



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IX

75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

JUN 01 2007

Nancy Wrona, Director  
Air Quality Division  
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality  
1110 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: Adequacy Status of Yuma PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

Dear Ms. <sup>Nancy</sup>Wrona:

We have found adequate for transportation conformity purposes the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the *Yuma PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan* (August 2006). As a result of our adequacy findings, the Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Federal Highway Administration must use these budgets in future conformity analyses once the finding becomes effective.

By letter dated August 17, 2006, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality submitted the *Yuma PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan* to EPA as a revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan and requested redesignation of the Yuma air quality planning area from "nonattainment" to "attainment" for the PM<sub>10</sub> national ambient air quality standard. The plan identifies regional motor vehicle emission budgets in the table below:

Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets	
Budget Year	PM <sub>10</sub> - tons per year (tpy)
1999	12,914
2005	12,169
2016	10,803

On October 31, 2006, we announced receipt of the plan on the Internet and requested public comment by November 30, 2006. We did not receive any comment letters during the comment period.

This letter transmits our decision that the motor vehicle emissions budgets contained in the Yuma  $PM_{10}$  Maintenance Plan are adequate for transportation conformity decisions. After reviewing the plan, we have preliminarily determined that it provides for maintenance of the  $PM_{10}$  24-hour standard in Yuma. We have detailed our adequacy findings in the enclosure. A copy of this letter and its enclosures will soon be posted on the Internet at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm>. We will also announce the adequacy findings in the Federal Register. The findings will become effective 15 days after the Federal Register announcement.

If you have any questions regarding these adequacy findings, please contact Colleen McKaughan at (520) 498-0118 or Rebecca Rosen at (415) 947-4152.

Sincerely,



Deborah Jordan  
Director, Air Division

Enclosure

cc: Paul Melcher, Yuma MPO  
Ed Stillings, FHWA

Enclosure

Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review  
 Yuma PM<sub>10</sub> Maintenance Plan  
 Adopted August 17, 2006, Submitted August 17, 2006

Adequacy Review Criteria (40 CFR part 93)	Is Criterion Satisfied?	Reference in SIP document/comments
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(i)  The plan was endorsed by the Governor (or designee) and was subject to a public hearing by the State.	Y	The August 17, 2006 transmittal letter submitting the plan was sent by ADEQ's Director, Stephen Owens, the governor's designee. The transmittal letter does not indicate that ADEQ's Director formally adopted the plan, but we understand from ADEQ staff that the omission of the typical recitation ("hereby adopts and submits") that is found in transmittal letters for SIP revisions submitted by ADEQ was inadvertent. A letter dated May 24, 2007, by Stephen Owens does indicate that the ADEQ Director formally adopted the plan. We find that submission of the plan as a SIP revision under the Director's signature as sufficient evidence of endorsement for the purposes of 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4)(i). ADEQ held a public hearing on April 4, 2006 on an earlier version of the plan and provided the public with the opportunity to request a second public hearing on a revised version of the plan during a second comment period held during July 2006. No one requested a second public hearing and thus none was held on the revised plan. See chapter 8 and appendix K of the plan.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(ii)  The plan was developed through consultation with federal, state and local agencies; full	Y	Documentation accompanying the plan describes a public and agency outreach effort. See, e.g., chapter 1, section 1.5, of the plan. EPA received a copy of the draft plan and EPA's comments were largely addressed.

	<p>implementation plan documentation was provided to EPA and EPA's stated concerns, if any, were addressed.</p>		
<p>Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iii)</p>	<p>The motor vehicle emission budgets are clearly identified and precisely quantified.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The budgets are found in table F-16 of appendix F to the plan's technical support document. In table F-16, the motor vehicle budgets can be determined by adding two source categories together: Unpaved Roads - Re-entrained Dust and Paved Roads for years 1999, 2005 and 2016. In response to a request by EPA for clarification, ADEQ staff confirmed this approach by memo dated June 16, 2006. We note that chapter 4 of the maintenance plan presents mobile source emission estimates developed by the Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and refers to these estimates as "budgets," but that these "budgets" are included in the maintenance plan for informational purposes only.</p>
<p>Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iv)</p>	<p>The motor vehicle emissions budgets, when considered together with all other emission sources, are consistent with applicable requirements for reasonable further progress, attainment, or maintenance (whichever is relevant to the given</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>EPA has preliminarily concluded that the submitted SIP demonstrates maintenance in the Yuma area and that the motor vehicle emissions budgets are consistent with that demonstration.</p>

	plan).		The emission inventories for all point, area, and mobile sources for 1999, 2005, and 2016 are contained in Table F-16 of appendix F of ADEQ's Technical Support Document for the maintenance plan. The control strategy is set out in Chapter 6 of the plan and Appendix G. Table 6-3 provides the emission reductions from the control strategy for PM <sub>10</sub> .
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(v)	The plan shows a clear relationship between the emissions budgets, control measures and the total emissions inventory.	Y	
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(vi)	Revisions to previously submitted control strategy or maintenance plans explain and document any changes to any previous submitted budgets and control measures; impacts on point and area source emissions; any changes to established safety margins (see 93.101 for definition), and reasons for the changes (including the basis for any changes to emission factors or estimates of vehicle miles traveled).	Y	Budgets submitted in the 1994 PM <sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan were disapproved. See 64 FR 58837 (November 1, 1999). The budgets approved in this action do not constitute a revision to the previously submitted budgets in the 1994 plan.
Sec. 93.118(e)(5)	EPA has reviewed	Y	ADEQ compiled public comments submitted during the April 4,

	<p>the State's compilation of public comments and response to comments that are required to be submitted with any implementation plan.</p>	<p>2006 public hearing and during the public comment periods. These comments and the responses are included in appendix K of the plan. We have reviewed the compilation of comments and responses and find ADEQ's responses to be acceptable. No issues that might have affected our adequacy finding remain unanswered.</p>
<p>Reviewer: Rebecca Rosen</p>		<p>Date of Review: January 12, 2007</p>