



Interagency Consultation Committee

June 2, 2010 – 1:30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Community Planning Association

Notice: The online document requires Adobe Acrobat to read it; COMPASS' homepage <http://www.compassidaho.org> (under "Committees") contains a free download link. The online document includes bookmarks at the left of the screen that are named to correspond to agenda items that have attachments. Clicking on a bookmark will take you directly to the named document.

**** AGENDA ****

I. Agenda Additions/Changes

1:30

II. Open Discussion/Announcements/Introductions

1:35

III. Consent Agenda

1:40 *A. Approve the May 5, 2010 Meeting Minutes

IV. Action Items

**1:45 *A. Approve the Project List for the
FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement
Program and the *Communities in Motion*
Update Regional Emissions Analysis**

**MaryAnn
Waldinger**

V. Information/Discussion Items

2:00 A. State Implementation Plan Update

DEQ Staff

**2:30 *B. Project Level Analysis and Federal
Guidance Changes**

FHWA Staff

VI. Other

2:45 A. Next Meeting

VII. Adjournment

3:00

Chair

***Attachments will be distributed 14 days prior to the meeting.**

T:\FY10\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Agenda\agenda060210.doc

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

**INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION COMMITTEE
MAY 5, 2010
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**



****MINUTES****

ATTENDEES: Beth Baird, City of Boise
Scott Frey, FHWA (*Ex-Officio*)
Ron Kerr, Idaho Transportation Department
David Luft, IDEQ
Kirk Montgomery, ACHD Commuteride
Amar Pillai, Ada County Highway District, **Vice Chair**
MaryAnn Waldinger, COMPASS
Greg Vitley, Idaho Transportation Department–District 3,
Chair

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit

OTHERS PRESENT: Lee Coe, COMPASS
Rick Hardy, IDEQ
Carl Miller, COMPASS
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Vitley called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

None.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Introduction of all members present.

MaryAnn Waldinger announced the *Communities in Motion* Update – “Meeting in a Bag” discussion group. In a “Meeting in a Bag” discussion group, residents of Ada and Canyon Counties get together with friends, coworkers, or neighbors to discuss the draft update of *Communities in Motion* and provide comments back to COMPASS.

Hosting a “Meeting in a Bag” is a simple process:

- An individual signs up to host a meeting.
- The host picks a time/date/location and organizes the meeting in whatever manner he or she chooses...a meeting with coworkers over lunch, dessert with the neighbors, a potluck brunch on the patio.
- The host invites friends, neighbors, coworkers, etc. to the meeting.

- COMPASS provides the host with the meeting materials including a DVD, the draft plan update and summaries, a map showing the planned transportation system, comment forms, a host instruction booklet, and more.
- The host holds the meeting. Participants watch the DVD, read the summaries, explore the other materials, discuss what they've learned, and provide feedback to COMPASS via comment forms.
- The host mails the comment forms back to COMPASS.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve the August 27, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Amar Pillai said he was not present at the August 27th meeting as indicated on the attendees' list.

David Luft moved and Kirk Montgomery seconded to approve the August 27, 2009 Meeting Minutes as amended. Motion was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEM

A. Approve FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis Modeling Assumptions

MaryAnn Waldinger presented the emissions estimation assumptions and methodologies as drafted for use in the FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and *Communities in Motion* Update Regional Emissions Analysis.

After discussion, **Beth Baird moved and Amar Pillai seconded to approve FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis Modeling Assumptions. Motion passed unanimously.**

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Review FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis – Draft Project List

MaryAnn Waldinger reviewed the draft project list for the FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and the *Communities in Motion* Update.

Scott Frey said where right-of-way is required with federal funds; it needs to be programmed into the plan and the TIP, and include an environmental document. It is in the plan but not in the conformity because it would not have been built within the timeframe of the conformity. Scott referred to Project No. 75 – Broadway interchange: a reconfigured interchange. As a footnote, conformity applies to reconstructed interchanges for project-level conformity but not for regional conformity.

Beth Baird commented that the Regionally Significant: Yes* text represents a proposed change in the functional classification as part of the 2035 Regional Planning Functional Classification Map, but the projects prior to 2035 have the Yes*. Is that an indication that they will be changing?

MaryAnn replied it is probably a carryover that was not caught. MaryAnn will go back and verify based on the draft and what has been submitted.

B. 2035 Demographic Forecast Update

Carl Miller provided an update on the 2035 demographics for the *Communities in Motion* Update.

C. Review Conformity Calendar for the FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program

MaryAnn Waldinger reviewed the calendar of major events for the FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and the *Communities in Motion* Update.

OTHER

A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 2, 2010, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

Kirk Montgomery moved and David Luft seconded to adjourn at 10:00 a.m. Motion carries.

T:\FY10\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Minutes\minutes050510.docx



MEMORANDUM

TO: Interagency Consultation Committee

FROM: MaryAnn Waldinger, Principal Planner

DATE: May 20, 2010

RE: **Approve Project List for the FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and *Communities in Motion* Update Regional Emissions Analysis**

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve Project List for the FY2011-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and *Communities in Motion* Update Regional Emissions Analysis

BACKGROUND:

The ICC is required to review and approve the assumptions and emissions estimation methodologies used in regional emissions analyses. These analyses are conducted for transportation conformity purposes per 40CFR93 and IDAPA 58.01.01.563. Any Northern Ada County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and long-range transportation plan must demonstrate conformity to the motor vehicle emissions budgets established by the Northern Ada County PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan. Budgets are established for particular matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). A regional emissions analysis is not federally required for carbon monoxide (CO). However, Northern Ada County's Limited Maintenance Plan for CO requires COMPASS to conduct a build/no build emissions analysis for local planning purposes.

STATUS:

Staff has prepared the attached listing of projects to make up the "build" travel demand model networks for use in the FY2011-2015 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and *Communities in Motion* Update Emissions Analysis and subsequent conformity demonstration for Northern Ada County. The model networks include projects listed in Ada County Highway District's (ACHD) Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), Five-Year Work Program (FYWP), draft Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, draft Regional Transportation Improvement Program, and draft *Communities in Motion* Update.

Staff requests the ICC's approval of the roadway project list (Attachment 1).

Attachments (1)

pc: 685.1

MW:dw T:\FY10\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Packets\060210\project memo list.docx

**FY 2011-2015 Regional Emissions Analysis Model Networks
As of May 19, 2010**

The following table lists the transportation projects recently completed or under construction. Projects under construction are expected to be open to the motoring public by December 31, 2010.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
1.	Meridian Rd & Main St (Ph 1 of split corridor)	I-84 - Franklin Rd	3	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U/TIP/STIP	RD205-06	Yes	No	No	Done
2.	ParkCenter East Bridge	ParkCenter Blvd - Warm Springs Ave	4	FYWP/CIP/TIP/STIP	MA203-02	Yes	No	No	Done
3.	Deer Flat Rd	Ten Mile Rd - SH 69	3	FYWP/CIP	RD125	No	No	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	Under construction
4.	I-84	Garrity IC - Meridian IC	6	TIP/STIP/CIM-U	11489	Yes	Yes - GARVEE	No	Under construction
5.	Orchard IC	Reconstruct - add new ramps and lanes	NA	TIP/CIM-U/STIP	9817	Yes	Yes - GARVEE	Yes - (40CFR93.127)	Under construction
6.	Ten Mile Rd	Franklin Rd - Cherry Ln	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U	RD309	No	No	No	Under construction
7.	Vista IC	Reconstruct - add new ramps and lanes	NA	TIP/STIP/CIM-U	9818	Yes	Yes -ARRA	Yes - (40CFR93.127)	Under construction

2011 Network

The base network uses 2011 demographics and consists of the existing roadway network and the projects assumed to be completed and open to the motoring public by December 31, 2011. The 2011 demographics forecasts were developed using the demographic allocation approved by DAC on February 4, 2010. The 2011 network uses 2011 demographics and includes all the projects listed above along with the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year
8.	Eagle Rd	Victory Rd - Ridenbaugh Canal	5	FYWP/CIP/TIP/STIP	RD203-07	Yes	No	No	2011/2011
9.	I-84	Garrity IC - Meridian IC	8	STIP/CIM-U	11489	Yes	Yes - GARVEE	No	UC/Funded
10.	I-84	Cole / Overland IC - Broadway IC	8	STIP/CIM-U	09819/ 09820/ 09823	Yes	Yes - GARVEE	No	UC/Funded
11.	Overland Rd	Ten Mile Rd - Linder Rd	5	FYWP/CIP		Yes	No	No	2011/2014-2018
12.	Ten Mile Rd IC	New Interchange at I-84 and Ten Mile Rd between New Overland Rd – Franklin Rd	NA	TIP/STIP	9815/RDO 210-01	Yes	Yes – GARVEE/ local	No	UC anticipated open summer 2011

2015 Network

The 2015 network uses 2015 demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2011 and the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year
13.	30 th St (new road)	Fairview Ave - State St	5	FYWP/CIP	RD202-09	No	No	No	2013/2014-2018
14.	Five Mile Rd	Franklin Rd - Fairview Ave	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/TIP	F038/11582	No	Yes	No	2013/2013
15.	Five Mile Rd	Fairview Ave - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP	RD195A	No	No	No	2015/UF ROW only
16.	Franklin Rd	Touchmark Way (~1000' e/o Eagle Rd) - Five Mile Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/TIP	RD282/77737/12062	Yes	Yes	No	2011-12
17.	Franklin Rd	Ten Mile Rd - Linder Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/TIP/CIM-U	RC0165	Yes	No	No	2012/2012
18.	Hill Rd Extension	State St - Horseshoe Bend Rd	3	FYWP	RD308	No	No	No	2012
19.	I-84	Franklin Blvd - Garrity IC	6	STIP/CIM-U	10916	Yes	Yes - GARVEE	No	2015/Funded
20.	Meridian Rd & Main St (Ph 2 of split corridor)	Franklin - Fairview Ave	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U/TIP/STIP	RD205-07	Yes	No	No	2013/2012
21.	SH 16 River Crossing	Connect SH 16 from SH 44 to US 20/26	4	CIM-U/TIP/STIP	11236	Yes	Yes - GARVEE	No	Funded / 2011-12
22.	Ten Mile Rd	Cherry Ln - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U	RD188	No	No	No	2015/2013/funded
23.	Ustick Rd	Meridian Rd – Locust Grove Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U	RD202-37	Yes	No	No	PD/2014-2018/ Funded
24.	Ustick Rd	Locust Grove Rd – Leslie Dr	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U	RD205-05	Yes	No	No	2015/2014-2018/ Funded
25.	Ustick Rd	Duane Dr (1/4 mile e/o Eagle Rd– Five Mile Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U	RD202/RD205-04	No	No	No	2014/2014-2018/ Funded

2025 Network

The 2025 network uses 2025 demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2011, 2015, and the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year
26.	36th St	Hill Rd - Cartwright Rd	3	FYWP/CIP		No	No	No	UF/ 2019-2027
27.	Adams St	Improved connection 36 th to 37 th St (Clay St)	3	FYWP	RD208-08	No	No	Yes	PD
28.	Avalon Rd (Kuna Rd)	Linder Rd - Orchard St	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2019-2027
29.	Cloverdale Rd	Ustick Rd – Chinden Blvd	5	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RD207-13 /RC0092	No	No	No	UF/2014-2018/Funded
30.	Cloverdale Rd	Franklin Rd – Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RD202-14 / RC0087	No	No	No	PD/2014-2018/Funded
31.	Cloverdale Rd	Overland Rd - Franklin Rd	5	CIP/ CIM-U		No	No	No	2019-2027UF/ Funded
32.	Cloverdale Rd	Amity Rd – Overland Rd	5	CIP/ CIM-U		No	No	No	2014-2018/Funded
33.	Cloverdale Rd	Lake Hazel Rd – Amity Rd	5	CIP/ CIM-U		No	No	No	2014-2018/Funded
34.	Cloverdale Rd	Columbia Rd – Lake Hazel Rd	5	CIP/ CIM-U		No	No	No	2019-2027 UF /Funded
35.	Cole Rd	I-84 Ramps – Franklin Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/	RD207-16	Yes	No	No	PD/2014-2018
36.	Cole Rd	Lake Hazel Rd - Victory Rd	5	CIP		Yes	No	No	2019-2027
37.	Fairview Ave	Meridian Rd - Locust Grove Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RC0135	Yes	No	No	UF/2019-2027 UF/Funded
38.	Fairview Ave	Locust Grove Rd – Eagle Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RC0133	Yes	No	No	UF/2014-2018/ Funded
39.	Fairview Ave	Eagle Rd – Cloverdale Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RC0130	Yes	No	No	UF/2014-2018/ Funded
40.	Fairview Ave	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RC0127	Yes	No	No	UF/2019-2027/Funded/
41.	Fairview Ave	Five Mile Rd - Maple Grove Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/ TIP/ CIM-U	RC0131	Yes	No	No	UF/2019-2027/Funded
42.	Fairview Ave	Maple Grove Rd - Cole Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/ CIM-U	RD207-17	Yes	No	No	UF/2019-2027/Funded
43.	Fairview Ave	Cole Rd - Orchard St (or e/o Curtis Rd)	7	CIP/ CIM-U		Yes	No	No	2019-2027 UF/Funded

2025 Network

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year
44.	Franklin Rd	Black Cat Rd – Ten Mile Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U/	RC0152	Yes	Yes	No	PD/2019-2027 /Funded
45.	Franklin Rd	McDermott Rd - Black Cat Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	No	No	2019-2027 UF /Funded
46.	Maple Grove Rd	Lake Hazel – Victory Rd	5	CIP		No	No	Yes - Safety (40CFR93 .126)	2019-2027
47.	Lake Hazel Rd Extension	Cole Rd - Pleasant Valley Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	No	No	2014-2018/ Funded
48.	Lake Hazel Rd	Locust Grove Rd – Cole Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	No	No	2014-2018/ Funded
49.	Linder Rd	Franklin Rd - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U	RD077	No	No	No	UF/2019-2027/ Funded
50.	Linder Rd	Ustick Rd to Chinden Blvd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	No	No	2019-2027/ Funded
51.	McMillan Rd	Locust Grove Rd - Eagle Rd	5	FYWP/CIP	RC0240	No	No	No	UF/2019-2027
52.	Pine St	Eagle Rd - Cloverdale Rd	5	CIP		No	No	No	2019-2027
53.	Ten Mile Rd	Victory Rd – Overland Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U	RC0299	Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027/ Funded
54.	Ten Mile Rd	Ustick Rd - Chinden Blvd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF/ Funded
55.	Ustick Rd	Black Cat Rd – Ten Mile Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2014-2018 /Funded
56.	Victory Rd	Maple Grove Rd - Cole Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2014 - 2018

2035 Network

The 2035 network uses 2035 demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2011, 2015, 2025, and the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year
57.	36 th St	Extend 36 th St from existing to Cartwright Rd and Bogus Basin Rd	3	CIP	RD307	No	No	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF 2019-2027
58.	Amity Rd	McDermott Rd - Meridian Rd	3	CIP/(5 lanes in CIM-U)		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF/ Funded
59.	Amity Rd	Meridian Rd - Eagle Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	2019-2027/ Funded
60.	Emerald St	Curtis Rd -Orchard St	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2019-2027
61.	Executive St / Presidential	3 In couplet with Presidential	N.A.	CIP		No	No	No	2019-2027
62.	Federal Way	S/o SH 21 - Isaac Canyon IC	5	Developer Funded		No	Developer Funded	No	NA
63.	Overland Rd New Extension	Black Cat Rd – Ten Mile Rd	5	South Meridian Study		Yes	TBD	No	2035 Overland Rd east of Ten Mile Rd will be realigned due to the Ten Mile IC.
64.	State St	Glenwood St – 36 th St	7	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U (to MMC)		Yes	TBD	No	UF/2019-2027 /Funded
65.	Ten Mile Rd	Lake Hazel - Victory Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF /Funded
66.	Ustick Rd	Star Rd – Black Cat Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF /Funded
67.	Ustick Rd	Ten Mile Rd – Meridian Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 /Funded
68.	Ustick Rd	Cole Rd - Curtis Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF/ Funded

Unfunded and/or ROW only: The following projects will not be included in the travel demand forecast model networks for air quality conformity purposes.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
69.	Amity Rd	Federal Way - Holcomb Rd/Surprise Way	3	FYWP	RD209-01	No	No	Yes	UF
70.	Beacon Light Rd	Extend Beacon Light Rd from Ada Co. Line - SH 16	2	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only/ Unfunded
71.	Beacon Light Rd	SH 16 - Park Ln	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only/ Unfunded
72.	Beacon Light Rd	Park Ln - Eagle Rd	3	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only/ Unfunded
73.	Black Cat Rd	Amity Rd - Cherry Ln	3	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF-ROW only/ Unfunded
74.	Black Cat Rd	Cherry Ln - Chinden Blvd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF-ROW only/ Unfunded
75.	Broadway IC	Reconstruct - add new ramps and lanes	N.A.	CIM-U	9821	Yes	Yes	Yes - (40CFR93.127)	unfunded
76.	Cherry Ln	McDermott Rd - Black Cat Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF/ Unfunded
77.	Eagle Rd	I-84 - ½ mile north of Fairview	7	City of Meridian/ CIM-U/TIP		Yes	No	No	Highway districts and developers still negotiating roadway improvements. As of August 2009 improvements may be more operational than capacity.
78.	Eagle Rd	Lake Hazel Rd – Amity Rd	5	CIP		Yes	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF- ROW only
79.	Emerald St	Five Mile Rd – Curtis Rd	5	CIP			TBD	No	UF- ROW only
80.	Executive St / Presidential	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
81.	Five Mile Rd	Lake Hazel Rd – Amity Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
82.	Five Mile Rd	Overland Rd - Franklin Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
83.	Five Mile Rd	Ustick Rd - McMillan Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
84.	Franklin Rd	Eagle Rd - Milwaukee St	7	CIP		Yes	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
85.	Glenwood St / Cole Rd couplet	Two way couplet - Mountain View Dr	3	CIP		Yes	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
86.	Gowen IC	Reconstruct	NA	CIM-U	9822	Yes	Yes	Yes - (40CFR93.127)	Unfunded
87.	Hill Rd	Castle Dr - 36 th St	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
88.	I-84	Broadway IC - Isaacs Canyon IC	8	CIM-U	K307/ K301	Yes	Yes	No	Unfunded
89.	Lake Hazel Rd	SH 69 – Eagle Rd	5 (3 lanes in CIP)	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 UF /Unfunded
90.	Lake Hazel Rd	McDermott Rd - SH 69	5	CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	Unfunded
91.	Lake Hazel Rd (Gowen Rd Realignment)	Gowen Rd - Eisenman Rd	4-5	CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	2019-2027 ROW only/ Funded
92.	Linder Rd	Victory Rd - Overland Rd	5	CIM-U		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	Unfunded
93.	Linder Rd	Kuna Mora Rd - Victory Rd	5	CIM-U		No	TBD	No	Unfunded
94.	Linder Rd	Overland Rd - Franklin Rd (includes overpass)	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF - ROW only/ Unfunded
95.	Linder Rd	Chinden Blvd - State St (4 lane bridge)	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only/ Unfunded
96.	Linder Rd	State St - Beacon Light Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only/ Unfunded
97.	Locust Grove Rd	Fairview Ave - McMillan Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
98.	Maple Grove Rd	Fairview Ave - McMillan Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
99.	McDermott Rd	Lake Hazel Rd - I84	5	CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	Unfunded
100.	McMillan Rd	McDermott Rd - Locust Grove Rd	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
101.	McMillan Rd	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
102.	McMillan Rd	Five Mile Rd - Maple Grove Rd	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
103.	Meridian Rd	Cherry Ln – Ustick Rd	5	CIP/CIM-U		No	TBD	No	2018-2027 UF/ Unfunded
104.	Meridian Rd	Ustick Rd - Chinden Blvd	3	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
105.	Meridian Rd IC	Reconstruct interchange	NA	CIM-U		Yes	Yes	Yes - Safety (40CFR 93.126)	Unfunded
106.	Overland Rd	Meridian Rd - Maple Grove Rd	7	CIP		Yes	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
107.	SH 16 Expressway	Ada Co. Line - I-84 (Urban ICs at Chaparral, Beacon Light, SH 44, US 20/26, and Ustick)	4	CIM-U		Yes	Yes	No	Unfunded
108.	SH 16 IC	I-84 - Vicinity of McDermott		CIM-U		Yes	Yes	No	Unfunded
109.	SH 44	Ada Co. Line - Ballantyne Rd	4	CIM-U		Yes	Yes	No	Unfunded
110.	SH 55	Beacon Light Rd - Brookside Ln	4	CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	Unfunded
111.	SH 69 Connection	Kuna Mora Rd - Kuna Rd	2	CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	Unfunded
112.	State St	36 th St – 27 th St	7	FYWP/CIP/CIM-U		Yes	TBD	No	UF/2019-2027 UF /Unfunded
113.	Three City's River Crossing (new road & bridge)	Chinden Blvd - State St	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/CIM-U	C202-01/9189	Yes	Yes	No	UF/2019-2027/PD/ Unfunded
114.	US 20/26	Can Ada Rd - Eagle Rd	4 or 6	CIM-U		Yes	Yes	No	Unfunded
115.	Victory Rd	Eagle Rd - Cloverdale Rd	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
116.	Victory Rd	Cloverdale Rd – Maple Grove Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only

Source of Projects:

FYWP = Ada County Highway District's Five Year Work Plan FY 2011-2015

CIP = ACHD 2006 Capital Improvements Plan FY 2006-2027

STIP = Idaho Transportation Department's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program FY 2010-2013 and Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) Bond Scenario 7 approved by the IT Board in October 2006

TIP = Draft FY 2011-2015 Regional Transportation Improvement Program list

CIM-U = Draft *Communities in Motion Update* Project List – Long Range Transportation Plan for the six county region

Unfunded = Unfunded projects in the Draft *Communities in Motion Update* Project List

FYWP #/ITD Key #:

FYWP# = ACHD GIS Numbers are alpha numeric identification numbers (ex. RD169)

ITD Key# = ITD Key Numbers are from the Transportation Improvement Program and the State Transportation Improvement Program and are strictly numeric (ex. 6299)

Regionally Significant:

Yes = Represents functional classification on the 2015 Federal *Functional Classification Map*

http://www.compassidaho.org/documents/prodserv/maps/adacan2015_E.pdf

Regionally Significant Roadway Project Definition:

Regional emissions analyses, for the purposes of demonstrating transportation conformity of a TIP or long-range plan, must include all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects in the nonattainment or maintenance area. On January 30, 2002, the ICC developed the following definition of a "Regionally Significant" project:

"A transportation project in Ada County, Idaho is designated 'Regionally Significant' if:

- (a) the project is for the improvement of either:
 - (i) a principal arterial or higher functional classification; or
 - (ii) a minor arterial which will have a twenty (20) year projected traffic volume of at least 45,000 vehicles a day after completion of the project; and
- (b) the project will add at least one new continuous vehicular lane which either:
 - (i) extends from one intersecting principal or minor arterial to another intersecting principal or minor arterial; or
 - (ii) in the case of an interstate, extends from the on ramp of one interstate interchange to a point beyond the off ramp of the next adjacent interstate interchange."

Despite these definitions, the ICC maintains discretionary authority in interpreting and applying them to the area's transportation programs, plans, and projects. For the purposes of this conformity determination, all applicable roadway projects, despite their significance, were included in the travel demand model networks.

Exempt:

Pursuant to 40CFR93.126 (Exempt Projects), certain projects listed in a long-range transportation plan or TIP may proceed even in the absence of a conformity finding/demonstration. Exempt projects include highway safety or mass transit projects, landscaping projects, roadway rehabilitation and repair, transportation enhancement projects, and transportation planning activities that do not lead directly to construction. However, the exempt projects listed in 40CFR93.126 are not considered exempt if the ICC concludes that they may have an adverse impact on air quality.

Federal Aid:

GARVEE = Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds are tax-exempt financing mechanisms backed by annual federal appropriations for federal-aid transportation projects.

Construction Year:

UF = Construction is unfunded, illustrative, or listed for preservation of right-of-way only in FYWP and/or CIP

PD = Preliminary development projects

UC = Project is currently under construction

Status:

Based on monthly GARVEE reports provided by ITD, ACHD's FYWP 2011-2015 and CIP.

The COMPASS model is a two-county model. The planned projects in Ada and Canyon County are included in the appropriate model network year.

T:\FY10\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Packets\060210\1115TIPCIMList.docx

Regulatory and Procedural Updates Affecting Project Level

Air Quality Analysis for CO, Particulate and MSAT

By: R. Scott Frey
Date: May 20, 2010

Introduction:

The following paper has been prepared to provide ITD with updated guidance and explanation concerning current and anticipated requirements for assessing the air quality impacts and, as applicable, demonstrating air quality conformity, for highway projects in Idaho.

Background:

In 2007 representatives from the FHWA Idaho Division, ITD and IDEQ together produced an update to ITD's Project Level Air Quality (PLAQ) Screening and Analysis process. The general purpose for this document was to provide clear guidance and procedures for screening and where warranted, analyzing anticipated highway projects to determine the relative impact of these projects on air quality and the proper documentation of the findings in the project's environmental document.

This PLAQ document is to be used for analyzing the following pollutants:

- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Particulates (PM-10 and PM-2.5)
- Mobile Air Source Toxics (MSAT)

A summary table outlining the application of the PLAQ procedures and criteria in Idaho is provided in Table 1 (See Attachment A)

Subsequent to ITD's 2007 adoption of PLAQ, the FHWA and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have issued the following updates and changes to their regulations, policies and guidance pertaining to project level air quality analysis:

- FHWA issues updated guidance on MSATs effective October 2, 2009
- EPA adopts MOVES2010 for SIPs and regional emissions analysis effective March 2, 2010

In addition, EPA will be issuing PM quantitative hot-spot modeling guidance in the near future.

FHWA's MSAT Guidance Update:

On October 2, 2009, FHWA issued an update to its February 2006 Guidance on Mobile Source Air Toxic (MSAT) Analysis in NEPA Documents. In reviewing this guidance, it appears that the changes from FHWA's earlier guidance are relatively minor, but that it will

warrant some updating in the PLAQ, particularly to address changes in wording to be used for documenting the MSAT analysis in the environmental documents (**See Attachment B for details**).

MOVES2010:

On March 2, 2010, EPA adopted the new emissions model, MOVES2010, for use in SIP development and regional emissions analysis. With respect to project level (hotspot) analysis, it was explained in the March 2nd Final Rule that a separate rule would be issued approving the use of MOVES2010 for project level conformity analysis following finalization of the guidance for conducting such analyses. Until MOVES2010 is adopted for project level conformity, the analysis requirements and procedures outlined in the PLAQ will remain current and in effect. (**For details concerning the transition to MOVES2010 during the anticipated two year grace period following its adoption, see Attachment C**).

Conclusions/Recommendations:

See below table for a summary of the status, recommended changes and time line for additional actions and information for those pollutants subject to project level analysis.

STATUS AND ANTICIPATED CHANGES BY POLLUTANT			
Pollutant	Status	Required or Recommended Changes	Time Line
MSAT	ITD PLAQ is consistent with FHWA's updated MSAT guidance and, therefore, remains valid.	Proposed refinements to NEPA statements and documentation to reflect FHWA's October 2, 2009 updated guidance are outlined in Attachment B.	Update PLAQ now to incorporate refinements. No deadline.
CO	MOVES2010 has not yet been approved for project level analysis, therefore ITD PLAQ remains valid.	Once MOVES2010 has been approved, new emissions factors will need to be generated and dispersion modeling conducted to determine if changes in current screening volumes are needed.	Following adoption of MOVES2010, a 24 mth grace period will exist during which current PLAQ screening and analysis criteria will remain valid.
PM	MOVES2010 has not yet been approved for project level analysis, therefore ITD PLAQ remains valid.	Once MOVES2010 has been approved, new project level analysis procedures and documentation will need to be developed.	Following adoption of MOVES2010, a 24 mth grace period will exist during which current PLAQ screening and analysis criteria will remain valid.

ATTACHMENT A

PLAQ Table 1: Project Screening By Pollutant, Area and Criteria

TABLE 1

PROJECT SCREENING BY POLLUTANT, AREA AND CRITERIA

POLLUTANT:	APPLICABLE AREAS:	SCREENING PARAMETER AND CRITERIA:	RECOMMENDED STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE FOR NEPA DOCUMENTATION:						
<p>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</p>	<p>Northern Ada County, Canyon County</p>	<p>Exempt Project Types per 40 CFR 93.126 (See Exhibit 680-2)</p>	<p><i>“This project has been identified as being exempt from air quality analysis in accordance with 40 CFR 93.126. It is therefore concluded that the project will have no significant adverse impact on air quality due to CARBON MONOXIDE.”</i></p>						
		<p>Level of Service per 40 CFR 93.123 LOS C</p>	<p><i>“This project is forecast to have a level of service of “C” or better at all intersections within or directly affected by the project. It is therefore concluded that the project will have no significant adverse impact on air quality due to CARBON MONOXIDE.”</i></p>						
		<p>Total Intersection Volume By Year (AADT):</p> <table border="0" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>2015</td> <td>2020</td> <td>2025+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100k</td> <td>125k</td> <td>150k</td> <td>175k</td> </tr> </table>	2010	2015	2020	2025+	100k	125k	150k
2010	2015	2020	2025+						
100k	125k	150k	175k						
<p>Particulate (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})</p>	<p><u>PM-10</u> Northern Ada County, Portneuf Valley, Fort Hall (Tribal Lands), Pinehurst, Sandpoint Canyon County <u>PM-2.5</u></p>	<p>Project Types (includes LOS & Volumes, as applicable) A. Exempt per 40 CFR 93.126, (See Exhibit 680-2)</p>	<p><i>“This project has been identified as being exempt from air quality analysis in accordance with 40 CFR 93.126. It is therefore concluded that the project will have no significant adverse impact on air quality due to PARTICULATE MATTER.”</i></p>						

TABLE 1

PROJECT SCREENING BY POLLUTANT, AREA AND CRITERIA

POLLUTANT:	APPLICABLE AREAS:	SCREENING PARAMETER AND CRITERIA:	RECOMMENDED STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE FOR NEPA DOCUMENTATION:
	Franklin County (pending), Pinehurst Canyon County		
<p>Particulate (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) (continued)</p>	<p><u>PM-10</u> Northern Ada County, Portneuf Valley, Fort Hall (Tribal Lands), Pinehurst, Sandpoint Canyon County</p> <p><u>PM-2.5</u> Franklin County (pending) Pinehurst Canyon County</p>	<p>B. Not of Concern per 40 CFR 123(b)(1)*</p> <p>*Projects other than the following five types are not considered to have the potential to impact air quality standards and, therefore, are exempt from hot-spot analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New or expanded highway projects that have a significant number of or significant increase in diesel vehicles (> 10k trucks per day); 2. Projects affecting intersections that are at LOS D or worse with a significant number of diesel vehicles, or those that will change to LOS D or worse because of increases traffic volumes from a significant number of diesel vehicles related to the project; 3. New bus and rail terminals and transfer points that have a significant number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single point; 4. Expanded bus and rail terminals, and expanded transfer points, which significantly increase the number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location; and <p>Projects in or affecting locations, areas, or</p>	<p><i>“The proposed undertaking is not ‘a project of air quality concern’ as defined in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1). Therefore the project-level conformity determination requirements of 40 CFR 93.116 have been satisfied and no qualitative Particulate Matter hot-spot analysis is necessary.</i></p>

TABLE 1

PROJECT SCREENING BY POLLUTANT, AREA AND CRITERIA

POLLUTANT:	APPLICABLE AREAS:	SCREENING PARAMETER AND CRITERIA:	RECOMMENDED STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE FOR NEPA DOCUMENTATION:
		categories of sites which are identified in the PM-10 SIP as sites of violation or possible violation (of which Idaho has none).	
<p>Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT)</p>	<p>Statewide <i>(when identified as an issue through public or agency in-put).</i></p>	<p>Project Types (includes LOS & Volumes, as applicable)</p> <p>A. Exempt Projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Projects qualifying as “C-List” categorical exclusions (ref. 23 CFR 771.117(c)). 2. Projects exempt under EPA’s Conformity Regulations (ref. 40 CFR 93.126-Exhibit 680-2) 3. Other projects with no meaningful impacts on traffic volumes or vehicle mix. <p>B. Projects with Low Potential MSAT Effects: Projects that “serve to improve operations of highway, transit or freight without adding substantial new capacity or without creating a facility that is likely to meaningfully increase emissions”. Examples include highway widening, new interchanges, new connector highways, and new or expanded intermodal centers. The volume criteria for highway projects in this category is a maximum design forecast of 150,000 AADT. The general criteria for intermodal centers in this category</p>	<p><i>“This project will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility, or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts. As such, FHWA has determined that this project will have a minimal impact with respect to mobile source air toxics (MSAT). Moreover, EPA regulations for vehicle engines and fuels will cause overall MSATs to decline significantly over the next 20 years, thus minimizing any new emissions as a result of this project and at the same time lowering current background levels from the transportation network as a whole.”</i></p> <p>(See Exhibit 680-3, 680-6A and 680-6B)</p>

TABLE 1

PROJECT SCREENING BY POLLUTANT, AREA AND CRITERIA

POLLUTANT:	APPLICABLE AREAS:	SCREENING PARAMETER AND CRITERIA:	RECOMMENDED STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE FOR NEPA DOCUMENTATION:
		is that the project not create or significantly alter a major intermodal freight facility.	
<p>Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) (continued)</p>	<p>Statewide <i>(when identified as an issue through public or agency in-put).</i></p>	<p>C. Projects with Higher MSAT Effects: This category is limited to projects which create or alter a major intermodal freight facility that has the potential to concentrate high levels of diesel particulate matter in a single location; or which create or add significant capacity to urban highways where the forecast traffic volume will be in excess of 150,000 AADT; and located in proximity to populated areas or, for rural areas, in proximity to concentrations of vulnerable populations (e.g., schools, nursing homes, etc.).</p>	<p>Projects falling into this category will require coordination with FHWA Headquarters for further guidance on conducting quantitative analysis and documentation.</p>

ATTACHMENT B

FHWA-ID Recommendations to Update PLAQ for MSAT

FHWA'S 2009 UPDATE TO GUIDANCE ON
MOBILE SOURCE AIR TOXICS:
ANALYSIS OF MSAT IN NEPA DOCUMENTS

By: R. Scott Frey, Transportation Engineer

FHWA Idaho Division

Date: October 7, 2009

INTRODUCTION:

On October 2, 2009, FHWA issued an update to its February 2006 Guidance on Mobile Source Air Toxic (MSAT) Analysis in NEPA Documents. In reviewing this guidance, I have concluded that while the nature and extent of the changes is relatively minor, they are sufficient to warrant updating Idaho's 2008 Project Level Air Quality (PLAQ) Policy document to incorporate the updates in FHWA's guidance.

Therefore, I have prepared the following draft update to the PLAQ for your review and consideration. This update would revise MSAT section of Exhibit 680-3 in the current PLAQ as follows:

MOBILE SOURCE AIR TOXICS (MSAT):

The FHWA developed a tiered approach for analyzing MSAT in NEPA documents, depending on specific project circumstances. The FHWA has identified three levels of analysis:

1. No analysis for projects with no potential for meaningful MSAT effects;
2. Qualitative analysis for projects with low potential MSAT effects; or
3. Quantitative analysis to differentiate alternatives for projects with higher potential MSAT effects.

For projects warranting MSAT analysis, the seven priority MSAT should be analyzed.

1. Projects with No Meaningful Potential MSAT Effects or Exempt Projects:

The types of projects included in this category are:

- Projects qualifying as a categorical exclusion under 23 CFR 771.117(c);
- Projects exempt under the Clean Air Act conformity rule under 40 CFR 93.126; or
- Other projects with no meaningful impacts on traffic volumes or vehicle mix.

For exempt projects, appropriate documentation to include in the NEPA document would be as follows:

For projects that are categorically excluded under 23 CFR 771.117(c), or are exempt from conformity requirements under the Clean Air Act pursuant to 40 CFR 93.126, no analysis or discussion of MSAT is necessary.

Documentation sufficient to demonstrate that the project qualifies as a categorical exclusion and/or exempt project will suffice. For other projects with no or negligible traffic impacts, regardless of the class of NEPA environmental document, no MSAT analysis is required. However, the project record should document the basis for the determination of "no meaningful potential impacts" with a brief description of the factors considered. Example language, which must be modified to correspond with local and project-specific circumstances, is as follows:

The purpose of this project is to (insert major deficiency that the project is meant to address) by constructing (insert major elements of the project). This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for CAAA criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. As such, this project will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause an increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the no-build alternative.

Moreover, EPA regulations for vehicle engines and fuels will cause overall MSAT emissions to decline significantly over the next several decades. Based on regulations now in effect, an analysis of national trends with EPA's MOBILE6.2 model forecasts a combined reduction of 72 percent in the total annual emission rate for the priority MSAT from 1999 to 2050 while vehicle-miles of travel are projected to increase by 145 percent. This will both reduce the background level of MSAT as well as the possibility of even minor MSAT emissions from this project.

2. PROJECTS WITH LOW POTENTIAL MSAT EFFECTS:

The types of projects included in this category are those that serve to improve operations of highway, transit or freight without adding substantial new capacity or without creating a facility that is likely to meaningfully increase MSAT emissions. This category covers a broad range of projects.

We anticipate that most highway projects that need an MSAT assessment will fall into this category. Any projects not meeting the criteria in subsection (1) or subsection (3) as follows should be included in this category. Examples of these types of projects are minor widening projects; new interchanges, such as those that replace a signalized intersection on a

surface street; or projects where design year traffic is projected to be less than 140,000 to 150,000 annual average daily traffic (AADT).

For these projects, a qualitative assessment of emissions projections should be conducted. This qualitative assessment would compare, in narrative form, the expected effect of the project on traffic volumes, vehicle mix, or routing of traffic and the associated changes in MSAT for the project alternatives, based on VMT, vehicle mix, and speed. It would also discuss national trend data projecting substantial overall reductions in emissions due to stricter engine and fuel regulations issued by EPA. Because the emission effects of these projects are low, we expect there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the various alternatives. In addition, quantitative analysis of these types of projects will not yield credible results that are useful to project-level decision-making due to the limited capabilities of the transportation and emissions forecasting tools.

In addition to the qualitative assessment, a NEPA document for this category of projects must include a discussion of information that is incomplete or unavailable for a project specific assessment of MSAT impacts, in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1502.22(b)). This discussion should explain how air toxics analysis is an emerging field and current scientific techniques, tools, and data are not sufficient to accurately estimate human health impacts that would result from a transportation project in a way that would be useful to decision-makers. Also in compliance with 40 CFR 150.22(b), it should contain information regarding the health impacts of MSAT.

Introductory Language for Qualitative Analysis of Low-Potential Projects:

A qualitative analysis provides a basis for identifying and comparing the potential differences among MSAT emissions, if any, from the various alternatives. Examples of qualitative assessments for projects with low potential for MSAT effects are as follows:

(1) Minor Widening Project:

For each alternative in this EIS/EA (specify), the amount of MSAT emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. The VMT estimated for each of the Build Alternatives is slightly higher than that for the No Build Alternative, because the additional capacity increases the efficiency of the roadway and attracts rerouted trips from elsewhere in the transportation network. Refer to Table ____ (specify). This increase in VMT would lead to higher MSAT emissions for the preferred action alternative along the highway corridor, along with a corresponding decrease in MSAT emissions along the parallel routes. The emissions increase is offset somewhat by lower MSAT emission rates due to increased speeds; according to EPA's MOBILE6.2 model, emissions of all of the priority MSAT except for diesel particulate matter decrease as speed increases. The extent to which these speed-related emissions decreases will offset VMT-related emissions increases cannot be reliably projected due to the inherent deficiencies of technical models. Because the estimated VMT under each of the Alternatives are nearly the same, varying by less than ____ (specify) percent, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the various alternatives. Also, regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result

of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by 72 percent between 1999 and 2050. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

(The following paragraph may apply if the project includes plans to construct travel lanes closer to populated areas.)

The additional travel lanes contemplated as part of the project alternatives will have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby homes, schools, and businesses; therefore, under each alternative there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSAT could be higher under certain Build Alternatives than the No Build Alternative. The localized increases in MSAT concentrations would likely be most pronounced along the expanded roadway sections that would be built at _____ (specify location), under Alternatives _____ (specify), and along _____ (specify route) under Alternatives _____ (specify). However, the magnitude and the duration of these potential increases compared to the No-Build alternative cannot be reliably quantified due to incomplete or unavailable information in forecasting project-specific MSAT health impacts. In sum, when a highway is widened, the localized level of MSAT emissions for the Build Alternative could be higher relative to the No Build Alternative, but this could be offset due to increases in speeds and reductions in congestion (which are associated with lower MSAT emissions). Also, MSAT will be lower in other locations when traffic shifts away from them. However, on a regional basis, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will over time cause substantial reductions that, in almost all cases, will cause region-wide MSAT levels to be significantly lower than today.

(2) New Interchange Connecting an Existing Roadway with a New Roadway

(This scenario is oriented toward projects where a new roadway segment connects to an existing limited access highway. The purpose of the roadway is primarily to meet regional travel needs, e.g., by providing a more direct route between locations.)

For each alternative in this EIS/EA (specify), the amount of MSAT emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. Because the VMT estimated for the No Build Alternative is higher than for any of the Build Alternatives, higher levels of MSAT are not expected from any of the Build Alternatives compared to the No Build. Refer to Table ____ (specify). In addition, because the estimated VMT under each of the Build Alternatives are nearly the same, varying by less than ____ (specify) percent, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the various alternatives. Also, regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by 72 percent from 1999 to 2050. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in virtually all locations.

Under each alternative there may be localized areas where VMT would increase, and other areas where VMT would decrease. Therefore, it is possible that localized increases and decreases in MSAT emissions may occur. The localized increases in MSAT emissions would likely be most pronounced along the new roadway sections that would be built at _____ (specify location), under Alternatives _____ (specify), and along _____ (specify route) under Alternatives _____ (specify). However, even if these increases do occur, they too will be substantially reduced in the future due to implementation of EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations.

In sum, under all Build Alternatives in the design year it is expected there would be reduced MSAT emissions in the immediate area of the project, relative to the No Build Alternative, due to the reduced VMT associated with more direct routing, and due to EPA's MSAT reduction programs.

(3) New Interchange Connecting New Roadways

(This scenario is oriented toward interchange projects developed in response to or in anticipation of economic development, e.g., a new interchange to serve a new shopping/residential development. Projects from the previous example may also have economic development associated with them, so some of this language may also apply.)

For each alternative in this EIS/EA (specify), the amount of MSAT emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. The VMT estimated for each of the Build Alternatives is slightly higher than that for the No Build Alternative, because the interchange facilitates new development that attracts trips that would not otherwise occur in the area. Refer to Table ____ (specify). This increase in VMT means MSAT under the Build Alternatives would probably be higher than the No Build Alternative in the study area. There could also be localized differences in MSAT from indirect effects of the project such as associated access traffic, emissions of evaporative MSAT (e.g., benzene) from parked cars, and emissions of diesel particulate matter from delivery trucks (modify depending on the type and extent of the associated development). Travel to other destinations would be reduced with subsequent decreases in emissions at those locations.

Because the estimated VMT under each of the Build Alternatives are nearly the same, varying by less than ____ (specify) percent, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the various Build Alternatives. For all Alternatives, emissions are virtually certain to be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by 72 percent from 1999 to 2050. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future than they are today.

(The following discussion would apply to new interchanges in areas already developed to some degree. For new construction in anticipation of economic development in rural or largely undeveloped areas, this discussion would be applicable only to populated areas, such as residences, schools, and businesses.)

The travel lanes contemplated as part of the project alternatives will have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby homes, schools and businesses; therefore, under each alternative there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSAT would be higher under certain Alternatives than others. The localized differences in MSAT concentrations would likely be most pronounced along the new/expanded roadway sections that would be built at ____ (specify location), under Alternatives ____ (specify), and along ____ (specify route) under Alternatives ____ (specify). However, the magnitude and the duration of these potential increases cannot be reliably quantified due to incomplete or unavailable information in forecasting project-specific MSAT health impacts. Further, under all Alternatives, overall future MSAT are expected to be substantially lower than today due to implementation of EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations.

In sum, under all Build Alternatives in the design year it is expected there would be slightly higher MSAT emissions in the study area relative to the No Build Alternative due to increased VMT. There also could be increases in MSAT levels in a few localized areas where VMT increases. However, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations will bring about significantly lower MSAT levels for the area in the future than today.

(4) Minor Improvements or Expansions to Intermodal Centers or Other Projects that Affect Truck Traffic

(The description for these types of projects depends on the nature of the project. The key factor from an MSAT standpoint is the change in truck and rail activity and the resulting change in MSAT emissions patterns.)

For each alternative in this EIS/EA (specify), the amount of MSAT emitted would be proportional to the amount of truck vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and rail activity, assuming that other variables (such as travel not associated with the intermodal center) are the same for each alternative. The truck VMT and rail activity estimated for each of the Build Alternatives are higher than that for the No Build Alternative, because of the additional activity associated with the expanded intermodal center. Refer to Table ____ (specify). This increase in truck VMT and rail activity associated with the Build Alternatives would lead to higher MSAT emissions (particularly diesel particulate matter) in the vicinity of the intermodal center. The higher emissions could be offset somewhat by two factors: 1) the decrease in regional truck traffic due to increased use of rail for inbound and outbound freight; and 2) increased speeds on area highways due to the decrease in truck traffic. The extent to which these emissions decreases will offset intermodal center-related emissions increases is not known.

Because the estimated truck VMT and rail activity under each of the Build Alternatives are nearly the same, varying by less than ____ (specify) percent, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the various alternatives. Also, regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by 72 percent from 1999 to 2050. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the EPA-projected reductions are so significant (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future as well.

(The following discussion may apply if the intermodal center is close to other development.)

The additional freight activity contemplated as part of the project alternatives will have the effect of increasing diesel emissions in the vicinity of nearby homes, schools, and businesses; therefore, under each alternative there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSAT would be higher than under the No Build alternative. The localized differences in MSAT concentrations would likely be most pronounced under Alternatives _____ (specify). However, as discussed above, the magnitude and the duration of these potential differences cannot be reliably quantified due to incomplete or unavailable information in forecasting project-specific health impacts. Even though there may be differences among the Alternatives, on a region-wide basis, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will cause substantial reductions over time that in almost all cases the MSAT levels in the future will be significantly lower than today.

(Insert a description of any emissions-reduction activities that are associated with the project, such as truck and train idling limitations or technologies, such as auxiliary power units; alternative fuels or engine retrofits for container-handling equipment, etc.)

In sum, all Build Alternatives in the design year are expected to be associated with higher levels of MSAT emissions in the study area, relative to the No Build Alternative, along with some benefit from improvements in speeds and reductions in region-wide truck traffic. There also could be slightly higher differences in MSAT levels among Alternatives in a few localized areas where freight activity occurs closer to homes, schools, and businesses. Under all alternatives, MSAT levels are likely to decrease over time due to nationally mandated cleaner vehicles and fuels.

MSAT Mitigation Strategies:

Although there is no obligation to identify and consider MSAT mitigation strategies as part of a qualitative analysis, such strategies may be part of a project's design. Refer to the examples provided in (4) Minor Improvements or Expansions to Intermodal Centers or Other Projects that Affect Truck Traffic, above. For these and similar circumstances, MSAT mitigation strategies should be discussed as part of a qualitative analysis.

CEQ Provisions Covering Incomplete or Unavailable Information CFR 1502.22):

The introductory language for qualitative analysis should be followed by a 40 CFR 1502 assessment of incomplete or unavailable information. When an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment in an environmental impact statement and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking.

- a. If the incomplete information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the environmental impact statement.
- b. If the information relevant to reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts cannot be obtained because the overall costs of obtaining it are exorbitant or the means to obtain it are not known, the agency shall include within the environmental impact statement:

- a statement that such information is incomplete or unavailable;
- a statement of the relevance of the incomplete or unavailable information to evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment;
- a summary of existing credible scientific evidence which is relevant to evaluating the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment; and
- the agency's evaluation of such impacts based upon theoretical approaches or research methods generally accepted in the scientific community. For the purposes of this section, "reasonably foreseeable" includes impacts that have catastrophic consequences, even if their probability of occurrence is low, provided that the analysis of the impacts is supported by credible scientific evidence, is not based on pure conjecture, and is within the rule of reason.

- c. The amended regulation will be applicable to all environmental impact statements for which a Notice to Intent (40 CFR 1508.22) is published in the Federal Register on or after May 27, 1986. For environmental impact statements in progress, agencies may choose to comply with the requirements of either the original or amended regulation.

Recommended Narrative to Address Assessment of Incomplete or Unavailable Information (per 40 CFR 1502):

In FHWA's view, information is incomplete or unavailable to credibly predict the project-specific health impacts due to changes in MSAT emissions associated with a proposed set of highway alternatives. The outcome of such an assessment, adverse or not, would be influenced more by the uncertainty introduced into the process through assumption and speculation rather than any genuine insight into the actual health impacts directly attributable to MSAT exposure associated with a proposed action.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for protecting the public health and welfare from any known or anticipated effect of an air pollutant. They are the lead authority for administering the Clean Air Act and its amendments and have specific statutory obligations with respect to hazardous air pollutants and MSAT. The EPA is in the continual process of assessing human health effects, exposures, and risks posed by air pollutants. They maintain the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS), which is "a compilation of electronic reports on specific substances found in the environment and their potential to cause human health effects" (EPA, <http://www.epa.gov/ncea/iris/index.html>). Each report contains assessments of non-cancerous and cancerous effects for individual compounds and quantitative estimates of risk levels from lifetime oral and inhalation exposures with uncertainty spanning perhaps an order of magnitude.

Other organizations are also active in the research and analyses of the human health effects of MSAT, including the Health Effects Institute (HEI). Two HEI studies are summarized in Appendix D of FHWA's Interim Guidance Update on Mobile source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents. Among the adverse health effects linked to MSAT compounds at high exposures are cancer in humans in occupational settings; cancer in animals; and irritation to the respiratory tract, including the exacerbation of asthma. Less obvious is the adverse human health effects of MSAT compounds at current environmental concentrations (HEI, <http://pubs.healtheffects.org/view.php?id=282>) or in the future as vehicle emissions substantially decrease (HEI, <http://pubs.healtheffects.org/view.php?id=306>).

The methodologies for forecasting health impacts include emissions modeling; dispersion modeling; exposure modeling; and then final determination of health impacts - each step in the process building on the model predictions obtained in the previous step. All are encumbered by technical shortcomings or uncertain science that prevents a more complete differentiation of the MSAT health impacts among a set of project alternatives. These difficulties are magnified for lifetime (i.e., 70 year) assessments, particularly because unsupported assumptions would have to be made regarding changes in travel patterns and vehicle technology (which affects emissions rates) over that time frame, since such information is unavailable. The results produced by the EPA's MOBILE6.2 model, the California EPA's Emfac2007 model, and the EPA's DraftMOVES2009 model in forecasting MSAT emissions are highly inconsistent. Indications from the development of the MOVES model are that MOBILE6.2 significantly underestimates diesel particulate matter (PM) emissions and significantly overestimates benzene emissions.

Regarding air dispersion modeling, an extensive evaluation of EPA's guideline CAL3QHC model was conducted in an NCHRP study (http://www.epa.gov/scram001/dispersion_alt.htm#hyroad), which documents poor model performance at ten sites across the country - three where intensive monitoring was conducted plus an additional seven with less intensive monitoring. The study indicates a bias of the CAL3QHC model to overestimate concentrations near highly congested intersections and underestimate concentrations near uncongested intersections. The consequence of this is a tendency to overstate the air quality benefits of mitigating congestion at intersections. Such poor model performance is less difficult to manage for demonstrating compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards for relatively short time frames than it is for forecasting individual exposure over an entire lifetime, especially given that some information needed for estimating 70-year lifetime exposure is unavailable. It is particularly difficult to reliably forecast MSAT exposure near roadways, and to determine the portion of time that people are actually exposed at a specific location.

There are considerable uncertainties associated with the existing estimates of toxicity of the various MSAT, because of factors such as low-dose extrapolation and translation of occupational exposure data to the general population, a concern expressed by HEI (<http://pubs.healtheffects.org/view.php?id=282>). As a result, there is no national consensus on air dose-response values assumed to protect the public health and welfare for MSAT compounds, and in particular for diesel PM. The EPA (<http://www.epa.gov/risk/basicinformation.htm#g>) and the HEI

<http://pubs.healtheffects.org/getfile.php?u=395>) have not established a basis for quantitative risk assessment of diesel PM in ambient settings.

There is also the lack of a national consensus on an acceptable level of risk. The current context is the process used by the EPA as provided by the Clean Air Act to determine whether more stringent controls are required in order to provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health or to prevent an adverse environmental effect for industrial sources subject to the maximum achievable control technology standards, such as benzene emissions from refineries. The decision framework is a two-step process. The first step requires EPA to determine a "safe" or "acceptable" level of risk due to emissions from a source, which is generally no greater than approximately 100 in a million. Additional factors are considered in the second step, the goal of which is to maximize the number of people with risks less than 1 in a million due to emissions from a source. The results of this statutory two-step process do not guarantee that cancer risks from exposure to air toxics are less than 1 in a million; in some cases, the residual risk determination could result in maximum individual cancer risks that are as high as approximately 100 in a million. In a June 2008 decision, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upheld EPA's approach to addressing risk in its two step decision framework. Information is incomplete or unavailable to establish that even the largest of highway projects would result in levels of risk greater than safe or acceptable.

Because of the limitations in the methodologies for forecasting health impacts described, any predicted difference in health impacts between alternatives is likely to be much smaller than the uncertainties associated with predicting the impacts. Consequently, the results of such assessments would not be useful to decision makers, who would need to weigh this information against project benefits, such as reducing traffic congestion, accident rates, and fatalities plus improved access for emergency response, that are better suited for quantitative analysis.

3. PROJECTS WITH HIGHER POTENTIAL MSAT EFFECTS

This category includes projects that have the potential for meaningful differences in MSAT emissions among project alternatives. We expect a limited number of projects to meet this two-pronged test. To fall into this category, a project must:

- Create or significantly alter a major intermodal freight facility that has the potential to concentrate high levels of diesel particulate matter in a single location; or
- Create new or add significant capacity to urban highways such as interstates, urban arterials, or urban collector-distributor routes with traffic volumes where the AADT is projected to be in the range of 140,000 to 150,000 or greater by the design year; and
- Be located in proximity to populated areas.

Projects falling within this category should be more rigorously assessed for impacts. If a project falls within this category, you should contact the Office of Natural and Human Environment (HEPN) and the Office of Project Development and Environmental Review (HEPE) in FHWA Headquarters for assistance in developing a specific approach for assessing impacts. This approach would include a quantitative analysis to forecast local-specific emission trends of the priority MSAT for each alternative, to use as a basis of comparison. This analysis also may address the potential for cumulative impacts, where appropriate, based on local conditions. How and when cumulative impacts should be

considered would be addressed as part of the assistance outlined above. The NEPA document for this project should also include relevant language on unavailable information described in the discussion on Projects with Low Potential MSAT Effects, above.

If the analysis for a project in this category indicates meaningful differences in levels of MSAT emissions, mitigation options should be identified and considered.

4. OTHER PROJECTS:

In the event that a project has the potential to substantially increase future MSAT emissions but the project type does not reasonably fall within any of the three categories described above, the FHWA Division Office should consult with its Headquarters Office (HEPN and HEPE) for further guidance.

In addition, for projects with high potential for litigation on air toxics issues, it may be advantageous to conduct a more rigorous analysis of MSAT (e.g., quantitative in lieu of qualitative), even though not otherwise called for in this guidance, to enhance the defensibility of the NEPA document in court.

ATTACHMENT C

PROJECT LEVEL CONFORMITY DURING TRANSITION TO MOVES2010

EPA intends to establish a two-year grace period before MOVES2010 will be required to be used when completing new CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} quantitative hot-spot analyses in areas outside of California. This grace period would begin on the effective date of the *Federal Register* notice announcing the release of the final version of MOVES2010. EPA believes that a two-year grace period is appropriate before requiring MOVES2010 for new hot-spot analyses, due to the degree of change in the model as compared to past EPA models and the time necessary to prepare for using MOVES2010 for project-level analyses.

Background: When is Project Level Conformity Necessary?

Sections 93.116 and 93.123 of the conformity rule continue to serve as the basis for when a hot-spot analysis is required for project-level conformity determinations. In general, project level conformity is necessary under the following circumstances:

In CO nonattainment and maintenance areas, a hot-spot analysis is required for all non-exempt projects, with quantitative hot-spot analyses being required for larger, congested intersections and other projects (40 CFR 93.123(a)(1)). In addition, the conformity rule requires that a quantitative PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} hot-spot analysis be completed for certain projects of local air quality concern once EPA releases modeling guidance and announces in the Federal Register that the PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} quantitative hot-spot analysis requirements are in effect (40 CFR 93.123(b)).

In coordination with DOT, EPA is currently preparing guidance on how to conduct quantitative PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ hot-spot modeling to implement this requirement.

Grace Period – General:

The conformity rule provides some flexibility for analyses that are started before the end of the grace period. A conformity determination for a transportation project may be based on a previous model if the analysis was begun before or during the grace period, and if the final environmental document for the project is issued no more than three years after the issuance of the draft environmental document (40 CFR 93.111(c)). The interagency consultation process should be used if it is unclear if a previous analysis was begun before the end of the grace period. If you have questions about which model should be used in your conformity determination, you can also consult with your EPA Regional Office.

Implementation of grace period for CO hot-spot analyses:

For CO hot-spot analyses that are started during the two-year grace period, project sponsors can choose to use either MOBILE6.2 or MOVES2010. EPA encourages sponsors to use the consultation process to determine which option may be most appropriate for a given situation. Any new quantitative CO hot-spot analyses for conformity purposes begun after the end of the grace period must be based on MOVES2010.

Implementation of grace period for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} hot-spot analyses: For PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} hot-spot analyses, the conformity rule presently requires a *qualitative* analysis to be performed until EPA releases guidance on how to conduct *quantitative* hot-spot analyses for PM and announces in the *Federal Register* that such analyses are in effect (40 CFR 93.123(b)). EPA stated in the preamble to the March 10, 2006 final conformity rule that finalizing the MOVES2010 emissions model was critical before quantitative PM hot-spot

analyses are required, due to the limitations of applying MOBILE6.2 for PM at the project level. EPA also stated that today's guidance would be used to describe the grace period for using MOVES2010 in quantitative hot-spot analyses for certain project-level conformity determinations in PM nonattainment and maintenance areas.

During the conformity grace period, project sponsors can continue to conduct qualitative PM10 and PM2.5 hot-spot analyses for analyses that are started during the grace period. Section 93.111(c) of the conformity rule allows conformity determinations for projects based on the previous version of an emissions model to be completed after the end of the MOVES2010 grace period, if the analysis was begun before the end of the grace period.¹² Quantitative PM10 and PM2.5 hot-spot analyses can also be completed for conformity purposes during the grace period, if desired. However, any quantitative PM10 and PM2.5 hot-spot analyses conducted during the grace period must use MOVES20 since MOBILE6.2 does not have the capabilities to conduct project-level PM emissions analyses and is therefore not approved for this purpose, as described above. Any quantitative PM10 or PM2.5 hot-spot analysis for conformity purposes begun after the end of the grace period must use MOVES2010. EPA is currently working with DOT to prepare guidance on how to conduct quantitative PM2.5 and PM10 hot-spot modeling for transportation conformity purposes.¹³ See Question 15 for what emissions model must be used when completing quantitative PM hot-spot analyses for certain projects with California.