STPMM Category 7 Call for Projects

for

KILLEEN – TEMPLE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Proposal Description
Federal Highway Administration
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)
Surface Transportation Program Metropolitan Mobility—Category 7
(FYs 15/16)

Central Texas Council of Governments
2180 N. Main
Belton, Texas 76513
(254) 770-2210

ISSUE DATE: September 25, 2015

RESPONSE DEADLINE: November 10, 2015

KILLEEN – TEMPLE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Call for Projects
Instructions

The Central Texas Council of Governments on behalf of the Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization, Belton, Texas is soliciting project proposals for:

Federal Highway Administration
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21)
Surface Transportation Program Metropolitan Mobility—Category 7 (FYs 15/16)

General Information

The Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization hereinafter referred to as KTMPO serves as the planning organization for the federally designated Transportation Management Area located in the Central Texas area. The KTMPO boundary covers all of Bell County and parts of Lampasas and Coryell Counties along with portions of Fort Hood. The Central Texas Council of Governments (CTCOG) serves as the lead agency staff for the KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board.

KTMPO is issuing a Call for Projects (CFP) to utilize federal funding available through the Surface Transportation Program Metropolitan Mobility—Category 7 (STPMM). The CFP is available on the KTMPO website at www.ktmpo.org and describes detailed activities which need to be completed for submission of a project. Any revisions or updates to the CFP will be posted on the KTMPO website. Questions about the CFP may be sent via fax to: Jason Deckman, (254) 770-2376 or email to: jason.deckman@ctcog.org. Questions will be addressed upon receipt. A proposers' conference will be held 10:00 a.m., October 7th in the CTCOG offices located at 2180 North Main, Belton, Texas 76513. Questions regarding the CFP must be received by end of the proposers' conference. The final Q&A document will be posted on the KTMPO website by close of business on October 9, 2015.

One original of the project response must be received at the CTCOG **by 12 noon CST on November 10, 2015.** Email submissions are acceptable and must be received by the same deadline.

Submission of Project Proposals

By Mail
Central Texas Council of Governments
Attention: Jason Deckman
P.O. Box 729
Belton, Texas 76513

Hand Delivery
Central Texas Council of Governments
Attention: Jason Deckman
2180 North Main
Belton, Texas 76513

By Email
jason.deckman@ctcog.org

Project Proposals submitted must be marked:
"Confidential – STPMM Category 7".

Part I

Proposal Selection Process

The proposals will be evaluated by the KTMPO Staff and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC will rank the proposals and provide a recommendation to the Transportation Planning Policy Board (TPPB). Final approval of selected projects for funding will be made by the KTMPO TPPB. However, the KTMPO reserves the right to select an independent review team for the purpose of CFP evaluation should the need arise. The following considerations apply to the selection process:

A. All proposals considered must be received on time and be responsive to the CFP instructions. Project submissions that do not meet the deadline or are not responsive will not be considered for scoring or selection. Factors that will deem a proposal as non-responsive are:

- i Response does not meet the minimum matching fund requirements (minimum 20% non-federal funds);
- ii Agreement to meet TxDOT deadlines for "Advance Funding Agreements" is not officially signed; See Exhibit D.

B. Lead agencies may submit up to 3 projects.[1] All projects will be scored and ranked. Projects not able to be funded with current allocation will remain on the prioritized list of projects and may be selected as future funding becomes available.

C. Partner agencies may participate with more than one responding Lead agency.

D. Paper responses must be on 8 ½" x 11", 8 ½" x 14" or 11" x 17" only.

E. Electronic responses must be formatted for 8 ½" x 11", 8 ½" x 14" or 11" x 17" output only.

F. Responses may be submitted for all funding available or a portion of the budget shown in **Part IV**.

G. KTMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members may have questions about respondent's proposals as part of their review. Respondents must have a representative available during the KTMPO TAC scoring meeting to address specific questions committee members may have. Formal presentations are not required but are optional. Presentations will be limited to five (5) minutes per lead agency. The KTMPO TAC meeting will be held: **December 2, 2015**, **9:30 a.m., at the CTCOG office, 2180 North Main, Belton, Texas 76513**.

H. The KTMPO Transportation Planning Policy Board will base final selection on the evaluation factors exhibited in the evaluation criteria (Part II of this document).

I. Final selections will be posted on the KTMPO website following the Policy Board's approval (*anticipated December 16, 2015*).

[1] Project review minimum eligibility requirements are part of Exhibit A on page 15. Concerns regarding eligibility of a project should be directed to KTMPO staff. Staff will consult with TxDOT as needed to ensure eligibility.

Part II

Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization
Category 7—STPMM
FY 15/16 Scoring Criteria

Pts	Criteria	Notes	Points	Score	Notes
15	Congestion	Current LOS: A or B - 0pts C or D - 3 pts E or F - 5 pts For new roads - identify the current LOS on the connecting and/or parallel roadways. Choose the lower letter value and score accordingly.	5		Objective See Tab A
		LOS change: Compare build vs no-build. No change - 0 pts LOS increase by 1 letter - 5 pts LOS increase by 2 or more letters - 10 pts	10		Objective
15	Safety	Crash Rate – Crashes per Million Vehicle Miles Traveled	5		Objective- See Tab B
		Narrative describing safety improvements	10		Subjective
15	Connectivity	Narrative describing how this project improves connectivity. Examples: Added capacity, turn lanes, median, flyovers, roundabouts or diverging diamond interchange	15		Subjective
10	Traffic (ADT)	Show existing and projected volumes (For proposed project, take average of ADT on connecting or parallel roadways.)	10		Objective - See Tab C
10	Multi-modal	Describe how project design integrates, encourages or enhances use of other transportation modes.	10		Subjective
10	Regional Benefit	How does this project impact regional movement of people and/or vehicles?	3		Subjective
		Project is already in an entity's approved plan? One plan: 1 pt Two or more plans: 2 pts	2		Objective
		Principal Arterial or greater: 5 pts Minor Arterial: 3 pts Major or Minor Collector: 1 pt	5		

Pts	Criteria	Notes	Points	Score	Notes
5	Community Support	Is there funding available from community partner(s)? No – 0 pts Yes – 2 pts	2		Objective
		What level of funding match will partners contribute? No match: 0 Up to 5%: 1 pt Over 5%: 3pts	3		
5	Project Readiness	PE Completed - 2 pt All ROW Acquired - 1 pt Environmental Clearance initiated - 1 pt Utilities coordination – 1 pt	5		Objective
5	Economic Benefit	Describe how the project will enable economic development opportunities? For example: Commercial or Industrial development, freight movement, employment, etc.	5		Subjective
5	Environmental Effects	Describe how project may affect air quality (reduced congestion or emissions). Will this project impact environmentally and/or culturally sensitive areas? Does this project incorporate **Context Sensitive Solutions, landscaping, or other features** in order to enhance aesthetics and quality of life?	5		Subjective
5	Socioeconomic effects (including Environmental Justice)	Sponsor must compare **planned benefit** against **adverse impacts** to the surrounding neighborhood.	5		Subjective - sponsor must make the case for benefits versus impacts of project
		Staff identifies project in or adjacent to (1/4 mile) **EJ area**	Flagged by staff		Subjective
100			Total Score:		

*Maps depicting Environmental Justice areas in the KTMPO region available at: http://bit.ly/KTEJ_15.
Maps are also available on the KTMPO website at www.ktmpo.org, *Planning* page, *Plans,* bottom of page.

Tab A: Level of Service

Roadway Type	V/C ratios				
	A	B	C	D	E
1 - Freeway	0.29	0.47	0.68	0.88	1.00
2 - Multilane Arterial	0.29	0.47	0.70	0.95	1.00
3 - Arterial/Collector	0.29	0.47	0.50	0.90	1.00

Present LOS	Future LOS (Build)	Change in LOS	
A	A	No change in LOS	0 points
C	B	LOS increase by one letter	5 points
D	C		
D	A	LOS increase by more than one letter	10 points
F	B		

Tab B: Safety

CRASH RATE FORMULAS PER 3 YEARS

The formula for calculating the crash rate for a roadway segment is presented below. The "Rate" (R) is expressed in crashes per Million Vehicle Miles Traveled (MVMT), which is standard to the Traffic Engineering profession. The "per 3 year" formula provides an overall average rate for an area.

$$\textbf{Crashes Per Mile} = \frac{\textbf{(3 years crash total)}}{\textbf{(3 years) x (section length)}}$$

$$\textbf{Crash Rate} = \frac{\textbf{(3 years crash total) X 1,000,000}}{\textbf{(3 years) x (ADT) X (365 days/year) x (section length)}}$$

Tab C: Traffic Counts

Existing Facilities		
	Existing ADT (average if proposed)	Projected ADT
Over 40,000	5	5
Less than 40,000	4	4
Less than 20,000	3	3
Less than 10,000	2	2
Less than 5,000	1	1

Part III

CFP Conditions

1. KTMPO reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals submitted.

2. This CFP does not commit KTMPO to pay for any cost. Selected Responses will be added to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). After completion of this task, all communication about contracts and funding will occur between the project sponsor/lead agency and the Texas Department of Transportation District Office.

3. The intent of this CFP is to identify the various project alternatives and estimates of costs. KTMPO is under no legal requirement to execute a contract from any response submitted.

4. Respondent agencies shall not make contact with, or make offers of gratuities or favors, to any officer, employee or member of the KTMPO. Questions should be directed only to the CFP contact person (see pg. 2). Violation of this instruction may result in immediate rejection of the proposed project.

5. All Responses received and their accompanying attachments will become property of KTMPO after submission and materials will not be returned.

6. The contents of a selected Response may become contractual obligations with the Texas Department of Transportation, if a contract is awarded. Failure of the proposer to accept those obligations may result in the cancellation of the Response for selection.

7. KTMPO reserves the right to select more than one Response from the Responses received.

CFP Background and Funds Available

The Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization has received authority to allocate certain federal transportation funds in Fiscal Year 2015 and 2016. Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) legislation allocated federal funds through the Surface Transportation Program for transportation needs within the boundaries of designated metropolitan planning areas (MPAs) of metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) located in a transportation management area (TMA). These funds are referred to as Surface Transportation Program Metropolitan Mobility funds or STPMM funds. TxDOT categorizes these dollars as "Category 7."

KTMPO became eligible to receive STPMM funds in FY13 due to its designation as a TMA. The Category 7 funds may be used for a variety of projects to include roadway, transit, or bike/pedestrian projects. To use these funds, a minimum 20% match is required. Category 7 funds do not have to be obligated during the fiscal year for which they are allocated, but may roll over to the next year and be combined with following fiscal year funding. Funds are available for obligation for a period of 3 years after the last day of the fiscal year for which the funds are authorized. (Example: FY 15 funds must be obligated by September 30, 2018).

The KTMPO Policy Board authorized 10% of the STPMM funds to be dedicated to transit projects. See table below for breakdown of funding.

Summary of Anticipated STPMM Funding for KTMPO

	STPMM Funding	10% Dedicated to Transit Projects	20% match	80% available	90% Remaining for Other Projects	20% match	80% available
FY15	$4,896,055						
FY16	$3,560,000						
Total	$8,456,055	$ 845,606	$169,121	$676,484	$ 7,610,450	$1,522,090	$6,088,360

Note: Funding is estimated and subject to revision.

Funding Features: See Attachment A for background information and eligibility requirements.

Attachment A—Funding Features

US Department of Transportation—Federal Highway Administration
Surface Transportation Program (STP)—MAP-21 Fact Sheet

Program purpose
The Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals.

Statutory citation(s): MAP-21 §1108; 23 USC 133

Funding features
Funded by contract authority from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. Funds are subject to the overall Federal-aid obligation limitation.

MAP-21 has a new approach to core formula program funding, authorizing a lump sum total instead of individual authorizations for each program. Once each State's share of the total is calculated, it is divided up by program within the State. (Go to source website to see "Apportionment" fact sheet for description of calculation).

<u>Set-asides</u>
From the State's STP apportionment, the following sums are to be set aside:

- A proportionate share of funds for the State's Transportation Alternatives (TA) program. (Go to source website to see "Apportionment" fact sheet for a description of this calculation)
- 2% for State Planning and Research (SPR). [§52005; 23 USC 505]
- For off-system bridges, an amount not less than 15% of the State's FY 2009 Highway Bridge Program apportionment (may not be taken from amounts suballocated based on population).

The set-aside for Transportation Enhancements is eliminated.

<u>Suballocation</u>
50% of a State's STP apportionment (after TA and SPR set-asides) is to be obligated in the following areas in proportion to their relative shares of the State's population--

- *Urbanized areas with population greater than 200,000* – This portion is to be divided among those areas based on their relative share of population, unless the Secretary approves a joint request from the State and relevant MPO(s) to use other factors.
- *Areas with population greater than 5,000 but no more than 200,000* – Projects in these areas are to be identified for funding by the State in consultation with regional planning organizations, if any.
- *Areas with population of 5,000 or less*

The remaining 50% may be used in any area of the State.

Federal share: Determined in accordance with 23 USC 120, including a special rate for certain safety projects and a new provision for increased Federal share for projects incorporating Innovative Project Delivery. Exceptions to 23 USC 120 are provided for certain freight projects, workforce development, training, and education activities, and Appalachian development highway system projects. (See "Federal Share" fact sheet).

Eligible activities
STP eligibilities are continued, with some additions and modifications. Eligibilities are described below, with changes emphasized in bold text:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, **preservation**, or operational improvements for highways, **including designated routes of the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) and local access roads under 40 USC 14501**.
- Replacement, rehabilitation, **preservation, protection**, and anti-icing/deicing for bridges **and tunnels** on any public road, including construction or reconstruction necessary to accommodate other modes.
- Construction of new bridges **and tunnels** on a Federal-aid highway.
- **Inspection and evaluation of bridges, tunnels and other highway assets as well as training for bridge and tunnel inspectors.**
- Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, including vehicles and facilities used to provide intercity passenger bus service.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, **including electric and natural gas vehicle charging infrastructure**, bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways, and ADA sidewalk modification.
- Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, **installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges**, hazard eliminations, mitigation of hazards caused by wildlife, railway-highway grade crossings.
- Highway and transit research, development, technology transfer.
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management and control facilities and programs, including advanced truck stop electrification.
- Surface transportation planning.
- **Transportation alternatives** --newly defined, includes most transportation enhancement eligibilities. [See separate "Transportation Alternatives" fact sheet]
- Transportation control measures.
- Development and establishment of management systems.
- Environmental mitigation efforts (as under National Highway Performance Program).
- Intersections with high accident rates or levels of congestion.
- Infrastructure-based ITS capital improvements.
- Environmental restoration and pollution abatement.
- Control of noxious weeds and establishment of native species.

- **Congestion pricing projects and strategies, including electric toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs**.
- **Recreational trails projects.**
- **Construction of ferry boats and terminals.**
- **Border infrastructure projects.**
- **Truck parking facilities.**
- **Development and implementation of State asset management plan for the NHS, and similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads.**
- **Surface transportation infrastructure modifications within port terminal boundaries, only if necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of the port.**
- **Construction and operational improvements for a minor collector in the same corridor and in proximity to an NHS route if the improvement is more cost-effective (as determined by a benefit-cost analysis) than an NHS improvement and will enhance NHS level of service and regional traffic flow.**
- **Two eligibilities formerly covered by the repealed Highway Bridge Program (HBP)—**
    - **Construction of a bridge that replaces a low water crossing of any length, a bridge that was destroyed prior to January 1, 1965, a ferry that was in existence on January 1, 1984, or any road bridge rendered obsolete by a Corps of Engineers (COE) flood control or channelization project and not rebuilt with COE funds.**
    - **Actions to preserve or reduce the impact of a project on the historic integrity of a historic bridge under specified conditions.** [§1111; 23 USC 144(f)-(g)]

Workforce development, training, and education activities are also an eligible use of STP funds. [§1109; 23 USC 504(e)]

Location of Projects

In general, STP projects may not be on local or rural minor collectors. However, there are a number of exceptions to this requirement. A State may use up to 15% of its rural suballocation on minor collectors. Other exceptions include: ADHS local access roads, bridge and tunnel replacement and rehabilitation (not new construction), bridge and tunnel inspection, carpool projects, fringe/corridor parking facilities, bike/pedestrian walkways, safety infrastructure, Transportation Alternatives, recreational trails, port terminal modifications, minor collectors in NHS corridors, and the two new bridge eligibilities brought over from the HBP.

Program features

Off-system bridges

- States are required to obligate a portion of funds (not from suballocated amounts) for bridges not on Federal-aid highways (off-system bridges). The amount is to be not less than 15% of the State's FY 2009 Bridge Program apportionment. The Secretary, after consultation with State

and local officials, may reduce a State's set-aside requirement if the State has insufficient off-system bridge needs.

- Credit for off-system bridges -- For projects to replace or rehabilitate deficient off-system bridges funded wholly by State/local sources, any amounts spent post-enactment that are in excess of 20% of project costs may be credited to the non-Federal share of eligible bridge projects in the State.

Rural minor collectors

Special rule allows States to use up to 15% of funds suballocated for areas with a population of 5,000 or less on rural minor collectors. The Secretary may suspend permission if the State is using the authority excessively.

Bridge and tunnel inspection standards

If a State is in noncompliance with bridge/tunnel inspection standards established by the Secretary, a portion of STP funds must be used to correct the problem. [§1111; 23 USC 144(h)(5)]

Performance

The STP supports national performance goals, but there are no measures tied specifically to this program.

Page last modified on December 23, 2014. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/factsheets/stp.cfm

Order of Submission

All Responses submitted **must** be in the following order (please do not attach Parts I thru IV):

- **Exhibit A** - Proposal Summary Form
- **Exhibit B thru B4** – Description of Project
- **Exhibit C thru C2–** Budget Form
- **Exhibit D -** Certification Form

Exhibit A

KTMPO

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM

FOR

STPMM (FY15/16)

Project Name:

_____
Lead Agency

_____
Address, City, State & Zip Code

_____
*Project Contact Name *Phone Number

_____
Project Contact Email Address

_____
Authorized Signature

_____
Printed Name

_____
Date

**Note: Name and phone number of person who will either be present or available to answer questions at KTMPO Technical Advisory Committee meeting on December 2, 2015.*

Please briefly demonstrate how the proposed project meets the following minimum eligibility requirements:

Proposed project is consistent with the KTMPO area long-range goals:

Proposed project has an identified local funding source for mandatory 20% match requirement:

Proposed project has a project readiness and implementation timeline:

Exhibit B--Category 7 Project Nomination Form

Required attachments:

- ☐ Project location map
- ☐ Typical Cross Section Diagram
- ☐ Other Supporting Documents (Right of Way approval, Railroad agreements, Engineering plans, Environmental studies, Resolutions, etc.

City:	County:

Project Name:
Limits from: Limits to:
Project length (miles):
Project description:

Estimated Let date:
Estimated Completion Date:

Project readiness:	Status
Preliminary Engineering	
Right of Way Acquired	
Environmental Review	
Utilities Coordination	

Functional Classification:
- ☐ Major or Minor Collector
- ☐ Minor Arterial
- ☐ Principal Arterial or greater

www.txdot.gov/apps/statewide_mapping/StatewidePlanningMap.html

Is this project listed in one or more approved plans?

KTMPO

Exhibit B

Category 7 Project Nomination Form

Community Support - Funding by sponsor and/or partners as percent of total project cost:

Enter narrative descriptions in the appropriate sections (refer to scoring criteria). Each block will expand to fit entered text.

Safety:

Connectivity:

Economic Benefit:

Environmental Effects:

Regional Benefit:

KTMPO

Multi-Modal:

Socioeconomic Effects:

Exhibit B1 thru B3
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM—METROPOLITAN MOBILITY
Description of Project
Required Attachments

Please provide the following as attachments to this Exhibit:

Exhibit B1 – Project Location Map

Exhibit B2 – Typical Cross Section Diagram

Exhibit B3 – Any other supporting documentation such as; Right of Way District approval, Railroad agreement, engineering studies, environmental studies, etc.

Exhibit B4
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM—METROPOLITAN MOBILITY
Description of Project
Assurances, Permits and Clearances

Each project will have to undergo ENV review and clearance should it be selected for funding. Please indicate any permits and clearances that you foresee may be required for the project area/activities.

Please circle appropriate sections and provide comments for any "No" answers. Any additional comments are welcomed

1.	Is this project independent of any current or planned TxDOT project in the area?	Yes	No	N/A
2.	If the project is within TxDOT ROW, has the District approved it? (Provide document)	Yes	No	N/A
3.	If the proposed work below is located within or adjacent to a TxDOT highway:			
	(a) Lighting: Has the appropriate lighting type and height for a highway been provided?	Yes	No	N/A
	(b) Signals/signage: Has appropriate type and placement been provided, if applicable?	Yes	No	N/A
4.	Does this project appear to conform to AASHTO standards and ADA requirements?	Yes	No	N/A
5.	Does the proposal appear free of pedestrian/vehicular conflicts?	Yes	No	N/A
6.	Does the proposal address all foreseeable engineering concerns and associated issues?	Yes	No	N/A
7.	Do the location, budget, and proposed activities appear appropriate and sufficient for the project?	Yes	No	N/A
8.	Have all known environmental concerns that may be associated with the proposed activities been considered in the nomination and budget?	Yes	No	N/A

If a project nomination includes:

9.	Locations inside a FEMA flood plain: Are possible hydraulic concerns considered in the budget?	Yes	No	N/A
10.	Landscaping: Does the project consider erosion control, irrigation, xeriscaping, and maintenance?	Yes	No	N/A
11.	Bicycle facilities: Is the proposal compatible with the municipality's bicycle plan?	Yes	No	N/A
12.	Encroachment or crossing RR property: Is RR Agreement provided?	Yes	No	N/A
13.	Trails and walkways: Has safety lighting/illumination been provided?	Yes	No	N/A
14.	Historic brick street preservation: Has an engineering study been performed to determine the appropriate speed limit and the brick's glazing/skid factor? (Is document provided?)	Yes	No	N/A
15.	Historic preservation: Does the budget include costs for demolition, disposal, and mitigation?	Yes	No	N/A
16.	Historic bridge restoration: Has the structural load and span capacity been considered in the placement and adaptive reuse of the bridge for pedestrian/bicycle use?	Yes	No	N/A
17.	Historic bridges: Have approaches, extensions, and relocation cost been considered in the proposal?	Yes	No	N/A

Exhibit C

Surface Transporation Program--Metropolitan Mobility

Budget Summary

Killeen-Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization

	Agency Name	STP-MM Federal Funds	* Non-Federal Matching Funds		Total
		Dollar Amount	Source of Funds	Dollar Amount	
Lead Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
Partner Agency					$ -
	TOTAL COST	$ -		$ -	$ -
	PERCENTAGES	- - %		- - %	- - %

**** Must be a minimum Non-Federal match of 20%***

Exhibit C1

Killeen - Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM--METROPOLITAN MOBILITY

NAME OF PROJECT

Name of Agency (Please provide separate line item budgets for each partnering agency)

Line Item Proposed Budget

Item No.	Quantity	Unit	Item Description	Unit Cost	Amount
					$ -
					$ -
					$ -

Exhibit C2
Killeen – Temple Metropolitan Planning Organization
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM—METROPOLITAN MOBILITY
Resolutions

Please provide the resolution form from the appropriate governing body that approved the Exhibit C financial commitments.

Exhibit D

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM—METROPOLITAN MOBILITY

TxDOT ADVANCE FUNDING AGREEMENTS

I, hereby acknowledge and understand that TxDOT requires "Advance Funding Agreements" once a project has been selected by the KTMPO. I also understand that these agreements are time sensitive and will return them within the specified deadlines as designated by the TxDOT Waco/Brownwood District office.

Name of Authorized Representative	Title
Signature	Date