

## 2. NO<sub>x</sub> Reductions Consistent With the Modeling Demonstration

Inside the Baltimore-Washington modeling domain, the District, Maryland and Virginia modeled only the measures indicated in Table 3. The only NO<sub>x</sub> control measure beyond CAA requirements was an additional level of control beyond RACT at large stationary sources of NO<sub>x</sub> in the District's and Maryland's portion of the Washington area. The status of all measures was discussed in the preceding section of this document.

## 3. Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets

As discussed in section III.B.3 of this document, the motor vehicle emissions budgets are the estimate of motor vehicle emissions in the attainment year that when considered with emissions from all other sources is consistent with

attainment. The attainment demonstrations for the Washington area contain levels of modeled emissions that the EPA concludes demonstrate attainment once transport from upwind areas is addressed. The basis for this conclusion will not be altered if the Washington area can demonstrate that the level of nonattainment area emissions in 2005 is equal to or less than the 1999 control strategy levels contained in the attainment demonstrations considering growth. Thus, Maryland, Virginia and the District have demonstrated that revised motor vehicle emissions budgets for 2005 in the attainment demonstrations for the Washington area are adequate by showing that overall emissions including the revised motor vehicle emissions budgets when considered with emissions from all other sources

are less than the 1999 control strategy levels. In the February 2000 plans, the States submitted such a demonstration. The EPA has reviewed these submittals and found that all measures upon which the States relied are now in the approved SIP.

The EPA has interpreted the general adequacy criteria with respect to the 1-hour ozone attainment demonstrations to require the motor vehicle emissions budgets to include the effects of all motor vehicle controls, including Federal measures and the mobile source control measures assumed in the NO<sub>x</sub> SIP Call, that will be in place in the attainment year. Therefore, the revised motor vehicle emissions budgets presumptively must include all currently promulgated Federal measures and State SIP measures and opt-ins shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4.—ON-ROAD MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL MEASURES CONTRIBUTING TO ATTAINMENT OF THE 1-HOUR OZONE NAAQS IN THE WASHINGTON NONATTAINMENT AREA IN 2005

Control measure	Implementation year	Assumed in local modeling demonstration?	In the 2005 motor vehicle emissions budget?
Federal Motor Vehicle Control Program (FMVCP):			
Tier 1 .....	1994	Tier 1 FMVCP only .....	Yes.
Tier 2 .....	2004	.....	Yes.
High enhanced I/M (CAA Mandate) .....	1997	Yes .....	Yes.
Reformulated Gasoline (State Opt-in):			
Phase I .....	1995	Yes .....	Yes.
Phase II .....	2000	No .....	Yes.
Clean Fuel Fleets/National Low Emissions Vehicles (NLEV) .....	1999	No .....	Yes.
Federal Heavy-duty Diesel Vehicle (HDV) 2 gm std .....	2004	No .....	Yes.

## 4. Tier 2/Sulfur Program Benefits

The EPA concludes that based on the modeling and WOE that the Washington area would not need any additional emission reductions beyond those contained in the area attainment demonstration to ensure attainment of the ozone NAAQS by 2005. Like other areas that rely, in part or in full, on Tier 2 reductions in order to demonstrate attainment, the Washington area attainment demonstration was revised in the February 2000 plans to estimate the effects of Tier 2 according to our policy. However, as noted, this was done with the MOBILE5 model which is inaccurate and must be redone with the MOBILE6 model.

The EPA is proposing to conditionally approve the attainment demonstration SIP revisions which include the commitment found in section 9.1.1.2 of the March 2000 plans for the Washington area because the State of Maryland, Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia have

committed to revise and submit to the EPA by April 17, 2004, an updated attainment demonstration SIP that reflects revised MOBILE6-based motor vehicle emissions budgets, including revisions to the attainment modeling and/or weight of evidence demonstration, as necessary, to demonstrate that the SIP continues to demonstrate attainment by November 15, 2005.

## 5. Mid-Course Review (MCR)

In accordance with the provisions of section III.B.5. of this document, the EPA must receive an enforceable commitment to include a MCR from each of the three Washington area States before their attainment demonstrations can be approved. Virginia, Maryland and the District submitted these commitments on February 9, 14 and 22, 2000, respectively. The EPA has concluded that the enforceable commitments found in February 2000 plans are acceptable. However, an enforceable commitment to perform a

mid-course review is meaningless outside of the context of an approved attainment demonstration. For this reason, our proposal to conditionally approve the attainment demonstration includes the enforceable commitment to perform and submit the MCR contained within the February 2000 plans.

## IV. Rate-of-Progress Plans

### A. What Agencies and Organizations Developed the 1996–1999 ROP Plan for the Washington Area?

The District of Columbia, Virginia and Maryland must demonstrate reasonable further progress (RFP) for the Washington area. These jurisdictions, under the auspices of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) (with the assistance of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments) collaborated on a coordinated 1996–1999 ROP plan for the Washington area. The MWAQC includes state and local elected officials and representatives of the DC