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## Additional Federal Funding Available for Local Programming

- STP-Metro \$ 17,967,299
- Bridge Off-System \$ 2,347,363
-CMAQ \$ 22,219,683
- Enhancement \$ 3,454,078
- Metro Planning \$ 2,141,931


## Options for TC Allocation

- Allocate 100\% of Funds for Immediate Programming
- Hold 100\% of Funds in Case of Federal Revenue Reductions in FFY12
- Allocate Some Portion of Funds for Immediate Programming and Hold Remainder


## Option 1-Allocate 100\% Now

- Issues
- Projects can begin being programmed right away
- New projects will be slow to start anyway, since they have not been previously programmed for FY12-starting now might not expend any funds until late in FY12 or FY13 anyway
- No funding set aside for shortfall


## Option 2—Hold 100\%

- Issues
- Reserves funding in case of a federal shortfall in FFY12
- Lose time and money (construction inflation) in getting program out when it could go now


## Option 3—Allocate Some Portion <br> Now

- Issues
- Reserves some funding in case of federal shortfall
- Still lose time and money
- Compromise position
-Discussion
-Questions
-Develop Recommendation to TC on:


## ADDITIONAL LOCAL PROJECT FUNDING TIMING

# RESEARCH ON STATE DEPARTMENTS OF <br> TRANSPORTATION LONG-RANGE PLANS AND PROCESSES 

Submitted to: The Colorado Transportation Commission
Prepared by: Division of Transportation Development: Statewide Planning

## Introduction

At the April 2011 Transportation Commission (TC) retreat, TC members expressed interest in having staff conduct research on what other state DOTs are doing in terms of developing their transportation plans with particular interest in those states that exhibited innovative concepts and that articulated priorities and direction for the intermediate time frame as well as the long-term. DTD planning staff conducted preliminary research on 16 states based on staff knowledge of states most likely to have innovative planning practices. This involved literature and website review of long-range transportation plans (LRTP) and any shorter range strategic plans, and preparation of a one-page summary for with highlights for each state. Reviews focused on statewide plans, inclusion of performance measures, shorter range strategic plans, and innovative approaches.

## Results

The attached report summarizes information for each of the 16 states. In general, states vary in planning process and documentation by type of plans (policy, project-based, or corridor-based) and long, mid- and short-term planning horizons. All states have developed some level of mission, vision, goals, objectives, strategies, and performance measures or metrics. All address in some fashion the required federal planning factors: system preservation, system operation and management, safety, security, environmental protection, accessibility and mobility, intermodal integration and connectivity, and support economic vitality. All states also incorporate the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) plans into the Statewide Plan. Colorado is one of the few states that require "fiscally constrained" Long-Range Transportation Plans. Colorado statute states: "A regional transportation plan shall state the fiscal need to maintain mobility and what can be reasonably expected to be implemented with the estimated revenues which are likely to be available." Because the regional transportation plans are incorporated into the statewide transportation plan, the Colorado statewide plan also is fiscally constrained.

The summary table highlights the findings of the DTD research on the 16 states. The table categorizes findings by the planning process, performance measures and recent funding proposal information.

| State DOT | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Planning Process }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Recent Funding } \\ \text { Proposal }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Information |  |  |$\}$


| State DOT | Planning Process | Performance Measures (PM) | Recent Funding Proposal Information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Georgia | A 2005-2035 Georgia Statewide Plan Update highlights primarily funding needs and shortfalls. A Statewide Strategic Transportation Plan adopted in April 2010 focuses on jobs and state GDP. Goals, objectives and PMs are provided for economic growth, safety and security, maximizing asset values, and minimizing environmental impacts. Comparisons to other state DOTs are considered. | Evaluating 45-minute commute between employers/employees. Considers competition between states; emphasizes cost/benefit analysis; considers "risk to mobility" as priority; performance measures for public involvement is included in the LRTP. | State ballot measure in 2012 for a one percent sales tax for transportation. Votes will be structured by region; failure of the ballot measure in one region will not prevent passage statewide. |
| Minnesota | Minnesota Statewide Transportation Policy Plan: 2009-2028 is the long-range transportation plan (LRTP). Multiple mid and long-range plans: four, five to 10,11 to 20 , and 50 - year planning horizons considered; Statewide 20-year Highway Investment Plan 2009-2028 presents priority projects to consider and will be multimodal for its next version. | PMs listed for each strategic priority. Plan cites measures, targets, target purpose, data sources, PM methodology, and transportation trends. Developed an annual PM scorecard. | None identified. |
| Missouri | Missouri's Long-Range Transportation Plan is dated 2007 and covers a 20-year horizon. The LRTP lists specific projects. LRTP included findings of extensive customer surveys. | The Tracker program, utilized for more than five years, presents 18 "Tangible Results" items and associated PMs for each. Tracker is published quarterly and used by management. | None identified. |
| Montana | The LRTP is TranPlan 21. In the plan, policies lead to goals and action items for six key areas. This plan extended the horizon from 2025 to 2030 to meet SAFETEA-LU requirements. MDT has a specific Corridor Study Planning Process, and uses it to ensure costeffectiveness for projects. | Systems Impact Analysis Process (SIAP) coordinates with local land use agencies, developers, and government agencies. The Highway Economic Analysis Tool (HEAT) assesses cost effectiveness of highway capacity expansion, and the Performance Planning Process (P3) assesses condition and performance of roadways. | Funding is set aside every year for the Corridor Study Planning Process due to its effectiveness. |


| State DOT | Planning Process | Performance Measures (PM) | Recent Funding Proposal Information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Mexico | The New Mexico 2030 Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan is the New Mexico LRTP. Goals and major projects are identified in the NM LRTP by RPO. A 2010 Statewide Public Transportation Plan(SWPTP) was developed and includes PMs. Communities were identified for potential new rural transit service and ranked in terms of expected future riders, cost per rider and improvement to mobility/connectivity. | NMDOT uses HER/ST and REMI's TranSight models that combine traditional engineering data with economic analysis capability. The SWPTP assesses public transportation access for the elderly, disabled and lowincome populations. Good to Great is NMDOT's PM program that is published quarterly. | None identified. |
| Ohio | Go Ohio Policy Plan is still under development. Policies from the plan feed into the Go Ohio System Designation Volume 1 Draft Technical Memorandum: Executive Summary. This memo highlights analyses that prioritize corridors in terms of transportation and economic factors (targeted industries for movement of people and goods, and livability and general economic analysis). | Transportation System for Economic Prosperity (TranSEP) Analysis prioritizes corridors based on transportation and economic factors. | None identified. |
| Oregon | The 2006 Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) is the state's long-range multimodal transportation plan with a horizon of 2030. The OTP is a policy document among a series of plans that together form the state transportation system plan (TSP). Oregon developed a strategic plan for GHG reductions. No short- or mid-range documents were identified. | Oregon TC adopted PMs based on vision, goals, policies and strategies for these investment scenarios: flat funding, preservation and improvement, and facility expansion. | None identified. |
| Pennsylvania | PA Mobility Plan: Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan 2006-2030 is the LRTP. Goals, objectives and strategies lead to 90 actions identified. Four sections of the plan include: summary, direction, implementation and user's guide. Annual state of the system reports (conditions) and Implementation progress plans (project/action status) are generated. | None identified. | None identified. |


| State DOT | Planning Process | Performance Measures (PM) | Recent Proposed Revenue Information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Texas | The TxDOT Strategic Plan 2011-2015 provides goals and associated PMs. A 2035 LRTP is in development. A 2011 Strategic Action Plan with projects listed is linked to the TxDOT Strategic Plan 2011-2015 goals and objectives. | Performance measures are incorporated into strategic plans and several PMs are attached to each goal. | None identified. |
| Utah | The Utah Department of Transportation's (UDOT's) Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) 2011-2040 is a 30-year plan that lists projects in the rural areas of the state. The projects in these plans are divided into three phases: 1: 2011-2020, 2: 20212030, and 3: 2031-2040. There is also a fourth, unfunded phase. MPOs list projects in their own LRTP. A Unified Transportation Plan is a comprehensive state project list. | UDOT produced a 2011 <br>  <br> Performance Measures report. Ten PMs, incorporating a combination of measurable reductions/ increases and coordination actions, are included. | Senate Bill 229, a proposal to raise sales and use tax for transportation, was vetoed by the Governor, but is under consideration to override by the legislature. |
| Washington | The Washington State Transportation Plan 2030 (WTP 2030) is a policy plan. The WTP 2030 links its goals to the 2007-2026 WTP, which also is a longrange policy plan. The Target Zero program goal is to eliminate trafficrelated deaths. The Moving Washington program goal is to decrease travel times and collisions. | A stewardship goal in WTP 2030 encompasses use and development of PMs. State legislation requires a reduction in GHG by a certain percentage and timeframe. The Gray Notebooks is the quarterly reporting of PMs. The latest report covers the last quarter of 2010. | None Identified. |
| Wyoming | The WYDOT LRTP is one of four components of Wyoming Connects, a strategic policy and project implementation concept for short- and long-range transportation planning. The integrated planning framework, the corridor visions, and corridor plans are the other components. The corridor plans document that is under development will provide a detailed look at specific needs and locationbased solutions. Sixteen state significant corridors are identified in the LRTP. | A 2010 Strategic Plan has been developed and contains measurable goals called strategic performance measures | None Identified. |
| FTP $=$ Florida Transportation Plan PM $=$ Performance Measure <br> GDP $=$ Gross Domestic Product RPO $=$ Regional Planning Organization <br> HOV $=$ High Occupancy Vehicle  <br> LRTP $=$ long-range transportation plan  |  |  |  |
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## Additional Regular Program Funding

\$91 Million in additional federal funds is available in 'flexible' funding for TC allocation.

## Options for Allocating Funds

- Allocate off the top for strategically significant project (I 70 Twin Tunnels)
- Allocate and put funding aside for use in FY13 to 15
- Allocate and use the spending authority to advance other statewide projects, then have the money paid back in years of project construction
- Allocate funds to a program (Surface Treatment?)


## Option 1a—Allocate and Hold Funding <br> - Issues

- Ensures funding is available when needed, even in event of decreased revenues
- Funds are not working for us, and losing value to inflation


## Option 1b—Allocate and Advance Projects <br> - Issues

- Statewide benefit by getting projects advanced (projects would primarily be surface treatment)
- Severe downturn in revenues could leave regions with no funding in year of payback, or leave the project unbuilt if payback impossible


## Allocate Funds to a Program

- Issues
- Statewide benefit
- Strategic project not able to be built in foreseeable future


# QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, DISCUSSION 

