



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

JUN 13 2017

Mr. Richard W. Corey
 Executive Officer
 California Air Resources Board
 1001 I Street, P.O. Box 2815
 Sacramento, California 95812

Re: Adequacy Status of San Joaquin Valley 2008 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets

Dear Mr. Corey:

We have found adequate for transportation conformity purposes certain motor vehicle emission budgets (MVEBs or “budgets”) in the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District’s *2016 Plan for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard* (“2016 Ozone Plan”). As a result of our finding, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in the San Joaquin Valley and the U.S. Department of Transportation must use these budgets in future conformity analyses once the finding becomes effective.

On August 24, 2016, you submitted the 2016 Ozone Plan as a revision to the California State Implementation Plan. The plan relies on existing control measures to demonstrate attainment and reasonable further progress (RFP) for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The plan identifies sub-regional MVEBs for each county in the nonattainment area for reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) for each RFP milestone year through 2030 and for the attainment year 2031. We announced receipt of the plan on the internet on February 23, 2017, and requested public comment by March 27, 2017.¹ We did not receive any comments on the budgets.

This letter transmits our determination that the MVEBs for 2018, 2021, 2024, 2027, 2030, and 2031 contained in the 2016 Ozone Plan are adequate for transportation conformity decisions. These budgets are consistent with the state’s RFP demonstrations for milestone years 2018, 2021, 2024, 2027, and 2030, and these budgets are based on control measures that have already been adopted and implemented. The budgets also meet the transportation conformity adequacy criteria found in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). The adequate budgets² for each county in the nonattainment area are as follows:

Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets (summer planning, tons per day)												
County	2018		2021		2024		2027		2030		2031	
	ROG	NOx										
Fresno	8.0	27.7	6.4	22.2	5.4	14.1	4.9	13.2	4.5	12.6	4.3	12.5
Kern (SJV)	6.6	25.4	5.5	20.4	4.8	12.6	4.5	11.7	4.2	10.9	4.1	10.8

¹ <https://www.epa.gov/state-and-local-transportation/state-implementation-plans-sip-submissions-currently-under-epa#Sanjoquin2017>

² CARB calculated the by taking each county’s emissions results from EMFAC2014 and then rounding each county’s emissions up to the nearest tenth of a ton.

Kings	1.3	5.1	1.1	4.2	0.9	2.6	0.9	2.5	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.3
Madera	1.9	5.1	1.5	4.1	1.2	2.6	1.1	2.3	0.9	2.0	0.9	2.0
Merced	2.5	9.4	2.0	7.8	1.6	4.8	1.5	4.4	1.3	4.2	1.3	4.1
San Joaquin	5.9	13.0	4.9	10.3	4.2	6.9	3.8	6.2	3.5	5.7	3.3	5.5
Stanislaus	3.8	10.5	3.0	8.3	2.6	5.6	2.3	5.1	2.1	4.7	2.0	4.7
Tulare	3.7	9.5	2.9	7.2	2.4	4.7	2.2	4.1	1.9	3.8	1.9	3.7

We have detailed our adequacy findings in the enclosures. A copy of this letter and its enclosures will soon be posted on the internet at <https://www.epa.gov/state-and-local-transportation/conformity-adequacy-review-region-9>. We will announce the adequacy findings in the Federal Register. The findings will become effective 15 days after publication in the Federal Register, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.118(f).

Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104(e), within 2 years of the effective date of the adequacy finding, the metropolitan planning organizations in the San Joaquin Valley and the U.S. Department of Transportation will need to demonstrate conformity to the new MVEBs if the demonstration has not already been made. For demonstrating conformity to the MVEBs in this plan, the motor vehicle emissions from implementation of the transportation plan should be projected consistently with the budgets in this plan, *i.e.*, by taking each county's emissions results from EMFAC2014 and then rounding each county's emissions up to the nearest tenth of a ton.

If you have any questions regarding these MVEB adequacy findings, please contact Meredith Kurpius at (415) 947-4534, or Anita Lee at (415) 972-3958.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth J. Adams
Acting Director, Air Division

Enclosures

cc: Seyed Sadredin, Executive Director, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
Barbara Goodwin, Fresno COG
Ronald Brummett, Kern COG
Terri King, Kings COG
Patricia Taylor, Madera COG
Jesse Brown, Merced COG
Andrew Chesley, San Joaquin COG
Vince Harris, Stanislaus COG
George Finney, Tulare COG
Steve Luxenberg, Federal Highway Administration
Ted Matley, Federal Transit Administration

Enclosure 1: Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review

San Joaquin Valley 2016 Plan for the 2008 Ozone Standard (2016 Ozone Plan), Submitted to EPA on August 24, 2016			
Reviewer: Anita Lee, June 12, 2017			
Adequacy Review Criteria 40 CFR part 93			Reference in 2016 Ozone Plan
Citation	Requirement	Is Criterion Satisfied?	
§ 93.118(e)(4)(i)	The plan was endorsed by the Governor (or designee) and was subject to a public hearing.	Y	The August 24, 2016 transmittal letter submitting the 2016 Ozone Plan was sent by the Executive Director of the California Air Resources Board (CARB), Richard Corey, the Governor's designee. The transmittal letter indicates that CARB formally adopted the plan on July 21, 2016 through a Board Resolution (16-8). CARB issued a notice of the public hearing, held on July 21, 2016, on June 17, 2016. CARB did not receive any comments.
§ 93.118(e)(4)(ii)	The plan was developed through consultation with federal, state, and local agencies; full implementation plan documentation was provided and EPA's stated concerns, if any, were addressed.	Y	Consultation with federal, state, and local agencies was undertaken. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) formed the Public Advisory Workgroup (PAW) and hosted public workshops and meetings beginning in 2014 through 2016 to discuss details and solicit input on the development of the attainment plan for the 2008 ozone standard. PAW meetings and workshops were open to the public. EPA and CARB participated in the PAW (p. 1-11). The District also consulted with the eight MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley in developing the MVEBs in the 2016 Ozone Plan. EPA received a copy of the draft 2016 Ozone Plan and EPA did not provide any comments on the draft plan to the District or CARB.
§ 93.118(e)(4)(iii)	The motor vehicle emission budgets are clearly identified and precisely quantified.	Y	The motor vehicle emission budgets are clearly identified in Table D-1 in Appendix D of the 2016 Ozone Plan. The budgets generally reflect control measures listed in <i>Attachment C: State of California Motor Vehicle Control Program (1990-present) Transportation Control Strategies Adopted by the California Air Resources Board Since 1990 to</i>

			Appendix D, that are already adopted and implemented. More specifically, the ROG and NOx MVEBs reflect the on-road motor vehicle control measures reflected in EMFAC2011 plus more recently adopted and implemented measures incorporated into EMFAC2014, such as Advanced Clean Cars (adopted 1/26/12), 2014 Amendments to the Truck and Bus Rule (adopted 4/24/14 and 11/20/14), and the Heavy-Duty Greenhouse Gas Phase I Regulations (adopted 12/12/13). The budgets do not include new emission reductions attributed to general commitments; therefore, these budgets are precisely quantified.
§ 93.118(e)(4)(iv)	The motor vehicle emission budgets, when considered together with all other emission sources, are consistent with applicable requirements for reasonable further progress and attainment.	Y	EPA has preliminarily concluded that the budgets, when considered with all other emission sources, are consistent with the requirement to demonstrate reasonable further progress (RFP) and attainment. This finding is based on review of the RFP and attainment demonstration in Chapter 6 and Appendix H of the 2016 Ozone Plan.
§ 93.118(e)(4)(v)	The plan shows a clear relationship among the emission budgets, control measures, and the total emissions inventory.	Y	The emission inventory for all stationary, area, on-road mobile and non-road mobile sources are described in Appendix B of the 2016 Ozone Plan. The relationship between the control measures and budgets is described in Appendix D. The MVEBs are consistent with the emission inventory for on-road sources in Appendix B.
§ 93.118(e)(4)(vi)	Revisions to previously submitted control strategy or maintenance plans explain and document any changes to any previously submitted budgets and control measures; impacts on point and area source emissions; any change 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	The most recent budgets for the 1997 8-hour Ozone NAAQS are revised budgets for the years 2017, 2020, and 2023, developed using EMFAC2014 and approved on August 12, 2016 (81 FR 53294), with an effective date of September 30, 2016. The budgets for the 2016 Ozone Plan are for the 2008 ozone standard, also developed with EMFAC2014 and are for the years 2018, 2021, 2024, 2027, 2030, and 2031. The adequate budgets from the 2016 Ozone Plan replace the previously approved budgets for the 1997 8-hour Ozone NAAQS because that NAAQS has been revoked. Since the revocation of the 1997 8-hour ozone NAAQS, transportation conformity no longer applies with respect to the revoked standards. 80 FR 12264, 12284 (March 6, 2015).

§ 93.118(e)(5)	EPA has reviewed the state's compilation of public comments and responses to comments that are required to be submitted with any implementation plan.	Y	Appendix M to the 2016 Ozone Plan contains public comments received at public workshops held on March 22, and May 23, 2016, and responses from the District. The transcript from the CARB board hearing held on July 21, 2016, shows that the only comments received on CARB's adoption of the plan were two comments in general support of adopting the plan. We have reviewed the compilation of comments and responses and find the responses to be acceptable. No issues that might have affected our adequacy finding remain unanswered.
----------------	---	---	---