



Tier II Consultation Meeting DRAFT Minutes – September 26, 2019

Committee Members

Table with 2 columns: Name and Agency. Rows include John Donovan (FHWA), Matt Fuller (FHWA - via phone), Michael Leslie (EPA), Tony Greep (FTA), Chris Schmidt (IDOT), Buzz Asselmeier (IEPA - via phone), David Bloomberg (IEPA - via phone), and Russell Pietrowiak (CMAP).

Participants

Table with 2 columns: Name and Agency. Rows include Leroy Kos (CMAP), Teri Dixon (CMAP), Jesse Elam (CMAP), Sara Buchhorn (CMAP), Claire Bozic (CMAP), Mark Janssen (LADCO - via phone), Janel Veile (IDOT - via phone), and Scott Marlow (IDOT - via phone).

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. All participants introduced themselves.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes –February 22, 2019

On a motion by Mr. Leslie, seconded by Mr. Greep the minutes of the February 22, 2019 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 that was released for public comment. No public comments were received and the analysis demonstrated that CMAP conformed to the budget for the region. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that a small error was then discovered that impacted data produced from travel demand model that is used in MOVES. This small error was discovered after the public comment period had closed and after the Transportation

Committee had recommended the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity amendments to the MPO for approval. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the small error resulted in the need to rerun the conformity analysis. While all the model runs have not been completed prior to this meeting some of them were including 2025 which is the year our emissions are closest to our Motor Vehicle Emission Budget (MVEB). These results show a slight uptick in emissions (1% increase) but are still under the MVEB used by CMAP to demonstrate conformity. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the real issue was that these results did not go through the public comment period only the previous results did and that there wasn't enough time to do another 30 day public comment period prior to the MPO meeting. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that he had had some conversations with FHWA and FTA about how to proceed. Their consensus is that the Tier II consultation group should discuss this issue and make a recommendation on how to proceed. Mr. Greep stated that FTA was hesitant to take something to the MPO Policy committee that was different (even if only slightly) then what had been released for public comment and that the process calls for transparency. Mr. Pietrowiak then stated that while the conformity results were slightly different than what was released for public comment the mix of projects and the changes to those projects were unchanged. Mr. Leslie stated that the EPA did not have an issue with what was being done and that this if the information about why things changed was provided to the MPO Policy committee that would be sufficient particularly since the results were not that close to the budget. Mr. Schmidt concurred with what Mr. Leslie had stated. Mr. Schmidt stated that in terms of the public knowing about this is that it would be stated at the MPO meeting, which is a public meeting. Mr. Pietrowiak confirmed that this would happen and suggested that a memo could be produced that explains why the change occurred which could accompany the conformity memo that is part of the packet that gets released for the MPO meeting. Mr. Donovan asked which Regionally Significant Projects (RSP's) were in the conformity memo. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the RSP's in the memo were projects that had been delayed and crossed a horizon year such as moving from 2019 completion year to 2021 or something like that. Mr. Donovan stated that these type of projects need to follow the process. Mr. Donovan then stated that being as transparent as possible was important and that he would be OK with taking the conformity amendment with a corresponding memo stating what took place and that the memo going to the MPO Policy committee didn't go through the public committee period but that something very similar had. Mr. Asselmeier stated that IEPA did not have anything to add. Mr. Greep stated that he would be comfortable with the approach being considered which is to attach a technical correction memo to the conformity amendment memo that will be considered by the MPO policy committee for approval which explains what happen and why. Ms. Dixon stated that as long as we are upfront about what happened that should be fine. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that if the projects on the conformity memo needed to go through the public comment period again then this conformity would likely need to be cancelled and these changes would need to wait until the next conformity amendment change opportunity opened up (Late Nov. Early Dec.). Mr. Pietrowiak said that the next round of conformity amendment changes would be approved at the March MPO meeting. Mr. Elam stated that he thought the MPO Policy committee would be fine

with what we are doing so long as we are clear about it. Mr. Pietrowiak stated based on what was discussed CMAP would present the updated conformity amendment results with an accompanying memo that explains why this is different from what was released for public comment and why another public comment period was not possible at this time to the MPO Policy committee for approval. Mr. Schmidt added that he would like to see it mentioned that CMAP's approach was supported by the Tier II consultation committee too.

5.0 CMAP's Conformity Process

Mr. Pietrowiak gave a power point presentation on CMAP's approach to doing transportation conformity. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that he was looking to see if we are missing anything or if something should be done differently. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the basic process is for projects to be entered into the TIP, TIP data then is feed into the travel demand model (TDM). TDM outputs are then imported into MOVES to be used for emissions modeling. Mr. Donovan stated that he is always surprised that this MPO typically receives no comments during the public comment period while other MPO's routinely get them. He also stated that during the last certification review there was a recommendation to tighten/follow the established conformity process and not have so many special amendments. Mr. Greep stated that it is important to follow the process and when we don't is when problems can occur. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that CMAP runs MOVES slightly different than IEPA and LADCO in that the region is only divided up into an IM and a Non-IM area. IEPA runs move by county and LADCO divides the region into 3 sections. Mr. Marlow asked how CMAP solicits public comment for conformity amendments. Mr. Pietrowiak stated the process used is the same for anything that CMAP is soliciting public comment for and included a web posting, inclusion in the weekly distribution email, etc. and that this process is approved by FHWA. Mr. Donovan agreed that the process being used is fine but that he is surprised it doesn't generate more public comments. Ms. Bozic stated that our process is put out there for the public to see and that we don't hide how we do things. Mr. Donovan asked if the presentation could be put on the Tier II web page perhaps as part of the FAQ section. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that can be done. Mr. Greep asked how our process is different than what other MPO's do. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the AMPO Air Quality working group is going to be putting together a white paper on how different MPO's do transportation conformity. Mr. Leslie said one of the differences sometimes is where the consultation happens, in some places consultation is a little earlier in the process.

6.0 2008 OZONE NAAQS Nonattainment Reclassification Status Updates

Mr. Bloomberg stated that the region has been bumped up to serious non-attainment of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS but at the same time the region is now in attainment of the 2008 standard according to monitor date. Mr. Bloomberg stated the IEPA is now work with US EPA to get a redesignation request of attainment of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS. This means the IEPA needs to work on 2 paths, one for the bump up and the other on attainment. Mr.

Bloomberg stated that the goal is to be redesignated but to be prepared in case that doesn't happen. Mr. Leslie stated this creates 2 different SIPs. The redesignation SIP, which is an inventory based SIP and the attainment demo which is a modeling based SIP. Mr. Leslie said of the 2 the inventory SIP is a little easier to develop. Mr. Bloomberg also stated that the modeling one will be a little more difficult because it is based on 2016 information which was a bad year for Ozone so projecting that data outward is problematic, thus it is possible the modeling will say the region won't attain even though it has attained which is the inverse of what had been happening. Mr. Pietrowiak asked how this impacts budgets (MVEB) that CMAP uses. Mr. Asselmeier stated that doing the inventory based is a little easier and from conversations with CMAP regarding budgets that's a starting place. Mr. Asselmeier also stated that the Tier II committee will need to review and approve the budget that is developed by IEPA in consultation with CMAP. Mr. Leslie stated that there will be a new budget regardless. Mr. Pietrowiak asked about the timeframe for a new budget. Mr. Asselmeier stated that it would likely be before Thanksgiving.

7.0 2015 Ozone NAAQs Development

Mr. Bloomberg stated that there was no changes or updates at this time and that the nonattainment area has not changed but that there is a court case that is pending. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the transportation committee is interesting in hearing about the revised SIP when that is finished and would be interested in have IEPA give a presentation at a future meeting.

8.0 PM 2.5 Status

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that in the spring there was a request to conduct a Hot Spot analysis on a project for PM 2.5. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the region was in attainment and this was no longer a requirement but it was still a requirement in IDOT design manual. Mr. Pietrowiak then contacted IDOT to see if they could update their manual to reflect that this was no longer required which they did. Mr. Schmidt stated that IDOT did update the manual to say the state is in attainment and a hot spot analysis is no longer needed but they left the language on what the conditions are that would require a hot spot analysis should the region ever need it or go back to being in non-attainment status again. A memo from IDOT was put out explaining the change.

9.0 Transportation Committee Update

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that he has been giving roughly quarterly updates to the transportation committee on Transportation Conformity and if anyone has any questions on this they can contact him.

10.0 AMPO Air Quality Working Group

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the group would be developing a white paper on CMAQ and one on how transportation conformity is done by various MPO's over the next year or so.

11.0 Other Business

None

12.0 Public Comment

None

13.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on call.

14.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:55pm.