MPO Comments on FHWA Notices of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRMs)

Performance of the National Highway System, Freight Movement on the Interstate System, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program ("NHS, Freight, & CMAQ")
NPRM: April 22, 2016
Comments Due: August 20, 2016

MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform
NPRM: June 27, 2016
Comments Due: August 26, 2016
OVERVIEW of NHS, Freight, & CMAQ

Performance of the NHS
- Percentage of Interstate & non-Interstate NHS providing for Reliable Travel Times
- Percentage of Interstate & non-Interstate NHS where Peak Hour Travel Times meet expectations

Freight Movement on the Interstate System
- Percentage of Interstate providing for Reliable Truck Travel Times
- Percentage of Interstate Mileage Uncongested

Traffic Congestion
- Annual Hours of Excessive Delay per Capita

On-Road Mobile Source Emissions
- Total Emission Reductions for Applicable Criteria Pollutant and Precursor*

Proposed Rule Making: Schedule for Setting Targets
Performance of NHS, Freight, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
- State Baseline Report due Oct 2018, with 2 & 4 year targets
- MPO targets due 180 days after State targets set; report to State DOT
- State targets could be as early as fall 2017, and MPO targets would still be due 6 months later
- Non-NHS travel time reliability targets not due until 2020
- FHWA “significant progress” determination every 2 years, statewide
MPOs Can Adopt State Targets or Set Their Own

Currently, FDOT only has established targets for Air Quality

• “FDOT has a long-standing commitment to maintaining air quality attainment levels in compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)”

MPO’s Potential Comments on NPRM for NHS, Freight, and CMAQ

• We will comply with Final Rules, however the proposed measures:
  – Encourage addressing congestion by moving traffic at a high rate of speed without consideration of safety or community impacts
  – Only address reliability of car travel, which fails to account for alternative travel modes
  – Treat highways and arterial roads the same, despite the different needs and functions served
MPO’s Potential Comments on NPRM for NHS, Freight, and CMAQ

• Continued:
  – Fail to encourage system connectivity to promote economic growth
  – Utilize delay metrics to assess congestion, which fail to account for alternative travel modes
  – Threshold for average truck speed is >50mph, which may not be realistic for a dense, urban community

OVERVIEW of MPO Coordination & Planning Area Reform

- Would clarify that the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) must include the entire urbanized area, plus the contiguous area forecast to become urbanized within the 20 year planning horizon.
  – In practice, MPA has been synonymous with the MPO boundary.
  – In statute, MPA is intended to be the entire urbanized area.
  – In complex areas, the statute envisions there could be multiple MPOs within one MPA.
Multiple MPOs in the MPA

- Governors and MPOs would determine whether multiple MPOs are warranted within a single Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA).
- Based on the size and complexity of the area.

Multiple MPOs in an MPA

- Would jointly develop planning products including a single metropolitan long range transportation plan (LRTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and performance targets.
Formal Planning Agreements

- Must maintain a current planning agreement to improve coordination.
- Must have a dispute resolution process.
- Must coordinate on analyses of areas within the MPA.

Justification for MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform NPRM

- Strengthen coordination of MPOs and States
- Promote use of regional approaches to planning and decision-making
- Emphasize importance of regional perspective
- Ensure transportation investments reflect needs and priorities of entire region
- Recognize critical role of MPOs in providing for region’s well-being
- Strengthen voice of MPOs in transportation planning process
Tampa-St. Pete Urbanized Area, 2010 Census:
– 3 Counties
– 2.4 M people
– 957 sq mi urban
– 400 sq mi water
Eight Is Enough?

Urbanized Areas, 2000 Census & 2010 Census

• What will it look like in 2020?

Option 1: Merge three MPOs

Need to address:

• 25-member cap – which board seats eliminated?
• Financial issues for stand-alone MPOs – capital float for grant reimbursement; also higher overhead costs
• Process for boundary adjustments on regular basis with Hernando, Polk, & Manatee; note planning boundaries will not match implementers’ boundaries
Option 2: Merge six MPOs

Need to address:
- 25-member cap – which board seats eliminated?
- Merger with TBARTA to aid with financial issues?
- Fewer boundary issues – UZAs & future growth largely contained within boundary of 8 counties
- Removes transportation decision-making from level of land use decisions & community involvement

Option 3: Keep separate MPOs but create new tri-county LRTP, TIP, etc., etc.

Supported by Forward Pinellas

Need to address:
- Invent new decision-making process
- Agree on representation (unlike TMA Leadership Group?)
- Consensus-building re: different planning contexts & priorities
- What is the role of existing MPO board & cmtes.?
- What is the role of TBARTA/CCC?
Option 4: Keep separate MPOs but create new eight-county LRTP, TIP, etc., etc.

Already have most of these organizational structures & planning products in place ....
- Regional interlocal agreement for planning & coord.
- Regional dispute resolution process
- Regional performance measures: CMP State of the System
- Regional air quality agreement (draft, awaiting USEPA)
- Regional public participation program ←Hills MPO is sponsoring an update in FY 16/17
- Recent legislative change to merge CCC with TBARTA
  ❑ Need to prepare a regional TIP

Traveling Across County Lines for Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Commuters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>3,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Hernando</td>
<td>19,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>83,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>50,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>43,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>33,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>13,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Airport Travel Impacts: TIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passengers Reside in</th>
<th>Annual Passengers</th>
<th>Daily Passengers</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>3,014,857</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>1,996,013</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>682,815</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>535,224</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>502,282</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>287,561</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando</td>
<td>195,974</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>109,813</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,324,539</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,068</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non-Resident Passengers:</em></td>
<td>12,007,441</td>
<td>32,898</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,331,980</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,966</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TBARTA Priorities: 5 Year Horizon

- I-275 SR 60/Memorial Interchange
- Gateway Expressway
- Howard Frankland Bridge
- Tampa Bay Express: Phase I
- SR 54/56 Improvements
- Suncoast Parkway 2
- TIA/People Mover Connection/Westshore Regional Multimodal Center
- University Parkway/I-75 Interchange Area

Adopted at February 2015 Board Meeting

TBARTA by the Numbers

2 FDOT Districts (1 & 7)
2 Toll Authorities
2 RPCs
5 MPOs
3 Seaports
3 Commercial Airports
7 Counties
7 Transit Providers
46 Cities

*Source: 2010 U.S. Census
MPO’s Potential Comments on NPRM for MPO Coordination & Planning Area Reform

• We support multi-county planning, and have put our money where our mouth is, again & again.

• Our region is quite large & complex, & becoming more so.

• Focusing on just one UZA is short-sighted. We have 5 that are already growing into each other, and will be even more intertwined in 20 years.

• An 8-county planning area reflects the region’s economy but is too large for meaningful community engagement or land use coordination.

• FHWA should allow an “umbrella” approach.

QUESTIONS? COMMENTS?