ITEM 1: Welcome and Introductions
Carmelo Acevedo opened the meeting and attendees introduced themselves.

ITEM 2: Review of activities since May 20th meeting
Ben Spargo and Robert Samour discussed activities related to the project since the last meeting (May 20th). The Air Quality Report was submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on June 2. Since then, there has been ongoing comment and response between Federal Highway Association (FHWA) and EPA. FHWA and EPA held conference calls on June 17th and July 15th. During the July 15th call, EPA directed FHWA to update the analysis and methodology related to meteorological data, receptor locations, analysis locations and background value calculations. The focus of this meeting is to brief the area air quality agencies on the direction received from EPA and document concurrence through the interagency consultation process.

ITEM 3: Interagency Consultation Topics
1) Meteorological Data
Ben Spargo stated that met-data for MOVES modeling obtained from MAG is consistent with regional PM10 conformity analysis and that met-data for CAL3QHCR modeling was purchased from Lakes Environmental by ADOT. EPA had raised concerns related to the Lakes Environmental data and FHWA asked EPA to contact Lakes Environmental directly to discuss their concerns. FHWA has confirmed that EPA contacted Lakes Environmental, but it has not been confirmed whether the issue is resolved.

2) Receptor Locations
Ben Spargo stated that the project team has revised the receptor locations so that they are aligned in an array or grid surrounding the interchange analysis location. The first row of receptors is located on the right-of-way line, the second is 25 meters away from there, and then multiple rows at 50 meter spacing are included up to approximately 200 meters. Ben passed out maps showing the receptor location arrays at each analysis location. EPA had raised concern that additional receptors be included beyond 200 meters from the analysis locations. HDR prepared additional maps that displayed that the results at each
receptor. These maps showed that concentrations decreased at receptors farther from the freeway and supporting that additional receptors were not warranted.

3) Analysis Locations
Ben Spargo stated that EPA expressed to the team that it is only required to analyze the worst-case location to demonstrate project conformity. EPA agreed that the I-10 system-to-system interchange represented the worst-case location. Therefore, the team will separate the analysis for the I-10 Interchange to specifically demonstrate conformity. Although not required, the project team will also present analysis results at two additional, Broadway Road and 40th Street, in the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) context and to respond to public interest and comment.

4) Background Value Calculation
Ben Spargo explained that EPA directed the team to use a single monitor to establish the background value for each analysis location. Each analysis location would be represented by a monitor in proximity and which represented the existing or planned surroundings at the analysis location.

For the I-10 Interchange, the West Phoenix monitor was selected because it was closest and because the Greenwood monitor would not be appropriate since it is already influenced by traffic-related emissions on I-10. For the Broadway Road Interchange, the Durango Complex monitor was recommended. The team determined that the West 43rd Avenue (which is closest to the analysis location) was not appropriate for use as a background monitor because its specific purpose is to measure maximum concentrations from sources or source categories including sand and gravel operations, auto- and metal-recycling facilities, landfills, paved and unpaved haul roads, and cement casting operations. Similar sources are not present at the Broadway Road Interchange site. For the 40th Street Interchange, the West Chandler monitor was selected because it was closest and was located south of the South Mountains.

Ben Davis confirmed that the West 43rd Avenue monitor was located by EPA to measure maximum concentrations of pollutants and its readings are directly influenced by the heavy industrial activities surrounding it. Since the Broadway Road Interchange is not surrounded by similar heavy industrial activities, it is not appropriate as a representative background monitor for that location. Ben Davis also stated that the Durango Complex monitor is surrounded by a more diverse set of land uses including light industrial, residential that is more similar to the Broadway Road Interchange location.

Ben concluded by summarizing the methodology used to revise the Air Quality Report including updates to the CO methodology.

Discussion Conclusion:
Maricopa County Air Quality Division (MCAQD) expressed concurrence with the methodology presented by the project team.
The project team will send the meeting presentation, notes, and sign-in to MCAQD for review. MCAQD agreed to respond to ADOT by July 25th.

RESOURCES: Agendas and meeting minutes will be available on the MPD Air Quality Consultation Website @ http://www.azdot.gov/business/environmental-services-and-planning/air-quality-planning/conformity