

Jessica Baas: MPO Coordination NPRM in Federal Register:

<https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2016/06/27/2016-14854/metropolitan-planning-organization-coordination-and-planning-area-reform>

Rebecca - RTC Washoe County: Will a copy of this presentation be available to download?

Jessica Baas: yes, the presentation is available in the pod above the chat pod

Connecticut DOT: Will MPO performance measures be required to be assessed and performance targets be required to be established only for urbanized areas within an MPA or all areas within an MPA?

PDCTC: Does this proposed rulemaking require a single UPWP for multiple MPOs in a MPA? If not, was there a particular reason it was not included?

Connecticut DOT: Would an MPO and/or town (with multiple urbanized areas within its boundaries) have the ability to remain part of and/or serve multiple MPAs?

Atlanta Regional Commission: We have heard that the request by AMPO, NARC, NADO and AASHTO to extend the comment period by 60 days has been denied, but there is no official response to this effect on the docket. Can you clarify the status of the extension request?

Mark Hamilton: Do you anticipate the final rule will be published in calendar year 2016?

Connecticut DOT: What will the process be for projecting urbanized area growth? Also, who will be responsible for making these projections? U.S. Census Bureau? State? MPO? Other?

Cliff Sinnott: I understand that the AMPO / ASSHTO request for extending the comment period was denied. Why? The potential impact of this rule is more far-reaching than the planning rules.

guest 27: The Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission and the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning are also jointly requesting an extension of the comment period. We feel August 26 is an unrealistic deadline considering the potential impacts.

Karl D Welzenbach: There are multiple examples of voluntary regional cooperation across the states. Why does the Secretary of Transportation feel it is necessary to mandate this effort?

PDCTC: What would happen if multiple MPO's refused to merge under this rule?

Jessica Vargas Astaiza: What is the relationship of this NPRM with the 2014 NPRM on Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning that for example, recommended transit agencies be included as part of MPO Board members? What is the status of the 2014 NPRM then?

Lydia McIntyre: How does this the proposed regulation achieve the stated purposes of the NPRM: strengthen the voice of the MPO, facilitate more efficient, comprehensible, and critical-regional-needs-

focused outcomes, and reduce public confusion? These are excellent goals but the NPRM would appear to create major inefficiencies, increase the likelihood of public confusion, and not really strengthen the MPO hand in any substantive way.

DeLania Hardy, AMPO: What is the August 2005 date tied too? The MPA boundaries that existed on August 10, 2005 shall be retained for an urbanized area designated as a nonattainment area for ozone or carbon monoxide under the Clean Air Act (

Alan Piper: Who makes the determination of the 20 year growth area?

Jackie Eastwood: Please speak to this comment in the rule: "...many MPOs interpreted the MPA to be synonymous with the boundaries of their MPOs jurisdiction." The rule is quite clear as to what the MPA is, but I have found no definition for the MPO boundary. What defines the MPO boundary?

Lower CT River Valley COG: The Census Bureau significantly changes methodology and data used each census to define UZAs. UZAs cannot be appealed and in many places like Connecticut they are arbitrary. Why did USDOT decide that UZAs, rather than elected officials, should be the ones to determine what constitutes a region?

GHMPO: What "size and complexity" would justify multiple MPOs in a single MPA?

Karl D Welzenbach: If you will not question the decision of the governor and local governments regarding multiple MPOs in an urbanized area ... what is the purpose of these rules?

Ed Mierzejewski: What if the Governor and the MPO(s) don't agree on issue of multiple MPOs in an MPA?

guest 7: how does "jointly develop" or "jointly establish" differ from "coordination" occurring now?

Sooraz Patro (A/P MPO): Would the MSA be allowed to be the MPA even though the urbanized area will not grow in the next 20 years?

Lydia: Is the list of the 142 MPOs that may be impacted available online?

Fred Budde: FB OCTC Wouldn't it make sense to enact these proposed changes after the 2020 Census when new population and urbanized area boundaries are determined? Otherwise a MPO may need to change and reorganization within a short, 2 year year timeframe based upon the new urbanized boundaries determined from the 2020 Census..

April Delchamps: The requirement to have a dispute resolution in the agreement will mean a new agreements will have to be developed for a majority of MPOs in the State of Alabama. What is the time frame for having this new agreement in place?

Cliff Sinnott: Please take us through how this would work in a large complex UZA like Boston, with 7 or 8 existing MPO, three states, 4 million+ people. How could a single Plan and TIP work and ensure fair and equitable access and input for all participants? This seems very unrealistic

Jeff Kramer: What does the USDOT envision for where UZAs are back-to-back-to-back across large areas of the state(s)?

Mike Greenwald: What, if any, assistance will FHWA and FTA provide to those MPOs that, as a result of this rule, would be either formally or effectively escalated into a TMA where they were not previously?

Lydia McIntyre: The final rule for metro and statewide planning provides sufficient text on coordination of contiguous MPOs including those sharing a UZA. What justifies an additional level of requirements addressing the same topic?

Connecticut DOT: In the case of multi-state urbanized areas, if one multi-state MPO is not formed, how would TIPs, metropolitan plans, performance targets be developed?

MPO: no MPO's will want to merge willingly.

CMAA: In a bi-state MPA/UZA, would both governors have to agree to keep 2 separate MPOs or could one governor decide to force a merge by NOT agreeing to keep two MPOs for the UZA/MPA?

Guest1: Is this in any way focused on a specific MPO's ? seems odd - there are many other transportation issues that serve the public that we/MPO should be focused on at this time vs. this

Lloyd Robinson: If MPOs within a UZA choose to adjust their boundaries, and if in some cases this results in some MPOs exceeding 200,000 population, would those MPOs be recognized as TMAs?

Lower CT River Valley COG: RiverCOG in CT merged willingly in 2014. Why weren't carrots sought instead of sticks to achieve the same results?

SJTPO: Who's responsibility is it to develop the UZA +20-year growth boundaries? Also, where can we find a map of the MPAs?

Guest1: this is more than just documents and mpas - this will impact how funding and implementation of programs are handled - very little local input in a regional model

Guest 34: The proposed 450.340(h) on the phase-in indicates that the State and MPOs must comply "before the next metropolitan transportation plan update that occurs on or after [date 2 years after the effective date of the final rule]". Does that not suggest that if an MPO recently adopted an MTP and it is updated every 5 years, that the MPO would have more than 2 years and as much as 5 years to comply with the new rules?

MACOG: Forcing MPO's to work across state lines, especially when good coordination already exists, does not sound like an improvement in efficiency. It would overly complicate amendments to TIPS, passing the MTP, and require coordination with multiple states.

Dave (MCCOG): Can LPA officials request to stay within their existing MPO rather than being stolen by an adjacent MPO?

Spencer Stevens: Here is the link to the Forecast of MPOs affected by this NPRM - <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FHWA-2016-0016-0002>

Jessica Vargas Astaiza: Thank you Spencer!

guest 27: Thank you for the link.

DeLania Hardy, AMPO: Couldn't all these revisions be accomplished under current law if the MPOs and states, and transit agree?

Margaret Scully: Where can a list of the 142 MPOs that will be required to change be found?

Guest1: joint products - have you been in an MPO before ? any thought of implementation vs. just regs ?

Kenneth Petty: margaret, please see the link spencer provided above. thanks!

CMAA: In a situation where two MPOs remain in a UZA that is bistate, would each MPO have to approve each others TIP/TIP amendments to maintain a valid TIP?

MACOG: What if the boundary in Example 2 was also the state line? Adjusting the boundary would still require more complicated multi-state coordination.

Lower CT River Valley COG: If MPOs "choose" to work jointly, can this decision be vetoed by the Governor?

Guest1: is this an issue now ? what is not being accomplished now that this new reg will make happen ?

NMCOG: What happens when one community lies within 2 urbanized areas?

Jessica Vargas Astaiza: For the options where they would develop joint planning products, would they have to also develop individual planning products or not?

Dave (MCCOG): What if the local officials and the governor do not agree with each other on MPO consolidation?

MPO: So just to clarify, UZA boundaries that are adjacent do not trigger changes. It's just those that overlap.

Guest1: have you considered the PL funds that will have an impact on local govt that "merge" with other ?

Florida DOT: Why not wait to phase until after the release of the 2020 Census for the update of agreements?

Lydia McIntyre: If this was a needed change, how come USDOT did not work with Congress to enable the proposed changes under statute under the FAST Act?

RMAP: How would joining planning documents, and therefore potentially certification reviews function in areas in which a TMA and a non-TMA would coexist within one MPA?

Tim Roseboom: Is a every situation where an MPO that serves two or more states considered complex?

Lauren DeVore (DNREC): Will the new jurisdictions that added to MPObe subject to the Conformity budgets already established?

James Doolin: Can you provide a lists of MPOs that could be affected by this new rule making. Alabama Department of Transportation. Jim Doolin

Florida DOT: What happens if currently, the MPO boundary is more than the prescribed MPA definition?

Alaska DOT&PF Central Region Planning: What entity will provide the 20 year forecast ofthe urbanized area?

Lydia McIntyre: To the extent the proposed regulation would force redesignations in some instances without local concurrence, the regulation would violate 23 usc section 134 (d) 4 & 5 MPO designation and redesignation clauses under which MPO designations remain in effect until a redesignation occurs. Redesignation requires the concurrence of local govt including 75% or pop including largest city. How can the proposed regulatory language be justified given it is in conflict with the clear language of the statute?

Bill Keyrouze (AMPO): Would the rule require redrawing the boundaries in two years? If so does the MPO size and complexity decision need to be made to retain all the existing MPO(s) or do any MPOs that existed prior to the redrawing of boundaries remain?

Jeff Kramer: Just for clarity, there are situations that look similar to Example 3, but include multiple UZAs (well over 10) that string together across a state or states.

MWCOG: Have you considered having this requirement kick in only when a certain percentage of an MPA UZA's lies outside the MPO boundary? Like 5 or 10%?

Courtney: Can you provide maps of forecasted 20 year UZA growth?

James Doolin: What happens if an attainment takes in a non-attainment area?

Lynne Goldsmith: My main concerns of new Fed rules: (1) increased and improved participation by the public (current MPO system does not encourage participation by the public - it is primarily an "academic exercise" of open houses, if that), (2) re performance measures that are only vehicle focused when other modes of travel need to be prioritized.

KYTC: The proposed rule requires multistate MPOs to provide coordinated transportation planning for the entire metropolitan area - not just the MPA. Does "metropolitan area" refer to the MSA?

Glenn: If there are two adjacent UZAs and two MPOs, with one of the MPOs MPA boundary taking in a small portion of the adjacent UZA, but not overlapping with the other MPA Boundary, would the two MPOs be required to develop 1 Plan, 1 TIP, and 1 UPWP?

Guest1: why require 1 set of docs/plans if the local action is not merge? obviously this lack of merger indicates a willingness to operate and meet all planning regs

Holly: Is the dispute resolution process requirement between MPOs who do not merge but produce joint planning products, between the States and MPOs, or both?

Jessica Vargas Astaiza: Thanks for the clarification!

Lower CT River Valley COG: The proposed rule makes the claim that there will be minimal cost associated from this rule. The merger of Midstate MPO and CT River Estuary MPO cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and lost productivity. We can document the costs of our MPO merger. Also, will MPO merger costs be a PL eligible expense?

Guest1: where are the state DOT's on this matter? I see very little input from the states?

Cliff Sinnott: In our view the UZA is not always (and frequently is not) a sound basis for a transportation planning area, particularly in very large UZAs that have grown and merged from smaller ones based on Census USA definitions. If MPAs must equal an entire UZA you may be forcing illogical planning regions onto the process.

MWCOG: Given the additional resources that would be needed to produce joint planning products for an even larger area; in particular for the Metropolitan Washington region, we would be required to have joint products with Baltimore, FAMPO, Southern MD, possibly parts of PE-- possibly possibly 5 states, will there be an increase in PL funds t?

CMAP: Where in the statute does it require joint planning products for an MPA?

Brandon Kovnat: how does the MPO boundary differ from the MPA

Guest1: why/how will "governors" / stateDOT's being asked to be the decision maker in this federally created concept ?

Levi Roberts: You mentioned that you determined that this would affect 142 MPOs? Can you share the list of MPO's that this would affect?

CMAP: are MPA boundaries impacted or treated differently if they are in non-attainment zones?

Guest1: who creates ideas like this ? was this the outcome of some major issue at FHWA, FTA, etc. ?

MJ: I looked on the document but couldn't find the list of 142 MPOs that would be potentially affected. Where can I find this.

MJ: correction - meant to say "looked on the docket..."

Lower CT River Valley COG: What does the 180-day limit for conforming MPAs to the new UZAs mean? Does this mean that affected MPOs have only 180 days to redesignate? Our experience in CT is that the necessary votes and gubernatorial approval took much longer to occur.

Courtney: link: <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FHWA-2016-0016-0002>

Miguelito: Is this rule intended to ameliorate emergent FHWA budgetary concerns?

Tom Sills: How would the growth of a non-TMA urbanized area to the boundary of a TMA NOT impact the TMA status of the smaller UA as they are now contiguous?

Mike Greenwald: The response to the TMA question doesn't seem accurate. Based on the answer provided, it is entirely possible that a new MPO that covers two adjoining UZAs which, individually were below the population threshold, could EASILY be recategorized as a TMA when combined. Also, what happens if the two MPOs under consideration have different Air Quality conformity designations?

william haas: It appears the supplemental information on the docket page, including the list of anticipated MPOs is now gone or at least hidden

Florida DOT: Are the terms "State", "State DOT", and "Governor" being used interchangeably?

Miguelito: :)

Mark Hamilton: MPO Boundaries: <http://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/>

Kari Snyder MDOT: Two MPO's swap land from their UZA's to conform to county boundary lines. Can they continue to do this or would this trigger this ruling?

GHMPO: is the underlying goal of the proposed rules to reduce the number of MPOs

VDOT: What is the impact of this proposed rule on transportation conformity?

Lower CT River Valley COG: If a municipality is split between two MPOs because it contains portions of two UZAs, could that municipality be a member of two MPOs and have votes on two different policy boards? Since these fringe areas are usually whiter and wealthier than the central cities, does this create environmental justice issues?

Levi Roberts: For clarification, is the one planning product, which multiple overlapping MPO's would not need to produce essentially the Long-Range Regional Transportation Plan?

Erich Zimmermann: Can you discuss the specific statutory authority that calls for the creation of unified planning documents?

Connecticut DOT: Section 450.300 seems to remove references to intermodal facilities that support intercity transportation, including intercity buses, intercity bus facilities and commuter vanpool providers as well as the removal of references to take into consideration resiliency needs. These references were included in the FAST Act and included in this Section in the recently published final planning rules. Is the removal of these references in this NPRM, an omission?

SJTPO: We cannot find a map or shapefile of MPAs on the FHWA Planning website - please provide us with a link. :)

CMAA: You reference bringing the definition of MPA back in line with statute, did DOT/FHWA/FTA ever make a general counsel opinion on the current definition satisfying the statute?

Cliff Sinnott: The question has been raised several times but not answered: what if the Governor and MPO(s) do not agree on the need or lack of need to remain as separate MPOs? The rule should anticipate what happens in a stalemate.

Bob Herrington: Can MPOs that currently have their own LRTPs and TIPs but also have regional coordination agreements as well as regional roadway networks and conflict resolution process with neighboring MPOs continue to have both?

Jeff Kramer: Was this NPRM based on research conducted by USDOT, VOLPE or other similar agencies?

Lauren DeVore (DNREC): Will the addition of new areas into the MPO

KATS: If two MPOs agree to remain as they are and develop joint MTP and TIP would the estimates for federal funds be considered separately as the joint documents are prepared?

Lynne Goldsmith: Thank you for not asking my question, it did not pertain to this discussion.

Lauren DeVore (DNREC): Will the addition of new areas incorporated into existing MPOs be subject to the conformity budgets that have already been determined by those particular MPOs?

Lower CT River Valley COG: Will the final rule include a conflict resolution process when MPOs and Governors do not agree?

Mark Hamilton: SJTPO, here is the link: <http://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/>. You need to check "MPO Boundary" in Layers and zoom in to see boundaries.

CMAP: the NPRM allows an MPA to include "additional areas" beyond the UZA + 20 year projections, are there any restrictions on how large or how many UZAs an MPA can get?

Mark Kirstner: We have looked for the list 142 potentially impacted MPO's in docket but can not find it.

CDTC: Is the urbanized area defined as the official census bureau urbanized area or the adjusted or smoothed uab's that many MPO's use?

DeLania Hardy, AMPO: Is it intentional to make it difficult to have a new MPO?

CMRPC: MPOs only project population, employment and household growth not UZA growth. We generally use the decennial census information of the UZA boundaries. Are there any examples with MPOs/States that project UZA boundaries?

Kari Snyder MDOT: MPA boundaries

[http://www.census.gov/population/metro/files/metro\\_micro\\_Feb2013.pdf](http://www.census.gov/population/metro/files/metro_micro_Feb2013.pdf)

Lydia McIntyre: 450.312(f)3 (i) says "If after a Census, two previously separate urbanized areas are defined as a single urbanized area, not later than 180 days after the release of the U.S. Bureau of the Census notice of the Qualifying Urban Areas for a decennial census, the Governor and MPO(s) shall redetermine the affected MPAs as a single MPA that includes the entire new urbanized area plus the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within the 20-year forecast period of the metropolitan transportation plan." Would this require consolidation regardless of governor and local agreement or could they they just do the joint plan and TIP under the proposed regulation?

Guest1: continuing to alter and adjust organization is not the way to get programs and MPo products and federal infrastructure to the public any faster - merging and regionalism is not a way to fix all issues at the federal level

Mike Greenwald: At the close of the public comment period, who on the FHWA/FTA staff will be responsible for reading and summarizing the comments? Will they be required to respond to comments in the same manner MPO staff is required to do?

Richmond Regional TPO: If two MPOs within an MPA first decide to comply by producing joint planning products initially, and then later (after 2020 Census) jointly reconsider consolidating into a single MPO what is the process for this to take place?

Paul (2): Dear SJTPO: For the MPO boundaries, see <http://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/>

Jessica: In the case were 3 MPOs do not merge but a joint product is required, which MPO Board will approve the joint product? Will a new entity/committee/council need to be created to approve the joint planning product?

SPC: Since this rule requires significant additional coordination among mpos will timetables for update of plans and tips be extended during the implementation period?

Erich Zimmermann: Follow up to earlier questions about statutory authority regarding unified planning. The relevant section says "Each metropolitan planning organization shall prepare and update a transportation plan for its MPA." But if multiple MPOs are allowed and required to create unified documents, then would "each" be creating a transportation plan?

Karl D Welzenbach: The statutory language has not changed in over 20 years. Neither has the regulatory interpretation. Where in the current FAST Act is the statutory authorization for this new interpretation?

Jackie Eastwood: Comment: If you look at the map of MPOs in Wisconsin, you would get the impression that MPO boundaries and MPA boundaries are the same. <http://wisconsin.gov/Documents/doing-business/local-gov/plning-orgs/map.pdf>

Spencer Stevens: for those still looking for the MPO list <https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=FHWA-2016-0016>

Spencer Stevens: Look under supporting documents

SPC: In areas where other laws define regional boundaries such as Local Development Districts in the Appalachian region will alignment of these other geographic boundaries be considered in approval of an MPO boundary?

Lower CT River Valley COG: Between the 2000 and 2010 the U.S. Census increased the length of a jump by 60% when calculating UZAs. How is anyone supposed to know what methodology the U.S. Census Bureau may choose for the 2020 census?

Cliff Sinnott: THE USDOT has effectively overlooked the statutory mandate that MPA=UZA for 20+ years. Why the change? Is a faulty original statute the root of the issue here?

Mark Hamilton: Under the proposed rule, MPA boundaries can still only grow to the combined statistical area as defined by OMB, is this correct?