



**Tier II Consultation Meeting**  
**MINUTES – August 21, 2014**

**Participants:**

Michelle Allen	FHWA IN Division – via phone
Ron Bales	INDOT Environmental Services – via phone
Patricia Berry	CMAP
Michael Connelly	CTA – via phone
Kama Dobbs	CMAP
John Donovan	FHWA
Jim Earl	INDOT – via phone
Tony Greep	FTA
Larry Heil	FHWA IN Division – via phone
Laura Hilden	INDOT – via phone
Greg Katter	INDOT – via phone
Michael Leslie	USEPA
Alice Lovegrove	Parsons Brinkerhoff – via phone
Kathy Luther	NIRPC – via phone
Tony Maietta	USEPA
Holly Ostdick	CMAP
Russell Pietrowiak	CMAP
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Julie Ritzler	INDOT – via phone
Mike Rogers	IEPA
Ken Runkle	IDOT BD&E – via phone
Chris Schmidt	IDOT OP&P – via phone
Lisa Shrader	INDOT – via phone
Ron Shimizu	Parsons Brinkerhoff
Scott Weber	NIRPC – via phone
Kermit Wies	CMAP
Andrew Williams-Clark	CMAP

**1.0 Call to Order and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 11:01 a.m. All participants introduced themselves.

**2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

None.

### **3.0 Approval of Minutes – May 15, 2014**

On a motion by Mr. Leslie, seconded by Mr. Rogers the minutes were approved as presented.

### **4.0 Illiana Expressway PM<sub>2.5</sub> Hot Spot Analysis**

Mr. Shimizu highlighted changes to the Air Quality Technical Report, including minor changes to web links, documentation of the actions taken by both MPOs, and changes to the analysis. The changes addressed adjustments to the segments analyzed based on the determination of a preferred alternative. The initial analysis included a full interchange at IL 53. In the preferred alternative, this proposed interchange is located at Riley Rd., which is approximately three-quarters of a mile east of IL 53. This shift resulted in lower traffic volumes at the interchange. Since the initial analysis, the widening of I-65 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from SR 2 to US 231 was amended into NIRPC's fiscally constrained long range transportation plan. The inclusion of 6 lanes on I-65 resulted in nearly identical traffic projections in the area of the interchange of the Illiana and I-65. Mr. Rogers has identified some minor language changes that need to be made and those will be provided. Ms. Berry called for concurrence on the analysis and results of the Hot Spot Analysis from the CMAP Tier II Consultation Team, which was provided. Mr. Weber called for concurrence from the NIRPC Interagency Consultation Group, which was provided.

### **5.0 GO TO 2040 Update and Development of FFY 2014-2019 TIP**

Mr. Williams-Clark reported that, as previously discussed, the public comment period for the plan update and proposed TIP was held from June 13 to August 1. Eleven public meetings were held throughout the region generally based on Council of Mayors areas. Attendance ranged from 10 to 40 people, which is fairly good, given the relatively minor nature of the updates. Comments were also accepted via an online form and emails to CMAP staff. In total, over one thousand comments were received and staff is currently completing a summary. The largest volume was form letters addressing two topics: opposition to the inclusion of the Illiana Corridor project in the fiscally constrained plan and requests to include the CrossRail Chicago project as an illustrative project in the plan. The remaining comments were on a variety of topics. As a result of the comments, modest revisions to the document's text will be made. The approval process calls for action by the Transportation Committee, the Regional Coordinating Committee, the CMAP Board and the MPO Policy Committee. The MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board are scheduled to meet jointly in October.

There followed discussion on some of the federal certification recommendations. Informal meetings between FHWA, FTA and CMAP staff have already occurred.

- CMAP staff is continuing to work with IDOT staff to obtain the Governor's sign off on the revised boundary, adopted by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee in March of 2013.

- No changes to the Plan are expected on the definition of regionally significant projects related to FTA New Starts and Small Starts given project implementation schedules and the possibility of further evolution/interpretation of rules.
- IDOT and FHWA continue to work with CMAP on appropriate means to ensure the fiscal integrity of the TIP given the extensive use of Advance Construction.
- A project in CMAP's 2015 work plan should result in a better understanding of the local programming process and the opportunities for involvement in local agencies' program development.
- RTA, CMAP and FTA staff are working to update the language in the proposed TIP to outline the suballocation processes for 5307 funds between states and within Illinois.
- CMAP is working with the FTA to investigate options on how projects with unexpended FTA funds for CMAQ projects can be identified. Any such funds will be included with other funds and programmed by the region.
- The language on environmental justice has been revised to clarify the analyses of the effects of the Plan and TIP on underserved and sensitive populations that was completed. A project in CMAP's 2015 work plan is a regional equity analysis and it is expected that it will be a significant part of the development of the next long range plan.
- The draft ITS architecture is on schedule for consideration by the MPO Policy Committee in January of 2015.

Mr. Donovan and Mr. Greep indicated a general level of comfort with the approach to addressing these certification findings. Mr. Pitstick reported that in response to a finding regarding having up-to-date agreements within two years of federal re-authorization, the RTA is drafting updated agreements.

#### **6.0 State Implementation Plan Update**

Mr. Leslie reported that USEPA received one adverse comment on the proposed revisions to the SIP. A response is being reviewed by the office of the General Counsel and concurrence on the response is expected this week. An additional week is needed for the rest of the necessary sign-offs. The SIP revisions are likely to be approved by the second week of September.

#### **7.0 MOVES2014**

Mr. Leslie reported that USEPA has released a new emissions model. Upon notice in the Federal Register there will be a grace period of up to two years for converting to using MOVES2014 for SIPs and conformity. Mr. Rogers added that IEPA has no SIP requirements within the grace period.

#### **8.0 Tracking Projects of Air Quality Concern (PAQC)**

Ms. Berry noted that the PAQC table was included and asked participants to provide updates and early notice of projects being considered for inclusion in the table.

## **9.0 MAP-21**

### **9.1 Revised Interim Guidance on CMAQ Operating Assistance**

Ms. Berry noted that Interim Guidance was included in the agenda packet.

### **9.2 Notices of Proposed Rule-Making**

Mr. Donovan stated that a notice was issued to clarify the requirement for 25% of CMAQ funds to be spent on projects that reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The rule proposes that the requirement be based on a prorated portion of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> non-attainment area population vs. the Ozone non-attainment area population. For the CMAP region, the populations are identical; however in areas where the ozone population is greater than the PM<sub>2.5</sub> population, the 25% rule applies to the prorated amount of PM<sub>2.5</sub> population. In response to a question from Mr. Rogers, Mr. Donovan stated that the rule has no effect on the allocation of funds to the states, just what portion of that funding has to be spent to reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions. Mr. Rogers asked if an area was only designated for PM<sub>2.5</sub> non-attainment, would that area receive a CMAQ allocation. Mr. Donovan and Mr. Leslie stated that they don't believe so and that allocations are still based on 2009 allocations. Mr. Rogers also asked if the 25% requirement applies to states or non-attainment areas and stated that the East St. Louis area has stated that they are not planning any PM<sub>2.5</sub> reduction projects because CMAP spends enough to cover the requirement for the state. Mr. Donovan confirmed that the requirement is by state and stated that FHWA needs to work with IDOT and East St. Louis to encourage direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions reduction projects there. Mr. Pitstick stated that a NPRM for Metropolitan Planning was also issued and asked if CMAP would be making or encouraging comments. Ms. Berry stated that CMAP staff analysis of the rule revealed no major concerns. Mr. Donovan noted that 11 comments have been received to date, compared to over 10,000 on the rule related to safety performance measures. In response to a question from Mr. Greep, Mr. Donovan added that he is not sure if any of the comments will be considered adverse and that most seem to be about having transit providers represented on MPO Boards, which is already the practice at CMAP. Mr. Pitstick added that performance measures, CMAQ scoring, and project selection, which will be discussed at the CMAQ Project Selection Committee in the afternoon, may be relevant to the proposed rule.

## **10.0 Other Business**

None.

## **11.0 Public Comment**

None.

## **12.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting was left on call.

### 13.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

#### **Tier II Consultation Team Members:**

	CMAP		FHWA		FTA		IDOT
	IEPA		RTA		USEPA		