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About NADO

- National association for 540 regional development organizations, including emerging network of regional transportation planning organizations

- Promote public policies that strengthen local governments, communities and economies through the regional strategies
More Resources

- Report published in 2011 on RTPOs efforts in:
  - Project Prioritization
  - Performance-based Planning

- Available online at www.RuralTransportation.org
Webinar Information

• This webinar is supported under a cooperative agreement with the Federal Highway Administration

• Webinar recording and speakers’ slides will be posted to www.RuralTransportation.org and www.NADO.org

• 1.5 AICP CM and 1.5 AICP CM Law credits available

• Type comments into the Question box in the GoToWebinar panel at any time, and speakers will respond after their presentations are finished
Webinar Speakers

• Connie Yew
  – Federal Highway Administration

• Michael Nesbitt
  – Federal Highway Administration

• Don Voelker
  – North Carolina Department of Transportation

• Bjorn Hansen
  – Centralina Council of Governments
MAP-21
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
Performance Management Elements
An Overview of Requirements and Implementation Status
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MAP-21 Background-Performance Requirements

- National Goals
- Measures
- Targets
- Plans
- Reports
- Accountability and Transparency
Transportation Performance Management

9 Inter-related Rules

- Highway Safety Programs (NHTSA)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (FHWA)
- Metro and Statewide Planning (FHWA-FTA)
- Safety Performance Measures (FHWA)
- Infrastructure Performance Measures (FHWA)
- System Performance Measures (FHWA)
- Highway Asset Management (FHWA)
- Transit Asset Management (FTA)
- Transit Safety Plan (FTA)

## Planning

### Metropolitan and Statewide Planning Rule
- Establish a performance-based planning process at metropolitan and state level.
- Define coordination in the selection of targets, linking planning and programming to performance targets.

## Highway Safety

### Safety Performance Measure Rule
- Propose and define fatalities and serious injuries measures, along with target establishment, progress assessment and reporting requirements.
- Discuss the implementation of MAP-21 performance requirements.

### Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Rule
- Integration of performance measures, targets, and reporting requirements into the HSIP.
- Strategic Highway Safety Plan updates.

### Highway Safety Program Grants Rule *
- State target establishment and reporting requirements.
- Highway safety plan content, reporting requirements, and approval.

* Interim Final Rule issued by NHTSA in January 2013.

## Highway Conditions

### Pavement and Bridge Performance Measure Rule
- Propose and define pavement and bridge condition measures, along with minimum condition standards target establishment, progress assessment and reporting requirements.

## Asset Management Plan Rule
- Contents and development process for asset management plan.
- Minimum standards for pavement and bridge management systems.

## Congestion/System Performance

### System Performance Measure Rule
- Define performance of the interstate system, non-interstate national highway system, and freight movement on the interstate system.
- Finalize interpretation of scope of CMAQ performance requirements, including congestion and on-road mobile source emissions.
- Summarize MAP-21 highway performance measure rules

## Transit Performance

### Transit State of Good Repair Rule
- Define state of good repair and establish measures.

### Transit Safety Plan Rule
- Define transit safety standards.
- Transit safety plan content and reporting requirements.

---

**Anticipated Coordinated Performance Measure Effective Date**

- Indicates the comment period
## Measure Groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>MEASURE CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATUS I</strong></td>
<td>• Serious Injuries per VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 CY2013</td>
<td>• Fatalities per VMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of Fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATUS II</strong></td>
<td>• Pavement Condition on the Interstates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 CY2014</td>
<td>• Pavement Condition on the Non-Interstate NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bridge Condition on NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATUS III</strong></td>
<td>• Traffic Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 CY2014</td>
<td>• On-road mobile source emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Freight Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance of Interstate System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance of Non-Interstate NHS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinating Implementation – 9 Rulemakings

**Measure Rules**
- Define Measure
  - Data Elements
  - Data Source
- Interstate Pavement Condition
- Target Setting Requirements
- Define Significant Progress
- State Performance Reporting
- Establish Timing

**Planning Rule**
- Performance-based Planning Process
- Target Setting Coordination
- MPO Performance Reporting
- STIP/TIP Discussion
- Transition Period

**Program Rules**
- Plan Requirements
- Special Rules
- Integrating Performance
- Transition Period
Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rulemaking</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Target Setting</th>
<th>Reporting and Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TPM Initiatives

- Performance Monitoring
- Training
- Reporting
- Guidebooks
- Workshops
- Pilot Programs
- Assessment and Evaluation Tools
North Carolina
Refining a Performance Management System

NCDOT recognized they needed to refine their performance management system and therefore began a transformation process. (.pdf, 0.6 mb)
Additional Resources

- MAP-21 Web Site
  [www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21)

- Transportation Performance Management Web Site
  [www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm)

- Performance Measure Rulemaking Direct Contact to FHWA
  [PerformanceMeasuresRulemaking@dot.gov](mailto:PerformanceMeasuresRulemaking@dot.gov)

- Performance-based Planning and Programming
TPM Community of Practice

Michael Nesbitt
Office of Transportation Performance Management
What is the TPM Community of Practice?

- Virtual workspace for collaboration on activities related to performance management
- “Open” community for practitioners

Why the TPM Community of Practice?

- Promotion of best practices
- Insight into emerging questions and issues
How to Access the TPM Community of Practice?

- Community of Practice (CoP) now accessible: [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/cop](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/cop)

- Registration required via TransportationResearch.gov in order to contribute: [https://www.transportationresearch.gov/dot/fhwa/SitePages/register.aspx](https://www.transportationresearch.gov/dot/fhwa/SitePages/register.aspx)
Welcome to Performance Management Community of Practice

The purpose of this external collaboration portal is to support FHWA’s effort to improve communication and collaboration among its TPM stakeholders. Feel free to explore the document libraries and discussion forum. To upload documents and participate in the discussion forum, you must register here.

If you have any questions or comments about this site, contact michael.nesbitt@dot.gov.
Transportation Performance Management

Browse and share links

Access resources

Make announcements

Contribute to discussions
Future Developments

- Calendar of events
- Posting of additional resources
- Integration with related websites (FHWA TPM, TRB ABC30)
- Email alerts
- Enhanced user profile settings
NCDOT’s Strategic Prioritization Process &
North Carolina’s New Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) Law

October 30, 2013

Don Voelker, North Carolina Department of Transportation
Background

Challenges facing the Department prior to 2009:

• 7-Year Construction Program (more needs than revenue)
• Delivery Rate below 50%
• Priorities not clearly defined
• Various mission and goal statements
• Inability to clearly articulate performance results
Turning the Battleship

Creation of a Strategic Prioritization Office (SPOT)
• 3 founding members

Implementation of a biennial strategic prioritization process
• 2009 - Prioritization 1.0 (P1.0)
• 2011 - Prioritization 2.0 (P2.0)
• 2013 - Prioritization 3.0 (P3.0) now nearly finalized

Results:
• Improved Communication & Credibility with Partners
• Data-Driven Decision Making
• Open and Visible Process (Transparency)
• Performance & Results Driven Organization
Strategic Prioritization Law of 2012

NC legislative staff conducted survey after P2.0

Results showed overwhelming (>90%) approval of process

Law enacted in 2012 to codify strategic prioritization process as outlined by NCDOT

Data driven

Local input

NCDOT must approve MPO and RPO local methodologies
NEW Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) Law

New Governor in 2013 proposed to reform transportation funding and build off the success of strategic prioritization

Proposal enacted by June 26 with nearly unanimous bi-partisan support in NC General Assembly

Historic change – eliminated 1989 funding strategy

Capital Costs from Highway Trust Fund and Maintenance and Operating costs from Highway Fund and all modes compete with each other for capital funding.

Law reinforces P3.0 as the strategic prioritization process
Prioritization 3.0 Work Group

Work Group members provide input and act as liaisons to respective organizations

Representation:

- **Local Partners** - Metropolitan and Rural Planning Organizations
- **Advocacy Groups** – Metro Mayors Coalition, Assoc. of County Commissioners, NC League of Municipalities, NC Regional Councils of Gov’t
- **Internal NCDOT Staff** – Transportation Planning, Program Development, Non-Highway Modes, NC Ports Authority, 3 Division Engineers
- **FHWA (advisory)**
The STI Formula

40% of Funds = $6B

Statewide Mobility
Focus → Address Significant Congestion and Bottlenecks
Eligible Projects
- Statewide type Projects (such as Interstates)
  • Selection based on 100% Data
  • Projects Programmed prior to Local Input Ranking

30% of Funds = $4.5B

Regional Impact
Focus → Improve Connectivity within Regions
Eligible Projects
- Projects Not Selected in Statewide Mobility Category
- Regional Projects
  • Selection based on 70% Data & 30% Local Input
  • Funding based on population within Region

30% of Funds = $4.5B

Division Needs
Focus → Address Local Needs
Eligible Projects
- Projects Not Selected in Statewide or Regional Categories
- Division Projects
  • Selection based on 50% Data & 50% Local Input
  • Funding based on equal share for each Division = ~$34M per yr

Estimated $15B in Funds for SFY 2016-2025
Requirements – STI Formula

Brings traditional construction programs (such as urban loops and improving secondary roads) under one formula

Protects projects in the “pipeline” - funds obligated for projects scheduled for construction by July 1, 2015 are not subject to formula

All transportation modes must compete for the same construction dollars

Local Input will be part of the scoring criteria for all Regional Impact and Division Needs projects
Local Input Scoring

- 38 Metropolitan and Rural Planning Organizations (MPOs/RPOs) and 14 NCDOT Divisions will assign points to projects in Regional Impact and Division Needs categories.

- Everyone receives minimum of 1000 points (additional points awarded based on area population).

- Points must be assigned during 3 month window (May 1 – July 31, 2014).

- Points can be allocated to both Highway and Non-Highway projects.

- 100 point cap for any one project; points can be donated across Regions/Divisions.
## Eligibility Definitions - Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         | • Interstates and Future Interstates  
          • Routes on the NHS as of July 1, 2012  
          • Routes on Department of Defense Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)  
          • Appalachian Development Highway System Routes  
          • Uncompleted Intrastate projects  
          • Designated Toll Facilities | • Other US and NC signed Routes | • All Secondary Routes |
# Highway Project Scoring Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Projects:</th>
<th>Statewide Mobility</th>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Division Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Statewide</td>
<td>• Statewide</td>
<td>• Statewide</td>
<td>• Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional</td>
<td>• Regional</td>
<td>• Regional</td>
<td>• Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division</td>
<td>• Division</td>
<td>• Division</td>
<td>• Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Weights:</th>
<th>100% Quantitative Data</th>
<th>70% Quantitative Data / 30% Local Input</th>
<th>50% Quantitative Data / 50% Local Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quant. Criteria</td>
<td>• Benefit-Cost</td>
<td>• Benefit-cost</td>
<td>• Benefit-cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Congestion</td>
<td>• Congestion</td>
<td>• Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic Competitiveness</td>
<td>• Safety</td>
<td>• Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety</td>
<td>• Freight</td>
<td>• Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Freight</td>
<td>• Multimodal</td>
<td>• Multimodal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pavement Condition</td>
<td>• Pavement Condition</td>
<td>• Pavement Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lane Width</td>
<td>• Lane Width</td>
<td>• Lane Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shoulder Width</td>
<td>• Shoulder Width</td>
<td>• Shoulder Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility and connectivity to employment centers, tourist destinations, or military installations</td>
<td>• Accessibility and connectivity to employment centers, tourist destinations, or military installations</td>
<td>• Accessibility and connectivity to employment centers, tourist destinations, or military installations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Projects Selected Prior to Local Input</th>
<th>Quant. Criteria can be different for each Region</th>
<th>Quant. Criteria can be different for each Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Recommended Highway Scoring Criteria and Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>QUANTITATIVE Data</th>
<th>LOCAL INPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Division Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Mobility</strong></td>
<td>[Travel Time] Benefit/Cost = 30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion = 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Competitiveness = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimodal [&amp; Freight + Military] = 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact</strong></td>
<td>[Travel Time] Benefit/Cost = 25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion = 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility/Connectivity = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 70%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division Needs</strong></td>
<td>Benefit/Cost = 20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion = 20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety = 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 50%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Eligibility Definitions – Non Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>Large Commercial Service Airports. Funding not to exceed $500K per airport project per year</td>
<td>Other Commercial Service Airports not in Statewide. Funding not to exceed $300K per airport project per year</td>
<td>All Airports without Commercial Service. Funding not to exceed $18.5M for airports within this category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle-Pedestrian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Federally funded independent projects only. No state match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Service spanning two or more counties and serving more than one municipality. Funding amounts not to exceed 10% of regional allocation.</td>
<td>Service not included on Regional. Multimodal terminals and stations serving passenger transit systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>State maintained routes, excluding replacement vessels</td>
<td>Replacement of vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Freight Capacity Service on Class I Railroad Corridors</td>
<td>Rail service spanning two or more counties not included on Statewide. Short lines not eligible.</td>
<td>Rail service not included on Statewide or Regional. Short lines not eligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prioritization Formula – Non-Highway Criteria

Strategic Statewide, Regional Impact and Division Needs Categories

Separate prioritization processes for each mode

Must have minimum of 4 quantitative criteria (no prescribed menu of criteria like highways)

Local input is from Division’s, MPO’s and RPO’s

Criteria based on a scoring scale up to 100 points with no bonus points and not favoring any particular mode of transportation
Normalization

Definition – Methodology for comparing quantitative scores across all modes together

Challenges:
• Different criteria and weights used for evaluating projects in each mode
• No easy solution → conducted review of methodologies across country
• No other state has successfully implemented such a comparison
• Evaluated several potential options including:
  - Qualitative value judgment
  - Weighted benefit/cost
  - Statistical analysis
Normalization

For P3.0 Only (Initial Implementation of STI)

- Statewide Mobility (only) – No normalization, scores are stand-alone for comparison (highway, aviation, freight rail)
- Regional Impact & Division Needs – Allocate funds to Highway and Non-Highway modes based on minimum floor or %s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>BOT Recommendation</th>
<th>Historical Budgeted</th>
<th>Historical Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>90% (min.)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Highway</td>
<td>4% (min.)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Continue research with national experts
- Conduct a statistical analysis of scores by an outside agency after all quantitative scores are completed in 2014. Request a recommendation on how to normalize.
- Incorporate research and analysis findings into Prioritization 4.0 (P4.0)
Factors Which Impact the STIP

Prioritization Does Not Equal Programming

- Priority Ranking
- Project Development Time
- Transition Period Projects
- Funding Category Allocations
Final STIP must be Approved by October 1, 2015 by FHWA to Continue Receiving Federal Dollars
Local Perspectives on NCDOT’s Data-Driven Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) Initiative

October 30, 2013

Bjorn E. Hansen, AICP CTP
Centralina Council of Governments
- NC: 38 MPOs and RPOs for 9.8 million people
- Chicago region: One MPO for 8.6 million people
MPOs and RPOs in North Carolina

- Most represent 80,000-250,000 people (24 MPOs and RPOs), but two represent over one million people (Charlotte and Raleigh)
- Vary in size from one county (four MPOs) to 10 counties (RPO for the Outer Banks)
- Nearly all RPOs are housed in Councils of Government
- 15 out of 19 MPOs are housed in the largest cities in the urbanized areas
- Each includes a TCC and TAC for staff and elected official level representation
History of MPO and RPO Input into NCDOT’s STIP before SPOT (pre 2009)

- Wide range of formats used submitting prioritizations
- No clear weighting for inclusion of MPO/RPO priorities into STIP
- No requirement for legislators or Board of Transportation members to even work through MPO/RPO process to advance projects
- Most MPOs and RPOs did not consider fiscal constraint when submitting project prioritization lists

Result: Inconsistent project solicitation and ranking processes and public outcry at increasing congestion in larger urban areas
History of Funding Projects in North Carolina

- **Equity Formula**
  - Congestion not considered
  - Population and economic activity worth less than half of funding allocation formula
  - Universally loathed

- **Loop Projects**
  - Intended to build loop roads around large urban areas in state
  - Separate funding allocation
  - No ranking process

- **Intrastate connectivity**
  - Long-standing goal to connect all parts of the state with multi-lane road access for economic development

- **Legacy of Road Ownership**
  - Counties own no roads
  - Cities have increasingly built roads in their jurisdictions

Result: Lack of trust, overly political process, and “legislated” project selection
MPO and RPO Project Input Under SPOT 1.0 and 2.0 (2009-now)

- Number of highway projects submitted limited to 25 per organization
- MPOs and RPOs assign 1-100 local points in support of highway projects
  - 1,300 total points per organization, regardless of size
  - Most organizations choose to assign 100 points to 13 projects
  - Results still subject to equity formula
- Unlimited number of bike and ped projects may be submitted
  - NCDOT assigns technical score to project for ranking
  - 600+ projects submitted, yet ~20 received funding
- Very uneven consideration of public transportation
  - Since O+M grants were outside this process, most systems did not actively participate in process

Result: Increased MPO and RPO deliberations on prioritizing projects and consideration of NCDOT’s objective scores, but requests exceeded available funds by an order of magnitude
Multi-Modal Considerations

- Public transportation and aviation projects solicited separately from highway process
  - Non-highway planning and management staff seldom attended MPO/RPO meetings
  - Lack of familiarity with each other’s requirements and processes
- Independent bicycle and pedestrian projects “sometimes” solicited at same time as highway process
  - Has improved under SPOT 1.0 and 2.0
  - Evaluation processes previously were always separate

Result: Planning for non-highway modes inconsistently interacted with the MPOs and RPOs, with duplication of efforts
Linkages to LRTPs (MTPs)

- 19 MPOs in NC develop 20-25 year long-range plans (MTPs) every 4-5 years
  - MPOs in same region typically on the same cycle
  - As a state the process is nearly continuous
- Plans developed largely in parallel and without interaction with STIP development process
  - Separate ranking processes
  - Intermittent input from NCDOT leadership
- Plan format, assumptions and ranking processes developed individually
  - Inability to consolidate plans to definitively present a region’s needs

Result: MPOs developed plans that really did not serve as visions for the region or binding documents for the NCDOT
MPO and RPO Input in SPOT Evolution

- MPOs and RPOs have been valued partners in the development of the data-driven processes
  - Dialogue and feedback has been appreciated by both sides
  - NCDOT has provided consistent and competent support throughout process

- Themes of feedback
  - More multi-modal consideration in funding allocations
  - Need at least “some” local input points in prioritizing statewide tier of projects
  - Pulling the curtain back on project ranking has been a big accomplishment
  - You cannot quantify everything; local input is local
Trends Going Forward

• Candidate project lists are being reduced
  ▫ Projects being eliminated from consideration
  ▫ Projects being reduced in scope
• Modeling future congestion is becoming irrelevant
  ▫ NC barely has enough money to address existing issues
  ▫ Many organizations are reducing local data collection/analysis and relying on NCDOT developed cost, safety, congestion, and economic benefit scores

Result: More realistic project lists and consistent evaluations, but consistently lagging emphasis on expanding capacity in growing areas
Conclusions

• For the most part MPOs and RPOs are on board
  ▫ Local leaders are increasingly participating in MPO and RPO meetings
  ▫ Much more open process
  ▫ Predictability in process
  ▫ Reliance on objective data

• But there are some concerns
  ▫ Percent for non-highway modes is too low
  ▫ No local input into statewide tier projects
  ▫ State legislature requiring NCDOT “approval” of local solicitation and ranking processes is excessive
  ▫ Maybe there is a reason no other state is attempting to normalize all modes?