



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

NOV 03 2011

James N. Goldstene, Executive Officer
 California Air Resources Board
 1001 I Street, P.O. Box 2815
 Sacramento, California 95812

Re: Adequacy Finding for Sacramento County PM₁₀ Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

Dear Mr. Goldstene:

We have found adequate for transportation conformity purposes the motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) in the *PM₁₀ Implementation/Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request for Sacramento County (October 28, 2010)* (“Sacramento PM₁₀ Plan” or “PM₁₀ Plan”) for the federal 24-hour PM₁₀ national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). As a result of our adequacy finding, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and the U.S. Department of Transportation must use these budgets in future conformity analyses.

The PM₁₀ Plan was adopted without amendment by the governing board of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) on October 28, 2010. The California Air Resources Board formally adopted the PM₁₀ Plan on November 18, 2010, and they submitted it to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on December 7, 2010.

The PM₁₀ Plan identifies MVEBs for the Sacramento County area for PM₁₀ and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) for 2008, 2012, and 2022. We announced receipt of the PM₁₀ Plan on the Internet on September 1, 2011, and requested public comment by October 3, 2011. We did not receive any comments on the budgets and PM₁₀ Plan during the comment period. We are not acting on the PM₁₀ Plan at this time.

This letter transmits our decision that the MVEBs in the PM₁₀ Plan for the Sacramento County area are adequate for transportation conformity decisions. The adequate budgets are listed in the following table.

Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for PM ₁₀ Sacramento County Nonattainment Area		
Budget Year	NO _x tons per average winter day	PM ₁₀ tons per average winter day
2008	50	15
2012	38	15
2022	19	17

In reaching this decision, we have reviewed the PM₁₀ Plan, including responses to public comments on the plan, and have determined that the related MVEBs, when considered with all other emissions sources in Sacramento County, are consistent with applicable requirements for maintenance of the PM₁₀ NAAQS through the year 2022. The budgets also meet the other adequacy criteria found in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4).

We have enclosed a table that summarizes our adequacy determination. We will soon post this information on the Internet at: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm>. We will also announce this adequacy determination in the Federal Register. This determination will become effective 15 days after the Federal Register announcement pursuant to 40 CFR 93.118(f). If you have any questions regarding this decision, please contact Kerry Drake at (415) 947-4157 or John Ungvarsky at (415) 972-3963.

Sincerely,


Deborah Jordan
Director, Air Division

Enclosure

cc: Larry Greene, Executive Director, SMAQMD
Mike McKeever, Executive Director, SACOG
Joseph Vaughn, Federal Highway Administration
Ted Matley, Federal Transit Administration
Mike Brady, CA Department of Transportation

Enclosure

Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review

Control Strategy State Implementation Plan (SIP) Under Review: <i>PM₁₀ Implementation/Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request for Sacramento County</i>		Date of SIP Revision Receipt by EPA: 12/10/10	
Reviewers: John Ungvarsky		Date: 10/4/11	
Transportation Review Criteria		Is Criterion Satisfied? Y/N	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	<p>The December 7, 2010 transmittal letter submitting the Sacramento PM₁₀ Plan was sent by the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) Executive Officer, James Goldstene, the Governor's designee. The notice for the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Board hearing was published in the Sacramento Bee on September 27, 2010 and sent to over 2000 e-mail addresses. The Draft Plan was made available on the District's website and was available for viewing at the District office on and after September 27, 2010. The Board of Directors for the SMAQMD held a public hearing prior to considering approval of this PM₁₀ plan.</p> <p>SMAQMD approved the Plan at a public hearing on October 28, 2010 and transmitted the Board Resolution (2010-046) with the plan and other supporting documentation to CARB on November 2, 2010. CARB adopted the plan, including a supporting PM₁₀ transportation conformity budget, as a revision to the California State Implementation Plan (SIP), at a public hearing on November 18, 2010. See CARB Resolution 10-37, which was included as enclosure IV in the SIP submittal package.</p>
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	<p>The Plan uses information provided by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and CARB. Staff consulted with SACOG during Plan preparations because SACOG provides vehicle activity data needed for plan development, and the plan sets motor vehicle emissions budgets that SACOG will have to meet when approving future transportation plans.</p> <p>The public review process also included consultation with SACOG's Regional Planning Partnership (RPP) and SACOG's Climate and Air Quality Committee. SACOG's RPP is an advisory group with representatives from U.S. EPA, Federal Highway Administration, CalTrans, city and county transportation agencies, as</p>

			well as business, environmental, and minority organizations and associations. The RPP serves as the interagency consultation process to provide comments on transportation conformity budgets.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iii)	The motor vehicle emission budget(s) is clearly identified and precisely quantified.	Y	Section 8, <i>Transportation Conformity Budgets</i> , in the Plan clearly identifies the MVEBs and the information used, including references, to develop the MVEBs.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iv)	The motor vehicle emissions budget(s), when considered together with all other emission sources, is consistent with applicable requirements for reasonable further progress, attainment, or maintenance (whichever is relevant to the given plan).	Y	EPA has determined that the MVEBs, when considered together with all other emission sources, are consistent with applicable requirements for maintenance of the PM ₁₀ National Ambient Air Quality Standard. The MVEBs include a safety margin which is clearly explained on pages 8-3 and 8-4 of the plan. The safety margins were included in the emissions estimates used in the maintenance demonstration. See page 6-2 of the plan.
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	Emissions inventory estimates are documented in Section 4, <i>Emissions Inventory</i> and appendix A of the plan, and the control measures in Section 5, <i>Control Measures</i> and appendix B of the plan. The documentation in these portions of the plan clearly shows the relationship among the inventories, control measures, and MVEBs.
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 VMT).	Y	SACOG has been using the build/no build test for PM ₁₀ in their conformity determinations because there have been no previous adequate or approved PM ₁₀ MVEBs. Because this is SMAQMD's first maintenance plan, there are no changes to previous MVEBs to address.
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	We have reviewed the comments and responses. Only one comment letter was received by SMAQMD on the plan. Both the comment letter and SMAQMD's response was included in the submittal package. The comment did not relate to the MVEBs and does not affect EPA's adequacy finding. No comments were received by CARB during the State review process for the plan.