

**LINKING TRANSPORTATION AND
AIR QUALITY PLANNING:
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATIONS
IN 15 NONATTAINMENT AREAS**

Arnold M. Howitt and Elizabeth M. Moore

Taubman Center for State and Local Government
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

March 1999

*A Report to the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
and the
Federal Highway Administration,
U.S. Department of Transportation*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a genuine pleasure to thank the many people who have made this research possible. We owe our most important debt of gratitude to the more than 230 individuals – identified by name in an appendix to this report – who were interviewed and provided other data about the transportation conformity process. Their knowledge and insight are reflected on virtually every page that follows. Without the cooperation, patience, and candor of all of these people – sometimes provided on multiple occasions – this study quite literally could not have been carried out.

From the outset, the researchers were promised full intellectual independence by the federal agency sponsors, EPA and FHWA. That independence has been scrupulously respected by the federal agency staff with whom we have worked closely throughout this project. Particular assistance, for which we are extremely grateful, was provided by Laura Voss, Meg Patulski, Kathryn Sargeant, and Margo Oge of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Lucy Garliauskas and James Shrouds of the Federal Highway Administration.

At Harvard, our efforts have been ably supported by Treina Fabre, Sophie Delano, and James Scafide, who served at various points as research assistants, and by Rochelle Furman, Kate Fitzpatrick, and Julie Zanotti, who transcribed numerous interview tapes. Sandra Garron effectively managed project finances, and Julie Zanotti deftly performed many other administrative tasks that kept the project moving. On several occasions, Stephanie Abundo and Todd Olmstead took time out from their Ph.D. research to provide helpful technical assistance.

Joshua Anderson was a partner with one of the authors in conducting an earlier study of implementation of the transportation provisions of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. The current work has benefitted significantly from his earlier efforts.

The people at the Taubman Center for State and Local Government are genuinely delightful companions, supportive colleagues, and thoughtful commentators. Alan Altshuler, David Luberoff, Mary Graham, and Jay Walder, in addition to those mentioned above, deserve special thanks for their support, but others too numerous to mention by name are responsible for creating a unique and stimulating environment.

The authors of this study are solely responsible for the accuracy of the data presented here and for the generalizations and conclusions they have reached. They have benefitted greatly, however, from the careful review and scrutiny of all or parts of this manuscript by representatives of the federal agencies and some of their interview respondents. The authors are extremely grateful to these commentators, who have saved them from errors of omission and commission, while helping them refine their interpretations of the data. Any shortcomings that remain, however, are the exclusive responsibility of the authors. Neither the project's federal sponsors nor Harvard University necessarily agree with or endorse the findings and conclusions presented here. Those are ours alone.

Arnold M. Howitt and Elizabeth M. Moore
March 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
Executive Summary	ix
Chapter 1: The Conformity Assessment Project	1
Project Purposes	1
Focal Questions	2
Selection of the Research Sites	3
Research Methods and Data	8
The Research in Perspective	9
Outline of the Report	10
Chapter 2: The Purposes and Requirements of Transportation Conformity	12
Policy Antecedents	12
Purposes and Expectations	14
Pollution Reduction and Public Health	14
A Procedural Framework and Incentives	14
Improving the Planning Process	15
Public Deliberation and Decision Making	16
Advancing the Environmental Advocacy Agenda	16
Conformity Requirements	17
The 1991 Interim Conformity Guidance	18
The 1993 Conformity Rule	19
Performance Standards	20
Procedural Requirements	21
Penalties and Penalty Triggers	22
Amendments to the 1993 Conformity Rule	24
The August 1995 Amendments	24
National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	25
The November 1995 Amendments	25
The August 1997 Amendments	27
Chapter 3: Implementing the Transportation Conformity Requirements ..	28
Passing the Emissions Tests	30
Budget Test	30
Build/No-Build Test	36
Less-than-1990 Test	37

Using the Required Modeling Techniques	37
Demonstrating Timely Implementation of SIP TCMs	38
Meeting the Fiscal Constraint Requirement	38
Links to SIP Failures	39
Human Error	40
Chapter 4: Institutional Roles in the Transportation Conformity Process	41
Building Institutional Capacity	44
Contextual Conditions	44
Organizing for Conformity	46
Developing Technical Capacity	49
Establishing Interagency Consultation Procedures	52
Start-up Issues	52
Formalizing Consultation Procedures in a Conformity SIP	53
Interagency Consultation in Practice	56
Stakeholder Participation in Conformity	64
Environmental Advocates	65
Business Associations	68
The Broader Visibility of Conformity	69
Engaging Policy Makers	69
Public Visibility	71
Chapter 5: Conformity Effects on Transportation and Air Quality Plans ...	73
Effects of Conformity on Transportation Plans and Programs	73
Effects on Highway Projects	74
Effects on Transit, Other TCMs, and Land Use Planning	80
Conformity and Air Quality Planning	86
1992 CO and PM ₁₀ SIPs	86
1993 VOC Reduction SIPs	87
Effects on Subsequent SIP Planning	89
Conformity Effects on SIP TCMs	92
Other SIP Impacts	93
Chapter 6: Toward A New Planning “Arena”	96
Better Data and Analytic Tools	96
Analysis and the Regulatory Process	97
Confronting Conformity Difficulties	99
Re-examining the Models	100
Generating Policy Debate	100
Institutional Dynamics of Changing Transportation and Air Quality Plans	101
Conformity as an Evolving Process	103

Appendix I: Glossary of Abbreviations 104

Appendix II: Conformity Profiles of 15 Study Sites 106

- Atlanta 106
- Baltimore 108
- Boston 109
- Charlotte 111
- Chicago 113
- Denver 114
- Houston 116
- Milwaukee 117
- Northern New Jersey 118
- New York 119
- Philadelphia 120
- Phoenix 121
- Portland 122
- Salt Lake City 123
- San Francisco 124

Appendix III: Interview Subjects by Study Site 125

- Atlanta 125
- Baltimore 126
- Boston 126
- Charlotte 127
- Chicago 128
- Denver 129
- Houston 130
- Milwaukee 131
- Northern New Jersey 132
- New York 133
- Philadelphia 134
- Phoenix 135
- Portland 136
- Salt Lake City 137
- San Francisco 137
- National 139

Appendix IV: Sources of Population and Transportation Data 140

Appendix V: Report Authors 143

Figures and Tables

- Figure 1-1: Nonattainment Areas in the Study 4
- Table 1-1: Growth Rates of Population and Vehicle Miles Traveled by Study Site 6

Table 1-2: Nonattainment Classifications for Study Sites by Pollutant	7
Table 3-1: Types of Conformity Problems by Nonattainment Area	29
Table 3-2: Problems Meeting the Conformity Requirements by Nonattainment Area	31-32
Table 4-1: Core Public Agencies in Transportation and Air Quality by Nonattainment Area	42-43
Table 5-1: Population and VMT Growth Rates by Higher- and Lower-Growth Study Sites	76