

February 21, 2008

TO: Members of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: John Kross, Queen Creek, Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Thursday, February 28, 2008 - 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

Please park in the garage underneath the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting; parking will be validated. For those using transit, the Regional Public Transportation Authority will provide transit tickets for your trip. For those using bicycles, please lock your bicycle in the bike rack in the garage.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Jason Stephens at the MAG office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Members of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee may attend in person, via video conference or by telephone conference call. Those attending by video conference must notify the MAG site three business days prior to the meeting.

Please be advised that under procedures approved by the MAG Regional Council, all MAG committees need to have a quorum to conduct the meeting. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your entity to represent you.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

1. Call to Order

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Members of the public will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee requests an exception to this limit. Please note that those wishing to comment on action agenda items will be given an opportunity at the time the item is heard.

3. Approval of the December 17, 2007 Meeting Minutes

4. Gila River Indian Community Air Quality Management Plan

A presentation will be given on the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) Air Quality Management Plan. The presentation will include a discussion of background information on the GRIC; types of air pollution sources; Tribal Implementation Plan elements; fugitive dust issues/ordinance/earthmoving permit and dust control plan; and next step/permitting.

5. PM-10 Source Attribution and Deposition Study

The MAG PM-10 Source Attribution and Deposition Study is designed to identify the sources of emissions contributing to violations of the PM-10 standard at monitors in the nonattainment area during stagnant conditions

2. For information.

3. Review and approve the December 17, 2007 meeting minutes.

4. For information and discussion.

5. For information and discussion.

and characterize the deposition of PM-10 particles emitted by these sources. Preliminary data and analysis from the study were presented to the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee during the preparation of the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. At this meeting, the draft final report will be presented by Sierra Research, MAG consultant.

6. CMAQ Annual Report

In accordance with federal guidance, the 2007 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Funds Annual Report describes how funds have been spent and the expected air quality benefits. The report was prepared by MAG in cooperation with the Arizona Department of Transportation. The report is in the electronic format required by the Federal Highway Administration. Please refer to the enclosed material.

7. Update on the Air Quality Monitoring Data

An update on the most recent air quality monitoring data for the region will be provided. The report will include eight-hour ozone and PM-10 monitor data.

8. Proposed New Air Quality Project for the MAG FY 2009 Work Program

A new project for Air Quality Technical Assistance On-Call for \$280,000 has been proposed for the MAG FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program. In general, the project would be for technical assistance in the preparation of an Eight-Hour Ozone Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan and preparation of supplemental analyses and information for the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 to the Environmental Protection Agency as necessary. Technical assistance may also be needed for air quality modeling; traffic surveys and emission inventories; dirt road inventories and tracking

6. For information and discussion.

7. For information and discussion.

8. For information and discussion.

progress made to pave dirt roads; analysis of control measures; tracking implementation of committed control measures; CMAQ evaluation methodologies; and transportation conformity.

9. Tentative MAG Air Quality Project Schedule

A Tentative MAG Air Quality Project Schedule has been prepared which describes the major air quality planning activities for 2008 and 2009. Please refer to the enclosed material.

10. Call for Future Agenda Items

The next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for Thursday, March 27, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. The Chairman will invite the Committee members to suggest future agenda items.

9. For information and discussion.

10. For information and discussion.

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

Monday, December 17, 2007

MAG Office

Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Kross, Town of Queen Creek, Chairman,
#Jess Segovia, Avondale
Lori Brown for Lucky Roberts, Buckeye
Jim Weiss, Chandler
*Jamie McCullough, El Mirage
Lisa Taraborelli for Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Doug Kukino, Glendale
James Nichols, Goodyear
Scott Bouchie, Mesa
Gaye Knight, Phoenix
Larry Person, Scottsdale
Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise
Oddvar Tveit, Tempe
*Jesse Mendez, 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
Randi Alcott, Valley Metro
Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association
*Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
Russell Bowers, Arizona Rock Products Association
*Michelle Rill, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce

*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
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments
Patrisia Navarro, Maricopa Association of Governments
Ieesuck Jung, Maricopa Association of Governments
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
Taejoo Shin, Maricopa Association of Governments
Nathan Pryor, Maricopa Association of Governments
Ranjith Dandanayakula, Maricopa Association of
Governments
Bob Martinez, ACE Asphalt
Mark Young, Town of Queen Creek
Steve Peplau, Arizona Department of Environmental
Quality

Amanda McGennis, Associated General
Contractors
Spencer Kamps for Connie Wilhelm-Garcia,
Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona
Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward
Kai Umeda, University of Arizona Cooperative
Extension
Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of
Transportation
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
Chris Horan for B. Bobby Ramirez, Salt River
Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
*David Rueckert, Citizen Representative

Steve Trussell, Arizona Rock Products Association
Ramona Simpson, Town of Queen Creek
Joonwon Joo, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Jane, McVay, Arizona Department of
Transportation
Scott DiBiase, Pinal County
Lucky Roberts, Town of Buckeye
Leonard Montenegro, Arizona Department of
Environmental Quality

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on December 17, 2007. John Kross, Town of Queen Creek, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:36 p.m. Cory Woods, American Lung Association of Arizona, and Jess Segovia, City of Avondale, 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 November 19, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the November 19, 2007 meeting. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, moved and Antonio DeLaCruz, City of Surprise, seconded and the motion to approve the November 19, 2007 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

4. MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10

Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), gave a briefing on the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She stated that the Plan is required by the Clean Air Act Section 189(d) for Serious PM-10 nonattainment areas that do not meet the standard by the attainment date which was December 31, 2006 for the region. The Plan is due to EPA one year later. Ms. Arthur indicated that this Plan must demonstrate attainment via modeling; show a five percent per year reduction in emissions until the standard is attained at the monitors; and contain contingency measures equivalent to one year of reasonable further progress. Ms. Arthur presented the 2007 PM-10 Emissions with Committed Control Measures which is about 1,000 tons higher than what was shown at the previous meeting. She added that the distribution by source remained the same. She presented the committed control measures quantified for the Plan. Ms. Arthur stated that the control measures are organized by source category in order to show which measures impact which source categories. She added that these 25 measures were quantified to show attainment through modeling as well as meet the five percent per year requirement.

Ms. Arthur presented the 2010 PM-10 Emissions with Committed Control Measures. She stated that the measures impact in 2010 is a 19.3 percent reduction. She added that the 2010 emissions are approximately 1,500 tons higher than what was previously presented. She commented that the numbers are slightly different from the previous meeting because MAG has responded to comments that were received from Maricopa County and Pinal County which addressed technical calculations for the committed measures. Therefore, there have been adjustments made. Ms. Arthur presented the reductions in 2010 for Committed Control Measures in the Five Percent Plan for PM-10.

Ms. Arthur stated that the committed control measures are to impact two things required by the Clean Air Act: demonstrate attainment by 2010 at the six monitors that exceeded the standard during

the 2004-2006 period and meet the five percent requirement. She added that the target per year is 4,872 tons. Ms. Arthur indicated that in the Salt River Area, dispersion modeling was performed by Sierra Research using AERMOD. She stated that two episodes were modeled, one was during windy conditions and the other during stagnant conditions. She commented that Sierra Research performed modeling using results of field work conducted for the MAG PM-10 Source Attribution and Deposition Study in November-December 2006. Ms. Arthur stated that attainment demonstrated with the committed control measures under stagnant conditions in 2010 with the highest value being 141 ug/m³ at Bethune Elementary. Attainment also demonstrated with committed control measures under windy conditions with the highest value at West 43rd Ave. a 145 ug/m³. She added that the value increased from 141 ug/m³ to 145 ug/m³ during windy conditions due to one of the comments provided by the County on credit taken beyond 80 percent compliance on the vacant lots.

Ms. Arthur commented on the rollback modeling performed at the Higley monitor. She added that the rollback modeling indicates that the Higley monitor should attain the standard by 2010. Ms. Arthur stated that a supplemental attainment demonstration was conducted at the Greenwood and West Phoenix monitors. She mentioned that both of the monitors exceeded the PM-10 standard on one day, December 12, 2005. She commented that the data that was used in the modeling for the Salt River Area was applied to the rollback model to show attainment at the Greenwood and West Phoenix monitors. She indicated that both monitors are close to the standard. A value of 155 ug/m³ is considered an exceedance of the PM-10 standard.

Ms. Arthur presented the emissions reductions that were achieved with committed control measures versus the five percent reduction target. She indicated that the five percent requirement has been met. She stated that the Clean Air Act also requires contingency measures to be included in the Five Percent Plan. She added that these measures need to be quantified above and beyond the emission reductions taken for committed control measures. She mentioned that the 25 committed control measures presented cannot be used as credit toward the contingency measure target, which is 4,869 tons per year. Ms. Arthur presented the reasonable further progress.

Ms. Arthur stated that nine measures have been quantified as committed contingency measures. She stated that the measures cover various source categories including public education, construction, offroad vehicles, paved roads, unpaved roads, and agricultural. She presented the reductions in 2010 of the individual committed contingency measures. Ms. Arthur stated that the committed contingency measures meet the target of 4,869 tons required in 2008-2010. She presented a pie chart with committed control and contingency measures combined. Ms. Arthur stated that the committed contingency measures are legally binding commitments. She mentioned that the benefit from the 25 control measures and the 9 contingency measures is about a 29,000 ton reduction. She added that both control and contingency measures result in a 28 percent reduction in 2010.

Ms. Arthur presented other requirements of the Clean Air Act for the Five Percent Plan. She stated that the Onroad Mobile Source Emissions Budget for Conformity has increased slightly since the last presentation to 103.3 metric tons per day since road construction emissions have increased slightly. Ms. Arthur stated that the public hearing on the Plan was conducted on December 12, 2007. She added that comments were received and the Committee has been provided with the response to comments. She stated that a Regional Council meeting is scheduled for December 19, 2007 for

possible action to adopt the Plan. She indicated that MAG will submit the Plan to ADEQ/EPA by December 21, 2007 if adopted by the MAG Regional Council.

Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors, inquired about the increase in road construction emissions. Ms. Arthur replied that most of the measures that impact road construction are control measures. She stated that when the measures are added together the percentage will change. She mentioned that the base comes down but the percent that the road construction represents is higher. Larry Person, City of Scottsdale, stated that the emissions decreased from seven to five percent. Ms. McGennis responded that the road construction emissions went from seven percent to four percent and than to five percent. Ms. Arthur replied that the reason for the change in percentages was because of the base being lower. Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, inquired about the Bethune monitor. Ms. Arthur replied that the Bethune monitor was mentioned in her presentation. She added that the Bethune monitor is still the high at 141 ug/m³ on the stagnant day that was modeled. She added that the value is higher than the West 43rd Ave. and Durango monitors on that day.

Lindy Bauer, MAG, indicated that a public hearing was conducted on the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 jointly with the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality on Wednesday, December 12, 2007. She noted that there were about eight people at the hearing and there was one verbal testimony. In addition, written comments were received. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response to comments, written comments, and public hearing transcript are at each place. Verbal testimony was received at the public hearing from Ric Tobin, Lewis and Roca, on behalf of the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona (HBACA) and Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors (AGC). In addition, nine submittals of written comments were received from Dianne Barker, Pinal County, Michael Hernandez, Arizona Desert Events, Maricopa County Air Quality Department (MCAQD), Salt River Project (SRP) and Arizona Public Service (APS), Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest (ACLPI), HBACA, and AGC, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Ms. Bauer summarized the comments received and the responses. She stated that written comments were received from Dianne Barker and read into the December 12, 2007 public hearing record as requested by Ms. Barker. The comments stated that Ms. Barker participates in the multi-modal choice of transportation by using her bike. The response stated that her efforts are commendable. The comments also proposed a bi-fueled train that would run from Fiesta Mall, I-60, around the Broadway Curve to Deck park, Phoenix and, further on Grand Avenue to Surprise, Arizona in order to reduce particulates.

Ms. Bauer stated that verbal testimony was received at the public hearing from Ric Tobin, Lewis and Roca, on behalf of the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona and Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors. She stated that his comments included that the HBACA and the AGC have participated in the air quality stakeholders' process and support the training programs and on site coordinators since they feel these measures will result in real emission reductions. She stated that his comments also indicated that AGC and HBACA share EPA's concern that the Plan must be targeted to address the reasons for nonattainment. Ms. Bauer stated that MAG appreciates the participation of AGC and HBACA in the Plan development process. She mentioned that we all share the same common goal of clean air. She stated that his comments included that the Home

Builders Association of Central Arizona and Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors cannot support the Plan; the Plan will fail to achieve attainment and is unlawful; and they are urging MAG to take time to develop a workable lawful Plan that actually leads to attainment. The comments stated that the two big reasons why this Plan is faulty is because first, the Plan contains an unrepresentative and therefore unlawful emissions inventory, and second, the Plan is not targeted toward the sources that are the cause of the nonattainment problem. Ms. Bauer indicated that MAG worked with MCAQD on the response. The response stated that the County indicated that many of the comments attached to the written comments are basically the same as those submitted to the County when MCAQD was working on the inventory. The County has since revised that inventory and has worked closely with the EPA. The County is now confident that EPA will approve the emissions inventory which is at EPA for approval. Ms. Bauer stated that regarding the targeting of the sources of the nonattainment problem, the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 includes 53 committed control measures targeting the sources of the nonattainment problem throughout the nonattainment area. She indicated that the response included a list of all the different source categories that the measures are targeting. She added that these sources are in the emissions inventory. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response included that in an April 20, 2007 letter, EPA indicated that "To target control or enforcement strategies at selected monitors would leave public health in these other areas unprotected, be inconsistent with the Clean Air Act, and could affect approvability of the Plan with attendant consequences." She stated that the EPA letter also indicated that monitors are sited to provide a representative picture of pollutant concentrations throughout the planning area.

Ms. Bauer indicated that the AGC and HBACA comments included that this Plan is an unnecessary burden on the industry and the proposals will cost over \$11,000 per single family residential unit and will not achieve clean air in part because the construction sector is not a significant contributor to the Salt River Area. She indicated that the response included that, as described in the regional emissions inventory, the construction emissions (residential, commercial, and road construction) comprise 36 percent of the 2005 PM-10 emissions inventory. Ms. Bauer mentioned that construction is being conducted throughout the PM-10 nonattainment area and is a significant contributor around some of the monitors in the nonattainment area. The response also included that EPA has indicated consistently that the measures for the sources need to be applied to all similar sources in the nonattainment area to protect public health, not just around the monitors. She indicated that the response included that for any air quality plan to be successful, the measures need to be implemented, complied with and enforced. The response stated that a rule effectiveness study conducted by MCAQD in 2006 indicated a very low compliance rate. With strengthened enforcement and training efforts underway by the County, perhaps compliance by all sources will increase and the Plan will be successful.

Ms. Bauer indicated that the HBACA and AGC comments also urge MAG to reconsider its current course and develop a targeted Plan that would, at a minimum, include an accurate emissions inventory that would help identify relative emissions contributions and impose measures on significant sources such as unpaved roads, unpaved shoulders, and unpermitted facilities. She indicated that the response included that the Maricopa County Air Quality Department has responded to comments on the 2005 emissions inventory, refined the inventory, and is confident that EPA will approve the inventory. She indicated that the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 includes 53 committed control measures. Many of the control measures are for unpaved roads, unpaved

shoulders, and other unpermitted sources as well as permitted sources. She mentioned that Chapter Six in the main plan document includes a list of the commitments made by measure. Ms. Bauer indicated that better compliance is needed by all sources in order to attain the standard.

Ms. Bauer summarized written comments received from Pinal County. She indicated that the comments caused some minor technical refinements that were included in the presentation given by Ms. Arthur.

Ms. Bauer summarized written comments received from Michael J. Hernandez by email and the responses. She indicated that the comments called attention to a report from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on low-level radioactive waste management. Ms. Bauer indicated that MAG thanked him for the information and reminded him that the topic for this public comment period is the MAG Five Percent Plan for the PM-10.

Ms. Bauer summarized written comments received from Arizona Desert Events and the responses. She indicated that the company has offered educational nature historical tours in the Sonoran Desert for the past eleven years. The comments included a concern that Arizona Desert Events would be impacted by some of the offroad vehicle requirements in Senate Bill 1552. She indicated that the comments included that Arizona Desert Events only drive their vehicles at five miles per hour. Ms. Bauer stated that there is a measure in the Plan to post signs on dirt roads of 15 miles per hour speed limits since slower speed keeps the dust down. She added that five miles per hour is three times slower than the required amount. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response included the requirements that are in Senate Bill 1552 and there is a statement in the bill that indicates that this section does not apply to the operation of vehicles used in the normal course of business or the normal course of government operations. She referred Arizona Desert Event to Maricopa County Air Quality Department for clarification.

Ms. Bauer stated that written comments were received from Maricopa County Air Quality Department. She added that the comments were similar to the comments provided by Pinal County in that they were technical comments which caused minor technical refinements to the Plan.

Ms. Bauer summarized written comments received from the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest and the responses. She indicated that the comments included that the Five Percent Plan must address all applicable requirements under the Clean Air Act. She indicated that the response included that the MAG Five Percent Plan for PM-10 is designed to address the attainment demonstration, five percent requirements, and all applicable requirements of the Clean Air Act. Ms. Bauer stated that the Plan includes contingency measures, reasonable further progress, commitments for measures, attainment demonstration, and meets the five percent reduction requirement. Ms. Bauer indicated that the comments stated that the Plan must include Best Available Control Measures (BACM) and Most Stringent Measures (MSM). She indicated that the response included that the Plan falls under Section 189(d) of the Clean Air Act and that BACM and MSM are required under Section 189(b)(1) which applies to the Serious Area plans. She indicated that the response also stated that the Five Percent Plan includes measures above and beyond the MAG 1999 Serious Area Plan.

Ms. Bauer indicated that the comments from ACLPI included that the annual 24-hour PM-10 standard needs to be met even though EPA has revoked the annual standard. Ms. Bauer indicated

that the response included that EPA revoked the annual PM-10 standard effective December 18, 2006. She indicated that the comments from ACLPI included that the state has failed to include true contingency measures in the Plan. The comments stated that these measures need to be extra measures that are not implemented and that would be called upon if we failed to make progress or miss a milestone. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response to the comment included that EPA allows for the early implementation of contingency measures. The EPA memorandum dated August 13, 1993 was cited. Ms. Bauer stated that the philosophy of this region for some time has been to implement the contingency measures right along with the main plan measures. She added that this philosophy is the best chance for success in attaining the standard.

Ms. Bauer indicated that the comments also included that ACLPI is disappointed that the Five Percent Plan did not consider adopting an indirect source review program similar to San Joaquin. The comments stated that new development contributes to the air pollution problems by increasing both the number of vehicles and the vehicle miles traveled and therefore an indirect source program should be implemented. Ms. Bauer mentioned that the response to ACLPI included that the 2005 PM-10 Emissions Inventory indicated that vehicle exhaust/tire wear/brake wear represents two percent of the total emissions inventory and vehicle exhaust by itself is less than one percent of the inventory. She stated that the San Joaquin Valley has a problem with the formation of secondary particulates and therefore San Joaquin chose to use indirect source review. The Maricopa County nonattainment area has a PM-10 problem from fugitive dust and not secondary particulate formation like San Joaquin.

Ms. Bauer stated that written comments were provided from the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona and Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors. She indicated that their comments were similar to those presented at the public hearing. Therefore the responses are similar to those already discussed.

Ms. Bauer summarized the response to comments received from the Environmental Protection Agency. She indicated that the comments included that EPA commended MAG, ADEQ, and MCAQD on the extensive effort that went into developing the Five Percent Plan and for the resources that are being committed to implement the Plan into the future. Ms. Bauer indicated that the EPA comments also included that since MAG has chosen 2010 as the attainment date, three years of clean data will be needed beginning in 2008. Clean data at the monitors will be needed in 2008, 2009, and 2010 in order for EPA to determine that the standard has been attained. The comments stated that if a violation occurs before EPA acts on the Plan, EPA will not be able to approve the Plan. If EPA disapproves the Plan, such disapproval could start the clock on sanctions which is the loss of the federal highway funds and also two to one offsets for industrial sources. There could also be a Federal Implementation Plan. She indicated that the EPA comments included that if EPA approves the Plan and a violation occurs thereafter, MAG will need to revise the Plan because the Plan would have failed to ensure attainment of the standard. Ms. Bauer stated that MAG appreciates the comments provided by EPA. She added that the comments are a warning to the region to implement the measures and attain the standard as quickly as possible.

Ms. Bauer indicated that the comments from the Environmental Protection Agency included that while the Plan appears to address the Clean Air Act requirements, based on a preliminary review, EPA is concerned about some of the assumptions made in the Plan and will need to go through a

more extensive review upon submittal of the Plan by ADEQ. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response to the comment included that MAG will work cooperatively with EPA to discuss the basis for the assumptions. Ms. Bauer indicated that the EPA comments included a concern that the new and more stringent measures will not be in place early enough in the three-year period to prevent a violation from occurring. The draft plan assumes that the nonattainment area will have three clean years of data beginning in 2008. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response to the EPA comment included that over the past year, the Maricopa County Air Quality Department has filled many of the vacant inspector positions and has been actively enforcing the fugitive dust control rules. In addition, the MAG 1999 Serious Area Plan includes 77 control measures designed to reduce PM-10. She stated that the measures must be implemented, complied with and enforced in order for the current plan or the new MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan to be effective. Ms. Bauer indicated that some of the measures are complex and cannot be implemented rapidly. For example, it takes approximately 18 to 24 months to pave an unpaved road. She added that the MAG Regional Council stepped up early by approving \$5 million for paving unpaved roads and then approved projects a few months later to get an early start.

Ms. Bauer indicated that the comments received from the Environmental Protection Agency included concern with the increased compliance to achieve the goals of the Plan. The comments stated that such a significant change in behavior seems optimistic. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response to the EPA comment included that the measures must be implemented, complied with and enforced in order for the Plan to be successful. The comments received from EPA also included that the cities have made commitments to adopt plans and ordinances that are intended to result in emission reductions that are relied on in the Plan. The EPA requested a summary table of the cities commitments that identifies what the cities are committing to do, how and when they will accomplish the measure, and who will be enforcing the measure. Ms. Bauer indicated that the response to the comment included that the commitments made by each jurisdiction are contained in the two volumes of commitments for implementation documents. In addition, Chapter Six of the main plan document includes a summary of each jurisdiction's commitment to implement a measure underneath the appropriate measure. The technical support document also summarizes the commitments made by jurisdictions. Ms. Bauer indicated that the comments provided by EPA included that the PM-10 problem in the region is very complex and EPA will look forward to working with MAG, ADEQ, and MCAQD during the formal review of the Plan. Mr. Kross thanked MAG staff for a tremendous effort in preparing the comprehensive plan which represents a lot of cooperation among the public and the private sector.

Barbara Sprungl, Salt River Project, requested further clarification on the responses provided to some of the comments submitted jointly by APS and SRP. She expressed concern with some of the measures that are being committed to in the Plan that are still in the rule development process. She added that there is significant dialogue going on in the rule processes. She commented that the response to comments states that on September 10, 2007, the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution to implement measures in the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Ms. Sprungl stated that her understanding was that when the measures were up for consideration by MAG and the Board of Supervisors, the measures were to be considered but were not necessarily measures that would be workable and would have to be looked at during the rulemaking process. She inquired about the approval of the measures. Ms. Bauer noted that APS and SRP had also provided comments on the Plan. She stated that MAG takes numeric credit for measures for the

commitments made by governing bodies. Ms. Bauer indicated that the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors adopted the resolution on September 10, 2007 and submitted a package of measures to MAG. She stated that the County has listed out the schedule that they will be going through to develop rules for the measures that need rules in the commitment package. She added that the County has been going through the process according to the schedule that was provided. The County committed to a package of measures with schedules. Ms. Bauer stated that the Suggested List of Measures, once approved by Regional Council, was provided to the different entities that have authority to put the measures in place. She added that the entity reviewed the measure and determined if it was feasible for implementation. Ms. Sprungl expressed her disappointment about the County not mentioning during the rulemaking processes that they were proceeding down that route when they had the stakeholders in the room.

Mr. Kamps inquired about the impact on the Plan if the County were to change the rule. Ms. Bauer responded if a plan is submitted and there is weakening of a measure, for example, then the shortfall for the measure would have to be addressed. She added that when the modeling attainment demonstration was completed, the numbers were close, and the modeling attainment demonstration became a more difficult task than obtaining the five percent reductions in emissions. Ms. Bauer provided the example of the Arizona Legislature scaling back on Remote Sensing. She added that a lawsuit was filed against the State since they did not go through the proper process. Ms. Bauer indicated that the measure can be replaced with a measure that has equal or greater impact. She mentioned that if there were to be a shortfall, then it would have to be addressed.

Mr. Kamps inquired about the difference between the five percent reduction goal and the attainment at the monitors goal. Ms. Arthur responded that there is a maximum of 145 ug/m³ for the wind blown concentration at the West 43rd Ave. monitor which could go higher. She stated that the rules have been bundled together for the Five Percent Plan. She added that one percent reduction was taken for 2008 and two percent reduction was taken for 2009 for the three rules. She commented that there is no specific credit assigned to any particular rule. Ms. Arthur indicated that an approximate 1,000 ton reduction has been assumed.

Mr. Kamps inquired about the trackout measure, reduce trackout onto unpaved roads (supported by other committed, but unquantified, measures). Ms. Arthur replied that the statement means that there was not any reduction taken for measures 13, 14, and 17 for the committed control measures. Mr. Kamps inquired about the description of the measures. Ms. Arthur stated that measure 13 is trackout from nonpermitted sources, and measure 14 is for covering trucks. Mr. Kamps inquired about trackout on nonpermitted sources. Ms. Arthur responded that all of the contingency measures are legally enforceable committed measures. She indicated that nonpermitted trackout would be under the trackout measure. Mr. Kamps inquired about who would be committing to the measure. Ms. Arthur replied that it will be part of the ordinances and codes adopted by cities and towns. Mr. Kamps inquired if it would be part of the committed measures from the cities. Ms. Bauer asked if Mr. Kamps is talking about dust from vacant lots that track out into the roadway. She stated that Senate Bill 1552 mandates the cities to have an ordinance for this purpose. She indicated that the measure is a committed measure that would keep dirt off the road, for example. Mr. Kamps stated that when the measure was considered there was talk about the sources around the Salt River Area. He added that the measure was more than just vacant lots. Mr. Kamps indicated that he believes the measure has been weakened. He inquired if the commitment got lost at the County or at a local

level. Ms. Arthur replied that based on the requirements of Senate Bill 1552, the cities will be generating new ordinances and codes to address that source. Mr. Kamps inquired if the trackout measures impact just vacant lots or businesses as well. Ms. Bauer replied that the trackout measures impact nonpermitted sources as well as permitted sources. She added that there are 22 different committed measures working toward trackout.

Mr. Kamps inquired about the dragout measure on nonpermitted sources. Ms. Arthur replied that measure 13 is for dragout and trackout from the nonpermitted sources. Mr. Kamps inquired about the location of the ordinances. Ms. Bauer replied that the cities have committed to pave unpaved roads, alleys, and parking lots. She stated that there are also mandates in Senate Bill 1552 for the ordinances such as unpaved parking areas and vacant lots. Ms. Bauer mentioned that an example of dragout is when a vehicle is coming off an unpaved road onto a paved road. She added that the mass of the vehicle can drag some of the dirt onto the road. Ms. Bauer commented that if dirt is not going to be dragged out from unpaved surfaces because the surfaces are going to be paved and stabilized, then dragout should be reduced. Mr. Kamps stated that this was not the measure that he envisioned when it was being considered. Ms. Bauer replied that the measures are designed to prevent dirt from being tracked out or dragged out onto a paved surface.

Mr. Kamps commented on the agenda which talks about the study that was conducted by MAG. He stated that based on the discussion about the measures months ago, the issue was nonpermitted sources around the Salt River Area. Mr. Kamps added that he envisioned having businesses, alleys, and unpaved shoulders reducing dragout. Ms. Bauer replied that it is included in the plan document. She stated that the City of Phoenix did some enforcement work with its parking ordinance.

Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, stated that the City has been enforcing the parking ordinance around the Salt River Area. She commented that the cities and the County are paving roads, stabilizing alleys, and stabilizing shoulders for a total of over 600 miles of roads, shoulders, and alleys in the Plan. Ms. Knight stated that there are also new ordinances for parking lots and vacant lots. She mentioned that the control method that would be used to control trackout is captured in the commitments that have been made for 600 miles of roads, shoulders, and alleys. She added that the video that showed dragout was from an unpaved road and that road is being paved. She inquired why Mr. Kamps thinks that dragout and trackout are different when the solution to the problem is to pave the road. Mr. Kamps stated that one of the issues that was previously discussed was about businesses and unpaved private parking lots. He mentioned that he envisioned a dragout measure to address those issues. Ms. Knight stated that at the legislature, the discussion was about cities adopting parking code ordinances. Mr. Kamps asked how many miles of paving was included in the Plan. Ms. Knight responded that there is over 600 miles of road, shoulders and alleys to be paved or stabilized. Mr. Kamps stated that paved and unpaved roads are the only sections of the pie chart that were allowed to increase. He expressed concern for the increase.

Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, stated that on 75th Avenue and Buckeye, the streets do not have curbs. He added that when it rains, the dirt washes on to the road and when it stops raining, there is a dirt road on top of a paved road. He commented on dirt and mud being tracked out from a variety of sources. Mr. Berry indicated that he was impressed that the next day there were street sweepers cleaning the road. He stated that he was relieved to see the effort taking place in cleaning up that road. Mr. Berry referenced the comments from EPA about the first clean

year taking place in 2008. He inquired about the clean year and how it is defined. Ms. Bauer replied that a clean year would be no violations at the monitors. She stated that a violation is more than three exceedances over a three year time period. Mr. Berry referenced the comments provided by EPA that stated if a violation occurs before EPA acts on the Plan, EPA will not be able to approve the Plan. He inquired if there is a certain time in which EPA needs to take action on the Plan. Wienke Tax, Environmental Protection Agency, stated that EPA has six months to determine the Plan complete and 12 months to act on the Plan, for a total of 18 months. Mr. Berry inquired if the clock starts when the Plan is complete. Ms. Tax replied that the clock starts when the Plan is submitted for the completeness finding. Mr. Berry inquired if the submission has occurred. Ms. Bauer responded that December 31, 2007 is the official date to submit the Plan. Ms. Tax stated that July of 2008 would be the deadline for the completeness finding and July of 2009 for approval of the Plan. Mr. Berry commented on a violation occurring before EPA acts on the Plan. Ms. Tax stated that four exceedances at one monitor in the three years would be a violation. Mr. Berry inquired if the standard is higher than what the region is currently operating under until the Plan is approved. Ms. Tax responded that in terms of exceedances, the requirements are the same before approval and when the Plan would be approved.

Mark Hajduk, Arizona Public Service Company, inquired about the consequence if EPA were to approve the Plan early and a violation occurs. Ms. Tax replied that the Plan would have to be revised. Mr. Hajduk inquired about the sanctions. Ms. Tax responded that if EPA disapproves the Plan then the disapproval would start the sanctions clock. Ms. Bauer stated that under Section 189(d) of the Clean Air Act, five percent reductions are needed per year until the standard is attained. She stated that another year would need to be added of five percent reductions in emissions until the standard is attained in order for the Plan to be approveable. Mr. Hajduk inquired if the clock would start over if on the second year a violation occurs after the Plan has been approved. Rusty Bowers, Arizona Rock Products, replied no.

Mr. Kamps stated that the Committee would like more clarification on the clock and when the sanctions happen. Ms. Bauer responded that EPA can invoke the sanctions at anytime. She stated that EPA has nondiscretionary authority, which means that EPA would have to levy sanctions if the region fails to submit the Plan, fails to implement any Plan requirements, fails to make any required submission or EPA disapproves the Plan. She commented that EPA may give up to 18 months to correct deficiencies if it thinks that a region is making a sincere effort to correct a Plan that has problems. She mentioned that if a region fails to fix the deficiencies within 18 months, the first sanction will fall which is typically to stationary industrial sources, two to one offsets. She added that if a region fails to correct the deficiencies within the next 6 months, it will lose the federal highway funds and get a Federal Implementation Plan. She indicated that EPA also has discretionary authority. She commented that if EPA feels that a region is not making a sincere effort and is not acting appropriately, EPA can impose the sanctions at any time. Ms. Bauer stated that EPA can also impose both sanctions at the same time. She added that conformity also lapses on the Regional Transportation Plan on the day EPA imposes the loss of federal highway funds.

Ms. Knight inquired about violations. Ms. Tax replied that four exceedances at one monitor equal one violation. Ms. Knight clarified that it would be a violation if there are exceedances on January 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th at the same monitor. Ms. Tax responded yes. Mr. Berry stated that the quicker

EPA acts the more certainty the region will have with the Plan. He inquired if there is anything that could be done to help EPA act quicker. Ms. Tax responded that everyone could help by providing prompt information when requested by EPA. Mr. Berry inquired about an estimate on how long it would take for the Plan to get approved by EPA. Mr. Kross commented that perhaps information on how long it took the San Joaquin Plan to be approved would help the Committee. Ms. Bauer stated that she does not know how long it took EPA to approve the San Joaquin Plan. She added that there were a series of lawsuits on the San Joaquin Plan which was also a Five Percent Plan for PM-10.

Mr. Bowers stated that there are different factors for unpaved roads, shoulders and alleys. He inquired about the benefit for unpaved shoulders per mile. Mr. Bowers indicated that there are 1680 miles of unpaved roads in the County and a significant amount are not at 150 vehicle trips per day. He stated that the unpaved roads at 150 trips per day or above should be addressed as soon as possible in the Plan. He commented on the amount of unpaved shoulders in the cities and County. Mr. Bowers inquired about the mix. Ms. Arthur replied that each of the measures are evaluated separately. She added that the unpaved shoulder measure is a control measure. She mentioned that there are 307 miles of shoulders being paved or stabilized by 2010. She indicated that the mathematical equation is different depending upon whether the average daily trips (ADT) are less than 10,000 per day or greater than 10,000 per day on the arterial. Ms. Arthur stated that traffic on half of the road is assumed because the miles of a shoulder is curb miles. She indicated that half of the ADT is multiplied by a factor depending upon whether it is less than 10,000 or greater than 10,000 ADT. Ms. Arthur stated that those factors are shown in the technical support document. She indicated that the factors are 3.51 minus 1.7 for a low ADT arterial and 2.14 minus .65 for a high ADT arterial. She commented on the factors for the level of traffic of the facility that is multiplied by the miles and ADT in order to get the reductions for the shoulders.

Ms. Arthur stated that the base rate for roads is 666.62. She added that the assumption for speed on an unpaved road is 25 miles per hour (mph). She mentioned that the emissions rate for a paved road is 1.7 or .65 depending on ADT. She commented that the rates are explained in the technical support document. Ms. Arthur stated that 666.62 is subtracted by either 1.7 or .65 in order to get the grams per mile benefit of paving an unpaved road. She added that the number is multiplied by the ADT on that unpaved road. Mr. Bowers inquired if the roads, shoulders and alleys were added in order to get the total. Ms. Arthur replied that they are separate because each measure has its own reduction. However, the benefits are added together in some of the charts in the Plan that are separated by source category. She stated that most of the figures are shown separately for the measures. Mr. Bowers inquired about the miles that are being counted for unpaved roads, unpaved shoulders and alleys. Ms. Arthur replied that there are 307 miles for unpaved shoulders and 275 miles for unpaved roads by 2010. She added that the 275 miles is for roads and alleys, paved and stabilized. She commented that full credit is only taken for paving and half credit is taken for stabilizing. Mr. Bowers inquired if the 1680 miles include alleys. Ms. Arthur replied no. Mr. Bowers inquired how many miles out of the 275 is for alleys and how many miles is for roads. He asked how many roads are being attacked in the Plan since it is a major factor that needs to be addressed. Ms. Arthur referred to the table on page 4-8. She added that she did not have the answer in front of her; however, total roads and alleys paved is 114.

Mr. Kross called for a motion to recommend approval of the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. Mr. Berry moved and Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, seconded, and the motion to recommend approval of the MAG 2007 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 carried unanimously.

Mr. Bowers commented on his vote. He stated that if you took 1.264 pounds per mile, one car on a dirt road, multiply that by 150 vehicle trips per day, and multiply that by 15 miles, the benefit would be 2,844 pounds or 1.42 tons. Mr. Bowers mentioned that the number is for 150 cars on 15 miles of road. He indicated that there are 2.4 million cars in the County. He mentioned the impact on the region if these cars are driving on dirt roads that we are not addressing as fast as we can. Mr. Bowers stated that the Cities of Phoenix, Scottsdale, and Mesa have made sizable contributions of alleys and roads. He commented that Arizona Rock Products Association has paved 20 miles inside pits since May of 2007. He mentioned that there is a contribution associated with dirt roads. He encouraged everyone to address dirt roads as soon as possible. Mr. Bowers stated that he is voting in favor of the Plan. He indicated that he hopes it passes the modeling and monitoring tests. He commented that the population around the monitor will suffer for the benefit of the measurement of the whole because there cannot be specific control measures around the monitor. He indicated that this does not mean we cannot take discreet protection around the monitor. Mr. Bowers added that we should be taking discreet protection around the monitor. He recommended that the governments around the monitors, not only count the general practices that are in the Plan but also take discreet and individual if not collective active measures around monitors, especially high emission areas, to protect the population in that area.

5. Tentative 2008 Meeting Schedule for the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee

Ms. Bauer stated that the tentative 2008 meeting schedule for the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee has been provided.

6. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Kross announced that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for January 24, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned.

CMAQ DETAILED PROJECT LISTING REPORT (FY 2007)

Fiscal Year = '2007' and Status Selection Criteria = 'Approved by State' and State = 'Arizona'

STATE	Apportionment	APPORTION. AMOUNT	OBLIGATED AMOUNT	OBLIG. %	PROJECT AMOUNT	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE & DESCRIPTION	VOC (kg/Day)	CO (kg/Day)	NOx (kg/Day)	PM 10 (kg/Day)	PM 2.5 (kg/Day)	CONTINUING PROJECT?
Arizona	6/20/2027	\$49,484,047	\$31,996,863	65 %									
Arizona					\$1,947,109	I/M and Other TCMs	MAC: PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Program Purchase PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers				1,085		
Arizona					\$845,000	I/M and Other TCMs	Peoria: Pave dirt road Pave dirt road on Carefree Highway from Lake Pleasant Rd to Beardisley Canal				214		
Arizona					\$162,000	I/M and Other TCMs	Chandler: Pave dirt road Pave dirt road on Ryan Rd from Arizona Ave to McQueen Rd				73		
Arizona					\$3,557,383	Pedestrian/Bicycle	Glendale: Multi-use overpass Design and construct multi-use overpass on 63rd Ave at Loop 101	1	15	1	1		
Arizona					\$614,405	Pedestrian/Bicycle	Gilbert: Multiuse path Construct Western-Powerline Trail multiuse path from Cooper Rd to Gilbert Rd (phase III)	1	19	1	1		
Arizona					\$494,870	Pedestrian/Bicycle	Maricopa County: Bicycle lane Design and construct bicycle lane on McDowell Mountain Rd from Fountain Hills city limits to Forest Rd	1	3	1	1		
Arizona					\$400,000	Pedestrian/Bicycle	Paradise Valley: Pedestrian path Construct pedestrian path on south side of Lincoln Dr from 32nd St to Invergordon Rd	1	5	1	1		
Arizona					\$269,306	Pedestrian/Bicycle	Glendale: Bicycle lane Design and construct bicycle lane on 63rd Ave from Olive Ave to Grand Ave	1	22	1	1		
Arizona					\$30,000	Pedestrian/Bicycle	MAC: Regional Bicycle Planning Regional Bicycle Planning	14	170	11	13		
Arizona					\$919,329	Shared Ride	MAC: Trip Reduction Program Trip Reduction Program	403	4,882	327	367		

CMAQ DETAILED PROJECT LISTING REPORT (FY 2007)

Fiscal Year = '2007', and Status Selection Criteria = 'Approved by State' and State = 'Arizona'

STATE	Apporportionments	APPORTION. AMOUNT	OBLIGATED AMOUNT	OBLIG. %	PROJECT AMOUNT	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE & DESCRIPTION	VOC (Kg/Day)	CO (Kg/Day)	NOx (kg/Day)	PM 10 (kg/Day)	PM 2.5 (kg/Day)	CONTINUING PROJECT?
Arizona					\$598,681	Shared Ride	MAG: Regional Rideshare Program	281	3,404	228	256		
Arizona					\$300,000	Shared Ride	MAG: Telework and Ozone Outreach Program	521	6,322	424	475		
Arizona					\$135,000	Shared Ride	MAG: Travel Reduction Program	3	42	3	3		
Arizona					\$1,680,000	Traffic Flow Improvements	ADOT: Freeway Management System Design and construct Freeway Management System on Loop 101 between Cuadalupe Rd and Loop 202	3	14	4			
Arizona					\$1,424,844	Traffic Flow Improvements	Scottsdale: Left turn lanes Construct left turn lanes on Hayden Rd at Via de Ventura	2	6	1	1		
Arizona					\$1,350,000	Traffic Flow Improvements	Maricopa County: Aztech smart corridors Construct Aztech smart corridors Phase 3 (design-build)	2	-1	2			
Arizona					\$917,500	Traffic Flow Improvements	Glendale: Turn lane Construct 59th Ave for turn lane and sidewalk from Olive St to Mountain View Rd	1	2	1			
Arizona					\$902,440	Traffic Flow Improvements	Goodyear: Conduit and fiber cable Install conduit and fiber cable on Litchfield Rd from Wigwam Blvd to Maricopa County Route 85	3	-1	1			
Arizona					\$686,825	Traffic Flow Improvements	Glendale: Fiber optic cable Install fiber optic cable and video detection cameras	9	47	10			
Arizona					\$640,000	Traffic Flow Improvements	Goodyear: Traffic Operations Center Purchase and install equipment for Traffic Operations Center	9	45	10			
Arizona					\$540,000	Traffic Flow Improvements	Tempe: Traffic signal controllers Upgrade traffic signal controllers	24	-8	11			

CMAQ DETAILED PROJECT LISTING REPORT (FY 2007)

Fiscal Year = '2007' and Status Selection Criteria = 'Approved by State' and State = 'Arizona'

STATE	Apporportionments	APPORTION. AMOUNT	OBLIGATED AMOUNT	OBLIG. %	PROJECT AMOUNT	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE & DESCRIPTION	VOC (Kg/Day)	CO (kg/Day)	NOx (kg/Day)	PM10 (Kg/Day)	PM2.5 (Kg/Day)	CONTINUING PROJECT?
Arizona					\$368,401	Traffic Flow Improvements	Gilbert: Traffic management center Design traffic management center (phase B) and purchase equipment	49	171	53			
Arizona					\$356,018	Traffic Flow Improvements	Glendale: Dynamic message signs Purchase and install dynamic message signs and reversible lane control sign bridges with message signs	1	6	1			
Arizona					\$320,000	Traffic Flow Improvements	Tempe: Emergency vehicle preemption systems Upgrade emergency vehicle preemption systems	24	-8	11			
Arizona					\$11,554,441	Transit	Valley Metro Rail: Central Phoenix-East Valley Light Rail Transit Construct Central Phoenix-East Valley Light Rail Transit and repayment for construction of five Intermodal Transfer Facilities	142	1,772	118	144		
Arizona					\$400,000	Transit	Phoenix: Purchase bus Purchase one standard bus	1	1	1	1		
Arizona					\$337,500	Transit	Valley Metro: Purchase Vanpool Vans Purchase 15 vanpool vans	3	37	2	3		
Arizona					\$245,811	Transit	Phoenix: Regional park-and-ride Repayment of advance design Interstate-17 and Happy Valley Rd regional park-and-ride	4	54	4	4		
Nationwide Totals		\$49,484,047	\$31,996,863	65 %									

States without ozone or CO Nonattainment or maintenance areas QA - Qualitative Assessment PR - Previously Reported c - Changed benefit from previous year report

