



**Tier II Consultation Meeting
DRAFT Minutes – February 22, 2019**

Committee Members

John Donovan	FHWA
Michael Leslie	EPA
Tony Greep	FTA
Mark Pitstick	RTA
Chris Schmidt	IDOT
Buzz Asselmeier	IEPA – via phone
Russell Pietrowiak	CMAP

Participants

Leroy Kos	CMAP
Teri Dixon	CMAP
Kama Dobbs	CMAP
Liz Schuh	CMAP
Claire Bozic	CMAP
Mark Janssen	LADCO

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. All participants introduced themselves.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes –October 25, 2018

On a motion by Mr. Schmidt and seconded by Mr. Leslie, the minutes of the October 25, 2018 meeting were approved as presented.

4.0 ON TO 2050 Plan Amendment Process

Ms. Schuh discussed CMAP plan amendment process detailed in the memo included in the meeting packet ([ON TO 2050 Plan Amendment Process](#)) with the committee. It was stated that the process being discussed had yet to be presented to the transportation committee and MPO thus it's possible it could change from what is being presented today. Ms. Schuh stated the each project going through the plan amendment process has both a qualitative and quantitative analysis done by CMAP staff. Expressway and transit projects need to be submitted for consideration 6 months prior to when the CMAP board and MPO Policy

Committee action is being requested. Arterial projects will have an annual process in which every October 1st proposed arterial plan amendments can be submitted with a March MPO Policy Committee meeting targeted for consideration of the proposed amendment. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the travel demand modeling and conformity analysis for a plan amendment typically takes about a minimum of 3 weeks depending on the information that the sponsor has provided. Ms. Schuh stated that the 2 RSP plan amendments put forth by the city of Chicago do not follow this process because the process was not yet in place but the process in the memo will be used for future proposed plan amendments.

5.0 Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity Analysis

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Amendment Conformity analysis and the ON TO 2050 Regionally Significant Project (RSP) Amendments process occurred at the same time which made it more challenging to conduct the conformity analysis. Mr. Pietrowiak informed the committee that the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 TIP Conformity Analysis had gone through a public comment period in which there were no public comments received. Mr. Pietrowiak also noted that the language of the conformity memo had been updated as a result of comments received the last time conformity analysis was conducted. Specifically he stated that language was updated to better reflect when a project was being removed from the TIP and no longer subject to conformity. Mr. Pietrowiak also stated that the analysis showed that the region was under its Motor Vehicle Emissions budget (MVEB) and thus the TIP and ON TO 2050 were both conforming. There were no questions from those in attendance.

6.0 ON TO 2050 Regionally Significant Project (RSP) Amendments

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that he spoke with both FTA (Tony Greep) and FHWA (John Donovan) to discuss how to conduct conformity for the 2 proposed RSP's. He stated that the issue was does CMAP need to conduct conformity both with and without the proposed changes discussed in item 5. He stated that technically conformity for the RSP's should be done with both in the unlikely event that the Semi-annual ON TO 2050 Conformity amendment isn't approved by the MPO Policy committee. However, he stated that the memo has never not been approved so in consultation with FTA and FHWA the decision was made to first do the conformity analysis for the TIP amendments that were part of item #5 and then do the conformity analysis for then have the conformity analysis for the RSP's include the yet to be approved TIP amendments. Mr. Pietrowiak also stated that it was discussed with both FTA and FHWA whether conformity analysis had to be conducted individually for each proposed RSP or if they could be done together. He stated that the decision was that they could be done together as there was only a very slight change to one project (everything but the change had previously been conformed) while the other project was entirely new. In essence Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the way we viewed it is that while we were technically doing analysis of 2 proposed RSP's nearly all the change/new information was from only one of the RSP's. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that it would have taken at least 6 weeks to do all the analysis had they not used the aforementioned approach and since this was both during the holiday season when a lot of staff is off and subject to a public

comment period the time available to conduct the analysis was compressed. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the analysis showed the region was under its MVEB and thus the TIP and ON TO 2050 were both conforming. Mr. Donovan stated that one of the RSP's, the O'Hare Express while stated by the sponsors as zero emissions is not a zero emissions project as some people need to drive to the drive to the location to use the service. Mr. Donovan also noted that there was a similar project in Baltimore that went through general conformity not transportation conformity. He noted that CMAP kept to its process and used good planning and modeling assumptions in its analysis. Mr. Pietrowiak noted that staff was not asking for the Tier II committee to approve the RSP's but wanted to explain the process used and answer any questions related to the process. There were no questions from those in attendance.

7.0 2008 OZONE NAAQS Nonattainment Reclassification Status Updates

Mr. Pietrowiak stated that an attempt had been made to have a monthly call regarding this subject with CMAP, IEPA, and US EPA but due to the US EPA employees being furloughed that did not happen. IEPA was asked to provide an update. Mr. Asselmeier stated that they expected to be bumped up to serious nonattainment for the 2008 standard in spring and that determining budgets would be the next thing that needs to be done. Mr. Asselmeier stated that 9% reductions in NOx and VOC's would be needed. He also stated that the region does have some room in the budget via the safety margin but that things are getting tighter and it may be harder to find the necessary reductions. Mr. Asselmeier also stated that LADCO would be doing an attainment demonstration so we will have to wait and see how that turns out. Mr. Janssen stated that LADCO received some information from IEPA. Mr. Pietrowiak noted that LADCO and CMAP use different base years, 2016 and 2015 respectively. Mr. Janssen also stated that CMAP and LADCO use different geographic scales too. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that CMAP would work with LADCO on data sharing and on any other differences, such as geography. Mr. Leslie stated that the budgets will be part of the SIP revision. Mr. Leslie also stated that he expected the region to be "bumped up" in late spring. Mr. Leslie stated that the region would likely be reclassified as attainment/unclassifiable for PM 2.5 in October. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that CMAP would continue to model PM 2.5 as this doesn't take much extra effort.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

8.0 Conformity Modeling

Mr. Pietrowiak discussed changes in the vehicle population data, specifically that there were significant drops in the vehicles and large changes in the types of vehicles. He stated that when they did the conformity analysis they did 2025 twice once with the old and once with the new vehicle data and in both instance CMAP was under the MVEB. Ms. Bozic also noted that the vehicle age distribution had also change a lot and that they compared the number of vehicle registrations by county to data the Illinois secretary of state published to look for changes in the data. Mr. Pietrowiak also stated that there could have been changes in the way the data is processed or gathered by the IL. Secretary of state.

Mr. Jannsen stated that LADCO has purchased this data from a commercial vendor but that it might not be any better. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the concern is we just don't know what the correct data is. Is one data set to high or to low? He also said truck data is another ongoing issue. It was decided that CMAP, LADCO, and IEPA should get together to discuss these issue further.

9.0 Ozone SIP development

Mr. Leslie stated the IEPA submitted what was needed and that there would likely be a notice in March stating that they we no longer subject items that triggered the Findings of Failure To Submit State Implementation Plan Submittals for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) had been submitted and accepted by US EPA.

10.0 Transportation Committee Update

Mr. Pietrowiak discussed the presentation on conformity to the transportation committee that he recently gave. He stated that conformity and air quality were topics that the committee was interested in and that they have had a number of questions after each presentation.

11.0 AMPO Air Quality Working Group

Mr. Pietrowiak provided an update on what was discussed at the recent AMPO Air Quality working group. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that a substantial update to the MOVES model would be coming out in late 2019 or in 2020 which everyone would need to use. Mr. Pietrowiak stated that the group would be developing 2-3 white papers over the next year or so.

12.0 Other Business

None

13.0 Public Comment

None

14.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on call.

15.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.