

From: Jeffrey King  
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 4:25 PM  
To: Jeffrey King  
Cc: Ron Kirby; Stuart Freudberg; Joan Rohlf; Sunil Kumar; Mike Clifford; Daivamani Sivasailam; Jane Posey; Monica Bansal; Tanisha Williams; Eulalie Gower-Lucas; Erin Morrow; George Nichols; Leah Boggs; katz.judith@epa.gov; Kotsch.Martin@epamail.epa.gov; Fernandez.Cristina@epamail.epa.gov; rehn.brian@epa.gov  
Subject: FW: EPA Summary of Conformity Requirements fro P.G. and Montgomery Counties for Daily PM2.5 Standard

To Members of the MWAQC TAC.

FYI, as requested/promised at our Dec 9 meeting, EPA Region III sent along information on the possible options for dealing with transportation planning under the possible new area designations.

See attached.

Thanks to all who sent in questions. Those questions are being compiled and will be shared/sent to EPA asap.

-----Original Message-----

From: Kotsch.Martin@epamail.epa.gov  
[<mailto:Kotsch.Martin@epamail.epa.gov>]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2008 2:45 PM  
To: Joan Rohlf; Jeffrey King  
Subject: EPA Summary of Conformity Requirements fro P.G. and Montgomery Counties for Daily PM2.5 Standard

Attached is a summary paper which addresses most of the issues that were asked during the conference call. The one open question not answered in the write up is; would a conformity freeze in the Baltimore 8-hour ozone non-attainment area adversely impact the D.C area. Due to complexity of the issue, I am setting up a conference call with our Washington Program Office and our Washington Office of General Counsel to discuss the issue. Unfortunately due to the holiday, the earliest I will be able to confer with them is probably right after January 4. As soon as a consensus is reached on the question, we will provide a response.

(See attached file: Summary of Conformity Requirements After 2006 PM2.doc)