Ms. Britta Stein  
FHWA TN Division  
404 BNA Drive, Suite 508  
Nashville, Tennessee 37217

Re: FY 2008-11 TIP Amendments for Nashville Area MPO

Dear Ms. Stein:

We are requesting approval of the attached Amendment 71 to the Tennessee State’s Transportation Improvement Program. I have attached an amendment package which includes amendment number 2011-019 to the Nashville TIP.

The following information is included:

1. A checklist indicating that all requirements for amendments were met. This checklist is based on submitted assurances from the Nashville Metropolitan Transportation Organization. TDOT Local Programs office is in concurrence with the amendments to the STIP.

2. A letter from the MPO listing the amendments being made. The letter states that the changes leave the plan financially constrained. We have independently verified these figures and agree with this statement.

3. A resolution, properly signed by the TIP Chairman of the MPO Executive Board and the MPO director.

4. A Transportation Conformity Checklist.

5. Individual project sheets for each project. In the case of amended or adjusted projects, there are two sheets. One is labeled “original” and shows the project funding prior to the amendment/adjustment. The other is labeled “revised” and shows the project funding following the amendment/adjustment.

7. Two sets of financial summary sheets. One shows the funds disposition prior to the amendments. The second sheet shows the funds disposition after the changes to the TIP.

8. A spreadsheet showing the individual projects and each of the fund groups where there is a change.

The Nashville MPO has provided documentation that the public involvement process was followed and this amendment leaves the TIP financially constrained.

Based on a review of the attached material, we believe that the MPO has followed appropriate procedures and met all requirements necessary to permit approval of this amendment and request your concurrence with this assessment.

I trust this information is sufficient to allow approval of the presented amendments. If we need to provide any additional information please contact Larry McGoogin at 615-532-3160 or Larry.McGoogin@tn.gov.

Sincerely,

Teresa Estes
Transportation Coordinator

TE/Irm

cc:   Michael Skipper, Nashville Area MPO
      Felix Castrodad, Nashville Area MPO
      File
bl/cc:
Paul Degges
Chris Christianson
Jim Moore
Angie Midgett, w/attachment
Rick Pack w/attachment
Ronnie Porter, w/attachment
Ben Tyree, w/attachment
File, w/attachment
Book, w/attachment
Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Review Checklist

☐ Rural STIP Amendment  ☐ MPO STIP Amendment

Metropolitan Planning Organization: Nashville MPO STIP #71

Or

Rural County(s): ________________

Amendment is adding un-programmed Federal Funds?
   ☑ Yes – proceed with checklist  ☐ No

Amendment is adding a new project?
   ☐ Yes – proceed with checklist  ☐ No

Amendment changes an existing project scope?
   ☐ Yes – proceed with checklist  ☐ No

Amendment adds an amount of programmed funds to an existing project that is greater than 30% of the total project cost?
   ☐ Yes – proceed with checklist  ☐ No

Air Quality

Air Quality Status: ☑ Attainment  ☐ Non-Attainment/Maintenance

Non-Attainment/Maintenance: Conformity Determination Documentation Provided?
   ☑ Yes  ☐ No – Return for Documentation

Amendment is consistent with approved conformity horizon year?
   ☑ Yes  ☐ No – Return for Conformity Approval

MPO - Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Project is consistent with or included in adopted MPO’s LRTP?
   ☑ Yes*  ☐ No – Return for LRTP Amendment

*Nashville projects with an “x” are not eligible for inclusion in the TIP.
Public Involvement

Amendment meets adopted public involvement plan?

☐ Yes  ☐ No – Return for Public Involvement

Amendment Process

Amendment meets the adopted amendment process – for MPOs, the Board resolution is provided?

☐ Yes  ☐ No – Return for Process Completion

Rural Counties: RPO Review/Consultation Process

Amendment includes documentation of RPO review/consultation?

☐ Yes  ☐ No – Return for RPO Consultation

Fiscal Constraint

Amendment includes documentation of fiscal constraint demonstrating available funds vs. programmed funds?

☒ Yes  ☐ No – Return for Documentation

Amendment includes copies of both the original and adjusted project sheets?

☒ Yes  ☐ No – Return for Documentation

Project Sheet

Each project included in the amendment must include the following:

☒ Project Sponsor

☒ Project number

☒ Project description/scope

☒ Project termini

☒ Total Project Cost

☐ Source of Fund

(HPP must also include HPP number)

☒ Amount of Federal Funds by year

☒ Amount of matching funds by year

☒ Project phase by year