

## **ACTION TRANSMITTAL**

**DATE:** December 12, 2013

**TO:** TAC Funding and Programming Committee

**PREPARED BY:** Heidi Schallberg, Senior Planner (651-602-1721)

**SUBJECT:** 2014-2017 TIP Amendment for I-94

**REQUESTED ACTION:** The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) requests a TIP amendment to add a project (SP# 2780-66) in 2015 for auxiliary lane construction on I-94 from TH 241 in St. Michael to TH 101 in Rogers, including westbound exit ramp extension at TH 101 and westbound third lane from TH 101 to TH 241 using \$40,000,000 in state bonds.

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** Recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board adopt an amendment to the 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), pending approval of a related Transportation Policy Plan amendment, to add a project (SP# 2780-66) in 2015 for auxiliary lane construction on I-94 from TH 241 in St. Michael to TH 101 in Rogers, including westbound exit ramp extension at TH 101 and westbound third lane from TH 101 to TH 241 using \$40,000,000 in state bonds.

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION:** This amendment is needed to add a new project in 2015 that is one of 10 projects selected statewide for the Corridors of Commerce program. The I-94 project provides an eastbound auxiliary lane from TH 241 in St. Michael to TH 101 in Rogers. On westbound I-94, the project extends the westbound exit ramp to TH 101 and adds an additional general purpose lane through the TH 101 interchange extending to TH 241 in St. Michael. The bridges over the Crow River will be widened to accommodate the extra lanes. The Corridors of Commerce program was created by the 2013 Minnesota Legislature (2013 Session Law, Chapter 117) to provide additional highway capacity on segments where there are currently bottlenecks in the system and to improve the movement of freight and reduce barriers to commerce.

**RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL POLICY:** Federal law requires that all transportation projects that will be partially funded with federal funds must be in an approved TIP and meet the following four tests: fiscal constraint; consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan; air quality conformity; and opportunity for public input. It is the TAB's responsibility to adopt and amend the TIP according to these four requirements.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:** The TIP amendment meets fiscal constraint because the state-authorized bonds are sufficient to fully fund the project. The project is being amended into the Transportation Policy Plan that was adopted by the Metropolitan Council on

November 10, 2010, with FHWA/FTA conformity determination established on February 23, 2011. The Minnesota Interagency Air Quality and Transportation Planning Committee identified the project as an A20 regionally-significant project as part of its conformity analysis for the 2014-2017 TIP, which is attached. The analysis in the attachment has resulted in a Conformity Determination that the projects included in the 2014-2017 TIP meet all relevant regional emissions analysis and budget tests. The 2014-2017 TIP conforms to the relevant sections of the Federal Conformity Rule and to the applicable sections of Minnesota State Implementation Plan for air quality. Public input opportunities for this amendment are provided through the TAB's and Council's regular meetings, in addition to a public comment period for this amendment due the project's regional significance in adding highway capacity. The public comment period will be from January 15 through February 13, 2014.

---

**ROUTING**

| <b>TO</b>                                     | <b>ACTION REQUESTED</b> | <b>DATE COMPLETED</b> |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| TAC Funding & Programming Committee           | Review & Recommend      |                       |
| Technical Advisory Committee                  | Review & Recommend      |                       |
| Transportation Advisory Board                 | Review & Adopt          |                       |
| Metropolitan Council Transportation Committee | Concurrence             |                       |
| Metropolitan Council                          | Concurrence             |                       |

December 10, 2013

Karl Keel, Chair  
TAC Funding and Programming Committee  
Metropolitan Council  
390 Robert Street No.  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Re: Amendment to the Twin Cities 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Dear Mr. Keel:

Please amend the 2014 – 2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add a new project on I-94 in State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2015 for a total of \$40,000,000. This project is being submitted with the following information:

**PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:**

| SEQ # | STATE FISCAL YEAR | A T P | DIST | ROUTE SYS | PROJECT NUMBER (S.P. #) (Fed # if available) | AGENCY | DESCRIPTION include location, description of all work, & city (if applicable)  | MILES |
|-------|-------------------|-------|------|-----------|--|--------|--|-------|
|       | 2015              | M     | M    | I-94      | 2780-66                                      | MnDOT  | **ELLA**<br>AUXILIARY LANE CONSTRUCTION EB FROM TH 241 IN ST. MICHAEL TO TH 101 IN ROGERS, INCLUDES WB EXIT RAMP EXTENSION AT TH 101 & WB THIRD LANE FROM TH 101 TO TH 241 | 4.15  |

| PROG | TYPE OF WORK              | PROP FUNDS | TOTAL \$     | FHWA \$ | AC \$ | FTA \$ | TH \$        | OTHER \$ |
|------|---------------------------|------------|--------------|---------|-------|--------|--------------|----------|
| MC   | GRADE, SURFACE AND BRIDGE | SF         | \$40,000,000 | \$0     |       |        | \$40,000,000 | \$0      |

**PROJECT BACKGROUND:**

1. The Corridors of Commerce program was created by the 2013 Minnesota Legislature (2013 Session Law, Chapter 117) to provide additional highway capacity on segments where there are currently bottlenecks in the system, and to improve the movement of freight and reduce barriers to commerce. The legislation includes the specific selection criteria used to guide project selection. Projects were evaluated on the basis of project readiness, return on investment and support from the MnDOT district and local and regional agencies. Project submissions were ultimately considered and announced by Transportation Commissioner Zelle and Minnesota Governor Mark Dayton.

This amendment is needed to add a new project selected for the Corridors of Commerce Program, SP 2780-66, to SFY 2015 of the 2014-2017 TIP. This project, which provides operational improvements between TH 241 and TH 101, is Regionally Significant.

The project provides an eastbound auxiliary lane from TH 241 in St. Michael to TH 101 in Rogers. On westbound I-94, the project extends the westbound exit ramp to TH 101 and adds an additional general purpose lane through the TH 101 interchange extending to TH 241 in St. Michael. The bridges over the Crow River will be widened to accommodate the extra lanes.

2. How is Fiscal Constraint Maintained as required by 23 CFR 450.216 (check all that apply)?
  - New Money \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_
  - Anticipated Advance Construction \_\_\_\_\_
  - ATP or MPO or Mn/DOT Adjustment by deferral of other projects \_\_\_\_\_
  - Earmark or HPP not affecting fiscal constraint \_\_\_\_\_
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_

Legislation passed by the 2013 Minnesota Legislature created the Corridors of Commerce program and authorized the sale of up to \$300 million in new bonds for the construction, reconstruction and improvement of trunk highways.

SP 2780-66 has a total estimated design build contract cost of \$40,000,000 funded by Corridors of Commerce authorized TH bonds.

The TH bonds authorized by the Corridors of Commerce legislation are sufficient to fully fund this project, therefore fiscal constraint is maintained.

**CONSISTENCY WITH MPO LONG RANGE PLAN:**

The Metropolitan Council Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) will be amended in the future to include this project, its timing and funding sources.

The fiscally constrained (TPP was adopted by the Metropolitan Council on November 10, 2010, with FHWA/FTA conformity determination established on February 23, 2011.

**AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY:**

- Subject to conformity determination ..... \_YES
- Exempt from regional level analysis.....\_\_\_\_\_
- N/A (not in a nonattainment or maintenance area).....\_\_\_\_\_

The Minnesota Interagency Air Quality and Transportation Planning Committee identified the project as an A20 regionally-significant project as part of its conformity analysis for the 2014-2017 TIP, which is attached. The analysis in the attachment has resulted in a Conformity Determination that the projects included in the 2014-2017 TIP meet all relevant regional emissions analysis and budget tests. The 2014-2017 TIP conforms to the relevant sections of the Federal Conformity Rule and to the applicable sections of Minnesota State Implementation Plan for air quality.

Sincerely,

Brian Isaacson  
Planning Director, Program Management  
MnDOT Metro District

cc: Cindy Krumsieg, MN/DOT Metro Program Management  
Dan Erickson, MN/DOT Metro State Aid  
Heidi Schallberg, Metropolitan Council

**Appendix B.**  
**Conformity Documentation**  
**Of the amended 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program to the 1990**  
**Clean Air Act Amendments**  
*December 9, 2013*

The United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) *40 CFR PARTS 51 and 93*, referred to together with all applicable amendments as the "Conformity Rule," requires the Metropolitan Council (the Council) to prepare a conformity analysis of the region's *Transportation Policy Plan* (the Plan), as well as the *FY 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP). Based on an air quality analysis, the Council must determine whether the TIP conforms to the requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) with regard to National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for mobile source criteria pollutants.

Specifically, the Minneapolis/St. Paul Metropolitan Area is within an EPA-designated carbon monoxide (CO) limited maintenance area. A map of this area, which for air quality analysis purposes includes the seven-county Metropolitan Council jurisdiction plus Wright County and the City of New Prague, is shown in Exhibit B-1. The term "maintenance" reflects the fact that regional CO emissions were unacceptably high in the 1970s when the NAAQS were introduced, but were subsequently brought under control through a metro-area Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (VIM) Program completed in the 1990s. The EPA then re-designated the area as in attainment of the NAAQS for CO in 1999 and approved a "maintenance plan" containing a technical rationale and actions designed to keep emissions below a set region-wide budget. The maintenance plan was updated in 2005, when changes to the emissions rates approved by EPA necessitated an update of the approved CO budget as well. A second ten-year maintenance plan was approved by EPA on November 8, 2010 as a "limited maintenance plan." Every long-range Plan or TIP approved by the Council must be analyzed using specific criteria and procedures defined in the Conformity Rule to verify that it does not result in emissions exceeding this current regional CO budget.

A conforming TIP and Plan, satisfying the aforementioned analysis requirement, must be in place in order for any federally funded transportation program or project phase to receive FHWA or FTA approval. A conformity analysis for the Transportation Policy Plan was approved by the Council and submitted for FHWA/FTA and EPA approval on April 24, 2013, 2013. This appendix describes the procedures used to analyze the amended 2014-2017 TIP and lists findings and conclusions supporting the Metropolitan Council's determination that this TIP conforms to the requirements of the CAAA.

***The analysis described in the appendix has resulted in a Conformity Determination that the projects included in the amended 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program meet all relevant regional emissions analysis and budget tests as described herein. The amended 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program conforms to the relevant sections of the Federal Conformity Rule and to the applicable sections of Minnesota State Implementation Plan for air quality.***

# CONTENTS

Page

|  |      |
|--|------|
| I. CONFORMITY OF THE <i>amended 2014-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM</i> :<br>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS ..... | B-3  |
| II. CONSULTATION PROCEDURES.....   | B-4  |
| III. DESCRIPTION OF EMISSION ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS.....   | B-6  |
| IV. CONFORMITY DETERMINATION .....   | B-11 |
| V. TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES.....   | B-12 |
| VI. EXHIBITS .....   | B-15 |
| 1. CO MAINTENANCE AREA MAP   |      |
| 2. CODES FOR PROJECTS THAT DO NOT IMPACT REGIONAL EMISSIONS  |      |

## I. CONFORMITY OF THE AMENDED 2014-2017 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of the regionally significant projects listed in the TIP was prepared. The analysis included the projects listed in Tables B-1 through B-3. This analysis meets the following Conformity Rule requirements:

- *Inter-agency consultation* (§93.105, §93.112). The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) were consulted during the preparation of the TIP and its conformity review and documentation. The "Transportation Conformity Procedures for Minnesota" handbook provides guidelines for agreed-upon roles and responsibilities and inter-agency consultation procedures in the conformity process.
- *Regionally significant and exempt projects* (§93.126, §93.127). The TIP analysis includes all known federal and nonfederal regionally significant projects as defined in §93.101 of the Conformity Rule. Exempt projects not included in the regional air quality analysis were identified by the inter-agency consultation group and classified in accordance with §93.126 of the Conformity Rule.
- *Donut areas* (§93.105(c)(2)). No regionally significant projects are planned or programmed for the City of New Prague. The air quality analysis of CO emissions for Wright County is prepared by the Council as part of an intergovernmental agreement with the County, MNDOT and the Council. Four regionally significant projects were identified for Wright County to be built within the analyses period of the TIP. The projects are in the maintenance area, but are outside of the Metropolitan Council's seven-county planning jurisdiction.
- *Latest planning assumptions* (§93.110). The Council is required by Minnesota statute to prepare regional population and employment forecasts for the Twin Cities Seven-County Metropolitan Area. The published source of socioeconomic data for this region is the Metropolitan Council's *2030 Regional Development Framework*. This planning document provides the Council with socio-economic data (planning assumptions) needed to develop long range forecasts of regional highway and transit facilities needs. The latest update to these forecasts was published December 31, 2012.

Other conformity requirements have been addressed as follows:

- The TIP was prepared in accordance with the *Public Participation Plan for Transportation Planning*, adopted by the Council on February 14, 2007. This process satisfies MAP-21 requirements for public involvement, in addition to the public consultation procedures requirement of Conformity Rule §93.105.
- The TIP addresses the fiscal constraint requirements of 23 CFR Section 450.324 and Section 93.108 of the Conformity Rule. Chapter 3 of the TIP documents the consistency of proposed transportation investments with already available and projected sources of revenue.
- The Council certifies that the Plan does not conflict with the implementation of the SIP, and conforms to the requirement to implement the Transportation System Management Strategies which are the adopted Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) for the region. All of the adopted TCMs have been implemented.
- Any TIP projects that are not specifically listed in the Plan are consistent with the policies and purposes of the Plan and will not interfere with other projects specifically included in the Plan.
- There are no projects which have received NEPA approval and have not progressed within three years.
- Although a small portion of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area is a maintenance area for PM-10, the designation is due to non-transportation sources, and therefore is not analyzed herein.



## **II. CONSULTATION PROCEDURES**

### **A. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS**

The Council remains committed to a proactive public involvement process used in the development and adoption of the plan as required by the Council's Public Participation Plan for Transportation Planning. The Public Participation Plan is in Appendix D of the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (revision adopted February 14, 2007) and complies with the public involvement process as defined in 23 CFR 450.316 and the MAP-21 requirements of Title 23 USC 134(i)(5), as well as the most current revisions to the Conformity Rule.

In addition to the Public Participation Plan, the Council continues to develop, refine and test public involvement tools and techniques as part of extensive ongoing public involvement activities that provide information, timely notices and full public access to key decisions and supports early and continuing involvement to the development of plans and programs. For example, open houses, comment mail-in cards, emails, letters, internet bulletin board, voice messages and notices on its web site are used to attract participation at the open houses, disburse informational materials and solicit public comments on transportation plans.

Solicitation of comments on the TIP is done a 30-day comment period. The TIP is adopted after the public comment period and revised as needed in response to comments received. A copy of the TIP is available to download from the Council's web site. The TIP public comment period is announced on the Council's web site. The public can contact the Council's transportation department directly by phone using a contact phone number posted on the web site.

### **B. INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION PROCESS**

An interagency consultation process was used to develop the amended TIP. Consultation continues throughout the public comment period to respond to comments and concerns raised by the public and agencies prior to final adoption by the Council. The Council, MPCA and MnDOT confer on the application of the latest air quality emission models, the review and selection of projects exempted from a conformity air quality analysis, and regionally significant projects that must be included in the conformity analysis of the plan. An interagency conformity work group provides a forum for interagency consultation. The work group has representatives from the Council, MPCA, MnDOT, EPA and the FHWA. The following is a list of interagency meetings held and scheduled in 2013 to consult during the preparation and adoption of the plan document. Ongoing communication occurred along with periodic meetings, draft reports, emails and phone calls.

### Amended 2014-2017 TIP Adoption Schedule

| Date                  | Action  | Staff  | Notes   |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| Early December        | Mn Interagency AQ and Transportation Planning Comm. Review amendment schedule, project info, and AQ conformity analysis | MPCA, MnDOT Metro, Met Council Transportation Services, FHWA Planning and Research Manager |   |
| December 12           | Mailing to Funding and Programming Comm.  | Met Council, with materials supplied by MnDOT Metro  |   |
| December 19           | TAC Funding and Programming Comm. Recommend amendment to TAC  | Met Council Transportation Services and MnDOT Metro District                               |   |
| January 8             | TAC recommend amendment to TAB  | Met Council Transportation Services  |   |
| January 15            | TAB adopt for public comment  | Met Council Transportation Services  | Action item should include MPCA comment letter on AQ conformity analysis) |
| February 17 – April 4 | Public comment period   |  |   |
| April 16              | TAB adopts amendment and makes positive conformity finding  | Met Council Transportation Services  |   |
| April 14              | MC Transportation Comm. concurs   | Met Council Transportation Services  |   |
| April 23              | Met Council approves, sends to MnDOT  | Met Council Transportation Services  |   |

### III. PROJECT LISTS AND ASSUMPTIONS

#### Definition of Regionally Significant and Exempt Projects

Pursuant to the Conformity Rule, the projects listed in the 2014-2017 TIP and Plan were reviewed and categorized using the following determinations to identify projects that are exempt from a regional air quality analysis, as well as regionally significant projects to be included in the analysis. The classification process used to identify exempt and regionally significant projects was developed through an interagency consultation process involving the MPCA, EPA, FHWA, the Council and MnDOT. Regionally significant projects were selected according to the definition in Section 93.101 of the Conformity Rules:

*Regionally significant project means a transportation project (other than an exempt project) that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves) and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area's transportation network, including at a minimum all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel.*

Junction improvements and upgraded segments less than one mile in length are not normally coded into the Regional Travel Demand Forecast Model (RTDFM), and therefore are not considered to be regionally significant, although they are otherwise not exempt. The exempt air quality classification codes used in the "AQ" column of project tables of the TIP are listed in Exhibit B-4. Projects which are classified as exempt must meet the following requirements:

1. The project does not interfere with the implementation of transportation control measures.
2. The project is segmented for purposes of funding or construction and received all required environmental approvals from the lead agency under the NEPA requirements including:
  - a. A determination of categorical exclusion: or
  - b. A finding of no significant impact: or
  - c. A final Environmental Impact Statement for which a record of decision has been issued.
3. The project is exempt if it falls within one of the categories listed in Section 93.126 in the Conformity Rule. Projects identified as exempt by their nature do not affect the outcome of the regional emissions analyses and add no substance to the analyses. These projects are determined to be within the four major categories described in the conformity rule.
  - a. Safety projects that eliminated hazards or improved traffic flows.
  - b. Mass transit projects that maintained or improved the efficiency of transit operations.
  - c. Air quality related projects that provided opportunities to use alternative modes of transportation such as ride-sharing, van-pooling, bicycling, and pedestrian facilities.
  - d. Other projects such as environmental reviews, engineering, land acquisition and highway beautification.

**2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program**

The inter-agency consultation group, including representatives from MnDOT, FHWA, MPCA, EPA, and the Council, reviewed the list of projects to be completed by the 2014-2017 TIP timeframe, including the following:

- In-place regionally significant highway or transit facilities, services, and activities;
- Projects selected through the Council's Regional Solicitation process;
- Major projects from MnDOT's ten-year work program; and
- Regionally significant projects (regardless of funding sources) which are currently:
  - under construction, or;
  - undergoing right-of-way acquisition, or;
  - come from the first year of a previously conforming TIP (2011-2014), or;
  - have completed the NEPA process.

Each project was assigned to a horizon year (2015 or 2020) and categorized in terms of potential regional significance and air quality analysis exemption as per Sections 93.126 and 93.127 of the Conformity Rule, using the codes listed in this Appendix. The resulting list of regionally significant projects for 2015 and 2020 is shown in Tables B-1 through B-2.

**2030 Transportation Policy Plan; Adopted November 10, 2010**

The inter-agency consultation group also reviewed projects to be completed before 2030 but not within the 2014-2017 TIP timeframe, including the project types listed above, as well as regionally significant planned projects in the TPP and other regionally significant projects, regardless of funding source. Each project was assigned to a horizon year (2015, 2020, or 2030) and categorized in terms of potential regional significance and air quality analysis exemption as per Sections 93.126 and 93.127 of the Conformity Rule, using the codes listed in this Appendix. The resulting list of regionally significant projects for 2015, 2020 and 2030 is shown in Tables B-1 through B-3.

**Wright County and City of New Prague Projects**

A significant portion of Wright County and the City of New Prague are included in the Twin Cities CO maintenance area established in October 1999. However, since neither the county nor the cities are part of the Seven County Metropolitan Area, Wright County and New Prague projects were not coded into the Seven-County regional transportation model. However, Wright County and New Prague projects are evaluated for air quality analysis purposes, and the emissions associated with the regionally significant projects identified are added to the Seven-County region's emissions total. No regionally significant projects are currently planned or programmed for the City of New Prague during the time period of this plan. Three Wright County projects were considered in the regional air quality analysis:

- TH 25: Construct 4 lane from Buffalo to start of 4 lane south of I-94 in Monticello
- I-94: Add WB C-D road between CSAH 37 and CSAH 19 interchanges in Albertville.
- I-94: Add WB auxiliary lane between CSAH 18 interchange and TH 25 interchange in Monticello

| <b>Table B-1</b>                       |  |        |                               |
|--|--|--------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Regionally Significant Projects</b> |  |        |                               |
| 2015 Action Scenario                   |  |        |                               |
| Route                                  | Description  | Agency | MNDOT Project Number/Comments |
| TH 25                                  | TH 55 IN MONTICELLO TO I-94 IN BUFFALO, WRIGHT CO. - RECONSTRUCT TO 4 LANES            | MNDOT  | 8605-44                       |
| TH 23                                  | FROM E OF ST. CLOUD TO TH 25 IN FOLEY - 2 TO 4 LANE EXPANSION                          | MNDOT  |                               |
| I-94                                   | ADD WB C-D ROAD BETWEEN CSH 37 ND CSAH 19 INTERCHANGES IN ALBERTVILLE. INCLUDES WB OFF | MNDOT  | 8680-145                      |

| <b>Table B-1</b><br><b>Regionally Significant Projects</b><br>2015 Action Scenario |   |                      |             |
|--|---|----------------------|-------------|
|  | RAMP FOR CSAH 19  |                      |             |
| I-94   | ADD WB AUXILLARY LANE BETWEEN CSAH 18 INTERCHANGE AND TH 25 INTERCHANGE IN MONTICELLO   | MNDOT                | 8605-44     |
| TH 51  | FROM ANOKA CSAH 12 TO 121ST AVE IN COON RAPIDS & BLAINE-RECONSTRUCT TO 4-LANE RDWY, PED/BIKE, SIGNALS   | ANOKA COUNTY         | 002-651-007 |
| CSAH 11  | ON ANOKA CSAH 11 (FOLEY BLVD) FROM 101ST TO EGRET IN COON RAPIDS-RECONSTRUCT TO 4-LN RDWY, NEW SIGNALS, TRAIL   | ANOKA COUNTY         | 002-611-032 |
| CSAH 18  | ON CARVER CSAH 18 (LYMAN BLVD) FROM CARVER CSAH 15 (AUDUBON RD) TO CARVER CSAH 17(POWERS BLVD) IN CHANHASSEN-RECONSTRUCT TO 4-LN RDWY   | CARVER COUNTY        | 010-618-013 |
| TH 149   | FROM TH 55 TO JUST NORTH OF I-494 IN EAGAN-RECONSTRUCT FROM 4-LN RDWY TO 5-LN RDWY, TRAIL   | EAGAN                | 195-010-010 |
| CSAH 61  | FROM CSAH 3(EXCELSIOR BLVD) TO NO OF TH 7 IN HOPKINS & MINNETONKA-UPGRADE TO A 4-LANE RDWY, INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (TIED TO 2706-235)  | HENNEPIN COUNTY      | 027-661-046 |
|  | HWY 36 EAST P&R (STILLWATER)  | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL | TRF-TCMT    |
| TH 7   | AT HENNEPIN CSAH 61 (SHADY OAK RD) IN MINNETONKA - UPGRADE TO A 4-LANE RDWY, INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS  | MNDOT                | 2706-235    |
| I-94   | EB I94 FROM 7TH ST EXIT TO MOUNDS BLVD IN ST PAUL-ADD AUXILLIARY LANE, NOISEWALL, DRAINAGE, POND, TMS, SIGNING, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL   | MNDOT                | 6283-175    |
| TH 55  | FROM N JCT MN149 TO S JCT MN149 IN EAGAN- WIDEN FROM 4-LANE SECTION TO 6-LANE SECTION   | MNDOT                | 1909-95     |
| I-494  | FROM N OF I394 IN MINNETONKA TO I94/I494/I694 INTERCHANGE IN MAPLE GROVE - UNBONDED CONCRETE OVERLAY, CPR, RIGHT SIDE DYNAMIC SHOULDER, SIGNING, STRIPING, DRAINAGE, TMS, NOISE WALLS, REDECK AND WIDEN BRIDGES 27973, 27974, 27975, 27976, 27977, 27978, AND REDECK BRIDGE 27905 | MNDOT                | 2785        |
| I-394  | FROM RIDGEDALE DRIVE TO WESTBOUND I394 IN MINNETONKA - NEW ENTRANCE RAMP/BRIDGE 27W09   | MNDOT                | 2789-141    |
| TH 52  | REPLACE LAFAYETTE BRIDGE  | MNDOT                | 6244-30     |
|  | CEDAR AVENUE BUS RAPID TRANSIT  | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |             |
|  | CENTRAL CORRIDOR LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT   | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL | CCLRT       |

| <b>Table B- 2</b><br><b>Regionally Significant Projects</b><br>2020 Action Scenario |  |               |   |
|---|--|---------------|---|
| <b>Route</b>  | <b>Description</b>   | <b>Agency</b> | <b>MnDOT Project Numbers – comments</b> |
| CSAH 116  | FROM JUST E OF CRANE ST THROUGH JEFFERSON ST IN ANDOVER AND HAM LAKE-RECONSTRUCT FROM 2-LANE UNDIVIDED TO A 4-LANE DIVIDED ROADWAY INCLUDING SEPARATED BIKE/PED FACILITY, SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS AND | ANOKA COUNTY  | 002-716-015                             |

**Table B- 2  
Regionally Significant Projects  
2020 Action Scenario**

|                   |  |                      |             |
|-------------------|--|----------------------|-------------|
|                   | IMPROVE AT-GRADE RAIL CROSSING   |                      |             |
| CSAH 11           | FROM N OF EGRET BLVD TO N OF NORTHDALE BLVD- RECONSTRUCT CSAH 11 (FOLEY BLVD) AS A 4-LANE DIVIDED ROADWAY AS WELL AS A TRAIL AND SIDEWALK, PONDS, TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND DEDICATED LEFT- AND RIGHT-TURN LANES         | ANOKA COUNTY         | 002-611-034 |
| CSAH 34           | FROM W94TH ST TO T8500 BLOCK OF NORMANDEALE BLVD IN BLOOMINGTON-RECONSTRUCT OF CSAH 34 (NORMANDEALE BLVD) AS A 4-LANE DIVIDED ROADWAY WITH LEFT-TURN LANES AND MULTI-USE TRAILS                                    | BLOOMINGTON          | 107-020-065 |
| TH 55             | FROM THE MN149 NORTH INTERSECTION THROUGH THE MN149 SOUTH INTERSECTION-EXPANSION TO A 6-LANE ROADWAY INCLUDING TRAFFIC SIGNALS, AND CONSTRUCTION OF A MULTI-USE TRAIL  | EAGAN                | 195-010-011 |
| CSAH 53           | FROM JUST WEST OF WASHBURN AVE TO 16TH AVE IN RICHFIELD- RECONSTRUCT TO A 3-LANE SECTION CENTER TURN LANE, RAISED CONCRETE MEDIAN, SIGNAL REPLACEMENT, SIDEWALKS, ON-ROAD BIKEWAYS                                 | HENNEPIN COUNTY      | 027-653-021 |
| CSAH 81           | FROM N OF 63RD AVE N TO N OF CSAH 8 IN BROOKLYN PARK- RECONSTRUCT TO A MULTI-LANE DIVIDED ROADWAY INCLUDING CONCRETE MEDIAN AND A MUTLI-USE TRAIL  | HENNEPIN COUNTY      | 027-681-034 |
| TH 100            | FROM 36TH ST TO CEDAR LAKE RD IN ST. LOUIS PARK - RECONSTRUCT INTERCHANGES INCLUDING CONSTRUCTING AUXILLIARY LANES   | MN/DOT               | 2734-33AC   |
| I-35E             | FROM I94 IN ST. PAUL TO JUST NORTH OF LITTLE CANADA RD IN LITTLE CANADA - CONSTRUCT MNPASS LANE, REHAB PAVEMENT, REPLACE BRIDGES 6509, 6510, 6511, 6512, 6514, 6579, 9117, 9118, 9119, 9120 AND TMS                | MN/DOT               | 6280-367    |
| TH 610            | EXTENSION OF 105TH AVE TO W OF I94 IN MAPLE GROVE  | MNDOT                | 2771        |
| I-35W             | FROM 46TH ST TO I94 IN MPLS - MANAGED LANE COMPLETION, PAVEMENT RECONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR, NOISEWALLS, TMS, DRAINAGE, LIGHTING, REPLACE BRIDGES 9731, 9733, 27842, 27843, 27867, 27868, 27869, 27870, 27871, 27872 | MNDOT                | 2782-327    |
| I-35E             | FROM JCT MN36 IN ROSEVILLE TO JUST N I694 IN ARDEN HILLS/NEW BRIGHTON- MILL AND OVERLAY, DRAINAGE, GUARDRAIL, SIGNING, AUXILLIARY LANES  | MNDOT                | 6284-166    |
| CSAH 35           | CSAH 35 (PORTLAND AVE) FROM 67TH ST TO 77TH ST IN RICHFIELD-RECONSTRUCT TO 2-LANE ROAD WITH A CENTER TURN LANE AND INCLUDING TRANSIT FACILITIES, BIKE LANES AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES                              | RICHFIELD            | 157-020-026 |
| TH 101            | AT HENNEPIN CSAH 144 IN ROGERS-RECONSTRUCT INTERCHANGE, MULTI-USE TRAIL AND SIDEWALK, SIGNALS AND LIGHTING (AC PROJECT, PAYBACK IN 2015) (TIED WITH 2738-28, 2738-29)  | ROGERS               | 238-010-003 |
| PIERCE BUTLER RTE | FROM GROTTO ST TO ARUNDEL ST AT MINNEHAHA AVE- EXTENSION OF PIERCE BUTLER ROUTE ON A NEW ALIGNMENT AS A 4-LANE ROADWAY WITH BIKE LANES AND SIDEWALKS   | SAINT PAUL           | 164-020-123 |
| CSAH 17           | FROM S OF CSAH 78 TO N OF CSAH 42-RECONSTRUCT AS A 4-LANE DIVIDED ROADWAY AND MULTI-USE TRAIL  | SCOTT COUNTY         | 070-617-024 |
| TH 36             | NEW ST CROIX RIVER CROSSING  | MNDOT                | 8217-82045  |
| TH 610            | CONSTRUCT FROM I-94 TO CSAH 81   |                      |             |
|                   | I-35W BUS RAPID TRANSIT  | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |             |
|                   | WEST BROADWAY AVE BUS RAPID TRANSIT  | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |             |
|                   | ROBERT ST BUS RAPID TRANSIT  | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |             |

**Table B- 2**  
**Regionally Significant Projects**  
**2020 Action Scenario**

|       |  |                      |  |
|-------|--|----------------------|--|
|       | CHICAGO-EMERSON/FREMONT AVES BUS RAPID TRANSIT | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |  |
|       | SNELLING AVE BUS RAPID TRANSIT                 | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |  |
|       | EAST 7 <sup>TH</sup> ST BUS RAPID TRANSIT      | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |  |
|       | WEST 7 <sup>TH</sup> ST BUS RAPID TRANSIT      | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |  |
|       | SOUTHWEST LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT                   | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |  |
|       | BOTTINEAU LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT                   | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |  |
| I-694 | DYNAMIC SHOULDER LANE FROM RICE TO LEXINGTON   | MNDOT                |  |
| I-94  | LANE ADDITION FROM TH 101 TO TH 241            | MNDOT                |  |

**Table B- 3**  
**Regionally Significant Projects**  
**2030 Action Scenario**

| <b>Route</b> | <b>Description</b>                            | <b>Agency</b>        | <b>MnDOT Project Numbers - Comments</b> |
|--------------|---|----------------------|---|
|              | AMERICAN BOULEVARD ARTERIAL BUS RAPID TRANSIT | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |   |
|              | CENTRAL AVE ARTERIAL BUS RAPID TRANSIT        | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |   |
|              | NICOLLET AVE ARTERIAL BUS RAPID TRANSIT       | METROPOLITAN COUNCIL |   |

#### **IV. CONFORMITY DEMONSTRATION**

The EPA, in response to a MPCA request, redesignated the Twin Cities seven-county Metropolitan Area and Wright County as in attainment for CO in October 1999. A 1996 motor vehicle emissions budget (MVEB) was revised in January 2005 in a revision to the SIP. The SIP amendment revised the MVEB budget to a not-to-exceed threshold of 1,961 tons per day of CO emissions for the analysis milestone years of 2009, 2015, 2020 and 2030. In 2010, in response to a MPCA request, the EPA approved a Limited Maintenance Plan for the maintenance area. A limited maintenance plan is available to former non-attainment areas which demonstrate that monitored concentrations of CO remain below 85% of the eight-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for eight consecutive quarters. MPCA ambient CO monitoring data shows that eight hour concentrations have been below 70% of the NAAQS since 1998 and below 30% of the NAAQS since 2004.

Under a limited maintenance plan, the EPA has determined that there is no requirement to project emissions over the maintenance period and that “an emissions budget may be treated as essentially not constraining for the length of the maintenance period because it is unreasonable to expect that such an area will experience so much growth in that period that a violation of the CO NAAQS would result.” No regional modeling analysis is required, however federally funded projects are still subject to “hot spot” analysis requirements.

The limited maintenance plan adopted in 2010 determines that the level of CO emissions and resulting ambient concentrations continue to demonstrate attainment of the CO NAAQS. The following additional programs will also have a beneficial impact on CO emissions and ambient concentrations: Ongoing implementation of an oxygenated gasoline program as reflected in the modeling assumptions used the SIP; A regional commitment to continue capital investments to maintain and improve the operational efficiencies of highway and transit systems; Adoption of a regional long-term 2030 Regional Development Framework that supports land use patterns that efficiently connect housing, jobs, retail centers, and transit oriented development along transit corridors; The continued involvement of local government units in the regional 3C transportation planning process allows the region to address local congestion, effectively manage available capacities in the transportation system, and promote transit supportive land uses as part of a coordinated regional growth management strategy. For all of these reasons, the Twin Cities CO maintenance areas will continue to attain the CO standard for the next 10 years.



## V. TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION OF TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES

Pursuant to the Conformity Rule, the Council reviewed the amended TIP and certifies that the amended TIP conforms with the SIP and does not conflict with its implementation. All Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies which were the adopted TCM's for the region have been implemented or are ongoing and funded. There are no TSM projects remaining to be completed. There are no fully adopted regulatory new TCM's nor fully funded non-regulatory TCM's that will be implemented during the programming period of the amended TIP. There are no prior TCM's that were adopted since November 15, 1990, nor any prior TCM's that have been amended since that date.

As part of the Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA), additional transit lanes have been added to Marquette and 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave in Minneapolis, and transit capacity in the I-35W corridor has been enhanced through dynamic priced shoulder lanes.

A list of officially adopted TCM's for the region may be found in the November 27, 1979 Federal Register notice for EPA approval of the Minneapolis-St. Paul CO Maintenance Plan, based upon the 1980 Air Quality Control Plan for Transportation, which in turn cites transit strategies in the 1978-1983 Transportation Systems Management Plan. It is anticipated that the Transportation Air Quality Control Plan will be revised in the near future. The following lists the summary and status of the currently adopted TCM's:

- **Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program** (listed in Transportation Control Plan as a potential strategy for hydrocarbon control with CO benefits). This program became operational in July 1991 and was terminated in December 1999.
- **I-35W Bus/Metered Freeway Project.** Metered freeway access locations have bus and carpool bypass lanes at strategic intersections on I-35W. In March, 2002 a revised metering program became operational. The *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* calls for the implementation of Bus Rapid Transit in the I-35W corridor. As part of the Urban Partnership Agreement (UPA), additional transit lanes have been added to Marquette and 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave in Minneapolis, and transit capacity in the I-35W corridor has been enhanced through dynamic priced shoulder lanes.
- **Traffic Management Improvements** (multiple; includes SIP amendments):
  - *Minneapolis Computerized Traffic Management System.* The Minneapolis system is installed. New hardware and software installation were completed in 1992. The system has been significantly extended since 1995 using CMAQ funding. Traffic signal improvements were made to the downtown street system to provide daily enhanced preferred treatment for bus and LRT transit vehicles in 2009.
  - *St. Paul Computerized Traffic Management System.* St. Paul system completed in 1991.
  - *University and Snelling Avenues, St. Paul.* Improvements were completed in 1990 and became fully operational in 1991.
- **Fringe Parking Programs.** Minneapolis and St. Paul are implementing ongoing programs for fringe parking and incentives to encourage carpooling through their respective downtown traffic management organizations.
- **Stricter Enforcement of Traffic Ordinances.** Ongoing enforcement of parking idling and other traffic ordinances is being aggressively pursued by Minneapolis and St. Paul.
- **Public Transit Strategies** (from the 1983 Transportation Systems Management Plan):
  - *Reduced Transit Fares.* Current transit fares include discounts for off-peak and intra-CBD travel. Reduced fares are also offered to seniors, youth, medicare card holders, and persons with disabilities.
  - *Transit Downtown Fare Zone.* All transit passengers can ride either the Minneapolis or Saint Paul fare zones for 50 cents. Since March 2010 passengers can ride Nicollet Mall buses for free within the downtown zone.

- *Community-Centered Transit.* The Council is authorized by legislation to enter into and administer financial assistance agreements with local transit providers in the metropolitan region, including community-based dial-a-ride systems. This program had been used to provide funding assistance to local agencies operating circulation service coordinated with regular route transit service. A regional restructuring of dial-a-ride service, now called Transit Link, occurred in 2010.
- *Flexible Transit.* Routes 755 and 756 in Medicine Lake were operated on a flex-route in 2006 by First Student, a private provider. Also, Metro Mobility, a service of the Council, as well as the dial-a-ride services mentioned above, operates with flexible routes catered to riders' special needs.
- *Total Commuter Service.* The non-CBD employee commuter vanpool matching services provided by this demonstration project, mentioned in the 1983 Transportation Systems Management Plan as well as the Transportation Control Plan, are now by the Van-Go! program, a service of the Council.
- *Elderly and Handicapped Service.* ADA Paratransit Service is available for people who are unable or have extreme difficulty using regular route transit service because of a disability or health condition. ADA Paratransit Service provides "first-door-through-first-door" transportation in 89 communities throughout the metropolitan area for persons who are ADA-certified. The region's ADA paratransit service is provided by four programs, namely Metro Mobility, Anoka County Traveler, DARTS, and H.S.I. (serving Washington County). In addition, every regular-route bus has a wheelchair lift, and drivers are trained to help customers use the lift and secure their wheelchairs safely. LRT trains offer step-free boarding, and are equipped with designated sections for customers using wheelchairs. In addition, all station platforms are fully accessible.
- *Responsiveness in Routing and Scheduling.* Metro Transit conducted a series of Transit Redesign "sector studies" to reconfigure service to better meet the range of needs based on these identified transit market areas. The Sector 1 and 2 studies, covering the northeast quadrant of the region, were the first to be completed. Following the successful reorganization of transit service in those areas, the remaining sector were studied and changes were implemented. Service is now re-evaluated as needed..
- *CBD Parking Shuttles.* The downtown fare zones mentioned above provide fast, low-cost, convenient service to and from parking locations around the CBD.
- *Simplified Fare Collection.* The fare zone system in place at the time of the Transportation Systems Management Plan has since been eliminated. Instead, a simplified fare structure based upon time (peak vs. off-peak) and type (local vs. express) of service has been implemented, with discounts for select patrons (e.g. elderly, youth). Convenient electronic fare passes are also available from Metro Transit, improving ease of fare collection and offering bulk-savings for multi-ride tickets.
- *Bus Shelters.* Metro Transit coordinates bus shelter construction and maintenance throughout the region. Shelter types include standard covered wind barrier structures as well as lit and heated transit centers at major transfer points and light-rail stations.
- *Rider Information.* Rider information services have been greatly improved since the 1983 Transportation Systems Management Plan was created. Schedules and maps have been re-designed for improved clarity and readability, and are now available for download on Metro Transit's web-site, which also offers a custom trip planner application to help riders choose the combination of routes that best serves their needs. Bus arrival and departure times are posted in all shelters, along with the phone number of the TransitLine automated schedule information hotline. Some shelters and stations have real time "next trip" information.
- *Transit Marketing.* Metro Commuter Services, under the direction of Metro Transit, coordinates all transit and rideshare marketing activities for the region, including five Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) that actively promote alternatives to driving alone through employer outreach, commuter fairs, and other programs. Metro

Commuter Services also conducts an annual Commuter Challenge, which is a contest encouraging commuters to pledge to travel by other means than driving alone.

- *Cost Accounting and Performance-Based Funding.* Key criteria in the aforementioned Transit Redesign process include service efficiency (subsidy per passenger) and service effectiveness (passengers per revenue-hour). Metro Transit uses these metrics to evaluate route cost-effectiveness and performance and determine which routes are kept, re-tuned, or eliminated.
- *"Real-Time" Monitoring of Bus Operations.* The regional Transit Operations Center permits centralized monitoring and control of all vehicles in the transit system.
- *Park and Ride.* Appendix J of the *Transportation Policy Plan* provides guidelines intended for use in planning, designing, and evaluating proposed park-and-ride facilities served by regular route bus transit. The guidelines can also be used for park-and-ride lots without bus service and at rail stations. The Metropolitan Council administers capital funding to transit operating agencies building, operating, and maintaining park-and-ride facilities. In 2009 the region served 108 park-and-ride facilities with a capacity of 25,700. Average usage in 2009 was 67 percent.
- **Hennepin and First Avenue One-Way Pair.** These streets in downtown Minneapolis were re-configured subsequent to the 1980 Air Quality Control Plan for Transportation to address a local CO hot-spot issue that has since been resolved. The streets reverted to a two-way configuration in 2009.

The above list includes two TCM's that are traffic flow amendments to the SIP. The MPCA added them to the SIP since its original adoption. These include in St. Paul, a CO Traffic Management System at the Snelling and University Avenue. While not control measures, the MPCA added two additional revisions to the SIP which reduce CO: a vehicle emissions inspection/maintenance program, implemented in 1991, to correct the region-wide carbon monoxide problem, and a federally mandated four-month oxygenated gasoline program implemented in November 1992. In December 1999 the vehicle emissions inspection/maintenance program was eliminated.


The MPCA requested that the USEPA add a third revision to the SIP, a contingency measure consisting of a year-round oxygenated gasoline program if the CO standards were violated after 1995. The USEPA approved the proposal. Because of current state law which remains in effect, the Twin Cities area has a state mandate year-round program that started in 1995. The program will remain regardless of any USEPA rulemaking.

**VI. EXHIBITS**

This section contains the exhibits referenced in this appendix.

**Exhibit 1.**

**Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Area  
Seven County Metropolitan Area  
and Wright County**



Note: Shaded area is designated maintenance.



**EXHIBIT 2**

**PROJECTS THAT DO NOT IMPACT REGIONAL EMISSIONS, AND PROJECTS THAT ALSO DO NOT REQUIRE LOCAL CARBON MONOXIDE IMPACT ANALYSIS**

Certain transportation projects eligible for funding under Title 23 U.S.C. have no impact on regional emissions. These are "exempt" projects that, because of their nature, will not affect the outcome of any regional emissions analyses and add no substance to those analyses. These projects (as listed in Section 93.126 of conformity rules) are excluded from the regional emissions analyses required in order to determine conformity of the TPP and TIPs.

Following is a list of "exempt" projects and their corresponding codes used in column "AQ" of the 2014-2017 TIP. The coding system is revised from previous TIPs to be consistent with the coding system for exempt projects in the proposed Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) revision to the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality for Transportation Conformity.

Except for projects given an "A" code or a "B" code, the categories listed under Air Quality should be viewed as advisory in nature, and relate to project specific requirements rather than to the TIP air quality conformity requirements. They are intended for project applicants to use in the preparation of any required federal documents. Ultimate responsibility for determining the need for a hot-spot analysis for a project under 40 CFR Pt. 51, Subp. T (The transportation conformity rule) rests with the U.S. Department of Transportation. The Council has provided the categorization as a guide to project applicants of possible conformity requirements, if the applicants decide to pursue federal funding for the project.

SAFETY

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Railroad/highway crossing .....  | S-1  |
| Hazard elimination program .....   | S-2  |
| Safer non-federal-aid system roads.....  | S-3  |
| Shoulder improvements .....  | S-4  |
| Increasing sight distance .....  | S-5  |
| Safety improvement program.....  | S-6  |
| Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects ..... | S-7  |
| Railroad/highway crossing warning devices .....  | S-8  |
| Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions .....  | S-9  |
| Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation .....   | S-10 |
| Pavement marking demonstration.....  | S-11 |
| Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125) .....   | S-12 |
| Fencing.....   | S-13 |
| Skid treatments .....  | S-14 |
| Safety roadside rest areas.....  | S-15 |
| Adding medians .....   | S-16 |
| Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area .....                                    | S-17 |
| Lighting improvements .....  | S-18 |
| Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes) .....   | S-19 |
| Emergency truck pullovers .....  | S-20 |

MASS TRANSIT

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Operating assistance to transit agencies .....   | T-1 |
| Purchase of support vehicles .....   | T-2 |
| Rehabilitation of transit vehicles .....   | T-3 |
| Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities .....          | T-4 |
| Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g., radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.)..... | T-5 |
| Construction or renovation of power, signal, and   |     |

|   |      |
|---|------|
| communications systems .....  | T-6  |
| Construction of small passenger shelters and information kiosks .....   | T-7  |
| Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures<br>(e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities,<br>stations, terminals, and ancillary structures) ..... | T-8  |
| Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track<br>and trackbed in existing rights-of-way .....   | T-9  |
| Purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing<br>vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet .....  | T-10 |
| Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities<br>categorically excluded in 23 CFR 771 .....  | T-11 |

AIR QUALITY

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Continuation of ride-sharing and van-pooling promotion<br>activities at current levels ..... | AQ-1 |
| Bicycle and pedestrian facilities .....  | AQ-2 |

OTHER

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Specific activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as:  |      |
| Planning and technical studies   |      |
| Grants for training and research programs  |      |
| Planning activities conducted pursuant to titles 23 and 49 U.S.C.  |      |
| Federal-aid systems revisions .....  | O-1  |
| Engineering to assess social, economic and environmental effects<br>of the proposed action or alternatives to that action .....  | O-2  |
| Noise attenuation .....  | O-3  |
| Advance land acquisitions (23 CFR 712 or 23 CRF 771) .....   | O-4  |
| Acquisition of scenic easements .....  | O-5  |
| Plantings, landscaping, etc. ....  | O-6  |
| Sign removal .....   | O-7  |
| Directional and informational signs .....  | O-8  |
| Transportation enhancement activities (except<br>rehabilitation and operation of historic<br>transportation buildings, structures, or facilities) .....                      | O-9  |
| Repair of damage caused by natural disasters, civil unrest,<br>or terrorist acts, except projects involving<br>substantial functional, locational, or capacity changes ..... | O-10 |

Projects Exempt from Regional Emissions Analyses that may Require Further Air Quality Analysis

The local effects of these projects with respect to carbon monoxide concentrations must be considered to determine if a "hot-spot" type of an analysis is required prior to making a project-level conformity determination. These projects may then proceed to the project development process even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP. A particular action of the type listed below is not exempt from regional emissions analysis if the MPO in consultation with other state agencies MPCA, MnDOT, the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potential regional impacts for any reason.

Channelization projects include left and right turn lanes and continuous left-turn lanes as well as those turn movements that are physically separated. Signalization projects include reconstruction of existing signals as well as installation of new signals. Signal preemption projects are exempt from hotspot analysis. Final determination of which intersections require an intersection analysis by the project applicant rests with the U.S.DOT as part of its conformity determination for an individual project.

Projects Exempt from Regional Emissions Analyses

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Intersection channelization projects .....                               | E-1 |
| Intersection signalization projects at<br>individual intersections ..... | E-2 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Interchange reconfiguration projects .....        | E-3 |
| Changes in vertical and horizontal alignment..... | E-4 |
| Truck size and weight inspection stations .....   | E-5 |
| Bus terminals and transfer points .....           | E-6 |

Regionally significant projects

The following codes identify the projects included in the "action" scenarios of the TIP air quality analysis:

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| Baseline - Year 2010 ..... | A-10 |
| Action - Year 2015 .....   | A-15 |
| Action - Year 2020 .....   | A-20 |
| Action - Year 2030 .....   | A-25 |

Non-Classifiable Projects

Certain unique projects cannot be classified as denoted by a "NC." These projects were evaluated through an interagency consultation process and determined not to fit into any exempt nor intersection-level analysis category, but they are clearly not of a nature which would require inclusion in a regional air quality analysis.

Traffic Signal Synchronization

Traffic signal synchronization projects (Sec. 83.128 of the Conformity Rules, Federal Register, August 15, 1997) may be approved, funded, and implemented without satisfying the requirements of this subpart. However, all subsequent regional emissions analysis required by subparts 93.118 and 93.119 for transportation plans, TIPS, or projects not from a conforming plan and TIP must include such regionally significant traffic signal synchronization projects.