


EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR'S
REPORT



Budget

Included in the agenda packet

On Track

A decorative graphic consisting of several parallel white lines of varying lengths, slanted upwards from left to right, located in the bottom right corner of the slide.



MPOwerment Roundtable – The White House

MPOwerment Roundtable – The White House



MPOwerment Roundtable The White House



BUSINESS ITEMS AND PRESENTATIONS

The image features a solid blue background. In the upper left quadrant, the text "BUSINESS ITEMS AND PRESENTATIONS" is written in a white, sans-serif font, arranged in two lines. In the bottom right corner, there are several thin, white, parallel lines that extend diagonally from the bottom left towards the top right, creating a sense of motion or a modern design element.

Staff Directors Meeting Format

Policy and Technical Committee Meeting suggestion

Concept – Hold the Staff Director's Meeting one month prior to the Governing Board Meeting

Why?

- Similar to your MPO Technical Committee

- Would allow for more detailed meetings – workshop format

- Allows for suggestions to be vetted and formally presented

- Would double as a Policy and Technical Committee Meeting

FHWA/FTA FINAL PLANNING RULE

Issued - May 27, 2016

Effective Date - June 27, 2016

Compliance by - May 27, 2018

Two new planning factors are:

- Improve the **resiliency and reliability** of the transportation system and **reduce or mitigate stormwater** impacts of surface transportation.
- Enhance **travel and tourism**.
- Separately states "takes into consideration resiliency needs" as a purpose of statewide and metropolitan planning.

FINAL PLANNING RULE – CONTINUED

Performance Measures

States and MPOs **shall** integrate into the transportation planning processes

Directly or by reference

- goals

- objectives

- performance measures and targets

TIPs, Plans and STIPs adopted or amended 2 years after final rule for PM must comply

NPRM – Performance measures

FHWA staff is very generous with their time to be here today.

FHWA staff can only clarify what is in the NPRM.

FHWA cannot answer questions about intent or implementation.

NPRM – Performance measures

Comments are due August 20th

NPRM is 109 pages long

Most requirements are on FDOT

NPRM requires MPO and State coordination

Need to make comments

- We should support FDOT in our comments

NPRM – Performance measures

Key Message: We support the effort of FHWA to implement, in partnership with DOTs and MPOs, System Performance Measures.

Benefits

- Tells a national story
- Identical data across states and regions
- Hopefully demonstrates a need

Cons

- Measures only certain aspects of the total system
- Will not reflect the overall values of society

NPRM – Performance measures


Green House Gases Proposal

Where the Data comes from?

Who is responsible for what?

Target Setting

The How and Who



METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION COORDINATION AND PLANNING AREA REFORM

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

June 27, 2016

(60 Day Public Comment Period)

WHAT:

- ▶ USDOT - “promote more effective regional planning by States and metropolitan planning organizations (MPO)”.
 - ▶ Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundaries must include the entire Urbanized Area (UZA) and contiguous area expected to become urbanized within 20 years
 - ▶ USDOT is attempting to “right-size” metropolitan transportation planning
 - ▶ unify planning products by UZA.
- 

WHAT:

- ▶ These revisions will create requirements to coordinate MPO planning for those that share MPA boundaries.
- ▶ In such MPAs where more than one MPO is designated the unified planning products would be jointly developed by the multiple MPOs.
- ▶ Specifically, MPOs in multi MPAs must jointly prepare the following unified planning products:
 - ▶ **a single** metropolitan transportation plan for the entirety of the MPA,
 - ▶ **a single** transportation improvement program (TIP) for the entirety of the MPA, and
 - ▶ **a jointly established** set of performance targets for the entire urbanized area (MPA).

WHAT:

- ▶ The proposed rules also require:
 - ▶ metropolitan planning agreements to include coordination strategies and dispute resolution procedures between the States and the MPOs and, MPO to MPO for those sharing UZA boundaries.
 - ▶ Planning data to be consistent between States and MPOs.

WHY:

The Secretary of USDOT, FHWA and FTA believe that:

- ▶ Since the 2007 planning rules, the language of the regulation has been interpreted to support the possibility of multiple MPOs within an urbanized area rather than within an MPA and **has fostered confusion** about the statutory requirements **and resulted in less efficient planning** outcomes.
- ▶ This proposed rule is designed to correct the problems and return to the structure embodied in the rule before the 2007 amendments and envisioned in statute.

HOW:

The proposed revisions are intended to clarify:


- ▶ That the MPA must include the entire urbanized area and contiguous area expected to become urbanized within 20 years.
- ▶ The statutory requirements for the MPA to include an urbanized area in its entirety,
- ▶ The exception provisions to allow more than one MPO to serve a single MPA if warranted by the size and complexity of the MPA.

HOW:


The proposed revisions are intended to clarify:


- ▶ Establishes operating procedures, and **reinstate certain coordination and decision-making requirements for situations where there is more than one MPO serving an MPA.**
- ▶ To ensure that planning products reflect the regional needs of the entire urbanized area there are requirements for unified planning products for the MPA. These include:
 - ▶ **jointly established** performance targets within an MPA,
 - ▶ **a single** metropolitan transportation plan and
 - ▶ **a single** Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the entire MPA in order

WHEN:

- ▶ Implementation of these proposed coordination requirements and the proposed requirements for MPA boundary and MPO boundaries agreements will be phased in over 2 years.
 - ▶ Comments on the proposed rules must be received on or before August 26, 2016.
- 

REGIONAL EXAMPLES OF SINGLE UZAS WITH MULTIPLE MPOS





Miami Urbanized Area

Palm Beach MPO

MPO 2010 Population 1,318,571
(21 voting members)


Broward MPO

MPO 2010 Population 1,748,724
(25 voting members)

Miami-Dade MPO

MPO 2010 Population 2,492,108
(23 voting members)

Chicago Urbanized Area




Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (MPO Policy Committee)

MPO 2010 Population
8,453,793
(19 voting members)

Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission

MPO 2010 Population
771,648
(53 voting members)



Philadelphia Urbanized Area

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission

MPO 2010 Population 5,626,318
(18 voting members)

Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee


MPO 2010 Population 519,430
(22 voting members)

Wilmington Area Planning Council

MPO 2010 Population 639,457
(9 voting members)

South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization

MPO 2010 Population 594,419
(11 voting)



New York City Urbanized Area

NYMTC - New York Metropolitan Transportation Council

MPO 2010

Population 12,367,508
(9 voting members)

NJTPA - North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority

MPO 2010

Population 6,579,801
(15 voting members)

Boston Urbanized Area

Rockingham Planning Commission

MPO 2010 Population 191,906
(58 voting members)

Merrimack Valley MPO

MPO 2010 Population 333,357
(10 voting members)

Northern Middlesex MPO

MPO 2010 Population 286,951
(7 voting members)

Montachusett MPO

MPO 2010 Population 236,482
(10 voting members)

Boston Region MPO

MPO 2010 Population 3,159,512
(22 voting members)

Old Colony MPO


MPO 2010 Population 288,628
(8 voting members)

Central Massachusetts MPO

MPO 2010 Population 556,910
(10 voting members)

Southeastern Massachusetts MPO

MPO 2010 Population 616,689
(12 voting members)



Graphic Source: FHWA HEPGIS

NPRM – MPO COORDINATION

Multiple MPOs in one UZA must merge or.....

May remain separate if:

- All affected MPOs in UZA agree and

- The Governor agrees

Separate MPOs must produce

- A joint TIP

- A joint LRTP

NPRM – MPO COORDINATION

See the map

Future Census defined UZAs

A decorative graphic consisting of several parallel white lines of varying thicknesses, slanted diagonally from the bottom-left towards the top-right, located in the lower right quadrant of the slide.