



COMMENTS ON EPA PM NAAQS REVISIONS PROPOSAL

MARCH 8, 2006



National Cattlemen's Beef Association

**Comments on
EPA's Proposed Revisions to
the National Ambient Air Quality Standards
for Particulate Matter
71 Fed. Reg. 2620-2708 (Jan. 17, 2006)**

March 8, 2006

Tamara McCann Thies
Director, Environmental Issues
National Cattlemen's Beef Association
1301 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 347-0228

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Basis for the PM NAAQS.....	2
III.	EPA’s Proposed Provisions to the PM NAAQS.....	4
IV.	The Exclusion of Coarse PM from Agricultural and Mining, and of Crustal Material from Similar Sources Is Consistent with the Preponderance of the Scientific Evidence, and the Determinations of EPA, Congress and the Courts Since the Inception of the Clean Air Act.....	4
V.	The Preponderance of the Scientific Evidence Continues to Demonstrate That Fugitive Dust from Agricultural and Mining Operations Presents No Substantial Health or Welfare Concerns.....	7
VI.	EPA’s Proposal of an “Urban-Type” Coarse PM Indicator and PM NAAQS Is Not Based on Sound Science and Should Not Be Adopted.....	9
VII.	Neither (1)“Protection Equivalent to the 1987 PM10 Standard,” (2) Potential Effects of Deposition of Some Coarse PM in the Lung, Nor (3) Toxicology, Provides a Rational Basis for the Proposed 70 µg/m ³ Coarse PM Standard.....	14
VIII.	Because Coarse PM Falls Out of the Atmosphere Over Relatively Short Distances, and is a “Local” Pollutant, Central Monitors Do Not Reflect or Even Approximate the Exposure of Residents in Surrounding Communities and Metropolitan Areas, and Thus Cannot Support the Conclusions of Studies That Assume Such Representative and Uniform Exposure.....	16
IX.	The Interest of Cattle Operations in the Arid West in a Coarse PM Standard: Inability to Comply Even After Application of Best Available Control Methods...	17
X.	United States Department of Agriculture Secretary Michael Johanns Does not Believe Current Science Justifies the Setting of a Coarse PM Standard.....	18
XI.	Proposed Regulation of Crustal Material Under the Fine PM NAAQS.....	19
XII.	Conclusion.....	24

GLOSSARY

µm	micrometers, equal to one one-millionth of a meter.
1982 CD	Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter (EPA 1982)
1996 CD	Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter (EPA 1996)
2004 CD	Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter (EPA 2004)
BACT	Best Available Control Technology, referring to the control technology-based level of air pollutant emissions which must be achieved by any source which must obtain a PSD permit under the program for the Prevention of Significant Deterioration.
BS	British Smoke, a measure of the darkness of PM collected, estimated at approximately PM _{3.5-4.5} , prior to modern PM controls.
CAA	Clean Air Act
CASAC	The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, which reviews EPA proposals for ambient air quality standards and provides advice and reactions to EPA.
CO	Carbon Monoxide
D ₅₀	Due to the engineering difficulties of designing a sampling instrument with an absolute size cutoff, PM samplers are designed to have a 50% collection efficiency at a specified size (e.g., 10 microns), which then results in <u>increasing</u> collection efficiencies (up to ~100%) of smaller particles and <u>decreasing</u> collection (down to 0%) of larger particles. This is commonly referred to as the “D ₅₀ ” of the particular sampler, e.g., D ₅₀ =10µm.
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCBA	National Cattlemen’s Beef Association
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration.
PM	Particulate matter

PM _{coarse}	Coarse particulate matter, consisting of crustal material, including dust from surface mining, construction, agriculture, forestry and wind erosion (as well as sea salt and plant particles). Nearly all PM _{coarse} has an aerodynamic diameter greater than 1 µm, but EPA’s rule was PM _{2.5} as a size indicator to distinguish between PM _{fine} and PM _{coarse} .
PM _{fine}	Fine particulate matter, consisting of such products of combustion as the atmospheric conversion of combustion gases such as sulfur oxides and nitrogen oxides into sulfates and nitrates, tobacco smoke and soot. Almost all PM _{fine} has an aerodynamic diameter of 1 µm or less, but EPA’s rule uses PM _{2.5} as a size indicator to distinguish between PM _{fine} and PM _{coarse} .
PM _{2.5} , PM _{3.5} , PM ₁₀ , etc.	Particulate matter collected by an instrument with a 50 percent sampling efficiency at the aerodynamic sampling diameter specified by the sub-number in micrometers; e.g., PM ₁₀ is the PM collected by an instrument with a 50% sampling efficiency at a particle size of 10 µm. (See definition of D ₅₀).
PNOR	Particles not otherwise regulated, used by OSHA to mean non-chemical specific air-borne particles, for certain sizes of which OSHA has adopted workplace standards.
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration, referring to an EPA program designed to prevent deterioration of the air quality in areas in which levels of pollution are below the NAAQS.
SP	EPA’s “Staff Paper” – EPA’s staff review, analysis and recommendations of PM NAAQS based on the CD.
TSP	Total Suspended Particulate Matter, as measured by an EPA reference instrument, which captures PM with aerodynamic diameters in the range of PM ₂₅ to PM ₄₅ , based on wind speed and direction.
TWA	Time Weighted Average.

I. Introduction.

The National Cattlemen's Beef Association ("NCBA") represents tens of thousands of America's farmers, ranchers and cattlemen who provide much of the nation's supply of food. Our members are proud of their tradition as stewards and conservators of America's land, and good neighbors to their communities. They support dust control measures, which range from soil conservation to fugitive dust control plans, many contained in air pollution control permits or approved by air pollution control agencies. They carry out those measures every day of every year in supplying America with the food it needs.

NCBA members do not seek to roll back dust controls. Indeed, they seek to maintain and improve them, and make them more effective. NCBA's comments are premised upon farm, ranch and cattle operations, including cattle feeding, that apply Best Management Practices ("BMPs") or Best Available Control Technology ("BACT") to minimize dust emissions. Among others, these BMPs include wind-breaks, watering roads or applying other dust suppressants to them, as well as sprinkler systems to keep dust down in cattle pens. NCBA's comments go to the irreducible, minimal impacts of such dust that remain after applying BMPs. Technology-based, reasonable and feasible fugitive dust control measures have been in the past, and must continue to be in the future, the basis for controlling fugitive coarse PM from farm, ranch, and cattle-feeding operations. It is also important to recognize that producers must balance BMPs across the entire operation for dust, air emissions, water management, nutrient management, etc. so that addressing one environmental factor does not exacerbate another environmental factor. Each operation customizes their BMPs to maximize environmental benefits based upon their unique needs.

The amounts of fugitive dust remaining after BMPs from farm, ranch and cattle operations have never been demonstrated to have adverse impacts on health at ambient levels. Such dust is similar to that from county roads, highway construction, earth-moving of all kinds, surface mining and numerous other surface-disturbance activities. Because such dust has been generally agreed by health experts not to have substantial health or welfare effects at ambient concentrations, historically it has not been included in making determinations of ambient compliance. Over the last more than 30 years, EPA has excluded such dusts in making "attainment" determinations of compliance with the PM NAAQS, has determined not to list surface mines because of the lack of such effects, created the "fugitive dust exemption" to exclude it from ambient determinations under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration ("PSD") program, discounted it under its "rural fugitive dust policy," and excluded it under various "natural events" policies from being considered in determining compliance with the PM NAAQS. NCBA has detailed and documented the overwhelming scientific consensus on the lack of substantial health or welfare effects from such dusts over the last 30 years in the comments it has filed with EPA (*See* NCBA Comments dated July 9, 2002 at pp. 3-22, and the consensus on exclusion of such dusts from ambient determinations by EPA, the courts and Congress. *Id.* The proposed rule's exclusion of coarse PM from agriculture and mining from the coarse PM NAAQS continues EPA's historic,

scientifically-based, policy and practice of excluding such coarse PM from the PM NAAQS.

The fugitive dusts from farms, ranches and cattle operations, including cattle feeding, are by scientific definition “coarse particulate matter,” namely particles derived from “mechanical division” of earthen and other materials. Fine particulate matter, on the other hand, is derived from the primary and secondary results of combustion.

II. The Basis for the PM NAAQS

The critical feature of the Particulate Matter NAAQS, namely its concentration term, has, from its inception, been based on “British Smoke,” (“BS”) measurements, 62 Fed. Reg. 38659 (July 18, 1997). BS is a measure of the “blackness” of smoke produced by combustion appearing on a filter paper. Such material is dominantly below PM_{10} , only rarely “accumulating” in foggy atmospheres to $PM_{2.5}$. The concentration term of virtually all of the PM NAAQS promulgated from the Clean Air Act’s enactment forward and in effect from 1970 through 1997, was the BS data from a 1952 London smog, stagnation incident. It found associations with adverse health effects at 24-hour concentrations of $500 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of BS and above (in combination with high levels of sulfur oxides), and, for instance, in 1987, took approximately 1/3 of this amount, namely $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ as the basis for the PM_{10} standard. *Id.* It was not based on PM_{10} data, nor on Total Suspended Particulate (“TSP”) data, but on British Smoke data. It was not based on coarse PM data, and should not, scientifically, be applied to coarse PM, or used as a metric for determining the concentration at which coarse PM in the ambient air may be harmful. .

Unfortunately, from the beginning, EPA has not based the “indicator” term of the PM NAAQS on the data from which it was derived, namely BS (estimated at the time as $PM_{3.5}$ - $PM_{4.5}$). Instead, in the early 1970s EPA adopted TSP, which collected particles generally as large as PM_{35} to PM_{45} , based on its belief that some particles of that size might get into the nose and mouth and might contribute to health effects.

In 1987, EPA excluded particles above PM_{10} from the PM NAAQS, based on the clear lack of health effects evidence for such particles at ambient concentrations. However, PM_{10} still included coarse PM above the BS size indicator, on the possibility that further research and studies might show substantial health effects due to the fact that such particles had the potential to penetrate into primarily the upper airways of the human respiratory system. The material above PM_{10} , between PM_{10} and PM_{35} - PM_{45} , was discarded from the standard. There was no evidence indicating that material was producing adverse health effects, yet it was constituting most of the mass in arid, western atmospheres. Including it in the standard distorted and misdirected control efforts, producing no substantial environmental benefit. Several health scientists, environmental and industry groups argued that the particle indicator for the PM NAAQS should have been PM_1 or $PM_{2.5}$, because including particles above those sizes departed from the evidence of adverse health effects on which the PM NAAQS were

based, and diluted and misdirected control efforts to particles with no substantial health or welfare effects.

NCBA submits that after years of study, the clear, preponderant weight of the evidence continues to support EPA's historic conclusion that fugitive dusts at ambient concentrations do not present substantial health concerns that would justify the adoption of a coarse PM ambient air quality standard. The best and only indicator necessary for ambient regulation of particulate matter is that which best represents fine PM.

The 1997 PM NAAQS. None of the PM NAAQS adopted prior to 1997 had recognized the fundamental disjunction between the data that supported the concentration term of the PM NAAQS, namely BS, which was virtually entirely fine PM, and the coarse PM that EPA had included in the indicator term of the standard. In 1997 EPA recognized the fundamental difference between fine and coarse PM, and created a fine PM_{2.5} standard. While EPA initially proposed not to adopt a 24-hour coarse PM standard, in the final rule it did adopt such a standard. That coarse PM₁₀ standard was, however, set at 150 µg/m³, a concentration level quantified and derived from fine PM, BS data. The only concentration data discussed as the basis for this standard was at concentration levels well above 1000 µg/m³ and included both fine and coarse PM. (Hefflin, 1991; Gordian, 1996).

The 1997 coarse PM₁₀ standard was vacated and set aside as confounded, because it included both fine and coarse PM. The Court also found that EPA's lack of a rationale for the concentration term of the standards constituted an unconstitutional delegation of authority from Congress (a ruling later reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court). The result is that there has never been a valid coarse PM standard based on coarse PM evidence, nor a sustaining rationale of any kind connecting the 150 µg/m³ concentration term of that standard with any health studies based on coarse PM effects at those concentrations.

EPA's and CASAC's Controversial Review on Remand of the Vacated Coarse PM₁₀ Standard. CASAC's review of the coarse PM standard over the last three years has been marked by controversy, abrupt and unexplained changes of position, last-minute changes in possible theoretical bases for such a standard, and an unprecedented failure by CASAC even to review EPA's Final Staff Paper and reach "Closure" on its scientific basis for the coarse PM standard before that document and its recommendations to the EPA Administrator were finalized and released. CASAC reviewed that scientific basis only after that document had become final.

After several years of review and deliberation, several members of CASAC, including its then Chair and its leading health scientists, had expressed the view that EPA's Criteria Document and drafts of its Staff Paper did not provide an adequate basis for a coarse PM standard. Indeed, CASAC's May 11, 2005 draft letter to the Administrator stated that "the setting of this [coarse PM] standard be set aside until further deliberations on the appropriate metric can be made."

At its April 2005 meeting, CASAC had suggested a potential new rationale for a coarse PM Standard that EPA might substitute for its past, unsuccessful efforts to provide a basis for a coarse PM standard. This new concept was based not on the health effects of coarse PM, but its possible contamination by toxic urban contaminants that might be absorbed and carried by coarse PM in urban areas. EPA was urged to substitute this new concept for the years of work that had gone into the Criteria Document and two drafts of its Staff Paper that CASAC had found wanting. After a teleconference on its May 11, 2005 draft letter on May 18, 2005, CASAC wrote a final letter to the EPA Administrator stating that although “the evidence for a standard for coarse-mode particles was weaker than for the PM_{2.5}, the Panel agreed that a 24-hour NAAQS for PM_{10-2.5} was appropriate, especially in urban areas, with caveats to make exceptions for those types of rural dusts thought to have low toxicity.”

EPA’s Final Staff Paper. EPA issued its final Staff Paper on PM NAAQS revision at the end of June 2005. It recommended an “urban” coarse PM standard. Significantly, the Staff Paper noted that the studies and data on which it based its proposal were weak, uncertain, limited, and not even adequate to support a health risk assessment, since they did not fulfill the minimum requirements for such assessments. That remains the case. EPA also stated that a coarse PM standard might be based on providing protection somehow “equivalent” to the 1987 24-hour PM₁₀ standard, whose concentration term was based on fine PM, not coarse PM.

III. EPA’s Proposed Revisions to the PM NAAQS.

On January 17, 2006, EPA published its proposed revisions for the PM NAAQS. 71 Fed. Reg. 2620-2708. The coarse PM standard it proposed is a 24-hour PM_{10-2.5} standard “qualified so as to include any ambient mix of PM_{10-2.5} that is dominated by resuspended dust from high-density traffic on paved roads and PM generated by industrial sources and construction sources.” 71 Fed. Reg. 2620. The indicator for this standard “excludes any ambient mix of PM_{10-2.5} that is dominated by rural windblown dust and soils and PM generated by agricultural and mining sources.” *Id.* In addition, it states that “[a]gricultural sources, mining sources, and other similar sources of crustal material shall not be subject to control in meeting this standard.” *Id.* at 2698-99. The concentration term of the proposed coarse PM standard is 70 µg/m³. That level, EPA says, is intended to provide a “generally equivalent level of protection” to the 1987 PM₁₀ standard.

IV. The Exclusion of Coarse PM from Agricultural and Mining, and of Crustal Material from Similar Sources Is Consistent with the Preponderance of the Scientific Evidence, and the Determinations of EPA, Congress and the Courts Since the Inception of the Clean Air Act.

As noted above, fugitive dusts have been consistently determined not to present substantial health or welfare effects, and have been excluded from PM NAAQS determinations, PSD and NSR permit applicability determinations, and discounted or

not counted under exemptions ranging from the fugitive dust exemption to the rural fugitive dust policy for more than 30 years. These determinations and policies have been upheld by the courts, and endorsed by Congress on several occasions. CASAC counseled EPA to “make exceptions for rural dust thought to have low toxicity. This section provides specific reference for this history.

By the time of the CAA Amendments of 1977, it was well-known that coarse PM dusts, generally referred to as “fugitive dust,” from natural sources and activities, such as surface mining, agriculture, dirt roads, forestry, construction and earth-moving, routinely exceeded the PM NAAQS in the arid West. In the same Amendments, Congress added the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program into the statute, requiring all new or expanded sources of 250 tons/year or more of PM to demonstrate not only that the PM NAAQS were met, but that PSD PM increments, set at levels approximately one-fifth of the PM NAAQS, also were met. 42 U.S.C. §7460-69. It was apparent that if the PM NAAQS and increments were applied to new or expanded activities producing fugitive dust, those activities would be drastically reduced or prohibited because their emissions were projected to exceed those PM standards, even after the application of Best Available Control Technology(BACT).¹

Based on this uncontroverted assessment, EPA determined that fugitive dust should be excluded from the application of the PM NAAQS and increments, noting several factors cited at the time by the mining industry, namely:

that a large majority of the associated particulate matter is nonrespirable; that mining activity occurs in areas with limited population; that the particulate matter arises at ground level and falls out within very short distances; that visibility is not affected because the light scattering which hinders visibility is caused by smaller particles; and that even after the application of BACT, short-term particulate standards for NAAQS and PSD increments might not be met.

In view of these comments and other studies, EPA has decided to exclude from any air quality impact assessment of a source or modification any fugitive dust that would emanate from it.

* * *

Additional support for this exclusion can be found in the legislative history. It points to the utilization of ‘administrative good sense’ regarding fugitive dust (*see* S. Rep. No. 95-127, at 98 (1977)) and suggests that Congress

¹ See studies recited in fn. 3, col. 2, 43 Fed. Reg. 26395 (June 19, 1978) and EPA Region VIII Interim Policy Paper on Air Quality Review of Surface Mining Operations (1978).

did not intend PSD to prohibit surface mines of an economically viable size (*see* H. Rep. No. 95-294, at 165-66 (1977)).

43 Fed. Reg. 26395 (June 19, 1978).

EPA routinely classified “nonattainment” areas exceeding the PM NAAQS due to fugitive dust as “attainment” areas, applying its “rural fugitive dust policy,” e.g., 45 Fed. Reg. 78122 (Nov. 25, 1980), 56 Fed. Reg. 37564 (August 8, 1991).

As Judge Leventhal noted in this Court’s decision on fugitive PM issues in *Alabama Power Co. v. Costle*, 636 F.2d 323(D.C. Cir. 1979):

EPA’s regulation of fugitive emissions has been of special concern to the mining and forestry industries which contend, without serious opposition, that they are incapable of meeting the strict limitations on the emission of particulate matter set by the PSD provisions.

Id. at 369. The Court in this case held that fugitive emissions could not be included in determining applicability until EPA had performed a rulemaking to include them pursuant to section 302(j) of the Clean Air Act. Perhaps as or more important, the Court noted that:

“EPA has discretion to define the pollutant termed ‘particulate matter’ to exclude particles of a size or composition determined not to present substantial public health or welfare concerns.”

Id. at 369-70, fn. 134. It went on to explain how those particles could remain subject to reasonable controls under other provisions of the Clean Air Act. The Court also vacated the fugitive dust exemption.

Congress, in deciding not to enact a statutory exclusion of fugitive dusts, made very clear that EPA was expected to use its “administrative good sense” to exclude it:

Because of the imprecision inherent in the total suspended particulates standards, background dust in such States can cause levels in excess of the particulate standards. Fortunately, the logical dilemma posed by the shortcomings of the present particulates standards can be overcome by administrative good sense until such time as modification of the standards are adopted. *The States and EPA have begun to recognize this problem of background particulates and should discount its effects where the problem involves particulates not generally of the substances and respirable sizes thought to affect public health.* The Environmental Protection Agency has used this approach in its current

policy, and the committee endorses it. *In calculating baseline levels for the purposes of the nondeterioration requirements, and in making determination of attainment and nonattainment of ambient particulate standards, the committee would expect that this administrative good sense would apply.* (Emphasis supplied). S. Rep. No. 95-127, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 98 (1977).

EPA came to the same conclusion as this Court and Congress concerning coarse PM from surface coal mining. Following this Court's remand in *Sierra Club v. Gorsuch*, 715 F.2d 653 (D.C. Cir. 1983), EPA proposed to list such mines as sources whose fugitive dust emissions must be included in determining whether they are major stationary sources under the PSD program. It concluded that mine fugitive dust emission should not be included and surface mines should not be listed because of (1) the lack of substantial health or welfare effects from such coarse PM emissions, and (2) the prohibitive effect on the mining industry that including such coarse particle fugitive dust would have. 54 Fed. Reg. 48870 (November 28, 1989).

In summary, EPA's proposal to exclude coarse PM from agriculture, mining and similar sources is in keeping with past determinations of Congress, the courts and EPA itself.

V. The Preponderance of the Scientific Evidence Continues to Demonstrate That Fugitive Dust from Agricultural and Mining Operations Presents No Substantial Health or Welfare Concerns.

Over the last 30 years, the consensus opinion of the many eminent and experienced medical and public health experts in respiratory disease epidemiology, toxicology and clinical treatment has been that coarse PM has never been demonstrated to have adverse health effects at ambient levels. This section summarizes that evidence.

After many years of study, Benjamin G. Ferris, Jr., M.D., a nationally known expert in research on the effects of PM and other criteria pollutants on health, Professor of Environmental Health and Safety, Department of Environmental Science and Physiology, head of the Respiratory Epidemiology Program of the Harvard School of Public Health, and a principal author of the Harvard Six City Study stated this conclusion clearly in an unsolicited letter to EPA Administrator Lee M. Thomas dated August 27, 1987:

Throughout my forty years of studying the associations between air pollution and public health, which includes my personal involvement and observations of our Harvard Air Pollution Respiratory Health study (Six-City Study), and numerous epidemiological studies reported by a number of excellent investigators, it appears that the fine particle

fraction and its reactive constituents comprise the source of potential adverse effects of particulate matter. The fine fraction may include carcinogenic agents, toxic trace metals, and other organic and acidic components associated with combustion processes.

* * *

EPA's fugitive dust policy traditionally reflected the fact that standards for particulate matter were routinely exceeded by coarse particle fugitive dust from natural sources, agriculture, unpaved roads, mining, construction, and other sources, especially in the arid areas of the western U.S.A. **This fugitive dust at the levels measured in ambient air in the western and other parts of the United States over the years has never been documented to have had adverse effects on human health.** We began to realize this from research on particle deposition and clearance, showing that coarse insoluble particles deposited primarily in the upper airways while the fine soluble particles deposited primarily in the intrathoracic region. **Toxicological work in animals and clinical studies on humans further support the conclusion that fugitive dust at ambient concentrations poses little risk of adverse health effects to the public.** (Emphasis added).

Chatten C. Cowherd of the Midwest Research Institute, who has spent much of a distinguished scientific career in the study and characterization of PM, and authored much of EPA's work on fugitive dust, stated much the same opinion:

Fugitive dust emissions, whether from mining, agriculture, or unpaved public roads, consist largely of coarse particles which settle out of the atmosphere close to the source. These particles do not account for any known adverse effects to health or welfare other than localized nuisance problems usually associated with periods of dry, windy weather.

Dale A. Lundgren, an eminent professor, scientist and industrial hygienist, who often advises EPA on PM issues, concluded, after a thorough review, that "coarse particles are not of significant health effect at levels found in the ambient air. . ."

Professor David L. Swift of Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health, one of the country's leading authorities on PM for more than 20 years, also conducted a comprehensive review and weighing of all of the scientific evidence in 1996. He concluded:

It is concluded that the regulation of CF [coarse fraction] at ambient levels discussed in the SP [EPA Staff Paper] and preamble [to the EPA proposal to revise the PM standard] do not provide any substantial health benefit. By definition, CF is composed primarily of particles which are formed by mechanical processes from larger particles or bulk material. Such crustal particles, because of their lack of health effects at ambient levels well above the proposed standard, should be excluded from any PM standard.

NCBA submits that this substantial body of medical and public health expert opinion, as well as the rationale and basis of EPA's practice for more than three decades excluding coarse PM from PM standard determinations, should be accorded substantial weight.

To this must be added the weight of the recent reviews (attached) of Criteria Document and Staff Paper science by Dr. Jonathan Borak of Yale University School of Medicine. Dr. Borak's qualifications include expertise in toxicology, epidemiology and occupational health exposure to pollutants. His first review dated May 4, 2005 of the limited studies that EPA cited as showing an association of coarse PM with morbidity found "a general lack of scientific support for a proposed NAAQS for PM_{10-2.5}," while his second review dated August 10, 2005 of additional studies cited by EPA in its Staff Paper, found that such studies "do not sustain quantitative risk assessment." He also noted that "[i]mportant data deficiencies currently obstruct the setting of such a [coarse] PM standard, noting that "further "data and research are necessary to determine whether there is a need for a coarse PM [standard] to address public health risks at ambient concentrations, and to characterize the indicator and concentration."

The lack of a basis for quantitative risk assessment, which EPA Staff itself has noted, is a fatal flaw in the basis for a standard. Without that analysis it is not possible to quantify the concentration term of a coarse PM standard.

VI. EPA's Proposal of an "Urban-Type" Coarse PM Indicator and PM NAAQS Is Not Based on Sound Science and Should Not Be Adopted.

The new concept for development of a coarse PM standard based on its potential role in urban areas (where the hypothesis posits that it has the potential to combine with other substances that may be hazardous, such as industrial emissions, construction emissions, or mobile source emission components) is a novel one, first put forward in April of 2005, and now articulated in some detail with a proposed rationale in the January 17, 2006 Federal Register notice. The notice also asks for comment on a number of alternatives, including the alternative of not adopting a coarse PM standard at this time. NCBA submits that the concept and hypothesis advanced by EPA as proposed coarse PM NAAQS are just that, and no more. They cannot serve as the justification for adopting a health-based standard at a specific concentration level, such

as that proposed, especially when that standard is nearly double the stringency of the prior PM 10 standard in atmospheres dominated by coarse particles.

NCBA submits that EPA has not provided the scientific support to demonstrate that a coarse PM standard is necessary to protect public health or welfare, even in urban areas with other contaminants present. In fact, as EPA itself notes, when PM fine or other criteria pollutants are considered, even the marginal statistical associations in a few anomalous, one-pollutant studies disappear. 71 Fed. Reg. 2671-2672.

In presenting its proposed 24-hour coarse PM_{10-2.5} standard, EPA places primary reliance on four studies that it claims provided the support necessary for demonstrating the necessity of controlling coarse PM to a concentration of 70 µg/m³, 71 Fed. Reg. 2655-2568. It states that these studies show significant associations of coarse PM_{10-2.5} with mortality and morbidity at this concentration. The severe problems that militate against any reliance on these four studies are not discussed in EPA's discussion of them as its basis for the proposed coarse PM standard. However, in a later discussion of a possible "alternative interpretation" of the health evidence, EPA does acknowledge the fatal flaws in the four studies. Its treatment of them bears full quotation and careful consideration:

"Having decided to propose the 24-hour PM_{10-2.5} standard described above, the Administrator recognizes that there are important views on the information relating to the effects of coarse fraction PM that warrant consideration. For example, **an alternative interpretation of the available health evidence presented in the Criteria Document and the Staff Paper questions the conclusions about PM_{10-2.5} associations drawn from one-pollutant models.** This interpretation of the available epidemiological evidence suggests that the results from one-pollutant PM_{10-2.5} models are confounded by fine particles and gaseous co-pollutants.

The key PM_{10-2.5} epidemiologic results discussed in the Criteria Document and Staff Paper are drawn from one-pollutant models; i.e., PM_{10-2.5} is the only variable used in the statistical model reflecting exposure to air pollution. **There are four studies cited in these documents as being suggestive of a statistically significant role for PM_{10-2.5} in the reported associations: Ito (2003), Burnett et al. (1997), Mar et al. (2003), and Ostro et al. (2003).** However, there is strong evidence that adverse health effects similar to those observed in these studies, including both cardiovascular and/or respiratory health effects are associated with exposure to PM_{2.5}. The authors of several of these studies focus on fine particles (and in some cases one or more of the gaseous pollutants) as playing an important role in 'explaining' the association between PM and various

health endpoints. For example, in these key epidemiologic studies, the correlation coefficients between $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ concentrations range from moderate to high (i.e., 0.4 to 0.7), which increases the likelihood that associations between health effects and $PM_{10-2.5}$ identified in one-pollutant models may instead simply reflect the effects of exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ rather than independent health effects. With the positive correlations between pollutants and similar health effects, **it generally would be appropriate for any assessment of the effect of exposure to $PM_{10-2.5}$ to control for exposure to the $PM_{2.5}$.**

In this light, it is important to review how the authors of the four key $PM_{10-2.5}$ epidemiology studies have accounted for co-pollutants in their analysis. Ito (2003) noted significant estimates of the health effects of associations in one-pollutant models, but **in a two-pollutant model with $PM_{2.5}$ the $PM_{10-2.5}$ associations lost statistical significance.** Burnett et al. (1997) **concluded that the effect of $PM_{10-2.5}$ in a one-pollutant model could be explained by gaseous co-pollutants.** Mar et al. (2003) found $PM_{10-2.5}$ to be positively associated with adverse health effects in a one-pollutant model, but also **found similar associations with a range of other air pollutants.** In addition, Mar et al. (2003) noted that even though all PM mass metrics included in the study were associated with an excess risk of cardiovascular death, the strongest associations were with $PM_{2.5}$, followed by PM_{10} and $PM_{10-2.5}$. Ostro et al. (2003) **used a one-pollutant model to estimate the association between $PM_{10-2.5}$ on mortality using an effectively linear construct of PM_{10} (as observed in Indio, CA) to represent $PM_{10-2.5}$ for the entire study area. By using such a construct of PM_{10} , the estimated associations simply reflect a PM_{10} association (i.e., the construct does not provide additional information on the effect of $PM_{10-2.5}$).** Moreover, roughly 75 percent of the cardiovascular mortality in this study occurred in or near Palm Springs, CA and PM characteristics differ significantly between Palm Springs and Indio (e.g., average PM_{10} concentrations are roughly 30 percent lower in Palm Springs and $PM_{2.5}$ represents a higher fraction of PM_{10} , with a correlation coefficient between $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ of 0.46 in Palm Springs). Thus, the Ostro et al. (2003) study suggests a positive association between PM_{10} monitored in Indio and mortality in Palm Springs, but **some view this study as offering little basis for attributing significant mortality association to $PM_{10-2.5}$ as observed in either city.**

The Criteria Document and Staff Paper also present and discuss other epidemiology studies in support of the proposal for both the PM_{2.5} and PM_{10-2.5} standards (as shown in Figure 2 and discussed in Section III.A above): Burnett (1997), Fairley (2003), Ito (2003), Lipfert et al (2000), Mar et al (2003), Moolgavkar (2000), Sheppard et al (2003), Thurston et al (1994), Burnett (2000, 2003), Klemm and Mason (2003), and Schwartz and Neas (2000). However, these studies report positive statistically significant associations with PM_{2.5} that are more consistent and robust than the associations thus far identified for PM_{10-2.5}. Indeed, **several of these and other studies that specifically considered PM_{10-2.5}, but did not find statistically significant associations, including Schwartz et al (1996), Thurston et al. (1994), Sheppard et al. (2003), Fairley (2003), Schwartz et al (1996) and Lipfert et al. (2000).** With respect to mortality effects in the Six-City study, **Schwartz et al. (1996) concluded that the PM associations (in the six metropolitan areas – including Steubenville) were specifically associated with PM_{2.5}, with little additional contribution from the PM_{10-2.5}.** Sheppard et al. (2003) noted that bias in model selection and reporting can result in inflated excess risk estimates for PM. Fairley (1999) noted that PM_{10-2.5} effects become negative and insignificant when modeled jointly with PM_{2.5}. Lipfert et al. (2000) showed insignificant effects for PM_{10-2.5} in one- and two-pollutant models with O₃. The authors also caution against drawing casual interpretations from results when comparing health effects from one region in a metropolitan area to air quality observations in another region. In addition, several of these studies also report positive, statistically significant associations with one or more of the gaseous pollutants. **Both Thurston et al. (1994) and Burnett et al. (1997) reported substantial confounding with gaseous co-pollutants in Toronto, and Thurston et al. (1994, p. 282) reported that “it seems clear that these apparent associations were merely a statistical by-product of interpollutant confounding resulting from the shared day-to-day variations in dispersion conditions.”** In addition, Burnett et al. (2000) concluded that gaseous pollutants played an important role in explaining the effect of urban air pollution on health. Similarly, Moolgavkar (2000) concludes that gases were more strongly associated with respiratory effects than PM in Los Angeles.

Taken as a whole, evidence from PM_{10-2.5} epidemiologic studies could be interpreted to suggest that

one-pollutant PM_{10-2.5} models suffer from bias due to omitting co-pollutants in the statistical model, especially given the much stronger evidence (discussed above) that these effects are associated with exposure to PM_{2.5}. As noted by many of the aforementioned authors, while significant health associations may be noted for coarse fraction PM in one-pollutant models, the actual association may be insignificant from zero due to confounding co-pollutants. Of course, the Administrator must conclude in the final rule that the evidence about the health effects of PM_{10-2.5} is sufficiently robust to finalize a standard for PM_{10-2.5}.

The Administrator, recognizing notably large uncertainties in the underlying evidence and information that formed the basis for this proposal as well as the challenges associated with moving toward a new PM_{10-2.5} indicator and a related new monitoring network, solicits comment on this and other alternative interpretations of the available health evidence and alternative policy responses. Several such alternative interpretations and policy responses are discussed below.

71 Fed. Reg. 2671-2672. (Emphasis added.)

What should be clear is that the rationale for the proposed coarse PM standard is not at all supported by the four studies. This passage states that “it generally would be appropriate for any assessment of the effect of exposure to PM_{10-2.5} to control for exposure to the PM_{2.5}.” In the primary study on which EPA placed reliance to support an “urban” PM_{10-2.5} standard, namely that of Detroit (Ito 2003), it notes that when PM_{2.5} is considered “the PM_{10-2.5} associations lost statistical significance.” In the Toronto study (Burnett 1997), the apparent association of health effects with coarse PM_{10-2.5} “disappeared after adjustment for O₃, NO₂, and SO₂.” In addition, the Toronto study did not find statistically significant associations between monitored cardiac and respiratory effects and coarse particulate matter. In Phoenix (Mar 2003), only single pollutant models were used, and only a “marginally significant (p<.10)” association was found. Anomalously, Mar found no significant association between total mortality and PM_{2.5}, contrary to virtually all of the other epidemiological studies cited by EPA. Any reliance on the Coachella Valley (Ostro, 2003) study also seems entirely unjustified. Not only does it attribute deaths in Palm Springs to exposure measured in the city of Indio, but it finds no association between fine PM and health effects, contrary to virtually all other EPA studies. In addition it models 24-hour concentrations for the 75% of the period for which it has no PM_{2.5} data.

Even more misleading is the preamble text’s treatment of the Six Cities Study as supportive of a finding of an association of coarse PM with mortality and morbidity as a basis for its proposed coarse PM standard. 71 Fed. Reg. 2655, col. 3. Buried in a

footnote to this passage, EPA admits that upon reanalysis to correct errors, “the association for Steubenville was not statistically significant in most models reported in the two reanalyses . . .” 71 Fed. Reg. 2655, col. 3, fn. 49. Indeed, in the Schwartz review of the effects of coarse PM in the Six Cities Study, as well as the reanalyses, no significant associations with mortality were found in five of the six cities, and in the one city where coarse PM was a significant proportion of the PM₁₀ measured, Topeka, Kansas, there was a negative association with mortality. (Schwartz, 1996). The Six Cities Study likewise did not find associations with morbidity in five of the six cities, and only with cough in one of the six cities, St. Louis. Surely it is misleading by omission to cite the Six Cities Study for the proposition that it supports findings of associations with mortality and morbidity.

Even more egregious is the failure to consider and weigh the far larger number of studies with much larger and more powerful databases and longer duration that specifically considered PM_{10-2.5}, but did not find statistically significant associations. (Schwartz 1996), (Thurston 1994), (Sheppard 2003), (Fairley 2003), (Schwartz 1996), and (Lipfert 2000).

Any fair and sound scientific weighing of the evidence on coarse PM would, NCBA submits, determine that the preponderance of that evidence does not support the finding that a coarse PM standard is necessary to protect public health. The preponderance of scientific evidence does not show any significant association with health effects at ambient concentrations. Those few studies purporting to show an association with coarse PM health effects either do not support that characterization, or are so fatally flawed that they are contrary to virtually all of the other available evidence.

VII. Neither (1)“Protection Equivalent to the 1987 PM10 Standard,” (2) Potential Effects of Deposition of Some Coarse PM in the Lung, Nor (3) Toxicology, Provides a Rational Basis for the Proposed 70 µg/m3 Coarse PM Standard.

EPA asserts several other justifications for its proposed 70 µg/m³ coarse PM_{10-2.5} standard. Chief among this is its assertion that that concentration is “equivalent” to the 150 µg/m³ 1987 PM₁₀ 24-hour standard, and would therefore provide public health protection “equivalent” to that provided by the 1987 PM₁₀ standard. That proposition will not bear scrutiny.

First, the 1987 PM₁₀ standard was based on fine PM, namely British Smoke measurements, not coarse PM. 62 Fed. Reg. 38659 (July 18, 1997). Fine PM and coarse PM are separate subpollutants, in no way equivalent. It would be arbitrary to equate them.

Second, PM₁₀ is made up of different mixes of fine and coarse PM in different sections of the country. In arid, southwestern cities, coarse PM often constitutes 80% or more of PM₁₀, while in humid eastern cities, fine PM may constitute 80% or more of PM₁₀. 100 µg/m³ measured in an eastern city with such a ratio of fine to coarse PM

would have 20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of coarse PM, while 100 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ in a southwestern city would have 80 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ of coarse PM. With exactly the same amount of PM_{10} , the eastern city would be in compliance with the 70 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ standard proposed, while the southwestern city would be in violation. Again, not only are the two situations not equivalent, but the western cities where coarse PM predominates are discriminated against. This is particularly ironic in view of EPA's reliance on studies from Toronto, Detroit, Steubenville, and other humid, largely eastern cities to support its health effects contentions. Those cities would not be subject to any controls as a result of the doubling of the stringency of the 1987 PM_{10} standard of 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 70 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, while arid western cities, where the evidence is to the contrary, may be expected to exceed it.

Third, the Court in the *American Trucking Assn.* case found that PM_{10} was confounded by including indeterminate amounts of fine and coarse PM. The fundamental reasoning of the case negates any possibility of equating PM_{10} with one of the two indeterminate components of PM_{10} .

EPA also treats the fact that some coarse PM particles, particularly under mouth-breathing, may get into the upper and lower regions of the lung and have the potential to cause health effects, as a rationale for the coarse PM standard. Similarly, EPA treats toxicology as demonstrating that there is a mechanism by which coarse PM deposited in the lung in animal studies has been demonstrated to cause health effects at high dosages. Neither of these propositions is at all controversial. In fact, they are well-established, and furnished a justification for including coarse particles in the TSP and PM_{10} standards for many years. But just as clearly, neither consideration furnishes any basis for quantifying or deriving the concentration term of a PM coarse standard.

It has been undisputed for decades that coarse PM at high concentrations can cause adverse health effects. That evidence derives from occupational health studies that, while not directly relevant to ambient exposure of the general population is nonetheless edifying.

Occupational health standards also regulate fine and coarse PM separately. OSHA standards for PM fall into two categories, standards for specific substances, such as asbestos and arsenic, and standards for general, "Particles Not Otherwise Regulated" (PNOR). PNOR and inert or nuisance dusts are regulated in two categories, one the "respirable fraction," 5,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, and one for "total dust," 15,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The "respirable fraction" is a $\text{PM}_{3.5}$ standard that is close, if not identical, in function and purpose to EPA's new $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ fine particle standard while the "total dust" standard ($\sim\text{PM}_{100}$) is more akin to the purported purpose of the proposed coarse PM standard.

During 1988-89, OSHA proposed to tighten the 15,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 8-hour TWA for several PM substances to 10,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The changes were vacated because the agency failed to establish that the existing exposure limits presented significant risk of material health impairment or that the new standards eliminated or substantially reduced the risk. *AFL-CIO v. OSHA*, 965 F.2d 962 (11th Cir. 1992).

NCBA submits that one will look entirely in vain for any substantial study supporting the health effects of coarse PM in the ambient air at $70 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, a concentration that is less than 5 one-thousands of the concentration of the total dust occupational health standard serving an equivalent purpose. Indeed, the only two studies cited by EPA in support of its coarse PM₁₀ standard (Hefflin, 1991; Gordian 1996) were at concentrations well above $1,000 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, while several studies have shown no effects from exposure to concentrations well above $10,000 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

VIII. Because Coarse PM Falls Out of the Atmosphere Over Relatively Short Distances, and is a “Local” Pollutant, Central Monitors Do Not Reflect or Even Approximate the Exposure of Residents in Surrounding Communities and Metropolitan Areas, and Thus Cannot Support the Conclusions of Studies That Assume Such Representative and Uniform Exposure.

As depicted in the picture below of the dust plume behind a tractor plowing a field, it is entirely typical of fugitive dust plumes that they deposit on the ground over relatively short distances. It is patently clear that a home a mile from the tractor would not be exposed to even a miniscule fraction of the plume measured a few hundred yards from the tractor, and then only if directly downwind.



The case EPA attempts to make in support of a coarse PM standard relies on deposition of coarse PM particles in the lung, toxicology in animals at high concentrations showing mechanisms for health effects at high concentrations, and EPA's assertion that those circumstances make the results of the epidemiological studies it selectively cites in support of its proposed coarse PM standard plausible. EPA recognizes the high spatial variability of coarse PM over short distances and the fact that coarse PM is a local pollutant, but contends that these considerations go only to the "precision" and not to the validity of its conclusions and reliance on the epidemiological studies. 71 Fed. Reg. 2660.

NCBA submits that the spatial variability of coarse PM renders even the few, limited, uncertain epidemiological studies that have been cited by EPA invalid, as well as imprecise. Exposure to a local coarse PM source in downtown Indio simply has nothing to do with a patient living several miles away in Palm Springs admitted for a respiratory condition or indeed dying of such a condition. It requires little more than a close look at the plume of dust behind the tractor to discern the truth of that observation. The same is of course true of the studies in Phoenix, Tucson, and Reno/Sparks. The coarse PM measured or modeled in these localities is patently unrepresentative of the population exposure reflected in the hospital admissions studied. Aggravating the unrepresentativeness of the central monitor measurements that serve as the basis for the epidemiological studies is the fact that coarse PM does not penetrate indoors as fine PM does. Indoor exposure constitutes most of human exposure.

IX. The Interest of Cattle Operations in the Arid West in a Coarse PM Standard: Inability to Comply Even After Application of Best Available Control Methods

As we have noted in past presentations to CASAC and EPA, the best evidence available indicates that well-controlled cattle feeding operations produce PM₁₀ ambient concentrations of several hundred micrograms per cubic meter, with a highest second high of 647 µg/m³. These numbers should be compared to the 1987 PM₁₀ 24-hour NAAQS of 150µg/m³, retained in effect pending this review, and the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Class II 24-hour PM₁₀ increment of 30 µg/m³ applicable throughout many of the areas where NCBA members are located. These data, collected by a public agency, are shown in Figure 1. The 30 µg/m³ PSD PM₁₀ increment was set at 20 percent of the 150 µg/m³ PM₁₀ NAAQS. In other words, in order for well-controlled cattle operations (operations already doing what is practical and economic to achieve the PM NAAQS) to comply with a coarse PM NAAQS and PSD increments, the PSD coarse PM increment would have to be at least 647 µg/m³, and the coarse PM NAAQS would have to be at least five times that, i.e. approximately 3,750 µg/m³, and probably more, since these feedlots were near the median size of such lots, not the largest. As discussed earlier, that is on the order of one-third of OSHA's "total dust standard" of 15,000 µg/m³. We do not believe the evidence supports adoption of a coarse PM standard at this time, nor do we believe OSHA occupational health and safety standards should be the basis for a coarse PM NAAQS. This information does,

however, demonstrate the concentration at which coarse PM NAAQS and PSD increments would have to be set in order to permit well-controlled cattle and other operations producing fugitive dust in the arid West.




Figure 1

Note that even applying practical and economic controls, there are approximately 160 days of the year when the 150 µg/m³ standard was exceeded. In other words, as the data demonstrates, this is not an issue that may be delayed until implementation. A PM NAAQS must be met, without any exception or variance, even those based on economic or technical infeasibility. NCBA suggests that this data should have a bearing, not on whether there is or is not a health or welfare effect at some concentration, but on the need for careful judgment and evaluation of the studies presented by CASAC and the PM Review Panel before determining that there are effects that require prohibition of activities such as cattle operations.

X. United States Department of Agriculture Secretary Michael Johanns Does Not Believe Current Science Justifies the Setting of a Coarse PM Standard

Last year, United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) Secretary Michael Johanns asked USDA’s Agriculture Air Quality Task Force (“AAQTF”), comprised of distinguished scientists, engineers and other experts, to carefully review the relevant

EPA documents and recommend to him a position on the issue. After the AAQTF review, the Secretary wrote a letter (attached) expressing his full support of its recommendation “that the proposed PM_{10-2.5} standard not be promulgated unless and until sufficient research findings justify a standard. In addition, the AAQTF recommends that EPA address the sampler bias issues associated with ambient concentration measurements using Federal Reference Method samplers and that National Ambient Air Quality Standards should not be used as a ‘concentration not to be exceeded’ at the property line for permitting and enforcement of PM emissions from agriculture sources.” The Secretary also expressed his concern that “a coarse Particulate Matter standard might be issued in the absence of sound science and will result in ineffective, unfair and unnecessary controls.”

NCBA submits that the science has not changed since the AAQTF studied the issue and Secretary Johanns wrote that letter; and the EPA has not satisfied Secretary Johanns’ requirement that a coarse PM NAAQS “must be based on sound science to be effective and fair”.

XI. Proposed Regulation of Crustal Material under the Fine PM NAAQS

A. Introduction

1. Cattle Operations and Particulate Matter.

The dust produced by cattle pasturing and feeding operations in open pastures and feedlots is, by its scientific definition and characteristics, coarse PM. It is earthen and solid materials, including dried manure, that become airborne by virtue of the action of cattle hooves, wind, and other physical forces that divide it and cause it to become airborne. That manure in feedlots is periodically removed and applied to croplands, or composted to become fertilizer. The comments below address the inappropriateness of regulating this particulate matter under the fine PM standard.

2. Consequences of Proposed Rule to NCBA Membership.

In its Proposed Rule to implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards, EPA has, for the first time to our knowledge, begun treating crustal and other coarse PM as fine PM if it is below PM_{2.5}, even in cases where coarse PM dominates the PM being sampled, as is the case with feedlots in Arizona. (See discussion and reference below of PM_{2.5} measurements from feedlots in Pinal County, Arizona, where such ambient feedlot dust was measured at 79.8% of PM_{2.5} 24-hour concentrations of more than 183 µg/m³; soils added another 16.2 %, for a total of 96% coarse PM being measured as PM_{2.5}. See Pinal County Study at p. 64.). During four other 24 hour periods feedlot dust and soils ranged from 72.2 % to 82.7% of the PM_{2.5} measurements, all of which exceeded the proposed 24 hour PM_{2.5} standard of 35 µg/m³. *Id.*) As recounted below in more detail, historically EPA has acknowledged that coarse PM might “intrude” below PM_{2.5}, down to approximately PM₁, and that PM₁ has been thought by many public and private scientists to be a better indicator of PM

fine than PM2.5. EPA determined to set the PM fine indicator at PM2.5 because of reservations about the ability to measure PM1, and in order to capture the mass of fine particles in the accumulation mode in foggy, high-humidity events, recognizing that a small amount of coarse PM might also be collected. The possibility that PM2.5 might be made up of 80% or more of coarse particles was not anticipated. NCBA suggests that this development should now be addressed in implementation of the existing PM2.5 standard, as well as any revisions made to the PM2.5 standard. Specifically, NCBA believes that EPA should provide for the exclusion of the coarse PM intruding into the fine fraction. A specific method for doing so is suggested below.

The treatment of coarse PM, including crustal material, as fine PM2.5 will result in fine PM nonattainment from not only feedlot operations, but most certainly from other comparable coarse fugitive dusts, such as those from agriculture, mining and unpaved roads, especially in rural communities in the arid, western United States long-considered by EPA and the air pollution control community to have no adverse health effects at ambient levels, but nonetheless subject to control on nuisance and local visibility grounds. Classifying such ordinary coarse, fugitive dusts as fine PM2.5 will treat them as equivalent to tobacco smoke and other combustion PM. In *American Trucking Ass'n v. EPA*, 175 F.3d 1027, 1053-55 (D.C. Cir. 1999), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part, sub nom. Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass'n*, 531 U.S. 457 (2001), the D.C.Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the PM₁₀ indicator for this very reason, namely that it included both fine and coarse PM, making it impossible to determine whether coarse or fine PM was responsible for the health or other damage that NAAQS are intended to protect the public from, and confounding the material sampled, as well as the ability to identify and to control sources.

B. EPA's Proposed Rule to Implement Fine PM NAAQS Includes Crustal and Other Coarse PM Dusts That Should Be Excluded from PM2.5.

1. Background

It has long been recognized that particulate matter falls into a “bi-modal” distribution of coarse particulate matter (“coarse PM”) and fine particulate matter (“fine PM”). Fine PM generally has a particle diameter less than 1 µm, while coarse PM typically has a particle diameter greater than 3 µm. However, there is some overlap between fine and coarse PM in the “intermodal” range from about 1 to 3 µm.

Fine and coarse PM vary not only in particle size, but also in chemistry, source and formation:

The distinction between ‘fine particles’ and ‘coarse particles’ is a fundamental one. There is now an overwhelming amount of evidence that not only are two modes in the mass or volume distribution usually observed, but that these fine and coarse modes are usually chemically quite different.

CD (2004) at 2-7 (quoting Whitby (1978)). Thus, while “[m]odes are defined primarily in terms of their formation mechanisms,” they “also differ in sources, composition, transport and fate, as well as size.” CD (2004) at 2-14. Fine particles are formed primarily by combustion or chemical reactions of gases, and composed of metals and metal oxides, black or elemental carbon, primary and secondary organic compounds, and sulfate, nitrate, ammonium and hydrogen ions. CD (2004) at 2-15. In contrast, coarse particles are formed by the mechanical breakdown of minerals, crustal material and organic debris. *Id.* (See also EPA 1996 PM Criteria Document: “Coarse particles are generated by mechanical processes and consist of soil dust, fly ash, sea spray, plant fragments, particles from tire wear, and emissions from rock-crushing operations. These particles are removed primarily by impaction and settling.” (p. 3-6).

Within the intermodal range, the chemical composition of individual particles can usually (though not always) be used to identify the source or formation mechanism, and thereby identify a particle as fine PM or coarse PM. *See* CD (2004) at 2-15. Nonetheless, in 1997 EPA adopted the PM_{2.5} standard, a purely size-based criterion, for separating fine and coarse particles. PM_{2.5} particle size is defined by “size-selective sampling.” In other words, the standard refers to particles collected by a sampling device which collects 50% of particles with a diameter of 2.5 μm, and rejects 50% of such particles. CD (2004) at 2-17. (The device must also accept or reject specified percentages of other diameter particles, as specified in federal regulations. *Id.*)

Although compelling arguments—including some from EPA’s own scientists—supported selecting 1 μm as the “cut point” or “indicator” for fine PM, EPA chose to use the PM_{2.5} standard, recognizing that it is over-inclusive of coarse PM. Among the considerations that led EPA to choose the 2.5 μm cut point was the fact that limited data on the concentration and composition of intermodal PM mass was available. CD (2004) at 2-25.

2. EPA Should Adopt a Mechanism In Its Proposed PM Fine Implementation Rule For Exclusion of Coarse PM Before Making Nonattainment Determinations.

EPA’s Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards, 70 FR 65984 (Nov. 1, 2005) (“Proposed Implementation Rule”), describes requirements that States and Tribes must meet in their implementation plans for attainment of the PM_{2.5} national ambient air quality standards (“NAAQS”). The Proposed Implementation Rule recognizes that despite overlap in the intermodal particle sizes, fine and coarse PM are generally associated with distinctly different sources and formation processes. 70 FR 65922. Despite this recognition, the Proposed Implementation Rule lists a broad range of constituents for fine particles, including “Sulfate (SO₄); nitrate (NO₃); ammonium; elemental carbon; a great variety of organic compounds; and inorganic material (**including** metals, **dust**, sea salt, and other trace elements) generally referred to as “crustal” material, although it may contain material from other sources.” 70 FR 65988. (Emphasis added.) It seems clear that EPA is proposing to treat coarse PM dusts such as crustal material as fine PM, and to include it

deliberately in fine PM implementation, thus treating it as equivalent to fine PM. We respectfully submit that such inclusion will undermine and confound the PM fine standard by including coarse PM that is without substantial health or welfare effects, and will likewise misdirect control efforts. NCBA urges EPA to provide a mechanism for excluding coarse PM from fine PM_{2.5} before making PM_{2.5} nonattainment designations.

Without such a refinement, the PM_{2.5} indicator is likely to impose significant burdens on rural communities, particularly those in the arid western United States that are home to agricultural and mining activities. The Proposed Implementation Rule anticipates most non-attainment areas will be located in the eastern United States and California, and therefore focuses on those regions. 70 FR 65993. In doing so, it disregards the consequences for agricultural activities, including feedlots and ranching, if western and rural communities are determined to be in nonattainment of the PM_{2.5} NAAQS, as a result of the coarse PM contribution captured by the PM_{2.5} indicator. (See Pinal County, Arizona study summarized below.)

Table 2 in the Proposed Implementation Rule, 70 FR 65993, shows differences in the composition of PM_{2.5} between urban and rural areas, as well as across various regions of the United States. Notably, crustal material consistently comprises a larger component of PM_{2.5} in rural areas, and in the Desert West, South, East Texas and Northern Plains. Because the mechanical processes associated with coarse PM formation rarely produce particles with diameter less than 1 µm, it is likely that these elevated levels of crustal material in fact represent coarse particles in the intermodal range, which are captured by the over-inclusive PM_{2.5} indicator.

Shortcomings of applying the PM_{2.5} indicator without further refinement through the Proposed Implementation Rule are further illuminated by considering EPA's Proposed Rule on National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter, 71 FR 2620 (Jan. 17, 2006) ("Proposed PM NAAQS Rule"). The Proposed PM NAAQS Rule concedes that "within the intermodal range of 1 to 3 µm there is no unambiguous definition of an appropriate size cut for the separation of the overlapping fine and coarse particle modes." 71 FR 2645. Once again, however, it is asserted that certain policy considerations support the selection of the PM_{2.5}. In particular, a regulatory determination that it is more important to capture fine particles more completely under a range of conditions and across the United States, than to avoid coarse-mode intrusion into the fine fraction in some areas. *Id.*

Several flawed assumptions underlie this reasoning. First, it posits a false dilemma that the fine PM definition must be either under-inclusive of the fine mode or over-inclusive of the coarse mode. EPA has an opportunity in the Proposed Implementation Rule to retain the PM_{2.5} indicator, while supplementing it with a mechanism to eliminate coarse PM prior to making nonattainment determinations.

At the time the PM_{2.5} indicator was adopted in 1997, little information on the composition of intermodal mass was available, but it was assumed that there was only a

small amount of coarse PM intrusion that would be captured in the fine PM measurements. *See, e.g.*, CD (2004) at 2-25, 71 FR 2644. However, more recent information establishes that is such is not the case. The Proposed PM NAAQS Rule recognizes that while there is generally little mass in the intermodal range, in certain circumstances, such as dry, dusty areas, there will be increased coarse intrusion into the intermodal range. 71 FR 2645. This increased coarse PM mass in the intermodal range will be captured by the PM_{2.5} indicator, and without further refinement of the indicator or provision for exclusions from it in implementation, will lead to nonattainment determinations—particularly in western and rural communities—on the basis of coarse PM, which has never been demonstrated to be harmful at ambient concentrations.

The problem is vividly illustrated by the results of an EPA-funded study conducted in Pinal County, Arizona, published in July 2005, “Pinal County Air Quality Control District Source Apportionment Study” Prepared by Pinal County Air Quality Staff (July 29, 2005) (“Pinal County Study” hereafter, attached to NCBA’s comments on the Fine PM Implementation Rule as Exhibit A and incorporated herein, Docket ID No. OAR-2003-0062). The Pinal County Air Quality Control District conducted a source apportionment study to identify sources of elevated particulate matter in an agricultural basin in the heart of the Sonoran Desert, typifying the sort of arid western rural areas that will face the most severe consequences if agricultural or mining activities must be curtailed due to PM_{2.5} nonattainment resulting from high levels of crustal coarse PM intrusion. The study gathered data at a range of sites including downtown and residential locations, as well as areas surrounded by agricultural uses, feedlots and desert environments.

At four of the five locations, geologic soil² was, on average, the largest contributor to the PM_{2.5} mass, comprising between 40 and 50%. Pinal County Study at pp. 29, 32, 37 and 40. At the location nearest the feedlot, soil chemically identified as being from the feedlot represented 49% of the average and geologic soil another 24%. *Id.* at 34. These findings suggest that without an implementation mechanism that isolates crustal and other coarse PM material from fine PM, rural communities engaged in agriculture and mining will, like feedlots, almost certainly face significant nonattainment problems under the PM_{2.5} standard. Indeed, the Pinal County Study included one sample from the feedlot site where the measured PM_{2.5} contained 79.8% feedlot dust and 16.2% soil dust, for a total of 96% coarse PM, and the concentration was 183.3 µg/m³ – nearly three times the existing primary, 24-hour health standard for fine PM, and more than 5 times the proposed 24-hour primary, health standard for PM_{2.5}, namely 35 µg/m³. Pinal County Study at p. 64. During a single month, the Pinal County study measured PM_{2.5} above the proposed PM_{2.5} standard on six days when coarse PM exceeded 68.2% of the fine PM_{2.5}, and averaged 78.3% of the PM_{2.5}. *Id.*

² The study was unable to distinguish between soil from unpaved roads and from agricultural activities, and combined these two sources in the “geologic soil” category. In contrast, soil from feedlots had distinctive chemical markers.

The Proposed PM NAAQS Rule also provisionally concludes that current studies do not provide a sufficient basis for eliminating any individual component from the fine PM standard. At the same time, however, the Proposed PM NAAQS Rule establishes a new indicator for thoracic coarse particles $PM_{10-2.5}$, which excludes any ambient mix of $PM_{10-2.5}$ that is dominated by rural windblown dust and soils and PM generated by agricultural and mining sources. 71 FR 2627. The Proposed PM NAAQS Rule also notes in its discussion of $PM_{10-2.5}$ that certain classes of ambient particles, such as particles of crustal origin, “are relatively non-toxic under most circumstances, compared to combustion related particles,” 71 FR 2666 (citing 2004 CD), and that in light of limited evidence, “it is not appropriate to generalize the available evidence of associations with health effects that have been related to thoracic coarse particles generally found in urban areas and apply it to the mix of particles typically found in non-urban or rural areas.” 71 FR 2667 (citing 2005 Staff Paper). Thus, given the lack of substantial health or welfare effects from crustal and other coarse PM, and PM found in rural areas, an exception similar to that provided for rural soils and dust generated by agricultural and mining sources under the $PM_{10-2.5}$ standard is likewise appropriate to eliminate coarse intrusion under the $PM_{2.5}$ indicator.

EPA has an opportunity in the Proposed Implementation Rule to retain the $PM_{2.5}$ indicator, while supplementing it with a mechanism to eliminate coarse PM prior to making nonattainment determinations. Dr. Dale A. Lundgren developed one such methodology for excluding coarse particle intrusion from $PM_{2.5}$ measurements in 1996. Dr. Lundgren’s technique, described more fully in the comments and papers attached to NCBA’s comments on the Fine PM Implementation Rule as Exhibit B and incorporated herein (Docket ID No. OAR-2003-0062), provides a specific, practical methodology to estimate intrusion of coarse PM into the $PM_{2.5}$ region using only a PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ measurements. Dr. Lundgren has previously proposed that this procedure be incorporated into EPA regulations in order to overcome the cross-contamination and distortion that otherwise occurs when $PM_{2.5}$ is used as the indicator for fine PM. (See March 12, 1997 Comments of the National Mining Association on Proposed Changes to Federal Reference Method for $PM_{2.5}$, included in the materials in Exhibit B.)

XII. Conclusion

For all of the reasons discussed above, NCBA submits that there is not a sound or adequate basis for the adoption of a coarse PM standard at this time. It supports the alternative of not adopting a coarse PM standard for ambient exposure. There has never been a valid coarse PM in the past, and coarse PM health effects have not been the basis for past controls of fugitive dust. Continued control of fugitive dust is not dependent on the adoption of a coarse PM NAAQS. NCBA's members will continue not only their efforts at soil conservation and dust control, but will continue to support the improvement of those practices.

NCBA opposes the regulation of crustal material under the fine PM standard, and urges the EPA to adopt a mechanism to exclude coarse particle intrusion from PM2.5 measurements prior to making nonattainment determinations.

3521778_1.DOC