



Community and Economic Development

Avenue SE, Suite 205 • Albany, Oregon 97322
(541) 967-8551 • FAX (541) 967-4651 • TTY/TDD 711

Joint AAMPO/CAMPO Policy Board Agenda

Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2020
Time: 2:30 to 4:30 pm
Location: Oregon Cascades West COG, Upstairs Conference Room
Contact: Dana Nichols, AAMPO; or Nick Meltzer, CAMPO
Teleconference: 541-497-7311, pin #841

1. **2:30 Welcome, Agenda Review, and Introduction** **Staff**

2. **2:35 Public Comment** **Staff**

3. **2:40 History of Collaboration (Attachment A)** **Staff**
 The MPO Policy Boards have met sporadically since AAMPO’s inception in 2013. With greater alignment between the two organizations on the staffing side, there’s an opportunity to ensure collaboration between the two organizations at all levels. Staff has provided an overview of previous agenda topics between the two Policy Boards as a foundation to the discussion topics listed on the agenda.
Action Requested: Discussion

4. **2:50 Highway 20 Discussion (Attachment B)** **Staff**
 - Highway 20 Regional Study
 - ITS Plan
 - Corvallis to Albany Multiuse Path
 - FY 21 UPWP Opportunities*Action Requested: Meet consensus on Highway 20 project plan*

5. **3:30 Merging MPOs Discussion (Attachment C)** **Staff**
 MPOs were created to facilitate continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive regional planning. In our region, Albany and Corvallis have metropolitan planning areas only 2-5 miles apart that share common connections to transportation, housing, and the local economy. Is there a way for the MPOs to work together more closely, or merge? The attached memo provides greater detail about an MPO merge, and discusses potential funding, governance, and transit implications.
Action Requested: Discussion and/or direction

6. **4:15 Calendar of Future Joint Meetings?** **Staff**

7. **4:30 Adjourn**

ATTACHMENT A

Previous meeting topics:

February 2nd, 2016

- Highway 20 Safety Study – DKS Presentation (concerns about shortsighted planning in relation to bottlenecks and capacity were brought up – “at this time ODOT is trying to look at things more realistically and identify what can be done as soon as possible to improve safety along the corridor.” Focus on low cost/high benefit improvements.
- Linn Benton Loop – presentation of ridership numbers, governance of Linn Benton Loop IGA

February 11, 2014

- Linn Benton Loop – discussed budget and operation, transit routes; timeline for governance and stable funding
- Future topics of discussion - regional transit, vanpools, non-emergent medical transportation; human service aspects of transportation options and public transit; transit study to support service to Jefferson

December 12, 2013

- Linn Benton Loop governance and funding
- Oregon passenger rail project – study concerning high speed rail between Eugene – Springfield and the Columbia River area
- Frequency of meeting: suggestion for a twice-annual meeting to discuss common interests. “Parking Lot” list for interesting projects/discussion items should be created by staff and prioritized at a future joint meeting



1400 Queen Ave SE • Suite 201 • Albany, OR 97322
(541) 967-8720 • FAX (541) 967-6123

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 2020

TO: AAMPO and CAMPO Policy Boards

FROM: Nick Meltzer, Corvallis Area MPO Staff
Dana Nichols, Albany Area MPO Staff

RE: **Highway 20 Project Proposal**

Background

The Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO) and the Corvallis Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) received a letter on March 26th, 2019 from Managers and Administrators at Adair Village, Albany, Millersburg, Benton County, and Linn-Benton Community College. The letter focused on the need to begin addressing issues along the Highway 20 corridor between Albany and Corvallis.

Historical Context

This issue is not new to the region, and, in addition to being mentioned in many transportation system plan (TSP) and regional transportation plan (RTP) processes over the last ten years, the Corvallis Area MPO, in collaboration with the Cascades West Area Commission on Transportation (CWACT), submitted a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant application in 2008 to study the same issues. The grant was not funded for reasons undocumented. Brought up again at the most recent joint Policy Board meeting in 2016, the discussion inspired what is currently the Highway 20 safety project. At that time there was conversation the issue should be looked at more broadly, pushback from ODOT likely narrowed the project scope.

Councilor Collins questioned how we are ensuring that recommendations here and investment of money is not being shortsighted and inconsistent with the solutions of bottlenecks and high capacity which are a high priority to the Governor's Transportation Vision Panel (GTVP). Scott advised that bottleneck and capacity issues will be identified during the study and noted in the plan. However; at this time ODOT is trying to look at things more realistically and identify what can be done as soon as possible to improve safety along the corridor. This is the reason why the focus is on low cost/high benefit improvements while identifying the full needs of the corridor and being consistent with local TSP's.

This brings us to addressing the issue today.

Identified Next Steps

Through a follow up conversation with the CAMPO Policy Board, Staff were directed to further define the issues and develop a draft scope of work at a joint Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. Held in September and attended by members of the CAMPO, AAMPO, CWACTION TACs, as well as some of the letter writers, this memorandum serves as a progress update for the Policy Boards. Here are the next steps identified at previous meetings:

1. Develop a mailing list of interested parties/stakeholders. *This is complete.*
2. At the next MPO Joint TAC meeting (September 2019), we will discuss a unified letter to submit to ODOT with a more defined scope. *Completed, see discussion below.*
3. Assess the need of a Highway 20 regional analysis as compared with other priorities. *To be discussed at a later date.*
4. Explore other opportunities to move the conversation forward while providing regular updates. *Ongoing.*

In an attempt to further refine the issues, Staff solicited “concerns” from those present at the Joint TAC meeting on Highway 20, in regards to regional travel between the two metropolitan planning areas. The following is a summary of those concerns:

- Safety and crash history along the corridor, as well as the impacts on regional capacity of delays due to crashes.
- Ensuring solutions are phased for short medium and long term.
- Are the projected volumes from 10 years ago correct? And, how does this influence projections for the next 10 years?
- How much impact can non-automobile travel modes have in reducing regional congestion? How can dedicated transit routes/lanes help this?
- Are there ways to disincentive peak travel through travel demand management?
- Understanding the future cost of improvements is vital so the full funding (i.e. accounting for inflation) can be identified now
- How will regional growth impact travel along Highway 20?
- Oregon DOT is focusing on Interstate-5 alternate seismic routes and this could exacerbate issues on the local system even more
- Part of the analysis should include looking at current, historical and future traffic volumes

As the group further discussed the timeline and geographic scope of the issue, other questions arose:

- a) What immediate improvements can be made to the corridor to improve existing traffic flows? For example, signal timing, adaptive signals, etc. This geographic scope would be limited to downtown Albany and North Albany.
- b) What can be done from a non-infrastructure and infrastructure perspective to accommodate future growth within the region and along the corridor? For example, encouraging alternative work schedules, implementing dedicated transit lanes,

constructing an Albany to Corvallis multi-use path, etc. This geographic scope would include Philomath to Lebanon, along Highway 20 to I-5, and including Highway 34.

- c) Is there a point where growth will exceed the capacity created by interim improvements and require a more expensive investment? I.e. a new bridge across the Willamette. This geographic scope would follow the Philomath to Lebanon area outlined above.

One potential avenue for funding a regional project, in addition to planning dollars from ODOT Region 2, is through the Transportation and Growth Management program. Applications are accepted annually. Both Benton County and the City of Albany discussed contributing local funding as well.

Moving Forward

In the spring of 2019, OCWCOG partnered with the University of Oregon to submit a research project that examined the connection between housing and transportation across the Linn and Benton regions. The plan was to develop a localized housing and transportation index, to determine why residents chose to live where they do, and how that varies by two-income households, different income level households, employment type, etc. The project was not successfully funded, however the conversations related to Highway 20 spurred an idea to develop a similar study for MPO/CWACT consideration.

To help gain an understanding of regional travel, staff are proposing a modified version of this project be initiated. The goal would be to survey employees through their employers to ask a series of questions about how and why they chose to live where they do. These results would be analyzed, mapped and sorted by different demographics. It is our hope that this information would serve as a springboard for additional Highway 20 work. By knowing where people are living and working, it can help determine realistic solutions to the capacity problems along the Highway 20 corridor.

The total project cost for this research study is \$40,000, which could be split between MPOs and across two fiscal years. In short, each MPO could contribute \$10,000 this year and \$10,000 next year of existing PL funds. CAMPO has already set this money aside as "AAMPO Joint Project," and AAMPO has initially discussed incorporating a joint project with CAMPO into next years UPWP.

The scope of work is attached and we welcome comments from the Policy Boards.

Attachment 1: University of Oregon Scope of Work

Attachment 2: Historical Highway 20 Grant

Attachment 1: Scope of Work for Potential Joint Project

DRAFT Scope of Work: Understanding How Transportation Accessibility and Housing Costs

A 1998 study conducted by ECONorthwest for OCWCOG addressed the issue of households' locational choices. The study concluded: "It is difficult to separate cleanly the reasons that individual households and firms make location and structure choices from the reasons that urban areas grow: an urban area grows because households and firms make decisions to locate there."¹ The study found that households value a variety of site and structure characteristics, including:

- **Access to work.** At least one member of each household, and often two members, commutes to work daily.
- **Access to shopping, recreation, friends.** About 70% of all household travel is for non-work purposes. People travel from their homes to shopping, recreation, and other neighborhoods. Households value access to a variety of destinations.
- **Public services.** Households value a variety of public services, some of which vary by location. The quality and price of water, sewer, drainage, and power service typically vary little within an urban area. The quality of other public services, especially schools and police and fire protection can often vary substantially, and have a large impact on a household's location decision.
- **Neighborhood characteristics.** Characteristics of residential neighborhoods—character of development, income, age, and size of households, environmental quality—vary dramatically within a metropolitan area, and are important to households.
- **Land and improvements.** As with businesses, the desire for space varies by household, and households are willing to trade-off space for other attributes, such as accessibility and amenities. Some families, for example, are willing to pay more for space, and use less of it, in areas with especially good schools.

The study summarized the key finding: "The literature is inconclusive on the relative weight of site and structure characteristics in housing location choice. No one disagrees that travel time is an important variable that households consider when making a residential location choice."

With over 70 percent of employees commuting to different communities for jobs and 73 percent of employees driving to work alone, OCWCOG is interested in better understanding how commute options affect household choice decisions.

This proposal describes how a research team from the Institute for Policy Research and Engagement (IPRE) at the University of Oregon will approach the project. This study will analyze the relative importance of the factors listed above, as well as other factors such as housing and transportation costs. Similar to the 1998 study, we propose to conduct an extensive literature review on factors that affect

¹ Analysis of the Regional Economy and Housing for Linn and Benton Counties, ECONorthwest, 1998.

households' locational choices. An employee survey will examine how transportation options influence household choice and which transportation options are desirable.

We proposed to address the following research questions:

- What are the current commute patterns relative to households and jobs?
- How do households decide where to live based on employment, multimodal transportation options, and housing availability?
- How do the decisions vary by income group?
- How do decisions vary for two-income households or households with children?
- Based on the location of households and employers within the region, what are the transportation and housing costs for various types of households?
- Do housing costs vary across the region?
- Do residents tradeoff lower housing costs for higher transportation costs?

SCOPE OF WORK

To better understand the issues facing the region, it is important to understand household choice and the implications for transportation-housing affordability. The study area will include Linn, Benton, and Lincoln Counties and the incorporated cities within those counties.

The IPRE research team will be led by Robert Parker and Rebecca Lewis with support from graduate student researchers from the School of Planning, Public Policy and Management.

Task 1: Regional Employment and Commute Data Collection

The IPRE Research Team will collaborate with GIS staff at OCWCOG to collect data on population and employment, historical development trends, and commute times to develop a baseline understanding of how employees, residents, and visitors travel through the region. This base data collection will influence the employee survey (Task 2) and the transportation-housing affordability index (Task 3.)

Research Questions: What are the current commute patterns relative to households and jobs?

Objective: To understand where people live relative to work based on currently available data; To develop a sampling methodology for Task 2.

Schedule: January-February 2020

Investigators: OCWCOG GIS staff, Lewis, Parker and Graduate Student

OCWCOG Responsibility: obtain data and create maps

IPRE Responsibility: identify data and indicators to collect

Product(s): Spatial dataset; Map series

- 1.1 Obtain spatial data from LODES and US Census American Community Survey
- 1.2 Obtain taxlot data for Linn, Benton and Lane Counties (housing mix, density, year built)
- 1.3 Generate maps and tables of commute patterns using national data
- 1.4 Generate maps and tables of housing mix by city using taxlot data

Task 2: Develop and Administer Employee Survey

Researchers will develop an online survey that asks employees a series of questions related to their employment and subsequent housing decisions. These questions will help ascertain the reason why an individual or family chooses to live in a particular city, to what degree cost and availability of housing played a role, and the approximate costs of their daily transportation. Through these questions, we

hope to further solidify where people work and live across the tri-county region, and their combined housing and transportation costs. Working with the OCWCOG researchers, we will identify a list of major employers within each city in Linn, Benton, and Lincoln Counties. Major employers will distribute the survey to their employee email lists.

Research Questions: How do households decide where to live based on employment, multimodal transportation options, and housing availability? How do the decisions vary by income group? How do decisions vary for two-income households or households with children?
Objective: To understand how residents make location decisions based on employment, income, transportation access, and household characteristics.

Schedule: February 2020-June 2020

Investigators: Parker, Lewis, and OCWCOG transportation planning staff

OCWCOG responsibility: recruit major employers; field test survey; geocode responses
IPRE responsibility: develop survey; submit IRB application; administer survey; analyze results

Product(s): Survey; Survey report

- 2.1 Research previous citizen survey instruments related to housing choice and employment
- 2.2 Identify major employers in region from OCWCOG
- 2.3 Develop survey instrument including housing choice, transportation cost, transportation options, housing costs, and demographic information
- 2.4 Submit IRB application (required for university research with human subjects)
- 2.5 Field test survey
- 2.6 Administer survey to major employers using email lists
- 2.7 Geocode employee survey responses and generate maps
- 2.8 Generate report of survey results.

Task 3: Create Regional Transportation-Housing Affordability Index

Relying on the survey data and commute patterns, the researchers will generate a regional transportation-housing affordability index, based on actual data on transportation costs and housing costs from the survey. This work will build off of the CNT Housing + Transportation Affordability Index and HUD Location Affordability Index. While the national indices utilize readily available existing data sources to develop their indices, this task will refine that work by using actual, collected point data from households. We see this having broad based applications in other regions, through the development of a methodology to localize more specific data. We will generate indices for income quartiles to examine how transportation-housing affordability varies across the income spectrum.

Research Questions: Based on the location of households and employers within the region, what are the transportation and housing costs for various types of households? Do housing costs vary across the region? Do residents tradeoff lower housing costs for higher transportation costs?

Objective: To measure the commute patterns between cities and compute a transportation housing affordability index for the region

Schedule: June 2020-August 2020

Investigators: Lewis and Parker (with OCWCOG GIS support)

OCWCOG responsibility:

IPRE responsibility: compute costs; create typology; create scenarios

ATTACHMENT B

Attachment 2: Scope of Work from TGM Grant in 2006

Project Title: Highway 20 Corridor Plan

Description of Issue: Highway US 20, from west of the City of Philomath to I-5, through the Cities of Philomath, Corvallis and Albany is a narrow 2-lane rural highway that carries a large volume of commuter traffic for jobs in Corvallis and shopping opportunities in Corvallis and Albany. All cities along this corridor are experiencing a growth rate higher than the state growth rate. The existence of the Willamette River, the P&W railroad tracks and the varied land uses along the corridor are the influencing factors in improving the movement of people and goods.

Project Objectives/Expected Outcomes: To review the existing land use, traffic flow and assess the current and future needs of moving people and goods along this corridor. Evaluate all transportation options in relation to land use and the sensitivity of the river and its natural features. Develop a plan commensurate with land use and the surrounding natural areas in cooperation with all stakeholders. The City of Albany has expressed support for this project.



Community and Economic Development

1400 Queen Avenue SE, Suite 205 • Albany, Oregon 97322
(541) 967-8551 • FAX (541) 967-4651 • TTY/TDD 711

Joint AAMPO/CAMPO POLICY BOARD MEMORANDUM

To: AAMPO/CAMPO Policy Boards
From: Dana Nichols & Nick Meltzer, Staff
Date: January 22nd, 2020
Re: MPO Merge Discussion Memorandum

Background

The Corvallis Area Metropolitan Planning Organization was established in 2002 and the Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization in 2013. Per federal definition, these organizations serve to facilitate continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive regional planning within their metropolitan areas, yet the two MPOs are located only 5 – 10 miles apart. While each group of communities face issues unique to their specific geographies, the region as a whole is connected through housing, transportation, and economics. This interconnectedness can sometimes make it difficult to plan for regional scenarios because the issues are often between, and not within, the MPO boundaries.

MPO Merger

The request to investigate a merger of the two MPOs was initiated at recent ACT and MPO Policy Board meetings in an effort to better address issues of regional transportation, and in particular, Highway 20. This conversation is timely, as it is expected that the Rogue Valley and Middle Rogue MPOs will combine to become a Transportation Management Area after the upcoming Census. To aid in the discussion of an MPO merger, staff identified the following questions: Can we merge? What are the implications if we do? And, should we merge?

Of particular interest in a potential merger are the following topics: (1) funding, (2) governance, and (3) transit.

Federal vs. State Regulations

Metropolitan Planning Organizations were established as part the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, for the purpose of including local decision making in the planning and implementation of federal funds in urban areas. Established for an urban area over 50,000 people, the boundaries of MPOs are drawn around the “urbanized area.”¹ If Albany and Corvallis were in another state, it is likely only one MPO would exist, as development would occur along Highway 20. However, due to Oregon’s land use program and Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs), urban development outside UGBs is limited. This leads to two separate urbanized areas in our region.

The federal guidance for establishing MPO boundaries permits more than one urbanized area within one MPO and also states:

(d) MPA boundaries may be established to coincide with the geography of regional economic development and growth forecasting areas.

¹ <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/23/450.312>

Funding

Our MPO’s receive two types of funds. Planning (PL) funds, used for annual short and long range planning work, and Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding, allocated to construction projects every four years.

PL funding comes from a federal allocation that is given to the state to distribute to each MPO on the basis of: population, status of planning, attainment of air quality standards, metropolitan area transportation needs, and other factors necessary to provide for an appropriate distribution of funds to carry out Highway and Transit Program requirements and other applicable requirements of Federal law.²

Our State DOT has four components that make up the funding allocations for MPOs.

- **Component 1** takes money off the top to fund the two bi-state MPOs (Rainier with Longview/Kelso Washington and Freewater with Walla-Walla, Washington) and \$75,000 annually to fund the Oregon MPO Consortium (OMPOC).
- **Component 2** provides baseline funding for data needs in each MPO boundary. Allocations are broken up into four tiers: small non-TMA, larger non-TMA, TMA, and Metro. Money is also set aside for modelling, as this is seen as a significant area of responsibility for an MPO. To normalize modeling costs, ODOT considers the existing costs for the non-TMA models and then estimates comparison costs if ODOT were to provide a similar service to TMAs. Data and modeling account for approximately 29% of the federal allocation.
- **Component 3** accounts for population, and this is where a majority of funds are allocated (55%). It is calculated by percentage of population within the MPO boundary, as compared with the total number of people located in MPOs throughout the state.
- **Component 4** is a factor of complexity: number of jurisdictions, level of Air Quality requirements, requirements to develop a Congestion Management Process, timeline for updating RTS, bi-state MPO collaboration expectations. Weights are shown for each complexity as follows:

<u>Complexity Factor</u>	<u>Weight</u>
1-2 Jurisdictions	1
3-10 Jurisdictions	2
11-20 Jurisdictions	4
21+ Jurisdictions	6
Air Quality non-CMAQ	1
Air Quality CMAQ	2
Congestion Management Process	1
4yr RTP	1
Bi-State MPO Responsibilities	1

Ultimately, since population models are updated every few years, and federal allocation changes annually, exact financial implications of a merger are challenging to estimate. However, we know a few things about each component: Component 1 will remain the same; Component 2 may increase due to increased needs of modeling, but may also decrease due to a reduced baseline funding needed to manage only one organization; Component 3 may provide greater funding based on an increase in geography, and thus population, though we know this will be minimal due to constraints of Urban Growth Boundaries; and, Component 4 will likely remain the same as combined the two MPOs encompass 9 jurisdictions and other factors remain the same.

² 23 CFR 420.109: <https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?rgn=div5&node=23:1.0.1.5.11>

Surface Transportation Block Grant funding is provided to MPOs using a population-based formula set by the Federal government. Merging the two MPOs would only moderately affect the amount of STBG allotted each year, as the population between the two MPOs that would join a single MPO is likely around 2,000.

Governance

In the event of a merger, the MPO will need to “redesignate” and form a new governance structure. There are ways to address issues of geographic balance by establishing rules around voting rights and representation. Intergovernmental balance is often addressed through seat rotation, allocation of seats, and voting weight.³ Seat rotation/allocation is used when the number of seats at the table is less than the number of jurisdictions represented in the MPO. The seat may rotate between certain jurisdictions (smaller cities), or amongst regions, for a certain period of time. The other way to balance voices is to establish weighted voting, where jurisdictions are assigned a number of votes based on population (or some other mechanism). This is a largely uncommon practice, only seen amongst larger MPOs. Other MPOs incorporate more non-voting members as active ex-officio so as to include everyone in the conversation, but limit the number of voting members to simplify the decision making process.

Internally, rather than having a lead staff for each MPO, that position may be consolidated. Additional staffing may be needed to keep up with greater complexity of the organization, however this would likely have a minimal impact on Policy Board governance.

Transit

5303 funding that is provided to the state for apportionment to the MPOs is allocated in the same manner listed above for PL funding. On top of the money that our MPO receives for transit planning, Corvallis Transit System (CTS) and Albany Transit System (ATS) receive federal dollars that pass through the MPOs for both operations and capital purchases.

CTS currently receives nearly the maximum amount of federal funding available for transit operations. In addition to the 5307 money that both MPOs receive, Corvallis also receives money through the 5307 Small Transit Intensive Cities (STIC) program. This funding is provided to a transit agency within a small urbanized area (UZA) when they exceed specific performance factors: passenger miles per vehicle revenue mile, passenger miles per vehicle revenue hour, vehicle revenue mile per capita, vehicle revenue hour per capita, passenger miles per capita, and passenger trips per capita. CTS generally exceeds all of these, which, in 2019, amounted to \$1,309,556.⁴ There is, however, a concern that if the two MPOs combined, these factors would no longer be exceeded because the UZA would now include Albany and Corvallis.

23 U.S.C 134(e)(2)(a) pertains to Metropolitan Planning Areas (MPAs), which are the geographic areas determined by agreement between the MPO and the Governor, in which metropolitan transportation planning processes are carried out. The CFR states that MPA boundaries:

1. Shall encompass at least the existing urbanized area and the contiguous area expected to become urbanized within a 20-year forecast period for the transportation plan;
2. May encompass the entire metropolitan statistical area or consolidated metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Bureau of the Census. So, the UZA(s) is the minimum MPA boundary,

³ https://www.planning.dot.gov/documents/MPOStaffing_and_Org_Structures.pdf

⁴ Performance factors are based on the average level of service for all UZAs with populations between 200,000 and 1,000,000, which are updated every two years. This funding is not guaranteed, and requires that small transit agencies be reevaluated during each cycle to ensure their current numbers meet or exceed the performance factors set by the larger UZAs.

however this does not preclude expansion of the MPA to include areas beyond what is required by federal law.

The FTA currently recognizes Corvallis and Albany as two separate urbanized areas (population between 50,000 and 200,000). Again, due to Oregon's Urban Growth Boundaries, the density for each metro area is contained, with only a small buffer between them. It appears possible to have more than one urbanized area within an MPO boundary (examples exist in Florida, Idaho), which would allow Corvallis Transit System to remain separate from Albany Transit System, for the purposes of retaining funds. It doesn't appear that the two Urbanized Areas will combine in the next census. It's also evident that other areas in the state have more than one transit agency within their MPO boundary. Metro, in Portland, contains both SMART in Wilsonville and Tri-Met, which serves the tri-county region.

Conclusion

The process through which a merger would take place is called "redesignation". 23 U.S.C 450.310⁵ states that an MPO designation shall remain in effect until an official redesignation has been made. An existing MPO may be designated only by agreement between the Governor and units of local government that represent at least 75 percent of the existing metropolitan planning area population (including the largest city by Census designation). It is required when an MPO makes substantial changes to voting membership, or in the decision making authority or responsibility.

Staff provides this information for Policy Board discussion, and welcomes direction on whether we should investigate merging in more detail. If additional research is warranted, MPO staff can provide additional detail on any of the topics listed in this memo, or in other topics that are discussed in-person at the meeting.

⁵ <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/23/450.310>