



**Tier II Consultation Meeting  
DRAFT Minutes – June 17, 2020**

Committee Members

John Donovan	FHWA
Tony Greep	FTA
Michael Leslie	EPA
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Chris Schmidt	IDOT – via phone
Buzz Asselmeier	IEPA – via phone
David Bloomberg	IEPA – via phone
Russell Pietrowiak	CMAP

Participants

Leroy Kos	CMAP
Teri Dixon	CMAP
Jesse Elam	CMAP
Sarah Buchhorn	CMAP
Claire Bozic	CMAP
Jose Rodriquez	CMAP
Doug Ferguson	CMAP
Craig Heither	CMAP
Jason Navota	CMAP
Jared Patton	CMAP
Mark Jansen	LADCO

**1.0 Call to Order and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. All participants introduced themselves.

**2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

**3.0 Approval of Minutes –September 26, 2019**

On a motion by Mr. Leslie, seconded by Mr. Schmidt the minutes of the June 17, 2020 meeting were approved as presented.

**4.0 Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity Analysis**

Mr. Pietrowiak provided an overview of the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity amendments and analysis memo that was released for public comment on CMAP's website and that was included in CMAP's weekly email that is distributed externally.

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that no public comments were received, which is not uncommon as CMAP typically has not received public comments on the conformity analysis memo. He also stated the both the CMAP board and the MPO Policy Committee had approved the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity amendments. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the analysis demonstrated that CMAP conformed to the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget (MVEB) for the region but noted that while emissions continue to decline through 2040, they begin to increase slightly in 2050.

#### **5.0 Plan Amendment Transportation Conformity**

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that during the public comment period for the Plan Amendments CMAP did receive a letter from the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) regarding CMAP's analysis of the 2 plan amendments from IDOT for improvements on and near I-55 at Airport/Lockport Rd and at IL 59, which Mr. Pietrowiak read. The letter stated that CMAP did not analysis greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or other pollutants at the project level. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that CMAP does not analyze projects at the project level but analyzes projects by adding them to the group of projects analyzed at the regional level. Ms. Bozic stated that the consultants for the North Lake Shore Drive project are interested in doing a GHG emissions analysis and that if you do the analysis with and without the project at the regional level you are seeing the difference. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that any one project, when analyzed at the regional level is unlikely to show a significant difference in the region's emissions but you can see small changes from a project, even at the regional level. Ms. Bozic also stated that by looking at the system or regional level you can capture more of the impact of a large project, which you may not see looking only at the project level.

#### **6.0 2008 OZONE NAAQS Nonattainment Reclassification Status Updates**

Mr. Bloomberg provided an update, stating that the redesignation request had been submitted to U.S. EPA. Mr. Bloomberg stated that after the U.S. EPA reviews what was submitted that, if there are no issues the request can be submitted to be published in the federal register. Mr. Leslie stated that it would take through the current ozone season to approve it. Mr. Leslie stated that they were hopeful they could submit to the federal register within a month. Mr. Leslie said that they would have to see how the ozone season played out too. Mr. Bloomberg stated that both Northbrook and Evanston had had 1 exceedance of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS, which are the controlling monitors for the region right now, thus there were still a few more exceedances that could occur before the region was in violation of the 2008 ozone NAAQS this year. Mr. Pietrowiak asked if other monitors might be an issue. Mr. Bloomberg stated that Northbrook and Evanston are the controlling monitors at this time which is a little different as Chikwaukee has typically been the controlling monitor in the past. Mr. Pietrowiak asked what happens if the region has a 4<sup>th</sup> highest exceedance at Northbrook or Evanston and would the redesignation request to attainment be impacted? Mr. Bloomberg said that would be problematic, because these 3 years are also the years that are calculated for the severe bump up, thus it's not just that we wouldn't be in attainment but we could also get bumped up to severe next year. Mr.

Bloomberg also stated that if next summer was a good ozone season (little to no exceedances) then there is a window to do the request to redesignate to attainment again. Mr. Bloomberg stated that if the region isn't able to attain this year IEPA would need to implement a new NOx RACT and submit an attainment demonstration for serious nonattainment, which may require a new MVEB budget for the region. Mr. Bloomberg also stated that IEPA's focus is on redesignation. Mr. Pietrowiak then asked if the two scenarios are attainment or the region gets bumped up to serious and then severe. Mr. Bloomberg stated the region could be serious for one year and then attain before being bumped up to severe otherwise it would likely get bumped up to severe. Mr. Bloomberg stated that even if the 2008 standard is obtained the region will get bumped up to moderate for the 2015 standard due to violations that have already occurred. Mr. Pietrowiak asked if there were other things that CMAP should be aware of for the region. Mr. Bloomberg stated it was too early in the process to know. Mr. Pietrowiak then asked if U.S. EPA foresaw any issues if the region isn't able to attain the 2008 standard this summer. Mr. Leslie stated that the serious attainment demonstration can impact the budgets.

#### **7.0 2015 Ozone NAAQs Development**

Mr. Pietrowiak asked about the status of the court case for McHenry County as it pertains to being in the nonattainment area for the region. Mr. Bloomberg stated that he thought U.S. EPA had agreed to reconsider if McHenry should be in the nonattainment area. Mr. Pietrowiak asked was does a bump up for the 2015 NAAQS mean for the region? Mr. Bloomberg stated that at this time it didn't look like it would impact the CMAP region, regarding mobile sources all that much but there could be regulatory changes that could impact what may need to be done. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that a new MVEB budget had been published in the federal register. Mr. Leslie said that they have deemed it adequate and it should be approved in the federal register, unless the region can't redesignate to attainment for the 2008 ozone NAAQS, then it may need to be revisited. Mr. Pietrowiak then asked if CMAP should use the current MVEB or the new one published in the federal register for the October conformity modeling. Mr. Leslie stated that CMAP could go ahead and use the MVEB shown in the redesignation request. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that 2025 would likely become the first modeling year.

#### **8.0 CMAP's Climate Mitigation Effort**

Mr. Navota discussed CMAP's efforts to address some of the recommendations in ON TO 2050 regarding climate mitigation. Mr. Navota stated that CMAP's work plan now has specific efforts identified to address climate issues, one of which is to work on modeling and tracking of greenhouse gas emissions and another is to develop scenarios that can be modeled. Mr. Navota asked the committee for their thoughts on modeling GHG emissions and any ideas the committee may have on these issues. Mr. Bloomberg stated that IEPA looks at it through both a regulatory or inventory lens and has an energy group that works on GHG's. Mr. Bloomberg suggested that CMAP and IEPA have a discussion regarding what CMAP might want to do. Mr. Navota stated that CMAP will be looking at the transportation sector but wanted to know if there are other areas that CMAP should be

considering. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that CMAP could look at various scenarios such as changing the percent of electric vehicles that comprise the vehicle fleet mix but we lack context since their aren't standards or monitors for the GHG numbers that we can model and it's not entirely clear if the numbers are really high or low or somewhere in between and that's what we are hoping this committee can provide some input on. Mr. Schmidt said that he could see performance-based measures for GHG being something in the future that would need to be considered. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that GHG emissions would likely be shown on future conformity memo's even though it's not required, similar to PM 2.5. Mr. Schmidt stated that he would support this initiative by CMAP. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that a GHG modeling presentation may happen at a future meeting.

#### **9.0 Other Business**

Mr. Schmidt stated that the mid-point for the performance measures for CMAQ, there will be an opportunity to revise these targets in the fall.

#### **10.0 Public Comment**

None

#### **11.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be on call.

#### **12.0 Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 am.