

INTER AGENCY CONSULTATION GROUP
Tuesday, September 29, 2015
East-West Gateway Board Room

Members Present:

Michael Coulson, Chair - East-West Gateway Council of Governments
Stacy Allen - Missouri Department of Natural Resources
Joe Gray - Illinois Department of Transportation, District 8
Brad McMahon - Federal Highway Administration, MO
Betsy Tracy – Federal Highway Administration, IL Division
Heather Hamilton - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 7 (telephone)

Others Present:

Curtis Jones – Illinois Department of Transportation
Bob Randolph – Missouri Department of Natural Resources

Staff:

Lubna Shoaib Carol Lawrence Rodney Haldert

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Inter Agency Consultation Group (IACG) was called to order by Mike Coulson, East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWG).

2. Recap of Introduction to Transportation Conformity Course
Carol Lawrence – East-West Gateway Council of Governments

Earlier in September the Introduction to Transportation Conformity course was held at EWG. It was through the efforts of Ms. Shoaib that the National Transit Institute (NTI) offered the course here. Sarah Siwek, a national expert in conformity, led the two and a half day course. Twenty-three people attended and a number of EWG staff sat in on various sections. Participants represented: metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) from Kansas City, Omaha, Boston, Chicago, northwest Indiana and EWG; Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Region 5; Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) IL (Betsy Tracy); Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT); Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) (Chris Schmidt); and Metro. During the course, overviews of transportation planning and air quality planning were presented and the conformity determination process was reviewed. There were a number of hands-on exercises and role playing. For those interested, there are extra CDs containing the course appendices, conformity regulations and examples of conformity determinations.

Mr. McMahon, FHWA MO, apologized for not being able to attend the Friday session. He asked if the attendance was what was expected. Ms. Lawrence, EWG, replied that enough people had registered for NTI to go ahead and hold the course. Mr. Coulson, EWG, added there was a good geographic spread of participants from Boston to Kansas City. Mr. McMahon, FHWA MO, asked about the Local Participants in Conformity Determination panel discussion on Friday. Ms. Lawrence, EWG, said that all the

participants did a good job. Ms. Lawrence and Mr. Coulson from EWG, Mr. Henderson of MoDOT and Ms. Tracy of FHWA IL participated on this panel. Mr. McMahon, FHWA MO, pointed out that Ms. Siwek had led the 2011 Baseline Assessment Review. Mr. Coulson, EWG, said that during the panel discussion, EWG staff distributed copies of our Conformity Determination Users Guide. Ms. Siwek was very impressed and said she was going to see about having it posted on FHWA's conformity website. Mr. Coulson, EWG said that the Users Guide has a good discussion on hot-spot analysis and that Mr. Henderson spent a lot of time working on it as well as the Regionally Significant Project criteria and associated interrogatories.

3. MOVES2014 Fleet Age Projection Tool
Stacy Allen – Missouri Department of Transportation

Late last year the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released an update to its Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulation (MOVES) model. It is just now coming to light that EPA built into MOVES2014 an optional tool to allow you to project the fleet age of all cars and trucks into the future which was not available in previous versions. The tool has built-in algorithms which include some characteristics of future scrappage rates expected and expected fleet turnover (estimate new vehicles being purchased in various areas. EPA developed tool with input from R.L. Polk and other national companies. The documentation for the development of this tool and the associated databases has not yet been provided by EPA. EPA has indicated that the documentation is forthcoming.

Several states have started to examine this tool and have found that it does some unexpected things. It projects the age distribution of vehicles to be slightly older for future years. For example, Missouri always projects that the vehicle fleet would about the same age in the future (seven to eight years). If this tool is used, fleet age for passenger vehicles is eight or nine years older. Vehicles are lasting longer and the effects of the recession (people not buying new cars, etc.) may have been built into the tool. Result is that have an older fleet of vehicles and more emissions. It is not known if this tool would affect heavy duty vehicles in a similar manner. Using this tool will have more emissions in future years. Some states have considered using this projection tool and found that they would have problems with meeting the motor vehicle emissions budgets in their Conformity Determinations. These states also reviewed EPA's guidance which has not changed in the last ten years. According to the guidance, can never assume a younger vehicle fleet age in the future and can project an older fleet if want to which is what the projection tool does. In the past what St. Louis area and other states/agencies have done is to assume the exact same fleet age distribution.

Need to discuss the pros and cons of this tool, to continue to research this tool and to document technical details. But at this point in time, without the documentation and not having done any technical work with this tool, Ms. Allen said that Missouri will not be using the optional projection tool and will continue to use the same vehicle age distribution in future years as have in base year. Sticking with the planning assumptions used to develop the motor vehicle emission budgets used in conformity. In the MOVES model documentation will have to indicate the choice made.

Ms. Shoaib, EWG, concurred with not using this tool. Unless have all the information, should stick with what have been doing. Vehicle fleet distribution is a strong MOVES2014 variable affecting model results. Whatever planning assumptions were used to develop motor vehicle emissions budgets, the states and EWG need to continue to use them.

Ms. Allen, MoDNR, said that Pennsylvania had been working on a conformity determination and determined that if the projection tool was used, could not pass the budget tests. MoDNR intends to beta test the projection tool for future years after January 2016. MoDNR will also look at HAPs and fuel scenarios. Right now working to complete the 2014 emissions inventory before the end of 2015. She added that later this year EPA is to release an update to MOVES2014. MOVES2014a will include hazardous air pollutants in the off-road mobile source portion of the model.

4. 2016 Conformity Determination Regional Emissions Analysis Tables Carol Lawrence – East-West Gateway Council of Governments

Included in the email packet were the regional emissions analysis tables that EWG is proposing to use in the Conformity Determination next year. In July the IACG agreed on the years to be used in this analysis (2020, 2025, 2035 and 2045). For ozone, the action emissions/budget test will be used for both Missouri and Illinois. The Missouri motor vehicle emissions budgets (developed using MOVES2010) come from the Missouri Early Progress Plan for the 2008 standard. EPA found these budgets adequate for conformity purposes. The Illinois budgets, developed with MOVES2010, come from the EPA-approved Illinois 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan for the 1997 ozone standard. EWG will use MOVES2010 to estimate the action emissions.

EWG will be using the interim regional emissions analysis test (action emissions/2002 baseline emissions) for PM_{2.5}. Conformity will be done for the 1997 annual PM_{2.5} standard because EPA designated the St. Louis region (MO-IL) and Baldwin Township in Randolph County Illinois as “unclassified” for the 2012 PM_{2.5} standard. Mr. Coulson, EWG, pointed that the interim PM_{2.5} action/2002 baseline test is for the entire PM_{2.5} non-attainment area.

Ms. Lawrence, EWG, added that this year as EWG has not received any regionally significant projects proposals, a mid-year amendment to the current Conformity Determination and TIP/Plan does not have to be performed. Mr. Coulson, EWG, added that another item included in the Conformity Determination Users Guide is the process to conduct a mid-year Conformity Determination.

5. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting of the Inter Agency Consultation Group was adjourned.