



## AGENDA

### Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee

*Date:* Thursday, June 18, 2015

*Time:* 2:30 p.m.

*Location:* Courtyard Conference Room, Grants Pass City Hall, 101 NW 'A' Street, Grants Pass, Oregon

*Phone :* Sue Casavan, RVCOG, 541-423-1360

*MRMPO website :* [www.mrmppo.org](http://www.mrmppo.org)

**1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda .....Darin Fowler, Chair**

**2. Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1) .....Chair**

#### ***Presentation Item:***

**3. Grants Pass Interchange Exit 58 Update..... Art Anderson**

*Background:* ODOT to provide an update to the MRMPO Policy Committee on the future project for Grants Pass Interchange Exit 58, N. 6<sup>th</sup> Street at NW Morgan Lane.

*Attachment:* #2 – Click on the link below for Interchange Exit 58 Final Report from 2013:  
[http://mrmppo.org/images/Policy%20Committee/Meeting%20Materials/2015/Grants\\_Pass\\_Interchange\\_Exit\\_58\\_RSA\\_Final\\_Report\\_Only.pdf](http://mrmppo.org/images/Policy%20Committee/Meeting%20Materials/2015/Grants_Pass_Interchange_Exit_58_RSA_Final_Report_Only.pdf)

#### ***Action Items:***

**4. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project #502, I-5 Exit – 6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan.....Dan Moore**

*Background:* At the May 21, 2015 meeting, the Policy Committee approved the proposed 2015 – 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list with the exception of ODOT RTP Project #502, I-5 Exit – 6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan, pending further discussion with ODOT about the project. Art Anderson, ODOT, agreed to brief the Policy Committee on the need and scope of the project at the June 18, 2015 meeting.

*Attachment:* #3 – Memo

*Action Requested:* Upon conclusion of the project briefing and discussion, the Policy Committee is being asked to vote on including ODOT RTP Project #502, I-5 Exit-6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan on the 2015-2040 RTP project list.

## 5. Proposed Policy for Reallocation of STP/CMAQ Surplus Funds .....Dan Moore

*Background:* During TAC discussion on Grants Pass' request for additional CMAQ funds for the Allen Creek Rd. Improvement project, it was suggested that the MPO consider adopting a policy on re-allocation of MPO surplus CMAQ & STP funds. The TAC reviewed the proposed policy at their June 4, 2015 meeting, and voted to recommend approval.

*Attachment:* #4 – Memo outlining proposed policy.

*Action Requested:* Consider approving proposed policy.

## 6. Regional Significance Criteria .....Dan Moore

*Background:* The proposed regional significance screening criteria (attached) is intended to serve as a tool for determining whether a roadway facility in the MRMPO planning area is "Regionally Significant" with respect to the air quality conformity requirements found in the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93). The proposed regional significance screening criteria is modeled after the same criteria adopted by the RVMPO. The TAC reviewed the proposed criteria at their June 4, 2015 meeting, and voted to recommend approval.

*Attachment:* #5 – Proposed regionally-significant screening criteria document.

*Action Requested:* Consider approving the proposed criteria.

## 7. MRMPO Planning Update..... Dan Moore

## 8. Public Comment\*.....Chair

\*(Limited to one comment per person, five minute maximum time limit)\*

## 9. Other Business / Local Business .....Chair

(Opportunity for MRMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.)

## 10. Agenda Build for Next Meeting ..... Dan Moore

## 11. Adjournment ..... Chair

The next MPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 16, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. in the Courtyard Conference Room at Grants Pass City Hall.

- The next Middle Rogue MPO TAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 2, 2015 (cancellation of meeting due to holiday - TBD) at 1:30 p.m. in the Courtyard Conference Room at Grants Pass City Hall.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT SUE CASAVAN, 541-423-1360. REASONABLE ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE NEED FOR ACCOMMODATION PRIOR TO THE MEETING (48 HOURS ADVANCE NOTICE IS PREFERABLE) WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.



## SUMMARY MINUTES

### *Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee*

**May 21, 2015**

The following attended:

NAME

MPO Policy Committee

Art Anderson for Mike Baker  
Chuck De Janvier for Rob Brandis  
Colleen Roberts  
Dan De Young  
Darin Fowler, Chairman

Pam Van Arsdale, Vice Chairman  
Simon Hare

#### Others Present

Aaron Cubic  
Cindy England  
Fred England  
Ian Horlacher

#### RVCOG Staff

Dan Moore  
Bunny Lincoln  
Andrea Napoli

#### REPRESENTING

ODOT  
Josephine County  
Jackson County  
Grants Pass  
Grants Pass

Rogue River  
Josephine County

Grants Pass  
Rogue River  
Rogue River  
ODOT

RVCOG  
RVCOG  
RVCOG

---

---

### **1. Call to Order / Introductions/ Review Agenda**

Chairman Fowler called the meeting to order at 2:31 pm. The Committee began with introductions.

### **2. Review / Approve Minutes**

The Chair asked if there were any changes or additions to the April 16th meeting minutes.

**On a motion by Pam Van Arsdale, seconded by Simon Hare, the minutes were approved as presented. Art Anderson abstained.**

**Public Hearing #1:****3. MRMPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2015-16 (Resolutions 2015-1 and 2015-2)**

**The Chair read the procedure for the public hearing.**

Dan Moore referenced the **May 14, 2105 memo**, including the projects, budget, funding sources, and an outline of the current/proposed FY tasks, and requested the UPWP be adopted. ODOT allocations are included in the data. MRMPO planning funds will increase by \$31,000, with an anticipated total of \$220,000 for the ensuing year. An Associate Planner will be hired soon. Policy and TAC Committee time is calculated as in-kind match for FTA funds. Dues funds are available for other MPO expenses.

Predominant work tasks relate to:

1. Development of the 2015-40 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
2. Coordination on the Rogue Valley Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan

The TAC is recommending approval.

Table #1 **Transportation Planning Funds by Source and Activity.** Work tasks include:

- **Program Management**  
Clerical & Personnel, UPWP Development/Progress, Public Involvement/Education, Interagency/Jurisdictional Coordination, Grant Writing
- **Short Range Planning**  
TIP Activities, Air Quality Conformity, Local TSP Technical Assistance, STP/CMAQ Project Funds Management
- **Long Range Planning**  
RTP Development, ITS Coordination
- **Data Development**  
Research & Analysis Program, Data collection/analysis for Title 6 & EJ
- **Transit – JOCO**  
Grants Pass – Medford Transit Line Passenger Survey

Table #2 is the **Budget**, showing costs for the various work tasks:

- **Program Management -** Clerical & Personnel, UPWP Development/Progress, Public Involvement/Education, Interagency/Jurisdictional Coordination, Grant Writing
- **Short Range Planning -** TIP Activities, Air Quality Conformity, Local TSP Technical Assistance, STP/CMAQ Project Funds Management
- **Long Range Planning -** RTP Development, ITS Coordination
- **Data Development -** Research & Analysis Program, Data collection/analysis for Title 6 & EJ
- **Transit – JOCO -** Grants Pass – Medford Transit Line Passenger Survey

It was pointed out that the balance on page 4 was off by \$1. The table #1 is the budget to be approved. “In kind” is agency related, and is charted monthly by RVCOG Staff.

**The Chair opened the public hearing**

**In support:** None received  
**In opposition:** None received

**The Chair closed the public testimony.**

**On a motion by Simon Hare, seconded by Mark Gatlin, the MRMPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2015-16 (Resolutions 2015-1 and 2015-2), was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

***Action Items:***

**4a. Revised CMAQ/STP Programming for Allen Creek Road Improvement Project**

Dan Moore offered an overview of the revisions requested by Grants Pass. (**May 18, 2015 memo**) The City proposes to increase CMAQ funding by \$1,287,571 and decrease STP funds by \$3,069. ODOT assisted the City in developing the revised amounts. Per eligibility requirements, CMAQ funded projects must lie within the Grants Pass AQMA.

Establishment of a policy on allocation of excess funding has been recommended by TAC.

TAC has reviewed the request and recommended approval.

**4. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List**

**May 14, 2015 Memo** - Dan Moore presented the updated Project List. “Regionally significant” projects within the MPO boundaries (those adding capacity to a system for air quality purposes) are required to be in the List. The List does not include Enhanced funds because their future availability is unknown at this time. Those line items with red strikethroughs do not meet the “regionally significant” criteria, but can still be part of the list. All projects listed as Short Range can be matched with available funding. The Rogue River Greenway is on the Short Range project list.

Art Anderson complimented the MPO and Staff on the excellent quality of the RTP.

Chairman Fowler offered an opinion about the I-5 Exit 58 6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan project (#502), speculating on how much the improvements were actually needed, and whether the State would demand a jurisdictional exchange, if not in the near future, possibly at some future date, when ODOT staffing may have changed. Mr. Anderson said a jurisdictional exchange was never considered as part of this ODOT safety project. He also stated that the reason for the project, and its scope, could be briefed at the next meeting.

**On a motion by Mark Gatlin, seconded by Pam Van Arsdale, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List, with further discussion on Project #502, was approved by unanimous voice vote.**

**5. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapters 1, 2 & 4**

Andrea Napoli presented the RTP chapters review. JACO, ODOT and Grants Pass have offered comments. The TAC recommended approval of the chapters.

**Chapter 1 - Introduction**

Purpose, MPO establishment, quality of life, RTP updates process, boundary map

**Chapter 2 - Goals & Policies**

Vision, Goals 1-7 (remain the same), Planning Factor Correlation  
Goals, Strategies and Recommended Performance Measures

**Chapter 4 - Planning Area Characteristics**

Political & Physical characteristics,  
Population, 2010 Census & American Community Survey Demographics  
Employment, Commute Patterns Worker Demographics,  
Commute Modes, Major Employers, Poverty levels, Education  
Household Characteristics

Rogue River is challenging the American Community Survey. The question was raised as to how a successful survey might affect the RTP statistics. Staff shared that the data could be amended if warranted.

**On a motion by Pam Van Arsdale, seconded by Mark Gatlin, the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapters 1, 2 & 4 were approved by unanimous voice vote.**

**6. MRMPO Planning Update**

- Interviews continue for the Associate Planner position.
- The ITS Plan update continues.
- Suggestions are being sought for input on the upcoming RVCOG Associate Planner position, and how the various jurisdictions could utilize his/her expertise in specific fields.

**7. Public Comment**

None.

**8. Other Business / Local Business****8. Agenda Build for Next Meeting**

- ODOT Project #502
- Proposed STP/CMAQ policy on fund surpluses
- Screening criteria for regionally significant projects (part of air quality conformance process)

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.



**Middle Rogue  
Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Regional Transportation Planning**

Gold Hill • Grants Pass • Rogue River • Jackson County • Josephine County • Oregon Department of Transportation

**DATE:** June 10, 2015  
**TO:** MRMPO Policy Committee  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager  
**SUBJECT:** I-5 Exit 58 - 6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan

At the May 21, 2015 meeting, the Policy Committee approved the proposed 2015 – 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list with the exception of ODOT RTP Project #502, I-5 Exit – 6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan, pending further discussion with ODOT about the project. Art Anderson, ODOT, agreed to brief the Policy Committee on the need and scope of the project at the June 18, 2015 meeting.

Upon conclusion of the project briefing and discussion, the Policy Committee is being asked to vote on including ODOT RTP Project #502, I-5 Exit – 6<sup>th</sup> & Morgan on the 2015 – 2040 RTP project list.

Project information is included below.

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Short Range Funding Sources (2015 - 2020)						Cost by Phase	Conformity Status
					CMAQ	STP	Enhance- It	Local	Transit Funds	State ODOT		
Funds Available - Short Range										\$21,408,861		
ODOT												
502	I-5 Exit 58 6th & Morgan	Reconfig Intersection, Reconfig & Lengthen SB Offramp	Short	\$5,967,861	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,967,861	\$5,967,861	Exempt



**Middle Rogue  
Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Regional Transportation Planning**

Gold Hill • Grants Pass • Rogue River • Jackson County • Josephine County • Oregon Department of Transportation

---

**DATE:** June 10, 2015  
**TO:** MRMPO Policy Committee  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager  
**SUBJECT:** Proposed Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds

---

**Proposed MRMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds**  
(Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)

This proposed policy addresses the allocation of STP and CMAQ funds awarded to the MRMPO planning area for surface transportation improvements. Projects receive federal funding through the MRMPO by way of listing in the current MRMPO Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. Final approval for grant recipients is made by Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration through the funding obligation process, which occurs subsequent to publication in the MTIP.

1. MRMPO Policy Committee makes all final planning and programming decisions regarding STP and CMAQ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project, and must be spent on that project.
3. Funds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:
  - a. MRMPO member jurisdictions
    - i. When MRMPO grant funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the MRMPO region for re-allocation.
    - ii. When a jurisdiction determines it will not implement a project, it may offer a substitute project(s). Substitute project(s) will be evaluated according to current MRMPO evaluation criteria. The Policy Committee will consider the evaluation of the substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:
      1. Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or
      2. Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.
    - iii. When a project cannot be implemented for reasons beyond the recipient jurisdiction's control (generally but not limited to when Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration finds an awarded project in-eligible) recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final determination to submit a substitute project for consideration. Substitute project will be scored according to current MRMPO evaluation criteria. The Policy Committee will consider evaluation of substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:



1. Funds should be awarded to the substitute project
2. Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.

b. Recipients that are not MRMPO members

- i. All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the MRMPO region for re-allocation.

4. Priority for available funds will be given to funded projects that need additional funding for completion.

## **MRMPO Regional Significance Screening Criteria**

**June 10, 2015**

### **Background**

This document is intended to serve as a tool for assisting with determining whether a roadway facility in the MRMPO planning area is “Regionally Significant” with respect to the air quality conformity requirements found in the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93). The purpose is to provide pertinent information to the Interagency Consultation Group (IACG) on the characteristics that would normally be used to consider the regional significance of a transportation project and in particular one that is on a roadway facility classified as a Minor Arterial or lower. The IACG will make the final determination of regional significance on a case-by-case basis as needed, and additional criteria beyond what is being presented in this document may be used at the IACG’s discretion.

The MRMPO shall provide initial determinations regarding exemption and significance status for each project to the interagency consultation group (IACG) for review and comment. Following consultation, the MRMPO shall make a final determination for the project pool.

### **Federal Conformity Rule Definition of Regional Significance**

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 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 guide way transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel.

### **Examples of Regionally-Significant Projects**

Below are examples of projects which must be included in the network modeling for the regional emissions analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and amendments to RTP and TIP.

- **Interstates and Expressways**
  - New segment
  - Added through lane
  - Continuous auxiliary lane
  - New interchange
- **Other Principal Arterial**
  - New segment
  - Added through lane
  - Continuous auxiliary lane
  - New interchange
- **Rail and Fixed Guide-Way Transit**
- **Major expansion of fixed rail or fixed guide-way system**

## Examples of Non-Exempt Projects that are not Regionally Significant

- Addition of thru traffic lanes on arterial roads that do not extend the full distance between major intersections
- Addition of thru traffic lanes on roads that are not functionally classified as an arterial or higher and do not serve regional transportation needs
- New collector roads that serve minor developments
- New or expanded park-and-ride lots that do not serve regional transportation needs
- New collector road overpasses

## Regional Significance Screening Criteria

The proposed screening process is in two parts. Part 1 includes seven questions that should be addressed prior as part of the consultation process. Part 2 is applying the threshold criteria in Table 1(below) to determine if the project is regionally-significant, non-regionally significant, or requires consultation.

### Part 1 – Initial Project Review

- 1.) What are the Exempt status and Functional Classification of the roadway project?
  - A non-exempt project on a roadway facility classified as an Other Principal Arterial<sup>1</sup> or higher, and in some cases minor arterials will generally be considered Regionally Significant.
  - A project determined to be Exempt under 40 CFR 93.126 or 93.127 (see Appendix A) will generally be considered Non-Regionally Significant unless the IACG group determines that it will have regional impacts for any reason.
- 2.) Is the facility either included in the Regional Travel Demand Forecasting Model, or would it be if it does not currently exist?
  - It is the practice of the MRMPO to include most “major” roadways (most major collectors and above) in order to improve model performance so if a roadway is not modeled it can generally be considered to be Non-Regionally Significant.
- 3.) Does the facility provide direct connection between two roadways classified as a Principal Arterial or higher?

---

<sup>1</sup> Other Principal Arterials serve major centers of metropolitan areas, provide a high degree of mobility and can also provide mobility through rural areas. Unlike their access-controlled counterparts, abutting land uses can be served directly. Forms of access for Other Principal Arterial roadways include driveways to specific parcels and at-grade intersections with other roadways. For the most part, roadways that fall into the top three functional classification categories (Interstate, Other Freeways & Expressways and Other Principal Arterials) provide similar service in both urban and rural areas. The primary difference is that there are usually multiple Arterial routes serving a particular urban area, radiating out from the urban center to serve the surrounding region. In contrast, an expanse of a rural area of equal size would be served by a single Arterial. (FHWA: *Highway Functional Classification Concepts, Criteria and Procedures*).

- Direct connections between major principal arterials and in particular connections to the Interstate can generally be considered Regionally Significant.

4.) Does the facility provide the primary regional connectivity to a “Major Activity Center”?

- This is a criterion listed in the federal Regional Significance definition; however there can be different interpretations as to what constitutes a major activity center. Below is a list of general types of major activity centers, with specific locations to be determined on a case-by-case basis:
  - Major Hospitals and Regional Medical Centers
  - Central Business Districts of cities
  - Major Regional Retail Centers and Malls
  - Colleges and Universities
  - Tourist Destinations
  - Airports
  - Freight Terminals and Intermodal Transfer Centers
  - Sports Complexes

5.) Does the project add significant vehicular capacity?

- A project adding general purpose through lanes will typically be more significant than one that is adding “auxiliary” lanes or a continuous center turn lane or other projects that do not add significant roadway capacity.

6.) What is the length of the roadway segment being improved and what is the overall corridor length?

- Projects extending (or completing) long sections (typically greater than 1 mile) will tend to be more regionally significant.
- If the corridor is lengthy and there is an absence of other principal arterials in the vicinity then the roadway will tend to be more regionally significant.

7.) What is the current Average Daily Traffic of the roadway segment?

This is less important in determining Regional Significance although it will provide additional information to be considered along with the above criteria. Obviously high traffic segments will tend to be more correlated with the increased regional significance of a roadway.

New segments or added through lanes on arterials that are also associated with large land development projects may need AQ consultation even if the project is below the threshold in the table. Land development projects can be regionally significant when they have the potential to generate many trips or vehicle-miles of travel. Such developments are incorporated into the regional model during the update of socioeconomic forecasts, at the beginning of the update cycle for a new regional transportation plan.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	
<b>MRMPO Thresholds of Regional-Significance for Transportation Projects</b>	
<b>Criteria A</b>	
<b>Interstate and Expressways</b>	
<b>Criteria A-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria A-2 Threshold</b>
a. New Segment	a. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
b. Added Through Lanes	b. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
c. Continuous Auxiliary Lanes	c. > ¼ mile ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
d. New Interchanges	d. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
e. Modification of Existing Interchanges	e. AQ Consultation Required
<b>Criteria B</b>	
<b>Other Principal Arterials</b>	
<b>Criteria B-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria B-2 Threshold</b>
a. New Segment	a. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
b. Added Through Lanes	b. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
c. Continuous Auxiliary Lanes	c. > 1 mile ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
d. New Interchanges	d. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
e. Modification of Existing Interchanges	e. AQ Consultation Required
f. Separation of existing railroad grade crossings	f. Not regionally significant
<b>Criteria C</b>	
<b>Minor Arterials</b>	
<b>Criteria C-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria C-2 Threshold</b>
a. New Segment	a. ¾ to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required
b. New Segment	b. > 1 mile ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
c. Added Through Lanes	c. ¾ to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required
d. Added Through Lanes	d. > 1 mile ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
e. Continuous Auxiliary Lanes	e. > 1 mile ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
f. Separation of existing railroad grade crossings	f. Not regionally significant
<b>Criteria D</b>	
<b>Rail and Fixed Guide-way Transit</b>	
<b>Criteria D-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria D-2 Threshold</b>
a. New Route or Service	a. No Minimum ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
b. Route Extension with Station	b. > 1 mile from current terminus ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
c. Added track or guide-way capacity	c. > 1 mile ( <i>regionally-significant</i> )
d. New Intermediate Station	d. AQ Consultation Required
<b>Criteria E</b>	
<b>Bus and Demand Response Transit</b>	
<b>Criteria E-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria E-2 Threshold</b>
a. New Fixed Route	a. AQ Consultation Required
b. New Demand Response Service	b. Not Regionally Significant
c. Added Service to existing	c. Not Regionally Significant

## Appendix A

### 40 CFR 93.126 and 93.127

#### § 93.126 Exempt projects.

Notwithstanding the other requirements of this subpart, highway and transit projects of the types listed in table 2 of this section are exempt from the requirement to determine conformity. Such projects may proceed toward implementation even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP. A particular action of the type listed in table 2 of this section is not exempt if the MPO in consultation with other agencies (see § 93.105(c)(1)(iii)), 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 potentially adverse emissions impacts for any reason. States and MPOs must ensure that exempt projects do not interfere with TCM implementation. Table 2 follows:

**TABLE 2—EXEMPT PROJECTS**

#### *Safety*

Railroad/highway crossing.

Projects that correct, improve, or eliminate a hazardous location or feature.

Safer non-Federal-aid system roads.

Shoulder improvements.

Increasing sight distance.

Highway Safety Improvement Program implementation.

Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.

Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.

Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.

Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation.

Pavement marking.

Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125).

Fencing.

Skid treatments.

Safety roadside rest areas.

Adding medians.

Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area.

Lighting improvements.

Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).

Emergency truck pullovers.

### ***Mass Transit***

Operating assistance to transit agencies.

Purchase of support vehicles.

Rehabilitation of transit vehicles <sup>1</sup>.

Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities.

Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g., radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.).

Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems.

Construction of small passenger shelters and information kiosks.

Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures (e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities, stations, terminals, and ancillary structures).

Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way.

Purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet <sup>1</sup>.

Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR part 771.

### ***Air Quality***

Continuation of ride-sharing and van-pooling promotion activities at current levels.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

### ***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.

Engineering to assess social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed action or alternatives to that action.

Noise attenuation.

Emergency or hardship advance land acquisitions (23 CFR 710.503).

Acquisition of scenic easements.

Plantings, landscaping, etc.

Sign removal.

Directional and informational signs.

Transportation enhancement activities (except rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities).

Repair of damage caused by natural disasters, civil unrest, or terrorist acts, except projects involving substantial functional, locational or capacity changes.

NOTE: <sup>1</sup> In PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment or maintenance areas, such projects are exempt only if they are in compliance with control measures in the applicable implementation plan.

[62 FR 43801, Aug. 15, 1997, as amended at 69 FR 40081, July 1, 2004; 71 FR 12510, Mar. 10, 2006; 73 FR 4441, Jan. 24, 2008]

### **§ 93.127 Projects exempt from regional emissions analyses.**

Notwithstanding the other requirements of this subpart, highway and transit projects of the types listed in Table 3 of this section are exempt from regional emissions analysis requirements. The local effects of these projects with respect to CO concentrations must be considered to determine if a hot-spot analysis is required prior to making a project-level conformity determination. The local effects of projects with respect to PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations must be considered and a hot-spot analysis performed prior to making a project-level conformity determination, if a project in Table 3 also meets the criteria in § 93.123(b)(1). 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 in Table 3 of this section is not exempt from regional emissions analysis if the MPO in consultation with other agencies (see § 93.105(c)(1)(iii)), 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. Table 3 follows:

#### **TABLE 3—PROJECTS EXEMPT FROM REGIONAL EMISSIONS ANALYSES**

Intersection channelization projects.

Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections.

Interchange reconfiguration projects.



Changes in vertical and horizontal alignment.

Truck size and weight inspection stations.

Bus terminals and transfer points.

[58 FR 62235, Nov. 24, 1993, as amended at 71 FR 12511, Mar. 10, 2006]