

reasonable further progress (RFP). RFP is defined by section 171(1) as "such annual incremental reductions in emissions of the relevant air pollutant as are required by this part or may reasonably be required by [EPA] for the purpose of ensuring attainment of the applicable [NAAQS] by the applicable date." However, there is a gap in the statute in that the PM<sub>10</sub> specific provisions of the Act do not clearly specify when and in what manner states containing PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment areas that ultimately demonstrate it is impracticable to attain the NAAQS by the Moderate area deadline, such as the PPA, which is the subject of this document, must demonstrate they have met the RFP requirement. While section 189(c)(1) of the Act requires PM<sub>10</sub> SIP revisions to contain quantitative milestones which are to be achieved every 3 years until the area is redesignated attainment and which must also demonstrate reasonable further progress, that section, by its explicit terms, only applies to areas with "plan revisions demonstrating attainment." However, while it appears that the Act does not provide specifically for a quantitative milestone reporting requirement showing RFP is met for areas that demonstrate it is impracticable to attain the PM<sub>10</sub> NAAQS by the applicable deadline, EPA nonetheless believes, based on the general nonattainment area provisions regarding RFP as well as the overall purpose and structure of Title I and Part D of the Act, that such areas are not thereby relieved of the obligation to periodically demonstrate that they are meeting the requirement for RFP. Consequently, for purposes of implementing the RFP requirement for such areas, EPA believes that where the language in section 171(1) indicates that the purpose of the RFP reductions is to ensure "attainment of the applicable [NAAQS] by the applicable [attainment] date," the applicable attainment date for areas demonstrating that it is impracticable to attain would be the date set by section 188(c) when the area is reclassified as serious. Similarly, since the Act does not explicitly provide for states with PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment areas which demonstrate it is impracticable to attain to submit periodic reports demonstrating that RFP is being met, such as is required under section 189(c)(1) for PM<sub>10</sub> areas which demonstrate attainment, EPA believes it may invoke the discretionary authority provided the Agency under section 110(p) of the Act to require the submittal of such reports. That section states that "any State shall submit" such

reports as EPA may require, and on such schedules as EPA may prescribe, providing information on specific data but also including "any other information [EPA] may deem necessary to assess the development effectiveness, need for revision, or implementation of any plan or plan revision required under this Act." The initial RFP report for such areas is to be included in the SIP submittal containing the area's demonstration of impracticability, and should show that even though the emissions reductions achieved through the implementation of all RACM may not be enough to enable the area to demonstrate attainment by the Moderate area deadline of December 31, 1994, such implementation has resulted in "incremental reductions" in emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> as the RFP definition in section 171(1) specifies. Once the area has been reclassified, subsequent RFP report submittals will be timed to reflect emissions reductions which will be achieved due to the implementation of BACM. In summary then, EPA's policy is that the requirement to submit periodic reports demonstrating that RFP (as defined in section 171(1)) is being met applies equally to PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment areas that demonstrate attainment by the applicable deadline and to such areas that demonstrate it is impracticable to attain by such date; for the former areas the requirement applies pursuant to sections 189(c)(1) and 172(c)(2), for the latter areas the requirement applies pursuant to sections 172(c)(2) and 110(p). As described in greater detail elsewhere in this document, the Phoenix Planning Area, has provided information along with its impracticability demonstration, which proves to EPA's satisfaction that it has met the requirement to demonstrate RFP. Finally, the discussion in this document regarding the demonstration of RFP in PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment areas which demonstrate that attainment by the applicable attainment date is impracticable represents EPA's preliminary guidance on this issue, and is intended to clarify the confusion created by omissions in the Act and in prior EPA guidance. EPA also intends, in the very near future, to issue more comprehensive guidance on this issue.

#### **V. Response to Comments on Proposed SIP Approval**

Only ACLPI commented on EPA's proposed approval of the SIP revision; other commenters addressed reclassification. EPA appreciates the comments submitted by ACLPI, which are detailed and thoughtful. Some of the comments raise difficult issues

regarding the State's compliance with complex planning requirements, which often depend on coordination between a number of local governments. ACLPI's most detailed comments concern the State's implementation of RACM, particularly Transportation Control Measures (TCMs). In this document, EPA is providing its general response to ACLPI's comments on the implementation of RACM, and EPA is also providing very detailed responses concerning individual TCMs and other specific measures raised in ACLPI's comments in the Technical Support Document (TSD) accompanying this document.

#### **A. Technical Issues**

##### **1. Monitoring**

*Comment:* The PM<sub>10</sub> SIP revision for the PPA does not provide for the establishment and operation of a PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring network which meets the requirements of EPA guidelines and regulations. According to a 1992 EPA audit, the monitoring network for the Phoenix area "fails to meet many of the minimum CFR requirements".

*Response:* EPA disagrees with the comment. The PM<sub>10</sub> SIP revision provides for establishing and operating a PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring network in the PPA which meets the requirements of EPA guidelines and regulations. 40 CFR part 58; "Guideline for the Implementation of the Ambient Air Monitoring Regulations 40 CFR Part 58." The relevant provisions of the PPA's monitoring network are in Appendix B, Exhibit 14 of the SIP revision. Appendix B, Exhibit 14 also discusses proposed modifications to the network and the method by which the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department (MCESD) will address episode occurrences.

Since a 1992 Re-Evaluation of the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Program that was conducted by EPA, the MCESD has made and documented progress to meet the requirements in 40 CFR parts 50 and 58. The MCESD was required by the Agency to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to address deficiencies documented in the 1992 Re-Evaluation. The progress on the CAP is being monitored by EPA, Region IX Air Quality Section and Compliance and Oversight Section, through review and verification of progress reports by MCESD and visits with the MCESD Air Monitoring Program personnel. EPA has also withheld federal grant money to encourage the MCESD to address CAP commitments and regulatory requirements in a timely manner. There have been improvements by MCESD,