In this notice, the EPA is notifying the public of its finding that the State's current PM₁₀ emissions are adequately explained the derivation of the EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. The EPA's analysis of how the State's submission satisfies these criteria is found in the adequacy letter. The EPA's MVEB adequacy review is separate from the EPA's SIP completeness review and it also should not be used to prejudge the EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find the budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

The minimum criteria by which we determine whether a SIP's MVEBs are adequate for conformity purposes are specified at 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4). The EPA's analysis of how the State's submission satisfies these criteria is found in the adequacy letter. The EPA's MVEB adequacy review is separate from the EPA's SIP completeness review and it also should not be used to prejudge the EPA's ultimate approval of the SIP. Even if we find the budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Dated: May 23, 2013.

Dennis J. McLerran,
Regional Administrator, Region 10.

For any further information concerning this action, please contact Claudia Vergnani Vaupel, U.S. EPA, Region 10 (OAWT–107), 1200 Sixth Ave., Suite 900, Seattle WA 98101; (206) 553–8321 or vaupel.claudia@epa.gov.

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P
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