

Mn/DOT RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL PEER REVIEW

STATE DOT SCAN

Prepared by the Center for Transportation Studies

July 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
SUMMARY	ii
Department of Transportation Organization	iii
Oversight Boards	iii
Funding Allocation.....	iii
Project Programming.....	iv
Other Noteworthy Practices: Interview States	v
Other Noteworthy Practices: Other States	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
ARKANSAS	3
CALIFORNIA	5
COLORADO	7
NEW YORK.....	11
NORTH CAROLINA	15
OREGON.....	18
PENNSYLVANIA.....	21
TEXAS.....	24
APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONS	27
APPENDIX B: TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	28

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) Steering Committee members that set the tone for the Mn/DOT Resource Allocation and Organizational Peer Review and to the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) peer review panelists:

Mn/DOT Steering Committee

- Pat Bursaw
- Shawn Chambers
- Ginny Crowson
- Abby McKenzie
- Greg Ous
- Jim Swanson
- Jean Wallace

Peer Review Panelists

- Tom Eggum
- Ron Lundquist
- Robert (Buz) Paaswell
- Ken Perret
- Murl Sebring
- Becky Waldrup (ASCE Coordination)
- Benny Young

CTS would like to thank the very helpful personnel from state departments of transportation that provided written and verbal replies to various questions, contributing the information herein.

These are:

- Arizona: Larry Langer and Donald Mauller for e-mail dialog about Arizona.
- Arkansas: Ed Hoppe for a telephone interview and e-mail dialog.
- California: Sharon Scherzinger for a telephone interview, e-mail dialog, and provision of resources.
- Colorado: Pat Saffo, Ben Stein, and Scott Richrath for providing written replies to the telephone interview questions. Ben also helped through e-mail dialog and providing resources.
- Iowa: Jon Ranney for information about Iowa.
- Kentucky: Ron Rigney for a written description of Kentucky's processes.
- New York: Diane Kenneally for a telephone interview and e-mail dialog along with Sara Wilhelm for provision of resources.
- North Carolina: Calvin Leggett for a telephone interview and e-mail dialog along with Marie Sutton for provision of resources.
- Oregon: Jill Scofield for a telephone interview, e-mail dialog, and provision of resources.
- Pennsylvania: Tucker Ferguson for a telephone interview, e-mail dialog, and provision of resources.
- Texas: David Plutowski for a telephone interview and e-mail dialog.
- Washington: Julie Rodwell for provision of General Accounting Office survey replies.

Additionally, personnel from the following departments of transportation completed a brief online survey: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Vermont.

SUMMARY

The University of Minnesota’s Center for Transportation Studies (CTS) coordinated with the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) to conduct a Resource Allocation and Organizational Peer Review for the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT). ASCE conducted a peer assessment of Mn/DOT policy and practice as it relates to resource allocation and organizational structure. The peer review was conducted in response to the Transportation Strategic Management and Operations Advisory Task Force recommendation to validate statewide interests in the Mn/DOT regional structure and allocation process. To provide a broader national context and comparison for the peer review observations made by ASCE, CTS was asked to conduct a high-level scan of these same practices for other departments of transportation around the country.

To provide a setting for the more detailed feedback obtained from the scan interviews, CTS reached out to all 49 other states using an electronic survey to determine whether various functions are centralized or decentralized. Along with Minnesota, 24 states responded and the results are displayed in the table below.

Function	Central Office	Divisions/Districts	N/A	Other
Emergency Planning	12	5	1	5*
Capital Programming	19	0	1	4*
Maintenance	4	16*	1	3
Design-Highway	10	7*	1	6
Bridge Design	17*	3	1	3
Interstates	13	5*	1	4
Long-term Planning	18	3*	1	2
Environmental Impact Statements	12	7*	1	4
Environmental Assessments	12	8*	1	3
Preservation	7	11*	2	4
Modernization / Cap. Expansion	14	4*	2	4
Construction / Pre-Construction	5	13*	1	5
Traffic Engineering	11	9*	1	2
Surveys	12	8*	1	3
Safety Planning / Implementation	13	4	1	6*
Others	2	0	1	1
<p>“Others” was meant to allow respondents to indicate functions not included in the survey.</p> <p>Responding states: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont</p> <p>*Minnesota’s replies are not included in the numeric totals. However, they are denoted with an asterisk.</p> <p>See state-by-state replies in Table 1, Page 3.</p>				

Arkansas, California, Colorado, Oregon, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas were scanned and interviewed in greater detail regarding their organizational structure and resource allocation practices. These states represent a small sample of centralized, decentralized and hybrid structures and following are key points from the interviews with each.

Department of Transportation Organization

Every state interviewed has a number of districts (sometimes called “divisions” or “regions”) as well as centralized expert offices. In the truest sense of the terms “centralized,” “decentralized,” and “hybrid,” most states would be appropriately classified as the latter, as key functions occur both in central offices and districts. Bridge programs are almost always run centrally. New York is possibly the most decentralized state interviewed. In addition to accounting, the [New York State Department of Transportation](#)’s (NYSDOT) central office provides human resources, training, and funding for the regions. Most other key functions are provided by its 11 regions. In contrast, [North Carolina](#)’s 14 divisions are responsible for maintenance, but other projects are primarily handled centrally. [Texas](#) is unique in that it not only has 25 districts, but also four regions. The regions, which were developed within the last three years, have assumed some central office division tasks such as planning and maintenance. Bridge and maintenance activities remain central.

Oversight Boards

Unlike Minnesota, many states have an appointed board responsible for programming and planning. While this is not the case in New York, the other states that were interviewed do have such commissions.

- In [Arkansas](#), the governor appoints the five-member [Arkansas State Highway Commission](#), one member from each of the State’s four congressional districts and one at-large member. Each Commissioner represents two of the Department’s 10 districts.
- In [California](#), most of the [California Transportation Commission](#) members are appointed by the governor, though one is appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and one is appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly.
- In [Colorado](#), the 11 [Colorado Transportation Commission](#) members are appointed by the governor and represent geographic districts.
- In North Carolina, the [Board of Transportation](#) consists of five at-large members and the 14 division engineers.
- In [Oregon](#), the five commissioners are appointed to the [Oregon Transportation Commission](#) by the governor with geographic and party restrictions.
- [Pennsylvania](#) has two boards. The Pennsylvania [State Transportation Commission](#) consists of 15 members, ten appointed by the governor and approved by the Senate. The commission is advised by the [State Transportation Advisory Committee](#). Public members are appointed to three year terms by the governor (7), President Pro Tempore of the Senate (6) and the Speaker of the House of Representatives (6). Other membership consists of state staff and officials.
- In Texas, the five members of the [Texas Transportation Commission](#) are appointed by the governor.

Funding Allocation

In general, DOT central offices keep a portion of funds and distribute a portion to regions or districts. However, the specifics differ from state-to-state. Bridge funds are usually distributed throughout the state, rather than allocated to districts or regions.

- In Arkansas, discretionary funds are equally distributed to each two-region area represented by a commissioner, even though population is not equally distributed.

- In California, 75 percent of funding is allotted to metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs), while 25 percent is retained for programming by the state. MPO and RTPA allocation is based on a formula that includes such variables as lane miles and population.
- Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) staff work with MPOs and transportation planning regions (TPRs) to recommend allocation distributions to the Colorado Transportation Commission. Following this, CDOT, using performance models for some programs to accentuate funding needs, determines how much funding should be allocated to each program and allocations are made to the regions. Geographic allocation is based on two formulas, one for existing resources and a second for incremental funds.
- Similarly, for most programs in Oregon, funding is first divided among the programs and then distributed to the regions by each program. Working with executive staff, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) determines the overall State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding level and how much each program receives. Each program allocates to the regions. These decisions are data-driven and based on need.
- For most programs, NYSDOT allocates funding through formulas to its regions. Funding allocations are determined by the NYSDOT commissioner after key staff present recommendations to him or her. The formula changes based on need, which is affected by such variables as bridge rating.
- In North Carolina, each division receives a formula-driven portion of the funding. Each division's portion of the funding was established by state law in 1989.
- In Pennsylvania, allocation and programming are more MPO/ Rural Planning Organization (RPO)-driven than district-driven. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) distributes most funds to MPOs and RPOs based on a formula.
- Texas uses a very complex allocation process. The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) moves its federal funding into 12 funding categories. Depending on category, allocations are provided to the MPOs, districts, or statewide. Some categories have formulas based on pertinent factors such as population, traffic, and pavement condition. For some others, TxDOT central office works with the MPOs to determine "fair share."

Project Programming

In general, DOT central offices program a portion of funds, while the rest is distributed to regions or districts. In some states, the "final decision" for TIPs (or regional STIP projects) rests in the hands of regional bodies. In others, it is in the hands of the region or the central office. There are exceptions to most rules.

- In Arkansas, the Arkansas State Highway Commission decides what projects to put into the STIP. It does so with input from district engineers, department staff, and local officials. District engineers provide input on bridge priorities.
- In California, the MPOs and RTPAs create TIPs, which must be approved by the California Transportation Commission before entry into the STIP. Because approval is based on consistency with regional transportation plans, the MPO and RTPA are the decision makers.
- In Colorado, once funds are distributed to the regions, the "[Public Programming Priority Process \(4P\)](#)" is implemented to determine priorities in each region. Each region meets

with each TPR/MPO individually to discuss priorities, and then meets with all TPRs/MPOs together to come up with an overall regional priority list.

- In New York, MPOs select projects in their geographic areas, while the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) regions select them in non-MPO areas.
- In North Carolina, funds within each division are prioritized with collaboration between North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) division staff and local representation within the division. Bridge, interstate maintenance, and safety funding within the divisions are assigned to projects centrally.
- In Oregon, teams in the regional offices assemble lists of potential projects to be scoped to determine costs and limits for each. A final list of projects is developed and provided to the [Area Commissions on Transportation \(ACTs\)](#), which help represent local interest in the transportation programming process and establish a public prioritization process. The regions work with ACTs to determine priorities regarding which projects will go into the program. The decision is ultimately up to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), which approves the program.
- In Pennsylvania, most projects are programmed at the MPO/RPO level. PennDOT districts relay their needs to MPOs and RPOs, which meanwhile gather needs from local entities. The district and MPO/RPO then get together to create a program. Although programs are a result of a consensus, the MPOs and RPOs officially program the projects.
- In Texas, depending on category, projects are selected by the districts, selected by MPOs in consultation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), selected by the Texas Transportation Commission, or selected statewide.

Other Noteworthy Practices: Interview States

- Many states have performance measures in such areas as crashes and bridge condition. CDOT monitors success and reports it in simple green, yellow, and red light symbols. Some states have performance measurement units and/or produce [dashboards](#) with performance measurement indicators. Others (e.g., Oregon) have each program operate its own performance measures. CDOT is developing a dashboard for communicating internal indicators, and later external measures, in real time. When regions submit programs, NYSDOT's central office provides feedback on how well goals will be met (e.g., how well the goal of improving pavement conditions will be met).
- Many states are covered entirely by MPO regions or their rural counterparts.
- The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) works with councils of government, which examine the linkage between land use and transportation and the environment.
- Some states have regular interdistrict meetings of district personnel.
- In some states, districts work together on projects that cross boundaries.
- Although legislative and gubernatorial oversight is uncommon, some state DOTs must share proposed programs or amendments with their legislatures. In Oregon, the governor approves Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs). In Colorado, the governor (along with the Transportation Commission) approves the STIP.
- For projects outside the normal process, states distribute funds in various ways when enabling legislation lacks restrictions. PennDOT has discretion and has used proportional formulas as well as equal distribution to each district. In Oregon, the Transportation

Commission, after recommendations from executive staff, determines how to distribute the funds.

- CDOT puts aside a percentage of the federal program plus state match in anticipation of earmarks. If a region does not receive earmarks, it can use its share of the funding for regional priorities and the region and its TPRs can choose how to use the funds. CDOT sets aside state funds for matching earmarks if the earmark is in the STIP.

Other Noteworthy Practices: Other States

In preparing for interviews, several other states were contacted but were not interviewed because they did not reply or were unable to schedule a call. Below are some interesting facts gleaned from those contacts.

- For major projects, Arizona's funding distribution is 37 percent to the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) region, 13 percent to the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) region, and 50 percent to the remaining 13 counties, as opposed to distributing to districts. Programming in these counties is a central office function. In the MAG and PAG regions, programming is handled by MPOs, in consultation with the [Arizona Department of Transportation](#) (ADOT). While the [State Transportation Board](#) approves the PAG's and MAG's programs, the PAG and MAG develop them and change them through their TIP approval processes. ADOT programs over 50 percent of the state's transportation program centrally. For 13-county "greater Arizona," ADOT selects projects through performance criteria. The state's 10 districts share the "District Minor" subprogram.
- Iowa is very central. An [Iowa Department of Transportation](#) employee wrote, "Most Interstate, Bridge, Safety and major Capacity/Economic Development projects are programmed centrally, with input from our six District Offices. The Pavement Preservation portion of our program is programmed by our District Offices."
- [Kentucky](#) is unique in its high level of legislative involvement and extreme centralization. The general assembly can add projects, add project phases, change schedules, change funding, and remove projects from the [Six-Year Highway Plan](#). The general assembly submits a highway plan for the governor to sign. The governor's signature approves the highway plan, enabling the Kentucky Transportation Commission to act on its first two years as funding is available. The Six-Year Highway Plan is used to prepare the STIP. Projects located in MPO areas must go through the MPO TIP process.
- [Washington](#) stated in a General Accounting Office survey that it places "very great importance" on transportation projects recommended by rural planning organizations. *"All planning, analysis, modeling, political and public involvement occurs during the regional planning and TIP development processes. Additionally, all projects entered into the STIP electronically are reviewed by WSDOT staff for accuracy, completeness, and financial constraint. Any inconsistencies are addressed and corrected in consultation with the submitting agency. Projects are subsequently adopted into the STIP without change and submitted to FHWA and FTA for review and approval."* Washington also has published a [report](#) on progress made in meeting performance targets.

INTRODUCTION

The University of Minnesota’s Center for Transportation Studies (CTS) coordinated with the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) to conduct a Resource Allocation and Organizational Peer Review for the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT). ASCE conducted a peer assessment of Mn/DOT policy and practice as it relates to resource allocation and organizational structure. The peer review was conducted in response to the Transportation Strategic Management and Operations Advisory Task Force recommendation to validate statewide interests in the Mn/DOT regional structure and allocation process. To provide a broader national context and comparison for the peer review observations made by ASCE, CTS was asked to conduct a high-level scan of these same practices in other departments of transportation around the country.

To provide a setting for the more detailed feedback obtained from the scan interviews, CTS sent an electronic survey to all 50 states to determine whether various functions are centralized or decentralized. In addition to Minnesota, 24 states replied and the results are displayed in the table below.

Table 1: Results of Centralization/Decentralization Survey

Function	Central Office	Divisions/Districts	N/A	Other
Emergency Planning	12: AL, AZ, CA, IA, KS, NE, NH, NC, OH, TX, UT, VT	5: CO, IL, NV, OR, PA	1: RI	5: MN, ID, LA, MI, NY, ND
Capital Programming	19: AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IL, IA, KS, LA, NE, NV, NH, NC, ND, OR, PA, TX, UT, VT	0	1: RI	4: MN, ID, MI, NY, OH
Maintenance	4: AL, AZ, UT, VT	16: MN, AR, CA, CO, ID, IL, IA, KS, NE, NV, NH, NY, NC, OH, OR, PA, TX	1: RI	3: LA, MI, ND
Design-Highway	10: AL, AZ, AR, IA, KS, NE, NV, NH, NC, VT	7: MN, CA, CO, IL, OR, PA, TX, UT	1: RI	6: ID, LA, MI, NY, ND, OH
Bridge Design	17: MN, AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, ID, IA, KS, LA, NE, NV, NH, NC, ND, OR, UT, VT	3: IL, PA, TX	1: RI	3: MI, NY, OH
Interstates	13: AL, AZ, AR, IL, IA, KS, NE, NV, NH, OR, PA, NC, VT	5: MN, CA, CO, NY, TX, UT	1: RI	4: LA, MI, ND, OH
Long-term Planning	18: AL, AZ, AR, CO, ID, IL, IA, KS, LA, MI, NE, NV, NH, NC, ND, OR, UT, VT	3: MN, CA, PA, TX	1: RI	2: NY, OH
Env. Impact Statements	12: AL, AZ, AR, IA, KS, LA, NE, NV, NH, NC, ND, VT	7: MN, CA, CO, IL, OR, PA, TX, UT	1: RI	4: ID, MI, NY, OH
Environmental Assessments	12: AL, AZ, AR, IA, KS, LA, NE, NV, NH, NC, ND, VT	8: MN, CA, CO, IL, NY, OR, PA, TX, UT	1: RI	3: ID, MI, OH
Preservation	7: AL, AZ, AR, KS, NE, UT, VT	11: MN, CA, CO, ID, IL, IA, NV, NH, NC, OR, PA, TX	2: NY, RI	4: LA, MI, ND, OH
Modernization / Cap. Expansion	14: AL, AZ, AR, IL, IA, KS, LA, NE, NV, NH, NC, OH, UT, VT	4: MN, CA, OR, PA, TX	2: CO, RI	4: ID, MI, NY, ND
Construction / Pre-Construction	5: AL, AZ, AR, NH, VT	13: MN, CA, CO, IL, IA, NE, NV, NY, ND, OH, OR, PA, TX, UT	1: RI	5: ID, KS, LA, MI, NC

Function	Central Office	Divisions/Districts	N/A	Other
Traffic Engineering	11: AL, AZ, AR, IA, KS, NE, NH, NC, ND, UT, VT	9: MN, CA, CO, ID, IL, NV, NY, OR, PA, TX	1: RI	2: LA, MI
Surveys	12: AL, AZ, AR, CO, IA, KS, LA, NE, NH, NY, NC, VT	8: MN, CA, ID, IL, NV, OR, PA, TX, UT	1: RI	3: MI, ND, OH
Safety Planning / Implementation	13: AL, AZ, AR, CA, CO, IA, KS, NE, NH, ND, OR, TX, VT	4: IL, NV, PA, UT	1: RI	6: MN, ID, LA, MI, NY, NC, OH
Others	2: AR, ND	0	1: RI	1: MI

Notes:

- Minnesota’s replies are not included in the number listed in each box. However, “MN” is included in boxes corresponding with its replies.
- TX central office includes its four divisions.
- NC, MI, ID, ND, OH, LA, NY: Activities marked “Other” are done at both the central office and districts.
- Due to its size, Rhode Island does not have districts.
- “Others” was meant to allow respondents to indicate functions not included in the survey. Of the four states that marked “others”, only North Dakota specified any functions. These were construction bidding and civil rights/DBE.

The following centralized, decentralized and hybrid states were scanned and interviewed in greater details regarding their organizational structure and resource allocation practices.

- Arkansas, and North Carolina (centralized)
- New York, California, Texas, and Pennsylvania (decentralized)
- Oregon and Colorado (hybrid)

Survey replies and results of interviews are highlighted in the following pages. At the top of each state’s section is its reply to the survey question related to centralization and decentralization. At the end of each state’s section are replies to the other questions.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD)

- Central Office: Capital Programming, Highway Design, Bridge Design, Interstates, Long-Term Planning, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Preservation, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering, Surveys, Safety Planning/Implementation
- Districts: Maintenance, small surveying jobs, design of overlay projects and other minor jobs

“Most of the functions are handled out of the Central Office with some of the same functions handled at the District level. (All of our Divisions are located at the Central Office.) For example, design for overlay projects and other minor jobs are handled by the Districts; same with small surveying jobs.”

CTS staff interviewed Ed Hoppe, the division head of the Programs and Contracts Division.

Department of Transportation Organization

AHTD has 10 district offices in charge of construction and maintenance. All design, programming, planning, and surveying are in the central office. AHTD has four branches; three of these are directed by the assistant chief engineers for planning, design, and operations. Other business activities (e.g., human resources, computers, buildings & grounds) occur under the assistant to the director and serve somewhat as a fourth branch.

The governor appoints the five-member [Arkansas State Highway Commission](#), one from each of the state’s four congressional districts and one at-large. Each commissioner represents two of the Department’s districts and, roughly, 15 of the state’s 75 counties. While the general concept has not been revisited recently, some counties have moved from one district to another. The commission is responsible for directing AHTD. Commissioners are essentially volunteers, as they are not salaried, although they do receive a stipend. They attend letting meetings and numerous other meetings and functions.

Staff classifications are consistent across the districts. Practices are essentially consistent as well, as the same rules and guidelines apply to all districts.

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

Discretionary funds (certain federal funds (NHS, STP, CMAQ, EB, etc.) and 100 percent state-funded projects) are distributed at 20 percent for distribution by each commissioner. District engineers, department staff, local officials, and the public help develop project lists to propose for the STIP. With input from district engineers, department staff, and other local officials, the commission decides which projects to put into the STIP.

Interstate and safety funding diverges from the 20 percent formula and distribution is need-based.

Federal bridge funds are distributed throughout the state, with input from district engineers on priorities. This input is based on such factors as bridge rating and traffic.

There has been some lobbying to change the 20 percent-per-commissioner formula, particularly from the northwest and central parts of the state, which are the two most populous areas.

Communicating Decisions

AHTD publishes the STIP, which lists all projects. Its public outreach process includes placing information on its Web site. The department makes sure to communicate information with cities, MPOs, and planning development districts (PDDs).

Performance Measures

While the interviewee is aware of performance measures, the interviewee is unaware of any performance measure criteria or goals. The Department tracks pavement and bridge ratings and safety statistics, among other measures.

Relationships

Every part of the state is covered by an MPO and/or PDD.

Coordination among Districts

Coordination between districts occurs as needed for interdistrict projects.

Legislative Oversight

AHTD is an independent State agency. The legislature controls funding and the governor appoints the commissioners but otherwise their involvement is limited.

STIP Amendment Process

The Department has a process developed with the FHWA and the MPOs to amend projects in the STIP and TIPs.

Special Projects

Major projects that receive earmarked funds can cause difficulties for the Department when they are not fully funded.

A special fund such as this is non-discretionary, and therefore does not affect the 20 percent allotment to each commissioner, unless state matching funds are required.

Other Survey Replies

Neither the STIP nor TIP drives each other.

AHTD replied that the citizen appointed committee or commission is not applicable.

CALIFORNIA

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

- Central Office: Emergency Planning, Capital Programming, Bridge Design, Safety Planning/Implementation
- Districts: Maintenance, Highway Design, Interstates, Long-Term Planning, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Preservation, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering, Surveys

CTS staff interviewed Sharon Scherzinger, chief of the Division of Transportation Planning.

Department of Transportation Organization

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is divided into 12 districts. Caltrans also has centralized expert offices in areas such as bridge, planning, maintenance, structures, programming, traffic operations, and construction.

District boundaries are based on geography and population. Boundaries have been revisited, which resulted in the addition of a new district when Orange County was removed from the Los Angeles district.

Oversight is provided by the [California Transportation Commission](#). Nine of the eleven voting members are appointed by the governor, one is appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and one is appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly. There are also two ex-officio non-voting members, appointed by the state senate and assembly (usually their respective transportation policy committee chairs). The commission is responsible for programming and allocating funds in California.

District-to-district, staff classifications differ because of the differing workloads by geography. For example, districts in populated areas such as Los Angeles have a staff of higher and more diverse classifications than their less populated counterparts. District-to-district, practices are essentially consistent.

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

California is unique in that 75 percent of funding is allotted to MPOs and regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs), while 25 percent is retained for programming by the state. There is also funding set aside for maintenance purposes. Allocation for MPO/RTPA share is based on a formula that includes such variables as lane miles and population. For the state-programmed portion, Caltrans must follow rules as to how it can be invested. Much of this funding is used for interregional projects and rail projects.

The commission must approve MPO/RTPA TIPs, which it examines for consistency with regional transportation plans.

Communicating Decisions

STIP amendments must go through the commission for approval. Regional plans, created by MPOs/RTPAs, provide for extensive public involvement.

Performance Measures

Caltrans has a [performance measurement unit](#), which produces dashboards with performance measurement indicators. Along with submitting for public review, Caltrans communicates success in hitting performance targets to the commission, regional partners, and federal partners. Caltrans compares regions in terms of meeting standards for project delivery.

Relationships

Caltrans has close working relationships with MPOs, which is necessary given how much of the funding they control. Many counties have local sales tax measures, rendering federal money part of a joint project.

Caltrans works with councils of government, which examine the linkage between land use and transportation and the environment. Caltrans also works with resource agencies (on environmental issues), large transit providers, and joint power agencies (on heavy rail).

Local Option Tax-Funded Projects

There are many projects funded with local-option sales tax. These taxes do not impact a district or MPO “share” of Caltrans funding.

Coordination among Districts

Staff sharing is common when workloads dictate. In current poor economic times, Caltrans considers job sharing a cost-saving solution.

Legislative Oversight

While Caltrans’ budget is approved by the Department of Finance, the legislature, and the governor, there is no legislative approval required for the STIP.

STIP Amendment Process

Some STIP amendments are “administrative” while others are “full” STIP amendments. The latter requires a more strenuous process.

Special Projects

Specialty projects do not impact a district’s share of the funding allotment.

Other Survey Replies

TIPs drive the STIP.

Caltrans replied that the California Transportation Commission is helpful.

COLORADO

Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

- Central Office: Capital Programming, Bridge Design, Long-Term Planning, Surveys, Safety Planning/Implementation
- Regions: Emergency Planning, Maintenance, Highway Design, Interstates, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Preservation, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering,
- N/A: Modernization/Capacity Expansion

CTS staff received a reply from Colorado via e-mail. The reply was provided by:

- Pat Saffo, budget and policy analyst V, Office of Finance Management and Budget
- Ben Stein, manager, Office of Finance Management and Budget
- Scott Richrath, budget and policy analyst IV, Division of Transportation Development

Department of Transportation Organization

Colorado DOT (CDOT) is divided into six engineering regions by areas of the state, plus headquarters. CDOT has staff for bridge, division of transportation development (long-range planning), pavement group, intelligent information systems, etc., at headquarters.

The respondents are unsure how region boundaries were determined. There are periodic discussions about revising them, but in the past few years no one has made a serious effort to do so.

Oversight is provided by the [Colorado Transportation Commission](#) (TC). Each of the 11 members is appointed to a four-year term by the governor and represents a specific district. The TC formulates general policy, advises the governor and general assembly, and adopts budgets and programs.

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

CDOT has a lengthy process that involves staff, CDOT's planning partners (MPOs and rural Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs)) and the TC. Staff works with planning partners to recommend allocations and distributions to the TC. CDOT has performance models for some programs such as bridge, pavement, etc. that are presented to accentuate the differing needs. For programming the STIP, once funds are distributed to the six engineering regions by program and fiscal year, a public process ([Public Programming Priority Process \(4P\)](#)) is implemented to determine priorities in the regions. Each region meets with each TPR/MPO in its region individually to discuss that group's priorities, and then meets with all TPRs/MPOs together to come up with an overall regional priority list.

Resource allocation is first done on a program-by-program basis. For example, CDOT determines how much funding to provide for surface treatment or maintenance. Once CDOT has allocated by program, second-round allocations are made to the regions.

Essentially the TC determines how much funding is allocated to the regions. But the critical issue in CDOT's case is that there is an existing memorandum of agreement in place that allots

percentages to the TMAs and to the six planning regions based upon two formulae. One formula is used for “existing” resources, and a second for “incremental” funds.

Once funds are allocated to the regions by program, the region and its regional planning partners determine the projects. Some funds are entirely within the discretion of the TMAs as well.

Communicating Decisions

These decisions are communicated through TC workshops (public meetings), e-mail communications, and, in the case of the STIP, documents that are distributed around the state for public review and comment.

Resource allocation decisions are highlighted in public documents and through regular meetings. Specifically, the [Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee](#) (STAC) is consulted throughout the allocation process, and ultimately, a TC resolution is enacted. CDOT is in the process of documenting the current resource allocation process and results. The final document will be posted on the departmental Web site.

For the STIP, CDOT has its extensive [Public Programming Priority Process \(4P\)](#) process that the respondents feel is key to describing external communication occurs.

Performance Measures

Currently, CDOT’s 25 strategic performance measures are communicated via an [annual report](#). Success in hitting targets is highlighted with green, yellow, and red “lights.” Internal indicators and other measures are communicated directly with those affected. CDOT is developing a dashboard for communicating internal indicators and later external measures in real-time.

CDOT typically does not compare performance from engineering region to engineering region, as statewide performance is the primary concern.

Relationships

CDOT’s relationship with MPOs is a collaborative one. CDOT works on these processes with MPO participation. CDOT has 10 rural TPRs, also. Representatives of these planning partners are members of the STAC, who meet each month with CDOT staff and make recommendations to the TC about current issues.

Local Option Tax-Funded Projects

There are two local tax funding scenarios: First, Colorado statutes allow for the creation of regional transportation authorities (RTAs). RTAs are authorized to impose a sales tax of up to 1 percent in member counties, special districts, and municipalities. To impose this tax, however, the RTA must hold an election (all tax increases in Colorado require voter approval). RTAs may or may not use the proceeds for road construction; they can also use them to fund mass transit. There are only three RTAs in the state at present. By statute funds generated by an RTA’s locally generated sales tax cannot be factored into the distribution of state transportation dollars. Second, local governments have the power to set sales tax rates (subject to voter approval) and to collect sales tax. Therefore, there are a wide range of sales tax rates in Colorado. Local governments can use their sales tax proceeds to fund and construct roadway construction

projects. Most local governments in Colorado dedicate at least a portion of their local general fund revenues to roadway maintenance and construction.

Coordination among Regions

As noted above, local governments can create RTAs. In addition there are five MPOs within Colorado, three of which are transportation management areas (TMAs). All of them conduct regional planning efforts. Outside the MPOs are transportation planning regions, which coordinate and discuss planning in the rural portions of the state. All these entities are represented on the STAC. The department's regional engineering districts coordinate continually with their respective MPOs and TPRs.

Regional transportation directors meet monthly and have informal coordination. Interdistrict efforts are rare outside of the Denver metropolitan area, which is part of three regions.

Legislative Oversight

CDOT's legislative budget is only about three percent of its total budget. The rest is from the FHWA and the state highway user tax fund. It is represented in Colorado's "Long Bill" by a single line for all non-legislative funding.

The STIP is approved by the TC and the governor, who usually signs a new STIP and delegates updates to the DOT's executive director.

STIP Amendment Process

The STIP is amended daily. There are three types of amendments. The first is a policy amendment, which goes to the public for 30 days of review and is then approved by the TC and FHWA/FTA. Second is an administrative amendment, which is a minor change that is processed overnight and approved by the Office of Financial Management and Budget STIP analysts. The third is a TIP amendment—that is, any changes that go through an MPO's TIP process are entered verbatim into the STIP once the MPO public review and approval process has been completed. CDOT uses an enterprise resource planning system—and its STIP is in that system—integrated with funds management to keep the STIP fiscally constrained.

Special Projects

CDOT puts aside a percentage of the federal program plus state match in anticipation of earmarks. This funding is treated like a flexible program; that is, if a region does not receive earmarks, it can use its share of the funding for regional priorities. If earmarks come in, the funding needs to come from the appropriate region's funding for this purpose. CDOT sets aside state funds for matching earmarks if the earmark is in the STIP. When a local government gets an earmark other than one CDOT has agreed to request, the local agency must come up with the match. If there are no earmarks, then the money is reallocated to the regional priority program, and the region and its TPRs get to pick how to use the funds.

Other Survey Replies

The TIPs drive the STIP.

The commission is helpful.

“The State Transportation Commission is an appointed body that controls the Department's budget and sets most of its policies. The Commission is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The Commission is very helpful as it is largely apolitical and has the time and willingness to really learn transportation issues. We also have an aeronautics board, the statewide transportation advisory committee, and the Bridge Enterprise board, all are invaluable.”

NEW YORK

New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT)

- Central Office: Surveys
- Regions: Maintenance, Interstates, Environmental Assessments, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering
- Shared: Emergency Planning, Capital Programming, Highway Design, Bridge Design, Long-Term Planning, Environmental Impact Statements, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Safety Planning/Implementation
- N/A: Preservation

“For most NYSDOT functions, the Central or Main Office provides strategic direction, policy, procedures, guidance and resources for implementation by our Region (District) Offices. These directions may be circulated to our Regions and External stakeholders for review and comment when appropriate before implementation. Many of our subject matter experts are located in the Main Office for issues such as Civil Rights; materials - concrete and asphalt, contracts, locally administered federal aid projects, etc. who provide guidance, training and respond to questions from our Region Offices and project Sponsors. For Capital Programming, project selection for inclusion on the STIP occurs at the Regional Level, after the STIP is approved, there is some flexibility in selection in the Main Office due to funding availability such as ARRA funds. Due to the time frames and funding limitations, the MPOs and Regions agreed to have more flexibility in the obligation of funds for projects. Highway Design is performed in each Region office and there is a Design group in Main Office available to all Regions to handle overflow. New bridges are designed only in the Main Office with bridge rehabs designed in the Regions. Shop drawings are reviewed centrally not in each Region Office. There are other functions handled centrally for the Regions. Based on resources available, functions are performed to maximize the function and provide the service to all Regions and minimize duplication around the state. Pre-award review for State Construction contracts is performed in the Main Office while most other construction related activities are performed by the Regional Offices. Long term planning - is a function shared by Main Office and Regions. EIS - while the projects are primarily advanced by the Regional Offices, there is involvement by the Main Office, especially on Major Projects (greater than \$100,000) and coordination with FHWA as needed. For Safety Planning and Implementation - Main Office develops the safety plan while project specific implementation is performed by our Regional Offices.”

CTS staff interviewed Diane Kenneally, the director of the Local Programs Bureau, located in the Policy and Planning Division.

Department of Transportation Organization

The central office handles policy, procedures, training, staff guidance and human resources, as each of the Department’s 11 regions has only one human resources employee. Similarly, most accounting activities are handled centrally. The central office houses the policymakers that provide training and funding for the regions. Projects are implemented in the regional offices, each of which has planning, maintenance, etc. Two-thirds of New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) employees are in maintenance and operations.

Each region’s director reports to the chief engineer in the central office. The chief engineer oversees many of other offices (design, structure, technical services, construction, environmental services, and real estate – each office has a counterpart in the region). Region directors are not always engineers.

There are two examples in the past 20 years in which a county switched regions. In the most recent instance, it was so that county could be in the same region as its MPO.

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

NYSDOT allocates funding to its regions using a similar formula to that which the FHWA uses to distribute funding to states. For contingency purposes, it does not give out 100 percent of its allocations. Currently NYSDOT is in litigation over its allocations.

Some statewide programs, such as enhancements and Safe Routes to School are allocated via a competitive application process through the central office. The emergency relief program is run out of the central office and projects occur as events happen. “Statewide Significance” projects are allocated by the state and do not impact regional share, as some of those projects could take up a region’s entire share. These projects are deemed to be of importance to the entire state, warranting the costs to be shared by the state.

Funding allocations are determined by the NYSDOT commissioner after the executive management team, which includes the chief engineer and division directors, presents recommendations to the commissioner. The formula utilized changes based on need, which is impacted by such variables as bridge rating.

There are 13 MPOs in New York. These MPOs are located in 10 of the 11 regions. Unlike most states interviewed, New York has areas that are not incorporated into an MPO or a rural counterpart. NYSDOT goes through an extensive outreach process with MPOs. Projects are selected in an open public form. In the region without an MPO, outreach is to localities and selection is cooperative. MPOs select projects in their geographic areas, while the NYSDOT regions select them in non-MPO areas in cooperation with the municipalities.

In New York, all publicly owned bridges are eligible for federal aid, even those located on ineligible highways.

For projects in MPO areas, the [STIP](#) projects are driven by the TIPs.

There are disagreements on how to provide a “fair share” to regions.

Communicating Decisions

There is a 30-day public comment period on all TIPs and the STIP. MPOs provide information on their Web sites and use other traditional outreach methods.

Performance Measures

NYSDOT has been working on and improving performance measures. The Department measures bridge and pavement conditions and is trying to expand to include such things as Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) facilities and traffic signals.

The central office provides feedback to the regions on how well goals are met. When regions submit a program, the central office analyzes how well the program will meet goals, (e.g., how well the goal of improving pavement conditions will be met).

Relationships

Along with the aforementioned MPO relationships, [NYS MPOs](#) are “hosted” by one of their members, a public agency.

NYMTC is hosted by NYSDOT. It is unique in that to respond to local needs, [NYMTC](#) is composed of three transportation coordinating committees (TCCs): New York City TCC, Mid-Hudson South TCC and Nassau/Suffolk TCC. These committees recommend sub-regional transportation priorities and provide opportunities for the private sector, general public, local government, and interested stakeholders to become involved in the planning process on a more local level. The TCCs, as a subset of the MPO, can make amendments or modifications to NYMTC’s TIP without having to go to the full MPO only if an amendment does not necessitate a conformity determination.

NYSDOT works with some rural groups; these are not officially recognized as “RPOs,” but may be regional planning boards established during the “A-95 review” era.

Local Option Tax-Funded Projects

Local option taxes could conceivably be used for a local match. Some counties have additional sales taxes to fund transit.

Coordination among Regions

There is coordination among regions. One region may help out an adjacent region with staffing. For example, compliance specialists recently helped regions low on staffing.

Legislative Oversight

NYSDOT provides the legislature with a list of projects and costs. The legislature then signs a memorandum of understanding (MOU) stating that the finances will be there to support the program. The MOU has historically covered a five-year program, but going forward will cover only a two-year program because of funding difficulties.

STIP Amendment Process

The MPO runs through its TIP amendment process. Following this, the central office adds it to the STIP. For projects that occur outside of any MPO, a STIP amendment occurs at the central office prior to going to the FHWA for approval. In either case, the process for a “modification” is less complex than that used for an “amendment.” There is a clear set of guidelines to follow, which have been developed by the New York FHWA division office.

Special Projects

Specially funded projects do not affect regional allotments.

For DOT projects, NYSDOT follows state procedures. For local and nonprofit projects, the *Procedures for Locally-Administered Federal Aid Projects* manual is followed.

Other Survey Replies

TIPs drive the STIP.

“TIP Amendments and Administrative modifications are not necessarily STIP amendments and admin. mods. MPO procedures can be more restrictive. NYSDOT encourages MPOs to be consistent with STIP criteria for amendments and admin. modifications.”

Marked “Other” for whether the citizen appointed committee or commission is helpful.

“Currently there is not an appointed committee or commission. The last appointed commission assisted the NYSDOT in the development of our Statewide Master Plan 4-5 years ago. It was not a citizen appointed committee.”

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT)

- Central Office: Emergency Planning, Capital Programming, Highway Design, Bridge Design, Interstates, Long-Term Planning, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Traffic Engineering, Surveys
- Divisions: Maintenance, Preservation
- Shared: Construction/Pre-Construction, Safety Planning/Implementation

“For others responsibility is shared. While Preconstruction is done primarily in Raleigh, on site construction is handled by our Division offices. Safety planning is also done centrally while implementation is a field activity.”

Based on the above survey responses, North Carolina is highly centralized.

CTS staff interviewed Calvin Leggett, who works in the Fiscal Division as the program development director. His division works on the STIP, budgeting, and scheduling. NCDOT’s STIP is a seven-year document, which is beyond the federally required four years. NCDOT has been creating STIPs since the 1970s, before they were federally required.

Department of Transportation Organization

NCDOT’s 14 divisions are responsible for maintenance and do not work on many reconstruction projects. The divisions are responsible for most of the NEPA projects. There are no county roads in North Carolina, putting even greater responsibility on the divisions. The bridge maintenance program and construction/pre-construction are administered centrally. Along with five at-large members, the 14 division engineers make up the [Board of Transportation](#), the chief conduit for project selection. This is the group responsible for approval of the STIP.

The division engineers report to the chief engineer of operations.

Division boundaries were established in the 1950s and are based on relatively equal lane mileage. Boundaries have been examined several times over the last 20 years but have not been changed. This is due in large part to political difficulties more so than the current practicality of the boundaries.

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

Each division receives a formula-driven portion of the funding. Bridge, interstate maintenance, and safety funding within the divisions are assigned to projects centrally. Remaining funds within each division are prioritized with collaboration between NCDOT division staff and local representation within the division. Currently, NCDOT is working on implementation of a more data-driven project selection process. Each division’s portion of the funding was established by state law in 1989.

Communicating Decisions

NCDOT is trying to complete a strategic prioritization process, so what follows is a snapshot of today. Once a preliminary decision is made, a draft STIP is produced and provided to MPOs and RPOs. At this point, prioritization is already known, but budget constraints make it difficult to know which projects will be funded. This draft document provides that information. NCDOT

then meets with MPOs and RPOs and informs them of what is occurring with programming before the final STIP is completed.

Historically, public meetings are held in each division prior to completion of the draft for the purpose of collecting input. Another round of public meetings is held after the draft is produced.

Performance Measures

Performance measures are a work in progress. The current performance dashboard will likely be updated, as NCDOT is currently working on a more detailed internal Web site, many parts of which should eventually be made public (the [dashboard](#) is currently publicly available). Performance measures include crash rates and project delivery.

There is some internal comparison of division performance and no external comparison. These comparisons are difficult, as the “mountain” divisions and “coastal” divisions differ. For example, a “mountain” division may have to stick with an 18-foot roadway width because widening would require blasting of a mountain, a non-issue in a “coastal” division.

Relationships

North Carolina is home to 17 MPOs, 7 of which are TMAs. Although there are some disagreements between MPOs and NCDOT, there is good communication and an overall good relationship. Non-MPO areas are in Rural Planning Organization (RPO) areas. The entire state is located within an MPO or RPO. The RPOs have less-formal relationships with NCDOT than do MPOs because they are subject to fewer federal regulations. NCDOT subsidizes RPOs’ operating funds.

Coordination among Divisions

Most coordination is word of mouth. Divisions meet together roughly 10 times per year. If something is happening on a border or if one division is occupied while another is light on work, they will share resources.

Legislative Oversight

The legislature has to be notified 30 days in advance of a STIP amendment.

STIP Amendment Process

Historically, the process has been formal, starting with the division engineer and a board member in the division signing off on a new project or moving a project. Staff then recommends the amendment to the chief operating officer. If the chief operating officer agrees, the board of transportation and legislature are informed. Following the required 30-day notice to the legislature, it then goes to the board for formal action. Recently, some amendments have been less formal due to the large number of stimulus projects.

Special Projects

Funding outside of normal processes is exempt from the distribution formula. Generally speaking, if, for example, Raleigh is getting funding that would have gone to Charlotte, measures have to be taken to adhere to the distribution formula. However, if North Carolina gets funding that could have been used in another state, there is no need to adhere to the formula. If a local

entity receives funding not requested by the state, NCDOT will pass the money through to the local entity, which must develop the project. NCDOT will develop projects funded by its request.

Other Survey Replies

The STIP drives the TIP.

“Mostly. Sometimes it works the other way. It is collaborative.”

On the question of a citizen appointed committee or commission, “Other” was marked.

“We have a large (19 member) Board that sets policy. In that area they are very helpful. They also by statute deal with several day-to-day issues in which their involvement could be considered more of a nuisance. I feel that a much smaller policy Board would be better.”

OREGON

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

- Central Office: Capital Programming, Bridge Design, Interstates, Long-Term Planning, Safety Planning/Implementation
- Regions: Emergency Planning, Maintenance, Highway Design, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Preservation, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering, Surveys

CTS staff interviewed Jill Scofield, Statewide STIP Manager at Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). She works in the highway division of the Transportation Program Office.

Department of Transportation Organization

Oregon has five regions. It also has nine maintenance districts, but it is the regions that apply to the STIP and program projects. Some programs are managed by the regions, while others, such as the bridge and bike/pedestrian programs are centrally managed. Some other small programs such as fish passage, large culvert improvement, and enhancements are centrally managed as well. The rest of the programs are managed by the regions, except for preservation, half of which is managed by the regions while the other half is managed centrally.

Each region is headed by a region manager who reports to the highway division deputy director. Each region has a STIP coordinator.

Most regional boundaries follow county lines.

Oversight is provided by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The five commissioners are appointed by the governor, “ensuring that different geographic regions of the state are represented. One member must live east of the Cascade Range; no more than three can belong to one political party.” The commission establishes transportation policy and guides planning, development, and management.

Region-to-region, staff classifications and processes are fairly consistent.

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

For funding allocation, the executive staff (directors, region managers, etc.) work with the OTC. OTC decides the overall STIP funding level and how much each program receives. Funding is divided among the programs based on revenue and calculation of needs. Once program funding levels are decided on, each program takes its share and determines how much to allocate to each region. These decisions are data-driven and based on need. The only program with a formula is the modernization program, which is for capacity-adding projects. This formula is based on such things as population, miles, and traffic.

Funds are allotted statewide for the bridge and interstate maintenance programs. Others are distributed to regions with central oversight.

The individual programs each decide how much funding is allotted to the regions. This is a data-driven process based on needs.

Within each region, a team of people in the regional office assembles a list of potential projects to be scoped. In some cases, locals provide a list of priority locations. For the preservation program, a list of segments, and number of miles in those segments, in need of preservation is provided to establish a target. Once a list of potential projects is established, each is scoped to determine costs and limits. A final list of projects is developed; this list goes to the [Area Commissions on Transportation](#) (ACTs), each of which has its own charter. Membership is broad and varies from ACT to ACT. The regions work with the ACTs to determine priorities regarding what projects will go into the program. The decision is ultimately up to the OTC, which approves the program.

Communicating Decisions

As is federally required, the draft STIP goes out for a 45-day public review period. Each region partners with its ACT(s) for at least two public meetings, allowing for public testimony and comment. The program is reviewed in relation to these comments.

Performance Measures

ODOT has an overall performance measurement program with which the interviewee is not familiar. Each program has its own performance measures that feed into program goals. Examples are the number of bridges at a certain condition level and fatality rates.

Performance measures are communicated through ODOT's website. ODOT publishes annually its "State of the System" on the Web. If there is any comparison between regions, it would happen at the program level (e.g., comparing pavement performance levels (fair, good, etc.) to determine funding).

Relationships

MPOs work on the regional and ACT levels. Regional STIP coordinators interact with MPOs to coordinate MPO projects with ODOT projects. MPOs are represented on the ACTs (the Portland MPO has no ACT, but has a [Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation](#) (JPACT); the relationship is similar). MPO projects are locally funded and must be listed in the STIP. The state's three TMAs receive funding directly from the federal government, while other MPOs receive funding from ODOT. These projects are selected by the MPOs.

ODOT's local government section works with local agencies on local projects. Regional local agency liaisons work with localities to program projects.

Coordination among Regions

While the potential for inter-region coordination exists, it is not the norm. Sometimes one region will provide funding to another, and sometimes regions will work together on a project that spans region boundaries.

Legislative Oversight

In terms of the STIP, there is no legislative oversight. The state legislature provides bonding packages. The governor approves the TIPs that go into the STIP. The TIP follows STIP regulations. The STIP must include all TIP projects.

STIP Amendment Process

ODOT has guidelines to help determine what triggers an amendment and what kind of amendment is required. There are two types of amendments: “full” and “administrative.” The latter is for minor changes, such as combining two projects, moving a project to a different year, or other minor changes, and needs approval only from the highway division. More significant changes need a full amendment and OTC (if on the state highway system) and federal approval.

Special Projects

Special projects are handled through a normal STIP amendment. Earmarks, while in the STIP, are not part of the constrained STIP. Barring the inclusion of an enabling-rule condition on how it must be provided, OTC, after recommendations from executive staff, determines how to distribute the funds.

Other Survey Replies

TIPs drive the STIP.

The OTC is helpful.

“Oregon Transportation Commission approves funding levels for the STIP, approves full amendments for projects that are on the state highway system, and approves policies and selection processes.”

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT)

- Central Office: Capital Programming, Interstates
- Districts: Emergency Planning, Maintenance, Highway Design, Bridge Design, Long-Term Planning, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Preservation, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering, Surveys Safety Planning/Implementation

“For every one of the above items, both Central Office and District Offices play the role. I noted the areas that take the lead for the most part in these activities.”

CTS staff interviewed Tucker Ferguson, District 8 engineer at the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT). His move to that position occurred after his fall 2009 participation in Mn/DOT’s Project Management Peer Review, at which time he was employed by PennDOT’s central office.

Department of Transportation Organization

Each of PennDOT’s 11 districts is headed by a district engineer, who reports to the deputy secretary for highway administration, a position fairly analogous to that of a Mn/DOT division director. Under that same deputy director is the chief engineer for highway administration, who oversees the Bureaus of Maintenance & Operations; Construction & Materials; Design; and Highway Safety and Traffic Engineering.

Along with the above information, PennDOT’s organizational chart (dated April 1, 2010) indicates that the six deputy secretaries (roughly analogous to Mn/DOT’s division directors) are the deputy secretaries for Administration, Planning, Local & Area Transportation, Safety Administration, Highway Administration, and Aviation.

District boundaries are drawn on county lines and the interviewee is unsure when (or if) they were last revisited.

Oversight is provided by the [State Transportation Commission](#). The commission consists of 15 members, 10 appointed by the governor and approved by the senate. There are various limitations on membership, including geographic and party line. “The purpose of the Commission shall be to evaluate and determine the condition and performance of the Commonwealth’s transportation system and to assess the resources required to preserve, restore, extend, and expand transportation facilities and services to conserve Pennsylvania’s communities and to ensure economic development of the Commonwealth.”

Pennsylvania also has the [State Transportation Advisory Committee](#). Public members are appointed to three-year terms by the governor (7), President Pro Tempore of the Senate (6) and the Speaker of the House of Representatives (6). Other membership consists of the Secretary of Transportation, the Executive Director of the Governor’s Policy Office, the chairman of the Public Utility Commission, the Secretary of Community & Economic Development, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Environmental Protection, the Secretary of Agriculture, two members of the house of representatives appointed by the speaker and not from the same

political party, and two members of the senate appointed by the president pro tempore and not from the same political party.

District-to-district staff classifications are essentially consistent. All employee classifications are controlled out of PennDOT's central office Human Resources Bureau, which monitors consistency across the state. The only difference is the number of employees in each district, which relates to such factors as how many counties are in the district and the size of the bridge and roadway system. Similarly, practices are essentially the same across districts. There are likely some subtle differences in project program decision making, due to differing levels of expertise and abilities of planning partners. The interviewee has worked in two districts and the biggest difference he has seen is who is the chair of the MPOs (district engineer vs. non-PennDOT people).

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

PennDOT distributes funding across the state based on a statewide formula. Funding allocation and project programming relate more to MPOs and RPOs than to districts. Every part of the state is contained within an MPO or RPO area. Some funding is allocated to districts (state maintenance funding), but the majority is allocated to MPOs and RPOs.

In terms of programming, PennDOT is decentralized, with the majority of its projects programmed at the MPO/RPO level. PennDOT districts work very closely with MPOs and RPOs, sitting on their technical and coordinating committees and working with them on prioritization. PennDOT districts relay their needs to MPOs and RPOs while the MPOs and RPOs gather needs from local entities. Following that, the district and MPO/RPO get together to create a program. Officially, the MPO/RPO programs the projects, but generally, programs are a result of a consensus reached by the two parties. Each MPO and RPO produces a TIP. The STIP is therefore essentially a collection of the individual TIPs and is automatically amended whenever a TIP is amended.

The central office programs statewide initiatives, a small portion of the state's overall program. For these projects, the district makes recommendations on how funding should be spent. The central office also programs bridge and overlay projects on the interstate freeways, producing the Interstate TIP. Districts receive the money to complete the projects, which are centrally programmed. There is a great deal of regional input for this programming.

Communicating Decisions

PennDOT attends meetings with MPOs and RPOs and publishes TIPs. Information is shared on Web sites, including those of county planning commissions, PennDOT, and MPOs/RPOs. Public hearings are held throughout the state during each two-year TIP cycle. These are open forums in which anyone can champion a project and provide testimony. Information gathered at these forums is provided to the MPOs and RPOs.

PennDOT is undertaking "Linking Planning and NEPA," a key initiative to streamline and better link the planning process with early project development. The purpose is to gather as much information on prospective projects as necessary to make early and informed decisions while

eliminating wasted effort as projects move through the design stages. This initiative is still several months from finalization.

Performance Measures

PennDOT has put a great deal of time into performance measures, of which there are nearly 50, on such things as bridges, project delivery, and project management. Performance measures are reviewed regularly. District performance measures, which are displayed through dashboards, are used to compare districts.

Relationships

PennDOT's relationships with its 23 MPOs and its RPOs are not consistent in terms of participation levels of district engineers. Some MPOs are chaired by district engineers while others are chaired by elected officials or staff members.

Along with MPOs and RPOs, PennDOT deals with county planning commissions, community groups, and elected and appointed officials.

Coordination among Districts

Projects do not cross district lines, so coordination among districts is not a significant need. However, there is an effort to establish regional design centers to allow designers in one part of a state to complete work for another part of the state. This was initiated in large part in response to engineer attraction and retention difficulties in urban districts.

Legislative Oversight

There is minimal legislative oversight. Legislators sit on MPO committees.

STIP Amendment Process

As discussed above, the STIP is driven by the individual MPO and RPO TIPs. TIP amendments essentially automatically trigger STIP amendments. When a TIP is in need of an amendment, it is taken to the MPO/RPO technical committee (consisting primarily of local engineers), which forwards recommendations to the coordinating committee (consisting primarily of elected and appointed officials). The coordinating committee approves amendments.

Special Projects

For projects funded outside of normal processes (e.g., projects that received funding through congressional appropriations or via state legislature), PennDOT has discretion, barring specific legal requirements. As an example, the recent stimulus funding was distributed through the basic proportional funding formula while the "Smooth Roads Initiative" (a special one-time legislative initiative) saw equal distribution among each district.

Other Survey Replies

TIPs drive the STIP.

PennDOT stated that commission is helpful.

TEXAS

Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT)

- Central Office: Emergency Planning, Capital Programming, Safety Planning/Implementation
- Districts: Maintenance, Highway Design, Bridge Design, Interstates, Long-Term Planning, Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Preservation, Modernization/Capacity Expansion, Construction/Pre-Construction, Traffic Engineering, Surveys

“TxDOT divisions are assumed to be the Central Office. Some highway and bridge design, planning and maintenance is done in the central office/divisions, but most are done in districts or through consultants.”

CTS staff interviewed David Plutowski, unified transportation engineer from the Finance Division—Programming and Letting Branch.

Department of Transportation Organization

The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has 25 districts and roughly 20 divisions. The divisions, located at the central office, include bridge and maintenance, among others. Within the last two years, TxDOT has divided the state into four regions. These regions have taken on some division tasks, such as planning and maintenance.

Districts have remained the same for roughly the past 15 years, starting at a time at which TxDOT was going to reduce the number of districts. Local outcry stopped it, resulting in an increase from 24 to 25 districts.

The department is overseen by the five-member, governor-appointed [Texas Transportation Commission](#). The commission’s five members are appointed to six-year terms by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. The governor designates one member as chair. The commission oversees planning and policymaking; highway design, construction and maintenance; statewide transportation plan development; awarding of contracts; mass transportation development; and adopting rules for department operations.

TxDOT’s four regions will assist districts in organizing resources and staff. TxDOT has policies and procedures for many tasks and work, including the [Texas Administrative Code](#).

Funding Allocation and Project Programming

Texas has a very complex allocation process. TxDOT takes federal funding and moves it into the following 12 state funding categories:

1. Preventative Maintenance and Rehabilitation
2. Metropolitan Area Corridor Projects
3. Urban Area Corridor Projects
4. Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects
5. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement
6. Bridges
7. Metropolitan Mobility/Rehabilitation
8. Safety
9. Transportation Enhancements

10. Supplemental Transportation Projects (earmarks and others)
11. District Discretionary
12. Strategic Priority

Depending on category, allocations are provided to the MPOs, districts, or statewide. Projects in funding categories 1 and 11 are selected by the districts. Projects in funding categories 2, 3, 5, and 7 are selected by MPOs in consultation with TxDOT. For example, in funding category 5, a formula using population and an emissions multiplier is utilized. Projects in funding category 12 are selected by the Texas Transportation Commission. Projects in funding categories 4, 6, 8 and 9 are selected statewide. For example, category 6 (bridges) is prioritized statewide based on functional obsolescence and structural deficiency. Projects in funding category 10 include earmarks and multiple other programs, such as the curb ramp program for ADA compliance and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department projects. Some categories have formulas based on pertinent factors such as population, traffic, and pavement condition. For some others, TxDOT central office works with the MPOs to determine “fair share.”

There are also innovative funding sources such as bonds, revolving loans to local entities, and comprehensive development agreements (public-private partnerships). Many of the latter are toll road projects.

Communicating Decisions

The Unified Transportation Program (UTP), which is approved by the Texas Transportation Commission, is the primary source for communicating allotments to MPOs and districts. It is also subject to public review. In terms of public outreach, TxDOT is looking at Virginia DOT in terms of how to transparently display projects. TxDOT has a practice in development that involves posting projects on the Web, enabling users to click on a project and view key information.

Performance Measures

Performance measures are currently in development.

Relationships

Districts work most directly with MPOs. There is talk of establishing rural planning organizations, in order to be more inclusive of rural areas in programming and project selection.

Local Funding

Local matches are used for off-system roadways. Local contributions are sometimes made above and beyond the match (e.g., a retailer paying for an extra turn lane). Local contributions are not “charged against” local and regional allocations from TxDOT.

Coordination among Districts

Districts can transfer funds amongst each other, with the understanding that the funding will be reimbursed or paid back. The regions are also promoting resource sharing between districts.

Legislative Oversight

The legislature requires TxDOT to provide funding to other state agencies. While the legislature critiques whether the right projects are programmed, there is no direct oversight, except when the legislature appropriates funds to projects or districts through riders in a bill. Per the legislature, the State Auditor's Office is currently examining TxDOT's organization/structure and its processes and procedures. Also, development of performance measures is part of the recommendations.

STIP Amendment Process

The STIP traditionally undergoes quarterly revisions, but recent ARRA funding has led to monthly updates/revisions.

Special Projects

When projects are funded outside of the normal process, the funds do not "count against" regional and local allotments. For ARRA funding, TxDOT went to the districts for prioritized wish lists prior to the signing of the bill, and then later shortlisted projects to be fiscally constrained.

Other Survey Replies

TIP projects drive the STIP.

TxDOT marked "Other" for whether the citizen appointed committee or commission is helpful.
"Our commission is appointed by the Governor of Texas"

APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONS

A brief survey was sent via e-mail link to a recipient from all states. Recipients were chosen based on job title or division/office. In some cases, when it was difficult to find employees by title, the survey request was placed in a general contact form on the state Web site. The survey was conducted via SurveyMonkey™ and consisted of four questions. They were:

1. State:

2. Can you denote whether the following are functions of the Central Office or the districts/regions?

	Central Office	Divisions/Districts	N/A	Other
Emergency Planning				
Capital Programming				
Maintenance				
Design-Highway				
Bridge Design				
Interstates				
Long-term Planning				
Env. Impact Statements				
Environmental Assessments				
Preservation				
Modernization / Cap. Expansion				
Construction / Pre-Construction				
Traffic Engineering				
Surveys				
Safety Planning / Implementation				
Others (Explain Below)				
Explanation				

3. Do STIP projects drive the MPO TIPs? Or do MPO TIP projects drive the STIP? In other words, does a STIP amendment create an automatic change to the applicable TIP or does a TIP amendment create an automatic change to the STIP?

- STIP drives TIP
- TIP drives STIP
- N/A-Neither-other
- Other (please specify):

4. If your state has a citizen appointed committee or commission, does it get in the way of DOT business or is it helpful. Please explain (and include the name of the committee).

- Gets in the way.
- Helpful
- Other (explain)

APPENDIX B: TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- Please describe how your DOT is organized. Is your state divided into districts/regions? Do you have centralized “expert offices” (e.g. Bridge, Planning, Maintenance, etc.)?
 - How many districts/regions do you have?
 - To whom does the top person in your district/region report?
 - Do the districts/regions show up on your org chart? (Can you email me an org chart?)
 - How are/were regional boundaries determined? Are they ever revisited?
- Can you describe the decision-making process for funding allocation and programming projects?
 - Are funds allotted to districts/regions or are programs funded statewide? If it differs by program, please state which programs are funded on a statewide basis.
 - Who determines, and how is it determined, how much funding is allocated to the districts/regions?
 - Who determines, and how is it determined, which projects are funded within the districts/regions?
 - Is there a formula for determining regional “fair share”?
- How are these decisions communicated?
 - Within the DOT?
 - Externally?
 - Mn/DOT has “Hear Every Voice”, employee training to assure public outreach during program planning. Does the DOT have anything similar to assure outreach to the public during program planning?
- Can you describe your DOT’s performance measurement activities and performance measure categories? Do you manage based on performance?
 - How do you communicate success in hitting performance targets?
 - Do you compare performance of the districts? How?
- Can you describe your relationships with MPOs? Do you have relationship with other regional bodies, such as non-MPO regional planning bodies?
- Are roadway construction projects funded by local-option sales taxes? If so, is such a tax likely to negatively impact a regional/local “share” of DOT funding?
- Do districts have a mechanism for coordinating projects/programs and/or resource sharing?
- Can you describe the direct level of oversight/approval from by the state legislature?
- Describe your STIP amendment process.
- How does your state handle funding of projects outside of your normal process? For example, projects that received funding through the congressional appropriations process or via your state legislature.

Follow-up E-mail Questions

- District-to-District (or region, or division), are staff classifications essentially consistent? Are practices essentially consistent?
 - If you could provide examples or expansion on similarities or differences across districts, that would be helpful. Additionally, do your urban district(s) differ from your lower-populated districts?
- If you have a link to any formulas for funding allocation, can they be provided?