GVMC

Policies and Practices for Programming Projects

Revised February 14, 2014

Capacity Deficient Project Eligibility

Previously Stated Goal:

The MPO shall make efforts to reduce system-wide congestion and travel times.

TIP Committee recommended Strategy/Practice:

In Kent County, the MPO shall use all available TEDF funding to improve capacity of facilities that are rated or are projected to be rated Level Of Service (LOS) E and F. In Ottawa County, the MPO shall use available federal funding to improve capacity of facilities that are rated or are projected to be rated Level Of Service (LOS) E and F. These projects must be listed in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan prior to implementation through the TIP process. The funding ratios for capacity deficient projects should be set at 80% federal/EDFC with a required 20% local match. The committees may alter this ratio to accommodate funding shortfalls. STP funding may be used for capacity improvement projects in Kent County if the necessity exists to do so due to financial constraint demonstrated in the Long Range Plan.

Explanation:

If a facility has a 24 hour capacity of 24,000, and a 24 hour traffic volume of 18,000, then the V/C Ratio would be 0.75. Using the scale below, this facility would not be eligible for federal funding for the purpose of widening or adding capacity.

LOS Scale

V/C 0.00 - 0.25 = LOS A
V/C 0.26 - 0.50 = LOS B
V/C 0.51 - 0.75 = LOS C
V/C 0.76 - 1.00 = LOS D

V/C 1.01 - 1.25 = LOS E
V/C 1.26 - 9.99 = LOS F

Capacity Deficient

A comprehensive Roadway Infrastructure Management System (RIMS) will be developed and used as an inventory for all federal-aid roadways within the MPO boundary. The information contained in RIMS will be developed by MPO staff, reviewed by each jurisdiction, and approved through the MPO process. RIMS will be updated as information becomes available. All Long Range Plan projects (state and local) will come from RIMS. Data for RIMS will be acquired through various sources, including but not limited to local data submittal, the GVMC traffic count program, MDOT's traffic count program, etc.

All capacity and bridge improvement projects programmed in the TIP will be designed to reduce the congested or projected congested situation through the time period of the Long Range Plan. No improve/expand or bridge projects will be programmed that do not address current and future congestion through the life of the Long Range Plan.

Only projects that increase capacity by adding lanes (thru lanes, center turn lanes, and/or boulevard) should be funded using EDFC funding. Projects that widen existing lanes should not be funded EDFC funds.

GVMC staff will work to develop an improved scope and description of project including specific termini, proposed typical cross section and if required, work on existing structures. New transit routes to be included in the TIP that receive federal funding, must be first justified by current and accurate facts and figures identifying the need, the demand, and funding for such services. A commitment to continue the proposed service beyond the scope of the federal funding must also in place if rider ship meets projections.

Projects located in the high priority corridors will be noted on the deficient project pool listing. Capacity improvement projects shall include in the project as a participating cost any/all elements of planned ITS deployment.

All projects require consideration of Social and Environmental (S/E) impacts through the federal NEPA process. Minor projects, generally within the existing right-of-way, are usually classified as Categorical Exclusions. Projects which add capacity to an existing road or transit facility, and/or involve construction of a new transportation facility often require an Environmental Assessment (EA). The purpose of the EA is to identify the S/E effects of the proposed project and any mitigation required. If, through the EA process, significant S/E impacts are identified, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required. The EIS quantifies all S/E impacts associated with major projects, and identifies the required mitigation measures to address the impacts identified. Extensive public involvement, including a public hearing, and federal/state regulatory agency review, are included in both the EA and EIS processes. Proposed projects involving new or modified access to the Interstate system also require the completion of an Interchange Justification Report (IJR), to assess traffic impacts on the Interstate highway system.

The EA, EIS, and IJR processes may occur prior to inclusion of a project in the MPO LRP, or may occurs as part of the TIP project implementation process, depending on the scope of the proposed project.

This item was passed by the TIP and Technical committees to accept the Capacity Deficient Project Eligibility proposed strategy/practice as submitted.

Condition Deficient Project Eligibility

Previously Stated Goal:

To maintain and improve the system-wide pavement condition within the GVMC MPO boundary.

Strategy/Practice:

The MPO will maintain a Pavement Management System (PaMS). This system will include all necessary data to reasonably manage and improve the pavement condition of the federal aid network. MPO staff will update the condition data on the entire network annually.

Process

The Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) system will be utilized as the basis for determining project eligibility. The PASER survey process will be completed on the entire system in the network annually. Staff representing individual jurisdictions in conjunction with trained GVMC staff will conduct the survey in the GVMC data collection vehicle. Field data for the entire network will be verified by GVMC staff using data and photos collected concurrently using the automated data collection system. GVMC staff will make the final PASER determination. Final PASER ratings will be provided to each jurisdiction in the study area. Upon completion of the data review an annual system condition report will be produced and placed on the GVMC website for public consumption.

Programming/Investment Policy

GVMC shall program federal funds according to the following criteria:

	PASER Investment Scale
PASER 10 – 8	Not Eligible for federal funds
PASER 7	Eligible for crack sealing funding*
PASER 6 - 5	Eligible for sealcoat/thin overlay funding*
PASER 4	Eligible for structural overlay funding
PASER 3 – 1	Eligible for reconstruction funding

* Approved GVMC treatment. Subject to MDOT Programming approval.

Projects that receive funding through the MPO process should be designed and constructed to assure a long lasting improved condition.

Jurisdictions shall use due diligence to properly maintain each facility that receives federal funding. These maintenance strategies could include but are not limited to crack sealing when a

facility reaches a PASER “7”, sealing or thin overlay when it reaches a PASER “6”. Proper maintenance will assure a high level of return on the federal investment.

ASPHALT PASER RATING

Asphalt Surface Rating		Visible Distress	General Condition / Treatment Measures
10	Excellent	None	New construction
9	Excellent	None	Recent overlay, like new.
8	Very Good	No longitudinal cracks except occasional reflection of paving joints. Occasional transverse cracks, widely spaced (40' or greater).	Recent sealcoat or new road mix. Little or no maintenance required.
7	Good	Longitudinal cracks (open 1/4") spaced due to reflection or paving joints. Transverse cracks (open 1/4") spaced 10 feet or more apart, little or slight crack raveling. No patching or very few patches in excellent condition.	First signs of aging. Maintain with routine crack filling.
6	Good	Longitudinal cracks (open 1/4" - 1/2") due to reflection and paving joints. Transverse cracking (open 1/4" - 1/2") some spaced less than 10 feet. Slight to moderate flushing or polishing. Occasional patching in good condition.	Show signs of aging, sound structural condition. Could extend life with sealcoat.
5	Fair	Longitudinal cracks (open 1/2") show some slight raveling and secondary cracks. First signs of longitudinal cracks near wheel path or edge. Transverse cracking and first signs of block cracking. Slight crack raveling (open 1/2"). Extensive to severe flushing or polishing. Some patching or edge wedging in good condition.	Surface aging, sound structural condition. Needs sealcoat or non-structural overlay.
4	Fair	Multiple longitudinal and transverse cracking with slight raveling. Block cracking (over 25 - 50% of surface). Patching in fair condition. Slight rutting or distortions (1" deep or less).	Significant aging and first signs of need for strengthening. Would benefit from recycling or overlay.
3	Poor	Closely spaced longitudinal and transverse cracks often showing raveling and crack erosion. Block cracking over 50% of surface. Some alligator cracking (less than 25% of surface). Patches in fair to poor condition. Moderate rutting or distortion (1" or 2" deep). Occasional potholes.	Need patching and major overlay or complete recycling.
2	Very Poor	Alligator cracking (over 25% of surface). Severe distortions (over 2" deep). Extensive patching in poor condition. Potholes.	Severe deterioration. Need reconstruction with extensive base repair.
1	Failed	Severe distress with extensive loss of surface integrity.	Failed. Needs total reconstruction.

CONCRETE PASER RATING

Concrete Surface Rating		Visible Distress	General Condition / Treatment Measures
10	Excellent	None	New construction
9	Excellent	Traffic wear in wheelpath. Slight map cracking or pop-outs.	Recent concrete overlay or joint rehabilitation. Like new condition. No maintenance required.
8	Very Good	Pop-outs, map cracking, or minor surface defects. Slight surface scaling. Partial loss of joint sealant. Isolated meander cracks, tight or well sealed. Isolated cracks at manholes, tight or well sealed.	More surface wear or slight defects. Little or no maintenance required.
7	Good	More extensive surface scaling. Some open joints. Isolated transverse or longitudinal cracks, tight or well sealed. Some manhole displacement and cracking. First utility patch, in good condition. First noticeable settlement or heave area.	First sign of transverse cracks (all tight); first utility patch. More extensive surface scaling. Seal open joints and other routine maintenance.
6	Good	Moderate scaling in several locations. A few isolated surface spalls. Shallow reinforcement causing cracks. Several corner cracks, tight or well sealed. Open (1⁄4” wide) longitudinal or transverse joints and more frequent transverse cracks (some open 1⁄4”).	First signs of shallow reinforcement or corner cracking. Needs general joint and crack sealing. Scaled areas could be overlaid.
5	Fair	Moderate to severe polishing or scaling over 25% of the surface. High reinforcing steel causing surface spalling. Some joints and cracks have begun spalling. First signs of joint or crack faulting (1⁄4”). Multiple corner cracks with broken pieces. Moderate settlement or frost heave areas. Patching showing distress.	First signs of joint or crack spalling or faulting. Grind to repair surface defects. Some partial depth patching or joint repairs needed.
4	Fair	Severe polishing, scaling, map cracking, or spalling over 50% of the area. Joints and cracks show moderate to severe spalling. Pumping and faulting of joints (1⁄2”) with fair ride. Several slabs have multiple transverse or meander cracks with moderate spalling. Spalled area broken into several pieces. Corner cracks with missing pieces or patches. Pavement blowups.	Needs some full depth repairs, grinding, and/or asphalt overlay to correct surface defects.
3	Poor	Most joints and cracks are open, with multiple parallel cracks, severe spalling, or faulting. D-cracking is evident. Severe faulting (1”) giving poor ride. Extensive patching in fair to poor condition. Many transverse and meander cracks, open and severely spalled.	Needs extensive full depth patching plus some full slab replacement.
2	Very Poor	Extensive slab cracking, severely spalled and patched. Joints failed. Patching in very poor condition. Severe and extensive settlements or frost heaves.	Recycle and/or rebuild pavement.
1	Failed	Restricted speed. Extensive potholes. Almost total loss of pavement integrity.	Total reconstruction.

Functional Classification

Current Policy/Practice:

Currently there is no policy to determine how roads are classified.

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

1) Grandfather in the existing system.
2) Classify facilities as County Primary or City Major roads according to Act 51 designation.
3) Use the following table prepared as proposed recommended thresholds for consideration:

NFC #	Facility Type	Current Low Volume	Current High Volume	Current Average Volume	Proposed Minimum Threshold*
1	Rural Interstate	31,000	38,000	35,000	
2	Rural Freeway	26,000	51,000	41,000	
6	Rural Minor Arterial	2,100	23,000	8,700	5,000
7	Rural Major Collector	500	13,000	4,400	2,500
8	Rural Minor Collector	500	12,000	2,000	1,500
11	Urban Interstate	31,000	90,000	56,500	
12	Urban Freeway	44,000	129,000	95,500	
14	Urban Principal Arterial	4,000	55,000	23,300	25,000
16	Urban Minor Arterial	1,500	47,000	11,800	10,000
17	Urban Collector	750	17,000	5,000	5,000
	All Classes	500	129,000	13,000	

* Facilities not yet constructed would have to be modeled to determine out year volume (nearest modeled year).

Note: The above represent only volume thresholds. Other criteria must also be evaluated to determine regional significance of a roadway facility.

This item was passed by the TIP and Technical committees to accept the Functional Classification proposed strategy/practice as submitted.

High Priority Corridors

Current Policy/Practice

The current policy/practice is reviewed on a case by case basis.

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

Facilities Must:

- Be continuous
- Provide connectivity
- Provide alternative routing during emergency situations
- Serve a regionally significant purpose
- Serve major activity centers
- Serve intermodal facilities
- Serve regional medical facilities
- Be a Minor Arterial or above

The TIP and Technical committees recommend using the criteria developed for High Priority Corridors on a case by case basis to determine if a High Priority Corridor is eligible for special funding.

Obligation Authority

Current Policies/Practices:

Carry over projects (where possible) have priority to be funded in the next year of the TIP.

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

- Encourage the use of Advance Construction (in the second and third year of the TIP) (STP-Urban funds only).
- Goal to have projects obligated by April 1st
- If a project cannot be obligated in the first year that projects drops to the second or third year and the advance construction project(s) are converted (paid for) in the first year.
- Preferably the third year of the TIP contains easily built projects (several overlay projects).
- Monthly project tracking.

The TIP and Technical Committees recommend establishing a practice to increase the use of Advance Construct projects, and establish the goal that all projects are obligated by April 1st. Staff will also distribute to the committee a project tracking sheet on a monthly basis.

Adding/Programming New or Revised Projects to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) / Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

Below, more specific information is provided /recommended to augment the existing Policies/Practices for TIP and MTP revisions. Project revisions will only be made with the consent of the implementing jurisdiction.

MPO recommended Policy/Practice:

There are two actions that are covered by this policy/practice: administrative modifications and amendments.

TIP Amendments

Amendments require the review and recommendation of the Technical Committee and approval of the Policy Committee as well as federal approval, and are characterized by one of the following proposed changes (see matrix for appropriate MPO approvals):

- Projects with cost exceeding 20% of the TIP programmed Federal-aid amount.
- Adding a new project; the candidate project should be included on a deficiency list (see qualifications for adding projects listed below).
- Deleting a project; where applicable, funding will be returned to the MPO for reprogramming.
- Changing non-federally funded project to federally funded project.
- Major changes in project design concept or design scope, affecting roadway capacity and/or air quality (see matrix).
- Moving an illustrative project into the body of the TIP document.

An exception to this Policy includes new projects using Federal Aid funding sources not impacting other Federal Aid Funded projects such as MDOT, ITP, Transportation Enhancement, Bridge, Safety, HPP (earmarks), or other discretionary sources (see matrix). Upon MPO staff recommendation, the Technical and Policy Committee Chair or Vice Chair Persons are authorized to approve project amendments in the referenced federal funding categories.

Existing MPO, State and Federal processes will be followed for proposed TIP Amendments in the areas of air quality conformity, financial constraint, public participation, and environmental justice. TIP amendments involving the addition of a new project to an existing TIP will be subject to public involvement as described in the MPO Public Participation Plan. Public involvement for changes to existing projects or moving projects from the Illustrative List to the funded TIP project list will be accommodated through the MPO committees.

At all times the TIP must maintain financial constraint through a combination of Federal and non-federal funds. Committee approved amendments will be forwarded to MDOT via electronic format (E-File) and hard copy with updated project sheets, financial constraint documentation, and proof of MPO action. MDOT will then forward the changes to FHWA.

TIP Administrative Modifications

Administrative modifications will be considered when any of the following is proposed to an existing project (see matrix for appropriate MPO approvals):

- Changes in Federal-aid cost, more than 10% and less than or equal to 20% of the TIP programmed amount, is an administrative modification and requires MPO staff/Committee approval (before it is obligated).
    - Per Local Agency Programs; projects with a cost increase less than or equal to 10% of the TIP programmed amount do not require MPO action as long as financial constraint is maintained and should be reflected in the next TIP E-File.
- Minor Federal-aid changes may be allowed if other local projects are not impacted, and will be reflected in the next TIP E-File (ie-MDOT, ITP, TE, Bridge, Safety, HPP (earmarks), or other discretionary sources).
- Revisions that cause projects to switch years can be made by MPO staff with Committee notification; however, if financial constraint and/or another agency project are impacted, MPO Committee approval is required.
- Changes in non-federal funding participation; these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP E-File.
- Minor changes in scope; however, project scope changes affecting AQ conformity or other projects will require MPO Committee approval and may become a TIP amendment (see matrix).
- Changes in funding source within the same funding category (i.e. federal to federal, state to state and local to local, adding or changing job numbers within the project funding limits described herein); these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP E-File.
- Corrections to minor listing errors that don't change cost or scope; these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP E-File.
- Cost decreases (Federal or non-Federal); these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP E-File. Any resultant additional federal funding applied to a new or existing project will follow the amendment or modification process described herein.
- Changing an existing project to an advance construction project and vice versa.
- Adding lanes or non-motorized, up to one mile.

In most cases administrative modifications do not require Federal approval. GVMC practice is that administrative modifications that affect Federal-aid, and/or other projects, require Technical review and recommendation and Policy Committee approval only. In addition, MPO staff may approve modifications as noted above. The public will be notified of Administrative Modifications affecting existing projects in the TIP through the MPO committee meetings or the GVMC web-site.

In the event that an administrative modification must be considered immediately, staff will have the authority to implement that adjustment and/or with permission from the Chairpersons of the Technical and Policy Committees and the requesting agency impacted by the adjustment. If the Chairperson from either committee is not available, permission for the Vice-Chairperson will be sought. The modification will be included in the next TIP E-File.

At all times the TIP must maintain financial constraint through a combination of Federal and non-federal funds. Administrative modifications will be communicated to MDOT and FHWA in a timely fashion and reflected in the next TIP E-File.

Technical and Policy Committee Quorum

If a Quorum is not present, or an action item (modifications or amendments) is time sensitive, at the Technical Committee meeting, action items can go directly to the Policy Committee; if a quorum is not present at either the Technical and/or Policy Committee meeting(s), then action by the respective Chairperson(s) may be requested and then confirmed at the next committee meeting.

Qualifications for Adding/Amending New Projects to an Existing TIP-

PASER 10 – 8	Not Eligible for federal funds
PASER 7	Eligible for crack sealing funding*
PASER 6 - 5	Eligible for sealcoat/thin overlay funding*
PASER 4	Eligible for structural overlay funding
PASER 3 – 1	Eligible for reconstruction funding

* Approved GVMC treatment. Subject to MDOT Programming approval.

Expand & Widen Proj. -	Should be listed in the Congestion Management System capacity deficiency list and be listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
ITS Project -	Should be recommended by the ITS committee.
Transit Project -	Should be listed in the 5 year Short Range Public Transportation Plan or in the Long Range Public Transportation Plan.
Buses -	All buses should come from the Fleet Plan.

Procedure for Adding New Project(s) TIP –

A call for projects will be sent to all transportation providers, project(s) will be selected through the project selection process exercised by the TPSG, Technical and Policy Committees.

MTP Amendments

MTP Amendments require the review and recommendation of the Technical Committee and approval of the Policy Committee as well as state and federal approval, and are characterized by one of the following proposed changes (see corresponding MTP Revisions matrix):

- Adding a new regionally significant project. A project is considered to be regionally significant if it involves adding or reducing through road capacity over one mile or adding new Federal-aid road, transit, non-motorized, or rail infrastructure.
- Deleting a project; where applicable, funding will be returned to the MPO for reprogramming.
- Projects with cost exceeding 20% of the MTP programmed Federal-aid amount.
- Major changes in project design concept or design scope. A major change is one affecting roadway capacity and/or air quality.
- Moving an Illustrative List project into the body of the MTP document.
- Changing non-federally funded project to federally funded project.
- Changing air quality conformity model year grouping for a regionally significant project.

Existing MPO, State and Federal processes will be followed for proposed MTP Amendments in the areas of air quality conformity, financial constraint, public participation, and environmental justice. MTP amendments will be subject to public involvement as described in the MPO Public Participation Plan.

At all times the MTP must maintain financial constraint through a combination of Federal and non-federal funds. Approved MTP amendments will be forwarded to MDOT with updated project lists, financial constraint documentation, and proof of MPO action. MDOT will then forward the changes to FHWA.

MTP Administrative Modifications

Administrative modifications will be considered when any of the following is proposed to an existing project:

- Adding lanes or non-motorized facilities, up to one mile.
- Increase in Federal-aid cost less than or equal to 20% of the MTP programmed amount.
- Decrease in Federal-aid project cost.
- Change in Non Federal-aid project cost.
- Change in Federal or Non Federal funding category.
- Corrections to minor listing errors or other non-regionally significant project changes.
- Minor changes in scope, or scope changes not considered regionally significant.
- Update to the first four-years of the MTP to correspond to the most current TIP. The first four years of the MTP **are** the TIP and vice versa. When the MTP is updated or amended, the first four years will be adjusted to match the latest version of the TIP, including all TIP amendments and modifications to-date.

Administrative modifications regarding the addition of lanes or non-motorized facilities up to one mile and increases in Federal-aid project cost up to 20% require Committee approval. The other minor modifications to the MTP occur only when the MTP itself is undergoing an update or is being amended. The MTP document is visionary and long range by its very nature and is only administratively modified when other major changes (amendments) are demanded.

At all times the MTP must maintain financial constraint through a combination of Federal and non-federal funds. Administrative modifications will be communicated to MDOT and FHWA during the next MTP amendment or plan update.

Qualifications for Adding/Amending New Projects to an Existing MTP-

Reconstruct/Resurf Proj. -	These types of projects will only be added when/if the MTP is amended for other reasons to reflect the current TIP projects.
Expand & Widen Proj. -	Should be listed in the Congestion Management System capacity deficiency list. Project should be regionally significant.
ITS Project -	Should be recommended by the ITS committee.
Transit Project -	Should be listed in the 5 year Short Range Public Transportation Plan or in the Long Range Public Transportation Plan.

Procedure for Adding/Amending New Project(s) into the MTP –

See Qualifications for Adding/Amending New Projects to an Existing TIP above.

TIP Revisions

		Staff Recommendation	Committee Chair Approval	Technical Committee Review & Recommend	Policy Committee Approval	MDOT/FHWA/FTA Approval	Public Participation Procedure
TIP Amendment	Add New Project (including Safety, Transportation Enhancement, TAP, and CMAQ projects)	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting, Web posting
● *Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.*	Delete Project	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting, Web posting
	Federal-aid cost increase over 20%	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting
● *Any new project or major scop/design change shall be consistent with the MTP.*	Major* scope/design change	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting
	Move Illustrative List Project into the TIP (new project)***	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting
	Change non-federal aid funded project to federally funded project	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting
	New Discretionary Projects	X	X (Option)			X	Web posting

TIP Administrative Modification	Additional lanes or non-motorized, up to one mile	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
● *Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.*	Increase in Federal aid cost more than 10% and less than or equal to 20%	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
	Increase in Federal aid cost up to 10% (per LAP Policy)	X					Not required
● *Changes to existing projects.*	Decrease in Federal aid project cost	X					Not required
● *Changes will be reflected in the next e-STIP filing.*	Change in Non-Federal aid project cost	X					Not required
	Change in Federal funding category (applies to MDOT only)	X					Not required
	Change in Non-Federal funding category	X					Not required
	Change in Federal-aid funding level not affecting other projects (ex. MDOT, ITP, TE, Bridge, Safety, HPP (earmarks), or other discrecionary sources)	X					Not required
	Adding or changing job numbers within approved funding and scope limits	X					Not required
	Changing an advance construction project to Federal-aid	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
	Changing a Federal-aid project to advance construction	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
	Change of project year within the 4-year TIP	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
	Listing error corrections	X					Not required
	Minor** scope changes (not regionally significant as defined)	X					Not required

Notes:

- **Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.**
- **Any new project or major scope change shall be consistent with the MTP.**
- **Regionally significant for air quality = Adding or reducing through capacity over 1 mile; adding new Federal aid road, transit, non-motorized, or rail infrastructure.**
- **Major* = 1) change in lane configuration, 2) change affecting road capacity, 3) change affecting air quality (regionally significant)**
- **Minor** = May include at staff's discretion: 1) lane extensions up to 1/4 mile, 2) sidewalks & NM up to 1/4 mile, 3) ADA enhancements, 4) signalization and/or signs, 5) utility issues, 6) pavement type, 7) phase changes, 8) additional spaces in park-and-ride lots, 9) other**
- ***Any project from the TIP Illustrative Project list, which has previously been processed for public involvement with the TIP, is not required to have additional public involvement (Consultation, EJ and EA) prior to completing the TIP amendment process.**

MTP Revisions

		Staff Recommendation	Committee Chair Approval	Technical Committee Review & Recommendation	Policy Committee Approval	MDOT/FHWA/FTA Approval	Public Participation Procedure
MTP Amendment	Add/Delete Regionally Significant Project	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting, Web posting
	Major* scope/design change for regionally significant project(s)	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting, Web posting
	Move Regionally Significant Illustrative List Project into the MTP (new project)	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting, Web posting
	Change in air quality conformity model year grouping for regionally significant project	X	X (Option)	X	X	X	Committee meeting, Web posting

MTP Administrative Modification	Additional lanes or non-motorized facilities, up to one mile	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
● *Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.*	Increase in Federal aid cost up to 20%	X	X (Option)	X	X		Not required
	Decrease in Federal aid project cost	X					Not required
● *Changes to existing projects.*	Change in Non-Federal aid project cost	X					Not required
● *MTP modifications will be made during the next MTP amendment or plan update.*	Change in Federal or Non-Federal funding category	X					Not required
	Listing error corrections or other non-regionally significant project changes	X					Not required
	Minor** scope changes (not regionally significant as defined)	X					Not required
	Update to the first four-years of the MTP to correspond to the most current TIP	X					Not required

● Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.

● Any new project or major scope change shall be consistent with the MTP.

● Regionally Significant = Adding or reducing through capacity over 1 mile, Adding new federal-aid road, transit, non-motorized, or rail infrastructure.

● Major* = 1) change in lane configuration, 2) change affecting road capacity, 3) change affecting air quality (regionally significant)

● Minor = May include at staff's discretion: 1) lane extensions up to 1/4 mile. 2) sidewalks & NM up to 1/4 mile, 3) ADA enhancements, 4) Signalization and/or signs, 5) Utility issues, 6) pavement type, 7) Phase changes, 8) additional spaces in park-and-ride lots, 9)Other**

Advance Construction

Current Policies/Practices:

When the TIP program is developed it needs to be financially constrained.
The conversion of advance construction projects is the 1st priority.

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

When the TIP program is developed it needs to be financially constrained.
The conversion of advance construction projects is the 1st priority.

Allow advance construction within the three year TIP and the Illustrative program

The TIP and Technical Committees recommend that the use of Advance Construction be restricted to the first 3 years of the TIP and the 2 Illustrative years; that there are no limits on the dollar amount and the number of Advance Construct projects allowed, and that once the TIP is developed it will be financially constrained.

CMAQ Program

Current Policies/Practices:

Traditionally busses, intersections and the Ozone Action Program are funded with this program. MDOT/Local split of the funds (MDOT gets 50% of the CMAQ funds off the top).

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

Eliminate the 50/50 split of CMAQ funds allocated to this MPO between MDOT and the local jurisdictions.

With the CMAQ funds allocated to the MPO, the TIP Committee will rank all CMAQ eligible projects based on emission reduction/cost benefit basis. (Competitive based on emissions). Develop and have in place a consistent and improved statewide evaluation process of CMAQ projects.

All new transit route projects need to show a demonstration of need and that service will continue beyond a 3 year commitment if rider-ship meets projections.
Agreement for CMAQ funding in West Michigan

- MDOT will do the East/West estimating of funding split.
- MDOT will provide estimates of funding available for each MPO (GVMC, MACC, WMSRDC) and rural Ottawa County based on population using the 2000 Census data.
- Working through the TIP development process the MPO and MDOT representatives will cooperatively distribute the funds to local and state eligible projects.
- MDOT will provide a time line with the estimates for completion of task #3.
- All parties will meet to discuss all projects and compile the CMAQ program.
- MDOT makes the final decisions to reach financial constraint of the final program.
- This entire agreement will be re-evaluated when the USEPA takes action on the 8 hour standard.

This item was passed by the TIP and Technical committees to accept the proposed policy/practice as submitted.

Non-Motorized Transportation Federal Funding Eligibility

Goal:

The MPO shall support the development of an area-wide network of interconnected, convenient, safe, and efficient non-motorized routes so that they may become an integral mode of travel for area residents. A non-motorized element of the Long Range Transportation Plan shall maintain a listing of eligible non-motorized projects and funding shall be allocated through the long range plan and transportation improvement planning processes to achieve an overall goal of improving the condition of the system.

Background:

The GVMC 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) lays out goals that pertain to non-motorized transportation in our region. These LRTP goals carry over the federal and state level themes encouraging non-motorized transportation. Related objectives include:
1d: "Sustain and develop the interconnected regional network of non-motorized transportation facilities to provide access to employment, services, schools, and other destinations."
3d: "Collaborate with communities, public schools, and MDOT to regionally plan for safe bicycle and pedestrian routes for students to travel to and from home and school."
3e: "Encourage the multiple and safe use of transportation rights-of-way by different modes, including non-motorized transportation."

Federal surface transportation law provides flexibility to MPOs to fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements from a wide variety of federal programs (STP, CMAQ, Transportation Enhancement, etc). However, historically the GVMC Committees have restricted the use of federal funds for non-motorized projects, which permit solely the use of Transportation Enhancement (TE) statewide competitive grants for the construction of non-motorized transportation facilities. Federal funds have not historically been permitted for the construction of sidewalk.

Deficiency Definition

The MPO, in cooperation with the Non-Motorized Committee and using AASHTO standards, has developed definitions for each of the non-motorized facility types. These are the non-motorized facility types recognized by the MPO.

Sidewalks – A sidewalk is a paved pathway paralleling a highway, road, or street, and is intended for pedestrians. Sidewalks are typically four to five feet wide and made from concrete, but may be up to a maximum of eight feet wide and made from other materials depending on their location.

Shared Use Paths – Shared use paths mainly serve corridors not served by streets and highways, or where wide utility or former railroad rights-of-way exist (rail-trails), but may also parallel highway, roads, and streets (formally called "sidepaths"). Shared use paths are wider than sidewalks, between 8 and 12 feet wide (10 feet width is federally required for federal funds) with

a soft two to four-foot shoulder on each side, and a minimum width of 14 feet on all structures, such as bridges and boardwalks. They are shared facilities for use by both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Bicycle Lanes – Bicycle lanes are dedicated, marked, and signed rights-of-way assigned to bicyclists. They are paired one-way facilities located on both sides of a street, with standard intersection designs to minimized conflicts between bicycles and automobiles. Standard bicycle lane widths are six feet; five feet is the minimum width adjacent to curbs and four feet is the minimum width when no curb exists. Dedicated bike lanes must be accompanied by both pavement markings and bike lanes signs (R3-17).

Signed Shared Roadways – Signed shared roadways are designated bicycle routes that are signed (D11-1 or W11-1) or have pavement markings to indicate that the roadway is shared with bicyclists ("sharrow" chevron pavement marking).

Unsigned Shared Roadways – Unsigned shared roadways are open to both bicycle and motor vehicle and are designed and constructed under the assumption that they may be used by bicyclists, but are not signed or marked. Unsigned shared roadways typically have wider than the standard 12-foot lane. Shared roadways may also be standard width roadways with a minimum four-foot paved shoulder (where there is no curb and gutter), also known as a "wide-shoulder."

Bicycle Centers and Staging Areas – Bicycle centers and staging areas are auxiliary facilities to increase the convenience and effectiveness of non-motorized transportation and may offer amenities such as showers and bicycle parking, as well as motorized vehicle parking and network access points.

Pedestrian Bridges and Refuge Islands – Pedestrian bridges are modified road bridge structures that accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists, or they may be pedestrian/bike only structures. A refuge island is a protected area between traffic lanes providing pedestrians or bicyclists with a safe place to wait for gaps in traffic in order to cross a road safely.

Recommended Policy/Practice:

All non-motorized projects included in the GVMC Long Range Transportation Plan/Non-motorized Transportation Plan are eligible for funding as allowed under applicable federal-aid categories. A target of one-half of the allocated funds to the MPO for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) shall be used on bicycle and pedestrian related facility improvements. The allocated funds to the MPO for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program shall also be eligible and considered for use on bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements. All CMAQ funded non-motorized projects shall be addressed on a case by case basis to prove high use, mode shift, and connectivity and score well using the scoring criteria set forth in the Non-Motorized Plan. For the use of CMAQ funds all projects must demonstrate emission reduction and alleviate congestion.

All non-motorized projects requesting federal funds must be endorsed by the MPO to receive federal funds and be included in the MPO TIP.

Policies and practices regarding non-motorized facilities were updated and approved by the Policy Committee on November 20, 2013.

Federal Funding of Right of Way (ROW)

Current Policy/Practice:

Use of Federal funds is not allowed unless the committee deems a corridor with a high priority a special case as identified by the MPO.

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

Eliminate Federal/State funding of ROW. An exception may be approved by the TIP Committee if a jurisdiction requests to use ROW funds for a large or expensive project.

The TIP Committee recommends continuing the practice of not allowing the funding of right-of-way except on a case by case basis.

Federal Funding of Engineering Expenses

Current Policy/Practice:

There is no current policy or practice in the use of Federal Funds for engineering costs.

TIP Committee recommended Policy/Practice:

No Federal/State funds for Engineering.

Encourage local jurisdictions staff to work on future year projects, get programming into MDOT early in the fiscal year and obligate projects in a timely basis.

The TIP committee recommends continuing the current practice of not funding Engineering Costs – that restricts Federal Funds from being used for Engineering Costs by local jurisdictions.

Title VI

Current Policy/Practice:

The MPO will update the Title VI Plan before the beginning of the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The Plan will then be offered to the MPO members to complement their policies and practices. Any agency that receives federal funds must maintain a Title VI Plan that meets Federal regulations. GVMC will notify members to review their Title VI Plans to make sure they comply with the law at the start of the fiscal year.

All projects located in the Transportation Improvement Program/Metropolitan Plan fall under these Policies/Practices, regardless of funding source or category.