



# Enhanced Planning Review of the St. Louis Metropolitan Area

## Final Report

June 1996

prepared for:

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Transit Administration

Office of Planning

and

Federal Highway Administration

Office of Environment and Planning

prepared by:

U.S. Department of Transportation

Research and Special Programs Administration

Volume 1  
National Transportation Systems Center

#### NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

#### NOTICE

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the objective of this report.

#### NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

#### NOTICE

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the objective of this report.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is the tenth in a series of Enhanced Planning Reviews (**EPRs**) of major metropolitan areas produced for the Federal Transit Administration (**FTA**) and the Federal Highway Administration (**FHWA**) by the **Volpe** National Transportation Systems Center (**Volpe** Center), Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. An earlier series of nine independent planning reviews of major metropolitan areas was published by the **Volpe** Center for the **FHWA** and **FTA** in 1994.

William Lyons is the **Volpe** Center Project Manager for the **EPRs**. Melissa **M. Laube** was the lead author and analyst for this report. Other contributors included Beverly **R. Silverberg** under contract to the **Volpe** Center.

Overall guidance for the **EPRs**, including production of this report, was provided by the Program Manager, Deborah Burns, and Sam Zimmerman, Director, both from the Office of Planning Operations, **FTA**; and Sheldon **Edner** and **Barna Juhasz**, Chief, both from the Metropolitan Planning Division, **FHWA**.

The federal review team--consisting of staff from **FTA** Headquarters and Region VII Offices; **FHWA** Headquarters, Region 7, the Missouri and Illinois Divisions; and the **Volpe** Center--participated in all aspects of the **EPR**, including reviewing drafts of this report.

A draft of the Overview Report was provided to the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, which is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the St. Louis Metropolitan Area, and other participating major transportation agencies in the metropolitan area for review and comment. The Final Report adds background information for the observations and recommendations in the Overview Report and is written for public distribution. The assistance of local agency staff throughout the **EPR** is gratefully acknowledged. The Final Report, which was not reviewed in its entirety by the local agencies, is the responsibility of the federal agencies. Participating federal review team members are listed in the Introduction and state, regional, and local staff are listed in Appendix **B**.

Copies of the other reports can be requested from US **DOT/Volpe** Center by fax at (617) 494-3260 or by E-mail at: [vanderwild@volpe2.dot.gov](mailto:vanderwild@volpe2.dot.gov).









## Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

<b>Bi-State</b>	<b>Bi-State</b> Development Agency
<b>CMAQ</b>	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program
<b>CMS</b>	Congestion Management System
<b>Council</b>	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
<b>EPR</b>	Enhanced Planning Review
<b>FHWA</b>	Federal Highway Administration
<b>FTA</b>	Federal Transit Administration
<b>IDOT</b>	Illinois Department of Transportation
<b>IEPA</b>	Illinois Environmental Planning Agency
<b>HBRR</b>	Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program
<b>MDNR</b>	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
<b>MHTD</b>	Missouri Highway and Transportation Department
<b>MIS</b>	Major Investment Studies
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MPO</b>	Metropolitan Planning Organization
<b>MTIA</b>	Major Transportation Investment Analysis
<b>PTMS</b>	Public Transportation Management System
<b>SIP</b>	State Implementation Plan
<b>STP</b>	Surface Transportation Program
<b>TCM</b>	Transportation Control Measure
<b>TIP</b>	Transportation Improvement Program
<b>TPC</b>	Transportation Planning Committee
<b>UPWP</b>	Unified Planning Work Program
<b>VMT</b>	Vehicle Miles Traveled
<b>Volpe Center</b>	<b>Volpe</b> National Transportation Systems Center

## Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

<b>Bi-State</b>	<b>Bi-State</b> Development Agency
<b>CMAQ</b>	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program
<b>CMS</b>	Congestion Management System
<b>Council</b>	East-West Gateway Coordinating Council
<b>EPR</b>	Enhanced Planning Review
<b>FHWA</b>	Federal Highway Administration
<b>FTA</b>	Federal Transit Administration
<b>IDOT</b>	Illinois Department of Transportation
<b>IEPA</b>	Illinois Environmental Planning Agency
<b>HBRR</b>	Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program
<b>MDNR</b>	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
<b>MHTD</b>	Missouri Highway and Transportation Department
<b>MIS</b>	Major Investment Studies
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MPO</b>	Metropolitan Planning Organization
<b>MTIA</b>	Major Transportation Investment Analysis
<b>PTMS</b>	Public Transportation Management System
<b>SIP</b>	State Implementation Plan
<b>STP</b>	Surface Transportation Program
<b>TCM</b>	Transportation Control Measure
<b>TIP</b>	Transportation Improvement Program
<b>TPC</b>	Transportation Planning Committee
<b>UPWP</b>	Unified Planning Work Program
<b>VMT</b>	Vehicle Miles Traveled
<b>Volpe Center</b>	<b>Volpe</b> National Transportation Systems Center

## Executive Summary

The Federal Transit Administration (**FTA**) and Federal Highway Administration (**FHWA**) have initiated a series of joint Enhanced Planning Reviews (**EPRs**) to assess the impact of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (**ISTEA**) on the planning processes conducted by the transportation agencies serving metropolitan areas. The **EPRs** are also intended to determine the effects of planning on transportation investment processes. The information collected in the **EPRs** is intended to be of assistance to individual metropolitan areas in their continuing efforts to improve transportation planning practice, and to federal agencies in formulating policy and identifying technical assistance needs among agencies engaged in metropolitan planning.

The **EPR** for St. Louis included a federal site visit from September 11 through September 15, 1995. At the conclusion of the site visit, the federal review team presented preliminary observations and recommendations to the local agencies taking part in the review. The team then formulated several additional observations as a result of the further review of documents and notes. These observations were incorporated into a draft Overview Report which was distributed for review and comment to the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (the Council), which is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (**MPO**) for St. Louis, and other local participants in the **EPR**. The Overview Report formed the basis for this Final Report, which describes the **EPR** in greater depth and is intended for public distribution.

The following is the summary conclusion and a complete set of the observations and recommendations presented in the Overview Report. The section where the observations and recommendations are discussed in context is noted in parentheses.

The Council and its partner agencies have taken the tools provided by **ISTEA** to begin building a comprehensive, coordinated planning process that is evolving away from single-mode perspectives to an integrated multimodal problem-solving approach. The Transportation Plan reflects this effort, articulating an inclusive decision-making process in which transportation needs are addressed in a broad context encompassing socioeconomic and environmental objectives, as well as concerns for equity and cost-effectiveness. Increased emphasis on strategic planning should be a priority in the development of future versions of the Transportation Plan, which should present a vision of how transportation decision making will affect the region's future. More effective application of technical tools, including the Congestion Management System and travel demand modeling, are needed as a technical basis for the Plan.

Financial planning should take into account the effects of anticipated capital projects, including those being considered in Major Investment Studies (**MIS**). The Council has made substantial progress in integrating **MIS** into its planning process, and should focus these studies on the solution of corridor transportation problems. Public involvement and initiatives to improve access to employment demonstrate unusually strong commitment and insight in identifying and meeting community needs.

**A. Organization and Management of the Planning Process**

1. Interagency Coordination and Cooperation: While the partners in the planning process have made significant strides in developing cooperative working relationships, there remain opportunities for further improvement, most specifically in the formalization and documentation of evolving interagency roles and responsibilities, and the coordination of transit planning activities. (III)

**B. Development of the Plan, TIP, and Work Program**

1. Comprehensive Planning: The Council has undertaken a major effort to develop a more comprehensive, rational, and open planning process. This effort is reflected in the Transportation Plan, which establishes an inclusive and systematic framework for the planning process that addresses transportation in relation to economic, social, and environmental objectives. (IV)
2. Strategic Planning: The region's investment strategy emerges incrementally through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), rather than on a comprehensive basis in the Transportation Plan. The formulation of a strategic perspective in the Transportation Plan supported by activities in the Unified Planning Work Program (**UPWP**) would provide more coherent direction for the region's planning efforts and decision-making, including development of the TIP and other products of the planning process. (IV)
3. Technical Tools: More specific consideration of the fifteen factors and more effective application of analytical tools, particularly the Congestion Management System (**CMS**) and travel demand modeling, are needed to develop and support a strategic vision in the Transportation Plan. (IV)
4. TIP Development: The TIP development process is becoming more analytical and systematic, but still lacks a sufficiently strong technical foundation, based on demand modeling and traffic studies, to support comprehensive regional planning. The project tracking system is an asset and will become more important as it is implemented more fully. The integration of Missouri Highway and Transportation Department-selected projects within the metropolitan planning process would provide for a more comprehensive and cohesive approach to TIP development. (IV)
5. UPWP Context: A multi-year strategic context would clarify the role of activities included in the **UPWP** in relation to the Transportation Plan development and update efforts. (IV)
6. UPWP Scope: The **UPWP** serves as a comprehensive source of information on all regionally significant planning activities. Further elaboration in the document of the

**A. Organization and Management of the Planning Process**

1. Interagency Coordination and Cooperation: While the partners in the planning process have made significant strides in developing cooperative working relationships, there remain opportunities for further improvement, most specifically in the formalization and documentation of evolving interagency roles and responsibilities, and the coordination of transit planning activities. (III)

**B. Development of the Plan, TIP, and Work Program**

1. Comprehensive Planning: The Council has undertaken a major effort to develop a more comprehensive, rational, and open planning process. This effort is reflected in the Transportation Plan, which establishes an inclusive and systematic framework for the planning process that addresses transportation in relation to economic, social, and environmental objectives. (IV)
2. Strategic Planning: The region's investment strategy emerges incrementally through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), rather than on a comprehensive basis in the Transportation Plan. The formulation of a strategic perspective in the Transportation Plan supported by activities in the Unified Planning Work Program (**UPWP**) would provide more coherent direction for the region's planning efforts and decision-making, including development of the TIP and other products of the planning process. (IV)
3. Technical Tools: More specific consideration of the fifteen factors and more effective application of analytical tools, particularly the Congestion Management System (**CMS**) and travel demand modeling, are needed to develop and support a strategic vision in the Transportation Plan. (IV)
4. TIP Development: The TIP development process is becoming more analytical and systematic, but still lacks a sufficiently strong technical foundation, based on demand modeling and traffic studies, to support comprehensive regional planning. The project tracking system is an asset and will become more important as it is implemented more fully. The integration of Missouri Highway and Transportation Department-selected projects within the metropolitan planning process would provide for a more comprehensive and cohesive approach to TIP development. (IV)
5. UPWP Context: A multi-year strategic context would clarify the role of activities included in the **UPWP** in relation to the Transportation Plan development and update efforts. (IV)
6. UPWP Scope: The **UPWP** serves as a comprehensive source of information on all regionally significant planning activities. Further elaboration in the document of the

## **F. Air Quality and Conformity**

1. Interagency Cooperation: The Council, Missouri Department of Natural Resources (**MDNR**), and Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (**IEPA**) work cooperatively on air quality planning and are making progress in addressing communications problems related to limited staff resources. The Council should provide **MHTD** with the opportunity to become more involved in the process, which would facilitate improved technical coordination. (V)

## **G. Public Involvement**

1. Public Involvement Initiatives: The Council's public involvement effort is strong and has the potential to serve as a national model. A particular strength of the program is its emphasis on reaching out to the public at the grassroots and community levels, rather than expecting the public to come to the Council. (V)
2. Impact on the Planning Process: The value of public participation can be increased with a greater focus on its application to problem solving and strategic planning in the Plan and TIP development processes. The Council also could consider how it can build on its successes in generating community support to reinforce the role of the planning. (V)

## **H. ISTEA Fifteen Factors**

1. Strategic Development: While the planning process incorporates many of the fifteen factors through the seven focus areas and the Council's general planning principles, more specific attention to the factors is warranted to ensure their full consideration in strategic planning. (V)
2. Factors Omitted from Focus Areas: There are a number of factors that are not explicitly included within the focus areas as defined in the Transportation Plan. These factors, which also are essential to good planning practice, include: programming for enhancements, effects of all projects, coordination with the six management systems, use of life cycle costs, increased use of transit, and increased security in transit. A more explicit rationale for their exclusion would assist policy officials and the public in understanding why they are not addressed. (V)

## **I. Integration of Strategic Transportation Planning**

1. Relationship to Metropolitan Planning Process: Transit planning and public informational efforts are not fully integrated in the metropolitan planning process. There is significant potential to improve coordination of planning activities between the **Bi-State** Development Agency and the Council. (VI)

## **F. Air Quality and Conformity**

1. Interagency Cooperation: The Council, Missouri Department of Natural Resources (**MDNR**), and Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (**IEPA**) work cooperatively on air quality planning and are making progress in addressing communications problems related to limited staff resources. The Council should provide **MHTD** with the opportunity to become more involved in the process, which would facilitate improved technical coordination. (V)

## **G. Public Involvement**

1. Public Involvement Initiatives: The Council's public involvement effort is strong and has the potential to serve as a national model. A particular strength of the program is its emphasis on reaching out to the public at the grassroots and community levels, rather than expecting the public to come to the Council. (V)
2. Impact on the Planning Process: The value of public participation can be increased with a greater focus on its application to problem solving and strategic planning in the Plan and TIP development processes. The Council also could consider how it can build on its successes in generating community support to reinforce the role of the planning. (V)

## **H. ISTEA Fifteen Factors**

1. Strategic Development: While the planning process incorporates many of the fifteen factors through the seven focus areas and the Council's general planning principles, more specific attention to the factors is warranted to ensure their full consideration in strategic planning. (V)
2. Factors Omitted from Focus Areas: There are a number of factors that are not explicitly included within the focus areas as defined in the Transportation Plan. These factors, which also are essential to good planning practice, include: programming for enhancements, effects of all projects, coordination with the six management systems, use of life cycle costs, increased use of transit, and increased security in transit. A more explicit rationale for their exclusion would assist policy officials and the public in understanding why they are not addressed. (V)

## **I. Integration of Strategic Transportation Planning**

1. Relationship to Metropolitan Planning Process: Transit planning and public informational efforts are not fully integrated in the metropolitan planning process. There is significant potential to improve coordination of planning activities between the **Bi-State** Development Agency and the Council. (VI)







This report presents the results of an **EPR** conducted jointly by **FHWA** and **FTA** in the St. Louis metropolitan area. This report considers the regional transportation planning process as it existed at the time of the site visit as well as future trends. The review team acknowledges that this is an evolving process.

A federal review team consisting of **FHWA** and **FTA** headquarters and regional staff, **FHWA** division staff, and US **DOT/Volpe** Center staff conducted the site visit on September **11** through September **15, 1995**. The federal team consisted of:

Federal Transit Administration

Charlotte Adams, Office of Planning  
**Candace Noonan**, Office of Planning  
Joan **Roeseler**, Region VII Office  
Louise Lloyd, Region VII Office

USDOT/Volpe Center

Melissa **Laube**, Project Staff  
Beverly Silverberg, Contractor

Federal Railroad Administration

Sandra Newcomer, Office of Policy and  
Program Development

Federal Highway Administration

Sheldon **Edner**, Office of Metropolitan  
Planning  
Ron Rogers, Region 7 Office  
John Cater, Region 7 Office  
Dan Wheeler, Region 7 Office  
Dave Edwards, Missouri Division Office  
Jon-Paul **Kohler**, Illinois Division  
**Montie** Wade, Contractor

William Lyons is the **Volpe** Center project manager for the **EPRs**. Research assistance was provided by **D. Tilly Chang**, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Local participants in the site visit included staff of East-West Gateway Coordinating Council, the **MPO** serving the St. Louis metropolitan area; the Missouri Highway and Transportation Department; the Illinois Department of Transportation; the **Bi-State** Development Agency; the Missouri Department of Natural Resources; and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. The review team also met with local elected officials and representatives of civic organizations and advisory committees. A list of local participants is provided at the end of this report.

A list of **MPO** members, participants in the **EPR** site visit, and the agenda for the site visit are provided in Appendices A, **B**, and C of this report. A list of the documents reviewed as part of the **EPR** is provided in Appendix **D**.

## II. Local Conditions

### A. Metropolitan Area Characteristics

The St. Louis metropolitan area includes the City of St. Louis and St. Louis, St. Charles, Franklin, and Jefferson Counties in Missouri and Monroe, St. **Clair**, and Madison Counties in Illinois. (A map of the metropolitan area is provided in Figure 1). The population of the area was about 2.4 million in **1990**, following a twenty-year period in which population first declined and then stabilized, with natural population growth exceeding continuing net out-migration in the **1980s**. Over the **40-year** period beginning in **1950**, the City of St. Louis lost over half its population, while population in outlying suburban areas increased severalfold and the area in development increased **355** percent. In **1990**, **28** percent of the region's jobs were in the City of St. Louis, and **45** percent were in adjacent St. Louis County.

Low rates of future population growth are projected. By the year **2015**, regional population is expected to grow by 9 percent over **1990** levels. The trend of slowly declining central city population is expected to continue. Regional employment is expected to grow by approximately ten percent over the **1990** to **2015** period. The City of St. Louis and St. Louis County will continue as the region's employment center, despite lack of growth in the central city, with approximately **69** percent of all jobs located within these two jurisdictions. Dispersal of population and employment from the urban core has weakened the economy of the central city and contributed to the physical blight and social problems attendant with urban decay.

### B. Regional Transportation System

St. Louis historically has been a hub of river, rail, highway, and, more recently, air transportation. The city's economy has been linked to its location on the Mississippi River since its earliest beginnings. The regional transportation system includes highways, bus, passenger rail, **paratransit** services and facilities, airports, river ports, freight rail lines, and bicycle and pedestrian trails. Eighty percent of work trips are made in single-occupant automobiles, while three percent are made by transit, which compares to a nine percent average transit share of work trips among the nation's **39** largest metropolitan areas. Vehicle-miles traveled are forecast to increase **40** percent by the year **2015**, despite far lower projected rates of population and economic growth.

Interstate highways **55**, **70**, **44**, and **64** converge in the region's core and **I-270/255** form a circumferential beltway around the city. The principal public transit services are a regional bus system and an **18-mile** light rail line, both of which are owned and operated by the **Bi-State** Development Agency. Intercity rail service is operated by Amtrak. Bus ridership has been stable over the last two years following a three-decade declining trend, while the opening of the **MetroLink**

## II. Local Conditions

### A. Metropolitan Area Characteristics

The St. Louis metropolitan area includes the City of St. Louis and St. Louis, St. Charles, Franklin, and Jefferson Counties in Missouri and Monroe, St. **Clair**, and Madison Counties in Illinois. (A map of the metropolitan area is provided in Figure 1). The population of the area was about 2.4 million in **1990**, following a twenty-year period in which population first declined and then stabilized, with natural population growth exceeding continuing net out-migration in the **1980s**. Over the **40-year** period beginning in **1950**, the City of St. Louis lost over half its population, while population in outlying suburban areas increased severalfold and the area in development increased **355** percent. In **1990**, **28** percent of the region's jobs were in the City of St. Louis, and **45** percent were in adjacent St. Louis County.

Low rates of future population growth are projected. By the year **2015**, regional population is expected to grow by 9 percent over **1990** levels. The trend of slowly declining central city population is expected to continue. Regional employment is expected to grow by approximately ten percent over the **1990** to **2015** period. The City of St. Louis and St. Louis County will continue as the region's employment center, despite lack of growth in the central city, with approximately **69** percent of all jobs located within these two jurisdictions. Dispersal of population and employment from the urban core has weakened the economy of the central city and contributed to the physical blight and social problems attendant with urban decay.

### B. Regional Transportation System

St. Louis historically has been a hub of river, rail, highway, and, more recently, air transportation. The city's economy has been linked to its location on the Mississippi River since its earliest beginnings. The regional transportation system includes highways, bus, passenger rail, ~~para~~**transit** services and facilities, airports, river ports, freight rail lines, and bicycle and pedestrian trails. Eighty percent of work trips are made in single-occupant automobiles, while three percent are made by transit, which compares to a nine percent average transit share of work trips among the nation's **39** largest metropolitan areas. Vehicle-miles traveled are forecast to increase **40** percent by the year **2015**, despite far lower projected rates of population and economic growth.

Interstate highways **55**, **70**, **44**, and **64** converge in the region's core and **I-270/255** form a circumferential beltway around the city. The principal public transit services are a regional bus system and an **18-mile** light rail line, both of which are owned and operated by the **Bi-State** Development Agency. Intercity rail service is operated by Amtrak. Bus ridership has been stable over the last two years following a three-decade declining trend, while the opening of the **MetroLink**

## II. Local Conditions

### A. Metropolitan Area Characteristics

The St. Louis metropolitan area includes the City of St. Louis and St. Louis, St. Charles, Franklin, and Jefferson Counties in Missouri and Monroe, St. **Clair**, and Madison Counties in Illinois. (A map of the metropolitan area is provided in Figure 1). The population of the area was about 2.4 million in **1990**, following a twenty-year period in which population first declined and then stabilized, with natural population growth exceeding continuing net out-migration in the **1980s**. Over the **40-year** period beginning in **1950**, the City of St. Louis lost over half its population, while population in outlying suburban areas increased severalfold and the area in development increased **355** percent. In **1990**, **28** percent of the region's jobs were in the City of St. Louis, and **45** percent were in adjacent St. Louis County.

Low rates of future population growth are projected. By the year **2015**, regional population is expected to grow by 9 percent over **1990** levels. The trend of slowly declining central city population is expected to continue. Regional employment is expected to grow by approximately ten percent over the **1990** to **2015** period. The City of St. Louis and St. Louis County will continue as the region's employment center, despite lack of growth in the central city, with approximately **69** percent of all jobs located within these two jurisdictions. Dispersal of population and employment from the urban core has weakened the economy of the central city and contributed to the physical blight and social problems attendant with urban decay.

### B. Regional Transportation System

St. Louis historically has been a hub of river, rail, highway, and, more recently, air transportation. The city's economy has been linked to its location on the Mississippi River since its earliest beginnings. The regional transportation system includes highways, bus, passenger rail, ~~para~~**transit** services and facilities, airports, river ports, freight rail lines, and bicycle and pedestrian trails. Eighty percent of work trips are made in single-occupant automobiles, while three percent are made by transit, which compares to a nine percent average transit share of work trips among the nation's **39** largest metropolitan areas. Vehicle-miles traveled are forecast to increase **40** percent by the year **2015**, despite far lower projected rates of population and economic growth.

Interstate highways **55**, **70**, **44**, and **64** converge in the region's core and **I-270/255** form a circumferential beltway around the city. The principal public transit services are a regional bus system and an **18-mile** light rail line, both of which are owned and operated by the **Bi-State** Development Agency. Intercity rail service is operated by Amtrak. Bus ridership has been stable over the last two years following a three-decade declining trend, while the opening of the **MetroLink**

### III. Organization and Management of the Planning Process

The East-West Gateway Coordinating Council (the Council) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (**MPO**) for the St. Louis metropolitan area, which includes over 200 villages, cities and counties. The Council was formed in 1965. A 1977 Memorandum of Understanding (**MOU**) signed by the Council, the Missouri Highway Department (**MODOT**), the Missouri State Highway Commission, the Illinois Department of Transportation (**IDOT**), and the **Bi-State** Development Agency (**Bi-State**) designates the Council as the official agency responsible for carrying out the region's urban transportation planning process, in cooperation with the other signatories. At the time of the **EPR** site visit, this agreement had not been revised, although Council staff stated their intention to work **with their** partner agencies in preparing an update. The Council and **MHTD** have executed a Memorandum of Understanding since the **EPR** site visit was conducted. The Council does enter into annual planning grant agreements with the Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission and **IDOT** governing the disposition of federal planning funds for activities included in the Unified Planning Work Program.

The Council has a Board of Directors composed of 21 voting members, including the chief local elected officials within the region, the President of the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission, the President and Vice President of the Southwestern Illinois Council of Mayors, the President of the St. Louis County Municipal League, six citizen representatives, and the Chairman of **Bi-State**, which is the regional transit operator. Missouri and Illinois each have ten members on the Board. These members and **Bi-State** each have one vote. **Bi-State's** status as a voting member on the Board is a product of its traditional role as the region's development agency. **Bi-State's** responsibilities for transit operations, which have expanded in recent years with the opening of the **MetroLink** light rail line, are a by-product of its availability to absorb transit service delivery. The Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission and **IDOT** are non-voting members of the Board.

The Board Chairmanship rotates among the City of St. Louis and St. Louis, Madison, and St. **Clair** Counties. According to the Council staff, the center city has a major influence on decision making, as a result of active participation on the Board by the Mayor of St. Louis, and shared concern about center city issues among a number of Board members. The Council does not permit proxy votes by Policy Board members.

Two standing advisory committees established in the Council's by-laws serve the Executive Board: an Executive Advisory Committee and an Advisory Board for Youth. Until recently, a Regional Forum, which traditionally served as the principal venue for public involvement in Council activities, constituted a third advisory committee. The Regional Forum was disbanded through a by-laws revision, having been superseded by more direct community involvement initiatives in recent years. The Executive Advisory Committee consists of staff members representing the local officials on the Executive Board. Members of the Advisory Board for Youth provide youthful perspectives on access and other issues that come before the Council. The Council's by-laws also provide for the establishment of committees on an ad hoc basis. There are a number of such committees currently

in operation, including an Air Quality Advisory Committee, a Transportation Planning Committee, which works on development of the Transportation Improvement Program, and an Intermodal Freight Advisory Committee. The Council also provides staff support to several civic organizations that are outside the formal authority of the Executive Board, including the Regional Incident Management Coalition and the St. Louis Regional Clean Cities consortium.

The Council is responsible for three major program areas: transportation planning and programming, environmental resource planning, and community resource planning. In all three areas, the Council serves as a forum for intergovernmental coordination, and the staff plays an active role in problem solving and initiating and coordinating the implementation of projects. This role has recently involved the development of programs addressing employment training, counseling, and access, as well as the provision of social services transportation.

Collaborative relationships among the **MPO** and its partner agencies in the metropolitan planning process are evolving, as the agencies attempt to resolve differences in perspective, priorities, technical methods, and approaches to public involvement. Most recently, such differences have emerged with respect to the development of long-range transit capital improvement plans and their presentation to the public. Progress in establishing interagency working relationships is most evident in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and other products of the planning process, which have fostered communication and cooperative planning. Major Investment Studies, in particular, have been a focus for collaboration between the Council and each of the sponsoring agencies, specifically the Missouri Highway and Transportation Department (**MHTD**) and **Bi-State**. In the near future, several **MHTD** staff members will share office space with the Council on a full time basis to facilitate close interaction between the two agencies.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

- 1. Interagency Coordination and Cooperation:** While the partners in the planning process have made significant strides in developing cooperative working relationships, there remain opportunities for further improvement, most specifically in the formalization and documentation of evolving interagency roles and responsibilities, and the coordination of transit planning activities. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and **MHTD**, executed since the **EPR** site visit, represents continued progress toward this goal, as does the relocation of some **MHTD** planning activities to the Council's offices.

in operation, including an Air Quality Advisory Committee, a Transportation Planning Committee, which works on development of the Transportation Improvement Program, and an Intermodal Freight Advisory Committee. The Council also provides staff support to several civic organizations that are outside the formal authority of the Executive Board, including the Regional Incident Management Coalition and the St. Louis Regional Clean Cities consortium.

The Council is responsible for three major program areas: transportation planning and programming, environmental resource planning, and community resource planning. In all three areas, the Council serves as a forum for intergovernmental coordination, and the staff plays an active role in problem solving and initiating and coordinating the implementation of projects. This role has recently involved the development of programs addressing employment training, counseling, and access, as well as the provision of social services transportation.

Collaborative relationships among the **MPO** and its partner agencies in the metropolitan planning process are evolving, as the agencies attempt to resolve differences in perspective, priorities, technical methods, and approaches to public involvement. Most recently, such differences have emerged with respect to the development of long-range transit capital improvement plans and their presentation to the public. Progress in establishing interagency working relationships is most evident in the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and other products of the planning process, which have fostered communication and cooperative planning. Major Investment Studies, in particular, have been a focus for collaboration between the Council and each of the sponsoring agencies, specifically the Missouri Highway and Transportation Department (**MHTD**) and **Bi-State**. In the near future, several **MHTD** staff members will share office space with the Council on a full time basis to facilitate close interaction between the two agencies.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

- 1. Interagency Coordination and Cooperation:** While the partners in the planning process have made significant strides in developing cooperative working relationships, there remain opportunities for further improvement, most specifically in the formalization and documentation of evolving interagency roles and responsibilities, and the coordination of transit planning activities. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Council and **MHTD**, executed since the **EPR** site visit, represents continued progress toward this goal, as does the relocation of some **MHTD** planning activities to the Council's offices.



making” to development of an efficient intermodal network and selective expansion of the existing transportation system.

The decision-making framework addresses transportation project planning, project selection and implementation, and project monitoring and performance evaluation. Project planning must incorporate three principal elements: a focus on regional needs and priorities in conjunction with the **ISTEA** fifteen factors; an application of transportation management systems; and an evaluation of a broad range of project alternatives through “Major Transportation Investment Analysis,” which is the term used by the **MPO** for Major Investment Studies. Projects selected for implementation through the TIP must be consistent with criteria set forth in the Transportation Plan, the management systems, and State air quality plans. The role of public involvement throughout the planning process is emphasized as an essential component of decision-making, in keeping with the “customer service” theme articulated in the Plan. Project monitoring and performance evaluation will be based on the application of performance measures related to each of seven problem-solving focus areas and the transportation management systems.

The seven focus areas are: preservation of existing infrastructure; safety and security in travel; congestion management; access to opportunity; sustainable development; efficient movement of goods; and resource conservation. Conditions and issues relevant to each of these focus areas are described in the Plan, and multiple performance measures are defined; for example, about **30** measures characterizing facility age, physical condition, and operational characteristics are identified as performance measures for the preservation of existing infrastructure.

Three types of planning activities are identified that will be undertaken to implement the framework developed in the Plan: Planning and Management, which includes data collection, development of management systems, and formation of new community partnerships over a three-year period; Transportation Improvement Program development, in compliance with regional goals and objectives set forth in the Plan; and Major Transportation Investment Corridors, which will be the subject of Major Transportation Investment Analyses.

The Plan defines a process to be applied in the future for establishing priorities among potentially beneficial projects. Cost-benefit analysis will be performed based on the application of performance measures from each of the seven focus areas. Also to be factored into the process will be the ranking of each of the seven focus areas in terms of priority, with preservation of existing infrastructure having the highest rank, followed by safety and security, congestion management, access to opportunities, efficient movement of goods, sustainable development, and resource conservation. Additional factors to be considered include consistency with air quality requirements and public support.

The plan identifies specific preservation projects and committed projects, many of which were originally part of **MHTD's 15-year** plan, but does not relate these projects to the decision-making framework articulated in the Plan or the performance of the transportation system. The financial analysis included in the Plan takes into account only previously committed capacity expansion

projects and maintenance, preservation, and operating costs. Air quality conformity analysis was based on a build network that includes projects in the current TIP and projects expected to be in operation by the year **2015**.

Milestones, in terms of developing a long-range concept for the region's transportation system and its component elements, have not been defined for future updates of the Plan. Updates of the Plan will include new projects after they are added to the TIP. During the **EPR** site visit, Council staff acknowledged that the current Plan is a first step in the development of a more strategic plan to guide implementation of transportation improvements. They indicated that future updates will emphasize further development of the current Plan.

### **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Comprehensive Planning**: The Council has undertaken a major effort to develop a more comprehensive, rational, and open planning process. This effort is reflected in the Transportation Plan, which establishes an inclusive and systematic framework for the planning process that addresses transportation in relation to economic, social, and environmental objectives.
2. **Strategic Planning**: The region's investment strategy emerges incrementally through the TIP, rather than on a comprehensive basis in the Transportation Plan. The formulation of a strategic perspective in the Transportation Plan supported by activities in the **UPWP** would provide more coherent direction for the region's planning efforts and decision-making, including development of the TIP and other products of the planning process.
3. **Technical Tools**: More specific consideration of the fifteen factors and more effective application of analytical tools, particularly the Congestion Management System and travel demand modeling, are needed to develop and support a strategic vision in the Transportation Plan.

### **B. Transportation Improvement Program**

The current TIP covers the three-year period beginning in October **1994**. All of the projects in the TIP also are included in the Transportation Plan, either by reference or specific identification. The TIP includes all projects funded through federal and state sources, and according to the text, local sources as well, although projects funded through local sources only do not appear in the project listings. The TIP is updated on an annual basis. The Council is considering expanding the **three**-year planning horizon used for developing the TIP, although it has concerns about being too specific about plans that extend more than several years into the future.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (**CMAQ**), Urban Surface Transportation Program (**STP**) projects in Illinois, all Missouri **STP** projects, and local projects in the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (**HBRR**) program were developed through a cooperative

projects and maintenance, preservation, and operating costs. Air quality conformity analysis was based on a build network that includes projects in the current TIP and projects expected to be in operation by the year **2015**.

Milestones, in terms of developing a long-range concept for the region's transportation system and its component elements, have not been defined for future updates of the Plan. Updates of the Plan will include new projects after they are added to the TIP. During the **EPR** site visit, Council staff acknowledged that the current Plan is a first step in the development of a more strategic plan to guide implementation of transportation improvements. They indicated that future updates will emphasize further development of the current Plan.

### **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Comprehensive Planning**: The Council has undertaken a major effort to develop a more comprehensive, rational, and open planning process. This effort is reflected in the Transportation Plan, which establishes an inclusive and systematic framework for the planning process that addresses transportation in relation to economic, social, and environmental objectives.
2. **Strategic Planning**: The region's investment strategy emerges incrementally through the TIP, rather than on a comprehensive basis in the Transportation Plan. The formulation of a strategic perspective in the Transportation Plan supported by activities in the **UPWP** would provide more coherent direction for the region's planning efforts and decision-making, including development of the TIP and other products of the planning process.
3. **Technical Tools**: More specific consideration of the fifteen factors and more effective application of analytical tools, particularly the Congestion Management System and travel demand modeling, are needed to develop and support a strategic vision in the Transportation Plan.

### **B. Transportation Improvement Program**

The current TIP covers the three-year period beginning in October **1994**. All of the projects in the TIP also are included in the Transportation Plan, either by reference or specific identification. The TIP includes all projects funded through federal and state sources, and according to the text, local sources as well, although projects funded through local sources only do not appear in the project listings. The TIP is updated on an annual basis. The Council is considering expanding the **three**-year planning horizon used for developing the TIP, although it has concerns about being too specific about plans that extend more than several years into the future.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (**CMAQ**), Urban Surface Transportation Program (**STP**) projects in Illinois, all Missouri **STP** projects, and local projects in the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (**HBRR**) program were developed through a cooperative

date have been committed exclusively to transportation control measures (TCMs), including ridesharing programs, transit vehicle purchases, traffic flow improvements, incident management, and in Illinois, enhanced inspection and maintenance. The **1995-1997** TIP includes approximately **\$20** million in **CMAQ** funding. The State of Missouri initially planned to use these funds for Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance (I/M), but the Council decided that other projects had higher priority in this funding category. The Council has programmed a total of **\$3** million in **CMAQ** funds for I/M in Illinois. These funds were obligated in February **1996**.

In developing the **1995- 1997** TIP, the Council reviewed projects submitted by **MHTD** and **IDOT** for air quality conformity and financial viability. Enhancement projects will be selected by the states and included in the TIP by amendment in the future. **MHTD** is in the process of examining how it submits projects for the TIP, with the intention of decentralizing planning to a significant degree. In the past, **MHTD** would give a **15-year** plan to the **MPO**, providing for virtually no Council role in project selection. More recently, the Council has turned down several **MHTD** projects for the St. Louis metropolitan area. **MHTD** is considering programming all its funding for the next TIP through the metropolitan planning process, in the same manner as it does **STP** and **CMAQ** funds. According to its staff, **IDOT** traditionally has maintained close relationships with local governments, but, unlike **MHTD**, does not have plans to further integrate its project selection and programming with that of the Council.

The Council has developed a system for monitoring the implementation of projects programmed in the TIP and tracking the flow of federal transportation funds. The system is intended to facilitate management of the TIP development process and to optimize the use of financial resources. Council staff indicated during the site visit that they intend to refine the operating procedures for this system, and acknowledge that additional effort is needed to ensure its successful implementation.

### **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **TIP Development**: The TIP development process is becoming more analytical and systematic, but still lacks a sufficiently strong technical foundation, based on demand modeling and traffic studies, to support comprehensive regional planning. The project tracking system is an asset and will become more important as it is implemented more fully. The integration of ~~**MHTD-selected**~~ projects within the metropolitan planning process would provide for a more comprehensive and cohesive approach to TIP development.

### **C. Unified Planning Work Program**

The current Unified Planning Work Program (**UPWP**) covers fiscal year **1996**, beginning in July **1995**. The document covers all Council activities funded from all sources and cooperative planning efforts with other agencies, but not the transportation planning activities of other agencies conducted independently of the Council. Responsibilities of other agencies for planning are not defined. In addition to federal funding and a local match from **MHTD** and **IDOT**, the Council has a local revenue source generated through a lo-cent per capita annual assessment, and also has succeeded

date have been committed exclusively to transportation control measures (TCMs), including ridesharing programs, transit vehicle purchases, traffic flow improvements, incident management, and in Illinois, enhanced inspection and maintenance. The **1995-1997** TIP includes approximately **\$20** million in **CMAQ** funding. The State of Missouri initially planned to use these funds for Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance (I/M), but the Council decided that other projects had higher priority in this funding category. The Council has programmed a total of **\$3** million in **CMAQ** funds for I/M in Illinois. These funds were obligated in February **1996**.

In developing the **1995- 1997** TIP, the Council reviewed projects submitted by **MHTD** and **IDOT** for air quality conformity and financial viability. Enhancement projects will be selected by the states and included in the TIP by amendment in the future. **MHTD** is in the process of examining how it submits projects for the TIP, with the intention of decentralizing planning to a significant degree. In the past, **MHTD** would give a **15-year** plan to the **MPO**, providing for virtually no Council role in project selection. More recently, the Council has turned down several **MHTD** projects for the St. Louis metropolitan area. **MHTD** is considering programming all its funding for the next TIP through the metropolitan planning process, in the same manner as it does **STP** and **CMAQ** funds. According to its staff, **IDOT** traditionally has maintained close relationships with local governments, but, unlike **MHTD**, does not have plans to further integrate its project selection and programming with that of the Council.

The Council has developed a system for monitoring the implementation of projects programmed in the TIP and tracking the flow of federal transportation funds. The system is intended to facilitate management of the TIP development process and to optimize the use of financial resources. Council staff indicated during the site visit that they intend to refine the operating procedures for this system, and acknowledge that additional effort is needed to ensure its successful implementation.

### **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **TIP Development**: The TIP development process is becoming more analytical and systematic, but still lacks a sufficiently strong technical foundation, based on demand modeling and traffic studies, to support comprehensive regional planning. The project tracking system is an asset and will become more important as it is implemented more fully. The integration of ~~**MHTD-selected**~~ projects within the metropolitan planning process would provide for a more comprehensive and cohesive approach to TIP development.

### **C. Unified Planning Work Program**

The current Unified Planning Work Program (**UPWP**) covers fiscal year **1996**, beginning in July **1995**. The document covers all Council activities funded from all sources and cooperative planning efforts with other agencies, but not the transportation planning activities of other agencies conducted independently of the Council. Responsibilities of other agencies for planning are not defined. In addition to federal funding and a local match from **MHTD** and **IDOT**, the Council has a local revenue source generated through a lo-cent per capita annual assessment, and also has succeeded

## **V. FHWA and FTA Administrators' Focal Points**

The **FHWA** and **FTA** Administrators have identified six focal points for the federal certification reviews being conducted in metropolitan areas. One objective of the **EPRs** is to provide a base of information that will serve as a prelude to the certification reviews. The focal points are:

- Financial Planning and Analysis
- Major Investment Studies
- Congestion Management Systems and Other **ISTEA** Management Systems
- Air Quality and Conformity
- Public Involvement
- **ISTEA** Fifteen Factors

### **A. Financial Planning and Financial Constraint**

#### **Transportation Plan**

The Transportation Plan compares costs for system preservation, committed capital projects, and potential corridor improvements to future revenues. Total revenues for highway uses are estimated at **\$13.3** billion through the year **2015**. This projection is based on assumed annual rates of growth in the range of one to four percent for local, state, and federal funds. Federal funds are expected to account for **36** percent of total highway revenues, representing the single largest funding source, and are estimated to grow three percent per year. Funding for the regional transit system through **2015** is estimated at **\$4.8** billion, assuming that only revenues from existing sources will be available. These revenues include local sales taxes in both Missouri and Illinois sections of the metropolitan area.

System preservation needs have the priority claim on available resources. Of the total **\$13.3** billion in revenues available for highways, **\$12.6** billion or **95** percent could be spent on preservation, leaving only **\$695** million for new construction over the next 21 years. Preservation and operating costs for the transit system total **\$4.3** billion through **2015**, of which operating costs represent **\$3.4** billion or **80** percent. Total transit revenues are expected to exceed preservation needs by only **\$525** million over the time period covered by the Plan. The transit capital improvement program is conservative and does not reflect any system expansion except extension of the Metro Link light rail line in the St. **Clair** County Corridor. It is assumed that **IDOT** will increase its transit funding to support this project. Possible uses of the uncommitted **\$20** to **\$30** million per year include capital expenditures for commuter rail lines and additional light rail extensions, as have been proposed by the **Bi-State** Development Agency.

Combined highway and transit preservation and operations costs are projected at **\$16.9** billion, which compares to projected revenues of **\$18.2** billion, allowing only **\$1.3** billion for capital improvements. The states would have to defer over 9 percent of their preservation needs within the

## **V. FHWA and FTA Administrators' Focal Points**

The **FHWA** and **FTA** Administrators have identified six focal points for the federal certification reviews being conducted in metropolitan areas. One objective of the **EPRs** is to provide a base of information that will serve as a prelude to the certification reviews. The focal points are:

- Financial Planning and Analysis
- Major Investment Studies
- Congestion Management Systems and Other **ISTEA** Management Systems
- Air Quality and Conformity
- Public Involvement
- **ISTEA** Fifteen Factors

### **A. Financial Planning and Financial Constraint**

#### **Transportation Plan**

The Transportation Plan compares costs for system preservation, committed capital projects, and potential corridor improvements to future revenues. Total revenues for highway uses are estimated at **\$13.3** billion through the year **2015**. This projection is based on assumed annual rates of growth in the range of one to four percent for local, state, and federal funds. Federal funds are expected to account for **36** percent of total highway revenues, representing the single largest funding source, and are estimated to grow three percent per year. Funding for the regional transit system through **2015** is estimated at **\$4.8** billion, assuming that only revenues from existing sources will be available. These revenues include local sales taxes in both Missouri and Illinois sections of the metropolitan area.

System preservation needs have the priority claim on available resources. Of the total **\$13.3** billion in revenues available for highways, **\$12.6** billion or **95** percent could be spent on preservation, leaving only **\$695** million for new construction over the next 21 years. Preservation and operating costs for the transit system total **\$4.3** billion through **2015**, of which operating costs represent **\$3.4** billion or **80** percent. Total transit revenues are expected to exceed preservation needs by only **\$525** million over the time period covered by the Plan. The transit capital improvement program is conservative and does not reflect any system expansion except extension of the Metro Link light rail line in the St. **Clair** County Corridor. It is assumed that **IDOT** will increase its transit funding to support this project. Possible uses of the uncommitted **\$20** to **\$30** million per year include capital expenditures for commuter rail lines and additional light rail extensions, as have been proposed by the **Bi-State** Development Agency.

Combined highway and transit preservation and operations costs are projected at **\$16.9** billion, which compares to projected revenues of **\$18.2** billion, allowing only **\$1.3** billion for capital improvements. The states would have to defer over 9 percent of their preservation needs within the

management groups will consist of representatives of state transportation departments, state environmental agencies, the Council, **Bi-State** and other transit agencies, **FHWA**, **FTA**, and relevant local jurisdictions. Implementing agencies are responsible for executing the **MTIA** at the direction of the Management Group, and assume the costs of conducting the study. The **MTIA** guidelines require significant public involvement in defining the scope of analysis and selection of alternatives, as well as continuing public participation according to a strategy to be defined at an early stage of the study. While the Management Group will be responsible for selecting a preferred alternative, the Council will have final authority in determining whether or not to incorporate the recommended alternative into the Transportation Plan.

A high percentage of the **MTIAs** are for “pipeline” projects that already have been planned by implementing agencies, primarily the state transportation departments. Most of the **MTIAs** have been conceived in terms of conceptual highway projects, except for the few that are defined as transit corridors. Some of the **MTIAs** are for parallel corridors, which are being addressed separately without consideration of potential overlapping and interdependent effects. **Bi-State** has hired consultants to conduct **MTIAs** for two commuter rail lines and is taking the lead for those studies.

According to Council staff, consultants generally have not been responsive to the need for accurate problem definition that does not predetermine the range of improvements to be considered. A particular shortcoming has been the consultants’ failure to provide for adequate public involvement, consistent with the principles of the metropolitan planning process and the Council’s **MTIA** guidance. The Council’s partners in the planning process generally are supportive of the **MTIA** process, as initial resistance, following the introduction of the **MTIA** concept, has diminished. The Council is working with partner agencies to develop a joint strategy that will rely on a cooperatively staffed management team to implement the **MTIA** process more effectively.

The focus of the **MTIA** effort thus far has been on generating good projects, rather than evaluating the ramifications for the continuing development of the Transportation Plan. The Council plans to address funding issues primarily as they arise in connection with TIP development.

### **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Integration of MTIA:** A significant strength of the planning process is its integration of **MTIA**. The role of **MTIA** in contributing to a long-range vision of the region’s transportation system warrants further consideration and refinement.
2. **Refinements:** Several refinements would improve the efficiency of the process and more closely address the intent of MIS: better definition of corridors and alternatives in terms of the solution of travel problems rather than proposed projects; coordination among parallel corridors; more careful definition of purpose and need; advancement of current efforts to integrate resource and permit agencies; and further refinement of planned **MTIA** guidelines.
3. **Management:** Implementation of the management team concept will enhance the **MTIA** process.



management groups will consist of representatives of state transportation departments, state environmental agencies, the Council, **Bi-State** and other transit agencies, **FHWA**, **FTA**, and relevant local jurisdictions. Implementing agencies are responsible for executing the **MTIA** at the direction of the Management Group, and assume the costs of conducting the study. The **MTIA** guidelines require significant public involvement in defining the scope of analysis and selection of alternatives, as well as continuing public participation according to a strategy to be defined at an early stage of the study. While the Management Group will be responsible for selecting a preferred alternative, the Council will have final authority in determining whether or not to incorporate the recommended alternative into the Transportation Plan.

A high percentage of the **MTIAs** are for “pipeline” projects that already have been planned by implementing agencies, primarily the state transportation departments. Most of the **MTIAs** have been conceived in terms of conceptual highway projects, except for the few that are defined as transit corridors. Some of the **MTIAs** are for parallel corridors, which are being addressed separately without consideration of potential overlapping and interdependent effects. **Bi-State** has hired consultants to conduct **MTIAs** for two commuter rail lines and is taking the lead for those studies.

According to Council staff, consultants generally have not been responsive to the need for accurate problem definition that does not predetermine the range of improvements to be considered. A particular shortcoming has been the consultants’ failure to provide for adequate public involvement, consistent with the principles of the metropolitan planning process and the Council’s **MTIA** guidance. The Council’s partners in the planning process generally are supportive of the **MTIA** process, as initial resistance, following the introduction of the **MTIA** concept, has diminished. The Council is working with partner agencies to develop a joint strategy that will rely on a cooperatively staffed management team to implement the **MTIA** process more effectively.

The focus of the **MTIA** effort thus far has been on generating good projects, rather than evaluating the ramifications for the continuing development of the Transportation Plan. The Council plans to address funding issues primarily as they arise in connection with TIP development.

### **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Integration of MTIA:** A significant strength of the planning process is its integration of **MTIA**. The role of **MTIA** in contributing to a long-range vision of the region’s transportation system warrants further consideration and refinement.
2. **Refinements:** Several refinements would improve the efficiency of the process and more closely address the intent of MIS: better definition of corridors and alternatives in terms of the solution of travel problems rather than proposed projects; coordination among parallel corridors; more careful definition of purpose and need; advancement of current efforts to integrate resource and permit agencies; and further refinement of planned **MTIA** guidelines.
3. **Management:** Implementation of the management team concept will enhance the **MTIA** process.

year period. Four **exceedances** at one monitor are enough to prevent attainment of the ozone standard by the November **1996** deadline and raise the possibility of the area being reclassified as a serious ozone nonattainment area.

A **1992** Memorandum of Understanding among the Council, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (**MDNR**), and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (**IEPA**) established roles and responsibilities for air quality planning in connection with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Council is responsible for conformity analysis of the Plan using US EPA-approved forecasting methods (i.e. the latest release of the **MOBILE** model), and conducts regional emissions analysis, as required, to meet all applicable state and federal rules and regulations. According to the Transportation Plan, implementation of the “action” or “build” scenario, including planned and “expected” projects, would result in reduced regional emissions of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides, which are precursors of ozone, as well as lower carbon monoxide emissions within the carbon monoxide nonattainment area. Emissions reductions resulting from the programmed and implemented Transportation Control Measures (**TCMs**) in the TIP are forecast to exceed emissions reductions goals of the Missouri and Illinois **15** Percent Rate-of-Progress State **SIPs**, and implementation of the projects in the TIP is forecast to reduce regional emission levels.

The financing of Enhanced Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) has been the subject of a dispute between the Council and the State of Missouri, which intended to use **\$33** million in **CMAQ** funds to implement the program. The Council decided that the expenditure of **CMAQ** funds for other projects in Missouri warranted a higher priority and allocated the funds to these other projects. **MDNR** intends to return to the state legislature with an alternative proposal for funding I/M. Another SIP-related issue concerned the implementation of a reformulated fuels program, which was defeated by the state legislature. The Council did provide **\$3** million in **CMAQ** funds for I/M in Illinois.

A problem concerning technical coordination has been the inconsistency of **MOBILE** model results generated by the Council and the **MDNR**, which results from differences in the vehicle miles traveled (**VTM**) forecasts produced by the Council and **MHTD**. A reconciliation process is under way to eliminate these discrepancies, and **MHTD** is seeking a more active role in **transportation**-related air quality planning. The consultation process among participating agencies has been impaired by poor communications concerning SIP submittals and revisions. Staff resource constraints have contributed to these coordination problems. Participating staff envision that early involvement in the consultation process will improve working relationships in the future.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Interagency Cooperation**: The Council, **MDNR**, and **IEPA** work cooperatively on air quality planning and are making progress in addressing communications problems related to limited staff resources. The Council should provide **MHTD** with the opportunity to become more involved in the process, which would facilitate improved technical coordination.

year period. Four **exceedances** at one monitor are enough to prevent attainment of the ozone standard by the November **1996** deadline and raise the possibility of the area being reclassified as a serious ozone nonattainment area.

A **1992** Memorandum of Understanding among the Council, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (**MDNR**), and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (**IEPA**) established roles and responsibilities for air quality planning in connection with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Council is responsible for conformity analysis of the Plan using US EPA-approved forecasting methods (i.e. the latest release of the **MOBILE** model), and conducts regional emissions analysis, as required, to meet all applicable state and federal rules and regulations. According to the Transportation Plan, implementation of the “action” or “build” scenario, including planned and “expected” projects, would result in reduced regional emissions of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides, which are precursors of ozone, as well as lower carbon monoxide emissions within the carbon monoxide nonattainment area. Emissions reductions resulting from the programmed and implemented Transportation Control Measures (**TCMs**) in the TIP are forecast to exceed emissions reductions goals of the Missouri and Illinois **15** Percent Rate-of-Progress State **SIPs**, and implementation of the projects in the TIP is forecast to reduce regional emission levels.

The financing of Enhanced Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) has been the subject of a dispute between the Council and the State of Missouri, which intended to use **\$33** million in **CMAQ** funds to implement the program. The Council decided that the expenditure of **CMAQ** funds for other projects in Missouri warranted a higher priority and allocated the funds to these other projects. **MDNR** intends to return to the state legislature with an alternative proposal for funding I/M. Another SIP-related issue concerned the implementation of a reformulated fuels program, which was defeated by the state legislature. The Council did provide **\$3** million in **CMAQ** funds for I/M in Illinois.

A problem concerning technical coordination has been the inconsistency of **MOBILE** model results generated by the Council and the **MDNR**, which results from differences in the vehicle miles traveled (**VTM**) forecasts produced by the Council and **MHTD**. A reconciliation process is under way to eliminate these discrepancies, and **MHTD** is seeking a more active role in **transportation**-related air quality planning. The consultation process among participating agencies has been impaired by poor communications concerning SIP submittals and revisions. Staff resource constraints have contributed to these coordination problems. Participating staff envision that early involvement in the consultation process will improve working relationships in the future.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Interagency Cooperation**: The Council, **MDNR**, and **IEPA** work cooperatively on air quality planning and are making progress in addressing communications problems related to limited staff resources. The Council should provide **MHTD** with the opportunity to become more involved in the process, which would facilitate improved technical coordination.

groups engaged in cooperative planning; and the public's level of knowledge about the transportation system. These measures are a vital component of the Council's public involvement effort and can become a useful model for other agencies.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Public Involvement Initiatives:** The Council's public involvement effort is strong and has the potential to serve as a national model. A particular strength of the program is its emphasis on reaching out to the public at the grassroots and community levels, rather than expecting the public to come to the Council.
2. **Impact on the Planning Process:** The value of public participation can be increased with a greater focus on its application to problem solving and strategic planning in the Plan and TIP development processes. The Council also could consider how it can build on its successes in generating community support to reinforce the role of the planning process in public decisionmaking.

## **F. ISTEA Fifteen Factors**

The Transportation Plan establishes the **ISTEA** fifteen factors as essential considerations of all transportation planning activities. Moreover, the seven focus areas identified in the Plan as planning criteria reflect many of the same objectives as the fifteen factors, including preservation of existing infrastructure, congestion management, goods movement, and sustainable development. According to project staff, the seven focus areas, which are central to the planning process, represent a recombination of the fifteen factors. Many of the factors are specifically identified as performance measures within the focus areas, including energy conservation, land use impacts, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, intermodal considerations, and social, economic, and environmental effects.

The Council has developed a chart that maps the relationship between the fifteen factors and the seven focus areas. According to the chart, the focus areas corresponding to each of the fifteen factors are as follows:

- Preservation of Existing Facilities: Preservation, Sustainable Development
- Consistency with Energy Goals: Resource Conservation
- Need to Relieve Congestion: Congestion, Movement of Goods
- Effects on Land Use: Sustainable Development, Resource Conservation
- Programming for Enhancements: Access to Opportunity, Sustainable Development
- Effects of All Projects: No specific focus area, addressed through monitoring and evaluation functions
- Intermodal Considerations: Access to Opportunity, Movement of Goods
- Connectivity of Roads: Sustainable Development
- Coordination with Six Management Systems: Preservation, Safety, Congestion,

groups engaged in cooperative planning; and the public's level of knowledge about the transportation system. These measures are a vital component of the Council's public involvement effort and can become a useful model for other agencies.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Public Involvement Initiatives:** The Council's public involvement effort is strong and has the potential to serve as a national model. A particular strength of the program is its emphasis on reaching out to the public at the grassroots and community levels, rather than expecting the public to come to the Council.
2. **Impact on the Planning Process:** The value of public participation can be increased with a greater focus on its application to problem solving and strategic planning in the Plan and TIP development processes. The Council also could consider how it can build on its successes in generating community support to reinforce the role of the planning process in public decisionmaking.

## **F. ISTEA Fifteen Factors**

The Transportation Plan establishes the **ISTEA** fifteen factors as essential considerations of all transportation planning activities. Moreover, the seven focus areas identified in the Plan as planning criteria reflect many of the same objectives as the fifteen factors, including preservation of existing infrastructure, congestion management, goods movement, and sustainable development. According to project staff, the seven focus areas, which are central to the planning process, represent a recombination of the fifteen factors. Many of the factors are specifically identified as performance measures within the focus areas, including energy conservation, land use impacts, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, intermodal considerations, and social, economic, and environmental effects.

The Council has developed a chart that maps the relationship between the fifteen factors and the seven focus areas. According to the chart, the focus areas corresponding to each of the fifteen factors are as follows:

- Preservation of Existing Facilities: Preservation, Sustainable Development
- Consistency with Energy Goals: Resource Conservation
- Need to Relieve Congestion: Congestion, Movement of Goods
- Effects on Land Use: Sustainable Development, Resource Conservation
- Programming for Enhancements: Access to Opportunity, Sustainable Development
- Effects of All Projects: No specific focus area, addressed through monitoring and evaluation functions
- Intermodal Considerations: Access to Opportunity, Movement of Goods
- Connectivity of Roads: Sustainable Development
- Coordination with Six Management Systems: Preservation, Safety, Congestion,

## VI. Integration of Strategic Transportation Planning

### A. Transit

The **Bi-State** Development Agency has developed a **25-year** transit plan in cooperation with local officials and community leaders. The plan or “vision” provides for a major capital expansion program, including the addition of over **150** miles of new **MetroLink** light rail lines, construction of **75** miles of commuter rail, and the construction of transfer centers and a multimodal transportation complex, as well as the acquisition of new equipment to expand bus and **paratransit** services. This vision is the result of a four-year strategic planning process that also has produced a framework for strategic planning, in the form of policy goals. These goals range from implementation of a multimodal transportation system to expansion of **Bi-State’s** existing customer base and securing stable permanent funding. **Bi-State’s** development strategy also incorporates the creation of economic development opportunities as a principal objective.

There is evidence of substantial public support for **Bi-State’s** capital expansion plans, as demonstrated in voter approval of local taxes to fund the agency’s programs. A **1/2** percent sales tax in St. Louis City and County originally was enacted to support the **Bi-State** transit system, but the County has set a **\$30** million ceiling on its payments to **Bi-State** for basic services, and uses the remaining funds, which account for approximately half of the revenues derived from the tax, for other transportation purposes, primarily roadways. The most recent evidence of public support for **Bi-State** was provided by the passage last year of the Proposition M initiative in St. Louis City and County, which established a **1/4-cent** sales tax to fund extensions and enhancements of the Metro Link light rail line.

Transit does not appear to be fully integrated in the regional transportation planning process, as illustrated by Council staffs concerns regarding **Bi-State’s** promotional campaign to obtain voter approval of the **1/4-cent** sales tax. According to Council staff, the campaign implied that **Bi-State’s** entire rail development plan would be funded, and that operation of new services would be **self-supporting**. In fact, much of the revenue from the **1/4-cent** sales tax increase has been needed just to support existing operations and possibly a modest capital expansion. An emergency loan from the new sales tax was used in **1994** to cover operating deficits and forestall the complete cessation of service throughout the **Bi-State** system. In the past, the Council had been instrumental in arranging a **\$10** million loan from the highway fund to finance the **MetroLink’s** operating deficit.

**Bi-State’s** budget problems have not been solved to date. Most of the transit agency’s capital expansion program is not included in the metropolitan area’s Transportation Plan. Council staff expressed concern about the potential loss of credibility for the regional planning process if public commitments to implement rail service in multiple corridors are not honored.

Although Missouri provides no funding for public transit, Illinois provides grants to **Bi-State** for capital programs and to Illinois transit districts to help offset operating deficits. The transit districts

## VI. Integration of Strategic Transportation Planning

### A. Transit

The **Bi-State** Development Agency has developed a **25-year** transit plan in cooperation with local officials and community leaders. The plan or “vision” provides for a major capital expansion program, including the addition of over **150** miles of new **MetroLink** light rail lines, construction of **75** miles of commuter rail, and the construction of transfer centers and a multimodal transportation complex, as well as the acquisition of new equipment to expand bus and **paratransit** services. This vision is the result of a four-year strategic planning process that also has produced a framework for strategic planning, in the form of policy goals. These goals range from implementation of a multimodal transportation system to expansion of **Bi-State’s** existing customer base and securing stable permanent funding. **Bi-State’s** development strategy also incorporates the creation of economic development opportunities as a principal objective.

There is evidence of substantial public support for **Bi-State’s** capital expansion plans, as demonstrated in voter approval of local taxes to fund the agency’s programs. A **1/2** percent sales tax in St. Louis City and County originally was enacted to support the **Bi-State** transit system, but the County has set a **\$30** million ceiling on its payments to **Bi-State** for basic services, and uses the remaining funds, which account for approximately half of the revenues derived from the tax, for other transportation purposes, primarily roadways. The most recent evidence of public support for **Bi-State** was provided by the passage last year of the Proposition M initiative in St. Louis City and County, which established a **1/4-cent** sales tax to fund extensions and enhancements of the Metro Link light rail line.

Transit does not appear to be fully integrated in the regional transportation planning process, as illustrated by Council staffs concerns regarding **Bi-State’s** promotional campaign to obtain voter approval of the **1/4-cent** sales tax. According to Council staff, the campaign implied that **Bi-State’s** entire rail development plan would be funded, and that operation of new services would be **self-supporting**. In fact, much of the revenue from the **1/4-cent** sales tax increase has been needed just to support existing operations and possibly a modest capital expansion. An emergency loan from the new sales tax was used in **1994** to cover operating deficits and forestall the complete cessation of service throughout the **Bi-State** system. In the past, the Council had been instrumental in arranging a **\$10** million loan from the highway fund to finance the **MetroLink’s** operating deficit.

**Bi-State’s** budget problems have not been solved to date. Most of the transit agency’s capital expansion program is not included in the metropolitan area’s Transportation Plan. Council staff expressed concern about the potential loss of credibility for the regional planning process if public commitments to implement rail service in multiple corridors are not honored.

Although Missouri provides no funding for public transit, Illinois provides grants to **Bi-State** for capital programs and to Illinois transit districts to help offset operating deficits. The transit districts

## VII. Travel Demand Forecasting

The Council uses the standard four-step travel demand modeling process, with some modifications. The software package used is a modified version of **MINUTP**. A recent **FHWA** review identified a number of areas in which forecasting methods and documentation could be improved, as follows:

- documentation of reasons for nearly identical build and no-build scenarios;
- upgrading, formalizing, and documenting land use projections;
- documentation of differences in transit trip tables for major **MIS** versus regional transit ridership forecasts;
- more detailed level of **disaggregation** for input to air quality models; reconciliation of discrepancies in **VMT** forecasts;
- coordination with the **MHTD** if in-house modeling capability is developed at the state level.

The review also recommended that modeling results be used in the public involvement process to inform the public of the impacts of proposed projects. Potential projects and transportation needs have been identified by the Council through public involvement and contacts with other agencies, without reference to modeling results. The review concluded that the Council's overall modeling capability is good, but not well documented. The Council has included work items in the **UPWP** to respond to **FHWA** recommendations, and is evaluating how modeling should be used in **decision-making**.

### Observations and Recommendations

1. Technical Development: Continued improvement of the modeling effort as recommended by the **FHWA** is necessary to provide a technical foundation for the Transportation Plan. Development of a joint **Council/MHTD** planning group would facilitate this effort and reduce impediments to interagency technical coordination.



## VIII. Access to Opportunity

As an outgrowth of its public outreach efforts with transportation disadvantaged segments of the population, the Council has implemented a community mobility planning framework to improve access to employment and other opportunities for inner-city residents. A number of activities have been initiated as part of this effort, including a capital improvement program to connect a **MetroLink** station to a job training and business resource center, as well as “Bridges to Work” and “Regional Jobs Initiative” programs.

The Council is working in partnership with the County Economic Council and **Bi-State** on a capital improvement program that will link the **Wellston MetroLink** station with the Cornerstone Partnership community job training and economic development resource center. Improvements will provide for better access, improved lighting, **signage**, and construction of a mixed use facility housing a community service center, a police sub-station, retail establishments, and a child-care center. **FTA's** Livable Communities Program is funding the project, with local match from St. Louis County transit tax revenues. Bridges to Work is a collaborative effort organized by the Council in cooperation with **Bi-State**, the Urban League of Metropolitan St. Louis, Public/Private Ventures of Philadelphia, and several social service agencies and organizations to place inner city residents in suburban jobs through the coordination of job placement, transportation, and support services. The Regional Jobs Initiative is designed to provide new mechanisms connecting disadvantaged job seekers with potential employers. The Annie **E. Casey** Foundation has awarded a grant to help support the project.

### Observations and Recommendations

1. Community Service: The Council's initiatives related to employment access and urban development demonstrate the potential of integrating transportation and social service efforts to address essential community needs. These efforts, including resourceful approaches to securing funds from foundations and private corporations, can serve as a national example.
2. Matching Funds: The Council could investigate the use of the Annie **E. Casey** Foundation grant as a source of local match for federal planning funds.

## **IX. Meetings with Representatives of Advisory Committees, Citizens' Groups, and Local Officials**

### **A. Advisory Committee Members and Citizens' Groups**

The **EPR** site visit included a meeting of the federal team with nine representatives of the Council's advisory committees and partners in employment access initiatives. A number of the organizations represented were public agencies, including the St. Louis City Port Authority, the Missouri Division of Aging, and the St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment. Citizens' Groups represented at the meeting include the Citizens for Modern Transportation, the American Lung Association, and a bicycle planning consultant.

All of the group representatives expressed high regard for the Council's efforts in drawing their organizations into the planning process and working to understand and address their needs. The Council's role as a "bridge organization," bringing different public agencies and private organizations together, was cited as being especially important in an area divided into an unusually large number of governmental jurisdictions. Increased representation among Illinois-based organizations was mentioned as a desirable improvement, because most active participants in the advisory committees are from Missouri.

The need for improved transportation to promote economic development and individual economic opportunity, and the Council's work to meet this need, were noted. The role of **MetroLink** in improving mobility within the city was cited, and support for system expansion was expressed. **Paratransit** service for the elderly and disabled was identified as a pressing need to which the Council has devoted substantial and effective attention, particularly in terms of increasing cooperation among service providers. The Council's work in organizing the Air Quality Advisory Committee also was commended for its success in bringing together different concerned groups and providing a forum in which they could share information. Representatives of the port authorities said that the Freight Advisory Committee is working well. They also expressed approval of the Council's focus on accessibility to facilities.

One representative expressed the opinion that **ISTEA** had enabled the Council to make inroads into land use planning, as reflected in increased discussion of transit-oriented development. A grassroots effort to look at land use issues in connection with a proposed improvement to **I-44** also was noted.

### **B. Elected Officials and Agency Representatives**

The Federal Team met with eight members of the Council's Board of Directors. The Directors' comments are summarized below:

- One Director expressed disappointment about **ISTEA's** implementation, stating that local decision makers do not enjoy the increased flexibility intended under the law as a result of environmental regulations and that unnecessary planning studies are required.

## **IX. Meetings with Representatives of Advisory Committees, Citizens' Groups, and Local Officials**

### **A. Advisory Committee Members and Citizens' Groups**

The **EPR** site visit included a meeting of the federal team with nine representatives of the Council's advisory committees and partners in employment access initiatives. A number of the organizations represented were public agencies, including the St. Louis City Port Authority, the Missouri Division of Aging, and the St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment. Citizens' Groups represented at the meeting include the Citizens for Modern Transportation, the American Lung Association, and a bicycle planning consultant.

All of the group representatives expressed high regard for the Council's efforts in drawing their organizations into the planning process and working to understand and address their needs. The Council's role as a "bridge organization," bringing different public agencies and private organizations together, was cited as being especially important in an area divided into an unusually large number of governmental jurisdictions. Increased representation among Illinois-based organizations was mentioned as a desirable improvement, because most active participants in the advisory committees are from Missouri.

The need for improved transportation to promote economic development and individual economic opportunity, and the Council's work to meet this need, were noted. The role of **MetroLink** in improving mobility within the city was cited, and support for system expansion was expressed. **Paratransit** service for the elderly and disabled was identified as a pressing need to which the Council has devoted substantial and effective attention, particularly in terms of increasing cooperation among service providers. The Council's work in organizing the Air Quality Advisory Committee also was commended for its success in bringing together different concerned groups and providing a forum in which they could share information. Representatives of the port authorities said that the Freight Advisory Committee is working well. They also expressed approval of the Council's focus on accessibility to facilities.

One representative expressed the opinion that **ISTEA** had enabled the Council to make inroads into land use planning, as reflected in increased discussion of transit-oriented development. A grassroots effort to look at land use issues in connection with a proposed improvement to **I-44** also was noted.

### **B. Elected Officials and Agency Representatives**

The Federal Team met with eight members of the Council's Board of Directors. The Directors' comments are summarized below:

- One Director expressed disappointment about **ISTEA's** implementation, stating that local decision makers do not enjoy the increased flexibility intended under the law as a result of environmental regulations and that unnecessary planning studies are required.

## Conclusion

The Council and its partner agencies have taken the tools provided by **ISTEA** to begin building a comprehensive, coordinated planning process that is evolving away from single-mode perspectives to an integrated multimodal problem-solving approach. The Transportation Plan reflects this effort, articulating an inclusive decision-making process in which transportation needs are addressed in a broad context encompassing socioeconomic and environmental objectives, as well as concerns for equity and cost-effectiveness. Increased emphasis on strategic planning should be a priority in the development of future versions of the Transportation Plan, which should present a vision of how transportation decision-making will affect the region's future. More effective application of technical tools, including the **CMS** and travel demand modeling, are needed as a technical basis for the Plan.

Financial planning should take into account the effects of anticipated capital projects, including those being considered in MIS. The Council has made substantial progress in integrating MIS into its planning process and should focus these studies on the solution of corridor transportation problems. Public involvement and initiatives to improve access to employment demonstrate unusually strong insight and commitment to meeting community needs.

## Conclusion

The Council and its partner agencies have taken the tools provided by **ISTEA** to begin building a comprehensive, coordinated planning process that is evolving away from single-mode perspectives to an integrated multimodal problem-solving approach. The Transportation Plan reflects this effort, articulating an inclusive decision-making process in which transportation needs are addressed in a broad context encompassing socioeconomic and environmental objectives, as well as concerns for equity and cost-effectiveness. Increased emphasis on strategic planning should be a priority in the development of future versions of the Transportation Plan, which should present a vision of how transportation decision-making will affect the region's future. More effective application of technical tools, including the **CMS** and travel demand modeling, are needed as a technical basis for the Plan.

Financial planning should take into account the effects of anticipated capital projects, including those being considered in MIS. The Council has made substantial progress in integrating MIS into its planning process and should focus these studies on the solution of corridor transportation problems. Public involvement and initiatives to improve access to employment demonstrate unusually strong insight and commitment to meeting community needs.

**Appendix B**  
**St. Louis Enhanced Planning Review**  
**List of Local Participants**

East-West Gateway Coordinating Council-Staff

**Les Sterman**, Executive Director  
Al Walls, Director of Transportation  
Blair **Forlaw**, Director of Policy and Programming  
Bill **Grogan**, Director of Planning

Agency

**Martyn** James  
Royce **Bauer**  
Jim Wild  
Jerry Blair  
**Maryann** Taylor Crate  
Eric Victor **Cowle**  
John H. **Acock**  
Al **Boudreaux**

EWGCC Board Members

John **Baricevic**, St. **Clair** County Board  
Joseph **R. Ortwerth**, St. Charles County Executive  
Pierre **Blaine**, St. **Clair** County Regional Citizen  
Michael **Daniels**, Special Assistant to Mayor, St. Louis  
John **K. Leary**, Bi-State Development Agency  
Tom **Curran**, St. Louis County Planning Dept.

Missouri Highway and Transportation Department

Lawrence **Welty**  
Mike Shea  
Larry **Kopfer**

Illinois Department of Transportation

Ron **Tedesco**  
Steve Baker

Bi-State Development Agency

Susan **Stauder**  
Donald W. **Maag**

Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources

Keith **Berndtson**  
James **Kavanaugh**

Illinois Environmental Protection

**Toby Frevert**  
Cheryl **Kelley**

U.S. EPA Region 7

Lisa **Haugen**

**Appendix B**  
**St. Louis Enhanced Planning Review**  
**List of Local Participants**

East-West Gateway Coordinating Council-Staff

**Les Sterman**, Executive Director  
Al Walls, Director of Transportation  
Blair **Forlaw**, Director of Policy and Programming  
Bill **Grogan**, Director of Planning

Agency

**Martyn** James  
Royce **Bauer**  
Jim Wild  
Jerry Blair  
**Maryann** Taylor Crate  
Eric Victor **Cowle**  
John H. **Acock**  
Al **Boudreaux**

EWGCC Board Members

John **Baricevic**, St. **Clair** County Board  
Joseph **R. Ortwerth**, St. Charles County Executive  
Pierre **Blaine**, St. **Clair** County Regional Citizen  
Michael **Daniels**, Special Assistant to Mayor, St. Louis  
John **K. Leary**, Bi-State Development Agency  
Tom **Curran**, St. Louis County Planning Dept.

Missouri Highway and Transportation Department

Lawrence **Welty**  
Mike Shea  
Larry **Kopfer**

Illinois Department of Transportation

Ron **Tedesco**  
Steve Baker

Bi-State Development Agency

Susan **Stauder**  
Donald W. **Maag**

Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources

Keith **Berndtson**  
James **Kavanaugh**

Illinois Environmental Protection

**Toby Frevert**  
Cheryl **Kelley**

U.S. EPA Region 7

Lisa **Haugen**

**Appendix B**  
**St. Louis Enhanced Planning Review**  
**List of Local Participants**

East-West Gateway Coordinating Council-Staff

**Les Sterman**, Executive Director  
Al Walls, Director of Transportation  
Blair **Forlaw**, Director of Policy and Programming  
Bill **Grogan**, Director of Planning

Agency

**Martyn** James  
Royce **Bauer**  
Jim Wild  
Jerry Blair  
**Maryann** Taylor Crate  
Eric Victor **Cowle**  
John H. **Acock**  
Al **Boudreaux**

EWGCC Board Members

John **Baricevic**, St. **Clair** County Board  
Joseph **R. Ortwerth**, St. Charles County Executive  
Pierre **Blaine**, St. **Clair** County Regional Citizen  
Michael **Daniels**, Special Assistant to Mayor, St. Louis  
John **K. Leary**, Bi-State Development Agency  
Tom **Curran**, St. Louis County Planning Dept.

Missouri Highway and Transportation Department

Lawrence **Welty**  
Mike Shea  
Larry **Kopfer**

Illinois Department of Transportation

Ron **Tedesco**  
Steve Baker

Bi-State Development Agency

Susan **Stauder**  
Donald W. **Maag**

Missouri Dept. of Natural Resources

Keith **Berndtson**  
James **Kavanaugh**

Illinois Environmental Protection

**Toby Frevert**  
Cheryl **Kelley**

U.S. EPA Region 7

Lisa **Haugen**



## Appendix C (continued)

~~1:00-~~ Public Involvement Process Breakout Session  
~~4:00~~ (concurrent with Sessions 8 and 9)

Discussion Leader: Beverly Silverberg, Consultant

~~1:00-~~ Financial Planning and Financial Constraint  
~~2:00~~

Discussion Leaders:

Joan **Roeseler**, FTA Region VII

Sheldon **Edner**, FHWA Headquarters

2:00-  
4:00 Air Quality

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Dan Wheeler, **FHWA** Region 7

### Thursday, September 14, 1995

~~8:30-~~ Public Involvement  
~~10:00~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Beverly Silverberg, Consultant

~~10:00-~~ Congestion Management System and other Management Systems  
~~11:30~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Dave Edwards, **FHWA** MO. Division

~~11:30-~~ Intermodal Freight Planning  
~~12:30~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Sheldon **Edner**, **FHWA** Headquarters

~~12:30-~~ Lunch Meeting with Elected Officials  
~~2:00~~

Discussion Leader:  
Charlotte Adams, **FTA** Headquarters

2:00-  
3:30 Meeting with Public

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
John Cater, **FHWA** Region 7

## Appendix C (continued)

~~1:00-~~ Public Involvement Process Breakout Session  
~~4:00~~ (concurrent with Sessions 8 and 9)

Discussion Leader: Beverly Silverberg, Consultant

~~1:00-~~ Financial Planning and Financial Constraint  
~~2:00~~

Discussion Leaders:

Joan **Roeseler**, FTA Region VII

Sheldon **Edner**, FHWA Headquarters

2:00-  
4:00 Air Quality

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Dan Wheeler, **FHWA** Region 7

### Thursday, September 14, 1995

~~8:30-~~ Public Involvement  
~~10:00~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Beverly Silverberg, Consultant

~~10:00-~~ Congestion Management System and other Management Systems  
~~11:30~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Dave Edwards, **FHWA** MO. Division

~~11:30-~~ Intermodal Freight Planning  
~~12:30~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Sheldon **Edner**, **FHWA** Headquarters

~~12:30-~~ Lunch Meeting with Elected Officials  
~~2:00~~

Discussion Leader:  
Charlotte Adams, **FTA** Headquarters

2:00-  
3:30 Meeting with Public

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
John Cater, **FHWA** Region 7

## Appendix C (continued)

~~1:00-~~ Public Involvement Process Breakout Session  
~~4:00~~ (concurrent with Sessions 8 and 9)

Discussion Leader: Beverly Silverberg, Consultant

~~1:00-~~ Financial Planning and Financial Constraint  
~~2:00~~

Discussion Leaders:

Joan **Roeseler**, FTA Region VII

Sheldon **Edner**, FHWA Headquarters

2:00-  
4:00 Air Quality

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Dan Wheeler, **FHWA** Region 7

### Thursday, September 14, 1995

~~8:30-~~ Public Involvement  
~~10:00~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Beverly Silverberg, Consultant

~~10:00-~~ Congestion Management System and other Management Systems  
~~11:30~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Dave Edwards, **FHWA** MO. Division

~~11:30-~~ Intermodal Freight Planning  
~~12:30~~

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
Sheldon **Edner**, **FHWA** Headquarters

~~12:30-~~ Lunch Meeting with Elected Officials  
~~2:00~~

Discussion Leader:  
Charlotte Adams, **FTA** Headquarters

2:00-  
3:30 Meeting with Public

Discussion Leader: Status/Update/Discussion  
John Cater, **FHWA** Region 7





