

**Air Quality Conformity Task Force
Summary Meeting Notes
December 6, 2012**

Participants:

Dick Fahey – Caltrans

Ted Matley – FTA

Stew Sonnenberg - FHWA

Mike Brady – Caltrans

Ginger Vagenas – EPA

Jeff Kless – EPA

Lynn McIntyre – URS

Jeff Zimmerman – URS

Chadi Chazbek – URS

Roy Molseed – VTA

Joanne Parker – SMART

Bill Gamlin – SMART

John Kenyon – Parsons

C. Kim Franchi – Parsons

Eddie Barios – Fehr and Peers

Chad Copeman – City of Vacaville

Tracy Rideout – City of Vacaville

Susan Miller – CCTA

Carolyn Clevenger – MTC

Brenda Dix – MTC

Stefanie Hom – MTC

Harold Brazil – MTC

Sri Srinivasan – MTC

Adam Crenshaw – MTC

1. Welcome and Self Introductions: Brenda Dix (MTC) called the meeting to order at 9:30 am. See attendance roster above.

2. PM_{2.5} Interagency Consultations

a. PM_{2.5} Conformity Exempt List Review

City of Vacaville: Vacaville Intermodal Station Parking Structure

Chad Copeman (City of Vacaville) provided an overview of the project. This project is Phase 2 of the Vacaville Intermodal Station, which includes the construction of a 400 space multi-level parking structure on the existing Phase 1 property. Phase 1 is an operational regional bus transit facility and surface parking lot completed in 2010.

Brenda Dix (MTC) asked how many spots the parking structure would include.

Chad responded that there would be approximately 400 parking spots; this number could change based on the outcome of the feasibility study.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) indicated that the buses are primarily CNG and there will be not commuter buses at the station. The parking structure is essentially a park and ride, so the project cannot be considered exempt from conformity. But he did not think this project would be a project of air quality concern since it would not affect diesel traffic.

Chad indicated that the park and ride is already completed and confirmed that the City of Vacaville's bus fleet is all CNG; there are no diesel buses.

Mike indicated carbon monoxide (CO) does not need to be analyzed for conformity for NEPA.

On November 21, 2012, Matt Jones, Supervising Planner for Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD), emailed Brenda indicating that YSAQMD does not think this project is a project of air quality concern.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans), Ted Matley (FTA), Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA), Ginger Vagenas (EPA), Mike Brady (Caltrans), and Brenda Dix (MTC) agreed that the project is exempt.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that the project is exempt from PM2.5 project level analysis.

Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART): Sonoma Marin Area Rail Corridor

Joanne Parker (SMART) provided an overview of the project. The full 70-mile Sonoma Marin Area Rail Corridor project consists of restoration of commuter rail services and construction of a bicycle-pedestrian pathway in the counties of Marin and Sonoma. This project includes the following Phase 1 and Phase 2 elements (Phase 1 is locally funded and Phase 2 is potentially funded with federal funds):

- Phase 1 Rail under construction between Downtown San Rafael and Santa Rosa North with track to and maintenance facility at Airport Boulevard/Sonoma County Airport.
- Phase 1 Bicycle-Pedestrian Pathway constructed between Larkspur and Santa Rosa North, in segments.
- Phase 2 Rail to the south of Downtown San Rafael and a station at Larkspur;
- Phase 2 Rail north of Santa Rosa and up to two stations in the San Francisco Air Basin and two stations in the North Coast Air Basin; and
- Phase 2 Bicycle-pedestrian pathway between Marin Civic Center northward.

Phase 1 has been under construction for a year. No additional right-of-way is needed. No new parking structures will be constructed, and no additional bus services will be implemented. Sonoma County Transit bus fleet is all CNG.

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated that the technology used for the trains will create “clean” trains, so the project would not create any localized hot spots.

Joanne indicated that the trains would be two-car train sets, so the impact on intersections will not be substantial.

Bill Gamlin (SMART) indicated that the trains will have two Tier 4 compliant diesel-multiple unit rail cars; these engines are not in any trains at this time and technology is still being developed.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked for clarification on which part of the project the Task Force should be focusing on. Since Phase 1 is locally funded, which part of Phase 2 is going to be included in the TIP? Looks like a lot is in plan phase. What phase is going in the TIP?

Joanne indicated that the airport station is still a potential part of the project because it is not included in the CEQA document; they are just constructing a maintenance facility at that location right now. The impacts in the CEQA document are for Phase 1 of the project. When the

CEQA document is amended to include the airport passenger station, there will not be an additional fleet impact because the maintenance yard will already be there. Joanne added that all of Phase I is in the TIP under one TIP ID since it is included in the RTP as one project ID. All of Phase I was initially locally funded, but the project had to be phased. The upcoming RTP includes all elements of Phase 2 under separate RTPIDs; Phase 2 is all environmentally cleared through CEQA and underway with NEPA clearance.

Mike indicated that there are a lot of projects spread over long period of time. Since the TIP is only a four-year document, what should the Task Force be looking at for NEPA? Will there be one NEPA document for whole project, or just certain segments that will be in TIP for funding?

Joanne indicated that the NEPA process for the Larkspur extension is underway. The Phase 2 pathway project has been in the CE process with Caltrans and they anticipate that will be completed by December 2013. They are seeking federal funds through the MTC/ABAG OBAG program. It is likely that construction for Phase 2 will occur in phases. The NEPA clearance should be done soon. There is not an estimated timeframe for the rail extension to the north, but the bulk of that is out of the air district boundaries and fully in the CNG surface area district for Sonoma County Transit.

Mike indicated that he is trying to focus on what the federal activity is right now. He is not concerned about the bike/pedestrian path because it will be exempt from conformity. He is looking mainly at the rail portion of the project, since that is regionally significant. The Task Force should focus on the Larkspur and first extension in Sonoma County.

Brenda suggested that the Task Force focus on the entire project since that is how it is listed in the RTP and current TIP.

Mike asked if the project is listed in the current TIP for construction or just a study.

Joanne indicated that the project is in the TIP for construction.

Brenda indicated that if the Task Force is clearing the project in the TIP, they need to look at it in its entirety.

Mike indicated that the project does not include the construction of additional parking lots or a change in bus service. In places such as Windsor, how are commuters going to get to the station?

Joanne indicated that there is existing bus service in Windsor to the Windsor station that connects from different locations. Local transit operators would change service as they see fit. Sonoma County Transit includes an all CNG fleet.

Mike asked if a park and ride would be constructed.

Joanne indicated that Windsor is fairly high density and there is no physical space to construct a park and ride lot.

Bill added that there will be good connectivity with the bike and pedestrian path and SMART will allow bikes on trains.

Joanne indicated that Santa Rosa CityBus ends north of City of Santa Rosa; north of there is covered by Sonoma County Transit which has a full CNG fleet.

Stew asked if all the buses covered in the service area are CNG.

Joanne indicated that Sonoma County Transit is an all CNG fleet.

Mike indicated that Golden Gate Transit does not have a full CNG fleet. But most of their service area is included in Phase 1 and that is not under consideration because it is already under construction. The only area served by Golden Gate Transit is the extension to Larkspur.

Dick asked what the surrounding land uses are at the Larkspur terminal.

Joanne responded that the surrounding land uses include the Marin Airporter Terminal, retail, a movie theater, parking lots, and US-101.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) asked if the project will create more traffic on the highway. There is potential for more capacity for diesel truck traffic if freeways are moving better.

Joanne indicated that the project will make existing truck traffic move more efficiently. Approximately 1 to 2 percent of traffic in the area is diesel, depending on the county. She did not know if capacity would allow for a substantial shift.

Mike asked how much road traffic is the project expected to attract.

Joanne indicated that the bulk of the SMART ridership will be on Phase 1 of the project. The Larkspur station included in Phase 2 is a small extension. Most commuters will commute between the two counties.

Mike asked if the freight partners can attract enough traffic to take a few trucks off the road.

Joanne indicated that they are the dispatcher for the right of way. They have a freight train operator conducting business on the right of way as far south as Novato and branching out to the main line in the valley. Freight trains are permitted up to Windsor and they are in the process of getting permission to go further north. They are trying to attract rail traffic.

Mike indicated that even with the carpool lanes on US-101, there will still be traffic on the highway in the area so he did not foresee a large increase in truck traffic.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans), Ted Matley (FTA), Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA), Ginger Vagenas (EPA), Mike Brady (Caltrans), and Brenda Dix (MTC) agreed that the project is exempt.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that the project is exempt from PM2.5 project level analysis.

Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA): I-680 Southbound HOV Lane Gap Closure

Susan Miller (CCTA) provided an overview of the project. The I-680 corridor has operation deficiencies that (without improvements) will be exacerbated as traffic demand increases in the future. The proposed project will achieve the following goals:

- Improve High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) traffic flow by closing the southbound HOV gap in the current I-680 system and by providing a continuous HOV lane without interruption within Contra Costa County.
- Improve the overall operations of Southbound I-680.

C. Kim Franchi (Parsons) added that the project proposes to close the existing gap in the southbound HOV lane system along southbound I-680 by adding a median HOV lane from 0.6 miles north of the Livorna Road interchange to 0.2 miles north of Geary Road, a distance of 5.4 miles. To accommodate the new southbound HOV lane, the proposed improvements will widen southbound I-680 from 0.6 miles north of Livorna Road to 0.4 miles north of South Main Street, and restripe the existing southbound mainline from north of South Main Street to 0.4 miles north of North Main Street. The project will also require widening the bridge at South Main Street.

Eddie Barrios (Fehr and Peers) indicated that implementation of the project will result in a decrease of HOV travel time, and a slight decrease in single occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel time as a result of HOVs using the HOV lane. The truck volumes on the corridor will not be substantially high.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked if there will be a substantial amount of buses that will use the HOV lane.

Eddie indicated there will not be a lot of buses using the HOV lane.

Susan added that there will be express buses traveling between BART and the business park primarily during the peak commute hours that will use the HOV lane.

Mike asked if the express buses are diesel.

Susan indicated that the buses are converting to cleaner fuels. MTC is looking to convert HOV lanes to high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes on that corridor.

Mike asked if the HOV lane will be southbound only.

Susan indicated that the HOV lane will be southbound only, which is more cost-effective. The northbound corridor is more complex.

Dick asked if the buses serving Bishop Ranch are coming from both Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill BART stations.

Susan confirmed that the buses are coming from those BART stations, as well as Dublin BART station.

Mike asked if the HOV lane would support additional bus service. If the additional buses are diesel, that is a concern.

Susan indicated that they will check with Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (CCCTA) on the bus technology. She hopes additional bus service will be implemented to reduce SOV.

Eddie added that the buses currently sit in traffic. The project will get them moving faster, which is a benefit regardless of the fuel type.

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated that if CCCTA did increase their bus fleet, they would need to get approval from the Task Force.

Stew asked if the bridge at South Main Street would be widened; is that the only bridge?

C. Kim confirmed that the South Main Street bridge will be the only bridge that will be widened under this project. There are other bridges along the corridor, but none of them will be widened.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans), Ted Matley (FTA), Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA), Ginger Vagenas (EPA), Mike Brady (Caltrans), and Brenda Dix (MTC) agreed that the project is exempt.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that the project is exempt from PM_{2.5} project level analysis.

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA): US-101 Express Lane Project

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated VTA submitted both a Project Assessment Form for PM_{2.5} Interagency Consultation and a PM_{2.5} Hot Spot Analysis in the event that the Task Force determines the project is a project of air quality concern.

Ray Molseed (VTA) provided an overview of the project. VTA and Caltrans proposes to convert the existing High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes along US-101 to High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes (hereafter known as express lanes) and add a second express lane in each direction on northbound and southbound US-101. The project will also convert the US-101/SR-85 direct connectors in Mountain View to express lane connectors and restripe the northern 1.1 mile of SR-85 express lanes to the US-101 express lanes. The project would be implemented between the East Dunne Avenue interchange in Morgan Hill and the Santa Clara/San Mateo County line just north of the Oregon Expressway/Embarcadero Road interchange in Palo Alto. The project length is 36.55 miles on US-101 and 1.1 miles on SR-85, for a total of 37.65 miles.

US-101 typically has four lanes in each direction, including three mixed-flow lanes and one HOV lane with auxiliary lanes in some locations. The project consists of converting the existing HOV lane along both northbound and southbound US-101 into an express lane and widening the freeway to add a second express lane for the majority of the corridor. The project also proposes to build new express lanes in the northbound direction between East Dunne Avenue and the existing HOV lane at Cochrane Road, and in the southbound direction between Burnett Avenue and Cochrane Road.

The purpose of the project is to:

- Manage traffic congestion in the most congested HOV segments of the freeway between the SR-85 interchange in southern San Jose and the Oregon Expressway/Embarcadero Road interchange in Palo Alto, and
- Maintain consistency with provisions defined in Assembly Bill 2032 (2004) and Assembly Bill 574 (2007) to implement express lanes in the US-101 and SR-85 corridors.

Lynn McIntyre (URS) indicated that VTA assumed that the existing future with- and without-project annual average daily traffic (AADT) truck counts for the project would be above the thresholds (trucks are higher than 125,000 or greater than 8 percent of AADT), so they prepared a Hot Spot Analysis to determine if the project would exceed PM_{2.5} air quality standards. They used traffic modeling which assumed peak periods to forecast future AADT and VMT in the project area. The Hot Spot Analysis and PM_{2.5} emissions modeling for diesel trucks were prepared using EMFAC2007 for the years 2015 (opening year) and 2035 (horizon year). Results showed that, overall, the project would not contribute to or exceed PM_{2.5} air quality standards.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked if the express lanes network is essentially the entire length of the HOV system, and just converting HOV lanes to HOT lanes and doubling the number of lanes.

Lynn confirmed that yes, HOV lanes will be converted to HOT lanes. There will be a section where it will just be single express lanes, but the majority of corridor is going to have two express lanes.

Mike asked if the expansions will be from the median; there is not a lot of space in the median.

Chadi Chazbek (URS) indicated that the HOT network will be a combination of single and double express lanes in both directions. VTA will do both inside and outside widening. The inside widening will happen mostly in the southern section of the network in south San Jose where there is a wide median existing today. North of the SR-85 interchange in south San Jose will be outside widening since there is no space in the median. North of SR-85 is just restriping and conversion; the existing HOV lane will extend to just before the Oregon Expressway.

Mike indicated that if there is widening on the outside, it might push traffic closer to the existing land uses.

Chadi indicated that traffic will be pushed to the outside with outside widening. But the express lanes network will improve the overall performance of the system.

Mike asked if the truck traffic for the build and no-build scenarios are the same.

Chadi responded that, yes, they are the same. The only change in traffic patterns would be on SR-85, but SR-85 has truck restrictions so diesel emissions are not affected. Trucks can only travel on US-101.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) asked if trucks use Monterey Road.

Chadi indicated that trucks do not really use Monterey Road since it “zig-zags” through downtown San Jose. Monterey Road only gets trucks to SR-85, and then they need to go back onto US-101 so the incentive to use Monterey Road is minimal.

Mike indicated that truck traffic affected with the project, but not by a huge amount. He was “on the fence” if project is project of air quality concern due to the widening of lanes on the outside. Truck volumes will not change that much, but they are high to begin with.

Dick indicated he was “on the fence” if the project is a project of air quality concern.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) indicated that she and Karina O’Connor believe the project is a project of air quality concern due to the large scope of the project.

Mike asked if PM_{2.5} calculations for the Bay Area consider re-entrained dust. If it is considered, then the project would be a project of air quality concern.

Harold Brazil (MTC) indicated that re-entrained dust is not considered in PM_{2.5} in the Bay Area.

Ted Matley (FTA) indicated that the Task Force should review the Hot Spot Analysis.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) indicated that he leaning towards project being considered a project of air quality concern.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that the project is a project of air quality concern and is not exempt from PM_{2.5} project level analysis. The project sponsor must complete a PM_{2.5} Hot Spot Analysis (see section (b) below).

Brentwood: John Muir Parkway Extension Phase II

Brenda Dix (MTC) provided an overview of the project. The project includes the construction of a new roadway (John Muir Parkway) to replace Concord Avenue, required as a result of the State Route 4 Bypass project. This roadway is a continuation of John Muir Parkway Phase I and extends from Foothill Drive to Briones Valley Road approximately 1,600 linear feet. Project includes two 12-foot wide travel lanes, bike lanes, median island and sidewalk.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) indicated that more detail is needed. It is unclear what the scope of the project is. Concord Avenue already exists.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) indicated there is not sufficient detail to make a determination; numbers and maps need to be included.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) indicated he had a hard time locating the project.

Brenda indicated that they will bring the project back to the Task Force at a later date with more information.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that there is not enough information to determine whether the project is a project of air quality concern. The project will be brought back to the Task Force at a later date with more information.

b. Consultation to Review Hot Spot Analysis

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA): US-101 Express Lane Project

Lynn McIntyre (URS) indicated that they looked at quantitative factors, such as air quality trends in the local area and exceedances in the past five years. EMFAC2007 (approved by EPA) modeling was used to assume future conditions for build and no build for the years 2015 (opening year) and 2035 (horizon year). Results show an increase of PM_{2.5} emissions over no-build for the year 2015. This is likely due to additional traffic moving to general purpose lanes and does not include many of the new fleet regulations, including bus and truck regulations. In 2035, the PM_{2.5} forecasted emissions are lower with build than no build because of those regulations. Lynn noted that EMFAC2007 includes the fleet regulations in place up to the point EMFAC2007 was released, so additional improvements that went into effect after it was released are not accounted for. Also, the model uses peak VMT estimates, so results are conservative.

Jeff Kless (EPA) indicated that the project used EMFAC2007, which does not include the truck and bus regulations that went into effect in January 2012. The difference between the model years 2015 and 2035 is the reduction in PM_{2.5} emissions due to vehicle turnover. The truck and bus rule will accelerate vehicle turnover. If the project used EMFAC2011 (which is not yet approved for conformity purposes by EPA), it would have included the truck and bus rule and there would be enhanced turnover earlier on; the small increase in 2015 would disappear.

Jeff added that the project is located in a non-attainment area for the 24 hour PM_{2.5} standards in the Bay Area. There is less concern when an area is developing a plan that is looking to get attainment by 2015, and the project shows a slight increase in the early years, mainly due to the model used. He indicated that the Hot Spot Analysis looked good, and he was not too concerned about the other small “red flags”.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) indicated that the results are conservative because the model used peak VMT; if the numbers were based on annual daily traffic, results would be even lower.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) indicted the differences between build and no-build does not look very big to start with.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC concurred that the project would not cause or contribute to future PM_{2.5} air quality violations.

c. Confirm Projects are Exempt from PM_{2.5} Conformity

The Task Force had comments on the following projects:

Alameda: Vasco Road Safety Improvements (ALA030002)

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) indicated that part of Vasco Road is urbanized; he would like more information on where the truck climbing lanes will begin.

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated that they would check with the project sponsor for more information.

AC Transit: Enhanced Bus – Telegraph/Intl/East 14th (ALA050017)

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) asked if this project will include new stations and if the bus fleet is being expanded or replaced with new fleet. She suggested that projects with a large scope be broken up into smaller projects with multiple exemption codes, since a single exemption code for a does not always apply evenly.

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated that projects could not be broken up because it is complicated to split the funding. Also, it requires project sponsors to do TIP amendments to split the projects, which is time consuming. In the past, exemption codes were picked based on the largest element of the project scope.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked if the project is part of the AC Transit East Bay BRT line.

Brenda confirmed that, yes, the project is part of the BRT.

Carolyn Clevenger (MTC) added that the project will upgrade existing stops on the 1R line, which is one of the most heavily used routes. A new line will not be implemented.

Ginger asked if the database could list multiple exemption codes.

Brenda indicated that multiple exemption codes could be listed in the expanded description of the project.

Port of Oakland: Shore Power Initiative (ALA110010)

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) indicated that this project is not a transportation project.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked what the funding source is.

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated that the project is receiving CMAQ funding.

Mike asked if there is another exemption code other than “mass transit” for projects receiving CMAQ funding.

Brenda indicated that there is not another exemption code.

Mike indicated that this is not a surface transportation project. He asked what exemption code is used for CNG conversions. Diesel locomotive purchase projects are also similar. He suggested finding a similar project and using the same exemption code.

Brenda indicated that they would bring the project back to the Task Force with a proposed alternative exemption code, and will also talk to the project sponsor.

City of Berkeley Transportation Action Plan – TDM (ALA110007)

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) indicated that there are multiple elements to this project. OTAC indicated that parts of the project can be considered exempt, but the expansion part cannot.

Brenda clarified that the car share portion of the project is the only part that is expanding, but it will not be getting federal funding.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) indicated that there is still an expansion element to the project.

Brenda asked if the Task Force is concerned about parking pricing projects.

Mike indicated that the Task Force is concerned about parking pricing if it is changing VMT.

Brenda indicated that the goal of the project is to reduce VMT. She asked if the project sponsor should fill out a PM_{2.5} project assessment form.

Mike indicated that since the project includes expansion, it is not exempt.

Brenda indicated that exemptions should apply to projects that are beneficial to air quality emissions.

Mike clarified that exemptions are for neutral projects only.

Ginger requested more information on the project.

SFMTA: N-Judah Mobility Maximization Project (SF110042)

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) requested that the exemption code for construction and renovation of power systems also be applied to this project.

SFMTA: Mission Mobility Maximization (SF110043)

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) requested that the exemption code for construction and renovation of power systems also be applied to this project.

Contra Costa, Marin, and Sonoma Counties: Regional Dynamic Ridesharing Pilot (REG110015)

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked if this was an expansion project or just existing service. He was comfortable with the project being exempt.

Final Determination: FHWA, Caltrans, EPA, FTA, and MTC requested more information or different exemption codes be selected for ALA030002, ALA110010, and ALA110007. Additional exemption codes were selected in addition to the sponsor selected codes for

ALA050017, SF11042, and SF11043. All other projects not noted are exempt from PM_{2.5} project level analysis.

3. Transportation Air Quality Conformity Redetermination

Stefanie Hom (MTC) indicated that MTC prepared a conformity redetermination using the latest adopted conformity analysis for the Transportation 2035 Plan (T-2035) and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to comply with the 2008 ozone requirements by the July 20, 2013 deadline. MTC prepared a conformity redetermination to ensure that any delays to the upcoming Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is expected to be adopted June 2013, do not put the region at risk of a lapse in conformity. MTC will bring the conformity redetermination to the Planning Committee on December 14, 2012 to open up the 30-day comment period. They will come back to the Task Force with comments and then take the conformity redetermination to the February MTC Commission meeting for final adoption. The draft conformity determination can be found online at the MTC Planning Committee agenda for December 14, 2012.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) asked for clarification on if the 1-hour budgets are considered budget tests, rather than interim tests.

Harold Brazil (MTC) indicated the 1-hour budget is for ozone. The Bay Area also has budgets for CO₂. But they only perform the build- no-build interim tests for PM_{2.5}. They did that for the past conformity analysis.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) indicated that table 3a and table 6 both show NO_x emissions for the same year, but the numbers are slightly different.

Harold indicated that there are two sets of NO_x numbers: summertime NO_x for ozone conformity, and wintertime NO_x for PM_{2.5} conformity. For the PM_{2.5} conformity no-build interim test, wintertime NO_x is the precursor for PM_{2.5}.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) asked if the upcoming RTP will be released in June 2013.

Stefanie indicated that, yes, the RTP is expected to be adopted in June 2013.

Stew asked if the last RTP was released in February or March 2009.

Carolyn Clevenger (MTC) indicated that the 2009 RTP was adopted in April 2009; it was originally scheduled for March 2009, but there was a delay due to VTA sales tax revenues.

Stew asked when the 2009 conformity analysis was adopted.

Carolyn indicated that the 2009 conformity analysis and 2009 RTP were adopted concurrently.

Stew asked if the current conformity is on the RTP and if it included any plan amendments.

Carolyn indicated that there were amendments to the RTP, but a new conformity analysis was not prepared.

Stew indicated that the four year mark from when the last RTP was adopted is April 2013, which would then make the conformity analysis expired if a new one is not completed by then.

Stefanie indicated that they were under the impression that there is a one year grace period after the four year expiration for conformity analyses; MTC will release the next conformity analysis completed before the five year mark, or April 2014.

Mike indicated that the one year grace period is not “business as usual”. The RTP and TIP would be on “lock down”; only projects included in the previous RTP and TIP could be implemented, nothing new could be added.

Carolyn asked is there a place to find more information on the limitations of the grace period.

Ginger asked what the timeline is for the conformity redetermination and the upcoming RTP.

Carolyn indicated that they will take the conformity redetermination to the Planning Committee on December 14, 2012 to start the 30-day public comment period. They will then bring the item back to the Task Force in January to review comments and to the MTC Commission in February for final approval. They anticipate the draft release of the RTP in March 2013, and Commission approval on the TIP and conformity analysis in June 2013. The last RTP was approved in April 2009. April 2013 is when the grace period for conformity will start.

Stefanie indicated that the last conformity analysis conformed T-2035 and the 2011 TIP, so the latest conformity was actually released in 2011.

Harold confirmed that the 2011 conformity analysis fully re-conformed T-2035 to the 2011 TIP.

Mike suggested that Stew should check with FHWA to determine if the 2011 conformity analysis would be valid after the four-year release date of T-2035. California has two year TIP cycle instead of a four year one, so they prepare a conformity analysis for each two-year TIP. Does a conformity analysis for new TIPs start a new four year clock on the RTP?

Stew indicated that he will check with other staff at FHWA and then get back to Task Force.

4. Consent Calendar

- a. October 25, 2012 Air Quality Conformity Task Force Meeting Summary**
- b. Project Modification: Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA)**
- c. Proposed TIP Additions Regional Air Quality Conformity Exemption**

Mike Brady (Caltrans) asked for clarification on item C.

Brenda Dix (MTC) indicated there was memo in the packet.

Stew Sonnenberg (FHWA) asked if the bridge replacement project will be a minor replacement.

Adam Crenshaw (MTC) indicated that the project is in a rural area. The bridge is a small bridge, approximately 50-feet long.

Brenda indicated that the bridge is currently one-lane and it will be replaced with two-lane bridge. This scope fits within the exemption code.

Dick Fahey (Caltrans) asked if the replacement bridge will be two lanes on both sides. He could not determine the location.

Ginger Vagenas (EPA) indicated that she did not find the memo in the packet.

Stefanie Hom (MTC) indicated that the memo was not posted online.

Brenda indicated that they will email the memo out separately after the meeting and can follow-up if there are any concerns.

Dick indicated that the bridge project would not be exempt since it will add a lane.

Brenda indicated that there is an exemption code that allows a one-lane bridge to be replaced with a two-lane bridge. Project sponsors are not allowed to build a one-lane bridge with federal dollars.

Mike indicated that if a one-lane bridge is located outside of an urbanized area and is being replaced with a basic two-lane bridge, then that is considered a safety improvement.

On December 7, 2012, Stefanie emailed the Task Force the memo and provided a link to the project location.

Mike responded that the site is outside the urbanized area boundary (at least for the 2000 boundary maps from the Census web site - 2010 is not yet available). So replacement under the specified exemption per FHWA's policy statement would be appropriate.

Stew, Dick, Ginger, and Ted Matley (FTA) all concurred with Mike.

5. Other Items

Mike Brady (Caltrans) indicated that Caltrans consultants approved an updated version of CL4 for CALINE and is now available for download.

Mike also indicated that he will probably be retiring in Fall 2013. A replacement has not been identified yet.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 24, 2012, from 9:30 to 11:30 am.

