ADEQUATE MOTOR VEHICLE EMISSIONS BUDGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget year</th>
<th>Volatile organic compounds (tons per summer day)</th>
<th>Nitrogen oxides (tons per summer day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 ..........</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The criteria we use to determine whether a SIP’s motor vehicle emissions budgets are adequate for conformity purposes are outlined in 40 CFR 93.118(e)(4), promulgated on August 15, 1997.2 We have further described our process for determining the adequacy of submitted SIP budgets in our final rule dated July 1, 2004, and we used the information in these resources in making our adequacy determination.3 Please note that an adequacy review is separate from the EPA’s completeness review and should not be used to prejudge the EPA’s ultimate action on the SIP. Even if we find a budget adequate, the SIP could later be disapproved.

Pursuant to 40 CFR 93.104[e], within 2 years of the effective date of this notice, SANDAG and the U.S. Department of Transportation will need to demonstrate conformity to the new budgets if the demonstration has not already been made.4 For demonstrating conformity to the budgets in this plan, the on-road motor vehicle emissions from implementation of the transportation plan or program should be projected consistently with the budgets in this plan, i.e., by taking the county’s emissions results derived from CARB’s EMFAC model (short for EMission FACtor) and then rounding the emissions up to the nearest ton.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.
Alexis Strauss,
Acting Regional Administrator, Region IX.

EIS No. 20170222, Final, NMFS, OR,

EIS No. 20170223, Draft, NCPC, DC,
South Mall Campus Master Plan, Comment Period Ends: 01/16/2018, Contact: Matthew Flis (202) 482–7236.

EIS No. 20170224, Draft, USACE, VA,
Draft Integrated City of Norfolk Coastal Storm Risk Management Feasibility Study, Comment Period Ends: 01/02/2018, Contact: Kathy Perdue (757) 201–7218.

EIS No. 20170225, Final, DOS, DC,
Foreign Missions Center at the Former Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Review Period Ends: 12/18/2017, Contact: Geoffrey Hunt (202) 647–7530.


EIS No. 20170227, Draft, TVA, TN,

EIS No. 20170228, Final, FHWA, NY,
New York State Route 198 (Scajaquada Expressway) Corridor Project, Review Period Ends: 12/19/2017, Contact: Peter Osborn (518) 431–4127.

Dated: November 14, 2017.
Kelly Knight,
Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

1 See letter from Matthew J. Lakin, Acting Director, Air Division, EPA Region IX, to Richard Corey, Executive Officer, CARB, dated October 19, 2017.
3 See 69 FR 40004 (July 1, 2004).
4 See 73 FR 4419 (January 24, 2008).