

January 9, 2024

To: The Honorable Governor Ned Lamont
The Honorable Christine Cohen, Chair, Transportation Committee
The Honorable Roland J. Lemar, Chair, Transportation Committee
The Honorable Tony Hwang, Ranking Member, Transportation Committee
The Honorable Kathy Kennedy, Ranking Member, Transportation Committee
Members of the Transportation Committee

From: Brendan Sharkey, Chair, CT Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

RE: **Special Act 23-13 – An Act Studying the Consolidation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations**

In accordance with [Special Act No. 23-13 An Act Studying the Consolidation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(MPO\)](#) on behalf of the Connecticut Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) in consultation with the Department of Transportation, we submit the attached report.

As you'll see, the attached report responds to the seven questions posed in S.A. 23-13 regarding the possibility and advisability of consolidating MPOs in Connecticut. These responses are the product of several months of internal discussion among our members, as well as an informational meeting conducted on November 14, 2023 that brought national experts together with state and local MPO authorities.

We trust this report provides the insights sought by authors of the special act. Please contact us at ACIR@ct.gov should you have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brendan Sharkey". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Brendan Sharkey, Chair

Report to the Governor and Joint Committee on Transportation

Studying the Consolidation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Submitted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR)

Adopted –January 5, 2024

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) is a 25-member agency of the State of Connecticut created in 1985 to study system issues between the state and local governments and to recommend solutions as appropriate. The membership is designed to represent the state legislative and executive branches, municipalities and other local interests, and the general public. The ACIR meets on a monthly basis and the meetings are open to the public. Should the General Assembly require more study and analysis, ACIR can build it into our 2024 Workplan. Agendas, recordings, and minutes can be access on the [ACIR website](#).

The role of ACIR, as contained in [Section 2-79a of the Connecticut General Statutes](#) (CGS), is to: (1) serve as a forum for consultation between state and local officials; (2) conduct research on intergovernmental issues; (3) encourage and coordinate studies of intergovernmental issues by universities and others; and (4) initiate policy development and make recommendations to all levels of government.

For Further Information, please contact: ACIR@ct.gov

Executive Summary

[Special Act No. 23-13 An Act Studying the Consolidation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations](#) (MPO) instructs the Connecticut Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) in consultation with the Department of Transportation to study and make recommendations regarding the consolidation of metropolitan planning organizations to achieve a greater level of consistency and efficiency in transportation planning.

After discussing this study at various earlier meetings, the ACIR held an MPO Study Informational Meeting on November 14, 2023. Presenters included Patrick Hulin, Governor Lamont’s Deputy Policy Director, Amy Jackson-Grove, CT Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Karen Kitsis, Deputy Commissioner, CT Dept. of Transportation, Anthony Salvatore, Chair, Lower Connecticut River Valley MPO, Bill Keyrouze, Executive Director, Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Jeff Kramer, Program Director, Center for Urban Transportation Research. The December 1, 2023 monthly meeting of ACIR discussed a [memo received from four of the ACIR members who are MPO Directors](#) and from [Connecticut Council of Small Towns \(COST\)](#), in addition to prior studies and reports.

The last review of Connecticut’s MPOs was conducted by the Commission on Municipal Opportunities Regional Efficiencies (MORE Commission) that produced an [MPO Consolidation Progress Report to the CT General Assembly](#) in 2014 in conjunction with the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) re-designating the state’s planning regions per [CGS Section 16a-4c](#). For additional information on MPOs nationwide please refer to the Appendix of this report.

ACIR had limited time and resources to conduct a comprehensive review and analysis, including but not limited to, past history and more in-depth research. Should the General Assembly consider a more

thorough analysis, the ACIR would be happy to work with key subject experts and build it into our “2024 Workplan”.

The ACIR submits its recommendations to the Governor and the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation of the General Assembly in accordance with the provisions of [CGS section 11-4a](#) and the requirements of Special Act No. 23-13 to:

1. recommend a minimum population to be represented by a metropolitan planning organization;
2. recommend metropolitan planning organizations that can be consolidated or reconfigured to represent a larger population;
3. identify the potential consistencies, efficiencies and benefits to the state and municipalities as a result of consolidating metropolitan planning organizations,
4. identify any barriers that the state or municipalities may encounter while planning, and during, the consolidation of metropolitan planning organizations;
5. identify any state resources that can assist municipalities to overcome any such barrier;
6. include transition planning to address the staffing and funding needs of metropolitan planning organizations that are consolidated or reconfigured;
7. identify any conclusions that can be drawn from the configuration of metropolitan planning organizations in other states.

What is a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)?

A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is an organization created in accordance with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements to carry out the metropolitan transportation planning at a regional scale. Connecticut has eight: South Western, Housatonic Valley, Central Naugatuck Valley, Greater Bridgeport Valley, South Central Region, Capitol Region, Lower CT River Valley, and Southeastern CT. MPOs are required to represent localities in all urbanized areas (UZAs) with populations over 50,000, as determined by the U.S. Census. The state’s northwestern and northeastern corners lack the urbanized population necessary to independently be MPOs. Each of the state’s MPOs is hosted by one of the state’s regional Councils of Governments (COGs).

Initially, MPOs are designated by agreement between the governor and local governments that together represent at least 75 percent of the affected population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population) or in accordance with procedures established by applicable state or local law. MPOs are led by MPO Policy Boards that, in Connecticut, are the Chief Elected Officials of the member municipalities. Board members may include transit operators, state DOT, chambers of commerce, or others. Federal requirements governing MPOs allow considerable flexibility, other than that a board representing an urbanized area having a population of greater than 200,000 is required to include local elected officials, officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation, including providers of public transportation, and appropriate State officials.

In Connecticut, every MPO shares an urbanized area with another MPO. Decisions to have multiple MPOs serving urbanized areas were made by past Governors, consistent with the federal allowance for more than one MPO to serve an urbanized area or group of contiguous urbanized areas if the Governor

determines that the size and complexity of the urbanized area makes designation of more than one MPO appropriate.

MPOs are responsible for a [Metropolitan Transportation Plan \(MTP\)](#) with a planning horizon of no less than 20 years and work closely with the CTDOT, USDOT, FHWA, FTA, regional transit districts, municipalities, Indian Tribal governments, industry stakeholders, and the public. Transportation projects must first be included in the MTP before they can be considered for federal funding. MTPs must be updated every four years.

An MPO must also prepare the [Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\)](#), the short term program of projects to receive federal funding over a four-year period. A transportation project must be included in the current TIP before federal funding can be obligated. The TIP needs to reflect the investment priorities established in the current metropolitan transportation plan and must be approved by the MPO and by the Governor. The MPO develops a [Unified Planning Work Program \(UPWP\)](#) covering a variety of core transportation planning and administration activities but also air quality and congestion mitigation.

These documents outline projects which need local endorsement by the MPO Board in order to receive federal transportation funding.

Recommendation Report

1. Recommend a minimum population to be represented by a metropolitan planning organization.

[Federal Statute U.S.C. Title 23 § 450.310](#) specifies the minimum size of an MPO: “an MPO shall be designated for each urbanized area (UZA) with a population of more than 50,000 individuals.” Nationally, the median size of MPOs is 175,000, the population of Connecticut’s smallest MPO, but many of the nation’s MPOs are significantly larger or smaller than any in Connecticut. New York’s fourteen MPO have populations ranging from as low as 66,000 to more than twelve million, while New Jersey has two MPOs with populations of 590,000 and more than six million, respectively, and shares another with Pennsylvania with a combined population of almost six million. Massachusetts’s ten MPOs range from 130,000 to over three million.

The population ranges of MPOs in nearby states suggest that there is no single answer to the questions of what is an appropriate minimum size and that an MPO’s size must account for geography, the character of the transportation networks, the desires of different levels of government, and the administrative capacity available to administer the MPO.

Bill Keyrouze, Executive Director, Assoc. of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. “This is a fixed benchmark for MPO designations” across United States and “ensures areas with significant transportation needs are covered. It is also a requirement in order for “MPOs to access federal highway and transit funds.”¹

¹ [Keyrouze, B. \(2023, Nov. 14\) Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\). \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

Samuel Gold, Executive Director, RiverCOG MPO, Matt Hart, Executive Director, CRCOG MPO, Carl Amento, Executive Director, SCRCOG MPO, Francis Pickering, Executive Director, WestCOG -HVMPO & SWRMPO. “Connecticut’s MPOs” population ranges “are not outliers nationally. All MPOs in the state have populations many times the minimum population size prescribed by federal law. We recommend that consistency with federal law be maintained.”²

Anthony Salvatore, MPO Chair, Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments (RiverCOG). The RiverCOG “MPO has the lowest population of a CT MPO and is 175,000, the median MPO population nationwide.”³

2. Recommend metropolitan planning organizations that can be consolidated or reconfigured to represent a larger population.

It would be premature at this time to recommend MPOs that can be consolidated or reconfigured to represent a larger population without a more rigorous evaluation of intended purposes and potential impacts.

Any MPO consolidation is based on a voluntary basis and decided between the Governor and the municipal Chief Elected Officials per [23 CFR 450.310\(k\)](#) “an MPO serving a multistate metropolitan planning area requires agreement between the Governors of each State served by the existing MPO and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the existing metropolitan planning area population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census).”

Of note, [Public Law 115 - 33 An act to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform”](#), repealed USDOT rulemaking in 2016 to administratively force the consolidation of MPOs. This decision acted to protect the independence of MPOs and the power given by federal law to CEOs from federal and state executive branch actions. “The sponsors of this repeal were concerned by forcing MPOs to merge or consolidate TIPs, the rule takes local transportation investment decisions out of the hands of local authorities.”⁴

Connecticut could have been faced with similar issues with the whole state being subsumed into MPOs with New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. Considering CTDOT and the MPOs jointly program federal money on a statewide basis since 2014, focusing federal money on state facilities and priorities, the involvement of other states could undermine this highly coordinated and efficient arrangement.

The boundaries of the state’s planning regions must be re-evaluated at least every twenty years with consideration of various criteria in accordance with [CGS Section 16a-4c](#). Connecticut’s planning regions provide a geographic framework within which municipalities can jointly address common interests and

² [Gold, Hart, Amento, Pickering \(2023, Nov. 21\) Memo on Notes from the ACIR MPO Study Special Meeting from the MPO Directors \[Memorandum\] Connecticut ACIR MPO Directors](#)

³ [Connecticut Network \(2023, Nov. 14\) Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations November 14th Meeting \[Video\]](#)

⁴ [Shuster, B. \(2017, April 6\) Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Report to accompany H.R. 1346 \(Report No. 115-85\)](#)

coordinate such interests with state plans and programs. Connecticut planning regions are served by COGs which have been recognized as county equivalents under state and federal law respectively.

The last revision based on the [Status Report Analysis of the Boundaries of Logical Planning Regions](#) was enacted on January 1, 2015. It resulted in a reduction of planning regions by two (2) and consolidating of four (4) for a total of nine (9) planning regions. This state-led process is completely independent of federal processes governing MPO redesignation, but MPO boundaries are one of the factors to be considered in the state process. The next planning region evaluation process may assist in an overall review of boundaries.

David Williams, Program Development Team Leader FHWA outlined the steps for redesignation and Ms. Jackson-Grove, Division Administrator FHWA described resources available from the FHWA. “To the extent possible –only 1 MPO shall be designated for each urbanized area or group of contiguous urbanized areas.” “More than 1 MPO may be designated to serve an urbanized area only if the Governor(s) and the existing MPO, if applicable, determine that the size and complexity of the urbanized area make designation of more than 1 MPO appropriate.” “In cases where 2 or more MPOs serve the same urbanized area, the MPO shall establish official, written agreements that clearly identify areas of coordination, and the division of transportation planning responsibilities among the MPOs.”⁵

Betsy Gara, Executive Director, Connecticut Council of Small Towns. “The experts indicated that under federal law, the authority for MPO (re)designation is reserved for local governments (of which 132 in Connecticut are served by an MPO) and state governors. Examples were provided of a diverse array of MPO arrangements that fulfill federal requirements in a consistent and efficient manner. The experts did not suggest any particular arrangement, nor did they give compelling arguments for organizational consolidation or reconfiguration. The national scholar noted that MPOs in Connecticut were not unusual in their configuration. FHWA gave information on resources available to MPOs to support the planning process; AMPO and the MPO scholar gave examples of inter-MPO coordination, both informal and formal.”⁶

3. Identify the potential consistencies, efficiencies and benefits to the state and municipalities as a result of consolidating metropolitan planning organizations.

ACIR’s understanding is that that MPO consolidation will not by itself deliver more federal funding to the state. Any potential efficiencies and benefits resulting from consolidation of MPO seem to be far outweighed in the short term by the significant time and financial commitment necessary for the consolidation process. Existing opportunities for collaboration across MPOs already allow for certain efficiencies and a more detailed review of potential future gains from consolidation would require study at a level not currently available in this study. At this time, consolidation would create challenges by

⁵ [Williams, Jackson-Grove & Brady \(2023, Nov. 14\) FHWA - MPO Designation/Redesignation Process Overview \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

⁶ [Gara, B. \(2023, Nov. 30\) ACIR Study – Metropolitan planning Organizations \[Memorandum\] Connecticut Council of Small Towns \(COST\)](#)

diverting the focus of MPOs away from participating in the unprecedented expansion of federal funding for infrastructure and planning.

During the MPO Study Informational Meeting Mr. Keyrouze's, Executive Director of AMPO, presentation referenced the potential benefits to consolidation is "centralization of resources".⁷ In response, there was consensus that now is not the time for consolidation. Samuel Gold, Executive Director, RiverCOG/MPO, adding that redirecting focus to a consolidation "would take away opportunities to apply for the discretionary funding currently available".

The opportunity exists for coordinated regional transportation planning per [23 CFR Part 450 Subpart C](#) with the other MPOs in other urbanized area as well as coordination and division of transportation planning through written agreements. Mr. Kramer, Center for Urban Transportation Research at the University of South Florida, noted during his presentation of coordinated corridor planning through such agreements. Over time the urbanized areas of southeast Florida area have merged.⁸ The Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach MPOs within those areas have established a coordinated regional transportation planning partnership through a triparty [Interlocal Agreement Creating the Southeast Florida Transportation Council for Regional Transportation Planning and Coordination](#).

One such example in Connecticut is a [Memorandum of Understanding\(MOU\) Regarding Transportation Planning and Funding in the Bridgeport - Stamford Urbanized Area](#) which defines the method for distributing metropolitan planning funds within the Bridgeport-Stamford Urbanized Area and each MPO's responsibilities for coordinating transportation planning.

In addition, testimony during the public hearing for the [House Bill No. 6670](#) (2023), which became Special Act No. 23-13 was submitted by six (6) Connecticut MPO Directors highlighting the Lean Partnership as an opportune forum for further discussion on consolidation. "Connecticut Department of Transportation and MPOs established the Lean partnership in 2022 to identify and take advantage of opportunities to enhance transportation planning, programming, and project delivery. This process was highly productive and resulted in positive changes in the way we advance plans and projects. This is a continuing effort and would be a more appropriate forum to discuss the feasibility and effectiveness of MPO structure than through a legislative mandate that excludes MPO participation."⁹

The RiverCOG MPO Executive Director Gold mentioned during December ACIR meeting that for "the last ten years the state's MPOs have been programming their federal funds on state facilities and priorities and have been receiving state money through the [Local Transportation Capital Improvement Program \(LoTCIP\)](#)." This is an important distinction highlighting that Connecticut as a leader in efficiency by administering the state grant program cooperatively with Connecticut Department of Transportation and Council of Governments. LOTCIP has fewer constraints and requirements than currently exist when using [Federal Title 23 Funding](#). "Since federal money is already programmed on a statewide basis on state

⁷ [Keyrouze, B. \(2023, Nov. 14\) Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\). \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

⁸ [Kramer, J. \(2023, Nov. 14\) Center for Urban Transportation Research University of South Florida \(CUTR\). \[Presentation\] Special Meeting on the MPO Study Required by SA 23-13.](#)

⁹ [H.B. No. 6670 An act Studying the Consolidation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. House of Representatives, Public Hearing Connecticut General Assembly Transportation Committee. \(2023, Feb. 27\) \(Testimony of Fulda, M., Hart, M., Pickering, F., Gold, S., Amento, C., Dunne, R.\)](#)

priorities, consolidation of MPOs would not benefit the state in increased coordination of transportation investments.”¹⁰

Opportunities and examples of collaborative planning across MPOs were noted during the scope of this report and are a consideration for ACIR to explore further.

4. Identify any barriers that the state or municipalities may encounter while planning, and during, the consolidation of metropolitan planning organizations.

Obstacles and considerations for planning outside a potential new designation were outlined in Mr. Keyrouze’s presentation at the MPO Study Informational Meeting. He addressed the implications for modifying standards since federal law establishes uniformity in designations and any changes to population criteria would require federal legislative action. There is the risk of overlooking unique transportation needs when setting regional priorities. There are challenges integrating organizations with diverse styles and cultures which also cause disruption to established practices and partnerships. There are governance and legislative hurdles from the new [IIJA requirements](#), to financial costs and disruption to established planning activities.

Additionally, consolidation impacts MPO staff turnover and can exacerbate recruitment issues which were also highlighted by the CT Department of Transportation.¹¹

MPO mergers are rare. There are 420 MPOs nationwide. Mr. Keyrouze notes “only three mergers have taken place: Hampton Roads Region of Virginia in the 1980’s, RiverCOG in Connecticut in 2014, and Rio Grande Valley MPO in Texas in 2019. Federal law requires the agreement of local governments to undertake any such redesignation.”

5. Identify any state resources that can assist municipalities to overcome any such barrier.

No state fiscal or staffing resources were identified for consolidation or reconfiguration for MPOs. The future analysis of planning region boundaries required by [CGS Section 16a-4c and described in this report’s discussion of Recommendation 2](#) may inform future discussions.

Additional resources:

- [Status Report - Analysis of the Boundaries of Logical Planning Regions](#) - 2014
- https://consensus.fsu.edu/MPOAC-FDOT-Workshop/pdfs/12_Regional_Profiles-Executive_Summary.pdf
- <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/26555/metropolitan-planning-organizations-strategies-for-future-success>
- https://www.planning.dot.gov/documents/MPOStaffing_and_Org_Structures.pdf
- <https://www.ampo.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/WhitePaper-April-2018.pdf>

¹⁰ [Connecticut Network \(2023, Dec. 1\) Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations December 1st Meeting \[Video\]](#)

¹¹ [Keyrouze, B. \(2023, Nov. 14\) Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\). \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

6. Include transition planning to address the staffing and funding needs of metropolitan planning organizations that are consolidated or reconfigured.

The Federal redesignation steps to consolidate MPOs per [23 CFR 450.310](#) sets a framework to determine staffing and funding of the newly consolidated MPO.

As noted in the presentation by Amy Jackson-Grove, Division Administrator, FHWA –CT Division during the MPO Study Informational Meeting “Individual units of local government within the existing planning area should consider funding needs, conceptual organization, statistical data reporting and consolidation, and administrative staff when they vote on new MPO arrangement.” “States are required to make Planning (PL) funds available to MPOs in accordance with a formula developed by State DOT and approved by FHWA (23 USC 104(d)). Each State’s PL apportionment is calculated based on a ratio specified in law (23 USC 104(b)(6)) The Transfer of PL funds to other apportioned programs is prohibited.”¹²

Jennifer Brady, Transportation Specialist added that the “FHWA conducts a federal certification review every four years for a given Transportation Management Area, in accordance with [23 CFR 450.336](#), and the resulting report can include a federal finding of inadequacies to be resolved.”

7. Identify any conclusions that can be drawn from the configuration of metropolitan planning organizations in other states.

In October 2017, the US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration published the report [MPO Staffing and Organizational Structures FHWA](#). The comprehensive report discusses the organizational structure of MPOs, employment, employees, and specialization. It also covers the relatively new topics of performance-based planning/programming and scenario planning. Six (6) case studies were selected based on unique practices and intended to represent a variety of geographies, population levels, and hosting arrangements.

Mr. Keyrouze in his presentation summarizes that “if you’ve seen one MPO, you have seen one MPO.”¹³

It was added by the CT MPO/COG Directors, “Nationwide, there are over 400 MPOs, and they vary in size, configuration, and operations, but they all follow the same federal laws and are held to the same standards. Federal law ensures national consistency and efficiency in the metropolitan planning process but while allowing local governments to determine the institutional arrangements and regional priorities.”¹⁴

Best practices and opportunities for collaboration in Connecticut were identified in response to #3. Based on the presentations and discussion, the experience of other states may not translate well to Connecticut.

¹² [Williams, Jackson-Grove & Brady \(2023, Nov. 14\) FHWA - MPO Designation/Redesignation Process Overview \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

¹³ [Keyrouze, B. \(2023, Nov. 14\) Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\). \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

¹⁴ [Keyrouze, B. \(2023, Nov. 14\) Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\). \[Presentation\] MPO Study Informational Meeting, 14 Nov. 2023, Connecticut Legislative Office Building.](#)

Additional reference studies:

[Metroplan’s Transportation Planning Process and Structure – White Paper Winter 2018](#) which looks at the planning process and structure by analyzing a select group of MPOs, how they are organized and the process behind the policy making.

[The Metropolitan Area Planning \(MAP\) Forum](#), includes nine Metropolitan Planning organizations (MPOs) and Council of Government (COGs) in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut-Pennsylvania metropolitan region that are characterized by socio-economic and environmental interdependence, as evidenced through shared ecosystems, interconnected transportation systems, and inter-related patterns of employment and population.

[Metropolitan Planning Organization \(MPO\) and Transit Agency Planning Coordination in Florida Project Prepared For Florida Department of Transportation](#). The purpose of this study was to benchmark the current level of coordination and cooperation between Florida MPOs and transit agencies vis a vis the long-range transportation plan and Transit Development Plan. The work performed in this study, documents current federal and state requirements for planning coordination between MPOs and transit agencies, conduct an online survey of all MPOs and fixed route transit operators in Florida, and conduct case study interviews of MPO and transit agency staff in six selected Florida metropolitan areas.

Additional Resources:

[23 CFR 450 - Planning Assistance and Standards](#) - Federal transportation planning regulations (this link goes to the highway version--the transit version, adopted by FTA at 49 CFR 613, is an identical copy which incorporates this section by reference).

[FTA Circular 8100.1D - Program Guidance for Metropolitan Planning and State Planning and Research Program Grants](#) - FTA program guidance for metropolitan planning and state planning and research program grants.

[FAST Act Fact Sheet: Metropolitan, Statewide, & Non-Metropolitan Planning](#) - Brief FTA fact sheet on the planning provisions in the FAST Act.

[FHWA FAST Act Fact Sheet: Metropolitan Planning](#) - FHWA fact sheet on the metropolitan planning provisions of the FAST Act.

[U.S. Code Title 49, Chapter 53 - Public Transportation](#) - This is the public transportation section of U.S. Code. The Metropolitan Transportation Planning statute is found at Section 5303; Statewide Transportation Planning is found at Section 5304; and Planning Programs are found at Section 5305. The Metro and Statewide Planning sections are identical to the corresponding sections of Federal Highways code, 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135.

Additional resources related to [Metropolitan, Statewide & Non-Metropolitan Planning](#)

[Report to the Florida Legislature Exploring a Regional Metropolitan Planning Organization for Tampa Bay \(December 2023\)](#)

[Review-of-MPO-Regional-Planning-Decision-Making-and-Coordinated-Project-Implementation.pdf \(cutr.us\)](#)

[Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\)](#)

[METROPLAN: "METROPLAN's Transportation Planning Process and Structure: A White Paper"](#)

[NJTPA: "History of Metropolitan Planning Organizations"](#)

[National Academies: "Metropolitan Planning Organizations: Strategies for Future Success"](#)

[FCRC Consensus Center: "Evolving Roles of Metropolitan Planning Organizations: An Overview of Models from Around the Country that Illustrate Cross-Jurisdictional, Discipline, and Mode Planning Approaches"](#)

[FHWA: "MPO Staffing and Organizational Structures"](#)

[CT Department of Transportation Handbook for Councils of Governments and Metropolitan Planning Organizations 2017](#)

[Connecticut Department of Transportation 2022 Highway Transportation Asset Management Plan Executive Summary](#)

Appendix

11/14/2023 MPO Study Informational Meeting

- [Agenda](#)
- [Draft Minutes](#)
- [Video](#)
- [FHWA Presentation](#)
- [DOT Presentation](#)
- [AMPO Presentation](#)

Written Testimony from [House Bill No. 6670. AN ACT STUDYING THE CONSOLIDATION OF METROPOLITAN. PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS.](#)

- <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/tradata/TMY/2023HB-06670-R000227-Frankel,%20Emil,%20Former%20Commissioner-CTDOT-Supports-TMY.PDF>
- <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/tradata/TMY/2023HB-06670-R000227-Hulin,%20Patrick,%20Deputy%20Policy%20Director-Governor-s%20Office-Supports-TMY.PDF>
- <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/tradata/TMY/2023HB-06670-R000227-Rozen,%20Kate,%20Transportation%20Advocate-Supports-TMY.PDF>
- <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/tradata/TMY/2023HB-06670-R000227-Fulda,%20Matthew,%20Executive%20Director-MetroCOG--TMY.PDF>
- <https://cga.ct.gov/2023/tradata/TMY/2023HB-06670-R000227-Johnson,%20Jennifer,%20Former%20Board%20Member-SWRPA-Supports-TMY.PDF>