

MWAQC Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
February 10, 2015
10:00 AM to 11:30 AM

Present:

Cecily Beall, District Department of the Environment
Ram Tangirala, District Department of the Environment
Jessica Daniels, District Department of the Environment
Tom Ballou, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Doris McLeod, 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
Marcia Ways, Maryland Department of the Environment
Molly Berger, Maryland Department of the Environment
Brian Hug, Maryland Department of the Environment
Austina Casey, District Department of Transportation
Howard Simons, Maryland Department of Transportation
Jim Ponticello, Virginia Department of Transportation
Chris Voigt, Virginia Department of Transportation
John Kinsman, Edison Electric Institute
Gwen Kennedy, Loudoun County
Mike Lake, Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Asrah Khadr, EPA R3

Staff:

Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP
Jennifer Desimone, COG/DEP
Steve Walz, COG/DEP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Maia Davis, COG/DEP
Kanti Srikanth, COG/DTP
Elena Constantine, COG/DTP
Ron Milone, COG/DTP
Jane Posey, COG/DTP
Jinchul Park, COG/DTP

1. Call to Order and Review of Meeting Summary

Tad Aburn called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. The January 13 meeting summary was approved without any changes.

2. Evaluation of MOVES2014

Kanti presented an overview of the comparative study COG/DTP staff performed for MOVES2014 and MOVES2010a models for 2015. Jinchul presented the details of the study. He discussed the 2014 CLRP inputs used for this study along with pollutants and the corresponding jurisdictions selected. The year 2015 was selected for this study so that both models could be compared using the same set of fuel inputs and control programs built into them. MOVES2014 yields lower mobile emissions across all pollutants tested for the analysis year 2015 in 2014

CLRP. While MOVES2014 provided a reduction of 29% in Winter CO emission, it was only 2% for CO₂ equivalent across the region. A NO_x reduction in the order of 11-13% was estimated (depending on daily or annual estimation). Most of the overall emissions reductions by pollutant (with the exception of Winter CO and Ozone VOC) were attributed to the Running Exhaust emissions reductions. Most of the overall reductions of Winter CO and Ozone VOC were attributed to the Start Exhaust emissions reductions.

3a. Summary of Public Comments (2015 Ozone NAAQS)

Sunil discussed a summary of comments received in a public hearing event in Washington, DC in response to EPA's recently proposed ozone NAAQS on January 29th. There were a number of organizations and individuals who provided their respective comments. National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA) supported the new primary ozone NAAQS as proposed. They are still reviewing the proposed secondary ozone NAAQS and will provide written comments later. NACAA suggested EPA to:

- 1) propose the ozone implementation rule at the same time it finalizes the NAAQS revisions and finalize the implementation rule no later than one year following proposal,
- 2) adopt, or further strengthen, federal measures to control a range of emission sources, and
- 3) request additional federal funding for state and local agencies to enable them to successfully fulfill their statutory obligations to attain the more protective ozone standards.

American Lung Association supported the new ozone NAAQS at the 60 ppb level citing various research studies related to ozone exposure and its impact on human health to justify this level instead of the proposed 70ppb-65 ppb.

American Petroleum Institute opposed the new proposed ozone NAAQS range citing limitations and the lack of significance in the health studies. They opposed imposing more requirements on states and businesses since the current 75 ppb level has not been met in many areas in the country. They also said that the lowering the standard could put significant impact (cost, job loss) on the businesses. They also said that due to the existing peak background ozone levels approaching 70 ppb, lowering of the standard would impose unachievable emission reduction requirements on many parts of the nation. Even pristine areas such as, national parks would be out of attainment. Unattainable standards are not smart public policy.

Sierra Club supported the new ozone NAAQS at the 60 ppb level and urged EPA to change the concentration levels for code orange and code red accordingly to protect children and other vulnerable groups.

Several individuals supported the new ozone NAAQS as proposed citing the health concerns ozone poses.

3b. Draft MWAQC Ozone Comment Letter

Sunil discussed the draft MWAQC ozone comment letter to be sent to EPA in response to their recently proposed ozone NAAQS. Members agreed with the language of the letter for recommending it to MWAQC. There was a brief discussion regarding the proposal from ACPAC to consider the range of 60-70 ppb instead of the EPA proposed range of 65-70 ppb. States did

not agree with the ACPAC proposal. John Kinsman said that the background ozone level in east US is occasionally very high and so attaining the 60 ppb standard could be difficult. Also, NO_x emission offset could be needed, which is very expensive. There could be a chance that ACPAC might decide to write its own letter to EPA.

3c. Next Steps for 2008 Ozone NAAQS

Members discussed the next steps in light of the recent court decision regarding the attainment deadline for the current ozone NAAQS. Status of the certified 2014 ozone data was also discussed. It was decided to develop a letter for EPA for requesting an extension of one year for the attainment date for the Washington region. Sunil discussed a number of sample letters from different states in this regard.

4. State Gold Book

Isabel talked about the list of control measures and other voluntary actions (state & local gold book), which she developed in association with state air agency staff. She asked states how the information in the gold book should be presented to MWAQC. Tad said the information should first be presented to MWAQC in March and then a resolution to implement some of the measures in the gold book should be presented in May. He said the gold book should be turned into a regional action plan. Steve supported the idea of a resolution. He said he will work with states to develop an appropriate language for the resolution. He said timelines to implement these measures should be left to individual jurisdictions to allow flexibility in their implementation. In response to Isabel's question regarding the format for the gold book document for presentation to MWAQC, Steve said this can be presented as a list along with a statement of support.

5. UMD/MDE Photochemical Modeling

Tad discussed the details of the UMD/MDE photochemical modeling effort currently underway for the Baltimore nonattainment area's ozone SIP for the 2008 ozone standard. Maryland used 2007 as the base year for the modeling, but is now switching to 2011. The 2011 platform is giving results consistent with the 2007 platform. Results show that depending on the wind direction, different upwind areas contribute to Baltimore's ozone levels.

6. State and Local Updates

Tad said that MDE is working on Smartways and after-market catalyst rule. Maryland has put on hold its new power plant NO_x emission regulation as a few things need to be looked at. Jessica and Tom did not have any updates for the District and Virginia respectively.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.