

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, November 30, 2010
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Doug Kukino, Glendale, Chairman
Larry Person, Scottsdale, Vice Chair
*Sue McDermott, Avondale
*Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Buckeye
#Jim Weiss, Chandler
#Jamie McCullough, El Mirage
Kurt Sharp, Gilbert
*Cato Esquivel, Goodyear
#Scott Bouchie, Mesa
#Janet Ramsey for William Mattingly, Peoria
Phil McNeely, Phoenix
#Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise
Oddvar Tveit, Tempe
Grant Anderson for Mark Hannah, Youngtown
Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek
*American Lung Association of Arizona
Grant Smedley, Salt River Project
Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation
Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company
*Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association
*Valley Metro/RPTA
*Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association
Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau

Steve Trussell for Russell Bowers, Arizona Rock
Products Association
Amy Bratt, Greater Phoenix Chamber of
Commerce
#Amanda McGennis, Associated General
Contractors
Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of
Central Arizona
Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward
*Erin Taylor, University of Arizona Cooperative
Extension
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Leonard Montenegro for Diane Arnst, Arizona
Department of Environmental Quality
*Environmental Protection Agency
Jo Crumbaker, Maricopa County Air Quality
Department
#Duane Yantorno, Arizona Department of Weights
and Measures
Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration
*Judi Nelson, Arizona State University
#Christopher Horan, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.
#Participated via telephone conference call.
+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments
Patrisia Magallon, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments
Feng Liu, Maricopa Association of Governments
Taejoo Shin, Maricopa Association of Governments
Randy Sedlacek, Maricopa Association of Governments
Matt Poppen, Maricopa Association of Governments
Ranjith Dandanayakula, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
Eileen Yazzie, Maricopa Association of Governments
Frank Schinzel, Maricopa County Air Quality

Mitch Wagner, Maricopa County Department of
Transportation
Dan Catlin, Fort McDowell
Joe Gibbs, City of Phoenix
Michelle Wilson, City of Glendale
Shane Kiesow, City of Apache Junction
Rusty Van Leuven, Arizona Department of
Agriculture
Scott DiBiase, Pinal County
Matt Tsark, Strand Associates, Inc.
Will Barnow, Maricopa County
Joonwon Joo, Arizona Department of
Transportation

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on November 30, 2010. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:31 p.m. Antonio DeLaCruz, City of Surprise; Jamie McCullough, City of El Mirage; Scott Bouchie, City of Mesa; Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors; Jim Weiss, City of Chandler; Janet Ramsey, City of Peoria; Chris Horan, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Duane Yantorno, Arizona Department of Weights and Measures, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Kukino stated that according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the tables adjacent to the doorways inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for nonagenda items and nonaction agenda items. He noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Approval of the October 28, 2010 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the October 28, 2010 meeting. Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau, moved and Steve Trussell, Arizona Rock Products Association, seconded and the motion to approve the October 28, 2010 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

4. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2011 CMAQ Funding

Dean Giles, MAG, presented the evaluation of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2011 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding. He stated that seven street sweeper projects were submitted to MAG requesting \$1.27 million in CMAQ funds and \$900,000 is available for FY 2011. Mr. Giles indicated that an additional \$367,855 in CMAQ has become available from street sweeper projects that have been requested to be deleted and from savings on street sweepers that have cost less than anticipated, for a total amount of \$1,267,855. He noted that with the additional funding, all seven proposed street sweeper projects could be funded. Mr. Giles stated that a minimum 5.7 percent cash match is required for each of the projects. He mentioned that the deadline for submission of street sweeper projects was September 16, 2010.

Mr. Giles stated that the MAG Programming Principles have established a two-tier review process for street sweeper applications. He indicated that the first stop for these applications was at the October 12, 2010 MAG Street Committee meeting. The Street Committee reviewed the street sweeper projects and their comments have been provided. Mr. Giles noted that MAG staff evaluated the proposed projects consistent with the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. In addition, the emissions factors used to evaluate the projects are based on the Maricopa County 2008 PM-10 Periodic Emissions Inventory.

Mr. Giles mentioned that the evaluation indicates the estimated emission reductions in kilograms per day and the corresponding cost-effectiveness in dollars per metric ton per street sweeper project. He added that the list in the agenda packet is ranked in descending order of cost-effectiveness. Mr. Giles stated that there are additional opportunities for comment on the street sweeper projects at the MAG Management Committee meeting tentatively scheduled for January 12, 2011 and the MAG Regional

Council on January 26, 2011. The Committee is requested to recommend a Prioritized List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for Fiscal Year 2011 CMAQ funding to the MAG Management Committee.

Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, made a motion to recommend the Prioritized List of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for Fiscal Year 2011 CMAQ funding that was provided in the agenda packet. Phil McNeely, City of Phoenix, seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2014 CMAQ Funding

Mr. Giles presented the evaluation of proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2014 CMAQ funding. He stated that the paving of streets, alleys, and shoulders support measures in the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Mr. Giles indicated that 14 projects were evaluated requesting approximately \$9.2 million in CMAQ funding in FY 2014; however, only \$4,898,000 is available in FY 2014 CMAQ funding. He noted that there is a minimum local cash match of 5.7 percent. Mr. Giles mentioned that the deadline for submission of the projects was September 16, 2010.

In accordance with the MAG Programming Principles, the projects were first reviewed by the MAG Street Committee. Mr. Giles stated that a review sheet for each of the proposed projects has been included in the agenda packet. He added that comments were made at the October 12, 2010 meeting and the request for additional information was continued over to the November 16, 2010 meeting where the information was provided. Mr. Giles indicated that MAG staff evaluated the proposed paving projects based on detailed information provided by each of the member agencies. He mentioned that in addition to the CMAQ methodologies, updated emissions factors were based on the 2008 PM-10 Periodic Emissions Inventory.

Mr. Giles stated that the evaluation provides estimated PM-10 emission reductions in kilograms per day and the corresponding cost-effectiveness in dollars per metric ton for each project. He added that Attachment A provides the ranking of proposed projects in descending order of cost-effectiveness. Attachment B provides the same projects ranked in descending order of emission reductions. He noted that the Maricopa County Department of Transportation contacted MAG about possible changes to the average week day traffic that was provided in their application, which is the first project listed in the attachments. Mr. Giles indicated that MAG has currently not confirmed the information. He added that once the information is confirmed, MAG will update the table prior to forwarding it to the MAG Transportation Review Committee scheduled to meet on December 9, 2010. The Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee is requested to recommend a ranked list of proposed PM-10 paving unpaved road projects for FY 2014 CMAQ funding and forward the list to the MAG Transportation Review Committee.

Ms. Fish commented that the projects listed are not located within ten miles of the monitors that are most likely to have PM-10 exceedances. Mr. Kukino inquired if the Committee prefers the priority list in Attachment A or Attachment B. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, thanked MAG for providing Attachment B, which has the projects ranked by PM-10 efficiency. He added that he would prefer that the Committee use Attachment B.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that the first six projects in Attachment A subtotal \$4,564,885 out of the \$4,898,000 available. However, only the first four projects would be funded in Attachment B for a

subtotal \$4,160,491. He inquired about using the remaining balance in Attachment B to fund the Fountain Hills and Peoria #2 projects. Mr. Giles responded that with the funding available, the projects in Attachment A provide more emission reductions than the ranked list in Attachment B. Mr. Giles added that in the past, the Transportation Review Committee would go back to the jurisdiction next in line and ask if they would be willing to change the scope of the project and use the remaining funds available. Therefore, the first project below the line may potentially be funded as well.

Mr. Person stated that he would prefer to use Attachment B since it focuses on air quality rather than dollars. He suggested using Attachment B to fund the four projects above the line and add the Tempe Evergreen Project, which is 1.4 miles from a monitor, the Tempe Escalante Project, which is 2.1 miles from a monitor, and then offer the remaining funds to the Peoria #2 project.

Grant Anderson, Town of Youngtown, stated that adding the Fountain Hills and Peoria #2 projects to the list in Attachment B results in funding the same projects listed in Attachment A. He inquired about the savings and requested clarification. Mr. O'Donnell agreed with Mr. Anderson about the projects and costs being the same for both attachments if his mentioned changes were made. Mr. Anderson inquired about the difference mentioned by Mr. Giles. Mr. Giles stated that there are more emission reductions from the projects currently listed in Attachment A. Mr. Anderson noted that adding the two projects to Attachment B would make the lists identical. Mr. O'Donnell added that if the Fountain Hills and Peoria #2 projects were included above the line in Attachment B, the lists would become identical and the results would be the same. He inquired if Mr. Giles agreed. Mr. Giles responded that he made his comment before it was known that the two projects would be added to Attachment B. Mr. Anderson inquired if Mr. Giles agreed with their comment. Mr. Giles responded that he would need to go back and compare tables.

Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, commented that the emission reductions are included in the tables. Mr. Giles responded that is correct. Mr. Kamps indicated that including the same projects in Attachment A and Attachment B results in the same emission reductions.

Mr. O'Donnell commented about the two monitors by the Tempe Evergreen and the Tempe Escalante projects. He inquired if there was a problem with the emissions by those monitors. Mr. Person responded that the monitoring data provided by MAG at previous meetings has indicated that the Mesa monitor located by these projects is in good shape. He commented on including another variable in evaluating the projects which would be protecting the monitors. Mr. Person mentioned that after reading the detailed information provided in the packet, the two Tempe projects jumped out as being the closest to the monitors that are in existence. He commented that he agreed with Ms. Fish that those monitors are not the ones of concern. However, his concept was to take into consideration the monitoring systems along with the cost-effectiveness and PM-10 emission reductions. He noted that the Tempe Evergreen project almost has a higher PM-10 emission reduction than the other two projects combined. Mr. Person added that he was analyzing the data in terms of the region's biggest problem, which is PM-10.

Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward, inquired if there would be any reductions from potentially increasing speed limits by paving unpaved roads. This could reduce nitrogen oxide and carbon monoxide emissions given the reduction in travel time. Mr. Giles responded that MAG has not evaluated the projects for that purpose. Mr. Carpenter stated that there may be other advantages to the road paving projects.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend Attachment B with the addition of the Tempe Evergreen and the Fountain Hills projects. He added that these projects are the next two that could be funded and are cost-effective. Mr. Anderson noted that adding the Peoria #1 project would be over the funding limit. Mr. O'Donnell seconded, and the motion to forward Attachment B with the addition of the Tempe Evergreen and the Fountain Hills projects passed unanimously.

6. Update on the EPA Proposed Partial Approval and Disapproval of the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10

Lindy Bauer, MAG, provided an update on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed partial approval and disapproval of the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She stated that in the last agenda packet, MAG mailed out the first batch of answers to questions that were posed to the Environmental Protection Agency. Ms. Bauer indicated that the answers have again been included in the agenda packet along with answers to the remaining questions posed to EPA. She noted that the new responses begin after page seven and start with question number 13. Ms. Bauer stated that concern was expressed with EPA's short timeline for final action. Ms. Bauer noted that MAG, along with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), Maricopa County, and several other entities, requested an extension. She mentioned that EPA responded that they did not anticipate that the U.S. District Court or the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest would agree to any kind of extension to their time table, which is to take final action on the 2007 MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 on January 28, 2011.

Ms. Bauer referred to question number 14. She stated that when the EPA Region IX Administrator came to Phoenix, there was additional language in the EPA conformity paper that MAG thought may have some promise that had not been seen before in any of the regulations. The language indicated that EPA could act on the budgets separately and possibly lift the freeze earlier. However, when MAG posed the question, EPA stated that after further consideration they do not think this idea would be workable since everything is tied together.

Ms. Bauer stated that another question asked was how long it would take EPA to take action on the revised Five Percent Plan for PM-10 once it is submitted. She mentioned that EPA gave the usual timeline. EPA indicated that once the revised Five Percent Plan for PM-10 is submitted, it would take six months to determine if it is complete and 12 months to take action on the plan, for a total of 18 months. In addition, EPA stated that rulemakings usually take approximately six to eight months. Ms. Bauer noted that the time period would be very short if EPA goes final on January 28, 2011 with an effective date of February 28, 2011. The region would then have 18 months to fix the plan, have EPA make a completeness determination, and take approval action.

Ms. Bauer referred the Committee to the last paragraph on the page. It notes that if, at the time EPA proposes action on a revised plan, there are sufficient measured exceedances to preclude attainment by the attainment date projected in the plan, EPA will not be able to propose full approval of the plan. She stated that the best course of action is three years of clean data at the monitors. Ms. Bauer indicated that if a revised plan is submitted and the region does not have a year of clean data and EPA does not concur that there are exceptional events, EPA will not be able to give full approval. She stated that full approval is needed since a partial approval or disapproval is the same as a disapproval. Ms. Bauer stated that MAG provided the map of the monitor locations to the elected officials on the MAG Regional Council, Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee, City and Town Managers, and

Intergovernmental Coordinators. She added that the maps have also been given to the Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Bauer stated that one of the unanswered questions has to do with the base year that is used for modeling. She mentioned that MAG has discussed with EPA about taking credit for the Five Percent Plan measures. Ms. Bauer indicated that we want to take credit for them again in the revision. She mentioned that it was proposed to EPA that MAG would be able to use a 2007 base updated with the most accurate inventory, which would be the Maricopa County 2008 Periodic Emissions Inventory. Ms. Bauer commented that MAG discussed this suggestion with EPA and they are currently looking at the information. She stated that EPA has indicated June 12, 2012 as the attainment date. Ms. Bauer added that the best course of action is to have three years of clean data at the monitors by the time the plan is submitted. She indicated that if the region is able to have clean data, potentially a lesser plan could be submitted under their clean data policy. Ms. Bauer stressed that the best chance for success is to stay clean at the monitors.

Ms. Fish inquired if the region's ability to show clean data at the monitors has a direct relationship to EPA approving the exceptional events. Ms. Bauer responded yes and added that EPA is behind on their schedule for fixing the issues with the Exceptional Events Rule. She commented that EPA was going to have a briefing with Janet McCabe, EPA, in October 2010, which has been delayed. Ms. Bauer mentioned that EPA is now going to develop a process memorandum. She stated that the notice will most likely be released during the first part of the year. Ms. Bauer added that the region will still need to press to get the flawed Exceptional Events Rule fixed since high winds will always be present in the region.

Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company, inquired if MAG is still pursuing to extend the finalization of the determination in January. Ms. Bauer responded that fixing the Exceptional Events Rule is very much in the forefront at MAG. She added that it is critical that the Exceptional Events Rule be fixed. Ms. Bauer noted that she was reporting on some of the answers that EPA provided to the technical questions pertaining to the approvability issues. She indicated that MAG and ADEQ will continue to press EPA to fix the Exceptional Events Rule.

Mr. Hajduk stated that EPA will be forced to finalize the partial disapproval in January based on the court decision. He added that it seemed that MAG wanted to extend the action to avoid the sanction clocks from starting and EPA responded no to an extension. Mr. Hajduk inquired if MAG will continue to try to extend that action regardless of what EPA has answered. Ms. Bauer responded that MAG just received this answer from EPA and has already submitted comments to EPA previously asking for an extension. She added that the Congressional Delegation, ADEQ, and Maricopa County have also requested an extension. Ms. Bauer mentioned that the hope is to avoid a conformity freeze and be able to fix the Plan to avoid the sanctions.

Grant Smedley, Salt River Project, inquired if anyone has talked to the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest about the extension. He added that it seemed like the extension is contingent on their approval. Mr. Smedley noted that EPA does not seem optimistic that the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest is willing to approve an extension. He indicated that everyone is working hard to resolve the issue and to provide an approveable plan. Ms. Bauer commented that EPA is the entity that is in the consent decree with the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest and MAG is not a party to that consent decree.

Mr. DeLaCruz stated that the material he has read mentions additional measures may have to be developed depending on a revised plan. He inquired if there are any ideas on additional measures. Ms. Bauer responded that this is one of the unanswered questions. She added that EPA has indicated that MAG would have to conduct a Best Available Control Measure Analysis. Ms. Bauer noted that MAG is not expecting to find a lot of additional measures. She indicated that there are 53 measures in the Five Percent Plan for PM-10 and 77 measures in the Serious Area Plan. Ms. Bauer commented that Maricopa County has updated its Rule 310 and EPA has also approved Rule 316 recently. She mentioned that MAG is not expecting to find a big list of measures.

7. Draft 2010 MAG CMAQ Methodologies

Cathy Arthur, MAG, provided a presentation on the Draft 2010 MAG CMAQ Methodologies. She stated that she gave a presentation to the Committee in June indicating that the CMAQ methodologies would be updated this year. Ms. Arthur added that a copy of the Draft 2010 CMAQ Methodologies has been included in the agenda packet. She noted that the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program began almost 20 years ago. Ms. Arthur indicated that nationally there is a large sum of money over a five year period that is authorized for financing CMAQ projects. The purpose of the program is to fund transportation projects that improve air quality.

Ms. Arthur stated that the apportionment of CMAQ funding to the State of Arizona occurs based on a formula. She added that in order to qualify, the area has to be designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area for carbon monoxide or ozone. Ms. Arthur noted that Maricopa County is the only area in Arizona that currently qualifies for CMAQ funding. She indicated that the formula is based on whether the region is a carbon monoxide or ozone nonattainment or maintenance area or both and it is multiplied by the census population estimate. Ms. Arthur commented that the federal formula is currently using the 2000 U.S. Census data for Maricopa County and will most likely start to use the 2010 Census in 2012, which should be a positive for the region. She mentioned that there was approximately \$54 million apportioned to the State of Arizona in FY 2010. Ms. Arthur noted that the MAG region receives all of the CMAQ funds allocated to Arizona.

Ms. Arthur stated that the CMAQ Program was established by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 and each of the succeeding federal authorizations for transportation have continued with the program. She added that the latest authorization is the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Currently the program is under continuing resolutions so it has been carried over from FY 2009. Ms. Arthur indicated that once a new federal authorization is in place, we will find out whether CMAQ will continue to be a funded program.

Ms. Arthur provided an overview of the requirements for evaluating a CMAQ project for potential funding. She added that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provided guidelines in 2008. Ms. Arthur indicated that the last set of procedures drafted by MAG staff were finalized in April 2009. She noted that MAG felt it was important to update these procedures since the new EPA MOVES2010 mobile source emissions model changes the emission factors dramatically.

Ms. Arthur stated that the guidance provided to MAG member agencies on CMAQ project eligibility is included in the Transportation Programming Guidebook which is located on the MAG website. She added that the guidebook is updated every year. Ms. Arthur discussed the ways MAG uses the CMAQ methodologies. Typically, the MAG CMAQ methodologies are applied each year to evaluate:

CMAQ eligible projects proposed for the last year of a new Transportation Improvement Program; CMAQ eligible projects proposed for Fiscal Year-End Closeout funds; PM-10 certified street sweepers proposed for purchase; proposed projects to pave unpaved roads, alleys and shoulders; and projects implemented with CMAQ funds in the prior calendar year for the annual report required by FHWA. Ms. Arthur noted that MAG identifies in the annual report the emission reduction benefits of projects that were funded in that year. Ms. Arthur presented a list of the general types of projects that are eligible for CMAQ funding. She added that there are projects that do not fall into the general categories and MAG makes every effort to quantify the air quality benefits of those projects, as well.

Ms. Arthur stated that MAG hired Sierra Research in 2008 to evaluate the CMAQ methodologies and compare them with the methodologies used in other parts of the country, in particular, the western United States. She stated that Sierra Research indicated that the methodologies used by MAG are some of the most sophisticated in the Country. She added that Sierra Research did have some minor recommendations, which MAG has tried to address in subsequent revisions to the CMAQ methodologies.

Ms. Arthur discussed the recommendations from Sierra Research. She stated that MAG had already updated the methodologies in 2009 to be consistent with assumptions in the 2007 Ozone Plan and the Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Ms. Arthur added that MAG has since updated the survey reports that provide the new activity data. She indicated that another recommendation from Sierra Research was to look at the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) methodologies for evaluating projects. Sierra Research had stated that the TTI methodologies were more sophisticated. Ms. Arthur mentioned that Sierra Research pointed out that their methodologies are used to develop air quality plans for Texas and not to evaluate CMAQ projects. She added that in early 2010 MAG contracted with the Texas Transportation Institute and Lee Engineering to update the region's methodology for Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).

Mr. O'Donnell inquired why zero is used for the weight of carbon monoxide. Ms. Arthur responded that the region has been in attainment for the carbon monoxide standard for many years. She added that the region has been reclassified as a maintenance area; therefore, we are no longer a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide. In addition, the trends for carbon monoxide are continuing to go down as a result of the tailpipe emission standards. She commented that all of this is subject to input from Committee members and will be discussed at the workshop being held in December 2010. Ms. Arthur added that the priority weight for carbon monoxide have been zeroed out for the last three or four iterations of the report.

Ms. Arthur stated that the MOVES2010 mobile source emissions model is different than MOBILE6. She added that the categories of vehicles and types of facilities are a little different. Ms. Arthur commented that for the 2010 methodologies, MAG had to consider both the emissions on the network, which include exhaust emissions from vehicles traveling on the network, and emissions from vehicles that are not moving. She clarified that the off-network emissions are the vehicles that are stationary and the on-network emissions are moving vehicles. Ms. Arthur mentioned that when comparing the 2010 methodologies with the 2009 methodologies, in every case where there are exhaust emissions, both off-network and on-network emission factor calculations are provided. Therefore, it is almost double the calculations relative to the previous methodologies.

Ms. Arthur also stated that speed curves in the MOVES2010 emissions model are different. For example, the nitrogen oxide curve with MOBILE6 was u-shaped with the bottom being approximately 30 miles per hour. The new curves go up at about 60 to 65 miles per hour, resulting in a broader

u-shaped curve. Therefore, more cost-effectiveness is received from projects that improve speed. Ms. Arthur added that PM-10 emissions are also now sensitive to changes in speeds. She discussed priority weights and added that in the April 2009 version of the CMAQ methodologies, nitrogen oxide had a priority weight of 0.89 and 1.03 for volatile organic compounds. Ms. Arthur indicated that the priority weights for nitrogen oxide, volatile organic compounds, and PM-10 have now been set equal one. She stated that the biggest change in the Draft 2010 CMAQ Methodologies is the revision to the ITS methodology to incorporate recommendations from Texas Transportation Institute/Lee Engineering. Ms. Arthur noted that the equations are much more sophisticated. Ms. Arthur mentioned that a workshop on the Draft 2010 CMAQ Methodologies will be held on December 6, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. and added that more detailed information on the changes will be provided.

Ms. Arthur provided additional information on the revised ITS methodology. She stated that Texas Transportation Institute/Lee Engineering provided MAG with sophisticated equations; however, they indicated that MAG needs to use local input data. Ms. Arthur noted that MAG has a contract to measure nonrecurring congestion in the region which should be completed by the end of the summer. Texas Transportation Institute/Lee Engineering recommended the use of a simpler equation until the local data is available. The equation provides a comparison of speeds before and after the project. Ms. Arthur inquired about Texas Transportation Institute/Lee Engineering sharing data from Texas. However, they decided that the coefficients are too locally driven and did not feel comfortable with MAG using the Texas values. She indicated that their recommendations included using speed equations for ITS projects until the results from the MAG study are available.

Ms. Arthur discussed cost-effectiveness. She stated that the more emissions reduced per CMAQ dollar spent, the higher the ranking of a CMAQ project. She referred to Attachment A for the CMAQ evaluations discussed in an earlier agenda item as an example. Ms. Arthur mentioned time constraints on calculations. She noted that MAG only has a couple of weeks to apply the methodologies, calculate cost-effectiveness, and rank the CMAQ project requests.

Ms. Arthur presented a list of example projects in a ranked order by cost-effectiveness. She added that the ranked order is very similar to the list for the 2009 methodologies. Ms. Arthur mentioned that the only significant change is the ITS project which is now located in the middle of the list and was previously closer to the bottom of the list. Therefore, the new methodology did have a positive impact on ITS projects. Ms. Arthur noted that generally the order has not been impacted much by all the changes. She commented that even though the methodologies are updated whenever new information is available, the relative order of the projects is not that flexible.

8. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Kukino asked the Committee for suggestions on future agenda items. Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation, commented on having a discussion at the next meeting on the new ozone standard if EPA finalizes the standard by the end of the year. Mr. Kukino announced that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for Thursday, January 27, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.