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Outline

- Historical perspective on how and why Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) emerged

- Overview of the authority and responsibilities of MPOs/Transportation Planning Agencies (TPA)

- Critical questions in seeking funding for transportation initiatives

- Concluding thoughts on the role of TPA Governing Board and Governing Board Members
How Did We Get Here?

A Historical Roadmap of U.S. Transportation Policy
1940s and 1950s: The Emergence of The Interstate Highways Program

- **1950s concept:**
  - Provide for the national defense
  - Promote commerce and trade
  - Promote economic activity and job creation

- **1956 – 41,000 mile system approved**
  - Highway Trust Fund established
The Interstate Highways Program

- Conflicts arise over Interstate plans
  - Cities were bypassed
  - Communities bulldozed, divided

- Cities (and counties) sought a voice
  - Used existing regional advisory bodies
Transit Enters the Federal Policy Picture

- By the mid-20th century, most of the *privately run* transit services on which the public depended were going bankrupt or shutting down.

- By the early 1960s, many cities took over transit services in order to preserve the transit option.

- Cities turned to the federal government for help.
Emerging Federal Transportation Policy
The Early 1960s

- First federal support for transit comes in the Housing Act of 1961
  - Modest funding for capital
  - Supported metro-level planning

- First mass transportation act – Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964
Emerging Federal Transportation Policy
The Early 1960s

1962 Federal Highway Act

- ‘3 C’ regional planning requirement established
  
  Continuous

  Comprehensive

  Cooperative
Civil Rights and Environmental Protection Reforms

- **Civil Rights Act of 1964**
  - Mandated nondiscriminatory conduct in all federally-supported programs

- **The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969**
  - Mandated consideration of environmental impacts
Growing Tension Over the Urban Interstate

- Different priorities → Conflict

- **Proponents**
  - Efficient movement of goods and people
  - Economic impact of project expenditures
  - Project completion

- **Opponents**
  - Adverse impacts on neighborhoods
  - Loss of valuable land
  - Urban traffic congestion
The Creation of MPOs: The 1973 Highway Act

- Mandated MPOs for urban areas of over 50,000 in population

- Required MPOs to approach transportation planning in a multi-modal manner

- Allocated funds from the Highway Trust Fund for the purpose of funding the planning activities of these MPOs
  - PL funds
ISTEA: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991

- Changed the lines of authority and responsibility for transportation planning
  - Enhanced the role of MPOs
  - Allowed for greater flexibility in the spending of federal dollars
  - Established more stringent guidelines for the MPO planning process

- Generally recognized as a watershed event in transportation policy
FAST Act - 2015
Fixing America’s Surface Transportation

- Five-year reauthorization bill
- Continues performance-based planning and programming
- Program changes
  - National Highway Freight Program
- No earmarks, but…
- Transfers funds from General Fund to Highway Trust Fund
Themes in Federal Transportation Policy in the 20th Century

- An acknowledged tension between local and state perspectives
- An acknowledged need for regional coordination across local jurisdictional boundaries
- A commitment to planning
Framework
Establishment

- Areas with 50,000+ population, must have or be a part of at least one MPO

- Areas 200,000+, are Transportation Management Areas (TMAs)

- MPOs are designated by agreement of governor and local governments
TPA Participants

- Board members
  - Representing counties, municipalities and modal providers

- Committee members
  - Technical Advisory Committee
  - Citizens Advisory Committee
  - Other Committees (i.e. Bicycle/Greenway/Pedestrian Advisory Committee)

- TPA staff

- Public/Stakeholders
MPO governing board membership in TMA areas is to include three groups of individuals:

- Local elected officials
- Officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation
- Appropriate State officials
TPA Board Membership – Florida Law

- 5 to 25 members
- As a rule, voting members must be “elected officials of general-purpose local governments”
- County commissioners must be “not less than one-third of the MPO membership”
- Alternation of municipal representation permitted
- Area modal authorities may have voting membership
- Representatives of FDOT serve as nonvoting advisors
- Other nonvoting advisors may be appointed to the MPO
- MPOs contained entirely within a charter county of over one million population are permitted to develop their own membership structure
Role of the TPA Board

- To set the big-picture framework for transportation decisions
  - Forum for setting a community transportation vision and goals that all transportation agencies can use as guidance

- Make planning and programming decisions
  - Direct authority for TPA plans and programs
  - Discussing and vetting other agency planning and programming decisions

- Manage agency staff
Role of Committee Members

- Provide input for MPO Board members to consider

- Technical Advisory Committee
  - Professional staff from area jurisdictions, modal providers, and other agencies

- Citizens’ Advisory Committee
  - Represent affected areas and interests
  - “Minorities, the elderly, and the handicapped must be adequately represented.”
  - Members serve at pleasure of TPA
Role of the TPA Staff

- Provide information and technical support
- Prepare documents
- Foster interagency coordination
- Facilitate public input and feedback
- Engage consultants as needed
- Manage the planning process
Role of the Public/Stakeholders

- The public provides an overall community perspective on a wide variety of issues

- Stakeholders provide unique insight on specific issues
  - “Stakeholder” – one who has a share or an interest in something
Stakeholders

- Disabled
- Transportation disadvantaged
- Business and industry
- Neighborhoods and homeowners
- Senior citizens
- Schools
- Religious denominations
- Private property advocates
- Environmentalists
- Historic preservation advocates
- Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)
- Adjacent MPO/TPOs
- Regional planning councils
- Local governments
- Intergovernmental coordination and review agencies
- Airports/Seaports
- Transit providers
- Trucking interests
Broad Responsibility – Federal Law

- Manage the ‘3 C’ planning process
  - Continuing
  - Comprehensive
  - Cooperative

- Planning
  - Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
  - Other planning studies

- Programming
  - List of Priority Projects
  - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
Planning Factors – Federal Law

- Economic vitality
- Safety
- Security
- Accessibility & mobility
- Environment
- Connectivity
- Efficiency
- Preservation
- Resiliency
- Tourism
All transportation planning activities and products must take into account:

- Civil Rights
- Environmental impacts and preservation
- Consistency with adopted growth management and economic development plans
Additional Guidance – Florida Law

- Produce plans and programs that “give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions”

- Provide a “forum for cooperative decision-making by officials of the affected governmental entities”
Additional Guidance – Florida Law

- Must fulfill all requirements necessary to receive federal aid funding

- Must abide by state public records and sunshine law

- Must participate “in the planning and programming of transportation facilities, including, but not limited to, airports, intercity and high-speed rail lines, seaports, and intermodal facilities”
Questions
Product Requirements – Florida Law

- Long-range transportation plan (LRTP)
- Transportation improvement program (TIP)
- List of Priority Projects
- Unified planning work program (UPWP)
- All in cooperation with FDOT
LRTP Federal Requirements

- Describes a vision for the region, and policies, operational strategies, and projects to achieve it
- Looks forward at least 20 years
- Considers all transportation modes
- Reflects federal planning factors & public involvement
- Contains a fiscally constrained financial plan
- Expressed in Year of Expenditure dollars
- Performance based
- Updated every 5 years, amended anytime
LRTP Florida Requirements

- Must “give emphasis to” facilities of national, state, and regional significance
  - Strategic Intermodal System (SIS)
- Must reflect the goals of the Florida Transportation Plan (FTP)
- Must be consistent with local comprehensive plans
- Must reflect coordination among MPOs on facilities crossing MPO boundaries
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Staged, multi-year, intermodal program of transportation initiatives
- Reflects public and stakeholder involvement
- Fiscally constrained
- Performance based
- Shows annual activity over a 5-year period and must be updated every year
- Consistent with the LRTP, local comprehensive plans and local modal plans
**Palm Beach MPO Transportation Improvement Program - FY 2018 - 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Length:** 5.695 Mi  
**Lead Agency:** FDOT

**FY 2019**

- 4331095 ADD EXPRESS LANES
- 4124504 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENT
- 4304582 NEW TRL-RAIL STATION
- 20190902 RESURFACING
- 4383991 NEW TROLLEY SERVICE
- 2014500 ADD LANE
- 2013607 BRIDGE REHABILITATION
- 4383991 BRIDGE REHABILITATION

Updated as of 8/18/2017

File: MPO Common > TIP > TIP FY 2018-22 > Draft TIP > Maps

**Total Project Cost:** 114,145,875

© CUTR/USF 2018

MPOAC Institute
List of Priority Projects

- Based on selection criteria
- Contains projects from LRTP, TA, LI & SUNTrail Programs
- Reviewed by Advisory Committees & adopted by TPA Board
- Submitted to FDOT by October 1
- FDOT must consider projects during the development of the Tentative 5-Year Work Program
# List of Priority Projects

- **Major Highway, Transit and Freight Priority projects and funding**
- **Local Initiative projects and funding**
- **Transportation Alternative projects and funding**
- **SUNTrail projects and funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Proj. No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>&lt; FY 18</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
<th>FY 19</th>
<th>FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
<th>Funding Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2296643</td>
<td>SR 7</td>
<td>60th St to Northlake Blvd.</td>
<td>Construct new 4 lane road</td>
<td>$54,493</td>
<td>$49,612</td>
<td>ROW $44</td>
<td>ROW $516</td>
<td>ROW $44</td>
<td>ENV $2,863</td>
<td>ROW $371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2296644</td>
<td>SR 7</td>
<td>Okeeechobee Blvd. to 60th St</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$19,875</td>
<td>$19,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4193452</td>
<td>Southern Blvd / SR 80</td>
<td>L-8 Canal to W of Forest Hill</td>
<td>Widen from 4 to 6 lanes</td>
<td>$52,948</td>
<td>$7,854</td>
<td>CST $43,488</td>
<td>ROW $516</td>
<td>ROW $2,077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4279381</td>
<td>SR 7</td>
<td>Broward Co Line to Glades Rd</td>
<td>Construct buffered bike lanes, shared use pathways, transit shelters and turn lane improvements</td>
<td>$11,701</td>
<td>$11,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2331662</td>
<td>Glades Rd</td>
<td>Various Intersections</td>
<td>Add 3rd N/S left at SR 7, Increase NB off ramp storage at I-95, Convert NB thru to NB/L and SB Thru/Right to Excl. Right at NW 13th/University, Add 2nd NB left at NW 4th</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$8,198</td>
<td>RRU $2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

- Required by Florida law

- Serves 3 functions
  - 2-year budget for the TPA
  - Grant application for federal planning funds
  - Comprehensive document on all transportation planning activities in the area
Strategic Plan

- Mission & Vision
- Goals, Objectives, Measures, and Targets
- Strategic Plan Report Card
Fitting It All Together

- TPA LRTP
- TPA LOPP
- FDOT 5 YEAR W.P.
- LOCAL COMP. PLANS
- LOCAL CIPS
- TPA TIP

3-C Process

Project Monitoring

Must Be Consistent
Must Be Consistent
Questions
It’s All About the Money:

The Dollars and Sense of Transportation Finance
Critical Funding Questions

YOUR PROJECT
- Who are you?
- With whom are you working?
- What are you trying to do?
- Where are you trying to do it?
- Why are you trying to do it?

FUNDING SOURCE
- What is the potential source of funds?
- How much money is available?
- Who has authority over the funds?
- What are the requirements?
Critical Project Questions: Who are you?

- Some funds are available only to
  - MPO/TPAs
  - Transit providers
  - States
  - Ports, seaports, other transportation agencies

- Some funds are available to multiple entities

- Private sources sometimes provide funds as well
Over $20 million annually for Florida

FHWA (PL) and FTA Transit Planning Funds
- TPA = $1.2M FHWA & $680K FTA

These are the primary source of planning funding for most MPO/TPAs.
Local Sources

- Constitutional and Legislative Motor Fuel Taxes
- Local Option Fuel Taxes
- Discretionary Sales Surtax / Infrastructure Surtax
- Local Transportation-related Fees
- General revenue
Critical Project Questions: What are you trying to do?

- Some funds are only for specific types of projects
- Some funds have broader applicability
Federal Programs:
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP)

Off-System Bridge:
- Over $21 million each year for Florida

Recreational Trails:
- Over $2.6 million each year for Florida
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program:

- $515 million annually for Florida
- Projects associated with federal-aid highways
- Most flexible federal funding source
Critical Project Questions: Where are you trying to do it?

- Some funds must be spent on, or so that they directly impact, federal-aid highways.
- Some funds may be spent on other public transportation facilities of regional or national significance.
- Some funds may be spent on intermodal facilities such as hubs and terminals.
- Some funds may be spent on any transportation-related facility (may include private facilities in some cases).
Federal Programs:
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP)

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program:

- $515 million annually for Florida
- Projects associated with federal-aid highways
- Most flexible federal funding source
State Programs:
Strategic Intermodal System

- Facilities that serve a statewide or interregional purpose, including:
  - foster economic development
  - improve mobility
  - increase intermodal connectivity

- Receives at least 50% of new discretionary highway capacity funds by law (75% by policy).

- 100% match for roadways on or connecting to SIS
  - Less for other related facilities
Critical Project Questions:
With whom are you trying to do it?

- Some state programs require collaboration
- Partnering with the state makes some state funds available
- Less of an issue at the federal level
State Programs:
Transportation Regional Incentive Program (TRIP)

- Two or more contiguous MPO/TPO/TPAs;
  - Southeast Florida Transportation Council (SEFTC) – Miami Dade TPO, Broward MPO & Palm Beach TPA

- One or more MPOs and one or more contiguous counties, none of which is a member of an MPO;

- A multi-county regional transportation authority created by or pursuant to law;

- Two or more contiguous counties that are not members of an MPO; or,

- MPOs comprised of three or more counties
Critical Project Questions: Why are you trying to do it?

- The ‘purpose’ of the project is often critical to finding funds.

- Sample purposes:
  - Preserve capacity
  - Enhance safety
  - Increase freight mobility
  - Increase mobility for transportation disadvantaged
Federal Programs:
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

- Over $120 million on average annually for Florida
  - Administered by FDOT Central Office

- Projects that improve highway safety

- Emphasis on data and performance

- Mostly infrastructure-related projects
Federal Programs:  
National Highway Freight Program

- Over $55 million for Florida in FY2016, increasing to $71 million by FY2020

- Projects that improve highway freight transportation

- Highway focus, but up to 10% may be used for rail/port/intermodal projects
Federal Programs:
Transit: State of Good Repair

- Over $2.5 billion annually nationwide

- Maintaining existing transit systems
  - Fixed guideway
  - High intensity motorbus
Critical Fund Questions:
What is the potential source of funds?

- Different government sources have different rules
- Different programs from the same government entity have different rules
- Local funding options, including local option taxes and enterprise funding, have their own requirements
Critical Fund Questions:
What is the potential source of funds?

The Federalization Factor

- Federal dollars bring an extensive array of federal policy obligations

- These typically apply to all phases of the project, and all aspects of project work, whether or not federal dollars are being used on that specific phase or aspect
Critical Fund Questions:
How much is potentially available?

- Funds limited by:
  - Florida’s donor state status
  - Competition between districts in Florida
  - Previous commitments
  - State policy guidance
  - Local pressure for other uses
Critical Fund Questions: Who has authority over the funds?

Federal law generally describes authority over federal transportation dollars in one of two ways:

- ‘cooperation’
  - Working together to achieve certain goals or accomplish certain tasks

- ‘consultation’
  - Taking input from others while working to achieve certain goals or accomplish certain tasks
In general, the Florida DOT has primary authority over state transportation funds—subject to legislative direction.
Critical Funding Questions: What are the match requirements?

- Shares generally report the maximum percentage of a project’s costs that will be covered by the funding source.

- Matches vary depending upon the program, the kind of project, and the purposes for the project.

- Depending on the program, the match can be revenue or in-kind.

- In competitive situations, agencies that require a smaller than maximum share may have a better chance of securing funds.
Questions
TPA Governing Board Member – The Big Picture -

Some Final Thoughts On Influence
Fundamental TPA Governing Board Roles

- To set the overarching framework for transportation decisions in the metropolitan area
- To make planning and programming decisions
- To review other agencies’ planning and programming decisions
- To inform and educate the public about transportation issues (and their larger impact)
Fundamental TPA Impact

- Impact the transportation system
- Impact the economy
- Impact community character

All of these impacts have both a near-term and long-term component
Political Leadership through the TPA Process

- From inspiration to dedication is a long, long journey
  - One must be persistent and patient

- Legal Authority < Political Influence

- Transportation planning is highly interdependent

- Reasons matter
Questions