

Tier 2 Consultation Meeting
Friday, November 3, 2000
Immediately following the CMAQ meeting—approximately 11:30 AM
CATS Southeastern (Sun) Conference Room
Meeting Summary (final)

Participants

Vanessa Adams-Donald	FTA
Patricia Berry	CATS
Linda Bolte	CATS
Steve Call	FHWA
Dean B. Englund	CATS
Don Kopec	CATS
Patricia Morris	USEPA
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Mike Rogers	IEPA
Eugene Ryan	CATS
Susan Stitt	IDOT

1. Approval of October 4, 2000 meeting summary

The meeting summary was approved.

2. Attainment Demonstration SIP

Mr. Rogers said that the subject SIP demonstrates attainment of the one-hour standard. It includes rate of progress budgets for 2002 and 2005. He distributed a USEPA memo form November 1999 regarding guidance on motor vehicle emissions budgets in one-hour ozone attainment demonstrations. Mr. Rogers announced that the public hearing on the attainment demonstration SIP would be held on November 8. Only VOC budgets for 2002 and 2005 are included because of the NO_x waiver. To be addressed in this SIP are what will be required to meet those 2002 and 2005 budgets and a commitment by IEPA to use MOBILE6.

Ms. Adams-Donald said it was her understanding that there is not much difference between MOBILE5 and MOBILE6. Mr. Rogers said the emissions output won't change but the ins and outs will change.

Mr. Englund encouraged USEPA to provide a beta copy of MOBILE6 to the MPOs so that we can find out how those pluses and minuses will effect us. Ms. Morris concurred and said that the distribution of the beta version is planned.

Ms. Morris said that one of the conditions of an adequacy finding on this SIP is the inclusion of 2002 and 2005 budgets. USEPA is glad that IEPA is announcing its commitment to use MOBILE6 at the public hearing because, that, too is a requirement for the adequacy finding. As to how the ROP budgets will affect CATS' schedule, the submission of the attainment demonstration SIP will start an eighteen-month clock.

Unlike the 2007 budget, the 2002 and 2005 numbers are not revisions, but brand new budgets. CATS does not plan to do a full conformity analysis for three years.

Mr. Ryan asked what commitment IEPA is proposing for implementation of MOBILE6. Mr. Rogers explained the two options currently available: either commit to using MOBILE6 within one year or commit to using it the second year it is available. The catch is that if the commitment is for two years, no conformity determination may be made during the second year unless MOBILE6 is used. There may be other options offered before MOBILE6 is released and IEPA wants to retain the ability to choose other options if they are offered, so, IEPA is committing to a third option: in the attainment demonstration, the IEPA commits to issuing revised budgets using MOBILE6 within the constraints included in the federal register release of MOBILE6. The effects on the attainment demonstration will need to be considered in choosing a course of action.

Mr. Englund asked if CATS would be able to use MOBILE5 to meet the budgets included in the December submittal. Mr. Ryan said we need to deal with the budgets and to deal with MOBILE6—they are two separate issues. Mr. Rogers repeated his description of the third option above.

Mr. Ryan stated that when the MOBILE6 budgets are deemed adequate then they must be used for conformity and in the mean time MOBILE5 should be used. Mr. Kopec expressed concern about the region being ready to do conformity between years one and two and being locked out. Mr. Ryan said IEPA should commit to using MOBILE6 within one year of its release because CATS may need to do a conformity. Mr. Rogers said that IEPA does not want to lock itself in to a commitment to use MOBILE6 the first year it is released because if for unanticipated reasons it took IEPA longer than twelve months, the region would be in a bad position. Mr. Rogers stressed that although the IEPA intended to commit to revising the budgets within two years, it is aware of CATS' possible need to conduct a conformity determination during the second year. Therefore, the IEPA intends to act expeditiously to establish the revised budgets.

Discussion then turned to the specifics of the budgets being submitted. The 2002 and 2005 VOC budgets using MOBILE5 will be 212.10 tpd for 2002 and 196.4 tpd for 2005. In 2005 the tier II program will be in place (not to be confused with the tier II consultation process). The tier II program will be phased in beginning in 2004. Again, it does not include NOx budgets because of the waiver.

Mr. Ryan asked what USEPA wants to see from CATS to demonstrate conformity to the 2002 and 2005 budgets. What level of rigorousness is needed? Is interpolation an acceptable methodology? Ms. Morris responded that interpolation is acceptable. Mr. Ryan indicated that CATS' proposed course of action would be to write up the results of the interpolation exercise and release it for public comment. Ms. Morris said that generally conformity determinations include a horizon year of at least 20 years out, but for conformity purposes, USEPA is flexible and as long as not having the 20 year horizon does not violate the planning rules, they are comfortable with the proposed course of

action. Mr. Call said he would follow up, but was fairly certain the proposed course of action is acceptable from a planning standpoint.

Mr. Ryan reviewed alternatives for where in the conformity process the interpolation would take place. He mentioned that no benefits of the tier II reductions are included in the published numbers for 2007. If the conformity determination on the 2002 and 2005 budgets can be made without including those reductions, that's what CATS will do. Of course, CATS will wait for USEPA's adequacy finding before proceeding.

Discussion then turned to the 2007 budget. Mr. Rogers said that given that there is no way to deal with tier II in MOBILE5, IEPA relied on USEPA information sheet #18. The budgets for 2007 are 152.91 tpd for VOC and 293.92 tpd for NOx. Mr. Rogers asked how the 2007 budget would be addressed in the conformity determination. Mr. Ryan said that since 2007 is not a new budget, but rather a revision, we would not provide analysis to meet the new budget until the next full conformity cycle. Ms. Morris said she would check with headquarters to be sure that a simple demonstration for the 2002 and 2005 budgets would turn off the 18-month clock started by the submission of the attainment demonstration SIP. Mr. Ryan concluded the discussion, noting that it is important to keep the Work Program Committee informed on this issue.

3. Other Business

No other business was brought before the consultation team.

4. Next Meeting

Mr. Rogers suggested waiting to see what kind of comments IEPA receives during the public hearing before scheduling the next meeting.