



**AMPO Air Quality Work Group
December 9-10, 2010
Meeting Summary**

AMPO's Air Quality Work Group met on December 9-10, 2010 in Orlando, FL at the offices of Metroplan, Orlando. The list of participants is attached.

December 9

Welcome and Introductions

Rich Denbow, DeLania Hardy and Eric Hill welcomed the Work Group participants. On behalf of AMPO and the Work Group, Rich thanked Metroplan for hosting the meeting and recognized FHWA for their continued support of the Work Group.

CMAQ Issues

The Work Group asked that CMAQ be a discussion item. Amanda Graor from Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) led the discussion. Amanda said multi-state areas have different rules for spending CMAQ funds. For example, all programs at the end of the fiscal year in Kansas need to be zeroed out, which is not the same as in Missouri. Kansas has a 22-month project time line and can only plan on a 2-year cycle with air quality planning. Currently, there are also issues with local match for federal source CMAQ funds. A discussion followed on allowable CMAQ funding issues and state/local match issues. In Kansas, when dealing with in-kind matching, education and outreach efforts must be focused on mode shift and in some cases local match is being disallowed if the focus is different.

Mike Koontz, FHWA, asked why the in-kind match for CMAQ and STP projects is disallowed. He stated that federal aid is in the spending clause in constitutional law. USDOT is researching if disallowing the use of in-kind matching goes against federal law. This was sent to their legal department for analysis.

Amanda asked if air quality public outreach programs in other regions are funded with CMAQ. Some of the participants said they are. She asked if the mode shift issue has come into play. Ross Patrosky stated that in Northeast Illinois they have a good range to program what they want.

One participant asked if other regions use public-private partnerships for public outreach programs. Many do. Sara Tomlinson, Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC), talked about Clean Air Partners, which is a public-private partnership in the Baltimore region.

Ross Patrosky, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), summarized Chicago's project selection process, project readiness, and how these tie to their new long range plan. Their TIP is more of a bookkeeping effort than the long range plan. The agency's new vision is to shift projects to have more coherence with the long range plan, and to focus on themes, such as bike paths. CMAP is trying to get more control over their programming process.

The group discussed CMAQ funding in light of the new proposed ozone standards and related regulatory requirements. A significant portion of the country will be in nonattainment after new standards go into effect, so there will likely be less funding overall, spread out over more nonattainment areas. It was noted that PM fine is not included in SAFETEA-LU and there was a question about its inclusion in new legislation.

It was noted that as we move into the future, the emission benefits of individual mitigation projects would become smaller. What does this mean for the future of the CMAQ program? Should we think about moving to other sources that would have greater reductions, such as locomotives? This can be problematic. In the Baltimore region, CMAQ funds can be used only for projects that result in an emission credit for conformity. However, in the New York metro region funds can be used for goods movement projects that divert truck travel to other modes.

The group then discussed project ranking as it relates to “usual” projects funded by CMAQ. A number of work group members brought up different methods for project selection that include CMAQ funds. Of note, Kansas City has a CMAQ Committee that meets regularly to score and select projects.

Sara noted that BMC programs about \$1 to \$2 million annually in CMAQ money. Mike Conger, Knoxville Regional TPO, noted that his MPO submits project lists to Tennessee DOT, but the DOT assumes total project selection. Sara asked if others use common estimation techniques for analyzing CMAQ projects. MPOs in Texas use a consistent methodology developed by the state in partnership with the Texas Transportation Institute.

Federal News

Cecilia Ho, FHWA, discussed PM fine areas designated in 2006. EPA’s Quantitative PM Hot Spot Guidance comments were due in July 2010 and many were received, including joint AMPO/AASHTO comments. The guidance is nearly finished.

EPA will also release guidance on how to use MOVES for CO analysis.

EPA’s proposed ozone standards are delayed again until July 2011. The 2008 ozone standard is still in place, and no nonattainment areas under the 2008 standard have been named.

EPA is set to release the new CO standard in January 2011, but another court issue may delay the process until August 2011. It is expected that the standard will be lower than the current one hour standard.

The latest version of MOVES is 2010a. There is a grace period for regional conformity analysis through March 2012. The grace period for Hot Spot analysis will be two years after the Federal Register release. FHWA initiated two MOVES work groups, one focused on project level analysis and one on regional analysis. The next available training session is in January 2011. AMPO posted prior training presentations on its website.

In California, EMFAC PM analysis has a two year grace period. The model may not change much based on default values, but there are questions on how the inventories will line up with SB 375 (California’s climate change legislation).

It is expected that the new NO₂ monitoring standard will be released in 2013.

EPA's conformity restructuring rule is currently on hold.

Ozone and Other NAAQS Discussion

Jonathan Nadler, Southern California Association of Governments, began by noting that there are 18 million people in the Los Angeles area's 14 jurisdictions, all located in the South Coast Air Quality Management District. He then reviewed background ozone concentration levels in the region and noted that they are impacting attainment. Transport of emissions from China is also an issue in background ozone concentrations. Analysis showed that if all emissions from sources in California were reduced to zero, except federal sources, the area would still not attain the ozone standard. This leads them to ask what it will take to get into attainment of a low ozone standard. It also shows that federal sources are becoming a larger percentage of emissions as local controls go into place.

The group then discussed background ozone levels and their impact on air quality planning in several areas, including Kansas City, Houston, and New York City. The Texas air agency performed an analysis that shows background ozone levels over 60 ppb in some parts of the state. MARC reports that background ozone levels in the Kansas City region result from emissions that are about 1/3 naturally-occurring, 1/3 from local sources, and 1/3 from transport.

Amanda asked if other regions are looking at a large increase in nonattainment area boundaries with the proposed new standards. Some areas replied they are facing this. Angelina Foster, New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC), commented that this can lead to a situation of continuous conformity when the nonattainment area becomes so big it contains multiple MPOs that are on different planning schedules.

December 10

Climate Change

Metroplan Executive Director Harry Barley welcomed the group and thanked everyone for attending.

The Work Group conducted a roundtable discussion on climate change and reported on work their MPO is doing related to GHGs.

- Houston is starting a regional transportation plan that includes greenhouse gas calculations, along with control schedules for on road sources. This started in August and will be complete in September of 2011.
- Knoxville's MPO Board does not recognize climate change. Staff refers to it by a different name.
- San Francisco is currently working under SB 375, and their adopted RTP includes alternative scenarios. They are looking at different reduction options.
- VMT reduction is the objective for the Los Angeles area. This includes elements of land use, housing, and transportation. Jonathan also noted California law issues related to housing and MPO planning.
- Harold Brazil, MTC, followed up to note that MTC is not a land use agency, and has no controls over these areas.
- KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission stated that there is no climate change activity at this time in that region. The MPO retained a consultant to look at how to address this.

- Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) is performing a great deal of technical work but stakeholders and board members are not calling for action on climate change. ARC continues to work on scenario planning and livable centers. These items are being messaged as sustainable centers rather than climate change initiatives.
- NYMTC expressed concern over using VMT reduction as a focus because it can affect funding due to formula allocations.
- The North Central Texas Council of Governments conducted analysis at the staff level. They are continuing to look at what MPOs and technology can do and emission results under different scenarios. At their board level, they do not address climate change.

Amanda provided a presentation on MARC's activities regarding scoring projects, tools for the Transportation Outlook 2040 plan, models and software.

Washington Update

DeLania Hardy provided a Washington update. DeLania mentioned that a transportation bill would likely not pass in the next Congress. Rep. Mica is the incoming chair for the House T&I Committee. With the House's current financial considerations, it may be difficult for MPOs to hold on to current funding levels. She also mentioned, with the Republican now the majority in the House, climate change legislation in that body is not likely.

MOVES Implementation

Rich Denbow provided an update on MOVES implementation issues. Several MPOs are finding that MOVES emission results are significantly higher than previous analyses done with MOBILE6. Rich collected results from a handful of MPOs and presented tables summarizing the results. He described how AMPO is reaching out to EPA to inform them of these early findings, and asked participants to keep him updated as they continue to implement MOVES.

The group expressed concerns on new ozone standards and reopening SIPs to model with MOVES. With new standards on the horizon, states will have to develop new SIPs. In the same timeframe, many states may have to reopen SIPs to develop new emission budgets for conformity.

Best Practices in Conformity Implementation

Sarah Siwek provided an update on information available on FHWA's conformity webpage. The updates include a number of MPO examples. Key issues covered on the website are:

- Documentation
- Interagency Consultation
- Project Level Analysis
- Information Sharing

Please contact Sarah if there are other examples that should be shared.

The meeting was adjourned.

AMPO Air Quality Work Group Meeting Participants
Orlando, FL
December 9-10, 2010

Participant	MPO	Email
Sangeeta Bhowmick	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council	sbhowmick@dot.state.ny.us
Harold Brazil	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	hbrazil@mtc.ca.gov
Mike Conger	Knoxville Regional TPO	Mike.conger@knoxtrans.org
Rich Denbow	AMPO	rdenbow@ampo.org
David D'Onofrio	Atlanta Regional Commission	ddonofrio@atlantaregional.com
Angelina Foster	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council	afoster1@dot.state.ny.us
Amanda Graor	Mid-America Regional Council	agraor@marc.org
DeLania Hardy	AMPO	dhardy@ampo.org
Susan Hardy	Mountainland AOG	shardy@mountainland.org
Eric Hill	Metroplan Orlando	ehill@metroplanorlando.com
Cecilia Ho	FHWA	cecilia.ho@dot.gov
Mike Koontz (phone)	FHWA	Michael.Koontz@dot.gov
Graciela Lubertino	Houston-Galveston Area Council	Graciela.lubertino@h-gac.com
Jonathan Nadler	So. CA Association of Govts	nadler@scag.ca.gov
Ross Patronskey	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	RPatronskey@cmag.illinois.gov
Saleem Salameh	KYOVA IPC	ssalameh@ntelos.net
Sara Siwek	Sarah Siwek & Associates	ssiwek@aol.com
Sara Tomlinson	Baltimore Metropolitan Council	stomlinson@baltometro.org
Madhu Venugopal	North Central Texas COG	mvenugopal@nctcog.org