

**Air Quality Conformity Task Force
Summary Meeting Notes
April 26, 2012**

Participants:

Mike Brady – Caltrans

Dick Fahey – Caltrans

Ginger Vagenas – EPA

Ted Matley – FTA

Stew Sonnenberg– FHWA

Brenda Dix – MTC

Stefanie Hom - MTC

Ashley Nguyen – MTC

John Sindzinski – WETA

Tom Fitzwater - VTA

Margaret Simmons-Cross – VTA

Adam Crenshaw – MTC

Sri Srinivasan - MTC

- 1. Welcome and Self Introductions:** Ashley Nguyen (MTC) called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. See attendance roster above. Ashley also indicated to the Task Force members that a revised exempt list had been sent out by Stefanie Hom (MTC) and a revised project assessment form for the VTA project had been emailed out by Brenda Dix (MTC). Both revisions had been posted online.
- 2. PM_{2.5} Interagency Consultations:** To begin the interagency consultations for PM_{2.5} project level conformity, Ashley Nguyen (MTC) asked the project sponsors to give a brief overview of their projects prior to opening up the projects for questions by the Task Force.

POAQC Status Determinations

2ai: Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA): New Ferry Service from Berkeley/Albany to San Francisco

John Sindzinski (WETA) described that the project would build a new ferry terminal at the Berkeley waterfront to provide commute service to San Francisco. Project also includes the purchase of up to 2 new WETA vessels. The project would relieve cross-bay crossings via automobiles by providing accessible service from the East Bay to San Francisco employment centers.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) asked if there would be bus service to the project. John stated that there is existing AC Transit service to the project. Adding additional service to the area would be determined and proposed by AC Transit, not WETA.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) suggested that the Task Force look at the emissions from the vessels as well as the induced traffic, parking, and busses in order to determine the benefits and potential hot spot issues associated with the project. John responded that WETA did several air quality analyses for the WETA and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District considered WETA to be a TCM and now considers it to be neutral to air quality. WETA maintains a commitment to operate clean air ferry buses using biodiesel. They all meet or exceed EPA standards.

Mike asked for clarification of the site traffic conditions. John replied that a 400 space park and ride will be constructed for the project. WETA has made commitments that at least 50% of patrons will use alternative modes to get to and from the ferry service.

Mike requested that all information be documented in the project assessment form. All other Task Force members agreed with this.

Ashley suggested that the revised project assessment form include a link to the complete EIR with information on bus arrival information to the terminal, surrounding land use, opening and horizon date, traffic information at the parking ride and all other information requested on the form.

The Task Force agreed to follow up on this project via email.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC agreed to continue consultation for this project via email once receiving additional information.

2a: Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA): Development/Implementation of New South San Francisco Ferry Service and Terminal

John Sindzinski (WETA) explained that this project is nearly complete.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked if federal action is still needed for this project. John stated that there are no outstanding federal actions required for the project.

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) concluded that there is no follow up needed for this project since there are no federal actions remaining and all federal funds have already been obligated and spent.

Final Determination: No determination is required from the Task Force on this project.

2a: Valley Transportation Authority (VTA): US 101/Capitol-Yerba Buena Interchange Modifications

Tom Fitzwater (VTA) explained that this is Phase 2 of the project which has improvements near capitol expressway. The project is less than 2 miles long and will be adding an auxiliary lane as well as reconfiguring the interchange from a full cloverleaf to a partial cloverleaf to make it safer by reducing congestion and improving flow. The project is completely in the existing right-of-way. Both no-build and build traffic forecasts are the same since the project does not increase capacity. New truck data was provided to the Task Force to only include 3-axel and larger trucks. There was additionally a range of truck volumes based on Caltrans truck counts. Truck traffic varies from 4.55% to 3% of total traffic in the project area.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) asked for the distinction between 2-axel and 3-axel trucks. Tom replied that a 3-axel truck is almost certainly a diesel emitter while the smaller 2-axel trucks are less polluting and not all are diesel. The truck percentages with 2-axel trucks included is 7.91%.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) stated that the measurement of diesel traffic is inconsistent between Caltrans data and EPA classifications since Caltrans records the number of axels while EPA classifies vehicles by their weight class and registration data. It is hard to draw a direct correlation between the two. Mike stated that if the purpose of the Task Force is to look at heavy polluters, then the 3-axel information is appropriate; but if the assumption is that all

trucks are diesel, then the 2-axel truck counts are necessary even though that assumption is false.

Tom stated that the two main points VTA would like to make to the Task Force is that the number of diesel trucks on this segment of the road was originally overestimated and that either way there are essentially no changes in traffic volumes between no-build and build conditions in the horizon year.

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) reiterated that there would be little or no change between build and no-build conditions which indicates that the project would not create any localized air quality impacts.

Margaret Simmons-Cross (VTA) pointed out that traffic volumes do not change but flow would improve which will reduce idling and actually improve air quality conditions in the project area.

Ginger indicated that there are 2 different questions that need to be answered. The first is whether it is appropriate to use the Caltrans 3-axel truck counts or if the 2-axel trucks need to be included, seeing as one is overly inclusive and the other is not inclusive enough. This question can be followed up on later. The second is whether this specific project is a POAQC or not.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) requested clarification on whether this project is a new access point. Tom clarified that this is not a new access point; it is a reconfiguration from a full clover leaf to a partial clover leaf. Margaret added that the project eliminated a CD road on the southbound which currently backs up onto the main line. The additional storage on the ramps would alleviate congestion issues and updating the interchange design.

Stew asked if the shoulders of the mainline were being changed. Margaret responded that an auxiliary line is being added between Capitol and Yerba Buena but it would not be adding capacity.

Mike requested clarification that the auxiliary road is replacing the CD road. This was confirmed by Margaret.

Mike stated his belief that even with the high traffic volumes on the main line, since this project is not adding capacity and is improving operations he believes the project to not be a POAQC. Ashley agreed with Mike's assessment that future air quality conditions will be better than today.

Dick agreed that whichever truck numbers are used it is still not a POAQC. He questioned why the ADT went up with the revised numbers. Tom stated that this was because of newer Caltrans counts.

Ted Matley (FTA) and Stew agreed that the project is not a POAQC.

Ginger concurred with the other Task Force members since no capacity is being added.

Mike added that the project would make the interchange better for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that this project is not a POAQC.

2aiv: San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA):US 101 Doyle Drive Replacement

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) stated that the project sponsors were not in attendance but the project assessment form that was provided by the sponsor is comprehensive.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) questioned why the project was appearing for consultation since the environmental review had been completed several years earlier.

Ashley responded that all projects with active TIP projects are asked to complete the air quality information in the FMS.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) stated that he did not know of any additional federal action that was required on the project.

Sri Srinivasan (MTC) indicated that the project may be adding federal funds to the project and therefore may have to undergo consultation. She agreed to check with the project sponsor for clarification on the need to undergo consultation.

Mike stated that if the project does require a Task Force determination then it would be difficult to determine that the project is not a POAQC due to the high traffic volumes on Doyle Drive.

Ashley clarified that the project scope is a safety project to replace an asset that has exceeded its useful life. There will also be some operational improvements to improve traffic flow. The truck volumes on Doyle Drive are actually very low and should not create a hot spot.

Mike revised his stance to not a POAQC but advised that the Task Force not make a determination unless the sponsor requires one since a determination will require additional public review.

Ashley asked for consensus that if the sponsor requires a Task Force determination then the Task Force would determine that the project is not a POAQC.

Following the meeting, conversations between MTC and the project sponsor revealed that the project has completed environmental review but will be adding additional federal funding to the project. Stew confirmed in a phone conversation that the additional of federal funds does not require that the Task Force review the project as long as there are no scope changes associated with the additional funds.

The project sponsor confirmed that there are no scope changes associated with the additional funding so the project does not require any further federal action and is therefore not subject to the project level PM 2.5 hot spot analysis.

Final Determination: Project does not require any Task Force determination.

PM_{2.5} Conformity Exempt List Review

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) reminded the Task Force that a revision to the exempt list had been sent out by Stefanie Hom and was now posted online.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) asked for clarification on NAP110021 and if the project description was correct. Sri Srinivasan (MTC) responded that the project is a Highway Bridge Program Project and that the sponsor had selected the incorrect exemption code. Sri stated that this error would be corrected before the project was exempted.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) asked why CC-110068 referenced ASHTO standards for replacing a one-lane bridge with another one-lane bridge. Stew believes that the federal requirement is to replace one-lane bridges with two-lane bridges. Sri responded that this is the language Caltrans uses in its back-up listing so it is likely that the sponsor copied the language. Sri stated that she would correct his error.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) added that the project description should include whether or not the project is in the urbanized area.

Ginger asked for confirmation that SF-010015 was only building the Transbay Terminal and did not include additional service which would increase emissions.

Ashley confirmed that the project was replacing the transit terminal and provided the provision of space for future rail extensions but the project does not include any increased service.

Ginger asked if the removal of a right-turn lane in project SF-110024 would be considered a road diet?

Mike and Ashley determined that road-diet was not the most appropriate term for the project, It is really a de-channelization that would not affect the roadway operations.

Ginger asked if SM-030030 is a relocation of the South SF Caltrain station. Ginger asked for clarification on how far the reconstruction was moving the project. Mike agreed that more information would be useful even though it is likely a grade separation project. Sri stated she would obtain more information from the project sponsor.

Ginger asked for confirmation that SM-090021 is not relocating the station, it is simply reconstructing in the same location. Sri stated that it is only a grade separation project and is not shifting the station location. Ashley indicated that MTC would seek clarification from the project sponsor that the station location would not be shifted.

Ashley asked for consensus that all projects that were not discussed were approved for exemption. Hearing none the remaining projects were approved.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that all projects except NAP110021, CC-110068, SM-030030, and SM-090021 are exempt from PM_{2.5} project level

analysis. NAP110021 was determined to be exempt once the exemption code was modified to bridge reconstruction.

3. Transportation Improvement Program:

a: Overview of 2013 Transportation Improvement Program

Sri Srinivasan (MTC) reminded the Task Force that MTC is required by the state to update the TIP every two years and is in the process of creating the 2013 TIP. Most projects are anticipated to come from the 2011 TIP with very few new projects being added. This is because the current RTP and conformity analysis are still in effect.

Any new projects or changes to the current projects will be brought to the Task Force at the May meeting.

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) added that this is mostly an administrative process and there would be no substantial changes between the 2011 and the 2013 TIP

b: Approach to Conformity Analysis for the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) stated that the conformity analysis and determination for the 2013 TIP is relying on the previous regional emissions analysis from the most current conformity analysis on the Transportation 2035 Plan and the 2011 TIP. This is the process since no new non-exempt projects are being added to the 2013 TIP that aren't in the current TIP or the current plan therefore there is no change in the project listings. This is why MTC would like to move forward with reliance on the previous regional emissions analysis. Every assumption that is in the current conformity analysis will remain the same. There will be an opportunity for the public to provide input on this abbreviated conformity analysis. The draft schedule for the process is included in the memo. The 2013 TIP and conformity analysis will be taken to the MTC Committee and Commission for approval in June. The draft TIP and draft Conformity will be circulated for a 30 day period and a hearing will be held on the 2013 TIP and Conformity Analysis in mid-July. A final Conformity analysis will be taken to the Task Force and then to the MTC Committee and Commission in September. MTC aims to have a final TIP and Conformity by the end of September for submission to Caltrans, FHWA and FTA for final approval.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) agreed with this approach and asked what was included in the administrative amendments that had been made to Transportation 2035.

Sri Srinivasan (MTC) responded that the amendment was a funding change since MTC received \$400 million in FRA funds for the Transbay Terminal. RTP IDs were also added to the project list for clarity. Also, the Conformity analysis was repeated for the 2011 TIP.

Stew asked what the process would be when the new plan is adopted in April 2013.

Ashley responded that at that point a new conformity analysis will be completed for PlanBayArea and it will cover the 2013 TIP amendment. The draft conformity analysis for the new plan is likely to be completed in January 2013.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) added that the 2013 TIP is basically just rolling forward in the TIP 2 years and that EMFAC2007 can be used one last time.

Stew asked for clarification that EMFAC2011 would be used for the new plan.

Ashley responded that she would come back to the Task Force in a few months to ensure that MTC is using the most recent planning assumptions and tools in the PlanBayArea conformity analysis and that EMFAC2011 would be part of that discussion.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) stated that MTC's proposed approach is fine with EPA.

4. Consent Calendar

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) called the Task Force's attention to item 4a: Interagency Consultation for Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Revision 11-25. The attachment for this item was posted online the morning of the Task Force meeting.

Sri Srinivasan (MTC) stated that the amendment would go to the Commission for approval on May 23, 2012 and asked for comments on the amendment prior to that time. The main changes in the amendment include the deletion of approximately 20 projects; these projects were completed or funding was removed from the projects. The amendment also adds 30 new projects, 29 of which are exempt. The remaining project is non-exempt but not regionally significant since it is a highway bridge project not located in an urbanized area. Therefore, it did not qualify for the safety exemption or the highway bridge program. The bridge is 740 feet.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked why the non-exempt bridge project was adding an additional lane. Sri responded that it was for bike and pedestrian use. Mike suggested that a different exemption code such as Bike and Pedestrian facilities or channelization may be used if the additional lane is not a turn lane. Sri agreed to get clarification from the sponsor and update the exemption code if appropriate.

The Task Force members were having trouble accessing the online document so it was determined that the Task Force should review the document and provide comments within a week to MTC. Stefanie Hom (MTC) emailed the TIP amendment 11-25 project list to the Task Force later that day and confirmed that comments were due on Thursday, May 3, 2012.

On April 27, 2012, Mike emailed comments to the Task Force. On May 1, 2012, Stefanie emailed an updated TIP amendment 11-25 project list and included Sri's responses to Mike's comments (see Attachment A for Mike's and Sri's comments).

On May 3, 2012, Ginger Vagenas (EPA) emailed the Task Force indicating that she agreed with Mike's comments and did not have anything to add.

On May 4, 2012, Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) and Dick Fahey (Caltrans) emailed the Task Force indicating that they agreed with Mike's comments and did not have anything to add.

On May 7, 2012, Ted Matley (FTA) emailed Stefanie indicating that he had no comments.

On May 7, 2012, Mike emailed Stefanie and Dick indicating that he accepted Sri's clarification on several projects, but still had comments on four projects (see Attachment A). Additional discussion may occur at the next Task Force meeting.

5. Other Business

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) updated the Task Force that EPA and FHWA were still working to schedule a call to discuss road diets.

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) concluded the meeting at 10:45 am.

J:\SECTION\PLANNING\AIRQUAL\TSKFORCE\2012\05-24-12\Drafts\AQCTF Meeting Notes Summary - 042612.docx

Comments on TIP Amendment 11-25 Project List

TIP ID	Project Name	Project Description	Mike's Comments (4/27/12)	Sri's Comments (5/1/12)	Mike's Comments (5/7/12)
CC-030002	Hercules Intercity Rail Station	Rail Station Site & Access: Construct platform, realign tracks, construct necessary infrastructure like: creek realignment, utility relocation, retaining walls, transit loop, John Muir Pkwy extension	Looks OK from a conformity standpoint (non-exempt). Unofficial comment/suggestion: Given water-level grade on the RR line will potential for sea level rise effects and future adjustments to track grade be considered?	Question forwarded to the sponsor.	
MRN050026	Refurbish MS San Francisco Ferry Vessel	GGBHTD: Refurbish MS San Francisco Ferry Vessel in San Francisco.	Better choice might be EXEMPT (40 CFR 93.126) - Rehabilitation of transit vehicles	AQ code changed	
MRN070019	Marin Parklands Visitor Access, Phase 2	Phase 2 would implement construction of Pacific Way Bridge as part of the wetland and creek restoration at Big Lagoon in Muir Beach including reducing flooding on Pacific Way.	Marin Parklands Visitor Access, Phase 2 Not clear whether this is a new road bridge, reconstruction of existing road bridge, new or reconstructed bike/bed bridge, or adding bike/ped to existing bridge. If the first, it's NOT EXEMPT but if not in the TDM modeling network might not be regionally significant. If the second, it's probably not adding lanes & would be exempt (bridge reconstruction/replacement). Only if it's the third or 4th would the claimed bike/ped exemption be appropriate.	Spoke to the sponsor and the scope is to rebuild the existing multimodal bridge (to increase the vertical alignment to prevent flooding) and to widen to include bike lanes. There is no increased capacity for Auto vehicles - only for the creek, bikes and pedestriains. Let us know which code you would like us to use.	Given the description, bike/ped as claimed is marginally correct because they're adding bike lanes. Since they're replacing the bridge, (126) Bridge Reconstruction would probably be better, but I can live with bike/ped. Let's not emphasize the vertical alignment change too much ... would bring up the hot spot analysis issue.
MRN110032	San Anselmo - Center Blvd Bridge Replcmnt(27C0079)	San Anselmo: Center Blvd Bridge over San Anselmo Creek, at Sycamore Ave: Replace existing 2 lane bridge with 3 lane bridge	Discussed this at the meeting. Need more info - what's the 3rd lane for? If the 3rd lane is not through it might be exempt.-- if it's for channelization of an intersection near the bridge, it might be 40 CFR 93.127 - channelization rather than non-exempt. I'd only call it non-exempt if the extra lane is a through lane because that would in fact be road widening adding capacity (even if not regionally significant). Also, if Center Blvd is in your TDM network used for regional emission analysis, then capacity addition on that road IS regionally significant (see 40 CFR 93.101 definitions).	Left a message for project sponsor and waiting to hear from them for more details. It is not in the modeled network.	
SCL010040	SR-152/SR-156 Interchange Improvements.	SR-152/SR-156: WB SR-152 to SB-SR-156; Construct a flyover and other improvements at the interchange. Perform PA/ED studies for capacity improvements needed for the 152/156 interchange.	Thought this was already done? There's a flyover from EB152-EB152 in place making it a full i/c. What else is going on? In any case, the category and possibly description are wrong - if you're just doing capacity studies and PE (no construction) then it should be exempt planning studies. If you're widening things it's NON-EXEMPT capacity work. If you're rearranging existing ramps etc. then it's interchange reconfiguration. I don't see a circumstance where it would just be vertical/horizontal alignment change	The interchange changes (vertical and horizontal alignment changes) have been completed and the sponsor requested to add the ability to perform PA/ED studies for capacity improvements needed for the 152/156 interchange. The latter part is approx. \$3M in a \$45M project. We can change the exemption code to planning studies if that is the group consensus.	Still not clear what they're doing, but it sounds like they're doing environmental and preliminary design work for a larger project (probably non-exempt due to capacity addition). If that's true, and if they don't need a NEPA document completed before the next TIP, then it might be better to clarify the scope and use the (126) alternatives analysis or (126) planning studies exemption.

Comments on TIP Amendment 11-25 Project List

TIP ID	Project Name	Project Description	Mike's Comments (4/27/12)	Sri's Comments (5/1/12)	Mike's Comments (5/7/12)
SCL050075	Santa Clara Co. - Oregon/Page Mill Expwy Rehab	Santa Clara County: Oregon/Page Mill Expressway between I-280 and US 101; Rehabilitation and maintenance of roadway.	Based on description I don't see non-exempt components to this project -- is there widening (added lanes) to go with the bike/ped, signal improvements, and pavement rehab? Did this get confused with the following project on the list? Unless you're adding new signals, and channelization, suggest using one or a combination of rehab, bike/ped, and traffic control device exemptions.	This was only for the resurfacing and hence coded as an exempt project	
SCL050080	Oregon-Page Mill Expwy Improvements	Santa Clara County: On the Oregon-Page Mill Exwy btw US 101 and SR 82, Traffic improvements including traffic signal upgrade, optimizing timing plans & bike and ped facilities, and pavement rehab.	Based on description I don't see non-exempt components to this project -- is there widening (added lanes) to go with the bike/ped, signal improvements, and pavement rehab? Did this get confused with the following project on the list? Unless you're adding new signals, and channelization, suggest using one or a combination of rehab, bike/ped, and traffic control device exemptions.	No action	
SCL070005	Almaden Expressway Improvements	San Jose: On Almaden Expressway btw Branham Lane and Blossom Hill Road; Various improvement including adding northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes. The project is phased	Realize it's moot because the project is already built, but the conformity exemption is incorrect. Project is/was NON-EXEMPT because it added aux lanes. Was this mixed up with the previous project?	It was a separate project.	Still not clear what they're doing -- clarify scope to eliminate aux lanes if you want to keep the exemption.
SOL070029	Ulatis Creek Bike Path - Allison to I-80	Vacaville: Ulatis Creek Bike Path from Allison Drive to I-80; Construct Class 1 bike path.	Was this a TCM? In Vacaville, it's in the Sac Valley portion not Bay Area nonattainment area.	Not a TCM but sent a note to SACOG to check if this was a TCM for Sacramento.	agree with the exemption - it's OK. TCM status is a separate matter though there's always the question of how, if it's a TCM, you reconcile "neutral" air quality for the exemption vs air quality improvement as a TCM. Frankly, it's probably not a TCM - you should have confirmation of that shortly based on your notes.