Purpose & Background

Promote cooperation and coordination across MPO and State boundaries to develop a regional approach to transportation planning

Supported by:
• Planning Emphasis Area (PEA) Fiscal Year 2015
• Every Day Counts (EDC-3)
Why is Enhanced Coordination Needed?

Multiple Metropolitan Planning Organizations → Coordinated Regional Planning
Why is Enhanced Coordination Needed?

Recognize mutual needs, goals, and objectives of the geographic region as a whole.
Regional Models of Cooperation: Implementation Activities

1. Webinar Series
2. Peer Exchange Workshops
3. Handbook
Regional Models of Cooperation Webinar Series

1. Regional Models of Cooperation Overview (Jan 27, 2015)
3. Regional Transit Planning (date)
4. Safety Planning (date)
5. Congestion Management (date)
6. Freight Planning (date)
7. Data Sharing, Systems, and Tools (date)
8. Joint Planning Products (date)
Today’s Speakers

• Cecilia Ho
  Team Leader, FHWA Air Quality & Noise Team

• Pragati Srivastava
  Administrator, Memphis MPO

• Anna Gallup
  Program Manager, Metrolina Regional Model, Charlotte DOT

• Tanisha Taylor
  Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin COG
TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION & COOPERATION

Cecilia Ho
Air Quality & Noise Team Leader
FHWA Office of Natural Environment
Transportation Conformity: A Link Between Air Quality and Transportation Planning

- Transportation Conformity
- State Implementation Plan (SIP)
- Air Quality Planning
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Transportation Planning
Interagency Consultation - Overview

- A collaborative process between organizations on key elements of transportation and air quality planning
  - Required in all nonattainment and maintenance areas
  - Formally integrated into a SIP and legally enforceable by a state court
  - Conducted for development or modification of plans, TIPs, SIPs, and conformity determinations
Interagency Consultation Process

- Ensures all agencies:
  - Meet regularly
  - Share information
  - Collaboratively make decisions
    - Key issues
    - Assumptions
Roles and Responsibilities

• Regulations require the participation of all relevant agencies in interagency consultation
  • Not all agencies are required to participate in every activity covered by interagency consultation

• Typical key participants include:
  • MPO(s)
  • State and local transportation agency
  • State and local air quality / environmental agency
  • US DOT (FHWA/FTA)
  • US EPA
Best Practices

- The consultation process works best when:
  - The process is continuous with periodic meetings
  - Key decisions are made early in the process
  - Discussions and determinations are well documented
    - Agreements
    - Assumptions
    - Meeting agendas and notes
Benefits of a Well Executed Process

- Provides a forum for state and local agencies to share information

- Allows agencies to identify and discuss key issues early in the process and to reach agreement

- Facilitates for effective consensus building and decision making
Examples of Transportation Conformity Practices

- PM quantitative hot-spot analyses
- State and local procedures to determine project of air quality concerns
- Interagency consultation practices
- Conformity work groups information sharing
- Conformity determination reports
- CO screening protocols

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/conformity/practices/
Transportation Conformity Practices in Complex Areas

A key goal of the FHWA is to increase the capacity of MPOs throughout the country in meeting a host of planning requirements, including those related to air quality and transportation conformity. FHWA’s Office of Natural Environment recently completed an assessment of how conformity works in certain types of nonattainment and maintenance areas, so-called “complex areas.”

The purpose of this study was to further understand how MPOs have been carrying out the transportation conformity requirements in the different types of complex nonattainment and maintenance areas. Specifically, the research was designed to document how conformity determinations and regional emissions analyses are being done in these different types of areas, and to share with other MPOs and conformity stakeholders this information.

The metropolitan transportation planning process is designed around the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the federally designated planning entity for urbanized areas with a population over 50,000. In contrast, the air quality planning process is designed around nonattainment or maintenance area boundaries, which may or may not coincide with MPO planning boundaries.

While the simplest and most straightforward situation is one where the MPO planning boundaries and the nonattainment or maintenance area boundaries coincide, FHWA has identified four types of “complex” areas where this is not the case:

- **Multi-State Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas:**
  These areas include those where the boundaries of the nonattainment or maintenance area encompass portions of more than one state. For example, the Chattanooga, TN-GA-AL 1997 PM2.5 area encompasses one county in Tennessee, two counties in Georgia and a partial county in Alabama.

- **Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas Containing Multiple MPOs:**
  These areas include those where more than one MPO planning area is included within the boundaries of the nonattainment or maintenance area. For example, the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain, OH 2006 PM2.5 area contains the planning areas of both the Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study and the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency.

- **Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas with “Donut” Area(s):**
  Donut areas are geographic areas outside a metropolitan planning area boundary, but inside the boundary of a nonattainment or maintenance area that contains any part of a metropolitan area. For example, the Atlanta, GA 1997 PM2.5 area contains three “donut” counties which are not part of the transportation planning area of the Atlanta Regional Commission or the Southeastern PA MPO.

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/conformity/research/complex_areas/index.cfm
Multi-State Area: Memphis, TN-MS-AR
2008 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area

FHWA, July 2012
Multi-MPO Area: San Joaquin Valley, CA
2008 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area
MPO with Donut Area: Charlotte-Rock Hill, NC-SC
2008 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Map

2008 8-Hr Ozone Nonattainment Map
Charlotte-Rock Hill, NC-SC
2008 8-Hr Ozone Area

- 2009+1997 Charlotte-Rock Hill, NC-SC
- 1997 Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC

States: MPO, Water, Counties

1. Cabarrus-South Rowan Urban Area MPO
2. Gaston Urban Area MPO
3. Great Hickory MPO
4. Mecklenburg-Union MPO
5. Rock Hill-Fort Mill Area Transportation Study
6. High Point Urban Area MPO

FHWA, July 2012
Summary

• The importance of interagency consultation cannot be over emphasized

• Interagency consultation provides opportunities to raise issues early and minimize disruption to the conformity process

• State and local agencies should initiate interagency consultation as soon as possible after a nonattainment designation
Contact information

Cecilia Ho
Team Leader, Air Quality and Noise
FHWA – Office of Natural Environment
Email: Cecilia.ho@dot.gov
Phone: 202-366-9862

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/conformity/
REGIONAL MODELS OF COOPERATION IN AIR QUALITY PLANNING

MEMPHIS URBAN AREA MPO

August 25, 2015
Background

- Bi State MPO (TN and MS), includes 4 Counties:
  - Entire Shelby Co, TN
  - Entire Desoto Co, MS
  - Partial Fayette Co, TN
  - Partial Marshall Co, MS
- Population approx. 1.1 million
- Major Freight Hub
  - 5 Class 1 Railroad
  - 4th largest Inland Port
  - 2nd busiest cargo airport in the world
Background contd.

- **Memphis- TN-AR-MS MSA-**
  - 9 counties
  - Includes **2 MPOs**
    - Memphis Urban Area MPO (TN & MS)
    - West Memphis MPO, AR

**Air Quality**

- **Carbon Monoxide** - Shelby County, TN – in Maintenance, ends in 2017
- **Ozone** - Non-attainment under 2008 8 hr. Includes:
  - Entire Shelby Co and Partial Desoto Co (Memphis MPO)
  - Crittenden Co (West Memphis MPO)
Air Quality Coordination

- Inter-Agency Consultation (IAC) Group:

  IAC MEMBERS

  MPO Staff

  Transportation Agencies
    - Transit Authority
    - Airport Authority
    - Port Authority

  State Agencies
    - Environmental Departments
    - DOTs

  Federal Agencies
    - FHWA
    - EPA
    - FTA

  MPO Jurisdictions
    - TN Members
    - MS Members

  Neighboring MPO
    - West Memphis MPO
Air Quality Coordination cont.

- Requires consultation with IAC on:
  - Development of New Plans
  - Amendments to the Plan
- Cooperative and Consensus Based Approach
- MOU between the two MPOs:
  - Separate budgets, separate conformity process, separate plans
  - But continued participation in each others planning process, incl. AQ
- Budgets:
  - No MPO level budgets (Shelby Co has budgets, Desoto Co does not)
  - Hence, separate conformity analysis
Air Quality Coordination cont.

- **Data:**
  - Memphis MPO Regional Travel Demand Model (TDM)
  - Memphis MPO Regional Land Use Model
  - Some common Input
    - Metrological data from the airport
    - MOVES Model Technique (Inventory Method)
    - Age Distribution
    - Vehicle Type VMT
    - Some Model Years
Air Quality Process

New Plan

- Pre consensus plan for TN & MS
- Review of project list
- Submission of conformity report & draft plan for review & approval

Plan Amendments

- Exempt projects
  - OR
- Non-Exempt projects, but relying on previous conformity
  - OR
- Non-Exempt projects, requiring new conformity

Release the doc for Public Review, followed by MPO Board adoption

Federal conformity finding
IAC – what makes things works

- **Communication** - email, conf calls or one to one phone calls
- **Timely delivery** of information/ documentation
- **Provide easy to read** information e.g. summary documents
- **Education**
  - EPA’s presentation in Desoto Co before non-attainment designation
  - MPO 101 for members
- **Build relationships** with the agencies responsible for SIPs and budget's
  - Helped us with our timeline for MS amendments
  - Our model is used for their budgets development, their budgets effect our plans
- **Statewide IAC calls** — hosted by federal agencies- participants include MPOs. State agencies and neighboring state
IAC – Some challenges

• Level of understanding varies –
  • For Example- request for Project changes (scope/funding) and its impact on conformity
  • Misunderstanding of the time required by the process

• Additional dedicated staff time needed for coordination

• Timeline–
  • For example-interpretation of conformity status exempt vs non-exempt

• Project Delays due to review times involved
Benefits
Takeaways

- **Read the SIP** – Be aware of changes that can impact schedule
- **Timeline** – Have a good idea of timeframe needed to complete tasks related to conformity
- **Roles** – Have a clear idea regarding participants responsibilities. If needed have an MOU
- **Data** – If possible, have same data used for conformity as well as SIP
- **Education** – IAC Members have different backgrounds/levels of expertise
- **Tracking** - Technical nature of air quality planning, document plan and amendment review, correspondence, etc.
- **Communicate** – Keep everyone is informed, Emails, Conference Calls, etc.
Contact

Ms. Pragati Srivastava,
MPO Administrator
Pragati.Srivastava@memphistn.gov

Visit us
www.memphismpo.org

Follow Us
Regional Cooperation in the Metrolina Region

August 25, 2015
Metrolina Region
Metrolina Region

- Charlotte Regional TPO (CRTPO)
• Charlotte Regional TPO (CRTPO)

• Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)
• Charlotte Regional TPO (CRTPO)
• Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)
• Cabarrus-Rowan MPO (CRMPO)
• Charlotte Regional TPO (CRTPO)
• Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)
• Cabarrus-Rowan MPO (CRMPO)
• Rocky River RPO (RRRPO)
Metrolina Region

- Charlotte Regional TPO (CRTPO)
- Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)
- Cabarrus-Rowan MPO (CRMPO)
- Rocky River RPO (RRRPO)
- Rock Hill – Fort Mill Area Transportation Study (RFATS)
Charlotte Non-Attainment Area
Regional Partners

- Charlotte Regional TPO (CRTPO)
- Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)
- Cabarrus-Rowan MPO (CRMPO)
- Rocky River RPO (RRRPO)
- Rock Hill – Fort Mill Transportation Study (RFATS)
- Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT)
- Centralina Council of Governments
- Catawba Council of Governments
- NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT)
- SC Department of Transportation (SCDOT)
- NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR)
- SC Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDEHC)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Regional Cooperation

- MPO and RPO Technical and Policy Committees
- Charlotte Regional Alliance for Transportation (CRAFT) Technical and Policy Committees
- Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Technical and Policy Committees
- Interagency Consultation Process
Regional Cooperation

- MPO and RPO Technical and Policy Committees
  - Charlotte Regional Alliance for Transportation (CRAFT) Technical and Policy Committees
  - Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Technical and Policy Committees
- Interagency Consultation Process
Regional Cooperation

- MPO and RPO Technical and Policy Committees

- Charlotte Regional Alliance for Transportation (CRAFT) Technical and Policy Committees

- Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Technical and Policy Committees

- Interagency Consultation Process
Regional Cooperation

- MPO and RPO Technical and Policy Committees
- Charlotte Regional Alliance for Transportation (CRAFT) Technical and Policy Committees
- Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Technical and Policy Committees
- Interagency Consultation Process
Regional Cooperation

- MPO and RPO Technical and Policy Committees
- Charlotte Regional Alliance for Transportation (CRAFT) Technical and Policy Committees
- Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Technical and Policy Committees
- Interagency Consultation Process
Challenges

Sheer Number of Entities

“Voluntary” Participation
Benefits

- Saves Time and Money
- Consistency
- Opportunities for Regional Initiatives
- Share Information / Data Seamlessly
- Quick Response
- Better Results
Contact Information

Anna Gallup
Metrolina Regional Model Program Manager
agallup@charlottenc.gov
(704) 336-8034
San Joaquin Valley
EIGHT MPOS, THREE AIR BASINS
Overview...

- The Basics
- Air Quality Designations
- Why Coordinate
- Example of Coordination
- Other Coordinated Efforts
The Basics...

San Joaquin Valley MPOs

- Fresno Council of Governments
- Kern Council of Governments
- Kings County Association of Governments
- Madera CTC (Madera County Transportation Commission)
- MCAG (Madera County Association of Governments)
- TCAG

Air Quality Agencies

- California Air Resources Board
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

DOT: State and Federal

- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation)
Air Quality Designations...

- **PM10 Standard** – Maintenance
- **1997 PM2.5 Standards** – Nonattainment
- **2006 24-Hour PM2.5 Standards** – Nonattainment
- **2012 Annual PM2.5 Standards** – Nonattainment
- **8-Hour Ozone Standard** – Nonattainment
- **Carbon Monoxide** – Maintenance (Select Urban Areas)
Why Coordinate Planning Efforts?

1. It Takes All 8 For 1 To Conform
2. Same Requirements
3. Provides a Coordinated Voice
4. Reduces Risk
5. Effective Decision Making
6. Resource Sharing
7. Increased Efficiencies
8. Cost Savings
9. Facilitates Coordination on Other Mutual Interests
New Emissions Model – EMFAC 2011

As a Result, the MPOs Anticipated a Need for Updated 1997 PM 2.5 and 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard Conformity Budgets to Conform Plans and TIPS

- Updating the Budgets Required A Minimum 90-Day EPA Adequacy Process
- Budgets Needed to Be Updated Prior to MPO Adoption of 2008 Ozone Conformity Demonstration

EPA required All 8 MPOs Demonstrate Conformity to the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard by July 21, 2013
Federal Approval (FHWA and FTA) of **All 8 MPO** Conformity Analyses was Required at the Same Time and No Later Than July 21, 2013 to Prevent A Lapse

The SJ V 2012 PM2.5 Plan Needed to Be Submitted By December 14, 2012 to Prevent the Imposition of Highway Sanctions (Anticipated in Early 2015)

RTP Updates Underway for All 8 MPOs

Coordination of Conformity Budget Updates for the 1997 Ozone and 1997 PM2.5 Standard Vital to Success
How to Articulate the Issue In an Easily Understandable Manner
If MPOs can demonstrate conformity by July 2013, $1.5 Billion worth of transportation projects will be allowed to continue through project development before highway sanctions may be imposed in early 2015.

San Joaquin Valley MPO Important Milestone Dates

**2012 PM2.5 Plan**
- Required to address the 2006 PM2.5 Standard.
- Must be submitted to EPA by December 14, 2012 or 2 year highway sanction clock begins (after EPA publication in Federal Register).
- Highway Sanctions anticipated early 2015.
- Identifies conformity budgets MPOs must meet to expend money on regionally significant transportation projects.

**2007 Ozone and 2008 PM2.5 Plan Conformity Budget Update**
- MPOs are anticipated to need updated conformity budgets to demonstrate conformity by July 2013 due to updates to the ARB EMFAC model used to estimate emissions.
- Note: The need to update these conformity budgets is dependent on the impact of the PM2.5 plan conformity budget quantification methodology. Update may be unnecessary.

**2013 TIP Amendment**
- Needed to demonstrate conformity to the 2008 8-hour Ozone Standard
- 8 Valley MPOs need to adopt new conformity analysis
- If one MPO is unable to adopt a new conformity analysis all 8 lapse
- Regionally significant projects cannot advance beyond the phase of work they are currently in (e.g. projects in ROW cannot advance to construction).

**July 2013 and/or Early 2015**
- July 21, 2013 – If MPOs unable to demonstrate conformity, all 8 MPOs lapse
- If MPOs lapse approximately $20.5 billion would be at risk of loss or delay
- If MPOs do not lapse in July 2013, but lapse in early 2015, approximately $1.5 billion worth of transportation projects can proceed through project delivery.
- Early 2015 - If PM2.5 Plan not submitted/approved by EPA prior to this date, MPOs lapse.

**LAPSE**
- During a lapse regionally significant projects cannot proceed beyond the phase of work for which they have received federal or state approval.
- Exempt projects can proceed through construction (examples include bus operations, bus procurements, turn lanes)
- Federal approval = Authorization to proceed (E-7B)
- State approval = CTC Action, Caltrans Action

**September 0, 2012**
If MPOs can demonstrate conformity by July 2013, $1.5 Billion worth of transportation projects will be allowed to continue through project development before highway sanctions may be imposed in early 2015.
If MPOs can demonstrate conformity by July 2013, $1.5 Billion worth of transportation projects will be allowed to continue through project development before highway sanctions may be imposed in early 2015.
If MPOs can demonstrate conformity by July 2013, $1.5 Billion worth of transportation projects will be allowed to continue through project development before highway sanctions may be imposed in early 2015.
Other Coordinated Efforts...
Tanisha Taylor
San Joaquin Council of Governments
Phone: (209) 235-0600
Email: taylor@sjcog.org
Questions?

• Please enter your questions into the Q&A Pod on your screen
  
  • The moderator will direct your question to the appropriate presenter.

  • Slides from today’ presentation are available in the download pod

• For more information on the Regional Models of Cooperation initiative, please visit: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/regional_models/
Thank You!

• For more information on the Regional Models of Cooperation initiative, please visit: 
   http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/regional_models/

• Contact:
   Jody McCullough, 
   FHWA Office of Planning
   jody.mccullough@dot.gov
   (202) 366-5001