

NOTICE OF MEETING

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

DATE: May 5, 2021

TIME: 9:30 am

PLACE: [VIRTUAL Public Meeting via Zoom](#) Meeting ID: 924 9081 8366 - Passcode: 511638

AGENDA:

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes – March 3, 2021 Meeting Minutes (attached) – Action
4. Public Participation
5. Communications and Announcements
6. Old Business
7. New Business
 - A. HIP Covid Funding Strategy - Action

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

City of Ann Arbor • Ann Arbor DDA • Ann Arbor Township • City of Chelsea • City of Dexter
Dexter Township • Eastern Michigan University • Michigan Department of Transportation • City of Milan • Northfield Township •
Pittsfield Township • City of Saline • Scio Township • Southwest Washtenaw Council of Governments • Superior Township • The Ride
University of Michigan • Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners • Washtenaw County Road Commission • City of Ypsilanti • Ypsilanti Township •
• Ex Officio: Federal Highway Administration • Southeast Michigan Council of Governments •

An Intermunicipality Committee organized under Act 200 of Public Acts of Michigan (1957)
representing Washtenaw County

8. Agency Reports

Ann Arbor DDA
City of Ypsilanti
Ypsilanti Township
City of Ann Arbor
City of Saline
Dexter Township
WCRC
Non-motorized

Pittsfield Township
The Ride
MDOT Planning
MDOT Region/TSC
City of Dexter
U of M
Environmental
People with Disabilities

City of Milan
Washtenaw County
City of Chelsea
SEMCOG
EMU
FHWA
Equity
Senior

9. Adjournment

The Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS) financed the preparation of this document through grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Transportation and contributions from local government, public transit, and educational unit members of the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U. S. Department of Transportation.



MEETING MINUTES

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

DATE: March 3, 2021

TIME: 9:30 am

PLACE: This meeting was held virtually via Zoom in accordance with executive orders during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Members Present: Washtenaw County – Nathan Voght, Vice-Chair
City of Ypsilanti - Bonnie Wessler, Second Vice-Chair
MDOT Statewide Planning - Max Gierman
City of Chelsea - John Hanifan
Disability Representative - John Waterman
Environmental Representative - Evan Pratt
Washtenaw County Road Commission - Matt MacDonell
City of Saline – Jeff Fordice
City of Ann Arbor - Eli Cooper (for Raymond Hess)
MDOT University Region - Mike Davis
City of Milan - Stanley Kirton
TheRide – Caitlin Conway
Non-motorized Representative - Sarah Walsh
Northfield Township - Ken Dignan
University of Michigan – Steve Dolen

Members Absent: Eastern Michigan University – Dieter Otto, Chair
Ann Arbor DDA – Amber Miller
Dexter Township - Vacant
City of Dexter – Dan Schlaff
Equity Representative - Weneschia Brand
Pittsfield Township - Craig Lyon
Senior Representative - Ruth Ann Jamnick
Ypsilanti Township - Jason Iacoangeli

Others Present: WATS – Nick Sapkiewicz, Suzann Flowers, Emily Lake

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

City of Ann Arbor • Ann Arbor DDA • Ann Arbor Township • City of Chelsea • City of Dexter
Dexter Township • Eastern Michigan University • Michigan Department of Transportation • City of Milan • Northfield Township •
Pittsfield Township • City of Saline • Scio Township • Southwest Washtenaw Council of Governments • Superior Township • The Ride
University of Michigan • Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners • Washtenaw County Road Commission • City of Ypsilanti • Ypsilanti Township •
• Ex Officio: Federal Highway Administration • Southeast Michigan Council of Governments •

OHM Advisors - Marcus McNamara, Kent Early
SEMCOG - Tom Bruff
Stantec - Cassandra Winner
WAVE - Julia Roberts, Darlene Downerd
Washtenaw County Road Commission - Michele Ford, Brent Schlack

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Vice-Chair Voght called the meeting to order at 9:33 am and led the group in introductions.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Ms. Walsh made a motion to approve the meeting agenda, Mr. Kirton supported the motion, motion approved.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Dignan made a motion to approve the January 6, 2021 minutes, Mr. Pratt supported the motion, motion approved.

4. Public Participation

Ms. Roberts, Director of the WAVE, announced that the WAVE will be purchasing their first electric vehicle in FY 2022. That purchase has been approved by MDOT to add to the 3rd Call for TIP amendments.

5. Communications and Announcements

Mr. Sapkiewicz provided the following updates:

- Reminder to obligate projects quickly. The obligation authority for the rural program is at 55% obligated and the non-rural program is at 70% obligated.
- Another round of HIP funding and additional Covid-Relief funds, totaling approximately \$2.5 M, will be coming to Washtenaw County. WATS will be seeking guidance from the Technical and Policy Committees on these funds. More information will be forthcoming.
- The 2023-2026 TIP development is kicking off. WATS staff are currently working to develop a schedule.
- WATS has been participating and providing feedback during the development of the County's new Opportunity Index. More information will be forthcoming.
- WATS continues to provide support for tactical urbanism projects. The City of Ypsilanti will launch a project this summer and the City of Chelsea will launch another round of their project in the Fall.

6. Old Business

No old business.

7. New Business

A. 2nd Call FY 2021 TIP Amendments - Action

Ms. Flowers provided a list of 10 amendments to the 2020-2023 TIP. These significant changes

include significant cost changes, changes to scope and limits of projects, new grant awards, etc.

Ms. Lake provided an overview of the Environmental Justice and Opportunity Index review. Investment in these areas has increased significantly since the 1st TIP call in FY 2020.

Mr. Pratt made a motion to approve the 2nd call FY 2021 TIP amendments as presented, supported by Mr. MacDonell, motion approved.

B. 2nd Call FY 2021 TIP Modifications - Information

Ms. Flowers provided a list of 12 minor modifications to the TIP for the FY 2021 2nd Call, including minor cost changes, changes to scope and limits of projects, etc.

C. 2019 Traffic Crash Report - Information

Ms. Lake provided an overview of the annual report, which includes information on traffic crashes, fatalities and serious injuries in Washtenaw County. The 2019 report has been modified to include:

- 5-Year crash trends for fatal and serious injury crashes
- New crash factors: lane departures, intersections, speeding, and crashes with young and older drivers

8. Agency Reports

A. City of Ann Arbor

Mr. Cooper reported:

- The City's Vision Zero transportation plan update is out for City and stakeholder review
- The Healthy Streets program has been approved for 2021. An online nomination tool for streets to include will be available soon.

B. City of Saline

Mr. Fordice reported:

- Anticipate issuing \$7-8M bond for sanitary sewers, watermain work, etc.

C. Washtenaw County Road Commission (WCRC)

Mr. MacDonell reported:

- The WCRC is working to obligate projects for FY 2021.
- Working on TAP funded initiatives in Dexter, Pittsfield Twp, and Superior Twp.
- Improvements to M17 and US12 will go out for bid soon.

D. Non-Motorized Representative

Ms. Walsh reported:

- Reminder to keep pathways clear of residual snow and ice for non-motorized users.

E. TheRide

Ms. Conway reported:

- TheRide is planning to return to normal service levels by August 2021.
- Accepting feedback on service levels through April 2.
- Michigan Flyer is tentatively planning to resume the airport shuttle service by the end of April.

F. MDOT University Region

Mr. Davis reported:

- Working on a flex route extension project in Livingston County, and increasing engagement between WATS and Livingston County on non-motorized projects.
- Continuing to work on the non-motorized pathway and road diet projects with the City of Ypsilanti. Currently undergoing a feasibility of enhancements to the project.

G. University of Michigan

Mr. Dolen reported:

- The UM President's Commission on Carbon Neutrality has published their report with recommendations, including a piece on commuting and electric vehicles that could significantly change the parking system.
- RFP was recently finished to start transitioning the bus fleet to electric.
- Starting to break ground on the new maintenance facility for buses, which will feature electric charging stations.

H. People with Disabilities Representative

Mr. Waterman reported:

- Thanked local agencies for their clearing and winter maintenance efforts.
- Working with SEMCOG on a grant for planning to share stories of individuals with impairments and how they navigate our communities.

I. City of Milan

Mr. Kirton reported:

- The City of Milan was awarded \$248K of TEDF funding for E Main, from US-23 to the railroad.

J. Washtenaw County

Mr. Voght reported:

- A final draft of the uniform midblock crossing guidance is out for comment.
- Working with Ypsilanti Twp to use SBG funds to continue sidewalk infill on Washtenaw Avenue, east of Golfside Rd.

K. City of Chelsea

Mr. Hanifan reported:

- Working with WATS on Chelsea POP 2.0 tactical urbanism project.

- Working with County Parks on a connector from the Werkner Rd roundabout to Sibley Rd.
- The City has a project on Sibley with small urban funds that will kick off this summer.

L. SEMCOG

Mr. Bruff reported:

- SEMCOG's website features several new maps and webinars, including one on electric charging stations.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Voght adjourned the meeting at 10:30am.

MEMORANDUM

To: Technical Committee
From: Ryan Buck
Date: April 26, 2021
Re: HIP Covid Funding

Background

In February, the State of Michigan received notices regarding two types of funding, Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) and Highway Infrastructure Program Covid (HIP-COVID). The two programs have different eligibility requirements which are detailed in the attachment following this memo. For Washtenaw County these two funding sources will add approximately \$2.5 million dollars of federal funding, the majority of which does not require local match. This funding must be obligated by the end of federal fiscal year 2024.

Generally, federal funding is authorized in long-term bills which provide a relatively stable forecast of anticipated revenues. Working with SEMCOG, MDOT, FHWA, and FTA, WATS programs various funding programs based on eligible agency and project type using the policies and strategies included in the Long Range Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program prioritization process.

While additional funding is not unprecedented, revenue changes from year to year are generally minor and are handled through small changes to projects, and occasionally the acceleration or delay of a project or projects. With such a significant influx of unanticipated funding, staff presented information regarding the new funding to the Policy Committee at their March meeting. The Policy Committee provided some comments but asked that WATS staff work with the Technical Committee to recommend a process for prioritizing the funding.

The Policy Committee comments included:

1. Recognition that this funding is related to COVID relief rather than a traditional infrastructure bill and that funding need not necessarily follow the same process or fund the same priorities that Surface Transportation Program Block Grant funding has

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

City of Ann Arbor • Ann Arbor DDA • Ann Arbor Township • City of Chelsea • City of Dexter
Dexter Township • Eastern Michigan University • Michigan Department of Transportation • City of Milan • Northfield Township •
Pittsfield Township • City of Saline • Scio Township • Southwest Washtenaw Council of Governments • Superior Township • The Ride
University of Michigan • Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners • Washtenaw County Road Commission • City of Ypsilanti • Ypsilanti Township •
• Ex Officio: Federal Highway Administration • Southeast Michigan Council of Governments •

An Intermunicipality Committee organized under Act 200 of Public Acts of Michigan (1957)
representing Washtenaw County

traditionally funded in Washtenaw County.

2. The Long Range Plan outlines a number of regional priorities and should be considered as agencies apply for additional funding.
3. The Reimagine Washtenaw project and the M-17 corridor represent a prime, multi-jurisdictional opportunity for investment in a low-opportunity area, hitting on a number of Long Range Plan goals.
4. Preference is to award projects quickly.

Since that meeting, WATS staff has had discussions with a number of stakeholders and a number of additional issues have been identified that should be considered:

1. While groundwork for a reimagined Washtenaw Avenue has been completed as part of the Reimagine Washtenaw planning process, a “shovel-ready project” has not been prepared by an eligible agency.
2. Earmark requests for individual year appropriations, transportation reauthorization and direct allocations to local communities has caused some chaos with the prioritization process. This serves as a reminder that both the amount of funding available and the rules that govern it can always change.
3. As part of identifying earmark requests/priorities TheRide identified a new Ypsilanti Transit Center and new/expanded bus garage as critical needs that should occur before major transit improvements such as Bus Rapid Transit service on the Washtenaw Avenue Corridor.
4. Approximately \$660,000 is currently allocated to TheRide over the FY 2021-2023 period for pedestrian related and bus stop improvements along/adjacent to the Washtenaw Avenue corridor. The renewed emphasis on the Reimagine Washtenaw project has provided an opportunity for TheRide, in consultation with the broader community, to more completely define that project and ensure that it supports the Reimagine Washtenaw vision.
5. In addition to the \$660,000, funding from an old earmark and from an old grant provide the opportunity to design and possibly construct a mid-block non-motorized crossing and “Super Stop” on Washtenaw Avenue near the County Service Center.

Another consideration is whether or not to put a hard cap of funding on projects. Southeast Michigan utilizes pro-rata contracts, which allows for price increases outside the scope of the regional planning process. This provides significant flexibility but can come at the expense of individual agencies. If pro-rata contracts are used for the HIP and HIP-COVID funding any amounts in excess of the allocation will be deducted from the local Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) amount. However, while this could impact an agency in the short term, the WATS process engages locals following such an occurrence to ensure future funding changes make the impacted agency whole.

Considering the Policy Committee’s comments and the additional information outlined above, the following questions need answers to provide a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

- 1. Should the HIP-COVID funding sources be prioritized in a different manner than the**

current process? If so, how?

2. **Should the HIP-COVID funding be prioritized separate from or in concert with existing funding?**
3. **Should the HIP-COVID funding be capped? If not, should a local agency exceeding the programmed amount be responsible for making up the amount in a future year to the impacted agency or agencies (This matches the process that already occurs with STBG funding)?**

Regardless of the way forward, WATS wants to remain as nimble as possible to allow the funding to be quickly obligated in the unlikely case that unprogrammed funds are threatened to be clawed back. We encourage local agencies to advance construct projects if possible.

Action

Review the information and questions presented in this memo and come prepared to discuss and make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the method for prioritizing HIP-COVID funding.

FY 2021 Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Fund Announcement

Revised February 16, 2021 (with updated list of eligible activities)

Michigan received notices of two separate HIP funds. These funds are split 75% for trunkline and 25% for local agencies.

Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP)	\$ 49,851,686
<u>Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) COVID Relief</u>	<u>\$ 261,308,725</u>
Total	\$ 311,160,411

Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP)

Total \$ 49,851,686

Federal notice: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/notices/n4510852/>

Table 1: FY 2021 Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funding Allocations for Trunkline and Local Programs

FY 2021 HIP Program Funds	FHWA Program Codes	MDOT Fin Sys	Local Allocation	Trunkline Allocation	Total Allocation
HIP Any Area	Z918	HIP		\$ 7,663,446	\$ 7,663,446
HIP TMA	Z919	HIPU	\$ 5,263,605		\$ 5,263,605
HIP Small Urban/ Small MPO	Z920	HIPS	\$ 1,589,435		\$ 1,589,435
HIP Rural	Z921	HIPL	\$ 2,513,395		\$ 2,513,395
HIP Bridge	Z922	HIPB	\$ 3,096,487	\$ 29,725,318	\$ 32,821,805
Total			\$ 12,462,922	\$ 37,388,764	\$ 49,851,686
			25.00%	75.00%	

Rural Program funds totaling \$2,513,395 will be provided to the Local Bridge Program for rural bridges.

Local Bridge funds of \$3,096,487 are currently being held by MDOT to cover potential overages in the Bridge Bundle Pilot Program.

Table 2: FY 2021 HIP Funding Allocations for Local Program – Transportation Management Areas (TMAs)

FY 2021	
TMA's	Z919 (HIPU)
ANN ARBOR, Wash	\$ 290,008
DETROIT AREA	\$ 3,538,687
FLINT, Gen	\$ 337,577
GR. RAPIDS, Kent	\$ 540,111
LANS/E.LANS, Ing	\$ 297,125
SO. BEND, Ber	\$ 34,396
TOLEDO, Monr	\$ 26,972
Kalamazoo	\$ 198,729
Total	\$ 5,263,605

The funds listed to the left are being allocated directly to TMAs for local project selection through their metropolitan planning process. Projects should be programmed for eligible activities using the HIPU fin sys code in the HIP template for their TMA area.

Table 3: FY 2021 HIP Funding Allocations for Local Program – Small Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Small Urban Program

SMALL MPO PROGRAM:	Z920 (HIPS)
	Urbanized Area
	Population 2010-Census
	Share of
	50,000 to 200,000
BATTLE CREEK, Calh	\$ 74,321
BAY CITY, Bay	\$ 66,919
BENT. HARBOR, Ber	\$ 57,853
ELKHART, IN	\$ 853
HOLLAND, Alle/Otta	\$ 94,750
JACKSON, Jac	\$ 85,380
MICHIGAN CITY, IN	\$ 564
MIDLAND	\$ 55,949
MONROE,	\$ 48,579
MUSKEGON, Musk	\$ 152,903
PT. HURON, St.Cl	\$ 82,582
SAGINAW, Sag	\$ 119,707
SOUTH LYON-Howe	\$ 113,302
TOTAL Sm MPO	\$ 953,661
Small Urban	\$ 635,774
Total	\$ 1,589,435

Small MPO Program funds are being allocated to MPOs for local project selection through their metropolitan planning process. Projects should be programmed for eligible activities using the HIPS fin sys code in the HIP template for their MPO area.

Small Urban Program funds will be added to the Small Urban Program for urbanized areas with populations between 50,000 and 5,000.

FY 2021 HIP General Information

- Federal share is up to 81.85% with a 18.15% match requirement.
- These funds come with their own obligation authority and are not subject to any limitations on obligation.
- Projects must be obligated by September 30, 2024. MDOT recommends obligation as soon as possible.
- Eligible activities:
 1. Apportioned based on urbanized area for any of the following:
 - a. Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program activities eligible under 23 USC 133 (b) see Appendix A (page 6) for the full list of items.
 - b. To provide necessary charging infrastructure along corridor-ready or corridor-pending alternative fuel corridors designated pursuant to 23 USC 151.
 2. Set aside of funding for bridge rehabilitation and reconstruction.
- Projects must be programmed in S/TIP.
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) Program Section 1101 of FAST Act applies to this funding.

Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) COVID Relief

Total \$ 261,308,725

<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/directives/notices/n4510851/>

Table 4: FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief Funding Allocations for Trunkline and Local Programs

FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief Program Funds	FHWA Program Codes	MDOT Fin Sys	Local Allocation	Trunkline Allocation	Total Allocation
HIP COVID Relief Any Area	Z970/ Z971	HIP	\$ 29,333,963	\$ 195,981,544	\$ 225,315,507
HIP COVID Relief TMA Areas	Z972/ Z973	HIPU	\$ 35,993,218	\$ -	\$ 35,993,218
Total			\$ 65,327,181	\$ 195,981,544	\$ 261,308,725
			25.00%	75.00%	

Table 5: FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief Funding Allocations for Local Program – Transportation Management Areas (TMAs)

FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief	
TMA's	Z972 (HIPU)
ANN ARBOR, Wash	\$ 1,983,113
DETROIT AREA	\$ 24,198,005
FLINT, Gen	\$ 2,308,398
GR. RAPIDS, Kent	\$ 3,693,347
LANS/E.LANS, Ing	\$ 2,031,780
SO. BEND, Ber	\$ 235,202
TOLEDO, Monr	\$ 184,436
Kalamazoo	\$ 1,358,937
Total	\$ 35,993,218

The funds listed to the left are being allocated directly to TMAs for local project selection through their metropolitan planning process. Projects should be programmed for eligible activities using the HIPU fin sys code in the HIP template for their TMA area. If the TMA chooses to use the funds for activities listed in eligible activities #2 (page 6), then the MPO needs to contact their MDOT MPO Program Manager on or before June 1, 2021 to discuss how to program the funds.

Table 6: FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief Funding Allocations for Local Program – Small Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Small Urban Program

SMALL MPO PROGRAM:	Z970 (HIP)
FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief	Urbanized Area
	Population 2010-Census
	Share of
	<u>50,000 to 200,000</u>
BATTLE CREEK, Calh	\$ 531,329
BAY CITY, Bay	\$ 478,409
BENT. HARBOR, Ber	\$ 413,593
ELKHART, IN	\$ 6,100
HOLLAND, Alle/Otta	\$ 677,377
JACKSON, Jac	\$ 610,385
MICHIGAN CITY, IN	\$ 4,033
MIDLAND	\$ 399,983
MONROE,	\$ 347,293
MUSKEGON, Musk	\$ 1,093,118
PT. HURON, St.Cl	\$ 590,384
SAGINAW, Sag	\$ 855,795
SOUTH LYON-Howe	\$ 810,004
TOTAL Sm MPO	\$ 6,817,802
Small Urban	\$ 4,547,433
Total	\$ 11,365,235

Small MPO Program funds listed to the left are being allocated directly to MPOs for local project selection through their metropolitan planning process. Projects should be programmed for eligible activities using the HIP fin sys code in the HIP template for their MPO area. If the MPO chooses to use the funds for activities listed in eligible activities #2 (page 6), then the MPO needs to contact their MDOT MPO Program Manager on or before June 1, 2021 to discuss how to program the funds.

Small Urban Program funds will be added to the Small Urban Program for urbanized areas with populations between 50,000 and 5,000.

Table 7: FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief Funding Allocations for Local Program – Rural Task Force (RTF)

FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief				2/11/2021			
RURAL TASK FORCE							
2970 (HIP)							
RTF 1	Livingston	\$	298,635	RTF 9	Alcona	\$	164,461
	Monroe	\$	285,508		Alpena	\$	155,296
	St.Clair	\$	357,112		Cheboygan	\$	232,754
	Washtenaw	\$	308,033		Crawford	\$	148,745
	RTF 1 Total	\$	1,249,288		Montmorency	\$	141,737
	Hillsdale	\$	251,371		Oscoda	\$	147,945
	Jackson	\$	357,866		Otsego	\$	161,070
	Lenawee	\$	340,593		Presque Isle	\$	170,068
RTF 2	RTF 2 Total	\$	949,830		RTF 9 Total	\$	1,322,076
	Barry	\$	271,772	RTF 10A	Antrim	\$	189,791
	Branch	\$	212,839		Charlevoix	\$	155,655
	Calhoun	\$	281,471		Emmet	\$	184,124
RTF 3	Kalamazoo	\$	238,691		Kalkaska	\$	173,063
	St. Joseph	\$	225,153	RTF 10A	RTF 10A	\$	702,633
	RTF 3 Total	\$	1,229,926	RTF 10B	Manistee	\$	184,649
	Berrien	\$	282,220		Missaukee	\$	174,681
	Cass	\$	231,246		Wexford	\$	200,281
	Van Buren	\$	314,083	RTF 10B Total	RTF 10B Total	\$	559,611
RTF 4	RTF 4 Total	\$	827,549	RTF 10C	Benzie	\$	135,265
	Lapeer	\$	359,121		Grand Traverse	\$	228,402
	Shiawassee	\$	251,542		Leelanau	\$	138,635
RTF 5	RTF 5 Total	\$	610,663	RTF 10C Total	RTF 10C Total	\$	502,302
	Clinton	\$	253,825	RTF 11	Chippewa	\$	331,043
	Eaton	\$	250,030		Luce	\$	142,910
	Ingham	\$	228,963		Mackinac	\$	191,980
RTF 6	RTF 6 Total	\$	732,818	RTF 11 Total	RTF 11 Total	\$	665,933
	Huron	\$	307,967	RTF 12A	Alger	\$	161,223
	Sanilac	\$	361,437		Marquette	\$	377,838
	Tuscola	\$	350,546		Schoolcraft	\$	181,244
RTF 7A	RTF 7A Total	\$	1,019,950	RTF 12A Total	RTF 12A Total	\$	720,305
	Bay	\$	203,182	RTF 12B	Delta	\$	243,005
	Gratiot	\$	228,056		Dickinson	\$	147,153
	Saginaw	\$	372,056		Menominee	\$	251,188
RTF 7B	RTF 7B Total	\$	803,294	RTF 12B Total	RTF 12B Total	\$	641,346
	Clare	\$	203,651	RTF 13A	Baraga	\$	166,047
	Gladwin	\$	191,035		Houghton	\$	210,635
	Isabella	\$	243,079		Keweenaw	\$	81,499
RTF 7C	Midland	\$	212,909	RTF 13A Total	RTF 13A Total	\$	458,181
	RTF 7C Total	\$	850,674	RTF 13B	Gogebic	\$	203,096
	Arenac	\$	136,836		Iron	\$	206,318
	Iosco	\$	163,038		Ontonagon	\$	215,035
	Ogemaw	\$	191,537	RTF 13B Total	RTF 13B Total	\$	624,449
RTF 7D	Roscommon	\$	160,804	RTF 14	Lake	\$	177,181
	RTF 7D Total	\$	652,215		Mason	\$	178,813
	Mecosta	\$	228,611		Muskegon	\$	221,348
	Montcalm	\$	346,675		Newaygo	\$	321,842
	Osceola	\$	204,041		Oceana	\$	215,289
RTF 8A	RTF 8A Total	\$	779,327	RTF 14 Total	RTF 14 Total	\$	1,114,473
	Allegan	\$	427,174	Rural Total			
	Ionia	\$	252,055			\$	17,968,728
	Ottawa	\$	272,656				
RTF 8B	RTF 8B Total	\$	951,885				

The funds listed to the left are being allocated directly to RTFs for local project selection through their rural planning process. Projects should be programmed for eligible activities using the HIP fin sys code in the template HIP Rural. If the RTF chooses to use the funds for activities listed in eligible activities #2 (page 6), then the RTF needs to contact the MDOT RTF Coordinator on or before June 1, 2021 to discuss how to program the funds.

FY 2021 HIP COVID Relief General Information

- Must be obligated by September 30, 2024. MDOT recommends obligation as soon as possible.
- These funds come with their own obligation authority and are not subject to any limitations on obligation.
- Federal share is 100% payable. No match required.
- Eligible activities:
 1. Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program activities eligible under 23 USC 133 (b) see Appendix A (page 6) for the full list of items.
 2. **Special eligibilities:** costs related to preventative maintenance, routine maintenance, operations, personnel, including salaries of employees (including those employees who have been placed on administrative leave) or contractors, debt service payments, availability payments, and coverage for other revenue losses. Contact your MDOT representative or coordinator if you intend to utilize the funds in this way.
- TMA funds must be used in the TMA area they are assigned to.
- Must be programmed in S/TIP.
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) Program Section 1101 of FAST Act applies to this funding.
- FHWA Program Codes are listed below. If a special eligibility is intended to be used, please contact MDOT to discuss how to program the project.
 1. Z970 (parent) HIP COVID Supplemental – any area (regular STBG activities)
 2. Z971 (child) HIP COVID Supplemental special eligibilities– any area
 3. Z972 (parent) HIP COVID Supplemental – TMA areas (regular STBG activities)
 4. Z973 (child) HIP COVID Supplemental special eligibilities– TMA areas

Appendix A: Eligible Activities under Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program 23 USC 133

(b) source: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/23/133>

(1) Construction of—

- (A) highways, bridges, tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under section 14501 of title 40;
- (B) ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible for funding under section 129(c);
- (C) transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49;
- (D) infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements, including the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment;
- (E) truck parking facilities eligible for funding under section 1401 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and
- (F) border infrastructure projects eligible for funding under section 1303 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note).

- (2) [Operational improvements](#) and capital and [operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control](#) facilities and programs.
- (3) Environmental measures eligible under sections 119(g), 328, and 329 and transportation control measures listed in section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the [Clean Air Act \(42 U.S.C. 7408\(f\)\(1\)\(A\)\)](#).
- (4) [Highway](#) and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-[highway](#) grade crossings.
- (5) Fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs in accordance with section 137 and [carpool projects](#) in accordance with section 146.
- (6) Recreational trails [projects](#) eligible for funding under section 206, pedestrian and bicycle [projects](#) in accordance with [section 217](#) (including modifications to comply with accessibility requirements under the [Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 \(42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.\)](#)), and the safe routes to school program under section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU ([23 U.S.C. 402](#) note).
- (7) Planning, design, or [construction](#) of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former [Interstate System](#) routes or other divided [highways](#).
- (8) Development and implementation of a [State asset management](#) plan for the [National Highway System](#) and a performance-based management program for other [public roads](#).
- (9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on [public roads](#), and inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and other [highway](#) assets.
- (10) Surface transportation planning programs, [highway](#) and transit research and development and technology transfer programs, and workforce development, training, and education under [chapter 5 of this title](#).
- (11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal.
- (12) [Projects](#) and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electronic toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.
- (13) At the request of a [State](#), and upon Secretarial approval of credit assistance under chapter 6, subsidy and administrative costs necessary to provide an [eligible entity](#) Federal credit assistance under chapter 6 with respect to a [project](#) eligible for assistance under this section.
- (14) The creation and operation by a [State](#) of an office to assist in the design, implementation, and oversight of public-private partnerships eligible to receive funding under this title and chapter 53 of title 49, and the payment of a stipend to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development costs, if necessary to encourage robust competition in public-private partnership procurements.
- (15) Any type of [project](#) eligible under this section as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the FAST Act, including [projects](#) described under [section 101\(a\)\(29\)](#) as in effect on such day.