Census Update

Florida Transportation Commission July 12, 2012



Kathleen Neill Office of Policy Planning

2010 Urbanized Areas and Next Steps

- Federal/state requirements: MPO designation, boundaries, and membership
- u Growth of urbanized areas in Florida
- **u** FTC review of regional transportation planning (2003)
- u MPO regional coordination
- Upcoming activities



Designation of MPOs

- **u** Federal law and rule:
 - Designate a MPO for each urbanized area over 50,000 (as defined by Census)
 - To extent feasible, only one MPO per urbanized area or group of contiguous urbanized areas
 - More than one MPO may be designated due to size and complexity
 - MPO designation/redesignation based on agreement between Governor and local elected officials
 - Designation of an existing MPO remains in effect until the MPO is redesignated



Designation of MPOs, cont.

- u State law:
 - ✓ MPO voting membership: between 5 and 19 members
 - Exact number determined on equitable geographic-population ratio by Governor, based on agreement among affected local governments
 - Other MPO voting memberships provisions: minimum number of county commissioners, alternate members, etc.
 - Governor reviews MPO membership in conjunction with decennial census and reapportions it as needed
 - Special provisions: charter county over 1 million in population
- u After each census, existing MPOs:
 - Reassess their metropolitan planning area boundaries, voting membership



Highlights: Florida's 2010 Urbanized Areas

- **u** Continuing growth pattern, urbanized areas:
 - ✓ Growing, expanding
 - Especially along coastline, major corridors
- Two new urbanized areas:
 - ✓ Sebring-Avon Park
 - Population: 61,625
 - Homosassa Springs-Beverly Hills-Citrus Springs
 - Population: 80,962















Urbanized Areas in Lee & Collier Counties – 1980







Urbanized Areas in Lee & Collier Counties – 2000



Urbanized Areas in Lee & Collier Counties – 2010







FTC Review: Regional Transportation Planning (2003)

- Observations about MPO consolidation:
 - In other states, many urbanized areas more complex than any in Florida and function with a single MPO
 - ✓ Significant barriers to forming fewer, larger MPOs
 - Precedence from the 1970's
 - Organizations/institutional arrangements have been created and developed
 - Vested interests
 - Doubtful local governments would agree to consolidation



FTC Review: Regional Transportation Planning (2003)

U Observations about regional planning:

- Effective regional transportation planning/decision-making more dependent on collaborative process than specific organizational structure
- Coordination activities are only as meaningful as commitment to follow-through on local decisions to support regional objectives
- Improved regional transportation planning hampered by lack of coterminous boundaries among the primary participants



Economic Regions







Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)











FTC Review: Regional Transportation Planning (2003)

- u Suggestions:
 - Authorize MPOs to adopt regional long range transportation plans and to <u>prioritize</u> regional projects
 - Allocate funds for regional projects identified through a process involving more than one MPO
 - Encourage regional transportation planning by providing financial <u>incentives</u> for MPOs to consolidate, coordinate
 - ✓ Financial incentives contingent upon:
 - <u>Top down</u> regional long range transportation plans
 - Process for selecting regional transportation priorities
 - <u>Linking</u> regional transportation priorities in individual MPO work products and processes



MPO Regional Coordination

- u After the 2000 census:
 - ✓ 2 MPOs expand boundaries for new urbanized areas
 - 14 MPOs consolidate or alternatively establish coordinated planning process resulting in but not limited to:
 - Regional long range transportation, serving as basis for each MPO's transportation improvement program
 - Coordinated project prioritization and selection process
 - Regional public involvement process
- MPO coordinated planning:
 - ✓ Interlocal agreements regional coordination activities
 - Including TRIP program



Other activities vary significantly by region

MPO Regional Coordination

- u Examples of MPO coordinated planning
 - ✓ Regional MPO council meetings
 - Composite long range transportation plans
 - Include transportation projects from existing MPO plans (bottoms-up) for regional transportation network
 - May reflect regional goals, but not binding
 - Treasure Coast regional plan (2030): prioritized needs on regional transportation network (not linked to funding)
 - Upcoming initiative: composite transportation improvement plan and composite transit plan for Southeast Florida
 - Some regions: regional public involvement process, data sharing and mapping, transportation model



MPO Regional Coordination

- Key Point: Coordination and composite planning products, while useful, are not binding nor linked to MPO priority setting/decision making
- u Some exceptions:
 - Lee/Collier: regional long range objectives, binding for both MPO long range transportation plans
 - Lee/Collier: joint annual priority lists for SIS, TRIP, and regional trail projects
 - Sarasota-Manatee/Charlotte County-Punta Gorda joint annual priority for TRIP and regional trail projects
 - Decision-making alternates



Incentives: Regional Decision Making

- u Transportation Regional Incentive Program
 - Established in 2005, funded by documentary stamps
 - Purpose:
 - Provide an incentive for regional planning
 - Leverage investments in regionally-significant transportation facilities (roads and public transportation)
 - Up to 50% of non-federal share of project costs for public transportation projects
 - Significantly diminished funding, particularly after FY 2014



Transportation Regional Incentive Program Participating Areas



Incentives: Regional Decision Making

- u "PL" formula
 - ✓ Federal funds for carrying out federal MPO requirements
 - State DOTs develop the formulas
 - ✓ Current PL formula in Florida
 - Off-the-top distribution for statewide MPO activities
 - \$350,000 base amount for each MPO
 - Rest distributed proportionally to the MPOs
 - Prior disincentives removed:
 - MPOs that merge, retain base allocation
 - \$350,000 one-time allocation for MPOs pulling in new urbanized areas



Issues

- Designated MPO for each new urbanized area
- u Existing MPOs could be asked to:
 - Reaffirm existing boundaries/voting membership
 - Update metropolitan planning area boundary (*and voting membership as needed*) to reflect expanded urbanized area
 - ✓ For multiple MPOs representing single urbanized area:
 - Consider merging or enhancing coordinated planning process
 - Must coordinate on regional transportation priorities (HB 599)
 - Perhaps address differently MPOs with minor urbanized area extension into adjacent MPO



Issues

- Current state law: MPO voting membership
 - Originated toward single county MPOs
 - ✓ Cap on MPO voting membership needed?
- **u** FTC thought/input:
 - Policy recommendations: new urbanized areas, existing MPOs
 - ✓ Revitalize the TRIP program?
 - Update state law: MPO voting membership, regional coordination provisions
 - ✓ Other ideas?



Think Safety, Buckle Up

