

## Section J FINANCIAL PLAN

For purposes of implementing the provisions of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) jointly issued revised planning regulations governing the development of plan and programs for urbanized areas (23 CFR Part 450, 49 CFR Part 613). These regulations were designed to ensure the adequacy of metropolitan transportation planning and programming and the eligibility of metropolitan areas for federal highway and transit funds. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century of 1997 (TEA-21) continues these regulations for planning. One part of the regulations introduces the requirement to include a financial plan "*that demonstrates the consistency of proposed transportation investments with already available and projected sources of revenue*" (23 CFR Part 450.322(b)11) as a part of the Transportation Plan. This Financial Plan requirement was new, beginning with ISTEA, to the metropolitan transportation planning process.

To demonstrate the consistency of proposed investments (in the Plan) with sources of revenue, the Financial Plan must:

- Compare the estimated revenue (from existing and proposed funding sources that can be reasonably expected to be available for transportation uses) and the estimated cost of constructing, maintaining, and operating the total (existing plus planned) transportation system over the life of the Plan.
- Determine the estimated revenues by examining existing revenue sources (local, state, federal, and private) and identify any shortfalls.
- Identify proposed new revenues and/or revenue sources, including strategies for ensuring their availability for proposed investments.

- Existing and proposed revenues must cover all forecasted capital, operating, and maintenance costs.
- All cost and revenue projections must be based on data reflecting the existing situation and historical trends.

Because of the differences in the expenditure types, revenue sources, and reporting requirements, the financial forecast for highways, public transportation, and non-motorized transportation were made using different forecasting procedures or models. To ensure forecast concept compatibility, the same basic assumptions were used:

- All expenditures and revenues were expressed in 2000 dollars.
- Historic data, experience, and already committed funds were the principal drivers for all three forecasts.

Revenue generation for mode financing is highly dependent on state and federal dollars. The absence of any state motor vehicle tax increase since August, 1997 places this revenue source lower in terms of real dollars (adjusted for inflation). This factor results in a conservative forecast and is offset by the assumption of costs being forecasted in terms of 2000 dollars.

Increases in cost to provide transportation services (construction, maintenance, and operations) have frequently out paced inflation and increases in generated revenue. The use of costs in 2000 dollars throughout the Plan period (25 years) relies on revenues keeping pace with inflationary increases of expenditures. This is a cautiously optimistic assumption. It is presumed that any unrealistic variations within any one of the assumptions will be offset by this balance.

## HISTORY OF TRANSPORTATION FINANCING

The development and maintenance of the transportation system is primarily financed by user fees. Local finances have become an important contributor in recent years as well. At the State level, user fees include a per gallon tax on gasoline and diesel fuel and a per vehicle registration fee based on vehicle value. The State gas tax is currently \$0.19 per gallon for gasoline and \$0.15 per gallon for diesel. Michigan was the first state to adopt the gasoline tax in 1925 and since that time, all states have adopted some form of the tax. Gasoline is also taxed at the federal level at \$0.184 per gallon. Diesel fuel is taxed at the federal level at \$0.244 per gallon.

## SOURCES OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Collection and distribution of gasoline and diesel fuel taxes in Michigan is regulated under State Act 51 of 1951. Michigan's fuel tax is collected at the refinery and deposited into the Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF). Federal taxes are placed in the Federal Highway Trust Fund, with the exception of \$0.001 per gallon which pays for cleanup of underground storage tanks. Most states, as well as the federal government, earmark all or some portion of the tax for support of highways and mass transit improvements. MTF dollars are distributed to the Michigan Department of Transportation, county road commissions, cities, and villages.

Most states have vehicle registration fees that are earmarked for highway and mass transit improvements. In Michigan, the registration fees for automobiles and trucks are also deposited in the MTF. There is no passenger vehicle registration fee at the federal level, and no local community is permitted to assess a gasoline tax.

County and city MTF allocations have generally accounted for 50 to 60 percent of transportation revenues. Cities and villages may provide additional funding for transportation improvements. Typical sources at this level include:

- a community's general fund, millages and general obligation bonds;
- contributions from county governments and other communities;
- tax increment financing, and
- special assessment districts.

Some communities also accumulate interest on MTF revenue after it has been distributed to them.

County road commissions supplement their budgets through contributions from townships. The private sector has become involved as a source of financing as well. This usually involves developers paying for the construction of access drives or roadways leading to their development. The accounting of such expenditures is difficult as they are included in the overall cost of the development. These costs are not addressed in this report.

A more extensive listing of revenue sources is included in Table J-1.

At the federal level, ISTEA extended funding programs from previous highway legislation and created new programs for system improvements. TEA-21 continues this funding and new programs. The Interstate and National Highway System programs were developed primarily for improvements to the state trunkline system. The Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides funds for the urban and rural areas and for communities of between 5,000 - 50,000 in population. The STP also includes a Safety Fund and an Enhancement Fund for beautification, historic preservation, and non-motorized projects. There are separate programs specifically for bridge repairs and rehabilitation: the Critical Bridge Program (partially funded with State MTF revenues), and for projects that relieve congestion, the Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program (CMAQ).

-

Table J-1  
SOURCES OF REVENUE FOR ROADWAY PLAN DEVELOPMENT

*Federal Funding*

Surface Transportation Program (STP)  
National Highway System (NHS)  
Critical Bridge  
Highway Safety Funds  
Rail Crossing Safety  
Enhancement Funds

*State Funding*

Motor Vehicle Tax (Act 51) Distribution  
Transportation Economic Development Funds

*Local Funding*

General Revenue Contributions  
Township Contributions  
Street Improvement Assessments  
Road Improvement Bonds  
Tax Increment Financing Districts  
Special Assessment Districts  
Private Industry Contributions  
Foundation Contributions  
Others

## HIGHWAY/ROADWAY COMPONENT FORECAST

Several potentially applicable forecasting procedures and models were reviewed. Each had limitations and strengths and each necessitated sets of assumptions for the many variables to be considered. The financial forecasting model selected for both revenue and expenditures is nearly exclusively based on historic data and experience over the last 20 years.

The data foundation for the model is the "Act 51" reports made to the Michigan Department of Transportation by the three major road agencies in Kalamazoo County. Reports covering the periods 1994 - 2000 (inclusive) were used. Act 51 reports for the small cities and villages from 1997 - 2000 (inclusive) were also used.<sup>1</sup> The required reporting covers all transportation expenditures from the range of funding sources that may be available. In addition to the State "administrative classification" of major and local roads, several expenditure categories are reported. Historic data used for the highway forecast is presented in Tables J-16 to J-25. Data is included for all responsible road agencies in Kalamazoo County, except the Michigan Department of Transportation.<sup>2,3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Reports were missing for one years of one agency. Only four years of reports were used for the "small cities and villages."

<sup>2</sup> Data compilation and analysis included City of Kalamazoo, City of Portage, Kalamazoo County Road Commission, Village of Augusta, Village of Climax, City of Galesburg, City of Parchment, Village of Richland, Village of Schoolcraft, and Village of Vicksburg.

<sup>3</sup> The State transportation or trunkline system is addressed separately in the Statewide Plan prepared by the Michigan Department of Transportation. Transportation modeling and deficiency analysis for the urbanized area were treated in an integrated manner with the statewide model; however, financing and fiscal constraint were addressed separately.

The vast majority of the Federal Aid eligible roads within the local jurisdictions are administratively classified major or primary. In order to reduce some estimations, the local agency Act 51 reports were reviewed looking at major or primary streets only. Michigan Transportation Fund revenue increased in 1998 due to an increase in the gas and weight taxes. Looking at the historical expenditure for streets (major and local) shows that during the last 5 year period (1996-2000), the major Act 51 agencies spent more (as a percent of the total expenditures) for construction, including heavy maintenance, compared to earlier years.

The estimation of revenue available to the 2025 Plan from the local Act 51 agencies was based primarily on the expenditures for major/primary street construction and heavy maintenance for the years 1998, 1999, and 2000.

The analysis objective was to determine:

- the proportion of annual expenditures that can be expected to be available for roadway improvements, including both expand and rehabilitation projects for the major/primary street system.

A more detailed description of the process for local road highway agencies is as follows:

- A. Determine the average expenditures on the major/primary street systems for identified Act 51 categories for 1998 through 2000. This time period was used because funding and expenses changed following the August 1, 1997 Michigan fuel tax increase. This was done for each separate agency and accounts for variability in funding sources outside the Michigan Motor Vehicle Tax (Act 51) distributions (federal, locally generated, etc.).

Table J-2 shows the 1998-2000 average Major/Primary Street Revenues and Expenditures by Act 51 agency not including Federal STP funds. Tables J-12 through J-21 outline the historical expenditures for the Act 51 agencies in more detail.

- B. Assume that local funding sources available in 1998-2000 remain available in the same proportion through 2025.
- C. Calculate the average Federal STP funds availability to the area. Table J-3 shows this calculation.
- D. Calculate the annual average amount available to the Plan by taking the average Major/Primary Street Construction and Heavy Maintenance expenditure by agency and adding one quarter of the average Major/Primary Street Traffic Services expenditure for each agency. Include average STP funds for each major Act 51 agency. This assumes that over the period of the Plan, STP funds will average out uniformly between the agencies. Table J-4 shows the estimated revenue for the highway portion of the plan.
- E. Consult the current Transportation Improvement Program to determine revenues known to the agencies for identified projects in the first years of the 2025 Plan.

Using the three-year average of the Major/Primary Street, Construction, and Heavy Maintenance expenditures by the agencies plus a portion (25%) of the major/primary street traffic services expenditures takes into account funding sources in addition to MTF revenues. Federal STP average funding to the major Act 51 agencies were included in their major street expenditures after being estimated separately. The three-year average of Major/Primary Street Construction and Heavy Maintenance, plus a portion of Major/Primary Street Traffic Services expenditures, does account for some variability in funding amounts year-to-year and effectively removes local street expenditures plus Major/Primary Street “Non-Construction” costs, such as routine maintenance, winter maintenance, debt payment, administration, and the majority of traffic services. The small

portion of Major/Primary Street Traffic Services is identified as available to the Plan to cover design and construction activities associated with temporary and permanent project traffic control. Federal STP funding was averaged using 1999 through 2001 because 1998 STP funding was much lower than it was in later years. While identification of projects using STP funds are assigned by a project priority basis and not intentionally split between the agencies, it is assumed over the life of the Plan that the funds will distribute uniformly. Therefore, for outlying years, STP was assigned equally to the major Act 51 agencies. STP funds are assigned to specific projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in the early years of the Plan. These amounts are included with the appropriate agency as they are contained in the FY 2002 - 2004 TIP.

Table J-2  
1998 - 2000 Average Major/Primary Street Revenues and Expenditures

	City of Kalamazoo	City of Portage	Road Commission	City of Galesburg	City of Parchment	Village of Augusta	Village of Climax	Village of Richland	Village of Schoolcraft	Village of Vicksburg
<b>REVENUES</b>	<i>\$5,256,672</i>	<i>\$4,114,286</i>	<i>\$10,901,943</i>	<i>\$89,771</i>	<i>\$99,103</i>	<i>\$45,717</i>	<i>\$43,020</i>	<i>\$22,382</i>	<i>\$91,560</i>	<i>\$154,998</i>
Michigan Transportation Fund	\$4,241,575	\$2,191,971	\$9,787,008	\$74,511	\$91,010	\$44,884	\$38,000	\$21,395	\$88,765	\$146,038
Federal Funding*			\$3,878	\$15,260	\$8,093	\$833	\$5,020	\$987	\$2,796	\$6,739
Local Funding	\$628,967	\$19,661	\$1,111,057							\$2,221
Operating Transfers	\$386,131	\$1,902,654								
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>	<i>\$4,749,256</i>	<i>\$4,653,649</i>	<i>\$10,334,938</i>	<i>\$28,389</i>	<i>\$85,820</i>	<i>\$68,060</i>	<i>\$40,536</i>	<i>\$18,693</i>	<i>\$29,017</i>	<i>\$183,728</i>
Total Construction & Heavy Maintenance	\$2,757,393	\$3,030,755	\$7,429,879		\$26,558	\$50,922			\$6,537	\$84,014
Maintenance	\$809,535	\$706,351	\$1,210,675	\$14,887	\$26,157	\$13,305	\$36,595	\$14,442	\$8,387	\$63,130
Winter Maintenance	\$397,373	\$268,732	\$699,613	\$7,082	\$20,425	\$1,833	\$3,257	\$4,251	\$4,526	\$25,425
Traffic Services	\$378,388	\$162,471	\$513,226	\$3,245	\$6,486		\$81		\$4,383	\$7,521
Admin., Engineering & Record Keeping	\$406,567	\$485,340	\$481,545	\$3,175	\$6,194	\$2,000	\$603		\$5,184	\$3,638

\* Federal Funding does not include STP for road projects or enhancements

**Table J-3**  
**Historical Federal STP Funds Used for Road Projects**  
**(Excluding MDOT)**

Year	Amount
1998	\$2,060,103
1999	\$4,513,000
2000	\$3,563,000
2001	\$4,043,313
2002	\$4,001,525
1999-2001 Average	\$4,039,771
Annual Average Major Act 51 Agency STP (1999 - 2001)	\$1,346,590

This procedure allowed a realistic projection of major/primary street funds available for the 2025 Plan. Obviously, the remainder of revenues available will be directed to routine maintenance, winter maintenance, operations, administration, and similar expenditures to maintain the existing street system and to construct projects and maintain the local street system.

Since there are many discretionary funds available on a year-to-year basis, it is difficult to establish revenues available for any year or even five-year period. To circumvent this issue, all available revenues available for the Plan were calculated in terms of the average expenditure spent on Major/Primary Street Construction and Heavy Maintenance and Traffic Services averaged for the three-year period following the increase in Michigan gas taxes.

**Table J-4**  
**Revenues Available for Highway Portion of Transportation Plan**  
**Including STP Funds**

Year	City of Kalamazoo	City of Portage	Road Commission	Small Cities and Villages
2002	\$4,300,000	\$4,600,000	\$9,000,000	\$55,374
2003	\$4,300,000	\$4,600,000	\$9,000,000	\$55,374
2004	\$4,300,000	\$4,600,000	\$9,000,000	\$55,374
2005	\$4,300,000	\$4,600,000	\$9,000,000	\$55,374
2006 - 2025	\$86,000,000	\$92,000,000	\$180,000,000	\$1,107,480
Plan Total	\$103,200,000	\$110,400,000	\$216,000,000	\$1,328,976

Use of the average expenditure on Major/Primary Street Construction, Heavy Maintenance, and Traffic Services as a base results in the revenue forecast for roadway improvements (Table J-4). It is emphasized that this approach has effectively deducted the revenues used for maintenance, snow removal, administration, and similar expense items. Table J-5 shows the estimated target funding for the 2025 Plan for Expand and Preserve project categories.

Many agencies have variable revenue sources for different projects and different years. Agencies also “bank” some of their available resources in some years to construct large projects in other years. The Transportation Plan will show this variability. Over the Plan period, projected revenues will exceed projected expenditures.

Table J-5  
Local Act 51 Agency Target Funding for Expand and Preserve Projects  
Including STP Funds (\$000)

Year	City of Kalamazoo (\$000)			City of Portage (\$000)			Road Commission (\$000)			Combined Revenue (\$000)		
	Total	Expand 29 Percent	Preserve 71 Percent	Total	Expand 86 Percent	Preserve 14 Percent	Total	Expand 18 Percent	Preserve 82 Percent	Total	Expand 35 Percent	Preserve 65 Percent
2002	\$4,300	\$1,247	\$3,053	\$4,600	\$3,956	\$644	\$9,000	\$1,620	\$7,380	\$17,522	\$6,132.7	\$11,389.3
2003	\$4,300	\$1,247	\$3,053	\$4,600	\$3,956	\$644	\$9,000	\$1,620	\$7,380	\$17,522	\$6,132.7	\$11,389.3
2004	\$4,300	\$1,247	\$3,053	\$4,600	\$3,956	\$644	\$9,000	\$1,620	\$7,380	\$17,522	\$6,132.7	\$11,389.3
2005	\$4,300	\$1,247	\$3,053	\$4,600	\$3,956	\$644	\$9,000	\$1,620	\$7,380	\$17,522	\$6,132.7	\$11,389.3
2006 - 2025	\$86,000	\$24,940	\$61,060	\$92,000	\$79,120	\$12,880	\$180,000	\$32,400	\$147,600	\$350,440	\$122,654.0	\$227,786.0
Plan Total	\$103,200	\$29,928	\$73,272	\$110,400	\$94,944	\$15,456	\$216,000	\$38,880	\$177,120	\$420,528	\$147,184.8	\$273,343.2

Note: The percent of revenue expended on Improve and Preserve Projects by agency is calculated using 1998 to 2000 Transportation Improvement Program projects and their associated costs. See Table J-11.

As an area, a target of 35% of revenues expended on Expand/Improve projects was established for the 2025 Plan. The percentage continued during the development of the 2025 Transportation Plan.

#### FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THE HIGHWAY/ROADWAY PORTION OF THE PLAN

Federal funding that had been received between 1998 - 2000 by agencies for road and public transportation operations and capital has been included in the revenue forecasts for the local agencies, Michigan Department of Transportation, Metro Transit, and Care-A-Van. Other federal funding, such as Safety and Enhancement (including non-motorized projects), are also forecasted for the local agencies. The methodology again is to take the average of these funds used for safety, enhancement, or non-motorized during 1998 through 2000 to obtain an annualized estimate of federal funding not contained in other forecasts. Federal safety funds for local projects have generally been awarded at \$200,000 per year to the MPO's local agency safety project. KATS anticipates the continuation of this amount over the life of the Plan. An outline of Enhancement funding is discussed in the non-motorized section of this chapter.

#### MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING FOR THE HIGHWAY/ROADWAY PORTION OF THE PLAN

Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) funds available for the roadway portion of the Plan spent on MDOT facilities were estimated based on historic expenditures in Kalamazoo County from 1998 through 2001, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects identified in the FY 2002 - 2004 TIP, and MDOT's 5-year construction program ending in 2004. Table J-6 shows the estimated revenue available to MDOT for preserve, safety, and other non expand road projects including Federal funds.

MDOT funding for the expand/improve projects within the 2025 Plan were generally not available during the development of the Plan. The only projections that MDOT made was from the local region office which projected \$30,000,000 from their Preservation funding after FY 2006 and the annual average of capacity improvement projects from 1998 to 2004

in Kalamazoo County. Based on MDOT projections, only \$32,800,000 is identified for capacity improvement projects for the 2025 Plan. Proposed MDOT expand/improve projects, including the majority of the construction phase of the expansion of I-94 from US-131 to Sprinkle Road, must be listed as illustrative because of the lack of identified funding.

Table J-6  
Estimated Revenues Available to MDOT for the 2025 Plan

Category	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006 - 2025	Total
Capital Preventive Maintenance Highway	\$1,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,210,000	\$24,200,000	\$28,810,000
Capital Preventive Maintenance Bridge	\$1,700,000		\$500,000	\$775,000	\$15,500,000	\$18,475,000
Preliminary Engineering	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$7,000,000	\$8,400,000
Trunkline Rail Crossings	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,400,000
Highway Safety	\$915,000	\$915,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$23,830,000
Preserve		\$3,880,000	\$17,742,000	\$17,742,000	\$324,840,000	\$364,204,000
Capacity					\$32,580,000	\$32,580,000
Local Safety Projects on the non-trunkline system	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$5,000,000	\$6,000,000
Local Railroad Projects on the non-trunkline system	\$167,000	\$167,000	\$167,000	\$167,000	\$3,340,000	\$4,008,000
Enhancement Projects	\$128,000	\$128,000	\$560,000	\$560,000	\$11,200,000	\$12,576,000
MAB Planning		\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,150,000
I-94 Preliminary Engineering	\$6,187,500	\$3,750,000	\$212,000			\$10,149,500
US-131/US-131BR Study	\$100,000	\$700,000	\$700,000			\$1,500,000
US-131 Railroad Relocation/Overpass/Route Study	\$700,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,000,000			\$5,200,000
US-131 from Three Rivers to Schoolcraft Purchase Access Rights	\$150,000					\$150,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,747,500</b>	<b>\$13,990,000</b>	<b>\$24,831,000</b>	<b>\$22,204,000</b>	<b>\$446,660,000</b>	<b>\$519,432,500</b>

## PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FINANCIAL FORECAST

While there are base similarities in financing public transportation and roadways, there are also significant differences in revenue generation and expenditure patterns. These differences suggest the need for separate financial forecasting in the development of the Financial Plan.

The major difference for public transportation is that sustaining existing service levels are essentially not a cost variable. Although there is minor latitude in deferring capital cost, there is effectively no latitude in deferring operations and systems maintenance costs.<sup>4</sup> In simplest terms, the only decisions are to maintain, increase, or reduce levels of service. Historic or past necessary cost adjustments to address unbalanced revenue/cost relationships have been achieved by a combination of service adjustment and revenue enhancement.

A review of historic revenue and expenditure patterns was completed and not found to be useful in forecast procedures or model development. The review indicated a number of factors or variables, including the variability in amount or volume of service, capital cost of equipment, fuel cost, and similar elements that were each impractical to forecast. Except as explicitly stated in forecast assumptions, no attempt was made to predict or otherwise judge the threshold of public willingness to increase local participation levels.

As a result, the forecasting model was based on the following assumptions:

- All expenditures and revenues are based in Year 2000 dollars.
- A three-year history of revenue/expenditure was used as a historic basis. Revenues and cost projections were provided by the transit companies.

- Capital items and costs are obtained from the transit companies and use Year 2000 vehicle, equipment, and supplies cost and accepted replacement schedules.
- Operating costs are in Year 2000 dollars and assume existing levels of service. No additions or deletions to the operation of the transit services is assumed. However, if shortfalls are projected, mitigation may result in reduction of service(s).
- Fare and related revenue will represent the same percent of operational cost over the 2025 Plan.
- The local portion of revenue comes from farebox revenues for Care-A-Van. Metro Transit receives its local revenues from a combination of sources that include farebox, millage, local jurisdiction contributions, and Western Michigan University.

Table J-7 and J-8 show the projected operating and capital revenues for Metro Transit and Care-A-Van projections for the 2025 Plan.

---

<sup>4</sup> This statement does not imply or infer there cannot or can be internal expenditure variables relating to operations or maintenance.

Table J-7  
 Metro Transit Projected Revenue  
 2000 Dollars

Year	Operating Revenue				Capital Revenue				Metro Revenue
	Federal	State	Local	Total Revenue	Federal	State	Local	Total Revenue	
2002	\$712,616	\$3,328,057	\$5,426,327	\$9,467,000	\$3,502,175	\$870,501	\$5,043	\$4,377,718	\$13,844,718
2003	\$691,860	\$3,325,107	\$5,449,885	\$9,467,000	\$945,958	\$236,489		\$1,182,447	\$10,649,447
2004	\$671,709	\$3,322,242	\$5,472,759	\$9,467,000	\$896,102	\$224,026		\$1,120,128	\$10,587,128
2005	\$652,145	\$3,319,460	\$5,494,966	\$9,467,000	\$1,200,103	\$300,026		\$1,500,128	\$10,967,128
2006 - 2025	\$16,523,282	\$54,572,845	\$73,472,982	\$144,569,106	\$17,288,550	\$4,322,135		\$21,610,685	\$166,180,358
Plan Total	\$19,251,612	\$67,867,711	\$95,316,919	\$182,437,106	\$23,832,888	\$5,953,177	\$5,043	\$29,791,106	\$212,228,779

Table J-8  
 Care-A-Van Projected Available Operating and Capital Revenues  
 (\$000)

Year	Regular Operating				Regional Grant Operating			Specialized Services Operating			Capital				Care-A-Van Total
	Federal	State	Local	Total	State	Local	Total	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	
2002	\$105	\$467	\$430	\$1,002	\$42	\$25	\$67	\$108	\$175	\$283	\$234.6	\$61.6	\$12.8	\$309.0	\$1,661.0
2003	\$105	\$467	\$430	\$1,002	\$42	\$25	\$67	\$108	\$175	\$283	\$218.6	\$56.8	\$10.6	\$286.0	\$1,638.0
2004	\$105	\$467	\$430	\$1,002	\$42	\$25	\$67	\$108	\$175	\$283	\$151.0	\$38.4	\$2.6	\$192.0	\$1,544.0
2005	\$105	\$467	\$430	\$1,002	\$42	\$25	\$67	\$108	\$175	\$283	\$75.4	\$114.6		\$190.0	\$1,542.0
2006 - 2025	\$2,100	\$9,340	\$8,600	\$20,040	\$840	\$500	\$1,340	\$2,160	\$3,500	\$5,660	\$5,962.6	\$1,860.4	\$37.5	\$7,860.5	\$34,900.5
Total	\$2,520	\$11,208	\$10,320	\$24,048	\$1,008	\$600	\$1,608	\$2,592	\$4,200	\$6,792	\$6,642.2	\$2,131.8	\$63.5	\$8,837.5	\$41,285.5

NON-MOTORIZED REVENUE PROJECTIONS

In approaching revenue projections for the non-motorized portion of the 2025 Plan, it soon became apparent that simply using historic patterns will not work. Many facilities are built as part of other projects and costs for the non-motorized portion of the project are not reported separately from the total project costs. While Act 51 agencies report in their annual report non-motorized expenditures they often include such items as pedestrian signals, crosswalks, and sidewalk ramps that do serve the non-motorized users but are not what most people would consider a “non-motorized system.”

For the purpose of non-motorized financial constraint for the 2025 Plan, a distinction is made between separate paths or trails and bike lanes, wide traffic lanes, paved shoulders, and signed route non-motorized facilities. It is not likely that a bike lane, wide traffic lane or paved shoulder would be constructed without work on the adjacent roadway. Funding for those facilities that are part of the vehicle road structure will be considered to be included in the project funding for the street project and not listed separately. Funding for separate paths or trails have historically been completed with grant funding, primarily enhancement grants, local general fund revenues, and private contributions. For this 2025 Plan, financial constraint will be determined by taking the average amount of enhancement funds that have been used for non-motorized trails and assuming a local match to be available. Table J-9 shows the historic enhancement revenue awarded to Kalamazoo County. When known, the amount of enhancement dollars used for non-motorized plans and projects are shown<sup>5</sup>. These figures were used to estimate the amount of enhancement revenue that will be available for non-motorized and other projects in future years. The average from 1998-2002 is used because it is a lower figure and therefore more conservative.

Revenue for walkway/sidewalk facilities is not specifically projected here. As with bike paths, lanes, or wide traffic lanes, major walkway/sidewalk installations would generally be part of a street project and costs are assumed to be included with the street project.

Table J-10 shows the projected non-motorized funds that are available for the 2025 Plan assuming the historic average of 24% local match.

Table J-9  
Historical Federal Enhancement Funding

Year	Enhancement		
	Non-Motorized	Other	Total
1992	Unknown	Unknown	\$142,090
1993			\$0
1994	Unknown	Unknown	\$34,200
1995	Unknown	Unknown	\$120,000
1997	Unknown	Unknown	\$182,783
1998	\$476,225	\$234,700	\$710,925
1999-2000	\$1,320,910	\$276,392	\$1,597,302
2001		\$168,400	\$168,400
2002	\$434,003	\$136,000	\$570,003
1998 - 2002 Average	\$446,228	\$163,098	\$609,326

<sup>5</sup>For the 2025 Plan, 1998 - 2000 data was used to determine the average amount awarded to the area.

Table J-10  
Projected Federal Enhancement Funds

Year	Enhancement		
	Non-Motorized	Other	Total
2002	\$434,003	\$136,000	\$570,003
2003	\$626,000	\$136,000	\$762,000
2004	\$446,000	\$136,000	\$582,000
2005	\$446,000	\$136,000	\$582,000
2006 - 2025	\$8,920,000	\$2,720,000	\$11,640,000
Plan Total	\$10,872,003	\$3,264,000	\$14,136,003

Comparison Between Projected Revenues and 2025 Plan Projects

A review of the programs and projects that collectively represent the 2025 Plan (see Section K of this report) compared to the forecast of available revenues for the highway system portion of the Plan demonstrates financial constraint, meaning the forecast projected revenues exceed project costs for the 2025 Plan period. Table J-11 shows the historic split by the major local road agencies between Improve/Expand projects and Preserve and Other projects. Target percentage splits were determined using the 1998 to 2000 data. Table J-12 compares Plan road project costs to projected revenue for the major road agencies. There is a variability in individual years when revenues exceed expenditures or expenditures exceed project revenue. This is expected due to the different funding resources that were averaged by the projections but actually occur with specific projects and the “banking” of funds from one year to another. Over the total Plan period, projected revenues exceed projected expenditures. The Plan road project costs are less than projected revenue on the

road portion of the Plan is fiscally constrained. Table J-13 shows the split of road project costs between Improve/Expand and Preserve/Other projects. The 2025 Plan targets for the Preserve and Other road projects were met or exceeded for all major road agencies. This means that more projects went for Preservation and Other than was the case for 1998 to 2000 construction years. It is important to note that financial constraint was achieved by the omission of a number of significant projects.

A similar comparison was made for transit services. The Care-A-Van proposal for operations permits the continuation of the same level of service. The Care-A-Van capital projects proposed, including a shared transit garage and office, also meets financial constraint. Table J-14 shows a comparison of projected revenues and expenditures. Both operating and capital plan expenditures match projected revenues.

The comparison of operational cost to forecasted revenues for Metro Transit indicates the limitation of financial resources for providing current levels of services. Table J-15 of the Transportation Plan presents this comparison and indicates the level of “shortfall” for operating revenues beginning in 2007. For the 2025 Plan purposes, this shortfall will be represented as a reduction of services, specifically in those areas or jurisdictions where the deficit would be difficult to address. The City of Kalamazoo has recognized this problem and publicly accepted it as a challenge to redefine the transit system and services. They are encouraging this activity to begin immediately with a goal of successful completion prior to any major impacts on service.

Since the Plan, as currently proposed, must be financially constrained, Metro Transit must address the projected operating shortfall with a reduction in service, reduced capital projects, an increase in revenue, and /or realize efficiency gains. With these items being addressed, Metro Transit meets financial constraint guidelines.

#### NON-MOTORIZED SYSTEM FISCAL CONSTRAINT

The listed pathways/trailways shown on the Plan are expected to be constructed using Enhancement funds and locally generated match. The locally generated matching funds have historically come from private sources, capital improvement funds, and general funds. In order to compete during the selection process, the submitted projects historically have provided more than the minimum 20% match. Assuming that local matches will average the historic 24% of the projects construction estimate, the non-motorized plan portion also satisfies fiscal constraint with a projected revenue from Enhancement funds of \$10,872,003, compared to pathway project costs using \$10,757,800 of Enhancement funds. As stated earlier, costs for bike paths, paved shoulders, wide lanes, and signed routes are assumed to be included in the appropriate adjacent road project.

#### FISCAL CONSTRAINT SUMMARY

The 2025 Transportation Plan is fiscally constrained. Projected revenues exceed projected expenditures. It must be restated that there are several projects (road, public transportation, and non-motorized) that cannot appear on the Plan and remain illustrative due to the lack of adequate revenue (see Section L). This is particularly true for projects on the trunkline system.

Table J-11  
 Historical Expenditure Distribution Between Improve and Preserve Road Projects

Year	City of Kalamazoo			City of Portage			Kalamazoo County Road Commission			All Three Major Act 51 Agencies		
	Improve	Preserve	Total	Improve	Preserve	Total	Improve	Preserve	Total	Improve	Preserve	Total
1996	\$0	\$960,000	\$960,000	\$0	\$246,000	\$246,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,745,000	\$4,945,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,951,000	\$6,151,000
1997	\$0	\$299,000	\$299,000	\$0	\$140,000	\$140,000	\$0	\$1,860,000	\$1,860,000	\$0	\$2,299,000	\$2,299,000
1998	\$750,000	\$2,201,000	\$2,951,000	\$0	\$950,000	\$950,000	\$0	\$6,045,000	\$6,045,000	\$750,000	\$9,196,000	\$9,946,000
1999	\$0	\$2,233,000	\$2,233,000	\$2,133,000	\$564,000	\$2,697,000	\$1,100,000	\$4,408,000	\$5,508,000	\$3,233,000	\$7,205,000	\$10,438,000
2000	\$1,187,000	\$226,000	\$1,413,000	\$9,195,000	\$401,000	\$9,596,000	\$2,287,000	\$4,540,000	\$6,827,000	\$12,669,000	\$5,167,000	\$17,836,000
2001	\$1,629,000	\$1,777,000	\$3,406,000	\$0	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$0	\$4,998,000	\$4,998,000	\$1,629,000	\$7,150,000	\$8,779,000
1996 - 2001	\$3,566,000	\$7,696,000	\$11,262,000	\$11,328,000	\$2,676,000	\$14,004,000	\$4,587,000	\$25,596,000	\$30,183,000	\$19,481,000	\$35,968,000	\$55,449,000
Percent	32%	68%		81%	19%		15%	85%		35%	65%	
1998 - 2000	\$1,937,000	\$4,660,000	\$6,597,000	\$11,328,000	\$1,915,000	\$13,243,000	\$3,387,000	\$14,993,000	\$18,380,000	\$16,652,000	\$21,568,000	\$38,220,000
Percent	29%	71%		86%	14%		18%	82%		44%	56%	

**Table J-12  
Comparison of Project Costs with Target Funding  
For All Major Road Agencies**

Year	City of Kalamazoo		City of Portage		Road Commission		MDOT	
	Plan Total	Plan Target	Plan Total	Plan Target	Plan Total	Plan Target	Plan Total	Plan Target
2002	\$2,510,000	\$4,300,000	\$8,285,600	\$4,600,000	\$9,891,000	\$9,000,000	\$11,478,500	\$11,747,500
2003	\$4,887,000	\$4,300,000	\$6,720,000	\$4,600,000	\$7,863,000	\$9,000,000	\$12,390,682	\$13,990,000
2004	\$4,201,800	\$4,300,000	\$4,067,800	\$4,600,000	\$12,878,800	\$9,000,000	\$22,770,000	\$24,831,000
2005	\$3,924,800	\$4,300,000	\$4,600,000	\$4,600,000	\$7,372,010	\$9,000,000	\$22,048,000	\$22,204,000
2006 - 2025	\$84,770,000	\$86,000,000	\$85,283,000	\$92,000,000	\$176,042,000	\$180,000,000	\$446,460,000	\$446,660,000
<b>Plan Total</b>	<b>\$100,293,600</b>	<b>\$103,200,000</b>	<b>\$108,956,400</b>	<b>\$110,400,000</b>	<b>\$214,046,810</b>	<b>\$216,000,000</b>	<b>\$515,147,182</b>	<b>\$519,432,500</b>

**Table J-13  
Comparison of Project Costs with Target Funding  
For All Major Road Agencies**

Year	City of Kalamazoo (\$000)				City of Portage (\$000)				Road Commission (\$000)				MDOT (\$000)			
	Preserve	Improve	Plan Total	Plan Target	Preserve	Improve	Plan Total	Plan Target	Preserve	Improve	Plan Total	Plan Target	Preserve	Improve	Plan Total	Plan Target
2002	\$1,910	\$600	\$2,510	\$4,300	\$3,560.8	\$4,724.8	\$8,285.6	\$4,600	\$8,391	\$1,500	\$9,891	\$9,000	\$5,191	\$6,287.5	\$11,478.5	\$11,747.5
2003	\$2,712	\$2,175	\$4,887	\$4,300	\$1,820	\$4,900	\$6,720	\$4,600	\$7,863	\$0	\$7,863	\$9,000	\$7,940.7	\$4,450	\$12,390.7	\$13,990
2004	\$4,201.8	\$0	\$4,201.8	\$4,300	\$1,467.8	\$2,600	\$4,067.8	\$4,600	\$11,978.8	\$900	\$12,878.8	\$9,000	\$21,858	\$912	\$22,770	\$24,831
2005	\$3,924.8	\$0	\$3,924.8	\$4,300	\$2,000	\$2,600	\$4,600	\$4,600	\$7,372	\$0	\$7,372	\$9,000	\$21,919	\$129	\$22,048	\$22,204
2006 - 2025	\$68,036	\$16,734	\$84,770	\$86,000	\$15,100	\$70,183	\$85,283	\$92,000	\$145,516	\$30,126	\$176,042	\$180,000	\$413,880	\$32,580	\$446,460	\$446,660
<b>Plan Total</b>	<b>\$80,784.6</b>	<b>\$19,509.0</b>	<b>\$100,293.6</b>	<b>\$103,200.0</b>	<b>\$23,948.6</b>	<b>\$85,007.8</b>	<b>\$108,956.4</b>	<b>\$110,400.0</b>	<b>\$181,120.8</b>	<b>\$32,526.0</b>	<b>\$214,046.8</b>	<b>\$216,000.0</b>	<b>\$470,788.7</b>	<b>\$44,358.5</b>	<b>\$515,147.2</b>	<b>\$519,432.5</b>
Plan Percent	81%	19%			22%	78%			85%	15%			92%	8%		
Target Percent	71%	29%			14%	86%			82%	18%						

Table J-14  
Care-A-Van Operating and Capital Revenues and Expenditures

Year	Operating			Capital		
	Revenue	Expenditures	Shortfall	Revenue	Expenditures	Shortfall
2002	\$1,352,000	\$1,352,000	\$0	\$309,000	\$309,000	\$0
2003	\$1,352,000	\$1,352,000	\$0	\$286,000	\$286,000	\$0
2004	\$1,352,000	\$1,352,000	\$0	\$192,000	\$192,000	\$0
2005	\$1,352,000	\$1,352,000	\$0	\$190,000	\$190,000	\$0
2006 - 2025	\$27,040,000	\$27,040,000	\$0	\$7,860,500	\$7,860,500	\$0
Plan Total	\$32,448,000	\$32,448,000	\$0	\$8,837,500	\$8,837,500	\$0

Table J-15  
Metro Transit Projected Revenue and Expenditures  
2000 Dollars

Year	Operating			Capital		
	Revenue	Expenditures	Shortfall	Revenue	Expenditures	Shortfall
2002	\$9,467,000	\$9,467,000	\$0	\$4,377,718	\$4,377,718	\$0
2003	\$9,467,000	\$9,467,000	\$0	\$1,182,447	\$1,182,447	\$0
2004	\$9,467,000	\$9,467,000	\$0	\$1,120,128	\$1,120,128	\$0
2005	\$9,467,000	\$9,467,000	\$0	\$1,500,128	\$1,500,128	\$0
2006 - 2025	\$144,569,673	\$189,340,000	(\$44,770,327)	\$21,610,687	\$21,610,687	\$0
Plan Total	\$182,437,673	\$227,208,000	(\$44,770,327)	\$29,791,108	\$29,791,108	\$0

Table J-16  
 City of Kalamazoo  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures
1994	\$2,567,996	\$960,365	\$385,268	\$416,296	\$64,774	\$1,528,097	\$5,922,796
1995	\$442,863	\$920,992	\$418,744	\$332,157	\$73,252	\$1,653,398	\$3,841,406
1996	\$5,883,464	\$890,894	\$402,922	\$481,844	\$81,907	\$968,745	\$8,709,776
1997	\$1,561,504	\$854,923	\$356,212	\$560,592	\$206,511	\$1,057,765	\$4,597,507
1998	\$2,497,729	\$898,995	\$220,742	\$367,943	\$356,262	\$1,212,836	\$5,554,507
1999	\$2,980,575	\$847,407	\$419,697	\$367,151	\$379,225	\$1,157,189	\$6,151,244
2000	\$2,793,876	\$682,202	\$551,680	\$400,071	\$484,215	\$1,170,765	\$6,082,809
1994 - 2000	\$18,728,007	\$6,055,778	\$2,755,265	\$2,926,054	\$1,646,146	\$8,748,795	\$40,860,045
Percent of Total	45.83%	14.82%	6.74%	7.16%	4.03%	21.41%	100.00%
1996 - 2000	\$15,717,148	\$4,174,421	\$1,951,253	\$2,177,601	\$1,508,120	\$5,567,300	\$31,095,843
Percent of Total	50.54%	13.42%	6.27%	7.00%	4.85%	17.90%	100.00%
1998-2000	\$8,272,180	\$2,428,604	\$1,192,119	\$1,135,165	\$1,219,702	\$3,540,790	\$17,788,560
Percent of Total	46.50%	13.65%	6.70%	6.38%	6.86%	19.90%	100.00%

Table J-17  
 City of Portage  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures
1994	\$3,387,869	\$618,363	\$260,981	\$122,136	\$341,391	\$719,391	\$5,450,131
1995	\$7,912,484	\$639,747	\$176,674	\$194,149	\$350,050	\$948,633	\$10,221,737
1996	\$1,684,039	\$635,598	\$234,296	\$184,566	\$407,524	\$1,269,573	\$4,415,596
1997	\$767,852	\$664,550	\$262,888	\$168,172	\$630,372	\$-708,739	\$1,785,095
1998	\$347,922	\$695,723	\$200,502	\$142,313	\$419,147	\$200,000	\$2,005,607
1999	\$2,023,829	\$815,152	\$249,761	\$169,654	\$491,145	\$200,000	\$3,949,541
2000	\$6,720,514	\$608,179	\$355,934	\$175,447	\$545,727	\$393,800	\$8,799,601
1994 - 2000	\$22,844,509	\$4,677,312	\$1,741,036	\$1,156,437	\$3,185,356	\$3,022,658	\$36,627,308
Percent of Total	62.37%	12.77%	4.75%	3.16%	8.70%	8.25%	100.00%
1996 - 2000	\$11,544,156	\$3,419,202	\$1,303,381	\$840,152	\$2,493,915	\$1,354,634	\$20,955,440
Percent of Total	55.09%	16.32%	6.22%	4.01%	11.90%	6.46%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	\$9,092,265	\$2,119,054	\$806,197	\$487,414	\$1,456,019	\$793,800	\$14,754,749
Percent of Total	61.62%	14.36%	5.46%	3.30%	9.87%	5.38%	100.00%

Table J-18  
Kalamazoo County Road Commission  
Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures
1994	\$8,328,273	\$946,354	\$802,397	\$236,976	\$458,735	\$-94,688	\$10,678,046
1995	\$5,209,401	\$945,885	\$931,599	\$263,186	\$418,383	\$-44,857	\$7,723,597
1996	\$2,919,364	\$1,119,321	\$844,369	\$438,440	\$305,629	\$-21,027	\$5,606,096
1997	\$4,925,159	\$1,332,734	\$872,589	\$354,620	\$375,729	\$43,927	\$7,904,758
1998	\$7,923,758	\$1,318,804	\$411,656	\$332,821	\$467,169	\$75,791	\$10,529,999
1999	\$11,859,229	\$1,103,828	\$756,203	\$532,909	\$523,992	\$38,159	\$14,814,320
2000	\$7,707,299	\$1,098,875	\$930,980	\$673,948	\$453,473	\$-3,433	\$10,861,141
1994 - 2000	\$48,872,483	\$-2,871,617	\$-5,187,626	\$2,832,899	\$3,003,110	\$-6,128	\$68,117,958
Percent of Total	71.75%	11.55%	8.15%	4.16%	4.41%	-0.01%	100.00%
1996 - 2000	\$35,334,809	\$-4,763,856	\$3,815,797	\$2,332,738	\$2,125,992	\$133,417	\$49,716,314
Percent of Total	71.07%	12.02%	7.68%	4.69%	4.28%	0.27%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	\$27,490,286	\$3,521,507	\$2,098,839	\$1,539,678	\$1,444,634	\$110,517	\$36,205,460
Percent of Total	75.93%	9.73%	5.80%	4.25%	3.99%	0.31%	100.00%

Table J-19  
 City of Galesburg  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	\$362,120	\$6,351	\$0	\$5,732	NA	\$374,203
1998	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$0
1999	NA	\$18,700	\$10,972	NA	\$3,800	NA	\$33,472
2000	NA	\$14,318	\$3,191	\$3,245	\$2,550	NA	\$23,304
1997 - 2000	NA	\$395,138	\$20,514	\$3,245	\$12,082	NA	\$430,979
Percent of Total	0.00%	91.68%	4.76%	0.75%	2.80%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	NA	\$33,018	\$14,163	\$3,245	\$6,350	NA	\$56,776
Percent of Total	0.00%	58.15%	24.95%	5.72%	11.18%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.

Table J-20  
City of Parchment  
Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	NA	\$17,641	NA	\$6,153	NA	\$23,794
1998	\$12,729	\$33,340	\$24,494	\$8,030	\$6,360	NA	\$84,953
1999	NA	NA	\$15,185	NA	\$5,099	NA	\$103,872
2000	\$26,357	\$10,131	\$21,597	\$3,427	\$7,124	NA	\$68,636
1997 - 2000	\$39,086	\$43,471	\$78,917	\$11,457	\$24,736	NA	\$281,255
Percent of Total	13.90%	15.46%	28.06%	4.07%	8.79%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	\$39,086	\$43,471	\$61,276	\$11,457	\$18,583	NA	\$257,461
Percent of Total	15.18%	16.88%	23.80%	4.45%	7.22%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.

Table J-21  
 Village of Augusta  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	NA	\$1,519	NA	\$2,000	NA	\$25,715
1998	NA	NA	\$2,313	NA	\$2,000	NA	\$26,700
1999	\$14,910	\$12,915	\$899	NA	\$2,000	NA	\$30,724
2000	NA	NA	\$2,288	NA	\$2,000	NA	\$46,758
1997 - 2000	\$14,910	\$12,915	\$7,019	NA	\$8,000	NA	\$42,844
Percent of Total	34.80%	30.14%	16.38%	0.00%	18.67%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	\$14,910	\$12,915	\$5,500	NA	\$6,000	NA	\$104,182
Percent of Total	14.31%	12.40%	5.28%	0.00%	5.76%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.

Table J-22  
 Village of Climax  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	NA	\$4,480	NA	\$25	NA	\$41,582
1998	NA	NA	\$4,678	NA	\$25	NA	\$17,960
1999	NA	\$17,965	\$2,018	\$242	\$1,760	NA	\$21,985
2000	NA	NA	\$3,075	NA	\$25	NA	\$81,664
1997 - 2000	NA	\$17,965	\$14,251	\$242	\$1,835	NA	\$34,293
Percent of Total	0.00%	52.39%	41.56%	0.71%	5.35%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	NA	\$17,965	\$9,771	\$242	\$1,810	NA	\$121,609
Percent of Total	0.00%	14.77%	8.03%	0.20%	1.49%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.

Table J-23  
 Village of Richland  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	NA	\$2,094	NA	NA	NA	\$17,006
1998	NA	\$14,005	\$2,479	NA	NA	NA	\$16,484
1999	NA	NA	\$3,023	NA	NA	NA	\$12,886
2000	NA	\$19,458	\$7,252	NA	NA	NA	\$26,710
1997 - 2000	NA	\$33,463	\$14,848	NA	NA	NA	\$48,311
Percent of Total	0.00%	69.27%	30.73%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	NA	\$33,463	\$12,754	NA	NA	NA	\$56,080
Percent of Total	0.00%	59.67%	22.74%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.

Table J-24  
Village of Schoolcraft  
Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	NA	\$4,120	NA	\$5,883	NA	\$45,838
1998	\$5,959	\$7,101	\$3,897	\$3,572	\$7,438	NA	\$27,967
1999	NA	NA	\$5,556	NA	\$3,679	NA	\$35,952
2000	\$3,653	\$5,344	\$4,124	\$5,578	\$4,435	NA	\$23,134
1997 - 2000	\$9,612	\$12,445	\$17,697	\$9,150	\$21,435	NA	\$70,339
Percent of Total	13.67%	17.69%	25.16%	13.01%	30.47%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	\$9,612	\$12,445	\$13,577	\$9,150	\$15,552	NA	\$87,053
Percent of Total	11.04%	14.30%	15.60%	10.51%	17.86%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.

Table J-25  
 Village of Vicksburg  
 Historical Expenditures on Major Streets Only

Year	Construction	Maintenance	Winter Services	Traffic Services	Administration/ Engineering	Other Expenses	Total Expenditures *
1997	NA	NA	\$7,184	NA	\$7,184	NA	\$88,643
1998	\$54,421	\$92,023	\$10,689	\$3,113	\$2,922	NA	\$163,168
1999	NA	NA	\$10,342	NA	\$7,460	NA	\$336,222
2000	\$1,200	\$63,130	\$25,245	\$7,521	\$532	NA	\$97,628
1997 - 2000	\$55,621	\$155,153	\$53,460	\$10,634	\$18,098	NA	\$292,966
Percent of Total	18.99%	52.96%	18.25%	3.63%	6.18%	0.00%	100.00%
1998 - 2000	\$55,621	\$155,153	\$46,276	\$10,634	\$10,914	NA	\$597,018
Percent of Total	9.32%	25.99%	7.75%	1.78%	1.83%	0.00%	100.00%

\* The Total Expenditures does not reflect the total of line items shown. During years where Act 51 short forms were submitted to the State, information was not fully available for reporting.