

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Tier 2 Consultation Meeting
June 26, 2007
Final Meeting Summary

Participants	Representing
Patricia Berry	CMAP
Bill Brown (via phone)	NIRPC
Chris DiPalma	FHWA
Doug Ferguson	CMAP
Michael Leslie	USEPA
Les Nunes	IDOT-OPP
Ross Patronskey	CMAP
Mike Rogers	IEPA
Joy Schaad	CMAP
Kermit Wies	CMAP
Walt Zyznieuski	IDOT
Matt Fuller	FHWA-IL
Tom Murtha	CMAP
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Dean B. Englund	PB
Steve Ott	PB
Rick Powell	IDOT – District 3
Connie Lindenmier	IDOT – District 3
Holly Ostidick	CMAP
Peng Wang	CMAP
Ed Leonard	PB

1. Approval of the May 14, 2007 meeting summary

The draft May 14, 2007 meeting summary was approved.

2. SAFETEA-LU Compliance

Mr. DiPalma stated that at this time the SAFETEA-LU compliant RTP does not require any action by the USDOT. The team recognized the CMAP and Policy Committee board approved RTP Update is in compliance with the requirements of the SAFETEA-LU legislation. Additionally, Mr. DiPalma stated that at this time, per his review, the SAFETEA-LU compliant RTP meets the regulations of current federal legislation.

3. IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment Draft Procedure Memorandum

Mr. Zyznieuski of IDOT presented a draft memo with the request of approval by the team on the proposed procedures for determining PM_{2.5} Hot Spot analysis and triggers. The first hot spot analysis brought to the Consultation team was the Dan Ryan reconstruction and this memo follows the same format for that analysis. The Bureau of Design and Environment would like to finalize and distribute this memorandum with the approval of the consultation team. The memo states that all projects will be brought to monthly (District 1) or bi-monthly (District 3) District meetings with specific data

including annual average daily traffic (AADT) for design year and existing year and the percent diesel emissions, for evaluation. All projects will document whether or not they are "projects of air quality concern", in the minutes of the coordination meeting. Mr. Patronsky asked if local projects will be included in this determination. Mr. Zyznieuski stated that there is a local roads coordination meeting as well. Mr. Patronsky asked to be included on the distribution lists for the minutes that state the need or lack of need for hot spot analysis. Comments regarding the memo were requested by fall 2007. Mr. Zyznieuski stated that IDOT is also holding a peer review in October regarding hot spot analysis.

4. Prairie Parkway PM_{2.5} Hot Spot Analysis (TIP ID 09-02-9033)

Dean Englund from Parsons Brinkerhoff distributed copies of PowerPoint slides summarizing information from the draft hot-spot analysis report for the Prairie Parkway project previously made available to the consultation team members. Mr. Englund outlined the reasons for using a surrogate approach in the hot spot analysis for the Prairie Parkway and described the PM_{2.5} monitor locations and associated data used for the analysis. He summarized the report's finding that the Prairie Parkway project will not cause or contribute to PM_{2.5} violations. Mr. Englund responded to questions about the hot-spot analysis and received suggestions for clarifying some tables in the report. IDOT stated that public hearings that include the Prairie Parkway hot-spot analysis will be held in mid July, and if there are any comments on the analysis they would appreciate receiving them as soon as possible. IEPA subsequently commented suggesting more description of the project be added in the Executive Summary. No comments were received on the analysis subsequent to the meeting.

5. Travel Demand Impact of Grade Separations

Tom Murtha distributed a memo in regards to the impact of grade separations on the travel demand model. The memo provided evidence that incorporating grade separated crossings in the travel demand model should have no effect on VMT. Discussion continued on whether the model is sensitive enough to show a difference between the two types of crossings. It was determined that the travel demand model was not necessarily the best model to identify the impacts of grade separations. Mr. Leslie stated that the information would be forwarded to the Tier I consultation team and EPA headquarters for discussion.

6. Other Business

Mr. Brown from NIRPC reported via phone that the two Indiana redesignation petitions have been sent to the EPA, one for Lake and Porter counties and the other for LaPorte County. LaPorte County has completed the public comment period and is awaiting a final designation notice.

Lake and Porter Counties are still within the public comment period. The comment period ends in July. The budgets are submitted in the draft SIPs and NIRPC has used them in their conformity designation. If redesignation occurs, NIRPC has completed what is needed once those budgets go into affect. FHWA will need to issue a new conformity finding based on the fact that the new budgets have been taken into

account. Mr. DiPalma stated that the USDOT is working with INDOT to complete the conformity based on current information. The USDOT will have to take another federal action based on the attainment designation for meeting the attainment requirements with the new budgets that are within the maintenance SIPs.

Ms. Berry made the team aware of a Tollway study that is underway for an existing I-294 interchange in Rosemont where there are movements being added. The project is in phase I engineering and it is anticipated that design approval may occur approximately a year from now.

Mr. DiPalma had previously passed out a draft Hot Spot procedure for commuter rail projects and asked if there were any preliminary comments. Mr. Zyznieuski mentioned that this draft Hot Spot procedure is undergoing revisions and a new version will be sent out shortly. Mr. Ferguson stated that once all comments were incorporated, FHWA could forward the updated procedures to him and he would pass it on to the team.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting was left on call.