

Tier 2 Consultation Meeting  
Thursday, August 9, 2001  
Approved Meeting Summary

Participants

Vanessa Adams-Donald	FTA
Patricia Berry	CATS
Randy Blankenhorn	IDOT
Linda Bolte	CATS
Steve Call	FHWA
Penny DuBernat	CATS
Dean Englund	CATS
Tim Golemo	IDOT
Don Kopec	CATS
Patricia Morris	USEPA
Kevin O'Malley	RTA
Tom Palzer	CATS
Mike Rogers	IEPA
David C. Seglin	CDOT
Susan Stitt	IDOT
Mark Thomas	CATS
Kermit Wies	CATS

1. Approval of November 3, 2000 and January 31, 2001 meeting summaries

Ms. Morris and Mr. Rogers asked that the consultation team further discuss the 2007 budget in the attainment demonstration SIP. Ms. Morris said that CATS needs to address the 2007 budget somewhere in the documentation that will be developed to get a conformity determination for the 2002 and 2005 budgets. Mr. Englund said CATS can calculate a new pollutant burden for 2007 without running an analysis. Ms. Morris said that was acceptable, adding that the documentation should acknowledge that the 2007 budget is there and that the Plan and TIP will meet the budgets. CATS should also present 2015 and 2020. Mr. Englund said CATS can do that. Mr. Englund asked if NO<sub>x</sub> numbers for 2007 and 2015 should be included. Mr. Rogers replied affirmatively.

The November 3 and January 31 meeting summaries were then approved with minor modifications. The final meeting summaries are attached.

2. FY 02 CMAQ program, FY 02-06 TIP, and supplemental conformity.

Ms. Berry noted that review by the IEPA, USEPA and USDOT has been taking place concurrently with the development of the programs and the conformity supplement. She said that discussions occurred at the last TIP Procedures Committee on how much and what type of documentation on how the region is addressing environmental justice should be included in the proposed FY 02-06 TIP.

Ms. DuBernat has been working with the implementers to develop summaries to be included in Chapter 4 of the TIP. The Chapter currently includes a summary of the region's efforts and a reference to the *Environmental Justice Planning Process for the 2000 Edition of the 2020 RTP* document under the heading responses to TEA-21. Mr. Call recommended including more documentation of implementer and regional responses. Since public outreach is a big part of the environmental justice effort, he recommended further documenting the public outreach that has been going on.

Ms. Berry said that CATS is hoping to include maps of the TIP projects in the TIP update. The TIP Procedures Committee discussed overlaying those maps on the maps from the environmental justice documentation. Mr. Call said that he had brought up the possibility of doing overlays but that it is not a requirement. Especially in light of the upcoming certification review, Mr. Call stressed the importance of documenting the new things that CATS has been doing. Since the ability to map the projects is there, why not do the overlays?

Mr. Seglin noted that many non-regionally significant City projects are not included in the TIP. Mr. Blankenhorn questioned the value of providing such representation. He said the region has always opposed looking at a five year programming time slice as a method of determining equity. What would seem to result would be pitting one neighborhood against another. Ms. Adams-Donald said that was not the result she envisioned.

Mr. Blankenhorn also noted that no one has defined whether having a project in a particular neighborhood is a benefit or a dis-benefit. Ms. Adams-Donald said the overlay maps would simply be providing information. When people see the maps of the projects and the maps of the low-income and minority populations, they will do the mapping in their heads anyway, so why not show it?

Mr. Kopec said that developing and including the maps would be implying a direct relationship exists, and that CATS would be endorsing such analyses as a method to evaluate environmental justice of the plan and program. He noted that one of the prime environmental justice cases involved a rail line in Los Angeles that traversed a low-income, minority neighborhood. Simply mapping that project on top of socioeconomic data would have indicated a project benefiting low-income and minority populations.

Mr. Call said he was challenging CATS to do something to demonstrate equitable distribution of benefits. Mr. Kopec said that is just what the accessibility measures in the RTP demonstrate. Mr. Call agreed that the region is in good shape, but asked how CATS would go about demonstrating it in the TIP.

Ms. Adams-Donald repeated her request that CATS include the overlay maps and let people draw their own conclusions. Mr. Blankenhorn said we would have to show the whole system, not just the improvements and demonstrate how it impacts the citizens of the region. Ms. Adams-Donald asked that CATS tell the federal representatives what it plans to do in the documentation and they will react to it. She said the opinions being

expressed by her and Mr. Call are based on what they are hearing nation-wide. Mr. Blankenhorn said the region is demonstrating equity through accessibility measures.

This conformity neutral TIP update provides no new accessibility so the demonstration has already been documented. Ms. Bolte said that CATS is planning to include a summary discussion of what was done for the 2000 edition of the 2020 RTP and to include maps. Mr. Call reiterated that he is concerned with CATS showing progress since the last certification effort.

Mr. Blankenhorn said the region has defined equity as equitable access and that is what CATS has demonstrated. The appearance of a five year slice of projects may be inequitable. Mr. Seglin emphasized again that not all of the City's projects are included in the TIP.

Mr. Call said his experience with NIRPC had been that the maps had laid a lot of contentiousness to rest. Mr. Seglin said it seems that in northeastern Illinois, however, the maps may lead to misunderstanding.

Ms. Berry said CATS will continue its efforts to improve the documentation included in the TIP regarding public outreach efforts, implementers' efforts and environmental justice.

Ms. Bolte then described the public involvement activities planned for the release of the proposed CMAQ program, TIP and conformity supplement. A newsletter announcing the public comment period and products involved will be developed. The "hook" for the newsletter will be public health. CATS will hold the public meeting on the Policy Committee's meeting date and will ask some members to do presentations.

### 3. Development of the 2030 RTP

Ms. Bolte reviewed the proposed development schedule for the 2030 RTP. She noted that USDOT and IEPA have been at most of the RTP meetings, but not USEPA. The Plan will be out for public comment in the fall of 2003. The consultation team agreed that its practice of concurrent review would continue.

### 4. Status of MOBILE6

Ms. Morris began by stating that the model is not out yet. A 90 day period started in February when a version was released to state agencies. USEPA took comments and was planning to release it, but that hasn't happened yet. When it does, that will start the two year clock. USEPA will be offering a three day training class in September. It is anticipated that in October USEPA will approve IEPA's attainment demonstration SIP and its commitment to revise budgets using MOBILE 6.

A question has arisen about whether it is appropriate for USEPA to approve IEPA's proposal to change the ROP budgets. If IEPA revises the 2007 ROP budget in the attainment demonstration, will it have to go back and revise all ROP numbers? USEPA

is considering approving revising the 2007 budgets and asking Illinois to clarify that they are not committing to revising other ROP budgets.

Mr. Rogers said he is concerned that when CATS does its next analysis it may have to move from MOBILE5 to MOBILE6 depending on what year it is testing. If IEPA sticks with MOBILE5 for other ROP budgets, then CATS does its 2030 analysis we could be comparing MOBILE5 results with MOBILE6 results, which is a cause for alarm. Mr. Englund agreed that it would be a mistake to make such a comparison.

#### 5. Other Business

No other business was brought before the team.

#### 6. Next Meeting

The next meeting was left on call.