

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

ENCLOSURE 3

Formatted: Right: 0.13"

**RECORD OF HEARING AND SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT
NORTHERN VIRGINIA PM_{2.5} NONATTAINMENT AREA
MAINTENANCE PLAN AND MOBILE SOURCE EMISSIONS BUDGET**

As required by 40 CFR 51.102(e), the complete record of the hearing, along with a list of commenters and the text of the written presentations or summary of the oral presentations, is located at the Air Division, Department of Environmental Quality. The department contact to access this information is the Director, Air Division.

The record of the public hearing is blank since no one attended the hearing.

As required by § 2.1(h) of Appendix V of 40 CFR Part 51, below is a summary of the comment received and responses thereto. Included is a brief statement of the subject, the identification of the commenter, the summary of the comment and the response (analysis and action taken). Each issue is discussed in light of all of the comments received that affect that issue. All comments have been reviewed and responses developed based on an evaluation of the issues raised in consideration of the overall goals and objectives of the air quality program and the intended purpose of the document under review.

- 1. **SUBJECT:** Recent litigation regarding PM_{2.5}.

COMMENTER: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region III

TEXT: On January 4, 2013, in *Natural Resources Defense Council v. EPA*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit remanded to EPA the Final Clean Air Fine Particulate Implementation Rule (72 FR 20586, April 25, 2007) and the Implementation of the New Source Review (NSR) program for Particulate Matter Less than 2.5 Micrometers (PM_{2.5}) (72 FR 2831, May 16, 2008). No. 08-1250 (D.C. Cir. January 4, 2013). The Court found that EPA erred in implementing the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS pursuant to the general implementation provisions of Subpart 1 of part D of Title I of the Act, rather than the particulate-matter-specific provisions of subpart 4 of part D of Title I. EPA is still interpreting this court decision and its potential implications for redesignation requests and [n]maintenance plans, as well as a for, motor vehicle emisisions budgets.

Deleted: s

Deleted: f ro

RESPONSE: The proposed redesignation request and proposed maintenance plan fully conform to all current EPA guidance and regulatory requirements. Additionally, these documents provide data conclusively demonstrating that the Washington DC-MD-VA region has complied with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS since 2005. For example, see Figures 5-2 and 5-3 of the proposed maintenance plan.

Deleted: s

Deleted:

Deleted: Metropolitan

Deleted: D.C.

MWAQC-TAC, 03.1.12, DC Response to Public Comments on PM_{2.5} Redesignation Request & Maintenance Plan

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Furthermore, the area's current design value using 2009-2011 data is 10.8 µg/m³, which is 4.2 µg/m³ less than the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS requirement of 15.0 µg/m³ on an annual basis. Regardless of how EPA decides to implement the NAAQS requirements, both emissions and ambient air concentrations of relevant pollutants are expected to continue to improve. Given current mandates on a variety of PM_{2.5} and PM_{2.5} precursor emitting sources, it is improbable that the Metropolitan Washington D.C. area will ever violate the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS in the future. If this improbable event does come to pass, the proposed maintenance plan contains, in Section 8, contingency measures to further reduce PM_{2.5} emissions and PM_{2.5} precursor emissions. However, every indication is that PM_{2.5} air quality will continue the improvement trends depicted in Figures 5-2 and 5-3 of the proposed maintenance plan. The proposed maintenance plan notes in Table 5-1 that between the attainment year of 2007 and the out year of 2025, this region is expected to have reductions in SO₂ emissions of more than 158,000 tons, reductions in NO_x emissions of more than 90,700 tons, and reductions in primary PM_{2.5} emissions of more than 2,700 tons. More information is simply not needed to provide assurances that the area will continue to maintain compliance with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS through 2025. Should EPA decide to finalize a regulation requiring a different approach to the development of a 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS maintenance plan, the Washington DC-MD-VA region will review those requirements at that time to determine if they warrant the creation and submittal of a subsequent state implementation plan revision.

Deleted: inconceivable

Deleted: inconceivable

Comment [j1]: This seems extraneous, since the "current mandates" are in question. The data in the plan is referred to in the second and third sentences already.

There's no need to judge the comment!

Deleted: , Virginia

No modification to the proposed documents was made based on this comment.

2. **SUBJECT:** CSAPR.

COMMENTER: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region III

TEXT: On August 21, 2012, the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit issued a decision to vacate the Cross State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR). In that decision, the Court also ordered EPA to continue administering the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) "pending the promulgation of a valid replacement." *EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. EPA*, No. 11-1302 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 21, 2012), *reh'g denied* (per curiam) (Jan.24, 2013). While the D.C. Circuit has denied a rehearing of the decision to remand CSAPR, EPA is evaluating the ramifications of that decision and its potential implications for redesignation requests and maintenance plans.

RESPONSE: The proposed redesignation request and proposed maintenance plan does not rely on CSAPR or CAIR to facilitate the emission reductions from facilities located within the Washington DC-MD-VA nonattainment area that might have had either of these regulations as applicable requirements. Rather, these documents rely upon federally enforceable consent agreement requirements,

Deleted: Metropolitan Washington D.C.

MWAQC-TAC, 03.1.12, DC Response to Public Comments on PM2.5 Redesignation Request & Maintenance Plan

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

federally enforceable permit requirements, permanent retirement of electrical generating units, and requirements contained within the Maryland Health Air Act to control the emissions of electrical generating units within the Washington DC-MD-VA region. More detail on these requirements may be found in Section 3.2.2 of the proposed redesignation request and in Section 5.2.2 of the proposed maintenance plan. No further requirements are needed to ensure that the area complies with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS until at least 2025.

Deleted: Metropolitan Washington D.C. area

No modification to the proposed documents was made based on this comment.

3. **SUBJECT:** Product Emissions

COMMENTER: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region III

TEXT: The second paragraph in the proposed maintenance plan under **Section 5.2.2.4 Future Control Strategies** reads as follows:

The Washington DC-MD-VA area will work with jurisdictions and USEPA to demonstrate the feasibility of (and get SIP credit for) achieving reductions across the entire region from market forces that will result in cleaner products being distributed across the entire region even when the regulations driving the cleaner products have only been adopted in a part of the region.

Deleted: .¶

Please clarify what is meant by “cleaner products.”

RESPONSE: In this context, “cleaner products” include consumer, commercial, institutional and industrial goods and technologies sold on the market (e.g. paints, adhesives, sealants, fuels) have a capacity to inherently emit less pollution as compared to other similar products.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [j2]: Perhaps the question has more to do with use of the term PRODUCTS, not “cleaner”...eh?

No modification to the proposed documents was made based on this comment.

Deleted: as with most environmental documents, “cleaner” generally refers to products and technologies that minimize environmental impacts and thus have that

4. **SUBJECT:** SO₂ NAAQS Proposed Guidance

COMMENTER: Ms. Pamela F. Faggert, Vice President and Chief Environment Officer, Dominion

TEXT: The commenter requests that language in Section 5.2.2.1.4 of the proposed maintenance plan, which provides information on EPA’s proposed approach for implementing the 2010 SO₂ NAAQS, be either reworded or removed from the document.

Deleted: have

RESPONSE: The commenter is correct that the language in the proposed

MWAQC-TAC, 03.1.12, DC Response to Public Comments on PM2.5 Redesignation Request & Maintenance Plan

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

maintenance plan regarding implementation of the 2010 SO₂ NAAQS is obsolete. Reference to EPA's proposed guidance has been removed from the document.

5. MDE START
SUBJECT: D.C. Circuit Court Case, *NRDC v. EPA*, Case No. 08-1250

COMMENTER: Mr. Joshua Berman, Associate Attorney, Sierra Club

TEXT: The Redesignation Request fails to appropriately address ammonia and volatile organic compounds (“VOCs”) as PM_{2.5} precursors, as is required under the D.C. Circuit’s recent ruling in *NRDC v. EPA*, Case No. 08-1250 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 4, 2013);

On January 4, 2013, the D.C. Circuit struck down EPA’s Implementation Rule for PM_{2.5}. *NRDC v. EPA*, Case No. 08-1250 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 4, 2013). In holding that EPA impermissibly promulgated its PM_{2.5} implementation rules pursuant to the general implementation provisions of Subpart I of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act rather than Subpart 4, the Court observed that under Subpart 4, precursor pollutants (such as ammonia) are presumptively regulated. See *id.*, slip op. at 14 n.7. Consequently, MDE’s election to ignore both VOCs and ammonia, which it expressly acknowledged to be precursors of PM_{2.5}, see Redesignation Request at 9-10, is impermissible in light of the D.C. Circuit’s decision in *NRDC*. This deficiency must be remedied before EPA can approve MDE’s redesignation request.

RESPONSE: The Washington DC-MD-VA proposed Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan, in which Maryland is a regional contributor, fully complies with all requirements of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Notwithstanding recent litigation and EPA’s anticipated interpretation of the decision and its impacts on redesignation requests, the regional SIP demonstrates that air monitoring data in the Washington DC-MD-VA area has met the PM_{2.5} NAAQS since 2005. Furthermore, the area’s current design value using 2009-2011 data is 10.8 µg/m³, which is 4.2 µg/m³ less than the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS requirement of 15.0 µg/m³ on an annual basis. The monitoring and design value data reflects a measurement of all PM_{2.5} precursors and conforms to all EPA guidance. The proposed maintenance plan notes in Table 5-1 that between the attainment year of 2007 and the out year of 2025, this region is expected to have reductions in SO₂ emissions of more than 158,000 tons, reductions in NO_x emissions of more than 90,700 tons, and reductions in primary PM_{2.5} emissions of more than 2,700 tons. More information is simply not needed to provide assurances that the area will continue to maintain compliance with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS through 2025. The EPA is considering the ramifications of the court decision. EPA’s interpretation of the court decision will be done via the federal register and therefore will be open to comment. Any decision on the Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan will be done in accordance with the EPA interpretation of the decision. Should EPA decide to finalize a regulation requiring a different

approach to the development of a 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS maintenance plan- the Washington DC-MD-VA region will review those requirements at that time to determine if they warrant the creation and submittal of a subsequent state implementation plan revision.

No modification to the proposed documents was made based on this comment.

6. **SUBJECT:** D.C. Circuit Court Case, *NRDC v. EPA*, Case No. 08-1250

COMMENTER: Mr. Joshua Berman, Associate Attorney, Sierra Club

TEXT: The Redesignation Request fails to adequately analyze the effect that redesignation will have on Maryland's compliance with other NAAQS, including the 2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS and 2013 annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS, and with regional haze;

RESPONSE: Section 107(d)(3)(E) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, states that and area can be redesignated to attainment if the following conditions are met:

1. The EPA has determined that the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) have been attained.
2. The applicable implementation plan has been fully approved by EPA under section 110(k).
3. The EPA has determined that the improvement in air quality is due to permanent and enforceable reductions in emissions.
4. The State has met all applicable requirements for the area under section 110 and Part D.
5. The EPA has fully approved a maintenance plan, including a contingency plan, for the area under section 175A.

The Washington DC-MD-VA proposed Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan, in which Maryland is a regional contributor, fully complies with all requirements of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

No modification to the proposed documents was made based on this comment.

7. **SUBJECT:** EPA's Decision to Increase Ethanol Content in Gasoline

COMMENTER: Mr. Joshua Berman, Associate Attorney, Sierra Club

TEXT: The Redesignation Request's draft maintenance plan fails to consider

recent EPA decisions regarding mobile source emissions. Maryland Should Revise Its Maintenance Plan to Include Consideration of EPA's Decision to Increase Ethanol Content in Gasoline.

RESPONSE: The region has prepared a Maintenance Plan based upon those requirements and standards as determined by the EPA.

The Maintenance Plan constitutes a SIP revision and must provide for maintenance of the relevant NAAQS in the area for at least 10 years after redesignation, including additional measures to ensure prompt correction of any violation of the NAAQS. The state must also submit a SIP revision 8 years after the original redesignation request is approved to provide for maintenance of the NAAQS for an additional 10 years following the first 10-year period.

The Maintenance Plan contains a commitment to enact and implement additional contingency measures expeditiously in the event that future violations of the NAAQS occur and a list of potential contingency measures that would be implemented in such an event.

As such, the Maintenance Plan has adequate provisions to address any future regulations, court decisions, or unexpected events. These future scenarios will be evaluated as needed.