



State Funding for RDO Administration

Regional Development Organizations (RDOs), also known as Regional Planning Commissions (RPC), Regional Councils, Area Development Districts (ADD), or Councils of Government (COG), are member organizations that guide the development of public and private resources. RDOs support major community and regional planning goals such as infrastructure improvement, economic development initiatives, community planning, and more.

RDOs are funded through various sources. These range from Federal Departments (like the Economic Development Administration (EDA) or the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), State Departments of Commerce or Departments of Planning, and/or some funding through tax dollars or membership dues. Funds provided via governmental entities are usually designated for a specific project or task(s), leaving RDOs limited financial resources for their administrative planning and support. Internal administrative tasks and planning staff, not tied to any specific project, are crucial for the success of RDOs contributing to operational success and efficient resource allocation.

The National Association of Development Organizations Research Foundation (NADORF) recently conducted a survey to better understand how state agencies financially support non-project-based administration of their RDOs. The survey questions inquired about state sources for administrative funding and potential contingencies to use the funds directly for administration. NADORF primarily engaged the NADO Board via email; however, the team also collected data via phone calls and emails with other state and regional planning contacts.

Table 1, below, represents responses received from 23 reporting states, 22 of which did receive some amount of state funding related to administrative activities. Much of the funding appeared to be tied to a specific program or activity, limiting the direct funds available for internal administration. The rightmost column in Table 1 shows whether funds are specifically designated for internal RDO administration ("Administrative") or if the funds contain some contingency tied to a specific program or goal ("Programmatic"). Additional data from each state can be found in the narrative portion of the report.

Table 1: Funding Levels by State

State	Funding Agency	Frequency	Amount	Match Required	Programmatic vs. Administrative
Idaho	No administrative state funding is currently provided to Idaho RDOs				
Kansas	KS Department of Commerce	One Time (FY24), with an application process	\$100,000/RDO within a specified region	None	Programmatic
Alaska	AK Department of Transportation	Annual, multi-year agreement	\$150,000 for a single RDO	None	Programmatic
Arkansas	AR Act 118 Funding	Annual	\$100,000/RDO		Administrative
Colorado	CO Office of Economic Development	Annual	\$26,000/RDO	50% match required	Programmatic
	CO Office of Transportation	Annual	\$26,000/RDO	None	Programmatic
Iowa	IA State Legislature - Iowa Economic Development Authority	Annual, subject to appropriation	\$20,588/RDO	None	Administrative
Kentucky	KY Department of Local Government through Joint Funding Administration	Annual	\$3,984,000 total distributed based on formula	None	Programmatic
Maine	ME Department of Transportation	Annual	\$52,000/RDO	None	Programmatic
	ME Department of Agriculture, Conversation, and Forestry	Annual	\$23,500/RDO	None	Programmatic
	Community Development Block Grant – Technical Assistance (TA)	Annual	\$35,000/RDO	None	Programmatic
	Northern Border Regional Commission – TA	Annual	\$30,000/RDO	None	Programmatic
	ME Governor’s Office of Policy Innovation and Future via the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	Annual, guaranteed for five years	\$100,000/RDO	None	Programmatic

State	Funding Agency	Frequency	Amount	Match Required	Programmatic vs. Administrative
Michigan	MI Department of Transportation	Annual, through contracts and work plans – most with multi-year commitment	Total amount not specified. The breakdown of funding sources is as follows: 25.5% Federal Sources, 51.4% State Sources, 23.1% Local Sources	None	Programmatic
	MI Economic Development Authority			None	
	MI Housing Development Authority			None	
	MI Department of Environment			None	
	MI Great Lakes and Energy			Yes – amount not specified	
	MI Department of Natural Resources			Yes – amount not specified	
	MI Infrastructure Office			None	
Minnesota	MN Department of Transportation	2-year contracted funding	\$75,000/RDO	15% match required	Programmatic
Missouri	MO Office of Administration	Annual, subject to appropriation	\$25,000/RDO \$65,000/MPO	1:1 match required	Administrative
	MO Department of Transportation	Annual	Average \$90,000/RDO	20% match required	Programmatic
Nebraska	NE Department of Economic Development	Biannual	\$500,000 - \$1,000,000 total distributed based on formula	None	Programmatic
New York	NY Department of Environmental Conservation	Annual, with a five-year base contract	Varies based on RDO work agreement	10% match required	Programmatic
New Mexico	NM Department of Finance and Administration	Annual, subject to appropriation	\$99,000/RDO		Administrative
North Carolina	NC Department of Commerce	Annual	Varies based on state established formula, limited to specific geographic area	30% match required	Administrative
Ohio	OH Governor's Office of Appalachia	Annual, via an application process	\$210,000/RDO limited to a specific geographic area		Administrative

State	Funding Agency	Frequency	Amount	Match Required	Programmatic vs. Administrative
Oklahoma	OK Department of Commerce	Annual, with varying amounts each year	\$37,000/RDO		Programmatic
	OK Department of Transportation – SPR Funds	Annual	\$225,000 variably distributed	20% match required	Programmatic
Pennsylvania	PA Partnerships for Regional Economic Performance	Annual	\$300,000/RDO		Programmatic
South Dakota	SD Governor’s Office of Economic Development	Annual	\$40,000/RDO	None	Programmatic
Tennessee	TN Economic and Community Development Department	Annual	\$330,000 total distributed based on formula	None	Programmatic
Virginia	VA Department of Housing and Community Development	Annual	\$114,971 for 18 RDOs; \$152,957 for 1 RDO; and \$190,943 for 2 RDOs	None	Programmatic
West Virginia	WV Department of Economic Development	Annual	\$36,000/RDO	None	Programmatic
Vermont	Vermont Agency of Commerce and Community Development	Annual	\$663,669/RDO	None	Administrative

Major Findings:

1. Many funds listed in Table 1 are not fully designated to administrative tasks and RDOs must creatively support broad administrative function.
2. The most common schedule for this type of funding is annual.
3. A majority of RDOs receive the same amount of state administrative funding, though amounts can vary based on workplans and/or state formulas for disbursement.

Additional Information by State:

Idaho (Reported by Frontier Community Resources – Region IV Development)—No state-funded grants for administrative tasks are currently provided to Idaho EDDs.

Alaska (Reported by Southeast Conference)—The Alaska Department of Transportation provides funding to some Alaska RDOs that may be used for administrative tasks. These funds are provided through a multi-year agreement and currently, only one RDO receives \$150,000/year. The Southeast Conference reports that this funding is unique to their organization and awarded based on an established workplan. Funds can be used for planning, feasibility studies, public engagement, research, or related tasks. No match is required.

Arkansas—The State of Arkansas supports the administration of their Planning and Development Districts (PDDs) through funding distributed via Arkansas Act 118. The act was established in the late 1960s when the planning districts were officially designated. Each Arkansas PDD receives \$100,000 annually that may be used to support the direct administration of their organization or programs.

Colorado (Reported by Region 9 Economic Development District of SW Colorado)—Beginning in about 1990, the Colorado Office of Economic Development and the Colorado Department of Transportation both have provided funding to Colorado EDDs that may be used for programmatic administration. It is reported that both organizations provide \$26,000 annually to Colorado EDDs. The Region 9 Economic Development District reports using the Office of Economic Development dollars to administrate their Enterprise Task Zone program and the DOT grant to support their SW Transportation Planning Region through administration of meetings and meeting travel. Both funding sources provide the same level of funding to all Colorado RDOs, while the metropolitan region receives a different funding amount. The Office of Economic Development funds require a 50% match; however, no match is required for the DOT funds.

Iowa (Reported by Region XII Council of Governments)—The Iowa State Legislature provides \$350,000 annually, divided equally among all Iowa Council of Governments, averaging about \$20,000/COG. These funds are available to be used for administrative tasks and began in 1990. The funding is appropriated through the Iowa Economic Development Authority and although there are no specific tasks required, the funds must be used for work in one of the following categories: Support for Economic Development, Governmental Services, Infrastructure, Workforce Development, and Other. No match is required for this funding and the total amount provided varies from year to year.

Kansas (Reported by North West Kansas Planning and Development District)—The Kansas Department of Commerce provided a one-time administrative support grant to Kansas RPCs in FY24. The total funding available was \$100,000 and required an application to receive funds. Four out of seven Kansas RPCs received funding for activities contributing to the State of Kansas “Framework for Growth”. No match was required. This grant was not renewed in FY25.

Kentucky (Reported by Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA) and Pennyryle Area Development District)—Kentucky ADDs have been provided with administrative support funds through the Department for Local Government via the Joint Funding Administration (JFA) since about 1970. The current biennium budget allocates \$3,984,000 in annual funds to be distributed among Kentucky ADDs using the following formula: 70% even split, 20% proportion of state’s population, 10% proportion of state’s units of local government. Funds are provided annually and billed quarterly. The JFA requires an established [scope of work](#), which includes activities such as CEDs writing and intergovernmental activities. No match is required for these funds.

Maine (Reported by the Northern Maine Development Commission)—Multiple state departments provide Maine Development Commissions some level of funding that may be used for programmatic administration. Since 1994, the Maine Department of Transportation has provided \$52,000 to all Maine Development Commissions annually, with no match required. Tasks for this funding primarily focus on transportation planning activities. The Maine Department of Agriculture, Conversation, and Forestry also has provided administrative funding since 1994. All Maine RPOs receive \$23,500 for use in land use planning activities. No match is required for this funding. Additionally, Community Development Block Grant Technical Assistance funds, since 1990, and Northern Border Regional Commission Technical Assistance funds, since 2015, annually support RPO administrative activities related to community technical assistance. RPOs receive \$35,000 and \$30,000 for each grant, respectively. No match is required. Maine Development Commissions also receive funding of \$100,000 from the Governor's Office of Policy Innovation and Future (GOPIF) via the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The Maine GOPIF funding started in 2024, with an annual guarantee for 5 years. Tasks for these funds focus on Regional Resilience Planning and there is no match required.

Michigan (Reported by Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission)—Michigan RPC’s receive programmatic administrative funding support from a variety of sources. These include Michigan Department of Transportation, Michigan Economic Development Administration, Michigan Housing Development Authority, Michigan Department of Environment, Michigan Great Lakes and Energy, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, and the Michigan Infrastructure Office. These funders provide various levels of financial support to Michigan RPC’s that vary based on the type

of funding and the type of programming conducted by the RPC. The total amount of funding provided was not specified; however, the breakdown of sources is as follows: 25.5% Federal Sources, 51.4% State Sources, and 23.1% Local Sources. These funding sources all began at different times and match is only required for the Great Lakes and Energy and Department of Natural Resources funds. All other funding sources that are not grants do not require match. Most of this funding is provided annually based on contracts or work plans, while some run on multi-year contract cycles.

Minnesota (Reported by East Central RDC / Upper MN Valley Regional Development Commission)—It was initially reported that Minnesota RDCs do not receive administrative funding of this kind; however, an updated submission notes that Minnesota RDCs receive funding from the Minnesota Department of Transportation that may be used to support administrative tasks related to transportation planning. This funding first became available in 1980 and is distributed bi-annually for a 2-year contract period. Each RDC receives \$150,000 throughout the 2-year contract period and there is a 15% match required.

Missouri (Reported by Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments)—The Missouri Office of Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation both provide funds to Missouri RPCs that are used for administrative tasks. Both are annual funds; however, the DOT dollars are subject to appropriation. The Office of Administration has provided \$25,000 per year to Missouri RPCs and \$65,000 per year to Missouri MPOs (Metropolitan Planning Organizations) since 1973. The funding is consistent across organizations of the same type (MPOs vs RPCs). These funds are unencumbered and require a 1:1 local cash match. The Department of Transportation provided \$1,528,500 (total) in FY25 to all Missouri RPCs based on a funding formula that accounted for size, geography, and demographic factors – averaging \$90,000/RPC. These funds are provided annually and the RDO must use them for transportation related tasks including community and stakeholder engagement, administration of the advisory committee, and development of a Statewide Transportation Plan. There is a 20% local cash match required and these funds have been available since 1994.

Nebraska (Reported by Southeast Nebraska Development District)—Nebraska EDDs receive administrative funding support through the Nebraska Department of Economic Development. Nebraska does not currently utilize RDOs, so administrative funding is provided directly to the EDDs. Nebraska EDDs receive a portion of the budgeted total of \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 biannually, determined by a formula with the following considerations: base amount + number of jurisdictions served + population. Work plans are required to receive this funding and tasks generally align with the EDDs EDA scope of work. These funds have been available since about 2015. No match is required for these funds.

New Mexico (Reported by the South West New Mexico Council of Governments)—The State of New Mexico Department of Finance and Administration provides funding to COGs that may be used to support administration. Each COG receives \$99,000 annually, this however is subject to appropriation. These funds can be used to support the direct administration of the COG.

New York (Reported by Lake Champlain – Lake George Regional Planning Board and Southern Tier Central)—New York Regional Councils access New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DOEC) ([Clean Water Act Section 604b](#)) funds to support administrative activities. These funds are provided through five-year base contracts in which the Regional Councils commit to annual work plans of various involvement. The funds are released annually, and the councils receive various amounts, based on their work plan agreement. Lake Champlain reported receiving between \$140,000 and \$150,000. The funds must be used for tasks outlined in the work-plan but may include: water quality planning and grant writing, state Drinking Water Source Protection Plans, and MS4 Programs. A 10% match is required, and the funds have been available since about 2000. Although these funds were reported as administrative by Lake Champlain, the Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development organization reports receiving no direct state administrative support; the NY DOEC funds seem to be more programmatically focused.

North Carolina (Reported by the Foothills Regional Council)—The North Carolina Department of Commerce distributes Appalachian Regional Council (ARC) funds to support administrative activities for some North Carolina Regional Councils. To be eligible for this funding, the regional councils must be located in counties designated as Appalachian by the ARC. These funds are provided annually, since 2023, and allocation amounts to the regional councils vary based on the state tier system. The Foothills Regional Council reports receiving \$27,500/year which they are required to use for LDD planning work in their 4-county region. There is a 70/30 match required for these funds.

Ohio—Ohio RDOs receive administrative support from the Ohio Governor’s Office of Appalachia. These funds are provided to four RDOs that support 32 designated counties within the Appalachian region. The eligible RDOs can apply for an administrative grant of \$210,000 annually. RDOs outside the designated 32 county Appalachian region are not eligible to receive this support.

Oklahoma (Reported by Grand Gateway EDA / Southwest Oklahoma RTPO) —The Oklahoma Department of Commerce provides Oklahoma RDOs with annual funding that may be used for administrative tasks. This funding was established in the 1980s and the grant amount has had significant variance each year. In FY2024, all Oklahoma RDOs received \$37,000 and

were required to use the funds for RPO tasks, specifically focused on tasks that assist communities with economic and community development opportunities. Oklahoma RDOs may also receive Oklahoma Department of Transportation funds that can be used for administrative tasks related to transportation planning. These tasks may include updating various regional transportation plans, updating the website, data collection, grant writing assistance, and administrative tasks related to walkability and safety audits. The OKDOT funds were first distributed in 2009 and OKDOT currently offers \$225,000 annually distributed among some Oklahoma RDOs. There is a 20% match required.

Pennsylvania (Reported by North Central Regional Planning Commission)—The State of Pennsylvania offers approximately \$300,000 in state funding per year to each Planning Commission in the state. This funding is provided as a part of the Partnerships for Regional Economic Performance (PREP) program. These funds support administrative tasks related to business services, business lending, and other regional planning and development governmental procurement services. Some RPCs administrative costs are eligible expenses to be reimbursed by these funds.

South Dakota (Reported by Northeast Council of Governments / South Eastern Council of Governments)—The South Dakota Governor’s Office of Economic Development (SD GOED) provides annual funding to each South Dakota PPD that can be used for administrative tasks. Each PPD receives a total of \$40,000 per year since about 1992. While there is a general outline of allowable tasks, RDOs ultimately decide their work activities and are required to report on them. The PPDs are also required to assist on some programs provided by the SD GOED office and attend meetings, or trainings, as needed. There is no match required for this funding.

Tennessee (Reported by MidSouth Development District)— The Tennessee Economic and Community Development Department provides Tennessee RPOs with annual funding to complete regional planning and economic development activities for multiple Tennessee counties. Approximately \$330,000 is distributed based on a formula that is based on proportionality of population and dues collected by local governments. The funding was initiated in 1968, and no match is required. Tennessee RPOs also have contracts with other state agencies that may supply funding for administrative related tasks; however, they were not specified in the response.

Vermont—Vermont Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) are provided funding by the State of Vermont Agency of Commerce and Community Development (ACCD) to carry out functions outlined in state statute ([24 V.S.A. 4345a](#)) pertaining to twenty planning related activities. For FY 2025 the average ACCD allocation per RPC organization was \$663,669. Other

Vermont state agencies contribute similar funding to RPC organizations for related planning activities including emergency management and transportation. No match is required for this funding.

Virginia (Reported by New River Valley Regional Commission)—The State of Virginia has provided funding that supports administrative tasks via the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) since 1969. The RDOs receive varying amounts of annual funding based on state appropriations. The New River Valley Regional Commission reports that 18 RDOs receive \$114,971, 1 RDOs receives \$152,957, and 2 RDOs receive \$190,943. Funds must align with duties outlined in the Code of Virginia - [Chapter 42 Section § 15.2-4208](#), which includes tasks such as identifying issues of regional significance and providing technical assistance. No match is required for this funding.

West Virginia (Reported by Region VII Planning and Development Council and Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission)—The West Virginia Department of Economic Development provides a total of \$396,000 annually that may support West Virginia Planning and Development Councils (PDCs) administrative activity. These funds are distributed evenly among all West Virginia PDCs—about \$36,000 each in recent years. However, the level of funding has fluctuated since the grant’s establishment in 1973. The PDCs must use the funds for the following tasks: infrastructure evaluation, project management, information and funding opportunity sharing, capacity building, and supporting regional and multi-jurisdictional development efforts. No match is required for this funding.

This resource was authored by Program Manager Haley Schultheis with assistance from Associate Directors Bret Allphin and Carrie Kissel. It is published by the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) Research Foundation with support from Main Street America through a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide technical assistance to rural communities. USDOT is an equal opportunity provider. Any opinions, findings and conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agency.