



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

April 15, 2003

Ms. Catherine Witherspoon,
Executive Officer
California Air Resources Board
P.O. Box 2815
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812

Dear Ms. Witherspoon:

We have found adequate for transportation conformity purposes the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the particulate matter (PM-10) progress and attainment plan and motor vehicle emissions budgets for the Coachella Valley (November 2002). As a result of our adequacy finding, the South Coast Association of Governments, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Authority must use these budgets in future conformity analyses.

On March 2, 1999, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued a decision on *Environmental Defense Fund v. Environmental Protection Agency*, NO 97-1637, that we must make an affirmative determination that the submitted motor vehicle emissions budgets contained in the State Implementation Plans (SIPs) are adequate before they are used to determine the conformity of Transportation Improvement Programs or Long Range Transportation Plans. In response to the court decision, we are making any submitted SIP revision containing a control strategy plan available for public comment and responding to these comments before announcing our adequacy determination.

On June 21, 2002 and September 12, 2002 the South Coast Air Quality Management District adopted an amendment to the 1996 Coachella Valley plan. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) submitted the 2002 plan to EPA on November 18, 2002. The submittal consisted of an attainment plan and a request for an extension of attainment date until 2006. The plan identifies regional motor vehicle emissions budgets for PM-10 in tons per day for the years 2003 and 2006. We announced receipt of the plan on the Internet and requested public comment by January 16, 2003. We received no comments on the budgets during the comment period.

This letter transmits our decision that the emissions budgets in the Coachella Valley attainment plan are currently adequate for transportation conformity decisions. In reaching this decision, we have reviewed the plan and have preliminarily determined that it will result in the attainment of the PM-10 standards in the Coachella Valley by the extended attainment date of December 31, 2006. Note that we are making this adequacy determination concurrently with

approval of the attainment demonstration and emission budgets. However, since this approval is limited, new budgets developed using EMFAC 2002, may be used in future conformity determinations as soon as they are determined to be adequate. Both the SCAQMD and CARB have committed to submit in 2003 a revised plan for the Coachella Valley using EMFAC 2002. The revised plan will include revised budgets and, assuming that the new budgets are adequate and approved, the new budgets will replace the budgets in the 2002 plan.

We have enclosed a table that summarizes our adequacy determination. We will soon post this information on the Internet at:

[Http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/pastsips.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oms/transp/conform/pastsips.htm)

We will also include this adequacy determination in the Federal Register notice that announces final approval of the Coachella Valley attainment plan. This determination will become effective 15 days after the Federal Register announcement.

If you have any questions regarding this decision, please contact Eleanor Kaplan of my staff at (415) 947-4147.

Sincerely,

Jack P. Broadbent
Director, Air Division

Enclosure (Adequacy Review)

cc: Bob O'Loughlin, Federal Highway Administration
Randy Bellard, Federal Highway Administration
Leslie Rogers, Federal Transit Administration
Sharon Herzinger, California Department of Transportation
Charles Keynejad, South Coast Association of Governments
Elaine Chang, South Coast Air Quality Management District

Enclosure 1

Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review

Revised Coachella Valley Particulate Matter Attainment Plan

Adopted June 21 and September 13, 2002, Submitted November 18, 2002

TRANSPORTATION REVIEW CRITERIA		IS CRITERI ON SATISFI ED?	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 November 18, 2002 transmittal letter submitting the plan was sent by ARB's Executive Officer, Michael P. Kenny, the governor's designee. Documentation accompanying the describes both state and local level public hearings.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(ii))	The plan was developed through consultation with federal, state and local agencies; full implementation plan documentation was provided to EPA and EPA's stated concerns, if any, were addressed.	Y	Documentation accompanying the plan describes an extensive public and agency outreach effort. EPA received copy of the plan and EPA's comments were addressed.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(ii i)	The motor vehicle emission budgets are clearly identified and precisely quantified.	Y	The motor vehicle budgets are clearly identified and precisely quantified in Appendix E, Table E-3.

TRANSPORTATION REVIEW CRITERIA		IS CRITERI ON SATISFI ED?	REFERENCE IN SIP DOCUMENT/COMMENTS
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iv)	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 plan).	Y	EPA has preliminarily concluded that the submitted SIP demonstrates attainment in the Coachella Valley Area by 2006 and that the MVEBs are consistent with that demonstration.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(v)	The plan shows a clear relationship between the emissions budgets, control measures and the total emissions inventory	Y	The emission inventory for 2006 for all point, area and mobile sources is described in Table 3-6 of the 2002 plan. The control strategy is set out in Chapter 5 of the plan Table 3-7 provides the emission reductions from the control strategy for PM-10.. Budgets are calculated as 2006 emission inventory minus reductions from control strategy.
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 1996 PM Maintenance Plan were disapproved. See 64 FR 71136 (December 20, 1999). The reason for the disapproval was that different motor vehicle emissions elements were not combined into clearly defined budgets consistent with the federal conformity regulations. The budgets in the 2002 plan have been revised to include reentrained paved road dust, reentrant unpaved road dust and road construction.

TRANSPORTATION REVIEW CRITERIA	IS CRITERI ON SATISFI ED?	REFERENCE IN SIP DOCUMENT/COMMENTS
Reviewers: Eleanor Kaplan , Karina O'Connor,		Date of Review: 4/08/03

