

## **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 2030 TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN**

The Metropolitan Council (Council) is amending its 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (Plan) to include the locally preferred alternative for the Central Corridor Transitway. The Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority recommended LRT as the locally preferred alternative on June 6, 2006. The Metropolitan Council approved LRT as the locally preferred alternative on June 28, 2006. Following the approval of LRT by the Council, the Plan must be amended to reflect the selected alternative. The adopted Plan currently list BRT and LRT as alternatives along the corridor.

The attached proposed amendments are changes to the text and tables in the Plan to reflect the decision to proceed LRT on the Central Corridor.

Amendments 1-3 are text changes in chapter 4 on pages 61, 62, and 64. The amendments add LRT as the locally preferred alternative on Central Corridor and delete language identifying BRT as an alternative.

The cost figures are amended in the following tables in chapters 4 and 5:

- Amendment 4 – On Table 4-6, amend the Capital Cost for Central to \$840 M, by deleting the amounts for BRT, and change the Readiness for Central to AA/DEIS Hearing Spring 2006.
- Amendment 5 – On Table 4-7, amend the Capital Needs 2005 – 2020 under Transitways to \$1,400, deleting the cost amount for BRT.
- Amendment 6 – Table 5-2, amend the information for Central and the Total Capital and Average Annual Cost, deleting the cost amounts for BRT.
- Amendment 7 – Table 5-3, amend the amounts in the Transitways column and Total column, deleting the cost amounts for BRT.
- Amendment 8 – Table 5-4, Revise numbers in table.

As part of this amendment, the Council has revised the Conformity Documentation (Appendix K) for meeting carbon monoxide standards. The Conformity Documentation for both LRT and BRT was prepared and sent to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for review. Attached is a letter of staff review from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. The attached Addendum to Appendix K (Amendment 9) includes the conformity analysis for LRT.

Amendment 1

Chapter 4, Page 61, add language to the last bullet

- The most appropriate and cost-effective technologies will be determined on a corridor-by-corridor basis. Potential technologies will include LRT, commuter rail and BRT. Many of these corridors have been studied extensively since adoption of the 2001 TPP, and in some corridors – such as Northstar, Cedar, Central and Northwest – studies have progressed to select a locally preferred technology.

Amendment 2

Chapter 4, Page 62, first bullet

- The first tier of dedicated transitways would include Hiawatha and Central Corridor LRT lines, the Northstar commuter rail line coming from outside the metro area, and three bus rapid transit corridors, Northwest, I-35W and Cedar,

**Deleted:** , and the Central Corridor between Minneapolis and St. Paul

Amendment 3

Chapter 4, Page 66, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph

**Central Corridor:** This is the primary east-west transportation route between downtown Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota and downtown St. Paul. The Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was finalized in April 2006. LRT was selected as the locally preferred alternative in June 2006. The next step is to complete preliminary engineering and final EIS.

**Deleted:** is being

**Deleted:** Two build alternatives are being considered, BRT and LRT. Selection of the locally preferred alternative is anticipated by the end of 2004

**Table 4-6  
 Transitway Costs by 2020**

Corridor	Capital Cost	Net Incremental Annual Operating Subsidy	Readiness	Ridership Potential
<b>Tier I:</b>				
Cedar	\$60 M	\$5 M	Immediate	Medium
Central	\$840 M	\$6 M	Spring AA/DEIS Hearing May 2006	Very High
Northstar	\$265 M	\$5 M	Immediate	High
Northwest	\$50 M	\$5M	Immediate	High
I-35W (Lakeville-Mpls)	\$50 M	\$5 M	BRT Study Underway	High
<b>Tier II:</b>				
Southwest, Rush Line, and Red Rock*	\$135 M	\$5 M	Studies just beginning	TBD
<b>Existing:</b>				
Hiawatha	--	\$6 M		--
<b>I-394</b>				
<b>Total Capital</b>	<b>\$1,400 M</b>	<b>\$37 M</b>		
Table Note: Operating costs are in 2004 dollars Capital Costs are estimated for various years, depending on when corridor study was completed: Northwest: 2005 dollars Cedar: 2004 dollars Northstar: 2008 dollars I-35W: 2004 dollars Central: 2007 dollars\2008 start-up *Southwest, Rush Line, and Red Rock: Dollars are an estimate of what could be spent in 2004 dollars to advance these corridors during this time period.				

Formatted Table

Deleted: \$240 -  
 Deleted: AA Hearing Fall 2004

Deleted: \$800 -

Deleted: 2008

**Table 4-7  
 Incremental Transit Funding Needs**

Incremental Costs	Grow Bus Ridership	Transitways	Total
Capital Needs 2005 – 2020	\$500	\$1,400	\$1,900
Annual Operating Subsidy in 2020	\$83 M	\$37 M	\$120 M

Deleted: \$800 -  
 Deleted: \$1,300 -

**Table 5-2**  
**Projected Transitway Capital Funding Needed 2005 - 2020**  
 (in 2003 millions of dollars)

	<b>Total</b>	<b>State Bonds</b>	<b>Federal</b>	<b>New Funding Source</b>
<b>Tier I</b>				
Northwest BRT	\$50	\$20	-	\$30
Cedar BRT	\$60	\$10	30	\$20
I-35W BRT	\$50	-	-	\$50
Northstar Commuter Rail	\$265	\$37.5	\$132.5	\$95
Central <b>LRT</b>	<del>\$840</del>	-	<del>\$420</del>	<del>\$420</del>
<b>Tier II</b>				
Additional transitways *	\$135	-	-	\$135
<b>Total Capital</b>	<del>\$1,400</del>	<del>\$67.5</del>	<del>\$552.5</del>	<del>\$780</del>
<b>Average Annual Cost</b>	<del>\$93</del>	<del>\$5</del>	<del>\$37</del>	<del>\$52</del>

\*Rush Line, Southwest, Red Rock

- Deleted: \$240 -
- Deleted: \$120 -
- Deleted: \$120 -
- Deleted: \$800 -
- Deleted: \$282.5 -
- Deleted: \$450-
- Deleted: \$53-
- Deleted: \$18 -
- Deleted: \$31-

Amendment 7  
 Chapter 5, Page 116, Table 5-3

**Table 5-3**  
**Projected Additional Annual Capital Subsidy Needed in 2020**  
 (in 2003 millions of dollars)

	<b>Maintain Existing System</b>	<b>Expand Bus System</b>	<b>Add Transitways</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Regional Bonding</b>	\$520	-	-	\$520
<b>Federal</b>	\$505	\$250	<del>\$553</del>	<del>\$1,308</del>
<b>State</b>	-	-	\$68	\$68
<b>New Funding Source</b>	\$100	\$250	<del>\$780</del>	<del>\$1,130</del>
<b>Total</b>	\$1,125	\$500	<del>\$1,400</del>	<del>\$3,025</del>

- Deleted: \$282 -
- Deleted: \$1037 -
- Deleted: \$450 -
- Deleted: \$800 -
- Deleted: \$800 -
- Deleted: \$2425 -

**Table 5-4  
 Estimate of Revenues Available for Capital Investments, 2009-2030 (in millions)**

	Annual Allocation	2006 - 2020	2009-2030 Funding Level
<i>Historical Capital Funds for Highways</i>			
State Road Construction funds available to eight-county region according to Mn/DOT Office of Investment Management (OIM) (These include all federal and state funds spent by MnDOT or on MnDOT projects)	\$283.5		\$6237.0
Federal Funds allocated by the region for purposes other than Mn/DOT's projects according to Mn/DOT (OIM)	61.5		1353
Local funds to match federal funds based on \$50 federal funds (excluding TH funds)*	15.4		270.6
Reduction of funds to reflect seven-county region (reduction based on Mn/DOT formula for Chisago County)	(5.17)		(114)
<b>Highway Total</b>	<b>\$355.43</b>		<b>\$7753.9</b>
<i>Historical Capital Funds for Transit</i>			
<b>Federal Transit Funds (Title III)</b>			
Section 5307**Formula/Formular Fixed Guideway - Historic	33.0	505	740
Section 5309 Discretionary	10.0	150	220
CMAQ/STP	6.7	100	147
Section 5309 New Starts	35	553	811
<b>State Funds</b>	4.5	68	100
<b>Regional bonding</b>	34.5	520	759
<b>New Funding Source</b>	75	1130	1650
<b>Transit Total</b>	<b>\$179</b>	<b>\$3025</b>	<b>\$4151</b>
<b>Highway and Transit Total</b>	<b>\$551</b>		<b>\$12,054</b>
* STP Urban Guarantee, CMAQ, Enhancement, Bridge, Safety-Hazard Elimination, Rail Safety. ** Net grant amount being used for capital projects.			

- Deleted: 17-
- Deleted: 252-
- Deleted: 369-
  
- Deleted: 55-
- Deleted: 830-
- Deleted: 1217-
- Deleted: 161-
- Deleted: 2425-
- Deleted: 3345-
- Deleted: 531-\$
- Deleted: 11,624-\$

**Addendum to Appendix K**

**AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF THE CENTRAL CORRIDOR TRANSITWAY**

The air quality conformity documentation has been amended to include the Central Corridor transitway. The proposed action for the Central Corridor transitway, a transportation corridor that extends approximately 11 miles between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul, as well as serving the Capitol Area, the University of Minnesota – Minneapolis Campus and the University Avenue area, is a Light Rail Transit (LRT) facility. In order to calculate CO reductions resulting from the construction of the transitway, data from the *Central Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement* was used. The CO reductions resulting from the implementation of LRT are assessed in this evaluation.

The *Central Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement* provides data on the daily number of new transit riders diverted from autos in its Table 6.3-5:

**New Transit Rider Summary (Trips Diverted from Autos)**

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Forecast Year</u>	
	<u>2008</u>	<u>2020</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>3,300</u>	<u>3,800</u>

That document also provides data on the forecast daily vehicle miles traveled for the Central Corridor under the existing, baseline and build alternative in its Table 6.4-6:

**Forecast Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel for the Central Corridor**

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Daily VMT</u>	<u>Change from Baseline</u>
<u>Existing Condition</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>17,315,100</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Baseline</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>23,815,800</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>23,813,600</u>	<u>2,200</u>

The following calculations are used in the analysis:

The 2020 data from the two preceding tables was used to develop the average vehicle mile traveled per person trip diverted from auto yielding the following:

LRT: 0.58 VMT/Diverted Person Trip

These averages were then used to estimate the daily vehicle miles of travel reduction for 2008:

LRT: 0.58 VMT/Diverted Person Trip \* 3300 Diverted Trips = 1,914 Less VMT

← --- Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.5"

2010 was then interpolated between 2008 and 2020 and 2030 extrapolated beyond 2020, yielding the following results for all three analysis years:

**Table 1: VMT Reductions**

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>1,962</u>	<u>2,200</u>	<u>2,438</u>

The VMT reduction then needed to be assigned to the general road types for the air quality assessment. Given the short average trip lengths, it was assumed that the VMT reduction affected only arterials, collectors and local streets. The travel demand model highway assignment from the TPP AQ analysis provides the proportional distribution of VMT on these road types.

**Table 2: VMT Distribution**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Arterials and Collectors</u>	<u>Local Roads</u>
<u>2010</u>	<u>84.7%</u>	<u>15.3%</u>
<u>2020</u>	<u>84.6%</u>	<u>15.4%</u>
<u>2030</u>	<u>84.3%</u>	<u>15.7%</u>

The VMT reductions from Table 1 were then factored by the percentages in Table 2 to develop the VMT reduction by road type for LRT and forecast year, as shown in Table 3A, 3B and 3C.

**Table 3A: VMT Reduction by Road Type in 2010**

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Arterials and Collectors</u>	<u>Local Roads</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>1,661</u>	<u>301</u>

**Table 3B: VMT Reduction by Road Type in 2020**

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Arterials and Collectors</u>	<u>Local Roads</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>1,861</u>	<u>339</u>

**Table 3C: VMT Reduction by Road Type in 2030**

<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Arterials and Collectors</u>	<u>Local Roads</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>2,055</u>	<u>383</u>

The VMT reductions shown in Tables 3A, 3B and 3C were multiplied by the CO emission rates generated by MOBILE6 used in the TPP Air Quality Conformity Analysis. This resulted in the following estimated reduction in grams of CO per day:

**Table 4: Daily CO Reductions in Grams from Baseline Alternative**

<u>Mode</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>32,153</u>	<u>27,021</u>	<u>28,130</u>

Grams were then converted to tons to be consistent with the units of the SIP test threshold with the following results:

**Table 5: Daily CO Reductions in Tons from Baseline Alternative**

<u>Mode</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2030</u>
<u>LRT</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.03</u>	<u>0.03</u>

← --- Formatted: Centered

LRT shows slight reductions to the CO emissions. However, when rounded to a whole number, the analysis reports no change to the CO emissions of any of the Action Scenarios.



## **Minnesota Pollution Control Agency**

---

June 9, 2006

Ms. Amy Vennewitz  
Deputy Director – Finance and Planning  
Metropolitan Transportation Services  
Metropolitan Council  
390 North Robert Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

### **Re: Amendment to the Conformity Documentation for the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan**

Dear Ms. Vennewitz:

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff has completed its review of the above referenced document. The Metropolitan Council (Council) is amending its 2030 Transportation Policy Plan (Plan) to include the preferred alternative for the Central Corridor Transitway that has been distributed for comments in the Central Corridor Alternative Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The proposed actions consider two alternatives, the Busway/Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT).

As part of this amendment, the Council has revised the Conformity Documentation (Appendix K) for meeting carbon monoxide standards. This revision includes a description of the analysis of both the BRT and the LRT alternatives since no preferred alternative has yet been chosen. Air quality impacts of the Central Corridor Transitway that calculates reductions resulting from implementation of either BRT or LRT are provided in this evaluation. The regional modeling analysis for the two build alternatives show slight reductions to the CO emissions for the years 2010, 2020, and 2030 when compared to the Baseline Alternative. Based on this information, the future CO emissions in tons/day will remain below the regional emissions budget established by the MPCA's emissions inventory regardless of the build alternatives chosen. Therefore, the proposed amendment to the Conformity Documentation for the 2030 Plan fully meets the transportation conformity criteria.

The MPCA staff appreciates the opportunity given to review the Plan amendment, and looks forward to working with your staff to address any other policy concerns. The staff notes that after a preferred alternative is chosen, the

final revision to the Plan must include analysis of only the selected alternative and should be an addendum at the end of Appendix K. Please contact me at (651) 296 -7739 or by e-mail at [innocent.eyoh@pca.state.mn.us](mailto:innocent.eyoh@pca.state.mn.us) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*Innocent E. Eyoh*

Innocent E. Eyoh  
Principal Transportation Planner

Snail mail: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Environmental Analysis & Outcomes Division, Air Policy and Mobile Sources Unit, 520 Lafayette Rd. N., St. Paul, MN 55155.

cc: James Andrew, Metro Council  
Mark Filipi, Metro Council  
Susan Moe, FHWA  
Patricia Bursaw, Mn/DOT  
Michael Leslie, EPA  
John Seltz, MPCA  
David Thornton, MPCA  
Michael Sandusky, MPCA  
Todd Biewen, MPCA