

Tier 2 Consultation Meeting
Tuesday, April 22, 2003
Final Meeting Summary

Participants	
Vanessa Adams	USDOT/FTA
Patricia Berry	CATS
Steve Call	USDOT/FHWA
Don Kopec	CATS
Carl Mikyska	IDOT/OP&P (via speakerphone)
Patricia Morris	USEPA
Ross Patronsky	CATS
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Mike Rogers	IEPA
Gordon Smith	IDOT/OP&P (via speakerphone)
Mike Walczak	CATS
Kermit Wies	CATS

1. Approval of November 15 and December 19 meeting summaries
The third draft November 15 and fourth draft December 19 meeting summaries were approved.

2. Status of MOBILE6 Budgets

Mr. Rogers reviewed the background and timeline for use of the MOBILE6 budgets. The USEPA required states to commit to using MOBILE6 within either one year or within two years with the restriction that no conformity actions could occur during the second year unless MOBILE6 emissions and budgets were used. The IEPA committed to USEPA to update the budgets within two years, but also committed to the transportation community to update the budgets in a time which would allow the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan to proceed.

The IEPA developed draft 2005 and 2007 mobile source emissions budgets and held a public hearing on the proposed budgets on February 18, 2003. One comment from Patricia Morris of the USEPA was received. Ms. Morris' comment dealt with the level of the TCM commitment since the MOBILE6 model predicts lower emissions and lower emissions benefits. In response to this comment, the TCM benefit level was reduced from 5 tons per day (tpd) in 2005 and 6 tpd in 2007 to 4 tpd for both years. The final budgets submitted to USEPA on April 11, 2003 were:

	<u>VOC</u>	<u>NOx</u>
2005	151.11	
2007	127.42	280.40

Mr. Kopec said that he had heard that many areas are having to re-do their base year. Mr. Rogers responded that in many areas MOBILE6 is showing an increase in emissions as compared to the previous MOBILE5 budgets, especially for NOx. In those cases USEPA is allowing the area to re-establish its base year emissions to demonstrate the trend of emissions using MOBILE6 is still downward.

Ms. Morris said that the adequacy process has been started and posted to the USEPA Web site as under review. The comment period will close May 16.

Mr. Rogers said IEPA and USEPA were going to try to run the comment periods concurrently, but since their was a comment received that would likely change the budget, USEPA would wait until the submission of the budget before starting its comment period. Ms. Morris asked when the adequacy determination will be needed by CATS. Mr. Kopec said the comment period on the RTP and TIP conformity analysis will begin in August, with the schedule calling for the Work Program Committee to act on July 25. Ms. Morris said that the USEPA usually reviews and responds to any comments within thirty days of the close of the comment period. Once the adequacy determination is issued in the Federal Register it becomes effective 15 days later.

3. Status of the Eight-hour standard

USEPA extended the comment period for states to comment on the 8-hour standard from April 15 to July 15. In July 2000, IEPA proposed that the same area currently used for the 1-hour standard be used for the 8-hour standard. Implementation has been delayed due to lawsuits. A public meeting will be held to explain requirements and recommendations and take public comments. IEPA is currently evaluating Kankakee and DeKalb counties since, as of the 2000 Census, those two counties are considered a part of the Chicago Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area. These areas are rural in nature even though they're part of CMSA.

Mr. Kopec asked about potential PM areas in northeastern Illinois. Ms. Morris said the state recommendation on PMs will be in early 2004 and the designations will be later.

4. Analysis years for the conformity analysis of the 2030 RTP & the FY04-09 TIP
The consultation team established the analysis years as 2005, 2007, 2012, 2020 and 2030.

5. Concurrent review of the Plan, TIP and Conformity Analysis documentation

Ms. Berry and Mr. Wies reviewed the likely availability of documentation of the Plan, TIP and Conformity Analysis. The consultation team agreed to review and comment as early as possible in the process.

6. Fiscal constraint of the RTP

Mr. Wies distributed the draft of the “meeting the fiscal constraint” portion of the RTP. He noted that projects under consideration are currently out for review. The timing of re-authorization of the federal transportation programs makes it difficult for project implementers to take projects out of the Plan. The portion of the Plan dealing with fiscal constraint includes a review of how it was addressed in the past and a review of how it will be addressed in the 2030 RTP.

The proposal suggests fiscally constraining categories of RTP projects rather than the projects themselves. This allows evaluation of alternatives to continue without precluding any one alternative by the fiscal cutoff. For example: the Eisenhower HOV lane, Blue Line improvements and Bus Rapid Transit—are all three needed? Which one should happen first? The situation with the Northwest Corridor is similar. Other proposals might be desirable, but insufficient work has been done to adequately cost them out. This way the proposals can stay in view of the RTP while more work is done to refine the alternatives.

Ms. Adams asked if the Plan would identify the core part. Mr. Wies said yes. The categories give an indication of what stage or how quickly a project might be done. Pre-design engineering is usually more important to public involvement. For example, the mid-city transitway may be in the corridor category as we look at alternatives while an add lanes project, which doesn't usually generate a lot of alternatives, would be in the system category.

Mr. Wies then reviewed the conformity placeholder approach. The RTP Committee will come up with representative projects to reflect air quality benefits, but the RTP would not necessarily imply that the placeholders have priority just because they were conformed.

Ms. Adams asked what would happen if a project was ready to go forward, but was not one of the ones conformed. Ms. Morris said we would have to go back and verify that the air quality impacts are comparable. Mr. Call asked about NEPA requirements. Mr. Wies said that as long as the entire corridor is conformed, approval on a part of it may be requested.

Ms. Morris said she needed some time to think about this approach. Mr. Call agreed. He understands the direction the RTP committee would like to take, but wants to assure himself that it's allowable. Mr. Wies reiterated that this was the same approach taken in the last conformity for the EJ&E and SRAs. Mr. Pitstick said that RTA staff has been discussing with Mr. Wies how to bundle projects and believes it to be an appropriate approach. For example, in Oak Park, how can you specify a mode in the Plan when you haven't done an alternatives analysis? He noted that the SRT last time accommodated the Metra extensions without specifying them. Mr. Wies said projects should be in a corridor recommendation, with fiscally constrained categories, unless an LPA exists.

Ms. Morris asked about categories that constitute less than the full costs of the projects. Mr. Wies said there are a set of projects that take less time to implement, these still need to be in the Plan, but as we're pulling the Plan together we're asking for 30 years worth of projects and some of those will only take a few years to do. The Plan should recognize these "faster" projects. Mr. Wies said these didn't necessarily have to go ahead right away but it's a way of recognizing that there's an opportunity to make subsequent decisions about whether these smaller projects are necessary in subsequent updates.

Ms. Morris asked how we could say the Plan is conformed beyond the first fourteen to fifteen years. Mr. Wies said that representative placeholders will be selected to represent the Plan recommendations attainable within the fiscal constraint.

Mr. Pitstick asked if TEA-3 priorities would be in the program or in Plan categories. Mr. Wies said that it depends on whether the project can be completed in a shorter or longer period.

The consultation team members promised to contact CATS within the next week if they determine that the proposed approach is not appropriate under federal regulation.

In the subsequent weeks, Mr. Call spoke with Mr. Wies. After discussion among themselves, and considering the interest and encouragement of both members and citizens at the RTP meeting where this approach was introduced, Mr. Call felt that it would be "o.k." to use this approach.

7. Meeting with LADCO staff

IEPA, CATS and NIRPC staff met on April 11 with staff from the Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium to discuss MOBILE6 issues. Mark Jansen of LADCO was updated with information on what CATS and IEPA have used in the MOBILE6 model. IEPA worked with Kermit Wies and Dean Englund to be sure things are consistent. Examples given, included going from eight to twenty-eight vehicle types and the hot vs. cold start situation.

8. Other business

TCMs were discussed. Ms. Morris said that MOBILE6 comes up with lower benefits. Mr. Rogers said that IEPA has concluded that we should reduce our dependence on TCMs, but we still want to encourage the region to do TCMs. Right now we are claiming 4 tons per day (tpd), if we implement projects equaling 5 tpd, the extra ton could be used for conformity if we need it. Since TCM has a specific SIP-related meaning Mr. Kopec asked if we could call the reductions something else. We have something accepted from the conformity side. Ms. Morris said we need a review period and a letter saying it's acceptable. Mr. Kopec said that the TCM report tracks projects that have been implemented, not what might be in the SIP. We take credit for a category not for individual

projects. We claimed 4 tpd through 99 and have achieved 4.1 or 4.2 tpd. We want to continue the quantification. Mr. Kopec said that Dan Rice is tracking benefits. Another issue is projects in the TIP that are TCM eligible--staff can capture some benefit and use it as an off-network credit. Northeastern Illinois may not need them in the SIP, but CATS should still track them and submit them to IEPA & USEPA for acceptance. Projects captured that aren't in the models could be subtracted from the model results. Mr. Kopec said the projects will be cumulative until captured in the model.

Ms. Adams said she had not been able to touch base with Mr. Call and asked about the status of the emissions testing issue and whether it has been resolved. Ms. Morris said that USEPA & IEPA have been assured that it will get funding but the source has not yet been identified. Mr. Rogers said that June 30 is the end of the fiscal year and the funding issue should definitely be resolved by then. USEPA wrote a letter to the Governor on this topic. Ms. Adams asked what happens if the State does not meet the deadline. Mr. Kopec said there would be serious ramifications. Mr. Call said that USDOT and IDOT are investigating whether there may be some way to use CMAQ funds for construction costs.

On another subject, Ms. Adams said the City of Chicago made a request to re-obligate \$10 million in CMAQ funds. Ms. Adams directed CDOT to go through the CATS process. Mr. Patronsky said CATS has not heard from CDOT on this.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting was left on call.