

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Tier 2 Consultation Meeting
November 27, 2007
Final Meeting Summary

Participants

Vanessa Adams
Patricia Berry
John Beissel
Chris Byars
Brian Carlson
Bruce Christensen
Bob Dean
Chris DiPalma
Teri Dixon
Doug Ferguson
Chalen Hunter
Don Kopec
Michael Leslie
Tom Murtha
Les Nunes
Holly Ostdick
Jason Osborn
Ross Patronskey
Mark Pitstick
Chad Riddle
Mike Rogers
Jim Stack
Betsy Tracy
Kermit Wies
Walt Zyznieuski

Representing

FTA
CMAP
CCHD
FHWA
IDOT District One
Lake County
CMAP
FHWA
CMAP
CMAP
McHenry County
CMAP
USEPA
CMAP
IDOT OP&P
CMAP
McHenry County
CMAP
RTA
IDOT District One
IEPA
IDOT OP&P
IDOT OP&P
CMAP
IDOT Design and Environment

1. Approval of the August 21, 2007 meeting summary

The draft August 21, 2007 meeting summary was approved

2. PM_{2.5} Peer Review Meeting

Mr. Zyznieuski gave a brief summary of the PM_{2.5} Peer Review meeting held October 23-24, 2007 at Allerton Park hosted by IDOT, Illinois Center for Transportation and UIC. Information on the peer exchange including participants and presentations can be found at www.uic.edu/depts/cme/conferences/msat.

3. CREATE Passenger Rail and PM_{2.5}/PM₁₀ Initial Screening Method

Mr. Zyznieuski presented the most up to date version of the *Methodology for Determining if CREATE Passenger Rail Projects are "Projects of Air Quality Concern" in PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas*, which incorporated all of the

comments and suggestions received from Team members. Mr. Zyznieuski requested concurrence from the Team on the methodology before adding the document to the NEPA documentation for CREATE projects. CREATE Project P-1, a Metra flyover at the Norfolk Southern tracks, is going out for public comment in December.

Mr. Pitstick indicated that he was satisfied with the additional language concerning the use of 10,000 trucks as a baseline comparison for train emissions and the clarification of large and small transit terminals. Mr. Zyznieuski indicated that both the 10,000 trucks emission base line and the 50% increase for large bus terminals were taken directly from US EPA guidance.

The Team concurred in the methodology used in the document.

4. PM_{2.5} Hot Spot Analysis Method

Mr. Patronskey reviewed the previously approved method for conducting PM_{2.5} hot spot analyses on projects improvements to existing highway facilities. He indicated that there was a concern from FHWA headquarters staff with the method. Mr. Zyznieuski stated that FHWA's concerns related to the use of MOBILE6.2 to calculate PM_{2.5} emissions for specific projects. They did not have a problem with using the emissions estimates that were done for the regional conformity analysis. Mr. Zyznieuski said that IDOT will include the results from the regional conformity analysis with their hot spot analyses.

Mr. Leslie stated that FHWA's concern is if project level emissions are calculated, there might be pressure to apply models to calculate a concentration of the pollutant. The feeling among staff at the national level was that the MOBILE6 model is too crude to estimate emissions at a project level, so the calculation of concentrations would also be invalid. In particular, MOBILE6 does not capture the effect of speed on PM_{2.5} emissions, so speed improvements associated with transportation projects would not be recognized.

Mr. Patronskey understood that FHWA was advocating that the region use the method described in the guidance - identifying air quality monitors with (truck) ADT comparable to the maximum ADT on the proposed project and the assessment of the violation status of those monitors. He said that CMAP staff could generate for the 22 monitors in the region a buffer around them and estimate the truck traffic in those buffers to have on hand if needed. Mr. Zyznieuski indicated that IDOT does not think that is necessary.

Mr. Rogers asked if there were any concerns with doing the analysis this new way. No one indicated that they were concerned but Mr. Patronskey wanted to make sure whether or not the monitor buffer analysis was going to be needed. Mr. DiPalma indicated that FHWA headquarters' caution was that we should not cross the line between qualitative and quantitative analysis since only qualitative analyses are called for. Mr. Leslie felt that the regional analysis from the conformity document can be used to support a "weight of evidence" argument.

Mr. Rogers suggested that CMAP have the buffer analysis ready to go as a just in case measure. Mr. Patronsky asked for the addresses of the monitors from IEPA, which Mr. Rogers said that he would provide.

5. TIP Change and Project Grouping Procedures

Mr. DiPalma stated that according to USDOT's regulations, the region's TIP change procedures must address two issues: a) What is the threshold at which a TIP Change (Administrative Modification) becomes a TIP Amendment and b) what project information is contained in the TIP and how do projects move in and out of the TIP, both with respect to meeting air quality and fiscal constraint requirements. The federal planning rules that came out February 2007 further defined both TIP amendment and administrative modification. USDOT comparison of the regulations to the TIP Change and Project Grouping procedures has concluded that northeastern Illinois does not clearly define the difference between an amendment and a modification to the TIP, as evidenced by the controversy surrounding the Algonquin Road/IL 31 project. He distributed a spreadsheet that compared administrative modification/TIP amendment thresholds in similar MPOs across the country titled *A Summary of TIP Modification Thresholds in Market Basket MPOs* for informational purposes.

Mr. Kopec asked about the assessment that the region's procedures do not correctly define the difference between an amendment and a change. Ms. Berry reviewed what the TIP Changes procedures currently define as an amendment. Mr. DiPalma reviewed the fiscal thresholds for major cost change in the document he had distributed.

Mr. Kopec stated that he was not clear on what the USDOT saw as the deficiencies, gaps or holes in the region's change procedures. CMAP's procedures have an amendment as the deletion or addition of a non-grouped project or entire group of projects. Approval of this type of TIP amendment currently requires MPO Policy committee approval as do TIP changes to a regionally significant project that trigger a conformity analysis. He noted that the procedures do not characterize as an amendment a major change in funding shown in the TIP.

Mr. DiPalma stated that from the federal point of view projects in the first four years of a TIP listing are the ones subject to conformity and fiscal constraint. Projects in subsequent years are illustrative only. If a project is moved back beyond the 4 years that define the TIP it would be considered a project deletion and require an amendment. A project in the 5th or 6th year of the TIP that is advanced into the first through fourth years would be considered a project addition to the TIP and would also require a TIP amendment and verification of fiscal constraint.

Mr. DiPalma continued that, when defining what constitutes a major change in cost, which is a criterion for a TIP amendment, an objective threshold (either a percentage or dollar amount) should be established for the region. Mr. Kopec said that CMAP will need to get input from its partners before recommending any specific values. Mr. DiPalma stated that doing a good job of defining thresholds between TIP amendments and administrative modifications could prevent problems or confusion in the future.

A discussion was held on the difference between project funding and cost and how each will be represented in the TIP. Mr. DiPalma indicated that there are two methods to achieve fiscal constraint: showing only the funded phases of a project and clearly indicating that those are the only phases of a project being programmed, or identifying the total cost for the project and identifying all fund sources for that project. Projects that have only certain phases funded should be represented in the TIP as only those phases, so the project cost equals the funding in hand. When funding for other phases is added to the TIP, thus constituting a major change to project scope (a criterion for a TIP amendment), the new phases of the project should be added via amendment. . Mr. Kopec stated that this is a problem since currently the TIP shows the whole project, but the fiscal information is for funding, not costs, which are known outside data maintained in the TIP.

A discussion ensued on what information in the TIP best serves the public's need for understanding the near-term funding of transportation projects.

CMAQ staff agreed to draft changes to the TIP Procedures addressing the February 2007 regulations for discussion at the next consultation meeting. Mr. Carlson recommended that changes to safety projects be treated as modifications rather than amendments. Mr. DiPalma replied that such projects might very well be grouped project, and that grouped projects are not treated the same.

6. Other Business

Mr. Dean gave a brief update on the Regional Comprehensive Plan and indicated that the capital element portion of the plan will be developed after the vision, so that it will support the vision.

Mr. Zyznieuski stated that it may be useful to have a briefing for District 1 staff on the TIP and regional planning since there is a large portion of the District staff who are new and not familiar with many of the planning requirements. The training could be conducted by CMAP staff.

Mr. Rogers said that the comment period on the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard boundaries ends on November 30th. IEPA has recommended keeping the same NAA boundary as for the annual PM_{2.5} standard. Mr. Patrosky has drafted a letter supporting IEPA's position for submittal by CMAP.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for December 10, 2007 at 1:30pm.