

Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee

Suite 300, 777 North Capitol Street, N.E. • Washington, D.C. 20002-4239 • 202-962-3358 • Fax: 202-962-3203

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: March 11, 2005

Time: **10:00 a.m. – 12:00 NOON**

Lunch will be served at 12:00 pm

Place: **COG Board Room, 3rd Floor**

MWCOG, 777 North Capitol St., NE, #300

Washington, DC 20002

Agenda

-
- 10:00 1. Call to Order and Review of Meeting Summary (February 11, 2005),
Announce Stakeholder Participants**
Chairman Tad Aburn, Maryland Department of the Environment
- 10:20 2. 2005 Ozone Season -- Hot or Cold?**
Maryland Department of the Environment or University of Maryland meteorologists will provide a forecast for the upcoming ozone season. Monitors in the region and associated attainment requirements will also be discussed.
- 10:30 3. Draft Early Actions Report**
Jeff King, COG/DEP, will give an update on the status of preparing a draft early action control measures report.
- 10:50 4. Emissions Inventory Development: Update**
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP, will provide an update on emission inventory development, including a discussion of new inputs to Mobile 6.2 modeling for 8-hour SIP.
- 11:10 5. Attainment Modeling: Update**
Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP, will provide an update on the status of attainment modeling efforts.
- 11:20 6. Comment Letter on Dulles EIS**
Jeff King, COG/DEP, will present the final comment letter prepared for submission to FAA on the proposed Dulles runway expansion project.
- 11:30 7. State and Local Air Agency Report**
-- State Legislation
- 11:50 8. Other Business**
-- EPA Comments on Conformity Analysis
-- VIN Decoder Software
- 12:00 9. Set Date for Next Meeting, Future Agenda Items, Adjourn:**
Next TAC Meeting: April 8, 2005

FINAL

**MWAQC Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
February 11, 2005
10:00 am – 12:00 pm
COG Board Room**

Present:

Tad Aburn, Maryland Department of Environment
Kambiz Agazi, Fairfax County Department of Environmental Services
Rick Canizales, Prince William County Department of Public Works
Randy Carroll, Maryland Department of Environment
Diane Franks, Maryland Department of Environment
Barbara Hardy, Fairfax County Department of Environmental Services
Damon Harvey, District of Columbia Department of Transportation
Alex Hekimian, Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission
Doris McLeod, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Chris Meoli, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Jim Ponticello, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Mary Richmond, Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection
Howard Simons, Maryland Department of Transportation
Kanti Srikanth, Virginia Department of Transportation
Ram Tangirala, District of Columbia Department of Health
Didian Tsongwain, Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources

Staff:

Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP
Eulalie Lucas, COG/DTP
Jane Posey, COG/DTP
Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP

Observers:

Julie Crenshaw, AQPAC
Gary Koerber, U.S. Department of the Navy Regional Environmental Coordinator Region III

Presenters:

Charlie Baummer, Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority
Walter Seedlock, Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority

1. Call to Order

Mr. Aburn called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. The minutes of the January 21, 2005 meeting were approved with the addition of text to reflect comments made by Howard Simons regarding periodic updates to power plant controls and inviting Constellation Energy to present.

2. Dulles Airport EIS Emissions: Update

Charley Baummer and Walter Seedlock reported on the results of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed runway expansion at Dulles Airport. Charley Baummer said that the EIS is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) prepared the document and is directing the public comment process. Two public meetings are planned for February 22 and 23. Mr. Baummer described that the proposed project will involve construction of two new runways, acquisition of property for a buffer zone, and construction of a new concourse and walkway. Completion of the north-south runways is anticipated by 2010, with the east-west runways soon thereafter. The project is expected to He also said that the expansion is required because the projected demand is expected to exceed capacity causing unacceptable levels of delays.

In response to a question from Tad Aburn and Jim Ponticello regarding the relationship between operations and emissions, Charley Baummer said emissions and operations go hand-in-hand. An operation is defined as a takeoff and landing. Joan Rohlf asked whether the projections of demand reflect airline industry restructuring and bankruptcy of some carriers. Mr. Baummer said that the projections were done post 9-11 and are based on the long term trend forecast. Forecasts can be above or below actual demand, but generally the estimates in the EIS are believed to be reasonable.

Mr. Baummer discussed the various options that were considered in the EIS, including the no-action alternative. He said Alternatives #3 and 4 were determined to be the only two options that could meet the purpose and need for the project. The MWAA's preferred option is Alternative #3. He said 23 environmental impact categories were evaluated for each option. On May 20, 2002 the FAA released the Notice of Intent. The EIS was released for comment in January, the comment period closes on March 7. The Record of Decision (ROD) should be completed by the end of the year.

Damon Harvey asked how the FAA selected the preferred Alternative #3 and how it was decided that the other options couldn't be advanced. Mr. Baummer said that a number of factors were considered, but the overriding factor was purpose and need. If an option did not meet purpose and need, it was dismissed. In response to a question about FAA plans for expansion at other airports, including BWI, Diane Franks said that as part of the BWI 5-year expansion project, the FAA did not approve addition of another runway.

Mr. Baummer said that the reduction in operational emissions is a result of the estimated reduction in idling emissions from reduced delays. Damon Harvey and Diane Franks asked about the basis for these estimates, including airport usage in 2010 compared to current levels. Mr. Baummer said that the project alternative needs to accommodate the forecast traffic safely and efficiently. To determine whether there is excessive average delay, annual forecasts are

compared to capacity using a simulation model. Excessive delay exists if there is an average of 5 minutes delay per operation.

Ram Tangirala asked whether the EIS considered PM2.5 hotspots. Jim Ponticello said that EPA designations go final in April and there is a one-year grace period. As long as the ROD or NSEI are issued before April 2006, the FAA will not have to address. If the timetable slips past April 2006, they will have to consider PM hotspots.

Ram Tangirala asked if the FAA considered whether there was a way to accommodate increased traffic with the current airport layout and whether ground service equipment (GSE) were included in the analysis. Mr. Baummer said that GSE are considered, and that under the current configuration, delay time is projected to double by 2010.

Howard Simons asked about the mixing height and whether emissions from planes circling above the airport are included in the estimates. Mr. Baummer said the mixing height ranges from 1000 to 3000 feet, depending on time of day and that emissions from aircraft above the mixing height are not included in the estimates.

Julie Crenshaw asked whether the expansion plans include the need for an additional control tower. Mr. Baummer said yes and the new control tower is already under construction. Ms. Crenshaw also asked about whether the proposed project will also accommodate future needs of the other 2 airports in the region. Mr. Baummer said that although Congress could potentially modify the restrictions, the MWAA Act of 1987 restricts activities at National Airport because of noise, plus there are restrictions in terms of time of day, and distance planes can travel. The EIS forecasts include demand for all three airports.

Mr. Baummer said that the EIS used a build/no-build test to determine conformity. The analysis found that emissions under the preferred alternative are below the no-build scenario due to reductions in delays associated with airplanes waiting for gate access. The analysis also determined that construction emissions are below the levels established in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

Ram Tangirala raised the issue that the estimates in the EIS are not based on the nonroad model that was used to develop the 2002 PEI and that will be used for the 8-hour ozone SIP. Jim Ponticello said that the nonroad model was not used for the 1-hour ozone SIP. Ram Tangirala agreed but said he urges caution because the conformity determination in the EIS will not be consistent with the 8-hour SIP.

Tad Aburn asked if there is a way for the airports to reduce emissions. From his estimates between 1990 and 1999 airport operations and emissions increased by 25-50 percent. During the same period all other sources in the region that were regulated reduced emissions by 30 percent. We're at the phase now where we need more local reductions. Is it possible to take 1990 emissions and reduce by 10 percent and live with this cap? Or cap at 2005 levels? He said such an approach seems fair given the way other sources are regulated and that there are airport sources with cost effective emission reduction measures. Walter Seedlock said MWAA would support such an approach for the sources it has authority to control. He said there is a CNG

facility on site, new buses are being procured, and there is preconditioned air at every gate. In addition, they are phasing out the mobile lounges and procuring equipment with improved engines. There is also strong interest in setting up the infrastructure for electrified ground service equipment (GSE). MWAAC cannot regulate other airport sources. Tad Aburn said that TAC and MWAAC should establish a small workgroup to work on the details. He also said all three major airports in the region should be addressed.

Ram Tangirala asked about whether MWAAC has considered reductions from construction equipment and idling controls. Mr. Seedlock said that contracting options have not been feasible given concerns over impact on competition from small and disadvantaged firms.

Ram Tangirala asked if TAC could prepare a comment letter for submission to FAA. Tad Aburn said that a small group should work on drafting a comment letter.

3. Control Measure Development: Report

Jeff King gave a summary of the workgroup's review of the preliminary list and efforts to rank potential new control measures for the 8-hour SIP. He presented the updated control measures lists as well as a table presenting a summary of the potential to expand controls to upwind counties.

Alex Hekimian asked that an option, strengthen financial incentives for purchase of hybrids (e.g., hybrid tax credit), be considered by the workgroup for the priorities list. Howard Simons asked that the contingency measures from the 1-hour ozone SIP be considered. Tad Aburn said he wants to emphasize the need to address controls on federally preempted sources. Ram Tangirala said that DC supports an effort to encourage new locomotive standards, but that marine diesel standards may not provide much benefit to this region. He said that TAC should invite the railroads to a meeting. Joan Rohlf asked Ram to provide any railroad contacts to set up the meeting.

Howard Simons said that 19 locomotives are being refurbished to Tier 1 and 2 standards in Maryland. Ram Tangirala said that DC didn't approve the measure. The railroads want to bank the emission reduction credits for trading. Howard Simons said that he is concerned about dividing up Baltimore and Cecil County. He said the region should find measures that don't require local spending.

4. Proposed TPB Scope of Work for 8-hour Conformity

Mike Clifford, COG/DTP, provided a summary of TPB's proposed scope of work for handling conformity for the 2005 CLRP and 2006-2011 TIP. The work program only addresses 8-hour ozone because the guidance for PM_{2.5} is not yet available. Once the guidance is released, TPB plans to add PM_{2.5} conformity to the work plan. He said the procedures include use of the 1-hour ozone SIP mobile budgets until MWAQC updates the budgets. There are two changes to the scope. Inspection/maintenance program specifications changed in Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia. Discussions have also begun regarding potential changes to Mobile 6.2 modeling inputs. There will be a work session next week to review a list of potential changes to Mobile 6.2 inputs, including temperature and humidity. New registration data will be available later in the summer, but will not be available for use in this round of conformity. Conformity

modeling must be based on the same conditions as the 2002 base conditions, therefore changes to temperature and humidity inputs will only affect 8-hour SIP efforts.

Alex Hekimian said he is concerned about the travel forecasting models handling of hot-lane pricing and time of day. Mike Clifford said that the ICC didn't propose dynamic pricing. He said TPB is concerned about how the model characterizes reality, and that the concerns will be responded to throughout the process.

Ram Tangirala expressed concern over the model's overprediction of traffic volumes in the District of Columbia. Mike Clifford said that there are many Travel Demand Model outputs to examine, and that transit usage is particularly important for the District of Columbia. He said transit usage in the District of Columbia matches well, but the TDM is oversimulating traffic volumes. The travel forecasting subcommittee is interested in this and is meeting in March. In response to a question from Ram Tangirala, Mike Clifford said that TPB is also investigating the approach used to adjust annual average day to average weekday, as well as seasonal VMT adjustments. The current value of 11 percent has not been recently updated.

5. Proposed 2005-FY2006 MWAQC Work Program and Budget

Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP, presented the proposed budget for 2005 and FY 2006. The budget is for 18 months because the budget for the second half of FY 2005 was revised to reflect the changes to the MWAQC bylaws and discussions with the Interstate Air Quality Committee (IAQC). The work program and budget are draft and comments are welcome. Joan Rohlfs provided an overview of the changes. The funding formula changed to 1/3 each from state air agencies, state transportation agencies, and local governments. The core program emphasizes planning items for the 8-hour SIP. There is also a new supplemental budget, with three elements sought by local governments. MWAQC members, notably Dana Kauffman and Nancy Floreen, are particularly interested in assistance with air quality reporting and outreach, especially with the print media.

In terms of schedules, the SIP is due in December 2006, but plans are to complete the SIP approximately six months earlier. Control measures evaluation, attainment modeling coordination, emissions inventory development, and conformity work are also priorities in the work program. Fewer MWAQC meetings are proposed. There will be a total of 7 meetings over the 18 month period. Given concerns about continuity for members, there will be strategic planning sessions to discuss interim products that go into the SIP during months where there is no formal MWAQC meeting.

Tad Aburn recommended that the work program and budget may be revised to reflect any concerns identified by members. A call could then be organized to resolve more major points. He said that Kanti Srikanth is working with the state transportation agencies to resolve outstanding issues. He also said that the IAQC is moving along with the process of an MOU and certification letters. They also are developing a schedule, a list of reports, and a draft budget. Tad Aburn said that what Joan Rohlfs has presented today is consistent with IAQC positions.

6. State and Local Air Agency Report

Jim Ponticello reported on the status of legislative efforts in Virginia. The HOV bills to address the hybrid exemption were tabled or rejected. The CAL LEV II bill was tabled. Jim Ponticello also reported that Virginia is working on a redesignation request for the Fredricksburg area. As a new maintenance area, Virginia plans to require the OTC regulations, reformulated gas, and Stage I vapor recovery measures. New Source Review and Conformity will apply for 20 years.

Tad Aburn reported that the CAL LEV II and Multipollutant bills were introduced this week. The District of Columbia and local officials had nothing to report.

7. Other Business

Tad Aburn recognized a letter from AQPAC on control measures. He encouraged continued interest in identifying and nominating new measures to the list for consideration by the workgroup.

Joan Rohlfs provided an update on the process for nominating and selecting stakeholders to TAC. Stakeholder nominations to TAC are due by February 25, 2005. Julie Crenshaw asked about the process for circulating a list of candidates for AQPAC consideration. Joan Rohlfs said she would share the list of potential candidates and would accept suggestions and recommendations.

Sunil Kumar gave a brief update on the status of emission inventory development. The plan is to use the Periodic Emission Inventory for 2002 and Cooperative Forecasts to develop projections of uncontrolled emissions. The next step is to begin work on the controlled inventory.

Mary Richmond had a question about gas cans and whether the OSHA approved safety cans meet the permeability requirements for SIP credit. Tad Aburn said his staff, Gene Higa, would work to provide information on this issue.

9. Set Date for Next Meeting and Adjourn: March 11, 2005

The TAC will meet next on March 11, 2005 from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.