

**Chicago Area Transportation Study**  
**Tier 2 Consultation Meeting**  
**March 21, 2006**  
Final Meeting Summary

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Vanessa Adams	FTA
Bill Brown (via phone)	NIRPC
Ken Dallmeyer (via phone)	NIRPC
Chris DiPalma	FHWA
Doug Ferguson	CATS
Jack Groner	Metra
Michael Leslie	USEPA
Ross Patronsky	CATS
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Mike Rogers (via phone)	IEPA
David Simmons	CTA
Gordon Smith	IDOT
Kermit Wies	CATS

**1. Approval of the January 3, 2006 meeting summary**

The second draft January meeting summary was approved.

**2. TIP Changes**

Mr. Wies said the long-range plan will see little effect as a result of the transportation package proposed by the Governor.

Mr. Smith said he would get a list of projects in the proposal. He and Mr. Simmons confirmed that the transit funding in the package is for vehicle replacement; match for new starts is not included.

Mr. Wies said that the impact on the TIP would be on the completion year of projects receiving funding. Completion year changes can be addressed in the transportation model if they are known by about June.

Mr. DiPalma said that if there is a major project that comes in later, it could be held until the TIP and plan are approved in October and then amended in. Mr. Wies said that this could be done, but would require an explanation as to why CATS is waiting to put such a project in the TIP.

Mr. DiPalma suggested going to the Work Program Committee again to request any last-minute major projects that are being advanced in the new infrastructure program. Mr. Groner said that he did not know of any non-exempt projects in the wings.

**3. Fiscal Constraint in the 2030 RTP Update**

Mr. Wies distributed a document listing the proposed criteria for selecting and identifying RTP projects to include in the conformity modeling. Most improvements to

the existing system are included. New corridors that are at a stage of implementation that might need federal approval before 2010 will be included subject to fiscal constraint.

The 2030 RTP Update will also indicate which projects are conformed and assumptions regarding their fiscal status.

#### **4. PM<sub>2.5</sub> Hot-Spot Analysis**

Mr. DiPalma distributed a memorandum he had written concerning the recently-released hot-spot regulations. He and Mr. Leslie agreed that the MPO is best-qualified to identify projects in the TIP that may require hot-spot analysis.

Mr. Patronsky agreed to send out a list of work types from the TIP, including the number of projects showing each type.

Mr. Leslie indicated that monitors are used similar to those for CO for identifying projects that require PM<sub>2.5</sub> hot-spot analysis.

#### **5. Other Business**

No other business was brought to the consultation team.

#### **6. Next Meeting**

The next meeting was left on call.