

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

Thursday, December 11, 2008
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Kross, Town of Queen Creek, Chairman
Sue McDermott, Avondale
*Elizabeth Biggins-Ramer, Buckeye
#Jim Weiss, Chandler
#Jamie McCullough, El Mirage
Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Doug Kukino, Glendale
James Nichols, Goodyear
#Scott Bouchie, Mesa
Gaye Knight, Phoenix
Larry Person, Scottsdale
Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise
Oddvar Tveit, Tempe
Mark Hannah, Youngtown
*Walter Bouchard, Citizen Representative
*Corey Woods, American Lung Association of Arizona
#Barbara Sprungl, Salt River Project
Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation
Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company
#Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association
Peggy Rubach for Randi Alcott, Valley Metro
Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association
*Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
Russell Bowers, Arizona Rock Products Association

*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
Patrisia Magallon, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments
Randy Sedlacek, Maricopa Association of Governments
Ranjith Dandanayakula, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Ieesuck Jung, Maricopa Association of Governments
Taejoo Shin, Maricopa Association of Governments
Steve Peplau, Arizona Department of Environmental
Quality
Dan Catlin, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Justin Perry, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Joonwon Joo, Arizona Department of Transportation

Amanda McGennis, Associated General
Contractors
Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of
Central Arizona
Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward
*Kai Umeda, University of Arizona Cooperative
Extension
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Leonard Montenegro for Diane Arnst, Arizona
Department of Environmental Quality
Wienke Tax, 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
*David Rueckert, Citizen Representative

Joe DeVito, Salt-River Pima Maricopa Indian
Community
Jane McVay, Arizona Department of Transportation
Don Blair, Gila River Indian Community
Will Antone III, Gila River Indian Community
Bruce Friedl, Arizona Department of Environmental
Quality
Chris Turner-Notewape, City of Phoenix
Heather Hodgman, City of Apache Junction
Shane Kiesow, City of Apache Junction
Dianne Barker, D Team
Michelle Wilson, City of Glendale
Steve Trussell, Arizona Rock Products Association
Paul Ward, Olsson Associates
Russell VanLeuven, Arizona Department of
Agriculture

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on December 11, 2008. John Kross, Town of Queen Creek, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:35 p.m. Jamie McCullough, City of El Mirage; Jim Weiss, City of Chandler; Scott Bouchie, City of Mesa; Barbara Sprungl, Salt River Project; Jim Weiss, City of Chandler; and Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Call to the Audience

Mr. Kross 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 September 25, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Lindy Bauer, MAG, noted that the September 25, 2008 meeting minutes that were mailed out indicated incorrectly that the next meeting will be on May 27, 2008 and should have been December 11, 2008. She added that the minutes have been revised to reflect the changes and have been placed at their places. The Committee reviewed the minutes from September 25, 2008 meeting. Russell Bowers, Arizona Rock Products Association, moved and Mr. Kross, seconded and the motion to approve the September 25, 2008 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

4. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2011 and FY 2012 CMAQ Funding

Dean Giles, presented the MAG Evaluation of the Proposed PM-10 Paving Unpaved Road Projects for FY 2011 and FY 2012 CMAQ Funding. Mr. Giles stated that paved or stabilized unpaved shoulders and paved or stabilized existing public dirt road alley are committed measures in the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. He added that for FY 2011, 22 projects were evaluated requesting approximately \$14 million in CMAQ funds with only approximately \$3.6 million available. Mr. Giles mentioned that for FY 2012, eleven projects were evaluated requesting \$9.4 million in CMAQ funds with only approximately \$5 million in 2012 CMAQ funding available. He commented that paving projects may include projects located in public or publicly maintained unpaved roads within the PM-10 Nonattainment Area. Mr. Giles indicated that a minimum local cash match of 5.7 percent is required for the projects. He noted that the deadline for the projects was September 19, 2008. Mr. Giles stated that a tiered review process mentioned under the Federal Fund Programming Principles is new to the process this year. He added that the paving applications were reviewed before the MAG Street Committee on October 16 and 22, 2008 and wrapped up their evaluations on November 12, 2008. Mr. Giles mentioned that the evaluation was conducted on information provided by member agencies in detailed applications. He indicated that MAG staff evaluated the proposed paving projects using revised methodologies that were used for the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Mr. Giles commented that the evaluation provides the estimated PM-10 emission reductions as well as the corresponding cost effectiveness for each project. He noted that the projects are presented by fiscal year in the separate tables. Mr. Giles stated that the projects are footnoted for those that are in close

proximity to the PM-10 monitors. He requested that the Committee recommend a ranked list of the proposed PM-10 paving unpaved road projects for fiscal year 2011 and 2012 CMAQ funding and to forward the ranked list to the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC). Mr. Kross stated that the requested motion and task for the Committee is to forward a recommendation to the TRC as part of the MAG process.

Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation stated that there are different locations in the table for the City of Phoenix in the years 2011 and 2012. He inquired if it is assumed that the projects will be completed so that they do not get carried over to 2012. Mr. O'Donnell noted that the table for 2012 indicates 1.4 miles and the table for 2011 indicates 4.4 miles. He inquired about the list being carried over. Mr. Giles responded that the City of Phoenix project for fiscal year 2011 is for 41.2 miles of paving dirt alleys. He added that of the 41.2 miles there is approximately 4.4 miles within a PM-10 monitor. Mr. O'Donnell asked if the request is for all the mileage. Mr. Giles responded that is correct. Mr. O'Donnell noted that the City of Phoenix has a separate item for fiscal year 2012. He inquired if that project was not around in fiscal year 2011. Mr. Giles responded that each year, MAG provides a lump sum in the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He added that MAG programs specific projects for these individual years and MAG has now programmed projects through fiscal year 2010. Mr. Giles mentioned that MAG is now at the point where specific projects are identified for fiscal year 2011 and 2012. He indicated that the projects are being submitted at the same time.

Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, stated that the City of Phoenix is proposing 81 miles that do not overlap. Mr. O'Donnell inquired how much money would take to pave both of the projects of unpaved roads and alleys that are within one mile of the monitor. Ms. Knight responded that when the City of Phoenix programs alley projects the City sets them up in a area where they do not have to deploy. She added that some alleys have been done in the south Phoenix. Ms. Knight commented that the City of Phoenix did not specifically look at the areas because of the proximity to the monitor. Mr. O'Donnell stated that it should be the Committee's priority to submit projects that are within one mile of a monitor. Ms. Knight stated that the City of Phoenix has done some areas that are close to the south Phoenix monitors and are now trying to do more areas that are close to the air quality monitors. Ms. Knight asked Chris Turner, City of Phoenix, if there is opportunity to go back and find individual monitors to see if the City of Phoenix has alleys near the monitors. Ms. Turner responded that the applications have been submitted. She added that the 2011 application has 33 different quarter sections and 33 different pages within the application. Ms. Turner noted that the application must list quarter sections and the proximity to an air quality monitor. She indicated that of the 41 miles, 2.5 miles are from the air quality monitors reaching all 41 miles. Ms. Turner mentioned that for the 2012 application, there was 18 different quarter sections. She added that some of the quarter sections were closer to the monitors and some were far. Ms. Turner commented that the quarter sections had individual evaluation pages in the application that was submitted to MAG.

Peggy Rubach, Valley Metro, stated that the funds were focused on the unpaved roads and street sweepers and no applications were taken for the bike and pedestrians. She commented on the bang for the buck for air quality that is gathered from the street sweepers and paved roads. Ms. Rubach inquired why CMAQ funds were not considered for additional vanpool vehicles that take cars off the road. Mr. Giles responded that MAG did not have a call for projects for Transportation Demand Management type of activities. He added that MAG set aside funds a couple of years ago for fiscal year 2011 and 2012 to identify paving projects. Mr. Giles mentioned that this was the key intent for the funds. Ms. Rubach stated that her thought was that the key intent was to get MAG the most bang

for the buck for air quality reports so that the plan is as productive as possible. She added that there are other methods like vans for example which provide fairly decent emission reductions. Ms. Rubach commented that MAG provides allocations for vans. She inquired if there is a possibility that the vans could be included in the closeout funds for the future. Eileen Yazzie, MAG, responded that re-occurring programs are funded by CMAQ. She commented on the programs such as ride share and vanpool. She added that those programs are currently funded for 2008-2012 in the TIP. Ms. Yazzie mentioned that the Committee approved funding for programs in 2013 which were approved at the MAG Regional Council in January 2008. She indicated that these programs are waiting to be put into a new TIP and a TIP was not done for 2009-2013. Ms. Yazzie mentioned that those types of programs are programmed in CMAQ and are approved through this Committee from 2008 and our current year through 2013 which will be included in the draft 2010/2014 TIP.

Ms. Rubach inquired if funds from previous projects that did not get done could be used for the van pool. She added that the alternative has a fairly decent loading for air quality positive benefits. Ms. Yazzie responded that the process being discussed is the MAG Closeout Process which is handled through the transportation track. She added that the process begins approximately around March of every year. Ms. Yazzie noted that the open call can be found in the Transportation Programming Guide Book. She commented that the book explains schedules and the call for projects. Ms. Yazzie indicated that the call for projects is currently open and that Valley Metro and Valley Metro Rail are currently members of the TRC. She stated that last year, the remaining balance of funding for the light rail construction was approved through the closeout process. Ms. Yazzie added that it is possible to provide additional funds at closeout; however, all of the members will have to agree and will have to go through the process. Ms. Rubach commented on the possibility of having additional funds for the vanpool program. She added that this possibility would help the program since there is a waiting list for the vanpool. Tami Ryall, Town of Gilbert, inquired if the vanpool program reduced PM-10 emissions. Ms. Bauer responded that the program does not have a big impact on the PM-10 problem. She stated that the region is in a Serious Nonattainment Area for PM-10. Ms. Bauer added that the region failed to attain the standard by the deadline. She indicated that the region has a tough plan and that very little PM-10 is coming from tail pipe. PM-10 is mostly fugitive dust. Ms. Rubach commented that emissions are coming from construction that is not happening. Ms. Bauer mentioned that the construction industry has added several measures along with every level of government.

Mr. Kross stated that the focus should remain on the list of projects for FY 2011 and 2012. Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation, inquired why the projects had a 5.7 percent match since there was a 50 percent match the last time the projects were submitted. Mr. Giles responded that in July of 2007, the projects that were before the MAG Regional Council contained a 50 percent match. He added that MAG Regional Council had approved funding that required a local 50 percent match. Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, commented that the list of paving unpaved roads lists the cost effectiveness. He added that the column states CMAQ dollars per metric ton and inquired if the metric ton is per year or for the life of the pavement. Mr. Giles replied that the metric tons are annualized. Mr. Berry inquired if the Committee is being asked to pair the list down or if the list equals the total. Mr. Kross responded that the request before the Committee is to look at the lists for both fiscal years. He stated that there are parameters that the Committee has to work with which are prescribed in the rules. Mr. Kross indicated that the criteria under consideration that MAG staff has presented is in the FHWA guidelines as the cost effectiveness category.

Mr. Berry inquired if the Committee needed to whittle down the list to \$3.6 million dollars. Mr. Kross inquired why that group is shown as a subtotal and the others are not included in that subtotal category based on the criteria used. Mr. Giles responded that the subtotal was shown to indicate where the running total was with the amount of funding that was available. He added that an example of that is the \$3.6 million dollars available in fiscal year 2011, in which only the first five projects could be funded but to be inclusive of the sixth project. Mr. Kross indicated that whittling down is not a task of the Committee. He added that the Committee does not have the ability to do a budget to the projects on the list. Mr. Kross mentioned that scheduling is also off limits with respect to the process. He stated that there is a total amount of money that has been identified by MAG. Mr. Kross commented on the Committee focusing on PM-10 versus cost effectiveness.

Mr. Berry inquired if there is flexibility in which the Committee can move or make a recommendation between buckets in the event that a street sweeper project would outperform a paved road project. Mr. Giles responded that there is specific pots of monies set aside for these types of projects with so much funding available in each pot. He added when the solicitation for projects was issued in August, MAG indicated where the funding was and how much money was available. Mr. Berry stated that it sounds as money can not be switched between pots. Ms. Bauer commented that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) allocates money by mode. She stated that there are certain dollar amounts based upon percentages that were in the RTP. Ms. Bauer added that there are assumptions built into the RTP regarding street sweepers and unpaved roads that are outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Berry inquired if this was the new or the old plan. Ms. Bauer responded that this was under the new plan. Mr. Berry inquired if it was Proposition 400. Ms. Bauer replied yes and stated that the pots of money, according to the percent allocation in the RTP have been programmed in the TIP. Mr. Berry inquired if the TIP mentions street sweeper versus street. Mr. Kross inquired if Ms. Bauer's answer was referring to the implementation ratios that were established by type of program. Ms. Bauer responded yes. She added that the table indicates percent allocation by mode. Ms. Bauer indicated that the air quality projects are lumped together including street sweepers, unpaved roads, the Regional Rideshare Program, the State Travel Reduction Program, and the County Trip Reduction Program in one category. She mentioned that the RTP includes assumptions on the amount of PM-10 street sweepers that will be purchased and the number of unpaved roads that will be paved.

Ms. Ryall inquired on the relationship between the pots of money to the commitments and the State Implementation Plan. Ms. Bauer responded that the PM-10 Plan was sent to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on December 2007 and the region had to show attainment by 2010. She added that Mr. Giles went carefully through the commitments in preparation for this meeting. Ms. Bauer indicated that the projects are above and beyond the commitments that were made to pave unpaved roads. Mr. O'Donnell commented on the projects of the City of Phoenix and the Town of Buckeye. He inquired if it was possible to take partial parts of the projects and move them up within a mile or 1.1 miles away from the monitor. Mr. Giles responded that part of the Draft Programming Principles, is that an advisory committee is not to reduce or change the scope or cost of a project until its gone to the TRC where the programming of the projects take effect.

Mr. Bowers stated that the region has a plan and a placement of commitments and are fulfilling those commitments and should be without the assistance of these grants. He asked if its possible for the Committee to change the criteria of the grants to further the purposes of the commitment, that being to focus at the monitor since there is a plan already in place. Mr. Bowers inquired if the Committee could emphasize the work around the monitors as part of a commitment pattern for these projects or

others in the future. Mr. Kross responded that the criteria established is through the application process through other committees. He added that this committee, being an advisory one, is weighing on the projects that are presented and trying to rank order those within the context and the scope of the Committee's particular task. According to the Federal Fund Programming, a technical advisory committee shall not change the project's scope, schedule, budget or requested federal funds. Mr. Kross indicated that this should be considered when evaluating the circumstances of a project in the future. He commented that as part of the comprehensive Five Percent Plan, the Committee is looking at the entire region and not focusing exclusively on the monitors. Mr. Kross added that this is part in parcel of that approach and strategy. Mr. Bowers inquired if Mr. Kross mentioned part of the parcel of the strategy of the Five Percent Plan. He stated that the region has a Five Percent Plan in place. Mr. Bowers inquired if this is part of the strategy or if it was furthering the goals of that strategy. Ms. Bauer replied that the Plan contains measures which are being implemented region wide. She added that the Committee has expressed interest in knowing which projects are near a monitor since measures are implemented on sources around the monitors as well as region wide. Ms. Bauer mentioned that projects located near a monitor are indicated with a plus sign in order to help the Committee analyze them when considering the projects.

Ms. Knight stated that the projects have been sorted by cost effectiveness. She added that cost effectiveness should be considered; however, when the projects are sorted by raw PM-10 reductions the order would be different. Ms. Knight commented on the Fort McDowell, the Salt River and the City of Phoenix projects. She inquired if the cost effectiveness is important to consider when ranking the projects. Mr. Giles responded that the information presented to the Committee is presented in order of cost effectiveness. He added that in the past, the Committee has considered different approaches when ranking the projects. Ms. Ryall inquired how projects have been forwarded in the past. Mr. Giles replied that recommendations have been forwarded by cost effectiveness. Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, inquired if the violations at the monitors were used as a discussion item or used in any way to consider the projects. He asked if the projects were based on the cost effectiveness. Ms. Bauer responded that the Street Committee has reviewed the applications to make sure that they make sense and that the data is accurate. She added that the Street Committee is composed of representatives from the jurisdictions that have expertise in sweeping the streets as well as paving unpaved roads. Ms. Bauer noted that this Committee is an Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. She indicated that members of the Committee are lending their air quality perspective and evaluating cost effectiveness when ranking the projects.

Ms. Ryall stated that capturing the project for fiscal year 2011 would require the Committee to make a recommendation and reduce the scope by a small amount. She indicated that the Committee is not allowed to do that type of recommendation as per the rules of the Committee. Ms. Ryall made a motion to include the project and forward it to the TRC so that it would remain on the list in case the TRC decides to reduce the amount. She mentioned that this motion would move the subtotal line down below the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and give the Transportation Review Committee the option to reduce that scope of the project to make it fit within the federal allocation. Mr. Bowers seconded the motion.

Ms. Knight commented on the 40 miles of alley being less effective than paving two tenths of a mile on a road. She expressed her respect for MAG staff. Ms. Knight added that it has to be assumed that the two tenths of a mile in the Town of Buckeye and half a mile in the Town of Gilbert would indicate that those roads would have a tremendous amount of traffic compared to an alley in order to reduce

more emissions. Ms. Knight mentioned that the City of Phoenix projects could not get paired down since the Fort McDowell projects would get funded \$2.3 million out of the \$2.7 million that is available. Ms. Ryall amended the motion to include fiscal year 2012 following the same logic for the subtotal. She stated that there is \$5 million dollars available for fiscal year 2012. Ms. Ryall added that this would include the City of Phoenix paving alley project for 2012 and have the TRC make reductions to the allocation to make it fit within the appropriation. She noted that this motion would include both years and provide the paving in 2012. Mr. Bowers agreed to the amendment. Mr. Bowers stated that he would agree to paving alleys if the truck driver in the alleys was to drive 55 miles an hour causing dust to be transferred to a dirt road making a tremendous amount of dust generated in an alley. He inquired if ten percent of the City of Phoenix's mileage was near a monitor. Ms. Knight responded yes and stated that she agreed with Mr. Bowers. She added that dust can be generated on a road where a car can pick up more speed than a one block alley; however, some of the projects submitted have short sections of a road. Mr. Bowers indicated that those sections could be between pieces of road where you have two paved roads and one unpaved road.

Antonio DeLaCruz, City of Surprise, stated that he did not think that the total amount in the list had any significance. He inquired on the motion. Ms. Ryall responded that the motion would be to send the list as is and recommend that the list be funded through the Salt River Pima project in 2011 and all the way through the City of Phoenix project in 2012. She added that since the amounts can not be reduced by the Committee, it would have to be up to the TRC to cut the last two projects nominally in order to make them fit within the allocation.

Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, commented on the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project. He added that the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project indicated that the amount requested is for a certain portion of road preparation and apparently Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation will supplement the money with additional costs to do something else. Mr. Person inquired if this allocation of CMAQ funds is to sub grade or to pave roads. He asked what Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation is planning to do with the additional monies. Mr. Giles responded that the cost shown on the sheet is for construction costs. He added that when the jurisdictions submitted the applications they also indicated on the application costs associated with pre-design, design, right of way and the entire cost of the project. Mr. Giles mentioned that the project description is for the total project, and not just the construction portion. Mr. Person inquired if the project would be for a paved road or a sub grade construction road. Mr. Giles replied that this particular project is for paving a dirt road. Mr. Kross inquired if pave roads still have to comply with ADOT standards. Mr. Giles responded that is correct. Mr. Kross stated that pave roads are still required to be brought to the standard regardless of the type of road paving project. Mr. Giles commented that the project description is to provide additional information about the scope of the entire project. He indicated that the cost does not include the other parts of the project and that they are contributing local funds as well.

Ms. Rubach inquired if the funds only include construction costs. Mr. Giles responded that is correct. Wienke Tax, EPA, stated that the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Town of Buckeye, and the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community projects indicate design and environmental in their first phase. She added that the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community project indicates design and construction. Ms. Tax noted that the Town of Buckeye indicates that phase one involves environmental, utility and right of way clearance. She commented that it sounds like the Committee would be funding more than just construction. Ms. Yazzie stated that the applications are used to not only request CMAQ funds but are also used to program the Transportation Improvement Program.

She added that this is a shift of what the Committee is going to see now and in the future. Ms. Yazzie indicated that when MAG asks member agencies to fill out applications, MAG is asking for the description of the entire project as it relates to design, right of way and construction. She commented that MAG is also asking for information of when MAG is going to program those separate work phases. Ms. Yazzie mentioned that if there are design phases, right of way, purchasing or acquisition, it is programmed in a separate line item which is not funded by CMAQ. She stated that the funds being requested are only for construction.

Ms. Yazzie referred to Mr. Person's question on paving a dirt road. She indicated that the application inquired if the member agency will be installing curb gutter or drainage. Ms. Yazzie commented on the local costs and mentioned that it was added in the table in case the member agency would be required further grading as well as drainage at the time of the geo-technical report. She added that the agency would have to supplement CMAQ funds with their local funds to be able to complete the construction of the paving of the road. Mr. Kross requested to have additional information on eligibility of funding on certain programs. Mr. O'Donnell commented that the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation project indicated that it will provide a primary access point for several Tribal Enterprises. He inquired if the cost reduction takes into account the number of expected people that would be traveling on that road as part of the analysis. Mr. Giles responded that is correct and stated that the calculation included the vehicle miles traveled based on the information provided by the jurisdiction.

Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion to forward fiscal year 2011 and 2012 as is and recommend that the list be funded through the Salt River Pima project in 2011 and all the way through the City of Phoenix project in 2012. The motion passed with one member voting no.

5. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2009 CMAQ Funding

Mr. Giles provided a presentation on the Evaluation of the Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2009 CMAQ funding. Mr. Giles stated that there were fifteen street sweeper projects received that requested \$2.7 million in CMAQ funds; however, there is only approximately \$1.2 million in FY 2009 CMAQ funds available. He added that there is a 5.7 percent local cash match for this particular project. Mr. Giles indicated that the projects were due by September 19, 2008. He commented that MAG evaluated the proposed projects using the information provided to MAG on the project applications. Mr. Giles mentioned that the methodology used is consistent with the methodology that was used in developing the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. He stated that the evaluation included in the handout indicates the estimated emission reductions that is measured in kilograms per day. Mr. Giles added that the handout also included the corresponding cost effectiveness which is CMAQ dollars per metric ton of PM-10 reduced. He indicated that the list is ranked in order of cost effectiveness.

Mr. Giles mentioned that approximately six projects could be funded with the \$1.2 million available in CMAQ funds. He also mentioned the foot notes on the table and commented that the asterisks indicate that the projects are replacing older less efficient certified street sweepers. Mr. Giles stated that there is one exception, for the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community to replace a noncertified street sweeper. Mr. Giles commented on the projects that are requesting to sweep adjacent to PM-10 monitors. He indicated that the Committee is requested to recommend a prioritized list of the Proposed Certified Street Sweeper Projects for Fiscal Year 2009 CMAQ Funding and retain

the prioritize list for any additional fiscal year 2009 CMAQ funds that might become available to the region during the year end closeout including any redistributed obligation authority. Mr. Giles noted that for the Paradise Valley street sweeper project, the emission reduction should be revised to 75 kilograms per day rather than 100 kilograms per day.

Mr. Kross stated that the spreadsheet has been reviewed by the Street Committee. He referred to the column inquiring if the project is to expand or increase sweeping frequency, have additional local resources been committed for staff or equipment to support the project. Mr. Kross noted that there is two check marks in the no column. He inquired about the overall evaluation. Mr. Kross stated that its assumed that staff is present if the street sweeper is being replaced. Mr. Giles responded that the interpretation is correct. He added that there is supplemental information for the Committee. Mr. Kross asked if there has ever been circumstances were that the agency has not identified resources that would service the sweeper. He inquired on the evaluation process. Mr. Giles responded that in the evaluation process, this has not played a key part in the projects.

Mr. Person commented that the spreadsheet conveys a certain impression. He added that the Committee may not want to give the wrong impression once the list leaves the Committee. Mr. Person inquired if there was a way to alter that column. He stated that the column should be blank since it should only be answered if the jurisdiction is expanding or increasing the frequency. Mr. Person mentioned that “no” conveys the idea that there is no staff available to operate a sweeper. He recommended that the no column be deleted or just add everything in the yes column in order to convey the proper impression. Mr. Kross added that the column can also be foot noted to further explain. Mr. Person commented on the column inquiring if the requested sweeper satisfy a commitment by the agency in the SIP. He inquired if the agency should use the SIP that has been accepted by EPA for years or the one that was submitted and has not yet been accepted. Mr. Person suggested that there may be agencies that did not examine the distinction between the SIP and may have answered the application incorrectly. He proposed that the column be deleted from the recommendation that moves forward. Mr. Person indicated that this information has been requested in the past by the Committee but has not been well understood by the applicants; therefore, the Committee is receiving misleading information. Mr. Giles responded that MAG can continue to request the information and not provide it on the table.

Ms. Bauer stated that it is important to have the information when there are commitments in the SIP. She added that the information was for the year 2009 which is a year within the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Ms. Bauer commented that the attainment date for the Serious Area PM-10 Plan was for 2006. She indicated that the sweepers in the application appear to be for new commitments in the Five Percent Plan for PM-10 since they are for the year 2009. Ms. Knight mentioned that the cities committed to sweep with PM-10 efficient sweepers; however, this does not indicate that the commitment was to buy something other than a replacement sweeper within the SIP. She commented on the staff that are filling out the application for PM-10 street sweepers. Ms. Knight stated that there are sensitive issues in the application since the document indicates that some cities are committing to buying sweepers and other cities are not committing to buying sweepers. She added that the application states that the City of Phoenix is committing to buy a specific amount of sweepers; however, the City is just replacing the sweepers. Ms. Knight mentioned the befuddlement of the commitments that were made. She indicated that the staff who are filling out the application may not be answering the question in the way MAG staff is asking it in the application. Mr. Kross commented that a user group meet to make improvements to the application, the process and defining how the

members answer the questions. Ms. Ryall stated that the staff from the Town of Gilbert did not understand the application since many of their commitments made nebulous statements about increasing frequency. She added that from a policy perspective, buying more sweepers to be able to increase frequency is consistent with what is in the SIP; however, it may not have specifically designated that the frequency will increase on Baseline Road. Ms. Ryall indicated that the Town of Gilbert did make the commitment in the Five Percent Plan.

Ms. Knight commented on the question of the replacement sweeper. She inquired if the member agency indicating a request for a replacement sweeper stated whether it was expanding or increasing sweeping. Ms. Knight added that the City of Phoenix, Scottsdale and Chandler indicated whether they were expanding or increasing sweeping in the application. She mentioned that there could be a misinterpretation in the application on the replacement sweepers. Ms. Knight inquired if the City of Phoenix increased frequency. She added that she did not recall making a commitment that the City of Phoenix would increase frequency. Ms. Knight expressed concern about being careful in what was committed and what is being documented on the application. Ms. Bauer thanked Ms. Knight for explaining her concerns. Ms. Knight suggested that two or three members should get together for a proposal and provide the feedback to the Committee.

Mr. Berry stated that he is in favor of the recommendation before the Committee. He added that he is wondering the reason why one city is paying more than another city for a street sweeper. Mr. Berry commented on getting a better deal when buying more than two street sweepers. He mentioned that the Committee should consider in the future to have MAG purchase the street sweepers and maybe leasing or reselling them. Mr. Berry inquired if there is a way to combine the purchasing power. He indicated that MAG has purchased more than one hundred street sweepers over the years. Mr. Berry added that the Committee would get better warranties if there was a program in place that would buy 20 street sweepers a year. He moved to forward the street sweepers as proposed. Ms. Rubach seconded with an amendment to include the City of Phoenix street sweeper request. She added that the Committee would leave it up to the TRC to fund as needed. Mr. Berry accepted the amendment to the motion. Mr. Berry stated that the amended motion would be to recommend the top six street sweepers and add the one below the subtotal line which would be the City of Phoenix street sweeper project.

Mr. Person inquired if the motion is to forward the list that has seven street sweeper projects. He stated that the roll of the Committee is to rank the list and forward the ranked list. Mr. Person added that it is up to the TRC to worry about the dollars. He indicated that his vote would have been no in the last motion since the motion did not sound procedurally correct. Mr. Person mentioned that the Committee should forward the list ranked in the way the projects should be prioritized. He added that he would like the Committee to ignore the dollar amount and just rank the list. Mr. Kross agreed that the role of the Committee is to rank the list. Mr. Giles stated that the entire list will go on to the Management Committee and would be retained should there be additional regional funding that may become available. He commented on the possibility of funding the remaining street sweepers.

Mr. Kamps stated that his preference is to send the projects that the Committee deems appropriate to be funded in any of the categories. He added that the Committee is extremely head strong on how to use the monies. Mr. Kamps commented on the process. He indicated that the Committee's priority outside of MAG is to clean the air. Mr. Kamps mentioned that MAG's opportunity is to build the transportation system. He added that this is counter to the charge of the Committee which is to clean

the air. Mr. Kamps stated that the restrictions placed on the Committee hinder the ability to perform their job. He indicated that the Committee needs to send a message that the region needs to clean the air or face serious consequences on having the federal funds revoked. Mr. Kamps commented on the seriousness of the problem. Mr. Kamps mentioned that the Committee needs to send the message about the most important projects. Mr. Kross commented on the responsibility of the Committee. He stated that the Committee is to rank the list of projects that is before the Committee. Mr. Berry responded that he understood the responsibility of the Committee. He expressed gratitude towards the Committee since they work together as volunteers and give their time and expertise to MAG and other Committees. Mr. Berry stated that the role of the Committee is to advise. He added that the next group can act as they see fit with regard to the list. Mr. Berry mentioned that if the Committee provides the next group with a shorter list it will put an explanation point behind their recommendation. Mr. Berry indicated that sending forward a short list will not prevent them from considering the whole list. Mr. Kross commented on the rules that are prescribed for how the Committee conducts business and procedures for how the Committee develops motions.

Ms. Ryall commented on forwarding a recommendation that includes the additional project. She added that as a member of the TRC, she has seen recommendations from model committees and often times is hard to see how it evolves. Ms. Ryall indicated that it would help since it would be included within the staff report. She mentioned that the TRC would get the full list and would see that the Committee recommended going below to try to pick up an additional sweeper and an additional paving project with the intent to have the scope of some of those suggested to do more projects. Ms. Ryall stated that she would disagree with the recommendation. She added that the Committee should send the full list including the funding recommendation that includes the additional sweeper so that the TRC knows that the Committee's intent is to try to find a way to fund the project. Mr. Kamps inquired if the Committee gets a report on the projects that were ultimately funded. Ms. Bauer responded yes and stated that MAG staff will report on which projects get funded and whether they forwarded the Committee's recommendation to the Regional Council. Mr. Berry commented that his recollection is that the recommendations have been funded one hundred percent. Mr. Kross called for a vote on the motion, which failed.

Ms. Rubach made a motion to recommend the prioritized list as shown for the proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects and retain the prioritized list for any additional FY 2009 CMAQ funding that may become available in the close out and send a note to the TRC that the Committee would like them to consider the seventh project of that list should they be able to in the interest of cleaning the air. Mr. Berry seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Person inquired if the vote on the unpaved roads was for the full prioritized list. Mr. Kross responded yes and stated that the additional committees need to see the comprehensive list that is being submitted by the region.

6. Gila River Indian Community Air Quality Management Plan

Dan Blair, Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) presented the Gila River Indian Community Air Quality Management Plan. Mr. Blair stated that the Gila River Indian Community is made up of the Pimas and the Pii Posh tribes. He added that the Community is located in both Maricopa and Pinal County. Mr. Blair noted that this is important when talking about designations in nonattainment areas. He commented that Gila River Indian Community was established in 1859 by executive order and

consists about 374,000 acres. Mr. Blair indicated that the total population is 25,000 for the Community. Mr. Blair stated that the Gila River Indian Community has three industrial parks. He added that Logan Industrial Park is the largest park located across the Fire Byrd Race Way and South of Chandler. Mr. Blair mentioned that other area sources included 40,000 agricultural acres in production. He indicated that the Gila River Indian Community plans to increase acreage to 146,000 over the next 10 years which is made possible by the Water Rights Settlement in which the Community recently prevailed in. Mr. Blair commented that Interstate 10 is the largest source of air pollution. He added that one of the biggest issues that Gila River is facing is encroachment.

Mr. Blair presented a 100 year old picture of the Gila River. Mr. Blair commented on the Pima Irrigation Project which explained the history of the water rights and farming of the Gila River Indian Community. Mr. Blair showed recent pictures of the Gila River Indian Community and its agricultural areas. He commented on the Pima Maricopa Irrigation Project. Mr. Blair added that the project will allow the dispersal of water throughout the Community. He presented a map of the Gila River Indian Community which showed the proposed air monitoring stations, industrial sites and agricultural lands. Mr. Blair commented on encroachment and illegal dumping. He stated that there have been many complaints concerning agricultural and windblown dust from neighbors. Mr. Blair added that there has been 13 letters to the office of McCain concerning dust. He indicated that some of the fields are being put back in production as part of the water rights. Mr. Blair presented pictures of the fields in the Gila River Indian Community.

Mr. Blair stated that there are fifty industrial facilities in the Gila River Indian Community. He presented a picture of a medical waste incinerator that is no longer at the Gila River Indian Community. Mr. Blair showed a picture of an air pollution control equipment. He added that the Community drafted a tribal enforcefull ordinance which had the most stringent emissions for any medical waste incinerator in the nation. Mr. Blair indicated that the ordinance required the plant to crank down on emissions. He noted that the plant decided to terminate operations of the incinerator. Mr. Blair mentioned that the plant has also eliminated their chemotherapy and pathological waste stream. Mr. Blair presented a picture of Romac Environmental which is the largest hazardous waste storage and treatment facility. He stated that the plant has been shut down. Mr. Blair showed a picture of the air pollution control equipment for Romac which control Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) emissions. He indicated that the facility required a Ripper Part B Permit and have been operating under the Community's Interim Permit that was issued by EPA. Mr. Blair mentioned that the owner has to sign off on a permit as part of the Part B Permit Process; however, the Gila River Indian Community decided not to take that liability. He added that Romac had an incomplete permit; therefore, EPA denied a permit making the facility inoperable.

Mr. Blair commented on Pimalco Inc, a subsidiary of Alcoa Aluminum. He presented a picture of a furnace making logs of aluminum. Mr. Blair presented a picture of a 50 foot solvent tank that is within the Pimalco facility. He indicated that this facility makes aerospace parts and anything that has to do with aluminum. Mr. Blair added that Pimalco Inc is currently permitted on an EPA Title V Permit. He presented the Cemex asphalt facility. Mr. Blair mentioned that there has recently been enforcement action against Cemex. He stated that Cemex has since done a corrective action plan. Mr. Blair commented on the Community's mining operations. He added that the picture presents a pressing and screening operation. Mr. Blair noted the cone crusher which is a screening operation. He indicated that there is no emissions from this operation since the material is wet. Mr. Blair mentioned that Gila

River does a good job of controlling dust. He commented on the Monsoon Season and stated that it is a big issue to the Gila River Indian Community with respect to air quality monitoring.

Mr. Blair mentioned the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and the Tribal Implementation Plan (TIP). He stated that the plan is called the Air Quality Management Plan since there are elements in the plan which can not be approved by EPA as a TIP. Mr. Blair added that the TIP has Part I, General Provisions, Part II, Permit requirements, Title V and Non-Title V which are in the process of being separated. He indicated that Part III, Enforcement, just completed a Memorandum of Agreement for criminal enforcement, National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) and the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS). Mr. Blair commented on Part IV, Administrative Appeals and Part V, Area Source Emissions Limits which includes Open Burning and Fugitive Dust. He mentioned Part VI, Generally Applicable Individual Source Requirements which include Visible Emissions, VOC Usage Storage & Handling and Solvent Metal Cleaning. Mr. Blair noted Part VII, Source-Category Specific Emission Limits to include Secondary Aluminum processing, Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework Operation and Non-Metallic Mineral Mining. He indicated that the Community is currently working on ten permits under the Non-Metallic Mineral Mining.

Mr. Blair stated that the Community designed a monitoring network after meeting with EPA and State monitoring personnel as well as Pinal, Pima and Maricopa County to identify potential sites for the monitors. He added that three monitoring sites were identified: Sacaton, Ozone & Meteorological, TEOM; Casa Blanca, 2 co-located FRM PM-10 & TEOM; and St. John's, TEOM, Ozone & Meteorological, Toxics monitoring, and PM-2.5 Speciation. Mr. Blair commented that Gila River Indian Community submitted a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) to EPA. He noted that the QAPP has been approved by EPA. Mr. Blair mentioned that the Community is submitting air quality data to AQS on a quarterly basis. He indicated that their monitoring program is the first program to undergo a full systems audit by EPA and has been quite favorable with a couple of small findings. Mr. Blair presented a picture of the St. John's monitoring station. He stated that the air quality program has been monitoring to determine quality of ambient air at the Gila River Indian Community. Mr. Blair added that they have been comparing the Community's data to the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). He indicated that the data collected shows that the Gila River Indian Community meets the NAAQS for Ozone, PM-10, PM-2.5 and CO.

Mr. Blair presented a map of the Nonattainment Area. He stated that the Community is in attainment for CO and Ozone. Mr. Blair added that the data shows that the northern 1/3 of the Community under the PM-10 standard is in attainment. He indicated that EPA made the Gila River Indian Community a separate air quality management area for CO and Ozone. Mr. Blair mentioned that EPA will be designating Pinal County a nonattainment area under the PM-10 standard. He added that this would include 2/3 of the Gila River Indian Community that is currently in Pinal County as well as Ak-Chin. Mr. Blair commented that the Community met with EPA and the tribes to discuss issues surrounding the designation of the nonattainment area. He noted that the Community will be sending in a designation recommendation for the Gila River Indian Community. Mr. Blair stated that the Gila River Indian Community Council approved the Treatment of State Application (TAS) in November 2006. He added that the application was sent forward to EPA for approval. Mr. Blair mentioned that the Community has recently received a letter from EPA indicating that the TAS was complete and currently is in the process of being reviewed. He commented that the Community completed the Air Quality Management Program Plan (TIP) which was approved in December 2006. Mr. Blair indicated that the TIP was submitted to EPA for federal enforceability in February 2007. He mentioned that the Community has been working with EPA to complete the TAS and TIP support documents.

Mr. Blair stated that a law office letter with the boundary description and maps was required to support the TAS application. He commented on the AQMP and Title V support documents. He added that the Community has to re-think part 70.4 in the document. Mr. Blair indicated that the Community is currently working on Part 51 of the document and will subsequently address Part 70.4 of the document. He mentioned that the Fugitive Dust Controls that the Community has in effect include Fugitive Dust Producing Activities Ordinance, Non-Metallic Mineral Mining Ordinance, and Agriculture. Mr. Blair stated the Fugitive Dust Producing Activities Ordinance is similar to the Maricopa County Program since they both have an Earth Moving Permit/Dust Control Plan. He added that the difference is that Gila River Indian Community requires an Earth Moving Permit for one acre. Mr. Blair indicated that the reason behind that is that most homeowners at the Gila River Indian Community have their housing lot on an acre or more. He mentioned that the Fugitive Dust Control Plan will apply to initial development of agriculture lands and unpaved parking lots at commercial industrial facilities.

Mr. Blair stated that the Non-Metallic Mineral Mining Ordinance applies to the two mining/rock crushing operations, seven concrete batch plants, two hot mix asphalt plants, one vermiculite/perlite expansion plant and two concrete block plants. He added that the Non-Metallic Mineral Mining Ordinance is similar to Rule 316. Mr. Blair indicated that the Gila River Indian Community is currently drafting the first ten Non-Metallic Mineral Mining Ordinance Permits. He commented on Fugitive Dust Controls for Agriculture. Mr. Blair mentioned that agriculture can apply to clearing of virgin land which requires an Earth Moving Permit and Dust Control Plan. He added that the Community plans to implement low till operations, cover crops and lower speeds on farm roads. Mr. Blair commented on the water wagon. He stated that the Gila River Indian Community will continue with the permitting process and will complete the Part 70 program submittal. He indicated that the Community will do a PM-10 Designation Recommendation and begin on the Compliance Inspection Program.

Mr. Person thanked the Community and commented on the slide that indicates that Maricopa County is in nonattainment and the Gila River Indian Community in attainment. He inquired how the Community will treat that. Mr. Blair responded that the Gila River Indian Community will submit a designation recommendation for both Maricopa County Nonattainment Area and Pinal County as attainment. He noted that the monitors show that the Community is in attainment. Mr. Blair indicated that the Community will request for EPA to address the Gila River Indian Community as a separate air quality jurisdiction. Ms. Tax stated that EPA took out the Gila River Indian Community from the Phoenix area One-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan since the data did not support the Community being in the maintenance area. She added that the rules and controls in the plan would not apply because of the tribal nations. Ms. Tax indicated that the Community is not maintenance for ozone. She commented that the Gila River Indian Community did a designation recommendation for the eight-hour ozone standard indicating that they are not in nonattainment; therefore the Community is in attainment for ozone as well as for the CO Maintenance Plan. Ms. Tax added that EPA just received the request to remove them from the PM-10 nonattainment area and indicated that EPA will be evaluating the data separately. Mr. Kross thanked the Gila River Indian Community for the presentation.

7. Draft MAG Eight-Hour Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan

Taejoo Shin, MAG, presented the Draft MAG Eight-Hour Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan. He stated that the Maricopa Nonattainment Area is a Nonattainment Area for the Eight-Hour Ozone Standard of 0.08 parts per million (ppm) with the attainment date of June 15, 2009. Mr. Shin added that last year, MAG submitted the Eight-Hour Ozone Plan to EPA. He indicated that

the Plan demonstrated that the Nonattainment Area will attain the Eight-Hour Ozone standard in 2008. Mr. Shin commented that monitoring data substantiated that there have been no exceedances of the Eight-Hour Ozone Standard since 2004. He noted that MAG prepared the Eight-Hour Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan. Mr. Shin mentioned that the air quality modeling demonstration was performed to support the Eight-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan. He stated that the maintenance was demonstrated based on committed control measures which have been approved by EPA and used in the Eight-Hour Ozone Plan. Mr. Shin indicated that the CAMx model was used and evaluated for three ozone episodes: June Episode, July Episode and the August Episode. He commented that for meteorological data, MM5 meteorology was provided by Environ and was used in the maintenance modeling as the worst case meteorology. Mr. Shin mentioned that the maintenance modeling was performed with 2005 and 2025 emissions inventories. He noted that 2025 emissions were used as the baseline emissions inventory to project the future 2025 emissions.

Mr. Shin presented the air quality and meteorological modeling domains. He stated that the meteorological modeling domain was used to develop MM5 Meteorology. Mr. Shin added that the 4 kilometer (km) CAMx modeling domain includes the Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area. Mr. Shin commented that the bigger modeling domain in the slide indicates the 12km modeling domain. He mentioned that the emissions in the 12km modeling domain were used to develop the boundary condition data for the 4km modeling domain. Mr. Shin presented the emissions for the 12km modeling domain. He stated that Environ provided the Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP) emissions for 2002 and 2025. Mr. Shin added that the 2002 and 2025 WRAP emissions data were used for the modeling demonstration. He indicated that the 2002 WRAP emissions data were used for the 2005 12km emissions. Mr. Shin mentioned that MAG considered that this was a conservative assumption since WRAP data show a downward trend from 2002 through 2025. He presented the emissions for 4km modeling domain. Mr. Shin commented that VOC and NOx emissions increased by 10 percent for onroad emissions. He stated that figures for VOC emissions increased in 2025 because of the increase in area source emissions. Mr. Shin added that NOx emissions decreased because of the decrease in onroad and nonroad source emissions.

Mr. Shin presented the emission source contribution for total VOC emissions. He stated that the biogenics source emissions contributed a high proportion to total VOC emissions. Mr. Shin added that for VOC, point and area source emissions increased; however, onroad and nonroad emissions decreased in 2025. He presented the emission source contribution for total NOx emissions in 2005 and 2025. Mr. Shin mentioned that for NOx emission, onroad emissions showed the highest proportion of total NOx emissions. He added that point and area source emissions increased; however, onroad and nonroad emissions decreased in 2025. Mr. Shin presented the CAMx model performance evaluations and stated that the model performance evaluations were conducted for three episodes. He mentioned that statistical measures indicate that the model presents accurate model performance for the June episode. Mr. Shin added that the CAMx model shows under predictions for the July and August episodes. He commented on the comparison between model predictions and observations. Mr. Shin stated that the blue dotted line in the figures shows the observation data while the solid line indicates model predictions. He added that the CAMx model shows an accurate prediction for the variations of the ozone and peak ozone values for the June episode.

Mr. Shin commented that three groups considered were Maintenance Measures, Contingency Measures and Other Measures. He indicated that the emission reductions of Maintenance Measures were used in the maintenance demonstration. Mr. Shin stated that amongst the maintenance measures the Federal Nonroad Equipment Emission Standards showed the highest VOC emission deductions. He added that

the second highest maintenance measures was the Summer Fuel Reformulation which showed 0.5 percent VOC deductions. Mr. Shin mentioned that the other measures showed a small amount of VOC reductions. He commented on the emission reductions for NO_x maintenance measures. Mr. Shin indicated that the Federal Nonroad Equipment Emission Standards represented the highest NO_x reductions; however, the Summer Fuel Reformulation showed a slight increase in NO_x emissions. He stated that the Future Peak Design Value (2025) must be less than 85 ppb (0.085 ppm) in order to pass the maintenance test. Mr. Shin added that the Future Peak Design Value is calculated by multiplying the Baseline Design Value by the Relative Response Factor (RRF). He indicated that the Baseline Design Value is calculated based on the three year average of the annual 4th high daily maximum monitored ozone concentrations. Mr. Shin commented that the RRF is the ratio of the future (2025) CAMx Model Prediction to the baseline (2005) CAMx Model Prediction.

Mr. Shin presented the 2005 baseline design values for monitoring sites which were based on RRF factors. He stated that based on EPA guidance, the five year period of observation data was used to develop the 2005 baseline design value. Mr. Shin added that the three year average of the annual daily maximum ozone concentrations was calculated for the periods of 2003-2005, 2004-2006, and 2005-2007. He indicated that the three period averages were used for the 2005 Baseline Design Value. Mr. Shin indicated that 82.7 ppb of the maximum baseline design value was obtained from the North Phoenix site. Mr. Shin commented on the 2025 future design values for monitoring sites. He stated that the future design values were based on the RRF and the baseline design value. Mr. Shin added that the table shows that the Relative Response Factors for the monitoring sites and episodes were less than one. He mentioned that this indicates that the 2025 model predictions are lower than the 2005 model predictions. Mr. Shin noted that the 81 ppb for the maximum future design value was obtained from the North Phoenix monitoring site for the June episode. He added that this indicates that the maintenance was demonstrated with the 4 ppb of the safety margin.

Mr. Shin presented the supplemented technical analyses to support the major maintenance modeling demonstration. He commented that the technical analyses were conducted in the Eight-Hour Ozone Plan. Mr. Shin stated that an analysis of unmonitored areas were conducted based on the incorporated observation data to develop the baseline design value. He added that MAG obtained the 83 ppb of the maximum future design value in the unmonitored areas between the North Phoenix and Pinnacle Peak monitoring sites. Mr. Shin indicated that different maintenance tests were conducted using combinations of air quality and meteorological models. He commented that the first test was the CAMx with MM5 meteorological data which was used for the maintenance modeling demonstration. Mr. Shin mentioned that the second test was the CAMx with WRF meteorology, the third was CMAQ with MM5 meteorology and the fourth one was the CMAQ with WRF meteorology. He stated that the 81 ppb maximum was obtained for the monitoring sites using the CAMx and WRF meteorology. Mr. Shin added that for the unmonitored areas, 83 ppb was obtained from the August episode using the CAMx and MM5 meteorology. He indicated that the maintenance was demonstrated with all different air quality and meteorological models. Mr. Shin commented on the downward trend in the peak Eight-Hour Ozone design values.

Mr. Shin presented the NO_x and VOC sensitive areas to ozone. He stated that Hydrogen Peroxide and Nitric Acid concentrations are used for air quality modeling. Mr. Shin added that when the ratio is greater than 0.35 the area is considered a NO_x-sensitive area which means NO_x control is more effective; however, when the ratio is less than 0.35, the area is considered a VOC sensitive area which means that the VOC control will be more effective. He commented that the red color in the figures indicates a NO_x-sensitive area. Mr. Shin mentioned that the urban plume area is a VOC sensitive area.

He indicated that in 2025, the VOC sensitive area is reduced in comparison to 2002. Mr. Shin stated that air quality modeling indicated that the Eight-Hour Ozone standard of 85 ppb would not be violated in 2025. He added that VOC control is more effective in the urban plume area while NO_x control is more effective outside the urban plume area; however, the VOC sensitive area is shrinking in the future years. Mr. Shin commented that the contribution of onroad and nonroad sources to total anthropogenic emissions will decrease in 2025 due to more stringent federal emissions standards and emission control technologies. He indicated that the downward trend in the Eight-Hour Ozone concentrations is occurring as a result of the implementation of numerous federal, state, county, and local government measures. Mr. Shin acknowledged Maricopa County and Pinal County Air Quality Departments for providing the point and area source emissions and advice on predicting future emissions. He thanked the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Arizona Department of Transportation, and the Arizona Department of Weight and Measures for the information on running the models. Mr. Shin acknowledged EPA for providing modeling guidance for the maintenance modeling demonstration and Environ for providing the 12 emissions.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired if the modeling demonstration was for the 8 hour or 24 hour plan. Mr. Shin responded that this was for the Eight-Hour Ozone. Mr. O'Donnell inquired if the implication is that the region cannot meet the standard for 2025. Mr. Shin replied that the maintenance cannot be shown using the current emission inventory and current EPA guidance. He mentioned there is a difference in EPA's guidance for the One-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan and the Eight-Hour Ozone Plan. Mr. Shin added that the baseline design value critically affected the maintenance of the Eight-Hour Ozone standard. Mr. O'Donnell inquired when the new standard will come into effect. Ms. Tax responded that the standard is currently in effect. She added that EPA will be receiving recommendations from the state as to where the Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area should be under the new standard in March 2009. Ms. Tax indicated the EPA will make designations in March of 2010 and SIPS will be requested in 2013.

Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company inquired if the Maintenance Plan was approved by EPA. Ms. Bauer responded that the Eight-Hour Maintenance Plan presented was just a draft and will have to be taken through the public hearing process. She mentioned that the draft will come back to the Committee for recommendation and will hopefully get an approval from Regional Council by February. Ms. Bauer added that if approved, the plan will be sent to EPA. She indicated that ozone standards stay with the region until they are met. Ms. Bauer commented that EPA encouraged MAG to prepare the maintenance plan and subsequently have MAG work on the 0.075 standard. Mr. Hajduk inquired if the region is making sure that the maintenance plan of the old standard is met and then move forward with the 0.075 standard as it gets redesignated and the new ozone area gets defined. Ms. Bauer responded yes.

Mr. Hajduk commented on previous modeling that indicated that decreased NO_x will not show a benefit and would actually increase ozone. He inquired how this was identified in the plan. Mr. Hajduk inquired if there was a point in time within the analysis where is actually not true. Mr. Shin commented on the VOC sensitive and NO_x-sensitive area and responded that the plume area is a VOC sensitive area; however, the other major peak area is a NO_x-sensitive area. He added that in the future, VOC sensitive areas will gradually decrease. Mr. Hajduk inquired if 2025 would show that decreasing NO_x will be a benefit. Mr. Shin replied that VOC emissions will be more effective in the urban plume area. He added that the NO_x control will be more effective outside the urban plume area. Mr. Hajduk inquired if NO_x control is based on the maintenance plan. Mr. Shin responded that is correct. Mr. Hajduk inquired if the NO_x controls identified in the Maintenance Plan will be more effective in 2025

than it is now. Mr. Shin responded that NOx controls are more effective because the urban plume area is getting smaller; however this conclusion can not be applied for all areas since it depends on the area. He added that modeling results show that VOC controls are more effective in the urban plume area. Mr. Shin indicated that based on modeling results, MAG cannot conclude that NOx controls or VOC controls are more effective. Mr. Hajduk inquired if the statement was true in the urban plume area. Mr. Shin responded yes.

8. Tentative 2009 Meeting Schedule for the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

Ms. Bauer stated that MAG has provided the tentative 2009 schedule for the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. She added that the schedule will be sent again in January.

9. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Kross announced that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for January 29, 2009 at 1:30 p.m. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.