

Agenda

TAB Technical Advisory Committee



Meeting Date: December 7, 2022

Time: 9:00 AM

Location: Virtual

Public participation:

If you have comments, we encourage members of the public to email us at public.info@metc.state.mn.us.

You may pre-register to speak at a virtual public meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee by emailing us at public.info@metc.state.mn.us.

Call to Order

- 1) Approval of the Agenda (Agenda is approved without vote unless amended)
- 2) Approval of November 2, 2022, TAB Technical Advisory Committee Minutes - roll call

Public Comment on Committee Business

TAB Report

Committee Reports

- 1) Executive Committee (Jon Solberg, Chair)
 - a) TAC Chair Nominating Committee Report
- 2) Planning Committee/TPP Technical Working Group (Scott Mareck, Chair)
 - a) 2022-48: Metropolitan Airports Commission 2023-2029 Capital Improvement Program (Cole Hiniker, MTS Planning) – roll call
- 3) Funding & Programming Committee (Michael Thompson, Chair)

No items.

Information

- 1) Congestion Management Plan Corridor Analysis Handbook (Dave Burns, MTS)
- 2) Regional Transportation and Climate Change Multimodal Measures study (Tony Fischer, MTS)
- 3) Climate Action Work Plan (Jeff Freeman, Metro Transit and Tony Fischer, MTS)

Other Business

Adjournment

Council Contact:

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner
Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us
651-602-1705

Minutes

TAB Technical Advisory Committee



Meeting Date: November 2, 2022

Time: 9:00 AM

Location: Virtual

Members Present:

- Jon Solberg, Chair, MnDOT
- Joe MacPherson, Anoka Co
- Lyndon Robjent, Carver Co
- Erin Laberee, Dakota Co
- Brian Isaacson, Vice Chair, Ramsey Co
- Chad Ellos, Hennepin Co
- Lisa Freese, Scott Co
- Lyssa Leitner, Washington Co
- Andrew Witter, 7W

- Karl Keel, Bloomington
- Charlie Howley, Chanhassen
- Robert Ellis, Eden Prairie
- Brandon Brodhag, Fridley
- Paul Oehme, Lakeville
- Ken Ashfeld, Maple Grove
- Ross Beckwith, West Saint Paul
- Michael Thompson, Plymouth
- Jenifer Hager, Minneapolis
- Jim Voll, Minneapolis
- Paul Kurtz, Saint Paul
- Bill Dermody, Saint Paul

- Steve Peterson, Council MTS
- Michael Larson, Council CD
- Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB
- Innocent Eyoh, MPCA
- Bridget Rief, MAC
- Matt Fyten, STA
- Adam Harrington, Metro Transit
- Praveena Pidaparathi, MnDOT
- Colleen Eddy, DEED
- Vacant, MN DNR
- Danny McCullough, Bicycle
- Vacant, Pedestrian
- Vacant, FHWA (ex-officio)

= present

Call to Order

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Solberg called the regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee to order at 9:02 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

The committee approved the agenda with no changes. Therefore, no vote was needed.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Keel and seconded by Freese to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2022, regular meeting of the TAB Technical Advisory Committee. **Motion carried.**

Public Comment on Committee Business

None.

TAB Report

Koutsoukos reported on the October 19, 2022, Transportation Advisory Board meeting.

Business – Committee Reports

Executive Committee (Jon Solberg, Chair)

Chair Solberg reported that the TAC Executive Committee met prior to the TAC meeting and discussed the Regional Solicitation scenarios and nominations for the next Chair. He added that a

funding scenario created by the counties was discussed and that the scenario was not fiscally constrained.

Planning Committee/TPP Technical Working Group (Angie Stenson, Vice Chair)

TAC Planning Committee vice chair Angie Stenson reported that the TAC Planning Committee meeting was cancelled in October. She provided an update on the TPP Technical Working Group meeting that occurred in October.

Funding & Programming (Michael Thompson, Chair)

1. [2022-44: Program Year Extension Request: Maple Grove Rush Creek Boulevard/I-94/TH 610 Interchange](#)

Thompson said Maple Grove is requesting a program year extension from 2023 to 2024 for its four-lane divided A-minor arterial expander between CSAH 30 and the I-94 and MN 610 interchange. Barbeau added that the project scored eight on the program year extension assessment, which is better than the minimum score of seven required for a recommendation of approval.

It was moved by Freese and seconded by MacPherson to recommend that TAB approve Maple Grove's Rush Creek Boulevard/I-94/TH 610 Interchange Construction and MN 610 Extension (SP# 189-143-001) be extended from fiscal year 2023 to fiscal year 2024. **Motion carried** unanimously.

2. [2022-45: 2022 Regional Solicitation Funding Options](#)

Peterson introduced the item, which included three proposed funding scenarios: A) Midpoint Plus with Extra to Bicycle/Pedestrian, B1) Bicycle/Pedestrian-Heavy Option + Extra to Roadway, and B2) Bicycle/Pedestrian-Heavy + Extra to Bicycle/Pedestrian. These scenarios include \$2.1M to \$3.5M of yet-to-program funding available to bring the overprogramming up to 11%. In response to a question from Robjert, Peterson stated that MnDOT has enabled the Council to be more flexible in terms of project years for use of the Bridge funds, which will lead to funding more bridges in the next cycle. In response to a question from MacPherson, Peterson said that only the fifth-ranked bridge, funded with STPG Program funding, is included in the modal spits.

Keel asked whether not funding the yet-to-program funds would keep overprogramming to about 10%, to which Peterson replied in the affirmative. Solberg said that a larger number of projects will be funded, opening the possibility of overprogramming at a higher rate than possible.

Isaacson said that if TAC can show differences among the scenarios from a regional perspective, that could help prevent TAB from discussing the merits of individual projects.

Solberg suggested that TAC conduct a straw poll on which alternative(s) is preferred.

Leitner proposed narrowing to two scenarios by removing scenario B2 and using overprogramming to fund Scott County's multiuse trail application in scenario B1.

Laberee asked that regional balance be taken into consideration when looking into where to place extra funds. She added that Dakota County is consistently underfunded versus its population and jobs.

Hager expressed support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios. She then asked why safety is only monetized for roadway projects and why scenario A funds an extra transit project. Peterson replied that scenario A does not spread funding to bike/ped, enabling funding of the final transit expansion project. Hager replied that TAB had wanted to move funding to bicycle/pedestrian, to which Koutsoukos replied that TAB did not suggest that for the midpoint scenario. Peterson said that safety is only monetized for the roadway applications because those are the only applications that have scoring measures that are conducive to that. He added that there are safety measures in bicycle/pedestrian and there could be some math that could be done. He added that other measures are monetized and could be added. Hager added that if



emissions could be shown that might be valuable to TAB. Peterson replied that the Council is probably a cycle away from being able to measure this.

MacPherson suggested showing the proposed funding percentage by mode in the Key Differences table.

Freese suggested that the lowest-ranked transit project in scenario A could be removed and the funding could be moved to bicycle/pedestrian given how many transit projects are being funded. Robjent expressed agreement and suggested adding overprogramming to the roadway mode. He added that he supports scenario A with slight changes such as removing some of the lower-ranked pedestrian and Safe Routes to School projects.

Ellos expressed support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios and agreed that funding of the bottom transit expansion project could be used differently. He said that in scenario A multiuse trails should have carbon reduction funding, as this is more effective than the pedestrian and Safe Routes to School categories in terms of reducing carbon.

McCullough added support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios, adding that it would be great to fund the Scott County multiuse trails project, which scored well. He added that getting the Scott County and Dakota County projects will add regional balance.

Keel added support for Leitner's suggestion of eliminating one of the B scenarios along with adding the Scott County project to scenario B1. He questioned Ellos's comment about bicycle projects being most effective for carbon reduction because of the large use of roadway projects.

Koutsoukos reminded members that TAB is interested in funding smaller projects and that the focus on not funding the lowest-scoring transit expansion project is not consistent with funding the lowest-ranked project in the pedestrian and Safe Routes to School categories.

Howley suggested reporting "percent of need" as a metric, as it is difficult to complete a large project without support. He also agreed that combining B1 and B2 might make the discussion easier. Peterson replied that staff has determined percent of need and can add it to the key differences table.

Robjent said that roadways has \$900M of demand and bicycle/pedestrian has \$230M of demand. He added that percentage of total funding by mode should be shown, including the carbon reduction and bridge funds.

Harrington said that scenario B1 makes sense whether combined with scenario B2 or not.

Laberee said that Dakota County's CSAH 42 project, which is shown just below the funding line, is a higher priority than its 140th St. pedestrian overpass, which is shown as funded. She suggested that the CSAH 42 project could be funded with Carbon Reduction funds.

Fyten said SouthWest Transit prefers scenario A and added that transit providers tend to apply for their highest priorities, which can lead to lower-ranked projects being funded.

Thompson said he could support scenario B1 along with finding a way to fund the Scott County trail and the City of Victoria pedestrian project. He added that this leaves the two \$10M strategic capacity projects unfunded and that these projects can be difficult to fund without Regional Solicitation funding.

Freese said that low-scoring projects sometimes get funded but bike/ped and highway categories do not have low-scoring projects funded. She suggested that the inability for low-scoring projects to be funded be considered in the future.

MOTION 1: It was moved by Leitner and seconded by Isaacson to eliminate scenario B2 and use overprogramming to make scenario B1 resemble scenario B2 by funding bicycle and pedestrian projects from the latter. Solberg said that about \$7.2M would be available to fund the Scott County and Victoria projects with overprogramming at 12%. Peterson said two ways to fund the Scott County project in B1 have been suggested: 1) use the extra overprogramming to fund the Dakota County reconstruction and 2) remove pedestrian facilities projects. He added that iterations of all three scenarios should be brought back to TAB, though preferences can be



stated. Leitner suggested that it is the job of staff to bring TAB's ideas through the committee process and therefore is comfortable not showing all three scenarios. Robjent asked whether the overprogramming going to B1 can also go to scenario A. He added that because Dakota County has expressed preference for its roadway project over its pedestrian project, there needs to be discussion about the balance between those modes. Leitner suggested that it is not in an applicant's role to shift modes by identifying a preferred project. MacPherson clarified that this only works if additional overprogramming is allowed and Solberg concurred. Robjent expressed agreement with eliminating scenario B2 because the bicycle/pedestrian mode is funded higher than the TAB-established range.

MOTION 2: It was moved by Leitner and seconded by Solberg to table MOTION 1 and MOTION 1 was tabled.

MOTION 3: It was moved by Solberg and seconded by Robjent to recommend overprogramming to 12% and programming unprogrammed funds. **MOTION 3 carried** with 19 ayes, one nay, and three abstentions.

MOTION 4: It was moved by Leitner and seconded by Isaacson to recommend removing scenario B2 and using overprogramming discussed in MOTION 3 to reflect the sentiment of scenario B2 in scenario B1. MacPherson said that in the comments, Freese pointed out that that the carbon reduction proposed totals for Midpoint and B1, the proposed totals were roughly \$15.1M but \$18.6M in B2, leading to the question of whether the latter could be used on scenarios A and B1. Peterson replied that it could not. Keel noted that there has been discussion of two projects: the Scott County bike trail and the Victoria pedestrian project, adding that the Scott County project was tied with a Three Rivers Park District project. He suggested that the Three Rivers project should be funded before the Victoria project adding that the Victoria project has a large scoring gap with the project ranked just in front of it. Solberg stated the preference to talk about modes as opposed to projects, though TAC has typically not liked to see tied scores split. He added that splitting the tie can help with fiscal constraint. Leitner replied that the motion is to use the overprogramming to add bicycle/pedestrian projects to scenario B1 and make it reflect scenario B2. Ellos suggested that the action will merge scenarios B1 and B2 into one "B" scenario though Keel added that it includes additional resources. Koutsoukos and Peterson said that scenario B2 should be shown to TAB but TAC's preferences can be shared. Koutsoukos suggested that TAB could be shown scenarios A and B with B1 and B2 in the background. Leitner clarified that the motion is related to scenario B1 and not scenario A. MOTION 4 **carried** with 18 ayes, two nays, and three abstentions.

Peterson said that this will result in the addition of a bike trail project or a traffic management technologies project and a roadway spot mobility project. Ellos expressed interest in funding a trail project and a roadway project. Laberee asked whether the lowest-ranked transit expansion project can be removed to increase funding available. Peterson said that funding was already added to a roadway project.

Members expressed preferences for use of extra funds between roadways and bicycle/pedestrian with more members preferring the former. It was decided that that no motion was needed in response to this discussion with Solberg summarizing that there is more preference towards roadways and for any extra carbon reduction funding going towards bicycle and pedestrian projects.

3. [2022-46: 2022 Carbon Reduction Program Funding Distribution](#)

Solberg said that this action is reflected in the Carbon Reduction Program projects in 2022-45. He added that there has been a question of whether the funding program, currently proposing 2023 and 2024 distribution, could also program beyond those two years. He said that MnDOT is required by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) to develop a carbon reduction strategy by November of 2023, which will lay out the framework for how the funds should be distributed. MnDOT requested that Met Council program the first two years only but did not require this.



Peterson said that the Council was involved in how to distribute the Carbon Reduction Program funding because it is a new funding source and there is no process outlined in the memorandum of understanding between MnDOT and the Council.

It was moved by Isaacson and seconded by Eyoh to forward to TAB technical feedback on the Carbon Reduction Program funding options. **Motion carried** unanimously.

4. [2022-47: 2022 Highway Safety Improvement Program Project Selection](#)

Peterson said that this has not changed a lot since TAC last saw it. He added that TAC and TAB members have not wanted to fund single projects from both the Regional Solicitation and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) solicitation. IIJA provides over double of the previous cycles.

Robjent asked whether Carbon Reduction Program funds can be used towards HSIP projects. Peterson replied that most projects cannot accept those funds, though some bike and pedestrian projects are eligible. Solberg added that the carbon reduction strategy can help lay this out.

It was moved by Thompson and seconded by Isaacson to recommend to TAB approval of the attached 38 projects for funding through the HSIP solicitation and inclusion of all Urbanized Area projects in the draft 2024-2027 TIP. Freese asked how much MnDOT's own HSIP allocation increased considering the number of MnDOT projects shown as funded in this slate of projects. Thompson said that this came up at the last Funding & Programming committee meeting and MnDOT is willing to provide an overview and discuss the process. Freese suggested if any of the MnDOT-sponsored projects could go into their own program so that other locally sponsored projects could be funded. Solberg said that the state's ability to match projects is limited, though that should be temporary. Robjent said that he had not realized that MnDOT was going to apply in the HSIP solicitation. He added the question that if TAB selects a Regional Solicitation scenario that does not include a project that scored well enough for funding in both scenarios whether those projects get the HSIP money. Peterson replied that two projects scored well enough to be funded in both solicitations and that both are shown as funded in the Regional Solicitation because that is a higher award. Solberg said that if one or both projects is removed from the Regional Solicitation, there can be discussion about including them in the HSIP program.

Motion carried unanimously.

Information

1. TAC Chair Nomination Committees – Breakout Groups

Barbeau suggested that the breakout groups meet and report the results to him and Chair Solberg, adding that there may be need to schedule meetings for the near future. Solberg added that per the unwritten historic rule, it is the cities' turn to chair. He added that counties or agencies could nominate potential chairs in case no interest comes from the cities.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned.

Committee Contact:

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner

Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us

651-602-1705

Action Transmittal

Transportation Advisory Board



Committee Meeting Date: December 7, 2022

Date: November 30, 2022

Action Transmittal: 2022-048

Review of Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) 2023-2029 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: TAC Planning Committee
Prepared By: Cole Hiniker, Multimodal Planning Manager, 651-602-1748

Requested Action

MAC requests that the Metropolitan Council review the MAC's 2023-2029 Capital Improvement Program as required by MN Statutes 473.181 and 473.621.

Recommended Motion

Recommend acceptance of the staff analysis of MAC's 2023-2029 CIP and forward these comments to the Metropolitan Council for its consideration.

Background and Purpose

The Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) annually prepares a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for projects at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport (MSP) and their six General Aviation reliever airports. Under state statutes 473.181 and 473.621 the Council must:

- Determine adequacy of public participation in the CIP process,
- Approve CIP projects meeting certain dollar thresholds, \$5 Million at MSP and \$2 Million at all reliever airports and "significant effects" criteria (referenced in Attachment 2, A-H),
- Review and comment on all projects for consistency with the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), including planning and environmental concerns.

In order to allow letting of projects early enough for construction to start in the spring, the Council has agreed to utilize the draft CIP document released in September to expedite the review. The MAC will take action on December 19th to adopt the final 2023-2029 CIP and any changes from the draft will be incorporated into the report that goes forward to the Met Council in early 2023. Any changes identified after the MAC Commission action will be reported to the Council. Any comments provided by TAC/TAB will also be included for consideration with the final review report submitted by staff for Council action.

Relationship to Regional Policy

The Metropolitan Council is required by state law to annually review MAC's CIP to ensure consistency of proposed projects with regional plans. Although state law doesn't require TAC/TAB to review the CIP, staff traditionally has sought TAC/TAB comments in the review process.

Staff Analysis

Analysis confirms that an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AOEE) has been prepared for 2023 projects with potential environmental effects, and MAC has in place an adequate public participation process for development and review of its AOEE and CIP. MAC held a public hearing on the AOEE on November 7th, at 10:30 AM at the Planning, Development and Environment Committee meeting at the MSP Conference Room.

The following 2023 projects meet the dollar threshold levels but do not meet the other “significant effects” criteria to trigger project approval:

Airport	Category	Project	Cost
MSP	End of Life/ Replacement Projects	Terminal 1 – Passenger Boarding Bridge Replacements	\$10,000,000
MSP	End of Life/ Replacement Projects	30L Deicing Pad Reconstruction	\$10,000,000
MSP	End of Life/ Replacement Projects	Bituminous Shoulder Reconstruction	\$7,000,000
MSP	End of Life/ Replacement Projects	Concourse G Apron Pavement Reconstruction	\$7,500,000
MSP	End of Life/ Replacement Projects	MSP Liquid Deicer Storage Facility	\$11,200,000
MSP	End of Life/ Replacement Projects	MAC Technology Upgrades	\$10,000,000
MSP	Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects	Terminal 1 – Mechanical Room C-1043	\$9,800,000
MSP	Long-term Comp Plan Projects	Terminal 1 – Baggage Claim/Ticket Lobby Operational Improvements	\$47,675,000
MSP	Long-term Comp Plan Projects	Terminal 1 – Concourse G Infill Pod 2-3	\$23,500,000
MSP	Ongoing Maintenance Programs	Air Handling Unit Replacement	\$6,500,000
MSP	Ongoing Maintenance Programs	Electrical Substation Replacement	\$7,500,000
MSP	Ongoing Maintenance Programs	Emergency Power Upgrades	\$6,600,000
MSP	Ongoing Maintenance Programs	Campus Building Roof Replacements	\$8,300,000

Federal, state and MAC funding has been identified by the MAC for most projects in the 2023-2029 CIP.

All projects in the 2023 CIP appear consistent with the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). Many of the MSP projects were evaluated in the 2020 EA for MSP that received a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) in March of 2013 from the Federal Aviation Administration. Initial analysis of the future years (2024-2029) of the CIP shows that many projects will meet the dollar threshold of review but only one project will meet the significant effects criteria, the Airlake LVN Runway 12-30 Improvements, which is a runway extension project that is currently scheduled for 2024 implementation. This project will be formally approved during next year’s CIP review. All potential projects will be re-evaluated on an annual basis.

There is a large dollar project included in the 2023 CIP that do not meet the significant effects criteria. The Concourse G Infill Pod 2-3 project is \$375,000,000 over two years and will expand waiting areas and make other passenger improvements in the G Concourse but does substantially increase the enplanements capacity of Terminal 1. The Council reviewed an Environmental Action Worksheet for this project and had no comments.

Committee Comments and Action

At its November 10, 2022, meeting, the TAC Planning Committee recommend acceptance of the staff analysis of MAC’s 2023-2029 CIP and forward these comments to the Metropolitan Council for its consideration.



Routing

To	Action Requested	Date Completed
TAC Planning Committee	Review & Recommend	November 10, 2022
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	December 7, 2022
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Recommend	December 21, 2022
Metropolitan Council Transportation Committee	Review & Recommend	January 9, 2023
Metropolitan Council	Review & or Adopt	January 25, 2023

MAC 2023 – 2029 Capital Improvement Program

The MAC 2023 – 2029 Capital Improvement Program material included in this memorandum reflects the actions of the Metropolitan Airports Commission’s Planning, Development and Environment (PD&E) Committee on Sep. 6, 2022. Final action by the Commission is expected at their December 19, 2022 meeting. Any changes made on December 5th PD&E Committee Meeting that may affect the CIP review would be reported at the December 21st Transportation Advisory Board meeting.

The overall review schedule for the CIP is listed below. Materials for the Met Council/TAB review are included in the following summaries:

- Attachment 1 – MAC 2023-2029 CIP Development and Public Review Schedule
- Attachment 2 – Projects Meeting Statutory Review Criteria & Requiring Approval. There are no projects that meet the criteria and requires approval from the Met Council this year.
- Attachment 3 – 2023 Projects Requiring an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AOEE). No 2023 CIP projects meet criteria for environmental review.
- Attachment 4 – Projects Meeting \$5M and \$2M Thresholds 2023-2029. A number of projects potentially meet the threshold dollar levels.



Attachment 2 – 2023 Projects Meeting Statutory Review Criteria and Requiring Approval:

2023 CIP Projects, by Airport	Long-Term Comp Plan Reviews/ Actions	AOEE Actions	Capital Review Criteria (A)	Capital Review Criteria (B)	Capital Review Criteria (C)	Capital Review Criteria (D)	Capital Review Criteria (E)	Capital Review Criteria (F)	Capital Review Criteria (G)	Capital Review Criteria (H)
Details	Review Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EA-EAW Prepared EIS Reviewed NPDES Approved Legislative Requirement Regulatory Requirement Legal Requirement 	Project meets Dollar threshold at: MSP = \$5M Relievers = \$2M	Location of a New Airport	New Runway at an Existing Airport	A Runway Extension at an Existing Airport	Runway Strengthening other than Routine Maintenance	New or Expanded Passenger Handling or Parking Facilities for 25% or more capacity increase.	Land Acquisition associated with the other criteria, or that would cause relocation of residential or business activities	Project information made available by the MAC to affected cities for review
MSP International Airport 20223 Program	2030 LTCP Update Approved in 2010		Several projects, see business item	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
St. Paul Downtown Airport	2025 LTCP Approved in 2010		None							
Flying Cloud Airport	2025 LTCP Approved in 2010	MAC-City Agreement concluded; FAA review of Agreement & R.O.D. on FEIS completed as part of MAC/Airline Agreement. 2010 Plan being implemented.	None							
Crystal Airport	2035 LTCP Approved in 2017	FAA Issues FONSI in July 2019	None							
Anoka County-Blaine Airport	2025 LTCP Approved in 2010		None							
Lake Elmo Airport	2035 LTCP Approved 2016	FAA issues Finding of No Significant Impact in Aug 2018	None							
Airlake Airport	2035 LTCP Approval in 2018	Negotiations on sewer & water service	None							

Attachment 3 – 2023 Projects Requiring an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AOEEs):

Environmental Categories Affected by the Project, MSP Airport

Project Description	Are the Effects of the project Addressed in an Approved EAW, EA or EIS?	Air Quality	Compatible Land Use	Fish Wildlife and Plants	Floodplains and Floodways	Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste	Historical, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources	Light Emissions and Visual Effects	Parks & Rec. Areas and Trails	Noise	Water Quality (Storm, Waste and Ground Water)	Wetlands	Infra-structure and Public Services	Farmland	Erosion and Sedimentation
No EA or EIS Required for 2023 Projects	MSP 2020 Environmental Assessment findings MSP – Concourse G Infill – Pod 2-3 EAW	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None

Environmental Categories Affected by the Project, Reliever Airports

Project Description	Are the Effects of the project Addressed in an Approved EAW, EA or EIS?	Air Quality	Compatible Land Use	Fish Wildlife and Plants	Floodplains and Floodways	Hazardous Materials, Pollution Prevention and Solid Waste	Historical, Architectural, Archaeological and Cultural Resources	Light Emissions and Visual Effects	Parks & Rec. Areas and Trails	Noise	Water Quality (Storm, Waste and Ground Water)	Wetlands	Infra-structure and Public Services	Farmland	Erosion and Sedimentation
No projects for 2023															



Attachment 4 – MAC Projects Anticipated to Meet the \$5 million and \$2 million Thresholds from 2023 – 2029:

	=Projects that meet the \$5 million threshold at MSP or the \$2 million threshold at reliever airports but DO NOT meet “significant effects” criteria.							
	=Projects that meet the \$5 million threshold at MSP or the \$2 million threshold at reliever airports and meet the “significant effects” criteria requiring Council approval prior to implementation.							
NOTES	MSP End of Life/Replacement Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	10 - Terminal 1							
2	Concourse and Hub Tram Replacement	\$500,000			\$300,000,000	\$300,000,000		
3	Cooling Unit Replacement		\$1,125,000					
4	Passenger Boarding Bridge Replacements	\$10,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
5	Recarpeting Program			\$2,000,000				
5	Terminal 1 Outbound Baggage Handling System Replacement						\$250,000,000	
	13 - Energy Management Center							
5	Concourse E and F Bridge Heating and Cooling System Replacement	\$2,100,000	\$2,200,000	\$1,800,000				
7	EMC Boiler and Chiller Replacement Study	\$155,000						
3	GTC Dual-temperature Pump Improvements	\$1,800,000						
3	Variable Air Volume (VAV) Box Replacement	\$950,000	\$950,000	\$950,000				
	21 - Field and Runway							
2	30L Deicing Pad Reconstruction	\$10,000,000		\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000			
5	30L EMAS Replacement				\$19,000,000			
2	Airfield Snow Melter Replacement/Upgrades	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	
2	Bituminous Shoulder Reconstruction	\$7,000,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000		
2	Concourse G Apron Pavement Reconstruction	\$7,500,000	\$18,750,000	\$7,500,000		\$7,000,000		
2	Runway 12L-30R and 4-22 Intersection Reconstruction		\$11,000,000					
2	Taxiway A Pavement Reconstruction				\$6,500,000	\$9,500,000	\$8,500,000	
2	Taxiway B Pavement Reconstruction	\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000		
	26 - Terminal Roads/Landside							
2	Terminal 1 Access Roadway Bridge Rehabilitation	\$4,750,000						
2	UPS Loop Pavement Reconstruction		\$1,800,000					
4	Variable Message Signs Replacement, Phase 3		\$1,600,000					
	31 – Parking							
5	Parking Ramp Snow Melter Replacement/Upgrades		\$1,350,000	\$1,350,000				
	36 - Terminal 2							
4	Terminal 2 Pre-conditioned Air (PCA)	\$2,300,000						
5	Terminal 2 Recarpeting Program	\$800,000	\$1,300,000	\$150,000				
4	Terminal 2 Ticket Counter/Insert Replacement			\$730,000				

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).

NOTES	MSP End of Life/Replacement Projects Continued	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	39 – Public Areas/Roads							
2	East 62nd Street Reconstruction					\$3,900,000		
2	East 70th Street Reconstruction		\$2,400,000					
2	Post Road Reconstruction Project				\$5,000,000			
	56 – Trades/Maintenance Buildings							
6	MSP Liquid Deicer Storage Facility	\$11,200,000						
	66 – Fire							
5	Fire Alarm System Transition	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,200,000		
	70 – General Office/Administration							
3	GO Building Variable Air Volume (VAV) Replacement and Upgrade			\$2,000,000				
	MSP End of Life/Replacement Projects Subtotal	\$66,355,000	\$57,775,000	\$50,480,000	\$360,300,000	\$344,600,000	\$270,500,000	\$10,000,000
	MSP IT Projects							
	10 - Terminal 1							
4	Concourse C and G Digital Directory Replacement		\$200,000					
4	Customs and Border Protection Camera System Upgrade	\$850,000					\$1,000,000	
4	MAC Technology Upgrades	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
5	Telecom Room Equipment Continuity (TREC)		\$1,510,000					
	63 - Police							
5	Card Access Modifications		\$2,500,000		\$2,800,000		\$2,500,000	
	MSP IT Projects Subtotal	\$10,850,000	\$14,210,000	\$10,000,000	\$13,800,000	\$11,000,000	\$14,500,000	\$11,000,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).



NOTES	MSP Long Term Comprehensive Plan Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	10 - Terminal 1							
1	Baggage Claim/Ticket Lobby Operational Improvements	\$47,675,000	\$15,000,000					
6	Checkpoint Expansion							\$11,000,000
1	Concourse G Infill – Pod 2-3	\$23,500,000	\$351,500,000					
7	Design and Construction Standards Update	\$350,000						
1	D-Pod Outbound Baggage System					\$15,000,000		
7	MSP Airport Layout Plan			\$1,000,000				
7	MSP Environmental Review			\$2,000,000				
7	MSP Long Term Plan							\$3,000,000
5	MSP Obstruction Removals				\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	
	21 - Field and Runway							
7	NAVAIDs Study for North Campus Development	\$350,000						
1	Runway 30R Parallel Taxiway				\$12,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$14,000,000	
	36 - Terminal 2							
7	Long Term Plan Projects (fees)		\$1,000,000					
1	Terminal 2 North Gate Expansion		\$195,000,000					
	MSP Long Term Comprehensive Plan Projects Subtotal	\$71,875,000	\$562,500,000	\$3,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$14,000,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).



NOTES	MSP Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	10 - Terminal 1							
5	ADO Office Expansion		\$4,000,000					
9	Art Display Areas	\$200,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
9	Arts Master Plan	\$665,000	\$1,240,000	\$1,565,000	\$565,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	
4	C/G Connector Lighting Improvements			\$1,000,000				
4	Concourse A Heating System Upgrade		\$11,000,000					
4	Concourse G Moving Walks			\$6,000,000				
5	Delivery Node Redevelopment	\$2,700,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,700,000	\$7,800,000	\$4,320,000	\$5,000,000	
5	F/G Connector & Skyclub Repairs and Improvements			\$1,100,000				
2	Folded Plate Repairs			\$43,400,000				
5	Lavatory Buildings Rehabilitation		\$4,400,000					
4	Lighting Infrastructure Technology and Equipment (LITE)	\$2,300,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,550,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,550,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,200,000
5	LRT Station Updates			\$1,600,000				
5	Restroom Upgrade Program	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000	\$2,050,000
4	Steam System Upgrade Program		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	
4	Terminal 1 Information Booth Replacements			\$850,000				
4	Terminal 1 Curbside Canopy Repairs and Lighting Upgrades		\$350,000					
6	Terminal 1 Employee Breakroom			\$450,000				
5	Terminal 1 Mechanical Room C-1043	\$9,800,000						
2	Terminal 1 Tug Drive Heater Replacement	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000					
5	Terminal 1 Tug Drive Waterproofing		\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$2,900,000		
4	Way-Finding Sign Backlighting Replacement	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000		\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000
	13 - Energy Management Center							
4	Chiller Plant Optimization		\$3,000,000					
4	Energy Savings Program	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000		
4	Indoor Air Quality Monitoring System	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000					
4	MAC Automation Infrastructure Program	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,400,000
6	Material Storage Building - Boiler Room Addition	\$1,830,000						
3	Steam Trap Monitoring System				\$3,000,000			
4	Terminal 2 Penthouse Chiller Plant Infrastructure Upgrades		\$5,500,000					
4	Victaulic Piping Replacement		\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,350,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).

NOTES	MSP Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects, continued	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	21 – Field and Runway							
7	Airfield Security Screening Facility (Study)	\$250,000						
5	Anti-Climb Fencing and Lighting	\$275,000						
4	Apron Lighting LED Upgrade		\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
6	Field Maintenance Building Efficiency Program			\$53,000,000		\$105,000,000		\$46,000,000
4	Localizer Array Upgrade	\$2,000,000						
4	Runway LED Lighting Upgrade	\$1,500,000	\$1,700,000	\$2,700,000				
4	Taxiways B & Q Islands	\$700,000						
2	Terminal 2 Glycol Lift Station/Forcemain		\$1,100,000					
4	Tunnel Lighting LED Upgrade		\$1,100,000	\$1,000,000	\$900,000	\$400,000	\$1,200,000	
	26 – Terminal Roads/Landside							
2	Tunnel Approaches Reconstruction	\$2,600,000						
	31 – Parking							
3	Parking Guidance System			\$6,500,000				
2	Parking Ramp Railing Refinishing		\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	
2	Red/Blue Parking Levels 2 & 3			\$9,200,000				
4	Rental Car EV Charging Infrastructure	\$1,500,000						
	36 - Terminal 2							
5	Ramp Information Display System (RIDS)			\$3,600,000				
5	Terminal 2 Baggage Handling System			\$410,000				
2	Terminal 2 Gate Area Passenger Amenities			\$1,000,000				
2	Terminal 2 Gate Desk/Podium Replacement					\$450,000		
6	Terminal 2 Ground Transportation Waiting Area Expansion			\$400,000				
7	Terminal 2 Lobby Passenger Flow Program		\$1,000,000					
2	Terminal 2 MUFIDS/EVIDS Millwork Upgrades			\$350,000				
5	Terminal 2 Skyway to LRT Flooring Installation			\$800,000				
5	Terminal Door Locks and Emergency Egress Upgrades		\$400,000					

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).



NOTES	MSP Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects, continued	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	39 - Public Areas/Roads							
2	34 th Avenue Bus Area Reconstruction		\$800,000					
2	34 th Avenue Reconstruction				\$7,800,000	\$7,800,000		
2	34 th Avenue Sanitary Sewer Replacement				\$2,200,000			
3	34 th Avenue Traffic Control Improvements		\$200,000					
2	Diverging Diamond Intersection Rehabilitation					\$380,000		
4	Highway 494 Terminal and Airline Signs	\$300,000						
2	Taxi Cab Holding Lot Rehabilitation for Cell Phone Lot				\$650,000			
2	Terminal 1 Ground Transportation Modifications	\$1,140,000						
2	Terminal 1 Inbound Roadway Median Improvements			\$3,300,000				
4	Tunnel Fan Replacement		\$4,700,000	\$6,800,000				
	46 - Hangars and Other Buildings							
6	MAC Storage Facility		\$30,000,000					
6	Safety and Security Center		\$150,000,000					
	56 - Trades/Maintenance Buildings							
6	South Field Maintenance Building Wash Bay		\$3,500,000					
	63 - Police							
5	Perimeter Fence Intrusion Detection System			\$1,000,000				
5	Perimeter Gate Security Improvements		\$6,500,000	\$6,500,000				
5	Police Department Improvements at Terminals 1 & 2						\$1,500,000	
5	Public Safety Modifications	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000		\$850,000		\$850,000
2	Squad Parking Modifications				\$140,000			
	66 - Fire							
5	Campus Fire Protection		\$2,400,000		\$3,400,000		\$1,900,000	\$3,500,000
	76 - Environment							
4	Glycol Sewer & Storm Sewer Inspection/Rehabilitation		\$1,700,000	\$600,000				
4	Ground Service Equipment (GSE) Electrical Charging Stations	\$3,000,000						
4	Infield Fueling Facility Secondary Containment			\$400,000				
4	Lift Station at Ponds 1 and 2			\$2,300,000				
5	MSP Pond 3 / 494 Pond Sediment Removal and Repairs			\$5,500,000				
4	Runway 12R-30L Glycol Forcemain Environmental Improvements	\$2,000,000						
2	Terminal 2 Remote Ramp Lot/Drainage Improvements		\$2,000,000					
	MSP Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects Subtotal	\$45,110,000	\$263,490,000	\$186,675,000	\$45,155,000	\$138,750,000	\$22,300,000	\$61,600,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).

NOTES	MSP Noise Mitigation Consent Decree Amendment	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
8	MSP Noise Mitigation Consent Decree Amendment	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$500,000				
	MSP Ongoing Maintenance Programs							
	10 - Terminal 1							
4	Air Handling Unit Replacement	\$6,500,000	\$6,500,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$13,000,000
4	Baggage System Upgrades	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
4	Concourse G Rehabilitation		\$10,000,000					
4	Conveyance System Upgrades			\$3,000,000				
4	Electrical Infrastructure Program (EIP)	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
4	Electrical Substation Replacement	\$7,500,000	\$3,300,000	\$1,500,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000		
4	Emergency Power Upgrades	\$6,600,000	\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
4	Plumbing Infrastructure Upgrade Program	\$600,000	\$700,000	\$700,000	\$700,000	\$700,000	\$700,000	\$700,000
5	Terminal Building Remediation Program	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
4	Terminal Miscellaneous Modifications	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000
	13 - Energy Management Center							
4	EMC Life Safety Infrastructure Program		\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000
4	EMC Plant Upgrades (T1 & T2)	\$2,000,000	\$2,100,000	\$2,150,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,300,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,500,000
	21 - Field and Runway							
2	Airside Electrical Construction	\$2,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$4,500,000				
2	Airside Roadway Pavement Restoration	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
2	Miscellaneous Airfield Construction	\$3,500,000	\$1,500,000					
2	Pavement Joint Sealing/Repair	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
	26 - Terminal Roads/Landside							
2	Tunnel/Bridge Inspections	\$100,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
5	Tunnel-Bridge Miscellaneous Modifications			\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000
	31 - Parking							
2	Parking Structure Rehabilitation	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).



NOTES	MSP Ongoing Maintenance Programs, continued	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	39 - Public Areas/Roads							
2	Concrete Joint Repair	\$900,000	\$1,000,000	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$1,200,000	\$2,900,000	\$750,000
2	Landside Pavement Rehabilitation	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000		\$500,000	\$600,000	\$600,000
2	Landside Utility Rehabilitation	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000
2	Roadway Fixture Refurbishment	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
	46 - Hangars and Other Buildings							
5	Campus Building Rehabilitation Program	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000		\$1,500,000		\$1,500,000
2	Campus Parking Lot Reconstructions	\$650,000	\$650,000				\$700,000	
10	End of Life Campus Building Demolition			\$400,000	\$3,700,000			
2	MSP Campus Building Roof Replacements	\$8,300,000	\$6,100,000	\$12,500,000	\$10,200,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
	56 - Trades/Maintenance Buildings							
4	Sump Pump Controls		\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,500,000			
	70 - General Office/Administration							
5	GO Building Improvements		\$500,000		\$500,000		\$500,000	
	MSP Ongoing Maintenance Programs Subtotal	\$55,150,000	\$59,870,000	\$59,070,000	\$63,220,000	\$50,420,000	\$41,550,000	\$40,800,000
	MSP Tenant Projects							
	10 - Terminal 1							
2	Concessions Upgrades/Revenue Development	\$100,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
5	Concourse and Gatehold Modernization	\$23,800,000	\$85,600,000	\$73,100,000				
2	Delta Re-booking Station		\$350,000					
6	Elevator and Concourse Improvements - Relocated United Club	\$200,000					\$1,000,000	
2	Terminal 1 FIS Gate Common Use Additions	\$1,500,000		\$5,000,000				
4	Terminal 1 Pre-Conditioned Air (PCA)		\$2,500,000					
	36 - Terminal 2							
6	Terminal 2 Concessions Development	\$2,800,000						
	39 - Public Areas / Roads							
2	Tenant Parking Lot Reconstruction			\$2,900,000				
	46 - Hangars and Other Buildings							
7, 6	Ground Service Equipment (GSE) Maintenance Facility	\$200,000					\$2,000,000	
	MSP Tenant Projects Subtotal	\$28,600,000	\$88,650,000	\$81,200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$3,200,000	\$200,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).

NOTES	Reliever Airports Long Term Comprehensive Plan (LTCP) Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	81 - St. Paul							
7	STP Airport Layout Plan	\$500,000						
7	STP Environmental Review			\$800,000				
7	STP Long Term Comprehensive Plan	\$800,000						
	82 - Lake Elmo							
7	21D Airport Layout Plan		\$100,000					
7	21D Long Term Comp Plan							\$500,000
	83 - Airlake							
7	LVN Airport Layout Plan			\$100,000				
7	LVN Long Term Comp Plan							\$500,000
1	LVN Runway 12-30 Improvements		\$4,400,000					
	84 - Flying Cloud							
7	FCM Environmental Review		\$800,000					
10	FCM Purchase and Demolition of Hangars	\$1,300,000						
6	FCM South Building Area Utilities				\$800,000			
	85 - Crystal							
7	MIC Long Term Comp Plan						\$500,000	
	86 - Anoka County - Blaine							
7	ANE Airport Layout Plan		\$500,000					
6	ANE Building Area Development - Xylite St. Relocation			\$1,000,000				
7	ANE Long Term Comprehensive Plan Update		\$800,000					
	Reliever Airports LTCP Projects Subtotal	\$2,600,000	\$6,600,000	\$1,900,000	\$800,000	\$0	\$500,000	\$1,000,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).

NOTES	Reliever Airports Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	80 - Reliever Airports							
4	Relievers Building Miscellaneous Modifications	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000
5	Relievers Obstruction Removals	\$300,000		\$300,000		\$300,000		\$300,000
2	Relievers Pavement Rehabilitation Miscellaneous Modifications	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
6	Relievers Used Oil Sheds a& Tanks			\$550,000				
	81 - St. Paul							
6	STP Airport Perimeter Roads			\$500,000				
2	STP Airport Road and Eaton Street Retaining Wall						\$700,000	
6	STP Cold Equipment Storage Building				\$750,000			
6	STP Customs and Border Protection General Aviation Facility		\$4,500,000					
2	STP Floodwall Inspection and Repairs	\$200,000						
3	STP Intelligent Monitoring and Control System (IMACS) Expansion		\$2,250,000					
4	STP LED Edge Lighting Upgrades	\$500,000	\$1,500,000					
5	STP MAC Building Improvements	\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000
2	STP Pavement Rehabilitation-Taxilanes/Tower Road				\$750,000			
2	STP Runway 13-31 Pavement Reconstruction			\$5,000,000				
5	STP Runway 14-32 EMAS Replacement					\$10,000,000		
2	STP Runway 14-32 Reconstruction			\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000			
2	STP Storm Sewer Improvements		\$1,500,000					
2	STP Taxiway B Rehabilitation			\$800,000				
2	STP Taxiway Lima Rehabilitation					\$200,000		
5	STP Vehicle Gate Replacement	\$500,000						
	82 - Lake Elmo							
3	21D AWOS Replacement			\$100,000				
3	21D Intelligent Monitoring and Control System (IMACS)			\$1,150,000				
6	21D Materials Storage Building		\$500,000					
2	21D North Building Area Pavement Rehabilitation		\$900,000					
2	21D North Service Roads Rehabilitation			\$500,000				
2	21D Northside Taxiway Reconstruction			\$600,000				\$600,000
2	21D Runway 04-22 Pavement Rehabilitation		\$4,000,000					
NOTES	Reliever Airports Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	83 - Airlake							
3	LVN AWOS Replacement			\$100,000				
2	LVN Existing Runway 12-30 Reconstruction		\$3,500,000					
3	LVN Intelligent Monitoring and Control System (IMACS)				\$1,150,000			
4	LVN LED Edge Lighting	\$200,000						
5	LVN Maintenance Building Renovation			\$750,000				
2	LVN North Service Road Pavement Rehabilitation					\$500,000		
2	LVN North Taxilanes Pavement Rehabilitation					\$1,250,000		
6	LVN South Building Area Utilities and Taxilanes		\$1,300,000					
2	LVN Taxiway Bravo Pavement Rehabilitation		\$600,000					
	84 - Flying Cloud							
2	FCM Airport Access Roads and Tango Lane				\$500,000			
2	FCM Airport Access Roads Pavement Rehabilitation					\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
6	FCM Electrical Vault Modifications				\$500,000			
2	FCM Executive Aviation/MAC Maintenance Apron				\$600,000			

NOTES	Reliever Airports Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
5	FCM Gate Replacements			\$500,000				
3	FCM Intelligent Monitoring and Control System (IMACS)		\$2,250,000					
5	FCM MAC Building Improvements				\$600,000			
6	FCM Parcel 7 Sanitary Sewer and Water	\$300,000						
2	FCM Runway 10R-28L Pavement Rehabilitation		\$2,700,000					
2	FCM Runway 18-36 Pavement Rehabilitation							\$700,000
6	FCM Spring Lane Extension and Taxilane Connector	\$600,000						
5	FCM Tower Equipment for Airfield Lighting and Utilities			\$1,000,000				
2	FCM Underground Fuel Storage Tank Replacement		\$500,000					
	85 -Crystal							
4	MIC Existing Hangar Revitalization					\$800,000		
3	MIC Intelligent Monitoring and Control System (IMACS)					\$1,150,000		
3	MIC LED Edge Lighting Upgrade	\$400,000						
2	MIC Runway 6L-24R Pavement Rehabilitation						\$2,500,000	
2	MIC Service Roads	\$1,200,000						
2	MIC Taxilanes Pavement Rehabilitation	\$750,000		\$600,000		\$600,000		
2	MIC Taxiway Alpha Pavement Reconstruction							\$1,200,000
2	MIC Tower Parking Lot Reconstruction		\$675,000					
2	MIC Underground Fuel Storage Tank Replacement		\$500,000					
	86 - Anoka County - Blaine							
3	ANE AWOS Replacement	\$100,000						
4	ANE Electrical Vault Improvements			\$750,000				
6	ANE Equipment Storage and Maintenance Building	\$700,000						
5	ANE Gate Controller Upgrades					\$400,000		
3	ANE Intelligent Monitoring and Control System (IMACS)			\$1,150,000				
2	ANE Pavement Rehabilitation - Taxiway A and Edge Lights	\$1,800,000						
2	ANE Runway 18-36 Pavement Rehabilitation					\$3,000,000		
2	ANE Runway 9-27 Pavement Rehabilitation						\$3,750,000	
2	ANE Taxiway B Pavement Rehabilitation							\$1,400,000
2	ANE Underground Fuel Storage Tank Replacement		\$500,000					
6	ANE West Perimeter Road		\$1,800,000					
	Reliever Airports Maintenance/Facility Upgrade Projects Subtotal	\$8,450,000	\$30,175,000	\$20,250,000	\$12,900,000	\$19,750,000	\$5,650,000	\$5,600,000
	MSP Subtotal	\$278,440,000	\$1,047,495,000	\$390,925,000	\$495,675,000	\$569,970,000	\$367,050,000	\$137,600,000
	Reliever Subtotal	\$11,050,000	\$36,775,000	\$22,150,000	\$13,700,000	\$19,750,000	\$6,150,000	\$6,600,000
	Total	\$289,490,000	\$1,084,270,000	\$413,075,000	\$509,375,000	\$589,720,000	\$373,200,000	\$144,200,000

MAC Environmental Notes:

- 1) A project that has the potential for substantial environmental effects.
- 2) A reconstruction, rehabilitation, repair or replacement that does not physically alter the original size (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 3) An electrical or mechanical device that monitors, indicates or controls existing conditions (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 4) An electrical, mechanical or structural device and/or modification of an existing structure that does not significantly increase size or passenger capacity (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 5) A project that consists of safety or security enhancements, facility maintenance, or facility upgrades (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 6) A new, replacement or expansion project that does not have substantial effect (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 7) Consultant fees only for planning, design, or environmental work.
- 8) Residential noise mitigation efforts that are designed to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 9) Projects associated with the Airport Foundation art program (an EAW or EIS is not required).
- 10) Projects involving the demolition of existing buildings (an EAW or EIS is not required).