

1



Agenda Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Public Advisory Council

D T L P	Date: Time: Ocation:	uesday, July 19, 2016 :30 p.m. ogue Valley Council of Governments efferson Conference Room 55 N. First Street, Central Point Transit: served by RVTD Route #40 41-423-1360 (Sue Casavan, RVCOG) RVMPO website: <u>www.rvmpo.org</u>
1.	Call to Or	er/Introductions/Review Agenda Justin Hurley, Chair
2.	Review/A	prove Minutes (Attachment #1)Chair
3.	Public Co	nment (3-minute limit for each speaker)Chair
4.	MPO Orio	ntationDan Moore
	Backgroun	PAC members asked for some background information about MPOs. This is the first of a series of PowerPoint presentations on the functions of MPOs.
	Attachmen	: #2 – Power Point presentation handout, "MPO 101"
5.	Congestio	Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding Update Dan Moore
	Backgroun	Salem and Eugene are air quality maintenance areas that became eligible this year for CMAQ funding due to a recent FHWA determination. This affects the amount of funding that will be allocated to the RVMPO in the future.
	Attachmen	#3 – RVMPO letter to OTC; Air quality white paper; FAQ Sheet "What's Happening with CMAQ?"
Ac	ction Reques	ed: Review and discuss
6.	Air Qualit	v (PM 2.5)Dan Moore
	Backgroun	Medford is just below the PM2.5 standard. Attached is some information that describes how exceeding the PM2.5 standard might affect the Medford area, the current status of the standard, and things that can be done to address PM2.5 emissions in the Rogue Valley.

Attachments: #4 – Memo, Medford Area PM2.5 Issues; The Consequences of Non-Attainment

Action Requested: Review and discuss

2

7.	MPO Planning UpdateDa	n Moore
8.	Other Business	Chair
9.	Public Comment	Chair
10	. Next Meeting	Chair
11	 ** The next Public Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for September 20, 2016, at 5:30 p.m. at Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room ** Adjourn	Chair

Other RVMPO	Technical Advisory Committee: 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, August 10,
meetings	Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.
	Policy Committee: 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 26, Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CALL SUE CASAVAN, 541-423-1360. REASONABLE ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE NEED FOR ACCOMMODATIONS PRIOR TO THE MEETING (48 HOURS ADVANCE NOTICE PREFERABLE) WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

Summary Minutes Rogue Valley MPO Public Advisory Council May 17, 2016

The following attended:

MPO Public Advisory Council		
Aaron Prunty	Eagle Point	864-9868
Edgar Hee	Bike/Ped	734-4872
Glen Anderson	East Medford	770-6577
Kay Harrison	Central Point	664-1066
Mary Wooding	Ashland	482-1066
Michael Stanek	Eagle Point	821-1804
Mike Montero, Vice Chair	Freight Industry	779-0771
Ron Holthusen	Jacksonville	899-8080
Staff		
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369
Sue Casavan	RVCOG	423-1360

Others Present

Patrick McKechnie, Tom Humphrey

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review

Mike Montero called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Members present introduced themselves.

2. Review/Approve Minutes

The Vice Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the March meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mary Wooding and seconded by Kay Harrison the Council unanimously approved the minutes as presented. Glen Anderson abstained.

3. Public Comment -

None received.

4. Public Advisory Council New Member Application

Patrick McKechnie introduced himself and informed members that he was interested in the Mass Transit member position. He sees potential for growth in the region and would like to share his experience.

On a motion by Glen Anderson and seconded by Ron Holthusen the council unanimously forwarded recommendation to appoint Patrick McKechnie to the Public Advisory Council representing Mass Transit.

5. Central Point Urban Reserve Area (CP-3)

Tom Humphrey, City of Central Point, gave a Power Point presentation. He gave an overview area concept plan. He mentioned that the planning commission would like to keep the plan flexible at this time.

He provided an overview of the transportation concerns.

Glen Anderson asked if the statewide goals were considered in the conceptual planning process and Humphrey noted that for the final plan statewide goals will be used for the final plan but the conceptual plan uses performance measures.

Mary Wooding asked when the process would start and Humphrey responded that the City Council will start the UGB amendment process in the fall.

Anderson mentioned that it might create more traffic by narrowing a road.

Edgar Hee noted that a cul-de-sac creates out of direction travel. Minimizing out of direction traffic is better for bicycles and pedestrians.

Kay Harrison agreed that the area was challenging for traffic flow. The area has many different uses for transportation and the city would like to consider the potential for economic development.

Montero said that adding land to the UGB doesn't mean you can urbanize it. The cities are thinking about adding land and looking at transportation options that will work.

Humphrey noted that the process involves the obligation to do forward planning for the Regional Problem Solving (RPS) process. Ron Holthusen asked if the plan considered future population from a transportation perspective and Humphrey indicated that there was an economic element to the plan that results in numbers and ratios.

On a motion by Glen Anderson and seconded by Mary Wooding the council unanimously forwarded comment from the council that the concept plan did a reasonable job in exploring land use and transportation options in Central Point.

6. MPO Orientation

Due to time constraints, the agenda item will be brought back at the next meeting. Moore asked that members review the handout and come back with questions.

7. MPO Discretionary Funds, Project Criteria Changes

Andrea Napoli gave a brief overview of the discretionary fund program. She briefly discussed the Surface Transportation Program (STP) block grant program and Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) funding sources that MPO jurisdictions will be submitting project applications for. She briefly described changes to the application process brought about by the transportation needs assessment and alternative measures.

Hee suggested for Transportation Options, Item 3 that the region considers looking at more than linear miles for bike facilities.

Holthusen added that for Item 4 the region could include separated pathways for bike/ped facilities also.

8. MPO Planning Update

Napoli gave a Power Point presentation and updated members on the public input survey. It was noted that more outreach efforts could be targeted for White City and Eagle Point (Northern RVMPO).

9. Other Business

Montero briefly summarized the report document handout titled *One Oregon: A Vision for Oregon's Transportation System.* He noted that the report will help guide where funding will be allocated.

10. Public Comment

None received.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

















RVMPO Structure

Policy Committee

- The MPO consists of local elected officials; ODOT and RVTD.
- Policy Committee makes final RVMPO planning decisions
- The Policy Committee determines their own representation and decision making procedures through their bylaws.



RVMPO Structure

Public Advisory Council

- Acts in an advisory capacity to MPO Policy Committee as liaison to the public
- · Advises on public involvement strategies
- Assists in organizing and managing public meetings and comments
- · Composed of members of the public
 - Appointed by the MPO policy committee
 - Includes representatives of communities, stakeholder and advocacy groups like freight, mass transit, minority community interest, low income community interest, public health, senior, and bicycle and pedestrian



MPO Primary Responsibilities

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

- Must cover 20+ years, updated every 4 years
- RTP Revenues and Costs must balance

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- Determines regional **transportation** priorities, in cooperation with MPO member
 jurisdictions, RVTD & ODOT
- Identifies State, federal and local funding
- Must be consistent with RTP

Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD)

- RTP and TIP must meet AQ emissions regulations
- Federal funding withheld if Plans not "conforming"



Other MPO Federally Required Products

- Public Participation Plan
 - Communication with the public(s)and key affected groups
- Title 6/Environmental Justice Plan
 - A component of the Public Participation Plan
 - Addresses impacts of transportation projects/decisions that affect target populations (low income, minority ,etc)



<text><list-item><list-item><list-item>



14



May 12, 2016

Tammy Baney, Chair Oregon Transportation Commission 355 Capitol Street NE, MS #11 Salem, OR 97301-3871

Dear Commissioner Baney,

At our April 26, 2016 Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) Policy Committee meeting, staff briefed members about potential reductions in RVMPO Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding due to the addition of the Salem and Eugene Air Quality Maintenance Areas to the statewide CMAQ funding formula. ODOT prepared preliminary projections showing a 47% reduction in the RVMPO's CMAQ funding – the highest percentage reduction of all Maintenance Areas in Oregon. Although ODOT acknowledges that this figure is preliminary, it states that it cannot use the existing formula for determining how CMAQ funding would best be distributed because certain data are not currently available.

In our opinion, to compromise the integrity of a data-driven CMAQ funding allocation methodology that has served the State since 2006 for the purpose of immediately funding two new CMAQ programs – without any indication that the need in the Salem and Eugene Air Quality areas is sufficient to potentially compromise the viability of existing programs – would be problematic for the following reasons:

1) A distribution of air quality funding based solely or primarily on population completely ignores compelling local factors, not the least among being this region's unique topography (the driving force behind our seasonal air stagnation). An indication of how important non-population factors are in determining funding levels is the disproportionate percentage reduction now being proposed for the RVMPO – obviously the inclusion of a wider range of factors is critical in measuring the appropriate level of need for CMAQ funding in southern Oregon.

Recommendation: Make funding available to collect the data necessary to populate Oregon's existing funding allocation formula, and agree that no decision to redistribute CMAQ funding be made on the basis of expedience rather than sound technical merit.

2) The current Oregon CMAQ allocation, determined by FHWA, is based on the results of the 2010 Census. Due to the fact that Eugene and Salem were not included in that allocation determination, a significant decrease in funding for the current CMAQ recipients to accommodate these two new areas would compromise FHWA's original intent, which was to improve air quality by adequately funding effective CMAQ programs in the impacted areas then identified. It makes little sense to us to reduce the effectiveness of Oregon's existing CMAQ programs to fund new ones in areas that do not appear to have immediately compelling air quality issues – at least not

compelling enough to jeopardize decades of progress in air quality improvements in the Rogue Valley.

Recommendation: Wait to alter the current CMAQ funding distribution in the State until the results of the 2020 Census are available, at which time FHWA would determine a new allocation for Oregon based on the inclusion of the Salem and Eugene Air Quality Maintenance Areas.

3) Air Quality Maintenance Areas that currently receive CMAQ funds have all engaged in extensive public processes that culminated in a financially constrained list of projects funded through 2018. The proposed reductions in funding would, at the very least, extend the time frame of many of those projects, and could well jeopardize the viability of some due to timing issues, both logistical and financial. This of course would be exacerbated should the OTC consider Salem and Eugene's request to make their new CMAQ funding retroactive. **Recommendation:** Should the OTC decline to delay the award of CMAQ funding to the Salem

and Eugene areas until a new 2020 Census-based allocation can occur, then it could direct ODOT to begin funding the Salem and Eugene CMAQ programs with any available State transportation funds until a new FHWA allocation can occur. As an alternative to the State funding, Salem and Eugene could utilize a portion of the new 14.1% increase in FAST Act STP funding, available to TMAs only, to fund their programs until the next Census. Since this increased STP funding was unexpected and has not yet been allocated on the MPO level, its use would represent the only solution available at this time that would not adversely impact state transportation funding or existing CMAQ programs.

For an in-depth discussion of the technical rationale behind our position that any reduction in CMAQ funding, and especially a reduction based on population, would be inappropriate for Southern Oregon (including the Middle Rogue MPO), we have attached a recent analysis from Tom Carlson of Sierra Research. The information contained within this analysis not only demonstrates that air quality in Medford and Grants Pass is generally closer to a violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for CO and PH₁₀ than in either Eugene or Salem, it also highlights how close Medford is to being in violation of the standards for PM_{2.5} and the revised 8-hour standards for ozone. This is demonstrably the absolute wrong moment to weaken the CMAQ program in Southern Oregon.

The members of the RVMPO consider the CMAQ program to be one of the most effective uses of Federal funding available to MPOs, and we absolutely support needed air quality improvements in Oregon no matter where those improvements needs to take place. That said, we also support strategic decision-making based both on **need** and **capacity**, and consider the adage to "**do no harm**" an important consideration. In the case of the proposed reductions to current CMAQ funding levels, we absolutely question the **need** to immediately begin funding two new programs in the absence of critical date; we point to the **greater capacity** of the Salem and Eugene TMAs to temporarily fund their own CMAQ programs (especially considering their STP windfall increase under the FAST Act), as compared to the **reduced capacity** of non-TMAs such as the RVMPO to make up a significant funding shortfall; and we stress the likely **harm** that will befall our region's air quality as a result of a reduction in CMAQ funding.

Sincerely,

Mil. IC

Michael G. Quilty '' RVMPO Policy Committee Chair

Air Quality Factor Comparison between Medford/Grants Pass, Eugene, and Salem

Summary

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) elected to make the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program a local program, allowing federal Funds to go to eligible local governments. In 2005, a committee¹ of state and local agency stakeholders led by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) evaluated various approaches for allocating CMAQ funds to air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas in Oregon. The committee selected a well-reasoned allocation formula based on the air quality severity of each qualified air quality planning area. Although the population of each air quality planning area was a component, each allocation formula considered was also weighted based on <u>air quality severity</u>.

This white paper presents a comparative analysis of a series of key factors that affect local ambient air quality levels throughout Oregon. The analysis utilizes up-to-date data and focuses its comparisons across three areas: Medford/Grants Pass,² Eugene-Springfield (Eugene), and Salem. CMAQ eligible areas under MAP-21 are all ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM) nonattainment and maintenance areas, including former areas where the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) have been revoked.

Table 1 summarizes the planning area characteristics for these areas, including pollutants, area classification status, and 2010 planning area population. With the exception of the Salem Ozone area, each area is a Maintenance Area for either CO or PM_{10} (PM less than 10 microns in size).

Table 1						
Air Quality Planning Area Designations						
		Redesignation	Area	Population		
Planning Area	Pollutant	to Maintenance	Classification	(2010)		
Medford	CO	9/23/2002	Moderate	86,056		
Medford	PM ₁₀	8/18/2006	Moderate	87,458		
Grants Pass	CO	10/30/2000	Moderate	22,449		
Grants Pass	PM ₁₀	12/26/2003	Moderate	22,449		
Eugene-Springfield	CO	2/4/1994	Not Classified	234,972		
Eugene-Springfield	PM ₁₀	6/10/2013	Moderate	195,160		
Salem [†]	CO	3/2/2009	Not Classified	156,100		
Salem ^{††}	Ozone	n/a	Incomplete	388,564		

[†] Nonattainment area includes portions of both Marion and Polk County.

^{††} Former area where one-hour ozone standard revoked on June 15, 2005.



1801 J Street Sacramento, CA 95811 Tel: (916) 444-6666 Fax: (916) 444-8373 Ann Arbor, MI Tel: (734) 761-6666 Fax: (734) 761-6755

¹ Oregon Department of Transportation, "Congestion Mitigation for Air Quality Program (CMAQ) Proposed Alternatives to Target Funding for Qualifying Area," CMAQ Committee Meeting, August 1, 2005.

² Medford and Grants Pass are two separate air quality planning areas, but are grouped together for this analysis because of their relative proximity.

Three separate factors were considered for this comparative evaluation of air quality severity between Medford/Grants Pass, Eugene, and Salem as listed below:

- Ambient air quality levels (and comparisons to NAAQS);
- Meteorology and topographic effects; and
- Established vehicular emission control programs.

The results of these factor analyses are presented separately below and overall, indicate that a strong case can be made that air quality in Medford and Grants Pass is generally more severe (i.e., closer to violation of NAAQS, etc.) that in either Eugene or Salem.

Ambient Air Quality Levels

Air quality monitoring data were downloaded from EPA's AirData web portal³ for the five most recent years of data availability (by pollutant) and tabulated to develop comparisons of peak ambient air quality levels by pollutant across each of the three planning areas. To provide an effective comparison of each area's air quality relative to the health-based ambient standards, a series of plots were prepared that compare each area's peak air quality concentrations in each year to the most stringent applicable standard for each pollutant. For example, a value of 50% means peak concentrations for a specific pollutant were 50% or half of the applicable standard). This approach provides a clearer set of comparisons since standards are based on different averaging periods, and measurement units vary by pollutant.

<u>Maintenance Area Pollutants</u> – Figure 1 presents plots of peak air quality levels across each planning area for CO and PM₁₀, the two pollutants for which either planning area is currently designated a Maintenance area. As shown in the left panel, CO concentrations from 2006-2010 (the most recent period of ambient CO monitoring in any of these areas) were all less than half of the 8-hour ambient standard, ranging from 19% to 41%, although levels in Medford/Grants Pass were consistently higher than those in Eugene over the entire five-year period. In the right panel a similar comparison is shown for the five most recent years of PM₁₀ monitoring, 2011-2015. (Salem is not monitored for PM₁₀.) Medford and Eugene have similar peak PM₁₀ levels relative to the 24-hour standard, generally hovering between 26% and 40%, with excursions over 60% in Eugene in 2015 and Medford in 2013. For these two Maintenance area pollutants (CO and PM₁₀), air quality levels are similar in Medford and Eugene.

<u>Other Key Criteria Pollutants</u> – Figure 2 provides similar comparison plots for which monitoring data exist for two other key criteria pollutants: $PM_{2.5}$ (PM less than 2.5 microns in size) and ozone. These plots show that Medford/Grants Pass generally has higher (i.e., worse) peak air quality for these pollutants than Eugene and Salem and show, especially for PM_{2.5}, how close Medford is to being in violation of the standards.

³ www3.epa.gov/airdata/ad_rep_mon.html

Figure 1 Comparison of Peak Air Quality Levels for Maintenance Area Pollutants: CO and PM₁₀



Figure 2 Comparison of Peak Air Quality Levels for Other Criteria Pollutants: PM_{2.5}[†] and Ozone^{††}



[†]PM_{2.5} data from EPA have been corrected to exclude EPA-accepted forest fire-related exceptional events based on data provided by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

^{††}EPA revised the 8-hour ozone standard from 75 parts per billion (ppb) to 70 ppb, effective December 28, 2015. Percentages shown are based on the 75 ppb standard applicable during the monitoring period shown.

 $PM_{2.5}$ comparisons are presented in the left panel of Figure 2 and show how peak concentrations in each area, defined using the 98^{th} -percentile⁴ value, compare to the 24-hour standard. As seen, 98^{th} percentile values were at or above the standard in both 2015 (101%) and 2013 (123%) in

⁴ Violations of the 24-hour standard are determined on the basis of the 98th percentile value of 24-hour concentrations measured in each year. The 98th- percentile represents the value that is higher than 98 percent of 24-hour values for the year.

Medford, and above in Eugene in 2013 (114%). In all other years shown, $PM_{2.5}$ values in Medford were very close to the standard, ranging from 80-89%.

A violation of the 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standard occurs when a consecutive three-year average of 98th percentile values exceeds 35 µg/m³ (i.e., less than 35.5 µg/m³ when rounded to the nearest integer). Though not apparent from Figure 2, Medford's three-year average from 2013-2015 was 35.4 µg/m³. Thus, Medford currently stands on the cusp of violating the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard, and faces the prospect of being designated as non-attainment for PM_{2.5} by EPA unless ambient levels trend downward. (Eugene's three-year average 98th percentile value is 32.7 µg/m³.)

Ambient ozone level comparisons are presented in the right panel of Figure 2. As shown, peak 8-hour concentrations (defined as the 4th highest value in accordance with the standard) for all three areas ranged between 76% and 92% of the applicable standard over the last five years, although the average in Medford was about 5% closer to the standard than in either Eugene or Salem. However as explained in a footnote to Figure 2, EPA recently revised the 8-hour ozone standard from 75 ppb to 70 ppb, effective December 28, 2015. This represents a reduction of 7%. Going forward, Medford will be dangerously close to a violation of the revised 8-hour ozone standard based on recent measured ambient levels.

Thus, although all three areas have similar ambient air quality for CO and PM_{10} (where recent monitoring data are available), peak levels of $PM_{2.5}$ and ozone in Medford are perilously close to the applicable standards. In Eugene and Salem, recent peak levels of those pollutants indicate they have a wider safety margin before violating either the $PM_{2.5}$ or ozone standards.

Meteorology and Topography

Another key factor in evaluating the air quality severity of each area consisted of comparisons of meteorological and topographic metrics that significantly affect the general dispersion or ventilation potential (or lack thereof) characterizing each area.

<u>Meteorology Factors</u> – Broadly speaking across factors that affect all criteria air pollutants, the most important variables that reflect on the overall dispersion of emitted (or atmospherically formed) pollutants in an area are wind speed and mixing height.⁵ (In simple terms, mixing height refers to the vertical depth in which emitted pollutants are diluted and dispersed.) Mixing heights are inversely related to measured pollutant levels; low mixing heights generally reflect higher or worse pollutant concentrations.

Table 2 presents a comparison of three wind speed and mixing height metrics compiled from long-term meteorological measurements at the airport weather stations in each area, which provide an effective means for comparing overall "dispersion potential" in each area. Wind speed is compared using two different metrics: daily average speed (in miles/hour); and the frequency of calm winds (percentage of hourly wind speeds less than 1 mile/hour). Lower average wind

⁵ Mixing height is defined as the height of the layer adjacent to the ground over which pollutants or any constituents emitted within this layer or entrained into it become vertically dispersed by convection or mechanical turbulence.

Table 2 Comparison of Key Meteorological Variables				
Metric	Medford	Eugene	Salem	
Daily Average Wind Speed (mph)	3.9	6.7	6.4	
Frequency of Calms (speed < 1 mph)	61.9%	39.7%	24.5%	
Average Winter (Nov-Feb) Mixing Height (meters)	241	372	433	

speeds and higher frequency of calms reflect conditions with lower horizontal dispersion and potential for higher pollutant concentrations. Similarly, lower mixing heights are indicative of less vertical dispersion potential and higher pollutant concentrations (other factors being equal). As seen from comparisons of these metrics in Table 2, Medford's lower wind average wind speed, higher frequency of calms and lower average winter month (November through February) mixing height clearly indicates it has more limited atmospheric dispersion and mixing relative to Eugene and Salem, and thus greater potential for pollutant build-up.

<u>Topography Factors</u> – The gap in dispersion potential evidenced by these meteorological variable comparisons is further enhanced by the differences in topography that effectively define the size of the "airshed" of each area. Closely bounded by the Siskiyou and Cascade Mountains, Medford and Grants Pass have effective airshed sizes of roughly 250 square miles and 50 square miles, respectively. Conversely, Eugene (at the southern end) and Salem are located in the much broader Willamette River Valley, which has an airshed that exceeds 2,000 square miles. The proximity of mountains and other elevated terrain around Medford and Grants Pass form an effective barrier to ventilating their airsheds, especially during winter months when CO and PM concentrations are highest and mixing heights and wind speeds are low.

Collectively, the combination of these meteorological and topography/terrain factors are reflective of significantly lower dispersion potential in Medford and Grants Pass than exists in either Eugene or Salem.

Vehicle Control Programs

Finally, beyond factors related to ambient pollutant and meteorology/topography, the presence of motor vehicle related regulatory control programs in each area was also considered. Medford is one of two areas in Oregon (Portland is the other) in which a state-level vehicle emission control program, the Vehicle Inspection Program (VIP), exists. The VIP program was originally established in Medford when the area was a CO Nonattainment area. That it has remained in place since that time provides regulatory evidence at to its need for providing continued reductions in vehicle emissions and the air quality severity there, relative to Eugene and Salem.

What is happening with CMAQ?

1) What is the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program?

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program is a U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) funding program intended to "provide a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act." With the creation and implementation of the CMAQ program in 1991 as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), funding became available to areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas). The CMAQ program is housed and administered through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

2) Does the Rogue Valley MPO receive CMAQ funds?

Yes, the Rogue Valley MPO has received CMAQ funding since the start of the CMAQ program in 1991 because the region was formerly a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}) and is currently required to implement maintenance plans to address CO and PM_{10} emissions.

3) How are CMAQ funds distributed? (Federal Government to State Government)

Since the creation and implementation of the CMAQ funding program, CMAQ funding has been disbursed through state departments of transportation (DOT). The State DOT then decides how to allocate the CMAQ funds to eligible areas. Formulas which prescribe the amount of CMAQ funding to each state have evolved since the implementation of the program in 1991. In 2009 the authorization bill SAFETEA-LU changed the distribution formula from one that varied each year based on impacted populations and levels of exposure to emissions to one based on the proportion of funds each state received in 2009. Therefore, the proportion of funds to each state has not changed since 2009, even through the landscape of eligible areas and the air quality context has changed.

4) How are CMAQ funds distributed? (State Government to Local Government)

Because State DOTs have the discretion for determining the allocation of CMAQ funding to those eligible areas in the state, the CMAQ funding program differs from state to state. FHWA does not have statewide distribution requirements for State DOTs aside from establishing eligible areas. In Oregon, ODOT has taken a sub-allocation approach to distributing CMAQ funding to eligible areas. Since 2006, ODOT has used the same sub-allocation formula for CMAQ funding, which was based on multiple factors including air quality status, pollution severity and population. Eligible areas outside of MPOs have received an "off the top" allocation of \$65,000 per year, typically spent in one obligation of funds accumulated over several years.

5) How much of that CMAQ funding comes to the RVMPO?

The RVMPO currently receives approximately \$2.5 million per year to implement transportation projects which address air quality issues. Amounts change slightly each year consistent with the rate of annual growth of overall federal transportation funding to the state. In general, the funds have grown slightly over time and with no changes in the sub-allocation formula would be approximately \$2.8 million by the end of the current federal authorization bill in 2020.

6) What is currently happening with CMAQ in Oregon and why is this discussion happening now?

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) has elected to make the CMAQ program a local program, allowing federal funds to go to eligible local governments. The CMAQ program is a reimbursement program requiring non-federal matching funds of 10.27%, with a higher match rate for projects that are public-private partnerships. In Oregon, the only areas that qualified for CMAQ funds until recently are:

- Portland Metro area (CO maintenance area)
- Medford/ Ashland Metro area (CO maintenance, PM-10 maintenance area)
- Klamath Falls (CO and PM-10 maintenance area)
- La Grande (PM-10 nonattainment area)
- Lakeview (PM-10 nonattainment area)
- Oakridge (PM-10 nonattainment area)
- Grants Pass (CO and PM-10 maintenance area)

It was noted during the 2005 Statewide CMAQ Committee funding allocation meetings, that even though the Salem and Eugene-Springfield areas are designated as nonattainment or maintenance for CO, these areas did not qualify for CMAQ funding due to the following reason: *Areas which were designated nonattainment prior to December 31, 1997, but were not classified in accordance with [the Clean Air Act, Sections 181(a), 186(a) or 188(a) or (b)] are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds. These include but are not limited to areas that were formerly considered as ozone "transitional" and "incomplete data" areas and CO "not classified" areas.*

FHWA recently made a determination that the Eugene and Salem regions are eligible to receive CMAQ funding.

- Eugene/Springfield is eligible because it's <u>PM-10 Maintenance Area</u>. It became eligible in June 2013, the effective date of its PM-10 Maintenance Plan. This supersedes previous policy which said: Areas that were designated nonattainment prior to Dec. 31, 1997 but were not classified in accordance with the Clean Air Act—sections 181(a), 186(a), or 188(a) or (b)—are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds.
- Salem is eligible at least through March 2017 because it's an <u>Unclassified CO</u> <u>Maintenance Area</u> that has prepared and filed a maintenance plan. It became eligible in March 2009, the effective date of its CO Limited Maintenance Plan. As with Eugene, this supersedes previous policy which said: Areas that were designated nonattainment prior to

Dec. 31, 1997 but were not classified in accordance with the Clean Air Act—sections 181(a), 186(a), or 188(a) or (b)—are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds.

The Salem and Eugene MPOs have now requested ODOT to update the state distribution method to account for their eligibility. ODOT is considering how to update the distribution process and is expected to propose a process in the very near future.

7) If new places become eligible for CMAQ funding, does that mean the State of Oregon receives more CMAQ funding?

No, the federal transportation reauthorization does not increase or decrease the level of CMAQ funding each state receives based on the current air quality conditions and newly eligible areas.

8) How soon can the RVMPO be affected/impacted by the outcomes of the statewide CMAQ allocation discussions?

The impacts to the funding amounts will be determined by the Oregon Transportation Commission when they adopt a new distribution process, including the date the new process will go into effect.

9) How can the RVMPO contribute to the conversation about the statewide CMAQ funding allocation?

To date, ODOT has communicated a general description to undergo a process over the summer and looks to bring forward to the OTC a new recommendation on how to allocate CMAQ funds in the state by autumn 2016. As ODOT prepares to define a more specific process proposal, the RVMPO may consider sending a message to ODOT asking that there be adequate time to consider options.



DATE: July 12, 2016
TO: RVMPO Public Advisory Council
FROM: Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager
SUBJECT: Medford Area PM2.5 Issues

During the June 14th TRADCO meeting, there was discussion about a recent presentation by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) concerning Medford's PM 2.5 levels. ODEQ has been soliciting comments for a statewide workgroup in preparing a report for the legislature. I was asked to follow-up with ODEQ to find out more information, and how exceeding the PM 2.5 standard might affect the Medford area. Below are responses from ODEQ.

ODEQ

Medford is currently just below the daily standard for PM2.5. ODEQ determines if an area is above the standard by monitoring for PM2.5 throughout the year and taking the 98th percentile value for that year. Then ODEQ averages the 98th percentiles for the last three years to compare with the standard.

This happens every year to determine if an area is in violation of the standard. When an area has been designated as an in attainment, nothing regulatory happens for each year when it violates the standard. What ODEQ really has to watch out for is the EPA re-designations that happens every 10 years or so (ODEQ does not know exactly when EPA will start re-designation). During re-designation, EPA selects a three year span to determine whether an area is above or below the standard. If they are above the standard, they re-designate the area as non-attainment. ODEQ does not know which three year period the EPA will use.

If an area is designated as non-attainment, the state, county, city, and EPA will have to work on a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that will require the area to take actions to lower PM2.5 emissions. Once the area comes in below the standard, a maintenance plan is designed to keep you there.

The impact of non-attainment: attached is a document ODEQ found on line that summarizes the impact. Medford was in non-attainment for PM10 and is in a maintenance status now, so the Medford area has experienced this already. As for the standard, EPA revisited the standard in 2012 and kept the daily standard at 35ug/m3. They did lower the annual average standard from 15ug/m3 to 12ug/m3. Medford is in danger of violating the daily standard. ODEQ has not heard of any talk of lowering the daily standard to 30ug/m3, but EPA always looks at new health data and this is always on the table. Since EPA did not lower the daily standard in 2012, it would be surprising if they lowered it in the next few years, but ODEQ does not have any inside information on this.

Here is the EPA web page on the PM2.5 standard: https://www3.epa.gov/pmdesignations/

Here are some additional comments from ODEQ:

• EPA, under the Clean Air Act is supposed to review the PM2.5 standard every 5 years.

(Agenda Item 6) As mentioned above, EPA last reviewed the standard in 2012, and the next review is supposed to occur by 2017, but sometimes EPA does not complete its review within the 5 year timeframe. EPA has started its review process.

- EPA, in previous reviews of the standard has considered dropping the standard down to 30ug/m3, but as mentioned above, EPA did not do so in 2012. It's hard to predict what EPA will do, since it is based on the latest available health effects information, but ODEQ has mentioned the 30ug/m3 level to many communities as a caution and perhaps even a goal for communities to target to ensure they do not have to worry about a nonattainment designation.
- If Medford were to exceed the standard in the near future (and EPA has not changed the standard), then Medford could develop a voluntary "PM plan" that would identify any strategies the community is putting in place to bring levels down. That would give EPA the assurance that the area is working diligently to address the PM levels and would not designate the area as nonattainment. ODEQ has developed similar plans with the communities of Lakeview and Prineville, since they are violating the standard right now but have not yet been designated nonattainment by EPA. However, if EPA were to revise the standard, then federal law requires that any area not meeting the standard, even if they've developed a voluntary PM plan, would have to be designated as nonattainment.

Jackson County Health is very interested in seeing coordination among the county and the cities to reinvigorate the woodstove program to help address the PM2.5 issue. Jackson County and the cities have established programs and it should be effective to place a fresh emphasis on the outreach aspects in the coming winter seasons. Some of the recommendations from the local ODEQ presentations have been to include the desirability of providing funding for outreach efforts and other projects.

Finally, I asked ODEQ if the Rogue Valley area should be concerned about the PM2.5 standard. ODEQ thinks it's a concern, but the Medford-area has had the previous experience of dealing with nonattainment in the 1980's and we've already got the tools in place to address this.

For example, both Jackson County and all the cities in the area have ordinances to require woodstove curtailment on poor air quality days. Now it's just a matter of going back and re-educating the public and making sure people are following the curtailment calls. This effort could involve sending informational letters to folks who are burning, and ODEQ has found in other communities that folks usually comply after receiving the letter. ODEQ also thinks if we were to revive the air quality committee it would be really helpful just to make sure all the cities are checking in with each other and coordinating any outreach and education efforts. This could also include putting together a voluntary PM plan, if that's how the region wanted to proceed. Typically, you send a notification letter to EPA that you'd like to be part of the voluntary program and then you submit your plan to them. EPA usually requests that you develop a 5 year voluntary plan, with strategies for how you plan to reduce emissions, and provide annual updates to them. Here's more information on the program. https://www.epa.gov/advance/advance-basic-information

It is my understanding that Jackson County Public Health, (Jackson Baures with Chad Peterson and Danielle Morvan) are very interested in seeing coordination among the County and the cities to reinvigorate the woodstove program. Beyond that effort, I'm not aware of any other organization that has shown interest in organizing any other local efforts such as; developing a voluntary PM plan, or reconvening the Air Quality Committee. It depends upon who has the resources to help take the lead. ODEQ could offer technical assistance and support.

26

Attachment #4

(Agenda Item 6) Below are some charts and a graph that depict the PM2.5 monitoring data. This helps tell the story about why there needs to be a focus on woodstoves and burning – you can see its influence in the data. The graph shows levels rise in the winter months (mid-October through end of February) all primarily due to woodstove smoke. The huge spike shown in the summertime is due to wildfires, which is not counted against the data that gets reported to EPA and determines if the area is over the standard. In other words, wildfire data can be excluded.

There are some ways that the RVMPO can help:

- Reducing the amount of winter road sanding material placed on the roadway. For example, the RVMPO could ask ODOT and the city and county public works departments in the areas to utilize de-icing agents and salt instead of sand, increased plowing of roads and sweeping up of cinders during storms, and reduced sanding to intersections only.
- Another idea would be in the contracts that cities and counties have with construction companies • (or even in-house) would be to require anti-idling measures for construction equipment or other diesel powered engines.



2013-2015 Oregon Cities Compared to the New Daily PM2.5 Standard

Attachment #4

Sources of PM2.5 in Medford area (2011 data)





PM_{2.5} and Air Quality Index (2013)



2013 Medford Air Quality Index

Non-Attainment Designation: There are Consequences

When an area (usually a county or metropolitan area) is designated as a "nonattainment" (NA) area under the Clean Air Act, serious repercussions result immediately. These come in the form of increased costs to industry, permitting delays, restrictions on industry expansion within the area, as well as impacts to transportation planning. There are also increased costs to businesses and consumers due to special requirements for vehicles, fuels sold in the area, and for commercial and consumer products.

- Loss of industry and economic development in and around the Area. Companies interested in building a major manufacturing plant will likely not build in a NA area due to the increased costs, delays, and uncertainties associated with the restrictive permit requirements.
- Loss of federal highway and transit funding. Federally supported highway and transit projects may be halted in a NA area if the state cannot demonstrate that the project will cause no increase in applicable emissions.
- New emissions in the Area must be "offset," or the unit cannot be built. Companies must offset the projected emissions of the proposed new plant or major modification by purchasing unused emission credits from others, or by reducing their own emissions. The ability to purchase emissions credits becomes increasingly difficult as the available emissions credits are used up over time. Similarly, the ability to reduce existing emissions at a plant that is proposing a major modification may be difficult or impossible for sources that already meet stringent standards and have installed emissions control equipment. Where no offset can be found, the project may not go forward. In ozone NA areas, offsets typically must be greater than 1:1 ratio (e.g., a ton of offsets per ton of emissions).
- **Compensation for Foreign Sources of Emissions**. Certain States may also have to compensate for contributions to ambient concentrations in an area coming from foreign sources (such as Canada) in order to reach attainment with the NAAQS.
- Additional restrictive permitting requirements that are not applied in attainment areas. Companies that plan to build a new facility or construct a major modification to an existing facility in, or near, a NA area will be required to install the most effective emission reduction technology *without consideration of cost*. Less stringent controls may be installed in attainment areas. The permitting process can be expected to last a year or longer as the company demonstrates that its proposal will meet all of the applicable NA requirements. These differences would tend to discourage new business investments in NA areas compared with moving to an attainment area.
- **Greater EPA involvement and oversight in permit decisions.** EPA may intervene and require permit revisions, even after the state and company seeking the permit have negotiated the terms of a final permit. This causes tremendous uncertainty, delays, and increased costs in the permitting process.
- Continuing oversight by EPA even after the NA area meets the standard. Before a NA area can be redesignated as an attainment area, EPA must determine that: 1) the area has met the standard (for ozone, this means it must be in attainment for three full years); 2) the improvement in the area's air quality is due to permanent and enforceable emissions

reductions; and 3) the area has an approved maintenance plan and an approved contingency plan that contain enforceable requirements to keep the area from lapsing into NA.

• Technical and Formula Changes for Commercial and Consumer Products. In order to meet the NAAQS standard, some State Implementation Plans may include regulations that would reduce the pollutant or its chemical "precursors" (e.g., for ozone, certain types of Volatile Organic Compounds [VOC]), by requiring changes to operating processes, to a product's technical design, or to the actual chemical formulation of commercial or consumer products, such as paint, which may result in increased costs to users or differences in performance.