

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

Thursday, October 5, 2000
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman	*Associated General Contractors: David Martin
Scottsdale: Larry Person	*Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona: Connie Wilhelm-Garcia
Chandler: Jim Weiss	American Institute of Architects- Central Arizona: H. Maynard Blumer
Gilbert: Tami Ryall for Danielle Typinski	*Valley Forward: Peter Allard
Glendale: Doug Kukino	*Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Ian Calkins
Mesa: Christine Zielonka	*University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension: Monica Pastor
Phoenix: Gaye Knight	*Arizona Nursery Association: Cheryl Goar
Tempe: Kathy Jerik for Mary O'Conner	Arizona Department of Transportation: Pat Cupell
*Citizen Representative: Walter Bouchard	Arizona Department of Environmental Quality: Phil De Nee for Peter Hyde
*Citizen Representative: Arve Dahl	Maricopa County Environmental Services Department: Bob Downing for Jo Crumbaker
Arizona Lung Association: David Feuerherd	*Arizona Department of Weights and Measures: Mark Ellery
*Arizona Automobile Dealers Association: W. Knox Ramsey, Jr.	Federal Highway Administration: Dennis Mittelstedt
Salt River Project: Greg Witherspoon	Arizona State University: Judi Nelson
Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell	*Arizona Farm Bureau: James Klinker
*Arizona Public Service Company: Scott Davis	*Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: B. Bobby Ramirez
Western States Petroleum Association: Susie Stevens-Matthews	Citizen Representative: David Rueckert
Regional Public Transportation Authority: Bryan Jungwirth	
Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry	
*Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish	
*Arizona Rock Products Association: Samuel Aubrey	

*Those members were neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Joe Gibbs, City of Phoenix	Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration
Randi Alcott, Regional Public Transportation Authority	Ross Blakley, City of Phoenix
Doug Collins, Maricopa Association of Governments	Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments
Allan Kosecki, Maricopa Association of Governments	Dan Ranshaw, Tennant Company
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments	Sandra Gilbert, Arizona Department of Transportation
Cari Anderson, Maricopa Association of Governments	Gary Lasham, Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Robert Farrell, Pinal County Air Quality Control District	Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
	Steve Ochs, Maricopa Association of Governments
	Scott DiBiase, Maricopa Association of Governments
	Roger Roy, Maricopa Association of Governments
	Jerry Finnigan, Cruise America

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on Thursday, October 5, 2000. Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman, began a discussion of the agenda items at 1:30 p.m. since a quorum was not present.

3. Focus of CMAQ Funding on Particulate Pollution Program

This item was presented out of order since a quorum was not present. Cari Anderson, MAG, indicated that the purpose of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program is to provide funding for projects and programs designed to assist nonattainment areas in complying with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Federal guidance for the CMAQ program requires that MAG prepare an assessment of expected emission reductions for proposed CMAQ projects. MAG worked cooperatively with agencies to enhance the evaluation criteria used to estimate the emission reduction benefits of the proposed projects. The evaluation of proposed CMAQ projects for the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) has been completed. Ms. Anderson mentioned that it is important to note that there have been no violations of the carbon monoxide standard for the last three years and no violations of the ozone standard for the last four years. However, the Maricopa region is still experiencing violations of the PM-10 standard. She noted that this year, conformity was demonstrated by a very narrow margin. There continues to be a need to focus CMAQ funding on projects in the TIP that reduce PM-10 emissions to assist the region in demonstrating transportation conformity against the new PM-10 budget in the Serious Area Particulate Plan.

Mr. Cleveland indicated that a quorum was now present. He then called the meeting to order. Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, moved and Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, seconded a recommendation to focus CMAQ funding on projects that reduce PM-10 emissions to assist the region in demonstrating transportation conformity. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the June 29, 2000 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the June 29, 2000 meeting. Brian Jungwirth, Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) moved, and Christine Zielonka, City of Mesa seconded, and it was unanimously carried to approve the minutes from the June 29, 2000 meeting.

4. Evaluation of Proposed CMAQ Projects for the FY 2002-2006 MAG TIP

Ms. Anderson provided an overview of the evaluation of proposed CMAQ projects for the FY 2002-2006 MAG TIP and referred to Attachment A. She explained that the results of the project evaluation were being presented to the Committee for a possible recommendation to forward the CMAQ evaluation to the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) for use in prioritizing projects. In

addition, the projects which are not being forwarded to modal committees have been classified as “Air Quality” projects. The “Air Quality” projects are requested to be ranked and forwarded to the TRC for its October 31, 2000 meeting.

Ms. Anderson indicated that of the 82 total CMAQ projects submitted to MAG for potential CMAQ funding, 62 were evaluated for expected emission reductions and cost-effectiveness. Individual street sweeper requests submitted for FY 2006 are not included in the listing but rather are shown as a FY 2006 lump sum funding allocation. Each year, jurisdictions will be requested to submit information on street sweeping projects which will be evaluated by MAG to determine the allocation of CMAQ funds for that year. Attachment A provides the list of projects ranked by cost-effectiveness. The proposed projects that could not be quantified are also listed. It is important to note that all of the proposed projects support committed control measures contained in the MAG Serious Area Plans.

Ms. Zielonka requested that for next year the street sweeper item should be quantified. Ms. Knight questioned whether the CMAQ methodology required additional modification, following the actual use of the methodology to evaluate projects. Ms. Anderson responded that the draft CMAQ methodology was enhanced from last year and was made available for review and comment by the MAG modal committees in June, 2000. The methodology was revised in response to comments received.

Dennis Mittelstedt, Federal Highway Administration, asked about a cut-off point for cost-effectiveness noting that some projects may have a negligible air quality benefit. Ms. Anderson responded that no threshold has been established for projects and noted that a qualitative analysis is allowed in the federal guidance. Brian O’Donnell, Southwest Gas Corporation, inquired if the CMAQ methodology used the variable “time” in the calculations. Cathy Arthur, MAG, responded that the expected service life of the equipment or improvement was used to calculate the air quality benefit.

Ms. Zielonka inquired if the project listing for Attachment A reflected a MAG ranking. Ms. Anderson responded that the project listing was sorted by cost-effectiveness and was not a MAG ranking. Mr. Mittelstedt asked for clarification on the project “Purchase bus: vanpool” which was listed on Page 1 of Attachment A. Mr. Jungwirth, indicated that the project is for the purchase of vanpool vehicles.

Mr. Cleveland indicated the Committee is being requested to recommend the CMAQ evaluation with emission reductions and cost-effectiveness to the TRC for use in prioritizing projects. He suggested that an illustration of the process be developed next year to provide a better understanding. Mr. O’Donnell questioned if CMAQ could be used for maintenance projects. Ms. Anderson replied that routine maintenance projects to maintain paved roads, for example, are not eligible for CMAQ funding.

Mr. O’Donnell moved, and David Rueckert, citizen representative, seconded to forward the CMAQ evaluation to the MAG TRC for use in prioritizing projects. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Jungwirth requested to withdraw project number RPT11 “Implement RPTA ozone campaign” from Attachment A for FY 2006. He indicated that the last year for the ozone campaign was FY 2001 and that the project has not been programmed for fiscal years 2002 through 2005. Ms. Zielonka indicated that the ozone campaign program has been a worthy project.

Ms. Anderson informed the Committee that Attachment B is the second part of this agenda item which includes the evaluation of proposed Air Quality and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) CMAQ projects for the FY 2002-2006 MAG TIP. Ms. Anderson reviewed each project and the staff recommendation. The Capitol Rideshare Program (\$135,000), Travel Reduction Program (\$910,000), and PM-10 certified street sweepers (\$960,000) are proposed to be programmed in FY 2006 consistent with funding programmed for FY 2001-2005. She also indicated that the FY 2006 PM-10 certified street sweeper funding would be programmed as a lump sum, instead of individual projects.

Ms. Anderson indicated that the RPTA was originally funded at \$394,000 and was later increased by \$200,000 bringing the total to \$594,000. This year RPTA has requested \$722,692 in FY 2006 for the Regional Rideshare Program. She noted that in general rideshare and trip reduction programs primarily address reductions in carbon monoxide and ozone. The staff recommendation is to fund the Regional Rideshare Program at the existing level of \$594,000 and to conduct a performance evaluation of the program prior to increasing program funding.

Ms. Anderson indicated that the RPTA has requested \$365,000 in FY 2006 for the Ozone Campaign. She noted that the staff recommendation is to not forward the project to the TRC. The program is currently funded through FY 2001 and is not funded in fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

Ms. Anderson indicated the Valley Telework Program is a new project to be considered by the Committee and in previous years was considered by the MAG Telecommunications Advisory Group. The program is tied to trip reduction and is therefore included in the "Air Quality" list of projects. The staff recommendation is to conduct the Valley Telework Program as a joint MAG/RPTA project at the current funding amount of \$300,000 and to evaluate the program for future resource allocation.

Mr. Jungwirth informed the Committee that the proposed Regional Rideshare Program cost increases are associated with inflation which has diminished the ability to conduct adequate marketing and advertising. Mr. Ruecket questioned, if a program was eliminated and then reestablished at a later date, where the funding would come from. Ms. Knight indicated that the Phoenix area continues to record elevated ozone levels during the summer. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, added that the Ozone Campaign has achieved its goals and that it should remain on the list.

Tami Ryall, Town of Gilbert, moved and Mr. Jungwirth seconded to rank the "Air Quality" projects as follows: (1) PM-10 certified street sweepers; (2) Regional Rideshare Program; (3) Travel Reduction Program; (4) Capitol Rideshare Program; (5) Valley Telework Program; and, (6) Ozone Campaign at the funding levels requested to the MAG TRC for its October 31, 2000 meeting.

Mr. O'Donnell inquired about the telework program. Mr. Jungwirth replied that the telework program provides technical assistance to businesses about implementing remote work environments to their workforce. Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, asked why emissions were not quantified in Attachment B. Ms. Anderson responded that they are projects which are not easily

quantified. Ms. Ryall noted that the order of projects from her motion is from the focus on PM-10 emission reductions. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, requested that MAG and RPTA review the project order from a staff perspective. Ms. Anderson and Mr. Jungwirth responded individually with project lists similar in ranking.

Ms. Ryall amended her original motion, seconded by Ms. Knight, to rank the "Air Quality" projects as follows: (1) PM-10 certified street sweepers; (2) Travel Reduction Program; (3) Regional Rideshare Program; (4) Valley Telework Program; (5) Capitol Rideshare Program; and, (6) Ozone Campaign at the funding levels requested to the MAG TRC for its October 31, 2000 meeting. The motion passed with one No vote cast by Mr. Berry and one abstention from Susie Stevens-Matthews, Western States Petroleum Association. Following the vote, Mr. Cleveland asked if procedurally, the amended motion was acceptable to Mr. Jungwirth who seconded the original motion.

Greg Witherspoon, Salt River Project, inquired why the Capitol Rideshare Program is funded at a low level. Mr. Jungwirth responded that the State is the only agency to receive outside funding for conducting its rideshare program.

Ms. Zeilonka requested that staff quantify the FY 2006 street sweeper projects prior to forwarding the recommendation to the TRC. Ms. Anderson mentioned that an average number would be calculated for the TRC recommendation. At the request of Mr. Rueckert, Mr. Cleveland requested that staff send out the list of projects by mode to the Committee.

Mr. Berry inquired about the recommendation made by the Committee last year. Ms. Anderson responded that last year the priority list of programs were as follows: (1) Contingency Projects; (2) Regional Rideshare Program; (3) Travel Reduction Program; (4) Ozone Outreach Program; (5) Enhanced Rideshare Program; (6) Capitol Rideshare Program. She added that the funding set aside for contingency projects by the Committee was later programmed for street sweeper and paving dirt road projects to address approvability problems with the Serious Area PM-10 Plan.

5. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2001 CMAQ Funding

Ms. Anderson informed the Committee that an evaluation of proposed PM-10 certified street sweeper projects has been conducted for emission reductions and cost-effectiveness for FY 2001 CMAQ funding. The FY 2001-2005 MAG TIP contains \$960,000 in CMAQ funding to purchase PM-10 certified street sweepers in FY 2001. A minimum local match of 5.7 percent is required. Twenty-one projects requesting over \$2.5 million in federal funds were received from agencies by September 20, 2000. Additional supplemental information was provided regarding the use of the street sweeper (replacement of conventional equipment, expansion of service, or increase frequency of sweeping cycle), local resource commitment, use of alternative fuels, and geographic area in which the street sweeper will operate. She indicated that following consideration of information, the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee is requested to recommend a prioritized list of the proposed PM-10 certified street sweeper projects for FY 2001 CMAQ funding to the MAG Management Committee.

It is important to note that the project ranking will be retained for any additional FY 2001 CMAQ funds that may become available due to year-end closeout, including any redistributed obligation authority or additional funding received by this region from the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority provisions.

Mr. Berry inquired if the same cost for street sweepers was used by everyone and if it was possible for municipalities to pool the equipment. He also asked if there could be benefits from establishing a purchasing agent. Ms. Knight responded that different models of street sweepers are being requested by agencies through this process and that generally the equipment is used on a daily basis. In addition, the logistics of “pooling” the street sweepers would be prohibitive.

David Feuerherd, Arizona Lung Association, moved, and Mr. Berry seconded to recommend the prioritized list of proposed PM-10 certified street sweepers based on cost-effectiveness.

Mr. O’Donnell questioned if the number of streets being cleaned by the proposed equipment was considered. Ms. Anderson replied that the agencies supplied this information on the street sweeper project request form and that it was used to calculate the emission reductions. Mr. Cleveland asked if information such as “replacement” or “expansion” of proposed certified street sweepers was considered. Ms. Anderson responded that this was provided in the supplemental information requested on the project request form, but was not used in the calculation of emission reductions. She added that the street sweepers designated for expansion are estimated to be more effective than replacement.

Maynard Blumer, American Institute of Architects, stated that it is logical to use PM-10 emission reductions as the primary factor in ranking the PM-10 certified street sweeper projects. Mr. Weiss noted that Chandler did not increase the local match as some have done and as a result the city is lower on the list for cost-effectiveness. Ms. Ryall indicated that another consideration is to focus on problem areas with construction track-out. The monitors near Gilbert have historically recorded exceedances. Ms. Zielonka suggested a geographic distribution of street sweepers and indicated that “more bang for the buck” would be realized from the placement of street sweepers in outlying communities. Mr. Blumer noted that if the current motion failed, he would support an award of one street sweeper per jurisdiction. Ms. Knight stated that the City of Phoenix proposal hinged on the award of all four street sweepers to fulfill the objectives for the city street sweeper program.

Mr. Witherspoon reminded the Committee that the emphasis should be on reductions of PM-10. Mr. Berry concurred that the street sweeper projects which remove the most particulate matter should be funded. Mr. O’Donnell stated that the local match should also be a factor for consideration. However, Ms. Ryall suggested the issue of agencies providing a large local match for CMAQ projects is part of a broader policy discussion.

Ms. Anderson provided possible rankings to the Committee based on “Emission Reductions”, “Without Multiple Awards”, and “Location of Monitors”. Mr. Mittelstedt noted that the focus should be on getting the street sweepers out on the streets to get a better idea of their efficiency. Ms. Zielonka

indicated that a distribution by municipality should be considered. Noting his departure from the meeting, Mr. Feuerherd withdrew his motion.

After much discussion on the tentative ranking and the remaining available funds, Mr. O'Donnell inquired whether the City of Phoenix would be interested in the estimated \$40,000 remaining funds to purchase the third Phoenix sweeper requested. Ms. Knight indicated the City may be interested, however she would need to check on this matter.

Mr. O'Donnell moved, and Ms. Zielonka seconded to recommend the prioritized list of proposed PM-10 certified street sweeper projects for FY 2001 CMAQ funding to the MAG Management Committee as noted in the attached table. The motion passed with Ms. Stevens-Matthews abstaining.

Noting the time, Mr. Cleveland asked if it was appropriate to postpone agenda items #6 2000 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report, #7 Federal Approval of the 2000 Conformity Analysis, and #8 Governor's Brown Cloud Summit. Hearing no opposition from the Committee, the agenda items were postponed until the next meeting.

9. Call to the Public

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

10. Next Committee Meeting

Mr. Cleveland announced that the next meeting of the AQTAC is scheduled for November 2, 2000. With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.