

**Proposed Actions on the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Attainment Plans  
South Coast and San Joaquin Valley Areas in California  
Fact Sheet**

**June 29, 2011**

**Summary of Action**

- EPA is proposing to approve nearly all the elements of the fine particulate (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) air quality plans (Plans) for the South Coast (SC) and San Joaquin Valley (SJV) areas in California and to grant the State's request to extend the deadline for attaining these standards to April 5, 2015. These Plans, known as the State Implementation Plans, are the roadmaps to meeting the health based 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> (NAAQS).
- EPA believes these Plans will reduce pollution to the level required by the health based 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard by 2015.
- Specifically, EPA is proposing to approve the following elements for both areas:
  - Attainment demonstration and air quality modeling
  - Attainment date extension to April 15, 2015
  - Emission inventories
  - Reasonable further Progress demonstrations
  - Reasonably available control measures demonstration
  - Transportation conformity budgets
- EPA is, however, proposing to disapprove the Plans' contingency measures because they do not provide sufficient emissions reductions. EPA is continuing to work with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the air districts to address this issue.

**Background**

- The SJV and SC areas both violate the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. These areas have the highest annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels in the country. PM<sub>2.5</sub> can be emitted directly into the atmosphere or formed in the atmosphere as a result of various chemical reactions from emissions of nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, volatile organic compounds, and ammonia. These particles can reach the deepest regions of the lungs. Exposure to particle pollution is linked to a variety of significant health problems including damage to lung tissue, cancer and premature death. To tackle the PM<sub>2.5</sub> problem, the State has been seeking to adopt a number of pioneering rules that aggressively target air pollution.
- In November 2010, EPA proposed to disapprove the SC and SJV PM<sub>2.5</sub> plans because they relied heavily on emissions reductions from several State rules that had not been finalized or submitted to EPA for review.
- CARB is now finalizing these rules, which are three of the most progressive mobile source rules in the nation. These include the In-Use Diesel Truck and Bus rule, the Drayage Truck rule and the Ocean Going Vessels Clean Fuels rule. These rules will help ensure that emissions will continue to decrease even as California fully recovers from its recession. CARB has formally requested that EPA include these rules in the State Implementation Plans and will submit the final rules before EPA takes final action. Today's action proposes to approve these rules.

- CARB has also revised the Plans that were originally submitted to EPA to more accurately reflect emissions both now and into the future. For example, CARB performed field work to more accurately characterize the age of trucks and truck travel patterns in California, and collected data that showed they had overestimated usage and emissions from construction equipment. They also revised future emission forecasts to account for the economic recession and adjusted future growth based on economic forecasts by UCLA and the University of the Pacific.
- As a result of these changes, future emissions are forecasted to be lower and fewer emissions reductions are needed for attainment. For the SJV, the effect of these changes is that about 18% fewer reductions are needed because of better estimates of activity and emissions from trucks and construction equipment and about 5% fewer reductions are needed due to the recession. For the SC, about 5% fewer reductions are needed due to better estimates of activity and emissions from trucks and construction equipment and about 5% fewer reductions are needed due to the recession.
- Also, dozens of state and local measures have been improved to further reduce fine particle pollution from specific industries and activities. For example, San Joaquin recently required air pollution control equipment for commercial charbroiling restaurants and prohibited burning of prunings from various agricultural crops at all times. South Coast cut allowable sulfur emissions from hundreds of industrial boilers in their landmark RECLAIM program, and strictly limited the amount of solvents allowed in commercial cleaning products. Many of these rules are the most stringent in the nation.
- CARB has also provided additional documentation to support the air quality modeling in the SJV and to support their determination that VOCs do not need to be controlled for purposes of attaining the PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard in the SJV.
- EPA is proposing to grant the State's request to extend the deadline for attaining these standards until April 5, 2015. EPA is, however, proposing to disapprove the Plans' contingency measures because they do not provide sufficient emissions reductions. EPA is continuing to work with CARB and the air districts to address this issue.

### **EPA's November 2010 Proposed Disapprovals and Today's Actions**

The table below lists the main issues that led to the November 2010 proposed disapprovals and CARB's response to these issues since.

<b>Reasons for Proposed Disapproval on November 2010</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of adopted and submitted State rules needed for attainment in both the SC and SJV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CARB is finalizing the In-Use Diesel Truck and Bus rules, the Drayage Truck Rules and the Ocean Going Vessels Clean Fuels rule.</li> <li>• CARB has revised the Plans to account for the overestimation of activity and emissions from trucks and construction equipment as well as the economic recession.</li> <li>• For the SJV, the effect of these changes is that about 18% fewer reductions are needed because of better estimates of activity and emissions from trucks and construction equipment and about 5% fewer reductions</li> </ul>

	<p>are needed due to the recession.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the SC, about 5% fewer reductions are needed due to better estimates of activity and emissions from trucks and construction equipment and about 5% fewer reductions are needed due to the recession.</li> <li>• Dozens of stationary source rules, many the most comprehensive in the nation, provide further emissions reductions.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many of the emissions reductions needed to attain in the SC and SJV remained as future commitments instead of approved and submitted rules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the proposed approvals of the State and District rules, along with the new emissions data from CARB, the remaining future commitments have been reduced to approximately 10 percent.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate documentation of the air quality modeling in the SJV plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CARB has submitted additional documentation that addresses the concerns with air quality modeling.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate explanations as to whether VOC measures were required for SJV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under EPA's PM<sub>2.5</sub> implementation rule, VOC controls are presumed not to be effective for reducing PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels unless a technical demonstration indicates otherwise.</li> <li>• CARB submitted additional information to show that VOCs do not need to be controlled for purposes of attaining the PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard in the SJV.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal assignment for 10 tons per day reduction from locomotives in the SC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CARB and the SC have provided the necessary reductions, if needed for attainment.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient contingency measures in both the SC and SJV plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not resolved. Neither plan contains sufficient contingency measures to assure continuing progress towards interim emissions reduction goals.</li> </ul>

### Next Steps

- Today's proposed actions will be published in the Federal Register and will include a 30-day public comment period from the date of publication. EPA invites the public to submit comments on today's proposals and to resubmit comments on the November 2010 proposals. EPA's Federal Register notices and technical support documents contain detailed information on our proposed actions.

### For More Information:

<http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/actions/ca.html>