



**Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO)
Air Quality Working Group
October 24-25, 2018**

**Chicago Metropolitan Area for Planning (CMAP)
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606**

Meeting Attendees:

Bill Keyrouze, Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO)
Rachel Roper, Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO)
Cecilia Ho, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
John Donovan, Federal Highway Administration Illinois Division (FHWA Illinois Division)
Tony Greep, Federal Transit Administration Region 5 (FTA Region 5)
David D'Onofrio, Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)
Jesse Elam, Chicago Metropolitan Area for Planning (CMAP)
Doug Ferguson, Chicago Metropolitan Area for Planning (CMAP)
Russel Pietrowiak, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
Felix Nwoko, Durham Metropolitan Planning Organization
Robert Spotts, Denver Region Council of Governments
Graciela Lubertino, Houston Galveston Area Council (H-GAC)
Chris Schmidt, Illinois Department of Transportation (Illinois DOT)
Saleem Salameh, KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission (KYOVA)
Jane Posey, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC)
Jenny Narvaez, North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)
Mark Pitstick, Regional Transportation Authority
Sarah Siwek, Sarah J. Siwek & Associates, Inc.
Betsy Tracy, Federal Highway Administration Illinois Division (FHWA Illinois Division) *[phone]*
Victoria Martinez, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) *[phone]*
Sara Tomlinson, Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) *[phone]*
Mike Conger, Knoxville Transportation Planning Organization *[phone]*
Harold Brazil, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) *[phone]*
Vivek Thimmavajjhala, North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) *[phone]*

Welcome and Introductions

Bill opened the meeting by welcoming members of the working group and thanking CMAP for hosting the meeting. He asked participants to introduce themselves. Jesse and Russell also welcomed everyone and shared that CMAP had just adopted a new metropolitan transportation plan and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

MOVES Update

Following up from the discussion at the previous working group meeting, Bill asked the working group to identify possible recommendations, concerns, or opportunities to share with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) related to their updates to the Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator (MOVES)¹.

David, a participant on the MOVES Model Review Working Group, provided background on the updates. The changes related to MOVES 2014b are mostly for off network type issues such as off network idling, adjusting soaks and starts, and how to evaluate automated or electric vehicles. It will be important to look at how all the smaller changes aggregate.

Bill asked if the changes incorporate the perspectives of small and medium metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs).

David explained that a few new data sources have been added. Overall, he does not feel the changes will be burdensome.

Graciela asked about the grace period as agencies transition to the new versions.

Sarah responded that the rule usually has a 24-month grace period, but it varies.

David added that State Implementation Plan (SIP) updates are usually more immediate.

Bill shared that EPA will be fully transitioning from the MySQL tool.

Russell identified IT issues as something to pass on to EPA. They often encounter issues when running MOVES within their network. It does not sit well within their IT structure. They encounter similar issues with MySQL. Other MPOs are encountering similar challenges. To help minimize issues, they run MOVES on two computers that are not connected to the internet.

Vivek added that related to Russell's comment, they have also encountered run time issues. They set up runs in batch modes, which usually take seven to ten days. The run can get interrupted or even terminated by a Windows update. They are exploring how to run the model in the cloud server and will let the working group know how that works. Complexity usually

¹ <https://www.epa.gov/moves>

determines the duration of model runs. He wondered how long a run would take with the updated versions of MOVES. It would be helpful to have hardware recommendations. For example, would a certain processor or quantity of memory make it run faster?

Russell concurred—adding that the model usually has minimums, but not optimums.

The working group agreed that that these are common issue.

Jane added that the capability to do sensitivity tests should be another issue shared with EPA.

Cecilia asked the working group if they were aware that FHWA did one or two sensitivity analyses after EPA released MOVES2010.

David remembered this being done, but explained that if no policy changes are done ahead of time, it is not as helpful because it is just telling us we might have issues down the road.

Cecilia explained that FHWA is planning to conduct sensitivity analyses on the next MOVES update. During the last update, EPA allowed MPOs to test a beta version. Cecilia asked if MPOs would like to beta test the updated MOVES model.

The working group agreed that this would be helpful, but some members shared that they were not able to test the beta version because it was only made available to a small group of MPOs.

Cecilia suggested requesting EPA share the beta version with the AMPO Air Quality Working Group for testing.

Sarah shared that she is currently updating the National Transit Institute (NTI) conformity training course. She has included slides pointing out some common issues that have occurred when transitioning from one model to another. She asked if the working group would find this helpful.

The working group agreed that this would be helpful, but was not sure if some of the technical issues would be relevant since that transition was from MOBILE to MOVES and this is transitioning to a new version of MOVES.

David identified a policy issue to share with EPA. Because SIPs do not have to be revised when transitioning to new versions of MOVES, MOVES is run with whatever SIP is available. Some agencies may be reluctant to adjust/open the SIP so it would be helpful to have a policy requiring a SIP update when a major transition occurs.

The working group agreed that there would be interest in this—except agencies that do not prepare their own budgets may have concerns if this requirement is added.

The working group had a short discussion on the inputs that go into a conformity analysis, such as meteorological information, vehicle age and type, and population.

Russell identified training as another issue to share with EPA. He explained that the current introductory training is sufficient, but it would be helpful to have more advanced training opportunities especially when transitioning to a new model. For example, it requires trial and error to understand if the changes they are seeing in model outputs are due to changes in the model or data inputs.

Bill summarized the four concerns identified by the working group:

- IT issues encountered when running the model
- Sensitivity tests capability
- The need for advanced training
- Adding a requirement to revise SIPs when major transitions are made for MOVES.

Bill added that it is good timing for the policy issue since it could be looked at during reauthorization. Internally, AMPO will be putting together a document of policy recommendations to prepare for reauthorization.

Russell added that in previous discussions the group had suggested that if the CAFÉ standard was rescinded, it would not have a significant impact on running the model—that if more fuel is burned, more scrubbers will be added.

The working group responded that this has not been discussed much since the last meeting, but have heard mixed statements on whether or not this would affect NOX.

Transportation System Resilience and Climate Change

- *Definitions, Staffing, and Activities*
- *Needs and Resources*

Bill introduced the next agenda item. At the previous meeting in Phoenix, the working group shared their efforts and organization structure in terms of how they are integrating resilience as a planning factor. He asked the working group to share any updates or for those who were not present at the previous meeting, asked them to share their efforts and structure.

Cecilia shared information from the USDOT team on resilience:

- Integrating Resilience into the Transportation Planning Process-White Paper on Literature Review Findings (May 2018)²
- Resilience and Transportation Planning (January 2017)³

²https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/ongoing_and_current_research/planning/integrating_resilience.cfm

³ <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/publications/ratp/index.cfm>

- Frequently Asked Questions Document (coming soon)
- Handbook on Integrating Resilience into the Transportation Planning Process (coming soon)
- Texas Resilience and Planning Workshop: Summary Report (September 2017)⁴
- Resilience and Transportation Planning and Project Development Peer Exchange: U.S. EPA Region 5 (April 2017)⁵
- Climate Resilience and Planning Peer Exchange: Atlanta Regional Commission (January 2017)⁶

Robert shared that major flooding occurred in Boulder a few years ago. This helped put more focus on resilience. It has mostly been internal conversations so far, but it should be incorporated into their 2050 metropolitan transportation plan, which is just getting underway.

David shared that they are participating in the FHWA Pilot Program⁷ for Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather. As part of that, they are looking at a hydrological tool that will help identify what infrastructure might be vulnerable by taking into consideration flooding and future precipitation based on climate change. They will also be looking at heat exposure for vulnerable populations and how the twenty-five-, fifty-, and 100-year storm/flood events will change. This will help their State Department of Transportation (State DOT) see if additional design is needed when they evaluate infrastructure. This effort is expected to finish in March 2020.

He found the 2018 Transportation Resilience Innovations Summit and Exchange (RISE)⁸ that was held in Denver two weeks ago helpful. Many agencies are actively exploring resilience. Examples include Southeast Florida's Regional Climate Change Compact⁹, Capitol Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (CAMPO-Texas) participation in the FHWA Pilot Program for Vulnerability Assessments and Adaptation Options, MTC's resilience program¹⁰, H-GAC's participation in the FHWA Pilot Program for Resilience and Durability to Extreme Weather, and Massachusetts Department of Transportation (Massachusetts DOT) and Maryland Department of Transportation's (Maryland DOT) policy that they will not further invest in roads that will not be around in the future either due to land subsidence or sea level rise.

⁴https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/workshops_and_peer_exchanges/texas_06_20_17/index.cfm

⁵https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/workshops_and_peer_exchanges/chicago_april_2017/index.cfm

⁶<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/publications/atlanta/index.cfm>

⁷<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/resilience/pilots/>

⁸<http://www.cvent.com/events/2018-transportation-resilience-innovations-summit-and-exchange/event-summary-4a2139642c76431fbfb543a66f88f537.aspx>

⁹<http://www.southeastfloridaclimatecompact.org/>

¹⁰<https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/climate-change-programs/climate-initiatives-program>

Graciela shared that they are part of the FHWA Pilot Program for Resiliency and Durability to Extreme Weather. It is a vulnerability assessment of regional transportation infrastructure using a tool called VAST.

Jenny shared that they were part of a previous FHWA pilot. That effort was incorporated into their extreme weather, vulnerability and resilience plan. They have a team of three dedicated to that.

Felix shared that in North Carolina, Asheville did resilience planning work and recently completed a climate resilience planning report. Coordination for that effort includes law enforcement, MPOs, the Council of Governments, and land use planners. The effort included intense data collection and GIS work. The project commenced about nine months ago. The Durham MPO and Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO-North Carolina) have an eight-month project to build up resiliency. It is expected to start next month. They are in attainment/conformity. They will look at how land use forecasts and proposed projects in their metropolitan transportation plan impact resiliency and how they will address mitigation.

He explained that their MPO does not have dedicated staff. Based on the two people who work on resilience for them, he estimates 0.5 staff works on resilience. They also work with partner agencies—including demographic forecasting, storm water, and public works.

Saleem shared that KYOVA just completed a Street Flooding Mitigation Plan¹¹ using STBG funds (80% KYOVA, 10% state, 10% local). They had a rain intensity issue in the city. It included modeling—traffic forecasting along with a hydrology model. They will be implementing the recommendations with Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds. They would like to use LIDAR and other technology to scan the roads and sidewalks for most urbanized areas in their region. That will cost about \$100,000.

He explained that resilience work is done by senior staff. Since they are a small agency, they also rely on consultant assistance. Their region is complicated in that they have three states, three State DOTs, three EPA regions, three FHWA Division Offices, and three Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regions.

Chris shared that IDOT has been approaching resilience through planning studies funded by the State Planning and Research program. They have rated all state-owned assets in Illinois in terms of criticality and vulnerability to weather and manmade events. He works on this and brings in other staff from emergency management and homeland security as needed. He is working with their legal team so the information can be shared with CMAP. He is hoping they can expand on this effort in the future.

¹¹ http://www.kyovaipc.org/City_of_Huntington_Street_Flooding_Mitigation_Plan_FINAL.pdf

Chris also referenced the National Climate Assessment¹². Dr. John Posey, a climate researcher in the Midwest, is one of the authors. IDOT has worked closely with a state climatologist to bring in an Illinois specific data set. It will be helpful in modeling specific storm events. Many data sets are available, but it is helpful to have a local perspective.

Sarah highlighted the effort to develop regional all hazards emergency recovery plans. It was funded by an FTA grant. They first developed a plan for Portland and then developed a training course based on it. They held six trainings that reached over 180 agencies. Many of the attendees are following through with next steps. The role of the MPO is to bring people together for recovery planning. Recovery occurs after the initial emergency response and can last a few days to years depending on the extent of the event. The course is now available as a two-day workshop. Please reach out to Sarah for details.

Bill explained that Sarah and the MPOs who participated in the effort presented at the 2018 AMPO Annual Conference. The conference presentations will be made available on AMPO's website¹³ in the next few weeks.

Bill asked the working group if guidance on how resilience fits into the MPO organizational structure would be helpful? He mentioned that FTA recently issued guidance in terms of roles and responsibilities and performance measures. This information can be found online¹⁴.

The group concluded that it was not currently needed since MPOs are aware of what is involved in resiliency, but a clearinghouse or compilation of best practices would be helpful.

Felix added that MPOs play a critical role in coordination since the public is not always aware of jurisdictional boundaries.

CMAQ Survey Discussion and Development

- *Calculating Emissions Benefits of CMAQ funded projects*
- *MPO Survey and Results*
- *Recommendations and Next Steps*

Bill introduced the next agenda item. During the previous meeting in Phoenix, the working group decided to put together a state of the practice survey on calculating emissions benefits of CMAQ funded projects. Sarah will be assisting with this. Since the process for calculating emissions benefits is not standardized across the country, the intent is to distribute the survey to all MPOs to determine how MPOs, State DOTs, transit agencies and others calculate the

¹² <https://nca2014.globalchange.gov/>

¹³ <http://www.ampo.org/news-events/2018-ampo-annual-conference/>

¹⁴ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/transportation-planning/metropolitan-planning-organization-responsibilities>
<https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/transportation-planning/transit-asset-management-roles-responsibilities>

emission benefits of CMAQ funded projects. This is especially relevant now as the FHWA is working to enhance the use of the Public Access System where these estimates are reported and there are performance requirements for the CMAQ Program. As part of the working group's scope of work, four to five white papers will be written. The survey could be a white paper topic. He would like to have the survey done when the working group holds their next meeting in March or April 2019.

Sarah explained that the survey will help provide a narrative for reauthorization and confirm the importance of continuing the CMAQ program.

The working group suggested asking the following questions since practices vary significantly:

- Is the MPO a Transportation Management Area (TMA) or non-TMA?
- Who inputs the data into the User Profile and Access Control System (UPACS)?
- How are performance targets set?
- How is the Transportation Performance Management process documented—especially the target setting process?
- How is knowledge management handled in terms of staff turnover?
- Do MPOs have set roles and responsibilities within their agencies and with their partner agencies?
- What kinds of agreements are or are not established as part of the target setting process?
- Who carries out the emissions modeling for the state?
- Does the MPO or the state control the project selection process?
- How often is the conformity process updated?

Jenny shared an overview of the emissions performance measure process in Texas. NCTCOG, H-GAC, and El Paso MPO collaboratively developed a general methodology to set the baseline and targets in Texas. The targets and baseline are then submitted to Texas Department of Transportation, who compiles the data for the state. The process went smoothly. They have a summary of how the targets were developed, but no formal agreement. They do not use UPACS data when setting the targets because it is not an exact picture of what CMAQ projects that get funded in the TIP. It is just one snapshot in time. For example, states could handle obligating or de-obligating money for existing projects differently. The MPO enters the data into UPACS in Texas.

David further explained that if targets were over a longer time period, it might be less of an issue. It goes up and down so they try to use a rolling average. There is also an issue with the MPO calendar year vs. the UPACS calendar year. For example, they have a program that has an annual benefit. States could input the benefit for two different years, but it might show up in the same calendar year in UPACS. That would cause a big jump one year and nothing the next. Their state enters the data into UPACS.

He added that he feels the Texas process is a great best practice example of jointly setting the CMAQ targets.

Chris shared that he enters the data for Illinois, but the MPOs enter their own data.

Doug added that Illinois DOT was not entering NOX numbers, which relates to an issue of how projects are entered. The MPO controls project selection.

Mike explained that the State DOT controls the entire CMAQ project selection process on a statewide basis.

Cecilia suggested that the survey differentiate between the different measures and type of coordination and allow participants to click on what is applicable to them.

Chris explained that Illinois DOT worked closely with their MPO partners, but the MPOs set their own targets. He shared that the Buy America process has been challenging for the diesel retrofit program.

Bill pointed out that this will need to be incorporated into the MPO planning agreement soon. The safety performance measure is the only one required to be in there currently. AMPO is working with Matt Hardy, the Program Director for Planning and Performance Management for American Association for State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), to create an MPO portal for the performance measures. He asked the working group to share resources to include in the portal.

Jenny responded that they have a website.

Saleem shared that they have a ride share and carpool program in Ohio. It allows them to calculate emissions savings. He can share the spreadsheet that they use.

Jane explained that they coordinate with three states. They do not have a formal agreement for target setting, but include the process in their CMAQ performance plan. The other performance measures are included in their long-range plan. In setting the CMAQ targets, they looked at historical trends, projects in their TIP, and other factors.

Robert shared that the health department carries out emissions modeling for Denver and that the air pollution control division carries out the modeling using MOVES.

Sarah asked the working group how much time they think MPOs need to respond to the survey.

The working group agreed that two weeks (with a possible week-long extension, if needed) would be sufficient. They also suggested that the questions not be too open ended.

Vivek asked if FHWA was planning to release more strategies relating to bicyclists and pedestrians.

Cecilia responded that FHWA will continue to provide more CMAQ emissions calculations tools—two are being developed now and should be available soon. Based on feedback they have received, they are updating the existing tools as well.

Bill summarized the next steps. AMPO and Sarah will draft the survey and send it to the working group for their feedback. The goal will be to distribute it after the 2019 TRB Annual Meeting.

University of Massachusetts Lowell /Massachusetts DOT Survey

- Review Survey Questions (see attachment)
- Discuss Next Steps

Bill explained that Massachusetts DOT contracted the University of Massachusetts Lowell to do a cost benefit analysis of CMAQ projects. It focuses mainly on Traffic Flow Improvements (TFI) strategies. The initial findings are supposed to be provided by the end of this year or early next year. Does the group feel it is appropriate for AMPO to send out the survey in cooperation with the University of Massachusetts?

The group concluded that MPOs do not have the resources to answer the survey questions. Many questions would require before and after studies. Some MPOs have completed before and after studies, but the results were either not conclusive or did not focus on emissions, but on traffic flow. The questions seem more appropriate for a State DOT—perhaps they could partner with AASHTO.

FHWA Marketing and Awareness Plan

- See attachment

Sarah explained FHWA would like to get the working group's feedback on a marketing plan to help raise awareness of air quality issues and resources, including the FHWA CMAQ Program and It All Adds Up to Cleaner Air webpages¹⁵.

The working group suggested including the following questions:

- What is the process to share air quality information (other than air quality alerts)? Is social media used for this?
- Do MPOs work with their public involvement staff to share this information?
- Who are MPOs partnering with to share this information?

¹⁵ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/
https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/it_all_adds_up/

- How are performance targets set?

Sarah asked the working group if they had recently used the resources, what they were looking for, and if anything was missing. She also asked if their regions had projects that would make good best practice examples.

The working group responded that they have used the resources—for example the toolkit and the cost effectiveness tables. Projects funded include:

- Fueling stations
- Diesel retrofits for trains
- Express buses on shoulders
- Electric buses
- Enforcement of shoulder usage
- Tahoe MPO completed a Plug-in Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan¹⁶

The group suggested that it may be helpful to share in general the process for using CMAQ funds and for decision makers to have information on how the program is different for each state. For example, who runs the call or because CMAQ is evaluated in different ways it may be helpful to have a factsheet on eligibility.

John added that the MPO has a critical role in guiding people to the right place, but not everyone is aware of that.

Bill shared that communicating performance measures has been a focus. The AMPO Public Involvement Working Group is holding a series of webinar on this. Templates to help us explain the performance measures would be helpful.

The group suggested ensuring the benefits of CMAQ were covered and highlighting completed CMAQ projects. It helps fund innovative projects and projects that otherwise might not get funded.

Buy America Waivers

The working group requested that the agenda be modified to add a discussion on issues they have encountered with Buy America waivers for projects that are not related to transit.

Working group members shared that they and other agencies have submitted waivers to USDOT, but they do not know when (or if) they will be approved. This causes funds to sit and delays the benefits of improvements if those efforts could be implemented. Because some efforts are being done with private partners, delays may jeopardize the effort or future efforts. In addition,

¹⁶ <http://www.trpa.org/transportation/plans-projects-and-programs/>

unobligated balances put agencies at risk for rescissions. There is a \$7 billion rescission at the end of the FAST Act.

Bill suggested working with the affected agencies to identify the dollar value of projects that are being delayed. He also suggested partnering with AASHTO and the American Public Transportation Association (APTA).

Roundtable Discussion

- MPO Updates
- FHWA Update
- AMPO Updates
- Potential Whitepaper Topics

Working group members provided brief updates from their regions.

Cecilia provided the FHWA update:

- Two tools for the CMAQ Emissions Calculator Toolkit are in the last stages of development. One of the tools will be on Diesel Idle Reduction Technologies and the other is on bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Two additional tools are underdevelopment and will be released in 2019. Please let Cecilia know if MPOs are interested in helping to test the tools.
- Existing tools are being updated based on comments received.
- FHWA has developed a webpage¹⁷ on all information related to the CMAQ performance measures.
- The FHWA has selected 6 projects to provide training and technical assistance in communities where the local transportation agency will use a data-driven and performance-based decision-making framework to incorporate multimodal access, improve health outcomes, and enhance community considerations into corridor planning. Six projects were funded in Texas, Georgia, California, Maryland and Utah. The framework was developed about two years ago and is based on corridor planning technical steps that are familiar to practitioners and highlights specific activities that can inform transportation decisions at each step making it possible to support healthy outcomes while improving the transportation system. Five pilots were selected to test the framework. More information can be found on FHWA's Health in Transportation website¹⁸.
- Two CMAQ research tasks are underway. One is to update an assessment study that was done a few years ago to include CMAQ projects that were funded after the assessment study was completed. This will provide baseline information as well as trends from

¹⁷ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/measures/

¹⁸ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health_in_transportation/planning_framework/

CMAQ funded projects. The other research is the development of a data dictionary that will help MPOs and project sponsors to conduct emissions benefits calculations.

- On the modeling side, a research project is underway to develop a tool to extract data from three nationally available datasets—the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS), TMSs, and Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)—to help with air quality and noise analysis. This effort will hopefully be completed in the next year. In addition, FHWA is also conducting research to examine the queuing mechanism of intersections that is used for dispersion modeling.
- A web-based conformity training¹⁹ that covers the entire conformity process was recently completed. It is broken up into thirty-two modules. The air quality planning web-based training course available through the National Highway Institute (NHI)²⁰ is now free. NTI²¹ also offers the Introduction to Conformity training course. If MPOs have requests for specific air quality training, they can contact their FHWA Division Offices who will contact FHWA Headquarters or the Resource Center²².
- Guidance on the South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA decision was issued on October 1 and can be found on the AMPO website²³.

Bill explained that the working group scope of work includes four to five whitepapers. Each will be about five pages. The CMAQ survey will likely be the topic for the first whitepaper. He asked the group for suggestions for the other topics that would be beneficial for the MPO community.

Sarah recapped the topics mentioned during the last meeting:

- Performance measures and performance planning
- South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA
- Calculating CMAQ Emissions Benefits Survey
- MOVES update
- Community Conformity Guide
- Conformity 101 toolkit

The group suggested additional whitepaper topics:

- The Benefits of the CMAQ Program
- Quantification of the resource impacts caused by the South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA
- Best practices for the consultation process. (This might be especially helpful for new MPOs or MPOs who are newly not in conformity).

¹⁹ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/conformity/training/sdtrain.cfm

²⁰ <https://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/home.aspx>

²¹ <https://www.ntionline.com/>

²² https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/air_quality/conformity/training/sdtrain.cfm

²³ <http://files.constantcontact.com/d3dffe501/25f2340d-dd68-4ac8-be90-7ae790dda556.pdf>

- How to incorporate connected and automated vehicles in the modeling and transportation conformity process
- How many times are MPOs meeting or not meeting conformity
- Marginal vs. moderate designations
- How many MPOs developed budgets with MOBILE instead of MOVES

Discussion on the:

- South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA
 - AMPO Update
 - Guidance and Implementation Update
 - Potential Future Impacts (other pollutants)
- 2015 Ozone Standard Nonattainment Designations
 - Implementation Update
 - Resources and Needs

Working group members also discussed the South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA decision and the 2015 Ozone Standard Nonattainment Designations.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA decision court decision will not be effective until 2/16/19. The working group is waiting for the implementation rule to be released by the EPA. The discussion included issues related to:

- Orphan areas/the lack of guidance on orphan areas
- The inputs required to undertake a conformity process for the 1997 standard
- Implications the court decision could have for other pollutants
- Implications for SIPs
- The possible 2008 revocation and the implications if it is revoked
- Possible future appeals—deadline has passed.

Working group members also discussed recent changes to nonattainment areas.

Roundtable Discussion:

- Other issues?
- Next Meeting Location and Date

David asked if anyone was looking at health models to assess how changes in regional transportation planning will impact the burden of disease and mortality. Using the Integrated Transport and Health Impact Modelling Tool (ITHIM), they are able to model different scenarios of their air quality plan. For example, they can show the benefits of adding bicycle and pedestrian improvements. EPA developed the Environmental Benefits and Mapping Analysis Program (BenMAP), but it is significantly more complicated.

Jenny shared that a children's hospital reached out to them to see if there is a correlation between visits to the hospital and high ozone days.

Bill shared that he has heard of at least three or four other MPOs using ITHIM. He will share the presentations from the Transportation and Health session that was held at the 2017 AMPO Annual Conference.

Bill shared that it might be helpful to invite those who are new to conformity or who have not done conformity in a long time to the next working group meeting. At the previous working group meeting, ARC volunteered to host. It will be in March or April of next year. He asked the group to identify agenda items for the meeting.

Wrap-up and Adjourn