



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**REGION 8**  
**999 18<sup>TH</sup> STREET- SUITE 300**  
**DENVER, CO 80202-2466**  
**Phone 800-227-8917**  
**<http://www.epa.gov/region08>**

Ref: 8P-AR

MAY - 2 2005

Richard Sprott, Director  
Division of Air Quality  
Utah Department of Environmental Quality  
150 North 1950 West  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Subject: Adequacy determination for Salt Lake City and Ogden motor vehicle emission budgets.

Dear Mr. Sprott:

Pursuant to Section 93.118(e) of the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR 93, Subpart A), EPA has reviewed the Salt Lake City and Ogden carbon monoxide (CO) revised maintenance plans that were submitted by Governor Olene Walker on October 19, 2004 and November 29, 2004 respectively. Our review was intended to determine the adequacy of the motor vehicle emissions budgets for CO contained in these plans for purposes of conformity. The conformity rule spells out limited technical and administrative criteria that we must use in determining the adequacy of submitted emissions budgets, and we have determined that these criteria have been satisfied for these CO motor vehicle emissions budgets.


We find that the budget of 278.62 tons per day specified for Salt Lake City for the year 2019 and 73.02 tons per day for Ogden for the year 2021 are adequate for transportation conformity purposes. Previously approved budgets for years other than 2019 in Salt Lake and 2021 in Ogden must still be used in any conformity determination until the maintenance plans are fully approved by EPA (40 CFR 93.118(e)(1)). As a result of our adequacy finding, the Wasatch Front Regional Council of Governments, the Utah Department of Transportation, and the U.S. Department of Transportation are required to use these budgets in future conformity analyses.

We announced receipt of these maintenance plans on the Internet and requested public comment regarding the adequacy of the motor vehicle emission budgets by no later than March 24, 2005. We received no comments on the plan during that comment period. As part of our review, which is summarized in Enclosure 1, we also reviewed comments about the maintenance plan submitted to the Utah Division of Air Quality during the public hearing process. There were no adverse comments from the public submitted during the State hearing process regarding the budgets and EPA comments were addressed.

We will announce this adequacy determination in the Federal Register, but that notice will not constitute a new action or change the effect of this letter. This determination will become effective 15 days after the Federal Register announcement. If you have any questions,

please contact me at (303) 312-6005, or Jeffrey Kimes at (303) 312-6445.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard R. Long", written over the typed name and title.

Richard R. Long, Director  
Air and Radiation Program

cc: Steve Call, Utah Division, FHWA  
Kip Billings, Mountainland Association of Governments  
Eldon Bingham, Utah Department of Transportation

**Enclosure 1**

**Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review  
Revised Maintenance Plan for Salt Lake City and Ogden Carbon Monoxide Standard**

Transportation Conformity Adequacy Review Criteria	Condition Satisfied?	Y	Reference to 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	October 19, 2004 and November 29, 2004 for Salt Lake and Ogden respectively from Utah governor. Evidence of public hearings was included.
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	EPA's comments on drafts of the proposed rules were addressed adequately in the rules submitted for approval. EPA is aware that consultation with state, federal and local agencies occurred during the preparation of these plans. Full documentation of the plans was included.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(iii)	The MVEBs are clearly identified and precisely quantified.	Y	The MVEBs for SLC and Ogden seen in Section IX, Part C.7, page 7 and Section IX, Part C.8, page 7 respectively.
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 preliminarily concluded that the submitted SIP Revision demonstrates maintenance in areas for the remainder of the maintenance periods and that the MVEBs are consistent with that demonstration. Projected emissions in Table 3 on page 5 of the submitted rule revisions illustrates that total CO emissions from all sources are expected to be well below levels the areas reached when they attained the standard. The proposed motor vehicle emissions budgets (that include safety margins) when combined with expected emissions inventories from all other sources are lower than the levels needed to maintain the standard as discussed on page seven of the submitted rules.

Transportation Review Criteria	Is Criterion Satisfied?	Reference in SIP Document / Comments
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(v)	Y	The plans discuss the control measure and enumerate the total estimated emissions and include Technical Support Documents that describe in detail how the emissions were estimated.
Sec. 93.118(e)(4)(vi)	Y	<p>Emissions inventories were revised based on new emissions estimates derived from using the MOBILE6.2 model and from updated estimates for stationary sources.</p> <p>Safety margins changed.</p> <p>VMT estimates based on latest travel model from MPOs. Changes based on adjustments in growth projections and development patterns.</p>
Sec. 93.118(e)(5)	Y	There were no public comments.
Reviewer: Jeffrey Kimes		Date of Review: March 2005