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

Thursday, September 18, 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: Scott Bouchie for Christine Zielonka
Phoenix: Gaye Knight
#Scottsdale: Larry Person
*Surprise: Jerry Huston
Tempe: Oddvar Tveit for Tom Moore
Citizen Representative: Bill Pfeifer for 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: Mark Wheaton for Pat Cupell
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Peter Hyde
Maricopa County Environmental Services Department: Bob Downing for Jo Crumbaker
Arizona Department of Weights and Measures: Duane Yantorno
Federal Highway Administration: Ed Stillings for Dennis Mittelstedt
Arizona State University: Judi Nelson
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Stan Belone for 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
Roger Roy, Maricopa Association of Governments
Ruey-in Chiou, Maricopa Association of Governments
Carroll Reynolds, Town of Buckeye
Jean Parkinson, Pinal County Air Quality Control District
#Susie Stevens, Stevens & Stevens, P.C.
Carolyn Novak, Stevens & Stevens, P.C.
Kelly McMullen, Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Theresa Pella, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Cathy Jordan, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Dianne Barker, Citizen

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on September 18, 2003. Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:40 p.m. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, and Susie Stevens, Stevens & Stevens, P.C., attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

2. Approval of the June 19, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the June 19, 2003 meeting. Mark Wheaton, Arizona Department of Transportation, requested a correction to the minutes under agenda item #3, 8-Hour Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area Boundaries, to clarify that Mr. Cupell was concerned about the possibility of the MAG option not being approved, and the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) becoming the nonattainment area. Duane Yantorno, Arizona Department of Weights and Measures, moved and Brian O'Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, seconded and the motion to approve the June 19, 2003 meeting minutes as corrected carried unanimously.

3. Eight-Hour Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area Boundary

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided the Committee with an update on the Eight-Hour Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area Boundary. She indicated that Governor Napolitano submitted a recommendation to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on July 11, 2003. On August 22, 2003, the Chair of the MAG Regional Council sent a letter to EPA in support of the Governor's recommendation. Ms. Bauer displayed a map of the recommendation and indicated that only portions of Maricopa County are included. The Governor's recommended boundary is larger than the boundary option presented by MAG, and smaller than the ADEQ boundaries. The Governor's recommendation is 4,710 square miles and includes the growth in western Maricopa County as well as the power plants. A letter was sent to the Governor expressing appreciation for the consideration of the recommendations made by the MAG Regional Council. Ms. Bauer presented an Eight-Hour Ozone Boundary timeline. She mentioned that the plan will probably be due to EPA by April/May 2007 with a likely attainment date of 2007 or 2009.

Ms. Bauer stated that, based on preliminary monitoring data for the 2003 ozone season, the North Phoenix and Humboldt Mountain monitors will likely violate the standard. She mentioned that this is an improvement from last year when three monitors were violating. Ms. Bauer indicated that concentrations have slightly increased, but are still within 0.005 parts per million (ppm) of the standard. The *Federal Register* notice dated June 2, 2003 states that ozone concentrations slightly over the standard (within 0.005 ppm) will likely attain the standard without additional controls due to federal measures such as the Tier II motor vehicle tailpipe standards. Ms. Bauer indicated that for 2000-2002, violations were only 0.001 ppm over the standard, which is within the 0.005 ppm range mentioned in the *Federal Register*.

Theresa Pella, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, provided the Committee with an update on the process to designate nonattainment area boundaries for the eight-hour ozone standard. She mentioned that in August 2003, EPA Region IX presented the Governor's recommendation to EPA Headquarters. Ms. Pella added that there was no mention of designating the MSA as the nonattainment area. However, EPA has requested additional research on the potential growth in the

Pinal County portion of Area A to determine whether it should be included in the nonattainment area. Pinal County and ADEQ are working together on the issue. Mr. Cleveland asked for a description of the Pinal County portion of Area A for those participating via telephone conference call. Ms. Pella stated that the Area A boundary extends a little further into Pinal County than Apache Junction. Mr. Cleveland thanked Ms. Pella for her presentation.

4. Adequacy Finding for the Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets in the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan

Ms. Bauer gave a report on the adequacy finding for the motor vehicle emission budgets in the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan. She stated that on September 9, 2003, EPA made an adequacy finding for the motor vehicle emission budgets in the MAG Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area. These budgets are now required to be used in the conformity analysis for the upcoming Regional Transportation Plan. She mentioned the changes in socioeconomic data, transportation networks, transportation and air quality models, and air quality budgets. Ms. Bauer indicated that these changes will make the conformity analysis challenging, but MAG has been preparing for nearly a year. She mentioned that the conformity analysis will be available on October 23, 2003 followed by a public hearing on the conformity analysis on November 21, 2003. She noted that a special Committee meeting may be necessary on November 24, 2003.

5. Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan

Ruey-in Chiou, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided the Committee with a status report on the MAG Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for the One-Hour Standard. She listed the core elements established by EPA for approval of maintenance plans and mentioned that the Modeling Protocol was prepared and reviewed by the Planning Team in May 2002. The modeling was conducted using MOBILE6, M6Link, and UAM and includes the episode days July 17, 1998 and August 24, 1999. Ms. Chiou presented a map of the ozone modeling domain as well as the monitoring sites.

Ms. Chiou stated that the maintenance plan modeling demonstrates that the one-hour ozone standard will be met through 2015. In addition, a 2006 intermediate conformity budget was established. She highlighted the assumptions and methodologies used in the ozone modeling. Ms. Chiou presented emission inventories for nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) on the two episode days. Time-series plots, scatter plots, and ground level ozone contour plots were also presented.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired about the nonroad mobile source category for NOx in the 1998 and 1999 emission inventories. Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, indicated that most nonroad emissions are from construction equipment. Mr. O'Donnell commented that new diesel equipment used in the construction industry have less emissions. Mr. Yantorno asked if sources such as aircraft and locomotives were considered. Ms. Chiou replied that estimates of aircraft and locomotive emissions are included in the Ozone Maintenance Plan.

Mr. Cleveland asked if the conclusion of MAG staff is that the modeling results and the observations are close enough to be validated. Ms. Chiou responded that certain requirements need to be met

before a validation can be determined. Ms. Chiou presented the statistical measures that demonstrate accuracy of the model. All statistical measures were within EPA's recommended range.

Ms. Chiou listed ten committed control measures and four contingency measures included in the maintenance plan. Mr. O'Donnell inquired about offroad vehicle standards. Mr. Chiou responded that she was uncertain; however, all control measures provide a benefit.

Mr. Berry referred to the NOx emission inventories. He indicated that the NOx emission totals in July 1998 were 243 metric tons per day (mtpd), and 226 mtpd in July 2015. Mr. Berry stated that there is only a slight overall reduction; however, individual categories, including point sources, had more significant changes. Mr. Berry stated that the strides made by one source category are absorbed by the others, resulting in little progress. Mr. Cleveland asked what should be done. Mr. Berry responded that each source category should be looked at closely.

Mr. Berry inquired about the need for a NOx budget. Mr. O'Donnell asked if the NOx exemption is still needed. Ms. Bauer replied that the Tier II motor vehicle tailpipe standards, which are built into the MOBILE6 model, result in huge reductions in NOx. Mr. Berry asked if the small change in NOx could have an inverse effect on ozone. He inquired about holding VOC and NOx constant. Ms. Chiou referred to a graph showing ozone responses to NOx/VOC reductions. She stated that the graph illustrates instances of holding one or both variables constant.

Mr. Berry inquired about the NOx waiver. Ms. Bauer replied that the nonattainment area is classified serious for the one-hour ozone standard. She indicated that the huge reductions occurring due to Tier II motor vehicle tailpipe standards are causing a change in NOx sensitivity to the formation of ozone. Ms. Bauer stated that the current NOx waiver does not apply for the eight-hour ozone standard, therefore a state must reapply to EPA for a waiver. She added that the NOx wavier is still in effect for the nonattainment area. In the future, it may no longer be needed.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired about the impact of the NOx waiver on power plants. Peter Hyde, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, responded that all existing and proposed power plants must go through rigorous permitting and meet Best Available Control Technology. He added that he is unable to think of a situation where an existing power plant would be ordered to reduce their emissions certified by a permit. Mr. Hyde asked which year is represented by the data in the Ozone Responses to NOx/VOC Reductions graph. Ms. Chiou replied that the graph represents 2015.

Mr. Berry stated that the question arises as to what the policy should be on how other source categories contribute to reducing emissions. Mr. Cleveland asked who should address the policy question. Mr. Berrry responded the Legislature or MAG, but someone should think about it. Mr. Cleveland asked MAG staff to research the issue. Ms. Bauer clarified that the issue presented by Mr. Berry is that there have been huge reductions in mobile source emissions and that the focus should be on all sources to make sure each contributes to further reductions. Mr. Berry responded that is correct.

Mr. Berry inquired about the 2006 NOx budget. Ms. Chiou replied that a budget is set for only onroad mobile sources, not the total. Mr. Berry asked why the budget is set at 53.6 mtpd and not higher to allow for a little room. Ms. Bauer responded that she understands his concerns and mentioned the relationship between VOC and NOx and transportation. Mr. Berry commented that

if other sources reduced emissions by 30 tons, it could result in a larger budget for motor vehicle emissions. Mr. Cleveland asked what the schedule is for having to use the budgets as described. Ms. Bauer responded that assuming the plan is submitted in December, EPA will then have 90 days to find the budgets adequate. In addition, the budget will be used for the next conformity analysis. Mr. Cleveland inquired if it is possible to reallocate some responsibility to other sources before the plan is submitted. Ms. Bauer responded that in preparing the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and the Ozone Maintenance Plan, a determination is made if the existing measures are sufficient to maintain the standard. If not, additional control measures may be added to the plan. She mentioned that the Ozone Maintenance Plan has to be available for review in October. The Ozone Maintenance Plan was scheduled so that the region will be redesignated to attainment for the one-hour ozone standard before being designated a nonattainment area for the eight-hour ozone standard.

Mr. Berry commented on the fact that the savings are not being reflected, but instead consumed by other sources. He indicated that the source making the most progress is the one with the budget. Mr. Berry stated that if the budget is exceeded, mobile sources will suffer the consequences. He suggested that every category have a budget. Ms. Bauer responded that perhaps this issue should be further discussed when addressing the eight-hour ozone standard. Mr. Cleveland commented that a creative approach may be needed.

Mr. Berry inquired about new power plants. Mr. O'Donnell asked about the diesel standards. Mr. Berry replied that the standard will result in a 90 percent reduction by 2010. Mr. O'Donnell inquired about the turn around for diesel equipment. Mr. Berry responded that the average life span is 10-15 years. Mr. O'Donnell asked if the standard can be met with new engines. Mr. Berry replied yes, based upon modeling that has been conducted.

Ms. Chiou concluded her presentation and provided a tentative schedule for the Ozone Maintenance Plan. Mr. Hyde inquired about the control strategies for fuel in 1998 and 1999. He commented that there was no downward trend and that in 1998, the region already had reformulated fuel. He also asked about the change in biogenics from year to year. Ms. Chiou responded that budget emissions are sensitive to land use type and that the 2015 numbers are based on 2020 land use data. Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, asked if the assumption is that homes are replacing desert. Ms. Chiou responded that was correct.

Mr. Hyde inquired about peak ozone concentrations. Mr. Cleveland requested that any further questions for Ms. Chiou on modeling be continued after the meeting.

6. Salt River Monitoring Site Study Update

Ms. Pella provided the Committee with an update on the Salt River Monitoring Site Study. She indicated that on July 2, 2002, EPA found the Salt River Monitoring Area inadequate to attain the 24-hour PM-10 standard and that Arizona has until February 2, 2004 to correct the inadequacy. If Arizona fails to submit the required State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision, an 18-month sanction clock begins, along with a two-year Federal Implementation Plan clock. Ms. Pella stated that the SIP revision requires clean data from January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2006. Arizona is also required to provide for implementation of Best Available Control Measures (BACM) for all source categories significantly contributing to site exceedances. In addition, Arizona needs to provide for

expeditious Most Stringent Measures (MSM) implementation. Ms. Pella indicated that any new BACM or MSM controls that are adopted to demonstrate attainment at the Salt River site will also have to be applied to similar sources throughout the PM-10 nonattainment area.

Mr. Cleveland inquired about 2004 data. Ms. Pella responded that there has already been an exceedance in 2003 so clean data is required for 2004-2006 in order to attain the standard by December 31, 2006. Mr. Berry suggested having PM-10 alert days that are similar to ozone alert days. He asked which agency issues the alerts. Ms. Pella responded that RPTA does the summer ozone campaign and, previously, Maricopa County did the winter forecast. Mr. Berry commented on the different audiences for PM-10 and ozone. He suggested targeting the construction industry and having enforcement on dusty days.

Mr. Cleveland asked what happens if there is an exceedance. Ms. Pella replied that the classification is already "Serious" and that the consequence of an exceedance would be five percent reductions in PM-10 each year.

Mr. Cleveland commented that more education and communication may be necessary. Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors, recommended the development of public service announcements (PSAs) to get the message out to everyone. She stressed the need to include all activities to show that everyone is in this together. She also suggested developing PSAs in English and Spanish. Mr. Cleveland commented that an example would be to restrict activities in river bottoms on certain days.

Ms. Knight inquired about the location of the sources and asked if ADEQ is still working on the study. Mr. Hyde responded that the study is in the final stages. Ms. Knight commented that it is getting too late to make the changes that may be required such as writing rules and adding more commitments. Ms. Pella replied that ADEQ is planning to conduct a stakeholders meeting in October to discuss these issues. Ms. Knight stated that October is too late to get through Council.

Mr. Berry asked if the issue is control measures. He inquired if the control measures would be implemented in just the Salt River area or throughout the nonattainment area. Ms. Bauer responded that if new measures are needed in the Salt River area, the entire nonattainment area would face the same new control measures. She added that if new measures are needed, remodeling would be required for the Serious Area PM-10 Plan.

Ms. Pella stated that there are no new sources and that Maricopa County is considering enhancements to Rule 310. Ms. Knight expressed concern that some cities are unaware of the issue. She mentioned that if cities will be required to pave shoulders, each would have to pass a resolution. Ms. Pella replied that if two miles of shoulders need to be paved in the Salt River area, the other cities would not be affected. Ms. Knight stressed that a decision needs to be made. She suggested letting everyone know about the issue and begin running the models with the changes to Rule 310. Ms. Pella commented that the time crunch has been mentioned to EPA. Mr. Cleveland suggested that Maricopa County provide awareness to the cities and communities of the new enhancements to Rule 310.

Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau, asked if the date for the ADEQ stakeholders meeting has been set. Ms. Pella responded that the meeting may be on October 19, 2003. Ms. Fish inquired

about the exceedances that occur during the Summer. Ms. Pella replied that ADEQ will start year-round forecasting.

7. Call to the Public

Mr. Cleveland recognized public comment from Dianne Barker, Citizen, who expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present her case and response. Ms. Barker commented that she has concerns regarding the citizen input process. She stated that MAG takes public input, but no consideration or responses are given to citizen comments. Ms. Barker referred to the tentative schedule given for agenda item #5, Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan. She stated that the word "aggressive" should not have been used and questioned the assumption that no major comments will be received on the Ozone Maintenance Plan.

Ms. Barker commented that the public hearing on the Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan should have been publicized. She referred to a letter in which EPA said they reviewed comments to the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and stated that her name was not mentioned, so it is uncertain if her comments were included. Ms. Barker referred to comments made by Blue Crowley at the June 19, 2003 Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee meeting. She mentioned that politicians are submerging health issues and that a balance is needed.

Ms. Barker referred to the Input Opportunity Report prepared by MAG. She stated that in the report, Joe Ryan questioned why there is a three minute limit when a court reporter is present. Ms. Barker stated that MAG staff responded that the three minute limit is so all public input is allowed equal time. She commented that this makes little sense when there were few comments and the court reporter had to be there anyway. Mr. Cleveland thanked Ms. Barker and asked MAG staff to follow up on her comments.

8. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Cleveland announced that the next meeting of the Committee is tentatively scheduled for October 23, 2003. He noted that a public hearing may be scheduled on November 20, 2003 for the Ozone Maintenance Plan. Also, an Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee meeting may be scheduled for November 24, 2003.