



Association of Defense
Communities
Annual Conference
Norfolk, Virginia
July 17, 2011

2011

Navigating Regional BRAC Traffic Jams Innovation Lab: Challenges and Best Practices

Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Exercise Background	3
Presentations	3
Breakout Topic Area Outcomes	3
Next Steps	4
Introduction	4
Presentations	6
Breakout Session Area Outcomes.....	9
Key Recommendation and Concepts from the Facilitated Discussions.....	10
Potential Legislative Changes and Existing Authorities	10
Funding	12
Lessons Learned.....	14
Appendix A:.....	16
BRAC Transportation Planning and Sustainability Lab Concept of Operations	16
Appendix B:.....	19
Unedited Facilitator Notes.....	19
Mitigation Tools Notes.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive Summary

Exercise Background

Navigating Regional BRAC Traffic Jams was an “Innovation Laboratory” presented at the 2011 Association of Defense Communities (ADC) Annual Conference in Norfolk Virginia, on Sunday July, 17, 2011. Recently, as a component of enduring and sustainable installations, ADC has been exploring the issues surrounding traffic congestion and mitigation efforts due to growth at military installations. This three-hour innovation lab was designed as a companion session to support previous conference sessions dealing with sustainability, mission readiness and compatible land uses.

Over forty people took part in the event, which was run as an interactive facilitated discussion exercise focusing on the Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads experience with BRAC 2005 and the mission growth in the areas. The Innovation Lab was designed to provide a panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a variety of case studies and perspectives. The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for transportation compatibility and sustainability. Following the presentations, audience participants divided into facilitated groups to discuss approaches, practices and tools that could be further applied to achieve sustainable transportation outcomes at military installations and the surrounding communities. Lastly, the entire group discussed next steps for what to do with the data and ideas gathered in the course of the lab.

Presentations

The session began with a one hour panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a various case studies and perspectives on the challenges that were identified, best practices from regional and state perspectives and collaborative community and military efforts to address local and regional transportation sustainability. The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for transportation compatibility and sustainability. The panel included representatives from the United States Navy, Fairfax County Virginia, the Northern Virginia Regional Commission, The Commonwealth of Virginia and the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies who have been part of the process of managing transportation challenges and seeking solutions on the local, regional and federal levels.

Breakout Topic Area Outcomes

The breakout session was conducted as a series of interactive facilitated discussions between the panel with the panel and lab participants designed to identify challenges and road blocks, elicit recommendations for furthering collaborative approaches and the use of effective tools to achieve long term transportation solutions and sustainability. Each group was organized to allow each participant the chance to input concerns and ideas in a selection of discussion areas at three different tables. After tasking of the group, each facilitator was given a topic of discussion based upon input from the innovation lab’s panelist. The facilitated discussions were designed to capture suggestions, challenges and

recommendations from the Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia BRAC experience, which could be applied to known or emerging challenges at other installations and communities.

Next Steps

Innovation lab participants proposed a variety of potential uses for this after-action report and the data and information in the presentations. Workshop organizers captured and documented these ideas and will coordinate with stakeholders in the Commonwealth of Virginia, key military and regional stakeholders and ADC concerning these and other recommendations. Copies of this report and accompanying documents have been made available to the Association for Defense Communities who in turn will make it available to all innovation lab participants upon request.

Introduction

Sustainability connects the operations of our military installations to their surrounding communities and region. Gone are the days when installations were stand alone entities and if installations are to endure and become truly sustainable elements of local economies and regions, transportation issues must be dealt with in a mutually beneficial partnership with the communities, governments, and organizations that are all affected. Just as with many other factors, transportation issues contribute to complex challenges for installations/ranges and local communities. This problem has been exasperated lately as many installations have experienced massive growth both inside and outside the fence line and communities, ranging from small towns to large metropolitan areas, are facing significant transportation challenges resulting from BRAC-induced growth.

An increase in traffic congestion can lead to reduced employee productivity and degradation in the quality of life for both the military and civilian workforce, as well as affect our nation's military readiness if employees cannot efficiently travel to and from work. State and local governments are often forced to adopt strategies to expedite the planning and execution of transportation projects due to growing installations in their regions. Yet this must be done in the context of an ever changing mix of factors, both inside and outside the installation and done in a capacity that does not affect the ability of an installation to perform its mission. In the past, DoD has been limited in its own ability to provide the resources and assistance needed to help neighboring communities address the impact on the local transportation infrastructure. Yet, for today's installation of the 21st Century, transportation sustainability entails proactively planning for the long term. While continuing the mission and promoting the general welfare of the soldiers, the installation must effectively build relationships and partnerships with the surrounding community to effectively manage transportation issues and both internal and external stresses to the regional transportation infrastructure.

Navigating Regional BRAC Traffic Jams was an "Innovation Laboratory" presented at the 2011 Association of Defense Communities (ADC) Annual Conference in Norfolk Virginia, on Sunday July, 17, 2011. Recently, as a component of enduring and sustainable installations, ADC has been exploring the issues surrounding traffic congestion and mitigation efforts due to growth at military

installations. This three-hour innovation lab was designed as a companion session to support previous conference sessions dealing with sustainability, mission readiness and compatible land uses.

Over forty people took part in the event, which was run as an interactive facilitated discussion exercise focusing on the Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads experience with BRAC 2005 and the mission growth in the areas. The session began with a one hour panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a various case studies and perspectives on the challenges that were identified, best practices from regional and state perspectives and collaborative community and military efforts to address local and regional transportation sustainability. The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for transportation compatibility and sustainability. The panel included representatives from the United States Navy, Fairfax County Virginia, the Northern Virginia Regional Commission, The Commonwealth of Virginia and the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies who have been part of the process of managing transportation challenges and seeking solutions on the local, regional and federal levels. Following the presentations, audience participants divided into facilitated groups to discuss approaches, practices and tools that could be further applied to achieve sustainable transportation outcomes at military installations and the surrounding communities. Lastly, the entire group discussed next steps for what to do with the data and ideas gathered in the course of the lab, facilitators provided detailed notes on their discussions and this After Action Report was produced.

The groups discussed:

A) Potential Legislative Changes and Existing Useful Authorities:

- How do we make transportation a legislative priority?
- What existing funding and planning authorities can enhance transportation implementation?
- How can current state governments play a more active role?
- How can current local city and county governments be leveraged to play a more active role in encouraging transportation planning and smart growth?
- Does the notion of a new “umbrella” agency or organization, including local entities, make sense?

B) Funding Possibilities:

- How can long-range programs for implementing transportation solution and plans, including estimates of costs, dedicated funding streams and other relevant funding measures enhance transportation and traffic planning measures?
- How can installations and the Defense Access Roads Program play a more active long term role in funding transportation solutions?
- How can funding be used to direct growth to where infrastructure capacity is available or committed to be available for future growth?

C) Lessons Learned and Solutions for Future BRAC and Non-BRAC Installation Growth:

- What mitigation tools are available to support growth and development patterns around installations that can solve transportation challenges?
- How can the installation, the local and state government, NGOs and the private sector cooperate to manage transportation issues?

- What organizational changes are necessary to enhance smart growth and transportation planning?
- How can a regional council play a more proactive role in assessing and providing for the transportation solutions and sustainability at installations and communities?

The facilitated discussion groups were conducted as a series of interactive facilitated discussions between the panel with the panel and lab participants. Each discussion group was designed to identify and capture suggestions, challenges and elicit recommendations from the Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia BRAC experience, which could be applied to known or emerging challenges at other installations and communities, for furthering collaborative approaches and the use of effective tools to achieve long term transportation solutions. Each table was given the opportunity to provide input on each discussion area.

Representatives of each group briefed their set of suggestions and recommendations for addressing long-term needs in the spirit of enhancing the local partnership model. These were captured and presented here in this formal after action report. This after action report has been produced for use by other installations/ranges and communities seeking to enhance the application best practices and tools for transportation coordination and sustainability at the local and regional level and to provide insight into how the workshop was planned and executed, the ideas presented and the findings of the participants.

Presentations

The session began with a one hour panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a various case studies and perspectives on the challenges that were identified, best practices from regional and state perspectives and collaborative community and military efforts to address local and regional transportation sustainability. The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for transportation compatibility and sustainability. The panel included representatives from the United States Navy, Fairfax County Virginia, the Northern Virginia Regional Commission, The Commonwealth of Virginia and the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies who have been part of the process of managing transportation challenges and seeking solutions on the local, regional and federal levels.

Appendix A provides a Concept of Operations (CONOPS) document which was utilized by the innovation lab organizers.

The distinguished panel included:

- Mr. Steve Godwin, Director, The Transportation Research Board Studies and Special Programs, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies;
- Ms. Wendy Vachet, Regional Community Plans and Liaison Officer, Transportation, Integrated Planning and Partnerships, United States Navy, NAVFAC, Mid-Atlantic Region;
- Mr. Cord Sterling, Member, Commonwealth of Virginia Transportation Board, Stafford Virginia;
- Ms. Laura Miller, BRAC Coordinator, Fairfax County Department of Transportation, Fairfax Virginia;

- Ms. Peggy Tadej, BRAC Coordinator, Northern Virginia Regional Commission, Fairfax Virginia.

The following is a brief summary of each presentation. Copies of presentations are provided on the Association of Defense Communities website for the 2011 Norfolk Annual Conference and are available for all participants in the Annual Conference to download free of charge.

1. **“Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases”**, Mr. Steve Godwin, Director, The Transportation Research Board Studies and Special Programs, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies;

In his presentation Mr. Godwin, summarized the findings and recommendations of a 2011 Transportation Research Board (TRB) report: *Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases*. The study that produced the report was requested by Congress as a result of significant off-base transportation impacts resulting from the BRAC 2005 round. The report recommends changes in DoD funding for off-base transportation impacts of base growth in metropolitan areas and improvements in base-community communication about and planning for off-base infrastructure. Although focused on BRAC 2005, the findings and recommendations also apply to base growth more generally. TRB is a unit of the National Academies, a private-non-profit organization chartered by Congress to advise the government on matters of science and technology.

2. **“Regional Transportation Planning in Hampton Roads: An Alternative Approach,”** Ms. Wendy Vachet, Regional Community Plans and Liaison Officer, Transportation, Integrated Planning and Partnerships, United States Navy NAVFAC, Mid-Atlantic Region;

In her presentation Ms. Vachet described the difficulties and pitfalls of planning in reverse and the need to get in front of issues. She provided a regional community planning and liaison perspective and described the efforts of the United States Navy in becoming an active participant in regional transportation planning. Ms. Vachet described how Defense Access Roads Program is ineffectual and only comes in after the transportation damage has been done. She presented how the transportation planning process must result "in plans and programs that consider all modes of transportation and support metropolitan community development and social goals before growth decisions are made, yet often regional transportation planning and military facilities planning have jagged seams and do not fit together well. This planning must lead to the development and operation of an integrated, intermodal transportation system that facilitates the efficient, economic movement of people and goods and be data driven. Ms. Vachet also presented the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO), a body consisting of representatives of the Hampton Roads localities, appropriate state and federal agencies and the Virginia Department of Transportation. She described how HRTPO has produced a long-range plan to ensure an efficient, intermodal transportation system for the future in a unique and powerful construct through relationship building, educational awareness and regional cooperation.

3. **“Will Fort Belvoir BRAC Decisions and Defense Access Road Policy Cripple a Major East Coast Highway?”** Mr. Cord Sterling, Member, Commonwealth Of Virginia Transportation Board, Stafford Virginia

Mr. Sterling, Supervisor of Stafford County Virginia, provided his personal insights into the potential effects of BRAC 2005 on the 95/395/495 corridor in Northern Virginia. Mr. Sterling presented that Virginia did not really grow with BRAC 2005. While some new personnel were brought in from Fort Monmouth, most personnel were shuffled to new locations either on an installation or nearby. The difficulties lie in that these personnel shifted from mass transit transportation infrastructure, such as VRE and Metro, that had been built with the DoD commuters in mind over decades, to new installations or locations with no metro access, no train stops and minimal road infrastructure. He described how the Northern Virginia corridors are already stressed beyond capacity and the movement of people to the Mark Center, an Army facility being completed along 395, will cripple that corridor and the irony is that all of these people are moving from mass transit served locations. Mr. Sterling presented that the BRAC Transportation cost to the Commonwealth of Virginia is \$800 million to mitigate. Virginia provided \$400 million, while the Defense Access Roads Program contributed only \$60 million. Virginia was forced to utilize ARRA funds to close the gap. In Mr. Sterling's view, this highlights how the DAR program is outdated, funding is inadequate, the process has a lack of local government input and once funding is received length to design and construct projects is too long. In addition, Mr. Sterling also presented how the eligibility criteria are not functional due to the DAR formula and how the multiple stakeholders themselves are too divided in their interests. In his eyes, true success requires involving all stakeholders in a cooperative process early on, especially municipalities and local governmental agencies and keeping the lines of communication open throughout the planning process before decisions are made. Transportation must be an integral part of the BRAC decision making process, in order to be prepared for any future BRAC or growth.

4. **“Regional Transportation Planning in Fairfax County,”** Ms. Laura Miller, BRAC Coordinator, Fairfax County Department of Transportation, Fairfax Virginia

Ms. Miller provided an overview of the efforts and successes in planning for the massive BRAC growth in and around Fairfax County, most notably Fort Belvoir. She described how over 84,000 Department of Defense personnel will work within and along a 30 mile corridor in Northern Virginia. She explained how traffic is congested and at a standstill in various locations and transportation arteries in Northern Virginia and how the BRAC decisions made in a vacuum from transportation planning will clearly exacerbate the problem. Every day, she explained, thousands of commuters sit in their cars along Fairfax County's roads and highways idling in traffic. Ms. Miller explained that cooperation is in our mutual interests and that localities often feel they do not have a voice at the table when movement decisions, which impact the local community and transportation grid, are decided upon. She detailed the costs that Fairfax County has and is incurring to deal with BRAC transportation effects and detailed specific activities that were either currently underway or achieved which benefited both the Army at Fort Belvoir and the County. Lastly, Ms. Miller presented how Fairfax County, home to Fort Belvoir, is continuing to foster a cooperative relationship with their military neighbors to complete BRAC, plan for incoming off post support development, ongoing discretionary incremental growth and routine planning and integration efforts between Fairfax County and the Department of Defense. As a closing statement, Ms. Miller recommended that installations step up to provide management and oversight of transportation and transit planning, help to ensure coordination of TMP by tenant organizations and agencies and conduct transportation, transit and master planning in partnership with existing service providers.

5. **“Regional Solutions to Meet Challenges,”** Ms. Peggy Tadej, Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC), Fairfax Virginia

Ms. Tadej presented a Northern Virginia Regional perspective on the solutions necessary to meet regional transportation sustainability. Ms. Tadej discussed the recommendations from the NVRC BRAC Committee, of elected officials, private sector, academic representatives, that was formed to identify gaps in the planning process and develop plans to mitigate those gaps. She presented some key points that must be kept in the equation when dealing with transportation issues on a regional level, such as the need for Transportation Demand Management Strategies, regional education and outreach; and regional strategic planning for evaluation and monitoring. Ms. Tadej stressed that cities and localities are built and maintained by a host of agents: families, industrial firms, city bureaus, developers, investors, regulatory and subsidizing agencies, utility companies, and the like. The purposed infrastructure needs will take 3-5 years to construct for the short-term needs to mitigate the BRAC impacts, thus smart strategic planning before decisions are unilaterally made will allow time to prepare for transportation needs. The NVRC has been taking a comprehensive view, and has determined that cooperative joint planning between the military and the community can lead to efforts such as a new mode of transportation such as a commuter passenger ferry service viable along the Potomac that would provide the benefit of reducing the drive time from the Town of Indian Head, Maryland to Fort Belvoir, Marine Corps Base Quantico, Navy Yard, and Bollinger Air Force Base. The commuter ferry would provide the rest of the region as more enjoyable ride to work and serve a tourism and emergency evacuation need as well. Further, Ms. Tadej explained how cooperative efforts can bring about advances towards Dynamic Rideshare and other technologically advanced commuting methods that could help form car and van pools quickly. Lastly, Ms. Tadej explained how a regional coordinated assessment was necessary for Northern Virginia and a strong strategy developed for post-September 15, 2011, led by strong community and military leadership, elected officials, garrison commands and tenants.

Breakout Session Area Outcomes

As stated above, the breakout session was conducted as a series of interactive facilitated discussions with installation, local and regional government representatives, and other stakeholders designed to elicit recommendations for furthering collaborative approaches and the use of effective tools to achieve long term transportation solutions and sustainability. This session was intended to allow each participant the chance to input concerns and ideas in a selection of discussion areas at three different tables. After tasking of the group by Moderator, Carolyn Hayward-Williams, each facilitator was given a topic of discussion based upon input from the innovation lab’s panelist. The facilitated discussions were designed to capture suggestions, challenges and recommendations from their experiences with BRAC 2005 and transportation issues arising from this experience. Each topic area was provided 30 minutes of discussion, upon which time the facilitators moved to a new table. Thus each table was afforded the opportunity to discuss each topic. The Facilitators and facilitator assistants took notes and provided brief comments on the nature and content of discussions at their tables at the end of the innovation lab. See Appendix B for the verbal report notes.

1. Facilitators from Booz Allen Hamilton:

- Potential Legislative Changes and Existing Useful Authorities: John Crossen
- Funding Possibilities – John Corradetti
- Lessons Learned and Solutions for Future BRAC and Non-BRAC Installation Growth: Marta Dunn

Key Recommendation and Concepts from the Facilitated Discussions

Below are summaries of key outcomes and recommendations from the facilitated discussion period. The main areas of overlap identified were: Early Planning, Coordinated Efforts, Outreach and inter-governmental communication and Partnering. Raw working note from the facilitators are attached in Appendix C.

Potential Legislative Changes and Existing Authorities

The purpose of this topic area was to discuss how to create long-term collaboration and partnering opportunities to achieve regional transportation sustainability goals. The topic area produced a number of ideas and recommendations to improve communication and partnership among regional stakeholders. These ideas include creating a common regional transportation vision, developing a permanent transportation partnership and developing a strategy to support collaboration efforts.

Some of the key recommendation that were put forward included:

- The Defense Access Roads Program must change the calculations method for funding;
- Relationships between local, county, state and federal partners must be built at the staff working level as well as the senior leadership;
- Interagency understandings/agreements and strategic plans must be developed;
- Installations must start reaching out to local communities to develop cooperative transportation plans;
- Understand the local political environment and identify the low hanging fruit to assist everyone in taking baby steps focusing on common goals;
- Create liaisons between the military and local government organizations;
- Include local communities in installation master planning efforts

Defense Access Roads Program

A common thread of discussion among all three groups was change in the Defense Access Roads Program. While falling short of stating that the program was irreconcilably broken, all three groups did voice criticism of the criteria for funding, the mechanisms for actually getting to the criteria point and the bureaucracy. Many voiced opinions that control of DAR should be taken out of the hands of the DoD military services and placed in the control of the DoD Office of Economic Adjustment.

The DAR program looks at the percentage of traffic increase that a military decision places on a particular artery. If the percentage is greater than 50% funding will be provided for mitigation efforts along that corridor. In some instances, a rural road that carries 50 cars a day, near a military installation, doubles its traffic to 100 cars a day due to a military installation's action, would meet the criteria for funding. Interstate 395 in Northern Virginia, which could possibly see a 6000 car per commute increase due to the BRAC 133 action, an increase that would completely overwhelm the capacity of that highway, would not

qualify for funding under current DAR criteria because the percentage of increase is low when compared against the overall traffic on that already congested road. This was seen as a vast shortcoming of the DAR program by all participants. It was recommended that legislation efforts should reflect reality not simple criteria; this would allow DoD to fund projects where they have negative impact, not just where percentages dictate. Further, it was recommended that this legislation or legislative change should make transportation impacts due to BRAC decisions a full responsibility of the Federal government, thus forcing the military planners to include transportation impacts in cost/benefit analysis when making BRAC decisions and look at the transportation issues during the BRAC process. By skipping the DAR criteria and creating an Impact Fee, DAR would reflect reality, not criteria. If DoD implements the action, they should pay for it, or identify a funding source.

Regional Commission

Many participants voiced criticism of transportation planning as a whole and expressed frustration over the confused myriad of agencies involved, multiple stakeholders in the process and levels of government red tape and recommended legislative change in the creation of a regional commission which could look at the traffic situation as a geographic area of analysis. For example, DAR provides a legal vehicle by which DoD can indirectly help to pay for improvements to certain public highways. However, the process involves multiple agencies, too many according to participants, starting with the installation commander and ending with the Federal Highway Administration, along with local, county and state government agencies. In addition, most participants felt that the perception exists among localities, that there is not any hard and fast traffic related benchmark, other than the doubling of traffic, which would trigger the initiation of a DAR project and that each project results from the assessment of the on-site commander that road improvements are required. The perception also exists that during the decision making process, little or no efforts are made to gain insight, analysis and traffic planning inputs from the localities and stakeholders that are affected by BRAC. OEA performs transportation analysis but not until after BRAC is complete and DoD looks at moving personnel around, but does not look at the transportation impacts until after the BRAC decision is made, both reactionary. Many participants agreed that a regional commission can change that process. This regional commission can be formed by identifying a Military Influence Area, with a dedicated Commander's Council from regional installations. Next participants recommended that a Military Transportation Task Force, consisting of civilian, military, local, state and federal representatives, be formed to focus upon transportation mitigation efforts, sustainable traffic management and suitable placement of federal facilities in the context of regional planning and transportation demand management. This Task Force or Commission can be utilized to promote mass transit use, infrastructure improvements, regional or multi-state approaches and also to take control of the NEPA process as an objective third party to the BRAC decision.

Office of Economic Adjustment

A third major legislative proposal involved creating a more robust, proactive Office of Economic Adjustment. Many participants recommended that OEA be directed and funded to create liaison offices in each community that has a major military installation, allowing OEA to keep its fingers on the pulse of local transportation issues and all other factors that could affect the installation and the region. Further, many participants recommended that the DAR program be placed under the auspices of OEA and that OEA be given latitude to tie funding to impacts, not just too existing infrastructure. By doing so and by

changing the BRAC law to provide OEA a position at the BRAC decision making table, OEA would provide localities and counties the ability to be proactive, not reactive in the process. By allowing OEA, through DAR, to look at impacts and to calculate these impacts in BRAC decisions, traffic nightmares such as that envisioned on Virginia's 395 could be avoided. OEA could provide a conduit to the military leadership for rational application of DAR monies, local transportation demand management analysis, real time studies and input for decisions and coordinated efforts to incentivize use of mass transit, as opposed to the use of single passenger cars. It was highly believed that OEA could provide continuity which was a large concern echoed by each group and was a tie in to the regional commission, in the form of a process and forum that can live on after the commander and politicians move on. Transportation sustainability success will require leadership followed by planning and action. This particular initiative recognizes the need to integrate or establish responsibility and accountability across the board in order to meet objectives and targets. While some initiatives will be led and implemented by a single entity, most will require a cross-functional, cross-organizational structure, and cooperative action and oversight, to be achieved. Often successes are built upon personality; Commanders average two years and each new commander brings a different attitude, a different background, new concerns and even different values. This is mirrored on the local government side as well as the community. OEA, as a local presence and a member of the regional commission or task force can provide the continuity necessary after the military leader and the politicians are gone. The key is to provide a mechanism whereby long term transportation solutions can be developed over the long term regardless of constant changing of government and military leadership, can ensure that there is an entity such as OEA that offers stability through the constant turnover and can communicate with incoming installation and community leadership before their arrival to ensure that they are aware of the top transportation issues and the top priorities on the base and in the surrounding community.

Communications

Throughout the entire time period of the innovation lab, communication was stressed as a key foundation to transportation success. Many participants offered that effective communications and cooperation between local leaders and military base commanders are the keys to building good community-military relations. Communication is a two way street and that the key is for military leaders to work with localities and regions to establish good lines of communications, to collaborate on available resources to assist cities undergoing transition as a result of military actions and to build a relationship with the City, County and Regional Transportation Planners that all need to be informed about the mission. Each side must understand the expectations, all stakeholders need to understand that transportation issues are multi-faceted and they must communicate with one another to effectively address the problem. These relationships can take place in the recommended regional commission or can begin with informal meetings, such as monthly meetings sharing information, analyses and planning efforts. These relationships can also assist the military leaders to understand the local community issues, concerns and beliefs.

Funding Possibilities

The purpose of this topic area was to discuss what funding measures can be implemented to mitigate the problems for state and local jurisdictions where transportation issues are attributable to the rapid pace of traffic growth on heavily used facilities, particularly those in urbanized areas that have limited options for

expansion. Participants agreed that the lengthy process for projects to be evaluated for environmental impact and included in state and regional transportation plans, as well as the intense competition among state and local projects for available federal and state aid for capacity enhancements, coupled with the general shortage of available state and local funds, makes dealing with these transportation issues a local nightmare.

Participants almost unanimously agreed that as a result of BRAC consolidation, many communities will be facing dramatic traffic problems and that DoD should accept more financial responsibility for problems it is causing on the transportation facilities serving the military installations in the same way that developers are assessed impact fees for the costs that they would impose upon transportation grids. Participants believed that the DAR program should be revised to pay for the military's share of road improvements and that a separate DoD program should be established to fund the mass transit services necessary to meet military needs. These changes will require increased funding and segregation of these funds within the MILCON budget. In addition, participants believed that DoD's DAR criteria are simply unrealistic for developed urban and suburban area and that DoD should be forced to expand its responsibilities for off-base transportation facilities. Once again as voiced in the legislative possibilities discussion group, the participants voiced criticism of the DAR criteria, for which the most important in metropolitan areas is the doubling of traffic, which is impossible on facilities that are already congested. Participants expressed frustration that DAR is the only real mechanism to get DoD funding for roads improvements and yet inadequate in its availability to assist in funding transportation infrastructure in already congested and built-up areas.

Increased funding and segregation of base operating and maintenance accounts, as well as monetary incentives for base commanders to prioritize and implement transportation management measures, will be needed. Participants recommended that the Defense Department fully evaluate congestion issues and explore mass transit opportunities as it responds to installation growth and relocation challenges. DoD should provide base commanders resources to expand military base master plans to include necessary infrastructure off the base, fund strategies to shift modes, change time of travel, and encourage telecommuting work and carpools. These mitigations, while modest in appearance, have substantial benefit.

Participants also believed that many of the affected communities lack the funding and time to complete major projects before BRAC growth occurs and believed that the Department of Defense timeline is unrealistic. Many recommended lengthening of the BRAC completion timeline. The normal length of time for development of highway and transit projects—from required planning and environmental processes all the way through construction—is, at best, 9 years and usually 15 to 20 years. The BRAC completion timeline is 6 years. Participants stated that in many cases, the facilities affected by base growth are part of a larger and already dense network where the bottlenecks caused by increased military-related traffic may occur miles from where the base is located. From a funding perspective this is an almost impossible deadline to achieve true transportation mitigations. The military's responsibility, to fund transportation improvements, should be based on a detailed analysis of how expanded base traffic affects delay and the cost of improving facilities to accommodate traffic growth attributed to the military and the realistic timeline to execute those mitigations should be incorporated into the BRAC decision making process and completion schedules.

At the same time, many participants agreed that communities that benefit economically from the presence of military bases should pay their share of needed transportation improvements, relying on normal transportation resources. Some metropolitan areas may need to shift priorities in their capital plans accordingly and installations and local authorities should greatly improve communication and coordination concerning base demands on the infrastructure of their surrounding communities. Once again it was recommended that this should be accomplished by expanding services provided by DoD's Office of Economic Adjustment and that federal surface transportation-planning regulations should be revised to require MPOs to include base officials in their decision-making processes. It was highly recommended that OEA's presence could provide better coordination on these issues and stronger partnerships with the surrounding communities and work with DoD to improve outdated regulations. As a liaison, OEA can examine cases of congestion caused on metropolitan road and transit facilities when BRAC requirements cause shifts in personnel to occur faster than facilities can be improved through the usual state and local processes and assess the adequacy of current federal surface transportation and DoD programs that fund highway and transit improvements in BRAC cases to mitigate transportation impacts in urban areas. OEA can also assist in identifying promising approaches for funding road and transit improvements and streamlining transportation project approvals in BRAC cases.

Lessons Learned

Participants in the lessons learned discussions echoed the sentiments of the first two discussion groups on communications, lack of local transportation management analysis. Communication, they said, is essential to assist the local community understand why the Department of Defense is executing this move and creating the transportation issues in their community. Communication is also vital to educate the community on what DoD is doing to mitigate the issues. One suggested tool would be to have base leadership join community leaders in sessions "downtown" to communicate with the city council, mayor, state senators and other local government officials why the moves are important and what can be done to assist in transportation issues and to incorporate the installation into the local communities master planning. This communication with the local government can create a forum whereby the importance of the mission and the presence of the military are communicated to others by local community leaders, not just the military. This recommendation echoed the recommendation to create a regional commission or task force and could be used to give validity to the military statements and to convey local transportation concerns. In a cooperative forum all stakeholders can identify the low hanging fruit, mutual interests and needs and take baby steps focusing on common ground and achievable results.

Many participants believed that transportation infrastructure was not considered in the BRAC decision making process. To many it appeared that BRAC was decided in a vacuum and that even NEPA was given little regard before the decisions were made. Many recommended that both military and civilian leadership at all levels need to be a part of the entire BRAC process to ensure a smooth transition with minimal negative impact. As with communication, they stressed building relationships at the staff working level as well as the senior leadership and developing interagency understandings/agreements on how decisions would affect the transportation network. At the same time, they believed that dissemination of information is a two way street and that being part of the BRAC decision making process will allow

localities to bring their expertise to the table and their information of how local transportation networks will be affected.

Participants also echoed the recommendation of continuity and liaisons both within the military and local government organizations. It was observed that installation commanders rotate within 3 years and also that civilian professionals within the organizations tended to move on to new positions. AS with any long term project, these personnel changes will occur, but BRAC, to the participants, was something that needed continuity among the installation BRAC team at the least. This continuity could be provided through the regional commission, through a BRAC Task Force or through the immediate designation of a civilian division on post to serve as the BRAC office, so that the “not on my watch” or “I’ll let the next guy handle it” does not occur. Institutional knowledge can be carried forward. Another criticism was the view that in addition to the lack of continuity there was a lack of standard approach to how BRAC was implemented across the services. Many stressed that BRAC isn’t new to the military or civilian communities. However the process varies greatly from region to region and branch to branch. Service branches and civil authorities need to collaborate to standardize and align the BRAC process, establish a repository of tools such as communications best practices, checklists, timelines, committees etc. to assist future installations and regions navigate the BRAC roadmap.

- Communication
 - Keep structures in place
 - Don’t stop when problem is solved
 - Provide communities and counties the forum to express challenges to the BRAC Commissions
 - Create joint military and community planning
- Proactive
 - Today’s problems started 10-15 yrs ago
 - Develop indicators / metrics to ID problems early
- Organize communication structures before problems arise and execute in a cooperative fashion.

Appendix A:

BRAC Transportation Planning and Sustainability Lab Concept of Operations

PART 1 CASE STUDY (65 minutes)

- A) Introduction to the Lab (5 Minutes):** Moderator, Carolyn Hayward-Williams, will introduce the lab session, explain the concept and the time structure and introduce each panelist.
- B) Panelist Case Study/Presentation Session (60 Minutes)**
- Mr Steve Godwin will set the stage for the ensuing panel discussing by providing a review of the TRB transportation study. Approx 15-30 min
 - The focus of the remaining panelist presentation session would be for each of the panelists to introduce their subject matter and seed the discussion period to follow at the break out session to follow the presentations. Each Panelist will each have approximately 8-10 minutes to give a brief 3-8 slide presentation covering:
 - Their organization and its role in the process;
 - Challenges, issues, roadblocks, etc;
 - Accomplishments;
 - Success factors, lessons learned and effective tools for the partnership and process; and
 - Key recommendation for future success
 - Order of Presentation based upon input from and discussion with panelists:
 - Mr. Steve Godwin, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Presentation on the TRB Study
 - Mr. Tom Fahrney, Commonwealth of Virginia BRAC Coordinator, Virginia Department of Transportation, Commonwealth Perspective
 - Ms. Laura Miller, Fairfax County BRAC Coordinator, County Perspective
 - Ms. Wendy Vachet, Regional Community Plans and Liaison Officer, US Navy Mid-Atlantic Region, Regional Service Perspective
 - Ms. Peggy Tadej, Northern Virginia Regional Commission BRAC Coordinator, State Regional Perspective

BREAK (10 minutes)

PART 2 Facilitated Discussion Break Out Session (95 minutes)

Facilitators: John Corradetti, John Crossen, Marta Dunn:

Based upon discussion on the Tuesday 7/5/2011 and Wednesday 7/6/2011 conference calls with panelists, there will be 3 tables based upon participation of 30 people @ 10 people per table. In the event the lab session is attended by additional people, the tables will be adjusted accordingly. At the 3 table configuration, we will have 30 minutes of discussion time per table/facilitator. At the end of each half hour period the

FACILITATOR WILL ROTATE AND PARTICIPANTS WILL STAY AT THEIR TABLE.

D) Tasking the Group: 5 minutes: Moderator, Carolyn Hayward-Williams, will explain the concept of Facilitated Discussion Break-Out Session and introduce the table facilitators. Each facilitator will have a focus topic to begin the discussion. The facilitated discussions are designed to capture suggestions, challenges and recommendations from the BRAC experience, which could be applied to enhance future transportation planning and sustainability for future BRAC actions, non-BRAC installation growth and/or current transportation challenges in and around installations and communities.

Based upon panelist input, focus topics can be: (Questions and Topics are draft and completely open to discussion or revision.)

- Potential Legislative Changes and/or Existing Authorities:
 - How do we make transportation a legislative priority?
 - What existing funding and planning authorities can enhance transportation implementation?
 - How can current state governments play a more active role?
 - How can current local city and county governments be leveraged to play a more active role in encouraging transportation planning and smart growth?
 - Does the notion of a new “umbrella” agency or organization, including local entities, make sense?
- Funding Possibilities:
 - How can long-range programs for implementing transportation solution and plans, including estimates of costs, dedicated funding streams and other relevant funding measures enhance transportation and traffic planning measures?
 - How can installations and the Defense Access Roads Program play a more active long term role in funding transportation solutions?
 - How can funding be used to direct growth to where infrastructure capacity is available or committed to be available for future growth?
- Lessons Learned and Solutions for Future BRAC or Non-BRAC Installation Growth:
 - What mitigation tools are available to support growth and development patterns around installations that can solve transportation challenges?
 - How can the installation, the local and state government, NGOs and the private sector cooperate to manage transportation issues?
 - What organizational changes are necessary to enhance smart growth and transportation planning?
 - How can a regional council play a more proactive role in assessing and providing for the transportation solutions and sustainability at installations and communities?

E) Discussion the Issues: 90 minutes

Audience will self-select which table/focus areas they want to address first.

- Facilitators will lead discussions based on focus topics and scribes will capture discussion, key points and recommendations or challenges.
- Discussion at each table will last 30 minutes.
- Facilitators will rotate to the next table at the end of the 30 minute session.

F) Report Out/Follow On: 20 minutes

- Following another 10 minute break, Facilitators will give a one page bullet report on discussions, recommendations and challenges arrived at during the facilitated discussion groups. Groups will see their comments projected upon the screen and will have opportunity to comment
- Moderator, Carolyn Hayward-Williams, will describe the after action report that will be submitted to all jurisdictions/stakeholders and the outline for this report.
- Panelists and audience participants will be given a final opportunity to discuss what appropriate follow on actions should be and their thoughts on the report out results.

Appendix B:

Unedited Facilitator Notes

Potential Legislative Possibilities, Funding Possibilities and Lessons Learned

Defense Access Road criteria: metropolitan areas cannot apply for the program because the “doubling traffic” criteria cannot apply to them- traffic is already at max capacity. There should be an ‘impact fee’ approach for private developers, as well as DoD

- Non-discriminatory;
 - Return level of service to “before” condition;
 - Geographic area of analysis is commute shed (like Watershed)
 - Get last 2...
-
- DAR program should be fenced within MILCON
 - New DoD capital and operating program should be created for transit capital and operating expenses.
 - Base commanders need flexibility to retain savings in O&M and other accounts for base access issues
 - If DoD making improvements and a region is being economically benefited, they should contribute to the project as well.
 - Transportation demand management important and useful
 - Minor capital improvements (more buses; turning lanes, etc.. flex working hours, shuttles...
 - BRAC Committee needs to pay more attention to impacts outside the fence line
 - Bases need to cooperate with MPOs, MPOs and DoT need to cooperate with MPOs
 - Role of OEA should be expanded to provide BRAC support for cooperation and collaboration

Fairfax County: Fort Belvoir Main Post, North Area, Mark Center- 84,000 DoD employees driving through Fairfax County. The funding is just not there for the required projects in Fairfax County- 2Billion needed, \$40Million available. Fairfax County Schedule: Way behind BRAC, i.e.- Mark Center move happening in 2011, off-ramp from 395 complete in 2016.

Installations have many tenants- each tenant has their own transportation issues and plans. The county is now working with the military to coordinate plans for bus routes- from Springfield to Main Post of Fort Belvoir, project is funded and planned. The route is expected to be running in September 2011. Had the right people at the table- made it happen.

- Lack of standardized criteria in DAR process
- Lack of standardized metrics for bringing mass transit to DoD
- MPO’s do consistency checks with military planning- i.e. compare Encroachment Action Plan to match localities Comprehensive Plan Review. MPO reform at at least the state level would be helpful. And vice-versa. Smart Growth, is a very technical planning term, that doesn’t meet installation needs- caution support for Smart Growth. MPO reform needs to acknowledge that

Transportation Demand Schedules are different around military bases.- it's not a peak hour, it's a peak period.

- Access to federal stimulus money- Require 70% design to qualify for stimulus dollars? Lower the threshold for design to be able to get access to construction dollars.
- Congress will be involved in another initiative- should look at federal dollars to support transportation initiatives, also factor in time. Some support would be better than none.
- How about a state-wide military planning scenario? Identify Military Influence Areas. Set up Commanders' Councils. Build a Military Task Force- that is constructed of civilian and military, and keep transportation as a key topic.
- Look at E.O. (sustainability order) Sustainable Siting of Federal Facilities, in the context of regional planning and transportation planning- I64/I95- set that up as Military Influence Area.
- There is a need for a consolidated State view of the military. Need for regionalism- Must look at multi-state decision processes. Boston to Richmond has national impacts.
- Tie funding to impact- not to existing infrastructure. Find ways to incentivize use of transit on the installation. 'Dis-incentivize' using cars. Find legislation to force use of 'mass transit' to base, and on base.
- Change legislation to give installations a dedicated source of funding for mass transit.
- Fix access to federal stimulus dollars. Current criteria and process was ridiculous.
- Legislation is needed that pairs true traffic planning to impact.
- Legislation to force people out of cars.

Incentivize Regionalism

WHO CONTROLS THE MONEY??? State? Should there be a Regional Partnership for Infrastructure and Transportation? Like SERPPAS and WRP?

Oklahoma City: success story with Tinker. Closed GM Plant –the local community put together a bond to buy the plant and lease it to the AF for \$1/year. With state contributions- to ensure Tinker stayed open. A powerful move to comprehensively support a base staying open. Investigate as a case study. Using MILCON money to address traffic concerns.

LRAs are going to be the future model for base communities. Looking at Enhanced Use Lease instruments. Can't afford to keep up with installation maintenance costs- Military Community Partnerships coming into play.

Need facilitative legislation to support Military-Community Partnership to run/maintain a DoD facility. Don't wait for BRAC. The leases need to be written so they can't sneak in "extra tenants". Who bears the cost burdens.

Watch out for QDR, not necessarily BRAC.

Fort Riley is looking into a shuttle system to hit the surrounding communities and bring soldiers on base. There is the need for a DoD shuttle, and a University based shuttle- trying to work together.

What is the best use of transportation dollars? Make it easier for cars? Or make it harder for cars? Summary of group discussion on Legislative issues- the first BIG question to ask for legislative impact:

- ***What is the best use of transportation dollars? Make it easier for cars? Or make it harder for cars? What is the State-Wide view of infrastructure around Military facilities?***
- ***Enact legislation to support and empower REGIONAL BODIES to drive these decisions- removing the potential for local and political interests to divide incentives- the planning and decisions must be regional.***
- ***DAR requires standardization and simplification for early-planning purposes. Perhaps put DAR under the jurisdiction of OEA. The DAR criteria is not effective, correct, or applicable to serve the purpose DAR is designed for.***
- ***Legislatively drive MPO reform to require consistency between Military planning processes and community Comprehensive Plans.***
- ***Enact legislation that pairs true traffic planning to economic and infrastructure impacts, not current infrastructure status- and then fund that BRAC impact appropriately.***

Topic/Issue: Infrastructure not considered in BRAC.

- Observation: During the BRAC process infrastructure was not a consideration.
 - Discussion: As listed above it appeared Infrastructure and NEPA were not a major factor in the BRAC process. Little regard seemed to be given to local civic impact.
 - Recommendation: All parties both military and civilian at all levels need to be a part in the entire BRAC process to ensure a smooth transition with minimal negative impact.

Topic/issue: Lack of continuity among NEPA members.

- Observation: The BRAC process takes approximately 5-7 years and in some cases longer from cradle to grave. Installation Commanders usual tour is 3 years.
 - Discussion: Installation Commanders main focus is on day to day installation operations and mission accomplishment. Issues such as BRAC fall down in the priority list if it doesn't occur on "my watch" or in this case "my tour".
 - Recommendation: Most if not all Installation Commanding Officers (ICO) have an Executive Director's (ED) on staff. The ED is a civil service employee and does not rotate as do ICO. Recommend ED's be assigned as NEPA members to ensure long term continuity in the BRAC process.

Topic/issue: Lack of integrated process and planning in the NEPA process.

- Observation: No process or deliberate planning in the NEPA process.
 - Discussion: During BRAC 2005, the successful BRAC processes were those that applied a synergistic mission sustainability focused approach looking at all areas and not concentrated inside the installation fence line.

- Recommendation: NEPA, MPO and EDA's should all be key stakeholders in the BRAC planning process throughout. Open and honest communications both from and to the military is necessary for a truly successful BRAC. Public outreach is a major factor as well.

Topic/issue: Open and honest communication.

- Observation: Open and honest communication with community partners and the general public pays huge dividends.
 - Discussion: Prior BRAC closures have shown us that joint planning with regional authorities is a best practice. Working with civil and strategic partners to develop economic development strategies and impact statements before, not after the process and by using an active public affairs approach throughout the realignment process helps foster solidarity and cohesive relationships with communities impacted.
 - Recommendation: Make communications one of the highest priority elements of the plan. Military go out into the community and speak with local agencies and bring the local community onboard installations. Show what will change, what the change means and what it means to the community.

Topic/issue: Lack of standardization across the branches of the military.

- Observation: The BRAC process varies throughout the military service branches.
 - Discussion: BRAC isn't new to the military or civilian communities. However the process varies greatly from region to region and branch to branch.
 - Recommendation: Service branches and civil authorities collaborate to standardize and align the BRAC process. Establish a repository of tools such as communications best practices, checklists, timelines, committees etc. to assist future installations and regions navigate the BRAC roadmap.
- Transportation bottlenecks were never considered
- Councils of Governments (CoGs) need to be engaged earlier in the process
- Ft Riley established a "regional Council" of 11 counties in lieu of a CoG
- DAR needs a more holistic view – need to review and amend criteria
- Ft Knox and Ft Campbell are good examples of joint planning
- More time is needed for the communities/states to express challenges to BRAC Commissions
- Paid parking will reduce traffic
- Make people who use services, pay for them
- Telework will reduce traffic
- Need joint (military and community) planning during major government initiatives – need ongoing planning – don't wait for the crisis
- There should be no Federal funding for any project that is not included in a regional master plan
- Funding process needs to be streamlined
- Incentivize proximity between businesses and their employees
- Multiple jurisdictions complicate the challenges
- Multi-state jurisdiction examples: NY/NJ, Kentucky/Indiana, Illinois/Indiana