

**Air Quality Conformity Task Force
Summary Meeting Notes
April 23, 2015**

Participants:

Amir Fanai – BAAQMD
Andrea Gordon – BAAQMD
Michelle Bellows – Contra Costa
Transportation Authority (CCTA)
Susan Miller – Contra Costa Transportation
Authority (CCTA)
Deborah Dagang – CH2M
Terry Klim – DKS
Joseph Vaughn – FHWA
Stew Sonnenberg – FHWA
Mallory Atkinson – MTC

Tim Lee – WMH
Kyra Engelberg – Circlepoint
Elyse Engel – CH2M
Angela Villar – Contra Costa County Public
Works
Prasanna Muthireddy – Kimley-Horn
Jennifer Marquez – Circlepoint
Rodney Tavitas – Caltrans
Adam Crenshaw – MTC
Harold Brazil – MTC

1. Welcome and Self Introductions: Harold Brazil (MTC) called the meeting to order at 9:34 am.

Note: Ginger Vagenas (EPA), Ted Mately (FTA) and Dick Fahey (Caltrans) were unavailable on the meeting date and provided comments prior to and after the meeting via email. Those emails are provided below.

2. PM_{2.5} Project Conformity Interagency Consultations

a. Consultation to Determine Project of Air Quality Concern Status

i. I-680 Direct Access Ramps Project

Michelle Bellows (CCTA) started her presentation on the I-680 Direct Access Ramps project by indicating that:

- Construction of the project will generate travel time savings to HOV lane and express bus vehicles
- Level-of-Service impacts from the project are minimal
- Overall capacity of I-680 remains unchanged

Joseph Vaughn (FHWA) and Rodney Tavitas (Caltrans) both did not think that the I-680 Direct Access Ramps project was of air quality concern.

Final Determination: With input from FTA, EPA, Caltrans and FHWA (***please see email exchange below***), the Task Force concluded that the I-680 Direct Access Ramps project was not of air quality concern.

The Transportation conformity guidance coauthored by the EPA and FHWA defines a significant volume of diesel truck traffic as facilities with greater than 125,000 annual average daily traffic (AADT) and 8 percent or more of such AADT as diesel truck traffic or approximately 10,000 trucks. The latest truck counts for SR 4 in the project vicinity show that truck traffic constitutes 4.6 percent of the total AADT, which is 128,000 AADT¹. The average daily number of trucks would be 5,888, well below the approximate 10,000 trucks stated above.

The percentage of trucks will remain the same with the project as without the project. The traffic volumes will increase due growth in the area, but there will be no change in the truck percentages, and therefore, would not result in a significant increase in the number of diesel vehicles.

A key factor we consider in determining if a particular project is a POAQC is the change in traffic between the build and no-build scenarios. It is possible to envision a scenario where the percentage of truck traffic remains constant, but the increase in numbers is large enough to warrant a hot-spot analysis.

These types of misunderstandings come up from time to time. I think the AQCTF might have talked about the possibility of providing additional guidance in the project forms to ensure applicants have a better understanding of this, but I am not entirely sure I am remembering correctly. Maybe we can discuss this at the next meeting.

2. The following language appears to imply that the attainment determination obviates the need for a hot-spot analysis:

On January 9, 2013, the U.S. EPA issued a final rule to determine that the San Francisco Bay Area has attained the 24-hour PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). This action suspends the federal State Implementation Plan (SIP) provisions that apply to preparing an attainment plan to demonstrate how the Bay Area will attain the standard.

Therefore, the proposed project meets the Clean Air Act requirements and 40 CFR 93.116 without any explicit hotspot analysis. The proposed project would not create a new, or worsen an existing, PM_{2.5} violation.

To be clear, while an attainment determination does suspend certain attainment-related Clean Air Act planning requirements (e.g., the requirement for an attainment demonstration) it does not by itself change the designation status of the area or affect other requirements, including conformity. The Bay Area's nonattainment classification is unchanged, and transportation conformity requirements continue to apply. In other words, the attainment determination does not have an impact on the applicability of 93.116.

Thanks!

Ginger L. Vagenas
U.S. EPA, Region 9 | Air Planning Office (AIR-2)
75 Hawthorne Street | San Francisco, CA 94105
415.972.3964 | vagenas.ginger@epa.gov

From: Ted.Matley@dot.gov [<mailto:Ted.Matley@dot.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 2:57 PM

To: HBrazil@mtc.ca.gov; dick.fahey@dot.ca.gov; Vagenas, Ginger; Stew.Sonnenberg@dot.gov; Joseph.Vaughn@dot.gov; rodney.tavitas@dot.ca.gov

Subject: RE: 4-23-15 Task Force Mtg Follow-Up Items

[Ginger](#) – Not a POAQC.

[Joseph and Rodney](#) – Not a POAQC

[Ted](#) – Not a POAQC

Item #2: 2aii. Bailey Road / SR-4 IC Project

Dick - The documentation only addresses traffic volumes on SR-4, but not Bailey Road nor the on and off ramps at the interchange. While I agree that there would likely be very little change in volumes on the mainline (Route 4) between the build and no-build scenarios, I would, however, expect significant changes on Bailey Road and the ramps: especially the westbound diagonal off ramp to Bailey Road (which would have to accommodate the displaced traffic from the closed loop off-ramp). It is difficult to make a POAQC determination without knowing what changes in truck volumes might occur on Bailey Road and the westbound diagonal off ramp as a result of this project.

[Ginger](#) – I agree with Dick’s comments and would like to see more information about impacts on Bailey Road/west-bound ramp.

[Joseph defers to Rodney](#) – Rodney did not think the project was a POAQC, but would like to see additional traffic volume data [as Dick and Ginger referred to above].

The Project sponsor truck volume data in the file: [“Bailey Road PM25 Project Assessment 042915.doc”](#).

[Ted](#) – Not a POAQC

Item #3: 2aiii. I-680/SR-4 IC Project

Dick -- Question 1: Are we being asked to make a determination just on the Phase 3 portion of the project, or the entire project? What do the traffic numbers represent: just phase 3, or the entire project? If the former, I assume the task force will have another opportunity to review the other phases of the project.

[Answer 1 from project sponsor](#): the determination is being made on just the Phase 3, independent portion of the project. Other phases of the project will be constructed when funds become available and the task force will have more opportunities to review other phases of the project [at that time].

Question 2: Are the numbers and information on page 6 correct? There seems to be some errors in the 2040 table (two no-builds, and a drop in truck volumes), and the text at the bottom of the page appears to refer to a different project: I-680 HOV to express lane conversion.

I don’t expect the proposed improvements on SR-4 in phase 3 to result in an increase in truck trips, as demonstrated, nor would there likely be any significant diversion of traffic. But I would like answers to the above two questions before making a determination.

[Answer 2 from project sponsor](#): corrections and edits were made to the noted items on page 6 of the assessment form and are shown in [“Revised CCTA I-680 SR 4 PM25 Project Assessment Form 4 23 15 \(text only\).pdf”](#).

[Ginger](#) – I think this is unlikely to be a POAQC, but have the same questions Dick raised.

Joseph defers to Rodney – Rodney did not think the project was a POAQC and was fine with the corrections the project sponsor would make to page 6.

Ted – Not a POAQC

Item #4: 2b. Confirm Projects are Exempt from PM2.5 Conformity

Dick – These projects all appear to be exempt.

Ginger – No questions, looks good.

Joseph and Rodney – Confirmed that projects on “2b_Exempt List 40915.pdf” list were exempt.

Ted – Agree projects are exempt

Item #5: 3. Projects with Regional Air Quality Conformity Concerns

Dick [re: 3a. Attachment C] – I believe these bridge projects would be exempt from regional conformity under 40 CFR 93.126. The road on either side of each bridge is already one lane in each direction – the new bridges would simply match that configuration.

Ginger – Thanks for the info. The bridge replacement projects are fine under a previous agreement regarding conversion of 1 lane bridges to 2 lane bridges. (The visuals were nice!)

Stew and Rodney – Concur with MTC staff’s proposals, approach and/or exemption classification

Ted – Concur with exempt classification and approach

Item #6: 4. Consent Calendar

Dick – Looks fine. No comments.

Ginger – Looks good.

Joseph, Stew and Rodney – No comments.

Ted – No comments

ii. I-680/SR 4 Interchange – Phase 3 (SR 4 Widening) Project
 iii. Bailey Road-State Route 4 Interchange Project

- Follow-up information:

Opening Year: If facility is an interchange(s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT.

| 2020 | I-680 from Marina Vista Avenue in Martinez to SR4 AADT | | I-680 from SR 4 to SR 242 | |
|------------|--|---------|---------------------------|---------|
| | No Build | Build | No Build | Build |
| AADT | 139,500 | 139,500 | 159,500 | 159,500 |
| LOS | D | D | E | E |
| Truck AADT | 7,000 | 7,000 | 6,400 | 6,400 |
| % Trucks | 5% | 5% | 4% | 4% |

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: If facility is an interchange (s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT.

| 2040 | I-680 from Marina Vista Avenue in Martinez to SR4 AADT | | I-680 from SR 4 to SR 242 | |
|------------|--|---------|---------------------------|---------|
| | No Build | Build | No Build | Build |
| AADT | 169,000 | 169,000 | 191,000 | 191,000 |
| LOS | F | F | F | F |
| Truck AADT | 8,500 | 8,500 | 7,600 | 7,600 |
| % Trucks | 5% | 5% | 4% | 4% |

Opening Year: If facility is a bus, rail or intermodal facility/terminal/transfer point, # of bus arrivals for Build and No Build, % and # of bus arrivals will be diesel buses.

Not applicable; see above for highway facility.

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: If facility is a bus, rail or intermodal facility/terminal/transfer point, # of bus arrivals for Build and No Build, % and # of bus arrivals will be diesel buses.

Not applicable; see above for highway facility.

Describe potential traffic redistribution effects of congestion relief:

The results of the traffic study indicate that the initial phase of construction (widening SR 4 to extend existing general purpose and HOV lanes on SR 4 in the vicinity of the I-680/SR 4 interchange) would increase the AADT on SR 4 between Morello and SR 242 for the Design Year of 2020 or the Horizon Year of 2040, however there would be an improvement in the LOS. The truck AADT percentage would not change in the Design or Horizon year with the project. The extension of the existing general purpose lanes on SR 4 is expected to improve average travel speeds and reduce queue lengths between Morello and SR 242 during peak periods; therefore improving truck throughput on SR 4 through the interchange area.

Opening Year: If facility is an interchange(s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT

| Roadway | Existing | | |
|--|------------|----------|------------|
| | Total AADT | % Trucks | Truck AADT |
| SR 4 | 130,781 | 4.6% | 6,016 |
| Bailey Road, north of Canal Road East | 15,480 | 2% | 310 |
| Bailey Road, south of SR 4 Eastbound Ramps | 17,240 | 2% | 345 |
| SR 4 Westbound Diagonal Off-Ramp | 2,510 | 2% | 50 |
| SR 4 Westbound Loop Off-Ramp | 3,590 | 2% | 72 |
| SR 4 Westbound On-Ramp | 5,150 | 2% | 103 |
| SR 4 Eastbound Diagonal Off-Ramp | 4,680 | 2% | 94 |
| SR 4 Eastbound Loop Off-Ramp | 7,670 | 2% | 153 |
| SR 4 Eastbound On-Ramp | 4,260 | 2% | 85 |

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: If facility is an interchange (s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT

| Roadway | 2020 No Build | | | 2020 Build Alternative | | |
|--|---------------|----------|------------|------------------------|----------|------------|
| | Total AADT | % Trucks | Truck AADT | Total AADT | % Trucks | Truck AADT |
| SR 4 | 135,877 | 4.6% | 6,250 | 135,877 | 4.6% | 6,250 |
| Bailey Road, north of Canal Road East | 17,330 | 2% | 347 | 17,330 | 2% | 347 |
| Bailey Road, south of SR 4 Eastbound Ramps | 20,830 | 2% | 417 | 20,830 | 2% | 417 |
| SR 4 Westbound Diagonal Off-Ramp | 2,610 | 2% | 52 | 3,860 | 2% | 77 |
| SR 4 Westbound Loop Off-Ramp | 3,900 | 2% | 78 | N/A | -- | -- |
| SR 4 Westbound On-Ramp | 5,840 | 2% | 117 | 5,840 | 2% | 117 |
| SR 4 Eastbound Diagonal Off-Ramp | 5,280 | 2% | 106 | 5,280 | 2% | 106 |
| SR 4 Eastbound Loop Off-Ramp | 7,780 | 2% | 156 | 7,780 | 2% | 156 |
| SR 4 Eastbound On-Ramp | 5,050 | 2% | 101 | 5,050 | 2% | 101 |

| Roadway | 2040 No Build | | | 2040 Build Alternative | | |
|---------|---------------|----------|------------|------------------------|----------|------------|
| | Total AADT | % Trucks | Truck AADT | Total AADT | % Trucks | Truck AADT |
| SR 4 | 156,261 | 4.6% | 7,188 | 156,261 | 4.6% | 7,188 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------|----|-----|--------|----|-----|
| Bailey Road, north of Canal Road East | 22,600 | 2% | 452 | 22,600 | 2% | 452 |
| Bailey Road, south of SR 4 Eastbound Ramps | 31,100 | 2% | 622 | 31,100 | 2% | 622 |
| SR 4 Westbound Diagonal Off-Ramp | 2,900 | 2% | 58 | 7,700 | 2% | 154 |
| SR 4 Westbound Loop Off-Ramp | 4,800 | 2% | 96 | N/A | -- | -- |
| SR 4 Westbound On-Ramp | 7,800 | 2% | 156 | 7,800 | 2% | 156 |
| SR 4 Eastbound Diagonal Off-Ramp | 7,000 | 2% | 140 | 7,000 | 2% | 140 |
| SR 4 Eastbound Loop Off-Ramp | 8,100 | 2% | 162 | 8,100 | 2% | 162 |
| SR 4 Eastbound On-Ramp | 7,300 | 2% | 146 | 7,300 | 2% | 146 |