

The Preparation of this Report was Financed in Part Through Planning Grants from the United States Department of Transportation (FHWA & FTA) and the Ohio Department of Transportation.

FINAL

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO

Fiscal Year 1997 - 2000

Richland County Regional Planning Commission

June 14, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY	1
FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND FISCAL CONSTRAINT	2
AIR QUALITY	5
POLICY FOR PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN FTA FUNDED PROJECTS	5
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS	6
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS	7
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS	7
CHANGES IN PRIORITY	7
PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MAJOR PROJECT STATUS	8
APPENDICES	
A. FY 1996 PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS	10
B. FY 1997 - 2000 PROGRAM	15
C. OTHER PROJECTS BEYOND 2000	26
D. TRANSIT PROGRAM FORMS	29

INTRODUCTION

As part of the Urban Transportation Planning Process, under the Federal Planning regulations (Title 23 U.S.C. and Title 49 U.S.C.), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is required to develop and keep current a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in cooperation with State and local officials, the regional or local transit operator and any other affected implementing agency. The MPO in Richland County is the Transportation Coordinating Committee of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission in Richland County.

The TIP is a list of projects that have been identified through the transportation planning program and selected for implementation. Typically, implementation of a highway project involves three major phases or activities, design (PE), right of way acquisition (RW) and construction (C). The projects listed in the TIP are taking or are planned to take one of these major steps towards implementation during the time covered by the TIP. A TIP typically covers 3-5 years, few projects are developed in less than three years and many have taken longer than five years. Therefore, there are projects that have implementation status that will not move into a new phase in the development process during the 4 year period covered by this TIP.

The program lists all project activities and related costs during the program years. The costs must be reasonable within the estimate of financial resources. All projects included on the TIP must be documented as a need through the transportation planning process of the MPO. Projects shown in the first three years of the program may be advanced in a year other than that shown with a letter of concurrence by the MPO.

The first TIP prepared in Richland County as part of the Transportation Planning Process was developed in 1973 as part of the 1990 Transportation Plan. Each year it has been updated and extended. This report describes the methodology used, financial resources available, history of spending and the resulting program for FY 1997-2000 (State fiscal years; July 1, 1996 through June 30, 2000). It also includes listings describing program accomplishment in the last year and other projects with implementation status in Richland County.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY

The approach to the development of the Annual TIP consists of the following steps:

1. A subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is Selected to work with the staff to develop a proposed TIP for the next four (4) years. This subcommittee consists of persons who are familiar with the status of specific transportation projects, and funding capabilities of implementing agencies (the State, the County, Cities and Villages) within the study area.

- Project phases that have been funded or completed during the previous year are removed from the program and added to a list of program accomplishments for that year.
- 3. Status of projects is determined and cost estimates are verified or changed on the remaining projects.
- 4. Where projects can be added, we look to probable Transportation System Management (TSM) activities and the Long Range Plan. In both the TSM process and the Long Range Planning Process, priorities are part of the end product. When the opportunity arises to add a project to the TIP, additional considerations need to be made which include but are not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a) Amount, type and availability limitations of funds
 - b) Relative implementation times
 - c) Local priorities
 - d) Federal and State priorities
 - e) Emergency maintenance needs.
- 5. Once the draft of the TIP has been developed by the TAC sub-committee it is reviewed by TAC, by the Coordinating Committee and by State and Federal funding agencies. This process begins in November, between November and May (final), the TIP is discussed at the meetings of the transportation committees, which receive good press coverage and at which staff repetitively points out that these are draft materials and that comments are welcomed from members of the committees and the community at large.

Beginning in February 1993, in response to the Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 a special effort to enhance the planning program's public involvement and outreach efforts, public notices and public meetings or open houses were made a part of the TIP development process. In 1994 the Coordinating Committee adopted a formal public involvement process that encompasses not only the TIP process but the entire Transportation Planning Program. The results from it will be documented in the final TIP document.

6. It may become necessary to revise the program during the year. An implementing agency may request a revision, TAC reviews the request and recommends action to the Coordinating Committee and the Coordinating Committee takes the necessary action in the form of a resolution. Projects listed in the first 3 years of the TIP may be advanced by the implementing agency and/or ODOT in a year other than the year specifically mentioned in this document with a letter of concurrence from the MPO.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The purpose of this section is to estimate the financial resources that will be available during the fiscal years covered by this program. The Transportation Improvement Program should then conform to the financial resources that will be set forth in this section.

The Richland County Regional Planning Commission continually tracks available financial resources and the related levels of funding and history of spending and from time to time they publish a Transportation Financial Resources report that summarizes this effort.

As part of the TIP process it is a federal requirement that the program be fiscally balanced and constrained to available resources. There are many sources of funds, some of which are spent at the discretion of the local areas and others that are spent at the discretion of state agencies. There are specific sources of funds, Surface Transportation Program, Minimum Allocation and Donor State, that are allocated to and spent at the discretion of the MPO.

The following page summarizes the status of Surface Transportation Program (STP), Donor State Bonus and Minimum Allocation (MA) funds allocated and available to Richland County for federal fiscal years 1995 through 2000 (October, 1994 through September 30, 2000). Projects are listed as we believe they will be developed and ready for obligations.

In the last couple of TIPs we were able to demonstrate that our overall program was reasonably balanced but it was out of balance by year within the TIP window because all of the projects planned during the 4 years were going to be ready in the first couple of years. Shortfalls were proposed to be managed either through making arrangements to use unobligated funds from other MPO's or the State to implement these projects as shown, or some projects would have to be delayed until funding was assembled. Any additional Federal funding provided by the State would be considered an advance of future MPO funding allocations.

As the result of reduced state apportionments of both STP and MA and an adjustment to MPO allocations to reflect the 1990 census figures, our estimated resources for FY 96 and beyond are even less than we had anticipated.

Now we are in the position where all of the projects will be ready in the next year to 18 months. Estimated allocations of STP and MA are considerably less than what had anticipated. We still propose to handle the shortfalls the same way, but it is going to be difficult if not impossible to show reasonable overall balance within the present TIP window. There are no other STP projects presently being developed in the region and we understand that it will be at least the year 2002 before we can expect to fund another STP project under the present conditions.

RICHLAND COUNTY - MANSFIELD
STATUS STP/DONOR STATE & MA FUNDS, FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS (FFY) 1995-1999

								STP+MA AVAILA	BLE	EXPEND	DITURES	S							
	l		ĺ					FOR USE											
	ĺ		j			İ			TOTAL										
	1								WITH MA	LOAN .		PROJEC	TS						
			BALANCES		,	BORROV		OBLIGATION	+BORROW	STP	MA	STP	MA	TOTAL	PID	DESCRIPTION	PE	R	W
DATE	STP	MA	STP	MA	TOTAL	STP	MA	LIMIT (STP)	-LOAN	ļ	ļ		ļ		<u> </u>				_
FFY 94			\$383	\$799	\$1,182		ļ						ļ		ļ	FFY 1995 CARRY OVE	R	\perp	\perp
10/01/94	\$678	\$180	\$1,061	\$979	\$2,040	ļ	 _	\$615	\$1,594			ļ	ļ			BEGIN FFY 1995	_	\perp	4
FFY 95	ļ		\$770	\$979	\$1,749	ļ	_	\$324	\$1,303	 		\$291	\$0	\$291	13201	LEX-ONT. RD.		4	42
FFY 95	<u> </u>		\$456	\$979	\$1,435	<u> </u>	-	\$10	\$989		ļ	\$314	\$0	\$314	10013		1	+	^
FFY 95	 		\$456	\$679	\$1,135	010		\$10	\$689		 	\$0	\$300	\$300	4121	COOK RD.		X	4
FFY 95	 		\$428	\$679	\$1,107	\$18	-	(\$0)	\$679		 	\$28	\$0	\$28	9647	TRIMBLE 2		X	+
FFY 95 FFY 95	 		\$428 (\$110)	\$637	\$1,065 (\$110)	\$538	-	(\$0)	\$637		 	\$0	\$42	\$42	8562	TRIMBLE 3		X	4
FFY 95	 		(\$110)	(\$0) (\$0)	(\$110)	 	-	(\$0)	(\$0)		 	\$538	\$637	\$1,176	8562	TRIMBLE 3	+	+	X
FFY 95	ļ		(\$110)	(\$0)	(\$110)	 	 	(\$0) (\$0)	(\$0)		 	 	 	 			-	+	+
10/01/95	5689	\$34	\$579	\$34		 		\$750			+	1		 	 	DECIN EDV 4000		+-	+
FFY 96	3008	354	\$567	\$34 \$34	\$613 \$600	 		\$730	\$784 \$772		+		so		0047	BEGIN FFY 1996	+	+	+
FFY 96	 		(\$178)	\$34	(\$145)	\$7		\$736	\$34	 	 	\$12 \$745		\$12 \$745	9647	TRIMBLE 2		<u> x</u>	+
FFY 96		-	(\$3,556)	\$14	(\$3,543)			\$0	\$14		 	+	\$0		9647	TRIMBLE 2	+-	₩	X
FFY 96	 		(\$3.634)	\$14	(\$3,621)			\$0	\$14		 	\$3,378	\$20	\$3.398		COOK RD.	X	X	X
FFY 96			(\$4,415)	\$14	(\$4,402)	S781		\$0 \$0	\$14		 	\$78	\$0 \$0	\$78		CBD SIGNALS	+	 	-X
FFY 96	 		(\$4,415)	(\$0)	(\$4,402)	3/01		\$0	\$14		 	\$781 \$0	\$0 \$14	\$781 \$14	!	STEAM CORNERS SR 309/ROCK RD.	+-	+-	X
FFY 96	1	-	(\$4.415)	(\$0)	(\$4,416)			\$0	\$0		 	30	314	314	7263	Sh Suarhock RD.	+	+-	+-
FFY 96			(\$4,415)	(\$0)	(\$4,416)			\$0	\$0		-	 					+	+	+
10/01/96	\$792	\$30	(\$3,623)	\$30	(\$3,594)			\$792	\$822		 	 				BEGIN FFY 1997	+	+-	+
FFY 97	37.52	- 500	(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)	\$34		\$7.52	(\$0)			S826	\$30	\$856	15221	W. 4TH ST.	+-	╁	×
FFY 97			(\$4.449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)		 	3020	330	3030	13221	144. 4111 31.		╁	十
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)		-	 					+	╁	+-
FFY 97	 		(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4.450)			\$0	(\$0)								+	┿	┿
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)		 	 					+	+-	+-
FFY 97			(\$4.449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			\$0	(\$0)		 	 					-	╁	+
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)		-	SO SO	(\$0)		 						+	+	+
FFY 97			(\$4,449)	(\$0)	(\$4,450)			SO SO	(\$0)		 						+	+	+-
10/01/97	\$792	\$30	(\$3.657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822							BEGIN FFY 1998	+	+	+
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822		 						+	╁	+
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3.628)			\$792	\$822		 	-					+	+-	+
FFY 98			(\$3.657)	\$30	(\$3,628)		-	\$792	\$822		 	-					+-	 	+
FFY 98	 		(\$3.657)	\$30	(\$3.628)			\$792	\$822								+	\vdash	+
FFY 98		Ť	(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3.628)			\$792	\$822		-	-					+-	t^{-}	+
FFY 98			(\$3,657)	\$30	(\$3,628)			\$792	\$822								+	+	+
FFY 93		-	(\$3.657)	\$30	(\$3.628)		i	\$792	\$822							***************************************	\top	T	$^{+}$
FFY 98	1		(\$3.657)	\$30	(\$3,628)		$\overline{}$	so	(\$0)	\$792	\$30						 		-
10/01/98	\$792	\$30	(\$2.865)	S60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822							BEGIN FFY 1999	 	\top	\top
FFY 99			(\$2.865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822								\top	\Box	1
FFY 99			(\$2.865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822				i					T	+
FFY 99			(\$2.865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822								\top		\top
FFY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)	1		\$792	\$822					i		, ,		П	Τ
FY 99			(\$2.865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822									\vdash	\top
FY 99	1		(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822										T
FY 99			(\$2.865)	\$60	(\$2,806)			\$792	\$822								1	\Box	Τ
FY 99			(\$2,865)	\$60	(\$2.806)			\$0	(\$0)	\$792	\$30								\top
10/01/99	\$792	\$30	(\$2.073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822							BEGIN FFY 2000	T		T
FY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822										
FY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			5792	\$822										
FY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822				i						I
FY 2000			(\$2,073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822										T
FY 2000			(\$2.073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822										I
FY 2000			(\$2.073)	\$90	(\$1.984)			\$792	\$822										T
FY 2000			(\$2.073)	\$90	(\$1,984)			\$792	\$822										T
FY 2000			(\$2.073)	\$90	(\$1,984)		$\neg \uparrow$	\$0	(\$0)	792	30								T
																			_

BORROW - AVAILABLE FUNDS BORROWED FROM ANOTHER MPO OR ADVANCED BY ODOT FOR THESE PROJECTS, TO BE REPAID WITH FUTURE ALLOCATIONS.

- LOAN - AVAILABLE FUNDS RETURNED ON LOANS AND/OR ADVANCES, OR LOANED TO OTHER MPO'S FOR FUTURE REPAYMENT.

AIR QUALITY

The Richland County Area is considered attainment under the Clean Air Act for ozone and carbon monoxide (CO). As such we are not subject to the requirements under ISTEA for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program. However we feel that our planning program and improvement program lends itself to minimizing increases in emissions and maintaining the attainment status. Furthermore the program lends itself to being expanded and redirected towards efforts related to mitigation should Richland County become non attainment.

POLICY FOR PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN FTA FUNDED PROJECTS

Policy and Process Description - The planning of 1. public transportation services in Richland County the responsibility of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission. Implementation of these services the responsibility of the Richland County Transit This policy concerns the involvement of the private Board. sector in both planning and implementation of public transportation service. Therefore, this policy has been adopted by both agencies. The transportation plan identifies what public transportation service is to be provided. The development of this plan is reviewed with the Technical Advisory Committee and both, the Local taxi company, and the Richland County Transit Board, have membership on that Committee.

This private sector involvement policy states that the public transportation service, as identified in the Transportation Plan, will be provided by whatever method requires the least public subsidy. Furthermore, any interested private company will be given the opportunity to submit a proposal to provide this service. The subsidy required for the alternative of public operation will be compared with that required for private company proposals.

This solicitation of proposals and evaluation of alternatives will be conducted at five year intervals for the current public transportation service.

Planning for the Specialized Transportation Program, (to purchase vehicles for non-profit agencies to transport elderly and handicapped), is done by a separate committee. This committee includes representation from the local taxi operator and the Richland County Transit Board. This committee will also follow the general policy stated above.

- 2. List of New and Restructured Services None
- 3. Analysis of Existing Public Service All existing public transportation service is provided through

contracts with private companies. The bus service is provided through a contract with ATE. The current contract expires February 28, 1999. At that time a new solicitation of proposals and evaluation of alternatives will be conducted.

The subsidized taxi service in Shelby is provided through a contract with Mansfield Service Taxi. The original contract was implemented in October 1983 and has been renewed annually since that time.

- 4. Description of Private Proposals None in addition to those described above.
- 5. Description of Private Sector Capital Investment Strategies None
- 6. RCTB Private Enterprise Dispute Process In the event that any party file a protest with the RCTB regarding the procurement of any services, goods or equipment the following action will be taken. The fiscal officer will conduct an analysis of the procurement procedures utilized and the issues raised in the protest. These will be compared to the procurement and enterprise policy. The fiscal officer will pres the protest, the analysis and his recommendation present next RCTB meeting. The RCTB will review this information and decide whether to deny or accept the protest. This decision will be made and the protester notified in writing within no more than 30 days from the receipt of the protest. If the protest is accepted by the RCTB the procurement in question will be revised; if the protest is denied no change will be made in the procurement.

The RCRPC verifies, as part of the annual TIP report, that this private sector participation process has been followed.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

In October 1994 the Transportation Coordinating Committee of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission adopted a public involvement process for the Transportation Planning Program. The process described in that document for the development of Transportation Improvement Programs was followed.

Preparation of the draft TIP began in November 1995 by staff and a sub committee of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) of the Mansfield Area Transportation Study which is conducted by the Richland County Regional Planning Commission (RPC). A draft list of projects was submitted and approved for submission as a draft by the TAC and the Policy Body (Coordinating Committee of the Mansfield Area Transportation Study) at their February meetings. These meetings receive press coverage and it was stressed that the draft TIP was being

submitted, was available for review, that comments were being accepted and that a formal solicitation of public review and comment would be conducted prior to the adoption of a final document.

On March 18 and 25, 1996 legal notices were published in the Mansfield News Journal announcing the availability of the final draft document and inviting questions and comment on the proposed TIP through April 16, 1996. No copies of the document were requested and no questions or comments were recieved.

Copies of the final draft were distributed to all ODOT districts and all MPO's in preparation for the state TIP (STIP) public involvement process. In turn this agency recieved a copy of the STIP and all MPO TIPS which were available for review and comment through the STIP review period through May 22, 1996. Again no copies of the document were requested and no questions or comments were recieved from the general public.

Finally because there are a number of long awaited and rather exciting projects either under construction or about to go under construction in the community, we are using available STP resources through approximately 2002 to finance these projects, people are excited about what we will do next. Staff felt that this was an excellent oportunity to spend some extra time with the community explaining the actual status of the transportation program.

Special presentations on the status of the transportation program in Richland County were made to both the TAC and Coordinating committees in March and April. The presentation focused on:

- 1. The significant accomplishments made in the last 2 or 3 years.
- 2. All of the other projects we would like to see implemented.
- 3. Status of the State and Federal transportation funding programs.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

Many years ago the MPO recognized and adopted the philosophy that priority should be given to preservation over new construction in the use of available resources. That philosophy is also embraced by both ISTEA and ODOT's long range planning effort (Access Ohio).

There are projects that can be categorized as new construction in the Long Range Plan for Richland County, but the basis of those projects is related to building connecting links and relieving congestion on existing facilities.

More than 90% of the FY 1997-2000 TIP is considered system preservation.

REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS

The following projects, which are presently in some stage of implementation, can be considered regionally significant in that they have not only evolved as part of the MPO planning program but also as part of the State's (Access Ohio) or other parts of the state transportation planning programs.

- 1. RIC 30 15.208, .33 mi. West of Trimble Rd. to 0.20 Mi. E. of US 42., Widen, reconstruct and upgrade. This section of US 30 is over 40 years old, it carries 30,000 ADT per year, has a higher than average incidence of accidents, interchanges are of substandard design and it involves major structures in need of rehabilitation. Never the less it fails to be a priority project on the state's major capital improvements list through the year 2000.
- 2. CRA/RIC 30 15.949, Construction of a New 4-lane limited access facility coming into Richland County from the West, one of the few links that need to be constructed to make US 30 a 4-lane limited access facility across the state. This project is presently under PE, construction again will be beyond the year 2000. It is now proposed that the project be split into three phases, the first two of which would go to construction in FY 1999 and 2000, the phase in Richland County would be the last and beyond 2000.

CHANGES IN PRIORITY

The local priorities reflected in this TIP are consistent with priorities of previous TIPS. There have been some changes in State priorities related to fiscal limitations.

PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MAJOR PROJECT STATUS

For the most part the program in Richland County is progressing well. Projects seem to be staying on schedule much better than they had in the past. There are a number of very significant projects that have gone to construction in the last couple of years or that will go to construction in the first two years of this TIP.

I-71 and SR 39, new interchange	_	FΥ	95
Trimble Rd. 1, widen and reconstruct	-	FY	95
Construction of the Richland County Bikeway	-	FΥ	95
Shelby Ave., reconstruction	-	FY	95
Trimble Rd. 2, widen and reconstruct	-	FY	96
Trimble Rd. 3, widen and reconstruct	-	FΥ	96
City of Mansfield Signal Project	-	FY	96
Cook Rd. Extension, new facility	-	FY	96
Steam Corners Rd., widen and reconstruct	-	FY	96
W. 4th St., resurfacing	-	FΥ	97

The bridge replacement, rehabilitation and reconstruction program in Richland County seems to be progressing well. There

has consistently been about 30 projects on the program and 5-10 projects per year delivered. There were 5 delivered in 1996.

There are several major projects that have been identified in both the local planning program and ODOT's project identification process that have not progressed well. These are projects for which the State of Ohio is the implementing and primary funding agency. These projects have been on and off the program for a number of years and with the State's most recent proposed STIP they seem to be off again.

- RIC US 42 04.34, PDMS 4301, Lexington to Mansfield This project has been in design phase for a number of years, but is not scheduled for construction in this TIP.
- RIC US 42 12.80, PDMS 9086, Grace St. to Crider Rd.

 This project was originally identified in ODOT's Hazard elimination program as a high accident area a number of years ago, more recently it has been reinforced through ODOT's needs study related to Access Ohio. It is not scheduled for construction in this TIP.
- RIC SR 97 06.01, PDMS 6090, I-71 Interchange Area
 This project was also identified in ODOT's hazard elimination program as a high accident area a number of years ago. It is scheduled for construction in this TIP, but do to the fact that the area has recently been annexed into the Village of Bellville, it now appears to be Bellville's responsibility to advance or implement the project.
- RIC US 30 09.45, PDMS 12405, Trimble to US 42

 This is one of the original segments of US 30 constructed as a 4 lane limited access facility, it carries close to 30,000 cars per day and interchange geometrics are substandard. The project is perceived as widening from 4-6 lanes and upgrade of interchanges. It now appears that it will have no status during the period covered by this TIP.

APPENDIX A FY 1996 PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

FINAL	
RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROSEAN	
PREPARED BY THE RICHLARD COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION	
FIRCAL YEARS 1997 - 3000	
06/14/96 15:00:00	
FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND	
FEDERAL BR - BRIDGE PROGRAM BWM = BIKEWAY FUNDS, URBAN BWS = BIKEWAY FUNDS, RURAL FTA = TRAUSIT ADMINISTRATION HES = SAFETY PROGRAM IM = INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE NH = MATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM RRP = RAILROAD PROTECTION RRS = RAILROAD SAFETY STC = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, COUNTY ALLOCATION STM = SUPFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, URBAN ALLOCATION STS = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, STATE ALLOCATION CMA = CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY HPR = HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH PL = PLANNING	1. FY 96 SHOWN FOR INFORMATION ONLY, FUNDING OBLIGATED OR INCUMBERED BEFORE THE END OF FY 96. 2. FE OR RW COSTS FUNDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY AT 100% ARE NOT ALWAYS KNOWN AND SHOWN. 3. * IN COSTS INDICATES THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE ARE PLANNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THE EXACT SCOPE AND COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY IS USUALLY THE STATE, THE FUNDS INVOLVED ARE ALLOCATED TO THE STATE AND ARE TO BE USED WITHIN THE STATE. PRIORITIES ARE THEREFORE ESTABLISHED ON A STATE WIDE BASIS. 4. FY 3001 FOR INFO ONLY, OBLIGATIONS THAT WILL OCCUR AFTER 2006, FOR PROJECTS WHICH ARE PEING DEVELOPED AND FOR WHICH OBLIGATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR PE OR RW. 5. YEARS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED CONSIDERING PROJECT DEVELOPMENT STATUS (ODOT'S MILESTONE REPORT), LOCAL PRIORITIES, AND YEARLY FUNDING CAPACITY.
STATE	100 AD TRIVATITES, AND TEARED FOROIRS CAPACITY.
STATE = OHIO	LEGEND FOR PHASE OF WORK
LOCAL	C * CONSTRUCTION FOR HIGHWAY, CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL, ACQUISITION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
LEKIN = VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON MAUSE = CITY OF MANSFIELD ONTAR = VILLAGE OF OUTARLO	O = TRANSIT CREMATIONS. P = PE FOR HIGHWAY, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
COUNT = RICHLAND COUNTY SHELB = CIT OF SHELBY	R = RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION.

RICHL	WAD GOODLE	TRANSIS	ETATIC	U IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM															
C O II N T	R O U T E	(CH)	ь Е н Э Т Н	госяттой уно лекитит	T 0 T 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Y E E D H H	PHASE OF	****	1997	(RE OF COST (\$1,000) SCAL YEAR	2000	**** 2001	E T 7 0	D 3 - A R R E / R	E i	E T E H E R A B E R L B G	S 1	В В В В В В В В В В В В В В В В В В В
PROJ.	COOK RD. (PPMS) HUMBER	4121 19	1.609	WOODVILLE ROAD TO MANSFIELD-LU CAS ROAD HEW 2-LANE FACILITY	54.87	ыун нун нун	8 C P B C P B	192 33 424 217 38 484 133 286 3630					***	1)		X	0	s	соинг
	STEAM COF (PDMS) NUMBER	RNERS 4133 98		VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON WIDEN & RECONSTRUCT	1102	LEX LEX LEX	R C	111 [*] 15 195 781						>	:		0	A	LEXIN
PROJ.	TRIMBLE, (PDMS) NUMBER	PT 2 9647 112A	l	FARK AVE. W. TO WEST 4TH ST. WIDEN & RECONSTRUCT	15.36		R C R	726 200 2 265 9 334						×			1		MANSF
	(PDMS)	24.59; 		CITY OF MANSFIELD TRAFFIC CONTROL IMPROVEMENT	3607	ОН1 ОН1	R C C B C C B	1 5 538 1162 121 73 374 100 296									0	X	MANSF

RICHLA	тийсэ ам	Y TEAHSE	RTATIO	H IMPEOVEMENT PROGRAM															
с о и н т ү	R O U T E	S F C T 1	E E B G T H	LOCATION AND TERMINI	T G T A L	T Y P E	P H A S E			,	RE OF COST (\$1,000) SCAL YEAR	3		S A I I F I I E I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	3 3 - R	C A A B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	T H E B R	I H S A C N E G L E L A I	SAPGOENINSCIYB
	The second secon	(EM)	(EH)		\$1000	() 11 D	O R K	**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	R E		к U С	G E	0 0 8	E L
PROJ.	R039/061 (PDMS) HUMBER	06.244 10499 245	0.080	0.19 MI. S. OF SR 96 0.86 MI. H. OF SR 314 PRILOGE REPLACEMENT	6.34	BR OH I OH I OH I		367 156 9 91									2	7	STATE
1	RO71 (PDMS) NUMBER	021.979 15362 284		0.14 MI. N. OF MANS. LUCAS RF. INTO ASHLAND COUNTY RESURFACE	800	ти Ти	1 1	720 80							х				STATE
	RO81 (PDMS) NUMBER	17.188 12457 209	0.080	NOBLE RD., .5 MI E OF TOWNLINE RD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	229	BR RIC RIC		152 39 38									1		соинт
1	RO97 (PDMS) NUMBER	21.340 10500 246	0.241	0.03 MI. W. OF ETZWILER FD. 0.26 MI. E. OF B&O RR REPLACE 2 PRIDGES	1568	OHI OHI STS	C	138 289 1152									2	A	STATE
	R192 (PDMS) NUMBER	00.515 12458 254	0.097	FACKLER RD., .3 MI. N. LONDON EAST, TOLL REV. CREDIT (TRC) BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	226	BR RIC		182 44									1	Α	сочит
	R270 (PDMS) NUMBER	07.467 12459 220	0,889	PLEMING FALLS RD., .3 MI W OF BOWEN RD. BRITGE REPLACEMENT	265	PIC BP		178 42 45									ì	A	соинт
1	R350 (PDMS) NUMBER	00.435 10228 216	0.113	BUT. NEWVILLE FD., .3 MI E OF RT 95, TOLL BEV. CREDIT (TRC) BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	396	BR RIC		336 50									1	A	COUNT
			<u></u>																

С О U И Т Ү	R O H T E	S E C T I C II I	L E H G T H	LOCATION AND TERMINI	T G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G	T Y P E F P	H A S E O F				RE OF COST (\$1,000) SCAL YEAR	· 6		S A D F D E L Y A H U E P G R	E W 3 C R O U	R B B B A I	I H S A C H E G L E L A I	S A P G O E N H S C
		(1.01)	(7.63)		\$1000	11 11 Cl	Q R K	**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	R E A C	U C T	G E S	0 U	E
PROJ. (PE PROJ. (PE LOCAL HUN	DMS)	03.331 13460 355		SMART RD., 1.4 MI. H. SR 39 BPIDGE REPLACEMENT	4+2	PR RIC PIC		286 54 73								1	A	Cour
RIC COMP PROJ. (PI JOCAL HUM	DMS)	E HOHE 999D		TRAUSIT PLAUNING, CAPITAL & OPERATIONS	1058	FTA FTA MAN MAN OHL OHL OHL OHL OHL SHE SHE	10101010101010101010101010101010101010	369 128 163 143 10 139 16 25 1 70. 5										СОНИЗ

APPENDIX B

FY 1997 - 2000 PROGRAM

FIHAL RICHLAND COURT: TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PREPARED BY THE PICHLAND COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION FISCAL YEARS 1997 3000 06/14/96 15:00:00 FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND HOTES ON PROGRAM FEDERAL 1. FY 96 SHOWN FOR INFORMATION ONLY, FURDING OBLIGATED OR INCOMBERED PEFORE THE END OF FY 96. BR = PFIDGE PROGRAM 2. PE OR RW COSTS FUNDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY BWM = RIEEWAY FUHDS, URBAN AT 100% ARE NOT ALWAYS KNOWN AND SHOWN. BWS = BIEEWAY FUNDS, RURAL 3. * III COSTS INDICATES THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE FTA - TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ARE PLANNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THE EXACT HES - SAFETY PROGRAM SCOPE AND COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. THE 1M * INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY IS USUALLY THE STATE, THE FUNDS HH * HATIOMAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM INVOLVED ARE ALLOCATED TO THE STATE AND ARE TO BE RRP = RAILROAD PROTECTION USED WITHIN THE STATE. PRIORITIES ARE THEREFORE RES = EAILROAD SAFETY ESTABLISHED ON A STATE WIDE BASIS. STC * SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, COUNTY ALLOCATION 4. FY 2001 FOR INFO ONLY, OBLIGATIONS THAT WILL OCCUR STM = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, URBAH ALLOCATION AFTER 2000, FOR PROJECTS WHICH ARE PEING DEVELOPED STS - SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, STATE ALLOCATION AND FOR WHICH OBLIGATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR PE OR CMA = CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY HER - HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH 5. YEARS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED CONSIDERING PROJECT FL = PLAIMHING DEVELOPMENT STATUS (ODOT'S MILESTONE REPORT), LOCAL PRIORITIES, AND YEARLY FUNDING CAPACITY. STATE STATE - OHIO LEGEND FOR PHASE OF WORK C = CONSTRUCTION FOR HIGHWAY, CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL LOCAL ACQUISITION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS. LEXID = VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON O = TRANSIT OPERATIONS. MANSE - CITY OF MANSFIELD

P = PE FOR HIGHWAY, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.

R " RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION.

ONTAR = VILLAGE OF ONTARIO

COURT = RICHLAND COUNTY SHELB = CITY OF SHELBY

RICHL	AND COUNTY	TRAILER	#TATIO	N IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM															
C O U M T Y	В О П Т В	S E C T I O H	L E H G T H	LOCATION AND TERMINI	T 0 T A L C 0 S T	T Y F E D	P H A S E O F W O	***		(E OF COST 01,000) CAL TEAR	s		A F T T U P G	D 3 L A R R N S /	O A H F S E A R	T H E R B R I	S A C H G G L E L H H H H H H H	E SA PG OE
					\$1000	1	R E	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	R I	2	и С T	G E S	U	Е
PROJ.	COUNTY RO (PUMS) NUMBER	PADS HONE 1983	336.3	VARIOUS COUNTY ROADS	100	src	c		1410					х				3	совит
PROJ.	W 4TH ST (PDMS) NUMBER	15221 268	3,637	W. CORP TO BEEP RD. A LEX SPR TO HOME RD. (INTERCHANGE) RESURFACING	1160	ONT ONT MTS	le:	90	314 856						х				ONTAR
PROJ.	WHITHEY A (PDMS) HUMBER	AVE. 13454 75	NA	SHELBY BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	590	1	C P R C	55 5	107								1	A	SHELB
	(PDMS)	000 , 00 15965 287		VARIOUS STATE ROUTES	333	OHI	C		3,33								>		STATE
1	(PDMS)	021.560 12297 288		CULVERT REPLACEMENT	36	онт	С		26								2		STATE
1	(PDMS)	31,575 13623 264	0.032	0.32 MI E OF IP 71 PEPLACE DEF. 10' STRUCTURE	:73	OHI OHI OHI STS	R C	75			4 18 75]	Α	STATE
,	(PDMS)	02.639 12665 265	0.032	0.34 M N OF CR 35 (KINGS CORNERS RD) REPLACE 14' BRIDGE	15#	THO THO THO STS	R C		53	4 20 82							J	λ	STATE

RICHL	AND COUR	FT TRAUSP	OFTATIO	N IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM														
С О И Т Ү	R O U T E	S E C T I U U U	L E H G T H	Posation and lebuini	T O T A L C S T T	Y E E D	11 H A S E O F W			(RE OF COST (\$1,000) CAL YEAF	S		S A D D E D T A B U E F R R	E W 3 - C N	E T S H R R B R A I	E (E SA P G O E N N S C I Y
		(136)	(EM)		\$1000	1 1	O R E	**** 1996 ***	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	R E A C	U C T	G E	1 1	E
1	S042 (PDMS) NUMBER	021.430 NONE 289		2 LANE RESURFACING	151	olli	,,		151								X	STATE
	RO71 (PDMS) NUMBER	21.984 11378 263	12.00	.14 MI. H. MAHS-LUCAS RD. TO ASHLAND CO 4-LANE REHABILITATION	1 :498	1M HH	P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0 P 0		803 332 175			7551 3016 1593		x		1	F	STATE
	R076 (PDMS) NUMBER	нопе 272	0.032	ROME S. RD., 0.20 M S OF SR 60 3 BRIDGE REFLACEMENT	\$10	ER (P.	50		208						ı		COUNT
1	RO77 (PDMS) NUMPER	15174 273	0.644	OLIVESBURG-FITCHVLE, 1.50 M N OF SR 96 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	310	BR RIC RIC G		40		136 34						1		COUNT
	R088 (EDMS) HUMBER	60,950 13203 225	0.080	VANTILBURG, .6 MI E OF ST RT 5 45 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	256	8R 0 PIC 0	U P	59	158 79							1		COUNT
1	RO95 (PDMS) NUMBER	00.048 12014 258	0.032	0.03 MI. N OF ENOX CO. LINE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	१६ ५	091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091 091	R	81 6	62 246							1	A	STATE
	RO96 (EDMS) NUMBER	007.433 HONE 290		2 LANE RESURFACING	444	онт с			444								х	STATE

RICHL	анр совит	Y TEAHSE	RTATIO	BL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM										****				
С О И И Т Ү	R O U T E	3 E C T 1 O H	Е Н С Т Н	LOCATION AND TERMINI	TO T	7 P E E D	P H A S E O F W			(E OF COST \$1,000) CAL YEAR	s		Դ ե	E W 3 - C C C	S H E R A B E R A I	I H S A C H E G L E	E SA PG OE NN SC IY B
		(1.17)	(cer)		\$1000	11	ORE	**** 1996 ***	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	R E A C D	r C T		0 U S	E
	RU97 (PDMS) NUMBER	33.152 12015 260	0.032	0.23 MI. N OF ASHLAND CO. LINE REPLACE 13' BRIDGE	98	OHI OHI STS	aco	15		17 66						1	A	STATE
	R145 (PDMS) NUMBER	NОНЕ 281	0.080	WERNER RD., 150 FT N OF LOST R UN RD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	171	1.71	040		36			110				1		COUNT
1	R169 (PDMS) NUMBER	580 NOHE	0.080	STEIN RD., 0.10 M E OF STIVIN G RD. BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	218	BR RIC RIC			38			1 44 36				1		СОИНТ
	R191 (POMS) NUMBER	HONE 277	0.097	PLY. SPR. RD, 0.19 M S OF SR 9 6 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	306	ER RIC RIC	С Р С		46			208 52				1		COUNT
	R201 (PDMS) NUMBER	NOHE 279	0.113	MYERS RD., 0.30 M E OF SR 314 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	278	BR RIC RIC			38			192 48				1		COUNT
	R215 (PDMS) MUMBER	15314 269	0.016	ROWMAN ST., 0.2 ML N OF MILLER RD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	568	BF RIC RIC		90	390 95							Ł		Соинт
1	R233 (PDMS) NUMBER	NONE 278	0.064	AMOY GAUGES RD., 0.10 M S OF L THE RD. BPIDGE REPLACEMENT	171	BR R1C RIC			36			108 27				1		COURT
L		-																

				N IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	Ī		T							Г Г Т			т
C O U N T Y	R O U T E	5 6 7 1 0	L E H G T	LOCATION AND TERMINI	T A t C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	T F W				RE OF COST (\$1,000) SCAL YEAR	rs		0 E F /	3 C R O H S T	E T S II F E A B E R A I	S A C N E G L E L A I N N	S A P G O E H H S C I Y B
		(EM)	(EM)		\$1000	0 0 N R D E	1996	1997	1998	1999	3000	**** 2001 ****	- G R E A C D	H U T			L E
	(PDMS) UUMBER	01.625 13202 227	0.080	COMARD RD., .4 ML S OF FIVES P TS E PRIDGE REPLACEMENT	139	PR C RIC P	45	75 19							1		COUNT
	R320 (PDMS) NUMBER	15050 27 4	0.080	POSSUM RUN RD., 0.20 M S OF SH YDER RD. BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	244	BR C RIC P FIC C			159						1		COUNT
	R325 (PDMS) NUMBER	ноне 275	0.080	KOCKHEISER, 0.20 M E OF IR 71, OH RAMP BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	263	BFC C	48			188			-		1		COUNT
	(362 (POMS) NUMPER	15636 276	0.097	EAYLOR RD., 0.30 M E OF LUC. P ERRYSVLE. BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	312	BE C RIC P RIC C	57		30 4 51						1		соинт
	(430 (PDHS) NUMBER	11.668 7463 202	1.835	STEWART TO WOODCREST HES, WIDEN & RECONSTRUCT	515	OHI POHI CONTOCK				43	87 34 <i>6</i>				0 x		STATE
	431 (PDMS) NUMBER	02.317 12 4 61 223	0.161	APPLEGATE RD., 1.4 HI N OF GLA DEN RD BRIDGE PEPLACEMENT	413	BR C PIC P RIC C	71	248 94							1	Λ	совит
	437 (PDMS) NUMBER	15637 271	0.113	WALLACE RD., 200 FT S OF MT ZI ON RD BRIDGE PEPLACEMENT	294	BR C RIC P RIC C	57		120 47						1		сонит

RICHL	AND COUNT	TFANSEC	RTATIO	U IMPECASMENT PROGRAM									·					
с о и н т т	R O U T E	S E C T !	L E B G T	LOCATION AND TERMINA	T A L C O S F	T Y P E E D	H A S E O F W			(RE OF COST \$1,000) CAL YEAR	s		S A D F D E T L A H H E F / G R	E	T E R B E R A I	I H S A C N	E SA PG OE NN SC IY B
		(EM)	(EH)		\$1000	D H Ü	G R K	**** 1996 ****	1997	1928	1999	2000	2001	R E A C	о С Т	G E	0 0 5	E
	R545 (PDMS) HUMBER	009.930 15778 292		RESURFACING	386	OHI			286							3	x	STATE
	R546 (PDMS) HUMBER	002.633 NOME 291		2 LANE RESURFACING	638	OHI	C.		638								x	STATE
	R603 (PDMS) HUMBER	013.080 12274 293		RESURFACING	5.2	он1	Ċ		53								х	STATE
	R603 (PDMS) NUMBER	11.813 13365 266	0.097	0.16 MI S OF SR 96 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	466	OHI OHI OHI SE	C F R C	190			285 3 78					1	A	STATE
FROJ.	ALL SYST (PDMS) NUMBER	EMS NOHE 990		RAIL HIGHWAY CROSSING SAFETY	*	OHI OHI STS STS			* * *					Х				STATE
	(PDMS)	EMS NONE 991		HIGHWAY PLAUBING AND RESEARCH	*	HER OHI FL STS	p P		*									
PROJ.	ALL SYST (FDMS) DUMBER	EMS - NOUE - 992		PPE. OF IND. PROGRAM DOC. AND PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO LPAS	*	OHI STS	•		*									
L												!						

RICHI	AND COUNTY	TRAUSFO	OFTATIC	NI IMPROVEMENT FROGRAM				-							•				
C O U N T Y	R O U T E	S E C T 1 O N	L E H G T H	LOCATION AND TERMINI	TOTAL	T Y P E F	PHASE OF W				RE OF COS (\$1,000) SCAL YEAR	's		S A C F I I Y A O C E F I Y A G R) 3 , R	w s	T H E R I B	A C N E G E I N	E SA PG OE NN SC IY B
		(1.61)	(1.61)		\$1000	N D	R K	1	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	R E		U C	G C		E E
PROJ.	ALL SYSTE (PDMS) HUMBER	ноне		RIDESHARE FROGRAM	*	CMA OHI GTS	Į.		* *							1	S S		STATE
PROJ.	ALL SYSTE (PDMS) NUMBER	NONE 994		BRIDGE INSPECTION	*	ek oht	P P		*										
PROJ.	ALL SYSTE (PDMS) NUMBER	EMS NONE 995		R/W HARDSHIP & PROTECTIVE BUYING	*	UH OHT STS	R R		* *								x		STATE
PROJ.	ALL SYSTE (FDMS) NUMBER	NONE		TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACT IVITIES	*	OHI STS			*								x		STATE
FROJ.	ALL SYSTE (PDMS) NUMBER	MS HONE 197		ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENTS	*	OHI STS	P P		*										
PROJ.	ALL SYSTE (FDMS) NUMBER	ноив		OPERATIONS DIVISION PESURFACING	*	IM UH OHI STS	0000		* * *						X		x		STATE
PROJ.	ALL SYSTE (PDMS) NUMBER	MS NOHE 999		OTHER OPERATIONS DIVISION PROJECTS	*	IM OHI STS	0000		* * *								х	9	STATE

RICHLAND COUNT	7 Thatch	DETATIO	N IMPROVEMENT PROJEAN			_					······································						
C P O U U U T E Y	8 E C T I O	E H G T H	ŁOCATION AND TERMINI	T 0 T A L C 0 S T	T Y F E O	P H A S E O F			(E OF COST \$1,000) CAL YEAR	S		G A D D E D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D	3 C R C H	E	T I S C C C L	A S A P G O E N N S C I I Y N B
	(EM)	(131)		\$1000	11 11 10	O R E	**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	R E	1 10	`	3 0 E U	E E
RIC ALL SYST PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL HUMBER	TEMS HOHE 999A		NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROJECTS	*	ellt	C.		*								х	STAT
RIC ALL SYST PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL NUMBER	TEMS #KITE 999B		PUBLIC SAFETY 402 SAFETY PROGRAM	*	онт			*					x				STAT
RIC COUNTY WIT PROJ. (PDMS) LOCAL HUHRER	DE HONE	ΠA	TRANSIT PLANNING, CAPITAL & OPERATIONS	1278	FTA FTA MAR MAU OHI OHT RIC RIC SHE SHE	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		404 132 150 148 10 143 17 26 1 70 5									COUNT

RICHL	AND COUNTY	TRANSPO	FTATIO	N IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM											· ·			
C 0 0 T T	R O U T E	8 E C T I O H	L E H G	LOCATION AND TERMINI	TO T	T Y P E E E D	P H A S E O F W			(E OF COST. \$1,000) CAL YEAR	S		n E P /	3 - C R O N S T	E T S H T E A R E E R A I	I H S A C N E G L E A I N N	E SA PG OE NN SC IY B
		(EM)	(EM)		\$1000	H D	O R E	**** 1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	G R R E A C	R II C	G E	E D U	E
PROJ.	COUNTY WID (PDMS) HUHBER	E ионе 999F	na	TRANSIT PLANNING, CAPITAL & GPERATIONS	1292	FTA FTA FTA HAR HAR OHI OHI ONT ONT RIC RIC SHE SHE	\$ 0 0 9 0 0 9 0 0 9 8			418 136 110 154 10 1 147 17 6 27 2 76 5 11 144								COURT
PROJ	COUNTY WID (PDMS) HUMBER	aaag aaag none	na	TRANSIT PLANNING, CAPITAL & OPERATIONS	16	FTA ETTA MAH MAR OHI OHI OHI OHI SHE SHE SHE	040404004				433 140 30 160 10 152 18 28 2 78 5 14							СОИНТ

B1CIII.	AND COUNTY	TEAHSE(kTAT10	H IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM														
C O D B T	R O U T E	8 E C T L	L E U G	FOCULION WHO LEEMINI	T O T A L	T Y P E	P H A S E				E OF COST: \$1,900)	s		S A A B E B T L Y A H	3 - C R O	E S T	O M T I H S E C R E L	H E A S A P G O E
1		ÞI	##		0 3 T	D F	F			FIS	TAL YEAR			U E P / G R		E A	R A I N D E	11 B 1 1 A
		(131)	(EM)		\$1000	р н е	O R E	**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	R E A C	0 C T		3 O E U S S	E
PROJ.	CUNTY WIDE (POMS) HUMBER	399Н 1668	на	TRANSIT PLAUNING, CAPITAL & OPERATIONS	1261	FTA FTA FTA MAU MAN OHI OHT ONT RIC RIC SHE	0101010101					448 144 30 166 11 156 18 29 2 81 5						сони
							1						 	 - -	_	╂┷┼	++	

APPENDIX C

OTHER PROJECTS WITH IMPLEMENTATION STATUS BEYOND 2000

FIRML RICHLAND COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT FROGRAM PREFARED BY THE RICHLAND COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION FISCAL YEARS 1997-2000 06/14/96 15:00:00 FUNDING SOURCE LEGEND HOTES ON PROGRAM FEDERAL 1. FY 96 SHOWN FOR INFORMATION ONLY, FUNDING OBLIGATED OR INCUMBERED BEFORE THE END OF FY 96. BR = BRIDGE PROGRAM 2. PE OR RW COSTS FUNDED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY BWM = BIKEWAY FUNDS, URBAN AT 100% ARE NOT ALWAYS KNOWN AND SHOWN. BWS = BIKEWAY FUNDS, RURAL 3. * IN COSTS INDICATES THAT PROJECTS OF THIS TYPE FTA = TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ARE PLANNED BY THE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY. THE EXACT HES = SAFETY PROGRAM SCOPE AND COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN DETERMINED. THE IM = INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY IS USUALLY THE STATE, THE FUNDS NH = NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM INVOLVED ARE ALLOCATED TO THE STATE AND ARE TO BE RRP = RAILROAD PROTECTION USED WITHIN THE STATE. PRIORITIES ARE THEREFORE RRS = FAILROAD SAFETY ESTABLISHED ON A STATE WIDE BASIS. STC = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION FROGRAM, COUNTY ALLOCATION 4. FY 2001 FOR INFO ONLY, OBLIGATIONS THAT WILL OCCUR STM = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, URBAN ALLOCATION AFTER 2000, FOR PROJECTS WHICH ARE BEING DEVELOPED STS = SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, STATE ALLOCATION AND FOR WHICH OBLIGATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE FOR PE OR CMA = CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY HPR = HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH 5. TEARS HAVE BEEN DETERMINED CONSIDERING PROJECT PL = PLANNNING DEVELOPMENT STATUS (ODOT'S MILESTONE REPORT), LOCAL PRIORITIES, AND YEARLY FUNDING CAPACITY. STATE STATE : OHIO LEGEND FOR PHASE OF WORK C = CONSTRUCTION FOR HIGHWAY, CONSTRUCTION OR CAPITAL POCYF ACQUISITION FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.

- PEXIN AIPPAGE OF PEXINGLON
- MANSF = CITY OF MANSFIELD ONTAR = VILLAGE OF ONTARIO
- CHIAR VIPPAGE OF CHEARIO
- COUNT = RICHLAND COUNTY
- SHELB = CITY OF SHELBY

- O = TRANSIT OPERATIONS.
- P = PE FOR HIGHWAY, PLANNING FOR TRANSIT PROJECTS.
- R = RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION.

RICHLAN	ь солит	Y TRAHSP:	PRTATIO	N IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM							-	-							
С С И И Т Ү	R O H T E	S E C T J O H	L E H G T H	LOCATION AND TERMINI	TOUTH	T Y P E E D	F H A S E O F				RE OF COST (\$1,000) SCAL TEAR	'S		S A D E D T L Y A N U E F / G R	E W - C P O	T E A R E E A I	S E E L	1 P O S I I B	A G E N C
		(1:14)	(EM)		\$1000	и В	R E	**** 1996 ****	1997	1998	1999	2000	**** 2001 ****	R E A C D	H C T	C E	0 U S	E	1
RIC USO PROJ. (I LOCAL NI	PEMS)	00.000 10762 249	26.24	4 - LANE NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS IN CRAWFORD COUNTY FE ONLY, NEW FACILITY	1630	1HO	9.9	1304 326							х			STA	АТЕ
RIC USO: PROJ. (I LOCAL N	PDMS)	15,208 12405 339	7.596	.33 MI. W OF TRIM. TO .20 MI E OF US 42 PE ONLY, MAJOR REHAB & RECON.	2086	0H1	1						1669 417	x		0		STA	АТЕ
RIC USO- PROJ. (LOCAL NI	PDMS)	06.985 4301 28	5.359	LEXINGTON TO MANSFIELD WIDEN & RECONSTRUCTION	6970	ИАМ ПИ ПИ 11HO 11HO 11HO	្នកក្នុងក្នុ	4 1107 38					880 3780 220 945	х		1		STA	\TE
RIC USOA PROJ. (I LOCAL NI	PDMS)	18.588 12013 257	0.241	.17 MI. N OF SR 430, SUBWAY BPIDGE REPLACEMENT	2696	PR BR OH! OH!	3 2 4 5 3				4		160 1560 546 40 390	x		1	A	STA	TE
RIC USOA PROJ. (I LOCAL N	PDM3)	22.563 9086 332A	1.657	US 30 TO .11 MI N OF CRIBER RD HES, WIDEN & RECONSTRUCT	1294	HES HES HES OHI OHI	P C P E	115					231 319 26 91	x		0		STA	TE
RIC SROS PROJ. (E LOCAL NI	PDMS)	09.672 6090 137	1.014	SR 97 & I 71 HES, WIDEH & RECONSTRUCT	718	OHI OHI STS STS	P C P C	6 51					66 595			0	X	STA	TE

APPENDIX D TRANSIT PROGRAM FORMS

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TRANSIT

SUMMARY SHEET

	Total Expendi	tures		Federal F	undina	
F. Y. (begin July 1)	Capital *	Operating	Planning	Capital *	Operating	Planning
1997	158,000	953,900	168,000	150,000	403,000	134,00
1998	138,000	983,000	173,000	130,000	418,000	138,00
1999	38,000	1,012,000	178,000	30,000	433,000	142,00
2000	38,000	1,042,000	183,000	30,000	413,000	146,00
the shade a sll 5240 (0)	ocialized Transportation					

^{*}Includes all 5310 (Specialized Transportation) funds.

^{**} The use of Richland County's FTA Section 9 annual allocation to funds this program is illustrated on the attached table.

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TRANSIT

ANTICIPATED SECTION 5307 PLANNING SCHEDULE

(Thousands of Dollars)

F. Y.	Recipient of funds	Agency Responsible for Project Implementation	Total Project Cost	Fed. Fund. Section 9	State Fund. ODOT	Local Fund. Other	Sect.9 Allocation
1997	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	168	134	16	18	34 from FY97 100 Deobligated RCT Terminal
1998	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	173	138	16	19	99 from FY97 39 from FY98
1999	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	178	142	16	20	94 from FY98 48 from FY99
2000	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	183	146	16	21	84 from FY99 62 from FY2000

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TRANSIT

ANTICIPATED OPERATING SCHEDULE

(Thousands of Dollars)

₹. Y .	Recipient of funds	Agency Responsible for Project Implementation	Oper. Expend.	Oper. Revenues	Net Project Cost	Subsidy Local Other	State	Federal	Sect.9 Allocation
1997	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	954	147	807	261	143	403	106 from FY95 297 from FY96
	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	983	147	836	275	143		29 from FY95 297 from FY97 46 from FY98 46 deobligated from'95 Grant
1999	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	1,012	147	865	289	143	433	251 from FY98 182 from FY99
2000	Richland Cnty Comm.	Richland County Transit Board	1,042	147	895	339	143		116 from FY99 297 from FY200

OHIO TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TRANSIT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

		OAI II AL IIVII	VOAEIMEN 12					
Federal	Recipient	Agency Responsible for	Total	Source of	Amount of	Amnt of	Amnt	Planning
Fund	of funds	Project Implementation	Project	Federal	Federal	State	Local	Document.
Sec. 9	Richland Cnh	Richland County	Cost	Funding	Funding	Funding	Funding	
	Comm.	Transit Board			•		J	
Sp. Tr.	Agency to be	Agency to be						
	determined	determined				ODOT	Other	
F. Y.	Description							
1997	One Wheelch	nair Acc. Replacement	38	Sp. Tr.	30	-	8	95 TSM
	Vehicle			Program			_	
1997	Three Used S	Service Autos for RCT	120		120			95 TSM
	Bus Parts & C	Sarage Equipment for RCT						33 (3.11)
1998	One Wheelch	nair Acc. Replacement	38	Sp. Tr.	30		8	95 TSM
	Vehicle			Program				33 1 3111
1998	One Para-Tra	ansit Replacement Busses	100	Sect. 9 *	100		0	95 TSM
	RCT Service	Truck	ļ				J	00 10111
1999	One Wheelch	nair Acc. Replacement	38	Sp. Tr.	30		8	95 TSM
	Vehicle			Program				
2000	One Wheelch	nair Acc. Replacement	38	Sp. Tr.	30		8	95 TSM
	Vehicle	·		Program				33 13.01
+ 0 1: 1	L ODOT			<u> </u>	<u>-</u>			l .

^{*} Subject to ODOT approval the Governors apportionment of Section 9 funds and Toll Revenue Credit (TRC) will be used to fund these projects. If TRC is not available the RCTB will provide local matching or the project will be delayed.

TABLE 1 -USE OF RICHLAND COUNTY FEDERAL SECTION 9 ALOCATION- 1995-2000

FISCAL YEAR	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	Deobln*	1997	1998	1999	2000	Tr-4-1
Allocation		\$473,873	\$508,260	\$524,472	\$429,874		_ 1	\$429,874	\$429,874		Total
Operating Limit		\$194,310	\$403,253	\$396,140	\$297,105	1.		\$297,105	\$297,105	\$429,874 \$297,105	
Spent							-				
95 Operating	\$141,184		\$282,816					ļ			
95 Planning	\$25,521		\$92,816								\$424,000
95 Cap Misc.	,		\$59,000								\$118,337
95 Cap Terminal			\$73,565	\$193,666	\$132,769						\$59,000
			ψ73,303		φ132,709	ļ	ļ	- <u>-</u>			\$400,000
96 Operating		\$194,310		\$195,190		ļ	ļ	ļ <u>.</u>			
96 Planning		\$130,400		Ψ123,120							\$389,500
96 Capital		\$106,080		\$0	\$0						\$130,400
		1 = 5,500		0 0	\$0			 			\$106,080
97 Operating				\$106,395	\$297,105						
97 Planning				\$100,555	$\phi 297,103$	\$100,000	624.000				\$403,500
						\$100,000	\$34,000				\$134,000
98 Operating				\$29,221		\$46,000	0007 105	0.15.65.			
98 Planning				ΨΕΣ, ΕΕΙ		\$46,000	,	\$45,674		,	\$418,000
							\$98,769	\$39,231			\$138,000
99 Operating								9051 421	0101.5 60		
99 Planning						-	\$0	\$251,431	\$181,569		\$433,000
							\$0	\$93,538	\$48,462		\$142,000
2000 Operating		·							¢115 526	#	
2000 Planning								40	\$115,536	\$297,105	\$412,641
								\$0	\$84,307	\$61,693	\$146,000
Total Spent	\$166,705	\$430,790	\$508,197	\$524,472	\$429,874	\$146,000	\$420 974	\$420.074	¢400.074	#250 #25	
Balance			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	,,,,	¥ 122,074	Ψ170,000	φ442,014	P427,8/4	\$429,874	\$358,798	\$3,854,458
Oper.		\$0	\$120,437	\$65,334	\$0	\$0	\$0	60			
Total		\$43,083	\$63	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	*Funds will	be deobliga		ant \$100.000) from To		40	\$0	\$0	\$71,076	

^{*}Funds will be deobligated 1995 Grant, \$100,000 from Terminal Project & \$46,000 from Operating.