

AGENCY ORGANIZATION

The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments (OKI) is the planning agency designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the greater Cincinnati area. Although OKI currently maintains an interdisciplinary staff dealing with planning issues in the environmental and regional development sectors, among others, the agency was initially formed to assist the region in meeting the “continuing, comprehensive and cooperative” transportation planning requirements of the 1962 Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The OKI region is composed of eight counties in three states: Butler, Clermont, Hamilton and Warren counties in Ohio; Boone, Campbell and Kenton counties in Kentucky; and Dearborn County in Indiana.

OKI is governed by a Board of Directors comprised of approximately 117 members representing elected officials from each member County, cities over 5,000 persons, county planning agencies, residents, transportation/transit agencies, townships over 40,000, associations representing townships under 40,000 and other elected or responsible persons. The Board of Directors meets on a quarterly basis. An Executive Committee of approximately 40 members of the Board meets monthly to review and direct the activity of the staff.

The Intermodal Coordinating Committee (ICC) meets on a monthly basis and makes recommendations to the Executive Committee. The ICC is composed of 68 members representing local governments and other area organizations whose position and experience enable them to assist the Executive Committee in the evaluation of the technical aspects of regional planning.

The Prioritization Subcommittee, which meets on an as needed basis, deals with all aspects of the preparation, maintenance and amendment of the TIP, including ensuring the precepts of Transportation System Management (TSM) are applied in the process of short range planning—especially in the development of projects included in the TIP. The Prioritization Subcommittee is composed of the ICC, as a whole, with representation from the Board of Trustees. This representation ensures the Board has input and knowledge of highway and transit projects as they are advanced to the TIP.

LONG RANGE PLANNING

An important aspect of the long range planning process is the Long Range Plan (LRP). The LRP is a statement, expressed in terms of capital projects, of the transportation system requirements needed to serve the forecasted travel demand for some specified future year, generally twenty years from the study baseline. The OKI Board of Trustees adopted the *2030 Regional Transportation Plan—2004 Plan Update* in June 2004. Capacity-adding projects that are listed in the TIP must first be listed in the LRP and be

financially and air quality constrained. This ensures that the TIP is consistent with the current OKI LRP.

The scoring process by which new highway and transit projects are evaluated and added to the TIP encourages the maintenance of the existing transportation system by placing emphasis on expanding modal alternatives and improving the transportation system’s efficiency. This emphasis on maintenance of existing facilities in the TIP also provides consistency with the OKI LRP.

The OKI FY 2008 – 2011 TIP includes projects for improving highways that are accompanied by recommendations for improving bus service; advanced technologies to move traffic more efficiently; projects to help reduce drive-alone commuting including; ridesharing; bicycle and pedestrian projects; and upgrading highway operating efficiency.

The emphasis on adequately maintaining the existing highway structure is shown in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 includes all highway projects in the region, including operational and maintenance projects listed in the Line Items section of the TIP; Table 2 includes highway projects in the region funded with OKI sub-allocated funds, including SNK funds in northern Kentucky.

These tables compare capacity adding vs. operational/maintenance projects contained in the FY 2008 – 2011 TIP. The figures indicate a focus on capacity projects from operation/maintenance, but they also demonstrate that the existing transportation system in the OKI region is being adequately operated and maintained. Some capacity projects, such as the IR 75 widening, include an operation/maintenance component, which is not reflected in the operation/maintenance costs shown below. Costs shown are in millions.

Table 1
All Capacity Adding and Operation/Maintenance Highway Projects
In the OKI Region (millions)

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	Percents
Capacity projects	\$314.1	\$362.4	\$75.9	\$144.2	68.1%
Operation/Maintenance	\$180.0	\$107.8	\$84.1	\$47.1	31.9%
Totals	\$494.1	\$470.2	\$160.0	\$191.3	

Table 2
Capacity Adding and Operation/Maintenance Highway Projects
Funded in part with OKI sub-allocated Federal Funds—STP, CMAQ, TE and SNK
In the OKI Region (costs shown are the amount of OKI funds, in millions)

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	Percents
Capacity projects	\$0.92	\$20.27	\$2.90	\$13.30	35.9%
Operation/Maintenance	\$17.22	\$11.27	\$26.60	\$11.75	64.1%
Totals	\$18.14	\$31.54	\$29.50	\$25.05	

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

The concept of Transportation System Management (TSM) has come to be recognized as an essential element of transportation planning. TSM is a process of broadening the range of alternatives that should be evaluated in addressing a transportation problem. Multi-modal perspective and system efficiency improvements are the governing considerations, rather than the immediate choice of new construction as the solution to the problem. TSM is equally useful in long-range and short-range transportation planning situations.

During the evaluation process of potential projects to be added to the TIP using OKI sub-allocated federal funds, each project is evaluated whether it is a TSM (replacement) project or a new construction (expansion) project. The TIP is consistent with the OKI LRP in awarding more points to projects that improve system efficiency rather than add system capacity. For example, an intersection improvement project that improves the flow of traffic through the intersection, and related corridor, will receive higher points than a project that adds capacity by adding through lanes to a roadway. If the project also includes a park-and-ride facility, to encourage multi-modal use, it will receive even more points. The ICC is charged with the responsibility for assessing the impact of TSM type projects and which projects are selected for funding in the TIP.

The Project Scoring Process shown in Appendix 2 illustrates how both highway and transit projects in Ohio and Kentucky are evaluated based on their TSM approach to transportation planning—whether the project is replacement or expansion in nature or a blend of the two. Projects emphasizing more replacement than expansion receive higher points. In addition, the other factors used in evaluating potential highway and transit projects are shown and include such items as safety, existing condition and anticipated results of the proposed project. Highway and transit projects are first scored separately using transportation factors and then both types of projects are compared using planning factors, items that should have been considered early in the developmental phase of the project.

The Project Scoring Process was updated in 2006 to reflect recommendations made during the FHWA/FTA Certification Review in December 2004. Specifically, a point system for freight corridors was added to award more points for projects with a high percentage of truck traffic. In addition, the Title VI rating system for Environmental Justice communities was updated to incorporate not only the burdens but also the benefits of a project into the point system.

On January 10, 2006, the ICC adopted the Project Scoring Process for projects located in Northern Kentucky and funded with OKI sub-allocated SNK funds. The scoring process uses the same factors as those for Ohio projects requesting OKI sub-allocated STP or CMAQ funds and is shown in Appendix B.

In Indiana, given the limited amount of sub-allocated federal STP and CMAQ funds, staff works with Dearborn County officials and the results of corridor and other planning studies to determine which highway projects to fund.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The TIP is a compilation of all publicly assisted transportation programs, including both highway and transit projects, constrained to available funding levels and prioritized by need. It is the region's program for transportation improvement--the mechanism by which local governments, acting together in a coordinated effort, place system improvements in a comprehensive view to allocate limited resources in the most beneficial manner to the region. Upon adoption by the OKI policy board (Board of Directors or the Executive Committee) the TIP becomes a policy document that directs the flow of transportation improvements in the region.

Inclusion in the TIP is a prerequisite for federal funding assistance. Any project phase must be included in the document in order to receive federal authorization in the current year. Once authorized, that particular phase does not need to be included in the TIP once it has been completed. In Ohio and Indiana, highway projects are historically divided into three phases: preliminary engineering (P), right-of-way acquisition (R), including utility relocation if needed, and construction (C). In Kentucky, highway projects are divided into five phases: preliminary engineering/early public coordination (P), design (D), right-of-way (R), utility relocation (U), and construction (C). These phases are staged over a period of years and advance with the project's progress. Since the construction phase is the final step, the project is no longer included in the TIP once it has been awarded, or let, to a contractor. For transit projects, the project is removed once the Federal Transit Administration approves the grant.

Highway projects may also be removed upon request of the sponsoring agency. This may occur as the agency revises its funding priorities or the cost of a project increases beyond what was originally planned. Newly developed projects are added to the TIP in two ways. At various times during the year, the OKI policy board will act on a resolution

amending the TIP to modify existing projects or add new ones. Alternatively, when the TIP is updated every two years, and presented to the policy board for adoption, it includes all newly developed projects funded with OKI sub-allocated federal funds that are recommended by the Prioritization Subcommittee and the ICC. This process is subject to some limitations related to air quality conformity analysis that must be conducted on capacity adding projects listed in the TIP. Capacity projects typically include roadway widening projects that provide additional through lanes on a highway.

A listing of all highway projects that have been implemented since the last TIP was adopted in April 2005 is shown in Section 1, later in the TIP. Table 3 provides a list of major highway projects that have been delayed past their anticipated implementation date or have been cancelled.

Table 3 -- FY 2006 – 2008 TIP Projects Delayed or Cancelled

<u>PID</u>	<u>Location</u>	
6-219.00	BOO-Airport	Construct infrastructure for biodiesel fuel--cancelled
6-219.00	BOO-IdleAire	Construct an idleaire facility--cancelled
6-4.00	BOO-KY 237	Construct southbound left turn lane--cancelled due to future widening on KY 237 in project area
6-5.00	BOO-KY 237	Construct northbound left turn lane--cancelled due to future widening on KY 237 in project area
25308	BUT-SR 4	Crack sealing between Hamilton & Middletown--cancelled
78073	BUT-CR 20	Project moved from FY 2008 to FY 2009 per sponsor
77099	BUT-US 27	Project moved from FY 2008 to FY 2009 per sponsor
75303	CLE-SR 125	Project moved from FY 2008 to FY 2009 per sponsor
75679	CLE-IR 275	Crack sealing in Clermont County--cancelled
25385	District 8	District-wide pavement markings in FY 06--cancelled
22380	HAM-US 22	Bridge painting--cancelled
22836	HAM-US 22	Resurfacing in Norwood--cancelled
75718	HAM-US 22	Install rigid overlays--cancelled
77484	HAM-US 27	Project moved from FY 2008 to FY 2009 per sponsor
20082	HAM-US 50	Project moved from FY 2008 to FY 2010 per sponsor
25346	HAM-IR 71	Crack sealing in Hamilton County--cancelled
25196	HAM-IR 71	Microsurface a portion of IR 71--cancelled
75676	HAM-SR 126	Crack seal--cancelled
75675	HAM-IR 275	Crack sealing in Hamilton County--cancelled
6-999.00	KEN-KY 16	Construct several left turn lanes--cancelled
6-995.00	KEN-KY 17	Construct a northbound left turn lane--cancelled
NP	WAR-CR 19	Deleted from TIP
77743	WAR-SR 122	Urban paving in Middletown--cancelled

PRIORITIZATION

The process of prioritizing projects on a region level requires the MPO take a lead role in providing a forum for cooperative decision-making. With the limited nature of federal funds, and the necessity for scarce state and local funds to match these funds, it is incumbent upon local governments, acting cooperatively, to identify those projects and programs that will be most beneficial to the region.

In the OKI region, the ICC, with its Prioritization Subcommittee, provides the mechanics for prioritizing highway and transit projects using OKI sub-allocated federal funds that are included in the TIP. It is the responsibility of this group, with staff assistance, to evaluate existing and newly developed projects to form the TIP. This action takes place with a list of recommended projects for inclusion in the TIP presented to the policy board.

The ICC's work in prioritizing projects is guided by the *OKI Prioritization Process*. The document describes the overall process and details the individual criteria used in evaluating projects. These criteria, along with their corresponding points, are shown in Appendix B. While there have been several versions of this document to accommodate changes brought about by the enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act (ISTEA) in 1991, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in 1997 and the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users in 2005, the ICC adopted the latest version in January 2006. The latest version includes a freight factor that awards points for projects with high truck traffic volumes as a percentage of LOS, an updated Title VI/Environmental Justice factor that examines the benefits, as well as the burdens, of projects and a land use conformance factor.

The flexible funding component of the process allows both highway and transit projects to compete for federal funds allocated to OKI. These include Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds in Ohio and Surface Transportation Program funds for Northern Kentucky (SNK) in Kentucky. Transportation Enhancement funds may also be used to fund portions of highway projects that "enhance" the project such as sidewalks, lighting or landscaping.

AIR QUALITY

Transportation conformity is a mechanism to ensure that federal funding and approval are given to those transportation activities that are consistent with the air quality goals of the State Implementation Plans for Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio. Pursuant to provisions of the CAAA of 1990, U.S. EPA designated a nine county area in the Cincinnati area as a basic nonattainment area for ozone under the eight-hour ozone standard in April 2004. The Cincinnati ozone nonattainment area includes Lawrenceburg Township in Dearborn County Indiana, the Kentucky counties of Boone, Campbell and Kenton, and the Ohio counties of Butler, Clermont, Clinton, Hamilton and Warren. Clinton County is outside of the MPO, but is part of the nonattainment area. As such, Clinton County emissions are reported as part of this conformity determination. In

December 2004, U.S. EPA designated an eight county area as nonattainment for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) under the annual PM_{2.5} standard. The boundaries of the PM_{2.5} nonattainment area are identical to ozone nonattainment area excluding Clinton County, OH. The Warren County cities of Carlisle and Franklin, and Clinton County are outside of the OKI region, but are part of the nonattainment area. The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) is the lead planning agency for Carlisle and Franklin. Mobile source emissions from within those cities have been included in this conformity determination. The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) is the lead planning agency for Clinton County. The Clinton County emissions analysis has been prepared by ODOT and has been included in this conformity determination.

OKI has determined that the FY 2008-2011 TIP and the amended *OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan* are consistent with the air quality goals of SIP and the interim conformity requirements under the 8-hour ozone standard and the annual PM_{2.5} standard. OKI's quantitative conformity findings for ozone-forming emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) are found in Table 3. The Clinton County conformity findings, as provided by the Ohio Department of Transportation, are also shown in Table 4. Table 5 shows the quantitative conformity finding for annual PM_{2.5} emissions and annual NO_x emissions.

Table 4 - Conformity Findings for Ozone-forming Mobile Emissions

(tons per day)

Nonattainment Area Within a Portion of Dearborn County

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
Dearborn IN (p) VOC 2002 Baseline	0.64	0.64	0.64
Dearborn IN (p) VOC Emissions	0.50	0.34	0.31
Dearborn IN (p) NO _x 2002 Baseline	1.71	1.71	1.71
Dearborn IN (p) NO _x Emissions	0.90	0.39	0.29

Northern Kentucky Nonattainment Sub-Area

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
N. Kentucky VOC 2002 Baseline ¹	10.78			
N. Kentucky VOC 15% Plan Budget	9.94			
N. Kentucky VOC Budget		7.68	7.68	7.68
N. Kentucky VOC Emissions	7.54	7.09	4.94	5.05
N. Kentucky NO _x 2002 Baseline	28.02			
N. Kentucky NO _x Budget		17.42	17.42	17.42
N. Kentucky NO _x Emissions	18.60	16.91	7.41	5.70

Southwest Ohio Nonattainment Sub-Area

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
SW Ohio VOC 2002 Baseline	60.9			
SW Ohio VOC 15% Plan Budget	57.2			
SW Ohio VOC Budget		26.2	26.2	26.2
SW Ohio VOC Emissions	37.5	26.0	22.3	22.0
SW Ohio NO _x 2002 Baseline	116.3			
SW Ohio NO _x Budget		39.5	39.5	39.5
SW Ohio NO _x Emissions	71.4	39.1	27.0	20.0

Clinton County, Ohio Nonattainment Sub-Area

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
Clinton County, OH VOC Budget	2.42	2.42	2.42	2.42	2.42
Clinton County, OH VOC Emissions	2.41	1.95	1.78	1.02	0.96
Clinton County, OH NO _x Budget	3.45	3.45	3.45	3.45	3.45
Clinton County, OH NO _x Emissions	3.40	2.80	2.55	1.05	0.77

Table 5 - Quantitative Conformity Findings for Annual PM_{2.5} Mobile Emissions and Annual NO_x Mobile Emissions

(tons per year)

Nonattainment Area Within a Portion of Dearborn Co., IN

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
Dearborn IN (p) Direct PM _{2.5} 2002 Annual Baseline ¹	9.76	9.76	9.76
Dearborn IN (p) Direct PM _{2.5} Annual Emissions	5.71	3.72	3.67
Dearborn IN (p) Annual NO _x 2002 Baseline ¹	571.28	571.28	571.28
Dearborn IN (p) Annual NO _x Emissions	298.65	128.55	95.13

Northern Kentucky Nonattainment Sub-Area

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
N. Kentucky Direct PM _{2.5} 2002 Annual Baseline	164.68	164.68	164.68
N. Kentucky Direct PM _{2.5} Annual Emissions	99.88	66.28	69.75
N. Kentucky Annual NO _x 2002 Baseline	9509.84	9509.84	9509.84
N. Kentucky Annual NO _x Emissions	5549.15	2412.56	1864.96

Southwest Ohio Nonattainment Sub-Area

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
SW Ohio Direct PM _{2.5} Annual Baseline	710.6	710.6	710.6
SW Ohio Direct PM _{2.5} Annual Emissions	398.7	249.5	248.3
SW Ohio Annual NO _x 2002 Baseline	38057.8	38057.8	38057.8
SW Ohio Annual NO _x Emissions	21344.4	8834.7	6542.8

A summary of OKI's air quality conformity findings are as follows:

- VOC and NO_x emissions in OKI's portion of the nonattainment area do not exceed the corresponding 2002 baseline emissions, nor the VOC 15% Plan budget (Kentucky and Ohio portions), for the attainment year.
- VOC and NO_x emissions in the Kentucky and Ohio portions of the nonattainment area do not exceed the 1-hour SIP budget for any analysis year.
- Annual Direct PM_{2.5} and annual NO_x emissions in the PM_{2.5} nonattainment area do not exceed the 2002 baseline emissions for any analysis year.
- OKI qualitatively finds no factors in the TIP or the amended OKI *2030 Regional Transportation Plan* that would cause or contribute to a new 8-hour ozone violation or exacerbate an existing violation in the years preceding the first analysis year.
- OKI qualitatively finds no factors in the TIP or the amended OKI *2030 Regional Transportation Plan* that would cause or contribute to a new annual PM_{2.5} violation or exacerbate an existing violation in the years preceding the first analysis year.
- OKI qualitatively finds that no goals, directives, recommendations or projects identified in the FY 2009-2011 TIP and amended *OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan* contradicts in a negative manner any specific requirements or commitments of the applicable state implementation plan.

The applicable implementation plan does not contain any transportation control measures (TCM's), therefore, nothing in the FY2008-2011 TIP or the amended *OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan* can interfere with their timely implementation.

Details of the conformity determination are provided in the technical document "Air Quality Conformity Determination for FY2008-2011 TIP and Amendment 4 to the OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan – Technical Documentation", April 2007.

FINANCIAL CAPABILITY

In order to satisfy FTA's requirement concerning the assessment of financial capability on the part of the local sponsors of major new capital undertakings, OKI staff has sought additional information, where appropriate, to assist in the review of projects in the TIP. These items represent either replacements or investments of a fiscally appropriate nature.

FISCAL CONSTRAINT

An additional feature of the TIP is that the projects listed in the document are financially constrained. All highway and transit programs list associated funding sources and amounts that are needed to complete the projects.

In Ohio, ODOT allocates STP, CMAQ and Transportation Enhancement funds to OKI for the fiscal years covered by the current TIP. Table 6 illustrates the federal funding, by type, allocated from ODOT to OKI for fiscal years 2007 through 2011 and the associated programmed amounts.

Table 6

FY 2008-2011 TIP Fiscal Analysis

State Fiscal Year		STP	CMAQ	TEA	TOTAL
2007	Carryover - 6/30/06	18,334,353	8,262,849	956,430	27,553,632
	FY 2007 Allocation	20,660,736	7,610,004	1,049,935	29,320,675
	Federal Funds Available SFY 2007	38,995,089	15,872,853	2,006,365	56,874,307
	Federal Funds Programmed SFY 2007 Amount Overprogrammed SFY 2007	26,131,160	9,432,159	1,776,492	37,339,811 0
2008	Projected carryover - 6/30/07	12,863,929	6,440,694	229,873	19,534,496
	FY 2008 Allocation	20,129,622	5,299,787	1,900,681	27,330,090
	Federal Funds Available SFY 2008	32,993,551	11,740,481	2,130,554	46,864,586
	Federal Funds Programmed SFY 2008 Amount Overprogrammed SFY 2008	13,202,952	10,794,837	1,785,000	25,782,789 0
2009	Projected carryover - 6/30/08	19,790,599	945,644	345,554	21,081,797
	FY 2009 Allocation	19,224,375	9,870,990	1,922,438	31,017,803
	Federal Funds Available SFY 2009	39,014,974	10,816,634	2,267,992	52,099,600
	Federal Funds Programmed SFY 2009 Amount Overprogrammed SFY 2009	25,899,370	13,166,595	806,880	39,872,845 0
2010	Projected carryover - 6/30/09	13,115,604	-2,349,961	1,461,112	12,226,755
	FY 2010 Allocation	19,405,909	9,964,201	1,940,591	31,310,701
	Federal Funds Available SFY 2010	32,521,513	7,614,240	3,401,703	43,537,456
	Federal Funds Programmed SFY 2010 Amount Overprogrammed SFY 2010	20,280,000	15,031,823	0	35,311,823 0
2011	Projected carryover - 6/30/2010	12,241,513	-7,417,583	3,401,703	8,225,633
	FY 2011 Allocation	19,599,968	10,063,844	1,959,997	31,623,809
	Federal Funds Available SFY 2011	31,841,481	2,646,261	5,361,700	39,849,442
	Federal Funds Programmed SFY 2011 Amount Overprogrammed SFY 2011 Balance end of SFY 2011	15,516,870	6,471,131	0	21,988,001 0 17,861,441

The Ohio fiscal analysis shows that the OKI budget is fiscally constrained through the period fiscal year 2008 through 2011.

Table 7 provides information on the fiscal constraint analysis for Northern Kentucky. Unlike the Ohio Department of Transportation, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet

does not pass through Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funding to its MPOs, nor does it require constraint against a pass-through obligation ceiling.

Table 7
FY 2008 – 2011 Northern Kentucky STP (SNK Funds)

Year	Allocations
FY 2008	\$3,600,000
FY 2009	\$6,100,000
FY 2010	\$4,405,000
FY 2011	\$4,405,000

Table 8 provides information on the fiscal constraint analysis for Dearborn County, Indiana.

Table 8
FY 2008 – 2011 Federal Spending Authority – Dearborn County, Indiana

Year	STP Allocations	CMAQ	Total
FY 2008	\$77,126	\$97,298	\$174,424
FY 2009	\$77,126	\$97,298	\$174,424
FY 2010	\$77,126	\$97,298	\$174,424
FY 2011	\$77,126	\$97,298	\$174,424

See page 63 for the Regional Fiscal Constraint Table which lists federal, state and local funding amounts and sources for highway projects for the region.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The projects shown in Section 1 (beginning on page 11) reflect the progress made in implementing the highway programs in the previous TIP. The majority of projects that were anticipated to advance were sold and removed from the TIP. OKI expended available funding up to the obligation ceiling. This included a major effort toward VMT and VHT reduction in response to ozone alert periods.

TITLE VI/PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

OKI greatly expanded the role of the Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee with the development of the FY 2004 – 2007 TIP and continued that role with the FY

2008 – 2011 TIP. Each project considered for inclusion in the FY 2008 – 2011 TIP using OKI sub-allocated federal funds was reviewed by OKI’s Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. The committee awarded points based upon the anticipated impacts and benefits of a project on an environmental justice community. The point structure is shown on page B-9 for projects affecting environmental justice communities.

A copy of the minimal public involvement requirements for applicants seeking federal funds through OKI is shown in Appendix A. These requirements ensure that public involvement and Title VI compliance is achieved by project applicants and OKI throughout the development of the TIP.

The draft TIP was presented for public comment at a formal public hearing on March 12, 2007 held at the OKI offices. Announcement notices were published in the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, *The Spanish Journal* and the *Cincinnati Herald*. In addition, the notice was placed on the OKI website. The Provisions for Public Hearings, as listed on page 9 of the OKI Policy for Environmental Justice, was followed. Comments will be accepted thirty days before and thirty days after the public hearing and may be submitted to OKI in writing or by e-mail.

Once the OKI Participation Plan is adopted in 2007, all public input requirements for the TIP will follow this plan.

For comments on the TIP, OKI will maintain a separate record of comments for subsequent incorporation into the summary of comments prepared in conjunction with the public hearing on the TIP. If the TIP is changed significantly from the initial document made available for public comment and raises new issues, then OKI will provide additional opportunity for public comment on the revised document. All comments will be subjected to a summary of analysis to determine the appropriate response that is required.

The TIP will be on review at each of the Ohio MPOs and Ohio Department of Transportation District Offices as part of the statewide STIP/TIP review period, with appropriate newspaper announcements coordinated by ODOT. In addition, the TIP will be made available for review at the KYTC – District 6 office in Fort Mitchell, Kentucky and the INDOT district office in Seymour. A copy of the draft OKI FY 2008 – 2011 TIP was placed on OKI’s website with information on how comments about the document could be sent.

TIP AMENDMENTS/ADMINISTRATIVE CORRECTIONS

Occasionally, TIP amendments will be needed when project information currently listed in the document needs to be changed or projects need to be added or deleted. Project sponsors, such as the Departments of Transportation, local communities or transit

agencies will inform OKI when such changes are needed to reflect current conditions for transportation projects. Any capacity adding project must already be listed in the OKI Long Range Plan before inclusion in the TIP. These amendments are presented in resolution form to the ICC and the Board of Directors/Executive Committee for approval.

Some changes to a transportation project are minor and only require an administrative correction to show the change in the TIP. Typically, these minor changes involve a movement of a particular phase of a project from one fiscal year to another, within the four-year planning horizon of the TIP, or a minor change in the funding amount. Any change in scope to a project would require a TIP amendment.

Table 9
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used in the “phase” column of the highway reports for each county:

- P – Preliminary Engineering (Ohio and Indiana)
- D – Design (Kentucky)
- R – Right-of-Way (Includes utilities in Ohio and Indiana)
- U – Utilities (Kentucky)
- C – Construction

The following abbreviations are used in the “fund type” column of the highway reports to describe the type of funding associated with a project, whether federal, state or local.

APP	Appalachian
BR	Bridge Replacement
BRO	Federal Bridge Replacement On Federal System
BRX	Federal Bridge Replacement On or Off Federal System
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality
HES	Federal Safety Hazard Elimination
IM	Interstate Maintenance
NHS	National Highway System
NPDP	National Planning and Development Program
OKI-CMAQ	OKI’s Sub-allocated CMAQ funds (Ohio and Indiana)
OKI-ENH	OKI’s Sub-allocated Enhancement funds (Ohio)
OKI-STP	OKI’s Sub-allocated STP funds (Ohio and Indiana)
SAF	Safety
SNK	OKI’s Sub-allocated STP funds (Northern Kentucky)
STP	Surface Transportation Program
STP-E	State Enhancement Program
TCSP	Transportation & Community and System Pilot Preservation Program

