Maryland Department of Transportation
The Secretary's Office

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

Beverley K. Swaim-Staley
Secretary

Darrell B. Mobley
Deputy Secretary

June 2, 2011

Mr. Hassan Raza
Division Administrator
Attn: Mr. Kwame Arhin
Federal Highway Administration
10 South Howard Street
Suite 2450
Baltimore MD 21201

Ms. Letitia Thompson
Regional Administrator
Attn: Ms. Michele Destra
Mr. Timothy Lidiak
Ms. Gail McFadden-Roberts
Federal Transit Administration
1760 Market Street
Suite 500
Philadelphia PA 19103

RE: Amendment to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Maryland Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to Reflect an Amendment to the (FY) 2011 Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO) Transportation Improvement Program to Add Federal and Local Funds for Bridge Projects in Cecil County.
MDOT Control # 11-19.

Dear Mr. Raza and Ms. Thompson:

The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) hereby amends the FY 2011 Maryland Statewide Transportation Improvement Program to reflect the addition of federal and local (Cecil County) funds to the 2011-2014 Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). No state funds are programmed for these projects. Attached please find supporting documentation including the MPO resolution.

The funds are for FY 2011 & FY 2012. The table on the following page summarizes the cash flow breakouts by funding source by percentage and fiscal year.

WILMAPCO (TIP ID #CE0044, CE0087 & CE0007)
(All programmed dollars are displayed in $1,000's)

Category	FY 2011		FY 2012		FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2011-2014 Total
	Federal (0%)	Local (100%)	Federal (80%)	Local (20%)			
Preliminary Engineering	$0	$559					$559
Right of Way (ROW)	$0	$291					$291
Utility	$0	$265					$265
	Federal (80%)	Local (20%)					
Construction	$2,908	$727	$72	$18			$3,725
Total:	$4,023	$727	$72	$18			$4,840

(No State Funds will be programmed for these projects.)

The Maryland Statewide Transportation Improvement Program continues to be fiscally constrained. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 410-865-1295, toll-free at 888-713-1414 or via email at mnixon@mdot.state.md.us. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Nixon

Michael W. Nixon, Manager
Office of Planning and Capital Programming

Attachment

cc: Mr. Ian Beam, Regional Planner, Office of Planning and Capital Programming, Maryland Department of Transportation
Ms. Mary Deitz, Chief, Regional and Intermodal Planning Division, State Highway Administration
Ms. Lyn Erickson, Manager Federal Liaison, Office of Planning and Capital Programming, Maryland Department of Transportation
Ms. Heather Murphy, Deputy Director, Office of Planning and Capital Programming, Maryland Department of Transportation

Wilmington Area Planning Council

850 Library Avenue, Suite 100
Newark, Delaware 19711
302-737-6205; Fax 302-737-9584
From Cecil County: 888-808-7088
e-mail: wilmapco@wilmapco.org
web site: www.wilmapco.org

WILMAPCO Council:
Stephen Kingsberry, Chair
Delaware Transit Corporation Executive Director

Joseph L. Fisona, Vice-chair
Mayor of Elkton

James M. Baker
Mayor of Wilmington

Cleon L. Cauley
Delaware Dept. of Transportation Acting Secretary

Paul G. Clark
New Castle County County Executive

Vance A. Funk III
Mayor of Newark

Donald A. Halligan
Maryland Dept. of Transportation Director, Office of Planning and Capital Programming

Connie C. Holland
Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination, Director

James T. Mullin
Cecil County Commissioner

WILMAPCO Executive Director
Tigist Zegeye

RESOLUTION
BY THE WILMINGTON AREA PLANNING COUNCIL (WILMAPCO)

AMENDING THE FY2011-FY2014 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM CECIL COUNTY ELEMENT

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO) has been designated the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Cecil County, Maryland and New Castle County, Delaware by the Governors of Maryland and Delaware, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Transportation's (USDOT) Regulations of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Metropolitan Planning Requirements, require that, in air quality non-attainment areas, the MPO, in cooperation with participants in the planning process, develop and, at least every four years, updates the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the WILMAPCO TIP format incorporates a four-year period for the listing of priority projects to be implemented, as well as a list of program development projects; and

WHEREAS, the FY2011-2014 TIP has undergone appropriate community and technical reviews; and

WHEREAS, the TIP must be determined to be air quality conforming in accordance with SAFETEA-LU and Clean Air Act and Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 requirements; and;

WHEREAS, the FY2011-2014 TIP have been found to be financially constrained, as directed by 23 CFR 450.324 (e), and consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Wilmington Area Planning Council does hereby amend the FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program to include amended funding for Cecil County bridge projects.

May 12, 2011
Date:

Stephen Kingsberry Chairperson
Wilmington Area Planning Council

WILMAPCO

Partners with you in transportation planning

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SUBMISSION FORM

This form must be completed and all questions must be answered in order to process this request.

Date of Submission/Amendment: **April 14, 2010**

Sponsoring Agency: **Cecil County Board Of County Commissioners- Public Works**

Project Name: **Superstructure Painting of Bridges CE0007 and CE0087**

Project Category: **System Preservation**

Project Description: **Painting of two Bridge**

Project Justification: **These projects will help preserve the condition of these bridges and delay the potential need for replacement of the structures. The bridges have not been painted in the last few decades and require painting at this time. The replacement of CE0007 was reviewed and estimated at over $2.7 million dollars and it was decided to paint that bridge at this time to further delay the date of replacement.**

Funding:
Design/ROW/Utility: Federal_____ State_____ Local____ 100% ____ Total___ 100% _____
Construction :Federal___ 80% ____ State_____ Local____ 20% ____ Total___ 100% _____

Funding	Phase	Current	FY 2012_	FY 2013_	FY 2014	FY 2014	Total
	Prelim	$275					$ 275
	ROW						$ 0
	Utility						$ 0
	Construct	$500	$ 90				$ 590
Total		$775	$ 90				$ 865

All $s x 1,000

1. Does this project require a new conformity determination? No
(Section 51.400)(C2) "A TIP amendment requires a new conformity determination for the entire TIP before the amendment is approved by the MPO, unless it merely adds or deletes exempt projects listed in (Section 51.460)."

2. Is this project regionally significant? No
(Section 450.324)(f)(3) "The TIP shall include…all regionally significant transportation projects for which an FHWA or the FTA approval is required whether or not the projects are to be funded with title 23, U.S.C., or Federal Transit Act funds, e.g., addition of an interchange to the Interstate System with State, local, and/or private funds, demonstration projects not funded under title 23, U.S.C., or the Federal Transit Act, etc."

3. Has this project had the opportunity for public comment? Yes
(Section 450.326) "… Public involvement procedures consistent with Section 450.316 (b)(1) shall be utilized in amending the TIP, except that these procedures are not required for TIP amendments that only involve projects of the type covered in Section 450.324 (I)."

4. Has this project been found to be financially constrained? No, adequate funds are in place for this project.
(Section 450.324)(e) "The TIP shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. The financial plan shall be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State and transit operator…"

   Please indicate funding sources by agency: 20% County, 80% Federal Aid Bridge Program (SAFE-TEA-LU)

5. Is this project consistent with the WILMAPCO Metropolitan Transportation Plan? Yes
(Section 450.324)(f)(2) "The TIP shall include…only projects that are consistent with the transportation plan."

   If not, is there a resolution to amend the Metropolitan Transportation Plan? _____

6. Does the project promote economic development initiatives such as adding or improving access to brownfield locations or to an existing or planned site used for employment, tourism, manufacturing, commercial or industrial purposes, or addresses a problem, topic or issue identified through regional economic development planning? _____

   No, this is a system preservation project and will not change the servicablity or load capacity of the existing structures and should have no long term impacts on the type of number of users of these bridges.

7. Please provide any additional pertinent information below:

   This project has received a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion from the Maryland SHA Federal Aid Section. Design for the work havebeen completed. No right of way or utility relocations are required for this project. It was requested that this project be added to the TIP, as the Maryland FHWA reviewer no longer is accepting the Areawide project descriptions for this type of project.

WILMAPCO

Transportation Improvement Program Submission/Amendment

Description of Public Participation

Project Name: Superstructure Painting of Bridges CE0007 and CE0087

Which techniques were used to seek public comment (please use additional pages if needed).

__1__ Public workshops/meetings

Number of public workshops/meetings: __1__

Format: Public Information Session July 10 2009,

Location(s): Fire Station #7, Rt 222, (508 Rock Springs Road)
Conowingo, MD

Number of attendees: __3__

Main issue raised: Questions on detours from 2 Fire Chiefs in attendance

Consensus of meeting: Proceed with project

Overall, the public support for the project was (check one):

- __X__ Strong support, few concerns
- _____ Some support, but some concerns raised
- _____ Mixed, equal support and opposition
- _____ Some opposition, many concerns raised
- _____ Strong opposition, major problems identified

Unresolved issues identified: _____

_____ Citizen Advisory/Steering Committee

_____ Survey

Number surveyed: _____

Results: _____

_____ Elected officials briefings

_____ Project web site

__2__ Other Bridge CE0007 has been on the priority list at County budget hearings since 2008, and listed as a priority on the Cecil County Capital Investment Program since that time. In 2010 Bridge CE0087 was determined to warrant painThis is publically available information on the County website as well as in paper copies readily available at the County Administration building

How was the public notified about the project?

_____ Web page

_____ Legal notice

_____ Videos

_____ Radio/television

__X__ Other Posted on County Web Page

_____ Publications Distribution: _____

__X__ Newsletter/brochure

_____ Flyers

How has the project changed as a result of public comments? No,

Comment further on the quantity and quality of the public participation:

As typical not much feedback, the local users understand that the work is necessary and understand that they will have to deal with a detour during the project, There is good support for the project to move forward and the fact that the higher expense of bridge replacement will be delayed

WILMAPCO

Partners with you in transportation planning

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SUBMISSION FORM

This form must be completed and all questions must be answered in order to process this request.

Date of Submission/Amendment: **April 13, 2010**

Sponsoring Agency: **Cecil County Board Of County Commissioners- Public Works**

Project Name: **Replacement of Bridge CE0044 Nottingham Road over CSX**

Project Category: **Bridge Replacement**

Project Description: Replacement of a single span steel, timber, and concrete bridge, built 1970, 75' long with a clear roadway of 14'. Its 2005 inspection BSR is 2.5 and had a 12K/24K load posting until October 2010, when the bridge was closed due to structural deficiencies. The last record traffic count fro 8/04 was an ADT of 1134. The new bridge will have a span of 185 feet and meet all current design and sight distance requirements and will pass all legal loads.

Project Justification: This bridge is one of a limited number of crossings of the CSX railroad in this area. The detour is over 5 miles long. Reopening the bridge will provide increased circulation for both local and area users. It will also significantly reduce emergency response times along this route. In addition from passing fire trucks the reopened the bridge will also allow truck traffic which has been restricted for more than 10 years due to the severe load restrictions on the old structure

Funding:
Design/ROW/Utility: Federal_____State_____Local____100%____Total___100%_____
Construction :Federal___80%___State_____Local____20%____Total___100%_____

Funding	Phase	Current	FY 2011_	FY 2012_	FY 2013	FY 2014	Total
	Prelim	$ 284					$ 284
	ROW	$ 291					$ 291
	Utility	$ 265					$ 265
	Construct	$ 3135					$ 3135
Total		$ 3975					$ 3975

All $s x 1,000

1. Does this project require a new conformity determination? No
(Section 51.400)(C2) "A TIP amendment requires a new conformity determination for the entire TIP before the amendment is approved by the MPO, unless it merely adds or deletes exempt projects listed in (Section 51.460)."

2. Is this project regionally significant? No
(Section 450.324)(f)(3) "The TIP shall include…all regionally significant transportation projects for which an FHWA or the FTA approval is required whether or not the projects are to be funded with title 23, U.S.C., or Federal Transit Act funds, e.g., addition of an interchange to the Interstate System with State, local, and/or private funds, demonstration projects not funded under title 23, U.S.C., or the Federal Transit Act, etc."

3. Has this project had the opportunity for public comment? Yes
(Section 450.326) "… Public involvement procedures consistent with Section 450.316 (b)(1) shall be utilized in amending the TIP, except that these procedures are not required for TIP amendments that only involve projects of the type covered in Section 450.324 (I)."

4. Has this project been found to be financially constrained? No, adequate funds are in place for this project.
(Section 450.324)(e) "The TIP shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. The financial plan shall be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State and transit operator…"

   Please indicate funding sources by agency: 20% County, 80% Federal Aid Bridge Program (SAFE-TEA-LU)

5. Is this project consistent with the WILMAPCO Metropolitan Transportation Plan? Yes
(Section 450.324)(f)(2) "The TIP shall include…only projects that are consistent with the transportation plan."

   If not, is there a resolution to amend the Metropolitan Transportation Plan? _____

6. Does the project promote economic development initiatives such as adding or improving access to brownfield locations or to an existing or planned site used for employment, tourism, manufacturing, commercial or industrial purposes, or addresses a problem, topic or issue identified through regional economic development planning? _____

   Yes this is a maintenance replacement of a bridge that is no longer structurally capable of passing traffic and will allow car and truck traffic to safely pass without the significant detour that is now in place

7. Please provide any additional pertinent information below:

   This project has received a Categorical Exclusion from the Maryland SHA Federal Aid Section. Design of the bridge has been completed. All right of way has been secured for this project and utility relocation is 90% complete. It was requested that this project be added individual to the TIP, as the Maryland FHWA reviewer no longer is accepting the Areawide project descriptions for this type of project.

WILMAPCO

Transportation Improvement Program Submission/Amendment

Description of Public Participation

Project Name: Replacement of Bridge CE0044 Nottingham Road over CSX

Which techniques were used to seek public comment (please use additional pages if needed).

__2__ Public workshops/meetings

Number of public workshops/meetings: __2__

Format: Public Information Session October 2009,

Location(s): Cecil County Administration Building
200 Chesapeake Blvd, Elk Room

Number of attendees: _____

Main issue raised: Issues on construction impacts on adjacent properties

Consensus of meeting: Proceed with project

Overall, the public support for the project was (check one):

__X__ Strong support, few concerns

_____ Some support, but some concerns raised

_____ Mixed, equal support and opposition

_____ Some opposition, many concerns raised

_____ Strong opposition, major problems identified

Unresolved issues identified: Adjacent Property Owner individual Concerns- Have since resolved during Right of Way negotiations

_____ Citizen Advisory/Steering Committee

_____ Survey

Number surveyed: _____

Results: _____

__1__ Elected officials briefings Board Of County Commissioner Work Session December 5, 2009

_____ Project web site

__5__ Other Has been briefed in open session County budget hearings as a priority project since 2005, and listed as a top priority on the Cecil County Capital Investment Program since that time. This is publically available information on the County website as well as in paper copies readily available at the County Administration building

How was the public notified about the project?

_____ Web page

_____ Legal notice

_____ Videos

_____ Radio/television

__X__ Other Posted on County Web Page

_____ Publications Distribution: _____

__X__ Newsletter/brochure

_____ Flyers

How has the project changed as a result of public comments?

No, However minor adjustments to the plans were made to accomidate the concerns of the adjacent property owners

Comment further on the quantity and quality of the public participation:

As typical for a bridge maintenance replacement project, there was good support for the project to move forward