

Chicago Area Transportation Study
Tier 2 Consultation Meeting
September 20, 2005
Meeting Summary

Participants	Representing
Patricia Berry	CATS
Bill Brown	NIRPC
Chris DiPalma	FHWA
Doug Ferguson	CATS
Michael Leslie	USEPA
Carl Mikyska	IDOT
Ross Patronsky	CATS
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Mike Rogers	IEPA
Gordon Smith	IDOT
Kermit Wies	CATS

1. Approval of the August 3, 2005 meeting summary

The final (first draft) August summary was approved.

2. PM_{2.5} Conformity Documentation

Mr. Patronsky gave a summary of the comments received and the draft memo addressing the comments. Mr. DiPalma expressed concern over the comments received from McHenry County on assumptions for and outputs from the conformity process. A discussion on this matter came to the conclusion that what the comment was concerned with were the individual project characteristics used to develop the model and how one can find them. The project characteristics are available in the TIP database which is located on the CATS website and can be downloaded. The memo addressing the comments will be present to the CATS Work Program Committee on September 30, 2005 before the Committee is asked to approve the *Transportation Conformity Analysis for the PM_{2.5} and the 8-hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards*.

3. PM_{2.5} Conformity and Northwest Indiana

Mr. Brown gave background on the northwest Indiana area conformity determination for PM_{2.5}. Analysis areas that still require resolution include fleet inventories and temperature/humidity factors. Mr. Brown said that IDEM has asked NIRPC to use temperature/humidity factors that IDEM developed, not the ones that CATS used.

Mr. Brown indicated that INDOT is reviewing its financial capacity to cover all their projects in the plan. Because the plan would not be fiscally constrained the plan would lapse on conformity. Mr. Leslie stated that the preliminary discussions at EPA have concluded that northwest Indiana could lapse on the Ozone standard but the area could still pass on PM_{2.5}.

Mr. Brown indicated that NIRPC will be tweaking their model to adjust cold start and hot soak emissions outside the region for ozone conformity. It still looks like an ozone SIP budget revision will be needed. However, IDEM has said it will require transportation measures to offset any budget increase.

Mr. Rogers asked whether separate conformity determinations will be possible for PM_{2.5} if only one of the states had a PM_{2.5} SIP in place. Mr. Leslie said he would look into it.

Mr. Rogers stated that direct PM_{2.5} is required in the conformity analysis. The NOx precursor is required unless USEPA and the state air agency make a finding of insignificance. Neither USEPA nor IEPA have done this (nor has IDEM), so the NOx analysis is required.

VOC precursors are not required to be analyzed for PM_{2.5} conformity unless the state air agency or USEPA makes a finding of significance. Mr. Leslie and Mr. DiPalma said that if IDEM makes a finding of significance for northwestern Indiana, then northeastern Illinois will be required to analyze VOC as well.

Mr. Brown did not think that IDEM will make a finding of significance for VOC. Mr. Rogers indicated that he was taking part in a conference call on this matter later this week with IDEM, USEPA and LADCO and may have a more definitive answer then.

Mr. Patronsky did not think that running the MOBILE model for VOC would be that difficult but noted that the conformity determination process having to be repeated and that the timing of public review and committee action could be problematic.

Mr. Patronsky asked Mr. Brown if northwest Indiana is revising their fleet mix. Mr. Brown answered that they are not collecting new data but are using VIN decoder data and MOBILE6 defaults to change the allocation of registration data among the MOBILE6 vehicle types. The previous allocation method had resulted in too many heavy-duty vehicles.

4. Other Business

No other business was presented to the consultation team.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting was left on call.