CONFORMITY DETERMINATION REPORT
ADDENDUM #2

Atlanta Maintenance Area

In Support of:
The Atlanta Region’s Plan
Bartow on the Move
The contents of this report reflect the views of the persons preparing the document and those individuals are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Department of Transportation of the State of Georgia. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulations.
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Introduction

This report serves as the second addendum to Conformity Determination Report (CDR) for the Atlanta Regional Commission’s (ARC) 2016 Atlanta Region’s Plan Transportation Element and associated FY 2018-2023 TIP, along with the Cartersville-Bartow County MPO (CBMPO) transportation plan – Bartow on the Move. This document is being updated to reflect changes to emissions as a result of modifications to project timing and scope associated with the third amendment of the 2016 Atlanta Region’s Plan as well as modifications to Bartow on the Move.

Since the development of the main CDR in 2016 there have been three key changes to transportation conformity requirements as reflected in this documentation. First, the Atlanta nonattainment area has been classified as attaining the 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ standard and conformity was revoked by USEPA for areas in maintenance of the 1997 PM$_{2.5}$ standard.$^1$ This change means that ARC and CBMPO no longer demonstrate conformity to PM$_{2.5}$ budgets as part of the transportation plan development process. Second, because of the revocation of PM$_{2.5}$ conformity, the Gainesville-Hall MPO (GHMPO) is no longer tied to the air quality planning process outlined by the transportation conformity requirements. This document therefore drops references to GHMPO. Finally, the region has been reclassified as attainment for the 2008 eight-hour ozone standard and new maintenance budgets have been put in place and are discussed in the following sections.

Appropriate sections of this addendum have been updated to reflect the latest planning assumptions, project information and emissions results. For the full body of text, see the Atlanta Region’s Plan documentation available on ARC’s website at http://documents.atlantaregional.com/The-Atlanta-Region’s-Plan/rtp/Conformity-Determination-Report.pdf

The Region’s Current Attainment Status

The following section describes changes to the region’s attainment status since the documentation in the full Conformity Determination Report was released in February, 2016.

2008 Ozone Standard

On May 3, 2016 EPA ruled on a clean data determination for the 2008 ozone standard effective on August 15, 2016. This determination indicated that the Atlanta region had met the 2008 ozone standard for the three summers from 2013-2015. One day later, on May 4, 2016 the region was reclassified from a marginal to a moderate nonattainment area for failure to meet the ozone standard before July 20, 2015.

On July 18, 2016, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GA EPD) submitted a Maintenance Plan to USEPA. This document shows the state’s plan for continuing to attain the 2008 ozone standard into the future. Effective June 2, 2017, EPA has approved the State’s plan and the associated Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEBs).$^2$ This action redesignated the Atlanta region as a maintenance area.

---

1 FR 81 FR 58009 and 81 FR 61136 ruled all deferred counties in Georgia were in attainment effective on October 6, 2016 and that the PM$_{2.5}$ conformity requirements are revoked effective October 24, 2016
2 FR 25523
This window of attainment will likely be brief, as USEPA has moved ahead with the new 2015 ozone standard. Current monitored values indicate that some portion of the Atlanta region will be classified nonattainment for that standard in the future.

1997 PM$_{2.5}$ Standard

On February 24, 2016 USEPA approved the State’s PM$_{2.5}$ Maintenance Plan for the 1997 annual standard. Since all counties in Georgia were classified as attaining the newer 2012 PM$_{2.5}$ standard on September 6, 2016 and a Maintenance Plan was in place for the older 1997 standard, all conformity requirements for the 1997 PM$_{2.5}$ standard were revoked effective October 24, 2016. This action by USEPA unbinds GHMPO from the ARC & CBMPO transportation conformity planning process.

Statement of Conformity

An updated transportation conformity analysis is required under the eight-hour ozone standard for both MPO RTPs and TIPs as a result of numerous changes to regionally significant projects. Both ARC and CBMPO are making changes to the timing and capacity of nonexempt regionally significant projects in this update.

The purpose of this Conformity Determination Report is to document compliance with the relevant elements of the Clean Air Act (Subsections 176(c) (1) (2) and (3)), the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR Parts 51 and 93) and Metropolitan Planning Regulations (23 CFR Part 450) by demonstrating that the Atlanta Region’s Plan RTP (including the FY 2018-2023 TIP) and Bartow on the Move conform to the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the eight-hour ozone standard. ARC has conducted the conformity determination for the entire ozone maintenance area, encompassing both MPOs and part of the state outside the boundary of the MPOs.

The conclusion of the conformity analyses, documented below, indicates that the ARC and CBMPO TIPs and RTPs support the broad intentions of the Clean Air Act for achieving and maintaining the NAAQS for ozone as outlined in the Atlanta area SIPs.

Statement of Conformity – Eight-Hour Ozone Standard

For the eight-hour ozone conformity analysis the MVEB test is required to demonstrate conformity. The latest approved MVEBs applicable to conformity under the eight-hour ozone standard were established by GA EPD as part of Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP. These budgets differ from those used in the main body of the CDR and reflect the latest planning assumptions and approved SIPs.

Ozone is not emitted directly by any source; it is formed when NO$_x$ and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) combine in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. Therefore, air pollution control strategies are aimed at controlling NO$_x$ and VOC. Budgets are established for these two pollutants instead of ozone directly. The transportation conformity analysis for the 15-county eight-hour ozone maintenance area was performed with the MVEB Test using the approved budgets outlined in Table 1.
Table 1: Eight-Hour Ozone Standard Conformity Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishing SIP</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>MVEBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP</td>
<td>June 2, 2017</td>
<td>All conformity years prior to 2030</td>
<td>NOₓ – 170.15 tons/day VOC – 81.76 tons/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP</td>
<td>June 2, 2017</td>
<td>All conformity years 2030 and later</td>
<td>NOₓ – 58 tons/day VOC – 52 tons/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the emissions analysis for the Atlanta Region’s Plan RTP and the CBMPO RTP demonstrate adherence to the established MVEBs. The conformity analysis was performed for the years 2020, 2030 and 2040. The analysis years meet the requirements for specific horizon years that the transportation plan must reflect as specified in 93.106(a)(1) of the Transportation Conformity Rule and specific analysis years that the regional emissions analysis must reflect per Section 93.118(b) and 93.118(d)(2).

Upon completion of the technical conformity analysis, ARC staff have determined that the Atlanta Region’s Plan RTP and Bartow on the Move and associated TIPs together demonstrate compliance with the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 in accordance with all conformity requirements as detailed in 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 (the Transportation Conformity Rule) and 23 CFR Part 450 (the Metropolitan Planning Regulations as established in MAP-21).

Interagency Consultation

The draft Atlanta Region’s Plan Amendment #3 documents were made available to ARC planning partners through the TCC and the TAQC committees in July 2017, to allow for time to comment prior to formal adoption or publication, in accordance with 93.105(b)(2)(iii) of the Transportation Conformity Rule. Documentation was provided to interagency consultation group via email ahead of the initiation of public comment for both ARC and CBMPO on June 21, 2017. Final Atlanta Region’s Plan RTP/FY 2018-2023 TIP Amendment #3 documents are anticipated to be provided on August 10, 2017, upon approval of the update, fulfilling the requirements of 40 CFR 93.105(c)(7).

Public Involvement

The official public comment period for the Atlanta Region’s Plan RTP Amendment/FY 2018-2023 TIP Update was held between June 21 – July 20, 2017. ARC’s public involvement process as detailed in the Regional Community Engagement Plan for TIP amendments includes specific outreach strategies to share project information with the public:

- **30-Day Public Comment Period**: A public review and comment period ran from June 21, 2017 through midnight July 20, 2017. ARC must receive comments during this timeframe in order to be considered in the official record of comments. A summary of all comments received during the
period and responses to the comments was presented to ARC’s technical and policy committees and the ARC Board for their consideration before taking action on the amendment.

- **Project Summary:** A project summary was prepared to provide the public with a user-friendly explanation of the most important elements of the project and is accessible on the ARC website.

- ARC staff was available for questions, comments and speaking engagements by contacting 404-463-3272 or transportation@atlantaregional.com

- ARC hosted, in partnership with the Georgia Department of Transportation, two open houses, taking place on June 22, 2017. One was held at the Peachtree Center Food Court Plaza from 11:00 am-1:30 pm and another at GDOT from 3:00-7:00 pm.

- **Public Comments:** Following completion of the public comment period, ARC prepared a Public Comment Report, which summarizes all stakeholder and public outreach and comments. Any comments received and corresponding responses were posted on the TIP Amendment #3 webpage.

## Fiscal Constraint

This amendment was undertaken to accomplish six key outcomes:

1. Reflect programming and financial details from the Major Mobility Investment Program (MMIP)
2. Inclusion of new bridge replacement and intersection projects within the TIP period
3. Modifications or additions to other long range capacity projects
4. Adjust financial information for existing TIP projects that exceed the threshold of processing as an administrative modification
5. Update financial forecasting for federal, state and local fund sources
6. Incorporate changes to the travel demand model coding

The MMIP are 11 interchange and managed lane projects around the state which are being advanced for construction within the next ten years. Nine of those projects are either totally or partially within the Atlanta region. The projects are being advanced largely as a result of additional funding available at the federal level, through the FAST Act which was signed into law in December 2015, and at the state level, courtesy of the Transportation Funding Act of 2015. Both laws increased the amount of transportation funding available to the state and the region. In addition, several local jurisdictions have successfully passed referenda to increase local sales tax to fund additional transportation improvements.

The magnitude of changes to federal, state and local funding levels, combined with corresponding changes to project costs and implementation schedules, requires redemonstrating fiscal constraint for the plan. The tables presented in this section were developed to reflect both revenue and project cost/schedule changes made under this RTP Amendment / TIP Update.
Table 1: FY 2018-2023 Yearly TIP Balances – Federal Highway Administration Funds ($YOE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHWA Program</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022 See Note 2</th>
<th>2023 See Note 2</th>
<th>LR 2024-2030</th>
<th>LR 2031-2040</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation &amp; Air Quality Improvement</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>$29,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$174,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CMAQ)</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$42,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP - Urban (&gt;200K) (ARC)</td>
<td>$38,780,000</td>
<td>$40,644,000</td>
<td>$40,644,000</td>
<td>$40,644,000</td>
<td>$40,644,000</td>
<td>$40,644,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$242,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>$349,826,841</td>
<td>$305,762,380</td>
<td>$192,228,244</td>
<td>$278,468,943</td>
<td>$337,045,631</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,743,954,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)</td>
<td>$14,915,200</td>
<td>$11,186,400</td>
<td>$11,186,400</td>
<td>$11,186,400</td>
<td>$11,186,400</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$70,847,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG - Statewide Flexible (GDOT)</td>
<td>$74,500,000</td>
<td>$74,500,000</td>
<td>$74,500,000</td>
<td>$74,500,000</td>
<td>$74,500,000</td>
<td>$74,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$447,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Federal Aid 2024-2040</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$6,191,395,630</td>
<td>$8,338,586,391</td>
<td>$14,529,982,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs (CY)</strong></td>
<td>$646,276,813</td>
<td>$594,462,131</td>
<td>$592,933,386</td>
<td>$461,105,465</td>
<td>$598,352,907</td>
<td>$598,400,831</td>
<td>$6,191,395,830</td>
<td>$8,338,586,391</td>
<td>$18,021,505,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Expenditure Multiplier</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.2057</td>
<td>1.4238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total Cost (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$646,276,813</td>
<td>$1,240,738,944</td>
<td>$1,833,672,380</td>
<td>$2,294,777,795</td>
<td>$2,893,130,702</td>
<td>$3,491,531,533</td>
<td>$10,956,367,159</td>
<td>$22,828,535,556</td>
<td>$22,828,535,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated FHWA Revenue (YOE) See Note 1</strong></td>
<td>$722,089,681</td>
<td>$766,502,379</td>
<td>$787,663,544</td>
<td>$841,137,612</td>
<td>$894,974,430</td>
<td>$917,844,332</td>
<td>$6,886,134,630</td>
<td>$11,355,585,014</td>
<td>$23,171,931,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total Revenue (YOE) See Note 1</strong></td>
<td>$722,089,681</td>
<td>$1,488,592,060</td>
<td>$2,276,255,603</td>
<td>$3,117,393,215</td>
<td>$4,012,367,645</td>
<td>$4,390,211,977</td>
<td>$11,836,346,607</td>
<td>$23,171,931,622</td>
<td>$23,171,931,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total Balance (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$75,812,867</td>
<td>$247,853,115</td>
<td>$442,583,274</td>
<td>$822,615,421</td>
<td>$1,119,236,944</td>
<td>$1,438,680,445</td>
<td>$859,979,448</td>
<td>$343,396,066</td>
<td>$343,396,066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Note that all revenue estimates are based on assumptions about the average share of statewide revenues which will be directed to programs and projects in the Atlanta region. Actual amounts in any given year will fluctuate from these averages, as evidenced by the cost of projects programmed within the TIP period. GDOT has reviewed all TIP project commitments and confirms that financial resources are available to ensure no shortfall actually occurs within any individual fiscal year. Over the four year federally required TIP period (FY 2018-2021), the program is balanced and is less than revenue estimates.

(2) Fiscal years 2022 and 2023 are not considered to be part of the federally required four year TIP. For financial constraint purposes, project costs and revenue estimates are presented for information purposes only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus - New (80/20)</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,850,000</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>$29,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and Bus Facilities Program</td>
<td>$15,738,127</td>
<td>$5,705,030</td>
<td>$5,415,512</td>
<td>$4,541,343</td>
<td>$4,541,343</td>
<td>$4,541,343</td>
<td>$31,789,401</td>
<td>$45,413,430</td>
<td>$117,685,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Fuels Formula Program</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$25,900,000</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>$70,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$8,400,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$27,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Starts</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$163,188,000</td>
<td>$2,877,171,161</td>
<td>$3,040,359,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Good Repair Grants</td>
<td>$48,591,797</td>
<td>$48,591,797</td>
<td>$48,591,797</td>
<td>$48,591,797</td>
<td>$48,591,797</td>
<td>$340,142,579</td>
<td>$485,918,000</td>
<td>$1,117,611,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Nonurbanized Area Formula</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$5,320,000</td>
<td>$7,600,000</td>
<td>$17,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Urbanized Area Formula Program</td>
<td>$62,686,800</td>
<td>$62,686,800</td>
<td>$62,686,800</td>
<td>$62,686,800</td>
<td>$62,686,800</td>
<td>$438,806,200</td>
<td>$626,868,000</td>
<td>$1,441,795,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Bus Program</td>
<td>$6,840,400</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$6,840,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Expenditure Multiplier (Formula Programs)</strong></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0140</td>
<td>1.0282</td>
<td>1.0426</td>
<td>1.0572</td>
<td>1.0720</td>
<td>1.1333</td>
<td>1.2666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Expenditure Multiplier (New Starts Capital)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.2057</td>
<td>1.4238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formula Program Costs (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$141,067,124</td>
<td>$125,932,338</td>
<td>$121,999,680</td>
<td>$122,796,275</td>
<td>$124,515,423</td>
<td>$126,258,639</td>
<td>$975,999,828</td>
<td>$1,558,317,894</td>
<td>$3,296,887,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Starts Capital Project Costs (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$196,752,337</td>
<td>$4,096,409,023</td>
<td>$4,293,161,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$141,067,124</td>
<td>$125,932,338</td>
<td>$121,999,680</td>
<td>$122,796,275</td>
<td>$124,515,423</td>
<td>$126,258,639</td>
<td>$1,172,572,165</td>
<td>$5,654,726,917</td>
<td>$7,590,048,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total Cost (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$141,067,124</td>
<td>$266,999,462</td>
<td>$388,999,142</td>
<td>$511,795,417</td>
<td>$636,310,840</td>
<td>$762,569,479</td>
<td>$1,935,321,644</td>
<td>$7,590,048,561</td>
<td>$7,590,048,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated FTA Revenue (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$131,681,004</td>
<td>$133,524,538</td>
<td>$135,393,882</td>
<td>$137,289,395</td>
<td>$139,211,447</td>
<td>$141,160,408</td>
<td>$1,241,786,867</td>
<td>$5,777,276,827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total Revenue (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$131,681,004</td>
<td>$265,205,542</td>
<td>$400,599,423</td>
<td>$537,888,819</td>
<td>$677,100,281</td>
<td>$810,260,674</td>
<td>$2,040,047,541</td>
<td>$7,837,324,368</td>
<td>$7,837,324,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running Total Balance (YOE)</strong></td>
<td>$(9,386,120)</td>
<td>$(1,793,920)</td>
<td>$(11,600,281)</td>
<td>$(26,093,402)</td>
<td>$(40,789,426)</td>
<td>$(55,691,195)</td>
<td>$124,725,897</td>
<td>$247,275,806</td>
<td>$247,275,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) All revenue estimates are based on funding apportionments under the FAST Act and align with information shown in the previous table. TIP/RTP line item allocations for recipient transit agencies have not yet been adjusted accordingly to reflect changes in the various FTA programs under the FAST Act and any additional funds apportioned under those programs. This results in overall programmed expenditures during the TIP period being less than what is expected to be available. Project and program expenditures by transit agency recipients will be adjusted via a future update or amendment process to match actual allocation amounts each year. Over the four year federally required TIP period (FY 2018-2021), the program is balanced.

(2) Fiscal years 2022 and 2023 are not considered to be part of the federally required four year TIP. For financial constraint purposes, project costs and revenue estimates are presented for information purposes only.
**Latest Planning Assumptions**

ARC updates planning assumptions including (but not limited to) population, employment, socioeconomic variables, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on a recurring basis. A detailed listing of the planning assumptions for this conformity analysis is outlined in Exhibit 1. These documents were submitted to the interagency consultation group in accordance with Section 93.105(c)(1)(i) of the Transportation Conformity Rule which requires interagency review of the model(s) and associated methods and assumptions used in the regional emissions analysis. Final interagency approval was granted on April 4, 2017.

**Tolls and Managed Lanes**

One of the key changes to the Atlanta Region’s Plan RTP and FY 2018-2023 TIP is the advancement in timing of the region’s system of tolled managed lanes. Many of these projects are being built sooner than originally planned at the time of adoption of the Atlanta Region’s Plan Transportation Element. Additionally, on I-20 east of I-285, GDOT has introduced plans for a managed tolled zipper lane from 2020-2030, phasing into a full managed lane by 2040. This change adjusts AM and PM period capacities and has been reflected in the regional travel model.

**Transit Operating Procedures**

Since the adoption of the Atlanta Region’s Plan Transportation Element in February 2016 there have been some changes to the anticipated service levels of transit in the region. Those changes are outlined below.

**Fare Changes**

No changes to transit fares in the region are incorporated into this amendment.

**Service Level Changes**

Since the adoption of The Atlanta Region’s Plan in 2016, a few major service changes have occurred that involved the local transit agencies. MARTA has gone through five service modifications in the past year with several involving changes to service levels and routing of MARTA’s bus service. Overall, six routes were added and one was deleted. GRTA has incorporated most of their Horizon 1 Express changes with the rest to be implemented in 2017. CCT rebranded their service as CobbLinc in 2016 and added one route and three circulator routes in the Cumberland Area. CobbLinc plans to roll out the express route 10X in 2018 that connects universities along Cobb Parkway to Midtown. In Spring 2017, GCT added an express route between the Indian Creek Park & Ride and the CDC/Emory area. HAT rebranded their service in 2015 as Gainesville Express with some routing changes occurring in 2016.

**Future Regional Transit Service**

No changes to future transit service are incorporated into this amendment.
Quantitative Analysis

The regional emissions analysis used to demonstrate conformity for the eight-hour ozone standard relies on a methodology which utilizes ARC’s 20-county regional activity-based travel demand model. Updated travel model networks were created for each analysis year (2020, 2030 and 2040) to reflect projects as listed in the Atlanta Region’s Plan Amendment #3 and the Bartow on the Move RTP/TIP update.

Eight-Hour Ozone Standard

Results of Analysis – Eight-Hour Ozone Standard

The results of the emissions analysis for the eight-hour ozone maintenance area demonstrate adherence to the level of emissions necessary to meet the MVEBs contained in Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP. Table 4 and Figure 1 document the VOC and NOx emissions for each analysis year, as compared to the applicable MVEBs.

To maintain consistency between procedures used to estimate the motor vehicle emission budgets included in the ozone SIPs and the conformity analysis, ARC in consultation with GA EPD applies an off-model adjustment to emission results for the 13-county area to reflect an emissions debit resulting from a program to exempt senior citizens from the Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) program. This program was initiated by the Georgia General Assembly in 1996 (O.C.G.A Section 12-9). It exempts from emission testing vehicles ten years old or older driven fewer than 5,000 miles per year and owned by persons 65 years of age or older.

It was estimated that this senior I/M exemption increased VOC and NOx emissions by 0.05 and 0.03 tons per day respectively. These amounts are reflected in Table 6. This off-model adjustment is conservatively high and was applied to the emission results for VOC and NOx to produce final emission results for each analysis year in the 13-county area where the I/M program is in place. The same credit loss is assumed for each analysis year.

Table 4: 15-County Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget Test – Eight-Hour Ozone Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformity Year / MVEB Plan</th>
<th>NOx (tons/day)</th>
<th>VOC (tons/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP**
  Budgets for years before 2030 | 170.15          | 81.76         |
| 2020 Emissions Total        | 77.95           | 52.13         |
| **Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP**
  Budgets for years 2030 or later | 58              | 52            |
| 2030 Emissions Total        | 37.39           | 32.58         |
| 2040 Emissions Total        | 26.91           | 24.65         |
Figure 1: 15-County Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget Test – Eight-Hour Ozone Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Analysis Year</th>
<th>NOx MVEB</th>
<th>VOC MVEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>77.95 tpd</td>
<td>52.13 tpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>37.39 tpd</td>
<td>32.58 tpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>26.91 tpd</td>
<td>24.65 tpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a – Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP Budgets for years before 2030 NOx Budget
- b – Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP Budgets for years before 2030 VOC Budget
- c – Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP Budgets for years 2030 or later NOx Budget
- d – Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP Budgets for years 2030 or later VOC Budget
2008 EIGHT-HOUR OZONE STANDARD PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS & MODELING INPUTS

General Methods and Assumptions

1) Modeling Methodology: Use the MOVES model in inventory mode to determine the total NO\textsubscript{x} and VOC emissions in the 15-county maintenance area.
2) Analysis Years: 2020, 2030, 2040
3) Conformity Test
   a. Motor Vehicle Emission Budget (MVEB) Test\textsuperscript{1}
      i. For years prior to 2030, 2014 MVEBs are used:
         1. NO\textsubscript{x}: 170.15 tpd
         2. VOC: 81.76 tpd
      ii. For years 2030 and later, 2030 MVEBs are used:
         1. NO\textsubscript{x}: 58 tpd
         2. VOC: 52 tpd
4) Modeling Start Date: April 2017. This start date is defined by the ARC as the initiation of the first model run for plan amendment/update.

Travel Demand Modeling Assumptions

1) Calibration Year: 2010 (with some 2015 interim validations and benchmarking thereafter)
   a. Model validated to the year 2010 using a comparison between estimated volumes and observed counts. See Appendix A for validation/calibration information.
2) Social/Economic Data: Same as used for the Atlanta Region’s Plan update. See Appendix B.
3) ARC’s Activity-Based Travel Model (ABM) is the basis for these runs. See Appendix C for an overview of ABM specifications.

Emissions Modeling Assumptions

1) Emissions Model: MOVES2014a – Database: movesdb20151028
   a. Emissions Process – use MOVES in inventory mode for a July weekday
      i. For the years 2020, 2030 and 2040 modeled travel data is used to calculate emissions
   b. Run separately for the 13-county and 2-county portions of the nonattainment area\textsuperscript{2}
      i. 13-county area activity, vehicle population and other inputs are assigned to Fulton County while running MOVES
      ii. 2-county area activity, vehicle population and other inputs are assigned to Bartow County while running MOVES

\textsuperscript{1} 2014 and 2030 MVEBs established as part of Georgia’s 2008 Ozone Maintenance State Implementation Plan for the Atlanta 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area, effective June 2, 2017
\textsuperscript{2} For the eight-hour ozone standard there are two sets of MOVES input files, one for the 13 counties that make up the former one-hour ozone nonattainment area in which a specific set of emission control measures is in place, and one for the 2 remaining ring counties (out of the 7 historically used for 20-county conformity)
2) MOVES Inputs
   a. Road Type Distribution – Processed from the travel demand model, GDOT HPMS counts and MOVES defaults. Summarizes VMT fraction by road type and source type for the 13 and 2 counties separately.
   b. Source Type Population
      i. Started with 2014 R.L. Polk & Co. registration data for the Atlanta nonattainment counties
      ii. Future analysis year data is grown from 2014 based on the ratio of MPO population estimates
      iii. Since the population of vehicle type 62 (combination long-haul trucks) can easily be underrepresented in areas with lots of through traffic, the vehicle population for MOVES source type 62 was revised using MOVES default VMT/VPOP ratios and VMT for HPMS type 60 data
   c. Vehicle Type VMT
      i. HPMS VTypeYear - Processed from the travel demand model, GDOT HPMS Counts, and an EPA daily to annual VMT converter. Assigns total annual VMT by HPMS vehicle type.
      ii. Month VMT Fraction: MOVES defaults
      iii. Day VMT Fraction: MOVES defaults
      iv. Hour VMT Fraction: Derived from the travel demand model by source and road type. The fractions are determined separately for the 13 and 2 county areas.
   d. I/M Programs– Applied to the 13-county area only (See Appendix D)
   e. Age Distribution – Age data was derived from 2014 R.L. Polk & Co. registration data for the 13 and 2 counties separately for all vehicle types, except HDV8b (Source type 62) where MOVES defaults were used
   f. Average Speed Distribution – Processed from the travel demand model with HPMS VMT Adjustment factors applied. Calculates VHT by hour by speed bin by source. The distribution is determined separately for the 13 and 2 county areas.
   g. Ramp Fraction – Processed from the travel demand model. Calculates VHT by freeway and ramps by area type. The fraction is determined separately for the 13 and 2 county areas.
   h. Fuel – MOVES2014 defaults after 2015 do not match local fuel due to the removal/modification of Georgia summer fuel in the 45 county Atlanta region effective Oct 1, 2015
      i. Tier 3 Low Sulfur fuel (10ppm, 80ppm refinery gate and 95ppm downstream cap) for all counties
      ii. Summer Fuel reclassification
         1. 13 counties –
            a. Low Federal RVP summer requirements (June 1-Sept 15) for “designated volatility nonattainment areas” (40 CFR 80.27(a)(2)(ii))
b. Fuel region ID 170000000 kept but fuel formulations reflect region 178000000 for any model years after 2015

2. 2 counties –
   a. Standard Federal RVP summer requirements (June 1-Sept 15) for “designated volatility attainment areas” (40 CFR 80.27(a)(2)(i))
   b. Fuel region ID 170000000 kept but fuel formulations reflect region 100000000 for any model years after 2015

iii. Ethanol – The current assumption is an increasing percentage of ethanol fuel
   1. 2% in 2014, 28% in 2030 and 21% in 2040
   2. The rest of the gasoline blends with a larger percent of E15 with time:
      a. 0.8% in 2014, 19% in 2030 and 23% in 2050
   3. Remainder is E10

iv. Volatility waiver for E10 allows 1.0 psi RVP increase, but not in E15
   i. Meteorology – July 2014 weather for Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport was used for this analysis consistent with the 2008 Eight Hour Ozone Maintenance SIP
   j. Starts – Processed from the travel model. Determines the number of trip starts in each of the 13 and 2 county areas. Applies only to the trips per day input. Defaults used for the rest of the start inputs.
   k. Hotelling – MOVES defaults

3) VMT HPMS Adjustment Factors
   a. Calculated for the year 2010 (See Appendix E)
   b. HPMS adjustment in base year of calibration in accordance with Section 93.122(b)(3) of the Transportation Conformity Rule which recommends that HPMS adjustment factors be developed to reconcile travel model estimates of VMT in base year of validation to HPMS estimates for the same period
   c. Summer (seasonal) adjustment to convert from average annual VMT to summer-season VMT
   d. Factors applied to VMT estimates generated by ARC travel demand model for 13-county portion and 2-county portion of 20-county modeling domain, separately
      a. Factors aggregated up to MOVES road types from base HPMS functional classifications

4) Off-Model Calculations
   a. Senior I/M Exemption (emissions debit)
      i. The Senior I/M Exemption calculated for year 2002 is conservatively high and will be added to the regional emission inventories for each analysis year

5) TCMs
   a. No additional credit is taken in the emissions modeling process for SIP TCMs

---

3 Procedures for Emission Inventory Preparation, Volume IV: Mobile Sources, Section 3.4.2.6, EPA420-R-92-009, USEPA Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Mobile Sources, 1992.
APPENDIX A – Model Validation

2010 Daily Estimated vs. Observed Traffic Volumes

R² = 0.9543
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APPENDIX B – Socioeconomic Data for the Travel Model

ARC periodically revises its population and employment forecasts based on best available current information. Each revision is a multi-step process. First, new region-level forecasts are produced, followed by county-level forecasts. These then become region-level controls for census tract and traffic analysis zone (TAZ) forecasts.

The most current region-level control forecasts will serve as a foundation for The Region’s Plan, adopted in spring of 2016. The regional series, known as Series 15.0, was completed in late spring of 2015. The charts at the end of this section summarize the new updated population and employment controls for the 20-county study area.

Development of the most current draft regional forecast began in January of 2015. This forecast was developed from a calibration of a standard forecast for the 20-County Area by the Regional Econometric Models Inc. (REMI) econometric model, build 3.6.5R. This model was released by REMI in October 2014, and included 21 specific regions consisting of the 20 counties in ARC’s MPO, plus the rest of the state of Georgia. Forecasts are produced for over 6,000 economic and demographic variables.

ARC staff was assisted in the development of these regional forecasts by a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of nationally known, local experts on the Atlanta Regional Economy. The committee met three times in late winter and early spring of 2015. TAC members advised staff on REMI model calibration, policy variable development, and related iterative revisions to model runs. The TAC then recommended the final regional forecasts for use in the Region’s Plan forecasts.

In February of 2015 (in parallel to the TAC process), Research and Analytics division staff began a series of 23 meetings to meet with MPO member jurisdictions to collect “local expert” information that would be used in assessment of the draft regional forecasts and refinement of the county and subcounty forecasts of population and employment making up the entirety of series 15.0. These ‘local outreach’ meetings directly reviewed a previous series of forecasts (the ‘Needs Assessment’ or series 14.0) of households and total employment. These meetings also refined the region’s Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), which is a key input to the generalized zoning that influences land development in the small area allocation model.

A subsequent step in The Region’s Plan forecast process was development of county-level control totals. Regression analysis, third-party datasets, and input from the outreach meetings were core resources in arriving at these county control totals. The REMI model’s regional forecast was then recalibrated to mirror/reflect the county control totals. The county level controls for series 15.0 were finalized in mid-summer, 2015.

The final step in the forecasting process uses mathematical models to disaggregate the region-level/county-level control population and employment forecasts to “small areas”: the superdistrict, census tract and traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level. TAZs are nested within census tracts. Census tracts nest within superdistricts. The mathematical models underlying the region-level controls have evolved and become more complex, but ARC’s basic approach is the same today as in 1975.

The Production, Exchange, Consumption, and Allocation System (PECAS) model is being used as part of The Region’s Plan disaggregation of regional and county controls to small areas. This PECAS model runs annually and iteratively to produce not only a small-area allocation of population and households, but
labor dollars by industry, that serve as direct inputs to the travel model sets. Further, REMI model output at the county level provided detailed age distribution data that served as direct input to the travel model’s population synthesizer. The process is integrated with the ARC travel demand model, as impedances (travel costs) from the travel model are a significant influence on small-area allocation of population and job growth.

Population and job levels from each successive single-year forecast become the base for forecasts in the next model year. First, the Activity-Based Model (ABM) analyzes base year traffic patterns and produces accessibility measures (impedances or travel costs) within the 20-county forecasted area. Then, the PECAS model develops socioeconomic forecasts using the previous year’s composite impedances from the TDM; the economic activity forecast by its Activity Allocation (AA) module, and resultant built space produced in response to that economic activity (and construction prices/rents) by its Spatial Development (SD) module. The PECAS output is translated into household income by size and job by sector forecasts at the TAZ level, which then become the input used by the ABM to produce the impedance(s) measure that drives the next iteration of the integrated model run.

All these models are carefully calibrated based on the best and most current data available. Data used in the current small-area modeling effort include 2010 United States Census results, economic data from IMPLAN and REMI, parcel level datasets from local jurisdictions, joined assessor’s data, third-party datasets on real estate development and construction costs, ARC annual major jurisdiction estimates of population (using a hybrid method involving building permit information, birth and death data, and American Community Survey data), and ARC semi-annual estimates of employment by industry for counties, superdistricts, tracts and TAZs/block groups from the state of Georgia unemployment insurance base file. National forecasts of employment and population were derived from the REMI TranSight model. The results of ARC travel surveys (including the 2011 Household Travel survey, the 2009-2010 Transit On-Board survey, the 2010 Hartsfield air passenger survey, travel time studies, speed studies, and others) shape travel model parameters. Highway projects and the schedule for their completion (primary inputs to the ABM model networks) are developed as part of an extensive discussion between ARC staff, local planners, Georgia Department of Transportation and various federal agencies. Likewise, ARC staff coordinates with local transit and shuttle providers (such as MARTA, GRTA, CCT, GCT, etc) to update and maintain transit networks and schedules.

The area modeled by ARC for transportation/air quality purposes expanded from ten (10) to twenty (20) counties over the last 15 years. To meet current and future data needs, ARC produced employment estimates by county and census block group for the state of Georgia beginning in 2008, and continues to produce these estimates on a semi-annual basis. The county coverage by land-use data produced in the LandPro program expands as needed. Going forward, ARC’s population forecast program area will be expanded as required from the current 20 counties, using the decennial and intercensal Census estimates, as well as other available information, as data baselines.

Post-processing adjustments are made to the ARC forecasts to account for expected large scale changes and policy priorities that would not be reflected in model output driven by historical data. Events such as expected construction of a new highway or policy input restricting development within the region are accounted for directly in the PECAS model with parameter changes to the AA module. Factors such as expected job and household growth from the completion of known major development projects (e.g. Atlantic Station) or transit-oriented development are incorporated as post processing adjustments to the model output or via specific site development changes to the parcel layers in the SD module.
Projected Population and Employment Growth for the 20-County Area

- Population
- Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population (in Thousands)</th>
<th>Employment (in Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>3,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>4,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>5,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>6,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>10,753</td>
<td>8,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>9,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>13,485</td>
<td>10,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Atlanta Region’s Plan – Conformity Determination Report Addendum #2
Exhibit #1 – Planning Assumptions
APPENDIX C – Model Inputs

In 2016, ARC switched from its 4-step trip-based aggregate regional travel demand model to its newly developed, and recently calibrated disaggregate activity-based model (ABM). The ABM now serves as the major travel forecasting tool in the ARC region. This model has been developed to ensure that the regional transportation planning process can rely on forecasting tools that will be adequate for new socioeconomic environments and emerging planning challenges. It is equally suitable for conventional highway projects, transit projects, and various policy studies such as highway pricing and HOV / HOT analysis. The ARC ABM is based on the CT-RAMP (Coordinated Travel Regional Activity-Based Modeling Platform) family of Activity-Based Models. This model system is an advanced, but operational, AB model that fits the needs and planning processes of ARC.

The ABM has been tailored specifically to meet ARC planning needs, considering current and future projects and policies and also taking into account the special market segments that exist in the Atlanta region. The model system addresses requirements of the metropolitan planning process, relevant federal requirements, and provides support to ARC member agencies and other stakeholders.

1) Calibration Year: 2010 (with some 2015 interim validations and benchmarking thereafter)
2) Project Listing: Project listings will be provided in electronic format to Interagency Consultation Group for review in March 2017 and include:
   a. Regionally Significant and Federally Funded
   b. Regionally Significant and Non-Federally Funded
3) Demographic Data: Provided as separate attachment
4) Speed Data: Free-flow Speed by Area Type and Facility Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTYPE</th>
<th>CBD</th>
<th>Urban Commercial</th>
<th>Urban Residential</th>
<th>Suburban Commercial</th>
<th>Suburban Residential</th>
<th>Exurban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>interstate/freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>expressway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>freeway HOV (concurrent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>freeway HOV (barrier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>freeway truck only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>system to system ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>exit ramp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Within the ARC travel demand and emission modeling process, free flow speeds are adjusted to reflect the increase in delay and travel time on a roadway segment as traffic volumes build and congestion levels increase. Link-level congested flow speeds are used to estimate NOx and VOC emissions as required by Sections 93.122(b)(i)-(iv) and 93.122(b)(2) of the Transportation Conformity Rule.
5) Transit Modeling
   a. Model recalibrated to 2010 transit ridership estimates, provided by transit operators
   b. Reflects results from the 2009-2010 Transit On Board Survey
   c. Routes updated to reflect current operating plans
   d. Transit mode split is estimated using the mode choice model
      i. Estimates individual modal trips from the person trip movements developed in the trip distribution model
      ii. Composed of 15 modes, including auto by occupancy and toll/non-toll choice, walk and bike non-motorized modes, and walk and drive access to different transit line-haul modes:
         1. Auto SOV (Free)
         2. Auto SOV (Pay)
         3. Auto 2-Person (Free)
         4. Auto 2-Person (Pay)
         5. Auto 3+ Person (Free)
         6. Auto 3+ Person (Pay)
         7. Walk
         8. Bike
         9. Walk-All-Transit
         10. Walk-Premium-Only
         11. PNR-All-Transit (PNR = Park and Ride)
         12. PNR-Premium-Only
         13. KNR-All-Transit (KNR = Kiss and Ride)
         14. KNR-Premium-Only
         15. School Bus
      iii. The mode choice model is organized in terms of seven characteristics:
          1. Mathematical structure;
          2. Trip purposes and choice sets;
          3. Limitations on choice sets;
          4. Analysis of transit access;
          5. Treatment of HOV lanes;
          6. Stratification by income groups; and
          7. Analysis of alternative transit paths.
   e. Transit Fare Modeling
i. Transit fares are based on information provided by the local transit operators throughout the Atlanta region
ii. The base year for the travel demand model is year 2010; therefore, any costs of traveling incurred within the model are representative of year 2010 dollars 
   1. The base year calibration utilized transit fares that were in place in 2010; however, the majority of local operators have implemented a fare increase since 2010. To reflect these fare increases while maintaining year 2010 dollars, the year 2015 fares were adjusted using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) online calculator which accounts for inflation to calculate the cost of goods.
iii. A CPI adjustment was applied to all the operator fares and is carried forward for all model years from 2015 and beyond
iv. The current ARC transit coding approach enables fares to be coded by mode and operator (cases where an operator has a different fare for different modes).
v. The transit fare structure includes additional fares incurred from transferring from one operator to another
vi. The fare structure results in a fare matrix which includes the total fare of the trip on a zone-to-zone level

f. 2009-2010 Transit On Board Survey Calibration
   i. Update of regional transit travel targets based on expansion of the on-board survey data
      1. Modifications to express bus and BRT transfer constants
      2. Modifications to travel demand model estimates of zero-car transit work trips
      3. Modifications to travel demand model estimates of kiss-and-ride passenger access and use of transit system
      4. Overall evaluation of all modal constants
      5. Refinement to park-and-ride lot assumptions
      6. Updated walk connector and percent walk procedures
ii. Modified transit skimming procedures
iii. Re-calibrated air passenger model
iv. Assessment of travel demand model understanding of market segments and travel patterns relative to the on-board survey records

---

5 http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/cpicalc.pl

6 For example, the current year 2015 one-way MARTA fare of $2.50 translates to approximately $2.30 in year 2010 dollars. In other words, the MARTA fare increase from $2.00 to $2.50 outpaces inflation. So, using the consumer price index calculator, the 2015 MARTA fare in year 2010 dollars is $2.30.
Appendix D – I/M Program

- Exhaust and Evaporative (OBD and gas cap pressure test) for 1996 and newer vehicles
  - Annual inspection required
  - Computerized test and repair OBD – Exhaust
  - Computerized test and repair OBD & GC - Evaporative
  - Applies to all LDG vehicle types
  - Three year grace period
  - 3% waiver rate for all vehicles – Exhaust test
  - 0% waiver rate for all vehicles – Evaporative test
  - 97% compliance rate
- Exhaust and Evaporative test for 1975 – 1995 vehicles
  - Annual inspection required
  - Computerized test and repair ASM 2525/5015 Phase-in – Exhaust
  - Computerized test and repair GC – Evaporative
  - Applies to all LDG vehicle types
  - 3% waiver rate for all vehicles – Exhaust
  - 0% waiver rate for all vehicles – Evaporative
  - 97% compliance rate
  - 25 year and older model years are exempt
### Appendix E – VMT Adjustment Factors

#### Ozone VMT Adjustment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class Name</th>
<th>Functional Classifications</th>
<th>Factor for 13 County Area</th>
<th>Factor for 7 County Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstates / Freeways</td>
<td>1, 11, 12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterials</td>
<td>2, 14</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 16, 17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>9, 19</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **Welcome & Review of 11/15/16 meeting summary**

2. **Transportation Planning Updates**
   a. **ARC**
   i. **Future 2017-2018 Amendments**

   Haynes went on to explain ARC’s amendment schedule for the rest of the year. Amendment #3 will be comprised primarily of two components. First on the revenue side – the current RTP/TIP does not reflect the FAST Act and the Georgia Transportation Funding Act of 2015 (TFA 2015) revenue assumptions. These two revenue-changing laws occurred at the end of the Atlanta Region’s Plan approval process in 2015 and were not directly accounted for in ARC’s projections. Therefore, Amendment #3 will align the RTP/TIP with these state and federal revenue assumptions. To meet this goal, ARC will reconvene the Financial Planning Team. The first meeting will probably take place in March.

   On the project side, Amendment #3 will incorporate GDOT’s Major Mobility Improvement Projects (MMIP) and the local TSPLOST projects that passed in November 2016. There are time sensitive components with the MMIP projects; therefore Amendment #3 will be adopted in August 2017. Concurrently, ARC will be extending the horizon year of the TIP to 2023.
Later this year, ARC sees the need for an Amendment #4. This amendment will include all other items/projects that cannot be included with Amendment #3. Amendment #4 will likely be adopted in late 2017 or early 2018.

Since both amendments will modify existing or add new projects, both will require new emissions analyses. ARC will plan on bringing planning assumptions to the group ahead of model runs in the spring and fall.

b. CBMPO

Tom Sills, CBMPO, gave an update on planning activities in Bartow County. The Avatron amusement park planned for Bartow County has officially been canceled. There were several high profile transportation projects in the CBMPO TIP to support this project that will need to be amended. Staff is working with GDOT to identify the necessary changes and they will synch up their amendment with ARC’s schedule this year.

3. AQ Updates

a. Ozone

Elizabeth Munsey, EPD, noted that the 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP proposed rule was published to the federal register on December 23. There was one comment received. EPA will respond to the comment and then prepare the final rule classifying the Atlanta region as in attainment and promulgating the new ozone SIP budgets.

Munsey also noted that when the Maintenance Plan is finalized, for the first time going back to the 1 hour ozone standard in 1978, the Atlanta region will be attaining all air quality standards. This won’t last long, however, since designations for the 2015 Ozone standard are required in October. EPD recommended eight counties be designated: Bartow, Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton, Gwinnett, Henry and Rockdale. This area would be smaller than the 15 counties currently in the 2008 ozone nonattainment area. EPA is working on their 120 letter response which is due to the state in April or May. EPD will then get a final chance to respond before designations occur in October.
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1. Welcome & Review of 1/24/16 meeting summary

2. Transportation Planning Updates
   a. ARC
      i. ARC TIP Amendment #3

      Jean Hee Barrett, ARC, updated the committee on ARC’s Amendment #3. There are lots of changes due to the incorporation of GDOT’s MMIP program into the plan. There are also some financial changes to both exempt and nonexempt projects. ARC is shifting the TIP years forward to 2018 – 2023, rolling more projects into the TIP period.

      Barrett noted that ARC is looking to go to public comment with plan materials on June 21. Staff would seek TCC, TAQC and Board approval in August, with GRTA approvals in September followed by a federal conformity determination.

      ii. Review of Planning Assumptions for TIP Amendment #3

      D’Onofrio reminded the committee that on March 22, staff sent Interagency planning assumptions and project lists for the upcoming Amendment. Originally, concurrence was sought for March 28th, but some project tweaks have been identified for ARC and CBMPO
projects and concurrence will be requested by April 4\textsuperscript{th}. ARC staff planned to provide updated lists by March 29\textsuperscript{th}.

b. CBMPO

No one from CBMPO was able to participate in this meeting. D’Onofrio updated the committee that he had been working with Tom Sills to prepare a project list and align both amendments. ARC will provide CDR documentation ahead of CBMPO’s public comment period.

3. AQ Updates

Elisabeth Munsey, GA EPD, provided an air quality update. Currently, GA EPD is waiting for EPA approval of the 2008 Ozone Maintenance SIP. Those approvals are expected before ARC adopts Amendment #3. The State is also waiting for EPA’s 120 day letter, which provides comments on the State’s recommended 2015 ozone nonattainment area. Dianna Myers, EPA, noted that the agency is targeting June 1 for those letters to go out to the States.
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1. Welcome & Review of 3/28/17 meeting summary

David D’Onofrio, ARC, called the meeting to order. He noted that the draft March 28th meeting summary was distributed for review. There were no modifications and the summary was accepted.

2. Transportation Planning Updates
   a. ARC

David Haynes, ARC, updated the committee on ARC planning activities. The upcoming Amendments #3 and #4 will likely be rebranded as a brand new RTP Update. The planned amendments check many federal boxes for a full update, and ARC is investigating taking a few extra steps to create an updated plan, instead of a series of amendments. Creating an updated plan, instead of an amendment, is beneficial for ARC in that it resets the 4-year clock to produce a full plan and moves the RTP Update year off the timeline of our USDOT quadrennial review.

Jean Hee Barrett, ARC, explained the short-term actions ARC is taking for the pending Amendment #3 component of the update. Travel modeling is still underway and will conclude by June 1. ARC staff will run emissions and prepare an updated CDR to share with Interagency by June 12th for review ahead of public comment which opens on June 21st and closes on July 20th. ARC has planned several public engagements to share information about
the planned update/amendment. The official public hearing for the update/amendment is scheduled for July 13th, during the scheduled TAQC meeting.

The second component of the update, Amendment #4 is planned for later in 2017 or in the first quarter of 2018. This update will account for the projects ARC recently solicited from sponsors.

b. CBMPO

No one from CBMPO was able to participate in this meeting. D’Onofrio updated the committee that he had been working with Tom Sills to align both organization’s upcoming amendments. ARC will provide CDR documentation ahead of CBMPO’s public comment period.

3. AQ Updates

a. Ozone Updates

Richard Wong, EPA, announced that the Ozone Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request was signed on April 27th. It should be up on the Federal Register in the next week or two, effective immediately.

Dianna Myers, EPA, discussed the status of the 2015 Ozone Standard. Designations were planned for October 1, 2017. EPA’s new leadership is currently deliberating the rule. Until this process is complete, Designations cannot move forward.