

**Twin Cities Area Transportation Study
Highway Transportation Improvement Program Application
FY 2011-2014
Call for FY 2014 Projects**

The Southwest Michigan Planning Commission (SWMPC) has announced a call-for-projects for the Twin Cities Area Transportation Study (TwinCATS) 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). In an effort to comply with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and the goals of the NATS long range plan (LRP), projects eligible for federal funding will be evaluated based on the following categories:

- Compatibility, conformity, and advancement of the LRP Goals
 - I. Support the Economic Vitality of Southwest Michigan
 - II. Promote Safety Conscious Planning and System Security in Southwest Michigan
 - III. Ensure the Equitability and Accessibility of the Transportation System
 - IV. Preserve the Regional Transportation System
 - V. Promote Livable Communities and Environmental Responsibility in Southwest Michigan
 - VI. Efficiently and Effectively Move People, Goods and Services within Southwest Michigan
- Local Planning Considerations
- Public Input
- Environmental Considerations
- Funding

In keeping with the Participation Plan and Environmental Justice policies, project proposals will be circulated throughout local jurisdictions and in those neighborhoods most likely to be affected. Completed applications must be submitted to the SWMPC 10 days before the TwinCATS meeting at which they will be reviewed.

Additional Information Concerning PASER Ratings

Since 2003, the SWMPC has used the PASER road rating system to collect data on the surface condition of federal aid eligible roads in Berrien and Cass Counties. Data for each county are available online at http://www.swmpc.org/asset_mgmt.asp in the document entitled, "Road Condition by National Function Class (2003-2007)." PASER ratings of 8-10 generally indicate good pavement quality and require routine maintenance, such as street sweeping, drainage clearing, shoulder gravel grading, and sealing cracks. Ratings of 5-7 generally indicate average pavement quality and require capital preventative maintenance. Capital preventative maintenance is a planned set of cost effective treatments to an existing system that preserves, retards future deterioration, and maintains or improves the functional condition of the system. Ratings of 1-4 generally indicate poor pavement quality and require structural improvements, like rehabilitation and reconstruction to address the structural integrity of the road.

TwinCATS Highway TIP Application FY 2011-2014
Please fill out all gray cells. All white cells are for administrative use. For more information on code abbreviations select code tab.
AGENCY INFORMATION

Submitting Agency	MDOT		
Contact Person	Sarah Woolcock		
E-mail Address	WoolcockS@michigan.gov		
Phone	269.849.2460		
PROJECT INFORMATION			
Local Jurisdiction	Sodus Township	Date Submitted	5/18/2011
Project identification/name (e.g., I-94 BL)	US-31 NB and SB	Length in miles	2.533
Limits (e.g., Fair Ave to Riverview Dr.)	US-31 NB and SB over St. Joseph Riv	Traffic volume (include year of count)	7,400-10,600 (20
In what fiscal year should project be funded?	2012	*Estimated completion date	10/5/2013
*Attach proposed implementation schedule that includes major benchmarks			
Advance Construct (AC)/Advance Construct Conversion (ACC)?		Primary work type	Bridge - other
MDOT job number	113246	Phase	SUB
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT COSTS			
*Indicate all funding sources and dollars allocated. Projects must be fiscally constrained.			
Federal Funds \$	38734	Federal Sources	BHN
		Source 2	
		Source 3	
State Funds \$	9683	State Sources	M
		Source 2	
		Source 3	
Local Funds \$		Local Sources	
		Source 2	
		Source 3	
TOTAL PROJECT COST			
*Indicate the total amount being spent on everything involved with this project - including all phases, all years, construction, engineering, right of way acquisition, utilities, drainage work, etc.			
Total Project Cost			\$779,517.00
SURFACE RATING			
*Please provide the three previous year's worth of PASER rating(s) for the area involving this project.			
	Year	Rating	
Most Current Rating	2008	8	
Previous Rating	2007	9	
Previous Rating	2006	9	
What is the state of the current drainage?	Adequate		
What is the current base condition?	Excellent with well drained soil base and adequate sub-base		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION			
Explain the nature of the project and major work involved and provide a brief comparison of existing and proposed conditions (attach map(s) detailing the location and boundaries for the project; include status of existing right-of-way, any proposed intersection work, infrastructure or drainage improvements, traffic calming measures, signal work, sidewalks/trail ways, etc.).			

Healer sealer, resealign construction joints

PROJECT GOALS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following section is designed to ensure that proposed projects advance the goals of the LRP (available at <http://www.swmpc.org/transportation.asp>).

ECONOMIC VITALITY

Does the project improve connectivity to and from existing commercial/industrial areas (including shipping)?	No
Does the project improve the efficiency and use of truck and rail routes in and through the urban area?	No
Does the project support regional tourism/recreation? Describe how below.	No
Will completing this project result in infill development of underutilized sites, specifically in urban centers?	No
Was a study done to determine how this project would affect local land uses? If so, attach.	No
Are there additional aspects of this project that contribute to the economic vitality of the region? Describe below.	No

SAFETY CONSCIOUS PLANNING AND SYSTEM SECURITY

Will the project reduce crashes at the proposed location?	No
Will the project remove obstacles to clear vision or otherwise improve sight distance?	No
Does the project promote signal, sign, and pavement marking uniformity?	No
Does the project promote access management?	No
Are there additional aspects of this project that will enhance safety in the region (i.e., improving safety for vehicles, pedestrians, or bicyclists; explain traffic calming measures, etc.)? Describe below.	Yes
Maintains bridge deck in good condition, minimizing surface problems that could impact motorists.	
Does the project bring the facility into compliance with 3R guidelines for geometrics (available at http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MDOT_geometrics_77543_7.pdf)?	NA

MULTIMODALISM

Does this project improve connectivity of the system (i.e. train to truck routes, connecting missing pieces of roadway, connections to transit, trail ways, waterways, etc.)? Describe how below.	No
Does the project encourage multiple-occupancy vehicle or high-occupancy vehicle travel (i.e.: through park-and-ride facilities, bus lanes, and/or carpool lanes)?	No
Have you identified and contacted human service and transit providers who might be affected by this project? List all agencies contacted, the date the contact was made, and the name of the agency contact person.	No

Does the project create new non-motorized transportation options (i.e., sidewalks, trailways, wide shoulders)? These should appear in project description.	No
Is this project adding amenities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users (i.e., benches, transit shelters, trash cans, vegetation to buffer pedestrians and bicyclists from auto traffic)? These should appear in project description.	Yes
PRESERVATION	
Will the project preserve the existing pavement?	Yes
Does the preservation technique selected fit the existing condition?	Yes
Alternative Transportation Mode Consideration Only - For projects involving alternative transportation modes (i.e.: sidewalks, transit, aviation, water navigation, bicycling, trail ways) does the project preserve or improve existing facilities or services?	NA
ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATION	
Describe any potential impact of this project on environmentally sensitive areas. (Maps of environmentally sensitive areas are included in the Long Range Plan).	Not scored
Describe any potential impact (positive or negative) of this project on historic or cultural sites. (Maps of historic and cultural sites are included in the Long Range Plan).	Not scored
Were project alternatives considered? Describe below the method used to decide between the alternatives.	Yes
Bridge engineers review every project and select the most appropriate repair.	
Describe how you will restore any disturbed sites.	Not scored
Will this project reduce noise pollution?	No
How will the project reduce congestion to improve air quality?	No
Will this project increase vegetation? (This should be reflected in project plans).	No
Will this project reduce surface runoff? Describe how below.	No
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	
Will this project increase access to jobs, medical facilities, social service agencies, churches, schools, or grocery stores within a 30-minute trip by car for residents of EJ areas?	No
Will this project increase access to jobs, medical facilities, social service agencies, churches, schools, or grocery stores within a 15-minute walking or bicycling trip for residents of EJ areas?	No
Were any of the following methods used to gain input from EJ populations: translating outreach materials, providing translation services at public meetings, giving presentations to community groups?	No
Did any members of EJ populations submit comments about the project at meetings or via mail, phone calls, or the internet?	Not scored
If so, were these concerns addressed? Describe how below.	Not scored

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	
Is this project addressing public concerns raised or an issue that had media attention?	No
Was a public meeting held to gain input on this project?	No
Was a press release sent out to local papers asking for input on this project?	No
Was any online advertising done to gain public input on this project?	No
Did any members of the public submit comments about the project at meetings or via mail, phone calls, or the internet?	Not scored
If so, were these concerns addressed? Describe how below.	Not scored
PLANNING SUPPORT	
Was the project selected through a local decision-making process? Provide the date of the relevant meeting minutes indicating local project selection below.	No
Is the project part of another local plan (i.e., asset management, access management, future land use/master, corridor improvement, recreation, non-motorized)? Indicate the title and year of the plan/study, relevant chapter, and page number below.	No
<u>For Capacity Expansion Projects Only</u> - If this project involves capacity expansion, is this project consistent with local economic development plans and/or strategies? Indicate below the title and year of the plan/study, relevant chapter, and page number. The project must be air quality conforming.	NA
Does this project coordinate with other local projects (i.e. utility or sewer/water line improvements) in order to minimize inconvenience to users?	No
Describe below any special mandates for this project and how they are being met.	Not scored

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

Map(s) detailing the project.

A proposed implementation schedule (include major progress benchmarks).

Meeting minutes, letters documenting public input.

Completed safety and/or enhancement grants, if applicable.

Questions, comments, or concerns should be directed to Anna Rahtz at 269.925.1137 x 23. Completed applications should be submitted 10 days before the TwinCATS meeting at which they will be reviewed.

09)