MEETING OF THE

TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, February 26, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

SCAG Main Office
Policy Committee A Conference Room
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.236.1800

Teleconference
Call-in Telephone: (646) 558-8656 or (669) 900-6833
Meeting ID: 153 963 916

Zoom Meeting URL:
https://scag.zoom.us/j/153963916

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact:

Rongsheng Luo at 213.236.1994 or luo@scag.ca.gov

Agendas and Minutes for the Transportation Conformity Working Group are also available at:
http://www.scag.ca.gov/committees/Pages/CommitteeL2/SingleCommittee.aspx?CID=25

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency’s essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 236-1908. We request at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations and will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.
1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND SELF-INTRODUCTION
James Mejia, Chair

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the TCWG, must fill out a speaker's card prior to speaking and submit it to the Staff Assistant. A speaker's card must be turned in before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The Chair may limit the total time for comments to twenty (20) minutes.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR
3.1 Revised December 4, 2018 TCWG Meeting Minutes 3.1-1
  Attachment 3.1
3.2 January 22, 2019 TCWG Meeting Minutes 3.2-1
  Attachment 3.2

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS
4.1 Review of PM Hot Spot Interagency Review Form 4.1-1 10 minutes
  Attachment 4.1 LAF7123
4.2 Proposed Framework of Regional Emissions Analysis for SCAG’s Connect SoCal (2020 RTP/SCS)
  Mana Sangkapichai, SCAG 15 minutes
  Attachment 4.2
4.3 RTP Update John Asuncion, SCAG 5 minutes
4.4 FTIP Update John Asuncion, SCAG 5 minutes
4.5 EPA Update
  - Standing Update
  - Sanction Clocks Update
  Karina O’Connor and Wienke Tax, EPA 10 minutes
4.6 ARB Update
  - Standing Update
  - SIP Update
  Nesamani Kalandiyur, ARB 10 minutes
4.7 Air Districts Update
  - Standing Update
  - AQMP/SIP Update
  District Representatives 10 minutes

5.0 INFORMATION SHARING
5 minutes

6.0 ADJOURNMENT
The next meeting of the Transportation Conformity Working Group will be held on Tuesday, March 25, 2019 at the SCAG main office in downtown Los Angeles.
THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP. A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG’S OFFICE.

The Meeting of the Transportation Conformity Working Group was held at the SCAG office in Los Angeles.

**In Attendance:**
- Huddleston, Lori (Metro)
- Mejia, James (SBCTA)

**SCAG:**
- Asuncion, John
- Barragan, Carlos
- Louie, Matthew
- Luo, Rongsheng

**Via Teleconference:**
- Anderson, Kelsie (WKE)
- Brugger, Ron (LSA Associates)
- Cacatian, Ben (VCAPCD)
- Christian, Shalanda (Caltrans Headquarters)
- Chiou, Wayne (Caltrans District 12)
- D’onofrio, Joe (Jacobs Engineering)
- Hendrawan, Kevin (MDAQMD)
- Lau, Charles (Caltrans District 7)
- Lazarus, Margery (City of Moreno Valley)
- McFall, Valarie (TCA)
- Nord, Greg (OCTA)
- O’Connor, Karina (EPA Region 9)
- Pereira, Melina (Caltrans District 11)
- Sanchez, Lucas (Caltrans Headquarters)
- Slavick, Michael (LSA Associates)
- Stauffer, Panah (EPA Region 9)
- Salcedo, Hector (Michael Baker International)
- Tax, Wienke (EPA Region 9)
- Yoon, Andrew (Caltrans District 7)
1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND SELF-INTRODUCTION

Rongsheng Luo, SCAG, expressed sincere thanks to and acknowledged Lori Huddleston, Metro, for her outstanding extended services and contribution as immediate past TCWG Chair. Mr. Luo also welcomed and introduced James Mejia, SBCTA, as new TCWG Chair.

James Mejia, TCWG Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:06 am.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1. October 23, 2018 TCWG Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were approved.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Review of PM Hot Spot Interagency Review Forms

1) RIV010206

It was determined that this was not a POAQC (FHWA concurrence was received after the meeting).

2) RIV031215

It was determined that this was not a POAQC (Caltrans, EPA, and FHWA concurrences were received after the meeting).

4.2 FTIP Update

John Asuncion, SCAG, reported the following:

- 2019 FTIP had been adopted by SCAG Regional Council.
- Federal approval of 2019 FTIP was expected by mid-December 2018.

4.3 RTP Update

John Asuncion, SCAG, reported the following:

- 2016 RTP/SCS Amendment #3 had been adopted by SCAG Regional Council.
- Federal approval of 2016 RTP/SCS Amendment #3 was expected by mid-December 2018.
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4.4 EPA Update
Karina O’Connor, EPA Region 9, reported the following:
- Transportation conformity for NO\textsubscript{2} was no longer required for South Coast area effective September 22, 2018, twenty years after original maintenance area designation; a confirmation letter would be sent to Caltrans, SCAG, and other agencies.
- EPA staff hoped to finalize notice to approve South Coast 2006 24-hour PM\textsubscript{2.5} SIP by end of 2018. Final notice will approve previously deemed adequate transportation conformity budgets as well as trading mechanism.
- EPA had finalized guidance to address how transportation conformity can be implemented in ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas affected by February 16, 2018 decision of U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. SCAG region will not be impacted by the Court decision. The guidance had been emailed to SCAG, Caltrans, and other agencies for informational purposes.
- Implementation rule for 2015 8-hour ozone standards was signed on November 7, 2018 and expected to be published by December 7, 2018.
- On November 13, 2018, EPA announced it will work on cleaner heavy duty truck standards.

In response to questions, Ms. O’Connor, EPA Region 9, confirmed that SCAG will not need to make regional transportation conformity determination for NO\textsubscript{2} and 1997 8-hour ozone standards; In addition, 2008 8-hour ozone standards were not revoked in 2015 8-hour ozone implementation rule.

4.5 ARB Update
None.

4.6 Air Districts Update
None.

5.0 INFORMATION SHARING
None.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 am. The next Transportation Conformity Working Group meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 22, 2019, at the SCAG main office in downtown Los Angeles.
THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP. A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG’S OFFICE.

The Meeting of the Transportation Conformity Working Group was held at the SCAG office in Los Angeles.

In Attendance:
Huddleston, Lori    Metro
Mejia, James     SBCTA
Morris, Michael    FHWA

SCAG:
Asuncion, John
Louie, Matthew
Luo, Rongsheng
Sangkapichai, Mana

Via Teleconference:
Brugger, Ron     LSA Associates
Cacatian, Ben     VCAPCD
Chan, Jenny     RCTC
Gallo, Ilene    Caltrans District 11
McFall, Valarie    TCA
Nord, Greg     OCTA
Sanchez, Lucas    Caltrans Headquarters
Sun, Lijin    SCAQMD
Whiteaker, Warren     OCTA
Yoon, Andrew    Caltrans District 7

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND SELF-INTRODUCTION
James Mejia, TCWG Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
None.
TCWG Minutes January 22, 2018

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1. December 4, 2018 TCWG Meeting Minutes

In response to a comment, Rongsheng Luo, SCAG, confirmed that the meeting minutes would be revised to reflect reported status update on 2016 RTP/SCS Amendment #3 under agenda item 4.3 RTP Update.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Impact of Federal Government Shutdown on Transportation Conformity and Projects
Lucas Sanchez, Caltrans Headquarters, reported the following:
- Federal government shutdown in progress had potential to affect project scheduling and delivery.
  - Until federal government shutdown ended and EPA and FTA returned to normal operations, any major FTIP amendments and project-level determinations that require EPA and FTA concurrence (e.g., new conformity and POAQC determinations) could not move forward.
  - However, minor FTIP amendment, addition of and changes to exempt projects could move forward during federal government shutdown.
- RTP and FTIP conformity re-determination needed to receive federal approval by August 3, 2019 for 2015 8-hour ozone standards.

Michael Morris, FHWA, clarified that only changes to highway projects that do not require conformity determination would be approved during federal government shutdown.

In response to a question, Mr. Morris, FHWA, expected some backlog of work at EPA and FTA after end of federal government shutdown.

In response to a question, Mr. Sanchez, Caltrans Headquarters, clarified that a minor FTIP amendment was an amendment that did not require a new conformity determination (e.g., an FTIP administrative modification).

4.2 FTIP Update
John Asuncion, SCAG, reported the following:
- 2019 FTIP and 2019 FTIP Amendment #19-01 received concurrent federal approval in mid-December 2018.
- 2019 Administrative modification #19-02 was also approved before federal government shutdown.
In response to a question, Mr. Morris, FHWA, and Mr. Asuncion, SCAG, further clarified that change to transit projects in an FTIP administrative modification (e.g., bus replacement) could move forward during federal government shutdown.

In response to a question, Mr. Asuncion, SCAG, stated that project input for next 2019 FTIP Administrative Modification #19-04 would be due to SCAG by February 26, 2019.

4.3 RTP Update
Mr. Asuncion reported the following:
- 2016 RTP/SCS Amendment #3 was approved concurrently with 2019 FTIP.
- 2020 RTP/SCS, known as Connect SoCal, was under development.

4.4 EPA Update
None.

4.5 ARB Update
None.

4.6 Air Districts Update
None.

5.0 INFORMATION SHARING
None.

6.0 ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 am. The next Transportation Conformity Working Group meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 26, 2019, at the SCAG main office in downtown Los Angeles.
RTIP ID# (required) LAF7123

TCWG Consideration Date: February 26, 2019

Project Description (clearly describe project)
The proposed project is located on the north side of Magnolia Blvd. between Cahuenga Blvd. and Vineland Ave. in Council District 2 and in the North Hollywood–Valley Village community of the City of Los Angeles (Figures 1 and 2). The proposed project is on the Burbank 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle (California-Los Angeles County 7.5-minute topographic map series).

The City of Los Angeles (City) Bureau of Engineering proposes to widen the north side of Magnolia Blvd. between Cahuenga Blvd. and Vineland Ave. - a distance of 2,600 feet (ft) - to improve traffic flow and reduce traffic congestion along this segment of the street. The proposed project would increase vehicular traffic safety by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane.

The Magnolia Blvd. right-of-way between Cahuenga Blvd. and Vineland Ave. varies from 80 to 90 ft wide, with the north side of the street generally consisting of a 25-ft-wide paved roadway and a sidewalk that varies in width from 15 to 25 ft along the alignment. In addition to one through lane eastbound and two through lanes westbound, Magnolia Blvd. has left-turn pockets at intersections and a parking lane on each side of the street. On the south side of Magnolia Blvd., the sidewalk is 7 ft wide. The south side of this segment of Magnolia Blvd. was widened, reconstructed, and resurfaced in 2011. To increase pedestrian safety for this street widening project, curb extensions will be added at three locations on the south side of Magnolia Blvd.

The proposed project would reconfigure Magnolia Blvd. between Cahuenga Blvd. and Vineland Ave. to accommodate street parking on both sides, two travel lanes in each direction, and a center turn lane median. These changes would be accomplished by widening the northern half of the roadway between Cahuenga Blvd. and Vineland Ave. by 7 ft to a width of 32 ft, within an existing 40-ft-wide alignment, and narrowing the existing sidewalks on the north side to 8 ft wide (sidewalk width would vary). Proposed project improvements would include: concrete curbs, gutters, curb extensions, and 7-ft to 8-ft-wide sidewalk; asphalt-concrete pavement; storm drains and sanitary sewers; street trees and lighting; and traffic signals. The road would be restriped between Cahuenga Blvd. and Vineland Ave. The reconfigured and upgraded project alignment would meet Avenue II Street standards.

Construction of the proposed improvements is expected to start in January 2019 and to be completed within 12 months. During construction, one lane in each direction would be maintained and on-street parking would not be available. Construction would include grading, shoring, and resurfacing, as well as concrete forming and concrete pours. Approximately 16 street trees would be removed, 26 power poles would be relocated, and other utilities would be relocated as needed. Parking availability after completion of the project would be the same as at present.

Funding for the project would include both City local funds and federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Federal funding triggers a requirement to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in addition to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project would be designed, constructed, and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances, and formally adopted City standards including but not limited to: Los Angeles Municipal Code (Reference 25); Bureau of Engineering Standard Plans (Reference 33); Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Reference 1); Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (Reference 2); Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Reference 32).

Type of Project (use Table 1 on instruction sheet): Roadway Widening

| County | Narrative Location/Route & Postmiles: | Caltrans Projects – EA# |
| LA | Magnolia Blvd. between Vineland Ave. and Cahuenga Blvd. in the City of Los Angeles | NA |

Lead Agency: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering

Contact Person: Billy Ho
Phone#: 213-485-5745
Fax#: 213-485-5745
Email: Billy.ho@lacity.org

Hot Spot Pollutant of Concern (check one or both): PM2.5 X PM10 X

Federal Action for which Project-Level PM Conformity is Needed (check appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Categorical Exclusion (NEPA)</th>
<th>EA or Draft EIS</th>
<th>FONSI or Final EIS</th>
<th>PS&amp;E or Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PM Conformity Hot Spot Analysis – Project Summary for Interagency Consultation

Scheduled Date of Federal Action: 2019

NEPA Assignment – Project Type: (check appropriate box)

| Exempt | Section 326 – Categorical Exemption | X | Section 327 – Non-Categorical Exemption |

Current Programming Dates (as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Bid and Award</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Purpose and Need (Summary): (attach additional sheets as necessary)

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve traffic flow, reduce traffic congestion, and provide street infrastructure improvements along a 0.5-mile section of Magnolia Blvd. Curb extensions will be added at three locations on the south side of Magnolia Blvd. The widening of the northern side of Magnolia Blvd. would complete the City’s improvements to this stretch of Magnolia Blvd. that began with the widening of the southern side of the street in 2011.

The project is needed due to existing and projected future traffic congestion along Magnolia Blvd. As shown in Table 1, peak-hour conditions at Magnolia Blvd. and Cahuenga Blvd. and evening peak-hour conditions at Magnolia Blvd. and Vineland Ave. are congested.

Table 1: Existing (2017) Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection with Magnolia</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Through Volume</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Level of Service (LOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning (AM)</td>
<td>Evening (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland Avenue</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton Avenue</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuenga Boulevard</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AM – morning, PM – evening, LOS – Level of Service, v/c – volume to capacity. Level of Service is rated A (best) through F (worst)

Source: Parsons, 2018, Transportation Impact Study

Surrounding Land Use/Traffic Generators (especially effect on diesel traffic)

Adjacent land uses include small-scale retail businesses, multi-family and single-family residential development, and small-scale institutional facilities.

Opening Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility

Opening Year No-Build conditions are presented in Table 2. AADT is not available, but peak-hour traffic is believed to represent at least 10% of AADT. Truck counts are not available, but as there are no sources or destinations for heavy truck traffic in the vicinity of the project, heavy trucks are believed to be 2% or less of AADT.

Table 2: Year 2019 No-Build Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection with Magnolia</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Through Volume</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning (AM)</td>
<td>Evening (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland Avenue</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>1,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton Avenue</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuenga Boulevard</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AM – morning, PM – evening, LOS – Level of Service, v/c – volume to capacity. Level of Service is rated A (best) through F (worst)

Source: Parsons, 2018, Transportation Impact Study
RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility

Design Year No-Build and Build conditions are shown in Tables 3 and 4. AADT is not available, but peak-hour traffic is believed to represent at least 10% of AADT. Truck counts are not available, but as there are no sources or destinations for heavy truck traffic in the vicinity of the project, heavy trucks are believed to be 2% or less of AADT.

**Table 3: Year 2039 No-Build Traffic Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection with Magnolia</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Through Volume</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning (AM)</td>
<td>Evening (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland Avenue</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton Avenue</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuenga Boulevard</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AM – morning, PM – evening, LOS – Level of Service, v/c – volume to capacity. Level of Service is rated A (best) through F (worst)

Source: Parsons, 2018, Transportation Impact Study

**Table 4: Year 2039 Build Traffic Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection with Magnolia</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Through Volume</th>
<th>Peak-Hour Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning (AM)</td>
<td>Evening (PM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland Avenue</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton Avenue</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuenga Boulevard</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AM – morning, PM – evening, LOS – Level of Service, v/c – volume to capacity. Level of Service is rated A (best) through F (worst)

Source: Parsons, 2018, Transportation Impact Study

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, the project would improve the LOS at the Riverton Ave. intersection with Magnolia Blvd., midway between the Vineland Ave. and Cahuenga Blvd. intersections. Conditions at those intersections would remain substantially the same as under No Build conditions.

Describe potential traffic redistribution effects of congestion relief (impact on other facilities)

Congestion relief would occur primarily at mid-block. Improvements at the signalized intersections at either end of the project would be minimal. Thus, the project is not expected to have redistribution effects.

Comments/Explanation/Details (attach additional sheets as necessary)

The proposed project is not considered a Project of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) for PM\(_{10}\) or PM\(_{2.5}\) because it does not meet the definition of a POAQC as defined in USEPA’s Transportation Conformity Guidance:

- Average traffic volumes Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue are less than 125,000 vehicles per day, and diesel truck traffic on Magnolia Boulevard is less than 8 percent of this vehicle volume (less than 10,000 trucks per day);
- The intersections of Magnolia Boulevard with Cahuenga Boulevard and with Vineland Avenue do not experience significant numbers of diesel trucks, and the future No-Build LOS at these intersections would not be degraded to LOS D, E, or F with implementation of the project due to increased traffic volumes from a significant number of diesel vehicles;
- The project does not involve a new or expanded bus or rail terminal or transfer point; and
- The project is not in or affecting a location, area, or category of site that is identified in a PM\(_{2.5}\) or PM\(_{10}\) implementation plan or implementation plan submission, as appropriate, as sites of possible violation.
Figure 1: Project Vicinity Map
Figure 2: Project Alignment
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10} (2008 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10} (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td>PM\textsubscript{10}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO (2012 NAAQS)</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2037</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 5A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2037</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>Ozone$^a$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^c$</td>
<td>Ozone$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Western Mojave Desert Air Basin – Antelope Valley Portion of Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County Portion of MDAB excluding Searles Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone$^a$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6A: Western Mojave Desert Air Basin – Antelope Valley Portion of Los Angeles County and San Bernardino County Portion of MDAB excluding Searles Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2037</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS Ozone$^a$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone $^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^c$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Mojave Desert Air Basin – San Bernardino County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM$_{10}^*$</td>
<td>PM$_{2.5}^*$</td>
<td>PM$_{2.5}^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Build/No-Build test

### Table 8: Mojave Desert Air Basin – Searles Valley Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM$_{10}^*$</td>
<td>PM$_{2.5}^*$</td>
<td>PM$_{2.5}^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Build/No-Build test

### Table 9: Salton Sea Air Basin – Coachella Valley Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS Ozone$^a$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9A: Salton Sea Air Basin – Coachella Valley Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS Ozone$^a$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^b$</td>
<td>Ozone$^c$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Salton Sea Air Basin – Coachella Valley Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11: Salton Sea Air Basin – Imperial County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS Ozone$^a$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11A
Salton Sea Air Basin – Imperial County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12
Salton Sea Air Basin – Imperial County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Build/No-Build test

### Table 12A
Salton Sea Air Basin – Imperial County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td>PM2.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13
Salton Sea Air Basin – Imperial County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM10</td>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>PM10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Build/No-Build test

### Table 13A
Salton Sea Air Basin – Imperial County Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeling Year</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS PM10</td>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>PM10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Build/No-Build test