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Study Purpose

• Prepare for anticipated changes to the transportation planning and programming framework and requirements that will result from reauthorization

• Document existing Practice
Study Approach

- Document Review
- Legislative Research
- Interviews
Interviews

- Mn/DOT District Staff
- Mn/DOT Central Programming Staff
- MPO Staff
- Mn/DOT Modal Office Staff
- ATP Members
- RDC Staff
- Mn/DOT State Aid
Interviews

– Approximately 50 interviews conducted across Minnesota (as well as WI and ND).
Study

EXCERPTS
Federal Formula Funds $538M FY09

Centrally Programmed $95M

District C $15M

State Bridge/Corridor Fund $80M

Mn/DOT Projects $226M

Area Transportation Partnerships $392M

Local Projects $166M

Federally Mandated Programs $51M
Area Transportation Partnerships

- Created in 1993 to satisfy the requirements of ISTEA
- Purpose is to create a more collaborative decision making process
  - ATPs prioritize and select projects to receive federal formula funds for highways, trails, and transit capital projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th># of MPOs</th>
<th># of RDCs</th>
<th># of Elected Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP 1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro TAB</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP 7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATP Subtargets

• All ATPs subtarget, or allocate money to a particular category, except for Metro District and District 3.

• The broad categories that ATPs use for subtargeting are:
  – Safety
  – Enhancements
  – Rail Crossings
  – Mn/DOT Road and Bridge
  – City > 5,000 Road and Bridge
  – Off System Bridge
  – County Road and Bridge
  – Transit Capital
Area Transportation Partnerships

- ATP 1
  - Steering Committee
  - Work Group
    - Counties
    - Enhancements
    - Duluth-Superior MIC
    - Mn/DOT
Area Transportation Partnerships

ATP 3

ATIP Development Sub-Committee

Region 5 RDC  East Central RDC  Region 7W (Mn/DOT District 3)  St. Cloud APO  Mn/DOT

Transit
Area Transportation Partnerships
ATP Themes

• Good relationships between partners

• Project selection for local projects is largely based on jurisdictional equity

• Mn/DOT projects are vetted internally but minimal vetting is done by the ATP
## Greater MN MPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Lead for Bi-State MPO’s</th>
<th>Permanent Policy Board - # Members</th>
<th>Permanent Technical Committee - # Members</th>
<th>Additional Permanent Committees</th>
<th>Jurisdictions within Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/EGF</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro COG</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCOG</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Greater MN MPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Long-Range Transportation Planning</th>
<th>Local Transportation Planning Assistance</th>
<th>Economic Development Planning</th>
<th>Land Use Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/EGF</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro COG</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCOG</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>![Considerable Activity]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- ![Considerable Activity] = Considerable Activity
- ![Moderate Activity] = Moderate Activity
- - = Little/No Activity
# Greater MN MPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bike/Pedestrian</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Aeronautics</th>
<th>Ports/Waterways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF/EGF</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro COG</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCOG</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPC</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:** □ = Considerable Activity □ = Moderate Activity — = Little/No Activity
MPO Themes

- MPO roles vary considerably
- Planning coordination between Mn/DOT Districts and MPOs could be improved in some instances
- Though MOUs are required between Mn/DOT, MPOs, and transit operators, most are not maintained and are significantly out of date.
Regional Development Commissions

Legend:
- County
- Region
- Arrowhead
- Central - Inactive
- 7E - East Central
- Headwaters
- 6E - Mid-Minnesota
- Region 5
- Northwest
- Region 9
- Southeast - Inactive
- Southwest
- Twin Cities Area - Inactive
- 6W - Upper Minnesota Valley
- 4 - West Central Initiative
Regional Development Commissions

- Transit
- Functional Classification
- Trails
- Freight
- Rail
- Scenic Byways
- Safe Routes to School
- ATPs
RDC Notes

• Only West Central Initiative has an updated regional transportation plan

• In areas where there is not an active RDC, Mn/DOT District takes the role
Overview of Planning and Programming in Minnesota

• Comparisons between Minnesota’s:
  – ATPs
  – MPOs
  – RDCs

• Briefly describes Mn/DOT’s role in planning and programming for each mode

• Snapshot of current practice
Overview of Planning and Programming in Minnesota

http://www.dot.state.mn.us/planning/program/overview.html
Questions?