

GREAT FALLS URBAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
August 11, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Rearden called the Great Falls Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting to order at approximately 9:30 a.m. in the Rainbow Room of the Civic Center, #2 Park Drive South.

ROLL CALL OF TAC MEMBERS & ATTENDANCE

TAC Members Present/Represented:

Dave Dobbs	City of Great Falls Engineer
Andrew Finch	MPO, Sr. Transportation Planner, City of Great Falls
Craig Raymond	Director, City of Great Falls Planning & Community Development
Ken Jorgensen	Street Supervisor, City of Great Falls Street Division
Courtney Lyerly	Civil Engineer, Special Projects, City of Great Falls
Jerry McKinley	Traffic Supervisor, City of Great Falls
Jim Rearden	Director, City of Great Falls Public Works Department
Rick Schutz	Superintendent, Cascade County Road & Bridge Division
Sheila Ludlow	
(for Carol Strizich)	Statewide & Urban Planning Section, Helena MDT
Jerilee Weibel	Right-of-Way Supervisor, Great Falls District – MDT

TAC Members Absent/Not Represented:

Brian Clifton	Director, Cascade County Public Works Department
Susan Conell	Director, Cascade County Planning Division
Jim Ekberg	Deputy Director, Cascade County Public Works Department
John Faulkner	Director, Great Falls International Airport Authority
Jim Helgeson	Manager, Great Falls Transit District
Ken Jorgensen	Street Supervisor, City of Great Falls Street Division
Bill McLaughlin	Deputy Base Civil Engineer, Malmstrom Air Force Base
Christie McOmber	District Project Engineer, GF District MDT
Bruce Treis	Environmental Health Specialist, City-County Health Department

Recognition of Others Present:

Shyla Patera	North Central Independent Living Services
Connie Tryon	Sr. Administrative Assistant, City of Great Falls
Chris Ward	TD&H Engineering

MINUTES

Prior to the meeting, Committee members were provided a copy of the July 14, 2016, TAC meeting minutes. Mr. Finch moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Dobbs. All being in favor, the minutes were approved as submitted.

BUSINESS ITEMS

Prior to the meeting, TAC members were provided with copies of the TAC meeting agenda. Copies of the agenda and handout materials are attached and incorporated by reference.

5A. FFY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program

Mr. Finch said it is time to consider and adopt the yearly Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This is a continuation of previous years, and he highlighted a few of the items. The Long Range Transportation Plan will need a consultant to aid in the update, which has been budgeted for in the upcoming fiscal year. An

additional staff member has also been approved for the Planning and Community Development Department, which will assist in not only transportation planning, but long range planning and implementation as well. Mr. Finch said transit has identified a passenger count study, which is minor, but has been reflected in the UPWP as well. He offered to answer any questions from the Board.

MOTION: That the Technical Advisory Committee approve the FFY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program inclusive of any minor changes necessary to respond to FHWA/FTA comments and recommend approval by the Policy Coordinating Committee.

Made by: Mr. Lyerly

Second: Mr. Dobbs

VOTE: All being in favor, the motion passed.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was discussion on the proposed schedule for Fox Farm Road, with the letting date being in February or March of 2017.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Raymond moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Finch. All being in favor, the meeting adjourned at 9:41 a.m.



**STATE OF MONTANA
RAIL, TRANSIT & PLANNING DIVISION POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Policy No. POL 8.03.001	Subject: SHARED USE PATHS IN MDT RIGHT-OF-WAY POLICY	
Signature: <i>Signature on File</i>		Effective Date: 11/30/2016
<div style="text-align: center;">X _____ Michael T. Tooley Director</div>		

1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance regarding longitudinal occupancy of Shared Use Paths within MDT right of way, that are either to be funded by and included in MDT projects or as non-MDT funded encroachments.

2 DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 **Construction/Reconstruction** - Supervising, inspecting, building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, mapping, and costs of right-of-way or other interests in land and elimination of hazards at railway grade crossings.
- 2.1.1 This does not include minor rehabilitation or pavement preservation projects.
- 2.2 **Disproportionate Cost** - SUP costs should not exceed 10% of total project costs. All costs associated with the SUP, including but not limited to design, R/W, environmental mitigation, drainage, and construction must be included in the SUP cost estimate. The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Transportation Alternative (TA) Program may develop standalone SUP projects. In those instances, the program project selection processes must consider cost versus need.
- 2.3 **Enhancing Convenience** - The removal of barriers which will make a particular mode of transportation more attractive where and when feasible and which does not degrade the existing level of convenience for other transportation users.
- 2.4 **Maintenance** - The cyclical, seasonal, and long-term activities for the preservation of the surface, shoulders, structures and traffic control devices of a SUP and the removal of hazards to travel to keep it as nearly as possible in its original condition as constructed.

- 2.5 **Need/Probable Use** - Non-motorized transportation purpose trips generally occur within three miles of a city or town. To be considered a need, the SUP must be partially located within a three-mile radius of the city limits of incorporated cities or within three-miles of the geographic center of unincorporated towns, provide a transportation purpose, and be an integral part of a system designed to connect with an origin or destination within that city or town.
- 2.5.1 SUP projects identified as a need and entirely funded through HSIP may be constructed where needed to address the safety issue.
- 2.6 **Other Available Routes** - Alternatives to the SUP that allow the user to fulfill the transportation purpose of connecting the origin to the destination. Other available routes may include other shared use facilities open to the public for transportation, such as other shared use paths, public road shoulders, and public road traffic lanes.
- 2.7 **Public Sponsor/Agency/Entity** - The State of Montana, the United States, or a City, County or, Tribal Government. Agencies applying for Transportation Alternative (TA) projects must be eligible applicants as defined thru the applicable federal law and must have an agreement with a local government for maintenance.
- 2.8 **Promote/Enhance Traffic Safety** - Construction of a SUP must demonstrate a compelling (strong and convincing) need and improve the level of overall safety of the facility from the existing condition.
- 2.8.1 For example, constructing a SUP may have a compelling safety need if the adjacent roadway has no or narrow shoulders. Conversely, constructing a SUP would have a less compelling safety need if the adjacent roadway has 8-foot wide shoulders.
- 2.9 **Recreation Purpose** - SUP's provide a recreational purpose if their primary purpose is not to serve as a connection between origins and destinations. SUP's located in a rural environment are generally presumed to be for a recreational purpose. A closed loop or linear facility only serving recreational users is a recreational facility.
- 2.10 **Rural Environment** - Areas beyond the three-mile city/town threshold.
- 2.11 **Shared Use Path or SUP** - A facility primarily designed and used by bicyclists and pedestrians, wide enough to provide for mixed use by both, that is longitudinally placed in MDT's right of way and separated from the roadway.
- 2.11.1 Shared use paths are not sidewalks, which are paved paths parallel to a road or highway intended for pedestrian use only.
- 2.12 **State Highway** - All highways that are designated, selected, or established by the commission or constructed or maintained by the department. In general terms, any roadway that is on a designated system (Interstate, NHS, Primary, Secondary, Urban) regardless of maintenance responsibility, and any route that MDT maintains that are not on these designated systems.

- 2.13 **System Designed To Terminate At A City/Town** - Consists of a group of related facilities that are formally planned to work together to provide a transportation purpose and that terminates within a city or town. These facilities should be included within the applicable Statewide, Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), local, and tribal transportation plans.
- 2.14 **Transportation Purpose** - SUP's provide a transportation purpose if they serve as a connection between origins and destinations. For evaluation of eligibility, there must be a demonstrated connection between an origin and destination.
- 2.14.1 In general, SUP's serve a transportation purpose if they are located within 3 miles of a city or town and provide connections to origins and destinations.
- 2.14.2 Touring is an activity with the intent of moving through a place in order to see or learn about the place and does not meet the intent of being a transportation purpose.

3 SCOPE (PERSONS AFFECTED)

This policy applies to all agency staff (headquarters and districts) involved in the planning, programming, project development, engineering, construction, and maintenance of Shared Use Paths.

4 POLICY

4.1 Background

- 4.1.1 MDT regularly receives requests to include Shared Use Paths (SUP) within State highway right of way, either to be funded by and included in MDT projects or as non-MDT funded encroachments.
- 4.1.2 In the past, MDT has considered these requests on case by case basis. Consequently, the long-term implications associated with these facilities has not been given full consideration and there have been inconsistencies in MDT's response to these requests.
- 4.1.3 As resources for both construction and maintenance of transportation infrastructure become more limited, there is a need to better define how MDT addresses requests for SUPs across the state.

4.2 Application

- 4.2.1 This policy applies to longitudinal occupancy of MDT right of way. All new projects added to the program must comply. Requested perpendicular crossings of MDT's right of way will continue to be handled through MDT's encroachment permitting process.

4.3 Current Projects:

- 4.3.1 Projects under development that are pre-Scope of Work at the time this policy is enacted must be evaluated for compliance with this policy.

4.4 Considerations for Allowing SUP's in MDT Right Of Way

- 4.4.1 When considering a request to allow a SUP in state highway right of way the following criteria must be addressed and met. A written assessment of each of the following criteria, must be included in project documentation.
 - 4.4.1.1 A public sponsor/agency must be willing to accept ownership and long term maintenance responsibility for the SUP.
 - 4.4.1.2 It must be demonstrated that the SUP is principally to be used for transportation, not recreation.
 - 4.4.1.3 The SUP must be located within three miles of the city limits of incorporated cities, or within three miles of the geographic center of unincorporated towns. Construction of new SUP's partially within the three-mile threshold may extend beyond the three-mile limit if they provide a transportation purpose.
 - 4.4.1.4 Use of motorized vehicles, other than maintenance vehicles or snowmobiles, must not be permitted.
 - 4.4.1.5 Construction of the SUP must promote or enhance traffic safety and convenience.
 - 4.4.1.6 Generally, the path must be constructed in conjunction with a highway construction/reconstruction project. Standalone SUP projects may be constructed if they meet the requirements for full Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding, or if they are selected for funding through the Transportation Alternatives (TA) program.
 - 4.4.1.7 The SUP must provide connections to origins or destinations within a city or town, or be part of a system designed to do so.
- 4.4.2 If all of these requirements are met, construction is permissible unless:
 - 4.4.2.1 The cost of the SUP is disproportionate to the need or probable use.
 - 4.4.2.2 An environmental assessment (EA), environmental impact statement (EIS), or Planning/Other phase (OT) study was performed and a SUP was not identified as a need. For projects that do not include construction of a SUP, MDT will not acquire right of way or design the project with the intent of accommodating a future SUP.

4.4.2.3 Inclusion of the SUP increases project costs in a manner that impacts the ability to fund the project or will cause delay for other projects in the program. This generally would be experienced with non-core constrained funding programs (Urban, Secondary, Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ), etc.).

4.4.2.4 Other factors that indicate a lack of need, such as a rural environment or availability of other routes.

4.5 Maintenance and Liability Considerations

4.5.1 When considering a request to include a SUP in state highway right-of-way, the following maintenance considerations must be formally addressed through an executed maintenance agreement.

4.5.1.1 The facilities must be publically owned, operated and maintained.

4.5.1.2 There must be a formal agreement with the public agency accepting the responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

4.5.1.3 The formal agreement must include:

4.5.1.3.1 Provisions that require the public entity to indemnify MDT for that entity's negligence or misconduct in maintaining the facility.

4.5.1.3.2 Provisions that require the entity to pay MDT's cost to defend a lawsuit.

4.5.1.3.3 Provisions that require the public entity to obtain and maintain insurance to protect MDT from liability.

4.5.1.3.4 Provisions that allow MDT in the event the responsible party fails to adequately maintain the facility, the right to maintain the facility and bill the responsible party to recover maintenance costs.

4.5.1.4 The agreement must be executed prior to initiating project design.

5 CLOSING

Questions concerning this policy should be directed to Rail, Transit & Planning Division Administrator.

6 REFERENCES

6.1 Not Applicable.

7 ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

7.1 Not Applicable,

8 KEYWORDS

8.1 Right-of-Way

8.2 Pre-Scope of Work

8.3 Encroachment Permitting Process

REVISION HISTORY

DATE OF REVISION	REVISION # OF POLICY	REASON FOR MODIFICATION	AUTHOR OF REVISION
November 30, 2016	Policy # POL 8.03.001	New Policy	Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit & Planning Division Administrator



**STATE OF MONTANA
RAIL, TRANSIT AND PLANNING DIVISION POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Policy No. POL 8.03.002	Subject: HIGHWAY STATE SPECIAL REVENUE ACCOUNT MANAGEMENT: • NON-FEDERAL MATCH & MAINTENANCE IMPACTS TO THE ACCOUNT POLICY	
Signature: <i>Signature on File</i>		Effective Date: 11/30/2016
<div style="text-align: center;">X _____ Michael T. Tooley Director</div>		

1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish the criteria and processes all MDT staff and management will follow concerning MDT's role in providing non-federal match, maintenance responsibility, and making project development decisions that impact the balance of the Highway State Special Revenue Account (HSSRA).

2 DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 **Funding Program Manager** - The operational manager for the funding program/programs that are funding the project. For example, DA's are the managers for the district allocations (IM, NH, STPP). Other programs with individual managers include STPS, HSIP, STPU, BR, CMAQ, TA. If a project has multiple funding sources, coordination shall include all associated managers.
- 2.2 **HSSRA Exceptions Committee** - Consists of the Director/Deputy Director and the appropriate District Administrator, Administration, Planning, Maintenance, and Engineering Division Administrators. The Director is the chair of the committee and will make final decisions.
- 2.3 **MDT Formally Identified Existing Transportation System Condition Deficiencies** - System condition deficiencies identified through MDT planning, study, data and analysis.
- 2.4 **Montana Air & Congestion Initiative (MACI) Discretionary Program** - Discretionary CMAQ funds received by Montana that can be used on either CMAQ eligible or Surface Transportation Program eligible types of work.
- 2.5 **Montana Air & Congestion Initiative (MACI) Guaranteed Program** - CMAQ funds apportioned for air quality improvements in Missoula based on their air quality status and

CMAQ funds allocated to Billings and Great Falls at a level equivalent to what Missoula receives each year.

- 2.6 **Non-roadway purposes** - Activities allowed by federal law for the Surface Transportation Program not associated with roadway improvements like transit capital, transit operating, ride-share programs.
- 2.7 **Off-System** - Any location that is outside of the right-of-way of a federally designated or state designated highway system as defined in Section 2.8.
- 2.8 **On-System** - This includes any routes on the federally designated (Interstate and Non-Interstate National Highway System) or state designated (Primary, Secondary, Urban, State highways systems as specified in MCA 60-2-125) highway systems whether MDT maintained or not.

3 SCOPE (PERSONS AFFECTED)

This policy applies to all business units within MDT and service providers who have access to MDT's facilities or information.

4 POLICY

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The Montana Department of Transportation's ability to support the agency's mission and goals requires critical consideration of impacts that day-to-day decisions have on the balance of the HSSRA. The HSSRA is MDT's primary source of revenue to provide non-federal match for Montana's federal surface transportation program and to conduct statewide maintenance activities.
- 4.1.2 Revenue received through the HSSRA account is limited and must be managed to ensure it will continue to provide for the non-federal match for MDT planned projects, for MDT maintenance activities necessary to ensure the safety and mobility across the state highway system, and to meet federal maintenance of effort requirements.
- 4.1.3 This policy describes the criteria and processes all MDT staff and management will follow when determining uses of HSSRA in providing non-federal match, maintenance responsibility, and making project development decisions that impact the balance of the HSSRA.

4.2 Non-federal Match

- 4.2.1 The Montana Department of Transportation receives Federal Surface Transportation Program funds through various means, including authorization acts, appropriations acts, congressional earmarks; federal lands programs, and discretionary grant programs.

The majority of these funds require non-federal matching funds in a variety of percentage rates based on program specific requirements and adjustments provided under federal statute.

4.2.2 For non-MDT prioritized projects/programs, projects not in the current tentative construction program, and non-MDT solicited project funding allocated to MDT, the project/program sponsor is responsible for providing all of the required non-federal matching funds. (consistent with Commission Policy #5).

4.2.3 Details for MDT's application of matching fund requirements are as follows:

4.2.3.1 Non-Federal Match

4.2.3.1.1 In instances where more favorable non-federal match options exist, MDT will pursue these options. Utilization of non-federal match will be based on an assessment of the associated requirements.

4.2.3.1.2 In any instance where other sources of non-federal match are offered or available to a project, MDT will maximize the potential use of these other sources to match federal funds.

4.2.3.1.2.1 In-kind credit to locals will not be used to offset their required non-federal match as this creates added impact to state funds.

4.2.3.1.2.2 In-kind match will only be accepted as a means to reduce overall project costs.

4.2.3.1.2.3 In instances where match is required for discretionary (grant) or other funds outside of MDT's annual federal apportionments, the decision for MDT to provide non-federal match must be confirmed by MDT's Director prior to applying for the discretionary funds.

4.2.3.1.3 When other sources of match are not available, MDT will manage non-federal match as follows:

4.2.3.1.3.1 MDT will provide non-federal match funds for the following programs:

4.2.3.1.3.1.1 National Highway Performance Program (NHPP, IM, NHPP Bridge);

4.2.3.1.3.1.2 Surface Transportation Program Primary ;

- 4.2.3.1.3.1.3 Surface Transportation Program Secondary;
- 4.2.3.1.3.1.4 Surface Transportation Program On/Off System Bridge (preference is given to priorities that include other than MDT matching funds);
- 4.2.3.1.3.1.5 Highway Safety Improvement Program; and
- 4.2.3.1.3.1.6 Urban Pavement Preservation Program.
- 4.2.3.1.3.2 MDT will provide non-federal match for the following programs only when located on existing facilities on the State Highway System Routes or for MDT activities (i.e. air quality equipment):
 - 4.2.3.1.3.2.1 Surface Transportation Program Urban (limited to improving or preserving existing facilities);
 - 4.2.3.1.3.2.2 CMAQ MACI Discretionary Funds; and
 - 4.2.3.1.3.2.3 CMAQ MACI Guaranteed Funds allocated to MPO's (Missoula, Great Falls, and Billings).
- 4.2.3.1.3.3 MDT will provide non-federal match for the following programs only when located on existing facilities on the State Highway System Routes and used to address MDT formally identified existing transportation system condition deficiencies:
 - 4.2.3.1.3.3.1 Community Transportation Enhancement Program;
 - 4.2.3.1.3.3.2 Federal Lands Access Program Funds;
 - 4.2.3.1.3.3.3 Transportation Alternatives Program; and
 - 4.2.3.1.3.3.4 MDT Identified/Initiated/Sponsored/ Requested Grants or Discretionary Funds. Any MDT initiated applications that require match must be approved by MDT's

Director prior to submittal of the application.

4.2.3.1.3.4 MDT will not provide non-federal match for the following programs:

4.2.3.1.3.4.1 CMAQ MACI Guaranteed funds allocated to MPO's used for non-roadway purposes, or off system projects;

4.2.3.1.3.4.2 CMAQ MACI Discretionary -Non-MDT equipment purchase;

4.2.3.1.3.4.3 Surface Transportation Program Urban funds used for non-roadway purposes (transit, equipment, education, etc.) or off-system projects;

4.2.3.1.3.4.4 Non-MDT initiated/sponsored/requested grants, earmarks, or other directed funding. This includes applications initiated by non-MDT entities where MDT becomes the applying entity because program restrictions limit eligible applicants to State DOTs (consistent with Commission Policy # 5); and

4.2.3.1.3.4.5 Transportation Alternatives Off System or Educational Program Projects.

4.2.3.1.4 Any exceptions from the above will be handled on a case by case basis through the HSSRA Exceptions Committee.

4.3 **Maintenance**

4.3.1 In addition to non-federal match, it is critical to consider maintenance liability early in any process that allows improvement, construction, or installation of new facilities in MDT R/W or out of MDT R/W if the facility is constructed with MDT administered federal funds.

4.3.2 MDT may be responsible for assuming maintenance responsibility for paved Secondary routes. Projects to improve gravel Secondaries to paved surfaces may shift the maintenance responsibility to MDT. The effect of increased maintenance costs must be considered.

4.3.3 Maintenance

- 4.3.3.1 To ensure early consideration and prior to approval of MDT or non-MDT proposed construction of new facilities, such as shared use paths, wildlife crossings, transit stops, sidewalks, etc. within MDT right of way or MDT owned land (i.e. wetlands, excess land, etc.) that will require cyclical, seasonal, or long term maintenance, the following requirements must be met:
- 4.3.3.1.1 MDT's Maintenance Division (Maintenance Chief) must be involved in the initial discussions, and maintenance responsibility must be formally assigned prior to any MDT agreement to allow these facilities within MDT right of way.
 - 4.3.3.1.2 Specific evaluation process and liability mitigation for proposed Shared Use Path's is described in the *Shared Use Paths in MDT R/W Policy* (POL 8.03.001).
 - 4.3.3.1.3 In instances where MDT will construct and maintain the facility, project documentation must include a statement from MDT's Maintenance Division acknowledging and accepting the impact to the HSSRA.
 - 4.3.3.1.4 In instances where MDT will not construct or maintain the facility, the non-MDT requestor shall exhaust efforts to obtain alternative locations/alignments to eliminate or minimize placement within MDT R/W.
 - 4.3.3.1.5 If other locations/alignments are not available and MDT will not maintain the facility, regardless of who constructs the facility, the appropriate District Administrator shall present the request to the HSSRA exception committee for approval to allow the facility within MDT R/W.
 - 4.3.3.1.6 If the facility is allowed within MDT R/W, an executed maintenance agreement addressing and assigning future maintenance and cost responsibility must be executed prior to initiating the design phase for MDT projects, and before issuing MDT permits for non-MDT projects.
 - 4.3.3.1.7 Any maintenance agreement for non-MDT maintained encroachments shall include language which allows MDT, in the event the responsible party fails to adequately maintain the facility, the right to maintain the facility and bill the responsible party to recover maintenance costs. (this could apply to storm drain, shared use paths, sidewalks, signals, lighting, landscaping/irrigation, etc.).

4.3.3.2 None of these conditions preclude the rights provided to public utilities through state law.

4.4 **HSSRA Exceptions Committee**

4.4.1 Any requests for exception from this policy will be handled on a case-by-case basis through an HSSRA exceptions committee. The appropriate District Administrator will submit exception requests, along with supporting information, to the committee for consideration and discussion; with the final decision being made by the Director.

4.4.2 The following criteria will be considered when considering exceptions:

4.4.2.1 Administration assessment of fiscal impact.

4.4.2.2 Funding program manager assessment of impact/fundability under the program.

4.4.2.3 Planning assessment of long range plan/TIP/STIP/fiscal constraint impact and local approval processes.

4.4.2.4 Benefit the project will provide to statewide transportation system condition.

4.4.2.5 Impacts to MDT's current or future liability (maintenance or other).

4.4.2.6 Local government contribution to the project.

4.4.2.7 The extent of other avenues the project sponsor has pursued to obtain match from sources other than MDT.

4.5 **Operating Expectations**

4.5.1 Project authorization requests shall be carried out consistent with this policy.

4.5.2 Formal and informal communication between MDT staff and other entities shall be in accordance with this policy.

4.5.3 This policy sets the direction and intent for MDT's approach to these issues. If situations arise that are not specifically described, decisions made will be consistent with the spirit of the policy and approved through the HSSRA Exceptions Committee as needed.

4.5.4 HSSRA Exceptions Committee: District Administrator/Program Manager requests for exceptions will be forwarded to the Policy, Program & Performance Chief in the Planning Division. Requests for exception will be forwarded to the full exceptions committee for consideration. Planning Division staff will be assigned to manage the

process including scheduling meetings/calls and developing exception approval documents as needed. Approval document shall be signed by the Director and must accompany requests for programming and be attached to project funding agreements.

5 CLOSING

Questions concerning this policy should be directed to the Rail, Transit and Planning Division Administrator.

6 REFERENCES

6.1 *MCA 60-2-125. Definitions.*

7 ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

7.1 Not Applicable.

8 KEYWORDS

- 8.1 Federal Surface Transportation Program funds
- 8.2 Non federal match
- 8.3 CMAQ MACI Discretionary Funds
- 8.4 CMAQ MACI Guaranteed Funds
- 8.5 Shared Use Paths
- 8.6 Maintenance Agreement

REVISION HISTORY

DATE OF REVISION	REVISION # OF POLICY	REASON FOR MODIFICATION	AUTHOR OF REVISION
November 30, 2016	Management Memo # 14-02 (resc) Revision occurrence #1	Rescinded – Outdated Policy Format (Non-compliant per MDT PRO 1.01.001)	Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit & Planning Division Administrator

November 30, 2016	Policy #POL 8.03.002 Associated Management Memo # 14-02 (resc) Revision occurrence #2	New Policy Format	Paul Grant, Policy Specialist
-------------------	---	-------------------	-------------------------------

CMAQ PROJECT ESTIMATES FROM MDT

roundabout river drive and 25th	
cn	\$ 1,230,000
ce	\$ 123,000
w/ idc	\$ 1,353,000
w/ infl	\$ 1,568,498
rw	\$ 50,000
ic	\$ 20,500
pe	\$ 235,002
	\$ 1,997,000
River Drive 15th to 25th with roundabout	
cn	\$ 3,000,000
ce	\$ 300,000
w/ idc	\$ 3,300,000
w/ infl	\$ 3,825,604
rw	\$ 400,000
ic	\$ 54,000
pe	\$ 420,396
	\$ 5,000,000
roundabout 8th and park	
cn	\$ 980,000
ce	\$ 98,000
w/ idc	\$ 1,078,000
w/ infl	\$ 1,249,697
rw	\$ 50,000
ic	\$ 42,000
pe	\$ 160,303
	\$ 1,600,000

CMAQ Project Estimates - City of GF												
Priority Projects	2016 Cost Estimate	Inflation (X%)	Years of Inflation	Inflation	IDC (x%)	IDC \$	Total with IDC & Inflation	Off-System %	Local Match	On-System %	State Match	CMAQ Amount
Paving Gravel Roads												
52nd St N	\$505,000.00	0.03	5	\$ 80,433	0.1097	\$55,399	\$ 640,832	100%	\$ 85,999.64			\$ 554,832.27
Stuckey Rd	\$536,000.00	0.03	2	\$ 32,642	0.1097	\$58,799	\$ 627,442	100%	\$ 84,202.66			\$ 543,238.94
Intersection Improvements												
26th St N/River Dr												
6th St N/Park Dr/8th Ave N												
Additional Capacity												
Sidewalk/Ped Improvements												
City-wide sidewalk infill Phase 1	\$862,500.00	0.03	1	\$ 25,875	0.1097	\$94,616	\$ 982,991	100%	\$131,917.43			\$ 851,073.82
City-wide sidewalk infill Phase 2	\$805,000.00	0.03	4	\$101,035	0.1097	\$88,309	\$ 994,343	100%	\$133,440.84			\$ 860,902.25
On-Street bike striping/signing				\$ -								
Shared Use Path												
River Dr S Trail Underpass	\$1,500,000	0.03	3	\$139,091	0.1097	\$164,550	\$ 1,803,641	100%	\$242,048.56			\$ 1,561,591.94
Transit Enhancements												
Bus Purchase (clean emissions?)	\$884,000	0.03	1	\$ 26,520	0.1097	\$99,884	\$ 1,010,404	100%	\$135,596.22			\$ 874,807.82
Fleet Upgrades												

\$ 5,246,447.04

Great Falls MPO - Review, analysis and commentary upon POL 8.03.001 and POL 8.03.002.

Disregarding the specific policy items, the two Policies are in likely conflict with MDT's adopted Goals (TranPlan 21 Policy Paper: <http://www.mdt.mt.gov/publications/docs/plans/tranplan21/bikeped.pdf>). Taken as a whole, there's nothing in the two recently adopted Policies that encourages cooperation and coordination with local governments, or encourages MDT to work in good faith with same. It appears to: give MDT a mandate to reject any non-roadway projects in MDT right-of-way, whenever and wherever it is possible; reject the need and value of both non-motorized travel and cooperative planning process; and, reject the notion of expenditure of funding based upon anything but current need (essentially dismissing any long-range planning effort, analysis and product).

Bottom line: the Policies: 1) reject the notion of any State responsibility to provide for all modes of travel and 2) heavily discourages the location of non-motorized facilities within State right-of-way, even if the State is not going to maintain the facility.

Some specific observations:

- There is no recognition or acknowledgement of the MPO planning process, nor recognition of projects that come out of the process, or move forward as a result of the process. (POL 8.03.002 section 4.2.3.1.3.3). Further:
- MDT match on a TA project is limited to "on system" AND if it is "...to address MDT formally identified existing transportation system condition deficiencies". This implies projects in MPO Plans are not going to be matched unless it is "existing" and "MDT formally identified." Need clarification on what "MDT formally identified" means. Also must be an existing condition, not a condition that is projected through the transportation long range transportation planning process. (POL 8.03.002 section 4.2.3.1.3.3)
- MDT may reject proposals for sidewalks or paths in MDT right-of-way, and cities must "exhaust all efforts to obtain alternative locations/alignments to eliminate or minimize placement within MDT R/W." This is a problematic statement, as it gives MDT the mandate and an "easy out" to reject sidewalk or path projects. Note it says "all efforts", not "all reasonable" or "all feasible" efforts. With no stated reasoning, it concludes that MDT right-of-way is NOT a desired location for a bike or pedestrian facility. (POL 8.03.002 sections 4.3.3.1.4 and 4.3.3.1.5).
- MDT match on STP Urban projects is "limited to improving or preserving existing facilities". This statement is obviously limiting, but it is not clear what types of projects would not fall under that limitation. (POL 8.03.002 section 4.2.3.1.3.2.1)
- MDT will not match CMAQ projects "...for non-roadway purposes". Need clarification on what "non-roadway" means. (POL 8.03.002 section 4.2.3.1.3.4.1).
- It firmly places all non-roadway improvements outside the responsibility of MDT. It does not recognize shared facilities (i.e., stormdrain facilities) that are owned or maintained by the City but serve the MDT roadway, nor does it recognize any MDT maintenance responsibility for anything else. (POL 8.03.002 section 4.3.3.1.7)
- Should have had an urban and rural component, as the issues, concerns and needs are entirely different.

- MDT will not own, maintain or operate any shared use path. What about those on bridges?
- Mandates a project “promote or enhance traffic safety and convenience”, but makes no mention of non-motorized safety or convenience. (*POL 8.03.001 section 4.4.1.5*)
- Mandates the cost of the path must not be “...disproportionate to the need or probable usage.” There is no guidance or criteria for this apparently wide open requirement. Who determines this and how? (*POL 8.03.001 section 4.4.2.1*)
- MDT will not plan for future bicycle/pedestrian need (even if they are identified in local plans) unless it is built at the time of construction of the facility. (*POL 8.03.001, section 4.4.2.2*)
- POL 8.03.001 includes a great deal of language and criteria mandating exclusion of shared use paths from projects. It seems to be very difficult to include such in a project, even if it would be maintained by locals.
- It should be a strong concern of local governments that MDT will mandate local maintenance of Shared Use Paths AND to pay for defense of any lawsuit against MDT (*POL 8.03.001 section 4.5.1.3.2*), but that MDT will also 1) design and construct all such facilities and 2) oversee and direct the method for any change to the facility after it is constructed.
- I’m not certain our insurance will cover a facility that we do not own. (*POL 8.03.001 section 4.5.1.3.3*)

TABLE 4
MULTI-YEAR FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE PROGRAM*

	UPN	Project Activity	Total Estimated Cost	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10
				STP Urban Funds	MACT Funds Discretionary (FHWA/CMAQ)	CMAQ Local	NH Funds	IM Funds	HSIP	STPS, Earmarks Bridge, and other Funds	Tranportation Alternatives Program	Enhancement Funds		FTA Funds
												City	County	
Federal Fiscal Year 2015														
Estimated Carryover Balance				\$ 1,198,222		\$ 6,307,188	\$ -					\$ 1,655,040	\$ 549,367	\$ -
Estimated Allocation (10/1/14)*				\$ 1,430,409	\$ 60,000	\$ 1,432,171	\$ -	\$ 2,678,725	\$ 435,166	\$ 16,363,050	\$ 41,294			\$ 2,974,000
Estimated Beginning Balance				\$ 2,628,631	\$ 60,000	\$ 7,739,360	\$ -	\$ 2,678,725	\$ 435,166	\$ 16,363,050	\$ 41,294	\$ 1,655,040	\$ 549,367	\$ 2,974,000
Durable Pavement Markings		PE/Construction	\$ 57,000	\$ 57,000										
Urban System Maintenance Program		PE/Construction	\$ 185,618	\$ 185,618										
South Central Arterials	4566	IC/RW	\$ 471,125							\$ 471,125				
Bridge Preservation**	8085	PE/Construction	\$ 11,305,209							\$ 11,305,209				
MDT Urban System Pavement Preservation Prog.		PE/IC/RW/CN	\$ 300,000							\$ 300,000				
25th Ave NE	8587	PE/CN	\$ 619,679							\$ 619,679				
8th Ave N - 6th to 15th	8588	PE/IC/CN	\$ 908,019							\$ 908,019				
9th St S - 10th to 2nd	8589	PE/CN	\$ 111,516							\$ 111,516				
5th Street N & S	8591	PE/IC/CN	\$ 218,502							\$ 218,502				
HSIP Safety Projects		PE/IC/RW/CN	\$ 200,000						\$ 200,000					
SF 139 - Gtfl Adv Sgnl Flasher	8119	Construction	\$ 143,516						\$ 143,516					
SF 129-Great Falls Signal Borders	7981	Construction	\$ 91,650						\$ 91,650					
D3 Signing (I-15)**	7618	Construction	\$ 2,461,432					\$ 2,461,432						
Emerson Jct-Manchester	7621	RW	\$ 70,000					\$ 70,000						
Emerson Jct-Manchester	7621	IC	\$ 147,293					\$ 147,293						
25th/26th Sts Overlay (phase II)+		Construction	\$ 250,000							\$ 250,000				
Annual Operations & Maintenance - State		O & M Exp.	\$ 1,652,000							\$ 1,652,000				
Annual Operations & Maintenance - Local		O & M Exp.	\$ 527,000							\$ 527,000				
Sun River Connector Trail	6862	IC/CN	\$ 2,705,840			\$ 2,705,840								
10th Ave S & 32nd St	8663	IC/RW	\$ 60,000		\$ 60,000									
Enhancement Projects														
Courthouse Preservation	8594	CN	\$ 549,367										\$ 549,367	
River Drive Overlook	8879	PE/CN	\$ 87,303									\$ 87,303		
West Bank Park-ADA-	8878	PE/CN	\$ 169,834									\$ 169,834		
Charles Russell Park Path	8556	CN	\$ 42,557									\$ 42,557		
25th st North Bridge	5556	CN	\$ 291,900									\$ 291,900		
Bike Route Signs	7255	PE/CN	\$ 26,040									\$ 26,040		
Sidewalk 1st Ave S-GTF	7256	CN	\$ 976,218									\$ 976,218		
Overlook Dr Path	8694	PE	\$ 41,294								\$ 41,294			
Sec. 5307 Transit Operating Grant		Operating Exp.	\$ 2,865,000											\$ 2,865,000
Sec. 5310 Transit Capital Grants***		Capital Purchase	\$ 109,000											\$ 109,000
Sec. 5339 Transit Captal Grant		Capital Purchase	\$ -											
Adjustments				\$ (267,951)		\$ (13,988)								
Estimated Ending Balance				\$ 2,653,964	\$ -	\$ 5,047,508	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 61,188	\$ -	\$ -

Remaining funds plan on being spent on 1st ave south

Funding Categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, are matched by the State.

Funding Categories 3, 8, 9, and 10 are matched by the locals.

*Funding projections for 2014-2018 are based on best available information and are subject to change given current funding uncertainties and unknown impacts of future congressional or other federal actions. Federal program funding availability may impact the scheduling of projects. Funding will be subject to the obligation limitation set by the annual appropriations process.

Not all project locations are in the planning area. *Funds considered reasonably available but award is dependent on the outcome of MDT's competitive process

+ Local funds (City of Great Falls)

Andrew is this going to be an annual project? I see 7994 from FFY2014

Programmed 01/27/2015

Programmed

Any remaining funds for County CTEP will be used on courthouse pres

Was in previous tip but was dropped off. CN was in TCP

Added project from CTEP listing

Was in previous tip but was dropped off. CN was in TCP costs have increased.

TABLE 4
MULTI-YEAR FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE PROGRAM*

		Project Activity	Total Estimated Cost	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
				STP Urban Funds	MACI Funds Discretionary CMDP	CMAQ Local	NH Funds	IM Funds	HSIP	UPP	STPS, Earmarks Bridge, and other Funds	Tranportation Alternatives Program	State Transit Funds	FTA Funds
Federal Fiscal Year 2016														
Estimated Carryover Balance				\$ 2,653,964		\$ 5,047,508	\$ -						\$ -	\$ -
Estimated Allocation (10/1/15)*				\$ 1,430,409	\$ 1,594,800	\$ 1,516,062	\$ 1,827,900	\$ 500,000	\$ 236,412	\$ 520,000	\$ 5,157,537	\$ 444,618	\$ 39,600	\$ 2,865,000
Estimated Beginning Balance				\$ 4,084,373	\$ 1,594,800	\$ 6,563,570	\$ 1,827,900	\$ 500,000	\$ 236,412	\$ 520,000	\$ 5,157,537	\$ 444,618	\$ 39,600	\$ 2,865,000
Durable Pavement Markings		PE/CN	\$ 57,000	\$ 57,000										
Urban System Maintenance Program		PE/CN	\$ 185,618	\$ 185,618										
HSIP Safety Projects		ALL	\$ 200,000						\$ 200,000					
SF 139 - 6th ST/NW Bypass SFTY	8623	PE	\$ 15,517						\$ 15,517					
SF 159 Great Falls Dist CLRS**	9092	PE/CN	\$ 20,895						\$ 20,895					
Traffic Mitigation		ALL	\$ 250,000		\$ 250,000									
Fox Farm Rd.	8193	RW/PE	\$ 1,470,876	\$ 1,470,876										
South Central Arterials	4566	ALL	\$ 5,358,537			\$ 2,600,000					\$ 2,758,537			
Sidewalk Infill Project		PE	\$ 168,000			\$ 168,000								
MDT-Pavement Preservation/Preventative Maintenance - NH		ALL	\$ 250,000				\$ 250,000							
3rd St NW - GTF	8742	CN	\$ 576,100				\$ 576,100							
14th & 15th Street N & S - GTF	8743	CN	\$ 305,300				\$ 305,300							
10th AVE S-26th to 57th (GTF)	8971	CN	\$ 696,500				\$ 696,500							
MDT-Pavement Preservation/Preventative Maintenance - IM		ALL	\$ 500,000					\$ 500,000						
Urban Pavement Preservation Prog.		ALL	\$ 500,000							\$ 500,000				
Smelter 1st to 5th ST NW (GTF)	8978	RW	\$ 20,000							\$ 20,000				
38th St. Overlay - 7th Ave N-10th Ave N+		PE/CN	\$ 125,000								\$ 125,000			
Annual Operations & Maintenance - State		O & M Exp.	\$ 1,652,000								\$ 1,652,000			
Annual Operations & Maintenance - Local		O & M Exp.	\$ 527,000								\$ 527,000			
10th Ave S & 32nd St - GTF	8663	CN	\$ 1,344,800		\$ 1,344,800									
Transportation Alternative Projects		ALL	\$ 200,000									\$ 200,000		
Overlook Dr Path	8694	PE	\$ 64,750									\$ 64,750		
West Bank Trail Imprvts	8695	PE/CN	\$ 179,868									\$ 179,868		
25th st North Bridge	5556	CN	\$ 95,000								\$ 95,000			
Sec. 5307 Transit Operating Grant		Operating Exp.	\$ 2,865,000											\$ 2,865,000
Sec. 5310 Transit Capital Grants***		Capital Purchase	Per Grants											
Sec. 5339 Transit Capital Grant		Capital Purchase	Per Grants											
TRANSADE		Operating Exp.	\$ 39,600										\$ 39,600	
Adjustments				\$ (475,408)		\$ (456,108)								
Estimated Ending Balance				\$ 2,846,287	\$ -	\$ 4,251,678	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Funding Categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, are matched by the State.

adj is from the difference of 6862 engineer est at 3.1 and tip at 2.7 costs came in at 2.1

Funding Categories 3, 8, 9, and 10 are matched by the locals.

*Funding projections for 2014-2018 are based on best available information and are subject to change given current funding uncertainties and unknown impacts of future congressional or other federal actions. Federal program funding availability may impact the scheduling of projects. Funding will be subject to the obligation limitation set by the annual appropriations process.

**Not all project locations are in the planning area.

***Funds considered reasonably available but award is dependent on the outcome of MDT's competitive process

+ Local funds (City of Great Falls)

Andrew we have this as an annual program - is this still the case?

Andrew - please confirm if this annual program should continue. We have not see any projects for this since 2014?

Moved CN ot 2017

Andrew, are these city funds? Leave in or remove?

TABLE 4
MULTI-YEAR FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE PROGRAM

	UPN	Project Activity	Total Estimated Cost	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
				STP Urban Funds	MACI Funds Discretionary CMDP	CMAQ Local	NH Funds	IM Funds	HSIP	UPP	STPS, Earmarks Bridge, and other Funds	Tranportation Alternatives Program	State Transit Funds	FTA Funds
Federal Fiscal Year 2017														
Estimated Carryover Balance				\$ 2,846,287		\$ 4,251,678	\$ -							\$ -
Estimated Allocation (10/1/16)*				\$ 1,430,409	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 1,516,062	\$ 1,439,071	\$ 8,100,698	\$ 1,236,200	\$ 2,174,233	\$ 2,363,202	\$ 675,374	\$ 39,600	\$ 2,865,000
Estimated Beginning Balance				\$ 4,276,696	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 5,767,740	\$ 1,439,071	\$ 8,100,698	\$ 1,236,200	\$ 2,174,233	\$ 2,363,202	\$ 675,374	\$ 39,600	\$ 2,865,000
Durable Pavement Markings		PE/CN	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000										
Urban System Maintenance Program		PE/CN	\$ 185,618	\$ 185,618										
HSIP Safety Projects		ALL	\$ 200,000						\$ 200,000					
SF 129- GRTFLS Hrzntal Crv Signing**	7980	CN	\$ 1,036,200						\$ 1,036,200					
Traffic Mitigation		ALL	\$ 250,000		\$ 250,000									
ADA Compliance		ALL	\$ 250,000		\$ 250,000									
Great Fall ADA Upgrades	9205	ALL	\$ 2,500,000		\$ 2,500,000									
Fox Farm Rd.	8193	IC	\$ 1,105,267	\$ 1,105,267										
3rd Street NW - Great Falls	9053	RW/IC	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000									
Urban Pavement Preservation Prog.		ALL	\$ 500,000							\$ 500,000				
Smelter-1st to 5th ST NW (GTF)	8978	CN	\$ 477,133							\$ 477,133				
8th AVE N - 15th to 26th (GTF)	8979	CN	\$ 940,800							\$ 940,800				
Great Falls Urban (Phase II)	8980	CN	\$ 256,300							\$ 256,300				
Emerson Jct-Manchester	7621	CN	\$ 7,500,000					\$ 7,500,000						
MDT-Pavement Preservation/Preventative Maintenance - NH		ALL	\$ 1,057,071				\$ 1,057,071							
Great Falls - North**	7625	RW/IC	\$ 382,000				\$ 382,000							
MDT-Pavement Preservation/Preventative Maintenance - IM		ALL	\$ 500,000					\$ 500,000						
Great Falls - N & S**	8966	CN	\$ 284,900					\$ 100,698			\$ 184,202			
Annual Operations & Maintenance - State		O & M Exp.	\$ 1,652,000								\$ 1,652,000			
Annual Operations & Maintenance - Local		O & M Exp.	\$ 527,000								\$ 527,000			
Transportation Alternative Projects		ALL	\$ 200,000									\$ 200,000		
Overlook Dr Path	8694	ALL	\$ 475,374									\$ 475,374		
Sec. 5307 Transit Operating Grant		Operating Exp.	\$ 2,865,000											\$ 2,865,000
Sec. 5310 Transit Capital Grants***		Capital Purchase	Per Grants											
Sec. 5339 Transit Capital Grant		Capital Purchase	Per Grants											
TRANSADE		Operating Exp.	\$ 39,600										\$ 39,600	
Adjustments			\$ (725,726)	\$ 259		\$ (725,985)								
Estimated Ending Balance				\$ 2,925,552	\$ -	\$ 6,493,725	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

CMAQ increase started in 2016

moved from 16 to 17

Added bucket in case of additional ada projects get added

moved from 16 to 17

moved from 16 to 17

Updated costs from FPR

~ half of project is in MPO

half of project in MPO.

moved from 16 to 17

Sun River Connector gave back funds

Funding Categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, are matched by the State.

Funding Categories 3, 8, and 9 are matched by the locals.

*Funding projections for 2014-2018 are based on best available information and are subject to change given current funding uncertainties and unknown impacts of future

congressional or other federal actions. Federal program funding availability may impact the scheduling of projects. Funding will be subject to the obligation limitation set by the annual appropriations process.

**Not all project locations are in the planning area.

***Funds considered reasonably available but award is dependent on the outcome of MDT's competitive process

TABLE 4
MULTI-YEAR FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE PROGRAM

		Project Activity	Total Estimated Cost	1 STP Urban Funds	2 MACI Funds Discretionary CMDP	3 CMAQ Local	4 NH Funds	5 IM Funds	6 HSIP	7 UPP	8 STPS, Earmarks Bridge, and other Funds	9 Tranportation Alternatives Program	10 State Transit Funds	11 FTA Funds
Federal Fiscal Year 2018														
Estimated Carryover Balance				\$ 2,925,552		\$ 6,493,725								\$ -
Estimated Allocation (10/1/17)*				\$ 1,430,409	\$ 709,400	\$ 1,516,062	\$ 5,057,071	\$ 500,000	\$ 240,100		\$ 3,602,911	\$ 200,000	\$ 39,600	\$ 2,865,000
Estimated Beginning Balance				\$ 4,355,961	\$ 709,400	\$ 8,009,787	\$ 5,057,071	\$ 500,000	\$ 240,100		\$ 3,602,911	\$ 200,000	\$ 39,600	\$ 2,865,000
Durable Pavement Markings		PE/CN	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000										
Urban System Maintenance Program		PE/CN	\$ 185,618	\$ 185,618										
Urban Pavement Preservation Prog.		ALL	\$ 500,000							\$ 500,000				
HSIP Safety Projects		ALL	\$ 200,000						\$ 200,000					
SF 139 - 6th ST/NW Bypass SFTY	8623	CN	\$ 40,100						\$ 40,100					
Fox Farm Rd.^	8193	CN	\$ 4,354,339	\$ 4,354,339										
3rd Street NW - Great Falls	9053	CN	\$ 709,400		\$ 709,400									
MDT-Pavement Preservation/Preventative Maintenance - NH		ALL	\$ 1,057,071				\$ 1,057,071							
Great Falls - North**	7625	CN	\$ 4,000,000				\$ 4,000,000							
MDT-Pavement Preservation/Preventative Maintenance - IM		ALL	\$ 500,000					\$ 500,000						
Bridge Preservation**	8085	CN	\$ 1,423,911								\$ 1,423,911			
Annual Operations & Maintenance - State		O & M Exp.	\$ 1,652,000								\$ 1,652,000			
Annual Operations & Maintenance - Local		O & M Exp.	\$ 527,000								\$ 527,000			
Transportation Alternative Projects		ALL	\$ 200,000									\$ 200,000		
Sec. 5307 Transit Operating Grant		Operating Exp.	\$ 2,865,000											\$ 2,865,000
Sec. 5310 Transit Capital Grants***		Capital Purchase	Per Grants											
Sec. 5339 Transit Capital Grant		Capital Purchase	Per Grants											
TRANSADE		Operating Exp.	\$ 39,600										\$ 39,600	
Adjustments														
Estimated Ending Balance				\$ (243,996)	\$ -	\$ 8,009,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (500,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Funding Categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, are matched by the State.

Funding Categories 3, 8, and 9 are matched by the locals.

*Funding projections for 2014-2018 are based on best available information and are subject to change given current funding uncertainties and unknown impacts of future congressional or other federal actions. Federal program funding availability may impact the scheduling of projects. Funding will be subject to the obligation limitation set by the annual appropriations process.

Not all project locations are in the planning area. *Funds considered reasonably available but award is dependent on the outcome of MDT's competitive process

^STPU funds will go into borrow for partial year. TIP is fiscally constrained

moved from 16 to 18

moved from 17 to 18