

**Questions from the
“MAP-21: What it Means for Florida” Webinar
Other
(as of 10/02/12)**

Q - 1: Metropolitan Transportation Planning – Questions: What is the intent behind this addition? Should every TMA MPO board include direct representation by a provider(s) of public transportation in its metropolitan planning area (voting member or non-voting adviser)? What happens if there is more than one provider? Will the providers need to agree on one representative? What if the agency providing public transportation is not a public agency? How might the voice of school boards be affected, particularly with Florida’s current 19 voting member limit? Will USDOT be issuing guidance on this subject? Will it be addressed in our Governor’s post-2010 census MPO redesignation letters to TMA MPOs?

A: The bill states each MPO that serves an area designated as a TMA shall consist of “officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan area, including representation by providers of public transportation”. Currently MPOs have flexibility in addressing federal and state board membership requirements. The bill does state “major modes” of transportation, not every mode; but does specify “representation by providers of public transportation”, not every public transportation provider. Unless there is federal guidance provided, or state law addresses it, it would be up to the MPO how to define what representation would be and if the member would be voting or non-voting. We will need to see if Federal guidance will be provided. The federal bill does give MPOs up to two years to comply with this requirement. The current Florida Statute cap on the number of board members may have to be revisited.

Q - 2: Performance Management – State DOTs and MPOs – Questions: Will state DOTs and MPOs be able to identify and use performance measures (with targets) in addition to the performance measures that will be coming from USDOT focused on transforming the federal-aid highway program? What are the expectations with regard to performance measures and targets for MPOs adopting LRTPs in late 2014? The Southeast Florida Transportation Council MPOs (Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach) are in the process of identifying performance measures addressing regional transportation system performance. How can we make sure such efforts and the MAP-21 performance management efforts end up working together?

A: Yes, while USDOT is limited to the performance areas specified in MAP-21, states and MPOs are not. USDOT is to consult with states, MPOs and other stakeholders in establishing the MAP-21 performance measures.

Q - 3: National Highway System – When can we expect to have a GIS data layer(s) of the expanded NHS under MAP-21 available?

A: In accordance with Section 1104, the FHWA will expand the NHS effective October 1, 2012. The bulk of the expansion will consist of principal arterials not currently included in the NHS. A GIS-layer of all current principal arterial routes in Florida including the existing NHS will be provided on our MAP-21 website. Users should be aware that this information is preliminary and is subject to revision.

Q - 4: Selection of Federally Funded Projects – Request: Years ago someone in Central Office gave me a helpful one-page table covering the selection of federally funded projects. If recollection serves, it showed which entity led the selection of projects and which entities had to be consulted or coordinated with in the process (e.g., projects selected with STP funds for TMA MPOs). It also included definitions – e.g., of “consultation.” Could you produce a table along that line for MAP-21?

A: Yes. *The table will be updated and posted at MAP-21-FL.com.*

Q - 5: Can you please clarify that MPO’s are not eligible recipients for Transportation Alternative’s funding? In our area, a MPO has completed planning studies on behalf of local agencies. Example is a bicycle/pedestrian master plan for a small local agency that does not have the staff or expertise to complete a federally funded project, the MPO has stepped up and administered the project on behalf of the local agency.

A: *Under the Definition of Eligible Entity, MPOs and State DOTs are not eligible recipients. The bill states “any other local or regional governmental entity with the responsibility for or oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization or a State agency)...” The question of whether or not a MPO can administer a project for a local agency which will envision utilizing Transportation Alternative funding in the future will be referred to the FHWA office.*

Q -6: Slide 25 states cannot transfer metro planning or suballocated STP or Transportation Alternatives funding, does this mean that we would not be able to do FTAT’s any longer? Example: Collier and Lee both have purchased busses with their SU funds as a FTAT, would this prohibited in the future?

A: *Metro Planning or suballocated STP or Transportation Alternatives funding cannot be transferred to another MAP-21 funding category. However, nothing has changed regarding the ability to transfer highway funds to FTA for transit activities.*

Q -7: When will the performance measures be set?

A: *FHWA will identify the performance measures with input by state and local agencies. FHWA has up to 18 months from October 2012 to finalize the performance measures.*

Q - 8: When will the MPOs need to incorporate the performance measures and targets in their LRTP?

A: *No specific time frame was identified in MAP-21. Future FHWA guidance will identify when MPO documents will need to reflect MAP-21 changes. Since it could take up to 3 years for performance measures and targets to be known, I would anticipate an identified period of time based on when the targets are set that the MPO documents would need to be updated.*

Q – 9: Based on the new authorization of MAP-21 will the districts receive guidance or clarification on how to handle the Enhancement projects in this gaming cycle?

A: Yes.

Q -10: Hernando has some projects that were just determined feasible; when we notify the MPO, do we need to include some language about “though your project is determined feasible criteria is being analyzed based on MAP-21 and will be held for future funding” or something to that effect?

A: *A: FDOT Work Program instructions are being prepared at this time. We are awaiting further guidance from FHWA and plan to proceed with implementation of the Transportation Alternatives funding in a timely manner.*

Q -11: As a result of MAP-21, what is the percentage of Federal funding for projects that is at the discretion of MPOs in TMAs?

A: For the Surface Transportation Program (STP), 50 percent of the funds are to be obligated based on relative population shares. Since a little over 77% of Florida's population resides in TMAs, about 38% of the STP funds will need to be obligated in those areas..

Q -12: Why did there appear to be more money allocated to PL overall but Florida seems to be getting less PL funding?

A: An early summary of MAP-21 funding did show an increase in PL funding under MAP-21 from federal fiscal year 2012 to 2013. What it did not show was the reduction in PL funding from 2011 to 2012. FDOT did not apply the reduced 2012 PL funding for the partial year (nine months) of 2012 until the last three months of the year was funded by MAP-21.

Q - 13: How will the Transportation Alternatives program grant process requirement fit into the MPO's LRTP development given that MPOs are not eligible to apply for the funding? It seems that it will be difficult if not impossible to utilize these funds to address identified bike and pedestrian needs.

A: Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are an allowable use under the Transportation Alternative funding criteria. MPOs routinely solicit projects from local governments for funding to include in the list of priority projects submitted each year by the MPOs. Local governments, schools, regional transportation authorities, transit agencies, and tribal governments are eligible recipients which would look to the MPOs to select their projects for funding under the transportation alternative apportionment.

Q - 14: Can someone verify if the new procedures for CMP related to MAP 21 call for performance measures and if the MPO does not meet the objectives, there will be a corrective action?

A: MAP-21 makes essentially no change in the requirements for a congestion management process, and there appear to no references to a congestion management process in requirements for a "performance-based approach" for metropolitan planning. FDOT will continue to monitor evolving federal guidance and notify Transportation Management Areas of any required changes to a congestion management process.

Q - 15. Under the 5307 program, for areas with a population >200,000 and have fewer than 75 or 100 buses and may use some of their allocation for operating expenses, do you consider the buses for all agencies within the TMA or is it individual agency buses? Also, is it all vehicles (including spares) or just those operating in peak service?

A. The operating assistance is available to large (over 200,000) urbanized area systems with no more than 100 vehicles operating during peak. It appears to be available to any system meeting the criteria, not just one system per UZA.

Q -16. Does the new Transit Asset Management Program (5326) include Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds?

A. There is no funding allocated to complete an asset management program. Each system will have to develop a "transit asset management plan" that includes at a minimum, capital asset inventories and condition assessments, decision support tools, and investment prioritization. It's basically renaming and tweaking the capital replacement plan that most systems always did anyway and making it mandatory.

Q -17. Do the thresholds and processes remain the same for the Small Starts Program?

A. *The thresholds remain the same for Small Starts. Less than \$250 million total project cost, with no more than \$75 million FTA. The process, as with New Starts, has some significant changes, primarily the elimination of the separate AA requirement and use of NEPA to achieve mode and alignment, LPA, and to develop info for entry into Engineering phase of Small Starts.*

Q - 18. Is the 5303 funding program affected or reduced under MAP 21?

A. *For Federal Fiscal Year 12, 5303 was slightly higher statewide in Florida (about 15K) but some MPOs may have seen a reduction. For the two years authorized in MAP 21, it is hard to tell because the 5303 funding and the 5304 funding are rolled into one federal planning category.*

Q -19. Is the SPR State Research Funding reduced?

A. *State Planning and Research funding under MAP-21 is consistent with 2012 funding, which was slightly lower than prior years. However, funding for SPR under MAP-21 may be affected by a takedown of up to 5% to support SHRP2 implementation.*