



# TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH SYNTHESIS

Minnesota Department of Transportation  
Office of Policy Analysis, Research & Innovation  
Research Services Section  
(651) 366-3780  
[www.research.dot.state.mn.us](http://www.research.dot.state.mn.us)

TRS 1103  
Published September 2011

## Small MPO Funding

*The purpose of this TRS is to serve as a synthesis of pertinent completed research to be used for further study and evaluation by MnDOT. This TRS does not represent the conclusions of either the University of Minnesota or MnDOT.*

### **Abstract**

Federal law requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have a long-range financial plan for transportation investments in their area. Federal law also requires these plans be coordinated with State Departments of Transportation (DOTs). How this is done varies substantially from state to state.

This report looks at how state DOTs and regional-level MPOs coordinate funding estimates for long-range plans. It looks at whether state DOTs are directive about the funding estimates used by MPOs in their long-term plans and if so, how they do this. It also looks at how MPOs accommodate uncertainty in their funding estimates. This study also looks at how MPOs select projects and how state DOTs interact in these processes.

### **Introduction**

Since the early 1970's, federal law has required that state and local governments designate a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for regions with urbanized populations over 50,000 to help plan surface transportation infrastructure. Metropolitan areas have different interests and concerns than states, and this structure provides balance in the development of transportation plans.

Federal law (23 USC §134) mandates a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process between state and local governments that results in plans consistent with the projected development of an urbanized area. (See Appendix 1) In practical terms, this means that all MPOs must produce four documents: a long-range (minimum 20-year) transportation plan, a short-range (4-year) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), annual statements of planning priorities and activities (Unified Planning Work Program or UPWP); and a public involvement. Of these, the long-range planning is the least defined in how it must be developed. There must be coordination between the state DOT and the MPOs in the development of the long-range plans and TIPs, but exactly how this is done is left up to each state. Practices vary widely.

Also, the size of MPOs varies broadly. A recent survey by the GAO found there are currently 381 MPOs nationwide, with 43 representing areas of one million residents or more, 139 representing areas between 200,000 and one million, and 199 representing areas of between 50,000 and 200,000. This survey found that smaller MPOs (those representing regions with populations from 50,000 to 200,000) have unique challenges. Smaller MPOs had an average of two full-time staff and one part-time staff. This means that technical expertise and time to invest in projects may be limited due to the available staffing. On the other hand, the number of highway projects may be limited and the number of transit and multi-modal projects very

limited. Many smaller MPOs cited struggling to produce the four mandated MPO activities because of a lack of staff and resources. Also because smaller MPOs are in smaller regions, they may struggle to attract experienced, trained staff. Increasing federal requirements without expansions of small staff size and capacities exacerbate these problems. Data to support transportation planning is often difficult to obtain, a problem exacerbated in smaller regions. Smaller MPOs are often housed with other units of government due to their size. This can often limit the perception of their authority. For states, it can also be a challenge in coordinating among various MPOs to develop a coherent state-wide approach without limiting local autonomy. MPOs have local authority to make decisions about transportation planning but those local decisions may not jibe with other region's decisions, creating inconsistent policy across a state. This issue is exacerbated by the large and growing number of MPOs. For example, Texas has 25 MPOs to coordinate among. (Government Accountability Office, September 2009) <sup>1</sup>.

This study focuses on the relationship between MPOs and the state DOTs in how long-range plans are created. One critical question is how revenues are estimated. The numbers of projects that can be included in a plan are directly linked to the amount of revenues that are available. How states and MPOs determine what revenue amounts should be included in plans is one focus of this study.

A second question is how do DOTs and MPOs deal with uncertainty in their long-range plans? Federal law requires MPO plans be constrained to funds that can be reliably projected to be available in the future. But in reality, funding levels go up and down. It is one thing to cut projects from a constrained plan but another to scramble for possible projects should new funding emerge.

This project looks at how often MPOs develop multiple funding scenarios and thus multiple project lists or develop one funding scenario and one constrained plan with a second list of projects should available revenues increase.

The third question is how do smaller MPOs develop their long-range plans? What is their selection process for projects? Is it purely a local decision or is there interaction between the State and the MPO?

The goal of this research is to help Mn/DOT understand the state of the practice in how smaller MPOs project funding, choose projects, and prepare required constrained financial plans.

## **Study Method**

In May 2011, a survey was done of 208 MPOs with 2000 populations under 250,000. There were no small MPOs to survey in Hawaii or New Jersey, and Alaska was excluded due to the unique nature of its highway system. There were 47 respondents. The median population of MPOs that responded was 117,004 (2000 population) and the median size of the MPO was 330 square miles.

Four survey questions were asked:

- Does your state DOT tell you what revenue estimates to use in your long-range plan or do you come up with your own revenue estimates? And if they tell you what revenue estimates to use, do they tell you for all of your funds or just some of them?
- Do you develop one constrained plan or a constrained plan and an “unconstrained” or “sort of constrained” plan? If you develop only a constrained plan, do you include elsewhere other projects that could be funded should additional money become available? If not, what do you do when new money becomes available?
- Do you provide multiple forecasts with multiple sets of projects or just one revenue forecast?
- How do you pick which projects will get funded? Do you have a solicitation process to gather potential projects? Do you have a ranking or scoring process? Do your elected officials solely select projects or does staff or an advisory board develop a recommendation for your elected officials?

The respondents included MPOs from 31 states. Some MPOs represented more than one state. These states included: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

Responders included:

---

<sup>1</sup> Government Accountability Office. (September, 2009) Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Options Exist to Enhance Transportation Planning Capacity and Federal Oversight. Government Accountability Office.

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>
Auburn - Opelika MPO	Opelika	AL
Tuscaloosa Area MPO	Tuscaloosa	AL
Southeastern Connecticut COG (SCCOG)	Norwich	CT
Dover / Kent County MPO (D/KC MPO)	Camden	DE
Okaloosa-Walton Transportation Planning Organization (OWTPO)	Pensacola	FL
Indian River County MPO (IRCMPO)	Vero Beach	FL
Madison Athens-Clarke Oconee Regional Transportation Study (MACORTS)	Athens	GA
Coastal Region MPO	Savannah	GA
Hinesville Area MPO (HAMPO)	Hinesville	GA
Warner Robins Area Transportation Study (WRATS)	Warner Robins	GA
Ames Area MPO (AAMPO)	Ames	IA
East Central Intergovernmental Association (ECIA)	Dubuque	IA, IL, WI
Bannock Transportation Planning Organization (BPTO)	Pocatello	ID
Springfield Area Transportation Study (SATS)	Springfield	IL
West Central Indiana Economic Development District, Inc. (WCIEDD)	Terre Haute	IN
Radcliff-Elizabethtown MPO	Elizabethtown	KY
Ashland Area MPO	Grayson	KY
Cape Cod MPO	Barnstable	MA
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission (SWMPC)	Benton Harbor	MI
Region 2 Planning Commission (R2PC)	Jackson	MI
Saginaw Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (SMATS)	Saginaw	MI
Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)	Columbia	MO
High Point Urban Area MPO (HPMPO)	High Point	NC
Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC)	Nashua	NH
Santa Fe MPO (SFMPO)	Santa Fe	NM
Farmington MPO	Farmington	NM
Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)	Carson City	NV
Tahoe MPO (TMPO)	Stateline	NV, CA
Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council (ITCTC)	Ithaca	NY
Licking County Area Transportation Study (LCATS)	Newark	OH
Williamsport Area Transportation Study (WATS)	Williamsport	PA
Blair County Planning Commission	Altoona	PA
Rock Hill-Fort Mill Area Transportation Study (RFATS)	Rock Hill	SC
Grand-Strand Area Transportation Study (GSTAT)	Georgetown	SC
Spartanburg Area Transportation Study (SPATS)	Spartanburg	SC
South Eastern COG (SECOG)	Sioux Falls	SD
Johnson City Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO)	Johnson City	TN
Jackson Urban Area MPO	Jackson	TN
Texarkana MPO	Texarkana	TX, AR
Dixie MPO (DMPO)	St. George	UT
Cache MPO (CMPO)	Logan	UT
Tri-Cities Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (Tri-MATS)	Richland	WA
Sheboygan MPO	Green Bay	WI
Fond du Lac Area MPO	Menasha	WI
State Line Area Transportation Study (SLATS)	Beloit	WI, IL
La Crosse Area Planning Committee (LAPC)	La Crosse	WI, MN
KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission (KYOVA)	Huntington	WV, OH
Cheyenne MPO (ChATPP)	Cheyenne	WY

In specific instances, the long-range plans of these MPOs were examined to provide additional details on how plans are developed. In addition, follow-up contacts were made to clarify information as needed.

## **Study Results**

### **Who determines how much money to program in MPO long-range plans?**

The number of transportation projects that can be included in a plan is directly dependent upon how much money is available to program. One question of this study is who determines how much money will be programmed in an MPOs long-range plan? The survey found primarily three answers: the MPO, the DOT or a collaboration among MPOs and DOTs.

- **The MPO:** In some states, like North Carolina, Illinois, Kentucky Georgia, Michigan, Oregon, Illinois, Iowa, Tennessee and Washington, revenue estimating is left up to the MPO. The State does not provide projections. There are a number of variations on this idea however.
  - **MPO creates revenue estimates but DOT reviews:** One variation is that in some states such as Georgia, the MPO selects a revenue projection methodology but it is reviewed and approved by the DOT.
  - **State provides historical revenue data and/or inflation estimates but MPOs create estimates:** A second variation is that the DOT provides the data for the MPO to develop revenue estimates. In North Carolina, Iowa, Georgia and Michigan, the DOT provides historical revenues and/ or inflation estimates for the MPOs to base their revenue projections on. MPOs are free to use other figures if they choose.
- **The State:** In some states, such as Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Delaware, Connecticut, Florida, New York, Missouri, Alabama, South Carolina, Pennsylvania and New Hampshire, the DOT provides state and federal revenue estimates. In some states, the DOT provides local revenue estimates also; in other states, the MPOs estimate local revenues. To some degree, this appears to be dependent on the complexity of local revenues.

There are variations on this idea however.

- **DOT provides a range of estimates for MPOs:** In New Mexico, the DOT provides a range of estimates for MPOs. MPOs are then free to select from various estimates. Often-times the MPO will select the mid-range estimate but this is not required.
- **Department of Revenue:** One variation comes when the amount of money available is based on a single state-wide revenue source. In Wyoming, state transportation funding comes from a state sales tax. Revenues are disbursed based on a population-based formula. Because of this, revenue estimates for state funding come from the Department of Revenue and not the DOT. South Dakota handles its state funds similarly.
- **Collaborative Estimating:** In some states such as Utah and Idaho, the state and federal funding assumptions are determined through a collaborative effort by the MPOs and DOT. All of the state's MPOs meet with the DOT and they jointly derive revenue assumptions. The result is that all the MPOs use the same revenue assumptions in their long-range plans.
  - **Collaborative revenue estimating tool:** Texas has 25 MPOs, one of the largest state totals in the country. Because of this, they have developed a program called "TRENDS" which forecasts revenues for all available funds. MPOs are not required to use these exact estimates but can adjust them for local issues or other revenue sources. A description of the TRENDS system is in Appendix 2, along with a link to the system itself. Idaho is developing a similar system.

### **If the DOT is directive about how much funding to program, how do they do this?**

For DOTs that direct how much money MPOs should program in their long-range plans, there are basically three options for doing so.

- **Provide specific dollar amounts by funding source:** Some DOTs provide specific dollar amounts to MPOs to program. These are usually specific by funding source. Examples include: Delaware, Mississippi and Pennsylvania.
- **Provide inflation estimates and historical information but allow MPOs to calculate the exact figures:** In some states like Georgia, the DOT provides the components for doing estimates (inflation factors, historical funding

trends and current funding levels) but does not actually do the estimates. MPOs are not bound by these figures but can make adjustments to their estimates based on local factors.

- **Develop a revenue-projection model that is agreed upon by all parties:** Texas has a revenue-estimating model that was created jointly between the DOT and the MPOs. This allows the DOT to direct what revenue estimates should be without providing exact revenue figures to MPOs. Idaho is creating a similar model.

### How is revenue estimated?

Some DOTs are laissez-faire about revenue estimates used in MPO long-range plans. Other states specify how much money MPOs can include in their planning. For those that are directive about funding levels in plans, they have two questions to answer: how much revenue to forecast and how to divide those revenues across the MPOs. So how do DOTs estimate how much revenue to forecast?

There are a number of ways that future revenues are estimated.

- **Pivot off current revenues plus an inflation factor:** One way that many MPOs reported estimating future revenues is by simply taking current revenues and inflating those figures with a reasonable inflation factor. This is a traditional and well-tested approach to estimating revenues. Examples include MPOs in Georgia, North Carolina and Wisconsin, although many other MPOs use this approach. In many states, the inflation factor is provided by the State. Several MPOs noted that although not particularly sophisticated, this approach to estimating revenues has proved remarkably accurate over a number of years.
- **Forecast Model for Single Revenue Sources:** Adjusting today's revenues by an inflation factor, although effective and transparent, it is not a very sophisticated way of estimating. A more sophisticated approach takes into account other factors such as larger economic trends, longer-range demographic trends, potential changes in revenue sources, etc. These forecasts typically involve hiring a national revenue-forecasting firm who has a sophisticated economic forecast model. Similar models are used in other states, especially for more volatile revenue sources like sales taxes, vehicle sales or motor fuel sales. For example, South Dakota uses a model similar to Minnesota's for its transportation sales tax. Massachusetts uses this approach for its dedicated sales tax revenues. Many other states use similar approaches for state-wide revenues.
- **Projection Models:** The State of Texas has developed a sophisticated projection model that considers a wide range of funding sources and allows complex scenarios to be developed. It has over 70 inputs which can be changed depending on the desired projection. The model does not just include revenue changes but also allows forecasting of population changes, fuel costs and other drivers of transportation needs. Population changes, for example, both affect revenues as well as the demands on the highway system. A link to this system is here: [Texas TRENDS System](#). Appendix 2 provides a summary of this system.

### How is revenue allocated to MPOs?

If DOTs create revenue estimates, how do they divvy up the money? One widely used solution is to distribute funding using a formula. Wyoming, for example, distributes a portion of its 4 cents sales tax to MPOs based on population. South Dakota uses a population-based formula to allocate its state-wide transportation sales tax funds. South Carolina, in its Guideshare program, also uses population in determining federal funding allocations. The Guideshare program does differentiate among MPOs however. Selection of projects is left to the MPO for MPOs with populations over 200,000. For populations under 200,000, the State selects projects in consultation with the MPO. New Hampshire uses a formula based on population and lane miles to allocate federal and state funds.

Another solution is for the jurisdictions to each separately choose which projects to fund. In the case of Missouri, each jurisdiction (MoDOT, the County, and the City) handles its own solicitation process for its own funding. The MPO ultimately includes the projects from each solicitation in its plan but it does not prioritize or choose projects separately from these processes.

A third approach is to conduct a state-wide prioritization process for federal and state-funded projects. Wisconsin, for example, has a state-wide prioritization process which is used to for projects funded with . This process weighs projects across the state regardless of which MPO they are in. Similarly, West Virginia uses a state-wide prioritization process. It differs from the Wisconsin process in that it is a two-step process: first, a qualitative approach is used to screen projects and then a quantitative evaluation is done. The two sets of criteria are included in Appendix 3. Other states use a similar approach.

A fourth approach is for each MPO to get what it got before, adjusted for inflation. In New York State, revenues are allocated to MPOs by taking previous allocations and adjusting them for inflation. MPOs are then free to prioritize within these spending guidelines.

### **How do MPOs deal with financial uncertainty in their planning?**

One thing is certain about long-range planning: the future will be different from what we think today. There are two ways that MPOs deal with financial uncertainty. One way is to develop multiple funding scenarios. The second is to develop both a constrained plan (as required by federal law) and a list of additional projects should more funding become available.

Of the MPOs surveyed, every one reported having both a “constrained” list of projects and a second list of projects that would be considered should funding become available. This list is most often called an “illustrative” list but goes under many names.

There were some variations on this theme however. Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council (ITCTC) reported that their long-range plan is more of a policy document than a project-based plan. They establish a broad expenditure plan but do not specify specific dollar amounts for specific projects. They make it clear that they will stay within funding constraints but do not specifically match projects to funding.

Grand-Strand Area Transportation Study (GSATS) has one plan with three tiers: projects assumed to be entirely MPO funded in a constrained plan per federal requirements are Tier 1. Projects assumed to have other funding are Tier 2. Privately funded projects are considered to be Tier 3. Projects can move from Tier 2 or Tier 3 to Tier 1 should funding become available.

Licking County Area Transportation Study (LCATS) develops a constrained list of projects for traditional funding and a list of projects paid for from non-traditional funding. Some examples of non-traditional funding are vehicle miles traveled fees, tolling, congestion fees, tax on vehicle sales, etc. Projects can move from non-traditional funding to the traditional plan should funding become available. Similarly, Okaloosa-Walton Transportation Planning Organization (OWTPO) develops an “alternative revenue alternative” with tolls, additional gas tax and sales tax. If additional money becomes available through these alternative revenue sources or if there are increases in existing revenue sources, a project moves from one list to another.

Dixie MPO uses aggressive funding assumptions deliberately and just cancels projects if assumed revenue increases do not become available.

Two MPOs reported using multiple funding scenarios in the development of their plans, although no MPO reported presenting multiple funding scenarios as part of their final plan. Okaloosa-Walton Transportation Planning Organization (OWTPO) reported developing three cost feasible plan scenarios but ultimately a combination of all three scenarios (the hybrid alternative) is brought forward for adoption. Indian River County MPO (IRCMPO) also reported creating multiple scenarios based on differing land use and revenue, but ultimately adopting a single plan.

### **How do smaller MPOs allocate funds to projects?**

Every MPO, regardless of its size, has to create a long-range transportation plan. Typically this is a two-step process: choosing projects to include for consideration and then ranking projects to create a final constrained plan.

There are several considerations however. Because of their size, smaller MPOs have fewer projects to consider than larger MPOs. Because of this, the process is often less complex than processes in larger regions. In addition, because smaller MPOs generally have small transit needs and little in the way of multi-modal issues, their processes are often more streamline than larger MPOs.

Also, transportation funding has been decreasing, both in real terms and in the number of projects that can be accommodated. Because of this, increasingly the focus is shifting away from system expansion projects and focusing more on maintenance projects. This has reshaped the debate in some communities because the solicitation process is much less about which part of a community should get enhanced transportation resources and much more a mechanical analysis of pavement condition and bridge condition. One survey respondent noted that in Pennsylvania, only 3% of funding goes to new projects as 97% of funding goes to maintenance and preservation. Other MPOs responded similarly. Madison Athens-Clarke Oconee Regional Transportation Study (MACORTS) noted that they had to cut out about two-thirds of their projects in the “pipeline” from their previous long-range plan due to revenue reductions. Any increase in funding would go to restore projects that had been cut rather than truly new projects. The Blair County Planning Commission noted that they simply didn’t have capacity for any expansion projects in the foreseeable future as all their funding was going to maintenance. Because of this, they did not have to prioritize new projects.

### **Choosing projects for consideration**

MPOs report three ways of determining which projects to include for consideration in their long-range plan. First, a number of MPOs report using their previous plans as the foundation for the current plan. Madison Athens-Clarke Oconee Regional Transportation Study (MACORTS) for example, noted that due to financial constraints that their existing constrained plus “illustrative” projects substantially exceed any available funding. They simply review projects already on existing lists. This is becoming more common as funding levels decline and project costs increase.

Other MPOs conduct a solicitation for projects. Rock Hill-Fort Mill Area Transportation Study (RFATS), Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC), Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC), Grand-Strand Area Transportation Study (GSATS) and others conduct a solicitation process where different jurisdictions submit projects for consideration. The MPOs then rank the projects and select which projects will be included in their constrained plan.

Some MPOs are small enough that staff develops a list of potential projects based on travel demand modeling, pavement condition indices and other data. Okaloosa-Walton Transportation Planning Organization (OWTPO), East Central Intergovernmental Association (ECIA) and Hinesville Area MPO (HAMPO) are examples of this approach.

There are also a number of MPOs who limit the projects that they consider. For example, for the Tri-Cities Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (Tri-MATS) in Washington, the selection of projects is left to each jurisdiction based on their priorities, not the MPO. The MPO then assembles these various projects and their prioritization and approves them. Similarly, Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO) in Missouri does not prioritize or choose projects that are done by the individual member jurisdictions, in this case MoDOT, the County, and the City. It does include those projects in its long-range plan (as they are prioritized by those jurisdictions) but does not solicit or prioritize those projects itself.

For small MPOs, multimodal projects and transit projects play a very small part of their process. This is because small MPOs are located in small regions and small regions typically have small transit systems and few multi-modal issues. Typically funding that these systems receive is dedicated and has few programming issues.

### **Choosing projects to include in the Constrained Plan**

There are three ways that MPOs report developing a recommended list of projects for approval by their policy board. One way of doing a prioritization of projects is through the use of data. Dover/Kent County MPO (D/KC MPO), Spartanburg Area Transportation Study (SPATS) and Cache MPO (CMPO) reported relying primarily on its travel demand model to prioritize projects. Williamsport Area Transportation Study (WATS) expands on this, using additional data such as the bridge condition index and pavement condition index to rank projects. Blair County Planning Commission uses the pavement condition index to rank maintenance projects.

Other MPOs have staff rank projects using a set of criteria. Jackson Urban Area MPO has a staff committee rank projects based on a set of pre-determined criteria. The High Point Urban Area MPO (HPMPO) has a similar process. This works effectively for small MPOs with few projects.

Some MPOs also have committees which include persons from outside the MPO to do the initial ranking of projects. The Sheboygan MPO, the KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission (KYOVA), Madison Athens-Clarke Oconee Regional Transportation Study (MACORTS), Cheyenne MPO (ChATPP) and the Dixie MPO report handling ranking in this manner. DOT staff serves on these committees and take active roles in helping to select projects to recommend to policy-makers.

In New Hampshire, the DOT, in conjunction with the MPOs, prepares a 20 year plan and a three year plan. But the planning document that most of the decision-making is focused around is a ten-year plan controlled by the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), a state-wide board. The MPOs submit projects to the CAC but it is the CAC that decides which projects will be funded from state and federal funds. The CAC then makes its prioritizations, which it passes to the MPOs to include in their long-range plans.

Most MPOs are allowed to create their own ranking system for projects if they are going to use a ranking system. In South Carolina, however, all of the MPOs are required to use the same state-mandated ranking system for projects in cost-constrained plan.

In Connecticut, different funds are handled differently. For the Surface Transportation Program–Urban (STP-U), the MPO makes the initial selection but this becomes subject to a verification process by ConnDOT. CMAQ projects were once the exclusive prerogative of ConnDOT but that is changing as a portion of these funds will now be distributed on a formula basis to MPOs. Likewise, MPOs will control 50% of Enhancement projects with ConnDOT controlling the other 50%.

For most MPOs, a final list of projects is approved by the MPO governing board as part of adoption of the long-range plan. In Kentucky, MPOs solicit projects and rank them. This ranking is forwarded to the Highway District Office where they rank all of the projects that have been provided to them or have been submitted through the DOT. These projects are then forwarded to the DOT Secretary/Central Office who ranks projects. This list is then sent to the State Legislature for approval or revisions. Projects can be included in the MPO plan once the list is approved by the State Legislature.

## **Conclusion**

Federal law requires that areas with urbanized populations of more than 50,000 have MPOs to ensure a regional perspective in the allocation of federal transportation money. How this is done, however, varies substantially around the country. Decisions about who determines how much money to program in MPO long-range plans, how funding estimates are made, how revenue is allocated to MPOs and how MPOs carry out their prioritization processes are different from state to state, and often also from MPO to MPO within a state. Some states are very directive in what MPOs do. Other states are very laissez-faire, allowing MPOs great autonomy. It appears to some degree, that as the number of MPOs grows, states become more directive. But this does not hold consistently, as Connecticut is, in some ways, more directive than Texas. In the end, however, all these processes do result in the creation of MPO long-range transportation plans, the ultimate goal of these processes.

## **Appendix 1: Federal Requirements for Long-range Planning**

450.322 Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.

- (a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by the FHWA and the FTA. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.
- (b) The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.
- (c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every four years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas and at least every five years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. The transportation plan (and any revisions) shall be approved by the MPO and submitted for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.
- (d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP).
- (e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data utilized in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.
- (f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:
- (1) The projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;
  - (2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan. In addition, the locally preferred alternative selected from an Alternatives Analysis under the FTA's Capital Investment Grant program (49 U.S.C. 5309 and 49 CFR part 611) needs to be adopted as part of the metropolitan transportation plan as a condition for funding under 49 U.S.C. 5309;
  - (3) Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;
  - (4) Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide;
  - (5) Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system;
  - (6) Design concept and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities in sufficient detail, regardless of funding source, in nonattainment and maintenance areas for conformity determinations under the

EPA's transportation conformity rule (40 CFR part 93). In all areas (regardless of air quality designation), all proposed improvements shall be described in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;

(7) A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The discussion shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation;

(8) Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g);

(9) Transportation and transit enhancement activities, as appropriate; and

(10) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.

- (i) For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).
- (ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO, public transportation operator( s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under § 450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.
- (iii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified.
- (iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Starting December 11, 2007, revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect "year of expenditure dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator( s).
- (v) For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (i.e., beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/ cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.
- (vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.
- (vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may (but is not required to) include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.
- (viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (i.e., by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.

(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:

- (1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or
- (2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.

(h) The metropolitan transportation plan should include a safety element that incorporates or summarizes the priorities, goals, countermeasures, or projects for the MPA contained in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan required under 23 U.S.C. 148, as well as (as appropriate) emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security (as appropriate) and safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

(i) The MPO shall provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under § 450.316(a).

(j) The metropolitan transportation plan shall be published or otherwise made readily available by the MPO for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.

(k) A State or MPO shall not be required to select any project from the illustrative list of additional projects included in the financial plan under paragraph (f)(10) of this section. (l) In nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, the MPO, as well as the FHWA and the FTA, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended transportation plan in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93). During a conformity lapse, MPOs can prepare an interim metropolitan transportation plan as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim metropolitan transportation plan consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93. An interim metropolitan transportation plan containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section.

## **Appendix 2: Texas TRENDS Revenue Forecasting Model**

Texas is unique in two respects. First, it has the largest number of MPOs with 25. Second, it has developed a sophisticated revenue forecasting tool to support this large number of MPOs.

T.R.E.N.D.S. as a web-based tool to provide transportation planners, policy makers, and the public with a tool to forecast revenues and expenses for TxDOT for the period 2010 through 2035 based on a user-defined level of transportation investment. The user, through interactive windows, can control over 70 variables related to assumptions regarding statewide transportation needs, population growth rates, fuel efficiency, federal reimbursement rates, inflation rates, taxes, fees, and other elements. The output is a set of tables and graphs showing a forecast of revenues, expenditures, and fund balances for each year of the analysis period based on the user-defined assumptions.

In addition, a set of sub-models were developed for the 25 metropolitan planning areas in the State. With these sub-models, the user can forecast revenues from local option fuel taxes, vehicle miles traveled fees, and registration fees for the period 2010 through 2035 under alternative assumptions of fuel efficiency and population growth. While MPOs and other local entities do not currently have local option authority for the adoption of these fees, there is considerable discussion of the Texas Legislature allowing them to have such authority in the near future. With the model's local option capability, these entities will have the ability to assess how legislative changes might affect revenue availability and consequently their transportation plans.

This tool is also available for modeling the impacts of legislative proposals. Advocacy groups and citizens can also use this tool to better understand the issues facing transportation funding.

The link to this system is here: <http://trends-tti.tamu.edu/>.

### **Appendix 3: West Virginia Qualitative and Quantitative Project Evaluation Process**

West Virginia uses a two-step process to evaluate projects. First projects are evaluated from a qualitative perspective, then they are evaluated from a quantitative perspective.

Qualitative factors:

Screen for Purpose and Need — In general, the purpose and need to make a project eligible for prioritization should include a general justification that the project:

- Addresses a transportation problem – for example, it improves safety, congestion, mobility, accessibility, or modal connectivity
- Addresses a goal or need of a local government, regional or state government agency, or it is mentioned in a planning document adopted by a government agency – for example, it supports economic development, opens areas for development as part of a water and sewer development project, provides access to tourism or recreation site, etc.)
- Promotes advanced technology or operational improvements
- Screen for Independence — Each project proposed for prioritization should be able to advance as a stand-alone project and meet the purpose and need test described above. Projects such as a —bridge to nowhere! or an arbitrary construction or widening of a roadway segment to four lanes without reason or connectivity to other similar segments should not be advanced. Basically this screening test means that the project, if advanced, could stand alone to achieve its purpose or need and is not dependent on another project advancing.
- Screen for Duplication — All projects being advanced should be screened to verify they are not simply another approach or version of a separate eligible project. This screening process is not intended to select which of the two or more duplicate projects propose the best approach. That evaluation should be done as part of the planning and environmental, and preliminary design process. It is recommended that duplicate projects be combined and advanced as a single project.
- Screen for Project Sponsor — In most cases, the source for projects brought before the WVDOT or the Department of Highways are supported or sponsored by a local or regional government agency or State of West Virginia department. It is recommended that support for each project be confirmed or verified prior to it being eligible to advance.

Quantitative Measures

A cost-benefit is done for each project. A spreadsheet has been created to do these calculations, which includes:

- Existing & Proposed Facility Type (i.e. Freeway/Non-Freeway)
- Existing & Proposed Number of Lanes
- Existing & Proposed Length
- Existing & Proposed Speeds
- Existing & Proposed Traffic Volumes
- Existing & Proposed Accident Rates
- Existing & Proposed percent Trucks
- Existing & Proposed Capacity
- Estimated O Estimated Capital Cost
- Estimated Value of Earmarks or Local/Private Funding
- Estimated Number of Jobs Created
- Estimated Value of —Other! Benefits
- Opening Year

**Appendix 4: Survey Responses**

Name	State	City	Population	Does the State DOT Tell You What to Budget for Revenues?	Do you develop one constrained plan or a constrained plan and an “unconstrained” or “sort of constrained” plan?	Do you provide multiple forecasts with multiple sets of projects or just one revenue forecast?	How do you pick which projects will get funded?
Tuscaloosa Area MPO	AL	Tuscaloosa	74,281	The Alabama DOT provides the revenue estimates for all funding categories	The Tuscaloosa Area MPO develops one constrained plan and includes a list of unconstrained projects in an appendix of the plan. The unconstrained project list is titled the Visionary Plan.	The Tuscaloosa Area MPO uses the one revenue forecast developed by the Alabama DOT with one set of projects.	The Policy Committee of the Tuscaloosa Area MPO selects the projects for the plan based on recommendations from the MPOs three advisory committees (bicycle and pedestrian, citizens, and technical).
Auburn - Opelika MPO	AL	Opelika	164,875	Yes, ALDoT provides annual allocation estimates. Only STP funds allocated to the MPO.	Our constrained plan also includes a few ‘aspirational’ projects.	One revenue forecast.	Projects are weighted and evaluated based on need, magnitude, and capability of sponsoring gov’t, location, classification and safety. Scoring process is internal to TAC. TAC develops recommended list of projects for MPO to consider.
Southeastern Connecticut COG (SCCOG)	CT	Norwich	242,754	Yes. It's a gross estimate. There is no breakdown by program	We develop a constrained plan and an unconstrained plan. In fact, our highest priorities are all what we call "unfunded."	Just one. (see answer to question #1).	Hmmm. This is more complicated than the way the question was posed. The reason is that in 2009-2010, Connecticut discovered that it was overcommitted and did a serious re-evaluation of its commitments. This resulted in many projects in the pipeline being dropped. The point being that ConnDot is both a partner in the selection

							process with the MPOs as well as an independent selection body on its own. For STP-U, the MPO makes the initial selection but this becomes subject to a verification process by ConnDot. CMAQ projects were once the exclusive prerogative of ConnDOT but that is now changing. Likewise, MPOs will control 50% of Enhancement projects with ConnDOT controlling the other 50%. Staff's role is to point out need and to conduct an initial screening of solicited projects. These are then given to an Executive Committee, acting as a Transportation Committee, and finally forwarded to the full Council of Governments (MPO) for final action
Camden MPO	DE	Camden	130,561	State DOT tells us what estimates to use for all of the funding.	We develop one constrained plan with discussion of other unfunded needs.	There is just 1 revenue forecast.	The added capacity projects are based on the TransCAD Model which shows problem areas. Over time, the cost of widening projects and declining local dollars have turned several added capacity projects into reconstructions, most with center turn lanes. So our program of projects and available funding does not leave a lot of room for additional projects. The local officials/engineering

							departments do propose their projects but there has to be planning support from the model and LRP. We have committees that finalize project selections after a public input process.
Indian River County MPO (IRCMPO)	FL	Vero Beach	110,635	The state supplies most revenue sources. We supply local estimates (e.g. LOGT, Impact fees, etc.).	A Constrained (Cost Feasible) and an Unconstrained (Needs) Plan.	We develop multiple scenarios based on land use and revenue, but ultimately we adopt a single plan.	Staff develops a recommendation. The recommendation is based on a formula which assesses points for different criteria such as congestion, emergency evacuation, and connectivity. Most of the criteria are weighted to present and future congestion, which results from testing multiple scenarios through our travel demand forecasting model.
Okaloosa-Walton Transportation Planning Organization (OWTPO)	FL	Pensacola	189,714	Yes the Florida Department of Transportation provides the revenue estimates to us for Capacity Projects, Enhancement Funds, Transportation Regional Incentive Program, and New Transit Starts.	We developed a constrained plan which is required. The Bay County TPO's also developed an Alternative Revenue alternatives with tolls and additional gas tax and sales tax. If additional money becomes available we usually wait until the next update unless the project that is funded with the additional money does not affect the existing projects such as the Department of Defense money that can fund projects that benefit the military but are on the state highway system.	We use one revenue forecast, but we develop three cost feasible plan scenarios and ultimately a combination of all three scenarios, or hybrid alternative, is brought forward for adoption by the TPO Board.	TPO staff develops a recommended priority list based upon existing priorities and an Evaluation Criteria matrix that was developed during the Long Range Transportation Plan update. This recommended priority list is first presented at a workshop with our advisory committees, then presented for review to the TPO and Advisory Committees at each of their meetings, then approval to the TPO Board with advisory

							committee recommendation as their next meetings. However, the TPO Board can move the priority projects around as they see fit. Depending upon the TPO, a super majority vote is required in some cases.
Coastal Region MPO	GA	Savannah	232,048	DOT provides estimate of historical state and federal expenditures. MPO develops forecasts for federal, state and local funds.	MPO first identifies needed projects for horizon year, then prepares cost estimates and prioritizes projects to form the constrained plan. Remaining projects are placed in the vision plan (unconstrained).	One forecast, unless a project were to provide partial funding such as a toll or other user fee.	MPO conducts annual prioritization process as part of the TIP development based on previously established principles. Mostly this reaffirms previously pipelined projects until complete, and enhances consistency of priorities from year to year. Ranking process with measurements is used for non-pipelined projects. Have not had to solicit projects.
Hinesville Area MPO (HAMPO)	GA	Hinesville	66,446	GDOT provides estimates for their revenues, we develop an estimate of any local revenues to be used to implement the long-range plan.	We develop an unconstrained or “needs plan” then constrain the list to meet expected funding.	We use one revenue forecast. The estimated project costs are inflated to an anticipated “Year of Expenditure” using bands of time (example 2020 – 2025) not a precise year.	We have staff rank and then recommend the projects included in the constrained plan by priority and expected year (band or range of years) for implementation to our Policy Board which includes elected officials from our MPO governments.

<p>Madison Athens-Clarke Oconee Regional Transportation Study (MACORTS)</p>	<p>GA</p>	<p>Athens</p>	<p>130,866</p>	<p>GDOT provides a couple of estimates to us during the development of the LRTP. Usually, one is based on our historic project funding levels and one is based on a projection of statewide project funding levels using the most recent year and multiplying it by some inflation factor that seems reasonable. We are welcome to develop our own numbers if we don't like either of those as long as we can document our rationale and method of arriving at that number. They also provide us with a required maintenance figure for the state and federal routes for the period of our LRTP. We have to develop the local funding side of the house.</p>	<p>2) I had to snicker at the last question on this one - about new money becoming available. That would be a lovely problem to have indeed. Seriously, until this last update, we developed one constrained plan. During this last update, since we had to cut out about 2/3 of our projects from the previous plan for it to remain fiscally constrained, we decided to create an 'Unfunded' section of the LRTP. Projects in that section technically are not in the LRTP; therefore, for any of them to be funded, we have to amend the LRTP to bring it into the funded section</p>	<p>3) We produce only one financial forecast. With such and small staff (1.5) and small MPO, more than one wouldn't gain us anything.</p>	<p>To pick projects for the LRTP, we start with the previous version of the LRTP. We create a subcommittee of our Technical Coordinating Committee that sifts through the projects and decides which ones are still valid projects. They also bring in other projects that their counties want. Once we get a list of potential projects together then we present our financial projection and tell the subcommittee what the magic number is that we cannot exceed to remain fiscally constrained. From there, the subcommittee develops a proposed list of projects that is taken to the full Technical Coordinating Committee. They then recommend a list to the Policy Committee, who has final say on the list. Of course, there is public involvement in there too.</p>
<p>Warner Robins Area Transportation Study (WRATS)</p>	<p>GA</p>	<p>Warner Robins</p>	<p>117,387</p>	<p>The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) provides us with anticipated funding figures for federal and state funds. Projected funding assumes that the current growth in the level of funding</p>	<p>Our plan is required to be financially constrained; however, we do include an illustrative list of projects in the event that additional money becomes available.</p>	<p>We provide one forecast, but we divide the funding by time period (short, mid, and long)</p>	<p>The projects in our most current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) make up the short term list. We solicit potential projects through our planning committees (Technical, Citizens Advisory, and Policy) and also have the committees review projects that were</p>

				provided to the area remains constant at approximately 2.5%. We estimate the local funding based on previous Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST).			included in the last LRTP to see if priority has changed. We have ranked them by priority in the past, but did not do so for our most recent plan.
Ames Area MPO (AAMPO)	IA	Ames	51,747	We estimate our own revenues based on an inflation rate that must be reasonable and logical by standards which the Iowa DOT, FHWA, and FTA agree is such based on our historical revenue data	One constrained plan is developed for the LRTP. Other projects are included in the LRTP but are listed as "Illustrative" projects and are outside of the constrained plan but available if such additional money becomes available.	One revenue forecast is provided with a list of projects fiscally constrained to our projected revenue.	Yes several public visioning workshops, alternatives meetings, and charrettes are held to gather public input for all modes of transportation (bike/ped, transit, roadway, etc.). These workshops and meetings produce alternatives which are then reviewed by staff to develop recommendations for our Policy Committee to discuss and approve a final list of projects. Just an additional note, as a small MPO, the AAMPO has only produced two LRTPs to date. For both plans, a consultant was hired to produce the plan while working side by side with MPO staff.

East Central Intergovernmental Association (ECIA)	IA, IL, WI	Dubuque	76,932	A. The DOT provides guidelines on what to use in the Long-Range Plan. The MPO staff will come up with revenues for the MPO area basing on the historical trends and create future projections by following the guidelines. We get information like Road use Tax funds, farm Market funds, Maintenance & operational funding, RISE, etc from DOT.	A. We develop a constrained plan but we also create a list of Illustrative projects that can be funded if more funding is available.	A. We have one revenue forecast for each type of projects. We break our projects into three types Roads and bridges, Trails and Transit.	A. The MPO staff create list of projects basing on input from public, county and city staff. The MPO staff with MPO tech board ranks the projects using a raking process created by MPO staff. The list of projects that are ranked are submitted to MPO tech board. The projects are then submitted to MPO policy board with the approval of tech board. The MPO policy board will finalize the list with the input provided by tech board and staff.
Bannock Transportation Planning Organization (BPTO)	ID	Pocatello	65,865	Currently we develop the estimates as an MPO group (all MPOs in the state). The state is working on developing a system to estimate funds for each MPO and region.	We develop a constraint plan but all project which were identified in the planning process as needed (meets selection criteria) were included in an appendix as illustrative.	We provide one revenue forecast.	In the latest update we used a priority corridor process. Input from the public and Technical Advisory Committee ranked the corridors for high to low. The highest ranked corridor was selected and projects in that corridor prioritized. The Policy Board makes the final selection, but the public and TAC recommendations were kept. Are potential project are selected by establishing performance measure for each mode of transport. We do not use call for project due to the small amount of funds available. The process is very collaborative.

Springfield Area Transportation Study (SATS)	IL	Springfield	161,792	The Illinois DOT does not provide revenue estimates.	The Springfield Area Transportation Study 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan includes: 1) Committed Projects, Years 2011-2015 - These projects appeared in the current TIP, include costs based on the anticipated year of construction, and have identified funding sources. 2) Planned Illustrative Projects, Years 2016-2035 - These projects have the highest priority and a probability of being constructed during the timeframe, have cost estimates based on 2009 dollars, but do not have completely identified funding sources. 3) Future Illustrative Projects, Beyond 2035 - These projects are included to complete the vision of the transportation network, have cost estimates based on 2009 dollars, but have no identified funding sources.	Revenue projections are made per funding source and are generally based on a 4% annual increase, although for some sources other information is available to more accurately calculate potential revenue.	Projects are submitted for the LRTP by each jurisdiction. For funding that comes to the area for allocation, such as Surface Transportation Program - Urban money, a project prioritization method has been created to rank projects based on a scoring system that uses eleven weighted criteria. This method has only been used for TIP project selection for ST-U projects and ARRA projects.
West Central Indiana Economic Development District, Inc. (WCIEDD)	IN		105,848	We work with the state DOT to develop a revenue estimate for the long-range plan. The estimate includes STP-II (small MPO >50,000), CMAQ and HSIP funding. The state DOT also provides estimates of the revenue it will take to cover state projects	The Indiana Division of FHWA requires us to develop a constrained plan. However, we typically include some "illustrative" projects that we'd like to advance if additional money becomes available.	We have one 20-year revenue forecast that is generally broken down into 5-year increments. Most of the time we just flat line the estimates for years 15 and 20.	We use a combination of output from our travel demand model and the state's model, other subsets of the LRTP (i.e. MPA-wide trails plan), the comprehensive land use plan, and inputs from our planning partners and the public to develop a list of potential projects to be included in the long-range

				that they're planning to do within in our metropolitan planning area.			plan. The projects are then scored and ranked based on things like accident history, ADT, LOS, compatibility with other related plans, etc., by our Transportation Technical Committee (includes reps from the state DOT, FHWA and FTA). The scoring and ranking is then submitted to our Transportation Policy Committee (local elected officials, state DOT District Commissioner, FHWA Rep, FTA Rep, etc.) who approves the preliminary list of projects to be put out for public comment and interagency consultation (we're an air quality maintenance area for ozone). After considering public and interagency comments, the Transportation Policy Committee selects the final list of projects adopts the long-range plan during a meeting open to the public.
Ashland Area MPO	KY	Grayson	86,643	State DOT provides the data for all financial and long-range plans.	Have 2: one constrained the other “anticipated projects” with estimated funding amounts and projected dates.	One revenue forecast	Projects are solicited by local officials and the public on a continual basis. These projects are placed on a list and then we have a ranking/prioritization process that occurs every two years. The committee

							<p>ranks/prioritizes the projects. These rankings are forwarded to the Highway District Office and they rank/prioritize. Then sent to state DOT's central office and they complete the ranking. These rankings are provided to DOT secretary. DOT Secretary/Central Office provides draft highway plan to legislators during their sessions for approval or changes. When decided it meets the criteria of the DOT and Legislators it is approved as the state highway plan. This is a very simplistic overview – the process is actually very complex.</p>
Radcliff-Elizabethtown MPO	KY	Elizabethtown	116,621	Our MPO utilizes historic expenditures provided by the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet to estimate our own revenues for our MPO area. This covers all funding sources.	Our plan is a fully constrained plan. We maintain a list of projects that could be funded should additional funding come available.	One revenue forecast.	<p>We utilize a scoring process to rank the projects. Our MPO Policy Board (Elected Officials) has the final say on which projects are included in the plan. They normally follow the ranking process, but will sometimes make adjustments based on their view of the needs.</p>
Cape Cod MPO	MA	Barnstable	222,230	Revenue estimates for the long-range plan are developed from Federal Highway Administration estimates for Massachusetts, and the MassDOT puts	There is one long-range plan developed for the Cape Cod region, but there is included in the plan a longer list of the projects, programs, studies, and smart solutions that were vetted throughout the long-	Once the top regional priorities are considered within the financial resources, one list of projects is aligned with one revenue forecast.	Both an online survey of problem areas, preference in solutions, and direct solicitation are used during early input in the long-range plan development. The projects sub-committee is

			<p>together spreadsheets for both FHWA and state bond funding for both the statewide amounts and the individual regions. A meeting with MassDOT and the Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies (MARPA) is then held to discuss the draft financial information. This round, there were five categories of estimated funding for the regional long-range plan. These five categories are: Major Infrastructure, Regional Discretionary (STP-U, STP-E, CMAQ, HSIP, Enhancements), Federal Aid Bridge projects, Interstate Maintenance (IM) /National Highway System (NHS) Maintenance, Statewide Maintenance . Of these five categories, the first two are basically for regional projects through the MPO process, and the other three-- bridge, IM/NHS and Statewide Maintenance-- categories are for projects of that type</p>	<p>range planning process. This is generally in the chapter before the financial chapter where resources are aligned with the top regional priorities.</p>	<p>There generally is concern over the limited funding available, but agreement that the top priorities should remain--this is due in part to the process of input and review of the alternatives list (as outlined in the answer below).</p>	<p>made up of both RPA staff and representatives of the advisory group. This group works from the input/alternatives list first, and the resulting ranked list is distributed for further input. Typically, there are multiple presentations of the alternatives list (projects, programs, studies, and smart solutions) to both the MPO advisory group, a projects sub-committee, and the MPO itself. However, once the top regional priorities are considered within the financial resources, there generally is concern over the limited funding available, but agreement that the top priorities should remain</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				within the region, but are selected at the state level during the annual TIP process based on need, design readiness, and funding availability			
Region 2 Planning Commission (R2PC)	MI	Jackson	158,422	MDOT provides the small MPOs with the revenue forecasts for our LRP. For the last plan update, completed in 2008, I believe the estimates were not broken down by category.	We are only permitted to submit a financially constrained LRP. However, we are permitted to add an Illustrative Project List that includes significant projects we are anticipating or do not have a funding source currently available or identified. Otherwise, if a new previously unidentified project is proposed, we then have to include it as an amendment.	One forecast.	The overwhelming number of projects included in our plan fall under the category of Preservation & Maintenance, which do not have to be specifically identified by project name in our LRP. We do issue a call for projects to eligible agencies and also review capacity projects identified as deficient by our model. A subcommittee of our Technical Advisory Committee reviews the proposed projects ranking them by traffic volume, roadway condition, capacity, crash history, and ability of the local agency to provide the required matching funds. This subcommittee then makes the project recommendations to the elected officials.
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission (SWMPC)	MI	Benton Harbor	126,856	In the past we have been given some help projecting our funding up to the horizon of our LRP. That assistance usually comes in the form of a very conservative and somewhat informal;	Our Transportation Improvement Program sets out four years of projected expenditures that are divided into a portion that is fiscally constrained and another that is described as “illustrative.” Indeed if circumstances dictate,	I presume that by this you are referring to multiple forecasts that might fall under the categories of revenue conservative, moderate, and	Prior to about four years ago our priority projects were the byproduct of what I call the smoky backroom methodology. We relied on the good, productive relationships that existed among the members of our policy

				<p>“use an annual 2% projection.” That has been how it has gone in the past. Those previous LRPs pre-date the state’s current fiscal austerity measures. I suspect we might still be provided with some assistance in the future but that any projection of annual increases would be rather unlikely.</p>	<p>projects in the fiscally constrained portion can be removed and replaced by those in the illustrative list. Both of these lists are contained in the same Plan. As for our LRP, we do not attempt to place projects into the same two categories. However, we do include a section on projected revenue and an overall estimate of project costs. This section is specifically referred to as an examination of fiscal constraint but does not attempt to generate a fine-grained representation of fiscal constraint over the span of the LRP term.</p>	<p>ambitious. We do not include these sorts of multiple scenarios in our forecasts.</p>	<p>board. I pushed to institute an objective method of choosing the projects that tied the selection criteria more directly to the goals set out in the LRP. Ultimately that methodology has been instituted for every project submitted. Upon project submission, each project is rated against a scorecard that is linked to those mutually agreed upon LRP goals. One caveat here...we are MPO to two different study areas within our region. One of the study areas agreed to implement the aforementioned selection methodology. The other study area still uses the smoky room methodology. So I guess you could say we’re half-way there but you’d have to guess in which direction we are half-way toward.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---

Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)	MO	Columbia	110,478	We do utilize MoDOT revenue estimates strictly for their project section. We also use estimates from our local jurisdictions, both the City of Columbia and Boone County, for the remainder of the document.	We develop a constrained plan only. Other projects for potential funding are included in the CATSO Long-Range Transportation Plan, although other projects may be considered if additional funding becomes available. Though not typical, we sometimes include purely illustrative projects in the TIP, the cost estimates for which are not included in the financial summary. If new \$ is available to be programmed in the current FY, then a TIP amendment is processed	Typically just one.	The MPO itself does not prioritize or choose projects that are done by the individual member jurisdictions, in this case MoDOT, the County, and the City. We do have a solicitation process to receive listings of anticipated projects. This includes making contact with member jurisdictions as well as with local private transportation providers. At the member jurisdiction level project selection is done cooperatively by elected officials and respective staff.
High Point Urban Area MPO (HPMPO)	NC	High Point	175,271	NCDOT does not provide revenue estimates. I can get (and have) longitudinal expenditures for both construction and maintenance from 1984 through 2010 at this point. Once you account for inflation you find that the yearly expenditures tend to be fairly constant.	Our current plan is what I would call semi-constrained. That is the first two horizon years are fairly close to the mark and the last two tending to be oversubscribed in terms of dollars. There is also a large unfunded component post thirty years. In this update I hope to get to a well constrained plan by estimating time to completion rather than cost	We only do one financial estimate. It seems unlikely that we will have the opportunity for extra funds.	We use a the following steps: 1) Ask the public for comment on the existing plan and its priorities (specifically additions and deletions) 2) Use a simple technical ranking to develop a constructability index to provide a ranked list. (Our current ranking schema includes 6 categories. As you add categories you add work, make each criterion less useful, and run the risk of measuring the same thing twice. ) I would like to add a cost benefit criterion but have not had time to do so yet. 3) Present the staff

							<p>'recommendation' to our Board for their re-ranking. We accomplish the re-ranking using dot voting in which each member has a set number of votes: ½ of the votes must be expended on separate projects and the other ½ of votes may be distributed at will. Members may ally and trade votes. The top vote getters are moved up the list so that the #1 vote getter is the #1 priority and so on until we run out of projects with dots. Once we run out of dots the remaining projects are ranked according to the staff ranking until we run out of money. That list goes to the public for comment. At the end of the comment period the board asked to vote up or down on the entire list.</p>
Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC)	NH	Nashua	195,788	The New Hampshire DOT provides a formula that theoretically distributes funding across the state. The formula is based on population and lane miles and shows that our region should receive 12.7% of the "total allocation". Exactly what the "total allocation" is remains a mystery. We assume it	We develop one constrained plan. Part of that plan includes projects that are considered illustrative projects. The illustrative projects have no legal standing with the Federal agencies relating to funding or transportation conformity and would not be included in the fiscal constraint analysis. Should funding become available we would amend the plan, removing the illustrative	We just provide one revenue forecast.	The MPOs in New Hampshire have very little programming authority. It would take a white paper to explain the details of the process here as a state law has effectively short circuited the federal transportation planning process. But to answer your questions: A.) We do have a solicitation process to gather potential projects. Although, given the fiscal

				is the total federal dollars allocated to the state and go from there. We generally assume that funding will increase by about 3% annually.	label from the project and make sure fiscal constraint and air quality conformity requirements are met.		constraints we are under we have not accepted or added new projects through this process in over 5 years. B.) We have a Transportation Technical Advisory Committee that develops recommendations to the NHDOT that are considered by the NH State legislature through the process that I alluded to above. This state process known as the Ten Year Plan Process highly political and ultimately feeds projects back into the NHDOT STIP and from there into regional TIP. So rather than having a true ground up approach where the local/regional decision makers work with the MPO to program projects. It comes from the state level back down to the MPO. It's essentially backwards. J But we try to make it work as best we can.
Santa Fe MPO (SFMPO)	NM	Santa Fe	92,407	-NMDOT gives us an estimated funding range based on our district's expected annual allocation [NMDOT has 6 districts in the state]. We use a mid-range amount and apply it annually over our MTP 25 year timeframe as "reasonably expected"	-We have a fiscally constrained plan and an 'illustrative' list of projects without identified funding.	-No; only one set of projects and one revenue forecast. We do break out projects by priority need in short, medium, and long term time frames	We solicit projects from MPO members and rate them according to MTP criteria. Higher rating scores helps in initial ranking. Projects are not necessarily funded or constructed in the initial ranking order. Final selection occurs when we develop the TIP

				revenue. This estimate applies to federal STP funds to which we have limited discretionary access.			
Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)	NV	Carson City	87,117	We rely on the revenue estimates from the funding agencies for projects that aren't being implemented/ funded by the Nevada DOT. However, we assume the same inflation rate that NDOT does for consistency.	We show both a constrained and unconstrained plan in our RTP.	We show only one revenue forecast. However, that being said, we are a relatively small MPO with only a few major projects.	Most projects are multi-year projects that have already been initiated, and are included in our TIP. However, we do coordinate with NDOT and many other agencies/organizations as to what projects to include in the plan. Since we are not a TMA, we don't receive any direct funding to pass through to other projects. The only situation when this might apply is when our Board ranks applications for Transportation Enhancement funding.
Tahoe MPO (TMPO)	NV, CA	Stateline	62,752	The State DOT tells us some of the funding estimates for the programs where they administer rural distribution. Other funding sources that come direct to the MPO have a funding methodology applied to them to project revenues for the life of the long-range plan.	We include a constrained plan and a "Tier 2" project list that is not constrained that includes projects that can be brought in as funds become available.	We provide only one forecast.	We currently have an advisory board that develops a project list recommendation. However, we are moving toward a scoring process (criteria) to select project for inclusion in the long-range plan that will be more performance based.
Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council (ITCTC)	NY	Ithaca	96,501	They provide estimates for State and Federal funds. We calculate local revenues from tax records showing how much is spent on	I'd say a 'sort of constrained" plan. Our plan is more of a policy document than a project based plan. We identify (estimate) potential	One revenue forecast.	We don't specify specific project for funding. See Q2 above.

				transportation.	available funding, establish a broad expenditures plan based on that funding and policy priorities, but don't specify dollar amounts for specific projects. We make clear our commitment to work within fiscal constraints. We do have a chapter that identifies 'projects for implementation' based on projects found in local/regional plans and 'wish list' items.		
Licking County Area Transportation Study (LCATS)	OH	Newark	127,161	ODOT gives us information on their prediction of state and federal revenue streams. We have the option to use their estimates or to develop our own estimates. Some do some do not. Some MPOs use CPI as an increase rate, some use historical data, some choose to use ODOT's. It is a local decision. Local funding projections such as license plate tax and local general fund, etc. are completely decided by the MPO (large and small.)	This varies from location to location. We develop a list of projects using tradition funding and a list of projects using non-traditional funding. In the text we talk about various sources of funding styles that may be adopted in the future as non-traditional funding. Some examples of non-traditional funding are vehicle miles traveled fees, tolling, congestion fees, tax on vehicle sales, recovery of hybrid or electric vehicle usage of system, etc.	We provide one revenue forecast for each traditional 'source' of funds. This revenue 'pot' is used for the 'traditionally funded project list. This is a constrained list.	
Blair County Planning Commission	PA	Altoona	129,144	The Commonwealth issues financial guidance for each round (LRTP and TIP) for all available funds. Fiscally constrained budgets have been the	Both the LRTP and the TIP are 100% constrained. We also have what we euphemistically call the "Waiting List:" which is just that – an annotated listing of projects that did	We use just the financial guidance from the DOT so we are all consistent throughout the Commonwealth.	Maintaining what we have in place is top priority followed closely by SAMI (Safety/Mobility). Capacity adding has been suspended for the last two

				norm in PA for quite a few years, and the DOT is diligent in keeping everyone informed so we are all using the same standards and procedures – fiscally at least.	not fit into the plan. We pull from this list when extra funds are available. (Our local DOT District is very efficient and we are able to do this more than other regions.) When pulling from the list, we take the highest priority project(s) that can be fully funded with the available cash. The local District has been authorized by the MPO to reallocate “minor amounts” for small projects – generally maintenance-related – without formal MPO approval for each one. These transfers are accounted for at each MPO meeting.		years and will continue that way for the foreseeable future due to the economy. In terms of maintenance bridges generally take priority over roadway issues. We have a detailed inventory, which includes inspection data, which forms the basis for the prioritization for maintenance. Also, in PA Interstates are not included on the MPOs TIP or LRTP; they are handled separately on a statewide basis.
Williamsport Area Transportation Study (WATS)	PA	Williamsport	120,044	PennDOT tells us our federal and state revenue estimates for all categories of transportation funding except rail and air modes. Our MPOs do get input with PennDOT during the development of the revenue estimates by participating on a Financial Guidance Work Group.	Our MPO develops a constrained plan of projects but does include other “illustrative projects” that are important to our region and should be acknowledged in the plan as “needs” but have costs that exceed the constrained plan limits. This is to ensure we have an additional list of regionally significant projects in case additional future funding opportunities arise.	We have one revenue forecast over the 20 year plan horizon.	LCPC Staff utilizes state and local databases to evaluate and prioritize projects for the TIP and Long Range Plan. For example, bridge inspection data feeds heavily into the bridge risk assessment and prioritization of bridge needs. Pavement life cycle analysis is done for state highway maintenance and restoration. New capacity projects undergo much scrutiny both using data and needs studies and political considerations due to severe funding constraints and backlog of system maintenance needs

							in PA. Only about 3% of federal/ state dollars going to new capacity right now in PA. 97% is system maintenance and preservation. PA has worst % of structurally deficient bridges in nation and over 8,000 miles of poor roads on state system and condition of local system of highways is unknown and local bridges are typically worse situation than state bridge system.
Grand-Strand Area Transportation Study (GSATS)	SC	Georgetown	187,343	The SCDOT Commission adopted a formula (Population and VMT) for current funding levels, which is assumed to remain constant (although they have historically increased). All dedicated funds... Other sources (safety, bridge, etc.) are distributed statewide and can fluctuate.	One "plan" but is has three tiers: projects assumed to be entirely MPO funded (i.e. constrained at \$150 Million), projects assumed to have other public funding (around \$2 Billion), and privately funded projects (around \$150 Million). Federal funds would be eligible on any project on the LRTP (Tier 2 or 3) but is not made available unless the other public or private money is identified.	We have only developed a detailed revenue forecast for the Tier 1 -- entirely MPO funded projects. Individual counties have detailed revenue forecasts for select Tier 2 or 3 projects but the MPO doesn't adopt them.	How do you pick which projects will get funded? When funding is available, the Technical and Policy Committees are notified and asked to recommend projects from the LRTP that fit within the amount available. The technical committee collects other relevant data that wasn't known when the LRTP was developed (individualized model run, pavement quality, other available funding). Do you have a solicitation process to gather potential projects? Yes, major public involvement process every five years. Do you have a ranking or scoring process? See attached. Do your elected officials solely select projects or does staff or

							an advisory board develop a recommendation for your elected officials? Technical Committee makes a recommendation to the Policy Committee, which they can: accept, reject, or send back to the Study Team for reconsideration.
Rock Hill-Fort Mill Area Transportation Study (RFATS)	SC	Rock Hill	119,844	State DOT provides Guideshare revenue estimates only	We develop a cost-constrained plan and accompanying unfunded needs list. We have never been so fortunate to have additional money!!	Just one.	We have a process: 1) solicitation of potential projects from stakeholders and public; 2) travel demand modeling of projects; 3) state-mandated ranking system for projects in cost-constrained plan
Spartanburg Area Transportation Study (SPATS)	SC	Spartanburg	199,446	We use what we expect to receive over a 25 year horizon. That is derived by what we receive now per year times 25.	Only constrained.	One	Staff ranks and recommends to policy board based on modeled LOS and community input.
South Eastern COG (SECOG)	SD	Sioux Falls	164,605	The SDDOT receives federal funding from the Federal Highway trust fund. The SDDOT allocates funding through a formula to cities with a population of greater than 5,000 and all counties. The jurisdictions that receive federal funding in the Sioux Falls MPO area are Sioux Falls, Brandon, Minnehaha County and Lincoln County. Based on the uncertainty of the	The long-range plan is constrained based on estimated funding levels. A listing of all projects that either cannot be budgeted during the planning period or may have difficulty in gaining a commitment from the appropriate jurisdiction is included in the long-range plan. Earmarks are included in the constrained list based upon historical earmark trends. Any projects that are needed for capacity improvements that cannot be constrained are included	One revenue forecast.	A Market Research Study was completed in 2010 to gather input from the community to help assess the needs and desires of the Sioux Falls area transportation system. The results of the study were used to help identify priorities for the long-range plan along with capacity needs that were identified through the MPO Traffic Demand Model. Also, the following sustainability planning factors are considered when

				Highway Trust Fund, the Sioux Falls MPO has agreed to keep federal funding at a constant dollar level throughout the planning period included in the long-range plan and increase local dollars by 3% per year.	as “illustrative” projects.		determining project priority: public participation, accessibility and mobility, economy, multi-modes, operations, maintain existing system, environment and livability, safety, and security.
Jackson Urban Area MPO	TN	Jackson	91,837	TDOT only gives us input on state level projects in our planning area, we come up with all other local revenue estimates.	We use a combined plan showing only constrained projects in the actual plan and revenue/cost estimate tables, but show unconstrained projects as needs that no funding has been identified yet.	only one revenue forecast, but use a mid-plan horizon year for planning and funding purposes.	We have a prioritization scoring process with our MPO Technical Staff to rank projects based on a set criteria. The highest ranked project gets the funding and so on until the funding is expended.
Johnson City Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO)	TN	Johnson City	124,878	The Johnson City MTPO uses our own estimates based on previous studies, and studies conducted by MPOs in Tennessee with a similar size. We hire a consultant to complete the plan and follow city procurement policies (with state and federal clauses) in issuing an RFP.	We do two things, one we have a general statement similar to this if other funding becomes available through an act of Congress or other foreseen revenue source the MTPO or its member jurisdictions are eligible we reserve the right to use these funds for an existing or planned project. The other is for a project which is identified as a potential project we list it as "illustrative" and when or if funding becomes available we will use it.	We are a small MPO under 200,000. We only receive around 1.2 million annually in STP allocations. This is our maximum and most of the time we are lucky to get that. As for major State Project along a state route the state of Tennessee provides the funding, manages the project, and issues a contract for construction. The MPO just clears the bureaucratic paperwork as it relates to MPO Planning.	Staff reviews the projects along with the Executive Staff which is also referred to as the Technical Advisory Committee and they rank them, this list is then submitted to the Executive Board which is comprised of the Chief Elected Official of the member jurisdictions (we have 6 Mayors and the Governor). It is up to the Executive Board to make the final decision and they do not have to follow the recommendations of the Technical Staff but most often they do.

Texarkana MPO	TX, AR	Texarkana	88,565	We use a program called TRENDS that was mutually developed by the MPOs and TxDOT with consultant assistance. The program projects revenues for all available funds. MPOs are not required to use the TRENDS estimate but can adjust for local issues/concerns and take into account other potential revenue sources such as grants or local taxes/fees/tolls, etc.	We develop a constrained plan and then include a list of additional projects as an unconstrained list that have been identified but do not have funding available.	Each MPO can choose how many forecasts/project alternatives to develop. We currently only develop one forecast. We would like to develop multiple scenarios with associated fiscal data but our travel model does not allow for that possibility at this time.	We solicit MPO member agencies and the general public for project suggestions as well as MPO staff recommendations. Currently we provide as much information related to each project that is available (traffic counts, LOS, crash data, etc.) and the Technical Comm. submits a ranked list to the Policy Board. The Policy Board then takes into account other pertinent local issues and agrees on a list of projects. However, we group our projects in multi-year timeframes without being tied to particular projects having to be let in a particular order. The projects are grouped by the first 4 years of the plan (to correspond to the TIP), the second 6 years of the plan and the last 15 years. This gives us more flexibility related to arranging project funding. We are currently developing a performance management program that will assist in this process.
Cache MPO (CMPO)	UT	Logan	79,453	We develop our own, but they are an important source.	We do both.	We use just one.	There is a solicitation process, but we rely heavily upon our travel demand model. Member cities are well aware of where the various projects

							rank so that control many of the solicitations. Nevertheless, there are always funding requests for projects that are outside the high ranking core projects.
Dixie MPO (DMPO)	UT	St. George	67,507	WE WORK WITH UTAH DOT AND UTAH'S OTHER THREE mpos IN THE UNIFIED PLANNING GROUP TO DETERMINE FUNDING ASSUMPTIONS. BESIDES STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING, DETERMINED AT THAT LEVEL, WE ALSO WORK WITH OUR LOCAL OFFICIALS TO DETERMINE FUNDING ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE LOCAL AREA.	WE WORK WITH A CONSTRAINED PLAN THAT HAS AGGRESSIVE FUNDING ASSUMPTIONS. IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE, WE SIMPLY CANCEL OR POSTPONE ONE OR MORE OF THOSE ASSUMED REVENUE INCREASES.	THE REVENUE FORECAST WORKSHEET CONSIDERS MULTIPLE FUNDING SOURCES. WE HAVE ONLY ONE SET OF PROJECTS (INTENTIONALLY NON-PRIORITIZED)	WE HAVE FORMED A TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE PUBLIC WORK DIRECTORS WITHIN THE MPO, THE STATE, AND FHWA. THIS COMMITTEE TAKES CONCEPT REPORTS THROUGH A RATING AND RANKING PROCESS ANNUALLY – WHICH THEN IS RECOMMENDED TO OUR GOVERNING BOARD, MADE UP OF ELECTED OFFICIALS FROM THE AREA. THE GOVERNING BOARD GENERALLY ACCEPTS THE WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.
Tri-Cities Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (Tri-MATS)	WA	Richland	159,047	Revenue estimates are entirely the responsibility of the MPO. The Benton-Franklin Council of Governments' forecast is based on annual documentation developed by each city and county in the State. Each jurisdiction files an annual "City Street	We develop a constrained plan, with a list of additional projects labeled as "Unmet Need".	We provide one revenue forecast.	Selection of projects is left to each jurisdiction based on their priorities.

				and County Road Report” of revenues by amount and source, and expenditures is filed with WSDOT. Our forecasts are based on a decade’s worth of reports by each jurisdiction. Estimates must be logical, and based on some sort of data. WSDOT does not participate, but will eventually review and approve the methodology.			
Fond du Lac Area MPO	WI	Menasha	55,365	WisDOT provides the revenue estimates for the State and federal system, while we prepare estimates for local revenue based on historic expenditures.	Our plans are financially constrained, if a major project would be added to the plan, proposed funding would also be identified.	We have one revenue forecast.	All urbanized area projects receiving federal funds are approved through the MPO Committee process. However, only the STP Urban projects are selected through the MPO process. Federal funds for the STP-Urban Program is distributed by WisDOT to the MPOs based on specific formulas. MPO staff solicits projects from the counties and communities, then uses an adopted prioritization process to recommend projects to the Technical Advisory Committee (Comprised of Local Government). The projects are approved by the Transportation Committee, and finally by the full Policy Board (Commission). The

							details are available on our web site. That's it.
Sheboygan MPO	WI	Green Bay	74,155	Our state DOT has traditionally assisted in providing us with revenue estimates for federal and state funding that we can reasonably expect to have available over the life of the plan. This covers nearly all funding sources. We occasionally develop our own revenue estimates for STP Urban, and work with our county to develop revenue estimates for the Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Program (NMTTP - I know that the area I work with, Sheboygan County, WI, and your Twin Cities metro, are two of four recipients of these funds as a result of SAFETEA-LU). Our state DOT also provides us with an annual inflation rate for the "year of expenditure" analysis; this gets updated periodically. In terms of operations and maintenance, we rely on revenue and expenditure reports from our state's Department of Revenue	We have one constrained plan. However, in the area of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, we have identified illustrative projects that could be funded if additional revenues were to become available, and they have become available as SAFETEA-LU gets extended. With the other modes, we would amend the plan and TIP if additional revenues were to become available (with the exception of ARRA, this is rarely the case for us).	We provide separate forecasts for each mode (street/highway, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian), but they are included in the same financial plan chapter of the long-range transportation plan.	Our selection process mainly involves the STP Urban program. We have a prioritization procedure for this program. We solicit projects together with our state DOT. MPO staff rank the candidate STP Urban projects using the prioritization procedure, but our advisory committees (Technical and Policy) make the decision on project selection - they usually adhere to the staff recommendation, but it's been interesting in cases where there is a tie (in points from the prioritization procedure from staff)

				in terms of the transportation revenue/expenditure line items in the development of our financial plan. I think this is standard practice among the MPOs in Wisconsin.			
State Line Area Transportation Study (SLATS)	WI, IL	Beloit	61,843	The MPOs develop their own revenue estimates, but need to find out from the District fiscal manager how much STP-U funds they are designated to receive and then add an annual multiplier. Bike and other funds are based on rule of thumb estimates.	One constrained plan and a wish list that is unconstrained (illustrative).	Just one.	Solicitation process and a meeting.
La Crosse Area Planning Committee (LAPC)	WI, MN	La Crosse	107,658	WisDOT provides revenue estimates, Mn/DOT does not. Not all revenues are forecast.	We develop a long range transportation plan that includes planned projects that are “illustrative” and do not have identified funding at this time.	We include only one revenue forecast	We have a solicitation process in Wisconsin with a scoring process and a technical advisory board that ranks projects. We do not have a dedicated funding source in Minnesota for project solicitation; instead we participate in the ATP process at the Mn/DOT District level.
KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission (KYOVA)	WV, OH	Huntington	202,006	First of all, KYOVA is Bi State (WV and Ohio) and the state DOT's come up with revenue estimates for our use, so we usually use their estimates or we have the option of using our own	KYOVA always develop a constrained plan. We do show some projects that we feel are needed should funds become available in an unfunded section, however not to the point of producing a wish list of projects.	We do not provide multiple forecasts, only one.	The staff and TAC committee selects projects for our Policy (elected officials) Board’s approval. If the policy board and or other elected officials have projects then we would include them as well. Also,

				estimates, we just have to justify our estimates to them.			public involvement meetings sometimes bring projects into our plan.
Cheyenne MPO (ChATPP)	WY	Cheyenne	73,763	Our State/County/City has a total of 6 cents on the dollar sales tax. A share of the State 4 cents is distributed to the Cities/Counties by a population distribution. The County/City has an optional 5th penny which is mainly used to fund transportation projects in for those local governments, and the city/county also has a 6th penny which is used to build specific projects (which may include transportation projects). Therefore our funding which goes to highways and roads is pretty much set and I then get forecasts mainly from the state revenue department.	Our last plan called PlanCheyenne (www.plancheyenne.com) did both and unconstrained and constrained. We looked into all potential funding sources that were outside the 6 cents sales tax listed above. You can find that chapter in the plan on the web site.	We did one revenue forecast.	If you are now talking about the TIP selection process then: The MPO helps the City prioritize and select projects to be placed on the 5th penny sales tax ballot based on the Master Transportation Plan plus other unspecified factors. The projects in the 5th penny are for 4 years, then we do it all over again. The County citizens approve the 5th penny every 5 years. WYDOT has their own selection process and the MPO is minimally involved.
Farmington MPO	NM	Farmington	81,295	During the last long range plan update, we were advised to use a historical average of revenue from the previous 5 years and use that figure as an estimated projection for 25 years out. We combined this average with an average of revenue from the TIP. This estimate was based on funding that	We went with a combination of financial plans - low, mid, and high for revenue scenarios - so that we could have a range of estimates. The mid estimate took the averages described in Question #1 and is our constrained plan. The low estimate reduced that estimate by 25%, due to the lack of a new authorization bill and funding uncertainties. The	The answer is similar to Question #2. In our LRP, the three revenue forecasts also indicate which priority projects could be funded.	Regional projects are identified through a 'Call for Projects' solicitation and are discussed annually through the TIP process. Our Technical Committee, an advisory board to the Policy Committee, reviews and discusses how to rank the projects in order to develop priorities. Because only a handful of projects are chosen,

				the MPO typically receives - NHS, STP, Safety, and Enhancements.	high estimate is our 'unconstrained' plan and is more generous with the average funding amounts. This was added to the LRP under the assumption that times will get better and funding levels will be higher than they are now.		verbal agreement has been the common practice for project selection. The recommended projects are then forwarded to the Policy Committee, which can modify the list and ultimately approves the final project list.
Saginaw Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (SMATS)	MI	Saginaw	159,102	MDOT has provided the revenue estimates for our LRP. In the past, they have provided estimates for most of the highway funds. Estimates for transit were limited to UZA operating and capital. The estimates appeared to be based on a 3-yr average from our most recent TIP and projected out to the horizon year for the LRP. There is currently a financial work group in place that includes representatives from MDOT, MPOs, and FHWA that has been meeting to review the methodology. We are presently waiting for new revenue estimates for our next LRP update (2040), which is due about 1 year from now.	In the past our plan was limited to a financially constrained plan, although some MPOs have included a chapter on “unfunded needs” or something similar. Our latest TIP includes an illustrative project list, and it appears that we are headed toward including an illustrative list of projects in the next LRP.	We have traditionally gone with one forecast. However, we have attended various seminars on scenario planning and revenue forecasting, so I guess multiple revenue forecasts are a possibility. As I mentioned above, we are waiting to see what the financial work group comes up with. Also, MDOT is in the process of updating the travel demand model for our area, and we need the results of their deficiency analysis to select potential projects for modeling.	Our LRP includes local capacity projects and other major projects that are submitted by MDOT, such as major corridor work. At the local level, project selection is largely staff driven by the road agencies, although we solicit input from elected officials and the community. For the next plan, there are some active economic development and other community organizations that we will need to try to include in the process. We generally do not include preservation projects in the LRP and, due to limited funding, preservation projects are mostly what get funded in our area: system preservation takes priority over capacity in most cases, unless there are earmarks or discretionary grants to provide the funding. We have a project ranking process for our TIP development, but not for the LRP.

## **Bibliography**

- Dempsey, P. S., Goetz, A., & Larson, C. (2000). Metropolitan planning organizations: An assessment of the transportation planning process. A report to Congress (Vols. 1–3). Denver, CO: University of Denver Intermodal Transportation Institute and the National Center for Intermodal Transportation, University of Denver.
- Foster, Kathryn A. 2001. "Regionalism on Purpose." Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Monograph.
- Gerber, E. & Gibson, C. (2009) Balancing Regionalism and Localism: How Institutions and Incentives Shape American Transportation Policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (Jul., 2009), pp. 633-648.
- General Accounting Office. (1996). Urban transportation: Metropolitan planning organizations' efforts to meet federal planning requirements. Washington, DC.
- Katz, B., Puentes, R., & Bernstein, S. (2003). TEA-21 reauthorization: Getting transportation right for metropolitan America. Washington, DC: Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution.
- Lowery, D. (2000), "A Transactions Costs Model of Metropolitan Governance: Allocation Versus Redistribution in Urban American," *Journal of Public Administration* 10 (January 2000): 49-78.
- Lewis, P. G., & Sprague, M. (1997). Federal transportation policy and the role of metropolitan planning organizations in California. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- McDowell, B. (2003). "The State of Regional Government." In *Regional Government Innovation* R.L.Kemp.
- McDowell, B. (1995). MPO capacity: Improving the capacity of metropolitan planning organizations to help implement national transportation policies. Washington, DC: U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
- Nelson, A. C., Sanchez, T. W., Wolf, J. F. & Farquhar, M. B. (2004). Metropolitan planning organization voting structure and transit investment bias: Preliminary analysis with social equity implications. *Transportation Research Record*, 1895, 1-7.
- Puentes, R., & Bailey, L. (2005). Increasing funding and accountability for metropolitan transportation decisions. In B. Katz & R. Puentes (Ed.), *Taking the high road: A metropolitan agenda for transportation reform* (pp. 139-168). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press
- Solof, M. (1998). *The history of metropolitan planning organizations*. Newark, NJ: Transportation Planning Authority.
- Taylor, B. D., & Schweitzer, L. (2005). Assessing the experience of mandated collaborative inter-jurisdictional transport planning in the United States. *Transport Policy*, 12(6), 500-511.
- Vogel, R. & Nezelkewicz, N. Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the New Regionalism: The Case of Louisville. *Publius*, Vol. 32, No. 1, Federalism and Surface Transportation (Winter, 2002), pp. 107-129