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2010 Urbanized Areas and Next Steps

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

- 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

- 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
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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
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)
District Boundaries
Congressional Districts
State Legislative Districts

Suggestions:

- Authorize MPOs to adopt regional long range transportation plans and to prioritize regional projects
- Allocate funds for regional projects identified through a process involving more than one MPO
- Encourage regional transportation planning by providing financial incentives for MPOs to consolidate, coordinate

Financial incentives contingent upon:

- Top down regional long range transportation plans
- Process for selecting regional transportation priorities
- Linking regional transportation priorities in individual MPO work products and processes
**MPO Regional Coordination**

- 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

- 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

- 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
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

Counties in Regional Transportation Areas

Regional Authorities in Regional Transportation Areas

Note: Interlocal Agreements executed as of September 2008
Incentives: Regional Decision Making

- “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

- 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?

- 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?
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