

Appendix D: Interagency Consultation

- Interagency Consultation Meeting Minutes
- Consensus Plan
- Conformity Process Schedule

Metrolina Region Transportation Conformity
Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO
Cabarrus Rowan MPO

2040 MTPs

TIP Conformity Planning Meeting

ACTION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS/NOTES

January 8, 2015

ATTENDEES

CDOT: Eldewins Haynes, Anna Gallup

NCDOT: Anil Paniker, Terry Arellano, Jamal Alavi, Heather Hildebrandt, Brian Wert, Reuben Crummy

CRTPO: Bob Cook

Cabarrus-Rowan MPO: Phil Conrad

Gaston MPO: Bjorn Hansen

RFATS:

Lake Norman RPO:

Rocky River RPO:

FHWA: Eddie Dancausse, Loretta Barren

FTA:

NCDAQ:

SCDHEC:

Kimley-Horn:

EPA:

SCDOT:

SCDEHC:

Mecklenburg Co. AQ:

NC Turnpike Authority:

Union Co.:

Court Ruling on the 1997 Ozone Standard

On December 23, 2014, the DC Circuit Court issued its decision in the litigation concerning EPA's revocation of the 1997 ozone NAAQS for transportation conformity purposes. The court ruled (2 to 1 decision) to vacate EPA's decision to revoke the transportation conformity requirements for the 1997 ozone standard.

Here's a link to the decision:

[http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/E97A64FFBFE4DC1D85257DB70054D5EE/\\$file/12-1321-1528834.pdf](http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/E97A64FFBFE4DC1D85257DB70054D5EE/$file/12-1321-1528834.pdf)

The Agency is currently evaluating the court's ruling and does not currently know how this will impact the 1997 ozone maintenance areas or what the next steps will be.

As soon as some guidance is issued on this FHWA (Dancausse) will work with the impacted MPO's to advise them on the best course of action.

Items Discussed

- DA and bonus allocation at the NCDOT Division level
 - There is a concern from CRTPO (Cook) and CR MPO (Conrad) related to the conformity schedule for the 16-22 TIP work and the timing of when the NCDOT Division will make the project selection for the DA and bonus allocation dollars at the NCDOT Division level. They think that there may be an issue where the NCDOT Division office will not complete their project selection process by the time the TRM modeling will begin and could result in delaying the current process resulting in another conformity process in the near future.
 - FHWA (Dancausse) suggested that a follow-up meeting with the NCDOT Division Office be held to go over the draft CPS and see how it coincides with their process.
- The one-on-one meetings between NCDOT project development and the Metrolina MPO's will take place in the near future and should not impact the TIP-MTP comparison work and the subsequent conformity process.
- The MRM modeling for the TIP amendments should take approximately 60 days. CDOT (Gallup or staff) will send out the mapping and project list to all the MPO's (like what was done for the maintenance SIP data collection effort) for the collection of the projects changes associated with the 12-18 TIP conformity process. This information will be sent out by 1/20/15
- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) will draft the conformity determination report and will coordinate the collection of information that will populate the appendices.
- FHWA (Barren) mentioned some concern on the timing of when the NCDOT Project Development Group would send their 16-22 STIP package for the FHWA approval and how that would line up with the 16-22 TIP conformity process. FHWA (Dancausse) suggested a meeting with that group once the CPS is updated and reviewed by the MPO's and NCDOT.
- CRTPO (Cook) mentioned that the northern part of Iredell County was going to become part of CRTPO in the near future and he wanted to see if there were going to be any planning and/or conformity implications associated with it. The northern part of Iredell County is attainment and there are little or no projects in that area. FHWA (Dancausse/Barren) mentioned that there were no planning or conformity issues that would impact this upcoming process

Conformity Process Schedule (CPS)

- FHWA (Dancausse) will revise the CPS based on the meeting discussion and will send out the draft CPS for feedback from the group

Consensus Plan (CP):

- FHWA (Dancausse) will send out the ".doc" version of the CP for feedback (additions/corrections/deletions) from the group

ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS

- As soon as some guidance is provided on the court decision related to the 1997 ozone standard FHWA (Dancausse) will work with the impacted MPO's to advise them on the best course of action.
- FHWA (Dancausse) will schedule a meeting with CRTPO (Cook), CR MPO (Conrad) and the NCDOT Division Office to go over the CPS and see how it coincides with NCDOT Division Office project selection process.
- CDOT (Gallup or staff) will send out the mapping and project list to all the MPO's (like what was done for the maintenance SIP data collection effort) for the collection of the projects changes associated with the 12-18 TIP conformity process. This information will be sent out by 1/20/15.
- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) will draft the conformity determination report and will coordinate the collection of the information that will be contained in the appendices.
- FHWA (Dancausse) will schedule a meeting with the NCDOT Project Development Branch to discuss the Metrolina Area CPS and how it coincides with the STIP Approval process.
- FHWA (Dancausse) will send out the revised CPS for the group to review
- FHWA (Dancausse) will send out the ".doc" version of the CP for feedback (additions/corrections/deletions) from the group

Comments on Cabarrus-Rowan MPO MTP Project List

	Project TIP or Project ID Number		FHWA Comment	EPA Comment	NCDAQ Comments	MPO/NCDOT Reply	Comment Addressed
	ID# 14			Project not in TIP		This project is complete now.	Agency Comments Addressed
	I- 2304		Will this project be completed by 12/31/2015?			Project will be completed by 12/31/15	Agency Comments Addressed
	U- 3459		This project is not in the TIP			U-3459 is a grade separation project under the High Speed Rail and is in the TIP.	Agency Comments Addressed
	I- 3802		Will this project be completed by 12/31/2025?			It is a new interstate pavement rehabilitation project. Project will be completed by 12/31/25	Update MTP with new TIP number
	I- 3803	B			Ensure project completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	Est completion date 3/1/15, ITS 10/16	Agency Comments Addressed
	I- 3804		This project is not in the TIP			I-3804 is a new interchange project that did not score high enough under STI to receive funding	Agency Comments Addressed
	U- 4910		Will this project be completed by 12/31/2025?			Project will be completed by 12/31/25	Agency Comments Addressed

W	5314		This project is not in the TIP			W-5314 is a safety project to improve an intersection and is in the TIP.	Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5541		This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		It is a new project for economic development purposes that will be constructed with state funds, shortly.	State funded project, not regionally significant no Federal approvals, Agency comments addressed
U-	5608		There is no mileage shown in the TIP	No mileage found		Mileage is 0.6 miles	Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5738		This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		It is in the MTP as index #32	Update MTP with new TIP number
I-	5741		This project is not in the MTP			It is a new project for economic development purposes that will be constructed with state funds, shortly.	Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5761		This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		U-5761 is a new STI intersection improvement project that will be constructed with state funds.	State funded project, not regionally significant no Federal approvals, Agency comments addressed
U-	5773		This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		U-5773 is in the MTP as index #39.	Update MTP with new TIP number

U-	5806	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		U-5806 is a new STI intersection improvement project that will be constructed with state funds.	update MTP to add project-amendment with out REA
U-	5820	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		U-5820 is a new STI project that will be constructed with state funds on a non-regionally significant road.	State funded project, not regionally significant no Federal approvals, Agency comments addressed

Comments on Charlotte Regional TPO MTP Project List

Project TIP or Project ID Number	FHWA Comment	EPA Comment	NCDAQ Comments	MPO/NC DOT Reply	Comment(s) Addressed
13		Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Also, location description mismatch between MTP and TIP			OK-Agency Comments Addressed
14	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. It is exempt 93.127	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
26	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP	Is project going from 2 to 4 or 3 to 4 lanes		Part of R-2307B	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
34	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
45	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
47		Appears to combine I-5717 and I-4720. Please clarify		Unclear about comment. MTP ID #47 and I-5717 correspond to the I-77/NC 150 interchange, whereas I-4720 is a pavement rehabilitation project on I-77 from I-277 to the SC state line.	?
50		Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Termini mismatch between TIP and MTP.		There is a mileage difference to be resolved (MTP 1.0; TIP 1.5), but the basic project is described adequately in both documents. MTP description is slightly more descriptive	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths

51			Is project going from 2 to 4 lanes or 3 to 4 lanes (MTP)		The existing cross-section varies from 2-3 lanes; the project will construct a 4-lane cross-section	?
71		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. NC 115, Washam Potts to NC 73 Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
76			Is project going from 3 to 4 lanes or 2 to 4 lanes (MTP)		Existing cross-section varies from 2-3 lanes	?
103		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. US 21, Harris to Gilead Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
107		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project being completed by Charlotte-Douglas Airport. Airport Entrance Road Project being completed by Charlotte-Douglas Airport	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
129		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			WT Harris, Reames to 485 Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
135		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is in TIP as I-5718E. I-277 (Brook Fwy)/I-77 Project is in TIP as I-5718E	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
136			No mileage in TIP. Please clarify the location description		Will request NCDOT to add mileage to TIP; project termini recently modified-MTP will be amended at time of TIP adoption	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths

138			Project length mismatch		MTP 17.0; TIP 16.6 Will work with NCDOT to establish uniform length for both documents	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
148			Mismatch between TIP and MTP		MTP 6.7; TIP 6.3 Will work with NCDOT to establish uniform length for both documents	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
151		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is part of U-2509. Krefeld Dr Ext, Krefeld Dr to Sardis Rd N Project is part of U-2509	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
161		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Proposed to receive bonus allocation funding; will be added to TIP if MPO and NCDOT agree to apply DA funding	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
165		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP	Mismatch between TIP and MTP		This is a newly funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
170		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. NC 49, I-77 to Yorkmont Not a funded project TIP# U-5772	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
173		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. NC 160, NC 49 to SC state line Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
175			Mismatch between TIP and MTP			CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
186		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is part of U-2509	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

	188	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is part of U-2509	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	189		Mismatch between TIP and MTP		MTP 6.7; TIP 6.3 Will work with NCDOT to establish uniform length for both documents	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
	193	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is part of U-2509. NE Pkwy, Overcash to Matthews Mint Hill Rd Project is part of U-2509	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	194		Mismatch between TIP and MTP		MTP 0.8; TIP 0.6 Will work with NCDOT to establish uniform length for both documents	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
	195	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is part of U-2509	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	196	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Project is part of U-2509	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	199		Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Segment B listed as 2 miles in MTP		ID #199 the A section of U-4714; MTP is correct with 1.2 mile project length (TIP does not provide project length for A section); MTP lists B section as 3.0 miles	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	209	Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?		Project listed as Under Construction in TIP but modeled in MTP in Horizon Year 2025. If project is currently under construction, will project be completed after 12/31/2015?	Yes	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths

	210	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Listed as U-5007	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	4913	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			MTP ID# 213 Proposed to receive bonus allocation funding; will be added to TIP if MPO and NCDOT agree to apply DA (STP-DA) funding	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	244		Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Segment C is missing		MTP 4.0; TIP 3.8 Will work with NCDOT to establish uniform length for both documents	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
	247		Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Segment C is missing		MTP 4.0; TIP 3.8 Will work with NCDOT to establish uniform length for both documents	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
	249	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP				OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	261	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			C section description missing from TIP; will request NCDOT to add description	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	275	The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			This project is in the TIP. R-4902, I-485, 77 to Rea This project is in the TIP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	278		Also, location description mismatch between MTP and TIP...Sullivan road?		Draft TIP funded slightly different project than anticipated in MTP; MTP will be changed to correct project limits	?

280			Mismatch between MTP and TIP. Project length mismatch.		ID 280 is linked with I-4750AA	?
282		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			This project is funded by the City of Charlotte. R-2420A, City Blvd Ext This project is funded by the City of Charlotte	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
283		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			This project is in the TIP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
284			No mileage in the TIP		CRTPO will request NCDOT to include a project length.	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
285		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Could not find ID in MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
287			Can't see the description for segment A		MTP provides description; will request NCDOT to provide description	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project description
289					U-5008, Sugar Creek Road/NCRR grade separation	?
290			Mismatch between TIP and MTP. No MTP description of 6 to 8 lanes		MTP and TIP match with 1.4 mile project length; Neither MTP nor TIP reference a specific number of lanes	?

	291		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. Dixie River Rd Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	292		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project. Garrison Rd Ext Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	293		The following project ID#'s are in the MTP but not in the TIP			Not a funded project	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
	295			Mismatch between TIP and MTP		MTP project length of 0.3 miles is correct (TIP does not list separate length for the B section)	?
R-	2248	E	Will this project be complete by 12/31/15			Yes	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
R-	2420	A			Project is not included in 2012-2018 TIP, is this project complete and open to traffic?	Project is complete and open to traffic.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	2509		Will this project be complete by 12/31/25? Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?			Yes	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
R-	2522		Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?		Project is scheduled for construction in FY2024, should project be included in Horizon Year 2025?	It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.

R-	2555		TIP mileage is not correct. The correct mileage is 2.4			CRTPO will request that NCDOT provide the correct mileage	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
R-	2632		Why is this project not in the MTP?		This is a capacity adding project scheduled for construction in FY2015 but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	AB section accelerated under STI; MTP will be amended to reflect project status. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
I-	3311			Mismatch between MTP and TIP. Project length mismatch.		ID 280 is linked with I-4750AA	?
U-	3467		Will this project be open to traffic by 1/1/2030?			This project has been accelerated under STI and will be moved into the MTP's 2025 HY	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
I-	3819				The project is shown as under construction and unfunded. How was the project modeled in the TDM in Horizon Year 2025?		OK-Agency Comments Addressed
R-	3833	C	Why is there no mileage in the MTP?	Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Is Talbert Road same as I-77		MTP lists R-3833C as Talbert Rd to US 21 at 0.8; TIP lists it as I-77 to US 21 but provides no mileage estimate for the C section; the A and B sections are complete (full length listed as 5.9)	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

U-	4713			Ensure project completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	This project may be delayed. The MTP will be amended if the project sponsor indicates that the project's opening will occur after 12-31-15.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
U-	4714	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25? Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?		MTP lists project length as 2.0 miles and TIP lists the project length as 3.0 miles	B section Yes; A & C sections No. The MTP lists the project length as 3.0.	CDOT (Gallup) will look at this project and get back to FHWA and NCDOT. Will require a MTP amendment including REA
I-	4720	Why is there no TIP number and mileage in the MTP.				OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	4723	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a mill and resurface project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	4733	Will this project be complete by 12/31/15		Ensure project completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	Project is now open to traffic. Project is complete and open to traffic.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	4750	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25		Project is currently unfunded but in the MTP is modeled in Horizon Year 2025. Has the project received funding?	Segment AA will be complete by 12/31/25. AA is the HOT lanes project and is funded. Sections AB, B and C are not funded.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

R-	4902	Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?		The length in the MTP states 6.6 miles, the TIP length is 9.2 miles and the comment regarding this project states 8.1 miles. What is the length of the project that was modeled in the TDM?	The MTP is incorrect and will be changed. 9.2 miles was modeled	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
C-	4956			Ensure project completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	Project will be complete and open to traffic by 12-31-15.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5006	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5007	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25? Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?		MTP lists project length as 4.1 miles and TIP lists the project length as 3.9 miles	Yes. CRTPO will work with NCDOT determine which length is correct.	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	5108	There is no mileage provided in the TIP		Intersection improvement project that is under construction in FY2015. Why was the project not included in the MTP?	CRTPO will request NCDOT to include a project length. This is a CMAQ project to construct turn lanes at Ballantyne Commons Parkway and US 521 in Charlotte and thus is exempt.	CRTPO will add these exempt projects to their MTP
U-	5114			The project is listed in the Horizon Year 2015 in the MTP but construction is shown to occur in FY2016 in the TIP.	Project schedule has slipped; MTP will be amended to place project in 2025HY	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.

C-	5201		Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a CMAQ project to add bike lanes to NC 115 in Mooresville and thus should be exempt	CRTPO will add these exempt projects to their MTP
U-	5325	B			Project is not included in 2012-2018 TIP, is this project complete and open to traffic?	Unable to find this project in the TIP	Project is complete and open to traffic- Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5507		Will this project be complete by 12/31/15. Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP? There is no mileage provided in the TIP			Yes. Project is under construction and nearing completion. CRTPO will request NCDOT to include a project length.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5507		MTP mileage is 17; TIP mileage is 16.6.			Will work with NCDOT to develop consensus on which mileage to use	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	5519				Project length in MTP is N/A and the length is 1.2 miles in the TIP. Why is the Functional Class listed as "Unclassified"? How was the road modeled in the TDM?	A. N. Community House Road is not a component of the federal functional classification system. B. It was modeled as an urban principal arterial.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
W-	5520		Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a newly funded project	Will require a MTP amendment including REA. Ok on mismatch

U-	5526	There is no mileage provided in the TIP. The project termini in the MTP an TIP need to be consistent			CRTPO will request NCDOT to include a project length. The MTP will be modified accordingly	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
C-	5531	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a CMAQ project to construct sidewalks in various locations in Mooresville and thus should be exempt	CRTPO will add these exempt projects to their MTP
C-	5543	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a CMAQ project to construct on Sunset Road in Charlotte and thus should be exempt	CRTPO will add these exempt projects to their MTP
C-	5613	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a placeholder for unallocated CMAQ funds	CRTPO will add these exempt projects to their MTP
U-	5703	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
U-	5712	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
U-	5714	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a newly funded project	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.

I-	5715	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be included in MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA
I-	5718	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25. Why is the 1.5 miles of segment C not shown in the TIP?			No, MTP will need to be amended to shift project to 2030 HY. The draft TIP does not breakdown each segment by mileage; however, the listed length of the entire project (9.6 miles) matches the MTP	Will require a MTP amendment including REA. Ok on mismatch
U-	5723	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
I-	5746	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5747	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5748	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

U-	5762	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
U-	5766	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25			Yes	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	5767	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25			Yes	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5768	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25? Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?			Yes	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths.
I-	5768	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5769	Will this project be complete by 12/31/25? Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?			Yes	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths. Ok with completion date
I-	5769	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

I-	5770	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5772	Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?				CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	5779	Should the remainder if this project be in the MTP (I-40 to Hartness Rd.)			The CRTPO is not aware of any desire to upgrade this segment of NC 115. Much of the segment is residential.	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5796	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5797	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5798	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5799	Why is this project not in the MTP?		This is a capacity adding project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.

I-	5800	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a bridge rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5803	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
U-	5804	Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?				CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	5805	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
U-	5808	Why is this project not in the MTP?		This is a capacity adding project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
I-	5813	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

U-	5816	The project in the TIP does not match the MTP			There is a mileage difference to be resolved, but the basic project is described adequately in both documents. MTP description is slightly more descriptive	CRTPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
U-	5817	Why is this project not in the MTP?		When will project be added to the MTP?	This is a newly funded project. It will be included as an amendment when the 2040 MTP is amended when the TIP is adopted in August.	Will require a MTP amendment including REA.
I-	5826	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5827	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5828	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5871	Why is this project not in the MTP?			This is a pavement rehabilitation project; such projects are not usually shown in the MTP	OK-Agency Comments Addressed
R-	3329/2559	Does the MTP need to be changed to match the project in the TIP?	Mismatch between TIP and MTP		No, the MTP 2025 HY is still appropriate	OK-Agency Comments Addressed

Comments on Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO MTP Project List

Project TIP or Project ID Number		FHWA Comment	EPA Comment	NCDAQ Comments	MPO/NCDOT Reply	Comment Addressed
ID#	1	This project is not in the TIP			Project is in 2025 horizon (TIP # U-3608)	MTP will be updated to show TIP number.
ID#	12	This project is not in the TIP			Project did not make it into STIP and is in 2040 horizon	Agency Comments Addressed
ID#	14	This project is not in the TIP			Project did not make it into STIP and is removed from MTP	MTP amendment including a REA
ID#	22		Mismatch between TIP and MTP		Project is in 2025 horizon in MTP, which is the same as the STIP	GCLMPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
ID#	26		Mismatch between TIP and MTP		MTP being updated to reflect new horizon	GCLMPO will work with NCDOT to correct project lengths
ID#	34	This project is not in the TIP			Project did not make it into STIP and is in 2030 horizon	MTP amendment including a REA
ID#	60	This project is not in the TIP			o Project did not make it into STIP and is in 2030 horizon	MTP amendment including a REA

ID#	61	This project is not in the TIP			Project did not make it into STIP and is removed from MTP	MTP amendment including a REA
ID#	62	This project is not in the TIP			Project is in 2025 horizon (TIP # U-2567)	Agency Comments Addressed
ID#	105	This project is not in the TIP				HY shift to 2040-MTP amendment including REA
ID#	110		Mismatch between TIP and MTP		Project is being removed from MTP	MTP amendment including a REA
R-	2307	This project is not in the MTP	Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Location Description in MTP and TIP hard to follow	This is a capacity adding project but that is scheduled to start construction in FY2019 that is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	Not in GCLMPO area. Project is not located in GCLMPO study area. Funded project stops in Catawba County	Agency Comments Addressed
U-	2523	Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?			Will revise MTP list to reflect STIP mileage U-2567, STIP number to be added to project, but project was already in MTP	Agency Comments Addressed
U-	2567		This project is not in the MTP			MTP will be updated to show TIP number.

R-	2707		Mismatch between TIP and MTP. Location Description in MTP and TIP hard to follow	Ensure segments AA, AB, B completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	David- will these be complete by the end of 2015? Project schedule in MTP being updated to reflect what is in STIP	REA correct HY in MTP. MTP amendment including a REA
ID#	3321	This project is not in the TIP		This is a capacity adding project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	Garden Parkway did not receive funding in STIP and was removed	Moved out of MTP. MTP amendment including REA
U-	3608					MTP amendment including a REA
U-	3608	Why is there a mileage difference between the TIP and MTP?			Will revise MTP list to reflect STIP mileage	Agency Comments Addressed
W-	4712	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP	Project is currently under construction, when will project be added to MTP? When is project scheduled for completion?	Completed in 2014	Agency Comments Addressed

I-	4928			Ensure project completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	David- will this be complete by the end of 2015?	Weigh station - ok. Agency Comments Addressed
C-	4934	Is this project complete?	MTP location description says widen from 4 to 5 lanes. Is this really a CMAQ project?	Ensure project completed and open to traffic by 12/31/2015.	No- being moved to 2025 horizon. Yes, CMAQ funds being used to add turn lanes. No, being moved to 2025 horizon	Exempt 93.127- Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5007		This project is not in the MTP		I-5007, Not a capital project	Agency Comments Addressed
U-	5103	This project is not in the TIP			Project did not receive funding in STIP and was removed	MTP amendment including a REA
C-	5148	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		C-5148, Sidewalk project. CMAQ project expected to be completed in 2014	Agency Comments Addressed
C-	5149	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		C-5149, Rail-trail project. CMAQ project listed in plan text	Agency Comments Addressed
C-	5186	This project is not in the MTP			CMAQ project listed in plan text	Agency Comments Addressed

P-	5200	Is this project complete?		Project is not in GCLMPO Study Area	Agency Comments Addressed
I-	5503		This project is not in the MTP	I-5503, Not a capital project	Agency Comments Addressed
C-	5505	This project is not in the MTP		o CMAQ project listed in plan text	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5506	This project is not in the MTP			Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5508	This project is not in the MTP		CMAQ project listed in plan text	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5510		This project is not in the MTP	C-5510, Not a capital project	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5532	This project is not in the MTP		CMAQ project listed in plan text	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5536	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP	C-5536, Not a capital project. CMAQ project listed in plan text, but not involving construction	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5562	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP	C-5562, Sidewalk improvement project. CMAQ project listed in plan text	Add project to MTP as exempt

C-	5563	This project is not in the MTP		CMAQ project listed in plan text, but not involving construction C-5566, Not a capital project. CMAQ project listed in plan text	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5566	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5583		This project is not in the MTP	C-5583, Unknown STIP number	Add project to MTP as exempt
C-	5606	This project is not in the MTP		o Placeholder for FY 16-17 CMAQ projects to be submitted to NCDOT when project web site opens.	Add project to MTP as exempt
R-	5710		This project is not in the MTP	This is an intersection improvement project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be included in the MTP? This is a capacity adding project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	Amend MTP add project to 2025 HY. Project is exempt under 93.127 Being added to 2025 horizon
R-	5712		This project is not in the MTP	This is an intersection improvement project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	Amend MTP add project to 2025 HY. Project is exempt under 93.127 Being added to 2025 horizon.

I-	5713	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP		I-5713, STIP number to be added to project, but project was already included in MTP. New project to be added to MTP for 2025	MTP will be updated to show TIP number.
I-	5719	Will this project be completed by 12/31/2025?			No, will not be complete by 2025	correct MTP to 2030 HY. MTP amendment including REA
R-	5721	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP	This is a capacity adding project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be added to the MTP?	Being added to 2030 horizon. STIP number to be added to the project, but project was already in MTP. Previously in MTP, now has STIP number	MTP amendment add project to 2030 HY - REA
U-	5775		This project is not in the MTP		U-5775, Project to be added to MTP	MTP amendment add project to 2025 HY - REA

U-	5800	This project is not in the MTP		This is an intersection improvement project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be included in the MTP?	Being added to 2025 horizon	Amend MTP add project to 2025 HY. Project is exempt add exemption category i.e., 93.127,.127 or.128
U-	5819	This project is not in the MTP	This project is not in the MTP	This is an intersection improvement project but is not included in the MTP. When will this project be included in the MTP?	Being added to 2025 horizon. Project to be added to MTP	Amend MTP add project to 2025 HY. Project is exempt add exemption category i.e., 93.127,.127 or.128
I-	5869		This project is not in the MTP		I-5869, Not a capital project.	Exempt ITS project add exemption category i.e., 93.127,.127 or.128

Metrolina Region Transportation Conformity

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO
Cabarrus Rowan MPO

2040 MTPs

TIP Conformity Planning Meeting

ACTION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS/NOTES

March 11, 2015

ATTENDEES

CDOT: Anna Gallup, Martin Kinnamon, Sara Familian
NCDOT: Anil Paniker, Jamal Alavi, Amar Pillai, Reuben Crummy
CRTPO: Bob Cook
Cabarrus-Rowan MPO: Phil Conrad
Gaston MPO: Bjorn Hansen
RFATS:
Rocky River RPO: Dana Stoogenke
FHWA: Eddie Dancausse, Loretta Barren
FTA:
NCDAQ: Phyllis Jones, Anne Galamb, Vicki Chandler, Todd Pasley
SCDHEC:
Kimley-Horn:
EPA: Dianna Myers, Amanetta Sommerville
SCDOT:
SCDEHC:
Mecklenburg Co. AQ:
NC Turnpike Authority:
Union Co.:

Items Discussed:

- **Court Ruling on the 1997 Ozone Standard**
On December 23, 2014, the DC Circuit Court issued its decision in the litigation concerning EPA's revocation of the 1997 ozone NAAQS for transportation conformity purposes. The court ruled (2 to 1 decision) to vacate EPA's decision to revoke the transportation conformity requirements for the 1997 ozone standard. **Effective on 4/6/15, the 1997 Ozone Standard will be revoked and will not impact this conformity work as long as the MRM modeling work does not start before 4/6/15.**
- **2008 Ozone Standard Maintenance Plan**
NCDAQ is planning to submit this maintenance SIP to EPA mid to late 4/2015 and will request adequacy for the motor vehicle emission budgets. It will take approximately 90 days for EPA to make an adequacy finding.

16-20 TIP Comparison to MTP Agency Comments-MPO Reply

- The CRTPO (Cook), the GCLMPO (Hansen), and CRMPO (Conrad) will provide a reply showing how they will resolve the pending agency comments to FHWA (Dancausse) by 4/3/15

Metrolina Regional Model (MRM) Update

- MRM modeling work will begin around 4/6/15.
- CDOT (Gallup) mentioned that there is an environmental document for I-485 that is underway and could involve 8 different scenarios. This work might be included in this 12-16 TIP conformity work and could add additional significant work (MRM modeling and DAQ emissions work and impact this process). We may hear more about the I-485 work in the future and may have to discuss this topic further.

Consensus Plan (CP):

- There were several approaches presented for doing the regional emission analysis (REA). There are currently a 1997 8-hr Ozone Standard Maintenance Plan MVEBs and a proposed 2008 8-hr Ozone Standard Maintenance Plan MVEBs. The Metrolina MPO's/RPO partners need to decide how the REA is going to be done for this process. Are they going to choose the 1997 MVEB's or the proposed 2008 MVEB's or both for conducting the REA? This topic was tabled and will be discussed further at the 4/13/15 (1pm) IC meeting
- There was a question as to what version of the emissions model will be used for this conformity process. The options are to use MOVES2010b (1997 MVEBs) and MOVES 2014 (Proposed 2008 MVEBs) or MOVES2014 (for both the 1997 MVEBs and the proposed 2008 MVEBs). This topic was tabled and will be discussed further at the 4/13/15 (1pm) IC meeting
- EPA (Myers) is going to review the transportation conformity analysis years for the proposed 2008 8-hr O3 maintenance SIP to make sure they are correct.

Conformity Process Schedule (CPS)

- The Metrolina MPO's will take action on their amended MTP projects the last two weeks in 3/2015.
- The MRM modeling is scheduled to begin on 4/6/15 (the CPS will be updated to reflect this change)
- The GCLMPO will ask for approval to release the draft conformity determination report (CDR) during their 5/2015 TAC meeting (the CPS will be updated to reflect this change)
- The CPS will be updated to reflect doing a regional emissions analysis (REA) for both the 1997 Ozone Standard Maintenance Plan MVEBs, and the proposed 2008 Ozone Maintenance Plan (current and revised RVP) MVEBs

ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS

- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) will draft the conformity determination report and will coordinate the collection of the information that will be contained in the appendices.
- The CRTPO (Cook), the GCLMPO (Hansen), and CRMPO (Conrad) will provide a reply showing how they will resolve the pending agency comments to FHWA (Dancausse) by 4/3/15

- The Metrolina MPO's/RPO partners need to decide how the analysis is going to be done for this process. Are they going to choose the 1997 MVEB's or the proposed 2008 MVEB's or both for conducting the REA?
- The Metrolina MPO's/RPO partners need to decide what version of the emissions model to use: MOVES2010b (1997 MVEBs) and MOVES 2014 (Proposed 2008 MVEBs) or MOVES2014 (for both the 1997 MVEBs and the proposed 2008 MVEBs).
- EPA (Myers) is going to review the transportation conformity analysis years for the proposed 2008 8-hr O3 maintenance SIP to make sure they are correct.
- FHWA (Dancausse) will draft the meeting minutes, revise the CPS and the CP.

Metrolina Region Transportation Conformity

Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO
Cabarrus Rowan MPO

2040 MTPs

TIP Conformity Planning Meeting

ACTION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS/NOTES

April 13, 2015

ATTENDEES

CDOT: Anna Gallup, Sara Familian, Eldewins Haynes
NCDOT: Heather Hildebrandt, Jamal Alavi, Linda Dosse
CRTPO:
Cabarrus-Rowan MPO: Phil Conrad
Gaston MPO: Bernie Yacobucci
RFATS:
Rocky River RPO: Dana Stoogenke
FHWA: Eddie Dancausse, Loretta Barren
FTA:
NCDAQ: Anne Galamb, Vicki Chandler, Todd Pasley
SCDHEC:
Kimley-Horn:
EPA: Dianna Myers, Amanetta Somerville
SCDOT:
SCDEHC:
Mecklenburg Co. AQ:
NC Turnpike Authority:
Union Co.:

Items Discussed:

- 2008 Ozone Standard Maintenance Plan
 - NCDAQ is planning to submit this maintenance SIP to EPA on 4/16/15.
- The plan for this conformity process is to have emission comparisons for both the 1997 and the 2008 8-hour ozone standard maintenance plans when the conformity determination report (CDR) goes out for agency/public review.
- MOVES2014 will be used for the emissions modeling

Metrolina Regional Model (MRM) Update

- Working on the final stages of coding including various scenarios of the I-485 project (4 scenarios with 2 tolling options-one tolling & one non-tolling).
- Finishing transit networks.
- 4/17/15 is the deadline for any additional project changes.

- CDOT (Gallup) will provide FHWA (Dancausse) the I-485 modeling scenarios.
- Model runs will begin on 4/20/15 and the modeling work is currently on schedule

Consensus Plan (CP):

- Remove the 2015 horizon year (HY) from the following:
 - Pages 3, 6, 10 and 11
- Page 5, on the chart remove the word “interpolated” from 2026
- NCDAQ (Pasley) will go over Item#16 during the 5/26/15 IC status meeting
- EPA (Myers) reviewed the transportation conformity analysis years for the proposed 2008 8-hr O3 maintenance SIP and they are correct.
- FHWA (Dancausse) will set up a meeting with NCDAQ (Strait) to discuss the emissions work in light of them having to do approximately 600 model runs
- NCDAQ (Pasley) will provide a matrix to the IC group showing project scenarios related to the emissions work

Conformity Process Schedule (CPS)

- No comments or revisions to the CPS

ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS

- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) will draft the conformity determination report and will coordinate the collection of the information that will be contained in the appendices.
- The CRTPO (Cook) will provide a reply showing how they will resolve the pending agency comments to FHWA (Dancausse) by 4/3/15
- CDOT (Gallup) will provide FHWA (Dancausse) the I-485 modeling scenarios.
- NCDAQ (Pasley) will go over Item#16 during the 5/26/15 IC status meeting
- FHWA (Dancausse) will set up a meeting with NCDAQ (Strait) to discuss the emissions work in light of them having to do approximately 600 model runs
- NCDAQ (Pasley) will provide a matrix to the IC group showing project scenarios related to the emissions work
- FHWA (Dancausse) will draft the meeting minutes, revise the CPS and the CP

Date: 4/17/15

Call Purpose: Discuss the Metrolina 2008 8-hour ozone Maintenance Proposed SIP Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEB's) and the Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) SIP Approval in relation to the Metrolina Area 16-20 TIP Conformity Process.

Conference Call Attendees:

FHWA: Eddie Dancausse

EPA: Dianna Myers

NCDAQ: Randy Strait, Todd Pasley, Vicki Chandler

Metrolina 2008 8-hour ozone maintenance SIP MVEB Adequacy

- On 3/17/15, EPA posted the SIP MVEB adequacy approval request for public comment on their website. The comment period ended on 4/16/15 and there were no comments received.
- The following steps remain to complete the SIP MVEB adequacy approval:
 - EPA will send a letter to inform the NCDAQ that submitted MVEBs have met the adequacy review criteria and can be used to demonstrate conformity.
 - EPA will draft the Federal Register (FR) notice and submit it to the EPA Regional Administrator for signature.
 - The FR notice will be sent to the Office of FR for publication
 - Once the MVEB adequacy approval notice is published in the FR, they will become effective in 15 days (for use) – anticipated by the end of May or early June
- Since there were no public comments that need to be addressed, the adequacy approval at this point is strictly administrative and there is a **HIGH** confidence level that MVEB's will be available for use long before October 1, 2015
- The SIP MVEBs were established based on the existing summer time fuel volatility standard for Gaston/Mecklenburg of 7.8 pounds per square inch (psi) Reid Vapor Pressure (psi)

Section 110 (I) Non-Interference Demonstration for the Relaxation of the Current Summer Time RVP Fuel Volatility Standard for Gaston and Mecklenburg County from 7.8 psi to 9.0 psi

- EPA plans to approve this SIP by October 1, 2015
- EPA suggested that for the regional emissions analysis (REA) for the Metrolina Area 16-20 TIP, comparison be done for the MVEB's reflecting the current RVP standards (based on 7.8 psi RVP for Gaston and Mecklenburg Counties and 9.0 psi for the remaining 5 counties) and one for the MVEB's (based on the 9.0 psi RVP for all 7 counties) and be

included in the conformity determination report (CDR) that will go out for public/agency review on July 16, 2015. The reason for this approach is that if the RVP SIP is approved (or not) both scenarios were modeled and shared with the public.

- In order to reduce the number of MOVES2014 model runs by 64, NCDQAQ asked if only one REA comparison could be completed for the 9.0 psi RVP for all 7 Metrolina Counties. The emissions modeled for REA based on the 9.0 psi RVP would represent a “conservative-case” scenario from an emissions comparison stand point. MOVES2014 modeling has shown that with all other parameters held constant, using 9.0 psi RVP relative to 7.8 psi RVP increases NOx and VOC emissions only slightly in the affected counties. In 2026, NOx emissions increase by 0.01 ton/day for Gaston County and do not change for Mecklenburg County. In 2026, VOC emissions increase by 0.04 ton/day in Gaston County and 0.28 ton/day in Mecklenburg County. Overall for the 7 counties combined, NOx emissions increase by 0.01% (0.01 ton/day) and VOC emissions increase by 0.32% (0.32 tons/day) in 2026. Therefore, comparing emissions modeled with 9.0 psi RVP to MVEBs that are based on 7.8 psi RVP represents a more conservative approach. If the emissions modeled at 9.0 psi RVP are lower than the MVEBs based on 7.8 psi RVP, then the emissions would also be lower than the MVEBs based on 9.0 psi RVP. If this approach is agreed upon, the number of modeling runs can be reduced substantially from 288 to 224.

The EPA and NCDQAQ agreed to this approach as long as it is explained in the CDR.

RECOMMENDATION: REA approach for the Metrolina 16-20 TIP conformity process to significantly reduce the number of NCDQAQ MOVES2014 model runs

- Conduct a REA using **ONLY** the 2008 8-hour ozone Maintenance SIP proposed MVEBs since there is a **HIGH** level of confidence that these MVEBs will be found adequate before October 1, 2015. There will be **NOx** emission comparisons to the 1997 8-hour ozone SIP MVEBs. This decreases the number of model runs by 216 (from 504 to 288).
- Use the “conservative-case” scenario described above for the REA emissions comparison. That is, compare 9.0 psi RVP-based emissions modeling results to the 7.8 psi RVP-based MVEBs that will likely be deemed adequate in May or June. This decreases the number of model runs by 64 (from 288 to 224).

Metrolina Region Transportation Conformity

**Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO
Cabarrus Rowan MPO**

2040 MTPs

TIP Conformity Planning Meeting

ACTION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS/NOTES

May 26, 2015

ATTENDEES

CDOT: Anna Gallup, Sara Familian, Eldewins Haynes, Mark Kinnamon

NCDOT: Heather Hildebrandt, Jamal Alavi, Linda Dosse, Anil Paniker

CRTPO: Bob Cook, Neil Burke

Cabarrus-Rowan MPO: Phil Conrad

Gaston MPO:

RFATS:

Rocky River RPO:

FHWA: Eddie Dancausse, Loretta Barren

FTA:

NCDAQ: Vicki Chandler, Todd Pasley, Phyllis Jones, Matthew Davis

SCDHEC:

Kimley-Horn:

EPA: Kelly Sheckler, Amanetta Somerville

SCDOT:

SCDEHC:

Mecklenburg Co. AQ:

NC Turnpike Authority:

Union Co.:

MPO Update:

- CRMPO (Conrad)
 - MPO will meet tomorrow to approve the release of the draft CDR when it is ready as well as the 2040 MTP amendment
- CRTPO (Cook)
 - The MPO will ask their board for permission to take out the draft CDR to the public during their June meeting

Metrolina Regional Model (MRM) Update (Gallup)

- MPO's received information from NCDOT (Argabright) on some last minute STIP changes and CDOT (Gallup) is requesting MPO's to review the list and verify that there was not an

impact to the projects that were included in the MRM. This information is needed as soon as possible

- CRTPO and CRMPO reviewed the list the projects included in the MRM were not impacted.
- MRM modeling is complete and VMT/speeds were provided to NCDAQ (Pasley) last week.
- There was some follow-up information provided to NCDAQ (Pasley) related to the human population input for the MOVES2014 model
- There were no I-485 scenarios included in this conformity process. Once a scenario is selected a separate conformity process will be done.

General Discussion:

- **REA approach for the Metrolina 16-20 TIP conformity process**
 - Conduct a REA using **ONLY** the 2008 8-hour ozone Maintenance SIP proposed MVEBs since there is a **HIGH** level of confidence that these MVEBs will be approved or found adequate before October 1, 2015. There will be **NOx** emission comparisons to the 1997 8-hour ozone SIP MVEBs.
 - Use the “conservative-case” scenario described above for the REA emissions comparison. That is, compare 9.0 psi RVP-based emissions modeling results to the 7.8 psi RVP-based MVEBs that will likely be approved or deemed adequate in May or June.
 - All the agency partners agreed to this approach
- The redesignation maintenance plan was published in the Federal Register on May 21 for a 21-day comment period that ends on June 11.
- After 21 day period there will be the EPA final rule making and then to OMB for publication.
- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) is working on the draft CDR and when complete will send it to FHWA (Dancausse) for review prior to its release for public/agency review/comment
- CDR should be completed by 6/26/15

Consensus Plan (CP):

- Pages 4 & 5: 2026 HY - replace “interpolated or modeled’ – with -“modeled”
- Page 12, item j, l, & o – replace (2013 or later) with 2014

Conformity Process Schedule (CPS)

- No comments or revisions to the CPS

ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS

- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) will draft the conformity determination report and will coordinate the collection of the information that will be contained in the appendices.
- EPA (Somerville) requested that NCDAQ (Pasley) provide the MOVES 2014 files (around 6/15/14) prior to the agency review of the draft conformity determination report (CDR)
- MPO’s received information from NCDOT (Argabright) on some last minute STIP changes and CDOT (Gallup) is requesting MPO’s to review the list and verify that there was not an impact to the projects that were included in the MRM. This information is needed as soon as possible
- FHWA (Dancausse) will draft the meeting minutes and revise the CP

Metrolina Region Transportation Conformity

**Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO
Cabarrus Rowan MPO**

2040 MTPs

TIP Conformity Planning Meeting

ACTION & FOLLOW-UP ITEMS/NOTES

June 23, 2015

ATTENDEES

CDOT: Anna Gallup, Sara Familian
NCDOT: Heather Hildebrandt, Anil Paniker
CRTPO:
Cabarrus-Rowan MPO: Phil Conrad
Gaston MPO: Bjorn Hansen
RFATS:
Rocky River RPO:
FHWA: Eddie Dancausse, Loretta Barren
FTA:
NCDAQ: Vicki Chandler, Todd Pasley, Phyllis Jones
SCDHEC:
Kimley-Horn:
EPA: Amanetta Somerville
SCDOT:
SCDEHC:
Mecklenburg Co. AQ:
NC Turnpike Authority:
Union Co.:

MPO Update:

- CRMPO (Conrad)
 - Nothing has changed since the May meeting. Working on the financial plan for the TIP/MTP. Ready to begin the public comment period. Will send FHWA (Dancausse) adopting resolutions for review
- CRTPO (Gallup)
 - Workshops were held for both the MTP amendments and the conformity determination.
 - At the June MPO board meeting there was approval to release MTP amendments, the 16-20 TIP and the conformity determination when available.
- GCLMPO (Hansen)
 - Running ads and holding 30 day comment period

Metrolina Regional Model (MRM) Update (Gallup)

- Model runs had to be redone due to I-485 speed increases. Submitted VMT/Speeds to NCDAQ. Modeling complete

Emissions Update (Pasley)

- Emissions results will be emailed out today. NCDAQ is currently reviewing the emission results.

Other

- The official name of the new TIP is 16-20. FHWA approves years 16-19.
- Draft CDR (Hildebrandt): The draft CDR is ready to go just waiting for the NCDAQ emission results. The draft CDR should be ready by the end of the week. The draft CDR appendices (newspaper affidavits and the adoption resolutions) are needed when available.
- NCDAQ (Pasley) mentioned that EPA received a comment on the 2008 Ozone Maintenance Plan and wanted to know what the impact would be on the approval of that document. FHWA (Dancausse) mentioned that this was discussed with EPA (Myers) and that the comment would be addressed and it was expected that the SIP approval would take place prior to September. Worst case the adequacy request remains in place as a contingency to have the MVEBs available for use. FHWA (Dancausse) will email EPA (Myers) and ask her to provide an email with current status to the IC group.
- EPA (Somerville) will review the NCDAQ emissions work and will provide an email to let the group know if the work is ok or if there are any issues.

Consensus Plan (CP):

- Page 12, item j – replace (2014) with 2013

Conformity Process Schedule (CPS)

- No comments or revisions to the CPS

ACTION ITEMS/NEXT STEPS

- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) will draft the conformity determination report and will coordinate the collection of the information that will be contained in the appendices.
- NCDOT (Hildebrandt) is requesting that the MPO's provide the following CDR appendices when available:
 - newspaper affidavits
 - adoption resolutions
- FHWA (Dancausse) will email EPA (Myers) and ask her to provide an email with current status.
- EPA (Somerville) will review the NCDAQ emissions work and will provide an email to let the group know if the work is ok or if there are any issues.
- FHWA (Dancausse) will draft the meeting minutes and revise the CP

Metrolina Area Transportation Conformity:
Pre-Analysis Consensus Plan (8-Hour Ozone & CO)

June 26, 2015

**Prepared Cooperatively Between the
Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Cabarrus Rowan MPO
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO
North Carolina Department of Transportation
and the
Federal Highway Administration**

**Metrolina Area Transportation Conformity:
Pre-Analysis Consensus Plan
June 24, 2015**

The Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO), Cabarrus Rowan MPO (CRMPO), Gaston/Cleveland/Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO) and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT-representing rural portions of the Metrolina non-attainment area) are proposing the following plan and procedures to conduct a transportation conformity analysis. This plan is being submitted to the interagency consultation partners for soliciting consensus before commencement of a full-scale transportation conformity analysis. The plans and procedures may be revised as the MPO's and NCDOT proceed with the analysis. After consensus is reached; notification of changes will be made to the interagency consultation partners.

Metrolina Area MPOs:

- ❑ Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO)
- ❑ Cabarrus Rowan MPO (CRMPO)
- ❑ Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO (GCLMPO)

Donut Areas:

- ❑ Rural portion of Union county outside of the MPO area

The following pollutants will be included in this conformity determination:

- ❑ 8-Hour Ozone (8-hour O₃)
- ❑ Carbon Monoxide (CO) – Mecklenburg County

Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

1. Existing Land Use and Demographics: For CRTPO, CRMPO, GCLMPO and rural (donut) Union County

Staff collected data as outlined in Attachment A. An economist was contracted to produce population, household, and employment estimates in five-year increments from 2010 to 2050 using a top down approach. The Regional partners then applied local knowledge to finalize the county totals in their areas and produce the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level data and projections.

Data sources include the following:

- 2010 Census data;
- 2010 InfoUSA employment data;
- 2010 Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data;

- Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) data;
- area school system data;
- building permit data;
- tax data;
- zoning; and
- land use plans

2. MTP Model Validation (Base) Year:
2010

3. MTIP Years: 2016-20

4. MTP Horizon Year: 2040

5. MTP Travel Demand Intermediate Years:

- a. Proposed 2008 O3 Maintenance SIP: 2025, 2026 & 2030

6. Transportation Conformity Analysis Years (8-Hour Ozone)

Proposed 2008 O3 Maintenance SIP

The Table below summarizes transportation conformity analysis methods and years for the different parts of the Metrolina non-attainment/maintenance areas. Specific conformity year information is listed in the following table:

County	Area model status	Area emissions budget status	Emissions analysis source	Emission comparison years			
				2025	2026 ² (modeled)	2030	2040 Horizon
Cabarrus Rowan MPO (portions of Cabarrus and Rowan Counties in the maintenance area)	modeled all	Proposed 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan	TDM ¹	O3	O3	O3	O3
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO (portions of Gaston and Lincoln Counties in the maintenance area)	Modeled all	Proposed 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan	TDM ¹	O3	O3	O3	O3
Charlotte Region TPO-Rocky River RPO MVEB (all of Mecklenburg and portions of Union and Iredell County in the maintenance area)	Modeled all	Proposed 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan	TDM ¹	O3	O3	O3	O3

1. The baseyear of the MRM is 2010
2. 2026 is a SIP MVEB for NOx and VOC

Additional table notes and explanations:

County:

- Ozone: The Metrolina area is non-attainment area for the 2008 Ozone Standard which consists of 1 whole county and 6 partial counties (Mecklenburg (CRTPO), Union (CRTPO-partial), Union (RRRPO-donut), Gaston (GCLMPO-partial), Cabarrus (CRMPO-partial) Rowan (CRMPO-partial), Lincoln (GCLMPO partial) and Iredell (CRTPO-partial).
 - NCDAQ has drafted a Maintenance Plan for the 2008 Ozone Standard that will be submitted to EPA the April/May 2015 timeframe and it is anticipated that the SIP

Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets will be found adequate prior to October 2015. The proposed SIP MVEB's from the 2008 Ozone Standard will be used in this process in anticipation of their approval

**Note: a doubt area is an area outside the MPO boundary but within the non-attainment/maintenance area.*

Model Status: Mecklenburg, Union, Cabarrus, Rowan, Gaston, and Lincoln, plus one partial county (Iredell) are completely within the Metrolina Regional Model (MRM) boundary.

Emissions analysis years:

- Proposed 2008 8-hour Ozone Standard Maintenance SIP: 2025 (modeled), 2026 (modeled or interpolated) 2030 (modeled) & 2040 (modeled)

Emission analysis source: The VMT and speeds for the regional emissions analysis (REA) will be derived from the MRM.

Emission Comparison Years:

- Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget Test
 - **Proposed 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance SIP:** (*Mecklenburg, Union-partial, Gaston-partial, Cabarrus-partial, Rowan-partial, Lincoln-partial, Iredell-partial*)
 - 2025 (modeled-compare to 2014 MVEB), 2026(modeled-compare to 2026), 2030 (modeled- compare to 2026 MVEB), and 2040 (modeled-compare to 2026 MVEB)

List of Specific Conformity Years

Proposed 2008 O3 Maintenance SIP

Horizon: 2040

b. 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance SIP MVEB Year: 2014 & 2026

c. Emission comparison years (NOx and VOC): 2025, 2026 (modeled or interpolated), 2030 & 2040

7. Non-attainment / Maintenance Counties:

- CO Limited Maintenance Plan: Mecklenburg County is maintenance for the Carbon Monoxide (CO) standard. A CO limited maintenance plan was approved on June 20, 2013 with an effective date of July 22, 2013. In accordance with the transportation conformity rule, approval of a maintenance plan removes the requirement to conduct a regional emissions analysis as part of the conformity determination. The requirement to demonstrate conformity per the requirements of in Table 1 of 40 CFR 93.109 still applies. The CO maintenance plan for the Charlotte Area (Mecklenburg County) ends on 9/18/15. Mecklenburg County will become attainment for the CO standard and transportation conformity will no longer be required.
- 8 Hour Ozone Non-attainment Area: Gaston Co. (partial), Mecklenburg Co., Cabarrus Co. (partial), Rowan Co.(partial), Union Co.(partial), Lincoln (partial), and Iredell Co. (partial)

8. Land-Use Demographics Projections/Forecast:

Land-use demographic projections for the region were developed using both a top-down and bottom-up approach.

An economist was contracted to develop regional and county level population, household, and employment projections for 5-year increments from 2010 to 2050 through a top-down forecasting approach. The economist's forecasting model is based on the metropolitan growth of 43 mid-sized US regions and calibrated to trends and capture rates in the Metrolina region over the past 40 years. Refer to the *METROLINA REGIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC DATA AND DATA FORECASTS (DRAFT REPORT)*, December 12, 2012, by Stephen J. Appold, PhD for more detailed information.

MPO and RPO staff projected population, household, and employment data for 2015, 2025, 2030 and 2035 through a bottom-up forecasting approach. Data inventoried for the base year was used as quantitative inputs to the process of deriving projections. Qualitative inputs to the projections process include future land use plans, building permits data, transportation plans and other capital improvements plans (such as water and sewer extensions and schools construction), and other factors limiting development (such as soils, floodplains, and water supply watershed regulations.) The final qualitative input was "planners' judgment", meaning the collective knowledge of planning officials and staff about the development patterns and development potential of specific areas within their jurisdictions.

Although the top-down approach addresses many factors influencing growth in the region, it does not address change in public policy, the influence of large-scale transportation projects, or natural land constraints. As such, the top-down forecasts were used as a guide when reviewing results from the bottom-up approach but were not used as control totals.

9. Travel Demand Model: Metrolina Regional Model (MRM)

The regional travel demand model is a four-step model developed for a 2-state, 12- county (9 whole, 3 partial) region (refer to Attachment B). The modeling area encompasses 4 MPOs and 1 RPOs.

As described previously, a multitude of land use and demographic data was collected as input into the model. Additional data collected includes transit and highway network data as well as multiple travel surveys. Transit data collected includes routes, headways, and travel times. Refer to Attachment C for the highway network data dictionary. Following is a list of the travel surveys completed:

- 2001 (Freeway) and 2013 (non-freeway) External Travel Survey;
- 2012 Household Travel Survey;
- 2009 On-board Transit Survey of Express and Local Buses and South Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT) Survey and Counts;
- 2010 Inrix Speed Data; and
- 2010-2012 Vehicle Classification Counts

10. Mode Split / Mode Choice:

The nested logit mode-choice model is structured similar to the Houston-Galveston Area Council's regional travel model. Nesting and mode constants were developed using CATS's on-board ridership survey conducted in 2009.

Transit paths include in-vehicle travel time, out-of-vehicle time (walking / driving and waiting), transfers, and direct cost (fare, parking). Four trip purposes are modeled. For the Home-Based Work, Home-Based-Other, and Home-Based University trip purposes, the potential transit Council's regional travel model. Nesting and mode constraints were developed using CATS's on-board ridership survey conducted in 2009.

Walk, drive, and drop-off approaches are handled in the nesting structure. Parking is provided at selected suburban stations.

The mode choice model was developed under contract with AECOM Consult

11. Local Street Count & VMT Estimate:

Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) – the sum of the distance that each vehicle travels during a specified period (day, year, etc.) – is the most typical measure of the level of travel in an area. Like most statistics, it is still impossible to actually measure. To do so, *all* vehicles would have to be monitored all day. The most common method of estimating VMT uses traffic counts. We have a large count database from CDOT, NCDOT, and SCDOT including counts from 2000 – 2011. Each count will be factored to the base year (2010). Average Daily Traffic volumes will be factored to Average Weekday volumes. The adjusted base-year weekday counts are then aggregated by County and functional class. The average (mean) volume for each county / functional class will be multiplied by the number of road miles to obtain VMT. For future year estimates, the travel demand model, calibrated to the base year counts and VMT, will provide VMT for thoroughfares (VMT = assigned volume * length).

Local streets make up 60%-70% of the roadway miles, but a much smaller fraction of VMT. Most serve to accumulate traffic from neighborhoods. The bulk of the trip is then made on thoroughfares (that are modeled). Few local streets are included in the model. Counts are sporadic and usually concentrated on local streets experiencing traffic problems. Many of the local streets are represented by zonal centroid connectors in the model. We will use the centroid connectors times 2 to better approximate actual local VMT. VMT derived with this method compares favorably with local VMT estimated using street miles and assumed volumes. The centroid method provides a better method of relating VMT to high growth TAZs.

12. Rural (Donut) Area Projects

The rural areas do not develop long range transportation plans like the MPOs. The rural area projects that are included in the conformity regional emissions analysis (REA) come from the State TIP. It is NCDOT's position that projects that are in the State TIP and have right of way or construction phases scheduled in the first seven years should be included in the REA. In addition, for rural areas adjacent to an MPO the MPO may extend projects outside their boundary to a logical terminus. The MPO may include the portion outside of their MPO boundary in the financial element of their MTP.

13. VMT Adjustments:

No VMT adjustments are used.

14. Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

The Metrolina area is non-attainment for the 2008 8-hour ozone standard and a limited maintenance area for Carbon Monoxide (CO)

- a. CO SIP: Mecklenburg County is maintenance for the Carbon Monoxide (CO) standard. A CO limited maintenance plan was approved on June 20, 2013 with an effective date of July 22, 2013. In accordance with the transportation conformity rule, approval of a maintenance plan removes the requirement to conduct a regional emissions analysis as part of the conformity determination. The requirement to demonstrate conformity per the requirements of in Table 1 of 40 CFR 93.109 still applies.

The CO maintenance plan for the Charlotte Area (Mecklenburg County) ends on 9/18/15. Mecklenburg County will become attainment for the CO standard and transportation conformity will no longer be required.

- b. Proposed 2008 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance SIP MVEBs.

- Ozone: The Metrolina area is non-attainment area for the 2008 Ozone Standard which consists of 1 whole county and 6 partial counties (Mecklenburg (CRTPO), Union (CRTPO-partial), Union (RRRPO-donut), Gaston (GCLMPO-partial), Cabarrus (CRMPO-partial) Rowan (CRMPO-partial), Lincoln (GCLMPO partial) and Iredell (CRMPO-partial).
 - NCDAQ has drafted a Maintenance Plan for the 2008 Ozone Standard that will be submitted to EPA the April/May 2015 timeframe and it is anticipated that the SIP Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets will be found adequate prior to October 2015. The proposed SIP MVEB's (using the current RVP standards) from the 2008 Ozone Standard will be used in this process in anticipation of their approval.
 - The regional emissions analysis (REA) approach to decrease the number of model runs are provided below:
 - Conduct a REA using **ONLY** the 2008 8-hour ozone Maintenance SIP proposed MVEBs since there is a **HIGH** level of confidence that these MVEBs will be found adequate before October 1, 2015. There will be **NO** emission comparisons to the 1997 8-hour ozone SIP MVEBs.
 - Use the "conservative-case" scenario described above for the REA emissions comparison. That is, compare 9.0 psi RVP-based emissions modeling results to the 7.8 psi RVP-based MVEBs that will likely be deemed adequate in May or June.

Proposed 2008 8-hour Ozone Maintenance SIP (kilograms/day) – (MVEBs using current RVP standards)

Cabarrus Rowan MPO			
	2014	2026	
NOx	11,814	3,749	
VOC	7,173	3,762	
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO			
	2014	2026	
NOx	10,079	2,992	
VOC	5,916	2,748	
Charlotte Regional TPO-Rocky River RPO			
	2014	2026	
NOx	32,679	9,941	
VOC	18,038	9,661	

NOx: Proposed 2008 8-hour Ozone Maintenance SIP (kilograms/day) (MVEBs using current RVP standards)					
Area	Comparison Year				
	2025	2026	2030	2040	
Cabarrus-Rowan MPO	11,814	3,749	3,749	3,749	
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO	10,079	2,992	2,992	2,992	
Charlotte Region TPO-Rocky River RPO	32,679	9,941	9,941	9,941	

VOC: Proposed 2008 8-hour Ozone Maintenance SIP (kilograms/day) (MVEBs using current RVP standards)				
Area	Comparison Year			
	2025	2026	2030	2040
Cabarrus-Rowan MPO	7,173	3,762	3,762	3,762
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO	5,916	2,748	2,748	2,748
Charlotte Region TPO-Rocky River RPO	18,038	9,661	9,661	9,661

Proposed 2008 8-hour Ozone Maintenance SIP (kilograms/day) – (MVEBs using revised RVP standards Gaston and Mecklenburg)

Cabarrus Rowan MPO			
	2014	2026	
NOx	11,814	3,749	
VOC	7,173	3,762	
Gaston Cleveland Lincoln MPO			
	2014	2026	
NOx	10,079	2,996	
VOC	5,916	2,755	
Charlotte Regional TPO-Rocky River RPO			
	2014	2026	
NOx	32,679	9,946	
VOC	18,038	9,690	

15. Control Strategies: Emission reduction credits will be taken for the following on-road mobile SIP commitments or Federal programs. Currently there are no TCMs in the Metrolina Area SIPs.

<u>Strategy</u>	<u>Methodology/Approach</u>
<i>I/M Program</i>	<i>Accounted for in the MOVES model</i>
<i>Tier 2 vehicle's Emission Standards</i>	<i>Accounted for in the MOVES model</i>
<i>Low Sulfur Gasoline and Diesel fuels</i>	<i>Accounted for in the MOVES model</i>
<i>Heavy Duty Vehicle Rules 2004 and 2007</i>	<i>Accounted for in the MOVES model</i>
<i>Low RVP Gasoline</i>	<i>Accounted for in the MOVES model</i>
<i>On board vapor recovery</i>	<i>Accounted for in the MOVES model</i>

16. MOVES Model Settings: The following model-input parameters will be used in the conformity analysis.

- **2008 Eight Hour Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area*:** Cabarrus (partial), Gaston (partial), Lincoln (partial), Mecklenburg, Rowan (partial), Union (partial) and Iredell (partial)

MOVES (2010b) Model (MOVES2014)
Charlotte Region MPOs/RPOs (rural area)

MOVES Model Settings: The following MOVES model-input parameters will be used in the conformity analysis performed by DAQ.

Parameter	Details	Data Source
a. <i>Emissions Model Version(s):</i>	(MOVES2014)	
b. <i>Emission Model Runs:</i>	Typical Summer Weekday (NOx and VOC)	
c. <i>Evaluation month:</i>	July (NOx and VOC)	
d. <i>Time Periods:</i>	VMT and speeds modeled for 4 daily travel periods (see item #24 below) will be processed according to USEPA guidance to generate hourly speed and VMT distribution data in the required MOVES input formats.	
e. <i>Pollutants Reported:</i>	NOx, VOC	
f. <i>Emissions Budget Years:</i>	2014 and 2026 (NOx and VOC)	
g. <i>Emissions Analysis Years:</i>	2025, 2026, 2030 and 2040	
h. <i>Temperature and Relative Humidity:</i>	July 2010 monthly average 24-hour temperature and relative humidity profiles from the Charlotte-Douglas International Airport (KCLT). January 2010 monthly average 24-hour temperature and relative humidity profiles from KCLT. (if the MVEB is	

deemed adequate, do we use 2014 meteorological data from the pending 2008 8 hr SIP?)
<= Yes

- i. **Vehicle Classes:** 13
- j. **VMT mix:** Statewide mix based on 2013 data using the method in the August 2004 USEPA Guidance.
- k. **Speed Distribution:** Regional Model MRM15v1.0
- l. **Source type (vehicle type) age distribution:** The latest available 2014 vehicle registration data provided by NCDOT, which also includes a breakdown of the number of vehicles by model year, will be used to create the required source type age distribution input file for each county. As per EPA guidance, the source type age distribution will not be projected for future years.
- m. **I/M Program:** For modeling 2015 and later years, the following I/M program parameters will apply: compliance rate = 96%, waiver rate = 5% with an exemption for vehicles from the 3 year latest model years.

n. **RVP:** July 9.0 psi for remaining counties

- o. **Source Type (vehicle type) Population:** Vehicle population estimates will be developed for each future modeling year based on the latest available 2014 vehicle registration data provided by NCDOT. This data includes the total number of registered vehicles by county, divided into nine source type categories. The data will first be reorganized into thirteen source type categories (i.e. passenger cars, light commercial trucks, combination long-haul trucks, etc.) as required for MOVES2014. These source type population estimates will then be projected for each required modeling year, using the same base and future year-county human population data that were used in the TDM model, according to the following formula:

$$\text{Total Vehicle Population}_{\text{future year}} = \text{Total Vehicle Population}_{\text{base year}} * \left(\frac{\text{Human Population}_{\text{future year}}}{\text{Human Population}_{\text{base year}}} \right)$$

- p. **Strategies:** None

17. Emissions analysis units, conversion factors, significant figures, rounding and truncating conventions:

Units= Kilograms or Grams

Grams to tons conversion factor= Divide x grams by 907184.7 to get tons

Round to 2 decimal places

18. CMAQ Projects: Not Applicable

19. Regionally Significant Projects (Federal and Non Federal): Not Applicable

20. List of Exempt Projects and Non-Regionally Significant Projects (Federally Funded):
Not Applicable

21. Conformity Schedule: *(A draft conformity schedule has been developed and is provided as an attachment to this document)*

22. Conformity Determinations: Four organizations will be responsible for making conformity determinations in four distinctive parts of the Metrolina non-attainment/maintenance areas:

- i. The CRTPO within its metropolitan area boundary (MAB) -all of Mecklenburg County and parts of Union and Iredell County
- ii. The GCLMPO within its metropolitan area boundary-all of Gaston and Lincoln Counties
- iii. The CRMPO within its metropolitan area boundary-all of Cabarrus and Rowan Counties
- iv. The NCDOT for the rural areas are comprised of the parts of Union County that are outside of any MPO MAB

Each of these responsible organizations must make a conformity determination for its respective area in order for all of the areas to be designated in conformity.

The following resolutions will be needed for this conformity process:

- CRMPO
 - 2040 MTP amendment adoption
 - Conformity Determination for the amended 2040 MTP
 - Conformity Determination for the 16-20 TIP
- GCLMPO
 - 2040 MTP amendment adoption
 - Conformity Determination for the amended 2040 MTP
 - Conformity Determination for the 16-20 TIP
- CTRPO
 - 2040 MTP amendment adoption
 - Conformity Determination for the amended 2040 MTP
 - Conformity Determination for the 16-20 TIP
- NCDOT Conformity Determination for the donut area of Union
-

23. Other

- Any reference to York County in this document has been removed since EPA has made the 8-hour ozone designations. Although a portion of York County, South Carolina was designated as part of the bi-state Charlotte 8-hour ozone nonattainment area, they are allowed to demonstrate transportation conformity independent of the North Carolina portion of this nonattainment area. Therefore, the planning assumptions and methodologies used for the York County, South Carolina portion of this nonattainment area is reflected in a separate transportation conformity determination that is generated by the Rock Hill-Fort Mill Area Transit Study Metropolitan Planning Organization.
- The techniques used for this conformity process are the following:
 - VMT and speed will be done for 4 times of day (the 4 times of days are summed for the regional emissions analysis)

- 6:30 am - 9:30 am
 - 9:30 am - 3:30 pm
 - 3:30 pm - 6:30 pm
 - 6:30 pm - 6:30 am
- For the MOVES modeling component the times of day will consist of whole hours and are as follows:
- 6:00 am – 9:00 am
 - 9:00 am - 3:00 pm
 - 3:00 pm - 6:00 pm
 - 6:00 pm - 6:00 am

16-22 TIP Draft CPS - 5.6.15
Transportation Conformity Process: Metrolina Area

Discussion Draft -- 5/6/2015

Line ID#	Conformity Elements	Schedule Summary			Line ID#	Participating Organizations and Staff (lead staff in bold)
		Start Date	End Date	Length (Days)		
1	Project start --			NA	1	
2	STIP & MTP Comparison	01/05/15	03/10/15	65	2	
3	Develop Customized STIP (Metrolina, Triangle & Hickory)	01/05/15	01/26/15	22	3	NCDOT TPB
4	Send out Draft STIP for Agency Review	01/27/15	02/10/15	15	4	Dancausse
5	MPO/NCDOT provide reply to Agency Review	02/11/15	02/18/15	8	5	NCDOT/MPOs/RPOs
6	MPO meetings with Agency Partners do discuss comments	02/25/15	02/25/15	1	6	NCDOT/Dancausse/Jones/Myers/LaShore
7				#VALUE!	7	
8				1	8	
9				#VALUE!	9	Dancausse
10				#VALUE!	10	NCDOT/MPOs/RPOs
11				#VALUE!	11	NCDOT/Dancausse/Jones/Myers/LaShore
12				1	12	
13	Kick-off IC Meetings	03/11/15	03/11/15	1	13	NCDOT/NCDAQ/Dancausse/Jones/Myers/LaShore
14	Email Agenda, draft TCPCP and draft CPS to IC partners			1	14	Dancausse
15	IC Meeting			1	15	
16	Meeting Minutes			1	16	Dancausse
17	Circulate and Review meeting minutes			1	17	
18	Follow up to address comments			1	18	
19				#VALUE!	19	
20					20	
21					21	
22					22	
23	MPO TACs (or TCCs) approve MTP Amendment lists: CRMPO: 3/25/15 , CRTPO: 3/18/15 and GCLMPO: 3/26/15	03/18/15	03/26/15	9	23	MPOs/RPOs
24					24	
25					25	
26	Transportation Modeling (50 days): Includes PTRM and NMAA	04/06/15	05/22/15	47	26	CDOT, NCDOT
27	Base year network and land use (20xx)				27	
28	Horizon year 1 network and land use				28	
29	Horizon year 2 network and land use				29	
30	Design Year network and land use -- 2040				30	
31	Develop plan version for initial air quality analysis				31	
32	Extract draft plan VMT and speeds				32	
33	Evaluate draft plan speeds and VMT				33	
34	Preliminary Regional Emissions Analysis				34	
35	Emission Factors Review (additional iterations, if needed)				35	
36	Extract Final VMT and speeds				36	
37	Evaluate final speeds and VMT				37	MPOs, RPOs, NCDOT
38	Modeling Complete (Includes Emission Factor & REA)		05/26/15		38	
39	Emission Analysis	05/27/15	07/02/15	37	39	
40	NCDAQ Emissions Model Work	05/27/15	06/26/15	31	40	NCDAQ Pasley
41	Off model analysis, including off-model TDM-not applicable			#VALUE!	41	
42	EPA/MPO/NCDOT Review	06/29/15	07/02/15	4	42	EPA/NCDOT/MPOs
43	Conformity Report Preparation	03/27/15	07/02/15	98	43	NCDOT (Hildebrandt)
44	TACs release draft conformity determination report and MTP Amendments for public comment: CRMPO: 6/24/15 , CRTPO: 6/17/15 and GCLMPO: 6/26/15	06/17/15	06/26/15	10	44	MPOs, RPOs
45	Interagency & Public Review	07/06/15	08/03/15	29	45	
46	DENR Review	07/06/15	07/27/15	22	46	Jones
47	FHWA Initial Review	07/06/15	07/27/15	22	47	Dancausse
48	FTA Initial Review	07/06/15	07/27/15	22	48	Tajsha
49	EPA Initial Review	07/06/15	07/27/15	22	49	Myers
50	Respond to Agency Comments	07/28/15	08/03/15	7	50	MPOs/RPOs/NCDOT
51				0	51	
52					52	
53	MPO & Rural Conformity Determination	08/26/15	09/01/15	7	53	NCDOT
54	MPO TACs Adopt Final MTP amendments & 16-22 TIP with conformity: CRMPO: 8/26/15 , CRTPO: 8/19/15 and GCLMPO: 8/27/15	08/26/15	08/27/15	2	54	MPOs
55	NCDOT Secretary issues conformity letter for rural area: Union	08/27/15	08/27/15	1	55	NCDOT, RPOs
56	Conformity analysis, report and review complete	08/28/15	08/28/15	1	56	
57	Place conformity report on website	09/01/15	09/01/15	1	57	
58	Federal Action	09/03/15	10/01/15	29	58	Dancausse
59	Transmit Report to FHWA/TPB	09/03/15	09/03/15	1	59	
60	FHWA transmit report to EPA & FTA	09/03/15	09/03/15	1	60	Dancausse
61	USDOT Determination	10/01/15	10/01/15	1	61	Dancausse
62	USDOT Letter to State/MPO	10/01/15	10/01/15	1	62	Dancausse
63	Process Complete	10/01/15	10/01/15	1	63	
64	Conformity Process Complete -- October 1, 2015	10/01/15	NA	NA	64	