DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Credit Reforms in Organized Wholesale Electric Markets; Notice of Technical Conference

April 15, 2010.

Take notice that on May 11, 2010, the Commission staff will convene a technical conference to discuss issues related to the Commission’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Credit Reforms in Organized Wholesale Electric Markets.1

The technical conference will be held from 9 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. (EDT), in the Commission Meeting Room at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426. All those that are interested are invited to attend. The conference is free and no registration is necessary. Further notices with detailed information will be issued in advance of this conference. A free Webcast of this event will be available through http://www.ferc.gov. Anyone with Internet access who desires to listen to this event can do so by navigating http://www.ferc.gov’s Calendar of Events and locating this event in the calendar. The event will contain a link to its Webcast. The Capitol Connection provides technical support for free Webcasts and offers the option of listening via phone-brige for a fee. If you have any questions, visit http://www.CapitolConnection.org or call 703–993–3100. Commission conferences are accessible under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For accessibility accommodations, please send an e-mail to accessibility@ferc.gov or call toll free 1–866–208–3372 (voice) or 202–208–1659 (TTY), or send a FAX to 202–208–2106 with the required accommodations. For more information on this conference, please contact: Christina Hayes, Office of General Counsel—Energy Markets, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, (202) 502–6194, christina.hayes@ferc.gov.


Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2010–11232 Filed 5–11–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Public Utility District No.1 of Snohomish County, WA; Notice of Technical Conference for the Jackson Hydroelectric Project Settlement Agreement


On October 14, 2009, the Public Utility District No.1 of Snohomish County, Washington (District), on behalf of itself, the city of Everett, the city of Sultan, Tulalip Tribe, American Whitewater, and six State and Federal agencies, filed a comprehensive settlement agreement (Settlement) and Joint Explanatory Statement for the relicensing of the Jackson Hydroelectric Project. On May 5, 2010, staff issued a draft environmental assessment analyzing the terms and conditions of the Settlement.

Commission staff will hold a technical conference to discuss the proposed license articles submitted by the District as part of its Settlement and the Commission’s draft environmental assessment.

The technical conference will be held on Tuesday, June 8, 2010, beginning at 9 a.m. (PST). The technical conference will be held at the District’s Electric Building Headquarters located at 2320 California Street, Everett, Washington.

For further information, contact David Turner at (202) 502–6091, or by e-mail at david.turner@ferc.gov.

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2010–11235 Filed 5–11–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Adequacy Status of Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets In Submitted San Joaquin Valley PM2.5 Reasonable Further Progress and Attainment Plan for Transportation Conformity Purposes; CA

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of adequacy and inadequacy.

SUMMARY: In this notice, EPA is notifying the public that the Agency has found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets for the years 2009 and 2012 from the San Joaquin Valley 2008 PM2.5 Plan are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. In this notice, EPA is also notifying the public that the Agency has found that the motor vehicle emissions budgets for the year 2014 from the San Joaquin Valley 2008 PM2.5 Plan are inadequate for transportation conformity purposes. The San Joaquin Valley 2008 PM2.5 Plan was submitted to EPA on June 30, 2008 by the California Air Resources Board as a revision to the California State Implementation Plan and includes reasonable further progress and attainment demonstrations for the 1997 annual and 24-hour PM2.5 national ambient air quality standards. As a result of our adequacy findings, the San Joaquin Valley Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the U.S. Department of Transportation must use the adequate budgets, and cannot use the inadequate budgets, for future conformity determinations.

DATES: This finding is effective May 27, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Wicher, U.S. EPA, Region IX, Air Division AIR–2, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901; (415) 972–3957 or wicher.frances@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Throughout this document, whenever “we,” “us,” or “our” is used, we mean EPA.

Today’s notice is simply an announcement of a finding that we have already made. EPA Region IX sent a letter to California Air Resources Board (CARB or the State) on April 23, 2010 stating that the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the submitted San Joaquin Valley 2008 PM2.5 Plan for the reasonable further progress (RFP) milestone years of 2009 and 2012 are adequate. The finding is available at EPA’s conformity Web site: http://
Our letter dated April 23, 2010 also states that budgets for the attainment year of 2014 are inadequate for transportation conformity purpose. The State has included additional on-road mobile source emissions reductions in the budgets for 2014 from the 2007 State Strategy for the California State Implementation Plan (SIP). The adequate budgets include no such reductions but rather reflect emissions reductions from CARB rules that have already been adopted. EPA has determined that the 2014 budgets are inadequate because they include new emission reductions that do not result from specific or enforceable control measures. As a result, three of the transportation conformity rule’s adequacy criteria are not met (40 CFR 93.118(e)(4)(iii), (iv), and (v)) for these budgets. The inadequate motor vehicle emissions budgets are provided in the following table:

### SJV PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets Found Inadequate

[Annual average, tons per day]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PM&lt;sub&gt;2.5&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>NO&lt;sub&gt;X&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern (SJV)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipt of the motor vehicle emissions budgets in the San Joaquin Valley 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan was announced on EPA’s transportation conformity Web site on August 19, 2008. We received no comments in response to the adequacy review posting. The finding is available at EPA’s transportation conformity Web site: [http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm).

Transportation conformity is required by Clean Air Act section 176(c). EPA’s conformity rule requires that transportation plans, transportation improvement programs, and projects conform to SIPs and establishes the criteria and procedures for determining whether or not they do conform. Conformity to a SIP means that transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The criteria by which we determine whether a SIP’s motor vehicle emission budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4) which was promulgated in our August 15, 1997 final rule (62 FR 43780, 43781–43783). We have further described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in our July 1, 2004 final rule (69 FR 40004, 40038), and we used the information in these resources in making our adequacy determination. Please note that an adequacy review is separate from EPA’s completeness review, and should not be used to prejudge EPA’s ultimate approval action for the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.  
**Date:** Dated: May 5, 2010.  
**Jared Blumenfeld,**  
Regional Administrator, Region IX.  
**Docket:** [FRL–9150–4](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/adequacy.htm)

**SUMMARY:** On March 1, 2010, EPA published a notice in the Federal Register to notify the public of an adequacy determination that the Agency made with regards to the motor vehicle emissions budget (MVEB) for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>X</sub>) and for an insignificance determination related to fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) for mobile sources’ overall contribution to the PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollution in the Hickory-Morganton-Lenoir area (hereafter referred to as the Hickory Area). In that notice, EPA identified the units of measure for the NO<sub>X</sub> MVEB as kilograms per day (kgd) and for PM<sub>2.5</sub> as kilograms per year (kgy). Additionally, the March 1, 2010, Federal Register notice included an inadvertent error to the docket ID number which is being corrected in this action.

**DATES:** This action is effective May 12, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the documentation used in the action being corrected are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following location: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, 61 Forsyth Street, SW., Atlanta, Georgia 30303–8960. The Regional Office’s official hours of business are Monday through