

Tier 2 Consultation Meeting

Friday, November 15, 2002 10:00 AM
CATS Cunningham-Williams Conference Room
Final Meeting Summary

Participants	
Vanessa Adams	USDOT/FTA
Patricia Berry	CATS
Randy Blankenhorn	IDOT/OP&P
Steve Call	USDOT/FHWA
Dean B. Englund	CATS
Don Kopec	CATS
Carl Mikyska	IDOT/OP&P
Patricia Morris	USEPA
Ross Patronsky	CATS
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Mike Rogers	IEPA
Gordon Smith	IDOT/OP&P
Kermit Wies	CATS

1. Approval of May 2, June 5, and August 2 2002 meeting summaries

Minutes for all three meetings were approved.

2. MOBILE6 Budgets Timetable

Mr. Englund informed the group that he has been working with Mr. Long of IEPA on developing budgets using MOBILE6.2. Facility type break down has been made available to IEPA. In this release, VOC and NOx emission rates are unaffected, but estimates of toxic emissions rates have been modified. Many parameters remain the same but output options changed.

He reiterated that the air quality budgets are based on programs, whereas conformity evaluations are based on projects. The budget development and conformity processes follow vastly different paths. The conformity analysis is the last step and it can't take four months—it is important to have robust procedures in place. Mr. Englund noted that he has been spending time on setting up those procedures.

Cold start will not be tracked separately. The only way to do that would be with a massive database management effort. Ms. Morris asked about the age distribution. Mr. Englund said that would be introduced incrementally, so in some runs the answer would be yes, it has been done. Although they haven't been used in all of the runs to date, ultimately the most current (2001) age distribution will be used for budget setting and the next conformity analysis. Mr. Long and Mr. Englund are striving for consistency. Initial test runs with the

inputs/settings used for MOBILE5b on the 2007 network show VOC and NOx 5% to 15% higher under MOBILE6.

MOBILE6 estimates bus emissions, so that will no longer be done off-model. Good, reasonable information is available on transit buses, but not on school buses.

Mr. Rogers said that he has not heard of a need for a conformity determination before the 2030 plan. He said that Mr. Blankenhorn had discussed the January 29, 2003 implications with the Policy Committee at its October 31 meeting and none of the implementers has indicated a need. IEPA would still like to move forward as quickly as possible. If a meeting of the minds regarding procedures and estimates can occur in December, then IEPA could move forward with a 30 day public comment period in January or February. The final package could then be submitted in February or March, with USEPA's adequacy determination in April or May.

Ms. Morris expressed concern that Mr. Englund is coming up with 5-15% higher output, but she hasn't heard the same about the budgets. She said she is anxious to see IEPA's draft numbers.

3. FY 2004 CMAQ Program

Ms. Berry pointed out that FY 2004 CMAQ projects requiring a conformity analysis (i.e., signal interconnects) will be included in the FY 2004-2009 TIP even though they will not be part of the conformity analysis. This is because the CMAQ and TIP approvals will be sought simultaneously. Mr. Call thought it would be acceptable to include signal interconnects in the TIP on the assurance that they would be included in the next conformity analysis.

4. Definition of no-build network

Mr. Wies said that the RTP scenarios are under development and staff will be testing benefits of the various scenarios. He reviewed various definitions of no-build with the most conservative being what's already in place. The RTP Committee has agreed to the definition included in the agenda. Mr. Rogers asked whether all projects in the no-build scenario must be conformed. Mr. Wies replied that they did not because the conformity test does not require a no-build or baseline comparison. All committed projects appearing in the no-build network are included in subsequent networks that are subjected to the budget test.

Mr. Pitstick said he would find out why the Brown Line project is not included in the no-build scenario. He thought it might be because the project does not have a full-funding agreement yet, and that this was part of the definition of projects to include. Mr. Blankenhorn said he would be uncomfortable if it was not included. Ms. Adams said CTA and FTA are in the process of doing it but it's been delayed because of funding. It's in final design.

Mr. Wies noted that the definition can be revisited by the RTP Committee, and there is no conformity implications of the no-build definition since CATS is meeting budgets and not testing against a no-build network. Mr. Blankenhorn and Mr. Pitstick agreed that the definition should be revisited by the RTP committee.

5. In the event of an RTP conformity lapse

Mr. Call noted that the key point is that the conformity finding will lapse next November, in which case only exempt projects can proceed. Expiration of the Plan in and of itself does not result in specific consequences.

6. Other Business

Ms. Berry noted that the consultation process had been complimented in the certification review and congratulated the team on its work and recognition. Mr. Call noted that Harvard has recently updated an analysis of the conformity process they had done six or seven years ago and reported complimentary things about the process.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on call.