



CAPITAL REGION

**Transportation
Council**

**DRAFT 2025-2030
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (TIP)
-
APPENDIX
FOR POLICY BOARD REVIEW**

As of February 27, 2025

DISCLAIMER

Financial assistance for the preparation of this report was provided through grants from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), U.S. Department of Transportation through the New York State Department of Transportation. The Capital Region Transportation Council is solely responsible for its content and the views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

TITLE VI AND NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY STATEMENT

The Capital Region Transportation Council (Transportation Council) is committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, its metropolitan transportation planning process on the basis of race, color, or national origin as protected by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d). Additionally, the Transportation Council will provide meaningful access to services for persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) in accordance with Executive Order # 13166. The Transportation Council is also committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, its transportation planning process on the basis of sex, age, or disability as protected by Section 162 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 (23 U.S.C. § 324), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

If information is needed in another language, contact 518-458-2161 or send an e-mail to info@capitalmpo.org.

Si se necesita información en otro idioma, llame al teléfono 518-458-2161 o bien enviando un correo electrónico a info@capitalmpo.org.

如欲获得其他语言的相关信息，请联系：518-458-2161，或发送电子邮件至：
info@capitalmpo.org。

أو إرسال رسالة 518-458-2161 إذا كنت بحاجة إلى المعلومات بلغة أخرى، فيرجى التواصل مع الرقم
بريد إلكتروني إلى info@capitalmpo.org.



Find us at @CapitalMPO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A - GLOSSARY	3
APPENDIX B - FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS.....	6
APPENDIX C - FEDERAL FUND SOURCE SPLITS	11
APPENDIX D - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND CONSULTATION.....	13
APPENDIX E - AMENDING THE TIP	15
APPENDIX F - 2025-2030 TIP PROJECT CANDIDATES	17
APPENDIX G - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) GUIDANCE DOCUMENT	22
APPENDIX H - TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA	24
APPENDIX I - ADDITIONAL DATA TABLES USED IN PROJECT EVALUATION	26
APPENDIX J - SELECTION OF NEW PROJECTS	36
APPENDIX K - FEDERAL-AID TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS COMPLETED ON THE 2022-2027 TIP	40
APPENDIX L - TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL SELF CERTIFICATION.....	42
APPENDIX M - AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY.....	52
APPENDIX N - TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.....	54
APPENDIX O - CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL MEMBERS	56

APPENDIX A

-

GLOSSARY

DRAFT

Abbreviation	Description
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AGFTC	Adirondack Glens Falls Transportation Council
BFP	Bridge Formula Program
BIL	Bipartisan Infrastructure Law
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
CDRPC	Capital District Regional Planning Commission
CDTA	Capital District Transportation Authority
CLEAR	Crash Location & Engineering Analysis & Reporting
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
IIJA	Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act
IRI	International Roughness Index
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
LOTTR	Level of Travel Time Reliability
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NHFP	National Highway Freight Program
NHPP	National Highway Performance Program
NHS	National Highway System
NSP	National Public Transportation Safety Plan
NYSDOT	New York State Department of Transportation
NYSTA	New York State Thruway Authority
PIN	Project Identification Number (used by NYSDOT)
PSR	Present Serviceability Rating
PTASP	Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan
RTP	Recreational Trails Program
SFY	State Fiscal Year
SGR	State of Good Repair
SHSP	New York Strategic Highway Safety Plan
SMS	Safety Management Systems
SOV	Single Occupancy Vehicle
STAR	Special Transit Service Available by Request (Paratransit)

Abbreviation	Description
STBGP	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
STBGP - Flex	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Flexible
STBGP - LG Urb	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Large Urban
STEP Model	Systematic Transportation Evaluation and Planning Model
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TAM	Transit Asset Management
TAP	Transportation Alternatives Program
TERM	Transit Economic Requirements Model
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMC	Traffic Management Center
TTTR	Truck Travel Time Reliability
ULB	Useful Life Benchmark
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation

APPENDIX B
-
FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAMS

DRAFT

National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)

The National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), for the construction of new facilities on the NHS, and to ensure that investments of Federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a State's asset management plan for the NHS.

The IIJA directs FHWA to apportion funding as a lump sum for each State then divides that total among apportioned programs. Within this process, a State's NHPP apportionment is calculated based on a percentage specified in law. The NHPP Program includes a 2% set-aside of a State's NHPP funding for State Planning & Research (SPR). [23 U.S.C. 505] A State may transfer up to 50% of NHPP funds made available each fiscal year to the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, National Highway Freight Program, Carbon Reduction Program, and PROTECT Formula Program. Conversely, subject to certain limitations, a State may transfer up to 50% of funds made available each fiscal year from each apportionment of the State to NHPP. [23 U.S.C. 126]

The Federal share of NHPP funds is generally 80 percent. See the "Federal Share" fact sheet for more information¹.

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP)

The Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) is a flexible funding source with broad eligibility. The IIJA requires 10% of STBG funds to be set-aside for Transportation Alternatives, and an additional 2% for State Planning and Research (SPR). An additional set-aside for bridges on public roads other than Federal-aid highways (commonly known as 'off-system bridges') was increased by the IIJA from 15% to 20% of the State's FY 2009 Highway Bridge Program apportionment. After set-asides, 55% of the remaining funding is suballocated to urban and rural areas in proportion to their relative share of the State's population. The remaining 45% may be obligated in any area of the State.

¹ <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/federalsharefs.pdf>

The IIJA continues all funding features that applied to the STBGP under the FAST Act, with some exceptions.

The IIJA continues all prior STBGP eligibilities and adds 16 new eligible project types. Newly eligible activities include projects and programs designed to reduce wildlife crashes, recreational trail maintenance, electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure, installation of intelligent transportation technologies, and more. The full list of new eligibilities is found in 23 U.S.C. 133(b).

As with the NHPP, funds may be transferred to or from the STBGP, subject to certain limitations [23 U.S.C. 126(a)]

The Federal share of STBG funds is generally 80 percent. See the “Federal Share” fact sheet for more information².

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program fund sources included on the 2025 – 2030 TIP include:

- ◆ STBGP FLEX (Includes STBGP Rural, STBGP Small Urban 5-50, STBGP Medium Urban 50-200)
- ◆ STBGP Large Urban (STBGP LG Urban)
- ◆ STBGP Off System Bridge (STBGP Off)

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

The IIJA continues the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-State-owned public roads and roads on tribal land. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads that focuses on performance.

The IIJA continues all funding features that applied to the HSIP under the FAST Act, with some exceptions.

The IIJA allows a State to use up to 10% of its HSIP funds for specified safety projects, including projects that promote public awareness and inform the public

² <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/federalsharefs.pdf>

regarding highway safety matters, facilitate enforcement, emergency vehicle infrastructure, safety-related research, and more.

As with the NHPP and STBGP, funds may be transferred to or from the STBGP, subject to certain limitations. [23 U.S.C. 126(a)]

Under the IIJA, HSIP funds may now be used to purchase, operate, or maintain an automated traffic enforcement system (this was prohibited under FAST Act). The IIJA adds six new HSIP eligible activities, including intersection safety improvements that provide for the safety of all road users, railway-highway grade crossing safety features or grade separation projects, traffic calming measures, traffic control devices for pedestrians and bicyclists, and more. The full list of eligible activities may be found in [23 U.S.C. 148(a)]

Full details on the eligibility requirements for federal-aid highway programs authorized in the IIJA can be found on the Federal Highway Administration website at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure-investment-and-jobs-act/>.

Bridge Formula Program (BFP)

The Bridge Formula Program is a new formula funding program established with the IIJA to replace, rehabilitate, preserve, protect, and construct highway bridges. Eligible activities include highway bridge replacement, rehabilitation, preservation, protection, or construction projects on public roads. The IIJA directs USDOT to apportion BFP funds to states based on the relative costs of replacing a state's bridges classified as being in poor condition and rehabilitating a state's bridges classified as being in fair condition. There is a pre-apportionment set-aside for Tribal transportation facility bridges and a post-apportionment set-aside of 15% for "off-system" bridges (highway bridges located on public roads, other than bridges located on Federal-aid highways).

More information on the BFP can be found on the Federal Highway Administration website at <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure-investment-and-jobs-act/bfp.cfm>.

Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)

The Carbon Reduction Program is a new formula funding program established with the IIJA to fund projects designed to reduce transportation emissions, defined as

carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from on-road highway sources. Eligible projects include traffic monitoring technologies, certain public transit projects, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, congestion management technologies, alternative fuel infrastructure, and more. Under the IIJA, FHWA apportions funds to states who then obligate 65% of the funds within urbanized areas in proportion to their relative population and the remaining 35% anywhere in the state.

More information on the CRP can be found on the Federal Highway Administration website at https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure-investment-and-jobs-act/crp_fact_sheet.cfm.

DRAFT

APPENDIX C
-
FEDERAL FUND SOURCE SPLITS

DRAFT

INSERT FHWA FEDERAL SHARE FACT SHEETS IN FINAL PDF

UPDATED VERSION AVAILABLE HERE:

[HTTPS://WWW.FHWA.DOT.GOV/INFRASTRUCTURE-INVESTMENT-AND-JOBS-ACT/FEDSHARE_FACT_SHEET.CFM](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure-investment-and-jobs-act/fedshare_fact_sheet.cfm)

DRAFT

APPENDIX D
-
**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND
CONSULTATION**

DRAFT

The Transportation Council hosted a series of virtual and in-person public participation opportunities that employed a range of strategies and technologies in order to make the metropolitan transportation planning process reasonably accessible to as many stakeholders as possible.

The public review period began on March 6, 2025 and continued through April 21, 2025. The summary of public comments received and materials used for public engagement is presented below.

[PLACEHOLDER FOR SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED]

[PLACEHOLDER FOR MATERIALS USED AT OPEN HOUSE, WEBSITE, SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS, ETC.]

APPENDIX E
-
AMENDING THE TIP

DRAFT

INSERT NEW GUIDELINES FOR AMENDING THE TIP DOCUMENT 2 PAGES

UPDATED AMENDMENT GUIDELINES ARE HERE:

[HTTPS://WWW.CAPITALMPO.ORG/WP-CONTENT/UPLOADS/2023/11/CRTC-AMEND-GUIDELINES_FINAL.PDF](https://www.capitalmpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/CRTC-AMEND-GUIDELINES_FINAL.PDF)

DRAFT

APPENDIX F

-

2025-2030 TIP PROJECT CANDIDATES

DRAFT

2025-2030 DRAFT Transportation Council TIP – Appendix

The Transportation Council issued a solicitation for new TIP projects on October 15, 2024 and received 61 project applications from state and local project sponsors. The following table is a complete list of the 61 project applications that were submitted for the 2025 – 2030 TIP.

ID#	Sponsor	Project Name	Category	Total Proposed Cost (Matched Funds)
1	City of Rensselaer	Enhancing Waterfront Connectivity	Roads - Complete Streets	\$ 8,400,000
2	NYS DOT	I-87 Over Dwass Kill	Bridge	\$ 8,000,000
3	NYS DOT	I-87 Over Rt 29	Bridge	\$ 20,750,000
4	NYS DOT	I-90 Over Rt 150	Bridge	\$ 25,665,000
5	NYS DOT	Rt 4 Over the Hudson River & Canal (Northumberland)	Bridge	\$ 24,795,000
6	NYS DOT	I-787 Over Little River	Bridge	\$ 7,720,000
7	NYS DOT	I-787 South Mall Interchange Bridge	Bridge	\$ 20,050,000
8	NYS DOT	Rt 9W Over I-787	Bridge	\$ 18,265,000
9	NYS DOT	I-87 Pavement from E9 to E11.5	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 19,860,000
10	NYS DOT	I-87 Pavement from Mohawk River to E9	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 17,740,000
11	NYS DOT	I-87 Pavement from Western Ave to Mohawk River	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 16,320,000
12	NYS DOT	Rt 7 Pavement Rt 9 to I-787	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 13,500,000
13	NYS DOT	Rt 67 Slope Repair	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 6,760,000
14	NYS DOT	Roundabout Rt 9 at Cramer Rd	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 4,500,000
15	NYS DOT	I-87 E13 Realign at Rt 9	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 750,000

2025-2030 DRAFT Transportation Council TIP – Appendix

ID#	Sponsor	Project Name	Category	Total Proposed Cost (Matched Funds)
16	Schenectady County	Union Street Paving	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 706,480
17	NYS DOT	Rt 2 Congress St Bridge Repair	Bridge	\$ 5,550,000
18	NYS DOT	Rt 29 over D&H RR Bridge Replacement	Bridge	\$ 1,936,000
19	NYS DOT	Rt 4 Over the Hudson River Bridge Replacement (Troy-Waterford)	Bridge	\$ 92,050,000
20	Village of Colonie	Sand Creek Rd Improvements	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,901,025
21	Schenectady County	Broadway Pavement Preservation	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 472,260
22	NYS DOT	Rt 155 Pavement Maple Road Roundabout to Rt 20	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 4,266,650
23	NYS DOT	Rt 20 Western Pavement Ave Cornell Ave to I-87	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 3,972,720
24	NYS DOT	Rt 32 Pavement Elm Ave to Rt 9W	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 5,086,560
25	NYS DOT	Traffic Signal Consultant Setaside	Other	\$ 600,000
26	NYS DOT	Pedestrian Safety Action Plan - Enhanced Upgrades	Other	\$ 2,000,000
27	Albany County	Albany Shaker Rd Corridor Enhancement	Roads - Complete Streets	\$ 6,890,000
28	Saratoga County	CR9 over Hudson River Rehab	Bridge	\$ 5,000,000
29	Saratoga County	CR4 over Sand Creek Rehab	Bridge	\$ 1,150,000
30	Town of Guilderland	Carman Rd Sidewalk Infill	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,453,760
31	City of Cohoes	Saratoga St Enhancement Project	Roads - Complete Streets	\$ 9,733,766
32	Saratoga County	CR51 Pavement Preservation	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 2,775,000

2025-2030 DRAFT Transportation Council TIP – Appendix

ID#	Sponsor	Project Name	Category	Total Proposed Cost (Matched Funds)
33	Village of Voorheesville	Pedestrian Safety and Sidewalk Project	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,900,000
34	Saratoga County	Tabor Rd over Dwaas Kill	Bridge	\$ 2,780,000
35	Saratoga County	Viall Ave over Anthony Kill	Bridge	\$ 2,780,000
36	Saratoga County	CR64 Culvert over Kayaderosseras Creek	Bridge	\$ 2,680,000
37	Saratoga County	CR64 over Tributary to Saratoga Lake	Bridge	\$ 1,120,000
38	Saratoga County	CR29 over Tributray to Hudson River	Bridge	\$ 1,735,000
39	Saratoga County	CR19 over South Branch Creek	Bridge	\$ 1,735,000
40	Saratoga County	Burgoyne Rd over Fish Creek	Bridge	\$ 2,475,000
41	Saratoga County	CR8 over Sacandaga Reservoir	Bridge	\$ 3,780,000
42	Saratoga County	CR33 over Snook Kill	Bridge	\$ 3,830,000
43	Saratoga County	Maltville Rd over Tributary to Round Lake	Bridge	\$ 1,977,500
44	Town of Greenfield	Porter Corners Rd over Kayaderosseras Creek	Bridge	\$ 1,815,000
45	Town of Sand Lake	First Dyke Rd over Burden Lake	Bridge	\$ 2,050,000
46	City of Saratoga Springs	Crescent Ave Connector	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,031,745
47	Town of East Greenbush	Gillilgan Rd Sidepath and Multimodal Enhancements	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 2,815,000
48	City of Albany	Washington Ave Complete Streets	Roads - Complete Streets	\$ 8,300,000
49	Town of Guilderland	Western Tawasentha Bike Ped Path	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,162,920
50	Saratoga County	Zim Smith Trail Northern Expansion	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 11,439,000
51	Town of Guilderland	Willow St Sidewalk	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 2,080,400
52	Village of Schaghticoke	Main St Sidewalk Extension	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,780,000

2025-2030 DRAFT Transportation Council TIP – Appendix

ID#	Sponsor	Project Name	Category	Total Proposed Cost (Matched Funds)
53	Town of Guilderland	Gun Club Rd Sidewalk	Bike and Ped Only	\$ 1,121,800
54	Saratoga County	CR92 Pavement Preservation	Roads - Pavement Only	\$ 4,131,000
55	Town of Guilderland	Krum Kill Basin Analysis	Other	\$ 500,000
56	Town of Malta	East Line Rd & Rt 67 Intersection	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 4,450,000
57	Town of Halfmoon	Rt 236 and Guideboard Rd Intersection Improvements	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 4,011,500
58	Town of Halfmoon	I-87 E8A & Grooms Rd Intersection	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 6,825,000
59	Town of Brunswick	Hoosick Rd Widening at Roosevelt Ave	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 700,000
60	Town of Wilton	Rt 50 Intersection Improvements	Congestion, Freight, and Air Quality	\$ 8,910,000
61	NYS DOT	Route 378 over the Hudson River Bridge Replacement - Design Only	Other	\$ 6,000,000

APPENDIX G
-
**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (TIP) GUIDANCE
DOCUMENT**

DRAFT

Insert PDF of TIP Guidance Document here. Use the updated guidance doc from 3-6-2025 Policy Board.

DRAFT

APPENDIX H

-

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (TIP) PROJECT EVALUATION
CRITERIA**

DRAFT

Insert as a PDF. Use the updated guidance doc from 3-6-2025 Policy Board.

DRAFT

APPENDIX I
-
**ADDITIONAL DATA TABLES USED IN
PROJECT EVALUATION**

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

Each candidate project received in the 2025-2030 TIP Update Solicitation was evaluated using the methodology described in the TIP Guidance Document and the accompanying Project Evaluation Criteria. Additional data used in parts of the evaluation but not included in the Guidance Document or Project Evaluation Criteria is provided here.

BENEFIT COST METHODOLOGY

Quantitative benefit-to-cost ratios are calculated for each Pavement, Complete Streets, and Bridge project. The Transportation Council STEP (Systematic Transportation Evaluation and Planning) Model is used to estimate the annual transportation benefits provided by each proposed roadway and bridge investment. The STEP model is a regional transportation network model maintained by the Transportation Council and used for transportation planning and forecasting. The model runs in the industry standard PTV Visum software suite and is calibrated to recent real-world traffic data.

The model takes into account facility usage and all available detours. To estimate the annual benefits of a road or bridge investment, the STEP model is run with the facility open to traffic and run again with the facility closed to traffic or with greatly reduced capacity (to simulate the effect of the facility not being maintained). These two scenarios are compared to calculate the annual benefits of the facility to the traveling public, measured in millions of dollars per year. The benefits of transportation investments are typically found to far outweigh the costs, demonstrating the importance of investing in our region's infrastructure.

The table below contains the operating cost assumptions used by the STEP model to estimate the mobility benefits (in dollars) of a transportation project.

TABLE 1 – AVERAGE HIGHWAY VEHICLE OPERATING COSTS

Dollars Per Vehicle Mile Traveled, by Operating Speed and Posted Speed

Operating Speed (mph)	Speed Limit						
	30	35	40	45	50	55	65
2.5	0.849	0.868	0.886	0.904	0.923	0.940	0.958
5	0.849	0.868	0.886	0.904	0.923	0.940	0.958
7.5	0.796	0.818	0.841	0.863	0.878	0.892	0.906
10	0.744	0.769	0.795	0.821	0.833	0.844	0.855
15	0.666	0.693	0.720	0.736	0.758	0.775	0.793
20	0.626	0.648	0.670	0.690	0.715	0.726	0.738
25	0.600	0.618	0.635	0.654	0.674	0.689	0.704
30	0.586	0.600	0.615	0.629	0.646	0.663	0.679
35	NA	0.586	0.599	0.611	0.626	0.639	0.651
40	NA	NA	0.594	0.605	0.616	0.628	0.639
45	NA	NA	NA	0.603	0.611	0.620	0.629
50	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.608	0.616	0.625
55	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.614	0.620
60	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.616
65	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.616

Operating costs are derived from the NYSDOT Highway User Cost Accounting Microcomputer Package, August 1991. Operating costs are increased by 28.7%, in order to agree with 2021 operating costs. Vehicle ownership costs per mile were included. This is consistent with AAA estimates and the IRS allowances for driving costs. Truck ownership costs were added based on the assumption that the percentage of VMT consisting of trucks is 7%. If operating speed is less than posted speed, congestion is assumed. Travel time costs will be valued at \$13.84.

For pavement and bridge projects, a portion of the total mobility benefits are assigned to the project based on the estimated extension to service life. Projects with greater expected service life extensions are given higher facility life benefits.

For pavement projects, the benefits are estimated based on the current pavement condition, the expected pavement condition after treatment, and the type of pavement surface (rigid, overlay, or flexible). Greater improvement in condition yields greater facility life benefits.

For bridge preservation projects, the benefits are pro-rated based on the expected improvement in bridge condition. For full bridge replacements and for pavement projects, the project is expected to return the facility to the highest condition score and are assigned the full benefits. Projects with proposed mobility improvements

such as roundabouts are modeled using the STEP model, and these additional mobility benefits are included.

Facility life benefits are measured in the dollar value saved per year by deferring abandonment of the facility. Facility life benefits are a product of the percent extended life of the facility, and the mobility benefits that result from keeping the facility usable. Facility life benefits could also be described as "life cycle cost savings" or "extended facility value". The facility life benefits of an infrastructure project are defined as:

$$\text{Facility life benefits} = (\text{Annual Transportation Benefits}) \times (\text{Pct. Extended Life})$$

where:

Annual Transportation Benefits is derived from the STEP Model as described above and
 $\% \text{ Extended Life} = \text{Years of Facility Life Added by Project} \div \text{Normal Facility Life}$

Percent extended facility life is determined using the data in the tables below.

TABLE 2 – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EXTENDED LIFE OF A HIGHWAY AND ITS SURFACE RATING

Surface Score	% Extended Life		
	Rigid Pavements	Overlay Pavements	Flexible Pavements
10	0%	0%	0%
9	5.9%	4.3%	3.8%
8	14.7%	8.7%	11.5%
7	26.5%	21.7%	23.1%
6	47.1%	43.5%	46.2%
5	79.4%	78.3%	69.2%
4	100.0%	100.0%	88.5%
3	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Derived by the Transportation Council from an internal NYSDOT memorandum regarding new pavement deterioration rates dated August 8, 1986.

TABLE 3 – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EXTENDED LIFE OF A BRIDGE AND ITS RATING

Bridge Rating	% Extended Life
7	0%
6	22.2%
5	44.4%
4	66.6%
3	88.9%
2.5	100.0%
2.0	100.0%
1.0	100.0%

Source: Transportation Council

For projects with proposed safety countermeasures, the annual crash reduction benefit is estimated using the NYSDOT CLEAR (Crash Location & Engineering Analysis & Reporting) system and added to the project benefits. Safety benefits are measured in the dollar value of the projected reduction in crash costs per year for all project candidates except those in the “Bridge” and “Other” categories. The crash reduction and associated benefit in dollars is calculated using the NYSDOT CLEAR Safety application. This application follows the procedures in the Highway Safety Improvement Program Procedures and Techniques publication, also known as the Red Book. The system enables the user to consider recent crash data and apply project components expected to reduce crashes (countermeasures) to the relevant segments and intersections, resulting in an annual benefit.

The project cost is annualized over the anticipated service life of the project. The table below lists estimated service life durations for many types of transportation projects.

TABLE 4 – DESIGN LIFE OF VARIOUS FACILITIES

Pavement Treatment	Service Life
Pavement Single Course Overlay or Mill and Fill	15 years
Pavement Multi-Course Overlay or Mill and Fill	25 years
Cold Recycling with Overlay	18 years
Thin HMA Overlay 1" (Formerly Armor coat)	10 years
Reconstruction	30 years

Source: NYSDOT Comprehensive Pavement Design Manual Appendix 5B Pavement Restoration Techniques (2018)

Bridge Treatment	Service Life
Bridge Element Specific Rehab	15 years
Bridge Deck Replacement	20 years
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	40 years
Bridge Replacement	75 years

Source: Correspondence from NYSDOT (December 31, 2021)

Other Treatment	Service Life
Major geometrics (roundabout, reconfiguration)	20 years
Minor geometrics (left turn lane)	15 years
High friction surface treatment	10 years
Signals and flashing beacons	10 years

Source: FHWA Countermeasure Service Life Guide (2021); Correspondence from NYSDOT (2021)

The benefit-to-cost ratio is then calculated by dividing the total annual project benefits by the annualized cost. Annualized costs are a product of the total project cost and the 6% Capital Recovery Factors in the table below.

TABLE 5 – 6% CAPITAL RECOVERY FACTORS FOR ANNUALIZED COSTS

Design Life in Years	Capital Recovery Factor	Design Life in Years	Capital Recovery Factor
1	1.060000	26	0.076904
2	0.545437	27	0.075697
3	0.374110	28	0.074593
4	0.288591	29	0.073580
5	0.237396	30	0.072649
6	0.203363	31	0.071792
7	0.179135	32	0.071002
8	0.161036	33	0.070273
9	0.147022	34	0.069598
10	0.135868	35	0.068974
11	0.126793	36	0.068395
12	0.119277	37	0.067857
13	0.112960	38	0.067358
14	0.107585	39	0.066894
15	0.102963	40	0.066462
16	0.098952	45	0.064700
17	0.095445	50	0.063444
18	0.092357	55	0.062537
19	0.089621	60	0.061876
20	0.087185	65	0.061391
21	0.085005	70	0.061033
22	0.083046	75	0.060769
23	0.081278	80	0.060573
24	0.079679	90	0.060318
25	0.078227	100	0.060177

BICYCLE / PEDESTRIAN PROJECT MERIT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Consistent with the previous TIP Updates, Transportation Council Staff again used potential market for bicycle/pedestrian travel, cost-effectiveness, and potential safety benefits (e.g., accident reduction or avoidance) in the evaluation of bicycle and pedestrian projects. These measures are defined below.

Potential Market for Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel Score

This measure is based on the modeled short trip response on the bicycle/pedestrian version of the Transportation Council's Systematic Traffic Evaluation and Planning (STEP) model. A potential bicycle trip table was created by selecting all PM peak hour trips from the STEP Model that are less than 10 miles. A potential pedestrian trip table was created by selecting all PM peak hour trips from the STEP Model that are less than 2.5 miles. A pedestrian distance threshold of 2.5 miles was selected to allow for the extra distance between loading nodes in the model. This measure aims to get an indication of how many trips might be realistic candidates for conversion to cycling or walking.

For this analysis, project candidates are represented in the STEP Model using the conventions that correspond with biking or walking. In the STEP Model, illegal facilities are closed to bicycle and pedestrian travel, for example, Interstates have no bicycle or pedestrian access. The STEP Model discourages the use of very undesirable facilities, for example, facilities with no sidewalks with a 1 MPH speed limit. For the pedestrian model, facilities with sidewalks were coded at 3 mph. For the bicycle model, bicycle-friendly streets were coded at 10 mph and bicycle lanes and bike/hike trails were coded at 15 mph.

Projects were modeled under this rubric to see how many short trips could potentially walk or cycle based on the project improvement. The process does not model how many walkers or cyclists there will be on a given day, rather it provides a relative estimate of how many people would have access to use the project improvement for walking or cycling. Each project is then given a potential market score of A, B, or C based on their relative levels of access provided in comparison with other projects.

Cost Score

Candidate projects are divided into three cost groups in comparison to each other and assigned scores of A, B, or C. The lowest-cost projects received a grade of "A", medium-cost projects a grade of "B" and high-cost projects a grade of "C".

Cost Effectiveness Score

Cost-effectiveness is calculated by comparing the market value score with the cost. This cost grade was compared to the grade given for market potential. Final cost-effectiveness scores were based on the following table:

Cost Score	Potential Market Score	Final Cost-Effectiveness Score
A	A	A
A	B	A
A	C	B
B	A	A
B	B	B
B	C	C
C	A	B
C	B	C
C	C	C

Potential Safety Benefit

The Transportation Council's Active Transportation Advisory Committee suggested this measure as a way of illustrating the safety enhancement which comes in making accommodations for cyclists and pedestrians within the transportation system. The potential safety benefit is calculated using the NYSDOT CLEAR Safety platform. CLEAR provides a quantitative estimate of the effectiveness of a proposed improvement (i.e., high-visibility crosswalks, bicycle lane, etc.) on decreasing crashes at the site where it will be implemented. The Potential Safety Benefit score is dependent on traffic volume, existing conditions, and car-bicycle and car-pedestrian crash histories. Candidate projects are given a safety benefit score of A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, or C based on their relative safety benefit in comparison with other projects.

Total Bicycle and Pedestrian Score

A weighted score for each project is calculated by assigning weighted score points as follows: A+=7, A=6, A-=5, B+=4, B=3, B-=2, C+=1, C=0. Market Potential and Safety are worth 2X Cost Effectiveness.

DRAFT

APPENDIX J
-
SELECTION OF NEW PROJECTS

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

The Transportation Council issued a solicitation for new TIP projects to be considered in the 2025-2030 TIP Update on October 15th, 2024. A public notice was issued, and the solicitation notice was provided to the Policy Board, Planning Committee, state and local governments, and other potential project sponsors. In addition, a TIP update webpage was launched that included the solicitation and evaluation information, as well as supporting documents and data. A TIP Guidance Workshop was held on October 24, 2024 as a hybrid meeting (in-person at the Transportation Council office with an option to join via Zoom). At the workshop, information was provided on what the TIP is, how to apply for TIP projects, how projects would be evaluated, and more.

Project applications were submitted by sponsors using the online Jotform platform. Separate Jotform applications were prepared for each of the six project categories. Project sponsors were required to provide information on project limits, scope, schedule, and cost sufficient to determine the federal-aid eligibility of the project and to provide the information needed for the project evaluation process. Once submitted, the applicant received a PDF version of the application via email for their records.

TIP project submissions were due December 6, 2024. In total, 61 candidate project applications were received. The full list of projects received can be found in Appendix F.

Transportation Council staff evaluated each project using the methodology described in the TIP Guidance Document. Evaluation results were shared with the Planning Committee in the form of one-page Fact Sheets prepared for each project. Staff also prepared a summary list of all projects received, requested funding, and potential fund sources available to each project – this summary list was also shared with Planning Committee.

The Planning Committee met on January 8, 2025 to approve the list of projects rolling-off the TIP (including completed projects), the list of projects rolling-on (including projects with funding in FY2025 or later years), and FTA-funded transit projects. The Planning Committee also reviewed proposed regional set-asides and the candidate project list. At its January 29, 2025 meeting, the Planning Committee approved additional changes to the roll-on and roll-off project lists, approved funding target estimates, approved set-asides, and selected 29 new projects from

the candidate project list to be included in the 2025-2030 TIP. Projects were selected based on fund source eligibility, programming capacity, and project evaluation results. The recommended TIP Program was prepared for Policy Board approval at its March 6, 2025 meeting.

PROVISION OF LOCAL MATCHING FUNDS

Project sponsors are required to be willing and able to provide the local matching funds. All fund sources are not required to be "in hand" but need to have a "reasonable expectation" of being in place by the year of programming. As part of the TIP project solicitation, applicants are required to submit a local match assurance letter. The 20% local match may be reduced depending on the project type, the federal fund source and the availability of Marchiselli funding. Public/private financing possibilities should be addressed, if applicable. Transit operators are required by FTA to document financial capacity in the adopted TIP. All facilities that require an ongoing operating budget to be useful are required to demonstrate that such financial capacity exists.

FTA GRANT PROGRAM PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA) is primarily responsible for submitting funding requests to the Transportation Council for transit related projects utilizing FTA fund sources. This includes transit operating assistance, equipment and support facilities. Unlike the project selection process for highway funds described above, the Transportation Council normally defers to the judgment of CDTA, the region's public transit operator, for project recommendations for transit fund sources from the state and federal governments.

Candidate capital projects are identified through transit improvement studies and evaluations of fleet and other capital requirements, keeping in mind transit development goals and supporting objectives established as part of CDTA's Capital Planning Process. CDTA maintains a short-range transit capital plan that identifies a series of actions and strategies that provide the basis for coordinating and prioritizing CDTA transit capital improvements. The TIP follows directly from the plan and generally is a simple project listing. The final decisions regarding project inclusion in the program are made by the Transportation Council Planning Committee and Policy Board.

The following projects funded with dedicated transit funds are included in the 2025 – 2030 TIP.

TIP#	PIN	Fund Type	Project Name
T11	182495	FTA 5307	Passenger Facility Improvements at Various Locations
T140	CDTA03	FTA 5307	Flex Micro-Transit Vehicle Replacement / Expansion
T14B	182498	FTA 5307	Transit Operations Support for Saratoga Service: Preventive Maintenance & Operating Assistance
T16	182496	FTA 5307	Transit Support Vehicles
T17	182048	FTA 5307, FTA 5339	Transit Bus Replacement/Expansion
T57	182497	FTA 5307	Preventive Maintenance for Transit Projects
T6B	182494	FTA 5307	Star Bus Replacement and Expansion

More details of projects funded with transit fund sources can be found in the project listings.

APPENDIX K
-
**FEDERAL-AID TRANSPORTATION
PROJECTS COMPLETED ON THE 2022-
2027 TIP**

DRAFT

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROJECTS AUTHORIZED FOR CONSTRUCTION IN THE 2022-2027 TIP

[PLACEHOLDER FOR TABLE OF COMPLETED PROJECTS]

FEDERAL-AID TRANSIT PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN THE 2022-2027 TIP

[PLACEHOLDER FOR TABLE OF COMPLETED PROJECTS]

DRAFT

**APPENDIX L -
TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL SELF
CERTIFICATION**

DRAFT

Transportation Council Self Certification Documentation

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) certified effective August 27, 2024 that the Transportation Council’s planning process meets and/or exceeds most of the requirements mentioned in 23 CFR Section 450.336 and 49 USC 5303. Concurrent with the submittal of the 2025-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the Capital Region Transportation Council (Transportation Council) as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the counties of Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga and Schenectady, excluding the Town of Moreau and the Village of South Glens Falls, is required to complete a self-certification of its planning process. This self-certification serves as documentation that the Transportation Council is in compliance with federal planning requirements in accordance with 23 CFR Section 450.336 and 49 USC 5303.

A. Required Agreements

- 1. What is the status of the cooperative planning agreement between the Transportation Council (formerly CDTC), NYSDOT, and the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA)?** The cooperative planning agreement entitled “Agreement Defining Roles and Responsibilities for Metropolitan Transportation Planning in the Capital District” was approved in January 2009.
- 2. What is the status of the performance-based planning agreement between the Transportation Council, NYSDOT, and the Capital District Transportation Authority (CDTA)?** The performance-based planning agreement entitled “Performance Management Agreement between the Transportation Council, NYSDOT, and CDTA was approved in March 2019.

B. Planning/Technical

- 1. UPWP - Does the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) cover relevant planning activity and needs, including support for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan?** Yes. The Transportation Council prepares a new UPWP on an annual basis. The most recent version covering the 2025-2026 fiscal year was approved in March 2025. Development of the UPWP included a solicitation for planning projects from local governments in the Transportation Council’s planning area as well as a refresh of ongoing planning tasks as described in the previous UPWP. The UPWP includes a

section entitled “UPWP Planning Priorities for the Capital Region”, describing the priorities of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, known as New Visions 2050, and their relationship to planning tasks in the UPWP. There are no known progress or scheduling issues.

- 2. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) – Discuss required elements and implementation, program level environmental mitigation activities and current or planned activities for consultation with State and local agencies during plan development.** The Transportation Council’s MTP is New Visions 2050 (the horizon year), adopted in September 2020. The MTP is currently being updated. In accordance with a United States Court of Appeals South Coast Air Quality Management District vs. EPA decision, a conformity determination for the plan was needed for the 1997 ozone NAAQS. Air quality conformity was approved in September 2020. New Visions is based upon the best available estimates of long-range federal, state, and local revenue streams and TIP investments have tracked New Visions priorities.

Implementing New Visions 2050 is ongoing and the Transportation Council operates under the adopted principles and recommendations of that plan. The Transportation Council requires careful community-oriented planning, including environmental consideration, prior to committing to major projects with potentially significant environmental impacts. Three Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) Studies are underway or have been completed including Reimagine I-787, the 378 Bridge Study, and the I-890 Exit 4C study.

The Transportation Council also utilizes its Transportation and Community Linkage Planning Program (Linkage Program) as a planning tool to better integrate transportation and land use decision making with over 100 collaborative planning studies funded to date. The Transportation Council’s environmental mitigation procedure is used to map environmental features as they relate to capital projects in the TIP, Linkage Program study recommendations, and other major Transportation Council studies. Native nations and federal landholders are consulted with when developing the MTP and on other aspects of the transportation planning process.

3. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- **When was the TIP and related Air Quality Conformity document approved?** The 2022-2027 TIP and air quality conformity document were

approved in September 2022 and will remain in place until at least September 30, 2025. The 2025-2030 TIP and conformity document is in development with approval scheduled for June 2022. Projects were identified from municipal, State, and regional needs and evaluated using the Transportation Council's Evaluation Criteria.

- **Is the TIP fiscally constrained?** As of June 2022, the 2022-2027 TIP is fiscally constrained. The Transportation Council works cooperatively with NYSDOT Region 1 and CDTA to identify reasonable budgets for the metropolitan planning area and has programmed to those budgets. The Transportation Council monitors fiscal constraint using a table updated monthly and available on the Transportation Council's website.
 - **Is the TIP consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, known as New Visions 2050?** The Transportation Council's TIP development process maintains a tight relationship with the New Visions 2050 plan by deriving evaluation criteria from the principles and priorities of the New Visions plan. As a result, the TIP reflects the Transportation Council's long standing implementation principle of "steady progress" across all plan elements. TIP project evaluation includes a benefit/cost score as well as a merit score.
 - **Does the TIP meet federal requirements?** The TIP contains priority lists of projects, plans, and programs for five years; summaries of financial plans; a demonstration of fiscal constraint; and project descriptions (including project type, termini, length, etc.).
 - **What are the consultation activities for the 2025-2030 TIP?** Consultation on the 2025-2030 TIP will include outreach to federal land holders including National Parks and the Department of Defense. Native nations with cultural resource interests in the Capital Region will also be consulted as well as state agencies including but not limited to NYSDOH, NYSDEC, NYSOPRHP and NYSERDA.
- 4. Technical Areas** – The Transportation Council used a TIP Task Force to prepare a TIP Guidance document in 2024 that describes what the TIP is, federal funding programs and eligibility, and the project solicitation, evaluation, and approval process. The evaluation process was streamlined and new project application forms in broad project categories were developed

and utilized in the preparation of the 2025-2030 TIP. In addition, the Transportation Council initiated the update of its metropolitan transportation plan to be known as In Motion: The Plan to 2050. Ongoing support for the Linkage Program and other regional planning initiatives continues identify project, plan, and program candidates for implementation through federal and state funding programs as well as local government initiatives.

5. Title VI - How have Title VI concerns been addressed in the planning process and documented in the UPWP, TIP and MTP?

- **Title VI Reporting** – The Transportation Council updated and approved its Title VI analysis report in January 2023. The Transportation Council performs a review after each TIP and MTP update and monitors the planning process. The analysis methodology includes staff created demographic parameters using data from the American Community Survey (ACS) at the census tract level. Map data is housed in ArcMap and made available on the Transportation Council’s website.
- **Limited English Proficiency (LEP)** – The Transportation Council updated its LEP plan in 2024. Executive summaries of the MTP, TIP, UPWP, and Public Participation Plan are translated into Spanish, Simple Chinese and Arabic as identified in the LEP Plan and posted to the Transportation Council’s website. In addition, written executive summaries of studies conducted in geographic subareas where language groups within the population constitute 1,000 people or 5% of the subarea will be translated into those languages upon request and posted online. With at least 48 hours of notice, the Transportation Council will provide interpreting services at meetings, in person if possible.
- **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** – The Transportation Council supports consultant assistance for municipal ADA infrastructure data collection and the development of transition plans. In addition, the Transportation Council’s public meetings, including the Policy Board, Planning Committee, and Advisory Committee meetings, are held using a hybrid meeting format in person at 1 Park Place, Albany, NY 12205 and virtually via Zoom and YouTube. When meetings are conducted in other venues, the Transportation Council assures that the facility is accessible, externally, and internally. When possible, meeting locations are selected along public bus routes. The Transportation Council provides or

coordinates the provision of auxiliary aids or services and reasonable accommodations upon request by a person with a disability at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. The Transportation Council updated its website to meet the current Web Content Accessibility Guidelines standard.

- **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)** – The Transportation Council follows the NYSDOT DBE plan and submits semi-annual DBE reports in a timely manner.

6. Private Operators – Discuss how private operators are accommodated.

CDTA assumed authority over Northway Express services, in keeping with the Transportation Council’s adopted Public-Private Transit Policy. The Transportation Council continues to coordinate with CDTA and Upstate Transit on transit planning for this service. Actions in recent years have provided ongoing federal transit support to Adirondack Trailways and provided for further system integration efforts through CDTA involvement.

7. Planning Factors – Discuss how the federal planning factors are considered in planning processes and products.

The Transportation Council incorporates the federal planning factors into its MTP, UPWP and TIP.

Discussion is included in each document connecting the federal planning factors to the proposed projects, plans and programs.

8. Congestion Management Process (CMP): Discuss the status of CMP and how it is used.

An updated CMP was approved by the Transportation Council in December 2023. The CMP will be used to support planning projects that will improve system reliability.

9. Participation Plan

- **Discuss the status of public involvement/participation plan procedures and a periodic evaluation process to determine its effectiveness.** The Transportation Council public participation plan was adopted in March 2024 and is assessed to maintain its effectiveness.
- **Discuss how visualization techniques will be employed for Plans and TIPs.** The Transportation Council uses ArcMap and ArcGIS online maps, including StoryMaps, as tools to display data via interactive maps for use

by the public, particularly to identify the location of TIP projects. Infographics, interactive surveys, and other tools are also utilized.

- **Discuss the status of making public information available in electronically accessible formats such as the World Wide Web.** The Transportation Council requires electronically accessible documents with recognizable text and videos with subtitles to be available on its website and social media.
- **Discuss incorporation of consultations which are listed under “Transportation Plan” and “TIP” in this document.** The Transportation Council consults with federal landowners, native nations, and others as part of the public review process for the MTP, TIP and UPWP.
- **Address coverage in the participation plan of users of pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation facilities, and persons with disabilities.** The Transportation Council strives to make its meetings accessible to the public via hybrid meeting formats (in person and video). In person meetings are held at locations accessible to transit and accessible to persons with disabilities. The Transportation Council’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee allows persons with disabilities and those who walk and ride bicycles to directly participate in the transportation planning process.
- **Coordinated Public Transit-Human Service Agency Transportation Plans: Discuss the MPO’s coordinated planning process including development of or implementation of these Plans.** The Transportation Council’s Coordinated Plan was adopted on December 7, 2023. The Transportation Council’s Human Services Transportation Advisory Committee (HSTAC) assisted Transportation Council staff in developing the Coordinated Plan along with CDTA, particularly its para-transit division “STAR”, and seniors through outreach to senior centers.

C. Administrative/Management

1. Progress Reports: Are progress reports submitted to FHWA/FTA on time?

Yes. The Transportation Council prepares and submits Performance and Expenditure Reports on time to meet FHWA and FTA reporting requirements.

2. Bills: Are bills submitted and paid on time? Yes. The Transportation Council staff bills are submitted on time for review and approval.

3. Audits

- **Are single audit requirements met through audits performed on an annual basis?** Yes. Audits for the Transportation Council and its host CDTA are undertaken annually and simultaneously. The most recent audit was completed in December 2024 for the period ending 3/31/25.
- **Are any identified deficiencies corrected?** There were no identified deficiencies. The Transportation Council continues to work with its host agency CDTA to strengthen internal controls.

4. Annual Program: Is the Annual Program closed out in a timely manner? Yes. The Transportation Council's Annual Program is closed out in a timely manner.

5. Budget: Are grant budgets up to date? Yes. Revisions and amendments are made as necessary. An annual budget update was adopted in March 2025 for the fiscal year 2025-2026 UPWP.

6. Consultant Selection: Are acceptable consultant selection procedures in place and what are the provisions for DBE's? Yes. Consultant selection procedures are updated annually. The Transportation Council developed a standard Memorandum of Understanding to define local sponsor roles for consultant selection and administration of Linkage studies and technical assistance program projects, among others. DBE participation is a consideration but not a "quota" in the consultant selection process. The Transportation Council seeks to achieve full participation of DBEs in contracting opportunities while maintaining strict prioritization by merit.

7. Central Staff/Host Relations: Discuss any staffing or recruiting issues. Indicate if staff has the political support it needs for effective accomplishments. Despite recent staff turnover, there are no problems with recruitment. The Transportation Council continues to have the support it needs from member agencies to maintain its effectiveness.

8. Decision Making: Indicate if committees are adequately structured and staffed. Are reasonable decisions reached in a timely fashion? Committees are adequately staffed and reasonable decisions are reached in a timely manner. 2024 TIP amendment guideline changes increased thresholds for action by the Transportation Council’s Planning Committee and Policy Board, allowing for faster processing of minor TIP project cost and schedule changes.

9. Governance:

- **Are foundational documents for the MPO such as Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), operating procedures and financial/staffing plans reviewed and updated periodically to ensure that they are still relevant to current MPO operations?** An updated host agency Memorandum of Understanding was approved by the Transportation Council and its host, CDTA in 2024. Additional operating documents are being periodically updated through the Transportation Council’s Administrative and Finance Subcommittee.
- **Do members and host understand and execute their roles in a way that supports independent and unbiased work by MPO staff and sound MPO decisions?** Yes. The Transportation Council’s members and host understand and execute their roles in a way that supports independence and an atmosphere free of bias for the Transportation Council’s staff and decision making process.
- **Discuss status of working relationships with other governments, i.e., local, international and tribal governments.** The Transportation Council regularly engages with local governments and provides multiple opportunities to participate in the metropolitan transportation planning process. Local governments are encouraged to apply for planning, project development and capital project funding. The Transportation Council has been extremely successful at leveling the playing field between NYSDOT, CDTA and local governments. The Transportation Council consults with federally recognized native nations for its major initiatives such as the TIP.

10. Procurement

- **Does the Transportation Council comply with FTA Circular Guidance 4220.1F, Third Party Contracting Requirements and the most recent**

FTA Master Agreement? Yes. The Transportation Council follows and documents all FTA related activity according to the referenced documents.

- **Does the Transportation Council maintain a written history of all FTA-Related procurements?** Yes. The Transportation Council maintains all documentation involving procurements for all studies and projects.
- **Does the Transportation Council incorporate clauses and certifications for eligible FTA assistance program funding?** Yes. With the host agency CDTA's participation, the Transportation Council has incorporated clauses and certifications for eligible FTA program funding.

DRAFT

APPENDIX M
-
AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY

DRAFT

PLACEHOLDER FOR AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY

DRAFT

**APPENDIX N -
TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF
1964**

DRAFT

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based upon race, color, and national origin. Specifically, 42 USC 2000d states that “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” At the time of the solicitation for and review of new TIP projects, there were two Presidential Executive Orders placing further emphasis upon the Title VI protections of race and national origin. Executive Order #12898 (Environmental Justice) directed federal agencies to develop strategies to address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs on minority and low-income populations. Executive Order # 13166 (Limited- English-Proficiency) directed federal agencies to ensure that recipients of federal financial assistance provide meaningful access to their Limited-English-Proficiency applicants and beneficiaries.

As an additional analysis of the projects proposed for funding in the TIP, a Title VI merit evaluation was undertaken for all proposed projects except those in the “Other” category. The score was not used in the selection of projects. The Title VI merit evaluation was based on modal analysis by race/ethnicity and income of the traveler, as discussed in the Transportation Council’s 2023 Title VI Analysis, as well as nondiscrimination areas defined in that document. Those are census tracts where the proportion of low income or minority (non-white and non-Hispanic/Latino) residents is greater than the regional proportion.

Proposed projects within or directly connected to a nondiscrimination area and with a primary purpose or significant focus on transit, bicycling, walking, or carpool received 5 points. Significant focus means that the improvements are provided over a portion of the project which is significant relative to the overall project. Projects within or directly connected to a nondiscrimination area and that does not provide a significant focus as listed above received 2.5 points. Included are most highway resurfacing, traffic operations improvement, bridge deck repair, and preservation and rehabilitation type projects. Projects that either A) maintain existing infrastructure that has a significant focus on automobiles, or B) provide a greater benefit to areas outside of nondiscrimination areas received 0 points. Of the 29 new projects (not in the Other category) added during the 2025-2030 Transportation Improvement Program update process, 13 are located in nondiscrimination areas, totaling approximately \$120M.

APPENDIX O
-
**CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION
COUNCIL MEMBERS**

DRAFT

Planning Committee Members (February 2025)

Sharon Butler, *City of Cohoes*
Mark Castiglione, *Capital District Regional Planning Commission*
Michael Dutre, *City of Saratoga Springs*
Steve Feeney, *Schenectady County, Chair*
Rory Fluman, *Schenectady County*
Howard Goebel, *City of Albany*
Kelly Hoffman, *Rensselaer County*
Thomas Hulihan, *City of Rensselaer*
Andrew Kreshik, *City of Troy*
Joseph LaCivita, *City of Watervliet*
Kimberly Lambert, *Saratoga County*
Lisa Ramundo, *Albany County*
Tom Richardson, *City of Mechanicville*
Thomas Romano, *Town of Colonie*
John Schneidawin, *Albany Port District Commission*
Phil Serafino, *New York State Thruway Authority*
Chris Wallin, *City of Schenectady, Vice-Chair*
Greg Wichser, *New York State Department of Transportation – Region 1*
Michael Williams, *Capital District Transportation Authority*
TBD, *Albany County Airport Authority*

Advisory Members (Non-Voting)

Michael Culotta, *Federal Transit Administration*
Richard J. Marquis, *Federal Highway Administration*
Sandra Misiewicz AICP, *Capital Region Transportation Council, Secretary*
Michael Sheehan, *New York State Department Environmental Conservation*

Town & Village Members and Alternates

John Scavo, *Clifton Park (member)*

Alternates:

Rob Leslie, *Bethlehem*
Donald Csaposs, *Guilderland*
Jaime O'Neill, *Malta*
Peter Comenzo, *Rotterdam*
Tim Lane, *Menands*

Joshua Giller, *East Greenbush*
Ryan Riper, *Wilton*
Anthony Tozzi, *Glenville*
Laura Robertson, *Niskayuna*

Policy Board Members (February 2025)

- **Albany County:** *Daniel P. McCoy, Albany County Executive*
- **Albany County:** *Joanne Cunningham, Chair, Albany County Legislature*
- **Albany City:** *Kathy M. Sheehan, Mayor (Chair)*
- **Albany County Airport Authority:** *Peter Stuto*
- **Albany Port District Commission:** *Christine Stuto*
- **Capital District Regional Planning Commission:** *Lawrence Schillinger, Esq.*
- **Capital District Transportation Authority:** *Michael Collins, Interim CEO (Vice-Chair)*
- **Coeymans Town:** *Steven Donnelly, Supervisor*
- **Colonie Town:** *Peter Crummey, Supervisor*
- **Cohoes City:** *William T. Keeler, Mayor*
- **Federal Highway Administration:** *Richard J. Marquis*
- **Federal Transit Administration Region-2:** *Michael Culotta*
- **Mechanicville City:** *Michael Butler, Mayor*
- **NYS Department of Transportation Region-1:** *Michael Arthur, Reg. Director (Secretary)*
- **New York State Thruway Authority:** *Phil Serafino, Albany Division Director*
- **Rensselaer City:** *Michael E. Stammel, Mayor*
- **Rensselaer County:** *Steven McLaughlin, Chair, Rensselaer County Executive*
- **Rensselaer County:** *Kelly Hoffman, Chair, Rensselaer County Legislature*
- **Saratoga County:** *Philip Barrett, Chair, Saratoga County Board of Supervisors*
- **Saratoga County:** *Thomas C. Werner*
- **Saratoga Springs:** *John Safford, Mayor*
- **Schaghticoke Village:** *Scott Rice, Mayor*
- **Schenectady City:** *Gary McCarthy, Mayor*
- **Schenectady County:** *Gary Hughes, Chair, Schenectady County Legislature*
- **Troy City:** *Carmella Mantello, Mayor*
- **Watervliet City:** *Charles V. Patricelli, Mayor*

Advisory Members (Non-Voting)

- *Michael Culotta, Federal Transit Administration*
- *Richard J. Marquis, Federal Highway Administration*