



## AGENDA

### *Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization* **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

*Date:* Thursday, June 4, 2015

*Time:* 1:30 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 .....Chair
2. Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1) .....Chair

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

3. 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.

*Attachment:* #2 – Memo outlining proposed policy.

*Action Requested:* Forward recommendation for approval to the Policy Committee.

4. 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.

*Attachment:* #3 – Proposed regionally-significant screening criteria document.

*Action Requested:* Forward recommendation for approval to Policy Committee.

**5. MRMPO Update ..... Dan Moore**

**6. Public Comment\* .....Chair**

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

**7. Other Business / Local Business .....Chair**

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

**8. Adjournment .....Chair**

- The next Middle Rogue MPO TAC meeting will be **Thursday, July 2, at 1:30 p.m. in the Courtyard Conference Room at Grants Pass City Hall.**
- The next Middle Rogue MPO Policy Committee meeting will be **June 18, at 2:30 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 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)*

**May 7, 2015**

*The following people were in attendance:*

#### **MRMPO Technical Advisory Committee**

##### *Voting Members in Attendance:*

Chuck DeJanvier	Josephine County
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
John Krawczyk, Vice Chairman	Rogue River
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Terry Haugen	Grants Pass

##### **Others Present:**

Aaron Cubic

##### **RVCOG Staff**

Dan Moore, Bunny Lincoln

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM. Members introduced themselves.

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

The Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the March meeting minutes.

**On a motion by Ian Horlacher, seconded by Kelli Sparkman, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes as presented.**

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

#### **3. MRMPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2015-16**

Dan Moore reviewed information contained in his May 1st memo. The new Oregon MPO funding mechanisms resulted in a \$31,000 increase in MRMPO planning funds. \$220,000 is expected for the MRMPO upcoming planning year. The potential total for the transit survey is approximately \$17,000.

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

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

**On a motion by John Krawczyk, seconded by Ian Horlacher, the Committee unanimously recommended Policy Committee approval of the 2015-16 Unified Planning Work Program.**

#### **4. 2015-2040 Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List**

Dan Moore outlined the fiscally constrained project list (revised). The TAC previously recommended the List to the Policy Committee for their approval, but the Committee wanted Staff to determine which projects needed to be included based on federal regulations, and for the TAC to take another look at the List. Projects to be included fall under the following criteria:

- Regionally significant projects (adding system capacity), regardless of funding source
- Projects requiring a federal environmental clearance
- Projects to be programmed in the TIP
- Projects receiving State/federal transportation funds

Grants Pass submitted a proposal for the Allen Creek Road Improvements Project to increase CMAQ funding by \$1,287,571, and decrease STP funds by \$3,069. ODOT is working with the City in developing the revised STP/CMAQ amounts. Per eligibility requirements, CMAQ funded projects must lie within the Grants Pass AQMA. A \$4,608,760 available balance (including a surplus) of CMAQ dollars currently exists through FFY 2018. **Jackson County commented that a policy should be established for overruns and reallocations of surplus CMAQ or STP funds. Staff will draft a memo and proposed policy for the next meeting. Priority would be given to**

## **funding previously programmed projects.**

Enhance-It funds are not included because the program is in a state of flux at this point, but may be available later. CMAQ, STP and local funds are included. The List is divided into short, medium and long range projects, with a Tier 2 (unfunded but still needed) section as well. The Grants Pass TSP will identify more projects.

Short Range Projects:	Grants Pass, ODOT, Rogue River and JOCO Transit
Medium Range Projects:	Grants Pass, Josephine County, JOCO Transit
Long Range Projects:	Grants Pass, Josephine County, Rogue River, JOCO Transit

All projects are financially constrained.

“Exempt” projects do not have to address air quality conformity. The members briefly discussed other aspects of what makes a project regionally significant. ODOT is working with Gold Hill on a street Network Plan. Grants Pass Project # 215 (medium range - new local collector) is part of the Air Quality Conformity, and not eligible for CMAQ finding.

Rogue River’s local \$ can cover their medium range project. Their TPS update is expected to be completed in Fall, 2015.

**On a motion by Chuck De Janvier, seconded by Terry Haugen, the TAC recommended Policy Committee approval of the Allen Creek Improvements project. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**On a motion by Ian Horlacher, seconded by John Krawczyk, the TAC recommended Policy Committee approval of the RTP List, including the addition of the ....**

**The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

### **5. RTP Draft Goals and Policies**

Dan Moore led a brief overview/discussion on Chapter 2 – Visions & Goals (the previous “Objectives” headings have been amended to “Policies”)

John Krawczyk suggested that Goal 7 G7 - P3 should be moved to Goal 2 Policies (G2 - P5), and the members concurred with this change.

**On a motion by Terry Haugen, seconded by John Krawczyk, the TAC recommended Policy Committee approval of Chapter 2, with the removal of Goal #7 - G7-P2, and its relocation to Goal #2 – G2-P5.**

**“Identify, Prioritize and Apply for investment opportunities to preserve the existing transportation including all modes.”**

**The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

### **6. MRMPO Planning Update -**

Dan Moore presented an update on current COG activities:

- Jonathan David has resigned, and Dan Moore is the new Program Manager.
- Progress is being made on the RTP

- Updating Grants Pass TSP
- Model should be operational by June for TSP updates
- Working with ODOT on Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) to improve safety and traffic flow. An inventory will be done on existing capabilities, with decisions then made on expanding the program.
- RVCOG is interviewing for an additional planner.

**7. Public Comment -**  
None received.

**8. Other Business / Local Business -**

Terry Haugen asked about the Enhance-It, and what direction to take based on the ODOT memo encouraging pre-apps by July. Ian Horlacher will check on this issue.

**9. Adjournment -**  
The meeting was adjourned at 2:33 PM.



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

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

---

**DATE:** May 27, 2015  
**TO:** MRMPO Technical Advisory 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<sup>8</sup>
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

May 27, 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]