

Multi-State Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Approaches, Cases, and Institutional Arrangements

Requested by:

American Association of State Highway
and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)

Standing Committee on Planning

Prepared by:

Katherine F. Turnbull
Texas Transportation Institute
The Texas A&M University System
College Station, Texas

October, 2006

The information contained in this report was prepared as part of NCHRP Project 08-36, Task 44, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Transportation Research Board.

Acknowledgement

This study was requested by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and conducted as part of National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Project 08-36. The NCHRP is supported by annual voluntary contributions from the state Departments of Transportation. Project 08-36 is intended to fund quick response studies on behalf of the AASHTO Standing Committee on Planning. The report was prepared by Dr. Katherine F. Turnbull of the Texas Transportation Institute. The work was guided by a task group chaired by Charlie Howard, Puget Sound Regional Council, which included Sonna Lynn Fernandez, Idaho Transportation Department; Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Regional Transportation Council; Eric Phillips, Washington State Department of Transportation; and Mary Lynn Tischer, Virginia Department of Transportation. The project was managed by Ronald D. McCready, NCHRP Senior Program Officer.

Disclaimer

The opinions and conclusions expressed or implied are those of the research agency that performed the research and are not necessarily those of the Transportation Research Board or its sponsors. The information contained in this document was taken directly from the submission of the author(s). This document is not a report of the Transportation Research Board or of the National Research Council.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | v |
| LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| LIST OF FIGURES | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | vi |
| CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Project Objective..... | 1 |
| Activities Conducted..... | 1 |
| Organization of this Report | 2 |
| CHAPTER TWO – OVERVIEW OF MULTI-STATE MPOs | 3 |
| Location of Multi-State MPOs and Number of States Involved | 3 |
| Date MPO Designated..... | 5 |
| Population of Multi-State MPO Areas | 6 |
| Multi-State MPO Organizational Structures | 6 |
| Multi-State MPOs Enabling Authority | 8 |
| Policy Board Composition | 8 |
| Policy Board Voting..... | 10 |
| Policy Board Officers..... | 11 |
| Advisory Committees..... | 11 |
| CHAPTER THREE – MULTI-STATE MPO CASE STUDIES | 13 |
| Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission | 14 |
| Bi-State Regional Commission..... | 17 |
| Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization | 19 |
| Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council..... | 22 |
| Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization | 26 |
| National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board | 28 |
| Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments..... | 33 |
| Wilmington Area Planning Council..... | 37 |
| CHAPTER FOUR – MULTI-STATE MPO CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES | 41 |
| Transportation Planning Process | 41 |
| Legal Requirements and Institutional Arrangements..... | 44 |
| Multi-State MPO Structure..... | 45 |
| Multi-State MPOs and Characteristics of Successful MPOs | 46 |
| CHAPTER FIVE – FURTHER RESEARCH | 49 |
| RESOURCES | 51 |
| APPENDIX A – INFORMATION REQUEST | 57 |
| APPENDIX B –MULTI-STATE MPO PROFILES | 59 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Table 1. List of Multi-State MPOs. | 4 |
| Table 2. Date Multi-State MPOs Designated. | 6 |
| Table 3. Population of Multi-State MPO Areas. | 7 |
| Table 4. Multi-State MPOs Organizational Structure. | 7 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Figure 1. Location of Multi-State MPOs (City of Main Office Shown)..... | 5 |
| Figure 2. Location of Multi-State MPO Case Studies (City of Main Office Shown by Star). | 13 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared under NCHRP Project 8-36, Task 44, by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), a part of The Texas A&M University System. The Institute is part of the AECOM Consulting Transportation Group team on NCHRP Project 8-36. The Texas A&M Research Foundation is the contractor for the study. Numerous TTI staff members contributed to this project. Ms. Bonnie Duke was responsible for word processing, Mr. Anthony Simmons assisted with the background research, Ms. Penelope Weinberger helped with follow-up contacts on the information requests, and Mr. Gary Lobaugh edited the final report. Ron McCready served as the NCHRP staff liaison for the project. Finally, staff at metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), state departments of transportation, and other agencies offered information on institutional arrangements, organizational structures, and challenges and opportunities associated with multi-state MPOs. The assistance of all these individuals is both recognized and greatly appreciated.

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

Introduction

There are currently 384 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in the U.S. As required by federal legislation and regulations, MPOs are responsible for planning, programming, and coordinating federal highway and transit investments in urban areas with populations of 50,000 or more. MPOs conduct a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (“3-C”) planning process in association with state departments of transportation, local governments, and other transportation agencies. MPOs are established through formal agreements among the appropriate agencies and governmental units and must be officially designated by the governor.

The boundaries of 40 existing MPOs cross state lines. The establishment and operation of these multi-state MPOs also require formal agreements among agencies and government units and formal designation by governors in the participating states. The creation and operation of multi-state MPOs is more complex given differences in state laws, governmental and jurisdictional structures, and institutional and financial arrangements. The nature of multi-state MPOs may also be influenced by the state and local government decision-making context and the ownership of the transportation infrastructure in the various states.

While different facets of MPO institutional structures, as well as the composition of policy boards, decision-making approaches, and planning and public involvement methods have been examined over the years, little research has been conducted exploring the unique features of multi-state MPOs. This project helps address that need. The study examines the organizational structures, institutional arrangements, and challenges and opportunities associated with multi-state MPOs. It summarizes the current status of the 40 multi-state MPOs.

Project Objective

The objective of this project is to identify the approaches used in establishing and operating multi-state MPOs throughout the country. Information on the enabling authority for the 40 multi-state MPOs is presented, along with the institutional arrangements, organizational structures, and board composition and voting requirements. Insights are also provided on some of the unique challenges and opportunities facing multi-state MPOs. The results of this research are of benefit and use to professionals at existing multi-state MPOs, state departments of transportation, public transit agencies, and local governments. The results are also of use to multi-state areas that may reach populations of 50,000 in the 2010 Census, existing MPOs that may expand into adjacent states based on the 2010 Census, and multi-state areas that have separate MPOs.

Activities Conducted

The project objective was accomplished through the completion of numerous activities. First, a literature review was conducted using traditional and on-line search capabilities.

Articles, surveys, and reports addressing MPOs were identified. Literature examining institutional arrangements, organizational structures, and related topics was reviewed.

Second, a preliminary list of multi-state MPOs was identified through the Travel Model Improvement Program (TMIP) database. The TMIP database identified 31 multi-state MPOs. Researchers used the *Profiles of Metropolitan Planning Organizations* published by the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO), the AMPO Internet site, and other sources to search for additional multi-state MPOs. This task proved to be more difficult than anticipated, as new multi-state MPOs were designated and existing MPOs expanded into adjoining states based on the 2000 Census. In addition, the summary information in many sources does not always note the multi-state nature of MPOs. To address these concerns, researchers reviewed maps highlighting all MPOs and examined the Internet sites of those located along or close to state boundaries. An additional nine multi-state MPOs were identified through this process, bringing the total number of multi-state MPOs examined in the study to 40. Information on these 40 multi-state MPOs was obtained and reviewed from the individual Internet sites, available MPO documents, and other sources.

Third, an e-mail information request was sent to representatives at the initial list of multi-state MPOs. The e-mail addresses for representatives at the multi-state MPOs were obtained from the TMIP database and the AMPO Internet site. A copy of the information request is provided in Appendix A. Follow-up e-mails and telephone calls were used to obtain responses from these representatives and from individuals at the additional multi-state MPOs.

Finally, more detailed information was collected and examined on eight case study multi-state MPOs. The case studies were selected to provide a mix of organizational structures and institutional arrangements, as well as MPO area size, location, and years in operation. Additional information was obtained from representatives at these MPOs, state departments of transportation, public transit agencies, cities, and counties through telephone calls and e-mails. The case studies provide additional insights into the unique challenges and opportunities facing multi-state MPOs.

Organization of this Report

This report is divided into four chapters following this introduction. Chapter Two provides an overview of the 40 multi-state MPOs. Information on the year the MPO was designated, the enabling authority, the organizational structure, and the policy board composition and voting requirements is summarized for the 40 multi-state MPOs. The eight case studies are presented in Chapter Three. Chapter Four discusses some of the unique challenges and opportunities facing multi-state MPOs. The report concludes with the identification of areas for further research. Appendix A contains a copy of the information request form. Appendix B provides a profile of each multi-state MPO.

CHAPTER TWO – OVERVIEW OF MULTI-STATE MPOS

Information on the 40 multi-state MPOs was obtained through the AMPO and TMIP Internet sites, the AMPO MPO Profiles report, individual MPO Internet sites, and documents from the MPOs. An information request was e-mailed to the director or contact person at the initially identified multi-state MPOs to obtain updated information and to gather insights into the challenges and opportunities associated with multi-state MPOs. A copy of the information request is provided in Appendix A. Follow-up telephone calls and e-mails were used to obtain information on the 40 multi-state MPOs. The characteristics of the 40 multi-state MPOs are summarized in this chapter. A profile of each multi-state MPO, with information on the date the MPO was designated, the organizational structure, and policy board or committee composition is provided in Appendix B.

The 40 multi-state MPOs represent slightly fewer than 10 percent of the 384 current MPOs in the U.S. As noted in the previous chapter, maintaining up-to-date information on the number and nature of MPOs is not easy due to the continuing formation of new MPOs and expansion of existing MPOs based on the results of each Census. The information presented in this report provides a snapshot of current conditions.

Location of Multi-State MPOs and Number of States Involved

Table 1 lists the 40 multi-state MPOs. The name of the MPO, the city and state of the MPO office, and the participating states are listed in the table. The lead state, which is typically determined based on population, is listed first. Abbreviations used in the table include MPO, metropolitan planning commission (MPC), regional planning commission (RPC), council of governments (COG), and transportation planning board (TPB). In addition, “metro” has been used in place of metropolitan in a few MPO names. Figure 1 highlights the location of the 40 multi-state MPOs.

A total of five of the 40 multi-state MPOs involve three states, one includes two states and the District of Columbia, and 34 involve two states. As discussed in the next chapter, there are examples of changes in the lead state due to increases in population in that state. In other cases, communities and the corresponding state have been added to an existing MPO as a result of increases in population.

As Figure 1 shows, multi-state MPOs are found primarily in the midwest, east central, and southeast portion of the country. Ohio has the most multi-state MPOs with six, followed by Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia with five each. Minnesota and Iowa each have four multi-state MPOs. Tennessee is the lead state on five multi-state MPOs, while West Virginia and Ohio are the lead states on three multi-state MPOs.

Table 1. List of Multi-State MPOs.

| MPO | City | State | States (Lead State First) |
|--|--------------|--------------|--|
| Augusta Regional Transportation Study | Augusta | GA | Georgia, South Carolina |
| Belomar Regional Council | Wheeling | WV | West Virginia, Ohio |
| Bi-State MPO | Fort Smith | AR | Arkansas, Oklahoma |
| Bi-State Regional Commission | Rock Island | IL | Illinois, Iowa |
| Bristol Urban Area MPO | Bristol | TN | Tennessee, Virginia |
| Brooke-Hancock-Jefferson MPC | Steubenville | OH | Ohio, West Virginia |
| Chattanooga-Hamilton County RPC | Chattanooga | TN | Tennessee, Georgia |
| Clarksville-Montgomery County MPO | Clarksville | TN | Tennessee, Kentucky |
| Columbus-Phenix City MPO | Columbus | GA | Georgia, Alabama |
| Cowlitz-Wahkiakum COG | Kelso | WA | Washington, Oregon |
| Delaware Valley RPC | Philadelphia | PA | Pennsylvania, New Jersey |
| Dubuque Metro Area Transportation Study | Dubuque | IA | Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois |
| Duluth-Superior Metro Interstate Council | Duluth | MN | Minnesota, Wisconsin |
| East-West Gateway COG | St Louis | MO | Missouri, Illinois |
| El Paso MPO | El Paso | TX | Texas, New Mexico |
| Evansville Urban Transportation Study | Evansville | IN | Indiana, Kentucky |
| Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan COG | Fargo | | North Dakota, Minnesota |
| Florida-Alabama Urbanized Area Transportation Planning Organization | Pensacola | FL | Florida, Alabama |
| Grand Forks-East Grand Forks MPO | Grand Forks | ND | North Dakota, Minnesota |
| Hagerstown-Eastern Panhandle MPO | Hagerstown | MD | Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania |
| Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency | Louisville | KY | Kentucky, Indiana |
| Kingsport MPO | Kingsport | TN | Tennessee, Virginia |
| KYOV A Interstate Planning Commission | Huntington | WV | West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky |
| La Crosse Area Planning Committee | La Crosse | WI | Wisconsin, Minnesota |
| Lewis-Clark Valley MPO | Lewiston | ID | Idaho, Washington |
| Memphis Urban Area MPO | Memphis | TN | Tennessee, Mississippi |
| Mid-America Regional Council | Kansas City | MO | Missouri, Kansas |
| National Capital Region TPB | Washington | DC | DC, Maryland, Virginia |
| Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional COG | Cincinnati | OH | Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana |
| Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan Area Planning Agency | Omaha | NE | Nebraska, Iowa |
| Salisbury/Wicomico MPO | Salisbury | MD | Maryland, Delaware |
| Siouxland Interstate Metro Planning Council | Sioux City | IA | Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska |
| St. Joseph Area Transportation Study Organization | St. Joseph | MO | Missouri, Kansas |
| State Line Area Transportation Study | Beloit | WI | Wisconsin, Illinois |
| Tahoe MPO | Stateline | NV | Nevada, California |
| Texarkana MPO | Texarkana | TX | Texas, Arkansas |
| Toledo Metropolitan Area COG | Toledo | OH | Ohio, Michigan |
| Wilmington Area Planning Council | Newark | DE | Delaware, Maryland |
| Wood-Washington-Wirt Interstate Planning Commission | Parkersburg | WV | West Virginia, Ohio |
| Yuma MPO | Yuma | AZ | Arizona, California |



Figure 1. Location of Multi-State MPOs (City of Main Office Shown).

Date MPO Designated

Federal legislation in the early 1960s established requirements for MPOs and the metropolitan transportation planning process in urban areas of 50,000 or more in population. The roles and responsibilities of MPOs have evolved over the years based on changes in federal legislation. In addition, state legislation and local initiatives have influenced the nature and scope of some MPOs. The number of MPOs has increased since the 1960s, as more urban areas have reached the 50,000 population threshold.

Most multi-state MPOs were initially established covering multiple states. A few were initially designated as an MPO in one state and expanded into a multi-state MPO as a result of population growth in an adjacent state and the expansion of the urban area boundary. For the purpose of this study, the date of multi-state MPO designation was used. The case studies in Chapter Four and multi-state MPO profiles in Appendix B provide more information on changes in the MPO designation due to population growth in another state or other factors.

As Table 2 shows, 73 percent of multi-state MPOs were designated in the 1960s and 1970s, while 18 percent were established in the 1980s. One multi-state MPO was formed in the 1990s. A total of three multi-state MPOs, or seven percent, were designated after the 2000 Census. Overall, multi-state MPOs reflect more of the total MPOs formed in the 1960s and only one of some 90 MPOs designated during the 1990s.

Table 2. Date Multi-State MPOs Designated.

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Number of MPOs</u> | <u>Percentage of MPOs</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 2000-2005 | 3 | 7% |
| 1990-1999 | 1 | 2% |
| 1980-1989 | 7 | 18% |
| 1970-1979 | 15 | 38% |
| 1960-1969 | 14 | 35% |
| Total | 40 | 100% |

Population of Multi-State MPO Areas

As Table 3 shows, multi-state MPOs are found in small, medium, and large metropolitan areas. A total of 19 multi-state MPOs, or just under half, are classified as Transportation Management Areas (TMAs), as they represent metropolitan areas with populations of 200,000 or more. There are six multi-state MPOs covering areas with over 1 million in population. The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, representing the Philadelphia metropolitan area, is the largest multi-state MPO with a population of 5.2 million, followed by the National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board in the Washington, D.C., northern Virginia, and suburban Maryland area with a population of 4.7 million. As might be expected, the larger multi-state MPOs were all established in the 1960s and 1970s. The multi-state MPOs established since 1980 tend to be smaller in size, with the exception of the Florida-Alabama Urban Area Transportation Planning Organization which expanded from the Pensacola MPO to include portions of Alabama based on the 2000 Census.

Multi-State MPO Organizational Structures

Table 4 presents the organizational structure of the 40 multi-state MPOs. As the table shows, the organizational structure of multi-state MPOs are fairly split among those that are separate agencies, those that are housed within a regional agency, those located in a COG, and those that are part of a city or county. This distribution appears to be in line with the overall organization of all MPOs. There do not appear to be any specific trends relating the organizational structure to population or the date the multi-state MPO was established.

Table 3. Population of Multi-State MPO Areas.

| <u>Population</u> | <u>Number of MPOs</u> | <u>Percent of MPOs</u> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 50,000 – 99,999 | 8 | 20% |
| 100,000 – 199,999 | 13 | 33% |
| 200,000 – 499,999 | 6 | 15% |
| 500,000 – 999,999 | 7 | 17% |
| 1 Million and Above | 6 | 15% |
| Total | 40 | 100% |

For example, of the six multi-state MPOs representing areas with populations of over 1 million, four are part of COGs, one is housed in a county, and one is an independent agency. At the other end of the spectrum, of the eight multi-state MPOs under 100,000 in population, four are located in regional organizations, two are independent agencies, one is part of a county, and one is housed in a COG.

The organizational structure of multi-state MPOs may be influenced by state statutes or policies. For example, the Ohio Revised Code allows four MPO organizational structures. These organizational structures are regional planning commissions, regional councils of government, interstate planning organizations, and area planning commissions. Although there is no policy relating specifically to multi-state MPOs, the multi-state MPOs in Tennessee are all located within a city or county.

Table 4. Multi-State MPOs Organizational Structure.

| <u>Type of Agency</u> | <u>Number of MPOs</u> | <u>Percent of MPOs</u> |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Independent Agency | 11 | 27.5% |
| Within Regional Agency | 8 | 20% |
| Within Council of Government | 10 | 25% |
| Within City or County Government | 11 | 27.5% |
| Total | 40 | 100% |

Multi-State MPOs Enabling Authority

Representatives at the multi-state MPOs were asked to identify the enabling authority establishing the multi-state MPO. Information available on the multi-state MPO Internet sites was also reviewed related to the enabling authority. The majority of responses indicated that an intergovernmental or interstate agreement or compact provides the enabling mechanism. Other enabling methods identified included bi-state memoranda-of-understanding, joint powers agreements, inter-municipal agreements, legislative compacts, and governors' compacts. However, there does not appear to be any trend linking the type of enabling authority to the size, the date of designation, the organizational structure, or the states involved in multi-state MPOs.

Policy Board Composition

Representatives at the multi-state MPOs were asked to describe the organization of the policy board, committee, or council, including the number of members, the number of members by state, and the agencies or jurisdictions represented by members. Information available on the multi-state MPO Internet sites, including the by-laws and the enabling authority, was also reviewed to provide a better understanding of the policy board composition and representation. Follow-up telephone calls and e-mail requests were used as needed to clarify information.

Three main approaches are found with the composition of multi-state MPO policy boards, committees, or councils. The first approach involves equal designated members from each state regardless of the population distribution or the number of jurisdictions. The second approach involves designated members based on the population or size of participating jurisdictions. This approach results in more members from one of the states. The third approach includes all participating jurisdictions and agencies on the policy board, which results in relatively large boards. In addition, as described in the next section, some multi-state MPOs provide for weighted voting options.

Equal Designated Members from Participating States. The policy boards of eight multi-state MPOs include the same number of members from jurisdictions and agencies in each participating state, regardless of the population distribution among the states or the number of participating jurisdictions in each state. The multi-state MPOs with equal board membership are all two-state MPOs. The eight MPOs with equal board memberships are the Clarksville-Montgomery County MPO, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, the Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council, the East-West Gateway COG, the Grand Forks-East Grand Forks MPO, the Lewis-Clark Valley MPO, the State Line Area Transportation Study, and the Tahoe MPO. Two multi-state MPOs, Columbus-Phenix City MPO and the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency, have equal members from participating states, but also have additional staff or regional members. The Columbus-Phenix City MPO has a member from the citizen advisory committee and a staff member on the policy board, while the Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency has two additional regional representatives.

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission provides one example of equal membership from participating states. The Compact establishing the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission defines the membership, quorum, and voting requirements. The Commission includes 18 members, nine from Pennsylvania and nine from New Jersey. There are four ex-officio members representing the Pennsylvania Secretary of Transportation, the Pennsylvania Director of the Governor's Office of Policy and Planning, the New Jersey Commissioner of Transportation, and the New Jersey Commissioner of Community Affairs. The other seven members from Pennsylvania include an appointee of the Governor, and elected officials from Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery counties and the cities of Philadelphia and Chester. The other seven members from New Jersey include an appointee of the Governor, and elected officials from Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, and Mercer counties, and the cities of Camden and Trenton. The Compact establishes a 10-member Executive Committee.

The Compact defines a quorum for both the Commission and the Executive Committee and the voting requirements. On the Commission, at least five members from each state, including at least two of three state officials or appointed alternates from each state, must be present for a quorum. No action is effective unless a majority of each state's representatives who are present at the meeting, including at least two of three of the state's officials, vote in favor of the action. A quorum for the 10-member Executive Committee requires at least three representatives from each state, including at least two of three state officials, or appointee or alternate from each state. No action is effective unless a majority of each state's representatives who are present, including at least two of three state officials or appointees or alternates, vote in favor of the action.

Designated Members Based on the Population of Participating Jurisdictions.

Designated membership related to the relative population of jurisdictions in each state is the most common approach found with multi-state policy boards. Since population is not usually distributed equally between states, this approach results in uneven membership from the participating states.

In three cases of bi-state MPOs – the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum COG, the Salisbury/Wicomico MPO, and the Yuma MPO – the second state's share of the total area population is so small that it does not have any voting members on the policy board. For example, in the Salisbury/Wicomico MPO, communities in Maryland account for some 98 percent of the population. The policy board reflects this distribution, with nine voting members from Maryland and two non-voting members from Delaware.

The Hagerstown-Eastern Panhandle MPO is the only three-state MPO with non-voting representatives on the policy board from one state. The voting members include seven representatives from Maryland and six representatives from West Virginia. Pennsylvania has two non-voting members on the policy board.

Three multi-state MPOs – the Evansville Urban Transportation Study, the Florida-Alabama Urbanized Area Transportation Planning Organization, and the La Crosse Area Planning Committee – have one policy board member from the second state.

The policy boards of the remaining multi-state MPOs using this approach are typically closer in the number of members from participating states. The Mid-America Regional Council in the Kansas City area has 17 representatives from Missouri and 13 members from Kansas. The Texarkana MPO Policy Board includes eight members representing jurisdictions and agencies in Texas and six members from Arkansas.

All Participating Jurisdictions and Agencies. A third approach includes all participating jurisdictions and agencies as members of the policy board. The MPOs with the largest policy boards typically provide voting membership to all jurisdictions in the area and frequently to specific agencies or community groups. Examples of multi-state MPOs utilizing this approach include the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments, with a 103-member Board of Trustees, the Brook-Hancock-Jefferson Metropolitan Planning Committee, with a 76-member Policy Committee, and the Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan Planning Agency, with a 64-member Council of Officials. The OKI Board of Trustees represents the largest MPO policy board in the country and the policy boards of the Brook-Hancock-Jefferson and the Omaha-Council Bluffs MPOs are among the largest.

The policy boards with large memberships have some type of smaller executive committee. The 103-member OKI Board of Trustees has an Executive Committee with the power to act on behalf of the Board. The 28-member Executive Committee includes the Board president, first vice president, second vice president, treasurer, and members from specific categories. The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) by-laws establish a 10-member Steering Committee to help facilitate work program development and management of the transportation planning process. The Steering Committee is comprised of the TPB Chairperson, immediate past Chairperson, one local governmental representative from the District of Columbia, one local elected local governmental representative from Maryland, one elected local governmental representative from Virginia, the Chair of the Technical Committee, and the representatives from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the District of Columbia Department of Public Works, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority (WMATA). The Memphis Urban Area MPOs has a six-member Executive Board comprised of the Governors of Tennessee and Mississippi, the Mayors of Memphis and Shelby County, a representative of the DeSoto County Board, and one other individual. The 30-member Mid-America Regional Council Board of Directors has an Executive Committee comprised of the Chairman, the First Vice-Chairman, the Second Vice-Chairman, the Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Policy Board Voting

Most multi-state MPO policy board members have one vote. A few multi-state MPOs have weighted voting options that may be used in specific cases. Examples of multi-state MPOs with weighted voting options include Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments, La Crosse Area Planning Committee, and the National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board. Representatives from these multi-state MPOs indicated that the weighted voting option is rarely used. The Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan Area Planning Agency uses a slightly different approach by

providing Douglas County, which includes the City of Omaha, with an extra vote on the Executive Committee on-demand on specific issues.

Policy Board Officers

The multi-state MPO policy board officers are typically identified in the by-laws or enabling authority. The officers of most multi-state MPOs include at least a chair, vice-chair, and secretary. Many of the multi-state MPO by-laws or other documents provide some method to ensure that policy board officers are from different states or represent different jurisdictions within the same state.

The Duluth-Superior MIC Policy Board has a Minnesota Co-Chair and a Wisconsin Co-Chair. The monthly board meetings also alternate between Minnesota and Wisconsin, with the co-chair from the opposite state presiding. The Lewis-Clark Valley MPO by-laws require that the two policy board officers, the Chairperson and the Secretary/Treasurer, be from Washington and Idaho. The officers serve one-year terms, with the Secretary/Treasurer automatically assuming the Chair. The National Capital Region Transportation Policy Board includes a chair and two vice-chairs, all of whom serve one-year terms. The by-laws require that the three officers cannot be from the same state, district, or agency.

Advisory Committees

All of the multi-state MPOs have a technical advisory committee or technical coordinating committee, which includes staff from the jurisdictions and transportation agencies in the area. The technical advisory or coordinating committees are responsible for reviewing the various plans and projects, and making recommendations to the policy board, committee, or council. Many multi-state MPOs also have a citizen's advisory committee.

Most multi-state MPOs have other advisory committees that focus on specific modes or topic areas, including intermodal transportation, harbor planning, demographics, bicycles and pedestrians, freight, aviation, air quality, goods movement, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), transportation safety, transit and paratransit, rail, and environmental justice. As could be expected, the multi-state MPOs in larger metropolitan areas have more advisory committees than those in small-to-mid-sized areas.

CHAPTER THREE – MULTI-STATE MPO CASE STUDIES

This chapter presents the eight multi-state MPOs case studies. The case studies were selected to include examples of different organizational structures and institutional arrangements, as well as size, location, and years in operation. The case studies also include examples of changes in multi-state MPO boundaries and participating local governments due to increases in population, as well as MPOs that have not experienced any changes.

For each case study, more detailed information was obtained through reports available from the MPOs and the Internet site. Attempts were also made to contact additional representatives with state departments of transportation, public transit agencies, and local governments by telephone and e-mail. The exact agencies contacted for each case study varied depending on the institutional arrangements in the area and the availability of agency personnel.



Figure 2. Location of Multi-State MPO Case Studies (City of Main Office Shown by Star).

Each case study begins with an overview of the area, the organizational structure, and the institutional arrangements at the MPO. The issues and opportunities associated with the multi-state MPO identified by the agency representatives are described. The case studies include the following multi-state MPOs. The case studies are identified in alphabetical order.

- Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission
- Bi-State Regional Commission
- Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council

- Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
- National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board
- Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments
- Wilmington Area Planning Council

Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission

Augusta, Georgia and Aiken, South Carolina are located along the Savannah River in northeastern Georgia and southwestern South Carolina. Augusta is the second oldest city and the second largest city in Georgia. Augusta was once the capital of Georgia and the area includes numerous historic buildings. With a 2000 population of approximately 463,000, the area continues to experience rapid growth.

Well known as the home of the Masters Golf Tournament, the area is also the home of Fort Gordon, a multi-mission military installation that includes the U.S. Army Signal Center and Computer Science School. The Medical College of Georgia and other health care services, the Savannah River Nuclear Defense Site, manufacturing companies, financial institutions, and businesses are also important parts of the local economy. Tourism is a key part of the economy, and the area's popularity as a retirement location continues to grow.

The Augusta-Aiken metropolitan area is served by I-20, which connects the region with Atlanta to the west and Columbia to the east. The area is also served by I-520, state highways and roadways, and local streets. The Augusta Public Transit Authority and the Aiken County Transit System provide fixed route and specialized transportation services in the area. The Augusta Regional Airport at Bush Field provides air service to major hubs. The area is also served by the Norfolk Southern and CSX Railroads.

The Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission (ARCPC) is the designated MPO for the Augusta Regional Transportation Study (ARTS) through a bi-state memorandum of understanding. The MPO covers the Augusta, Georgia, and Aiken, South Carolina urban area. ARTS was designated as the MPO in 1965. Changes to the MPO boundaries have been made after the 1980 Census, the 1990 Census, and the 2000 Census to reflect population increases in the area. In Georgia, ARTS currently includes all of Richmond County, part of Columbia County, and Fort Gordon Military Reservation. The South Carolina portion of ARTS includes part of Aiken County and part of Edgefield County. The Georgia cities of Augusta, Hephzibath, Blythe, and Grovetown, and the South Carolina cities of Aiken, North Augusta, and Burnetown are included in the boundaries.

The ARTS Policy Committee includes one member from each jurisdiction in the MPO area, the South Carolina Department of Transportation, the Georgia Department of Transportation Highway Commissioner, and the Garrison Commander from Fort Gordon. The representatives from participating jurisdictions are elected officials, typically the mayor and county commissioner or council chairs. Currently, the Policy Committee includes seven members from Georgia and five members from South Carolina representing the jurisdictions and agencies noted below. There are also six ex-officio members.

Georgia (Seven members, one from each jurisdiction or agency)

- Augusta
- Blythe
- Columbia County Commission
- Grovetown
- Hephzibath
- Fort Gordon
- Georgia Department of Transportation

South Carolina (Five members, one from each jurisdiction or agency)

- Aiken
- Aiken County
- City of Burnetown
- North Augusta
- South Carolina Department of Transportation

Ex-Officio Members

- South Carolina Highway Commissioner
- South Carolina Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office
- Georgia State Transportation Board
- Georgia FHWA Office
- ARTS Project Director
- ARTS Citizens Advisory Committee

The ARTS Policy Committee meets on a quarterly basis. The Policy Committee is responsible for approving the long-range transportation plan, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and other documents. It also provides guidance on the development of planning and programming issues and studies.

There is a South Carolina Policy Subcommittee which is comprised of the voting local elected officials and the non-voting/ex-officio federal, state, and local appointed personnel. The South Carolina Subcommittee is responsible for keeping the South Carolina portion of ARTS informed and it serves in an advisory capacity to the Policy Committee.

The Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) also provide input to the Policy Committee and the planning process. The TCC reviews studies and plans, provides technical assistance, and makes recommendations to the Policy Committee. The TCC includes planners and engineers from the participating counties and cities, as well as GDOT and SCDOT. Representatives from Fort Gordon, Augusta Regional Airport Authority, and Augusta Public Transit Authority are also members of the TTC. Non-voting members include staff from GDOT, SCDOT, ARCPC, and the FHWA Georgia and South Carolina Divisions. The ARTS Project Director and the Chair of the ARTS CAC are also members.

The CAC assists with information dissemination and provides input to the Policy Committee on the social, economic, and environmental aspects of transportation plans and

projects. The CAC plays a key role in public involvement activities. The CAC includes citizens from each of the participating jurisdictions.

As noted previously, ARTS is part of the Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission and other agencies. The ARTS Project Director is the Executive Director of the Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission. Staff from the Aiken County Planning and Development Department conduct work tasks in Aiken County. Staff at the GDOT and the SCDOT coordinate state-related elements of studies and assist with the development and use of travel demand modules, and other analysis techniques.

The ARTS Long-Range Plan (LRP) covers a 20-year period and is reviewed and updated at least every five years. The LRP, which currently has a 2025 planning horizon, includes long-range and short-range projects, strategies, and actions. The TIP is updated annually. The TIP for the Georgia portion of ARTS covers a three-year period, while the TIP for the South Carolina part of ARTS covers a five-year period. Preparation of the TIP begins with a comparison of priority transportation needs and available funding. The draft TIP is developed and reviewed by ARTS committees in March, with public review in April. The final TIP is approved by the committees and Policy Board in May and June. The TIP must also be approved by the governors of Georgia and South Carolina.

In addition to the LRP and the TIP, ARTS conducts studies on transportation issues in the area and provides assistance to members. Examples of recent projects and studies include the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan, the Fall Line Air Quality Study and early action compact program activities, and pathway and greenway studies. Corridor studies and public transportation enhancement studies represent other recent activities.

As a multi-state MPO, ARTS faces both challenges and opportunities. Examples of challenges include the different time frames for the TIPs in the two states, differences in financing and funding, and differences in priorities. Examples of opportunities include providing a regional focus, bringing elected officials and groups together on a regular basis, and fostering cooperation and coordination.

As noted previously, the TIP for Georgia covers a three-year period, while the South Carolina TIP covers a five-year period. While this difference does not cause a major problem, it does reflect a different approach taken in the two states. In addition, the funding methods are slightly different in the two states. After each census, SCDOT provides MPOs in the state, including ARTS, with a “guideshare” level of funding that remains constant for the duration of the census. Given differences in needs, the project priorities may vary in the two states. The South Carolina Policy Committee helps keep jurisdictions in South Carolina’s portion of ARTS informed on issues and projects.

The ARTS provides a regional focus for the discussion of critical transportation needs and issues. It fills an important role that is not addressed by any other agency or group. ARTS allows elected and appointed officials to meet on a regular basis and helps foster communication and coordination. The inclusion of Fort Gordon on the Policy Board further ensures that key groups are participating in the transportation planning and decision-making process. ARTS staff have strong working relationships with jurisdictions and agencies in the area, and the TCC and

CAC provide important input. ARTS provides valued unbiased information and expertise to participating jurisdictions and agencies.

Bi-State Regional Commission

The Bi-State Regional Commission is the MPO for the five-county area in western Illinois and eastern Iowa. It covers the Davenport, Iowa and Rock Island and Moline, Illinois urbanized area, which is known as the Quad Cities. The MPO is part of the regional planning agency. Illinois is the lead state for the MPO.

The Quad Cities region is located along the Mississippi River in western Illinois and eastern Iowa. The area is an important intermodal hub, with 26 terminals located along the Mississippi River, 11 of which are served by railroads. The area is served by I-74, I-80, I-88, and I-280, and state and local roadways. The Quad Cities International Airport provides links to major cities by commercial airlines. Manufacturing, health services, food processing, and tourism are also important parts of the regional economy. The 2000 population of the area was approximately 505,700.

The Bi-State Planning Commission was established in 1966 through the merger of the Scott County Metropolitan Planning Commission in Iowa and the Rock Island County Regional Planning Commission in Illinois. The Bi-State Planning Commission has expanded twice in response to increases in population. In 1974, the Henry County Regional Planning Commission in Illinois merged with Bi-State, and in 1976, Mercer County in Illinois and Muscatine County in Iowa joined Bi-State.

The Bi-State Regional Commission includes Scott and Muscatine Counties in Iowa, Rock Island, Henry and Mercer Counties in Illinois, and 43 municipalities. The county boards, city councils, and village boards entered into an agreement designating Bi-State as the regional planning commission based on the Illinois Revised Statutes and the Code of Iowa.

The Bi-State mission is to serve as a forum for intergovernmental cooperation and delivery of regional programs and to assist member local governments in planning and project development. The 36-member Board of Directors services as the policy board for the Commission. It includes elected and non-elected officials. County board chairpersons, representatives and large city mayors, councilmen, and aldermen comprise 26 members. The remaining 10 members are appointed citizens representing business, housing, human service, labor, minority, and riverfront planning groups.

Officers of the Bi-State Regional Commission include a chairman, a vice chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer. The Executive Committee of the Commission is composed of nine members. A least two-thirds of the Executive Committee must be elected officials and must include at least one representative from each member county. The four officers serve on the Executive Committee, which is responsible for administration of the Commission activities. There is also a Finance and Personnel Committee, which is responsible for developing the agency budget, reviewing expenditures, and addressing personnel policies.

The Transportation Policy Committee is a delegated authority group of the Board. The Transportation Policy Committee is responsible for transportation planning activities in the Quad Cities urbanized area. The Transportation Policy Committee is composed of the chief elected officials of the cities and counties in the area, and representatives from the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), the Iowa Department of Transportation (IowaDOT), and the Illinois Quad Cities Transit District. Ex-officio members include representatives from the FHWA Illinois and Iowa Divisions, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Region VII.

The Bi-State Regional Commission has also established technical and advisory committees to provide technical review and guidance on data collection and analysis, plan preparation, and plan review and update functions. The Transportation Technical Committee, Bi-State Regional Trail Committee, Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, Quad Cities Air Quality Task Force, and Regional Transportation Advisory Group assist the Transportation Policy Committee.

The Transportation Technical Committee is composed of staff from the counties, cities, transit systems, and IDOT and IowaDOT. Ex-officio members include staff from the Illinois and the Iowa FHWA Divisions and FTA's Region VII. The Transportation Technical Committee make recommendations to the Transportation Policy Committee related to data collection and analysis practices, transportation plans, and special studies. The Bi-State Regional Trail Committee helps coordinate planning and development of multi-purpose trails in the region. It is composed of representatives from jurisdictions interested in developing and maintaining multi-purpose trails. The Disabled Transportation Advisory Group serves in an advisory capacity to the Transportation Technical Committee and provides a forum for receiving public input on issues associated with the impacts of transportation on disabled citizens. It is open to anyone interest in these issues.

The Quad Cities Air Quality Task Force provides a forum for the discussion of air quality issues, including voluntary measures to reduce emissions and public education and outreach activities. Representatives cities, transit systems, health departments, chambers of commerce, and industries in the in the Rock Island County and Scott County area are members of the task force, along with staff from state resource agencies and other groups. The Regional Transportation Advisory Group, which is open to anyone interested in transportation planning and projects, provides a forum for obtaining public input on the long-range plan, the TIP, and other projects and studies. Current members represent private transportation providers, transit riders, social service agencies, environmental groups, hiking and bicycling clubs, and other groups.

The Bi-State area receives an annual portion of the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds allocated to Illinois and Iowa. The authority to program STP funds was delegated to the Transportation Policy Committee by the Commission. The Policy Committee directed the Transportation Technical Committee to develop and implement a process to solicit, evaluate, and rank projects based on three levels of priority. Candidate projects are evaluated by three criteria – level of service (LOS), safety, and physical condition. The LOS category examines a project's ability to accommodate existing traffic, to reduce traffic congestion, and to address projected traffic needs in 10 years. The safety category examines the number of crashes

over a three-year period, including the severity of the crashes and the frequency of the crashes to traffic exposure. The physical condition of the roadway, including the type of surface, the condition, and the current and expected use, is also examined.

Additional consideration may also be given to candidate projects that demonstrate expected improvements to air quality or encouraging alternatives to driving alone. Also, projects that include the construction of sidewalks, transit lanes, or other facilities that would aid transit riders, pedestrians, and bicycles receive special consideration. Points are assigned to the various criteria and the total points for each candidate project are calculated. To obtain a final advisory ranking, the scores are grouped and logical clusters of projects are identified. Three clusters – A, B, and C – are identified, with cluster A including the highest-ranked candidate projects and cluster C the lowest.

The candidate project groupings are provided to the Policy Committee without individual ranked scores. The Policy Committee considers the cluster rankings and the Technical Committee recommendations, but may select lower priority projects based on factors including funding availability, economic development potential, regional significance safety concerns, and other non-quantitative factors.

In addition to the regional planning activities, the Bi-State Regional Commission conducts transportation programs. Examples of recent efforts focus on river crossing monitoring and coordination, multi-purpose trail planning, traffic safety activities, air quality planning, and providing general assistance to members.

The Bi-State Regional Commission has faced different challenges and opportunities over the past 40 years. Challenges related to the multiple states include the need for additional meetings with member agencies and jurisdictions, different policies and guidelines in the two states, and developing regional approaches in a metropolitan area divided by a river.

With two member states, Bi-State staff probably participate in more meetings than single-state MPOs. Rather than one state department of transportation, MPO staff meet regularly with personnel from IDOT and IowaDOT, as well as other state agencies, FHWA division offices, and local jurisdictions. Both states use different processes and schedules for development of the TIP, and there are differences in funding mechanisms in the two states.

The Bi-State Regional Commission is viewed as providing an important forum for the discussion of key transportation issues in the Quad Cities. For example, river crossings continue to be a critical concern in the area, and the Commission has played an important role in examining the need for expanding current crossings and adding bridges at strategic locations. The Commission has also taken leadership roles in addressing air quality concerns, bicycling and pedestrian facilities, and transportation for special population groups.

Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

The Bristol Urban Area MPO was established in 1982, following the designation of Bristol, Tennessee/Virginia as an urbanized area in the 1980 Census. The Bristol Urban Area MPO includes Bluff City, the City of Bristol, and part of Sullivan County in Tennessee, and the

City of Bristol and Washington County in Virginia. The cities of Bristol, along with Kingsport and Johnson City, Tennessee form the Tri-Cities region. There are three MPOs in the Tri-Cities region. In addition to the Bristol Urban Area MPO, the other two MPOs are the Kingsport MPO, which serves Kingsport, Tennessee and adjacent communities in Virginia, and the Johnson City Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization.

The Bristol urban area is located in northeast Tennessee and southwest Virginia in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains. The 2000 population for the MPO area was approximately 89,700. Bristol is a twin city, with State Street serving as the Tennessee/Virginia state line. Major employers in the area include food services, chemical companies, hospitals, and health system facilities. Bristol is also the home of East Tennessee State University and King College in Virginia. Tourism related to the Appalachian Mountains, Bristol Motor Speedway, country music, and other attractions are also an important part of the area's economy.

Interstate 81 bisects the area and provides connections to Knoxville, Tennessee to the southwest and the Baltimore/Washington, D.C. region to the northeast. The area is also served by the Norfolk Southern Railway, which links to the Port of Norfolk. There are also railroad spurs serving specific industries in the region. The Tri-Cities Airport, which is located outside the Bristol City MPO boundaries, provides commercial air service to the region.

The Bristol Urban Area MPO was established through an agreement between the governors of the State of Tennessee and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the local governments in the urban area. The Bristol Urban Area MPO is housed in the City of Bristol Tennessee Planning Department.

The Executive Board is comprised of seven members – four from Tennessee and three from Virginia. The principal elected officials from member jurisdictions serve on the Board. The following jurisdictions and agencies are represented on the Board.

Tennessee (4 members):

- City of Bristol;
- Bluff City;
- Sullivan County; and
- Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT).

Virginia (3 members):

- City of Bristol;
- Washington County; and
- Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), composed of staff and one or two representatives from each jurisdiction and TDOT and VDOT, assists the MPO staff in the development of plans and studies, and makes recommendations to the Executive Board. The TAC conducts the initial project ranking for the TIP and reviews the document prior to Executive Board action.

Examples of challenges and opportunities faced by the Bristol Urban Area MPO due to its bi-state nature include assisting in coordinating elements of the transportation system between two states, addressing different air quality designations, and developing the TIP. Other examples include providing a forum for the discussion of regional transportation needs, providing data and technical expertise to local jurisdictions, and enhancing coordination and cooperation among all groups in the region.

The area faces challenges in coordinating transportation services, especially between the two adjacent cities of Bristol. The operation of traffic signals represents one of these challenges, especially the signals along State Street, which forms the state line. The two cities have an agreement where by one city operates and maintains the entire traffic signals for specific intersections, rather than having each city maintain and operate half of each intersection. While this approach works well for maintenance and the provisions of municipal services, challenges remain relating to interconnecting and coordinating signals.

Public transportation services are provided by four agencies in the area. The Bristol Tennessee Transit System and the Bristol Virginia Transit System provide fixed route, coordinated pulsed bus service, which focuses on a downtown bus center on the Tennessee side of State Street. Both systems also operate point-to-point specialized van services, elderly and job access services, and shuttle bus service for the Bristol Motor Speedway and other planned special events. The First Tennessee Human Resource Agency and the District III Government Cooperative transportation providers operate paratransit services in other parts of the area. Like many urban areas, much of the recent growth is occurring outside the areas served by the fixed-route systems. The need for additional public transportation services has been identified in the long-range plan. The potential for commuter rail linking Bristol with Richmond, Virginia and Washington, D.C. is also being explored.

The Sullivan County portion of the MPO has been designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a non-attainment area for the eight-hour ozone standard. The effective date of this designation has been deferred, however, based on a Memorandum of Agreement with the EPA, the State of Tennessee, and the local communities to participate in EPA's Early Action Compact to voluntarily achieve and maintain the eight-hour ozone standard by 2007. As a result of this agreement, the MPO does not have to conduct a conformity analysis for the long-range transportation plan.

The development of the TIP is coordinated between the two states, which use different fiscal years and document deadlines. Projects in Tennessee and Virginia are examined separately and two different project lists are prepared. Project funds remain in each state. The TAC completes an initial review and ranking of projects based on the goals and objectives of the long-range plan. The Executive Board takes final action on the TIP.

In addition to working with two state departments of transportation, the Bristol Urban Area MPO also works with two FHWA regions and two FTA regions. The area is also on the border of two EPA regions. Working with numerous federal regions, adds complexity to the planning process, as different regions may have different priorities and may sometimes interpret guidelines differently.

The Bristol Area Urban MPO is the only organization in the area that promotes regional planning. It has been successful over the past 24 years in raising the visibility of regional transportation needs and fostering cooperation and coordination among jurisdictions, the state departments of transportation, local transit services, and other groups. The expertise of the MPO staff and the services provided are valued by jurisdictions and other groups.

Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council

Duluth, Minnesota and Superior, Wisconsin are located at the head of Lake Superior, the largest of the Great Lakes. The cities are separated by the St. Louis River and the Duluth-Superior harbor. There are two major bridges that link the two states and I-35 terminates in Duluth. The Duluth Transit Authority (DTA) provides regular route and specialized public transportation services in Duluth and surrounding counties, and to Superior under contract. The 2000 population of the metropolitan area was approximately 118,000. Duluth is the major city in the area. The Duluth-Superior port is the largest inland port in the country. Tourism, higher education, medical services, banking, and retail trade are also important segments of the area's economy.

The Metropolitan Interstate Committee (MIC) was established as the MPO for the Duluth-Superior metropolitan area in 1975. It was created through a joint powers agreement between the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission (ARDC) in Minnesota and the Northwest Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (NWRPC) and the designation of the governor's of the two states. The activities of the MIC are further defined in a Memorandum of Understanding among ARDC, NWRPC, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), and Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT). The name was changed in 2005 to the Metropolitan Interstate Council to better reflect its role in the metropolitan area.

The Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Area Transportation Study initiated the focus on metropolitan transportation planning in the late 1960s. The MIC replaced the Head of the Lakes Council of Governments located in the City of Duluth, which had served as the MPO for the area. The change was made to provide more of a metropolitan focus and to enhance links to regional planning efforts. Both ARDC and NWRPC are state-established, multi-county planning and development agencies.

ARDC includes the seven counties in northeastern Minnesota, while NWRPC covers the 10 counties of northwestern Wisconsin. Both are governed by boards of directors composed of county commissioners and other local officials, and have professional staff. Both have responsibilities related to planning for transportation, land use, housing, and economic development based on state and federal legislation and statutes. ARDC is governed by the Regional Development Act in Minnesota and NWRPC is governed by the Regional Planning Commission Law of Wisconsin.

The MIC Policy Board consists of 18 members – nine from Minnesota and nine from Wisconsin. Local elected officials or their alternates must comprise two-thirds of the membership. The members represent the following jurisdictions and agencies.

Minnesota (9 members):

- 2 – City of Duluth, selected from the City Council;
- 1 – City of Duluth citizen representative, selected by the Mayor of Duluth;
- 1 – Duluth Transit Authority (DTA), selected by the Board of Directors;
- 1 – St. Louis County selected by the Board of Commissioners;
- 1 – City of Proctor, the Mayor or City Council member;
- 1 – City of Hermantown, the Mayor or City Council member; and
- 2 – Suburban St. Louis County Townships, appointed by the St. Louis County Township Association.

Wisconsin (9 members):

- 3 – City of Superior, selected from the City Council;
- 1 – City of Superior citizen representative, selected by the Mayor;
- 4 – Douglas County, selected by the Board of Supervisors; and
- 1 – Douglas County citizen representative, appointed by the Board Chair.

Policy Board members serve two-year terms. There is no limitation on the number of times a qualifying board member may be reappointed. The Board's officers include a Minnesota Co-Chair, a Wisconsin Co-Chair, and a Secretary. The monthly meetings alternate between Minnesota and Wisconsin, with the Co-Chair from the appropriate state presiding. The Co-Chairs and the Secretary, who may be from either Minnesota or Wisconsin, are elected by the full Board. The Minnesota Co-Chair or the Secretary, if a Minnesota representative, also serves on the ARDC Board of Directors and the ARDC Commission as a representative of the MIC.

The MIC staff are employees of ARDC or NWRPC. The Director is an employee of ARDC, which is headquartered in Duluth and the Deputy Director is an employee of NWRPC, which is located in Spooner, Wisconsin. The MIC offices are housed within ARDC, and the majority of MIC staff are employees of ARDC.

The MIC has two advisory committees – the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Harbor Technical Advisory Committee (HTAC). The TAC is charged with advising the MIC on transportation-related matters including the development of plans and programs, preparation of the transportation portion of work programs and study designs, and review of transportation projects submitted to the MIC. It also provides a forum for the discussion of transportation topics in the area and encourages communication and coordination on transportation projects. The 17 voting members of the TAC include representatives from the following jurisdictions and modes:

- 4 – City of Duluth;
- 1 – City of Hermantown;
- 1 – City of Proctor;
- 1 – St Louis County;
- 1 – Duluth Transit Authority;
- 2 – State of Minnesota;
- 1 – Duluth Airport Authority;
- 1 – Duluth Seaway Port Authority;
- 2 – City of Superior;

- 1 – Douglas County;
- 1 – State of Wisconsin; and
- 1 – Bicycle/pedestrian representative.

The HTAC includes 30 voting members. Members include the cities of Duluth and Superior, St. Louis and Douglas counties, state transportation and environmental agencies, federal agencies, regional agencies, industry sectors, and citizen groups. Industry sectors represented include coal, grain, ore, general cargo, general bulk cargo, harbor service pilots, vessel operations, and recreation. Citizen groups represented include Save Lake Superior Association, St. Louis River Citizens Action Committee, and the Isaac Walton League. The HTAC provides a forum for the discussion of harbor-related topics. The MIC has been involved in harbor-related planning since the 1970s.

In addition to the long-range plan and the TIP, the MIC conducts a variety of studies included in the annual work program. Examples of recent projects include the urban growth/smart growth study, the safe routes to school program, ongoing freight movement and harbor projects, and various corridor studies.

As a multi-state MPO, the MIC faces a number of challenges and opportunities. Examples of challenges include different processes and timing for the TIP in Minnesota and Wisconsin, different air quality designations for the two areas, differences between the two state departments of transportation, differences in state planning laws, and an additional level for approval of plans, programs, and budgets. Opportunities include the equal voting provision, which enhances the metropolitan focus to the MIC, the long-term multi-modal nature of the work program, the strong working relationship with member entities and state and federal agencies, and the capabilities of staff.

One challenge for the MIC is that Mn/DOT and WisDOT use different processes and schedules for the project development process. The MIC follows two different approaches in preparing the TIP, one for Minnesota and one for Wisconsin. The process in Minnesota begins in December and ends with approval in July. The process in Wisconsin begins in July and ends with approval in October.

For the Minnesota TIP, MIC staff review the project applications submitted in December and presents their rankings to the TAC in February. The TAC prioritizes projects at the February TAC meeting using a MIC-adopted 100-point scoring system, which measures the merits of each project based on the six evaluation criteria listed in the application. High and low TAC scores are eliminated and the rest of the TAC scores are averaged. The project rankings are discussed by the TAC and modified appropriately as agreed upon. The adopted TAC ranking, along with supplemental information, is presented to the MIC Policy Board. The MIC discusses the TAC ranking and approves the final prioritized project list.

The MIC's prioritized project list then competes with projects throughout Mn/DOT's Northeast Minnesota Area Transportation Partnership (ATP). The ATP is a partnership of transportation interests, local and state governments formed to provide a regional priority list of transportation projects to Mn/DOT to be considered for federal funding.

A different process is used to consider enhancement program projects in Minnesota. An eight-county regional process managed by ARDC in conjunction with the Northeastern Minnesota ATP is followed to consider enhancement projects. Interested applicants are encouraged to attend a fall workshop and must complete a pre-application to determine eligibility. If applicants are deemed eligible, they are able to complete a Transportation Enhancement Application, which is evaluated on the eight-county basis.

In Wisconsin, staff at NWRPC develop the application and prepare the Superior Metropolitan TIP for the Superior metropolitan planning area. Federal-aid eligible and selected projects are included in the TIP, which is adopted by the TAC and MIC and sent to the WisDOT Central Office for incorporation into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The Wisconsin process is different from Minnesota in that jurisdictions apply to WisDOT for funding at a state level, competing against similar projects within the respective funding categories. Approved projects are then included in the TIP based on funding allocations. The TAC approves projects in a priority order.

The Superior urbanized area is allocated STP urban funds based on a population driven formula, with federal funds allocated on a two-year cycle and requiring a 20 percent local match. Proposed projects must go through the MIC, and formal funding request must be made to the WisDOT Central Office. Allocated funds not requested or spent, revert back to WisDOT. WisDOT's Northwest Region also receives federal funds for safety, enhancement, and other programs, which can be utilized on projects within the Superior urbanized area. These projects also go through the MIC to be included in the TIP.

As noted in the previous discussions of the differences in the TIP process in the two states, there are also differences between Mn/DOT and WisDOT. WisDOT has a more centralized focus, while Mn/DOT has a more decentralized focus. The WisDOT Central Office in Madison plays a major role in the project selection process and other activities. Within Mn/DOT, the District Office located in Duluth plays a much more significant role. As the lead state for the MIC, Minnesota and Mn/DOT are also more involved in ongoing MIC activities.

Another challenge for the MIC is the difference in air quality status between Duluth and Superior. Duluth is an air quality maintenance area, and Superior is not. As a result, prior to SAFETEA-LU, the long-range transportation plan was updated every three years. Without the air quality maintenance designation, a plan update would have been required every five years, which may have been more realistic given the relatively slow growth nature of the area. Under SAFETEA-LU, a four-year updated cycle is required.

As a joint venture of ARDC and NWRPC, the MIC faces an ongoing challenge of reporting to two additional policy boards. Approval of the work plan, budget, and other documents must go through the ARDC and the NWRPC Boards. While problems are typically not encountered with this approval process, it does require additional staff time and resources. Occasionally, questions or concerns may arise from Board members not directly associated with the MIC area.

The MIC also faces numerous opportunities. It provides a metropolitan focus that is not addressed by any other agency or group. The MIC staff and Board exhibit leadership on

metropolitan issues. The equal voting, co-chairs, and alternating meeting locations between the two states all enhance the metropolitan focus, even though Minnesota accounts for the majority of population and funding. Further, the MIC allows the smaller communities and rural and suburban townships to participate in metropolitan discussions, along with the cities of Duluth and Superior.

Along with providing a metropolitan focus, the MIC is viewed as an unbiased and objective source of information, partially because it is not located within any of the participating municipalities. The staff has a good working relationship with staff at other agencies and the TAC and HTAC provide important forums for discussion. The HTAC, with its mix of public and private partnerships, is viewed as one of the unique features of the MIC.

The MIC has been successful for over 30 years in conducting studies with high visibility that have been well received by participants, jurisdictions, and agencies. The ongoing harbor work, the safe routes to school efforts, the smart growth study, and ongoing ITS and transit activities reflect well received and visible activities.

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

The cities of Lewiston, Idaho and Clarkston, Washington are located at the confluence of the Snake and Clearwater Rivers in southeastern Washington and western Idaho. The cities are named after the explorers William Clark and Meriwether Lewis from the Corps of Discovery Lewis and Clark Expedition, which traveled through the area in 1805. The 2000 population of the area was approximately 52,000. The Lewiston and Clarkston area serves as the financial, commercial, and educational center for the region. In addition, tourism is a major contributor to the local economy.

The Port of Lewiston and the Port of Clarkston link the area with Portland, Oregon and the Pacific Ocean. The ports are the farthest in-land ports in the country. The 77-mile Great Northwestern Railroad connects the area with the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and the Union Pacific (UP) Railroads. The Lewiston-Nez Perce County Regional Airport provides commercial and general aviation services. The area is served by state and local roadways, and Valley Transit provides public transportation services in the area.

The Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (LCVMPO) was established as an independent agency through a joint powers agreement in 2003. It encompasses the Lewiston and Clarkston metropolitan areas, which reached the 50,000 population level based on the 2000 census. Planning for the MPO began in the early 2000s. The Idaho Department of Transportation (ITD) funded a facilitator to assist with initial meetings and discussions, as there were some concerns among the various local jurisdictions. These meetings resulted in the development of a joint powers agreement and by-laws for the LCVMPO. Idaho is the lead state, although the LCVMPO office is currently located in Asotin, Washington.

Initially, the City of Clarkston did not join the LCVMPO. While a number of factors may have contributed to this decision, it appears that city personnel did not perceive significant benefits from the city's participation. The LCVMPO included Clarkston as an ex-officio

member, and member jurisdictions continued to work with Clarkston to include them in key discussions. This approach resulted in the City of Clarkston formally joining them LCVMPPO in 2005.

The joint powers agreement and the by-laws identify the composition, powers, and duties of the LCVMPPO Policy Board. The Policy Board currently includes eight members; four members from Idaho and four members from Washington. Five members constitute a quorum and actions require five affirmative votes to pass. The Policy Board members represent the following local jurisdictions.

Idaho (Four members):

- 3 – City of Lewiston; and
- 1 – Nez Perce County Commission.

Washington (Four members):

- 1 – City Asotin;
- 2 – Asotin County; and
- 1 – City of Clarkston.

In addition, seven ex-officio members currently participate in the Policy Board meetings. The LCVMPPO by-laws allow the Policy Board to add or delete ex-officio member agencies as appropriate. The following agencies currently have one ex-officio member on the Policy Board:

- Port of Lewiston;
- Port of Clarkston;
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT);
- Idaho Transportation Department (ITD);
- Valley Transit;
- Lewiston-Nez Perce County Regional Airport; and
- Nez Perce Tribe.

The Policy Board officers include a Chairperson and a Secretary-Treasurer. The by-laws require that officers alternate between the two states, with one officer from each state at any given time. Officers serve one year terms and the Secretary-Treasurer automatically becomes the chairperson.

The by-laws also establish an Executive Committee and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Executive Committee is comprised of the Policy Board Chair, the Secretary-Treasurer, and the immediate past Chair. If the immediate past Chair is no longer a member of the Policy Board, the Board elects a third member. The Executive Committee has authority to review and approve payments and other items as needed. The TAC includes staff from the member jurisdictions, as well as the Nez Perce Tribe, the Port of Lewiston, the Port of Clarkston, Valley Transit, the Lewis/Nez Perce County Regional Airport, ITD, WSDOT, Great Northwest Railroad, and Watco.

The joint powers agreement also outlines the funding requirements for members to match federal planning funds to support the LCVMPPO. A two-part formula is used which allocates 50 percent of the funding requirement based on the jurisdiction's percentage of the metropolitan

area population and 50 percent based on the number of votes held by each member. The funding formula may be changed based on the results of each decennial census, changes in membership, or other action by the Policy Board.

The LCVMPPO has undertaken a number of activities since its formation in 2003. Finalizing the by-laws, organizing the Policy Board and TAC, and hiring a director and other staff represent initial tasks. Other early activities included developing the LCVMPPO Internet site, information on the LCVMPPO, and information on transportation in the area.

A Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was developed and adopted by the Policy Board in December 2004. An Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2005 was also completed. A consultant was selected to develop the long-range transportation plan and work on the plan was initiated. Public open houses were held in early 2006 to obtain input on four future alternatives for the long-range plan and the public transit master plan.

The LCVMPPO faces some unique challenges as a multi-state MPO. Some of these include challenges relating to the size of the LCVMPPO, which is the second smallest MPO in the country and the smallest multi-state MPO. Further, as a new MPO, the LCVMPPO also faced the typical challenges of creating a new agency.

The delay in the City of Clarkston officially joining the LCVMPPO represented a unique challenge. This challenge was addressed by continuing to work with representatives from Clarkston and including them in discussions and activities as an ex-officio member. As a result of these efforts, Clarkston joined the LCVMPPO in 2005. As a small MPO, the funding to staff the LCVMPPO is limited. Approaches to address this challenge include maximizing available resources, using part-time positions, and using consultants for specific projects.

The LCVMPPO also faces numerous opportunities as a multi-state MPO. The LCVMPPO provides a regional focus for the discussion of key transportation issues. No other agency or group has this perspective. As an independent agency, no one city, county, or state can dominate the transportation planning and project development process. The five votes required for LCVMPPO action helps foster coordination and cooperation between jurisdictions in both states.

The LCVMPPO has been successful in working with the congressional delegations from both states to obtain funding for a regionally-significant project. Funding would probably not have been obtained without all groups working together to agree on the priority project and to promote it with the congressional delegates. The LCVMPPO has also been successful in fostering improved cooperation and coordination among jurisdictions, agencies, and groups in the area.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

The Washington, D.C. metropolitan region includes the District of Columbia (DOC), northern Virginia, and suburban Maryland. The region covers some 3,000 square miles, has a population of approximately 4.2 million, and supports approximately 2.7 million jobs. The national government and federal agencies in the DOC provide the economic center for the region. Tourism, higher education, financial institutions, high technology industries, and retail and commercial businesses also comprise key segments of the regional economy.

The transportation system in the region includes major freeways, local roadways, the Metrorail system, commuter rail service, and local and commuter bus service. The region is served by three major airports – Reagan National, Dulles International, and Baltimore/Washington International. There are also numerous pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the region.

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) serves as the MPO for the Metropolitan Washington area. In 1966, the TPB and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (WASHCOG) adopted a plan for associating the two organizations. The TPB was designated as the MPO for the region by the governors of Virginia and Maryland and the Mayor of the DOC based upon an agreement between the local governments. Under this plan, the TPB serves as the transportation policy committee of WASHCOG, which was established in 1957. This approach improves coordination between the TPB's transportation planning process and WASHCOG's comprehensive regional planning process. Economies and efficiencies are realized through joint staffing and administration of the two activities.

The by-laws outline the TPB membership to include the following governmental units, legislative groups, and agencies. The membership includes:

- one elected member from each local governing body of the cities and counties in Maryland and Virginia participating in WASHCOG. In addition, one elected member of the governing body or any other city or county recommended for membership by a majority of the vote of the TPB based on substantial interest in the metropolitan planning process and financial support of the planning process in an amount determined by the TPB;
- participating cities and counties in Maryland and Virginia with populations of more than 400,000 have one additional member that is the county executive or designated representative when the form of government includes an elected county executive or an additional elected member of the local governing body when there is not an elected county executive;
- four members from the DOC including two members of the DOC Council and two from the executive branch, one of whom must be from the Department of Public Works;
- one member from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), one member from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and one member from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA);
- one member each from the House and Senate of the Maryland and Virginia General Assembly and the DOC Council; and
- non-voting members that include one representative from the National Capital Planning Commission, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, FHWA, FTA, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the National Park Service (NPS).

Non-voting members are able to offer and second motions and resolutions and participate in discussions.

Currently, county and city membership on the TPB includes Loudon, Prince William, Fairfax, and Arlington counties, and the cities of Manassas, Manassas Park, Fairfax, Alexandria, and Falls Church in Virginia. Additionally, it includes Frederick, Montgomery and, Prince George's counties, the urbanized area of Charles County, and the cities of Gaithersburg, Rockville, Takoma Park, Greenbelt, College Park, and Bowie in Maryland; and the DOC. As noted above, other voting board members include a representative from the Maryland House of Delegates, the Maryland Senate, the Virginia House of Delegates, the Virginia Senate, the DOC Council, MDOT, VDOT, and WMATA. Ex-officio members include representatives from the FHWA, FTA, NPS, Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, National Capital Planning Commission, and the Private Providers Task Force.

Regular meetings of the TPB are scheduled in January, March, April, May, June, September, and November. Additional meetings may be called as needed. TPB officers include a Chairperson, a First Vice Chair, and a Second Vice Chair. Officers are elected to serve one-year terms. The three officers cannot be from the same state or agency. The WASHCOG Department of Transportation Planning staff serves as secretary for the TPB and conducts the work of the TPB.

Under normal voting procedures, each representative from the participating cities and counties, the General Assemblies of Maryland and Virginia, the DOC Council, MDOT, VDOT, and WMATA have one vote. A quorum consists of 10 members or their alternates, including at least one voting member or their alternate representing Maryland, Virginia, and the DOC. All actions, with the exception of amendments to the by-laws, require a majority of those present and voting, provided that the extent of financial participation by a jurisdiction, agency, or public body shall be determined only with the concurrence of that jurisdiction, agency, or public body. Amendments to the bylaws require a majority vote of all the voting members of the TPB.

The by-laws provide for an alternate proportional voting procedure for the TPB. Any voting member may require that the alternate voting procedure be used instead of voting on a regular basis, or subsequent to a vote taken by the regular basis, as long as the subsequent vote is taken at the same meeting. The proportional voting method assigns five votes each to the DOC, Maryland, and Virginia. One of the five votes in each case is provided to MDOT, VDOT, and DOC Department of Public Works (DOC DPW). Three of the votes allocated to Maryland and Virginia are divided among participating local governments based on population. Each member of the House and Senate of the Maryland and Virginia General Assemblies are allowed one-half (0.5) of a weighted vote. The remaining members from the DOC are allocated one of the four remaining DOC votes.

The alternate process further provides that all the total votes for Maryland, Virginia, and the DOC must each equal five votes. If the proportional votes do not equal five for any one state based on members attending the meeting, the votes are proportionately increased to ensure a total of five votes.

The by-laws establish a TPB Steering Committee to help develop the the work program and manage the transportation planning process. The Steering Committee is composed of 10 members, including the Chairperson, the immediate past Chairperson, one local governmental representative from the DOC, one elected local government representative from Maryland, one elected local government representative from Virginia, the Chair of the Technical Committee, and the representatives from MDOT, VDOT, DOC PPW, and WMATA.

In addition to the Steering Committee, the TPB utilizes other committees and task forces to assist in developing plans, projects, and programs. Other committees include the Technical Committee, the Citizen's Advisory Committee, and the Access for All Advisory Committee. The Emergency Transportation Work Group, the Private Providers Task Force, the Task Force on Value Pricing for Transportation, the Joint Technical Working Group for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study, and the Management, Operations, and ITS Policy and Technical Task Forces provide further support to the TPB. The Technical Committee utilizes a number of subcommittees focusing on model issues, travel forecasting, and commuter services.

The three major ongoing plans developed by the TPB are the TPB Vision, the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), and TIP. The Vision outlines eight broad policy goals to help guide transportation investments in the region. The CLRP provides a 25-year view of transportation needs, while the six-year TIP contains specific projects and funding sources. The TPB also conducts numerous studies on specific topics of interest to members and to meet federal or state requirements.

The TPB faces numerous challenges and opportunities in developing transportation policies, plans, and studies. Examples of challenges include different legal and institutional authority, different processes used in the project development and selection process, and different priorities among Virginia, Maryland, and the DOC. Other challenges include dealing with multiple federal agencies and different divisions of the FHWA and FTA, addressing funding needs, and obtaining support for projects within the individual states. Finally, as the MPO for the Nation's capital, the work of the TPB may be more visible and receive more scrutiny than in other regions, including input from members of Congress.

At the same time, the TPB faces numerous opportunities as the MPO for the Washington, D.C. region. The TPB provides an important forum for the discussion of key transportation issues affecting the region, including alternative future scenarios. The TPB also examines emerging issues and trends, such as transportation security and value pricing. Board members are knowledgeable about transportation issues and play a leadership role in the region. The expertise of the staff is highly regarded by members and there is a strong working relationship among agencies and jurisdictions at the staff level. Finally, the agreement and support of the two states and the DOC can assist in obtaining funding for projects and other activities.

There are a number of differences in the authority of VDOT, MDOT, and DDOT, as well as the mechanisms used to fund transportation. VDOT is responsible for the third largest state-maintained roadway system in the country, bridges, and tunnels. Covering 56,504 miles, the VDOT system includes interstate freeways, state roads, and most county and local roads. In Maryland, MDOT is responsible for the interstate and state system, while cities and counties have responsibility for local roadways. The Maryland Transportation Trust Fund provides a

unique method for financing projects in the state. The Trust Fund provides MDOT flexibility to fund priority transportation projects in all modes – roads, public transit, aviation, and ports – across the state. Cities and counties are responsible for most local roads. Since the DOC is not a state, the DDOT is not an official state department of transportation. It performs many of the same functions, however, and the U.S. Department of Transportation recognizes it as a state department of transportation related to federal funding. The DDOT is responsible for interstate highways within the DOC and is responsible for local roads and streets, except those maintained by the NPS.

In addition to these differences related to the transportation system, local governments in Maryland have more extensive land use powers based on state legislation than local jurisdictions in Virginia. Further, the federal government maintains a unique level of control over the DOC, including transportation funding. Congress reviews legislation passed by the DOC Council before it can become law, and has approval authority of the DOC's budget, including transportation funding.

In addition, WMATA operates the regional Metro rail and bus system. Established in 1967 by a compact among the DOC, Virginia, and Maryland, WMATA is responsible for planning, financing, constructing, and operating the Metro rail system, as well as bus services in the area. The WMATA Board is composed of elected and appointed officials from the service area. WMATA is the largest transit system in the county without a dedicated source of funding. WMATA receives federal funding directly, through formula grants to the states, and through special programs. Fare box revenues, advertising, and other sources of funds are also used to support Metro rail and bus services. Many jurisdictions operate their own bus services, and commuter rail service into the DOC is provided in both Maryland and Virginia.

In addition to the two states, the DOC, WMATA, the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority, the local bus and commuter rail services, other federal agencies and state agencies are responsible for various parts of the transportation system in the region. As noted previously, the NPS has responsibility for roads and other facilities in the region, including the George Washington Memorial Parkway, parts of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, the Suitland Parkway, and Memorial Bridge. The federal agency, National Capital Planning Commission, is responsible for providing overall planning guidance for federal lands and buildings in the area, and associated transportation issues.

The DOC, Maryland, and Virginia use their own transportation project development processes which tie into the TPB's CLRP and TIP. The Transportation Coordinating Council (TCC) of northern Virginia, an advisory group of locally elected officials, develops long-term project recommendations. These recommendations form the basis for Virginia's submissions to the CLRP. The Virginia General Assembly approves the biennial Appropriations Act, which includes funding for transportation. The Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board, which guides the work of VDOT, develops the six-year Virginia Transportation Development Plan based on funding available in the Appropriations Act. The plan is submitted to the TPB for including into the TIP.

In Maryland, MDOT develops a six-year Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP). The department obtains feedback on the program during the MDOT Secretary's Annual Tour.

The CTP is submitted to the Governor and then to the General Assembly, with the Governor's funding request. The CTP is submitted to the TPB for inclusion in the TIP.

The DOC Mayor submits the six-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to the DOC Council on an annual basis. After Council approval, the CIP is presented to Congress for approval. The CIP forms the basis of projects submitted to the TPB for inclusion in the TIP.

In addition to working with a variety of federal agencies in the region, the TPB also works with different divisions of FHWA and FTA. Similar to the experience at other multi-state MPOs, these divisions may have a different interpretation of federal guidance and may stress different requirements.

As the MPO for the Nation's capital, the work of the TPB often receives a lot of visibility. Further, since members of Congress use different components of the regional transportation system, they often have a perspective on issues and projects. These perspectives may find their way into legislation or direction may be provided to the TPB to examine specific issues or approaches.

The TPB faces numerous opportunities as a multi-state MPO. The TPB has provided a forum for the discussion and resolution of transportation issues for more than 40 years. It is recognized as both a source of credible information and expertise related to transportation in the region, and as an open and objective forum for the discussion of issues, especially those of regional significance such as air quality, mobility, congestion, and safety and security. Board members are knowledgeable about transportation issues and provide leadership in addressing transportation problems in the region.

The TPB provides technical resources and expertise to assist in the regional decision making process. The staff is respected for their technical expertise and understanding of the issues facing the region. The Technical Committee and ongoing work fosters a strong working relationship among staff at agencies and jurisdictions in the area.

After consensus has been reached on projects and programs, the multi-state nature of the TPB provides more support for obtaining funding. At the federal level, the congressional delegation from Maryland and Virginia can jointly support federal funding while. Challenging pooling funding available to the various federal, state, and local agencies may also be more feasible when consensus is reached.

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments

The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments is the MPO for the eight counties in southern Ohio, northern Kentucky, and southeast Indiana. OKI includes Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren counties in Ohio; Boone, Campbell, and Kenton counties in Kentucky; and Dearborn County in Indiana.

Cincinnati, Ohio, which is located on the north side of the Ohio River, is the largest city in the area. Covington and Newport, Kentucky, located on the south side of the river, represent the other major cities in the area. The 2000 population of the eight-county area was

approximately 1.8 million. The area is home to 10 Fortune 500 companies. High technology industries, financial and medical institutions, higher education, and commerce are important parts of the local economy.

Transportation has always been important in the region. The Ohio River supported Cincinnati's development in the late 1800s, including its role as a gateway to the west. The eight-county OKI region includes an extensive system of freeways, state roadways, and local streets. Three transit agencies operate fixed-route service and three other providers serve communities with demand responsive service. The Cincinnati/North Kentucky International Airport is the 26th largest airport in the country. There are also 10 publicly owned and two privately owned airports in the region. AMTRAK provides limited service on the Cardinal Route. One ferry service is operated on the Ohio River. There are numerous pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the area.

OKI was designated as the MPO for the metropolitan area in 1964. OKI was established through an intergovernmental agreement based on sections of the Ohio Revised Code, the Kentucky Revised Code, and the Indiana Statutes. The powers, purposes, and governance of OKI are outlined in the Articles of Agreement and By-Laws.

Four general MPO organizational structures are used in Ohio. These organizational structures include regional planning commissions, regional councils of governments, interstate planning organizations, and area planning commissions. Six of Ohio's 17 MPOs are multi-state MPOs. In addition to OKI, which is located in a Council of Governments, the other multi-state MPOs are KYOV A, Wood-Washington-Wirt (WWW) Interstate Planning Commission, Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments, Belomar Regional Council and Interstate Planning Committee, and Brooke-Hancock-Jefferson Transportation Study. Ohio is the lead state for OKI and the Toledo MPO. West Virginia is the lead state for the other multi-state MPOs.

The OKI Board of Trustees is comprised of elected officials and appointed representatives from municipal governments, townships, and counties in the eight-county, three-state metropolitan area. The Board of Trustees is the OKI Policy Board. Membership on the Board of Trustees, which currently includes 103 members, is established in the OKI Articles of Agreement and By-Laws. The OKI Board of Trustees represents the largest MPO policy board in the country. Membership on the Board of Trustees includes the following categories.

- One official elected to the governing body of each member county selected by such governing body.
- One elected official of each municipal corporation located in each member county in which the municipal corporation has a population of 5,000 or more persons according to the latest Federal Census, except that if, within the OKI Region, any state does not contain a municipal corporation with a population of 5,000 or more persons, then an elected official of the largest municipal corporation within the OKI Region of such state shall be chosen. This person shall be selected by the governing body of the municipal corporation concerned.

- One person selected by each legally constituted county planning agency or commission of each member county, and if the county is within an area in which a legally constituted area or regional planning agency has jurisdiction, then, in addition, one person selected by such area or regional planning agency. If two or more member counties are within the jurisdiction of the same area or regional planning agency, such agency shall be entitled to select only one person to be a Trustee pursuant to this subparagraph.
- Not more than 10 residents of the OKI Region selected by the Board of Trustees.
- Such other elected officials or personnel responsible to such officials from counties, municipal corporations, townships, special districts, or other political subdivisions or representatives of such persons as the Board of Trustees may select provided that, except as otherwise provided in Section 3, the total membership of the Board of Trustees, excluding ex-officio members, shall not exceed one hundred.

Ex-Officio Members

- One person selected by each of the Departments of Highways or Transportation of Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana.
- One person selected by each of the Board of Directors of the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority and the Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky.

Officers of the Board of Trustees include a President, a First Vice-President, a Secretary, and Treasurer. The By-Laws also established an Executive Committee with the power to act on behalf of the Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee includes the President, First Vice President, Second Vice-President, and Treasurer of the Board of Trustees. Other members of the Executive Committee, which currently includes 28 members represents other categories on the Board of Trustees.

The Intermodal Coordinating Council (ICC), which is the technical advisory committee, includes 68 representatives from jurisdictions and agencies in the region. The ICC provides technical advice and assistance to the OKI Technical Studies Director and staff on regional planning, land use, transportation, air quality, traffic engineering, open space, special purpose projects, and other related topics. The ICC also makes recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors on plans, programs, special studies, and other items. Membership categories on the ICC and the number of members are outlined in the ICC By-laws and below.

- At-Large (3),
- Aviation (1 each, Cincinnati, Butler, Northern Kentucky – total 3);
- Bike/Pedestrian (1);
- Chamber of Commerce (1);
- Cities of 100,000 Population (3 each);
- Cities over 40,000 Population (2 each – Total 6);
- County Engineer/Road Manager (1 each per county Total 8);

- County Planning (1 each per county and NKADD Official – Total 9);
- Departments of Transportation (ODOT – 2, KYTC – 2, INDOT – 1; Total 5);
- Environmental Justice Representative (1);
- Environmental (3);
- Federal Highway Administration (1 each per federal region – Total 2);
- Freight (1);
- Indiana City under 40,000 Population (1);
- Kentucky City under 40,000 Population (3);
- Ohio City under 40,000 Population (4);
- Port Authority (1);
- TID (1 each Butler and Hamilton – Total 2);
- Townships over 40,000 Population (5); and
- Transit (1 each per system – Total 6).

As a multi-state MPO, OKI has faced unique challenges and opportunities over the past 42 years. Challenges include accommodating the different guidelines and procedures of the three state departments of transportation, as well as different regional offices of federal agencies, and determining equitable funding between the states for multi-state planning projects. Opportunities include providing a regional forum for the discussion and resolution of transportation issues, providing technical support to member jurisdictions, enhancing coordination and cooperation, and identifying and advancing projects of regional significance.

The OKI developed a process for soliciting, reviewing, and ranking highway and transit projects funded through the OKI-allocated portion of ODOT's federal Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congested Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), and Transportation Enhancement (TEA) funds. The process used for STP and CMAQ projects includes advertising for project solicitation, holding a workshop for prospective applicants, accepting applications, reviewing and ranking projects by the ICC, and approval by the Board of Trustees. The OKI uses an extensive evaluation system to review and rank highway and transit projects. Highway and transit projects are first scored separately based on transportation factors, which include items such as the project's impact on safety, LOS, and average daily traffic (ATD), as well as the type of project and other measures. Second, all projects are scored on the same planning factors, which include items related to environmental justice, land use, air quality and energy, intermodal connectivity, and local over-match. Finally, all projects are scored based on a generic benefit/cost analysis, which compares the points received in the previous two factors to the funding request. A total of 100 points are used in the scoring, with 40 points allocated to the transportation factors, 50 points allocated to the planning factors, and 10 points allocated to the benefit/cost analysis.

The ICC Prioritization Subcommittee conducts the project review and ranking process. The subcommittee also attempts to ensure that all parts of the region are funded as equally as possible, and that funds are separated between highway and transit applications in an equitable manner. The subcommittee makes a recommendation to the ICC and the Board of Trustees, which has final approval. This process has been used on the Ohio STP and CMAQ projects for a number of years. Starting in 2005, the same process is being used for STP and CMAQ projects in Kentucky and Indiana.

As noted previously, although jurisdictions in Indiana have been included in the COG for a number of years, Indiana was not within the MPO boundary until after the 2000 Census. With the addition of Indiana, OKI staff work with three state departments of transportation. The three state departments of transportation have different guidelines and approaches. In addition, OKI staff work with three different FHWA divisions. These divisions may place emphasis on different aspects of federal policies and guidelines. Working with these state departments of transportation, FHWA divisions, and other federal, state, and local agencies frequently requires OKI staff to attend more meetings than staff from single-state MPOs.

Another unique challenge for OKI is determining equitable funding between states for multi-state transportation projects. OKI derives approximately 83 percent of its funding from Ohio, almost 17 percent from Kentucky, and less than one percent from Indiana. This breakdown provides the model for funding region-wide transportation projects. Obtaining agreement from all states on the funding allocation takes time and is not always an easy process. Accounting for and reconciling the various funding sources is also more difficult.

The size and composition of the ICC and Board of Trustees fosters regional cooperation and coordination. With representation from over 100 member jurisdiction, the Board provides a forum for discussion and agreement on addressing transportation needs in the region. The OKI provides regional leadership and consensus building on identifying and advancing critical transportation projects. The agency is viewed as an unbiased source of information and staff are highly regarded for their technical expertise.

Air quality is a significant issue in the region. The three Ohio counties in OKI are classified as an air quality non-attainment area, as is the Indiana portion. OKI is responsible for conducting the air quality conformity analysis. OKI must also address obtaining and using data from three different state departments of transportation on different projects. Differences are sometimes encountered in the way each state collects, processes, and maintains various types of transportation data. Blending data from three different states can be a challenge.

Wilmington Area Planning Council

The Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO) is the MPO for Cecil County, Maryland and New Castle County, Delaware. The two counties cover a total of 744 square miles – 396 in New Castle County and 348 in Cecil County. While the land area in both states is similar, Delaware accounted for about 85 percent of the 2000 metropolitan population of 602,000. The area is located approximately mid-way between New York City and Washington, D.C.

Wilmington, Delaware is the largest city in the area. Located along the Delaware River, Wilmington is home to major financial institutions and companies. Tourism, transportation services, and industry are also important components of the region's economy. The area is served by I-95, I-495, I-295, and the New Jersey Turnpike/Delaware Memorial Bridge. AMTRAK and commuter rail service links the area with major eastern cities. Freight railroads also operate in the area. The Delaware Transit Corporation provides public transportation services in the area. New Castle County Airport provides private and charter air service.

WILMAPCO was established in 1970 through an intergovernmental agreement. The original name of the agency was the Wilmington Metropolitan Area Planning Coordinating Council. Authority for the State of Maryland and its local governments to participate in WILMAPCO is provided in the Annotated Code of Maryland and through the executive powers of the governor. Comparable legislation does not exist in Delaware. WILMAPCO is an independent agency and Delaware is the lead state.

The composition of the WILMAPCO Council, which is the policy making body, is outlined in the agreement establishing the agency and the by-laws. The Council consists of nine voting members – six from Delaware and three from Maryland. The members represent the following agencies or positions:

Delaware (Six members):

- Delaware Governor's Appointee;
- Delaware Department of Transportation Secretary or Appointee;
- Delaware Department of Transportation, Delaware Transit Corporation, Director;
- Wilmington, Mayor or Appointee;
- New Castle County, County Executive or Appointee; and
- New Castle County, Municipalities Representative.

Maryland (Three members):

- Maryland Governor's Appointee;
- Cecil County Commissioner or Appointee; and
- Cecil County Municipalities Representative.

Voting of the Council requires a quorum of Council members, which is defined as six members including a majority of each state's representatives. In addition, regional projects or programs that directly impact a state must be approved by a majority of that state's delegation. Projects determined to be of primary local interest by the Council, upon recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), require only a majority vote of the delegation from the affected state.

The TAC helps oversee the technical work of WILMAPCO staff and recommends projects and programs to the Council. The TAC includes representatives from the following WILMAPCO participating agencies:

- Delaware Transit Corporation (Chair);
- Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control;
- Delaware Department of Transportation;
- Delaware River and Bay Authority;
- New Castle County Department of Land Use;
- Wilmington Department of Planning;
- Wilmington Department of Public Works;
- Newark Planning Department;
- State Planning Coordination Office ;
- Delaware Economic Development Office;
- Maryland Department of Transportation (Vice Chair);

- Maryland State Highway Administration;
- Maryland Transit Administration;
- Maryland Department of the Environment;
- Maryland Department of Planning;
- Cecil County Office of Planning, Zoning, and Parks and Recreation;
- Town of Elkton; and
- Transportation Management Association of Delaware.

Ex-Officio Members

- AMTRAK;
- Environmental Protection Agency;
- Federal Highway Administration;
- Federal Transit Administration; and
- Diamond State Port Corporation.

The TAC utilizes subcommittees to help facilitate the development of plans and programs. Current subcommittees include the Air Quality Subcommittee, the Congestion Management System Subcommittee, the Demographic and Data Subcommittee, and the Non-Motorized Transportation Working Group.

The Public Advisory Committee (PAC) includes citizen representatives from counties, cities, businesses, environmental and citizen groups, private transportation providers, and public transportation riders. The PAC assists the Council in developing and conducting public participation strategies. It also provides a forum for the discussion of community issues and concerns.

WILMAPCO's 20-year Regional Transportation Plan focuses on a transportation investment area concept. This approach directs transportation projects to areas with existing communities to provide the most services to the most people and to help guide development. The transportation investment areas include centers, communities, developing, rural, and potential employment centers. The plan contains different objectives and approaches for these areas to match current needs and future goals.

Projects for the TIP are prioritized through a three-step process. Potential projects are first screened by staff for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, as well as local, county, and state transportation and land use plans. Second, staff scores potential projects based on criteria linked to Regional Transportation Plan goals. The criteria address air quality, environmental justice, safety, congestion management, transportation justice, and economic development initiatives. The technical scores developed by staff are reviewed and discussed by the TAC. The TAC ranks the projects and provides the Council with a priority list. After Council action, the priority project list is provided to the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) and the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) for use in priority projects on a statewide basis and selecting projects based on available funding.

In addition to the long-range plan, TIP, and UPWP, WILMAPCO conducts studies and undertakes activities supporting the transportation planning processing the area. Air quality studies, ITS coordination efforts, and goods movement, subregional, and transit studies provide a

few examples of these activities. WILMAPCO also conducts an ongoing data collection, management, and distribution program to support the local, metropolitan, and state decision-making process.

Over the past 36 years, WILMAPCO has faced opportunities and challenges as a multi-state MPO. WILMAPCO provides a metropolitan perspective on addressing transportation issues. It has established a forum for effective, multimodal, intergovernmental decision-making. Although there are differences in the processes and schedules used by DelDOT and MDOT, WILMAPCO has developed an approach that works for both states.

WILMAPCO provides the opportunity to leverage funding available through both states and to generate support for projects with policy makers from Delaware and Maryland. WILMAPCO helps foster coordination and cooperation among all public sector groups, as well as private transportation providers and private sector groups. The expertise of the staff is viewed highly, as is the unbiased nature of the studies and information provided by WILMAPCO.

CHAPTER FOUR – MULTI-STATE MPO CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

As required by federal legislation and regulations, MPOs are responsible for planning, programming, and coordinating federal highway and transit investments in urban areas with populations of 50,000 or more. MPOs conduct the “3-C” (continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative) planning process in association with state departments of transportation, local governments, other agencies, and various public and private sector groups. MPOs are responsible for developing and updating the long-range transportation plan, the TIP, and the UPWP. In developing these and other plans, MPOs are also responsible for data collection and data analysis, the public involvement process, and other activities. Further, some states have given MPOs additional responsibilities associated with transportation, transit, land use, and infrastructure investments.

All MPOs face challenges and opportunities in carrying out these responsibilities. Multi-state MPOs face additional challenges, however, given differences in state laws, governmental and jurisdictional structures, and institutional and financial arrangements. Representatives from the multi-state MPOs identified a number of challenges and opportunities related to the unique characteristics associated with institutions, legislation, and funding in their areas. Many of these challenges and opportunities were highlighted in the eight case studies in Chapter Three. These challenges and opportunities are summarized in this chapter by three general categories – factors influencing the transportation planning process, factors related to institutional and legal requirements, and factors associated with the MPO structure. The chapter concludes with a discussion of multi-state MPOs and characteristics of successful MPOs identified in other studies.

Transportation Planning Process

Multi-state MPO representatives identified a number of challenges and opportunities related to the transportation planning process. Factors associated with different approaches, procedures, and schedules in different states, which impact the preparation of the long-range transportation plan, the TIP, the UPWP, air quality planning, and other elements of the metropolitan transportation planning process are highlighted in this section. These factors may add complexity to the transportation planning process at multi-state MPOs.

- **Developing and Updating the Long-Range Transportation Plan** The development of the long-range transportation plan at multi-state MPOs provides the opportunity to focus on the region as a whole. The plan development process allows for the discussion of the future vision for the metropolitan area, the goals and objectives of the transportation system, the priority transportation needs, and other key issues. In many areas, no other agency provides this regional focus. Representatives at many multi-state MPOs noted that the process of developing and updating the long-range plan brings an important and a visible focus to the discussion of transportation needs in the area, regardless of state boundaries. Multi-state MPOs provide the forum for the discussion of these and other important transportation issues. Multi-state MPO representatives noted that some elements of the long-range

planning process may vary by state. For example, there may be differences in public involvement guidelines, planning philosophies, funding approaches, and other related items. Multi-state MPO representatives suggested that these differences do not cause major problems in the development of long-range transportation plans.

- **Development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** Developing the TIP at multi-state MPOs represents a unique challenge. As would be expected, all the multi-state MPOs reported developing separate projects lists for each state within the MPO. Further, many multi-state MPO representatives noted that the methods used to select projects differed by state, and a few also noted that the schedules for development and adoption of the TIP vary by state. Development of the TIP for the National Capital Transportation Planning Board follows different approaches within the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland. Development of the TIP for the Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council involves different processes in Minnesota and Wisconsin, as well as different schedules.
- **Development of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** Development of the UPWP, which contains the annual work activities and funding sources, may be more complex at multi-state MPOs. This complexity relates to the additional funding sources, which may include multiple states, FHWA and FTA regional offices and districts, and local jurisdictions. Determining the specific projects to include in the UPWP may also be more complex. Some multi-state MPO representatives indicated that consideration is typically given to the funding provided by each state in selecting projects, while other representatives noted that projects were selected more based on need rather than the share of the state's funding.
- **Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, and Transportation Enhancement Program** Representatives at many multi-state MPOs noted that different methods are used in the various states for selecting projects for STP, CMAQ, and Transportation Enhancement Program funds. Some multi-state MPOs, including the Bi-State Regional Commission in the Davenport, Iowa and Rock Island and Moline, Illinois area and the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments in the Cincinnati area, have developed processes for soliciting, reviewing, and ranking highway and transit projects. Other MPOs use separate processes based on the procedures or guidance from each state department of transportation.
- **Data Collection and Analysis Methods.** Representatives at many multi-state MPOs noted differences in collecting, storing, and analyzing transportation data by member states. Blending data from multiple states for safety plans, air quality conformity analysis, travel demand modeling, financial planning, and other activities can be challenging. Many multi-state MPOs also collect, maintain, and analyze different types of transportation data as part of their annual work tasks. The case studies indicate that representatives from local jurisdictions and other agencies view these activities as very important and very beneficial. These activities also support the role

of multi-state MPOs as the unbiased source of information on transportation in the region.

- **Travel Demand Forecasting** Representatives at some multi-state MPOs identified travel forecasting in a multi-state environment as a unique challenge. Potential issues include differences in data collection among states, differences in land use requirements, and difficulty in calibrating travel models across state boundaries.
- **Air Quality Issues.** Air quality issues were identified by a number of multi-state MPO representatives as a unique challenge. The EPA air quality designation varies among states in almost one-fourth of the multi-state MPOs. The difference in designation, which is typically related to the ozone requirement, impacts multi-state MPOs in a number of ways. Potential air quality issues identified by MPO representatives included the air quality conformity modeling process, identifying and gaining consensus on transportation control measures and approaches to attaining and maintaining conformity, and the impact on the schedule for updating the long-range transportation plan. In addition, multi-state MPOs often deal with different EPA regions in addressing air quality concerns, as well as the different state departments of transportation, state natural resource agencies, and FHWA divisions. Some multi-state MPO representatives indicated that the air quality nonattainment designation in one state provided the opportunity to raise awareness about air quality issues in the region as a whole. Other multi-state MPOs with nonattainment designations in only one state are participating in EPA's Early Action Compact to voluntarily achieve and maintain the eight-hour ozone standard by 2007.
- **Public Involvement Process.** Representatives at some multi-state MPOs noted that there are differences in the public involvement guidelines or requirements in the member states. It was suggested that these differences benefit the public involvement process as the MPOs can use the best techniques from participating states and jurisdictions. The public involvement process may be more complex at multi-state MPOs, with more meetings and other outreach activities, to ensure that groups in member states have the opportunity to participate. Information gathered in the case studies indicates that multi-state MPO public involvement elements are viewed positively.
- **Advisory Committees.** The number and the focus of advisory committees vary widely among the multi-state MPOs. All of the multi-state MPOs have at least a technical advisory committee, comprised of staff from local jurisdictions, transportation agencies, and other groups. A challenge for multi-state MPOs is ensuring the participation of appropriate jurisdictions, agencies, and groups from member states. The larger multi-state MPOs have more advisory committees than the smaller to mid-sized MPOs. Information from the case studies indicates that the advisory committees are viewed positively as providing a valuable forum for the discussion of a wide range of transportation issues.

Legal Requirements and Institutional Arrangements

Differences in legislation, laws, policies, and institutional arrangements in each of the participating states influence the structure and operation of multi-state MPOs. The challenges and opportunities associated with differences in state laws, ownership of the transportation system, state departments of transportation, state financial resources and funding sources, and local jurisdictions are discussed in this section. Differences in the operation and funding of public transportation services and interacting with multiple federal agency divisions and regional offices are also highlighted.

- **Differences in State Legislation, Laws and Funding Sources.** Differences in state legislation, laws, and funding sources represent a challenge to multi-state MPOs. State laws regulate the responsibilities and powers of state, regional, and local agencies, local jurisdictions, and special districts. The approaches and mechanisms used to fund various components of the transportation system may vary among member states. These differences add complexity to the transportation planning process conducted by multi-state MPOs. Coordinating different funding sources among states represents a challenge for multi-state MPOs.
- **State Financial Resources.** The financial resources available to member states, which are linked to the laws and funding programs noted above, may also vary. The actual amount of funding available for various transportation projects depends on the financing mechanisms, the status of the state's economy, and other factors. Representatives at some multi-state MPOs noted that differences in the financial resources of member states was a challenge.
- **Differences in State Departments of Transportation** A total of 34 multi-state MPOs interact with two state departments of transportation, while five deal with three state transportation agencies, and one interacts with two state departments of transportation and the District of Columbia. Each state department of transportation has different organizational structures, guidelines, policies, and procedures based on state legislation. They may also have different funding programs. State departments of transportation also frequently reflect different agency cultures and philosophies. Multi-state MPO representatives and personnel at the various state departments of transportation contacted in the case studies noted that these differences can be challenging for all groups involved in multi-state MPOs.
- **Differences in Ownership of the Roadway System.** Differences in the ownership or jurisdiction over highways, roadways, and bridges exist between member states in some multi-state MPOs. As described in the case studies, the differences in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia provides one of the more complex examples. In Virginia, VDOT is responsible for interstate freeways, state roadways, and most county and local roads. In Maryland, MDOT is responsible for the interstate and state roads, while cities and counties have responsibility for local roads. The District of Columbia is responsible for interstate freeways within the District and most local

roadways. The National Park Service is responsible for some roads and bridges in the District, however.

- **Differences in Local Jurisdictions.** Differences may also exist in the powers, responsibilities, and duties of local jurisdictions based on state law. These differences may influence the planning process at multi-state MPOs, as well as specific projects. Counties, cities, and towns in one state may have different authority related to zoning, land use planning, subdivision regulations, and local streets and roadways than their counterparts in the other state or states. Local jurisdictions also provide significant funding for the local transportation system. The source of funding and the level may vary between communities in multiple states. The National Capital Regional Transportation Board provides one example of these differences. Based on state laws, local governments in Maryland have more extensive authority related to land use than local jurisdictions in Virginia.
- **Federal Regions and Divisions.** Multi-state MPOs interact with multiple FHWA, FTA, EPA, and other federal agency regional and divisional offices. Some multi-state MPO representatives noted that federal regions and divisions may have different interpretations of regulations, different priorities, and different approaches. Resolving these differences can take time and additional staff resources. A few MPO representatives suggested that these differences enhance the planning process, as the MPO can use the best of all approaches.
- **Public Transportation Agencies and Funding Sources** The number, organizational structure, and funding sources of public transportation agencies in the area may add complexity to the multi-state MPOs planning process. While a few multi-state MPOs have only one public transportation agency providing service in the region, most have at least two. The larger multi-state MPOs have multiple transit agencies providing different combinations of modes, including bus, light rail transit (LRT), heavy rail, commuter rail, and high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. The state and local funding sources for public transportation services frequently vary by state. Examples of different funding sources include the state gasoline tax, the state motor vehicle excise tax, local sales tax, cigarette and alcohol taxes, revenues from gambling, and the state general revenue fund. Working with two or more public transportation agencies, who receive funding from different sources, represents a challenge to some multi-state MPOs.

Multi-State MPO Structure

Representatives at some of the multi-state MPOs identified challenges and opportunities associated with the institutional structure of their MPO. Examples of organizational-related challenges and opportunities noted by multi-state MPO representatives are highlighted in this section. These examples include approval of plans and other documents by additional governing bodies, staffing and budget limitations, and maintaining a balance among participating jurisdictions.

- **Additional Levels of Approval** Multi-state MPOs located within another organization, including regional agencies, COGs, cities, and counties typically have an additional level of approval for plans, projects, and budgets. Representatives at some multi-state MPOs housed within another agency noted that approval by the governing body of that agency is needed on some items. While this additional approval level is not viewed as a problem, it does take extra time and resources as the higher governing body may not always be fully engaged in the MPO issues and topics. In a few cases, such as the Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council, established through a joint powers agreement between two regional agencies, two additional governing bodies must approve certain items.
- **Staffing and Budget Limitations.** Representatives at a few of the smaller multi-state MPOs voiced concerns related to available funding to maintain adequate staffing levels and to provide needed support to member jurisdictions. This concern was not related to any specific organizational structure. Many smaller MPOs, not just multi-state MPOs, face this problem. Concerns about hiring and maintaining staff at small MPOs have been noted in other studies.
- **Maintaining Balance Among Participating Jurisdictions.** A few representatives from multi-state MPOs located within cities or counties noted that there is sometimes a perception that the MPO focuses too much on that jurisdiction. This issue may be more pronounced when an MPO is housed in the dominant jurisdiction in an area. It may also be more difficult to fully engage other areas in the MPO activities if there is a perception that one jurisdiction or state is dominating the process. Representatives from multi-state MPOs that are independent agencies noted that one of the strengths of their organizational structure was not being linked to a specific jurisdiction. Representatives from other multi-state MPOs noted that maintaining a metropolitan focus is important, as is working with all member jurisdictions.

Multi-State MPOs and Characteristics of Successful MPOs

As noted in the introduction to this report, a variety of studies over the past 40 years have examined different aspects of MPO institutional arrangements, effectiveness, and characteristics of successful MPO processes. This section examines how characteristics of successful MPOs identified in other studies related to multi-state MPOs.

In examining attributes of successful MPOs, it is important to remember that there is a wide variety in the 384 MPOs in the U.S., including the 40 multi-state MPOs. In addition to the challenges and opportunities associated with multi-state MPOs discussed in the previous sections of this chapter, a number of other factors may influence the focus of multi-state MPOs and their ability to conduct effective metropolitan transportation planning and project selection processes. Examples of these factors include the population of the area and the rate of growth, the existing public and private sector infrastructure, the physical characteristics of the area, the severity and complexity of the transportation problems, and available funding.

Multi-state MPOs cover small, medium, and large metropolitan areas. Some multi-state MPOs continue to experience rapid growth and associated development pressures, while others reflect relatively stable population and development trends. The age and composition of the public and the private sector transportation infrastructure is very different among the multi-state MPOs. Since rivers often form state boundaries, most multi-state MPOs are physically divided by rivers, lakes or harbors. A few multi-state MPO areas, such as Bristol, Tennessee/Virginia, and Texarkana, Texas/Arkansas are not physically separated. All of these factors will influence the severity and the complexity of the transportation problems to be addressed in the MPO planning process. Finally, the funding available to multi-state MPOs varies widely. The funding level influences the ability of multi-state MPOs to conduct activities necessary to help address the transportation problems in the area.

- **Regional Focus.** Providing a regional focus or ethos among policy board members and the agency as a whole has been suggested as an important attribute of successful MPOs. Multi-state MPOs promote regional transportation planning, project development, and operation. Many of the individuals contacted for the case studies noted that the multi-state MPO was the only agency that addressed the region as a whole. While multi-state MPOs provide an important forum for the discussion of critical transportation issues, most are organized to ensure that no one state or jurisdiction can dictate to the other state or other jurisdictions. The policy boards of some multi-state MPOs favor the dominate state. In other cases, policy boards reflect equal membership from participating states, regardless of the population distribution. While it would be impossible to say that multi-state policy boards are free of parochial interests, most appear to provide a regional focus.
- **Effective Leadership.** The ability of MPO directors, staff, and board members to work with diverse groups and to build consensus for regional decisions has been identified as an important characteristic of successful MPOs. The case studies and other available information indicates that multi-state MPO policy board members and staff are viewed as effective leaders in advancing the discussion of critical transportation issues and helping address key needs.
- **Cooperative Working Relationships with Federal, State, and Local Agencies**
Engaging state departments of transportation in cooperative and collaborative decision making has been identified as a key to successful MPOs. The information collected and examined in this study, including the case studies, suggest that multi-state MPOs maintain strong working relationships with multiple state departments of transportation, regional and divisional offices of federal agencies, and local jurisdictions and agencies. These cooperative working relationships are critical for the success of multi-state MPOs. As noted previously, staff at multi-state MPOs probably attend more meetings with state and federal agencies due to the multiple states involved in the planning process. While working with multiple agencies can present a challenge due to differences in approaches, philosophies, cultures, funding sources, and interpretations of regulations, multi-state MPOs also benefit from robust discussions on possible approaches and using the best of all suggested techniques.

- **Staff Expertise.** Similar to any agency or business, staff expertise has been identified as a key characteristic of successful MPOs. The number and the areas of expertise of multi-state MPOs' staff vary based on agency size and available funding. The case studies and other information examined in this study indicate that staff at all sizes of multi-state MPOs are viewed positively for their technical knowledge and understanding of local issues. The areas of expertise and skill sets needed to address the issues facing the large multi-state MPOs may be different than those needed in smaller MPOs, however.
- **Public Participation Process.** Active public participation programs and involving the public in the transportation planning process has also been suggested as an important characteristic of successful MPOs. While the public involvement process was not examined extensively in this study, it appears that multi-state MPOs use a variety of methods to promote public involvement and participation. Multi-state MPOs may face challenges related to different public involvement guidelines in member states. These differences appear to enhance the public participation process rather than detract from it, however, as multi-state MPOs benefit from using the best of all available approaches.

Although varying based on size, funding, and other factors, multi-state MPOs exhibit the characteristics of successful MPOs. Additional research into some of these characteristics that were beyond the scope of this project would be of benefit to multi-state MPOs and other groups. Potential areas for further research are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE – FURTHER RESEARCH

This report highlights the basic characteristics of the 40 multi-state MPOs in the country. Information on the date the multi-state MPO was established, the population of the MPO area, the organizational structure, and the enabling authority is presented. The policy board composition, board voting methods, board officers, and advisory committees are summarized. The unique challenges and opportunities facing multi-state MPOs are discussed. More detailed case study information on eight multi-state MPOs is provided.

The information presented in this report is of benefit to staff and policy makers at multi-state MPOs, state departments of transportation, local jurisdictions, public transportation agencies, and federal agencies. It is also of use to researchers and other groups interested in enhancing all facets of the metropolitan transportation planning process.

Areas for further research were identified through the literature review, the multi-state MPO information request, and the case studies. Additional research needs focus on multi-state MPO travel forecasting methods, the use of weighted or alternative voting methods, policy board representation, coordinating federal agency divisions and regional offices, and multiple MPOs in multiple states. These areas for further research are highlighted next.

- **Multi-State MPO Travel Forecasting** Examining the travel forecasting models and techniques used at the multi-state MPOs was beyond the scope of this study. Additional research exploring the unique features and needs of travel forecasting in a multi-state setting would be beneficial. Topics to be examined in this research include data needs, consistency of data collection methods among states, and approaches for advancing the state-of-the-practice with travel forecasting models in the multi-state environment.
- **Use of Weighted or Alternative Voting Methods** At least four multi-state MPOs have weighted or alternative voting methods that may be used in specific cases. While MPO representatives indicated these voting options are rarely applied, a detailed assessment of their use was beyond the scope of this project. Additional research examining the use of weighted or alternative voting methods would provide a better understanding of the possible advantages and disadvantages of this approach. The additional research would focus on the number of times the weighted or alternative voting methods have been used, the nature of the votes they have been used with, and the voting results, including changes from the initial vote. Assessing the general perceptions on the part of policy makers to the use of alternative voting methods would also be of benefit.
- **Multi-State MPO Policy Board Representation.** The general membership on multi-state MPO policy boards was examined in this study. A detailed assessment of representation among policy board members by population, ethnic, and socio-economic characteristics was beyond the scope of the study, however. Additional research examining the multi-state MPO policy board representation by factors such

as urban/suburban areas, racial and ethnic populations, and other factors would be of benefit, especially in relationship to other recent studies.

- **Coordination Among Federal Agency Divisions and Regional Offices** As noted in this report, multi-state MPOs typically interact with and receive guidance from multiple divisions and regional offices of FHWA, FTA, and EPA as well as other federal agencies. Divisions and regional offices within the same agency may provide different guidance or may reflect different priorities. Additional research examining the interaction of federal agency divisions and regional offices with multi-state MPOs, including coordinating the various elements of the planning process, would be of benefit.
- **Multi-State/Multi-MPOs.** In addition to the 40 multi-state MPOs examined in this study, there are other cases where separate MPOs exist in each state. These situations add complexity to the transportation planning process, requiring coordination and cooperation between the MPOs, state departments of transportation, federal agencies, local jurisdictions, and other groups. How this coordination and cooperation occurs, especially related to travel forecasting, air quality conformity, public involvement, environmental justice, and project development and project selection, is critical to the effective and efficient operation of the transportation system in the metropolitan area. Additional research is needed to examine the coordination methods and techniques used by multiple MPOs in metropolitan areas that cross state boundaries. Multi-state metropolitan areas with multiple MPOs would benefit from sharing experiences on effective approaches for coordinating the various planning functions and requirements.

RESOURCES

The following resources were used in the development of this report.

Chapter One – Introduction

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *Profiles of Metropolitan Planning Organizations*. Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Washington, D.C., April 2005.

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations Website <http://www.ampo.org/>.

Schmitt, R. P., E.A. Beimborn, and J. P. Weitman. “Local Organization of Transportation Planning Activities in the United States.” *Transportation and Planning Technology*. Volume 9, Issue 3, December 1984, 225-236.

Travel Model Improvement Program (TMIP) Website <http://tmip.fhwa.dot.gov/>.

Chapter Two – Overview of Multi-State MPOs

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *AMPO Survey Results: Policy Board Structure*, <http://www.ampo.org/content/index.php?pid=52>

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *AMPO Survey Results: Institutional Survey*, <http://www.ampo.org/content/index.php?pid=52>

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *AMPO Survey Results: Local Outreach*, <http://www.ampo.org/content/index.php?pid=52>

Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *AMPO Survey Results: Planning and Operations*, <http://www.ampo.org/content/index.php?pid=52>

Benjamin, S., J. Kincaid, and B. McDowell. “MPOs and Weighted Voting,” *Intergovernmental Perspective*, Volume 20, Spring 1994, 31-36.

Dempsey, P., A. Goetz, and C. Larson. *Metropolitan Planning Organizations: An Assessment of the Transportation Planning Process – A Report to Congress*. University of Denver Intermodal Transportation Institute, Denver, CO, 2000.

Dempsey, P., A. Goetz, and C. Larson. *Metropolitan Planning Organizations: An Assessment of the Transportation Planning Process – A Report to Congress, Volume Two – Structure and Process of Transportation Planning*. University of Denver Intermodal Transportation Institute, Denver, CO, 2000.

Dempsey, P., A. Goetz, and C. Larson. “Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Findings and Recommendations for Improving Transportation Planning.” *The Journal of Federalism*, Volume 32:1, Winter 2002, 87-105.

Florida Transportation Commission. *Assessment of Florida's Regional and Intermodal Transportation Planning Process*. Florida Transportation Commission, Tallahassee, FL, December 2003.

Hohl, J. *Directory of Metropolitan Planning Organizations and State Transportation Agencies*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C., January 1992.

Institute for Transportation Research and Education. *Analysis of the Governance of Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the United States for Potential Application in North Carolina*. Prepared for the North Carolina Department of Transportation by the Institute for Transportation Research and Education, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, 2001.

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments. *OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan – 2004 Executive Summary*. Cincinnati, OH, 2004.

Sanchez, T.W., *An Inherent Bias? Geographic and Racial-Ethnic Patterns of Metropolitan Planning Organization Boards*. The Brookings Institute Series on Transportation Reform, January 2006.

Chapter Three – Multi-State MPO Case Studies

Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission

Augusta Regional Transportation Study. *2015 Long Range Transportation Plan with Extensions to 2020 and 2025*.

Augusta Regional Transportation Study. *Transportation Improvement Program FY 2006-2008*. Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission, June 2005.

Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission. *Unified Planning Work Program for the Augusta Regional Transportation Study*. December 2005.

Ellis, D. City of Augusta. Telephone interview with the author. March 16, 2006.

Fulmer, B. South Carolina Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. June 21, 2006.

McKinney, C. Georgia Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 14, 2006.

Bi-State Regional Commission

Bi-State Regional Commission. *Draft 2035 QUAD City Area Long-Range Transportation Plan*. Bi-State Regional Commission, January 2006.

Bi-State Regional Commission. *FY 2007 – 2010 Transportation Improvement Program For the Davenport-Moline-Rock Island Urbanized Area*. Bi-State Regional Commission, May 2006.

Bi-State Regional Commission. *Surface Transportation Program Evaluation Manual*. Bi-State Regional Commission, September, 1998.

Bi-State Regional Commission. *Transportation Planning Work Program FY 2006*. Bi-State Regional Commission, 2005.

Dean, F. Iowa Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 8, 2006.

Durbin, S. Illinois Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 6, 2006.

Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Bristol Urban Area Long-Range Transportation Plan Year 2030*.

Chandler, R. Virginia Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. April 11, 2006.

City of Bristol, TN. *Draft – Bristol Tennessee Land Use and Transportation Plan*. 2006

Midgett, A. Tennessee Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 16, 2006.

Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council

Bly, L. Minnesota Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. February 1, 2006.

Chicka, R., Metropolitan Interstate Council. Telephone interview with the author. February 15, 2006.

Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council, *Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council Bylaws*. Revised July 15, 2004.

Forbes, M. Wisconsin Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. February 22, 2006.

Helig, J. Duluth Transit Authority. Telephone interview with the author. February 6, 2006.

Johnson, D. Minnesota Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. February 3, 2006.

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Helm, K. Idaho Transportation Department. Telephone interview with the author. March 6, 2006.

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Annual Report – Fiscal Year 2005*.

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. *By-Laws of the Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization* July 12, 2005.

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Joint Powers Agreement: Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization* Revised July 12, 2005.

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Unified Planning Work Program – Fiscal Year 2005*. December 2004.

Preston, B. Washington State Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 7, 2006.

National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board

Kirby, R. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Telephone interview with the author. February 22, 2006.

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments and National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board. *FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program for Transportation Planning for the Washington Metropolitan Region* Washington, D.C., March 2005.

National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board. *A Citizen's Guide to Transportation Decision-Making in the Washington Metropolitan Region* Washington, D.C., April 2002.

Price, J. Arlington County. Telephone interview with the author. March 9, 2006.

Rybeck, R. District of Columbia. Telephone interview with the author. March 8, 2006.

Spalding, R. Maryland Transit Administration. Telephone interview with the author. March 22, 2006.

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments

Dehart, S. Ohio Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 9, 2006.

Ohio Department of Transportation. *MPO Administrative Manual*. Columbus, OH, September, 2004.

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments. *OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan – 2004 Executive Summary*. Cincinnati, OH, 2004.

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments. *Articles of Agreement and By-Laws*. 1973, revised 1994.

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments. *Funding Application and Instructions for OKI-Allocated STP and CMAQ Federal Funds*. Cincinnati, Ohio, April 2006.

Pain, M. Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments. Telephone Interview with the author. July 24, 2006.

Rushley, L. Ohio Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. February 14, 2006.

Smith, S. Indiana Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 6, 2006.

Wilmington Area Planning Council

Dennis, C. Delaware Transit Corporation. Telephone interview with the author. March 9, 2006.

Kingsberry, S. Delaware Transit Corporation. Telephone interview with the author. March 9, 2006.

Oliver, G. Delaware Department of Transportation. Telephone interview with the author. March 16, 2006.

Wilmington Area Planning Council. *Fiscal Year 2006 Unified Planning Work Program for the Wilmington Metropolitan Area*. May 2005

Wilmington Area Planning Council. *WILMAPCO's Public Guide to Transportation Planning*. July 2003.

Wilmington Area Planning Council. *WILMAPCO's 2005 Regional Progress Report – Executive Summary*. January 2006.

Chapter Four– Multi-State MPO Challenges and Opportunities

Dempsey, P., A. Goetz, and C. Larson. “Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Findings and Recommendations for Improving Transportation Planning.” *The Journal of Federalism*, Volume 32:1, Winter 2002, 87-105.

APPENDIX A – INFORMATION REQUEST

MULTI-STATE MPOs INFORMATION REQUEST

The Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) is currently conducting a National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) project examining the organizational structures and institutional arrangements of multi-state MPOs. Your assistance is requested to help ensure that the project includes correct and current information on each multi-state MPO.

Please take a few minutes and respond to the following questions. Please return this form by e-mail to k-turnbull@tamu.edu. Please feel free to contact me by e-mail or telephone (979-845-6005) if you have any questions on this information request or the project.

Katherine F. Turnbull
Texas Transportation Institute

MPO:
Contact Information:

Year MPO Established:
Enabling Authority:
States (Please list lead state first):
Governing Board Composition and Voting:

Is the governing board composition and voting designated in the enabling authority?

If so, what is the basis for determining representation (population, equal number by state, etc.)?

Please identify the organizational structure for the MPO (independent agency, part of regional agency, council of governments, city, etc.).

Please identify the funding sources for operation of the MPO. Please indicate federal, state, and local funds by government agency or source.

Please identify the mechanisms used to prioritize and select projects to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Please describe the role the technical advisory committee (TAC) plays in the project selection process and the composition of the TAC.

Please identify the mechanisms used to coordinate transportation project selection and project funding decisions among the states in the MPO.

Please identify the top two or three benefits of your organizational structure and enabling authority.

Please identify the top two or three limitations of your organizational structure and enabling authority.

Please identify any unique issues you face as a multi-state MPO.

Please identify how these issues are addressed.

Please provide copies of:

- 1) Enabling legislation, interagency agreements, and other documents relating to:
 - a. organizational structure,
 - b. institutional arrangements, and
 - c. membership and voting requirements.
- 2) Project selection process, criteria, and funding allocation mechanisms.

Thank you again for your assistance. Please return this form by e-mail tok-turnbull@tamu.edu. Please call 979/845-6005 if you have any questions on this information request or the project.

APPENDIX B –MULTI-STATE MPO PROFILES

The profiles for the multi-state MPOs provide information on the date of the multi-state designation, the enabling authority, the organizational structure, and the lead state. Information is also provided on the composition of the multi-state MPO policy board, advisory committee, and contact name, address, telephone number, and e-mail. The information contained in the profiles was obtained through the e-mail request conducted as part of this study, the AMPO and TMIP Internet sites, and the individual MPO Internet sites. Given changes in staffing and other activities, the profiles represent a current snapshot of the multi-state MPOs.

Augusta Regional Transportation Study

Date Designated – 1965

Enabling Authority – Bi-State Memorandum of Understanding

Organizational Structure – Part of the Augusta-Richmond County Planning Commission

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Georgia**, South Carolina

Board Composition – Voting members on the Policy Committee include one member from each jurisdiction in the MPO area, the State Engineer from the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT), the Highway Commissioner from the Georgia Department of Transportation, and the Garrison Commander from Fort Gordon. The Policy Committee currently includes seven members from Georgia and five members from South Carolina. Non-voting members include the Highway Commissioner from SCDOT, representatives from FHWA Georgia and South Carolina Divisions, the MPO Project Director, a member of Georgia State Transportation Board District, and the Chair of the Citizens' Advisory Committee. More information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee and the Citizen's Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – Urbanized portions of Ken County, South Carolina and Columbia and Richmond counties in Georgia. Augusta, Georgia is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 390,000.

Contact Information – Paul DeCamp, Planning Director
Augusta Regional Transportation Study
525 Telfair Street
Augusta, GA 30901
(706) 821-1796 Fax: (706) 821-1806
E-mail: pdecamp@augustaga.gov
Website: http://www.augustaga.gov/departments/planning_zoning/aug_plann_comm.asp

Belomar Regional Council

Date Designated – 1966

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of Regional Council

States (Lead State in Bold) – **West Virginia**, Ohio

Board Composition – The Belomar Regional Council Policy Board is a 50-member regional council. Participating municipalities and counties have one member, with additional representation depending on population. The Belmont-Ohio-Marshall Transportation Study, which functions as the MPO, has additional members, including representatives from the state departments of transportation.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes Belmont County in Ohio and Ohio and Marshall counties in West Virginia. The 2000 population was approximately 159,300.

Contact Information – William C. Phipps, Executive Director
Belomar Regional Council
P. O. Box 2086
Wheeling, WV 26003
(304)242-1800 Fax: (304)242-2437
E-mail: bhipps@belomar.org
Website: <http://www.belomar.org/>

Bi-State Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – Initially designated in 1974 as multi-state MPO within a regional commission. Re-established as an independent agency in 2005.

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency (originally part of the regional commission)

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Arkansas**, Oklahoma

Board Composition – The Policy Committee includes county judges from Arkansas, county commissioners from Oklahoma, mayors from local jurisdictions, a representative from Fort Smith Transit, and a representative from the regional airport. Non-voting members include representatives from the Chamber of Commerce and the Fort Chaffee Trust.

Advisory Committees – Intermodal Task Force, Technical Task Force, and the Citizens Task Force

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the Fort Smith/Van Buren metropolitan area, including Crawford and Sebastian Counties in Arkansas and LeFlore and Sequoyah counties in Oklahoma. The 2000 population was approximately 154,640.

Contact Information – John Guthrie, Executive Director
Bi-State Metropolitan Planning Organization
Western Arkansas Planning and Development District
1109 South 16th Street
Fort Smith, AR 72901
(479) 785-2651 Fax (479) 785-1964
Website: http://www.wapdd.org/bistate_index.html

Bi-State Regional Commission

Date Designated – 1966

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of Regional Planning Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Illinois**, Iowa

Board Composition – The Bi-State Regional Commission includes 36 representatives from financially contributing member governments and additional representatives from specified program areas, designated constituencies, and minority representation. Elected county board chairpersons and representatives, mayors, and councilpersons or alderpersons comprise 29 members. A total of 16 of these members represent counties and cities in Illinois and 13 members represent counties and cities in Iowa. The other members are appointed citizens representing business, housing, human services, labor, minority, and riverfront planning groups. More detailed information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee, Demographic Advisory Committee, and the Transportation Modal Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the counties of Henry, Mercer, Rock Island, and Scott in Iowa and Muscatine County in Iowa. Mayor cities include Davenport, Iowa and Rock Island and Moline, Illinois. The 2000 population was approximately 505,700.

Contact Information – Denise Bulat, Executive Director
Bi-State Regional Commission
P. O. Box 3368
1504 3rd Avenue
Rock Island, IL 61204
(309) 793-6300 Fax (309) 793-6305
E-mail: dbulat@bistateonline.org
Website: http://www.bistateonline.org/index_ie.shtml

Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1982

Enabling Authority – Interstate Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of the City of Bristol, Tennessee Planning Department

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Tennessee**, Virginia

Board Composition – The Executive Board includes seven members – four from Tennessee and three from Virginia. The Tennessee members represent the City of Bristol, Bluff City, Sullivan County, and the Tennessee Department of Transportation. The Virginia members represent the City of Bristol, Washington County, and the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the twin cities of Bristol, Tennessee and Bristol, Virginia, as well as Bluff City and part of Sullivan County in Tennessee and Washington County in Virginia. The 2000 population was approximately 87,000.

Contact Information – Rex Montgomery, Transportation Planning Manager
Bristol Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
P. O. Box 1189
Bristol, TN 37621-1189
(423) 989- 5519 Fax (423) 989-5717
E-mail: rmontgomery@bristoltn.org
Website: <http://www.bristoltn.org/planning/page6.htm>

Brooke-Hancock-Jefferson Metropolitan Planning Commission

Date Designated – 1973

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Ohio**, West Virginia

Board Composition – The Policy Commission currently includes 77 members, who are local elected officials or city/county representatives. A total of 45 members represent jurisdictions in Ohio and 32 members represent jurisdictions in West Virginia. In Ohio, the City of Steubenville has nine members and Jefferson County has 36 members. In West Virginia, the City of Weirton has seven members, Brooke County has 18 members, and Hancock County has seven members.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Steubenville and Jefferson County in Ohio and the City of Weirton and Brooke and Hancock counties in West Virginia. The 2000 population was approximately 130,000.

Contact Information – John Brown, Executive Director
Brooke-Hancock-Jefferson Metropolitan Planning Commission
124 North Fourth Street
Steubenville, OH 43952
(740) 282-3685 (Ohio) (304) 797-9666 (West Virginia)
E-mail: jbrown@bhjmpc.org
Website: <http://www.bhjmpc.org/>

Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency

Date Designated – 1977

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Chattanooga Urban Area MPO for Transportation Planning is part of the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Tennessee**, Georgia

Board Composition – The Chattanooga Urban Area MPO Executive Board is composed of the principal elected officials of governmental jurisdictions and officials of agencies which administer or operate modes of transportation in the metropolitan area participating in the Chattanooga Urban Area Transportation planning process. The 27-member Executive Board includes 17 members representing jurisdictions and agencies in Tennessee and 10 members representing jurisdictions and agencies in Georgia. The members from Tennessee represent the State of Tennessee, the City of Chattanooga, the Chattanooga City Council, Hamilton County, the Hamilton County Commission, the Hamilton County Legislative Delegation, the Chattanooga Area Regional Transportation Authority, the Chattanooga Metropolitan Airport Authority, and the cities of Collegedale, East Ridge, Lakeside, Lookout Mountain, Red Bank, Ridgeside, Signal Mountain, Soddy-Daisy, and Walden. Members from Georgia represent the Georgia Department of Transportation, the North Georgia Legislative Delegation, Dade County, Walker County, Catoosa County, and the cities of Chickamauga, Fort Oglethorpe, Lookout Mountain, Ringgold, and Rossville. Weighted voting based on population may be used on announced critical issues.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes municipalities of Chattanooga, Collegedale, East Ridge, Lakesite, Lookout Mountain, Red Bank, Ridgeside, Signal Mountain, Soddy-Daisy, and Walden, and unincorporated Hamilton County in Tennessee. The northern portions of Dade, Walker, and Latoosa counties in north Georgia are included. Cities in these counties include Rossville, Fort Oglethorpe, Lookout Mountain, Chickamauga, and Ringgold. The 2000 population was approximately 361,400.

Contact Information – Karen Rhodes, MPO Coordinator
Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency
1250 Market Street, Suite 2000
Chattanooga, TN 37402-2713
(423) 757-5216 Fax: (423) 757-5532
E-mail:
Website: <http://www.chcrpa.org/index.htm>

Clarksville-Montgomery County Regional Planning Commission

Date Designated – 1977

Enabling Authority – Governor’s Compact

Organizational Structure –Clarksville Urbanized Area MPO (part of the Clarksville-Montgomery County Regional Planning Commission)

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Tennessee**, Kentucky

Board Composition –The Policy Board includes eight members, four from Tennessee and four from Kentucky. Members from Tennessee represent the Governor or the Tennessee Department of Transportation Commissioner, the Mayor of Clarksville, the Montgomery County Executive, and the Executive Director of the Nashville Regional Council. The members from Kentucky represent the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Secretary, the Mayor of Oak Grove, the Mayor of Hopkins, and the Christian County Judge Executive.

Advisory Committees – Technical Coordinating Committee

General Area and Characteristics –The MPO area includes Montgomery County, Tennessee and Christian County, Kentucky. Clarksville, Tennessee is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 144,700.

Contact Information – Stan Williams, Transportation Planning Coordinator
Clarksville-Montgomery County Regional Planning Commission
329 Main Street
Clarksville, TN 37040
(931) 645-7448 Fax: (931) 645-7481
E-mail: stanwilliams@cityofclarksville.com
Website: <http://www.cityofclarksville.com/planning/commission/>

Columbus-Phenix City Metropolitan Planning Organization (CPCMPO)

Date Designated – 1964

Enabling Authority – State Legislative Resolutions

Organizational Structure – Part of the Columbus Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Georgia**, Alabama

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes 10 members. Four members are designated from Georgia jurisdictions and agencies and four members are from Alabama jurisdictions and agencies. Members from Georgia include the Mayor of Columbus, a representative from Fort Benning, and two representatives from the Georgia Department of Transportation. Members from Alabama include the Mayor of Phenix City, two county commissioners, and a representative from the Alabama Department of Transportation. The final two members are a representative from the Citizens Advisory Committee and one MPO staff.

Advisory Committees – Technical Coordinating Committee and the Citizen Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Columbus and Muscogee County in Georgia, and Phenix City and portions of Russell and Lee counties in Alabama. The 2000 population was approximately 220,700.

Contact Information – Rich Jones
Columbus-Phenix City Metropolitan Planning Organization
P.O. Box 1340
420 10th Street
Columbus, GA 31902
(706) 653-4421 Fax: (706) 653-4534
E-mail: cpcmpo@columbusga.org
Website: <http://www.columbusga.com/mpo/>

Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments (CWCOG)

Date Designated – 1982

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of the Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Washington**, Oregon

Board Composition – There are three classes of members – general members, special members, and associate members. General members include representatives from Cowlitz County, Wahkiakum County, the Town of Cathlamet, and the cities of Longview, Kelso, Woodland, Castle Rock, and Kalama. All of these jurisdictions are in Washington. Special members include representatives from the ports, school districts, sewer district, and planned unit developments. Associate membership is open to any public agency or community, non-profit organization who, upon approval of the COG, pays an annual membership fee. Current associate members include the City of Rainier, Oregon; Lower Columbia College; the Lower Columbia Community Action Program; and the Lower Columbia and the Cowlitz Economic Development Councils. There is a weighted voting option, but it has not been used.

Advisory Committees – Technical Coordinating Committee and the Citizen Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the cities of Longview, Kelso, Woodland, Castle Rock, and Kalama, the Town of Cathlamet, and the Counties of Cowlitz and Wahkiakum in Washington, and the City of Rainier in Oregon. The 2000 population was approximately 63,500.

Contact Information – Rosemary Brinson-Siipola, Transportation Planner/Manager
Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments
Administration Annex Building
207 4th Avenue North
Kelso, WA 98626
(360) 577-3041 Fax (360) 425-7760
E-mail: rsiipola@cwco.org
Website: <http://www.cwco.org/>

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission

Date Designated – 1965

Enabling Authority – Delaware Valley Urban Area Compact enacted by the legislatures of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and approved by the governors of the two states.

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Pennsylvania**, New Jersey

Board Composition – The Policy Board is comprised of 18 members, including four ex-officio members. Nine members are from Pennsylvania and nine members are from New Jersey. The ex-officio members from Pennsylvania are the Secretary of Transportation and the Director of the Governor’s Office of Policy and Planning. The ex-officio members from New Jersey are the Commissioner of Transportation and the Commissioner of Community Affairs. Members from Pennsylvania include an appointee of the governor, and elected officials from Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery counties and the cities of Philadelphia and Chester. Members from New Jersey include an appointee of the governor and elected officials from Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, and Mercer counties and the cities of Camden and Trenton. Non-voting members include not more than three representatives of FHWA and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and one representative from FTA, the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, the New Jersey Transit Corporation, EPA, and other state agencies. The Executive Committee includes 10 members. It consists of the four ex-officio members, the two appointees of the Governors, one representative selected by the four New Jersey county members, one representative selected by the four Pennsylvania county representatives, the representative from Philadelphia, and the representative from Camden.

Advisory Committees – Regional Citizen’s Committee, Environmental Justice Public Involvement Task Force, Regional Transportation Committee, Planning Coordinating Committee, Regional Air Quality Committee, Regional Aviation Committee, Goods Movement Task Force, Land Use and Development Committee, Regional Housing Committee, Information Resources Exchange Group, Intelligent Transportation Systems Committee, and the Tri-County Water Quality Management Board

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Philadelphia and Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia counties in Pennsylvania and Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, and Mercer counties in New Jersey. The 2000 population was approximately 5.2 million.

Contact Information – Donald Shanis, Assistant Executive Director
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
190 N. Independence Mall West, 8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520
(215) 592-1800 Fax (215) 592-9125
E-mail: dshanis@dvrpc.org
Website: <http://www.dvrpc.org/>

Dubuque Metropolitan Area Transportation Study

Date Designated – 1976

Enabling Authority – Articles of Agreement by Participating Organizations

Organizational Structure – Part of the East Central Intergovernmental Association

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Iowa**, Wisconsin, Illinois

Board Composition – The Policy Committee includes representatives from participating entities including the City of Dubuque, the City of Asbury, Dubuque County, Jo Davies County, the City of East Dubuque, the Illinois Department of Transportation, Grant County, Jamestown Township, the Southwest Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Keyline Transit System Advisory Board, the East Central Governmental Association, and the Regional Planning Affiliation. The City of Dubuque has seven members and the other entities have one member. The Iowa Department of Transportation, FTA Region VII, and the FHWA Iowa Division are ex-officio members.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the cities of Asbury and Dubuque, and Dubuque County in Iowa; the City of East Dubuque and Jo Daviess County in Illinois; and Jamestown Township, the unincorporated Town of Kieler, and Grant County in Wisconsin. The 2000 population was approximately 77,000.

Contact Information – Larry Nagle, Assistant Director
Dubuque Metropolitan Area Transportation Study
East Central Intergovernmental Association
3999 Pennsylvania Avenue, Suite 200
Dubuque, IA 52002
(563) 556-4166 Fax: (563) 556-0348
E-mail: ecia@ecia.org
Website: www.ecia.org

Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council

Date Designated – 1975

Enabling Authority – Joint Powers Agreement between the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission in Minnesota and the Northwest Regional Planning Commission in Wisconsin

Organizational Structure – Housed within the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Minnesota**, Wisconsin

Board Composition – The Policy Council includes 18 members. Nine members are from Minnesota and nine members are from Wisconsin. The Minnesota members include four from the City of Duluth (two city council members, one from Duluth Transit Authority, and one citizen representative), one from the City of Hermantown, one from St. Louis County, one from the City of Proctor, and two from suburban St. Louis County townships. The Wisconsin members include four from City of Superior (three from City Council and one citizen representative), four from the Douglas County Board, and one representative of the Douglas County Suburban Townships. More information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Transportation Advisory Committee and the Harbor Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the cities of Duluth, Proctor, and Hermantown and Townships in a portion of St. Louis County in Minnesota. In Wisconsin the area includes the City of Superior, Villages of Superior and Oliver, and Townships in part of Douglas County. The 2000 urbanized area population was approximately 118,200.

Contact Information – Ron Chicka, Director – Transportation Division
Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Interstate Council
221 West First Street
Duluth, MN 55802
(218) 529-7506 Fax (218) 529-7592
Email: rchicka@ardc.org
Website: <http://www.ardc.org/mic>

East-West Gateway Council of Governments

Date Designated – 1965

Enabling Authority – Not for Profit Corporation Act of Missouri

Organizational Structure – Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Missouri**, Illinois

Board Composition – The Board of Directors include 24 members representing top elected officials from the eight participating jurisdictions. These jurisdictions include the City of St. Louis, and Jefferson, St. Charles, St. Louis, and Franklin counties in Missouri and Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair counties in Illinois. Half of the members are from Missouri and half are from Illinois. Non-voting members include representatives from the Missouri Department of Transportation, the Missouri Office of Administration, the Illinois Department of Transportation, and the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs.

Advisory Committees – Air Quality Committee, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Executive Advisory Committee, Paratransit Advisory Committee, Transportation Planning Committee, Transportation Safety Advisory Committee, and the Water Resources Council.

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of St. Louis and Jefferson, St. Charles, St. Louis, and Franklin counties in Missouri and Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair counties in Illinois. The 2000 population was approximately 2.4 million.

Contact Information – Jerry Blair, Director of Transportation
East-West Gateway Council of Governments
One Memorial Dr., Suite 1600
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 421-4220 Fax (314) 231-5120
E-mail: jerry.blair@ewgateway.org
Website: <http://www.ewgateway.org/>

El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1988

Enabling Authority – Interagency Agreement

Organizational Structure – Within the City of El Paso

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Texas**, New Mexico

Board Composition – The Transportation Policy Board (TPB) is comprised of 25 elected officials or appointees of the following: City of El Paso (five), City of Socorro (one), County of El Paso (one), Town of Horizon City (one), Village of Vinton (one), Town of Clint (one), Town of Anthony (one), Texas State Representatives (four), Texas State Senator (one), Texas Department of Transportation (one), Sun Metro Mass Transit Department (one), El Paso International Airport (one), El Paso County Transit Agency or County-Wide Mass Transit Authority (one), New Mexico State Representative (one), New Mexico Senator (one), Doña Ana County (one), Town of Sunland (one), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (one). A total of 20 members are from Texas and five members are from New Mexico. The City of El Paso's representation must be equal to the number of incorporated Texas municipalities, cities, towns, or villages within the urbanized area who have representation on the TPB.

Advisory Committees – The TPB has three standing committees – the Executive Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Project Selection Committee.

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO urban area includes El Paso County, Texas and the City of Sunland Park and southern Doña Ana County, New Mexico. The City of El Paso is the largest city in the region. The 2000 population was approximately 619,280.

Contact Information – Roy Gilyard, Executive Director
El Paso MPO
10767 Gateway Boulevard West, Suite 605
El Paso, TX 79935
(915) 591-9735 Fax: (915) 541-9735
E-mail: rgilyard@elpasompo.org
Website: www.elpasompo.org

Evansville Urban Transportation Study (EUTS)

Date Designated – 1986 (initially created in 1969 and associated with the Southwest Indiana Kentucky Regional Council of Governments until it was dissolved in 1985)

Enabling Authority – Articles of Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Indiana**, Kentucky

Board Composition – The Policy Committee includes eight voting members – seven from Indiana and one from Kentucky. Members include the City of Evansville (three), Vanderburgh County (two), Warrick County (one), and the Town of Newburgh (one) in Indiana and the City of Henderson (one) in Kentucky. Non-voting members include the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Indiana FHWA Division, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the Kentucky Division of Air Quality, the Kentucky FHWA Division, FTA, and Henderson County in Kentucky.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The EUTS area includes the City of Evansville, Vanderburgh County, and Warrick County in Indiana and the City of Henderson and Henderson County in Kentucky. The 2000 population was approximately 183,000.

Contact Information – Rose Zigenfus, Executive Director
Evansville Urban Transportation Study
1 NW Martin Luther King Blvd
Evansville, IN 47708-1833
(812) 436-7833 Fax: (812) 436-7834
E-mail: eutse@evansville.net
Website: <http://www.eutsmmpo.com/home.htm>

Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

Date Designated – 1963

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **North Dakota**, Minnesota

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes 14 members, nine from North Dakota and five from Minnesota. Policy Board membership voting is based on each jurisdiction's approximate share of the area's population. The North Dakota members include seven representatives from the City of Fargo (five City Commission, two Planning Commission), one member from West Fargo (City Commission), and one from Cass County (City Commission). The members from Minnesota include three representatives from the City of Moorhead (two City Council, one Planning Commission), one representative from the City of Dilworth (City Council) and one representative from Clay County.

Advisory Committees – Transportation Technical Committee, Metropolitan Transportation Initiative, Metropolitan Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, Metropolitan Geographic Information System (GIS) Committee, Metropolitan Incident Management Committee, and the Metropolitan Rail Task Force

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the cities of Fargo and West Fargo, and portion of Cass County in North Dakota and the cities of Moorhead and Dilworth, and portion of Clay County in Minnesota. The 2000 population was approximately 142,000.

Contact Information – Bob Bright, Executive Director
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments
1 North 2nd Street
Case Plaza Suite, Suite 232
Fargo, ND 58102
(701) 232-3242 Fax: (701) 232-5043
E-mail bright@fmmetrocog.org
Website: <http://www.fmmetrocog.org/>

Florida-Alabama Urbanized Area Transportation Planning Organization

Date Designated – 2004 (replaced Pensacola MPO designated in 1970)

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of the West Florida Regional Planning Council

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Florida**, Alabama

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes 18 members – 17 from Florida and one from Alabama. The 17 members from Florida represent Escambia County (five members), the City of Pensacola (five members), Santa Rosa County (five members), the City of Gulf Breeze (one member), and the City of Milton (one member). The one member from Alabama represents the Baldwin County Commission.

Advisory Committees – Technical Coordinating Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee, Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and the Transportation Disadvantaged Coordinating Board

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO are includes major portions of Escambia and Santa Rosa counties in Florida and Lillian, Alabama. Pensacola, Florida is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 378,000.

Contact Information – Mike Ziegler, Director of Transportation Planning
Florida-Alabama Urbanized Area Transportation Planning
Organization
3435 North 12th Avenue
Pensacola, FL 32503
(850) 595-8910 or (800) 226-8914 Fax: (850) 595-8967
E-mail: zieglerm@wfrpc.dst.fl.us
Website: www.wfrpc.dst.fl.us/fatpo/default.htm

Grand Forks-East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1982

Enabling Authority – Bi-State Memorandum of Understanding

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **North Dakota**, Minnesota

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes eight members, four from each state. In North Dakota, two members are from the Grand Forks City Council, one member is from Grand Forks County, and one member is from the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Department. In Minnesota, two members represent the East Grand Forks City Council, one member is from Polk County, and one member is from East Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Department.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Grand Forks and Grand Forks County in North Dakota and East Grand Forks and a portion of Polk County in Minnesota. The 2000 population was approximately 60,000.

Contact Information – Earl Haugen, Executive Director
Grand Forks-East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization
P. O. Box 5200
Grand Forks, ND 58206-5200
(701) 746-2657
E-mail: ehaugen@grandforks.gov.com
Website: <http://theforksmpo.org>

Hagerstown-Eastern Panhandle Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1996 (reestablished in current multi-state form)

Enabling Authority – Interstate Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Maryland**, West Virginia, Pennsylvania

Board Composition – The Interstate Council includes 15 members, 13 voting members and two non-voting members. The voting members include seven representatives from Maryland and six representatives from West Virginia. The two non-voting members are from Pennsylvania. The seven members from Maryland include three officials from the Board of County Commissioners, one from the Maryland Department of Transportation, one official from Washington County, and the Mayor and a council member from the City of Hagerstown. The six members from West Virginia include one from Berkeley County, one official from Jefferson County, one representative from cities in Jefferson County, one official from the City Martinsburg, and one representative from the West Virginia Region 9 Planning Council. The two non-voting members from Pennsylvania include one representative from Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and one official from Franklin County.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Martinsburg and Berkeley and Jefferson counties in West Virginia; and the City of Hagerstown and Washington County in Maryland. The 2000 population was approximately 250,000.

Contact Information – Bob Gordon, Director
Hagerstown-Eastern Panhandle Metropolitan Planning Organization
County Administration Building
80 W. Baltimore Street
Hagerstown, MD 21740
Phone (240) 313-2430 or (304) 263-1743
Website: <http://www.hepmpo.net/us.htm>

Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA)

Date Designated – 1973

Enabling Authority – Designation by Governors and Memorandum of Understanding between the Indiana Department of Highways and the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet

Organizational Structure – Part of the Regional Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Kentucky**, Indiana

Board Composition – The Transportation Policy Committee is comprised of 27 members, including 18 voting members and nine non-voting or advisory members. The voting members include eight representatives from municipalities in Kentucky, eight representatives from municipalities in Indiana, a representative of the Regional Airport Authority, and a representative of the Transit Authority of River City (TARC). Members from Kentucky include the Mayors of Louisville, Shively, St. Matthews, and Jeffers-town; the Bullitt County Judge, a representative of the Jefferson County League of Cities, and the Secretary of the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Members from municipalities in Indiana include the Mayors of Charlestown, Jeffersonville, and New Albany, the Clarksville Town Council President, a Clark County Commissioner, a Floyd County Commissioner, and two representatives from the Indiana Department of Transportation. The non-voting or advisory members include representatives from the FHWA Indiana Division, the FHWA Kentucky Division, the Federal Aviation Administration/Memphis, FTA Region 4, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Metro Louisville Planning and Design, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, and the Transportation Technical Coordinating Committee.

Advisory Committees – Transportation Technical Coordinating Committee

General Area and Characteristics – KIDPA covers a nine-county area of southern Indiana and north central Kentucky. The MPO designation applies only to the counties of Bullitt, Jefferson, and Oldham in Kentucky and the counties of Clark and Floyd in Indiana. Louisville is the major city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 96,300, but the 2000 urbanized area population was some 863,500.

Contact Information – Harold Tull, Director of Transportation
Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency
11520 Commonwealth Drive
Louisville, KY 40299
Phone (502) 266-6084 Fax: (502) 266-5047
Toll Free (800) 648-6056
E-mail: harold.tull@ky.gov
Website: <http://www.kipda.org/>

Kingsport Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1977

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreements

Organizational Structure – Part of the City of Kingsport

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Tennessee**, Virginia

Board Composition – The Executive Board includes six members. The four members from Tennessee represent the City of Kingsport, Sullivan County, Mt. Carmel/Church Hill, and the Tennessee Department of Transportation. The two members from Virginia represent Scott County and the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area covers the City of Kingsport and Sullivan County, Hawkins County, and part of Washington County in Tennessee; and Gate City, Weber City, and Scott County in Virginia. The 2000 population was approximately 115,000.

Contact Information – William Albright, Transportation Planning Manager
Kingsport Metropolitan Planning Organization
City of Kingsport
225 West Center Street
Kingsport, TN 37660
(423) 229-9400 Fax (423) 224-2590
E-mail: albright@ci.kingsport.tn.us
Website: <http://www.ci.kingsport.tn.us/?BISKIT=1011933316&CONTEXT=cat&cat=29>

KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission

Date Designated – 1968

Enabling Authority – Interstate Compact

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **West Virginia**, Ohio, Kentucky

Board Composition – The Board includes member government’s chief elected officer (mayor or county commissioner) and their appointees based on a population formula.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes Cabell and Wayne counties, and the City of Huntington in West Virginia; Lawrence County and the City of Ironton in Ohio; and Boyd County and Green Up County, and the City of Ashland in Kentucky. The 2000 population was approximately 202,000.

Contact Information – Michele Craig, Executive Director
KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission
1221 6th Avenue
P.O. Box 939
Huntington, WV 25712
(304) 523-7434 Fax: (304) 529-7229
E-mail: mcraig@citynet.net
Website: <http://www.wvs.state.wv.us/kyova/>

La Crosse Area Planning Committee

Date Designated – 1967

Enabling Authority – Inter-municipal Agreement Among all Member Communities. The agreement is valid for three years and renews automatically unless terminated by one or more member municipalities.

Organizational Structure – Part of La Crosse County

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Wisconsin**, Minnesota

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes the highest ranking official from each member community. Currently, nine members represent communities from Wisconsin and one member represents the City of La Crescent, Minnesota. The jurisdictions in Wisconsin include the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska, the villages of West Salem and Holmen, the towns of Onalaska, Campbell, Medary, and Shelby, and La Crosse County.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee, Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and the Transit Coordinating Council

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the cities of La Crosse and Onalaska; the villages of Holmen and West Salem; the towns of Campbell, Medary, Barre, Greenfield, Onalaska, Shelby, and parts of Hamilton and Holland. Communities in Minnesota include the City of La Crescent and towns of La Crescent and Dresbach. The 2000 population was approximately 107,000.

Contact Information – Tom Faella, Director
La Crosse Area Planning Committee
400 North Fourth Street
La Crosse, WI 54601
(608) 785-5977 Fax: (608) 785-6525
E-mail: Faella.Tom@co.la-crosse.wi.us
Website: <http://www.lapc.org>

Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 2003

Enabling Authority – Joint Powers Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Idaho**, Washington

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes eight members from the four participating governmental units. Four members are from Washington and four members are from Idaho. Members from Washington represent the City of Asotin, Asotin County (two members), and the City of Clarkston. Members from Idaho represent the City of Lewiston (three members) and Nez Perce County. More information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Lewiston and Nez Perce County in Idaho, and the City of Asotin, the City of Clarkston, and Asotin County in Washington. The 2000 population was approximately 52,000.

Contact Information – Steven Watson, MPO Coordinator
Lewis-Clark Valley MPO
PO Box 759
Asotin, WA 99402
(208) 746-1318 Fax: (208) 746-5595
E-mail swatson@cityoflewiston.org
Website: <http://www.lewisclarkmpo.org/>

Memphis Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1977

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of County

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Tennessee**, Mississippi

Board Composition – The six-member Executive Board is comprised of the Governors of Tennessee and Mississippi, the Mayors of Memphis and Shelby County, a representative of the DeSoto County Board, and one other individual. The Transportation Policy Board is composed of the principal elected officials of participating governmental jurisdictions and the chairperson of the major providers of local and regional transportation facilities, including the state transportation agencies, the transit authority, the port commission, and the airport authority. Voting membership includes the following: Governor, State of Tennessee; Governor, State of Mississippi; Commissioner, Tennessee Department of Transportation; Executive Director, Mississippi Department of Transportation; Mayor, Shelby County Tennessee; the mayors of each duly incorporated municipality within Shelby County, Tennessee; Mayor, Fayette County, Tennessee, the mayors of each duly incorporated municipality within Fayette County, Tennessee; President, DeSoto County, Mississippi Board of Supervisors; the mayors of each duly incorporated municipality within DeSoto County, Mississippi; Chairperson, Memphis Transit Authority; Chairperson, Memphis and Shelby County Port Commission; and Chairperson, Memphis and Shelby County Airport Authority.

Advisory Committees – Air Quality Committee, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee, Engineering and Technical Committee, Freight Committee, and the Transportation Safety Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes Shelby and Fayette county, Tennessee and DeSoto County, Mississippi. Memphis is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 1 million.

Contact Information – Memphis Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
25 North Main Street
Memphis, TN 38103
(901) 576-6601 Fax: (901) 576-6603
E-mail:
Website: [http://www.dpdgov.com/\(efbn5p45vfecl1ih3b0k1c3i\)/RS/RS_content.aspx?id=231](http://www.dpdgov.com/(efbn5p45vfecl1ih3b0k1c3i)/RS/RS_content.aspx?id=231)

Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)

Date Designated – MARC formed in 1972, MPO designation by Governors in 1974

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of the Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Missouri**, Kansas

Board Composition –The MARC Board of Directors consists of 30 locally-elected officials from the eight member counties and the four largest cities in the region, as well as representatives from other cities in the area. Seventeen members represent Missouri jurisdictions and 13 members represent Kansas jurisdictions. The Mayor, Presiding Judge, County Executive or Chairman of the Board of Commissioners for each of the 12 jurisdictions serve on the Board. Each jurisdiction has between one to four additional members representing the city council or the cities in the county. The cities and counties represented and their respective members are: Missouri – cities of Independence (two) and Kansas City (four); and counties of Cass (two), Clay (two), Jackson (two), Platte (two) and Ray (two). Kansas – cities of Kansas City (two) and Overland Park (two); and counties of Johnson (three), Leavenworth (three) and Wyandotte (three). Non-voting members of the Board include representatives from local and regional organizations, state departments of transportation, the Governor’s Offices and the House and Senate of both states. The Executive Committee consists of the Council officers, which include the Chairman, the First Vice-Chairman, and Second Vice-Chairman, the Secretary, and the Treasurer.

Advisory Committees – Transportation Policy Committee

General Area and Characteristics –The MPO area includes 88 cities and the counties of Cass, Clay, Jackson Platte, and Ray in Missouri; and 31 cities and the counties of Johnson, Leavenworth, and Wyandotte in Kansas. The 2000 population was approximately 1.7 million.

Contact Information – Mell Henderson, Director of Transportation
Mid-America Regional Council
600 Broadway, Suite 300
Kansas City, MO 64105-1554
(816) 474-4240 Fax: (816) 421-7758
E-mail: mellh@marc.org
Website: <http://www.marc.org/>

National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board

Date Designated – 1965

Enabling Authority – Memorandum of Understanding – Designated by Governors of Maryland and Virginia, and Mayor of the District of Columbia

Organizational Structure – Independent Body Located with Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia

Board Composition – The National Capital Regional Transportation Planning Board is composed of representatives from the 19 cities and counties, including the District of Columbia, that are members of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the City of Manassas, the St. Charles Urbanized Area of Charles County, the two state and the district transportation agencies, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, four federal agencies, the General Assemblies of Maryland and Virginia, and private transportation service providers. A special voting procedure may be invoked that weights the votes of local jurisdiction members according to population. More information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Steering Committee, Technical Committee, Citizen Advisory Committee, Private Transit Providers Task Force, and the ITS Task Force

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the District of Columbia; Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, and Prince George’s counties, and the cities of Bowie, College Park, Gaithersburg, Greenbelt, Rockville, and Takoma Park, Maryland and Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William counties, and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Manassas, and Manassas Park, Virginia. The 2000 population was approximately 4.7 million.

Contact Information – Ron Kirby, Director of Transportation Planning
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capital Street, N.E., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20002-4239
(202) 962-3200 Fax: (202) 962-3202
E-mail: rkirby@mwkog.org
Website: www.mwkog.org

Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments

Date Designated – 1964

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreements

Organizational Structure – Authorizing Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Ohio**, Kentucky, Indiana

Board Composition – The Board of Trustees, which is the OKI Policy Board, includes 103 members. The Board of Trustees are elected and appointed representatives from county, township, and municipal governments in the eight counties in greater Cincinnati, northern Kentucky, and southeast Indiana. Representatives from 12 city and county planning commissions, two state departments of transportation, and interested citizens are also represented on the OKI Board. Ex-officio members include one representative from the Ohio Department of Transportation, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, and the Indiana Department of Transportation; and one member from the Board of Directors of the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority and the Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky. The Executive Committee includes 28 members. More information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Intermodal Coordinating Committee, Environmental Justice Committee, Groundwater Committee, and the Land Use Commission

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the counties of Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren in Ohio; the counties of Boone, Campbell, and Kenton in Kentucky; and Dearborn County in Indiana. Cincinnati is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 1.8 million.

Contact Information – Mark R. Policinski, Executive Director
Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments
720 East Pete Rose Way, Suite 420
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 621-6300 Fax: (513) 621-9325
E-mail: mpolicinski@oki.org
Website: <http://www.oki.org>

Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan Area Planning Agency

Date Designated – 1967

Enabling Authority – Interlocal Cooperative Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of the Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Nebraska**, Iowa

Board Composition – The Council of Officials includes 64 members representing each participating governmental unit. The Executive Committee or Board of Directors includes nine members representing specific Council of Officials member entities. Douglas County, which includes the City of Omaha, has an extra vote on demand on specific issues.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Omaha and Douglas, Sarpy, and Washington counties in Nebraska and Mills and Pottawattamie counties in Iowa. Omaha is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 685,000.

Contact Information – Paul Mullen, Executive Director
Omaha-Council Bluffs Metropolitan Area Planning Agency
2222 Cuming Street
Omaha, NE 68102-4328
(402) 444-6866 Fax: (402) 342-0949
E-mail: paul_mullen@mapacog.org
Website: <http://www.mapacog.org/>

Salisbury/Wicomico Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 2003

Enabling Authority – Memorandum of Understanding signed by all participating entities

Organizational Structure – Within the Salisbury/Wicomico County Department of Planning
States (Lead State in Bold) – **Maryland**, Delaware

Board Composition – The Salisbury/Wicomico Council consists of 11 members –nine voting members and two non-voting members. The seven voting members represent participating Maryland entities, including the Maryland Department of Transportation (three members), the City of Salisbury (two members), the City of Fruitland, the Town of Delmar, and the Tri-County Council for the Lower Eastern Shore of Maryland. The two non-voting members from Delaware represent the Delaware Department of Transportation and the Town of Delmar. The Council Executive Committee includes the Chair, Vice-Chair, and one other member appointed by the Chair.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics –The MPO area includes the City of Salisbury, Wicomico County, Town of Fruitland, and the Town of Delmar in Maryland and the Town of Delmar in Delaware. The 2002 population was approximately 59,400.

Contact Information – Gary Pusey, Chief Long Range and Transportation Planner
Salisbury/Wicomico Metropolitan Planning Organization
P. O. Box 870
Salisbury, MD 21803
(410) 548-4860 Fax: (410) 548-4955
E-mail: gpusey@wicomicocounty.com
Website: <http://www.wicomicocounty.org>

Siouxland Interstate Metropolitan Planning Council (SIMPCO)

Date Designated – 1965

Enabling Authority – Interlocal Cooperation Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Iowa**, Nebraska, South Dakota

Board Composition – The MPO Policy Board includes 12 members, including seven from Iowa, three from Nebraska, and two from South Dakota. The Iowa members represent the City of Sioux City (two members), Woodbury County, City of Sergeant Bluff, Plymouth County, and the Sioux City Transit System (two members). The Nebraska members represent the City of Dakota, the City of South Sioux City, and Dakota County. The South Dakota members represent the City of North Sioux City and Union County. The SIMPCO Council of Officials includes the principal elected officials from each member community and county.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee and Project Committees as needed

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area covers the tri-state area of western Iowa, northeastern Nebraska, and southeastern South Dakota. It includes the counties of Woodbury and Monona in Iowa, Dakota County in Nebraska, and Union County in South Dakota. Sioux City, Iowa is the largest city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 110,000.

Contact Information – Michelle Bostinelos, Transportation Planning Director
Siouxland Interstate Metropolitan Planning Council
507 7th Street, Suite 401
P. O. Box 447
Sioux City, IA 51102-0447
(712) 279-6286 Fax: (712) 279-6920
E-mail: mbostinelos@simpco.org
Website: <http://www.simpco.org/index.htm>

State Line Area Transportation Study

Date Designated – 1982

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Memorandum of Agreement

Organizational Structure – Within the City of Beloit

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Wisconsin**, Illinois

Board Composition – The 10-member Policy Committee is comprised of five members from Wisconsin and five members from Illinois. The Wisconsin members represent the City of Beloit, the Town of Beloit, the Town of Turtle, Rock County, and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. The Illinois members represent the City of South Beloit, the Village of Rockton, Rockton Township, Winnebago County, and the Illinois Department of Transportation.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The State Line Area Transportation Study includes parts of both Rock County Wisconsin and Winnebago County, Illinois. The Wisconsin portion includes the City of Beloit, the Town of Beloit, and the Town of Turtle. The Illinois portion includes the City of South Beloit, the Village of Rockton and Rockton Township. The 2000 population was approximately 65,000.

Contact Information – Bob Soltau, MPO Coordinator
State Line Area Transportation Study
100 State Street, 3rd Floor
Beloit, WI 53511
(608) 3641-6702 Fax:
E-mail: soltaub@ci.beloit.wi.us
Website: <http://www.ci.beloit.wi.us>

St. Joseph Area Transportation Study Organization (SJATSO)

Date Designated – 1974

Enabling Authority – Interagency Agreement

Organizational Structure – Within the City of St. Joseph

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Missouri**, Kansas

Board Composition – The Coordinating Committee includes a representative from the three counties and the five municipalities in the SJATSO area. Each participating member – Buchanan and Andrew counties, the City of Savannah and the Village of Country Club in Missouri and Doniphan County and the cities of Wathena and Elwood in Kansas – have one representative. The City of St. Joseph, Missouri has additional representatives to equal 50 percent of the total membership.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The SJATSO area includes the counties of Buchanan and Andrew, the cities of St. Joseph and Savannah, and the Village of Country Club in Missouri and Doniphan County and the cities of Wathena and Elwood in Kansas. The 2000 population was approximately 105,000.

Contact Information – Andrew Clements, Transportation Planning Manager
St. Joseph Area Transportation Study Organization
1100 Frederick Avenue
St. Joseph, MO 64501
(816) 271-5324 Fax: (816) 271-5355
E-mail: aclement@ci.st-joseph.mo.us
Website: <http://www.ci.st-joseph.mo.us/publicworks/mpo.cfm>

Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1969

Enabling Authority – Bi-State Compact Approved by the Nevada and California legislatures and Ratified by the U.S. Congress

Organizational Structure – Part of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – Nevada, California

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes 15 members. Seven are from California and seven are from Nevada. There is also one non-voting presidential appointee.

Advisory Committees – Advisory Planning Commission

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the City of Lake Tahoe, the adjacent parts of Douglas and Washoe counties, and Carson City in Nevada; and parts of Placer and El Dorado counties in California. The 2000 population was approximately 52,000.

Contact Information – Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
128 Market Street
P. O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 588-4547 Fax: (775) 588-4527
Email: transportation@trpa.org
Website: <http://www.trpa.org/>

Texarkana Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1973 (designation updated in 1999)

Enabling Authority – Interstate Compact

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Texas**, Arkansas

Board Composition – The Policy Committee includes 14 voting members. Eight members represent jurisdictions and agencies in Texas and six members represent jurisdictions and agencies in Arkansas. Members from Texas represent the City of Texarkana (three members), the City of Wake Village, the City of Nash, Bowie County, and the Texas Department of Transportation. Members from Arkansas represent the City of Texarkana (three members), Miller County, and the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee and the Citizens’ Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes the cities of Texarkana, Nash, and Wake Village and Bowie County in Texas; and the City of Texarkana and Miller County in Arkansas. The 2000 population was approximately 548,300.

Contact Information – Brad McCaleb, Director
Texarkana Metropolitan Planning Organization
Texarkana Municipal Building
3rd and Texas
P. O. Box 1967
Texarkana, TX 75504
(903) 798-3927 Fax: (903) 798-3773
E-mail: txkmpo@txkusa.org
Website: <http://www.txkusa.org/tx/departments/mpo/>

Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments (TMACOG)

Date Designated – 1975 (the prior organization, the Toledo Regional Area Plan for Action, was established in 1962 and was absorbed into TMACOG, which was established in 1968)

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Within Council of Governments

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Ohio**, Michigan

Board Composition – The TMACOG Transportation Council is the policy group for the MPO functions. The Transportation Council is comprised of members from jurisdictions and agencies in the MPO area. Members from jurisdictions include one elected official from the City of Toledo, other cities, villages, townships, Lucas County, Wood County, and Monroe County. Agency members include one representative from the Toledo Area Regional Transit Authority, the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority, the Lucas County Engineer, the Wood County Engineer, the City of Toledo Commissioner of Engineering Services, the Ohio Department of Transportation, the Monroe County Plan Commission, the Toledo-Lucas County Plan Commissions, and the Transportation Advocacy Group of Northwest Ohio. The chairs of standing committees of the Council are also members. The Council may also appoint other members to have a balanced representation from the region, the types of members, the activities underway, and to maintain at least a three-fourths majority of members from within the MPO area. Members may fill more than one of these category requirements. A member of the TMACOG Executive Committee is appointed by the Chair to serve as Chair of the Transportation Council.

Advisory Committees – Transportation Council Committees include the Transportation Improvement Program Committee, System Performance Monitoring Committee, Pedestrian and Bikeways Committee, Freight Committee, Planning Committee, and the Rail Passenger Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The TMACOG area covers the counties of Lucas and Wood in Ohio and Monroe, Michigan. It includes the cities of Bowling Green, Maumee, Northwood, Oregon, Perrysburg, Rossford, Sylvania, and Toledo. The 2000 population was approximately 503,008.

Contact Information – Anthony Reams, President
Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments
300 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive
P. O. Box 9508
Toledo, OH 43697-9508
E-mail: reams@tmacog.org
Website: <http://www.tmacog.org>

Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO)

Date Designated – 1970

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Delaware**, Maryland

Board Composition – The WILMAPCO Council consists of nine members. Six members represent jurisdictions and agencies in Delaware and three members represent jurisdictions in Maryland. The six Delaware members include an appointee by the governor, a representative from the Delaware Department of Transportation, a representative of the Delaware Transit Corporation, an official from the City of Wilmington, an official from New Castle County, and a representative from municipalities in New Castle County. The three Maryland members include a governor appointee, an official from Cecil County, and an official representing the municipalities in Cecil County. More information is provided in the case study in Chapter Three.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee and the Public Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes Cecil County, Maryland, and New Castle County, Delaware. The City of Wilmington, Delaware is the major city in the area. The 2000 population was approximately 602,700.

Contact Information – Tigist Zegeye, Executive Director
Wilmington Area Planning Council
850 Library Avenue, Suite 100
Newark, DE 19711
(302) 737-6205 Fax: (302) 737-9584
E-mail: tzegeye@wilmapco.org
Website: <http://www.wilmap.co.org>

Wood-Washington-Wirt Interstate Planning Commission

Date Designated – 1974

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Part of the Mid-Ohio Regional Council

States (Lead State in Bold) – **West Virginia**, Ohio

Board Composition – The Policy Board includes 10 voting members. A total of six members are from West Virginia and four members are from Ohio. The West Virginia members include the Mayor of Vienna, the Mayor of Williamstown, the Mayor of Parkersburg, the Mayor of North Hills, a Wood County Commissioner, and a representative from the West Virginia Department of Transportation. The Ohio members include the Mayor of Belpre, the Mayor of Marietta, a Washington County Commissioner, and a representative from the Ohio Department of Transportation.

Advisory Committees – Technical Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area includes Wood County, and the cities of Parkersburg, North Hills, Vienna, and Williamstown in West Virginia and the cities of Belpre and Marietta, and Washington County in Ohio. The 2000 population was approximately 131,160.

Contact Information – Randy Durst, Transportation Study Director
Mid-Ohio Valley Regional Council
531 Market Street
Parkersburg, WV 26101
(304) 422-4993 Fax: (304) 422-4998
E-mail: randy.durst@movrc.org
Website: <http://www.triplew.org/about.htm>

Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization

Date Designated – 1983

Enabling Authority – Intergovernmental Agreement

Organizational Structure – Independent Agency

States (Lead State in Bold) – **Arizona**, California

Board Composition – The 11-member Executive Board is comprised of three members from the City of Yuma, two members from Yuma County, one member from the City of San Luis, one member from the City of Somerton, one member from the Town of Wellton, one member from the Cocopah Indian Tribe, one member from the Arizona Department of Transportation, and one member from the Arizona State Transportation Board. No members from California are on the Executive Board.

Advisory Committees – Technical Advisory Committee

General Area and Characteristics – The MPO area covers Yuma County, Arizona, including the cities of San Luis, Somerton, and Yuma and the Town of Wellton. It also includes Winterhaven, California. The 2000 population was approximately 139,650.

Contact Information – Mack Luckie, Executive Director
Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization
502 South Orange Avenue
Yuma, AZ 85364-3049
(928) 783-8911 Fax: (928) 329-1674
E-mail: mluckie@ympo.org
Website: <http://www.ympo.org>