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Project Scope

- Refresh of 2010 report
- Document
  - MPO organizational structures
  - Staffing profiles and practices
- Case studies for illustrative purposes
Methodology and Participation

- Beta-tested survey instrument (design, content, terminology)
- On-line survey using Qualtrics
  - Dynamic survey logic (55-111 questions, depending on MPO characteristics)
  - Multiple users could collaborate on the same survey, but only one per MPO
- Survey in field for 3 months (Feb-April 2016)
- Participant recruitment
  - Timely AMPO, NARC and TRB reminders
  - State association and notable MPO leader solicitation
  - Targeted direct contact
- 70% participation rate
  - 279 completed all or at least enough to be included in dataset
Map of Participants
MPO Hosting Continuum
Types of Hosting

- More likely to be hosted if the MPO is a non-TMA
- Regional Council is most common host
- Combined, local governments host 36% of all MPOs
Board Size – Voting Seats

- **Wide range of MPO Board sizes**
  - 3 to 105 voting members

- **Measures of central tendency**
  - Median: 12.5
  - Bottom quarter: 9 or fewer
  - Top quarter: 19 or more
  - Mean: 16.7
  - Mode: 11.9
Board Composition – Percent of All Seats

- Municipal elected officials: 42.2%
- County commissioners: 15.4%
- Other: 8.9%
- Municipal elected executive officials: 8.7%
- State departments of transportation: 6.4%
- Countywide elected executive officials: 6.1%
- Public transit authorities: 3.6%
- MPO advisory committee representative: 2.0%
- Private sector representatives: 1.6%
- Regional councils/Councils of government: 1.0%
- Gubernatorial appointees: 0.9%
- Aviation authorities: 0.8%
- Seaport authorities: 0.7%
- Local school districts: 0.4%
- Tribal governments: 0.4%
- Toll or expressway authorities: 0.4%
- Colleges or universities: 0.3%
- Military installations: 0.1%
Board Composition – Voting Rights

- One member-one vote is the prevailing voting structure
  - Allocation of seats by population can give more seats to larger local governments
- Weighted voting
  - 13% of MPOs in the sample
  - Many MPOs with weighted voting have never used it
- “Rotating” voting seats
  - Mostly larger MPOs
  - 24% of MPOs in the sample have a “rotating” voting seat
- Other voting systems: Consensus Voting, Jurisdiction Majority
Number of Employees

- Ranged from 105 to less than one employee
- Several high outliers skew the mean higher. Median is more instructive.

- Median MPO: 5 full-time and 1 part-time employees (6 total)
  - Three-quarters of MPOs have less than 12 total staff
  - A quarter of MPOs have 3 or fewer total staff

### Total Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Q</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Q</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution

- Total Employees: 105
- Min: 1
- Max: 105
- Median: 6
- Mean: 10.5
- Mode: 3
- First Q: 3
- Third Q: 12
MPOs were asked if any staff member spent more than half of his/her time in a specialized area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Percent of MPOs with this Specialty</th>
<th>Median Staff Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand Modeling</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only selected results are shown*
Other Topics in the Survey

- Pay Scales
- Employee Benefits
- Organization Funding
- State Governance
- Performance-based Planning
- Advisory Committees
- Intergovernmental Efforts
- Indirect Rate
- Employee Tenure/ Turnover
- Consultant Work
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