

Land Use and Transportation Scenario Planning Costs Summary of Planning Costs From Reports

OREGON MPOs¹	Scenario Planning Costs
Metro 2040 Growth Concept	\$1,780,000
LUTRAQ	\$1,000,000 plus
Central Lane Region 2050	\$1,000,000
Bear Creek Valley RPS	\$976,718 plus millions of dollars worth of in-kind contributions
Salem Futures	\$500,000 plus
National Case Studies²	
Puget Sound Regional Council (Washington) Vision 2040	\$3,000,000
Sacramento (California) Regional Blueprint	\$1,000,000
San Joaquin (California) Valley Blueprint	\$5,850,000 split equally among 8 MPOs
Charlottesville (Virginia) Eastern Planning Initiative	\$518,000
Envision Missoula (Montana)	\$445,000
Albany (New York) New Visions and Linkage Program	\$400,000 plus
PlanCheyene (Wyoming)	\$335,000
Gainesville (Florida)	\$250,000

¹ Fregonese Associates, Inc., Alternative Land Use and Transportation Planning Case Studies in Oregon A Review of five case studies in Oregon Draft October 14, 2009. See below for details.

² Cambridge Systematics, Inc., State of the Practice Land Use and Transportation Scenario Development A Review of Eight Metropolitan Planning Organization Case Studies, October 30, 2009

Factors affecting the cost of scenario planning: type and level of public involvement, level of tool development, linkages to other associated planning process, and MPO staff size and capabilities (Cambridge Systematics).

Oregon MPO Funding and Staffing³

	Bend	Corvallis Area	Rogue Valley	SKATS	Central Lane	Portland Metro
PL Funding	\$182,000	\$183,000	\$335,927	\$418,363	\$430,135	\$2,448,430
STP-U/L Planning Funding	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$454,725	\$450,000	\$1,156,153
FTA 5303 Funding	\$41,000	\$53,000	\$68,040	\$20,000	\$96,280	\$609,966
Other Funding	\$0	\$34,000	\$72,335	\$208,118	\$0	\$24,832,898
Total FY 08-09 Planning Budget	\$223,000	\$320,000	\$476,302	\$1,101,206	\$976,415	\$29,047,447
Other Funding Sources	None	TGM Grants	Dues and Grants	None	None	General Funds, Grants, Sales, Jurisdiction Contracts
Modeling Budget (Baseline)	\$23,550	\$0	\$0	\$418,000	\$215,000	\$808,258
Planning Support to Local Agencies	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$99,500	\$145,000	\$318,200
Staff/FTEs	2.15	1	3.75	8	5.75	96

³ Oregon MPOs, A Spreadsheet Comparing Oregon's 6 Metropolitan Planning Organizations, September 9, 2009

Metro 2040 Growth Concept⁴

⁴Fregonese Associates, Inc., Alternative Land Use and Transportation Planning Case Studies in Oregon *A Review of five case studies in Oregon* Draft October 14, 2009.

MPO, Other Agency and Consultant Hours and Costs

- Metro Council authorized \$280,000 in 1990 to the consultant team of ECONorthwest, Cogan Sharpe Cogan, Cambridge Systematics, CH2M Hill, Pacific Rim Resources, Decision Sciences, Walker Macy, Saluddin Khan and Ernie Munch for the completion of Phase 1.
- Metro paid approximately \$1.5 million for a public outreach campaign effort that involved workshops, a household survey, published materials, media spots, and a video. This figure includes a Calthorpe Associates contract to conduct a community process in eight regional centers to develop a series of illustrative concepts of what growth could look like.
- Metro dedicated approximately 12 staff to the project including six individuals working full time for three years.

Funding

- Metro 2040 was funded by Metro, ODOT, and Tri-Met, with some funding provided by dues paid to Metro by the cities and counties of the region.
- MPO planning funds provided through the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration were supplemented by regionally allocated "Surface Transportation Program" funds made available for a variety of highway, transit and bike/pedestrian improvements. These were, in turn, matched by ODOT and TriMet.

LUTRAQ

MPO, Other Agency and Consultant Hours and Costs

LUTRAQ:

- 1000 Friends spent \$1 million in the creation of the alternative scenario
- Metro spent \$40,000 to assist with transportation modeling

Western Bypass Study:

- ODOT provided a part-time project manager and one full time staff for the project
- ODOT hired a consultant team to conduct all analysis

Funding

LUTRAQ Funding Sources:

- Federal Highway Administration
- Environmental Protection Agency
- The Energy Foundation
- Metro provided \$40,000 for purchasing the land use forecasting model

Western Bypass Study Funding Sources: ODOT

Central Lane Region 2050

MPO, Other Agency and Consultant Hours and Costs

- \$1 million was spent on the entire process.
- LCOG Staff dedicated to the project included one project manager working nearly full time and GIS staff. LCOG has many in-house capabilities so there was less need to pay consultants.
- Fregonese Associates created a land capacity model

- Region 2050 was staffed by a Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) comprised of the managers and planners from the eleven local governments, LTD, local utilities, the Department of Land Conservation and Development, other state agencies, and the League of Women Voters. They spent 2 hours a month for seven years in meetings.
- Regional Policy Advisory Board was made up of appointed elected officials from each local government, a Lane Transit District Board member and a staff from the Governor's office. The Regional Policy Advisory Board and the RTAC met regularly once a month from 1999-2006.

Funding

- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
- Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program (TGM) in partnership with ODOT
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Transportation modeling was paid for by ODOT

Bear Creek Valley RPS

MPO, Other Agency and Consultant Hours and Costs Required

If in-kind contributions were counted (such as the hours worked at the individual jurisdictions), the costs of the RPS process thus far would be upwards of several million dollars. The vast array of project partners at all levels of government make it hard to calculate hours worked. A project manager at RVCOG worked part time on the project for many years; independent consultants worked for 2.5 years at .5 full time employment (FTE). Assuming one staff member from every jurisdiction works on public involvement and attends meetings, we can assume .5 FTE from each jurisdiction for eight years.

Funding

- RVMPO: \$310,000
- Local Jurisdictions: \$261,998
- State of Oregon: \$319,720
- DLCD RPS grant for \$85,000 awarded in April 2000

Salem Futures

MPO, Other Agency and Consultant Hours and Costs

- A joint program of ODOT and DLCD provided \$500,000 in Transportation Growth Management (TGM) fund for phase two.
- The City of Salem hired McKeever Morris (a division of Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade and Douglas) as the lead consultant for phase two. McKeever Morris subcontracted Davis and Hibbits for \$20,000 to conduct public involvement; Robert Foster Consultants for \$5,000 to provide growth concept illustrations; ECO Northwest for \$36,000 to provide cost analysis of the scenarios; Urban Design Collaborative for \$42,000 to conduct design charrettes and develop illustrations; and Fregonese Calthorpe Associates for \$96,000 to evaluate the base case scenario, conduct a land use analysis of the alternatives, develop graphics, and illustrate the preferred alternative scenario.
- The City of Salem dedicated 2.5 full time employees (FTE) to the project for one year. The City spent another three years with 1 FTE working through the attempt at implementation.

- During phase two, the McKeever Morris consultant team dedicated approximately five half-time employees for approximately one year. The subconsultants to the consultant team likely spent the equivalent of 2 FTE for one year on the project.

Funding

Salem Futures was funded, in part, through grants from:

- Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program
- Portland General Electric
- NW Natural.

United States Scenario Planning Costs⁵

⁵ Cambridge Systematics, Inc., State of the Practice Land Use and Transportation Scenario Development *A Review of Eight Metropolitan Planning Organization Case Studies*, October 30, 2009

Puget Sound Regional Council (Washington) Vision 2040

Funding and Costs

Using the Vision 2040 process as a guide, the total estimated cost for preparing Transportation 2040 is \$3 million. Approximately two-thirds of this cost is for PSRC staff time, while the remaining one-third is for direct costs (consultants and publication materials). An additional cost for Transportation 2040 includes a formal, comprehensive environmental review process required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), which other MPOs may not have to incur. The funding for Transportation 2040 is solely from PSRC general funds, which come from Federal and state sources.

Sacramento (California) Regional Blueprint

Funding and Costs

Although the budget for the Blueprint project was initially \$500,000, the costs have climbed into the low millions. In 2005, the SACOG Board, representing 28 local governments, unanimously approved the Blueprint preferred growth scenario for the region. Congress awarded Blueprint a total of \$775,000 in FY 2004-2005. In 2006, Congress awarded \$875,000 (SAFETEA-LU allocation) in funding to be used for Blueprint implementation. It is worth noting that the total cost included the development or modification of each of the three tools (including the adaptation of I-PLACE3s so that it could be run over the Internet), in addition to the planning and conducting of the workshops. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) does provide state Blueprint grants, but SACOG also contributed significant funding to execute this process.

San Joaquin (California) Valley Blueprint

Funding and Costs

The San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Planning Process is a joint effort of the Council of Fresno Governments, the Kern Council of Governments, the Kings County Association of Governments, Madera County Transportation Commission, the Merced County Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, the Tulare County Association of Governments, and the Great Valley Center. The San Joaquin Valley Blueprint received California State Blueprint grants in Fiscal Year 2008 and 2009 amounting to \$1.35 million. It also obtained a \$4 million grant from the State Business

Transportation and Housing Agency, and an additional \$500,000 in matching funds from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. SJCOG was one of eight MPOs that shared equally the total funding for the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint process.

Charlottesville (Virginia) Eastern Planning Initiative

Funding and Costs

The TJPDC was awarded a Fiscal Year 1999 FHWA Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program (TCSP) grant of \$518,000 to undertake the EPI.

Envision Missoula (Montana)

Funding and Costs

The total expense of the LRTP update was estimated at \$400,000, with the Envision Missoula public participation component costing approximately \$45,000. Missoula County applied for Federal PL planning and other Federal fund sources, passed through by the Montana Department of Transportation(MDT), to cover the majority of this cost.

Albany (New York) New Visions and Linkage Program

Funding and Costs

CDTC staff estimated that the New Visions process (2004 through 2007) would cost over \$400,000, including CDTC staff support of task forces and working groups, as well as related research and technical activities. An additional \$300,000 annually was expended through the Linkages program, which supported New Visions public outreach goals during local strategic planning efforts. Roughly \$4.0 million in Federal, state, and local funds have been committed to the Linkage Program since its inception in 2000. The CDTC primarily utilizes FHWA metropolitan planning (PL) funds for the New Visions planning process.⁵ The Linkage Program, which requires a local match of 25 percent, is primarily financed through CDTC's PL allocation as an MPO with additional funding from Congestion Mitigation/ Air Quality and Surface Transportation Program funds.

PlanCheyenne (Wyoming)

Funding and Costs

A total of \$335,000 of funding came from the MPO, city, county, and parks and recreation were used to support the preparation of PlanCheyenne.

Gainesville (Florida) MTPO 2020 LRTP

Funding and Costs

The Gainesville MPTO is funded by Federal funding for highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian planning, which is provided by the FHWA and Federal Transit Administration. The Florida Department of Transportation matches these Federal funds with both cash and in-kind services. The Alachua County Board of County Commissioners and the Gainesville City Commission provide a local cash match. The Gainesville MTPO 2020 LRTP was funded using these same sources. The cost of the Gainesville 2020 LRTP update was approximately \$250,000, which included the scenario planning exercise.