

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

Thursday, June 19, 2003
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

*Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman
*Avondale: Michael Powell
Chandler: Jim Weiss
*Gilbert: Tami Ryall
*Glendale: Doug Kukino
Mesa: Christine Zielonka
Phoenix: Gaye Knight
Scottsdale: Larry Person
*Surprise: Jerry Huston
Tempe: Oddvar Tveit for Tom Moore
*Citizen Representative: Walter Bouchard
*Arizona Lung Association: David Feuerherd
Salt River Project: Chris Janick
Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell
Arizona Public Service Company: Jim Mikula
#Western States Petroleum Association: Gina Grey
*Valley Metro: Bryan Jungwirth
Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry
*Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish
Arizona Rock Products Association: Steve Trussell
for Rusty Bowers
*Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Michelle Rill

Associated General Contractors: Amanda McGennis
*Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona:
Connie Wilhelm-Garcia
*American Institute of Architects - Central Arizona:
Stephen J. Andros
Valley Forward: Peter Allard
University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension:
Patrick Clay
Arizona Department of Transportation: Pat Cupell
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality:
Peter Hyde
Maricopa County Environmental Services
Department: Ben Davis for Jo Crumbaker
*Arizona Department of Weights and Measures:
Duane Yantorno
Federal Highway Administration: Dennis Mittelstedt
*Arizona State University: Judi Nelson
*Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:
B. Bobby Ramirez
Citizen Representative: David Rueckert

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments
Julie Kicksey, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Scott DiBiase, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Roger Roy, Maricopa Association of Governments
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
Ruey-in Chiou, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration
Carroll Reynolds, Town of Buckeye
Tami Stowe, House of Representatives

Jean Parkinson, Pinal County Air Quality Control
District
Susie Stevens, Stevens & Stevens, P.C.
Kelly McMullen, Maricopa County Department of
Transportation
Scott Bouchie, City of Mesa
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Robert Wilson, Central Arizona Association of
Governments
Mike Sundblom, Arizona Department of
Environmental Quality
Blue Crowley, Citizen

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on June 19, 2003. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, Acting Chairman, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:50 p.m. Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Approval of the May 27, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the May 27, 2003 meeting. Pat Cupell, Arizona Department of Transportation, requested a correction to the minutes under agenda item #5, Blue Skies Training Program, to indicate the program is still being implemented. Christine Zielonka, City of Mesa, moved and Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, seconded and the motion to approve the May 27, 2003 meeting minutes as corrected carried unanimously.

3. 8-Hour Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area Boundaries

Peter Hyde, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, gave a presentation on eight-hour ozone boundary options developed by ADEQ. Mr. Hyde acknowledged the hard work Gary Neuroth, ADEQ, and Jana Hutchins, Arizona State University, put into developing the boundary options. He indicated that the presentation will be a condensed version of the one given at the ADEQ stakeholder meeting; however, the slide printout distributed to the Committee represents the entire presentation provided at the June 17, 2003 stakeholder meeting.

Mr. Hyde discussed the ozone monitoring network. He mentioned that nearly three-quarters of the ozone monitors are operated by Maricopa County Environmental Services Department. He added that the network has been expanding into Pinal County and the Indian Communities. Mr. Hyde displayed the eight-hour ozone concentrations from 1995-2002. He indicated that if 1995 and 1996 were removed, there would be a flat trend in ozone concentrations.

Mr. Hyde provided a map illustrating four study zones in the national forest land, northeast of the metropolitan area. He indicated that these zones were analyzed based on ozone concentrations of 80 and 85 parts per billion (ppb). Socioeconomic data was also used in developing the boundary options. Mr. Hyde presented the location of current residential, platted subdivisions, and zoned residential areas in the region. He also presented a map showing the change in traffic volumes projected in Pinal County for 2005-2020. In addition, ADEQ analyzed the relationship between VOC emission densities and population. Mr. Hyde provided a map of the emission source area, which is where the emission source precursors are located.

Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, asked if the source area is representative of growth for the future, or the present. Mr. Hyde responded that the source area includes current residential as well as platted subdivisions, which do extend into the future. Mr. Berry inquired about the meaning of platted subdivisions. Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, indicated that the platted subdivisions are subdivisions that have already been approved. She added that the platted subdivisions in the ADEQ presentation were derived from the MAG database and that a significant amount of the subdivisions extend past the year 2020. Mr. Hyde affirmed that some of the blue areas or platted subdivisions may not begin for fifteen years. Mr. Berry asked if controls

on the sources are reflected in the analysis. Mr. Hyde replied that the controls were not reflected. He indicated that the analysis is not quantifying emission changes. The source area maps the spatial distribution of people.

Mr. Hyde continued by mentioning that there are two aspects of the ADEQ analysis: the location of emissions, and the location of ozone concentrations. The ADEQ analysis produced two boundary options. Mr. Hyde indicated that Option-80 ppb is based on the 80 ppb design criteria. Using townships, ranges, and sections, Option-80 ppb extends down to Florence, includes Wickenburg, and encompasses portions of Yavapai and Gila Counties. Mr. Hyde added that Indian Communities are excluded from the designations. The second boundary being proposed is Option-85 ppb. This option also includes Florence and extends into Yavapai and Gila Counties; however, there is a smaller area of Yavapai County included in Option-85 ppb.

Mr. Hyde indicated that ADEQ is soliciting written comments until June 24, 2003. He added that the nature of the recommendation is unknown at this time. Mr. Hyde mentioned that he would like to incorporate the ideas of MAG and Pinal County and have ADEQ indicate which option is preferred, but submit all of the options to the Governor. Mr. Hyde indicated ADEQ would be working on a technical report. Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, mentioned that, based on earlier presentations, he thought the region would maintain the one-hour boundary. Mr. Hyde responded that the latest boundary options are larger due to more data being used in the analysis. He mentioned that the ADEQ analysis looked at the relationship between ozone concentrations and altitude and therefore identified Tonto National Monument, which had a fourth highest concentration of 87 ppb last year. The air quality argument is based on topographical data.

Mr. Berry inquired about the process and Mr. Hyde's suggestion of incorporating the MAG approach. He asked for clarification on what would be sent to the Governor. Mr. Hyde replied that ADEQ is obligated to choose between Option-80 ppb and Option-85 ppb. He added that Pinal County has indicated support of the MAG option; therefore, the ADEQ option, and the MAG option would be sent to the Governor. Mr. Berry clarified that ADEQ would submit one recommendation so there would be a couple of options for the Governor to choose from. Mr. Hyde indicated that he personally would like to see both maps go to the Governor.

Mr. Berry inquired about the difference between the two ADEQ boundary options for the western area of Maricopa County. Mr. Hyde responded that there is only a slight difference in the two options for the western area. Mr. Berry asked if the power plants will be in the nonattainment area. Mr. Hyde indicated that the western boundary of the nonattainment area should include power plants; however, there would be no present day control implications. Mr. Berry inquired if Gila Bend is included in the boundary options. Mr. Hyde replied that Gila Bend is not included in the boundaries.

Jean Parkinson, Pinal County Air Quality Control District, mentioned that during Mr. Hyde's presentation, June 24, 2003 was given as the end of the comment period. However, at the June 17, 2003 ADEQ stakeholder meeting, June 23, 2003 was given as the deadline. Mr. Hyde replied that June 23, 2003 is the correct date. David Rueckert, Citizen Representative, inquired about extending the comment period. Mr. Hyde indicated that in the short-term, the comment period cannot be extended. However, EPA will not be making final designations until April 2004 and the State is encouraged to submit 2003 data by December of this year. Therefore, EPA will be taking

additional comments until January or February of 2004. Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, confirmed that the State is strongly encouraged to submit 2003 data to EPA. Mr. Rueckert expressed concern about the sparse monitoring data in the rural areas and the projections used by ADEQ for future population. He asked if the State is required to extend the analysis through 2020 and implications of the boundary. Mr. Hyde responded that the requirements do not include vehicle inspection/maintenance, and new source review regulations would not be as rigorous.

Mr. Berry asked if a plan needs to be submitted once the region is designated nonattainment. Mr. Hyde replied that the plan may be due by 2007. Mr. Berry inquired about additional control measures in the plan. Mr. Hyde responded that there are federal mandates that accompany area designations. Also, larger areas could face more local controls. Mr. Berry commented that areas receiving the emissions, not contributing, would be subject to the controls. He also inquired about the nitrogen oxides (NO_x) waiver. Mr. Hyde indicated that the NO_x waiver under the one-hour ozone standard does not apply to the new eight-hour standard as addressed in the proposed rulemaking.

Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, commented that EPA is presuming that the nonattainment area be the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and that the State needs to provide evidence that the boundary should be different. Mr. Hyde replied that was correct. Ms. Knight asked if EPA might think that all four counties included in the ADEQ options should represent the MSA and therefore be the nonattainment area. Mr. Hyde responded that is possible. He added that the State needs to convince EPA that the MSA is inappropriate. Ms. Knight inquired about how the State plans on putting together a plan in four counties. Mr. Hyde responded that a coalition of agencies will be needed to represent a wider extent of the nonattainment area. Ms. Knight asked how the funds will be distributed and that having the boundary in four different counties seems challenging.

Mr. Cupell expressed concern about the possibility of the MAG option not being approved, and the MSA becoming the nonattainment area. He indicated that EPA is taking a hard stance on this issue, and if the recommendation is a small boundary, the justification needs to be strong. Mr. Cupell added that this is a major concern for ADOT. Mr. Berry commented that the MSA may be the lesser of two evils since it only includes two counties, not four. Mr. Berry indicated that he liked the plan MAG put forward and inquired if the opinion of MAG has changed. He also asked if any members of the Legislature have been briefed on the issue. Mr. Hyde responded that he was not aware of any briefing. Mr. Berry suggested that a courtesy call be placed to the Legislature. Mr. Person thanked Mr. Hyde for his presentation.

Ms. Arthur gave an update on the MAG option for an eight-hour ozone standard nonattainment area boundary. She referred to a map in the presentation by Mr. Hyde and pointed out that Area A very well captures the emission sources. Ms. Arthur indicated that the MAG approach on the area designations has not changed. She mentioned that MAG's boundary option was presented at the ADEQ stakeholder meeting on June 17, 2003. The MAG approach is slightly different than the ADEQ approach in that the focus is on the source area, not the receptor area. Ms. Arthur indicated that the MSA is approximately equal in size to three eastern states: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. The MAG boundary option expands the area used for the one-hour ozone standard boundary to include the Humboldt Mountain and Blue Point monitors. Violations that occur in northeastern Maricopa County are due to transport from the urbanized area. She indicated that all

monitors violating the eight-hour ozone standard during the 2000-2002 period, as well as the exceedances this year, are within the MAG boundary option. Ms. Arthur provided a table and map illustrating that most of the current and future population will occur within the boundary option.

Ms. Parkinson mentioned that Pinal County population estimates include the prison population. Ms. Arthur clarified that people living in group quarters are included in the population estimates. She continued by indicating that nearly all of the current employment is also within the boundary option. In addition, the majority of traffic congestion through 2020 will occur within the boundary option. Ms. Parkinson asked if improvements to Highway 85 will change the traffic volume projections. Ms. Arthur responded that planned highway improvements are already included in the traffic projections. She indicated that Area A controls and Tier 2 light duty vehicle and heavy duty vehicle controls and sulfur fuels will reduce emissions outside the boundary option. Therefore, expanding the boundary would have minimal marginal effect in reducing emissions in the MSA. A timeline was displayed for area designations.

Ms. Arthur expressed some concerns on the ADEQ boundary options. She indicated that documentation on the ADEQ boundary options should be provided. Also, the ADEQ boundaries seem excessively large given the extent of the problem. In addition, Ms. Arthur mentioned the increased risks for transportation conformity by extending the nonattainment boundary into four counties and that the conformity tests for the eight-hour ozone standard are unknown.

Mr. Cupell asked if the primary and secondary standards are addressed in the analysis. Ms. Arthur responded that the value is identical for both standards and if the sources in the nonattainment area are controlled, the primary and secondary standards will be met. She indicated that a larger nonattainment area would encompass transported emissions from California and biogenics, which cannot be controlled. Ms. Bauer mentioned that the Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG) Regional Council plans to pass a resolution in support of the MAG boundary option.

Ben Davis, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, inquired about the depth of the MAG analysis in terms of meteorology and topography. Ms. Arthur responded that the prevailing southwest wind transports urban emissions into northeastern Maricopa County and that the mountain ranges impact transport. Ruy-in Chiou, Maricopa Association of Governments, referred to the transition winds in the ADEQ presentation. She indicated that there are two time periods for transition. In the morning, the winds go upslope, and 3-4 hours later the winds turn back. Ms. Chiou added that the receptor areas seem too far since there is no scientific basis to support the distance of transport in the ADEQ options.

Mr. Rueckert inquired about the sites violating the eight-hour ozone standard this year. Ms. Arthur replied that Blue Point, Cave Creek, Glendale, Humboldt Mountain, Maryvale, North Phoenix, Pinnacle Peak, and South Scottsdale monitors exceeded the eight-hour ozone standard in 2003.

Mr. Person recognized public comment from Blue Crowley, Citizen, who commented on the number of ozone alert days already this year, the transportation plan, and expansion of freeways and HOV lanes. He commented that whether the boundary is to be big or small, the plan should be done right. In addition Mr. Crowley mentioned that high ozone concentrations southwest of the urban area are

not being considered, that business non-mobile sources need to be addressed, and that it is a privilege to drive, and it is a right to breathe. Mr. Person thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation, asked how the “location and emission sources” factor, set forth in the EPA guidance, justifies the smaller boundary option. She indicated that it did not appear that MAG followed the guidance to establish the boundary option. Ms. Bauer responded that EPA released a memo on March 28, 2000 addressing key factors in recommending area designations. She indicated that the MAG analysis started with data for the MSA. Then MAG looked at the current one-hour ozone boundary and found that growth will not be expanding much outside the boundary. However, northeastern Maricopa County did not meet the new eight-hour ozone standard and had to be included in the boundary option.

Ms. Chenausky asked why the Tonto National Monument monitor was not included when it is violating, but Blue Point is included and is not violating. Ms. Bauer replied that the Blue Point monitor is immediately adjacent to the boundary and, based on EPA guidance, the region may only have three years to attain. Ms. Arthur added that EPA guidance indicates monitors with violations of the standard, which is a three year average of the fourth highest ozone concentration, must be included in the nonattainment area. The Tonto National Monument monitor does not have three years of monitor data. She added that if the emission sources inside the boundary are controlled, the Tonto National Monument monitor will not violate.

Mr. Person recalled that at the May 27, 2003 meeting, the Committee requested to delay making a recommendation until the June 19, 2003 meeting, when the ADEQ eight-hour ozone area boundary options were available. He asked for a motion. Ms. Zielonka made a motion to adopt the MAG boundary as proposed, and strongly recommend that the MAG boundary option be sent to the Governor absent the ADEQ boundaries. Mr. Rueckert seconded the motion. Mr. O’Donnell requested that the minutes reflect the Committee strongly recommending the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Cupell, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Hyde voting no, and Chris Janick, Salt River Project, abstaining.

Mr. Berry asked if comments sent to ADEQ on this issue will be filed. Ms. Bauer, indicated that CAAG will be submitting their resolution to ADEQ. Mr. Berry inquired if the boundaries will be presented to the MAG Executive Committee. Ms. Bauer responded that the Executive Committee has already met this month and has been briefed on this issue. Mr. Berry asked if calling a meeting of the Executive Committee would assist in strengthening the comments. Ms. Bauer said she would ask for direction on that issue.

Mr. Berry inquired if ADEQ will be providing responses to public comments and if the Committee will be notified of what is sent to the Governor. Mr. Hyde responded that the Committee will be informed. He added that ADEQ will have a final technical report to take to the Governor, and will let the Committee know what is being submitted.

Mr. O’Donnell recognized the knowledgeable staff that ADEQ had working on the eight-hour ozone area designations. He inquired about the level of communication between ADEQ staff members on the analysis as it was being developed. Mr. Hyde responded that ADEQ staff worked together on

the analysis; however, he did not see the final results until the day before the ADEQ stakeholder meeting.

Ms. Zielonka commented on the awkwardness of the situation. She requested that MAG and ADEQ work cooperatively on the issue. Ms. Bauer replied that she agrees with Ms. Zielonka and that MAG and ADEQ need to work together. She indicated that the initial thinking of the MAG boundary option was presented to ADEQ on May 1, 2003. In return, ADEQ shared their boundary options with MAG on June 17, 2003, before the ADEQ stakeholder meeting. She noted MAG sent the "Preliminary Draft of the Initial Analysis for an Eight-Hour Ozone Boundary Option for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area" on June 2, 2003 to ADEQ, ADOT, Pinal County, CAAG, and Apache Junction. Ms. Bauer thanked Mr. Hyde for allowing MAG to present at the ADEQ stakeholder meeting and for being a team player.

4. Phoenix Area Visibility Index

Mike Sundblom, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, provided the Committee with an overview of the Phoenix Area Visibility Index. In 2001, the Governor's Brown Cloud Summit recommended a daily visibility index for the metropolitan area as defined through a public survey. House Bill 2538 required ADEQ to establish a daily visibility index by December 31, 2003. A Visibility Index Oversight Committee was established to assist ADEQ in carrying out the responsibilities set forth in HB 2538. Mr. Sundblom mentioned that the Committee was asked to provide advice to ADEQ. The Committee's charge included the review of the consultant's proposal for conducting the visibility survey, utilizing the survey to develop a visibility index recommendation, and presenting the visibility index recommendation to the Cap and Trade Oversight Committee. The Committee's charge also required the index to be presented to the public with ADEQ at a media event. Mr. Sundblom indicated that the field survey was conducted in July 2002 by BBC Research and Consulting. Twenty-seven sessions were conducted and a total of 385 participants were recruited to represent demographics from four areas of the Valley.

Mr. Sundblom mentioned that the Field Survey consisted of three components. The first component captured the ratings of the level of visual air quality, based on a seven-point scale. The second component asked the participants to indicate if the visible air quality in the slide was acceptable or unacceptable. Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate the number of days in which a given level of visible air quality would be acceptable. Mr. Sundblom added that eleven meetings of the Committee were held, the first being in May 2002. The Committee's visibility index recommendation was presented to the ADEQ Director in April 2003.

Mr. Sundblom indicated that there are four components of the Visibility Index. The first component, index categories, uses a scale from very poor to excellent. Averaging methodology is the second component, which is based on a four-hour rolling average. The statistic for the reporting period is the highest daily average deciview value, measured during daylight hours. The final component of the Index is the environmental goal. The goal is to show continued progress through the year 2018. Also, progress assessment will be conducted every five years.

Mr. Rueckert asked if the Committee has received any data from the Visibility Index Oversight Committee. Mr. Sundblom responded that Air Resource Specialist models take a clear image and

apply various levels of haze. Ms. Knight inquired about where the pictures are located. Mr. Sundblom replied that the pictures will be available on the website, but a slide show could be arranged.

Mr. Rueckert asked if images that are computer generated can be compared against modeling. Ms. Bauer inquired if ADEQ has visibility monitors. Mr. Sundblom responded that ADEQ does have visibility monitors and more are being added. Ms. Arthur asked if information is available online. Mr. Sundblom indicated that the website is still in the development stage. Ms. Arthur asked when it will be available. Mr. Sundblom responded possibly this Fall.

5. Call to the Public

Ms. Knight announced that the Cap and Trade Oversight Committee voted that an emissions cap and trade program cannot be used for visibility. She indicated that point sources already have controls and that capping sources such as lawnmowers would not be feasible.

Dennis Mittelstedt, Federal Highway Administration, announced his retirement and expressed appreciation to the Committee. Mr. Person thanked Mr. Mittelstedt and added that he will be missed. Ms. Bauer mentioned that Mr. Mittelstedt was great to work with and that the Federal Highway Administration has given MAG a lot of support.

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. No comments were presented.

6. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Person announced that the next meeting of the Committee is tentatively scheduled for July 31, 2003. Ms. Knight requested an update on the designation of the nonattainment boundary for the eight-hour ozone standard.