Transitioning to MAP-21

Getting the Most Out of the Program
State Smart Transportation Initiative

Practical Solutions to Move America Forward.

A network of reform-oriented state DOTs, founded in 2010 and housed at the University of Wisconsin.
The State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI), housed at the University of Wisconsin, promotes transportation practices that advance environmental sustainability and equitable economic development, while maintaining high standards of governmental efficiency and transparency.

SSTI operates in three ways:

• As a source of direct technical assistance to the agencies on transformative and replicable smart transportation reform efforts.

• As a resource to the wider transportation community, including local, state, and federal agencies, in its effort to reorient practice to changing social and financial demands.

• As a community of practice, where participating agencies can learn together and share experiences as they implement innovative transportation policies.
Framing the discussion

• Where we started

• How we got to where we are today

• Where we are going
  – Performance measures
  – Data driven decision making
  – Funding and balancing investments
  – Vocabulary
Where were we before ISTEA

- FHWA’s website shows 24 States record no federal aid program spending on bicycle/pedestrian programs between 1988 - 1991
Shifting the paradigm

• ISTEA
• TEA-21
  – SRTS pilot program
• SAFETEA-LU
  – SRTS a regular program
  – NMTP pilot program established
Changing attitudes, policies

- Massachusetts, one of the states spending nothing out of their federal highway aid, now has a goal of tripling mode share for bike, pedestrian, and transit by ??

- Part of GreenDOT sustainability efforts.
MAP-21 and TAP – Shifting the Paradigm

- Combines infrastructure and education programs
- Less money
- Requires competition for funding
- Restricts project sponsorship
- Eliminates adult safety education programs
- Reduces non-transportation spending options, e.g. museums and welcome centers
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**Previous Bill**

- 2011 - $1.2 billion for biking and walking programs
- Safe Routes to School: $202 million
- Transportation Enhancements: $928 million
- Recreational Trails: $97 million

**Current Bill**

- 2013 - $809 million
- Transportation Alternatives
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The workshop

- State DOTs
  - Arizona
  - Delaware
  - Kansas
  - Massachusetts
  - Minnesota
  - Tennessee
  - Vermont
  - Washington

- MPOs
  - Denver
  - Madison
  - Memphis
  - Minneapolis
  - Tucson

- Co-facilitator Jennifer Toole, Toole Designs

- Tour guides, Transportation for Livable Communities
Role of MPOs in MAP-21 and TAP

• More efficient process that are better able to provide direct benefits to MPO residents when projects locally driven.

• Particularly when state DOTs allocate funds directly to the the large "TMA" MPOs >200,000 pop.
Project selection

- Goal is to serve a transportation need
- Scoring
  - Connectivity
  - Safety
  - Compatibility with community plan
- Assess projects separately from funding
Project selection (cont’d)
Dollars in, dollars out

• Adding funding for bike-ped projects
  – Surface Transportation Program (need not transfer)
  – Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
  – Highway Safety Improvement Program
  – State and local sources
    • Discretionary funds
    • Technical assistance
    • Toll revenues
    • General or transportation funds

• Moving funding out
  – Combining TAP funds with STP could be efficient if the expectation is to use funds for bike/ped
Data-driven decision-making

• Performance measures lacking
• Before-and-after assessments beneficial
• Sources for assessing projects and systems
  – Bike, ped counts to determine demand
  – Crash and fatality data
  – Bike and ped LOS
  – Resident surveys
  – Gap analysis
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Scenario planning

• Encouraged by MAP-21
• Allows for varying land uses
• Analytics and visualizations helpful
  – LUTSAM
**Intrastate funding allocation**

- Allow TMAs to compete for state-held share of TAP
  - Large metros have most of the need for bike-ped facilities

- Or don’t
  - Smaller areas have many worthy projects
  - “Geopolitical balance”
Safe Routes to School

- Education component competes with infrastructure
- 20 percent match may discourage school districts
- Cannot spend TAP funding on adult safety education
- Some strategies:
  - Set aside a portion of TAP for non-infrastructure SRTS
  - Supplement federal dollars with state to help meet the 20 percent match
  - Use HSIP for safety improvements or safety education
Communication

- “Alternatives” little better than “Enhancements”
- Stop describing agency’s work as “highways”
- Show that bike-ped projects add efficiency to the system
- Show that bike-ped projects, and compatible land use development, add to livability and property values

A 10-point increase in Walk Score increases office and retail property values by up to 9% depending on property type. For example, all else being equal, an office or retail building with a score of 80 is worth 54% more per square foot than one scoring 20.
— Gary Pivo, University of Arizona
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