

Cass County Rural Task Force 2026-2029 Call for Projects

Program Guidance Packet

A FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM MANAGED BY THE SOUTHWEST MICHIGAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Introduction

The Southwest Michigan Planning Commission (SWMPC) is pleased to announce the Call for Projects for the Cass County Rural Task Force (RTF) program. Below you will find information on the Rural Task Force, the Call for Projects, and application instructions.

The purpose of this call is to solicit projects from local road and transit agencies to utilize federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds and state Transportation Economic Development Fund-Category D (TEDF-D) funding for fiscal years 2026-2029.

Rural Task Force (RTF)

The Rural Task Force (RTF) is a statewide program with 14 regions, which is charged with determining how to program the federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding and the state Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF) Category D (known as "State D") allocated to rural areas.

Cass County is a part of the Region Four RTF which also includes Berrien and Van Buren counties.

Each county is represented on the RTF by one person from the following agencies:

- County road agency
- Village or city within a rural area
- A rural transit provider

Eligible Applicants

All local road and rural transit agencies within rural areas of Cass County are eligible for RTF funding. The eligible applicants include the following:

- Village of Cassopolis
- Village of Marcellus
- Village of Vandalia

- Cass County Road Commission
- Cass County Public Transit

Eligible Project Costs

Only construction costs are eligible for STBG and State D funding. Preliminary and construction engineering is the responsibility of the project sponsor to complete without STBG funding.

Eligible uses include construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, enhancement, and operational improvements. Right-of-way, construction engineering, and preliminary engineering costs are not eligible.

STBG funding can also fund transit capital projects. Transit projects must also be eligible for FTA funding to use STBG funds. Eligible transit capital projects may include replacement buses and rehabilitation of existing buses, communication equipment, maintenance equipment, operational support equipment, and services, items related to services under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and facility renovations.

Location of Projects

Rural STBG funds must be used on a road that is classified as federal-aid eligible and is within the rural area of Cass County. Rural/urban designations are based on the 2020 Adjusted Census Urban Boundary (ACUB).

A map of road ownership, 2020 ACUB, and functional class can be found here: https://arcg.is/ePvfT

State D funds can only be used on roads classified as All Season. To qualify as an All-Season Road, the road must be built to all-season standards, connect to other all-season routes, and cannot restrict legally loaded commercial vehicles. You can find more information about all season requirements on MDOT's website. To see if a road is currently designated as All-Season please see the MDOT All-Season Road map. If a road is not currently classified as All Season or on the proposed list, a request can be made to reclassify the road which must be voted on at the county RTF meeting before being sent to MDOT. To be reclassified as an All-Season, the road must currently meet the all-season road standards or be reconstructed to All Season standards.

Local Match

STBG can fund up to 81.85% of the total eligible construction costs. The remaining 18.15% must come from a non-federal source of funding. State D can fund up to 80% of total project costs with a 20% match. State D funds may be used as match for federal funds.

Project Selection

SWMPC staff will compile and post candidate project information for a Cass County RTF meeting where the three RTF members from Cass County will review, discuss, and select a fiscally constrained project list to recommend to the Region Four RTF for final approval. Throughout the selection process, the public will have opportunities to be involved and comment on projects. Projects that are not chosen may be added to an illustrative list, meaning that these projects are considered first in line if additional funds become available.

The process for project prioritization has many steps and SWMPC strives to conduct a process that is fair and transparent. SWMPC encourages public input in accordance with the adopted SWMPC Public Participation Plan. The following is the procedure SWMPC will follow in Project selection:

- 1. ACT 51 agencies submit projects using the 2026-2029 RTF Project Application along with supporting documentation.
- 2. SWMPC staff will review project submissions and compile the project information into a spreadsheet, map projects and post project information for the public.
- 3. The County RTF will develop a draft list of funded projects and an illustrative list of projects.
- 4. The selected project list may need to be adjusted to remain fiscally constrained.
- 5. The recommended project lists from each county will be reviewed and approved at the Region 4 RTF meeting.
- 6. SWMPC will submit the approved project list to MDOT for state and federal approval.

Key Dates

Date	Activity	Public Involvement
June 28, 2024	Call for STBG funded projects issued	X
October 4, 2024	Applications due to SWMPC staff	X
October 21, 2024	Submitted projects available for public review and comment	х
November – Early January 2024/2025	County RTF meetings select a fiscally constrained draft list of projects.	Х
January 2025	Full RTF Region 4 review and approval of selected county RTF projects and illustrative list for submission to MDOT.	Х

Illustrative List of Projects

RTF Region 4 will adopt a list of projects that are financially constrained with the amount of STBG and State D funding available for programming. Applications not included in the fiscally constrained list will be placed on an illustrative list of projects, ranked in priority order based on the project's evaluation score. Should additional funding become available, projects on the approved illustrative list will be considered for funding. This illustrative list will be in effect only until the adoption of the next programming cycle.

General Considerations for Federal Funding

Projects carried out using USDOT funds must comply with applicable provisions in Title 23 of the United States Code dealing with Federal-aid highways, such as project agreements, authorization to proceed prior to incurring costs, prevailing wage rates (DavisBacon), Buy America, competitive bidding, and other contracting requirements, regardless of whether the projects are located within the right-of-way of a Federal-aid highway.

Applicants are urged to familiarize themselves with Title 23 requirements. Federal aid, including STBG, is generally most efficiently used for major road rehabilitation or reconstruction. The administrative burden of a federal-aid project can be substantial. Thus, a small project is often best accomplished with local funds to avoid this burden.

Application Instructions

The fillable PDF application is attached to the email sent out for the Call for Project. The application can also be found here: https://www.swmpc.org/downloads/rtf 20262029 application.pdf.

A sample application is attached to this packet.

The application includes several questions that require road data. You can find the required information through the following links:

- PASER Rating
- Average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume
- National Functional Classification (NFC) click on the road to get the NFC
- All Season Road Status check yes if the road is either All Season or Proposed All Season
- Crash Data

The applicant must fill out a separate application for each project for which they are applying for, with each road segment being considered a separate project. Although this is a call for the 2026–2029 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), projects approved and programmed for 2026 do not need to reapply.

All applications are due on Friday, October 4, 2024

Please save your final file in the following format: AgencyName_ProjectName.dox.

Please email the completed application to both Brandon Kovnat at kovnatb@swmpc.org and Kim Gallagher at gallagherk@swmpc.org. Please include "NATS STBG Application" in the subject line.

NOTE: SWMPC staff will contact you with an email confirmation of your submitted application. If you do not receive an email confirmation, please contact a SWMPC staff member.

Rural Task Force Region Four 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Project Application

If you need assistance, please contact Brandon Kovnat, SWMPC Transportation Planner Email kovnatb@swmpc.org or call (269) 925-1137 x 1524

Applicant Information	
Agency Name:	
Contact Name:	Title:
Email Address:	Phone Number:
Engineer/Consultant:	Company:
Email Address:	Phone Number:
Project Description	
Project Name/Road Name:	
Project Limits (From/To):	
Project Length (to the nearest hundredth of a mile): miles	
City, Village, or Township:	
Additional location description if needed	
Major Work Type:	Preferred Year of Funding:
Detailed Work Description (Include all work items as part of this replacement, guardrail, tree clearing, grading, culvert replacement	•
Describe any non-participating work if applicable	
What is the need and purpose for this project (what issues are be	ing addressed by the proposed work)
If you are submitting multiple applications, please rank your appli	ications by priority. Rank: of

Ρ	ro	pc	S	ed	В	ud	g	et
---	----	----	---	----	---	----	---	----

	Amount	Percent of Total
Total Participating Construction Estimate	\$	100 %
STBG Requested	\$	%
State D Requested	\$	%
Local Match	\$	%
	\$	%
	\$	%

Are the other funding sources secured? Yes □ No □ If no, provide details on	when these funds will be secured
Non-Participating Cost Estimate:	\$
Total Project Estimate with Non-Participating:	\$
Are you willing to contribute additional local match above the minimum 18.15%	required: Yes 🗆 No 🗆
Are you willing to use an Advance Construct (AC):	Yes □ No □
If so, what is the maximum Amount:	\$
Estimated Project Schedule	
Activity	Date (Month/Year)
NEPA/SHPPO Submitted	
Right-of-Way Certification Submitted	
Grade Inspection (GI) Completed	
Full Biddable Package Submitted to MDOT	
Project Letting	
Construction Start	
Project Completion	
System Preservation	
What is the most recent PASER rating (https://www.mcgi.state.mi.us/tamcMap/)	;
Do the project limits begin or end at a road with a PASER of 7 or higher:	Yes □ No □
Which MDOT guidelines will the project use:	
What is the expected increase in Remaining Service Life (RSL):	Years
What is the current state of drainage on the road:	

Regional Significance		
What is the average annual daily traffic (AADT	') volume for the limits of this project?	Vehicles/day
What is the National Functional Classification	(NFC) of the road:	
Is the project on a All Season Route		Yes □ No □
Safety		
For the questions below use the five-year total	als from 2019-2023 (https://www.michigantra	fficcrashfacts.org/)
All Crashes	Pedestrian and Bicycle Cras	<u>hes</u>
Total number of crashes:	Total number of crashes:	
Number of fatalities:	Number of fatalities:	
Number of Serious Injuries:	Number of Serious Injuries:	
List the safety countermeasures included in the Use the attached list of countermeasures and		
Counter Measure	Crash Type Addressed	Does this address a fatal or serious injury crash
Improved pavement markings	Angle, Rear-End Crashes	Yes □ No ⊠
		Yes □ No □
Complete Streets		
complete streets		
Are there existing pedestrian and/or bicycle for	acilities within the limits of the project? If so, p	olease explain
Describe any improvements to pedestrian and	d/or bicycle facilities included with the project	:
Will the new/improved pedestrian and/or bic or one that is planned to be completed before		icycle facility Yes □ No □
Does your agency have a policy for maintainir bike lanes and pedestrian pathways/sidewalk		e, such as Yes \square No \square

Accessibility and Equity				
Is the project located in a Disadvantaged Community (DAC), as identified by the Climate and Environmental Justice Screening Tool (https://screeningtool.geoplatform.gov/):			Yes □	No □
Does this project remove a priority ADA barrier, as identified in an adopted ADA Transition Plasimilar plan?	an or		Yes 🗆	No □
Strategic Planning & Investment				
The project crosses jurisdictional boundaries.		,	Yes □	No 🗆
The project will coordinate with other infrastructure projects (i.e. utility, water, sewer, etc.)		,	Yes □	No 🗆
The Project is identified in a pavement asset management plan		,	Yes □	No 🗆
There is an asset management plan covering utilities along the length of the project			Yes □	No 🗆
The city/village/Township has adopted an asset management policy			Yes □	No 🗆
The project supports goals or objectives from another planning document (ex. master plan or	rec pla	n)	Yes □	No 🗆
If the project supports goals or objectives in another planning document please identify the pgoals or objectives, and describe how this project will help achieve them	ılan, spe	ecify the	e releva	nt
Risk Assessment				
Does right of way need to be acquired?	Yes \square	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Does the project intersect with a railroad crossing?	Yes □	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Does the project require utility relocation?	Yes □	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Are the project limits within a defined FEMA floodplain?	Yes □	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Will there be trees removed within the project limits?	Yes \square	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Is the project within 100 feet of a cemetery?	Yes \square	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Are there historic elements withing 100 feet of the proposed work*	Yes □	No □	Unkno	wn 🗆
Describe approximately how many individual mature trees or acres of trees will be re	moved	if appl	icable	

^{*} Historic elements include any of the following if they are 50 years old or older: **objects** (ex. Statues or monuments), **structures** (ex. bridges, stone curbs, or brick streets), intentional/designed landscapes, **buildings**, **Historic districts**, **intentional/designed landscapes**

Existing and Proposed Roadway Design

					1				
	Existing				Proposed				
Number of	Through	Center Tui	rn	On Street Parking		Through	Center Tur	'n	On Street Parking
lanes	Lanes:	Lane (Y/N)):	(Y/N):		Lanes:	Lane (Y/N)	:	(Y/N):
Shoulder	☐ Paved ☑ Unpaved Width		npaved Width: Ft.			□ Paved □	Unpaved	Wid	th: Ft.
Sidewalk/ path	Placement		Widt	h: Ft.		Placement		Wid	th: Ft.
On road	o Bike Lane	:S	o 0	ther (Specify)		o Bike Lane	S	o C	ther (Specify)
bicycle	o Sharrows					Sharrows		_	
facilities	○ Wide Shoulders ○ None			o Wide Sho	ulders	o N	lone		
				☐ Replaceme	nt of utilitie	es			
Utilities Utility Work is needed					☐ Relocation of utilities				
	☐ Water/Sewer Work is needed		☐ Sewer and/or water line work			rk			
					_				

Applicant Acknowledgements

By signing below, the project sponsor ensures that they have read and understood the appropriate federal guidance and agree to follow all applicable federal regulations and requirements from the acceptance of federal funds, should this project receive an award. In addition, the project sponsor acknowledges the potential loss of federal funds if the project is not obligated within the programmed fiscal year or if Michigan Department of Transportation statewide obligation limitations have been met.

Certification of Matching Funds

By signing below, the Project Sponsor assures that sufficient funds are available to pay any costs above the awarded federal fund amount and that completion of this project is not contingent upon additional grants (the sources of matching funds may be changed after STBG funding has been awarded, in accordance with all established TIP amendment guidelines).

Name:	Title:
-------	--------

SEGMENT CRASH REDUCTION FACTORS

Proposed Improvement	% Reduction	Associated Crash Types
	tric Safety Enhar	
	80%	Rear-End Left-Turn
	50%	Head-On Left-Turn
Center Left-Turn Lane - Construct	20%	Head-On, Angle, Sideswipe*
	15%	Non Left-Turn Rear-End, Other*
	65%	Rear-End Right-Turn
	30%	Angle
Right-Turn Lane - Construct	15%	Rear-End
•	10%	Other*
Horizontal Curve Flattening	30%	Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 1' each side)	5%	Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 2' each side)		Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 3' each side)		Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 4' each side)		Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 5' each side)	+	Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 6' each side)		Lane Departure***
Shoulders - Widen to Standard Width (add 7' each side)		Lane Departure***
Vertical Curve Modification	20%	All Applicable Crash Types +++
Superelevation Correction	20%	Lane Departure***
<u> </u>	l Segment Enhar	
Access Management - Improve	15%	Drive-way Related Applicable Crashes
<u> </u>	44%	K and A injury Applicable Crashes
	46%	Single Vehicle Run off Road Left Crashes
Centerline Rumble Strips - Install	43%	Sideswipe Same Crashes
	55%	Sideswipe Opposite Crashes
High Frieding Confees Treatment (noted)	35%	Wet Crashes
High Friction Surface Treatment - Install	20%	All Other Applicable Crashes
Recessed Durable Pavement Markings	5%	All Applicable Crashes
D 10: 1/401 0 : 1 1 1 1 1	50%	Suburban - All Applicable Crashes
Road Diet (4-3 Lane Conversion) - Install	30%	Urban - All Applicable Crashes
Shoulder Rumble Strips	20%	Run-Off the Road Right Crashes
Signing/Delineation on Horizontal Curves (Including	20%	Lane Departure***
Recessed Durable Pavement Markings) - Install		·
Install Edgelines - Where none currently exist	15%	Lane Departure*** (CMF Clearing House ID 10243)
HMA Safety Edge Improvement	13%	All non-intersection crashes
	dside Enhancen	nents
Fixed Objects From Clearzone (Trees, Culverts, Etc.) - Removal	75%	Fixed-Object Applicable Crashes
Considerally Instally	55%	Lane Departure *** Fatalities and "A" Injury Crashes
Guardrail - Install	7%	Lane Departure *** B/C/O Applicable Crashes
Slope Flattening	15%	Fixed-Object, Overturn Applicable Crashes
Living Snow Fence	20%	Crashes due to wintry surface conditions
Lighting - install on segment	20%	Dark Unlighted Crashes

INTERSECTION CRASH REDUCTION FACTORS

Proposed Improvement	% Reduction	Associated Crash Types
Signal Timin	g / Hardware En	hancements
Install Reflectorized Backplates	15%	All Applicable Crashes
Add All-Red Clearance Interval - Add per ITE	20%	Head-On Left-Turn, Angle
Yellow-Change Interval - Increase	10%	All Crash Types
	65%	Angle
	-25%	Rear-End (Increases Crashes)
Box Span Signal - Upgrade from Stop Control	20%	All Other Non Rear-End Crashes
Box Span Signal - Upgrade from Diagonal Span	10%	All Applicable Crashes+
Protected Left-Turn Signal Phase - Add	30%	Left-Turn
Signal Head Size - Increase to 12 "	10%	All Applicable Crashes +
Signal Optimization & Timing Updates	10%	All Applicable Crashes +
Removing Night Flash from Signal Timing	50%	Nighttime Flash mode Related Crashes
	n Geometric Enl	_
	80%	Rear-End Left-Turn
	50%	Head-On Left-Turn
Center Left-Turn Lane - Construct	20%	Head-On, Angle, Other
	15%	Non Left-Turn Rear-End
	30%	Angle
Intersection Improvements (Realignment, Sight-	15%	Rear-End
Distance Improvements, Radii Improvements, Etc.)	10%	Head-On, Sideswipe, Pedestrian, Bicycle, Left-Turn Related
Offset Left-Turn Lane - Construct	65%	Angle-Turn, Head-On Left-Turn
Offset Left-Turif Lane - Construct	20%	Rear-End Left-Turn
	65%	Angle-Turn
Offset Right-Turn Lane - Construct	50%	Other Applicable Crashes
	20%	Rear-End Right Turn
Right-Turn Lane - Construct	65%	Rear-End Right-Turn
- Ingrit rum zume Gombinati	20%	Applicable Rear-End Crashes, Sideswipe Same Direction
Roundabout	78%	Fatal and A-Injury Reduction
	57%	Minor Crash Reduction
		n-Signalized Intersections)
All-Way Stop Control - New Installation	60%	All Applicable Crashes
Ground Mounted Flashing Beacons (Red)- Install **	30%	All Crashes On Install Approach
Ground Mounted Flashing Beacons(Amber) - Install **	20%	All Crashes On Install Approach
Signing - Improve/Upgrade	30%	Angle, Rear-End Crashes
Pavement Markings - Improve/Upgrade	30%	Angle, Rear-End Crashes
Reflective Sheeting on Sign Posts (lollipops)	15%	All Applicable Crashes

NON-MOTORIZED CRASH REDUCTION FACTORS

Proposed Improvement	% Reduction	Associated Crash Types				
Pedestrian / Bicycle Enhancements						
Pedestrian Refuge Island - Install	50%	Pedestrian Crashes (Review NCHRP Report 841)				
Bump Out / Curb Extension - Remove Parking / Install	30%	All Crashes				
Bicycle Lanes - Intersections, Install per standards	25%	Bicycle Crashes				
Bicycle Lanes - Segments, Install per standards	50%	Bicycle Crashes				
Shared Use Path - Install	33%	Bicycle and Pedestrian Related Crashes				
Sidewalk for Pedestrians - Construct	85%	Pedestrian Crashes				
	75%	Pedestrian Fatal - Dark Unlighted Crashes				
Intersection Lighting - install	40%	Pedestrian A-Injury - Dark Unlighted Crashes				
	30%	All Applicable Dark Unlighted Crashes				
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (HAWK Signals) - Install	55%	Pedestrian Crashes (CMF ID 9020)				
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons	47%	Pedestrian Crashes				
Ped. Countdown Signals - Install new Pedestrian signal	30%	Pedestrian Crashes				
Ped. Countdown Signals - <i>Upgrade from existing Pedestrian signal</i>	25%	Pedestrian Crashes				

Notes:

- * "Other" includes other crash which might be mitigated by the addition of a right-turn lane in the judgment of the crash analyst
- ** applies to new installation or with removal of existing overhead flashing beacon
- *** "Lane departure" crashes include the following types: Fixed Object, Overturn, Sideswipe Opposite, Sideswipe Same and Head-On (Run off Road Right/Left Crashes)
- + All Applicable Crash Rear End, Angle Crashes, Sideswipe Same. The Crashes should occur at The signal that is being upgraded. Does not include driveway and anima
- +++ All Applicable Crash Types Lane Departure, Fixed Object, Angle Crashes, Sideswipe Oppisite, Sideswipe Same. The crashes should occur on or near a vertical curve

REFERENCES:

The references listed below are the sources recognized by MDOT for obtaining crash reduction factors.

- MDOT Safety Programs Unit Crash Reduction Factors (As recommended by K. Kunde. P.E.); October, 1986
- 2) Selection Process for Local High Safety Projects, Transportation Research Record 847: 1982
- 3) UKTRP 85-6, University of Kentucky; March, 1985
- 4) Desktop Reference for Crash Reduction Factor, Federal Highway Administration. 2007
- 5) NCHRP Report 617: Accident Modification Factors for Traffic Engineering and ITS Improvements , TRB 2008
- 6) Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/index.cfm , 2009
- 7) Safety Edge https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/hsis/11025/11025.pdf
- 8) Removing Night Flash https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/hsis/13069/index.cfm
- 9) RRFBs CMF Clearinghouse ID 9024