

**MWAQC Technical Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**November 12, 2014**  
**10:00 AM to 11:50 PM**

**Present:**

Cecily Beall, District Department of the Environment  
Jessica Daniels, District Department of the Environment  
Ram Tangirala, District Department of the Environment  
Gaurav Bansal, District Department of the Environment  
Tom Ballou, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
Doris McLoed, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
Sonya Lewis-Cheatham, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
Mike Kiss, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
Tad Aburn, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Diane Franks, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Brian Hug, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Molly Berger, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Marcia Ways, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Mohamed Khan, Maryland Department of the Environment  
Howard Simons, Maryland Department of Transportation  
Lyn Erikson, Maryland Department of Transportation  
Jim Ponticello, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Chris Voigt, Virginia Department of Transportation  
Walter Seedlock, MWAA  
Khoa Tran, City of Alexandria  
Dawn Hawkins-Nixon, Prince George's County  
Malcolm Watson, Fairfax County  
Mike Lake, Fairfax County

**Staff:**

Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP  
Jennifer Desimone, COG/DEP  
Steve Walz, COG/DEP  
Jeff King, COG/DEP  
Elena Constantine, COG/DTP  
Eulalie Lucas, COG/DTP  
Jane Posey, COG/DTP

**1. Call to Order and Review of Meeting Summary**

Tad Aburn called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. The October 14 meeting summary was approved without any changes.

**2. Status of MWAQC Special Project**

Steve Walz said that the joint MWAQC/CEEPC meeting focused on the greenhouse gas. NOx would be addressed as part of the MWAQC work plan. He said a draft resolution will be prepared before the next MWAQC-TAC and Executive Committee call, which would mention the role of MWAQC in addressing criteria pollutants and greenhouse gas and greenhouse gas goals for CEEPC.

Steve outlined the basics of the multi-sectoral working group for addressing greenhouse gas and air quality. He said the group will identify viable strategies that could be implemented at the regional level. The group would look at the Gold Book, “What Would It Take” study, Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, etc and the approach taken by other states such as, California. The outcome document will be presented to different committees for review. The “What can We Do” report will identify things that the region could do to address the greenhouse gas and air quality goals. The group chaired by Stuart Freudberg will consist of members from various state and local transportation officials, COG staff, and a consultant. Inputs from academicians and Smart Growth Coalition will also be taken. Budget details will be presented after the Scope of Work has been developed. The process will start in December 2014, strategies will be identified by April 2015, full detail of these strategies will be available by October 2015, and the final report will be presented by December 2015.

Howard asked about the base year for the analysis and if NO<sub>x</sub> will be addressed by the group. Steve said it has not been decided yet, but 2005 could be a good candidate as this was the basis for the COG climate change report. He also said NO<sub>x</sub> will be addressed as a co-benefit from the greenhouse gas reduction measures.

Tad said the above work-group may take a long time. There is already lot of information available, which can be used now. Steve said this will be a short effort and will not take much time. Tad asked how the group intends to gather information on point, area, and nonroad sectors. Steve said it has not been decided yet, but will be done soon. Tad said the analysis for the three sectors is not essential, but he concurs with other members if they want so. Tom asked how the Special Project fits into this. Steve said the project will be folded into the group’s work.

### **3. Comments on “Call for Projects” for 2015 CLRP Analysis**

Jane Posey presented an overview of the brochure for the “Call for Projects” for 2015 CLRP Analysis. She also talked about the form for the 2015 CLRP project submission. The form has as an additional question this year regarding any alternate transportation mode. Jane mentioned that CO<sub>2</sub> will be included in the 2015 CLRP work plan. Elena added that the brochure is a user friendly document providing details of the project submission and also includes visions and goals from the regional transportation priorities plan, what it would take study, etc. Tad suggested sending a letter to TPB to include NO<sub>x</sub> and greenhouse gas in the “Call for Projects” document. Tom and Doris said these are already included in the brochure. So there is no value in sending a letter about it. Ram said the letter is a good idea. Howard suggested including economic development and jobs in the letter. Tad said he is fine with that but the letter should focus on air quality.

### **4. Experience with MOVES2014 Model**

Sonya from VDEQ, Mohamed Khan from MDE, and Sunil shared their experience with the MOVES2014 model thus far. Sonya from Virginia DEQ discussed a comparative study between MOVES2014 and MOVES2010b. NO<sub>x</sub> and CO emissions were compared for the Chesterfield and Albemarle counties for 2011 and 2018. CO emissions were lower for MOVES2014 for both counties and years. NO<sub>x</sub> emission showed a different trend. It was higher for MOVES2014 for both counties in 2011, but was higher for Chesterfield and lower for Albemarle in 2018. These results are consistent with EPA’s findings. Mohamed shared his experience with the installation of the model. He also mentioned issues with the conversion of a few local inputs into MOVES2014 format using the model’s GUI. He performed two test runs using MOVES2014 for

2011 and 2018 for Baltimore using local inputs. Mohamed said he is still trying to resolve issues related to the batch and distributed processing using Windows 7 where he encountered an issue executing the model successfully. He presented a summary of the differences between the two model versions. Sunil compared emissions developed by EPA for the NEI 2011 effort using the two model versions for the Washington region. He found emissions were lower for MOVES2014 for NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, VOC, PM<sub>2.5</sub>-Pri, and SO<sub>2</sub> for the entire region together. Both MDE and VDEQ are currently using default start inputs.

#### **5. Update on MOVES2014 October Release**

Sunil presented a summary of the changes in the MOVES2014 October Release version of the model from the one published by EPA in July 2014. There are no or little changes in emissions as a result of the changes in the new model version.

#### **6. Briefing on PM<sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan Revision**

Sunil discussed three specific questions and their possible responses related to the planned update of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> Redesignation Request & Maintenance Plan and mobile budgets.

First question was about the possibility of submitting the updated plan after December 2015, which is the deadline mentioned in the Appendix D of the above plan. The revision of the plan and budgets was not required by the CAA or any EPA regulation. Consequently, the revised plan submission deadline was also not set by the CAA or any EPA regulation, but by the states.

However, the plan was approved recently by EPA with the above commitment. Therefore, is the region required to seek EPA's approval for the extension of the submission deadline?

Response - Based on the verbal/informal interaction between state air agency and EPA R3 staff in the past, it seems that since the deadline was self-imposed and not mandated by the CAA or any EPA regulation. Therefore, simply explaining why we were late in the submittal would be sufficient. A short discussion could be included in the revised submittal noting that the new version of MOVES (MOVES2014), which includes the effects of new federal rules, was needed to make the updates to the budgets meaningful. Given that the timeline for making this version available to the states was elongated, the deadline set in the plan was by necessity missed. The group agreed with the above response.

Second question was the need to update the attainment year 2007 mobile emissions and budgets. Appendix D only mentions submission of updated 2017 and 2025 mobile budgets. However, the policy guidance document for MOVES2014 mentions updating the attainment year (2007)

inventory as well so that emissions for all three years are estimated using MOVES2014. Does this policy guidance mean we must submit revised 2007 mobile emissions as well as budgets? While one of the EPA staff asked for the revision of the 2007 onroad mobile emissions, another EPA staff had a different opinion and did not think it was necessary. Sunil requested members' opinion on how to proceed on this issue.

Response – The group asked COG staff to get a confirmation from EPA on this question. Staff was suggested to include following language in the email to Cristina Fernandez and Asrah Khadr (EPA R3) – “The Washington region only committed to updating its onroad mobile emissions

and MVEBs for 2017 (interim year) and 2025 (final year of maintenance plan) in the plan. The region did not commit to updating the 2007 (attainment year) onroad mobile emissions, which were developed using MOVES2010a in the plan. Since there are no new control measures in MOVES2014 for 2007, emissions developed using this version of the model are not expected to be very different from the MOVES2010a based emissions currently in the plan. Also, since the first year of the transportation conformity analysis for the Washington region is expected to be 2017 (assuming EPA approves MVEBs in 2016), onroad mobile emissions projected for 2017 and beyond would only need to conform to the 2017 or 2025 MVEBs. Therefore, there is no value in updating the attainment year 2007 onroad mobile emissions or 2007 MVEBs as far as the transportation conformity analysis is concerned.”

Third question was about the need to revise the other three emission sectors namely, point, area, and nonroad sectors in the plan.

Response - Based on the prior experience of state air agencies, it does not seem necessary to update emissions for point, area, and nonroad sources. These sectors need not be updated unless there is compelling information that indicates the emissions estimates made in the plan might be exceeded. A few plan revision submittals such as those submitted by West Virginia and Pennsylvania and subsequently approved by EPA have included a short description of growth to justify not updating these emissions. A short description noting that the growth indicators used for metro DC region continue to be appropriate and that the estimates for the three source sectors should therefore be conservative, should be sufficient for the Washington region’s submittal. The group agreed to the above response and did not think it was necessary to update emissions for the other three sectors.

## **7. State & Local Reports**

Ram said that EPA has approved a grant for the District for a park monitoring station mainly for outreach and education. The site is being decided. The national Zoo is being looked into and by the next week there will be some clarity into this. An emerging technology monitor will be installed using wind and solar energy to monitor PM2.5, ozone, and NO2. Doris said Virginia did not have any updates. Diane said Maryland Advisory Council will approve the NOx regulation in its December 8 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am.