**Who we are...**

The Grand Valley Metropolitan Council (GVMC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Greater Grand Rapids area. MPOs were mandated by the Federal Highway Act of 1973 to provide a cooperative, comprehensive, and continuing transportation planning and decision-making process. The process encompasses all modes and covers both short-range and long-range transportation planning.

**What we do...**

The MPO is responsible for transportation planning and programming in the Greater Grand Rapids area. Each urban area in the United States has an MPO which acts as a liaison between local communities, their citizens, and the state Departments of Transportation (DOTs). MPOs are important because they direct how and where available state and federal dollars for transportation improvements will be spent. MPOs currently operate under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

**Unified Work Program**

This program coordinates and encompasses all the transportation planning activities undertaken by all participants in the region. The unified work program identifies sources of funding, schedules, and the responsible agencies. This is a one-year program that lists all the regional planning studies.

**Transportation Improvement Program**

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a short-range planning document that identifies proposed projects developed by local agencies in accordance with the joint regulations of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). These regulations establish the TIP as the programming phase of the overall continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) planning process. This planning process includes local jurisdictions, transit agencies, and state and federal transportation officials. All federal monies returned to the Grand Rapids metro area from the federal fuel tax are distributed through this process. The Transportation Improvement Program is a three year program.

**Metropolitan Transportation Plan**

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) reflects a desirable state of the Grand Rapids metropolitan region transportation system in the years to come. Changing population patterns, economic conditions, social values, environmental views, and energy concerns necessitate the need to keep the MTP current. Priorities and values held by the public and decision makers will impact opinions on how the transportation system should develop into the future. When the plan is developed it generally looks at the transportation needs 20-25 years into the future.
**Congestion Management Process**
Federal transportation legislation requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations to develop and implement a Congestion Management Process (CMP) as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process (23 CFR 500). The CMP includes an ongoing method to provide information on the performance of the transportation system and on alternative strategies to alleviate congestion and enhance mobility.

**Asset Management**
Asset management is one of the decision-making tools that enable GVMC Committees to look at the investments in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Federal Aid Road network.

**Pavement Management**
GVMC has been collecting data on functionally classified roads since summer of 1996 as part of Asset Management. Managing pavement condition is a tool or method that can assist decision makers in finding cost-effective strategies for providing, evaluating, and maintaining pavements in a serviceable condition in the region.

**Traffic Monitoring**
GVMC uses traffic monitoring (traffic counts) as another tool in transportation planning. GVMC Committees use traffic volume when considering investment in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Federal Aid Road network.

**Non-motorized**
As an MPO GVMC is responsible for all modes of transportation including pedestrian and bicycle travel in the Grand Rapids Region. GVMC is currently in the process of updating its non-motorized plan that will determine facility needs and safety concerns in the region.

**Safety**
GVMC takes a proactive approach to addressing safety concerns on the Federal Aid road network. GVMC tries to integrate safety considerations into the transportation planning processes at all levels.

**Environmental Justice**
GVMC works diligently to ensure that all people have access to the transportation planning process, especially those citizens that have traditionally been under represented, including those residents that are members of racial or ethnic minority populations and low income persons. GVMC has developed a process to notify the underrepresented of the transportation planning process and to ensure there are not adverse effects on the minority or low income populations.

**ITS**
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is the next step in the evolution of the transportation system. As information technologies and advances in electronics continue to revolutionize all aspects of our modern-day world, the same is being done to the transportation system. ITS technologies include the latest in computers, communications, electronics, monitoring, and safety systems. Examples of ITS include, but are not limited to: cameras, changeable message signs, loop detectors, etc.
**Geographic Information System (GIS)**

Geographic Information System (GIS) is another tool used in the transportation planning process. A GIS is a computer system capable of capturing, storing, analyzing, and displaying geographically referenced information—that is, data identified according to location. GIS can be used in transportation planning to run models of the network, analyze accident locations, track traffic counts, etc.

**Clean Air Action**

The Clean Air Action Program is an air quality outreach program that partners with government, nonprofits, educational institutions and industry. It educates the public about ground-level ozone and fine particulate matter through the education and promotion of voluntary emission reduction activities. The program also declares "Clean Air Action Days" in order to notify the public when large amounts of ground-level ozone, fine particulate matter, or both, are present in West Michigan.
Disclaimer: GVMC makes no warranty or guarantee regarding maps or other information provided herein. GVMC assumes no liability for errors, omissions, or inaccuracies that result in any decisions made or action taken upon any maps or information presented.
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- **Policy Advisory Committee (POLICY)**
- **Metropolitan Planning Organization Board Final Approval (GVMC Board)**
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Technical & Policy Committee Membership List

Ada Township
Policy Committee Representative: Julius Suchy (jsuchy@adatownshipmi.com)
Technical Committee Representative: Jim Ferro (jferro@adatownshipmi.com)
7330 Thornapple River Dr.—PO Box 370
Ada, Michigan 49301
Phone (616) 676-9191

Algoma Township
Policy Committee Representative: Kevin Green (supervisor@algomatwp.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Kevin Green
10531 Algoma NE
Rockford, Michigan 49341
Phone (616) 866-1583

Allendale Township
Policy Committee Representative: Adam Elenbaas (supervisor@allendale-twp.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Adam Elenbaas
6676 Lake Michigan Drive, PO Box 539
Allendale, Michigan 49401
Phone (616) 895-6295

Alpine Township
Policy Committee Representative: Greg Madura (g.madura@alpinetwp.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Sue Becker (s.becker@alpinetwp.org)
5255 Alpine Ave NW
Comstock Park, Michigan 49341
Phone (616) 784-1262

Byron Township
Policy Committee Representative: Amos “Don” Tillema (Amos@byrontownship.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Don Tillema
8085 Byron Center SW
Byron Center, Michigan 49315
Phone (616) 878-1222

Caledonia Township
Policy Committee Representative: Bryan Harrison (bharrison@caledoniatownship.org)
Tim Bradshaw - alternate
Technical Committee Representative: Tim Bradshaw (bradshawt@progressiveae.com)
8495 Woodland Forest
Alto, Michigan 49302
Phone (616) 891-0070
Caledonia, Village of
Policy Committee Representative: Jeff Thornton (manager@villageofcaledonia.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Jeff Thornton
250 S. Maple
Caledonia, MI 49316-9434
Phone 616-891-9384

Cannon Township
Policy Committee Representative: Terry Brod (tbrod@cannontwp.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Terry Brod
6878 Belding Rd.
Rockford, Michigan 49341
Phone (616) 874-6966

Cascade Township
Policy Committee Representative: Ben Swayze (bswayze@cascadetwp.com)
Steve Peterson-alternate (speterson@cascadetwp.com)
Technical Committee Representative: Brian Hilbrands (b hilbrands@cascadetwp.com)
Steve Peterson-alternate
2865 Thornhills SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
Phone (616) 949-1500

Cedar Springs, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Mike Womack (manager@cityofcedarsprings.org)
Bill LaRose-alternate
Technical Committee Representative: Bill LaRose (dpw@cityofcedarsprings.org)
66 S. Main St.—PO Box 310
Cedar Springs, Michigan 49319
Phone (616) 696-1330

Courtland Township
Policy Committee Representative: Matt McConnon (mattmccconnon@gmail.com)
Technical Committee Representative: Matt McConnon
7450 14 Mile Rd.
Rockford, Michigan 49341
Phone (616) 866-0622

East Grand Rapids, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Doug LaFave (dlafave@eastgr.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Doug LaFave
750 Lakeside Dr. SE
East Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506
Phone (616) 940-4817
Gaines Charter Township  
*Policy Committee Representative: Robert DeWard (robert.deward@gainestownship.org)*  
*Technical Committee Representative: Tim Haagsma (thaagsma@kentcountyroads.net)*  
8555 Kalamazoo Ave  
Caledonia, Michigan 49316  
Phone (616) 698-6640

Georgetown Township  
*Policy Committee Representative: Rod Weersing (rweersing@georgetown-mi.gov)*  
*Technical Committee Representative: Rod Weersing*  
1515 Baldwin St. PO Box 769  
Jenison, Michigan 49429  
Phone (616) 457-2340

Gerald R. Ford International Airport  
*Policy Committee Representative: Casey Ries (cries@grr.org)*  
*Technical Committee Representative: Clint Nemeth (CNemeth@grr.org)*  
5500 - 44th St. SE  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49512  
Phone (616) 233-6000

Grand Rapids, City of  
*Policy Committee Representative: Karyn Ferrick (kferrick@grcity.us)*  
*Josh Naramore (jnaramore@grcity.us)*  
*Technical Committee Representative: Kristin Bennett (krbennett@grcity.us)*  
*Rick DeVries (rdevries@grcity.us)*  
300 Monroe Ave. NW  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503  
Phone (616) 456-3060

Grand Rapids Township  
*Policy Committee Representative: Mike DeVries (mdevries@grandrapidstwp.org)*  
*Technical Committee Representative: Mike DeVries*  
1836 E. Beltline Ave. NE  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505  
Phone (616) 361-7391

Grandville, City of  
*Policy Committee Representative: Ken Krombeen (krombeen@cityofgrandville.com)*  
*Technical Committee Representative: Charles Sundblad (sundbladc@cityofgrandville.com)*  
3195 Wilson Ave. SW  
Grandville, Michigan 49418  
Phone (616) 531-3030
Hudsonville, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Dan Strikwerda (dstrikwe@hudsonville.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Robert Miller (rmiller@hudsonville.org)
3275 Central Blvd.
Hudsonville, Michigan 49426
Phone (616) 669-0200

Interurban Transit Partnership – The Rapid
Policy Committee Representative: Kevin Wisselink (kwisselink@ridetherapid.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Kevin Wisselink
Liz Schelling – alternate (lschelling@ridetherapid.org)
300 Ellsworth
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
Phone (616) 456-7514

Jamestown Township
Policy Committee Representative: Laurie Van Haitsma (laurievh@yahoo.com)
Technical Committee Representative: Laurie Van Haitsma
2380 Riley St.
Hudsonville, MI 49426
Phone (616) 896-8376

Kent County Board of Commissioners
Policy Committee Representative: Melissa LaGrand
(melissa.lagrand@kentcountymi.gov)
Technical Committee Representative: Wayne Harrall (wharrall@kentcountyroads.net)
300 Monroe Ave. NW
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
Phone (616) 336-3550

Kent County Road Commission
Policy Committee Representative: Steve Warren (swarren@kentcountyroads.net)
Technical Committee Representative: Steve Warren
1500 Scribner
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504
Phone (616) 242-6960

Kentwood, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Terry Schweitzer (SchweitzerT@kentwood.us)
Technical Committee Representative: Brad Boomstra (Boomstrab@kentwood.us)
Terry Schweitzer - alternate
4900 Breton
Kentwood, Michigan 49518
Phone (616) 554-0770
Lowell, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Mike Burns (mburns@ci.lowell.mi.us)
   Dennis Kent-alternate (kentd@michigan.gov)
Technical Committee Representative: Mike Burns
   Dennis Kent-alternate
   301 E. Main St.
   Lowell, Michigan 49331
   Phone (616) 897-8457

Lowell Township
Policy Committee Representative: Jerry Hale (supervisor@twp.lowell.mi.us)
   Technical Committee Representative: Jerry Hale
   2910 Alden Nash Ave SE
   Lowell, MI 49331
   Phone (616) 897-7600

Michigan Department of Transportation
Policy Committee Representative: Don Mayle (MayleD@michigan.gov)
   Technical Committee Representative: Jeff Franklin (FranklinJ1@michigan.gov)
   Van Wagoner Building
   425 W. Ottawa—PO Box 30050
   Lansing, MI 48909
   Phone (517) 373-2090

Nelson Township
Policy Committee Representative: Tom Noreen (supervisor@nelsontownship.org)
   Technical Committee Representative: Tom Noreen
   2 Maple Street—PO Box 109
   Sand Lake, MI 49343
   Phone (616) 636-5332

Ottawa County Board of Commissioners
Policy Committee Representative: Jim Holtvluwer (jholtvluwer@miottawa.org)
   Technical Committee Representative: Jim Holtvluwer
   12220 Fillmore Street, Room 310
   West Olive, Michigan 49460
   Phone (616) 669-6523

Ottawa County Road Commission
Policy Committee Representative: Jim Miedema (jmiedema46@gmail.com)
   Betty Gajewski - alternate (betty@gajewski.us)
   Brett Laughlin – alternate
   Technical Committee Representative: Brett Laughlin (BALaughlin@ottawacorc.com)
   14110 Lakeshore Drive  P.O. Box 739
   Grand Haven, MI 49417
   Phone (616) 842-5400
Plainfield Charter Township
Policy Committee Representative: Cameron Van Wyngarden
(vanwyngardenc@plainfieldmi.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Rick Solle (soller@plainfieldmi.org)
6161 Belmont Ave. NE
Belmont, Michigan 49306
Phone (616) 364-8466

Rockford, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Jamie Davies (jdamies@rockford.mi.us)
Technical Committee Representative: Phil Vincent (pvincent@rockford.mi.us)
7 S. Monroe St. PO Box 561
Rockford, Michigan 49341
Phone (616) 866-1537

Sand Lake, Village of
Policy Committee Representative: Rachel Gokey (r.gokey@villageofsandlake.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Rachel Gokey
2 East Maple St.
Post Office Box 139
Sand Lake, Michigan 49343
Phone (616) 636-8854

Sparta, Village of
Policy Committee Representative: Shay Gallagher (villagerepresentative@spartami.org)
Technical Committee Representative: Shay Gallagher
160 E. Division Street
Sparta, Michigan 49345
Phone: (616) 887-8863

Tallmadge Township
Policy Committee Representative: Dave Datema (ddatema@tallmadge.com)
Technical Committee Representative: Dave Datema
0-1451 Leonard St. NW
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49534
Phone (616) 677-1248

Walker, City of
Policy Committee Representative: Darrel Schmalzel (dschmalzel@walker.city)
Technical Committee Representative: Scott Conners (sconners@walker.city)
4243 Remembrance Road NW
Walker, Michigan 49534
Phone (616) 453-6311
Wyoming, City of

Policy Committee Representatives: Dan Burrill (isellgr@grar.com)  
Rob Postema (RDP@rpaae.com)

Technical Committee Representative: Russ Henckel (HenckelR@wyomingmi.gov)  
Nicole Hofert (hofertn@wyomingmi.gov)

1155 28th Street – PO Box 905  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49509  
Phone (616) 530-7226
BY-LAWS
ARTICLE I - OFFICERS

1.1 - Composition & Election

The officers of the Grand Valley Metro Council (GVMC) transportation planning committees shall consist of a Chairperson, Vice Chairperson and Secretary. These officers shall be elected by the officially designated Committee members at the last regular meeting of a calendar year and take office at the first regular meeting of the next year.

1.2 - Chairperson

The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings and assure that the transaction of business shall be in accordance with these bylaws. The Chairperson may appoint special committees as he/she deems necessary and shall serve as an ex-officio member of these committees.

1.3 - Vice Chairperson

The Vice Chairperson shall execute the powers and duties of the Chairperson during the absence or incapacity of the Chairperson. In the absence of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, the Committee shall designate a temporary Chairperson who shall perform the duties and have the powers of the Chairperson.

1.4 - Term of Officers

Officers shall be elected for a one-year term. A member may not serve more than two consecutive terms in the same office. A member, after serving two consecutive terms in the same office, shall not be elected to an office for an interim period of one year.

1.5 - Officer Replacements

The Committee shall elect a member to any vacancy or unexpired term of an officer at which time they deem necessary. The newly elected officer shall serve in this capacity until the next regular election.
ARTICLE II - MEETINGS

2.1 - Location

All meetings shall be held in Kent or Ottawa Counties.

2.2 - Order of Business

The order of business to be conducted shall be in the following sequence: Roll Call, Minutes of Previous Meeting, Petitions and Communications, Reports of Staff; Reports of Committees, Old or Unfinished Business, New Business, Committee Members Discussion Period, and Adjournment.

2.3 - Agenda

The agenda for any given meeting shall be determined prior to that meeting by the Transportation Planning Division staff. All officially recognized Committee members may submit pertinent items for inclusion in the agenda. Staff shall have the responsibility for notifying all Committee members, sufficiently in advance, of an impending meeting.

2.4 - Special Meetings

Special meetings shall be held whenever necessary, if, in the opinion of the Chairperson, proposed topics of discussion are of regional concern or merit full committee consideration.

2.5 - Recording Duties

Secretarial and recording duties shall be performed by staff.

ARTICLE III - COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

3.1 - Membership

Policy Advisory Committee
The Policy Committee shall address all transportation matters related to transportation planning. The Grand Valley Metropolitan Council authorizes the Committee the following; develop and recommend to the Council, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, and the Unified Planning Work Program. The Committee is delegated the authority to amend the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program. The Committee is responsible for developing policies for compliance with the federal rules and procedures. In particular, this committee shall have responsibility for assuring that GVMC transportation plans and programs comply with the 1990 Clean Air Act and Amendments, and Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21).
Membership on the GVMC Policy Advisory Committee shall be composed of duly elected or appointed representatives of the legally constituted political units or publicly owned transportation providers contained within the Metropolitan Area Boundary (MAB), provided that none of the representatives of political units of government may be employees of the Michigan Department of Transportation, Grand Rapids Area Transit Authority, Kent County Road Commission or Ottawa County Road Commission. As of this date, membership includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/Unit</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cedar Springs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Grand Rapids</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grandville</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grand Rapids</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hudsonville</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kentwood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lowell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rockford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algoma Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonia Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtland Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaines Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallmadge Township</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Sand Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Sparta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County Board of Commissioners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County Road Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa County Board of Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa County Road Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interurban Transit Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent County Aeronautics Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Votes</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Votes Required for Quorum</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Or 14 Member Units Represented.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Committee
The Technical Committee is an advisory/recommending body to the Policy Committee. The Committee is authorized to address all technical matters relating to the multi-modal transportation planning process, as well as the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program. Membership on the GVMC Technical Committee shall be comprised of representatives of the agencies that are members of the Policy Advisory Committee. These representatives shall have the same voting powers as representatives on the Policy Advisory Committee. Other agencies or groups having a regional focus related to transportation shall be allowed membership. The voting status of these agencies shall be of an advisory nature; however, members shall be allowed to bring issues to the GVMC Technical Committee. Membership will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the GVMC Policy Advisory Committee, which will make a recommendation to the GVMC Board based on reference to the public information guidelines of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21).

VOTING Members
City of Cedar Springs
City of East Grand Rapids
City of Grand Rapids
City of Grandville
City of Hudsonville
City of Kentwood
City Of Lowell
City of Rockford
City of Walker
City of Wyoming
Ada Township
Algoma Township
Allendale Township
Alpine Township
Byron Township
Caledonia Township
Cannon Township
Cascade Township
Courtland Township
Gaines Township
Georgetown Township
Grand Rapids Township
Jamestown Township
Nelson Township
Plainfield Township
Tallmadge Township
Village of Sand Lake
Village of Sparta
Kent County Board of Commissioners
3.2 - Delegates

Each of the member units shall designate a delegate. Each delegate shall name an official alternate to represent him/her in the event of the delegate's absence from committee meetings. If neither designated representative can be present, a substitute delegate may attend and have full voting privileges. Any substitute delegate not from the same community shall have a signed proxy or have phoned in his/her proxy prior to meeting.

3.3 - Meeting Attendance

A delegate, alternate, or proxy from each member unit should be present at all meetings. If a member unit fails to have a representative present for three consecutive meetings, the said unit will be notified in writing by the Chairperson.

3.4 - Admission of New Agencies or Organizations

Committees may, upon request, permit additional agencies or organizations to sit on the Committee. Such organizations or agencies will be admitted as non-voting members. Admission of a new agency or organization shall require a recommendation from the Policy Advisory Committee and approval from the GVMC Board. The bylaws will be amended based on the recommendation from the Policy Advisory Committee.

ARTICLE IV - VOTING

4.1 - Voting Structure

Each member political unit shall be assigned one vote. Cities and townships shall have one additional vote for each 50,000 population based on the last certified census.
4.2 - Quorum

A quorum shall be required before any resolution, motion, or any other official action can be formally acted upon. A quorum shall consist of designated representatives from fourteen (14) or more units comprising the Committees or nineteen (19) total votes represented. A simple majority of those present shall be required to pass a decision. Revision of bylaws shall require two-thirds of the votes present of the Policy Advisory Committee Members.

ARTICLE V - SUBCOMMITTEES

5.1 - Standing Committees

One permanent subcommittee shall be established: Transportation Programming Study Group. This subcommittee will provide in-depth review for and recommendations to the Technical and Policy Committees. Items addressed by this subcommittee shall be at the direction of either the Technical or Policy Committee Chairperson. Meetings will be called by the subcommittee chairperson whenever necessary to accomplish its appointed tasks.

5.2 - Transportation Programming Study Group

This subcommittee shall address matters related to project selection and evaluation for the Transportation Improvement Program and Long Range Transportation Plan. This is a working subcommittee which prepares draft materials for the Technical Committee. This subcommittee is responsible for developing local guidelines for compliance with the federal rules and procedures. In particular, this committee shall have responsibility for assuring that GVMC Transportation plans and programs comply with the 1990 Clean Air Act and Amendments and Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21).

The Composition of the Transportation Improvement Program Committee shall include the following:

- City of Cedar Springs: 1
- City of East Grand Rapids: 1
- City of Grandville: 1
- City of Grand Rapids: 2
- City of Hudsonville: 1
- City of Kentwood: 1
- City of Lowell: 1
- City of Rockford: 1
- City of Walker: 1
- City of Wyoming: 2
- Village of Caledonia: 1
- Village of Sand Lake: 1
- Village of Sparta: 1
Voting
Each member shall have one vote, except the Cities of Grand Rapids and Wyoming, and the Kent County Road Commission. A simple majority of those present is required to establish a position or recommendation. All position/recommendations shall be submitted to and subject to Technical Committee acceptance and confirmation.

5.3 - Ad-hoc Committees

An ad-hoc committee may be appointed at any time by the Chairman of the Technical Committee to address a specific matter. Ad-hoc committees shall function for not more than (1) year. At the end of one (1) year, all responsibilities and remaining duties will be carried out by a standing subcommittee.
POLICIES
Policies and Practices for Programming Projects

November 20, 2019

All projects listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)/Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) fall under these Policies/Practices, regardless of funding source or category.
Transportation Performance Measure Targets

GVMC Staff, MDOT Staff recommended Strategy/Practice:

The MPO will monitor progress toward all TPM targets (either in support of statewide targets or individual MPO targets if applicable). The reporting of progress will be consistent with the procedures and documentation developed in consultation with FHWA/FTA, MDOT and MTPA. If progress is not being made toward the targets, the MPO investment strategies in each category will be adjusted for those areas within MPO control.

The MPO project prioritization process will support the federal Transportation Performance Measures (TPM targets, from the FAST Act identified in the attached appendix - add the summaries from MDOT). Each year, the MPO will assess the pavement and bridge condition to determine if progress is being made locally and toward the statewide targets, based on the funding available. If the MPO system is not within the parameters set by the statewide targets, the MPO will adjust pavement and bridge strategies to the extent feasible and practical.

In addition, all major pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction projects will assess and incorporate feasible safety enhancements to address correctable crash patterns, consistent with the Regional Transportation Safety Plan and TPM Safety targets, to reduce vehicular and pedestrian Fatal and Serious Injury crashes. If the MPO system is not within the parameters set by the statewide targets, the MPO will adjust pavement and bridge strategies to the extent feasible and practical.

Congestion and TPM Travel Time Reliability and CMAQ Targets will also be considered as part of other roadway and bridge improvement projects. However, this will need to consider the impact of revised federal Air Quality Conformity rules, which could impact major roadway and transit capacity improvement projects. The impact of these rules will need to be monitored and coordinated with TPM targets.

Decisions related to capital transit project funding will be made in the context of federal Transportation Asset Management (TAM) requirements and support regional TAM targets.

To the extent of the MPO’s ability, decisions related to bridge project funding will be made in the context of federal bridge performance requirements and support regional bridge condition performance targets.
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 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) prior to implementation through the TIP process. The funding ratios for capacity deficient projects should be set at 80% TEDF-C 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 MTP.

Travel time reliability is an important performance measure of congestion because it can better measure the benefits of traffic management and operation activities than simple averages. The MPO also shall use available TEDF and CMAQ funding to improve travel time reliability on the GVMC highway network that are identified as congested. Travel time reliability can be used to prioritize roadway segments for congestion improvement in the GVMC transportation system. Travel time index (TTI) and Planning time index (PTI) are the federally-selected performance measures for travel time reliability. The GVMC’s Congestion Management Process (CMP) rank roadways and intersections in the region’s National Highway System (NHS) based on TTI and PTI. Non-NHS roadways are not included due to data availability. Roadways with the worst congestion as identified by these performance measures are given priority for investment.

Explanation:

If a facility on the National Highway System (NHS) in the GVMC region 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS Scale</th>
<th>V/C Range</th>
<th>LOS Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V/C 0.00 - 0.25</td>
<td>= LOS A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C 0.26 - 0.50</td>
<td>= LOS B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C 0.51 - 0.75</td>
<td>= LOS C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C 0.76 - 1.00</td>
<td>= LOS D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C 1.01 - 1.25</td>
<td>= LOS E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/C 1.26 - 9.99</td>
<td>= LOS F</td>
<td>Capacity Deficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For a non-NHS facility in the GVMC region, peak period V/C ratio is used to define capacity deficient, as shown in the scale below,

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V/C</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.25</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26 - 0.50</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 - 0.75</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.76 - 1.00</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 - 1.25</td>
<td>LOS E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26 - 9.99</td>
<td>LOS F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comprehensive Roadway Infrastructure Deficiency Management System (RIDMS) will be developed and used as an inventory for all federal-aid roadways within the MPO boundary. The information contained in RIDMS will be developed by MPO staff, reviewed by each jurisdiction, and approved through the MPO process. RIDMS will be updated as information becomes available. All MTP projects (state and local) will come from RIDMS. Data for RIDMS will be acquired through various sources, including but not limited to local data submittal, Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) inventory, the GVMC traffic count program, MDOT’s traffic count program, Michigan Traffic Crash Fact data analysis, 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 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. No improve/expand or bridge projects will be programmed that do not address current and future congestion through the life of the MTP.

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 (aiming to address capacity/congestion issues) to be included in the TIP that receive non-FTA federal funding, must be supported by information identifying the need and demand for such services. A commitment to continue the proposed service beyond the scope of the federal funding must also be in place if ridership meets projections.

Projects located in the identified Congestion Deficient Corridors will also be noted on the deficient project pool listing in the RIDMS. 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 Interstate Access Change Request (IACR), to assess traffic impacts on the Interstate highway system.

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

Travel time index provides an easy way to understand the scale of congestion. It is defined as the ratio of actual travel time to free-flow travel time. GVMC also uses AM (7:00-9:00am) and PM (3:00-6:00pm) travel time index on weekdays to identify congested corridors on the highway network. The thresholds for different congestion levels based on travel time index are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time Index for congestion levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low/No Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning time index is defined as the ratio of the 95th percent travel time to the free-flow travel time. It represents the total time needed to plan for an on-time arrival 95% of the time. A value of 1.50 means that a 30 minute trip in free-flow traffic should be planned for 45 minutes. The thresholds for different reliability levels based on worst peak period (AM or PM peak) planning time index are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Time Index for Reliability levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 primary 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. PASER ratings are determined by 3 trained members, 1 MDOT representative, at least 1 MPO rep and preferably 1 ACT 51 rep. 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.

Additional metrics that pertain to the Federal Transportation Performance Measures (TPM) will be utilized on the National Highway System (NHS).

Programming/Investment Policy

GVMC shall program federal funds using PASER condition according to the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASER Rating</th>
<th>PASER Investment Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASER 10 – 8</td>
<td>Not Eligible for federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASER 7</td>
<td>Eligible for crack sealing funding*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASER 6 - 5</td>
<td>Eligible for sealcoat/thin overlay funding*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASER 4</td>
<td>Eligible for structural overlay funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASER 3 – 1</td>
<td>Eligible for reconstruction funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approved GVMC treatment. Subject to MDOT Programming approval.
TPM data will be collected by the MDOT and provided to the MPO. These metrics this will allow for the reporting of overall performance: Good, Fair, or Poor for each segment. International Roughness Index (IRI) data will be collected on all NHS classified roads where Rutting, Faulting (Concrete), and Cracking will be identified for Interstate NHS only.

A combination of PASER and TPM data metrics will be used to identify project eligibility on the NHS system. PASER will be used on all other Federal Aid Road Segments within the MPO area.

In planning for future improvements both TPM metrics and PASER data will be presented to our committees for review to help inform and validate the project selection process.

Projects that receive funding through the MPO process should be designed and constructed to ensure 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 ensure a high level of return on the federal investment. Please see the recommended Condition and Treatment Measures in the table below based on the PASER system.
## ASPHALT PASER RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asphalt Surface Rating</th>
<th>Visible Distress</th>
<th>General Condition / Treatment Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>New construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Recent overlay, like new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Recent sealcoat or new road mix. Little or no maintenance required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>First signs of aging. Maintain with routine crack filling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Surface aging, sound structural condition. Needs sealcoat or non-structural overlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Significant aging and first signs of need for strengthening. Would benefit from recycling or overlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Need patching and major overlay or complete recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Severe deterioration. Need reconstruction with extensive base repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Failed. Needs total reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- asphalt surface rating:
- visible distress
- general condition / treatment measures
## CONCRETE PASER RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concrete Surface Rating</th>
<th>Visible Distress</th>
<th>General Condition / Treatment Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Excellent</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>New construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Excellent</td>
<td>Traffic wear in wheelpath. Slight map cracking or pop-outs.</td>
<td>Recent concrete overlay or joint rehabilitation. Like new condition. No maintenance required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Very Good</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>More surface wear or slight defects. Little or no maintenance required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Good</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>First sign of transverse cracks (all tight); first utility patch. More extensive surface scaling. Seal open joints and other routine maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Good</td>
<td>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”).</td>
<td>First signs of shallow reinforcement or corner cracking. Needs general joint and crack sealing. Scaled areas could be overlaid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fair</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>First signs of joint or crack spalling or faulting. Grind to repair surface defects. Some partial depth patching or joint repairs needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fair</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Needs some full depth repairs, grinding, and/or asphalt overlay to correct surface defects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Poor</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Needs extensive full depth patching plus some full slab replacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Very Poor</td>
<td>Extensive slab cracking, severely spalled and patched. Joints failed. Patching in very poor condition. Severe and extensive settlements or frost heaves.</td>
<td>Recycle and/or rebuild pavement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Failed</td>
<td>Restricted speed. Extensive potholes. Almost total loss of pavement integrity.</td>
<td>Total reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety Project Eligibility

Goal:

GVMC shall undertake efforts to focus planning resources on traffic crashes in an effort to minimize the loss of human life and the impact they have on the economy of the region.

Deficiency Definition

The Safety Performance Management Final Rule issued by FHWA require the use of five year rolling average for each of the five safety performance measures shown below:

- Number of fatalities
- Rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
- Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

Deficiency rankings from the West Michigan Traffic Safety Plan are derived from excess expected fatal and serious injury crash frequency. The excess fatal and serious injury crash threshold for each ranking is as follows:

- Low: 1 to 3 crashes per year
- Medium: 3 to 5 crashes per year
- High: 5 crashes per year

Recommended Strategy/Practice:

Safety enhancement will be considered with all projects. High-priority roadway segments and intersections based on the performance measures shown above are identified in the West Michigan Traffic Safety plan as well as in the GVMC Traffic Safety Plan. Roadway segments, intersections and initiatives identified in both the plans are given priority for safety funding.
CMAQ Program

Policies/Practices:

Traditionally, buses, intersections and the Clean Air Action Program are funded with this program. Other eligible projects will be considered on a case by case basis. MDOT/Local split of the funds (MDOT 50%/Local Agencies 50% of the CMAQ funds statewide per MDOT Policy, less the ITS set-asides.)

With the CMAQ funds allocated to the MPO up to 50% will be flexed to transit. With the remaining funds, the TPSG Committee will rank all CMAQ eligible projects based on an emission reduction/cost benefit basis. MPO staff/Committees, through the MTPA process, will develop and implement a consistent and improved statewide evaluation process of CMAQ projects, and project selection process, based on federal guidelines and TPM targets for CMAQ currently being developed. The MPO will monitor improvements to AQ and the effectiveness of CMAQ projects based on MPO progress toward approved statewide or future MPO targets.

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 current 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 (CMAQ CFP Sub-Committee) makes the final decisions to reach financial constraint and project eligibility for the final program.
- This entire agreement will be re-evaluated when the USEPA takes action on the 8 hour standard, and/or new federal CMAQ guidelines and TPM targets are developed.
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 Metropolitan Transportation Plan shall maintain a listing of eligible non-motorized projects and funding shall be allocated through the MTP and TIP planning processes to achieve an overall goal of improving the non-motorized system.

Facility Definitions

The MPO, in cooperation with the Non-Motorized Subcommittee 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 “sidewalks”). 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.

Sidpath – Sidpaths are shared use paths that are located immediately adjacent and parallel to a roadway.

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 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Non-Motorized Transportation Plan are eligible for funding as allowed under applicable federal-aid categories. Proposed projects shall be evaluated during the development of the Non-Motorized Plan and scored using evaluation criteria set forth in the plan and agreed upon by the Non-motorized Subcommittee. Project evaluation results – along with fiscal constraint, project readiness, and other context-related factors – shall drive the programming process.

Federal surface transportation law provides flexibility to MPOs to fund bicycle and pedestrian improvements from a wide variety of federal programs (STP, CMAQ, TAP, etc.). However, historically the GVMC Committees have primarily funded projects containing only non-motorized elements (as opposed to a roadway project that includes new bike/pedestrian facilities) using competitive grant dollars from the regional Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) allocation.

Any 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.
Transit Asset Management

Goal:

Achieve and maintain a state of good repair for transit vehicles, equipment, and facilities in the GVMC region.

Background:

MAP-21 mandated that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) develop a rule establishing a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving public capital assets effectively through their entire life cycle. The Transit Asset Management (TAM) Final Rule 49 CFR part 625 became effective Oct. 1, 2016 and established four performance measures:

1. Rolling Stock - Percentage of revenue vehicles exceeding Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)
2. Equipment - Percentage of non-revenue vehicles exceeding ULB
3. Facilities - Percentage of facilities rated under 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale
4. Infrastructure - Percentage of track segments under performance restriction (only applies to rail fixed guideway systems – not applicable in GVMC region)

Through coordination with the region’s transit providers, the MPO has adopted region-level targets for each of these performance measures, which will be evaluated and updated, as necessary, during the MTP update process.

Policy/Practice:

Capital transit projects should be consistent with agency TAM requirements and contribute to meeting regional TAM targets.
Bridge Projects

Goal:

The national performance goal for bridge and pavement condition is to maintain the condition of highway infrastructure assets (including bridges) in a state of good repair.

Background:

MAP-21 transformed the Federal-aid highway program by establishing new requirements for performance management to ensure the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds. As part of performance management, recipients of Federal-aid highway funds need to make transportation investments to achieve performance targets that make progress toward national goals. The Pavement and Bridge Condition Final Rule, 49 CFR part 490, became effective February 17, 2017 and established two performance measures for bridge condition:

1. Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition
2. Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition

Through coordination with State and local planning partners, the MPO will adopt region-level targets for each of these performance measures (either by supporting state targets or developing MPO-specific targets), which will be evaluated and updated, as necessary, during each performance period.

Policy/Practice:

To the extent of the MPO’s ability, decisions related to bridge project funding should be made in the context of federal bridge performance requirements and support regional bridge condition performance targets.
Freight-Related Projects Funding Eligibility

Goal:

The MPO will fund freight related projects/corridors, where eligible, to minimize delay for major shippers and to support PBPP efforts.

Background:

Last year, the MPO worked with MDOT to identify Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridors within the MPO boundary, to support the National Highway Freight Network. Due to the limited mileage allowed for the Urban and Rural Freight Corridors in the FAST Act, the MPO worked with MDOT to identify candidate Freight routes, which serve critical local industries or provide connections to the formal Freight Network. These candidate routes could be formally designated if a project eligible for federal Freight funding is identified and proposed in the future. Freight related projects and funding will target the formal and candidate MPO Freight Network corridors and applicable performance measure targets.

Recommended Policy/Practice:

Allow the use of federal funds, where eligible, to address identified freight constrained intersections, roadways and corridors. While there are no identified federal fund sources specifically designated for planning and or specific freight projects, during the development of a TIP special consideration may be given to proposed projects that are located in an identified and/or candidate freight corridor/route, and contributed to statewide or MPO performance measure targets. If the proposed project specifically addresses the identified constraint/conflict point/etc. that project may be given a higher priority over a typical resurface/ reconstruct project. Freight needs will be balanced with other federal performance measures when selecting projects for the TIP, unless funds are allocated and restricted to freight corridor needs and improvements. All federal fund sources currently available (where appropriate) shall be considered for addressing freight related projects.
The Use and Definition of GPA’s

Below, information is provided on the currently allowed use of GPA’s in the TIP by MDOT, Local Jurisdictions and ITP The Rapid.

Policy/Practice:

Use, where and when possible, GPA’s to facilitate a smooth modification/amendment of projects listed in a current TIP.

Introduction:

Federal regulation 23 CFR 450.324 (f) states projects that are not considered to be of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program year may be grouped by function, work type, and/or geographic area using the applicable classifications under 23 CFR 771.117(c) and (d) and/or 40 CFR part 93. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, project classifications must be consistent with the “exempt project” classifications contained in the EPA transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR part 93). In addition, projects proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C. Chapter 2 that are not regionally significant may be grouped in one line item or identified individually in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

In Michigan, these groupings of projects are called General Program Accounts (GPAs). A project consists of all the job numbers and phases for proposed work that are included in the associated environmental documents. Projects that have similar work type activities can be grouped together in a GPA based on that work type activity and included in the state’s metropolitan area TIPs and/or the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for non-metropolitan areas. Trunkline Project lists for each individual GPA are maintained by MDOT.

In an effort to streamline TIP and STIP development processes and minimize the need to amend the TIP and STIP, a statewide committee was developed to review current definitions for General Program Accounts. The goal of the committee is to clearly define the General Program Account categories and to find ways to make more efficient use of them for eligible state, local and transit projects. Furthermore, this committee will review the GPA process and reconvene as deemed necessary to make updates to this process and this document. The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) Statewide Transportation Planning Division worked with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and others within MDOT to review the current use of GPAs and their definitions.

Advantages of Using Groupings:

GPAs may be used as a tool to streamline the TIP and STIP development processes and minimize the need to amend the TIP and STIP. Grouping projects in GPAs is a tool to reduce the record keeping requirements of individually listing minor projects. They reduce the volume of
projects listed individually on the TIP and STIP E-files. The line item GPA, while it encompasses several small-scale projects, is treated as one project for the purposes of amendment/administrative modifications to the TIP and STIP. This allows for more flexible programming of the TIP and STIP and a reduction in the number of amendments.

Terminology:

**General Program Account (GPA)** – Project groupings, into which the individual GPA Projects will be sorted, based on the work type code.

**GPA Project** – this is the individual phase that will be assigned to the appropriate GPA.

The following rules will apply to all GPA categories:

1. The project cannot be a new road, capacity expansion, or capacity reduction (road-diet) project.
2. The project cannot be funded with a congressional or state earmark.
3. The project cannot be experimental.
4. Each project must be a categorical exclusion and air quality neutral.
5. Advance Construct and Advance Construct Conversion phases cannot be listed as a GPA project.
6. Reconstruction projects are not GPA eligible. (Reconstruction projects are identified by work type codes).
7. GPA projects shall cost less than $5.0 Million
Adding/Programming New or Revised Projects to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 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 three actions that are covered by this policy/practice, as agreed to by FHWA/FTA, MDOT and MTPA: MPO Administrative Modifications, MPO Adjustment and Federal TIP Amendments.

Federal TIP Amendments

TIP 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):

- Applies to projects over $5.0 Million and all reconstruction projects
- Projects (including GPA Category Accounts/Budgets) with cost exceeding 25% of the programmed Total Participating Project Cost (participating funds only).
- Adding a new project; the candidate project should be included on a deficiency list as well as the Illustrative 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.

Exceptions to this Policy include new projects using Federal Aid funding sources not impacting other Federal Aid Funded projects such as MDOT, ITP, TAP, Bridge, Safety, or other discretionary sources (see matrix). Upon MPO staff recommendation, the Technical and Policy Committee Chair or Vice Chair Persons are authorized to approve Federal project amendments and MPO Adjustments in the referenced federal funding categories. Projects covered under these exceptions will be posted on the GVMC website for public review for 1 week prior to submitting for federal approval. MPO Committees will be notified at their next regular meeting.
Projects that are categorized as “GPA Projects” can be added, deleted, moved and changed in cost, through Administrative Modifications (per Policies herein), as long as the GPA Account/Budget does not exceed the 25% threshold outlined above.

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 Federal amendments will be forwarded to MDOT via electronic format with the noted changes, financial constraint documentation, and proof of MPO action. MDOT will then forward the changes to FHWA.

**TIP Administrative Modifications and MPO Adjustments**

Administrative Modifications or MPO Adjustment for the TIP 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 25% of the TIP programmed amount, is an administrative modification and requires MPO staff 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 list of projects.
  - Cost changes which may impact project funding available to other MPO members will be classified as **MPO Adjustments**, requiring MPO Committee approval as well as staff approval.
- Minor Federal-aid changes may be allowed if other local projects are not impacted, and will be reflected in the next TIP list of projects (ie-MDOT, ITP, TAP, Bridge, Safety, 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 (MPO Adjustment).
- Changes in non-federal funding participation; these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP list of projects.
- Minor changes in scope; however, project scope changes affecting AQ conformity or other projects will require MPO Committee approval (MPO Adjustment) 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, changing or combining job numbers within
the project funding limits described herein); these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP list of projects.

- Corrections to minor listing errors that don’t change cost or scope; these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP list of projects.
- Cost decreases (Federal or non-Federal); these modifications will be reflected in the next TIP list of projects. 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 ½ mile.
- Adding, deleting or changing GPA qualifying projects in most cases will be an Administrative Modification;
- GPA line items budget changes exceeding 25% will require a Federal TIP Amendment, consistent with the Statewide GPA Policy.

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

In the event that an Administrative Modification or MPO Adjustment must be considered immediately, staff will have the authority to implement that adjustment; and for MPO Adjustments, 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 list of projects.

At all times the TIP must maintain financial constraint through a combination of Federal and non-federal funds. Administrative Modifications and MPO Adjustments will be communicated to MDOT and FHWA in a timely fashion and reflected in the next TIP list of projects, and posted on the GVMC website for public information.

Major transit capital expenditures and/or projects may be considered a Federal TIP Amendment, depending on their scope and impact on the AQ Conformity process.

**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, as defined by inter-agency work group (IAWG) and/or air quality (AQ) conformity Non-Exempt project list. *See the definition of regionally significant projects below for more detail.*
- Deleting a project; where applicable, funding will be returned to the MPO for reprogramming.
- Projects with cost exceeding 25% 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 or project list 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.

Major projects affecting roadway through capacity or transit service capacity (Non-Exempt for AQ) shall be listed specifically in the MTP, and subject to a MTP amendment if not in the plan. AQ Exempt projects are not required to be listed individually, outside of those in the current TIP, but may be listed by categories of work (such as preservation, safety, etc.)

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, or as defined by the IAWG.
- Increase in Federal-aid cost less than or equal to 25% 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 25% require MPO 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, and for public information through the GVMC website.

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

### TIP Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Committee Chair Approval</th>
<th>Technical Committee Review &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Committee Approval</th>
<th>MDOT/FHWA/FTA Approval</th>
<th>Public Participation Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add New Project over $5.0 Million (including Safety, TAP, and CMAQ projects) in TIP Project List</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting, Web posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting, Web posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-aid cost increase over 25%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major* scope/design change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move Illustrative List Project into the TIP [new project]***</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change non-federal aid funded project to federally funded project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Discretionary Projects Over $5 million</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web posting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.**

**Any new project or major scope/design change shall be consistent with the MTP.**

**GAP line items budget changes exceeding 25%.**

**Generally refers to line items in TIP Project List (over $5.0 million).**

### TIP Admin. Mod/Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Committee Chair Approval</th>
<th>Technical Committee Review &amp; Recommendation</th>
<th>Committee Approval</th>
<th>MDOT/FHWA/FTA Approval</th>
<th>Public Participation Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional lanes or non-motorized, up to one mile</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding, deleting or changing project within existing GPA category and budgets as defined (under $5.0 Million)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At next Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Federal aid cost more than 10% and less than or equal to 25%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Federal aid cost up to 10% (per LAP Policy)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Federal aid project cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Federal funding category (applies to MDOT only)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Federal-aid funding level not affecting other projects (eg. MDOT, ITP, TAP, Bridge, Safety, MIP [earmarks], or other discretionary sources)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding or changing job numbers within approved funding and scope limits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing an advance construction project to Federal-aid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of project year within the 4-year TIP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing error corrections</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor** scope changes (not regionally significant as defined)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial constraint must be maintained at all times.**

**Changes to existing projects.**

**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, fixed guideway or BRT transit project, substantial multi-jurisdictional non-motorized, or major rail or transit 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 & NHI, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTP Amendment</th>
<th>Add/Delete Regionally Significant Project (defined by IAWG, AQ non-exempt project)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X (Option)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Committee meeting, Web posting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major* scope/design change for regionally significant project(s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting, Web posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move Regionally Significant Illustrative List Project into the MTP (new project)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting, Web posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in air quality conformity model year grouping for regionally significant project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committee meeting, Web posting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTP Administrative Modification</th>
<th>Additional lanes or non-motorized facilities, up to one mile</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X (Option)</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Not required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in Federal aid cost up to 25%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (Option)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease in Federal aid project cost</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes to existing projects.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTP modifications will be made during the next MTP amendment or plan update.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listing error corrections or other non-regionally significant project changes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor** scope changes (not regionally significant as defined)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update to the first four years of the MTP to correspond to the most current TIP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, fixed guideway or BRT transit project, substantial multi-jurisdictional non-motorized, or major rail or transit infrastructure.
- Major* = 1) change in lane configuration, 2) change affecting road capacity, 3) change affecting air quality (regionally significant)
Regionally Significant Project

Regionally significant project definition from 23 CFR 450.104:

A transportation project that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs and would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area's transportation network. A transportation project (other than projects that may be grouped in the TIP and/or STIP or exempt projects as defined in EPA's transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR part 93)) that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside the region; major activity centers in the region; major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, or employment centers; or transportation terminals) and would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area's transportation network. At a minimum, this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel.

Additionally for GVMC’s purposes a project is considered regionally significant if it involves adding or reducing through road capacity over one mile or adding a newly constructed Federal-aid road, fixed guideway or BRT transit project, substantial multi-jurisdictional non-motorized project, or a major rail or transit infrastructure project. Roadway and bridge preservation, operational and/or safety (turning lanes, signalization, ITS equipment or services, etc.) projects are not considered Regionally Significant, as long as any new turning lanes are one mile or less in length (or Exempt projects as defined in FHWA-FTA guidance issued on 4-23-2018 and Transportation Conformity Regulations issued in April of 2012 from EPA).

Adding a new Regionally Significant project as defined by IAWG and/or air quality (AQ) conformity Non-Exempt project list (per FHWA-FTA guidance issued on 4-23-2018 and Transportation Conformity Regulations issued in April of 2012 from EPA), may require a new AQ conformity analysis and finding, based on IAWG discussion and concurrence.

- Major projects affecting roadway through capacity or transit service capacity (Non-Exempt for AQ) shall be listed specifically in the MTP (in a TIP if applicable), and subject to a MTP/TIP amendment if not. AQ Exempt projects are not required to be listed in the MTP, outside of those in the current TIP, but may be listed by categories of work (such as preservation, safety, etc.)

All non-federal aid projects (for regional significance determination) will be considered on a case by case basis based on the regionally significant criteria herein by GVMC’s Technical and Policy committee for inclusion into a TIP and MTP.
Advance Construction

Policies/Practices:

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 four year TIP and the Illustrative program

The TPSG and Technical Committees recommend that the use of Advance Construction be
restricted to the first 4 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.
Obligation Authority

Policy/Practice:

- Encourage the use of Advance Construction.
- 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.
- Carry over projects (where possible) have priority to be funded in the next year of the TIP.
- Preferably the fourth year of the TIP contains easily built projects (several overlay projects).
- Monthly project tracking.

The TPSG 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 Technical Committee a project tracking sheet on a monthly basis.
- This section contains updates not acted upon by the Committees.
Functional Classification

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:

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

* 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.

NFC Modification Process

1. If a local jurisdiction wants to add/remove/modify a facility’s functional class that jurisdiction needs to draft a memo describing the justification for the change to the road on or adding to the Federal-Aid network and fill out the NFC Revision form. Justification needs to be that the function of the road has changed and not because the road needs to be improved using federal funds. Odds of the road getting reclassified go up for roads that serve as a pass-through between existing Federal-Aid roads, have multiple lanes, have high daily traffic volume, and have higher speeds.

2. MDOT and the MPO need to review the submission preliminarily before submission to the Technical & Policy Committees for review and approval. Once approved by the committees, the final submission is made by the MPO to MDOT. MDOT then reviews
the request then submits it to the Federal Highway Administration for their review and approval.
High Priority Corridors

Policy/Practice:

The current policy/practice is to review proposed corridors on a case by case basis by the TPSG Committee, considering the following:

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 TPSG and Technical committees recommend corridors to the Policy Committee, 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. - This section contains updates not acted upon by the Committees.
Federal Funding of Right of Way (ROW)

Policy/Practice:

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

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

MDOT federal funding for ROW will be allowed following the required TIP Administrative Modification, MPO Adjustment or Federal TIP Amendment.
Federal Funding of Engineering Expenses

Policy/Practice:

There is no local allowance for the use of Federal Funds for engineering costs by the MPO committees. MDOT federal funding for engineering will be allowed following the required TIP Administrative Modification, MPO Adjustment or Federal TIP Amendment.

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.
Title VI

Current Policy/Practice:

The MPO will update the Title VI Plan before the beginning of the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, with new censuses, or when one of the signers of the plan changes (such as the Title VI Coordinator). 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.
Federal Funding of Engineering Expenses

Policy/Practice:

There is no local allowance for the use of Federal Funds for engineering costs by the MPO committees. MDOT federal funding for engineering will be allowed following the required TIP Administrative Modification, MPO Adjustment or Federal TIP Amendment.

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.
Title VI

Current Policy/Practice:

The MPO will update the Title VI Plan before the beginning of the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, with new censuses, or when one of the signers of the plan changes (such as the Title VI Coordinator). 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.
GLOSSARY OF TERMS
Glossary of Terms

Access
The opportunity to reach a given point within a certain time frame, or without being impeded by physical, social, or economic barriers.

ADA
Americans with Disabilities Act

Allocation
An administrative distribution of funds among States which do not have statutory distribution formulas.

Alternative Fuels
Any motor fuel, other than gasoline, especially those that result in lower levels of air pollutants.

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
Group involved in setting standards for transportation facility development.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
Federal law that requires public facilities, including transportation services to be fully accessible for persons with disabilities. The law also requires paratransit service availability in areas where fixed route transit service is operated.

Apportionment
A division or assignment of funds based on prescribed formulas in the law and consisting of divided authorized obligation authority for a specific program among the States.

Arterial
A class of street serving major traffic movement that is not designated as a highway.

Average Daily Traffic (ADT)
The average number of vehicles passing a fixed point in a 24-hour time frame.

Base Year
The year which serves as a starting point of data used in a study.

Bikeway
A facility designed to accommodate bicycle travel for commuting or recreational purposes. Bikeways are not necessarily separated facilities; they may be designed and operated to be shared with other modes.

BLVD
Boulevard

BRRP
Federal Bridge Repair Program
Build/No-Build
Refers to a conformity requirement in which Metropolitan Planning Organizations must demonstrate the building or implementing of a long-range transportation plan or Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) will result in less air pollution emissions than not building or not implementing the plan or TIP.

CL
City Limits or County Line

CMS
Congestion Management System

CON
Construction Phase

CTF
Michigan Comprehensive Transportation Fund

Carbon Monoxide (CO)
A colorless, odorless, tasteless, gas that impedes the oxygenation of blood. CO is formed, in large part, by incomplete combustion of fuel.

Clean Air Act of 1990 and Amendments (CAAA)
Federal legislation that sets standards for air quality levels.

Clean Fuels
Fuels which generate fewer pollutants than gasoline (i.e. Compressed Natural Gas, methanol, ethanol, etc.)

Collector-Distributor Street
A road parallel to an expressway which collects and distributes traffic at access points involving through lanes.

Conformity
Compliance of any transportation plan with air quality control plans.

Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)
A type of alternative fuel that generates less pollutants than gasoline.

Congestion Management System (CMS)
One of six management systems required by ISTEA and subsequent transportation legislation. Future highway projects that significantly increase capacity for single occupant vehicles (SOV) should be part of a CMS or those projects may be ineligible for federal funding.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
Program which directs funding to projects that contribute to meeting national air quality standards.
**Contract Authority**
Budget authority that permits obligations to be made in advance of appropriations.

**DEMO**
Congressionally Designated Demonstration Funds

**Demand-Responsive**
Transportation services that can be variably routed and timed to meet the changing needs of the user on an as-needed basis.

**EDFA**
Transportation Economic Development Fund - Category A

**EDFC**
Transportation Economic Development Fund - Category C

**EPE**
Early Preliminary Engineering

**Elderly and Handicapped (E & H)**
Anachronistic designation for special transportation planning and services.

**Emissions Budget**
The part of the State Implementation Plan that identifies allowable emissions levels, mandated by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, for certain pollutants.

**Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**
Reports which details any adverse economic, social, environmental effects of a proposed transportation project that the federal government funds.

**Environmental Justice**
Refers to Executive Order 12898 which seeks to address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects in Federal programs or policies on minority and low income populations.

**Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or USEPA)**
Federal source agency of environmental and air quality regulations affecting transportation.

**Expenditures**
Disbursement of funds for repayment of obligations occurred.

**Expressway**
A controlled access, divided arterial highway, which is usually separated and designed to accommodate through traffic movements.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)**
Federal agency within the United States Department of Transportation that deals with roadway and highway issues.
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
Federal agency within the United States Department of Transportation that deals with transit issues.

Financial Constraint
A TIP and a Long Range Transportation Plan cannot reflect expenditures greater than anticipated revenues.

Fiscal Year (FY)
Year in which public and private agencies use for conducting business, it usually differs from the calendar year. Most State and Federal agencies use an October 1 through September 30 fiscal year.

Geographic Information System (GIS)
Computer mapping capabilities used to provide information.

Grand Rapids Area Transit Authority (GRATA)
Now known as the Interurban Transit Partnership, it is the agency responsible for providing public transportation and transit service in the Grand Rapids area.

Grand Rapids and Environs Transportation Study (GRETS)
Previous designation of the Grand Rapids Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

Grand Valley Metropolitan Council (GVMC)
Agency that serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Grand Rapids area. The Council is made up of members, all local units of government, that want to work cooperatively on issues that have a multi-jurisdictional or regional scope. Those issues include transportation, the environment, economics, and those with social impact.

Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)
A federal database of roadway characteristics and traffic information for pre-selected roadway segments throughout the entire MPO Study Area.

Improving Michigan’s Access to Geographic Information Networks (IMAGIN)
A statewide geographic data sharing organization.

Inspection and Maintenance (I/M)
An air quality program that calls for the inspection of automobiles for emissions problems and then repairs those problems.

Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)
Organization which contributes to the advancement of engineering issues in transportation.

Integrated Roadway Information System (IRIS)
System used to collect data about the roadway network.
**Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)**
Technologies that focus on monitoring, guiding, or operating motorized vehicles.

**Interagency Work Group (IAWG)**
Group consisting of Federal, State, and MPO staffs that meet periodically to discuss transportation project development and its relationship to air quality on both a short and long-range basis.

**Intermodal**
Refers to connections between modes of transportation.

**Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA)**
Federal legislation that reconstructed funding for the transportation program and opened up the transportation planning process to the public.

**IM**
Interstate Maintenance Program

**Interstate System**
The system of highways that connects the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers of the United States. The Interstate System also connects the U.S. to internationally significant routes in the Mexico and Canada.

**Interurban Transit Partnership (ITP – THE RAPID)**
Agency responsible for providing public transportation and transit service in the Grand Rapids area.

**Kent County Road Commission (KCRC)**
Agency responsible for road maintenance and construction in townships, villages, and other unincorporated parts of the county.

**Local Street**
A street intended solely for access to adjacent properties.

**Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**
A document that provides a strategy and methodology for an area’s long-range transportation needs. The Plan must have at least a twenty-year window and must be updated every three years.

**MTF**
Michigan Transportation Fund

**MIS**
Major Investment Study

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**
The MPO has responsibility for developing transportation plans for urbanized areas of 50,000 population or more. Grand Valley Metro Council (GVMC) is the MPO for the Grand Rapids area.
**Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)**
U.S. Census determination which delineates the boundaries of the Metropolitan area.

**Michigan Accident Location Index (MALI)**
Index which is compiled by law enforcement agencies to pinpoint the exact location of traffic accidents.

**Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ)**
State agency dedicated to environmental improvements and policies that impact public health and natural resources such as air quality, water quality, and waste management.

**Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)**
State agency responsible for monitoring and improving the transportation system in Michigan.

**Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS)**
State level data base which contains information on a number of items including roads, land cover, and natural resources.

**Mode**
Form of transportation, such as automobile, transit, bicycle, and walking.

**Model**
A mathematical and geometric projection of activity and interactions in the transportation system of an area.

**Multimodal**
Refers to the availability of transportation options within a system or corridor including automobile, bicycle, train, boat, etc.

**National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)**
Standards set forth through the Clean Air Act which monitor air quality.

**National Highway System (NHS)**
A federal transportation program authorized by ISTEA that designates nationally significant Interstate Highways and roads for interstate travel, national defense, Intermodal connections, and international commerce.

**Network**
A graphic and/or mathematical representation of multimodal paths in a transportation system.

**O/D**
Origin-Destination Study

**Obligations**
Commitments made by Federal agencies to pay out money as distinct from the actual payments themselves, which are outlays. Generally obligations are incurred after the enactment of budget authority.
Ottawa County Road Commission (OCRC)
Agency responsible for road maintenance and construction in townships, villages, and other unincorporated parts of the county.

Oxides of Nitrogen (NoX)
A byproduct of processes employing a high temperature combustion. Power plants, industrial boilers, and motor vehicles are all principle sources of NoX.

Paratransit
Services which serve the special needs of persons that standard mass transit services would serve with difficulty, or not at all.

Particulate Matter-10 (PM-10)
Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns. Consists of matter suspended in the atmosphere such as dust, chemicals, etc.

Parts Per Million (PPM)
A measurement used in relating concentrations of matter, such as ozone in the atmosphere.

Pavement Management System (PaMS or PMS)
A system used to monitor and evaluate pavement conditions on the road network.

Peak Hour
The 60-minute period in the morning and evening in which the largest volume of travel is experienced.

Penalty
An action that does not allow the State to use the full amount of its apportioned funds.

Person-Trip
A trip made by one person from one origin to one destination

Privatization
The supply of traditionally government-provided goods and services through for-profit businesses in order to enhance public cost efficiency.

Provider
An agency that causes clients to be transported, as opposed to an agency whose role is limited to funding programs.

Public Involvement Plan (PIP)
Plan developed by GVMC that dictates how public involvement will be incorporated into the transportation planning process.

Public Transportation Management System (PTMS)
A system which allows for the monitoring and evaluation of the public transportation system for an area.
**Region**
An entire metropolitan area including designated urban and rural subregions.

**Regional Geographic Information System (REGIS)**
Geographic Information System being utilized in the Grand Rapids area through the Grand Valley Metropolitan Council. (See Geographic Information System for more information)

**Regionally Significant**
A project that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area=s transportation network. Said project also offers an alternative to regional highway travel.

**Rescission**
Legislative action to cancel the obligation of unused budget authority previously provided by Congress before the time when the authority would have otherwise lapsed.

**Reverse Commute**
Commuting against the main direction of traffic or a commute from the central city to the suburbs.

**Right of Way (R-O-W)**
Priority paths for the construction and operation of highways, light and heavy rail, railroads, trails, etc.

**Road**
Any road or street under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority and open to public traffic.

**S9C**
Federal Transit Administration Program Section 9 Capital

**S9O**
Federal Transit Administration Program Section 9 Operating Assistance

**S18O**
Federal Transit Administration Program Section 18 Operating Assistance (Rural)

**S16B**
Federal Transit Administration Program Section 16B2 (Elderly & Handicapped)

**SAFETEA-LU**
Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act.

**Shuttle**
Usually a service provided with a vehicle seating twenty or more passengers that connects major trip destinations and origins on a fixed-route or route-deviation basis.
**Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV)**
The use of vehicle to get one person to a destination

**Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA)**
A U.S. Census delineation for larger metropolitan areas in the U.S.

**State Implementation Plan (SIP)**
Required documents prepared by States and submitted to EPA for approval. SIPs identify state actions and programs to implement designated responsibilities under the Clean Air Act and subsequent amendments.

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**
The compilation of Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) from around the State.

**Surface Transportation Program (STPC) – Small Cities**
Federal funding category geared specifically to small cities

**Surface Transportation Program (STPE) - Enhancements**
Federal funding category geared specifically to enhancement

**Surface Transportation Program-Rural (STPR)**
Federal funding category geared specifically to rural areas.

**Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STPU)**
Federal funding category geared specifically to urbanized areas.

**Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)**
The smallest geographically designated area for analysis of transportation activity.

**TRANPLAN**
Computerized Transportation Modeling Package (see model).

**Transit**
Passenger transportation service provided to the general public along established routes with fixed or variable schedules at published fares.

**Transit Dependent**
Persons who must rely on public transit or paratransit for most or all of their transportation needs.

**Transportation Control Measures (TCM)**
Local actions to adjust traffic patterns or reduce vehicle use to reduce air pollution.

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**
Process used to monitor and evaluate the need of the transportation network relative to the number of users, and the total amount of usage the transportation network will receive.

**Transportation Economic Development Funds (TEDF)**
This program has different lettered categories AA® through AF® that provide competitive
statewide funding for roadways of different types that serve economic development purposes.

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
A document prepared by States and MPOs citing projects to be funded under federal transportation programs for a three-year period.

**Transportation Management Area (TMA)**
An MPO with over 200,000 population. All transportation plans for these areas must be based on a continuing and comprehensive planning process carried out by the MPO in cooperation with the States and transit operators.

**Transportation System Management (TSM)**
The element of a TIP that proposes non-capital-intensive steps toward the improvement of a transportation system.

**Travel Time**
Customarily calculated as the time it takes to travel from door-to-door.

**Unified Work Program (UWP)**
Annual document prepared by the MPO that outlines transportation work tasks and products that will be completed and produced for the upcoming fiscal year.

**United States Department of Transportation (DOT or USDOT)**
The principal direct federal funding and regulating agency for transportation facilities and programs.

**Urbanized Area**
An area which contains a city of 50,000 or more population plus adjacent surrounding areas having a density of at least 1,000 people per square mile as determined by the U.S. Census.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**
The number of miles a vehicle or group of vehicles travel in a given unit of time.

**Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)**
Chemicals that are generated through the combustion of fossil fuels, industrial processes, and vegetation. VOCs are an ingredient in ground level ozone and smog.

**West Michigan Clean Air Coalition (WMCAC)**
A partnership of business, academia, government, industry, and the non-profit sector in Kent, Ottawa, and Muskegon counties working together to achieve cleaner air in the region.

**West Michigan Environmental Action Council (WMEAC)**
A non-profit environmental advocacy and education organization founded in 1968.
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