product may help clarify, for such a large region, how the process works and where citizens can play a role in shaping transportation decisions.

## Planning Process & Project Prioritization

Much of the discussion centered around the KIPDA project selection and prioritization process and the interface with the processes of INDOT and KYTC. The Program Development Process (PDP) procedure governs the INDOT project selection. INDOT engages its PDP and develops an active list of projects that is given to KIPDA. For KYTC, projects are initiated (on a statewide basis) through the Unscheduled Needs List process. They are then pulled from the UNL into the Statewide Transportation Plan and from there into the Statewide TIP and state-required Six-Year Plan. The list of regional projects identified in the Six-Year Plan is given to KIPDA. KIPDA then uses these prioritized lists in the development of the Transportation Plan and TIP. Finally, the TTCC and TPC review and endorse the Plan and TIP. For the 2002 Plan update, an analysis of transportation deficiencies was not examined. The methodology for the development of projects within this Plan was not clear in the documentation.

KIPDA uses the Congestion Management System (CMS) when a project moves from the TP to the TIP for alternative(s) analysis. Recommendations for bicycle, pedestrian, transit, ITS and other TDM/TSM measures are studied as potential stand alone or combined solutions to the corridor. In 1999, four projects were analyzed and in 2002, three projects were. However, KIPDA does not use their CMS, nor any other methodology with defined criteria, for selecting projects to be included in the Plan and TIP. Additionally, there was no methodology or criteria in which freight transportation needs were considered in the development of projects.

There was much discussion during the review, from both citizens and KIPDA committee members regarding the priorities that currently exist for the MPO and transportation funding for the region. Some people felt that there should be more of an emphasis on funding the maintenance and operations of existing facilities rather than adding new roadways, for various reasons. Others felt

that there should be increased funding for transit, bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities. Many felt that it was time for KIPDA to reexamine the vision and regional goals regarding transportation issues.

Effectively planning land development and transportation so that they complement one another has been a challenge, however, KIPDA has funded several small area and thoroughfare studies that have done just that. The results of many of these studies have included recommendations both on land-use development (planning/zoning) and transportation improvements. However, it is not clear what has been done from a larger, regional standpoint in developing the transportation plan and TIP. Efforts in this area need to be clearly illustrated in the planning documents.

**Corrective Action 2:** Per 23CFR450.324(n)(1), identify the criteria and process for prioritizing implementation of transportation plan elements for inclusion in the TIP and any changes in priorities from previous TIPs. This should include the specific process in which projects were selected to be included into both the TIP as well as the interface with statewide processes (KYTC UNL and INDOT PDP) that are used to develop statewide programs and projects.

**Recommendation 9:** KIPDA should reconsider using quantitative methods for the development of project lists to be included in the plan and TIP. This may be used as a cursory ranking method (that includes consideration and relevant weighting of factors, such as safety, congestion, air quality, mode-choice, land-use – consistent with federal regulations and the stated Vision, goals, and objectives contained in the plan) before the final list is developed and approved.

**Corrective Action 3:** Per 23CFR450.316(a)(11), the MPO shall consider and analyze the enhancement of the efficient movement of freight within and through the region as part of the planning process. Major freight distribution routes shall be one of the factors explicitly considered, analyzed as appropriate, and reflected in the planning process products. Supporting technical efforts should provide an analysis of goods and services movement problem areas, as determined in cooperation with appropriate private sector involvement.

**Corrective Action 4:** Per 23CFR450.316(a)(4), the connection between land use and transportation shall be explicitly considered, analyzed and reflected in the planning process products. This shall include a) the likely effect of transportation policy decisions on land use and development and b) the consistency of transportation plans and programs with the provisions of land use and development plans.

**Recommendation 10:** Continue the effort in developing thoroughfare plans in Bullitt, Floyd and Clark Counties that are balanced with the land-use planning for those areas. The use of analytical tools to project future growth scenarios and analyze transportation needs should be explored.

**Recommendation 11:** KIPDA staff should consider revisiting the Vision, Goals and balance of transportation investment for the region as part of the next plan update. Public comment indicated an interest in increasing and improving the coordination of regional transportation planning and policy with local land development activities. Extensive public involvement efforts should be used in accomplishing this endeavor.

**Recommendation 12:** Augment the current CMS so that it will identify the areas within the region most in need of congestion relief and consequently, transportation investment. This is recommended due to the likely designation of the Louisville area as non-attainment for ozone under

the 8-hour standard. 23CFR450.320(b) states that TMAs designated as non-attainment, Federal funds may not be programmed for any project that will result in a significant increase in carrying capacity for single occupant vehicles unless the project results from a CMS.

**Recommendation 13:** We encourage KIPDA to improve the coordination with motor carriers and associations in the region, railroads, riverports and airports to solicit their input during the development of transportation plans. We support the implementation of the proposed Freight Resource Network will be a good avenue for determining the access and service needs of intermodal facilities and shippers. To assist in freight planning, KIPDA may also consider the use of a model such as the FHWA Freight Analysis Framework to assist in identifying areas of improvement to increase freight productivity.

**Recommendation 14:** KIPDA staff should find ways to promote on a continuous basis the use of technology (ITS) as potential tools in transportation solutions.

**Commendation:** The Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the Long Range Plan is a major step in mainstreaming the needs of non-motorized travelers into the transportation planning and project development processes. We encourage KIPDA to carry forward their idea of including this plan's information into the main document of the next Transportation Plan update.

**Commendation:** The Project Location Inventory List is commendable as a tool for sharing information on environmental and historic features/resources along proposed project corridors in the Plan. This inventory should improve the project decisions through the NEPA process.

**Commendation:** The development of the new project specific statewide long-range plan by INDOT is commendable. This, along with the existing Kentucky Statewide Transportation Plan should aid in the development of the KIPDA plan.

**Commendation:** KIPDA is commended with funding the continuation of the Kentucky Centerline GIS mapping project into the two Indiana counties. This mapping of the entire road network should prove invaluable in future planning efforts.

## Financial Planning

Several years ago (about 2000 - 2001) KYTC discovered that KIPDA had been over-programming the allocated amount of Kentucky, dedicated-urban STP (SLO) federal funds. The problem was the result of miscommunication and a change in staff at KYTC. KIPDA was given the total amount of funding (federal plus match) which was misinterpreted as the federal-only amount of funding.

There are also additional problems that led to some over-programming of SLO funds: pre-financing projects, project cost overruns not amended to the TIP, a couple of old projects (presumably closed-out) still being charged to SLO, and several projects were never programmed, but charged to SLO.

Although KIPDA and KYTC are in the process of rectifying the situation, they should develop a process to ensure that KYTC communicates accurate funding projections to KIPDA for the development of the TIP.

There is also concern about the proposed funding sources for two major projects in the area (the Ohio River Bridges and TARC's light rail system). KYTC and INDOT are in discussion with FHWA and FTA to finalize the financial plan that will be included as part of the Record of Decision (ROD) for each project. TARC proposes to finance the light rail project with a tax increase that will be placed on a referendum in either 2003 or 2004.

**Corrective Action 5:** To assure sufficient financial resources (state and federal funds) are available for projects identified in the TIP, KYTC and KIPDA should develop a process to ensure that KYTC communicate accurate funding projections to KIPDA for the development of the TIP. 23CFR450.324(e)

## Transit Planning

Transit service in the KIPDA planning area is primarily provided by the Transit Authority of River City (TARC). The major points of discussion were TARC's participation in the MPO planning process and the status of the Transportation Tomorrow (T2) Light Rail Project.

TARC currently has a representative on KIPDA's Transportation Policy Committee and KIPDA staff has been directly involved with the planning efforts for the proposed light rail system and other TARC projects. The relationship between KIPDA and TARC appears to be one of mutual cooperation.

TARC is currently developing a long range plan for capital projects and operations. This plan will contain a listing of projects and identified funding sources. Input gained through the KIPDA public involvement as well as TARC's public involvement will be used in the development of this plan. New technologies (ITS) for improved transit service will also be included as part of this plan.

## Air Quality Conformity

The Louisville area was redesignated from Moderate Non-attainment to Maintenance for ozone under the current 1-hour standard. On April 15, 2004, EPA will make the final designations for the 8-hour ozone standard. It is expected that all five counties within the KIPDA MPO planning area will be designated as non-attainment for ozone.

Changes in the Vehicle Emissions Testing program and the decision to use the newly released MOBILE version 6 made the plan and TIP update and conformity determination a challenge during 2002. KIPDA led the effort to develop an Interim TIP, exempt-project Plan (as a preemptive move had they entered a lapse), and a full transportation Plan and TIP. They were able to complete all of these documents and demonstrate conformity within all deadlines to ensure the continuity of the transportation program.

In observance with FHWA guidance, KIPDA recently updated the planning assumptions in the transportation demand model (TDM) for the long-range plan update in 2002. Also, KIPDA is currently in the process of transferring information from the MINUTP software package to

TRANSCAD. Outputs from the TDF are used in calculations of VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emission levels.

**Recommendation 15:** In order to provide the most reliable estimates for polluting emissions, we recommend that KIPDA, APCD, DAQ, IDEM, KYTC, INDOT and FHWA work toward improving the procedures for speed estimation and updating the postprocessor of the TDM.

**Commendation:** The conformity MOU that was completed in 2001 was the first of its kind in Kentucky and used as a model in other areas. This MOU identifies and defines the roles of all parties involved in mobile source SIP development and conformity.

**Commendation:** KIPDA and the Louisville Metro Air Pollution Control District (formerly JCAPCD) are commended as the first entity in the country to use the MOBILE version 6 model for a conformity analysis. The lessons learned will serve to help other agencies as they make the transition from version 5.

## Public Meeting

Led by FHWA staff, the review team held a public meeting to solicit input regarding the transportation planning process in the Louisville-Southern Indiana urbanized area on February 5, 2003 at the TARC boardroom located at 1000 West Broadway in downtown Louisville. The location is accessible by private automobile, public transit, and non-motorized transportation. KIPDA staff advertised the meeting in five local newspapers including the Courier-Journal in addition to sending out email and U.S. Mail notices to many individuals on the KIPDA contact database.

There were four avenues for the public to provide comments for the certification review:

- sending a letter to FHWA or FTA
- sending a fax to FHWA
- sending an email to [kycomment@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:kycomment@fhwa.dot.gov)
- providing testimony at the public meeting

Approximately 55 people attended the meeting representing a number of different interests and organizations. A synopsis of the comments, organized by topic, heard during the meeting and received in writing is recorded below. There were several instances where more than one individual commenter repeated or reinforced a previous comment. Corrective actions, recommendations or commendations that relate to the comment are noted in parentheses next to the individual comment.

### MPO Organization

- Want proportional representation based on relative jurisdictional population of the new Metro government on the TPC. (R1)
- Want the MPO to be removed from KIPDA because of KIPDA's role as a development agency.
- KIPDA staff is very helpful when assistance is requested.

### Unified Planning Work Program

- NONE

### **Public Involvement and Title VI**

- The location of KIPDA headquarters is not centralized and has limited accessibility. (R6)
- Want the Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee reinstated. (R6)
- Want increased citizen education on the planning process. (R8)
- Want increased opportunities to participate in the planning process, including more avenues not reliant on the computer (e.g. email, website). (R6)
- Perception that citizen comments were not being considered in the planning process. (CA1)
- Felt there is a lower level/rate of transportation investment in west end of Louisville where there is higher levels of economically challenged citizens and higher concentrations of minorities. (R4, R11)

### **Planning Process & Project Prioritization**

- Want the connection between transportation investment and land development better addressed in planning efforts. New and expanded roadways are causing sprawled development. Need to minimize this pattern of development. Some felt that current patterns isolate people and segregate people of different races and economic classes. (CA4, R10, R11)
- Support of expanded greenway projects within the region.
- Want better pedestrian facilities including more sidewalks. (R11)
- Want improved transportation mobility (options) for elderly and disabled persons. This should include increased funding of transit. (R11)
- Want shift in funding emphasis toward system preservation and maintenance rather than system expansion. (R11)
- Want emphasis on maintenance of current system so school bus fleet can efficiently transport students. Maintenance of bridges so they can support bus loadings is important because of additional rerouting distance and time that is added when the carrying capacity is inadequate. (R11)
- Felt there is too much funding in highways, too little in mass transit. (R11)
- Want light rail in Louisville area. (R11)

### **Financial Planning**

- Concerns about the fiscal constraint of the KIPDA transportation plan because of the Ohio River Bridges and light rail projects.

### **Transit Planning**

- Want improved transportation connection between jobs and residences. One commenter expressed the need for increased transit service to the Riverport and Bluegrass Industrial Park areas.
- Want increased hours of transit service for late shift workers.
- Want transit oriented development planned along transit (bus and light-rail) lines.
- TARC service is excellent. Midnight train is doing a good job.

### **Air Quality Conformity**

- Felt KIPDA should have been more vocal in opposing the cessation of the Vehicle

Emissions Testing program.

**Miscellaneous**

- Did not receive adequate notice on the Certification Review public meeting.

**Appendix A  
Federal Review Team**

**Federal Highway Administration  
Kentucky Division Office**  
Brent A. Sweger  
Glenn Jilek  
Bernadette Dupont  
Shirley Scott

**Federal Highway Administration  
Indiana Division Office**  
Joyce Newland  
Sarah Koepke  
Ken Woodruff

**Federal Transit Administration  
Region 4 Office**  
Henrika Buchanan-Smith

**Federal Highway Administration  
Headquarters**  
Susan Lee

**Federal Transit Administration  
Headquarters**  
Vincent Valdes

## Appendix B Certification Review Participants

Harold Tull	KIPDA
David Burton	KIPDA
Mary Lou Hauber	KIPDA
Nedra Morrell	KIPDA
Stacey Clark-Gann	KIPDA
Lori A. Kelsey	KIPDA
Phil Williams	KIPDA
Randy Simon	KIPDA
Michelle Miller	KIPDA
Terri Wills	KIPDA
Jack Scriber	KIPDA
Glenda Seal	INDOT – Seymour District
David Holtz	INDOT – Program Development
Steve Smith	INDOT – Planning
Frank Baukert	INDOT – Planning
Larry Goode	INDOT - Multimodal
Geoffrey Hobin	TARC
Mike Kuzmich	TARC
Dwight Maddox	TARC
Bill Sexton	TARC
Barry Barker	TARC
Karen Scott	TARC
Lynn Soporowski	KYTC – Multimodal Programs
J. R. Ham	KYTC – Multimodal Programs
M. Chad LaRue	KYTC
John Carr	KYTC
Alvin Wilson	KYTC – Minority Affairs
Jesse Mayes	KYTC – Multimodal Programs
Art Williams	APCD
April Shutts	Metro Development Authority
Gordon F. Martin*	Floyd County
James Morse*	Oldham County
Louise Allen*	Oldham County Planning & Zoning
Rick Storm*	Metro Public Works
David Hamilton	KYTC
Barry Zalph*	Metro Air Pollution Control District
Sherman Kline*	Jeffersontown
Clay Foreman*	Jeffersontown

\* Attended TTCC/TPC Luncheon only

## Appendix C Certification Review Agenda

Start Time	Topic	Discussion Lead
<b>Tuesday, February 4, 2003</b>		
1:00	Introduction	Sweger
1:15	Review of Previous Findings & Progress	Sweger & KIPDA Staff
2:00	Presentation: Summary/Highlights of Activities since February 2000	KIPDA Staff
2:30	MPO Organization & Boundaries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffing</li> <li>• MPO Structure &amp; Committees</li> <li>• Effects from Merger</li> <li>• Planning Agreement</li> <li>• Boundary changes from Census</li> <li>• Interaction with Lincoln Trail ADD</li> </ul>	Jilek
3:00	<b>BREAK</b>	-
3:15	Planning Process & Project Prioritization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unscheduled Needs List (KY)</li> <li>• Program Development Process (IN)</li> <li>• CMS &amp; Plan project selection</li> <li>• TIP project selection</li> <li>• Updates &amp; Amendments</li> <li>• Freight</li> </ul>	Sweger Newland Dupont
<b>Wednesday, February 5, 2003</b>		
8:30	UPWP Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination with state DOTs</li> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Project Selection</li> <li>• Format Modifications (product, last years project authorizations)</li> </ul>	Dupont
9:30	Public & Agency Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach Methods</li> <li>• Use of Comments in Planning</li> </ul>	Newland
10:15	<b>BREAK</b>	-
10:30	Financial Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding Projections</li> <li>• Cost Estimates</li> <li>• Special Funding Considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Priority Projects</li> <li>Transportation Enhancements</li> <li>CMAQ</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Buchanan
11:00	TDM/TSM Improvements:	Sweger