Consolidated Planning Grant

- **Purpose**: 
  - To reduce multiple agency grants, management & oversight
  - Reduce multiple MPO contracts
  - Expedite work authorizations
  - Streamline the delivery of planning funds & provide MPOs greater flexibility to use planning funds
  - Simplifies accounting & invoicing process
- **Funding Sources**: 
  - FHWA PL, FTA 5305(d), & STBG
  - The CPG does not reduce the MPO’s transit planning responsibilities. FHWA will coordinate with & solicit input from FTA on major issues such as UPWP approval, grant closeout, & other MPO planning activities as needed*
  - Currently used by 31 states

*FTA C 8100.1D. Federal Transit Administration. September 10, 2018
Benefits of the CPG

• Simplifies funding administration for the State
  • Only one grant administrator (FDOT has selected FHWA)
  • Reduces the number of open grants and contracts
  • Simplifies procedures for fund carryover & grant extensions
  • Consolidates Reporting & Tracking

• Simplifies administrating funds for MPOs
  • One Contract to manage
  • Streamlines the invoicing process and simplifies budgeting

• Expedites fund availability
  • Only requires the approval by the lead grant agency at the beginning of the 2-year UPWP contract
CPG Funding Recommendation

- PL Funds
  - Maintain existing PL allocation formula
  - Continue to match PL funds at 100% with transportation development credits
- FTA 5305(d) funds
  - FTA 5305(d) funds become FHWA PL funds under CPG
  - Maintain existing 5305(d) MPO allocation formula
  - CPG 5305(d) PL non-federal share to be provided by FDOT with transportation development credits

**STBG Fund Supplement (Proposed)**

- FDOT to provide each MPO a STBG supplement equal to their annual 5305(d) 20% non-federal share
- Non-federal share to be provided by FDOT using transportation development credits
- Supplement will not be subject to the Office of Work Program 80/20 SU Rule
## CPG UPWP Budget Template: Option 1

### Estimated Budget Detail for FHWA CPG (PL)

#### Non-Federal Share PL (TDCs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>MPO staff salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Direct Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Estimated Budget Detail for CPG (80/20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>FTA/COP (PL)</th>
<th>Non-Federal Share PL (TDCs)</th>
<th>MPO/COP (PL)</th>
<th>Non-Federal Share PL (TDCs)</th>
<th>SU CPG (PL)</th>
<th>Non-Federal Share PL (TDCs)</th>
<th>FDOT Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Consultant Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Direct Expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect Rate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: 0
### CPG UPWP Budget Table: Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Estimated Budget Detail for FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPG (80/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO staff salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract/consultant services</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Direct Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and other expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% for no other base</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Estimated Budget Detail for FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPG (80/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO staff salaries, fringe benefits, and other deductions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract/consultant services</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Direct Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and other expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% for no other base</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Plan

- Implementation to occur with the next UPWP Cycle
- Critical Tasks:
  - Develop new UPWP with the CPG
  - Work with the Office of Work Program to provide STBG Supplement estimates to MPO’s for UPWP development
  - Coordinate with Office of General Counsel to revise MPO & FDOT contract
  - FTA & FHWA enter into a MOA regarding the transfer of the 5305(d) funds from FTA to FHWA
  - Request FTA to transfer 5305(d) funding to FHWA
CPG Key Points

• CPG to be 100% federalized
• The CPG non-federal share (20%) to be provided by FDOT using Transportation Development Credits
• FDOT to supplement the CPG with STBG Funds for each MPO equivalent to their 5305(d) 20% non-federal share
• FDOT to use Transportation Development Credits for the STBG non-federal share
Questions and Contacts

Mark Reichert:
MPO Administrator – Office of Policy Planning
  • Mark.Reichert@dot.state.fl.us
  • 850-414-4901

Scott Philips
MPO Analyst – Office of Policy Planning
  • Scott.Philips@dot.state.fl.us
  • 850-414-4801
Unified Planning Work Program

Discussion of Annotated Outline and Best Practices

presented by

Erika Thompson
Statewide MPO Coordinator,
Florida Department of Transportation
FDOT Led Discussion Agenda

- **What We Saw**: What UPWP similarities and differences do we see across MPOs and TPOs?

- **What is in the Annotated Outline of the UPWP**: What needs to be included? What does not need to be included?

- **How to Incorporate the Consolidated Planning Grants (CPG)**: What can the budget table look like?
What We Saw

- **TMA and Non-TMA**
  - There was minimal difference in UPWP length
  - On average, UPWP length has been consistent

- **Peer States:** The following states were looked at for additional guidance
  - California
  - Minnesota
  - Tennessee
  - Texas

- **Federal Guidance**
  - There is broad guidance in place, but what do we *really* need to include in our UPWP?
Suggested Outline

- Introduction

- Planning Priorities:
  » Current and long-term planning issues
  » Federal and State Emphasis Areas
  » Public Participation Plan (PPP)

- Prior Efforts

- Work Program Tasks

- Budget Table: Consolidated Planning Grant funding structure may be reflected in all future UPWP budget tables starting in FY 2020/21-2021/22

- Multi-Year Business Plan

- Appendix
Where to Consolidate

Introduction

» General background
» Planning Area
» Organizations

Prior Efforts

» Brief recap or bulleted list
» Focus on continuous, ongoing efforts

Work Program Task Sheets

» General description of required task activities
» Reference ongoing work in prior efforts section
» General overview of work products expected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>FY 2020/2021</th>
<th>FY 2021/2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal CPG (80%)</td>
<td>State CPG Match (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Examples of CPG Funding Tables

### Corpus Christi MPO, Texas (TMA)

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtask</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Transportation Planning Funds (TPF)</th>
<th>FTA Sect. 5307</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>FY 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$26,625</td>
<td>$26,625</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$65,512</td>
<td>$65,512</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$65,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$10,765</td>
<td>$10,765</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>$14,115</td>
<td>$14,115</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$117,017</td>
<td>$117,017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$117,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 TPF – Includes both FHWA PL-112 and FTA Section 5303 Funds. TxDOT will apply transportation development credits sufficient to provide the match for FHWA PL-112 and FTA Section 5303 programs. As the credits reflect neither cash nor man hours, they are not reflected in the funding tables.
### Bryan-College Station MPO, Texas (TMA)

#### 2020-2021 Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMP Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FHWA</th>
<th>FTA</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Administration/Management</td>
<td>$274,139.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$324,139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Data Development and Maintenance</td>
<td>$68,780.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$68,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Short Range Planning</td>
<td>$28,221.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$88,221.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$48,754.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$58,754.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Special Studies</td>
<td>$130,304.00</td>
<td>$21,414.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$151,718.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS** $900,139.00 $371,414.00 $20,000.00 $1,331,553.00

**Transportation Planning Funds (TX)**

TPF (FHWA PL-112 + FTA) $682,474.00

TPF Prior Years Carryover $39,062.00

**LOCAL** $20,000.00

**TOTAL FUNDING** $741,536.00

*TDOT will apply transportation development credits sufficient to provide the match for TPF funds. As the credits reflect state matching costs, they are excluded from the funding table.

*Based on FY 2020 and FY 2021 proposed funding.

*Funds are for MPO performed activities (and associated consultants) and not work performed by others.
What to Include

- Certification Statements
- Public Participation Plan (PPP)
- Planning Emphasis Areas
  - Federal
  - State
  - District Planning Emphasis Areas do not need to be included
- Multi-Year Business Plan
- Appendix
Erika Thompson,
Statewide MPO Coordinator

Erika.Thompson@dot.state.fl.us

850-414-4807
Unified Plan Work Program

Cross Task Documentation

presented to

presented by

Erika Thompson
Statewide MPO Coordinator,
Florida Department of Transportation
Regionally Funded Tasks

- **MPO transferring PL or STBG funds to FDOT**
  - Funds should show transferred in UPWP
  - Funds should be included in FDOT’s SPR
  - Task descriptions and names must match

- **MPO transferring PL or STBG funds to another MPO**
  - Lead MPO show additional funds in UPWP
  - Contributing MPO shows transfer of funds in UPWP
  - Task descriptions and names must match
PY 19 Program Accountability Results (PAR)
Non-TMA MPO Public Participation Plans
**PY 19 PAR PPP for Non-TMA**

**Purpose**
- To assess non-TMA MPOs’ Public Participation Plans (PPP) for compliance and implementation of 23 CFR 450.316

**Focus of Review**
- All Florida Non-TMA MPOs adopted PPP

**Number/Location**
- Nine non-TMA MPO reviews performed in PY 19:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bay County TPO</th>
<th>Charlotte Co/Punta Gorda MPO</th>
<th>Gainesville MPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Regional TPO</td>
<td>Hernando/Citrus MPO</td>
<td>Indian River Co. MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake-Sumter MPO</td>
<td>Ocala/Marion County TPO</td>
<td>Okaloosa-Walton TPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PY 19 PAR PPP for Non-TMA

Planning Staff
• FL Div – Create questions, evaluate and summarize results
• PA Div – Review Plans

Review Questions
• Compliance (20)
• Implementation (14)
PY 19 PAR PPP for Non-TMA

Areas of Across the Board Implementation

- Had a PPP
- Included summary of MPO and MPO’s role in transportation
- Provided MPO Contact Information
- Discussed LRTP/STIP/TIP amendment process
- Made public information available in electronically accessible formats and are on the Internet
- Documented PPP effectiveness evaluation procedures
PY 19 PAR PPP for Non-TMA

Areas of Concern in Implementation of LRTP and TIP Consultation/Coordination

- Several PPPs not consulting with Agencies responsible for other planning activities
- Most did not indicate consideration of other federal assistance programs
- Only 1 of 4 PPPs discussed Tribal coordination
- Only 2 of 6 PPP documented Federal Lands coordination procedures
- Majority did not outline roles, responsibilities and key decision points for consultation
### Opportunities for Improvement

1. Carry out all requirements for “interested parties, participation, and consultation” set forth in 23 CFR 450.316. (including)
   
   a) Recipients of assistance under title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53;
   
   b) Governmental agencies and non-profit organizations (including representatives of the agencies and organizations) that receive Federal assistance from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation services; and
   
   c) Recipients of assistance under 23 U.S.C. 201-204.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunities for Improvement

1. Outline roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies.

2. Consider the intent of 23 CFR 450.316 and demonstrate how each requirement is being met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions and Answers
AN INTEGRATED VISION FOR ENHANCED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

LEWIS G. GRIMM, P.E., PLANNING TEAM LEADER
FHWA, EASTERN FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY DIVISION, STERLING, VA

FMPP STATEWIDE COLLABORATION WORKSHOP
DECEMBER 2019
VISION STATEMENT

AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS THAT BETTER ALIGNS PRIORITIES AND NEEDS ACROSS AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS
DEFINITIONS

• Agencies:
  • Federal -> NPS, FWS, USFS, BLM, USACE, and BOR
  • Tribes
  • State -> DOTs and State Parks
  • Local -> MPOs, RPOs, COGs, and other Local Planning Agencies (LPAs)
  • Non-Governmental -> Private Companies and Non-profits

• Programs:
  • Federal -> FLTP, FLAP, FLPP, TTP, Fed-Aid, and other Federal Appropriations
  • State -> Transportation Trust Funds and other State Appropriations
  • Local -> Dedicated Sales Tax and Other Tax Measures
  • Private -> for profit operational services, philanthropic contributions, economic development investment

• Needs and Priorities: Locally identified projects (road, bridge, trail (bike/ped), transit or planning study) -> short and long term -> constrained and unconstrained -> capital and operational -> conceptual and well developed.
INTEGRATING FLMA NEEDS AND PRIORITIES IN STATEWIDE AND METRO CONTEXTS

What: Shared Needs and Priorities

Why:
A. Consistent with Planning Regs
B. Leverage Partners
C. Better Coverage of Need

How:
A = LRTP
B,C = FLTP/FLAP Profiles integrated in State and local plans
### FLH CATALOGUE OF PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

#### DATA, OUTREACH AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Systems and Processing</th>
<th>Targeted State, Local and Tribal Outreach</th>
<th>Performance Based Planning Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Technical Report on existing data management systems</td>
<td>• Stakeholder contact information</td>
<td>• Multiagency performance reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FLTP/FLAP Profiles</td>
<td>• Facilitated meetings in each state</td>
<td>• Federal Land Management Agency TPM Guidebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs Assessments</td>
<td>• Needs assessment reports</td>
<td>• National stakeholder database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCESS DESCRIPTION: IMPROVING LINKAGES BETWEEN FED LANDS AND FED-AID

FLMA LRTPs
National/Regional

FLTP/FLAP Profiles

Tribal Transportation Plans

State DOT LRTP

MPO/COG LRTP

Consistency / Consultation Correlation

Existing Statewide Planning Process

Federal / State / Local
Needs Assessment
Strategic Engagement & Deployment

Federal & Tribal
- FLMAs
- Bureau of Indian Affairs

State
- DOT
- State Parks

Local
- MPOs / COGs
- Counties

FLMA Assessment
State & Local Assessment- proximity to Federal Lands and/or FLMA identified need
FLPP JOINT PROJECT – INTEGRATED FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PLANNING

➢ Work to be Executed under FY19 NPS PA and joint funded in FY20 and beyond

1. Creating FLTP/FLAP Profiles
   • FLTP/FLAP Planning Networks for each state
   • Draft Data Template for Statewide Profiles
   • Draft Base Maps and Geodatabases for each state

2. Targeted State, Local, and Tribal Outreach
   • LRTP Case Studies or Cluster Analyses
   • Templates for MOUs, MOAs, Charters, etc.
   • Improved planning cycle alignment (Feds Lands & Fed Aid)

3. Statewide Needs Assessment Data Processing
   • Shared need, proposed improvements, and rough cost estimates
   • Customizing assessment attributes
   • Process documentation

4. Development of Online Multi-Agency Planning Tools
   • Automated statewide fact sheets for FLTP
   • Data Schema for data sharing among FLTP Core Partners, state DOTs, and select local agencies
COMMUNICATION PLAN FOR PARTNER ENGAGEMENT

• Audience
  • FLMA Core Partners – local and regional offices
  • Fed-Aid Division Offices
  • State and Local Partners - MPOs

• Means of Communication
  • Status reports and briefing memos
  • Webinars
  • Conferences and workshops
  • In-person meetings (bi-lateral and multi-lateral)

• Frequency
  • Regularly scheduled (monthly, quarterly, or annual)
  • Planning Cycle Driven (Plan/TIP/STIP update, adoption, amendment, etc.)
COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS?
LONG HISTORY OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

- Florida Transportation Commission Performance and Production Review of FDOT since 1990s
- FDOT Annual Performance Report since 1990s
- Individual MPO performance measures, reports
NATIONAL AND FLORIDA GOALS AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

National Goals for the Federal-Aid Highway Program
1. Safety
2. Infrastructure Condition
3. Congestion Reduction
4. System Reliability
5. Freight Movement and Economic Vitality
6. Environmental Sustainability
7. Reduced Project Delivery Delays

Florida Transportation Plan Goals
- Safety and Security
- Agile, Resilient, & Quality Infrastructure
- Mobility
- Economic Competitiveness
- Environment & Energy

Performance Management
- Highway Safety
- Pavement and Bridge Condition
- System Performance, Freight, Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality

Policy and General Purposes for Public Transportation
- Safety and Security
- Agile, Resilient, & Quality Infrastructure
- Transit Safety
- Transit Asset Management
FDOT/MPOAC TPM IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

- Communicate, communicate, communicate
- Collaborate, collaborate, collaborate
- Pilot project
- Consensus planning document
- Data sharing
- Target setting
- Technical support resources
CONSENSUS PLANNING DOCUMENT

- Developed cooperatively by FDOT and MPOAC; updated April 2019
- Addresses federal requirements for data sharing, target setting, performance reporting
- Outlines roles of FDOT, MPOs, transit providers
- Designed for inclusion in TIP; also can be adopted by separate MPO board action
- Allows transit provider agreement to occur through MPO board membership
DATA SHARING

FDOT
- Collect and maintain data for federal measures
- Perform calculations of performance metrics and measures
- Provide to each MPO calculations used to develop statewide targets for state, MPO planning area, and each county in MPO planning area

MPO
- Share supplemental data MPO uses to develop its own targets for any measure

Transit provider
- Collect performance data for transit asset management and transit safety measures
- Share data with FDOT and appropriate MPO(s)
TPM RESOURCES

- Model language for discussing TPM in TIPs updated April 2019
- Model template for LRTP System Performance Report updated August 2019
TPM RESOURCES

- Factsheets for all measures
- Timelines for FDOT, MPOs, transit providers
- Methodology and Data Sources report
- MPO Program Management Handbook
- Guidance memos
- Best practice sharing
- On-call assistance from FDOT staff, consultants
WHAT’S NEXT?

- Highway safety target updates
- Public transportation safety targets
- Mid-period performance report for PM2, PM3
- Continued coordination between FDOT, MPOs, transit providers
- Enhanced long-range plans and STIP/TIPs with clear linkage between performance goals, policies, and project selection
QUESTIONS?

MARK REICHERT
FDOT, Administrator for Metropolitan Planning
mark.reichert@dot.state.fl.us
(850) 414-4901
www.fdot.gov/planning/policy
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Transit Agency Planning Coordination in Florida

Jeff Kramer, AICP
University of South Florida
Center for Urban Transportation Research
Study Purpose

- Benchmark the current level of coordination and cooperation
- Identify suggestions to improve the degree of consistency between the two documents and agencies

Anecdotal accounts of varying levels of consistency in planning decision-making between MPOs and transit agencies, including LRPTs and TDPs.
Study Findings

1. **Both** MPOs and transit agencies expressed a **high degree of satisfaction** when it came to the process of coordination for the LRTP.

2. **MPOs were less satisfied** than transit agencies with coordination for the TDP and the level of consistency between planning document visions, goals, and strategies.

3. The vast majority of MPOs and transit agencies **do not coordinate the timing of LRTP and TDP updates** and a plurality identified this issue as their **biggest challenge**.

4. **Personality is key** (i.e., getting along contributes to better coordination).

5. Regularly scheduled **coordination meetings** improves coordination.

6. **Collaboration** on planning studies or transportation projects can lead to improved coordination on the LRTP and TDP updates.

7. **Formalizing coordination** through an interlocal agreement can improve planning coordination.

8. MPOs playing a role in transit system **operations** can improve planning coordination.
Suggestions

• Implement regular meetings
  • Formal or informal meetings
  • Builds bridges, fosters trust, and improves understanding between staff
  • Provides opportunities to heighten management level sensitivity to issues and concerns
  • Helps to overcome obstacles resulting from staff turnover

• Implement mechanisms to increase awareness between boards
  • Occasional joint meetings of agency boards to discuss issues of common concern
  • Provides a regular forum for coordinated and informed planning decision-making
  • Encourage board members to engage in dialogue on issues and concerns of each agency
  • Include a standing agenda item for both agencies
Suggestions

- Ensure that staff is active in the committee structure of the other agency
  - Report issues and concerns to inform planning decisions
  - Agencies can use the committees of the other agency (with permission) to advance the planning activities of their own agency
  - Increases familiarity with issues and concerns between agencies

- Share staff between both agencies
  - MPO staff takes on partial or full responsibility for transit planning activities
  - Transit agency staff conducts planning work for the MPO
  - Staff conducting planning work are deeply familiar with the needs and expectations of both agencies
Suggestions

• Enter into a formal agreement
  • Detail responsibilities, activities, and mechanisms for transit planning activities
  • Modify existing state statute and administrative code to define the roles each agency should play

• Adjust the update cycle of the TDP and LRTP*
  • Use common data sources
  • Saves costs and ensures the use of common data inputs
  • Coordinate technical and public engagement activities
  • Allows each agency to account for the newest planning considerations of the other agency

*Regulatory requirements may present obstacles in synchronization
Suggestions

- Align the vision statements of the LRTP and the TDP
  - Develop the TDP vision to support the LRTP vision (or adopt the LRTP vision as the TDP vision)
  - Facilitate through an interlocal agreement or the state administrative code
  - Helps to achieve a common outcome when conducting planning activities

- Conduct joint public engagement activities
  - Give additional focus to activities related to TDP and LRTP updates
  - E.g. a speaker’s bureau where representatives of both agencies educate community groups, organizations, and stakeholders on the transit planning activities of both agencies
Suggestions

• Jointly fund and conduct planning studies, data collection exercises, and software development activities
  • Agencies work together toward a common goal and provide information that could be used in both agencies’ decision-making processes
  • Builds trust and joint knowledge between staff
  • Increases cost savings through a shared procurement process and joint oversight of contractors

• Provide joint training for MPO and transit agency staff
  • Focus on general planning activities and processes and on the specific elements of the TDP and the LRTP
  • Possible training types include a statewide summit, workshop, webinar series, or peer exchange
  • Possible joint facilitators include FDOT, MPOAC, and FPTA
  • Modify existing FDOT TDP training to include MPO responsibilities in planning as it relates to transit and MPO coordination
  • Local agencies could provide joint training activities focused on TDP and LRTP development
  • Brings staff together and increases familiarity with the needs, issues and concerns of each agency
Questions?

kramer@cutr.usf.edu
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Florida Transportation Plan

- Long-range transportation plan
- A plan for all of Florida
- Policy framework for transportation decisions and investments
Why Does the FTP Matter?

• Guides state, regional and local transportation decisions and investments

• Examples:
  • 2020 FTP (2000) – Strategic Intermodal System
  • 2060 FTP (2010) – Alignment with Florida Strategic Plan for Economic Development; Florida Mobility and Trade Plan
  • Current FTP (2015) – Resilience, Workforce, Choices
## Cross-cutting Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>State/Interregional</th>
<th>Regional/Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Automated, connected, electric, and shared vehicles  
- Transportation system management and operations  
- Big data  
- New materials and processes | - Extreme weather  
- Emergency evacuation and response  
- Sea level rise  
- Flooding  
- Economic and societal changes | - SIS, including modal facilities  
- Trade & logistics  
- Multi-use/multi-modal facilities  
- Global, statewide, and interregional connectivity  
- Florida’s economic drivers and industries | - Urbanized, non-urbanized, and rural  
- Congestion relief  
- Land use and community planning  
- Regional visions  
- Environment  
- Economic development |
FTP Steering Committee

- 34-member Steering Committee
  - Guide the update process
  - Provide recommendations to FDOT
  - Members include
    - FHWA, DEP, DEO, DOH, FHP, MPO, RPC
    - Modal, environmental, and business partners
FTP Subcommittees

• Automated, Connected, Electric, Shared (Technology)
  • Broader definition of infrastructure

• Resilience
  • Environmental, weather, economic, operational disruptors
  • Ability to absorb, withstand, and recover from disruptors

• Safety *NEW*
  • Highlights importance of safety and identify new strategies
  • Supports Strategic Highway Safety Plan update and identification of emphasis areas
  • Includes Florida Police Chiefs, Florida Sheriffs’ Association, and FACERS, as well as FTP Steering Committee representatives

• Visit www.floridatransportationplan.com to become a friend of a subcommittee
Get Involved!
How will we use your input?

Input is received at meetings, online, through survey, etc.

Provided to the FTP Steering Committee and Subcommittees for review and consideration

Your input is used to shape the plan
Questions?

DANA REIDING
Office of Policy Planning
Florida Department of Transportation
dana.reiding@dot.state.fl.us
850-414-4719

www.floridatransportationplan.com