



Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Tuesday, October 20, 2020, at 10:30 AM

Location: Virtual Meeting

1. Call to Order

Mr. Steve Stepek called the meeting to order at 10:31 AM.

2. Introductions

Introductions were made.

3. Changes or Additions to the Agenda

Ms. Laurel Joseph made a motion to approve the agenda with the addition of a standing FHWA and FTA update, supported by Mr. Jason Nordberg. The **motion passed** unanimously.

4. Approval of the September 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Pat Karr made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, supported by Ms. Laurel Joseph. The **motion passed** unanimously.

5. Treasurer's Report

Ms. Lindsay Wallace reported:

- The account balance stands at approximately \$15,000.
- Two recent transactions included a filing fee for the state and a small fee for the MPTA website.
- MTPA is filed with the state as a non-profit, and there is a limit to the available balance that is allowed. More information will be forthcoming.

6. Policy Committee

Mr. Tom Bruff provided a memo with the current status of each item being discussed by the subcommittee:

- Ongoing items include: Update from TAMC on map portal, GPA estimates in JobNet, Updated GPA guidelines, MPG guidelines, STIP exemption, and Work Type Codes
- Items on hold include: FHWA amendment white paper
- Completed items include: Total cost functionality, and demonstration of SMART system

7. Financial Work Group

Mr. Brudzinski provided an updated draft template for TIP financial plans. The new draft template is similar to the original version, but now includes more information on funding sources and the Rebuilding Michigan bond program. The template is in a fillable format, and can be customized and used in Long



Range Plans. MTPA members were asked to review the draft template and take it up for adoption at a future meeting.

8. FHWA Update

Mr. Andy Pickard reported:

- The FAST Act has been extended until December 11, 2020
- MDOT will soon be submitting their mid-reporting period numbers for performance measures and that information will be made available on the FHWA dashboard. Mr. Andy Pickard applauded MDOT on their work, as he received compliments from the FHWA resource center that reviewed Michigan's work along with several states.
- FHWA is in the process of wrapping up the certification review for SEMCOG

9. Asset Management Council (TAMC)

Mr. Jon Start reported:

- TAMC 2020 Virtual Fall Transportation Asset Management Conference will be held October 28 and October 29 from 9am-noon.
- TAMC is looking to develop modified data gathering as a COVID contingency plan for next year. The biggest concern is data consistency with previous years. New methods may include a two person team.
- The QA/QC process is still to be determined and ideas are welcome. Ideas that have come up include having data files reviewed by other area data gatherers, and increasing the test system for the state QC after data collection is complete.

10. JobNet Technical Report

Mr. Steve Stepek reported that the subcommittee has been working on the Total Project Cost numbers that are now required to be updated with amendments in JobNet to meet state and federal requirements.

11. SEMCOG Walk Bike Drive Safe Campaign

Ms. Jenya provided a presentation on SEMCOG's Walk Bike Drive Safe Campaign, which focuses on traffic safety with an emphasis on pedestrians and bicyclists. This education campaign has two main components: 1. providing material to local communities and traffic safety partners and 2. providing public service announcement materials. All campaign materials are available on the SEMCOG website with additional resources and can be modified for your community. Learn more at semcog.org/walkbikedrivesafe.

12. MDOT



a. Federal Aid for FY 2021 Local Allocations

Ms. Heidi Phaneuf reported:

- Apportionments available for FY 2021 are now available. When the numbers were originally provided during TIP development, a 2% growth rate was anticipated, but that remained flat for FY 2021. Additional adjustments were made to ensure every state received the required 95% of their contribution to the Highway Trust Fund. These updated targets will be sent out to MPOs in the near future. The deadline to get these changes in JobNet is November 23. Local agencies should work with their committees to make any adjustments necessary to ensure the TIP is fiscally constrained when submitting TIP amendments after this target decrease.
- MPOs will be sent a “cheat sheet” of different templates that have been created and changed recently.
- Ms. Heidi Phaneuf thanked the MPOs that have already started moving projects to new HIP templates. Jobs that were not yet programmed for HIP funds were moved to FY 2021. FY 2020 HIP funds can be spent for 3 years, so these funds are available until 2023. If an MPO needs a project moved to a different year, contact Ms. Heidi Phaneuf to make those changes.
- Obligation limitation was made available for the state through December 11. The total was approx. \$200M, including NIPP the total was approx. \$216M. That funding is split between the Rural Task Force and the rest of the local program. \$9.1M is available for Rural Task Force and \$44.9M is available to the non-rural, or statewide, program for a total obligation authority of \$54M.
- Additional template updates include State D templates for the Rural Task Force that is moving from an RTF based template to a county based template, and the local federal fund exchange has a new template for urban counties. FY 2021 State D and state Category C amounts will be available November 7.

b. Required Documentation for SHPO Delegation Authority

Ms. Tracie Leix reported:

- SHPO has notified local agencies of changes to their application process. Documentation is now required to show that projects are funded with federal funds and that local agencies have been delegated authority to consult with the SHPO. A draft process has been approved by MDOT and FHWA, and requires local agencies to send the following documents to the SHPO:
 1. Documentation of the approval of projects. This could include approval in the STIP or TIP, or approval letters such as a conditional commitment letter from the office of economic development, or a bridge or safety selection letter from a



local program. A computer screenshot or email letter is considered an acceptable form of documentation.

2. Approval letter from FHWA (single draft template available)
3. SHPO application

More guidance will be forthcoming and made available on the SHPO website.

c. TPM Update - Committee Approvals for Safety Targets

Mr. John Lanum reported:

- All MPOs should have received the 2021 State Safety Targets. Committees will need to act on those targets by choosing to support or not by February 27, 2021. Local agencies have the option to develop their own safety targets as well.
- A list of upcoming TPM items due in the next year was emailed to MPOs in recent months.
- Public Transit Safety Plans are due December 31, and Committees will need to act on those plans by choosing to support or not by June 30.
- There are annual transit asset management targets that transit agencies should choose to adopt or not.

d. State Long Range Plan (MM2045) Status Update

Mr. Brad Sharlow reported:

- Four regional freight workshops were held between July and September.
- Transit workshops are being held on November 5 and November 6 for urban transit agencies.
- The metroquest survey has been extended through November 30. There are currently about 1,300 completed surveys. An additional survey targeted towards disability issues will be released in the near future.
- A successful scenario planning workshop was held in September and results should be ready by mid-November.
- Based on feedback from MPOs, the statewide congestion model was run with different congestion thresholds (changed to >0.9 = Congested and $0.7 - 0.9$ = Approaching Congested) and that cleared up some of the issues brought forth from MPOs.
- For reliability findings, MDOT uses two different measures: level of travel time reliability (the federal measure required) and the planning time index (ratio between 95th percentile travel time versus the free flow). Based on feedback from MPOs, adjustments were made to the original threshold of 2.0 = Unreliable and has been changed to >3.0 = Severely Unreliable and between $2.0-3.0$ = Moderately Unreliable.



- Congestion information will be released in the final existing conditions report in the next month. MDOT is completing the analysis of existing conditions, doing future needs analysis, and developing the financial revenue forecast. A full stakeholder group will be convening again in December for a strategies workshop. Local agencies are encouraged to continue promoting the public surveys at michiganmobility.org.

e. Additional MDOT Updates

Mr. Eric Mullen reported:

- The Total Project Cost corrective action is completed. MDOT staff is available to help input these values in JobNet. The changes should be complete by the end of the month to be in compliance with this federal requirement.
- MDOT is working on the timeline for the 2023-2026 STIP internally and will likely bring the topic to a working group in the coming months.
- The MDOT data inventory division is reporting that the new HPMS samples are scheduled to be released on November 16, 2020.
- The Open Meetings Act allows for public boards to meet virtually through December 2021. Local agencies could update public participation plans to include virtual meeting options for future contingencies.
- The state budget passed with approx. \$73M statewide cuts. The statewide system management section has been working with each of the regions to identify which projects those are. These changes may start to be reflected in JobNet. A complete list will be forthcoming but in summary, there were approx. \$30M of non freeway resurfacing program cuts statewide and approx. \$43M of federal aid projects used to backfill some of the Rebuilding Michigan bond funding.

Mr. Don Mayle reported:

- The MTPA webinar on reading the local balance report that was presented on May 29th has now been uploaded to the MTPA website under the Resource tab or by visiting mtpa-mi.org/resourcedetails.asp?did=21.
- A table that compares funding abbreviations used, actual funding programs, and templates has been made available on the MTPA website.

13. Other New Business

Mr. Steve Stepek added that with the anticipated 2020 Census, the PL group would benefit from meeting in the near future to discuss any formula adjustments.

14. Adjournment



Michigan Transportation Planning Association

Mr. Steve Stepek adjourned the meeting at 11:39 AM.



Michigan Transportation Planning Association

Meeting Attendance Tuesday, October 20, 2020 at 10:30 a.m.

Name	Organization
Andrea Faber	GVMC
Andrea Strach	Tri-County MPO
Jenya Abramovich	SEMCOG
Andy Brush	MDOT
Richard Bayus	MDOT
Anita Boughner	MDOT
Brad Sharlow	MDOT
Stephen Brudzinski	SEMCOG
Bryan Gillett	Midland MPO
Carolyn Ulstad	MACC
David Engelhardt	EMCOG
David Fairchild	MDOT
Edward Fowler	MDOT
Jeff Franklin	MDOT
Matthew Galbraith	MDOT
Maxwell Gierman	MDOT
Jacob Maurer	GCPC
Jay Anderson	Bay City MPO
Tyler Kent	MDOT

a voluntary association of public
organizations and agencies responsible for the administration of
transportation planning activities throughout the State of Michigan



Michigan Transportation Planning Association

Kim Gallagher	SWMPC
Mark Kloha	MDOT
Joel Fitzpatrick	WMSRDC
John Lanum	MDOT
Laurel Joseph	GVMC
Lindsay Wallace	SCCOTS
Tracie Leix	MDOT
Mara Gericke	MACC
Don Mayle	MDOT
Megan Mickelson	KATS
Eric Mullen	MDOT
Craig Newell	MDOT
Nick Sapkiewicz	WATS
Jim Snell	Tri-County MPO
Jon Start	TAMC
Nicole Baumer	Tri-County MPO
Jason Nordberg	GCPC
Pat Karr	BCATS
Heidi Phaneuf	MDOT
Andy Pickard	FHWA
Ryan Buck	WATS
Steve Duke	R2PC

a voluntary association of public organizations and agencies responsible for the administration of transportation planning activities throughout the State of Michigan



Michigan Transportation Planning Association

Steven Stepek	KATS
James Sturdevant	MDOT
Suzann Flowers	WATS
Tanya DeOliveira	R2PC
Tom Bruff	SEMCOG
Luke Walters	MDOT
Michelle Weber-Currie	MDOT
Mitch Huber	MDOT
Emily Lake	WATS

a voluntary association of public
organizations and agencies responsible for the administration of
transportation planning activities throughout the State of Michigan

Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act

Designation of Alternative Fuel Corridors

Request for Nominations

Round 5

Background:

Section 1413 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), signed into law on December 4, 2015, required the Secretary to designate national alternative fueling corridors. (23 U.S.C. 151). In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 151(a), corridor designations must identify near- and long-term needs for, and location of, electric vehicle (EV) charging, and hydrogen, propane, and natural gas fueling infrastructure at strategic locations along major national highways to improve the mobility of passenger and commercial vehicles that employ these technologies across the United States. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) must solicit nominations for corridors from State and local officials and involve a range of stakeholders (23 U.S.C. 151(b) and (c)).

The Secretary must update and re-designate the corridors not later than five years after the date of establishment of the corridors, and every five years thereafter. Because of the rapidly evolving state of vehicle technology and infrastructure related to the use of alternative fuels, it is important to update the corridor networks on a continuing basis. The FHWA has determined that annual updates are appropriate to reflect these changes. This includes annual requests for nominations, as well as periodic updates of corridor designations from previous rounds to reflect the changes in corridor status that have occurred since the original designation.

The FAST Act also directs FHWA to review designated corridors every five years to identify standardization needs and to set an aspirational goal for achieving strategic deployment of alternative fueling infrastructure by fiscal year 2020. Accordingly, the DOT issued a [report](#) that established a 2020 vision to ensure a user-centric experience. This vision will require a safe, reliable, effective, and high-performance system that aligns with DOT's vision for the National Highway System (NHS)¹ and strengthens U.S. energy security, economic vitality, and quality of life.

¹ For additional information on the NHS see: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/national_highway_system/. [Section 111 of Title 23 United States Code prohibits Interstate rest areas built after January 1, 1960 from offering commercial services such as fuel and food on the Interstate right-of-way. In light of this provision, an alternative fuel facility can be located on an Interstate right-of-way, but a fee may not be charged for the fuel or other use of the facility.](#)

The table below summarizes the results of the first four rounds of nominations:

	REQUEST FOR NOMINATIONS (DATE ISSUED)	NOMINATIONS RECEIVED	INTERSTATES DESIGNATED^b	US & STATE HIGHWAYS DESIGNATED	NUMBER OF NEW STATES^c	NHS MILEAGE COVERED^d
1 (2016)	July 2016^a	34	59	16	36	86,266
2 (2017)	September 2017^e	24	25	25	8	22,665
3 (2018)	October 2018^e	21	16	35	2	16,235
4 (2019)	October 2019^e	21	19	24	3	20,056
<u>TOTAL</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>145,222</u>

^a 81 FR 47852 (July 22, 2016), available at: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-07-22/pdf/FR-2016-07-22.pdf>

^b [Represents segments/portions of Interstates](#)

^c [Plus the District of Columbia](#)

^d [Includes some double counting for multiple fuel corridor segments](#)

^e Distributed through FHWA Division Offices

The FHWA will designate nominated highway corridors as either “corridor-ready” or “corridor-pending.” Corridor-ready segments currently contain a sufficient number of fueling facilities to allow for corridor travel with the designated alternative fuel. Corridors that do not have sufficient alternative fuel facilities to support alternative fuel vehicle travel are designated as corridor-pending. The table below describes the requirements for designations by fuel type. The FHWA will work with State and local agencies to bring corridors designated as corridor-pending up to the corridor-ready stage.

The FHWA supports the expansion of the national network of alternative fuel corridors and has established a process outlining the necessary steps and information for the 2020/Round 5 corridor designations in this request. The FHWA has created an [Alternative Fuels Corridor website](#) to provide information on the previous rounds of corridor designations and to keep stakeholders and the public informed on future designations. In addition, FHWA has developed specifications for [Signing for Designated Alternative Fuel Corridors](#) in compliance with [The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices](#) (MUTCD) for Streets and Highways that is available on the Alternative Fuel Corridors website.

Infrastructure Coverage Criteria

Fuel/ Technology	Corridor-Ready^a NHS Segment has...	Corridor-Pending^b NHS Segment has...
EV Charging^c	Public DC Fast Charging no greater than 50 miles between one station/site and the next on corridor, and no greater than 5 miles off the highway. Additionally, each DC Fast Charging site should have both J1772 combo (CCS) and CHAdeMO connectors.	Public DC Fast Charging stations separated by more than 50 miles. Location of station/site- no greater than 5 miles off the highway.
Hydrogen^d	Public hydrogen stations no greater than 100 miles between one station and the next on the corridor, and no greater than 5 miles off the highway.	Public hydrogen stations separated by more than 100 miles. Location of station- no greater than 5 miles off the highway.
Propane^e	Public, primary propane stations no greater than 150 miles between one station and the next on the corridor, and no greater than 5 miles off the highway.	Public, primary propane stations separated by more than 150 miles. Location of station- no greater than 5 miles off the highway.
CNG	Public fast fill, 3,600 psi CNG stations no greater than 150 miles between one station and the next on the corridor, and no greater than 5 miles off the highway.	Public, fast fill, 3,600 psi CNG stations separated by more than 150 miles. Location of station- no greater than 5 miles off the highway.
LNG	Public LNG stations no greater than 200 miles between one station and the next on the corridor, and no greater than 5 miles off the highway.	Public LNG stations separated by more than 200 miles. Location of station- 5 miles or less off the highway.

- a. A corridor-ready corridor is defined as having a minimum of 2 stations. Final classifications will be made on a case-by-case basis.
- b. If a corridor is being designated as corridor-pending and currently has no alternative fuel facilities located on it, then a strategy or plan and timeline for infrastructure build-out should be submitted.
- c. Electric vehicle designations will only consider corridors with DC Fast Charge infrastructure and both connector types. Tesla charging stations are considered a proprietary network and do not meet the designation criteria of being publicly accessible. Therefore, these stations are not eligible for inclusion.
- d. If a hydrogen refueling station currently used for non-road transportation purposes is being used to support the nomination process, then the station must be compliant with SAE J2601 standards, and meet all of the criteria outlined in this document for a hydrogen corridor including being publicly accessible.

- e. For propane stations, only "primary" stations (i.e., those stations that are staffed during regular business hours, do not require drivers to call ahead in order to fuel, accept credit cards or fleet cards as a payment type, and are able to fuel vehicles at a rate of 12 gallons per minute or faster, or at a rate similar to filling a gasoline vehicle, as designated by the U.S. Department of Energy's Alternative Fuel Station Locator) would be considered when determining infrastructure coverage along a nominated corridor.

Interface Between Previous Designations and Current Request for Nominations:

The first four rounds of corridor designations were announced by FHWA in November 2016, March 2018, April 2019 and June 2020. This fifth round of corridor designations may provide State or local agencies an opportunity to nominate additional corridors, extend currently designated corridors, and/or nominate a different fuel(s) along an already designated corridor. It is not FHWA's intention to require formal updates on the first four rounds of corridor designations through this current request for nominations, however #3 below discusses optional input that can be provided related to changes from past designations. The following guidelines are provided to clarify the interface between previous designations and this current request for nominations:

1. If a corridor is extended beyond its starting or ending points, a formal designation proposal through this current request for nominations **is needed** for the extension.
2. If additional fuel(s) are proposed for a designated corridor on an existing corridor, a formal designation proposal through this current request for nominations **is needed** for the additional fuel(s).
3. As part of the Round 5 nomination process, FHWA invites nominating agencies to provide information on any existing corridors that have changed designation status due to the addition or loss of charging or fueling facilities. To reflect current conditions, please identify and include the following information as part of the Round 5 nomination:
 - ✓ Corridors that have changed their status since their original designation (i.e. from Corridor-Pending to Corridor-Ready), due to new stations being added along these highway segments;
 - ✓ Additional/new corridor-ready highway segments that close gaps along existing corridors that have already been designated corridor-pending, due to new stations being added; and,
 - ✓ Corridors that have changed their status from Corridor-Ready to Corridor-Pending, due to station closures.
4. The initial round of designations in 2016 allowed the use of Level 2 chargers. FHWA encourages that States identify these highway segments, which were designated as "corridor-ready" in Round 1 of the Program (i.e. currently have only Level 2 chargers) and prioritize these corridors for upgrades to DCFCs. Additionally, the first three rounds of designations allowed a DC Fast Charging station to have either J1772 combo (CCS) or CHAdeMO connectors. Starting with Round 4, all corridor DC Fast Charging stations are required to have both J1772 combo (CCS) and CHAdeMO connectors to be eligible for designation. Similarly, FHWA does not plan to change the status of corridors that included stations with only one connector type, however it is recommended that these stations be prioritized for upgrades to include both.

5. Although the entire NHS is included in the corridor program, **FHWA is limiting the number of US highways/State roads to 1-2 per nomination in Round 5** so the “build-out” of fueling/charging infrastructure is focused on the Interstates across the country and flipping corridor-pending Interstates to corridor-ready. Also, there must be a compelling case made as to why US highways/State roads should be considered for designation.

FHWA Areas of Interest for Round 5 Nominations:

After the completion of the first four rounds of designations, FHWA has identified several areas of interest for the fifth round of corridor designations that State or local agencies should consider when planning/preparing their nominations. The following are the FHWA areas of interest:

- States that have no corridor designations (pending or ready).
- Nominations from States that have not submitted an application as a lead.
- States that currently have existing Interstates/highways that are corridor-ready for one or more alternative fuels, but have not submitted a nomination.
- Since corridors extend beyond State boundaries, nominations that take into consideration the next fueling site over State or international borders² are encouraged. Similarly, cooperation between neighboring States is highly encouraged.
- Nominations that will complete the nation’s longest and heavily traveled highways for one of more alternative fuels. For example, I-95, I-10, I-80, I-40, I-35, I-65, I-70, I-81, or I-90.
- FHWA strongly encourages EV nomination submissions from State and local officials who have Interstate highways within their States that have been targeted for investment in the first 30-month cycle by Electrify America in the National Zero Emission Vehicle Investment Plan. See page 22 of the [Cycle 1 Plan](#), and page 48 of the [Cycle 2 Plan](#).
- Coordination, integration, and inclusion with other DOT programs and regulations such as the development/update of State Freight Plans and Long-Range Transportation Plans (LRTPs).

Information to be Included in Nominations (Narrative Portion):

Any State or local agency is invited to nominate an alternative fuel corridor for designation. For the purposes of this solicitation, an eligible corridor is an Interstate highway (e.g. I-10, I-80, I-95, etc.). Or if a non-Interstate highway that is on the NHS is being nominated, then a compelling case should be made as to why it should be considered for designation (see language above on the limitation of nominating

US highways/State roads in round 5). It is the intention of FHWA to first focus on the build-out of alternative fueling/charging infrastructure along Interstate corridors, and then on other components of the NHS. This decision was made based on the size of the NHS compared to the limited resources available to make designation determinations. Corridors within a single State and multistate corridors are eligible, with the goal of connecting communities, cities, and regions to develop a national network of alternative fuel facilities. A State or local agency interested in submitting a nomination for an alternative fuel corridor designation should develop no more than a 25-page narrative nomination containing the following elements/information (requested station information may be displayed in a table):

1. Corridor(s) being proposed for designation (include the official name of the NHS segment and beginning and end points on the proposed corridor(s);
2. Name of lead State or local agency originating the nomination (please include name, title, e-mail address, and phone number);
3. Name of the entity (or entities) with jurisdiction over the proposed corridor(s) (i.e., State, local government, Indian tribe, and/or Federal land management agency). A letter of support from this entity (or entities) is strongly recommended;
4. Type of alternative fuel(s) projected to be used along the corridor(s);
5. Description of corridor(s), including the major metropolitan areas and/or intermodal facilities located along the corridor, how the corridor contributes to the national network, and why it is being proposed for designation;
6. If a non-Interstate highway that is on the NHS is being nominated, describe the importance of this highway corridor and why it should be considered for designation (see language above on the limitation of nominating US highways/State roads in round 5);
7. Type, number, and distance between existing alternative fuel facilities by fuel type located along proposed corridor(s);
8. A description of the plan for signage on the corridor, including the following:
 - Coordination efforts with State Department of Transportation;
 - Location of starting/ending corridor signage; and,
 - Plan for signage approaching exits and beyond off ramps.
9. Starting and endpoint of the corridor – designated by first and last fueling station on the corridor - based on mileage marker and town/city;
10. Listing of each station along the highway with the following information:
 - Address of the station;
 - Fuel(s) provided;
 - For electric vehicle charging sites, include EV connector(s) (number and type of network);

11. Distance between all the stations along the corridor.

- List the distance between stations (and basis of this calculation);
- Indicate if the station meets the distance criteria for each fuel's corridor-ready or corridor-pending (see the above section for this criteria)

12. A map of the corridor, including current station locations, as well as possible future locations.

NOTE#1 - The U.S. Department of Energy's Alternative Fueling Station Locator (Station Locator) at <https://www.afdc.energy.gov/stations> is the required data source for corridor designations.

NOTE#2 – For nominations that will include input related to changes from past designations, please provide the relevant information from #9-12 above.

Information to be Included in Nominations (GIS Shapefiles):

The following GIS Shapefile information shall be submitted, along with the narrative portion, for each designation proposal. Please **DO NOT** include alternative fuel station information in the shapefile. This will be done by NREL/FHWA during the analysis process.

Include the following fields and input for each centerline corridor in the shapefile:

- ✓ **Primary Corridor Route Name:** such as I-10 or I-HI (in Hawaii), U-95, U-9W, S-99, etc.
(I–Interstate, U -US Highway, S–StateHighway, C- County Highway; O-Others)
- ✓ **Electric Vehicle:** Corridor-Ready or Corridor-Pending
- ✓ **Hydrogen:** Corridor-Ready or Corridor-Pending
- ✓ **Propane:** Corridor-Ready or Corridor-Pending
- ✓ **CNG:** Corridor-Ready or Corridor-Pending
- ✓ **LNG:** Corridor-Ready or Corridor-Pending

Corridor Planning/Analysis Tools and Resources to Assist with Nomination:

The following information sources and/or tools are available for use to assist with the development of the designation nomination:

1. Station data and shapefiles to assist with nomination of alternative fuel corridors are available on the U.S. Department of Energy's Alternative Fuel Data Center (AFDC) at <https://www.afdc.energy.gov/corridors>. These datasets are organized by State and fuel type with filters applied to meet the infrastructure coverage criteria. This site also provides a mapping tool to explore potential corridors by fuel..
2. The Alternative Fueling Station Locator contains a Corridor Measurement Tool that can be used to measure the driving distance along

- Interstate Highways between stations that meet the specific distance criteria for each fuel (<https://afdc.energy.gov/stations/#/corridors>).
3. The above requested GIS shapefile information should be available from your State DOT or MPOs. To determine whether a route is on the NHS, please refer to the official FHWA NHS maps at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/national_highway_system/nhs_maps/ or interactive NHS map viewer at <https://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/#> .
 4. The applicant may utilize the FHWA NHS Shapefile as a base layer, and extract out the line segments needed to create a corridor specific GIS shapefile. The applicant can download the NHS shapefile at <https://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/#> (by clicking on “Download Data” shown on the second toolbar row of the menu on the top of the webpage and then selecting the NHS zip file).
 5. The applicant can also download the existing Alternative Fuel Corridor GIS Shapefile (including Rounds 1-4) to familiarize applicants with the attributes included in the FHWA Alternative Fuel corridor shapefile at <https://hepgis.fhwa.dot.gov/fhwagis/#> (by clicking on “Download Data” shown on the second toolbar row of the menu on the top of the webpage and then selecting the Alt Fuel Corridors zip file).

Points of Contact

For questions regarding the **information contained in this request**, please contact:

Diane Turchetta
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
202-493-0158 or diane.turchetta@dot.gov

Mike Scarpino
U.S. Department of Transportation
Volpe Center
617-494-3373 or michael.scarpino@dot.gov

Stephen Costa
U.S. Department of Transportation
Volpe Center
617-494-3852 or stephen.costa@dot.gov

For questions regarding **GIS/shapefile information**, please contact:

Sara Secunda
U.S. Department of Transportation
Volpe Center
617-494-3601 or Sara.Secunda@dot.gov

Submittal Information

To submit your **nominations** and **shapefiles**, please email Sara Secunda at Sara.Secunda@dot.gov and instructions will be provided on how to upload these files.

Timeline

The deadline for this solicitation is **COB Wednesday February 24, 2021**

The TAMC is considering a pilot data gathering program for Federal Aid Data Collection. There are four options:

1. Keep the three-person teams and continue with current and past practice.
2. Use a two-person two agency team.
3. Use a two-person one agency team having another agency review and concur with the data gathered set by a sample.
4. Use a two-person one agency team with no review of data until after the fact QA/QC is done statewide.

The TAMC is leaning toward the second option since it is close to what we have been doing and allows for agreement as the data is collected by two separate agencies.

Requesting feedback from the MTPA on their thoughts and preferences. The TAMC needs to decide to allow time to change training if necessary.



GENESEE COUNTY
METROPOLITAN
PLANNING

DEREK BRADSHAW
DIRECTOR-COORDINATOR

CHRISTINE A. DURGAN
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

GENESEE COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

1101 Beach Street – Room 111, Flint, Michigan 48502-1470 * (810) 257-3010 * www.gcmpl.org



MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the MTPA

FROM: Jason Nordberg, Division Manager
Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission

DATE: November 17, 2020

SUBJECT: **MTPA 2022 Conference Dates and Facilities**

The Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission (GCMPC) will be hosting the 2022 MTPA conference and we are planning to have the conference in downtown Flint from Tuesday July 26th through Friday the 29th. The Hilton Garden Inn just opened this November in downtown Flint and we have been working with the hotel staff to reserve these dates for the conference. The hotel does not have adequate conference space needed for the size of the MTPA conference, however, it is located next to the University of Michigan Flint campus with several conference facilities within a 2 to 5 minute walk.

At this time we are requesting approval of the conference dates and also the authority to work with the MTPA executive committee to sign contracts and pay deposits related to the hotel and conference facilities not to exceed \$3,000 without further committee approval.

Response to WATS Safety Questions

Below are MDOT responses (from Mark Bott, Manager, Traffic & Safety) to the specific questions passed along from the WATS Technical Committee.

1. *Why are the numbers showing that we expect the non-motor serious injury and fatality to increase, what factors are leading to this increase and what funding or projects is MDOT committing to that will keep peds/bikes safe* – Just as is done for serious injuries results from the UMTRI model (the fatality and serious injury relationship) were also used to generate non-motorized forecasted annual values of 714 for CY 2020, and 799 for CY 2021. Since fatalities were anticipated to be lower in 2020 the non-motorized estimate reflected this decrease while in 2021 fatalities are believed to increase with the increase in VMT and thus an increase in non-motorized numbers.

As you can see in the response below it is going to take more than just projects on the state trunkline system to address fatalities and serious injuries no matter what category they fall into. To MDOT, sharing tools to help state and locals address these crashes with possible roadway improvements or educational campaigns is paramount. Attached is a summary of the Pedestrian/Bicycle Efforts MDOT is engaged in. But we are not the only safety focused agency in the state. Others such as Office of Highway Safety Planning and Secretary of State are initiating efforts to address crashes on Michigan's roadways. You can find out more by participating in the Governors Traffic Safety Advisory Commission (GTSAC) meetings. In addition, other MPOs such as SEMCOG are implementing their own programs to educate the public on this issue. It is my understanding they made a presentation on their Walk.Bike.Drive. Safe campaign at the October 20th MTPA meeting. I heard it went over very well. Regarding the second part of question no. 1, the MDOT Traffic & Safety Section does work with the regions to provide pedestrian/bicyclist assistance in project review, and development of guidance and tools for improvements for the trunklines. Regarding federal funding for local projects, you could contact our local agency programs office (Tracie Leix, Manager) for information regarding what ped/bike projects local agencies are requesting funding for. Of course, those local representatives of your committee may also provide such information.

2. *What is the MDOT Safety Goal* - Michigan's [Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#) (SHSP) is our state's blueprint in addressing both fatalities and serious injuries and includes State of Michigan goals to reduce fatalities from 974 in 2018 to 945 in 2022, and reduce suspected serious injuries from 5,586 in 2018 to 4,994 in 2022. Under the guidance of the Governors Traffic Safety Advisory Commission (GTSAC), the SHSP has adopted the vision of Toward Zero Deaths. The strategy is a statewide campaign to positively enhance road user's behavior and safety. The current TZD strategy focuses on enhanced driver education, emergency response, enforcement, engineering, policy, communications, and other efforts. To carry forth the SHSP is focused on four broad emphasis areas:

1. High-Risk Behaviors,
2. At-Risk Road Users,
3. Engineering Infrastructure, and
4. System Administration.

Within these emphasis areas, 11 action teams provide more targeted guidance on area-specific safety issues. Structuring these action teams under the broad umbrella of these four emphasis areas creates

efficiencies given the degree of overlap among these teams. Updated goals, strategies, objectives, and activities for each are based on current traffic crash data. More information on the GTSAC and the SHSP can be found at the [GTSAC website](#). MDOT strongly encourages MPO involvement and can provide meeting information for those who are interested. At MDOT, safety is paramount. It is our goal to improve overall safety for all road users, internal staff, contractors performing work on roads, and emergency responders. We continue to work with partners to seek out innovative ideas and ways to keep Michigan's road users and workers safe. Our ultimate vision matches that established by the GTSAC in Michigan's SHSP, Toward Zero Deaths on Michigan roadways. But we cannot do it alone. **We need your assistance!**

3. Overall for safety are we seeing higher crashes, serious injuries or fatalities as compared to previous years, what is causing this to happen - Saying 2020 has been a strange year so far is an understatement. The same is true for crashes. In April, with travel significantly down all crashes were considerably lower when compared to 2019. However, with increases in travel (still down 20%), fatalities have risen to the point of being higher than last year. As of Tuesday, October 13, 2020 fatalities are up 27 (8.1%) compared to last year while serious injuries and total crashes are down by 293 (6.8%) and 53,151 (23.2%) respectively.

Why is that?

In early April, sheriff's in Wayne and Oakland counties announced they were relaxing enforcement of speeding and other minor traffic violations to protect deputies and the public from coronavirus. Volumes are lower, people are driving in separate vehicles more frequently, and preliminary indications suggest people are driving faster and taking more risks such as not wearing their seatbelts. Perhaps in response to social distancing minor crashes such as Property Damage Only are not being reported. The Governors Highway Safety Association reported in April, "Empty streets could be encouraging drivers to ignore traffic laws." Many states have noted dramatic increases in speeding. In Michigan, one driver was cited for traveling at 180 mph in a 70-mph zone in late April. Days later, another driver was cited for going 118 mph in a 70-mph zone. UMTRI has found that two factors affect crashes: exposure and risk. With exposure down, people are taking greater risks in those situations that could result in a fatality. Therefore, the risk of a fatal crash is greater than normal.

4. If possible, is there a way to parse out just the Washtenaw County data -

The MPO can access crash data in several ways as described below. Another source is your partner road commission.

Roadsoft Safety Analysis Tools. MPOs and local agencies can access crash data/safety analysis through Roadsoft. There is no cost to government agencies within State of Michigan courtesy of a state-wide license agreement funded by MDOT. If an MPO user requires access, they can connect with Michigan Tech LTAP to [establish a user account](#). If there is enough interest, we will pursue a "getting started" safety analysis training for MPO partners. We recommend a discussion through MTPA to determine the level of interest for potential training.

Michigan Crash Facts Data Query Tool. The [Michigan Traffic Crash Facts data query](#) tool is a good first step in gathering state and local crash statistics. Using the tool, under geographic location there is "Prior Michigan Metropolitan Planning Organization" and "Michigan Metropolitan Planning Organization." MDOT and MSP are discussing opportunities to improve the tool and identifying a potential fund source for improvements.

In addition, FHWA just released a website regarding the creation of Local Road Safety Plans. The Do It Yourself (DIY) site includes resources local agencies and their supporting partners can use to develop these lifesaving plans themselves, beginning with an introduction page to orient users and follows with subsequent pages that walk users through the steps of the LRSP process. The site contains training videos, downloadable templates, “local agency insights” videos where practitioners can learn from their peers, and example plans from other local agencies. [Local Road Safety Plan Do-It-Yourself website](#)

MDOT Pedestrian/Bicycle Efforts

MDOT has the follow research projects/efforts going on (the second one is not started yet):

1. Synthesis of National Best Practices on Pedestrian and Bicycle Design, Guidance and Technology Innovations - Transportation infrastructure design and guidance documents supporting the mobility of motor vehicles have advanced more rapidly than guidance for other modes such as walking or bicycling. And while MDOT has prioritized being multimodal and following context sensitive principles, there are opportunities to be realized by a thorough review of what strides have been made nationally and can be brought back to MDOT's guidance and design processes. Pedestrians and bicycles are the most vulnerable road users and are found along, or across, much of the transportation network – a network that MDOT has very little ownership of. However, MDOT is a resource for scoping, design, implementation, etc. for local agencies as well that make up the bulk of the roadway ownership. While progress has been made over the last decade, and MDOT is working through the (M2D2) spell out process; a comprehensive review of the Departments scoping and design guidance, along with a comparison of national efforts and best practices supporting active transportation could accelerate our efforts. This review is to be followed by recommendations related to: traffic signing traffic signal, and operational technologies to minimize excessive delays or detours and improve roadway crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists. Additionally, recommendations on geometric design changes that can improve user visibility, improving access, safety and mobility for people who travel on foot or by bicycle should be considered.

- a. Under this research we have update multiple guidance documents such as the Crosswalk Guidance and the Best Practices guidance.
- b. We will be developing educational materials for ped/bike safety topics

2. Effective Pedestrian/Non-Motorized Crossing Enhancements along Higher Speed Corridors - MDOT is seeking enhanced solutions for pedestrian/non-motorized crossings along highway corridors with speeds 45 mph or greater, at both signalized and unsignalized intersections. Specific treatments are desired (rapid flashing beacon, HAWK signal, etc.) and some current options do not meet minimum warrants per various guidance documents. In response, MDOT relies on judgment as to what we believe will work for additional enhancement features. MDOT would like research on effective treatments where pedestrian/non-motorized crossing warrants are not met for the bigger enhancements on corridors with speeds 45 mph or greater.

3. Developing a Consistent Data Driven Methodology to Multimodal, Performance Based and Context Sensitive Design - MDOT designers are tasked with understanding the context of a community and balancing modal needs with limited funding resources. Transportation decisions are currently made from input provided by

communities. This is often in a reactive rather than proactive process, with qualitative data and quantitative data evaluated separately to assist in transportation decision making. Methods for evaluating modal characteristics have typically been applied to individual modes. A new methodology is needed that will analyze and aggregate qualitative and quantitative pertinent data to assist in making decisions on competing interests such as to what roadway features should be designed and/or what mode(s) of transportation should be implemented for a given highway corridor.

4. Statewide Pedestrian Education Campaign - Michigan Fitness Foundation (MFF), in partnership with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) have taken steps to initiate a pedestrian safety education campaign in Southeast Michigan (SE MI), where pedestrian crashes are highest in the state. They will engage three SE MI communities as pilot sites for the campaign with goals to:

- Educate Michigan citizens—pedestrians and drivers alike—about best practices and laws surrounding pedestrian transportation.
- Reduce the total number of pedestrian crashes, fatalities, and severity of injuries in three target communities in SE MI

5. Considering Data Analysis of Pedestrian and Bicycle Fatalities and Serious Injuries – analysis being consider similar to that done by NHTSA.

6. Participation on the latest FHWA STEP Suburban Corridor Scan Tour - These suburban corridors or arterials are often complex multilane roadways located in urbanizing areas with pedestrian-generating land uses. The STEP team is inviting a small number of State DOT safety engineers and/or planners to participate in a series of online meetings to collectively brainstorm strategies for improving pedestrian safety along suburban corridors.

7. Updating the Ped/Bike Risk Model Databases and Making the Model User Ready - Generating the risk scores require multiple datasets and several modules. Pedestrian exposure was estimated using attributes of the built environment and travelers' characteristics from American Community Survey (ACS), Public Use Microdata sample (PUMS), ReferenceUSA and MI Travel Counts (Michigan State Household Travel Survey). The estimates were subsequently combined with data on roadway characteristics obtained from the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) and crash data from the Michigan Traffic Crash Facts (MTCF) to generate the risk score. The approach synthesizes both the crash data and the computed expected number of crashes to generate the risk scores.

8. NCHRP Panel Participation:

- a. 15-73 - Design Options to Reduce Turning Motor Vehicle – Bicycle Conflicts at Controlled Intersections
- b. 17-87 - Enhancing Pedestrian Volume Estimation and Developing HCM Pedestrian Methodologies for Safe and Sustainable Communities

c. 15-73 - Design Options to Reduce Turning Motor Vehicle – Bicycle Conflicts at Controlled Intersections