



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IX

75 Hawthorne Street

San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

DEC 19 2017

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

Re: Adequacy Status of South Coast PM_{2.5} Serious Area Plan Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

Dear Mr. Corey:

We have found adequate for transportation conformity purposes certain motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs or “budgets”) for the 2006 fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan* for the South Coast area (“2016 PM_{2.5} Plan” or “Plan”). Once our finding becomes effective, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the U.S. Department of Transportation must use the adequate budgets in future transportation conformity analyses.

On April 27, 2017, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) submitted the 2016 PM_{2.5} Plan to the EPA as a revision to the California State Implementation Plan. Among other things, the Plan includes demonstrations of reasonable further progress (RFP) and attainment of the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS in the South Coast serious PM_{2.5} nonattainment area. The Plan identifies MVEBs for directly-emitted PM_{2.5}, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) for the 2017 and 2020 RFP milestone years and for the 2019 attainment year. We announced the availability of the Plan and related MVEBs on the EPA’s website on October 18, 2017, and requested public comment by November 17, 2017. We received no comments on the budgets or Plan during this period.

This letter transmits our decision that the budgets for 2017 and 2019 contained in the 2016 PM_{2.5} Plan are adequate for transportation conformity decisions. These budgets are consistent with the Plan’s RFP and attainment demonstrations for the 2017 milestone year and 2019 attainment year and are based on control measures that have already been adopted and implemented. These budgets also meet the other adequacy criteria in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). Consistent with the requirements set out in the EPA’s implementation rule for the PM_{2.5} NAAQS (see 81 FR 58010), the 2016 PM_{2.5} Plan contains RFP budgets for the post-attainment year of 2020. We are not taking any action on the 2020 budgets at this time. The adequate budgets are as follows:

Adequate Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (Annual average tons per day)			
Budget Year	Directly emitted fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5})	Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) (tons per day)
2017	21	200	99
2019	20	169	83

We have detailed our adequacy findings in the enclosure. A copy of this letter and its enclosure will soon be posted on the Internet at: <https://www.epa.gov/state-and-local-transportation/state-implementation-plans-sip-submissions-epa-has-found-adequate-or>. We will also announce the adequacy findings in the Federal Register. The findings will become effective 15 days after the Federal Register announcement 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 SCAG 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 the Plan, the motor vehicle emissions from implementation of the transportation plan should be projected consistent with the budgets in the Plan, *i.e.*, by taking each pollutant's emissions results from EMFAC2014 and then rounding emissions up to the nearest whole number.

If you have any questions regarding these adequacy findings, please contact me at 415-972-3851 or have your staff contact Anita Lee at (415) 972-3958 or Wienke Tax at (415) 947-4192.

Sincerely,



Matthew J. Lakin
Acting Director, Air Division

Enclosure

cc: Wayne Nastri, Executive Officer, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director, Southern California Association of Governments
Michael Morris, Federal Highway Administration
Ted Matley, Federal Transit Administration

Enclosure 1: Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review

Control Strategy State Implementation Plan (SIP) Under Review: 2006 PM _{2.5} Serious Area Plan in the 2016 AQMP ("South Coast 2006 PM _{2.5} Serious Area Plan")		Date of SIP Revision Receipt by EPA: April 27, 2017
Reviewer: Wienke Tax		
Adequacy Review Criteria (40 CFR part 93)		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.	Y
Sec. 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
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iii)	The motor vehicle emission budget(s) is clearly identified and precisely quantified.	Y
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iv)	The motor vehicle emissions budget(s), when considered together with all other emission sources, is	Y

The April 27, 2017 transmittal letter submitting the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was sent by CARB's Executive Officer, Richard Corey, the Governor's designee. The transmittal letter indicates that the CARB formally adopted the plan on March 23, 2017 through a Board Resolution (17-7 and 17-8). The local air district (South Coast AQMD) released its draft plan on December 2, 2016 and held public workshops November 15 and 17, 2016 requesting that public comments be received prior to or at their Board adoption hearing. The District Board hearings were held on February 3 and March 3, 2017. CARB issued the public notice on March 6, 2017 and requested public comments at or before the public hearing held on March 23, 2017. A link to the CARB notice can be found here: https://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planaarea/seabsip/pubnot_mar2017.pdf

Consultation with federal, state and local agencies was undertaken. Page ES-12 of the 2016 AMQP describes the participation among the various agencies in development of the plan. Consultation on the Draft 2016 AQMP, including the conformity budgets, occurred throughout late 2016 via meetings between the EPA, CARB, and SCAQMD staff in consultation with SCAG staff. The EPA received a copy of the draft 2016 AQMP and the EPA's comments were addressed.

The motor vehicle emissions budgets for 2017 and 2019 are clearly identified and precisely quantified in Appendix VI-D of the 2006 PM_{2.5} Serious Area Plan. These budgets reflect control measures that are already adopted and approved into the SIP.

The EPA has preliminarily concluded that the budgets for the years 2017 and 2019, when considered together with all other emission sources, are consistent with the requirement to demonstrate reasonable further progress and attainment

	consistent with applicable requirements for reasonable further progress, attainment, or maintenance (whichever is relevant to the given plan).		for the 2006 PM _{2.5} standard. This finding is based on review of the plan's RFP demonstration (Appendix VI-C of the plan, specifically Tables VI-C-3, VI-C-3A, and VI-C-4). Attainment and RFP are demonstrated without reliance on new measures (i.e., RFP and attainment are demonstrated based on emissions reductions from existing measures).
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(v)	The plan shows a clear relationship among the emissions budget(s), control measures and the total emissions inventory.	Y	The plan shows a clear relationship among the budgets for years 2017 and 2019, the control measures and the total emissions inventories in those RFP milestone and attainment years. The planning emissions inventories for all stationary, area, on-road mobile, and nonroad mobile sources are shown in Table 3-4A of the plan and in more detail in Appendix III, Attachment A. The MVEBs shown on page VI-D-5, and documented in Appendix VI-D, are consistent with the on-road emissions estimates in Table 3-4A and the emissions estimates in Appendix III.
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	The most recent conformity budgets found adequate by the EPA for the PM _{2.5} standard were approved on November 9, 2011 (76 FR 69928) and were established as part of the attainment plan for the 1997 PM _{2.5} standards. The budgets under consideration do not replace the budgets approved in the 2007 AQMP because those budgets were for the 1997 PM _{2.5} standard. We did not act on MVEBs submitted for the attainment year of the South Coast 2006 PM _{2.5} moderate area plan because the plan was approved as an impracticability demonstration and the area reclassified to serious. Thus today's action is the first time the EPA is finding budgets adequate for the 2006 PM _{2.5} NAAQS. A discussion of the changes in the EMFAC model is discussed starting on page 3-3 of the Plan. More detailed information on the changes incorporated in EMFAC 2014 can be found at http://www.arb.ca.gov/msef/categories.htm . EMFAC2014 was approved by the EPA on December 14, 2015 (80 FR 77337), and the EPA's December 2015 notice of availability for EMFAC2014 details the basis for the changes to the emission factors. Changes in VMT and speed distributions are due to the use of VMT estimates and speed distributions from SCAG's 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), adopted April 2016.
Sec. 93.118(e)(5)	EPA has reviewed the State's compilation of public comments and response to comments that are required to be submitted with any implementation plan.	Y	Public comments are included and are addressed by the District. The District provided these comments and responses as an attachment to the SIP (two volumes of Comments and Responses to Comments) which they adopted in March of 2017. 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.