

CRS Report for Congress

Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}): Implementation of the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Updated April 16, 2008

Robert Esworthy
Specialist in Environmental Policy
Resources, Science, and Industry Division



**Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress**

Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}): Implementation of the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Summary

Particulate matter (PM), including fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), is one of the six principal pollutants for which the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) under the Clean Air Act (CAA). Primary NAAQS are designed to protect human health, with an adequate margin of safety. After years of litigation and other delays, the EPA is implementing the NAAQS for PM_{2.5} promulgated in 1997. Several key implementation milestones are scheduled to be completed during 2008. This report provides information on the designation process for PM_{2.5} “attainment” and “nonattainment” areas, and describes issues that have been raised as the EPA and states develop implementation strategies.

The EPA’s final designation of 39 areas, consisting of 208 counties in 20 states and the District of Columbia, as nonattainment areas for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS became effective in April 2005. A combined population of almost 90 million resides in these areas. States with PM_{2.5} nonattainment areas are required to develop comprehensive implementation plans, referred to as State Implementation Plans (SIPs), demonstrating how attainment will be reached by a designated deadline. SIPs include pollution control measures that rely on models of the impact on air quality of projected emission reductions to demonstrate attainment. States are required to submit SIPs for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS by April 2008 (three years after the effective date for the final geographic designations), but EPA does not expect to begin receiving them until July. States must be in compliance by 2010, unless they are granted a five-year extension. The EPA published its final “PM_{2.5} implementation” rule on April 25, 2007, to provide guidance and procedures for establishing controls to achieve and maintain attainment. Six petitions for review of the implementation rule were filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, and two petitions for reconsideration have been filed with the EPA. A number of issues will continue to be debated as the implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS progresses. Questions and concerns include the following: what criteria were used to determine nonattainment; whether special provisions can be made for meeting attainment deadlines, particularly for areas affected by upwind pollution; what grants or other funding might be available to help areas reach attainment; and how nonattainment designation might affect economic development and transportation planning in an area.

Other EPA rulemakings promulgated and proposed that affect various aspects of regulating air quality, in particular the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) published in May 2005, could influence the PM_{2.5} NAAQS implementation process. As part of its periodic review of the particulate matter standards (also referred to as the particulates NAAQS), as required under the CAA, on October 17, 2006, the EPA promulgated the final revisions to NAAQS for particulates, both PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, that included a strengthening of the 1997 PM_{2.5} standard. In late December 2006, several states and industry, agriculture, business, and public advocacy groups petitioned the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit to review the new 2006 particulates NAAQS. Judicial actions regarding these new PM NAAQS could affect implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

Contents

Introduction	1
The 1997 PM _{2.5} Standards	5
Geographical Area Designation Process	6
1997 PM _{2.5} NAAQS Geographical Area Designations: A Chronology	9
Demonstrating Attainment with the 1997 PM _{2.5} NAAQS	13
The State Implementation Plan	13
EPA's PM _{2.5} Implementation Rule	13
Transportation Conformity	14
Other National Air Quality Improvement Programs and Strategies	17
Other Issues	19
Defining Nonattainment Boundaries	19
Upwind Pollutant Contributions	19
Economic Impacts	20
Grant Programs	21
Identifying Sources and Control Measures	22
Completion of the EPA's Most Recent Review of the Particulates NAAQS and the September 2006 Changes	22
Impacts of Actions Regarding the 1997 Ozone NAAQS	25
Congressional Action Related to Particulates NAAQS Implementation	26
Implementation of the 1997 PM _{2.5} NAAQS: Timeline and Delays	27
Conclusion	28

List of Figures

Figure 1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Designations of Nonattainment Areas for the 1997 PM _{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)	12
--	----

List of Tables

Table 1. Areas Previously Identified as Nonattainment for 1997 PM _{2.5} NAAQS Designated as Attaining the Standards	11
Table 2. Schedule for Implementation of the 1997 PM _{2.5} NAAQS	27

Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}): Implementation of the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Introduction

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are a core component of the Clean Air Act (CAA).¹ NAAQS do not regulate emission sources of pollutants directly; rather, they define the level of pollution in ambient (outdoor) air above which health effects occur. The statute requires that, based on a review of the scientific literature, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) set (1) “primary” standards at a level “requisite to protect the public health” with an “adequate margin of safety” and (2) “secondary” standards at a level “requisite to protect the public welfare.”² NAAQS have been promulgated for six principal pollutants classified by the EPA as “criteria pollutants”: sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), ozone, lead, and particulate matter.

This report provides an overview of the NAAQS implementation process in the context of the 1997 standards for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), which consists of particles less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter. It also discusses issues and concerns of stakeholders that could potentially alter the PM_{2.5} implementation process. The EPA is in the process of implementing the NAAQS for particulates promulgated in 1997,³ delayed because of court challenges and other factors. The EPA’s 1997 revisions to the particulate matter standards (also referred to as the particulates NAAQS) included separate requirements for PM_{2.5} for the first time. Since they were modified, the particulates NAAQS have been the source of significant concern and national debate, which have delayed their implementation. Congress has been particularly interested in the EPA’s promulgation and implementation of the CAA standards and has held numerous hearings on particulate matter (and the ozone NAAQS established in 1997).

A key component of implementing the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS is the EPA’s designations of geographical areas for “attainment” or “nonattainment” of the air quality standards for PM_{2.5}. The EPA’s final designation of all or part of 208

¹ Sections 108 and 109 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) govern the establishment, review, and revisions of NAAQS (42 U.S.C. 7408 and 7409). See CRS Report 97-722, *Air Quality Standards: The Decisionmaking Process*, by John Blodgett and Larry Parker.

² 42 U.S.C. 7409(b)(1) for “primary”; 42 U.S.C. 7409(b)(2) and 7602(h) for “secondary.”

³ 62 *Federal Register* 38652-38760, July 18, 1997.

counties⁴ in 20 states and the District of Columbia for nonattainment of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS became effective on April 5, 2005.⁵ A combined population of almost 90 million lives in these nonattainment areas. The final designations were based, in part, on the EPA's consideration of recommendations previously provided by states and tribes, and supplemental 2004 air monitoring data submitted by some states. Nonattainment designation begins a process in which states (and tribes) must develop and adopt emission control programs sufficient to bring air quality into compliance by a statutorily defined deadline. States are required to submit, by April 2008, their "implementation" plans (referred to as SIPs) for how the designated nonattainment areas will meet the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. EPA expects about half of the 58 SIPs (there are 39 areas, but some have multiple states submitting individual SIPs) to be submitted before July 2008, and the remainder to be submitted in the following months.⁶ States with nonattainment areas must be in compliance with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS by April 5, 2010, unless they are granted a five-year extension.⁷

The designation of "nonattainment" areas raised questions and concerns, particularly for those areas designated as such for the first time. These questions and concerns included when and why the standards were established, what criteria were used to determine nonattainment, what measures will be necessary to achieve or maintain attainment by the scheduled deadlines, whether special provisions can be made for areas affected by upwind pollution, what flexibility is available for extending the deadline for reaching attainment, whether grants or other funding are available to help areas reach attainment, and how designation might affect economic development and transportation investments in an area.⁸ Concerns also have been raised regarding compliance deadlines with respect to the EPA's timely provision of implementation procedures and guidance for achieving and maintaining compliance

⁴ All designated counties and partial counties, including Indian Country, geographically located within such areas, except as otherwise indicated by the EPA. See EPA's PM_{2.5} Designations website at [<http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations>].

⁵ 70 *Federal Register* 944-1019, January 5, 2005. The EPA published a final supplemental rule on April 14, 2005 (70 *Federal Register* 19844), amending the agency's initial final designations published in January, re-designating as attainment/unclassifiable 17 counties previously designated nonattainment. The earlier rule included a provision for the EPA to withdraw a nonattainment designation prior to the April 5, 2005, effective date if a state provided 2004 air monitoring data by February 22, 2005, suggesting that a change in designation would be appropriate. Monitoring data for 2004 was not available in time for the EPA to meet its statutory deadline for completing its designations.

⁶ U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) based on information received from the EPA Regions regarding expected SIP submittal dates.

⁷ Under section 172(a)(2)(A) of the CAA, the EPA may grant an area an extension of the initial attainment date for one to five years (in no case later than 10 years after the designation date for the area). A state requesting an extension must submit an implementation plan (SIP) by the required deadline that includes, among other things, sufficient information demonstrating that attainment by the initial attainment date is "impracticable."

⁸ The EPA's April 15, 2004, designations for the ozone air quality standard (promulgated the same time as the PM_{2.5} NAAQS in 1997) raised similar concerns. See CRS Report RL32345, *Implementation of EPA's 8-Hour Ozone Standard*, by James E. McCarthy.

with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The EPA published its final “PM_{2.5} implementation” rule on April 25, 2007.⁹ Six petitions for review of EPA’s implementation rule have been filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (D.C.) Circuit,¹⁰ and two petitions for reconsideration have been filed with EPA.¹¹ Given that states are required to submit their SIPs by April 2008, state and local air pollution control agencies,¹² as well as some Members of Congress,¹³ had expressed their concerns about the delays in publishing a final implementation rule¹⁴ and the lack of guidance.

The CAA provisions require the EPA to consider revisions to NAAQS on a prescribed schedule.¹⁵ Based on its finding that a review of the scientific evidence continued to support associations of exposure to particulates in ambient air with numerous significant health problems, the EPA promulgated revisions to the NAAQS for particulate matter on October 17, 2006.¹⁶ The new particulates NAAQS tightened the 1997 standard for PM_{2.5} but did not include several proposed changes to modify

⁹ 72 *Federal Register* 20586 — 20667, April 25, 2007.

¹⁰ The six petitions are: Earthjustice on behalf of American Lung Association, National Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club and Medical Advocates for Healthy Air (*American Lung Association v. EPA*, No. 07-1233, D.C. Cir. filed June 26, 2007); National Environmental Development Association’s Clean Air Project (NEDA CAP); National Petrochemical & Refiners Association; State of New York; State of New Jersey; National Cattlemen’s Beef Association.

¹¹ Earthjustice, Petition for Reconsideration, *Final Clean Air Fine Particle Implementation*, filed before the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, June 25, 2007, (Docket #EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0062-0256 available at [<http://www.regulations.gov/search/index.jsp>]); and petition by the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association (based on information received by CRS from EPA’s Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, March 19, 2008).

¹² Letter of Shelley Kaderly and Ursula Kramu, Co-Presidents, the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA, formerly the State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators and the Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials (STAPPA/ALAPCO)), to Hon. Stephen L. Johnson, EPA Administrator, February 16, 2007, available at [<http://www.4cleanair.org/TopicDetails.asp?parent=2#Particle%20Pollution>].

¹³ Letter of the Hon. John D. Dingell, Chairman of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, to Hon. Stephen L. Johnson, EPA Administrator, January 19, 2007, [http://energycommerce.house.gov/Press_110/110pr_air_quality.shtml].

¹⁴ The EPA had published a proposed rule November 1, 2005 (70 *Federal Register* 65984).

¹⁵ Section 109(d)(1) of the CAA. According to the statute, the EPA is required to review the latest scientific studies and either reaffirm or modify the NAAQS every five years, but reviews have occurred less frequently in practice.

¹⁶ 71 *Federal Register* 61143-61233, October 17, 2006. See CRS Report RL33254, *Air Quality: EPA’s 2006 Changes to the Particulate Matter (PM) Standard*, by Robert Esworthy and James E. McCarthy. The schedule for completion of the agency’s review of the particulates NAAQS was governed by a consent decree resolving a lawsuit filed in March 2003, requiring EPA to finalize its decision regarding the particulates NAAQS by September 27, 2006 (*American Lung Associations v. Whitman*, No. 1:03CV00778 (D.D.C. 2003, as modified by the court)).

the standards for inhalable coarse particles smaller than 10 microns but larger than 2.5 microns (PM₁₀). The tightening of the PM_{2.5} standards¹⁷ is expected to increase the number of areas (typically defined by counties or portions of counties) in nonattainment. States provided recommendations to EPA in December 2007 for nonattainment boundaries based on 2004-2006 monitoring data. EPA expects to finalize these nonattainment designations (based on 2005-2007 monitoring data) by the end of 2008 with an effective date of April 2009, and state implementation plans would be due three years later in April of 2012.¹⁸ Under the CAA, states are required to meet the new 2006 PM_{2.5} standard “as expeditiously as practicable,” but no later than five years from the date of designation — April 2014. An extension of one to five years may be obtained if a state demonstrates that severe air quality conditions prevent achieving attainment within the five years after designation.¹⁹

The EPA urged states to consider control strategies that may be useful in attaining the new 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS when developing control strategies for the 1997 PM_{2.5} standards.²⁰ Several elements of the new 2006 particulates NAAQS have been controversial, including the decision not to exclude rural sources from the coarse particle standard that the EPA had initially proposed, and the divergence from recommendations made by the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC),²¹ in particular, with regard the stringency of the PM_{2.5} standard. In late December 2006, several states²² (and the District of Columbia) and industry, agriculture, business, and public advocacy groups petitioned²³ the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to review the new 2006 particulate matter NAAQS.²⁴ All briefs were filed

¹⁷ The new daily standard averaged over 24-hour periods is reduced from 65 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) to 35 µg/m³ (71 *Federal Register* 61143-61233, October 17, 2006).

¹⁸ See EPA’s guidance on its website: “Area Designations for 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS — Technical Information,” [http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/pm/pm25_2006_techinfo.html].

¹⁹ Under section 172(a)(2)(A) of the CAA, the EPA may grant an area an extension of the initial attainment date for one to five years (in no case later than 10 years after the designation date for the area). A state requesting an extension must submit an implementation plan (SIP) by the required deadline that includes, among other things, sufficient information demonstrating that attainment by the initial attainment date is “impracticable.”

²⁰ EPA’s Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking outlining an implementation plan for the transition to the January 17, 2006, proposed particulates NAAQS (71 *Federal Register* 6722, February 9, 2006).

²¹ See the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) Particulate Matter Review Panel website at [<http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabpeople.nsf/WebCommittees/CASAC>]. For a discussion of recent issues regarding the CASAC, focusing on the statutory and historical role of CASAC and various proposals for change, see CRS Report RL33807, *Air Quality Standards and Sound Science: What Role for CASAC?* by James E. McCarthy.

²² New York, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont.

²³ Pursuant to Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and §307(b) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §7607(b).

²⁴ Interests represented include coal, iron, steel, and corn refiners, oilseed processors, (continued...)

with the court by March 7, 2008. The date for oral arguments had not been scheduled at the time of the update of this report, but EPA anticipates a decision in late 2008.

These and other issues potentially affecting the implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS are discussed in the following sections of this report.

The 1997 PM_{2.5} Standards

Beginning in 1971, regulation and monitoring of particulate matter under the CAA focused primarily on total suspended particles (TSP) and, eventually, on coarse particles equal to or less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM₁₀).²⁵ After extensive analysis and review, the EPA revised the particulates standards in 1997²⁶ to provide separate requirements for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) based on their links to several types of cardiovascular and respiratory health problems, including aggravated asthma and bronchitis, and to premature death.²⁷ In the 1997 promulgation, the EPA also revised the coarse particles' designation (PM₁₀) to include particles larger than 2.5 but smaller than 10 micrometers (PM_{10-2.5}), so as to explicitly exclude fine particles. As part of the 1997 rule, the EPA also promulgated the eight-hour ozone standard. The EPA's standard for PM₁₀, as modified by the 1997 changes, was challenged shortly after promulgation. Concluding that PM₁₀ was a "poorly matched indicator" for thoracic coarse particles because it included the smaller PM_{2.5} category as well as the larger particles, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated the 1997 PM₁₀ standards and remanded them to EPA. The 1999 U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit decision²⁸ directed the EPA to ensure that the standard did not duplicate the regulation of fine particles. The pre-existing 1987 PM₁₀ standards remained in place.²⁹

The primary (health) PM_{2.5} NAAQS requirements, which became effective on September 16, 1997,³⁰ are the same and as the secondary (welfare) requirements. The 1997 PM_{2.5} standards are set at

- an annual maximum concentration of 15 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³), based on the three-year average of the annual

²⁴ (...continued)

farmers, and cattle and pork producers. The Court consolidated the cases. *American Farm Bureau Federation v. U.S. EPA*, No. 06-1410 (D.C. Cir. 2006).

²⁵ *52 Federal Register* 24634-24715, July 1, 1987.

²⁶ *62 Federal Register* 38652-38760, July 18, 1997.

²⁷ For an update of EPA's health effects and other particulates-related research activities, see [<http://www.epa.gov/pmresearch/>].

²⁸ *American Trucking Associations, v. EPA*, 175 F.3d 1027, 1054-55 (D.C. Cir. 1999).

²⁹ *65 Federal Register* 80776, December 22, 2000.

³⁰ *62 Federal Register* 38652-38760, July 18, 1997.

arithmetic mean $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from one or more community-oriented monitors,³¹ and

- a 24-hour concentration of $65 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, based on the three-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at each population-oriented monitor³² within the area.

In requiring both the annual and the 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards in 1997, the EPA reportedly considered the “combined effect of the standards rather than an approach that weighed short- and long-term exposure evidence, analyses, and standards independently.”³³ The EPA considers the annual standard the primary requirement for reducing total $PM_{2.5}$ risk. The 24-hour standard is intended to provide supplemental protection for days with peak $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, localized “hot spots,” and $PM_{2.5}$ risks arising from seasonal emissions.

In 1997, the EPA changed the “form” of the 24-hour standards to a concentration-based percentile form, indicating the percentage of the time that a monitoring station can exceed the standard. For example, a 98th percentile 24-hour standard indicates that a monitoring station can exceed the standard 2% of the time during the year. The previous form was known as the “one-expected-exceedance” form; monitoring stations could exceed the 24-hour particulates NAAQS only once per year (averaged over three years). Although the limits of PM_{10} remained the same, the form of the PM_{10} 24-hour standard was changed to be based on a three-year average of the 99th percentile of 24-hour PM_{10} concentrations.

Geographical Area Designation Process

The designation of geographical areas failing to comply with the NAAQS, based on monitoring and analysis of relevant air quality data, is a critical step in NAAQS implementation. The CAA establishes a process for designating nonattainment areas and setting their boundaries, but it allows the EPA Administrator some discretion in determining what the final boundaries of the areas will be. Areas are identified as “nonattainment” when they violate or contribute to the violation of NAAQS. Areas are identified as “attainment/unclassified”³⁴ when they meet the standard or when the data are insufficient for determining compliance with the NAAQS.³⁵

³¹ Community-oriented monitoring zones are defined as “an optional averaging area with well established boundaries such as county or census block” (40 *CFR* Part 58 Subpart A).

³² Population-oriented monitoring (or sites) applies to “residential areas, commercial areas, recreational areas, industrial areas, and other areas where a substantial number of people may spend a significant fraction of their day” (40 *CFR* Part 58 Subpart A).

³³ U.S. EPA Fact Sheet, *EPA’s Revised Particulate Matter Standards*, July 17, 1997 [<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg/naaqsfm/pmfact.html>].

³⁴ Section 107(d)(1)(A)(iii) of the CAA provides that any area that the EPA cannot designate on the basis of available information as meeting or not meeting the standards should be designated unclassifiable.

³⁵ The EPA “Greenbook” lists areas of the country where air pollution levels persistently (continued...)

The EPA reported 150 areas were designated as nonattainment for at least one of the six criteria pollutants (including particulate matter) as of March 2008.³⁶ In its report, *Latest Findings on National Air Quality - Status and Trends through 2006* report, published January 2008, EPA estimated that 105.6 million people lived in counties with measured air quality concentrations above the NAAQS levels for the six criteria pollutants (but primarily PM_{2.5} and ozone) in 2006.³⁷

The designation process is intended as a cooperative federal-state-tribal process in which states and tribes provide initial designation recommendations to the EPA for consideration. Though not required to do so, tribes have been encouraged to submit recommendations. The area designation requirements under the CAA (Section 107) are specific with respect to states, but not to tribes. The EPA follows the same designation process for tribes per Sections 110(o) and 301(d) of the CAA and pursuant to the 1988 Tribal Authority Rule, which specifies that tribes shall be treated as states in selected cases (40 CFR Part 49).³⁸ In Section 107(d)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 7407), the statute states that the governor of each state shall submit a list to the EPA of all areas in the state, “designating as ... nonattainment, any area that does not meet (*or that contributes to ambient air quality in a nearby area that does not meet*) an air quality standard” (emphasis added).

PM_{2.5} attainment or nonattainment designations were made primarily on the basis of three-year federally referenced PM_{2.5} monitoring data.³⁹ At the time the PM_{2.5} NAAQS were being finalized in 1997, the EPA began developing methods for monitoring fine particles. Using funding specifically authorized for this purpose in FY1998-FY2000 EPA appropriations,⁴⁰ the agency worked closely with states and tribes to initiate the deployment of a portion of the network of 1,200 monitors in January 1999. The majority of the monitors were not in place until January 2000. States and tribes were expected to rely on data collected during 2000-2002 for their recommendations. The EPA considered the 2001-2003 data to make the final PM_{2.5} designations published in January 2005.

³⁵ (...continued)

exceed the national ambient air quality standards and may be designated as nonattainment. Current information on the location of NAAQS nonattainment areas is available on EPA’s website at [<http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/greenbk/>].

³⁶ See, EPA’s *Criteria Pollutant Area Summary Report* (as of March 12, 2008; the data is periodically updated) at [<http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/greenbk/anc12.html>].

³⁷ Refers to trends in the principal pollutants relative to their air quality standards, as measured by monitors located across the country and does reflect all areas designated nonattainment. (U.S. EPA, *Latest Findings on National Air Quality — Status and Trends through 2006*, EPA-454/R-07-007, January 2008 [<http://www.epa.gov/air/airtrends/2007/>]).

³⁸ For information regarding tribes that have participated in the PM_{2.5} designation recommendation process, see [<http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations/>].

³⁹ A federally referenced monitor is one that has been accepted for use by the EPA for comparison of the NAAQS by meeting the design specifications and certain precision and bias (performance) specifications (40 CFR Part 58).

⁴⁰ Appropriations for monitoring averaged roughly \$50 million per year (P.L. 105-65, P.L. 105-226, P.L. 106-74).

In its guidance document,⁴¹ the EPA identified several factors that would be considered in determining attainment with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS and specified data and conditions that would not be acceptable. The EPA's nonbinding guidance also included a recommendation that states and tribes consider using the same boundaries for nonattainment for both the PM_{2.5} and eight-hour ozone standards, to facilitate consistency in future implementation plans. The EPA expected that many of the PM_{2.5} nonattainment areas would overlap with the eight-hour ozone designations.⁴²

PM_{2.5} designations do not include nonattainment classifications based on severity, as is the case with PM₁₀ and ozone, which have two and seven classifications, respectively. The 1990 CAA Amendments include classifications of nonattainment, based on the extent to which the NAAQS are exceeded, and establish specific pollution controls and attainment dates for each classification (Title I Part D Sections 171-193). Under subpart 4 of the CAA, PM₁₀ nonattainment designations are either "moderate" or "serious," and each of these categories is subject to specified control requirements.⁴³ The EPA interpreted those classification provisions in the act for particulate matter to apply explicitly to PM₁₀, but not PM_{2.5}, NAAQS. Based on this interpretation, PM_{2.5} implementation is governed by the general nonattainment planning requirements of Title I (Part A and Part D, subpart 1) of the act.

The EPA recognized that determining the geographic extent of nearby source areas that contribute to nonattainment would be complicated. The CAA does not specifically require combining neighboring counties within the same nonattainment area, but it does require the use of metropolitan statistical area boundaries in the more severely polluted areas (Section 107(d)(4)(A)(iv)). Echoing this requirement, and similar to the eight-hour ozone approach, the EPA recommended that Metropolitan Statistical Areas or Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas⁴⁴ serve as the "presumptive boundary" for nonattainment areas under the 1997 PM_{2.5} standards.

Metropolitan areas are generally treated as units, even when part of the area lies in a separate state or does not have readings exceeding the standards. In the latter case, even though a specific county may not exceed the standards, the pollution generated there is likely to influence PM_{2.5} levels elsewhere in the metropolitan area. In addition, including the entire metropolitan area avoids the creation of additional incentives for sprawl development on the fringes of urban areas. For rural areas in

⁴¹ Information regarding EPA's guidance for PM_{2.5} designation is available on EPA's PM_{2.5} website at [http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/pm/pm25_index.html] and its Policy and Guidance website at [<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/oarpg>].

⁴² A map showing the final designation areas for PM_{2.5} and for the eight-hour ozone NAAQS is available on EPA's website at [<http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/greenbk/mappm25o3.html>].

⁴³ Moderate areas require permits for new and modified major stationary sources of PM₁₀ and must impose reasonably available control measures (RACM). Serious areas must impose best available control measures (BACM) and reduce the defined major source of PM₁₀ from 100 tons per year to 70 tons per year. The deadline for attainment for moderate areas is six years after designation; for serious areas, the deadline is 10 years after designation. (Section 188 of Part D subpart 4 of Title I in the CAA; 42 U.S.C. Sec. 7513.)

⁴⁴ Defined by the Office of Management Budget. For more information on metropolitan areas, see [<http://www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/aboutmetro.html>].

violation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} standards, the EPA's guidance presumed that the full county would be designated a nonattainment area.

Following state and tribal designation submissions, the EPA Administrator has discretion to make modifications, including to the area boundaries. As required by statute (Section 107[d]1[B][ii]), the agency must notify the states and tribes regarding any modifications, allowing them sufficient opportunity to demonstrate why a proposed modification is inappropriate, but the final determination rests with EPA.

1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS Geographical Area Designations: A Chronology

By the end of February 2004, 18 states and the District of Columbia had recommended 142 counties as potential nonattainment areas for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.⁴⁵ After reviewing the recommendations, the EPA recommended modifications resulting in nonattainment designations for 244 counties⁴⁶ in 21 states and the District of Columbia at the end of June 2004. As required by statute, the EPA notified each of the affected states regarding their specific modifications, providing them with the opportunity to submit new information and demonstrate why a proposed modification was inappropriate. Some states responding to the EPA's proposal continued to support their original recommendations.

The EPA's final PM_{2.5} designation rule, published on January 5, 2005 (70 *Federal Register* 944-1019), established the boundaries for areas designated as "nonattainment," "unclassifiable" (data not sufficient to make a determination regarding compliance), or "attainment/unclassifiable."⁴⁷ The EPA designated 47 areas, composed of 225 counties in 20 states and the District of Columbia, as nonattainment; 5 areas consisting of 7 counties as unclassifiable;⁴⁸ and the remaining counties in the United States as attainment/unclassifiable.

⁴⁵ For the EPA's final and proposed PM_{2.5} geographical designation recommendations and those from individual states and tribes, see [<http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations>].

⁴⁶ Included seven cities: Baltimore, MD; St. Louis, MO; Alexandria, VA; Fairfax, VA; Falls Church, VA; Manassas, VA; and Manassas Park, VA.

⁴⁷ The EPA designates an area as attainment/unclassifiable if (1) monitored air quality data show that the area has not violated the standard during a three-year period or (2) there is not enough information to determine the air quality in the area. Despite the CAA, Section 107(d)(1)(A) definitions for "nonattainment," "attainment," and "unclassifiable," the EPA does not apply the "attainment" nomenclature. It is generally the case that the agency has sufficient data to determine that an area is *not* in nonattainment, but the data are insufficient or incomplete to fully determine attainment.

⁴⁸ The EPA concluded that there was insufficient information to designate these areas as either nonattainment or attainment/unclassifiable. According to the January 2005 Federal Register Notice (70 *Federal Register* 65984), these areas had violating monitors for years 2000-2002 but incomplete data or other data issues for years 2001-2003.

The EPA's designations reflected minor modifications to its June 2004 proposal. Primarily, 19 counties were removed from the list of nonattainment areas, and other counties were redefined by designating only specified locations ("partial") within the county as nonattainment. In some cases, when considering factors defined in its guidance in conjunction with the additional information provided by the states and tribes, the EPA determined that only those portions of a county that contained the significant sources of emissions should be considered as contributing to the violations. In other cases, the agency determined that if emissions from a large identifiable source in a county contribute to the violations in a nearby area, the portion of the county where the source is located would be designated nonattainment, even if it is not contiguous with the remainder of the designated area. The boundaries for these "noncontiguous" portions are based on legally recognized government boundaries, such as townships, tax districts, and census blocks.

Some states and stakeholders continued to contend that several counties should not be designated nonattainment, particularly when taking into account 2004 PM_{2.5} monitoring data. The EPA's final designations were based on monitoring data for the three-year period from 2001-2003. Monitoring data for 2004 were not available in time for the EPA to meet its statutory deadline for PM_{2.5} geographical area designations (see timeline and discussion later in this report). The final PM_{2.5} designation rule, published on January 5, 2005, included provisions allowing states to submit no later than February 22, 2005, certified, quality-assured 2004 monitoring data that suggest a change in designation is appropriate for consideration (70 *Federal Register* 948). A nonattainment designation could be withdrawn if the EPA agreed that the additional data warranted such a change.

On April 14, 2005, the EPA published a final supplemental rule amending the agency's initial final designations published in January 2005 (70 *Federal Register* 19844). After reviewing 2002-2004 air quality monitoring data provided by several states, the EPA determined that 8 areas comprising 17 counties previously identified as not meeting the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS should be designated as "in attainment" (see **Table 1** below). The EPA also changed four of the five areas designated as "unclassifiable" to "attainment," based on 2002-2004 data. The EPA did not consider the modifications for these areas "re-designations" because the changes were made prior to the April 5, 2005, effective date of the initial designations.

Table 1. Areas Previously Identified as Nonattainment for 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS Designated as Attaining the Standards

State	Area Name	County
Alabama	Columbus, GA-AL	Russell
California	San Diego, CA	San Diego
Georgia	Athens, GA	Clarke
	Columbus, GA-AL	Muscogee
Indiana	Elkhart, IN	Elkhart St. Joseph
Kentucky	Lexington, KY	Fayette Mercer (partial)
Ohio	Toledo, OH	Lucas Wood
	Youngstown-Warren, OH-PA	Columbiana Mahoning Trumbull
Pennsylvania	Youngstown-Warren, OH-PA	Mercer
West Virginia	Marion, WV	Marion Monongalia (partial) Harrison (partial)


Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, April 5, 2005. Available at [<http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations/documents/Apr05/changes.htm>].

Final nonattainment designations are in effect for 39 areas, comprising 208 counties within 20 states (and the District of Columbia) nationwide, with a combined population of almost 90 million. The designated nonattainment areas are primarily concentrated in the central, mid-Atlantic, and southeastern states east of the Mississippi River, as well as in California.⁴⁹ The EPA map in **Figure 1** highlights the PM_{2.5} nonattainment designation areas. More than 2,900 counties in 30 states have been designated attainment/unclassifiable for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Some public interest groups maintain that at least 150 additional counties warranted nonattainment designations on the basis of emission sources in those areas.⁵⁰ Any area initially designated attainment/unclassifiable may be subsequently re-designated to nonattainment if ambient air quality data in future years indicate that such a re-designation is appropriate.

⁴⁹ California has established its own PM_{2.5} standards; for more information, see CRS Report RL31531 (archived), *Particulate Matter Air Quality Standards: Background and Current Developments*, by Robert Esworthy, or access the California Air Resources Board website at [<http://www.arb.ca.gov/pm/pmmeasures/pmmeasures.htm>].

⁵⁰ American Lung Association, “No One Should Have to Breathe Unsafe Air,” December 17, 2004; press release available at [<http://www.lungusa.org/site/apps/s/content.asp?c=dvLUK9O0E&b=34706&ct=323661>].

Figure 1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Designations of Nonattainment Areas for the 1997 PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)



Source: Based primarily on 2001-2003 monitoring data, but 2002-2004 data was considered for a subset of states. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, website at [http://www.epa.gov/oar/particlepollution/pdfs/20061025_graphsmaps.pdf].

In letters dated January 20, 2006, the EPA denied six petitions submitted to the agency requesting reconsideration of the previous designations of one or more full or partial counties as nonattainment for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The petitions were for counties in Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and West Virginia.⁵¹

⁵¹ See [<http://www.epa.gov/pmdesignations/regs.htm#7>] for additional information.

Demonstrating Attainment with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS

The State Implementation Plan

Following the designation of an area as nonattainment, the state where the area is located must develop a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that demonstrates how attainment with the PM_{2.5} standards will be achieved. Under Section 110 of the CAA, states must submit their SIPs to the EPA within three years of designation; PM_{2.5} SIPs were due April 5, 2008. To be approved, a SIP must demonstrate that the area will reach attainment of the standards by a specified deadline — 2010 for PM_{2.5} unless a five-year extension allowed under the CAA is granted. SIPs include pollution control measures that will be implemented by federal, state, and local governments, and rely on models of the impact on air quality of projected emission reductions to demonstrate attainment. Based on information provided by the its Regions, EPA expects that about half of the 58 SIPs (there are 39 areas but some have multiple states submitting individual SIPs) to be submitted before July 2008. The remainder are expected in the following months.⁵² States with nonattainment areas must be in compliance with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS by April 5, 2010, unless they are granted a five-year extension.⁵³

EPA's PM_{2.5} Implementation Rule

On April 25, 2007, the EPA published its final rule⁵⁴ that describes the requirements that states and tribes must meet in their implementation plans to achieve and maintain attainment of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.⁵⁵ In addition to detailing provisions necessary to demonstrate how the PM_{2.5} NAAQS will be attained, the implementation rule includes guidance for submitting a SIP demonstrating that reaching attainment within the five-year requirement is impractical. A number of provisions that were of concern to an array of stakeholders

⁵² U.S. EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), based on information received from the EPA Regions regarding expected SIP submittal dates.

⁵³ Under section 172(a)(2)(A) of the CAA, the EPA may grant an area an extension of the initial attainment date for one to five years (in no case later than 10 years after the designation date for the area). A state requesting an extension must submit an implementation plan (SIP) by the required deadline that includes, among other things, sufficient information demonstrating that attainment by the initial attainment date is “impracticable.”

⁵⁴ 72 *Federal Register* 20586-20667, April 25, 2007.

⁵⁵ The rule addresses attainment demonstration and modeling; local emission reduction measures, including reasonably available control technology (RACT), reasonably available control measures (RACM), and reasonable further progress (RFP); regional emission reduction strategies; innovative program guidance; emission inventory requirements; transportation conformity; and stationary source test methods.

and generated comments during the proposal have been retained in the final rule,⁵⁶ and continue to be the topic of debate. As noted earlier, petitions for legal review of EPA's implementation rule have been filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, and two petitions for reconsideration have been filed with EPA.

Transportation Conformity

If new or revised SIPs for PM_{2.5} attainment establish or revise a transportation-related emissions allowance ("budget"), or add or delete transportation control measures (TCMs), they will trigger "conformity" determinations. Transportation conformity is required by the CAA, Section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)), to prohibit federal funding and approval for highway and transit projects unless they are consistent with ("conform to") the air quality goals established by a SIP and will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the national ambient air quality standards.

The initial conformity rule was promulgated by the EPA on November 24, 1993,⁵⁷ and has subsequently been amended several times. The most comprehensive amendments, clarifying and streamlining the 1993 rule, were published on August 15, 1997.⁵⁸ EPA published a final rule in the January 24, 2008, *Federal Register* to amend the general transportation conformity rule.⁵⁹ The final rule provides for more time and flexibility for state transportation agencies as per the amendments to CAA section 176(c) in the 2005 Safe Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) (P.L. 109-59).⁶⁰ Additionally, EPA included other changes not related to SAFETEA-LU, such as allowing the Department of Transportation (DOT) to make categorical hot-spot findings for appropriate projects in carbon monoxide areas.

Transportation conformity under the EPA's previous rules applied to ozone, PM₁₀, CO, and NO_x, but did not include PM_{2.5}. On July 1, 2004, the EPA published a final rule⁶¹ making transportation conformity regulations applicable explicitly to PM_{2.5} nonattainment areas and including criteria and procedures for the new PM_{2.5}

⁵⁶ Each section of the final April 25, 2007, PM_{2.5} implementation rule (72 *Federal Register* 20586-20667) summarizes policies and options discussed in the proposed rule, and provides responses to the major comments received on each issue. Comments and other supporting materials are available the docket established for this rule (ID-HQ-OAR-2003-0062) electronically at [<http://www.regulations.gov>] or in hard copy at the EPA Docket Center.

⁵⁷ 58 *Federal Register* 62188, November 24, 1993.

⁵⁸ 62 *Federal Register* 43780, August 15, 1997.

⁵⁹ 73 *Federal Register* 4419-4441, January 24, 2008. See also EPA website at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/conf-regs.htm#safetealu>].

⁶⁰ See CRS Report RL33119 *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act — A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU or SAFETEA): Selected Major Provisions*, by John W. Fischer; and CRS Report RL33057 *Surface Transportation Reauthorization: Environmental Issues and Legislative Provisions in SAFETEA-LU (H.R. 3)*, by Linda Luther.

⁶¹ 69 *Federal Register* 40004, July 1, 2004.

and eight-hour ozone NAAQS. Conformity determinations must be submitted to the EPA within one year of the effective date of designating an area as nonattainment. Since the conformity requirements could apply in PM_{2.5} nonattainment areas prior to the availability of SIP emission budgets, the EPA included provisions in the final rule for interim emissions tests for conformity determinations. However, the final rule was challenged by several petitioners, and on October 20, 2006, the interim test provisions were overturned by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.⁶² The Court found that “... petitioners correctly argue, the challenged interim rule, which purports to create a new standard to which transportation plans must conform, violates the Act’s requirement that transportation plans conform to an approved SIP, 42 U.S.C. § 7506(c).”⁶³ The court determined that there was no allowance under the Clean Air Act for interim tests and, as previously determined by the Court, that an EPA regulation may not allow a conformity provision to supersede an approved SIP.

Given the complexities associated with the final conformity rule, the EPA provided guidance to accompany the rule. The guidance, entitled *Companion Guidance for the July 1, 2004, Final Transportation Conformity Rule: Conformity Implementation in Multi-Jurisdictional Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas for Existing and New Air Quality Standards*,⁶⁴ expanded on the final conformity rule by including additional detailed examples and interpretations for generic scenarios that are present in the field and are expected to occur under the 1997 standards. The EPA has provided other fact sheets and summary tables, and has conducted training sessions for implementers to further assist understanding of the rule.⁶⁵

On May 6, 2005, the EPA published a final rule⁶⁶ further amending the transportation conformity regulations by adding transportation-related PM_{2.5} “precursors” and specifying when these precursors must be considered in conformity determinations before and after PM_{2.5} SIPs are submitted.⁶⁷ Precursors are pollutants that react chemically in the atmosphere to form other pollutants. The transportation-related PM_{2.5} precursors identified in the May 2005 rule are nitrogen oxides (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), sulfur oxides (SO₂), and ammonia (NH₃).

The EPA established the criteria for determining which transportation projects must be analyzed for local particle emissions (referred to as “hot spots”) in PM_{2.5} nonattainment and maintenance areas, and revised existing requirements for projects

⁶² *Environmental Defense v. EPA*, No. 04-1291 (D.C. Cir. October 20, 2006.), at [<http://pacer.cadc.uscourts.gov/docs/common/opinions/200610/04-1291a.pdf>].

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ EPA, July 2004, EPA420-B-04-012, Transportation and Regional Programs Division, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, available at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/policy.htm>].

⁶⁵ For EPA fact sheets, Q&As, and training material regarding conformity, see [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/index.htm>].

⁶⁶ 70 *Federal Register* 24280, May 6, 2005.

⁶⁷ See EPA’s website at [<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/index.htm>].

in PM₁₀ areas, in a final rule published on March 10, 2006.⁶⁸ The CAA defines “hot-spot analysis” as an estimation of likely future localized pollutant concentrations resulting from a new transportation project and a comparison of those concentrations to the relevant air quality standard.⁶⁹ The March 2006 final rule required quantitative PM_{2.5} hot-spot analyses only for projects of air quality concern. These projects are further defined in the final rule as highway and transit projects that involve significant levels of diesel vehicle traffic, or any other project that is identified in the PM_{2.5} SIP as a localized concern.

In May of 2006, three environmental organizations filed a complaint challenging the final conformity rule.⁷⁰ The petitioners alleged that (1) the regulation did not require that hot-spot analyses satisfy all of the requirements in Section 176(c) of the act for demonstrating conformity; (2) the regulation allowed EPA to issue quantitative PM modeling guidance without notice-and-comment rulemaking, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act; and (3) EPA had previously approved its current motor vehicle emissions factor model (MOBILE6.2) for use in PM hot-spot analyses and improperly withdrew that approval in the 2006 hot-spot rule. EPA published a proposed settlement agreement addressing the second claim in the June 22, 2007, *Federal Register*.⁷¹ According to the Notice, EPA and the Petitioners’ negotiated settlement agreement would require EPA to provide public notice and an opportunity for public comment on its draft guidance for quantitative hot-spot modeling for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. EPA filed a brief in May 2007 in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit responding to Petitioners’ allegations on the remaining two issues. On December 11, 2007, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals issued its ruling on petitions for review of EPA’s hot-spot regulation. The Court remanded to EPA to further explain one provision, and denied petitioners’ other challenges. Specifically, the Court denied petitioners’ first allegation, because petitioners failed to show that EPA’s interpretation of CAA § 176(c)(1)(A) is unreasonable or that EPA failed to give adequate notice and opportunity for comment prior to withdrawing the model. The Court granted the petition in part and remanded to EPA to further explain how the requirement in section 176(c)(1)(B)(iii) applies to local areas (hot-spot) analyses.⁷² The Court denied petitioners’ third allegation described above.

⁶⁸ 71 *Federal Register* 12468, March 10, 2006.

⁶⁹ 40 CFR 93.101.

⁷⁰ Natural Resources Defense Council, Environmental Defense, and Sierra Club. *Environmental Defense v. EPA*, No. 06-1164 (D.C. Cir. May 2006).

⁷¹ 72 *Federal Register* 34460

⁷² Petitioners contended that when incorporating PM_{2.5} into the hot spot regulations, EPA did not require that new projects contribute to reducing the severity and number of local NAAQS violations, as Petitioners contend CAA § 176(c)(1)(A) requires, and also did not require that the new projects not delay the timely attainment of emissions standards or milestones in any area, as Petitioners contend CAA § 176(c)(1)(B)(iii) requires. (*Environmental Defense v. EPA*, No. 06-1164 (D.C. Cir. May 2006)).

Other National Air Quality Improvement Programs and Strategies

According to the January 2008 EPA report entitled, *Latest Findings on National Air Quality Status and Trends Through 2006*,⁷³ nationally, annual PM_{2.5} concentrations declined by 14% between 2000 and 2006. Between 1990 and 2006, nationally PM₁₀ concentrations declined by 30%. For PM_{2.5} the areas that showed the greatest improvement were the ones that had the highest concentrations in the earlier years. Decreasing concentrations in southern California were largely the result of decreasing levels of nitrate particles; organic carbon levels remained relatively unchanged and have been the largest component of PM_{2.5} in southern California. The Southeast had little change in PM_{2.5}. The industrial Midwest and the Northeast showed decreasing concentrations, mostly due to reductions in nitrates and sulfates. Despite this progress, in 2006, nearly 67 million people lived in counties with measured concentrations exceeding the annual PM_{2.5} national air quality standard (based on one-year metric, not the three-year average).⁷⁴ A report released by the American Lung Association (ALA) in April 2007 indicated higher average concentration levels of year-round PM_{2.5} in densely populated areas of the eastern United States during 2003-2005, compared with 2002-2004. The report noted that outside of the eastern United States, particle levels continued to drop during the same time period, even in areas that the ALA has historically ranked as high in particle pollution.⁷⁵

The EPA has concluded that in many cases, attainment with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS will be reached by implementing national strategies developed under the 1999 visibility protection regulations (Regional Haze Rule);⁷⁶ voluntary diesel engine retrofit programs; and federal standards, scheduled to be implemented between 2004 and 2010, on cars, light trucks, heavy-duty, and nonroad diesel engines. In May 2005, the EPA published a final rule, the Rule to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone, or Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR), to address the interstate transport of pollutants (SO₂ and NO_x) that are hindering downwind states

⁷³ EPA-454/R-07-007, January 2008 [<http://www.epa.gov/air/airtrends/2007/>].

⁷⁴ Refers to trends in the measured PM_{2.5} concentrations relative to their air quality standards in those areas where monitors are located across the country, and does reflect all designated nonattainment areas. The combined population residing in EPA's final PM_{2.5} nonattainment designation areas, consisting of 208 counties in 20 states and the District of Columbia, is almost 90 million.

⁷⁵ Estimates are based on air quality data obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Air Quality System (AQS), formerly called Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS). American Lung Association, *State of the Air: 2007*, released April 2007, [<http://lungaction.org/reports/stateoftheair2007.html>].

⁷⁶ 64 *Federal Register* 35714-35774, July 1, 1999. See CRS Report RL32483 *Visibility, Regional Haze, and the Clean Air Act: Status of Implementation* by Larry Parker, John Blodgett ; also CRS Report RL32927, *Clean Air Interstate Rule: Review and Analysis* by Larry Parker.

from attaining the eight-hour ozone and 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.⁷⁷ The final rule covers 28 states in the eastern United States and the District of Columbia, including 26 jurisdictions in the PM_{2.5} region. CAIR is designed to assist states in meeting the PM_{2.5} and 8-hour ozone NAAQS by mitigating interstate air pollution. As a preferred implementation strategy, EPA encourages states to use a trading program to reduce emissions of target pollutants by up to 70% in a cost-effective manner.⁷⁸

Based on air quality analyses in support of the CAIR, the EPA predicted that 17 of 36 areas in the eastern United States designated as nonattainment (out of compliance) with the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS would reach attainment (come into compliance) by 2010 as a result of implementing CAIR in conjunction with other existing national programs.⁷⁹ On the other hand, the EPA analyses recognized that as many as 19 of the areas would remain in nonattainment, highlighting the importance of local and state emission reduction efforts. The extent of pollution reduction projected as a result of this rule has been the subject of considerable debate among stakeholders and some Members of Congress.⁸⁰

States, cities, utilities, and environmental groups challenged certain provisions of the CAIR.⁸¹ Not long after the final rule was published in May of 2005, EPA received 12 separate petitions for reconsideration of CAIR filed pursuant to section 307(d)(7)(B) of the CAA.⁸² Additionally, fourteen petitions for judicial review of the final rule (many by parties who petitioned EPA for reconsideration) were filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.⁸³ In separate notices, EPA granted the petitioners' request for reconsideration and solicited comment on

⁷⁷ Sulfur dioxide (SO₂) is a precursor contributing to the formation of PM_{2.5} concentrations, and NO_x is a precursor (a pollutant that is transformed in air to form another air pollutant) contributing to the formation of both ozone and PM_{2.5} concentrations. EPA has concluded that SO₂ and NO_x emissions, through the phenomenon of air pollution transport, contribute significantly to downwind nonattainment, or interfere with maintenance, of the PM_{2.5} and 8-hour ozone NAAQS. 70 *Federal Register* 25162, May 12, 2005.

⁷⁸ See EPA's CAIR website at [<http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/progsregs/cair/index.html>].

⁷⁹ See page 66006 of 70 *Federal Register* 65984, November 1, 2005, *Proposed Rule To Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards*.

⁸⁰ For more information on the CAIR, see CRS Report RL32927, *Clean Air Interstate Rule: Review and Analysis*, by Larry B. Parker, and CRS Report RL32273, *Air Quality: EPA's Proposed Interstate Air Quality Rule*, by Larry Parker and John Blodgett.

⁸¹ EPA's CAIR "Regulatory Actions" website at [<http://www.epa.gov/cair/rule.html>] presents overviews of these challenges and the agency's responses chronologically.

⁸² The complete petitions are available in the docket for the CAIR, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0053 [<http://www.regulations.gov>]. Additionally, prior to the publication of the final CAIR rule, North Carolina filed a petition in March 2004 under Section 126 of the federal Clean Air Act, which allows states to seek federal intervention on transboundary air pollution. The petition, settlement (*North Carolina v. Johnson*, No. 5:05-CV-112-BR(3), February 17, 2005, E.D.N.C), and subsequent actions regarding this petition can also be found in the CAIR Docket.

⁸³ Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0053 [<http://www.regulations.gov>].

five aspects of the final rule.⁸⁴ In April 2006, EPA published its determination that its decisions in the CAIR were reasonable and should not be changed in response to each of the issues under reconsideration.⁸⁵ EPA also concluded that reconsideration of the additional issues raised was not warranted under the Clean Air Act, denied all remaining requests for reconsideration, and denied two requests to stay CAIR.

The fourteen judicial cases were consolidated into a single case, *State of North Carolina v. EPA*, No. 05-1244 (D.C. Cir. filed 2005). In March 2008, oral arguments were presented before a three-judge panel of the D.C. Circuit.⁸⁶ Although litigation regarding certain aspects of CAIR is ongoing, EPA reported that its implementation continues.⁸⁷ According to EPA, all the states covered under CAIR have chosen to participate in the trading programs for SO₂ and NO_x; some also have direct control programs complementing the trading programs. States have been working to put implementing rules in place, and the regulated community is going forward with investing in equipment for CAIR. What effect this pending litigation might have on implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS depends on the actions by the court.

Other Issues

Defining Nonattainment Boundaries

The EPA has generally used its discretion to expand the size of nonattainment areas or to combine areas that a state listed as separate areas into a single larger unit. As it did in implementing other NAAQS, the EPA also has combined nonattainment counties across state lines into the same nonattainment area, if the counties are part of the same metropolitan area. Although, according to EPA, staff in the regions and the agency's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards were available for assistance and consultation throughout the designation process pursuant to the statutory requirements for working with states, some states disagreed with the EPA's final designations relative to the states' own recommendations.

Upwind Pollutant Contributions

One of the more frequently raised issues in nonattainment areas is whether any special consideration can be given to areas whose air quality is adversely affected by pollution from upwind areas. Unlike the larger coarse particles, which generally settle more rapidly and fall near their source of emission, the smaller PM_{2.5} particles frequently remain in the atmosphere longer and can travel significant distances from

⁸⁴ 70 *Federal Register* 72268, December 2, 2005, and Supplemental Notice 70 *Federal Register* 77101, December 29, 2005.

⁸⁵ 71 *Federal Register* 25303, April 28, 2006.

⁸⁶ *North Carolina v. EPA*, No. 05-1244, oral arguments, (D.C. Cir. July 25, 2008).

⁸⁷ *Acid Rain and Related Programs: 2006 PROGRESS REPORT*, EPA-430-R-07-011, November 2007 [<http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/progress/docs/2006-ARP-Report.pdf>].

their original source. The transport of PM_{2.5} can contribute to, and in some cases can be, the primary cause of nonattainment in areas downwind of the emission source.

Subpart 1 of the CAA allows the EPA to “classify the area for the purpose of applying an attainment date” and to consider such factors as “the availability and feasibility of pollution control measures,” and may provide the agency flexibility. As referenced in the proposed PM_{2.5} implementation rule, areas also may petition the agency under Section 126 of the CAA to impose controls on upwind sources that significantly contribute to their nonattainment of the standard.⁸⁸ The agency has imposed additional controls on sources of nitrogen oxides (which contribute to particulate and ozone formation downwind) through its “NOx SIP Call” and the “Regional Haze Rule.”⁸⁹ In addition, the CAIR, promulgated in May 2005, is intended to address interstate transport of pollutants that hinder attainment of PM_{2.5} and eight-hour ozone NAAQS in downwind states.

Economic Impacts

Another concern, particularly of local businesses and governments in areas with nonattainment designations, is the potential negative impacts on an area’s economic development. Nonattainment designation requires new major sources of pollution to offset pollution by equivalent or greater emission reductions from existing sources, and requires highway and transit planners to demonstrate that new projects “conform” to the area’s SIP. Although the EPA has not analyzed the potential economic impact of designating areas as nonattainment for particulate matter, a 2002 EPA analysis⁹⁰ found that ozone nonattainment designations had no net negative impact on those areas. Specifically, 6.5 million jobs were created in ozone nonattainment areas from 1990 to 1998, and “over 55 percent of ozone nonattainment areas had average annual employment growth rates greater than that of their region of the country.” Personal income growth in these nonattainment areas essentially matched the national average between 1990 and 1998 (38.5% versus 38.9%), according to the EPA.

In contrast to the EPA findings, a study conducted by NERA Economic Consulting for the American Petroleum Institute (API), found that meeting the 2010 ozone attainment deadline will lead to a \$3 billion reduction in economic output in

⁸⁸ A number of such petitions regarding NAAQS other than PM_{2.5} have been filed with the agency. The most well-known are those that were filed in August 1997 by eight northeastern states, four of which were granted by the agency in January 2000. See CRS Report 98-236, *Air Quality: EPA’s Ozone Transport Rule, OTAG, and Section 126 Petitions — A Hazy Situation?* by Larry Parker and John Blodgett (available from the authors).

⁸⁹ The Regional Haze Rule establishes Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) at stationary sources in 26 industrial categories; available at [<http://www.epa.gov/visibility/actions.html>].

⁹⁰ U.S. EPA, *Office of Air and Radiation, “The Historical Record: Nonattainment Status and Economic Growth,”* February 26, 2002.

the Philadelphia region in 2011.⁹¹ According to the report, “[t]he economic impacts would include the cost of local controls of \$3.9 billion per year, the loss of thousands of regional jobs, a reduction of billions of dollars in gross regional product, and a significant loss of disposable personal income in the area.” The summary indicates that delaying the eight-hour ozone NAAQS attainment deadline to 2015 would lower the cost to the local economy to \$100 million per year and lead to 1,000 fewer jobs. Some critics have questioned the analysis supporting these findings.⁹²

Grant Programs

Although the EPA does not have a grant program specifically designed to assist nonattainment areas, the agency generally provides several grants to state air pollution agencies in support of their programs. Other sources of funding are also available. For example, states may obtain funding for projects intended to contribute to attainment or maintenance of NAAQS under the Department of Transportation’s (DOT’s) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ). Congress authorized \$8.6 billion for this program for FY2005-FY2009 under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) (P.L. 109-59), signed into law on August 10, 2005.

Authorized initially by Congress under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA, P.L. 102-240) and funded by the Highway Trust Fund, CMAQ provides funding for surface transportation and other related projects that contribute to air quality improvements and congestion mitigation. In particular, the program is authorized to fund projects that contribute to the reduction of carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone concentrations. CMAQ funds are apportioned to a state based on its population and pollution reduction needs.⁹³ The population of each nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone and/or CO in a state is multiplied by a weighting factor based on the level of nonattainment (e.g., moderate, serious, severe). States with no maintenance or nonattainment areas for ozone or CO are guaranteed a minimum of 0.5% of each fiscal year’s authorized CMAQ funds.

CMAQ was expanded to allow the use of funds for projects intended to reduce particulates concentrations under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21, P.L. 105-178). TEA-21 did not, however, change the apportionment

⁹¹ *Economic Impact of 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Deadlines on Philadelphia Region*, September 2005 (released November 7, 2005); conducted by NERA Economic Consulting for the American Petroleum Institute.

⁹² Testimony of James Werner, Director, Division of Air and Waste Management, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, before the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety, *Implementation of the Existing Particulate Matter and Ozone Air Quality Standards*, November 10, 2005.

⁹³ For the FY2008 apportionment of CMAQ funds see the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration Notice: Revised Apportionment of Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program Funds, January 30, 2008[<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/directives/notices/n4510667.htm>]; for prior years, see [<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/directives/notices.htm>].

formula that is based on CO and ozone. States with maintenance or nonattainment areas for *only* particulates receive the guaranteed minimum.⁹⁴

Identifying Sources and Control Measures

Determining sources contributing to emission of fine particles to identify the appropriate actions for compliance with the PM_{2.5} standards is expected to be complicated. The EPA has been conducting several technical studies in an effort to develop guidance to help states identify appropriate control measures in their SIPs for specific parameters and conditions. The proposed PM_{2.5} implementation rule provides information related to this concern as well.

Completion of the EPA's Most Recent Review of the Particulates NAAQS and the September 2006 Changes⁹⁵

At the end of 2005, the EPA completed its statutorily required⁹⁶ review and assessment of relevant scientific studies to either reaffirm or modify the particulates NAAQS. Based on the review, on October 17, 2006, the EPA promulgated revisions to the particulates NAAQS.⁹⁷ Given the simultaneity of these new 2006 particulates NAAQS and the ongoing implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} standards, outcomes and challenges associated with the review and the EPA's changes to the existing (1987 and 1997) NAAQS for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} could affect the current implementation schedule.

Based on its review and analysis of scientific studies available between 1997 and 2002,⁹⁸ and determinations made by the Administrator, the EPA's modifications to the particulates NAAQS tightened the current NAAQS primarily by lowering the daily (24-hour) standard for PM_{2.5}. The new 2006 NAAQS lower the daily PM_{2.5} standard from 65 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) to 35 µg/m³ and retain the annual standard at 15 µg/m³. The EPA left the existing (1987) daily standard for

⁹⁴ For a more detailed discussion of CMAQ and relevant legislation, see CRS Report RL33119, *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act — A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU or SAFETEA): Selected Major Provisions*, by John W. Fischer; and CRS Report RL33057 *Surface Transportation Reauthorization: Environmental Issues and Legislative Provisions in SAFETEA-LU (H.R. 3)*, by Linda Luther.

⁹⁵ For more information regarding of EPA's changes to the particulates NAAQS, see CRS Report RL33254, *Air Quality: EPA's 2006 Changes to the Particulate Matter (PM) Standard*, by Robert Esworthy and James E. McCarthy. Information can also be accessed on EPA's website at [http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/standards/pm/s_pm_index.html].

⁹⁶ Section 109(d)(1) of the CAA.

⁹⁷ 71 *Federal Register* 61143-61233, October 17, 2006.

⁹⁸ EPA, *Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter*, October 29, 2004. EPA, *Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter: Policy Assessment of Scientific and Technical Information, OAQPS Staff Paper*, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, EPA-452/R-05-005, July 2005. The EPA criteria document and staff paper can be available at [http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/standards/pm/s_pm_2006_sp.html].

coarse particles (PM₁₀) in place at 150 µg/m³ and relaxed the standard somewhat by revoking the existing annual maximum concentration standard of 50 µg/m³.

Critics continue to argue that data do not support the stricter PM_{2.5} standards or, in some cases, even the 1997 standards. On the other hand, several public interest groups and scientists, including the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC),⁹⁹ advocated tightening the standards further than proposed. The Administrator's decisions regarding the particulates NAAQS represent the first time in CASAC's nearly 30-year history that the promulgated standards fall outside of the range of the scientific panel's recommendations.¹⁰⁰ In a letter dated September 29, 2006, the seven members of CASAC objected to the Administrator's actions, both as regards PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}: "It is the CASAC's consensus scientific opinion that the decision to retain without change the annual PM_{2.5} standard does not provide an 'adequate margin of safety ... requisite to protect the public health' (as required by the Clean Air Act)...."¹⁰¹

Tightening the PM_{2.5} NAAQS is expected to result in more areas classified as "nonattainment" and needing to implement new controls on particulate matter. States and local governments would be required to develop and implement new plans for addressing emissions in those areas that do not meet any new standards. In a February 2006 advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPR)¹⁰² outlining an implementation plan for the transition to the January 17, 2006, proposed particulates standards, the EPA indicated that it would be beneficial for states to consider control strategies that may be useful in attaining the new 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS when developing their strategies for the 1997 PM_{2.5} standards.

A stricter standard may mean more costs for the transportation and industrial sectors, including utilities, refineries, and the trucking industry, affected by particulate matter controls. In terms of public health, a stricter standard may mean fewer health effects for the general population and particularly sensitive populations, such as children, asthmatics, and the elderly.

⁹⁹ CASAC, mandated under Section 109(d)(2) of the CAA, reviews EPA's NAAQS criteria documents and staff papers, recommends improvements, and, after further meetings and reviews, signs off only when it is convinced that each accurately reflects the status of the science ([<http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabpeople.nsf/WebCommittees/CASAC>]).

¹⁰⁰ See CRS Report RL33807, *Air Quality Standards and Sound Science: What Role for CASAC?*, by James E. McCarthy.

¹⁰¹ Letter of Rogene Henderson, Chair of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, et al. to Hon. Stephen L. Johnson, EPA Administrator, September 29, 2006, available at [[http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/1C69E987731CB775852571FC00499A10/\\$File/casac-ltr-06-003.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/1C69E987731CB775852571FC00499A10/$File/casac-ltr-06-003.pdf)].

¹⁰² 71 *Federal Register* 6718, February 9, 2006.

The EPA released a regulatory impact analysis (RIA) on October 6, 2006,¹⁰³ to meet its obligations under Executive Order 12866 and in compliance with guidance from the White House Office of Management and Budget.¹⁰⁴ The RIA analyzed only the benefits and costs of implementing the new PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Based on several analytical approaches, the EPA estimated that compliance with the new NAAQS could prevent 1,200 to 13,000 premature deaths annually, as well as substantial numbers of hospital admissions and missed work or school days due to illness. According to the October 6, 2006, RIA, the estimated total annual health and welfare net benefits (subtracting social costs from the monetized benefits) in 2020 of attaining the new PM_{2.5} NAAQS range from \$9 billion to \$12 billion, based on modeling of morbidity and mortality using published epidemiology studies, and from \$2.4 billion to \$70 billion, derived through the use of expert judgement elicitation (interview) techniques.

Designation of geographical areas and the associated impacts on specific areas would be speculative at best, because implementation of the new 2006 particulates NAAQS is several years off. States will not be required to submit SIPs until 2013 and would not have to meet the new PM_{2.5} standard until April 2014 (April 2020, if qualified for an extension¹⁰⁵). For the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, states are required to submit implementation plans for how they will meet the standard by April 2008 and must be in compliance by 2010, unless they are granted a five-year extension.¹⁰⁶

As discussed previously in this report, in December 2006, several states and industry, agriculture, business, and public advocacy groups, separately petitioned the court to review the new 2006 particulates NAAQS.¹⁰⁷ These challenges could affect the current implementation schedule for the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The EPA's previous review and 1997 establishment of particulates (and ozone) standards was the subject of litigation and challenges, including a Supreme Court decision in 2001.¹⁰⁸ (See discussion below in "Implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS:

¹⁰³ EPA's Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) of the 2006 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particle Pollution (PM_{2.5}), available on EPA's website at [<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/ecas/ria.html>].

¹⁰⁴ 58 *Federal Register* 51735, October 4, 1993; and the White House OMB website, "Regulatory Matters," at [<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/regpol.html#rr>].

¹⁰⁵ Under section 172(a)(2)(A) of the CAA, the EPA may grant an area an extension of the initial attainment date for one to five years (not later than 10 years after the designation date for the area). A state requesting an extension must submit an implementation plan (SIP) by the required deadline that includes, among other things, sufficient information demonstrating that attainment by the initial attainment date is "impracticable."

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ The Court has consolidated the cases, *American Farm Bureau Federation v. U.S. EPA*, No. 06-1410 (D.C. Cir. 2006).

¹⁰⁸ *American Trucking Associations v. EPA*, 175 F.3d 1027, 1055-56 (D.C. Cir. 1999), rehearing granted in part and denied in part, 195 F.3d 4 (D.C. Cir. 1999), affirmed in part and reversed in part, *Whitman v. American Trucking Associations*, 531 U.S. 457 (2001). In March 2002, the Court of Appeals rejected all remaining challenges to the standards, (continued...)

Timeline and Delays.”) The final form of the new 2006 particulates NAAQS, and therefore the associated potential impacts of implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} standards, may not be known for some time.

Impacts of Actions Regarding the 1997 Ozone NAAQS

The final 1997 particulates NAAQS were signed by the EPA Administrator at the same time as new NAAQS for ground-level ozone. The two NAAQS were jointly published on July 18, 1997.¹⁰⁹ Generally referred to as the “eight-hour ozone standard,” the 1997 standard for ground-level ozone requires a more stringent concentration limit (0.08 parts per million versus the previous 0.12), but it averages the ozone concentrations measured over eight hours rather than the previous one hour.

On April 15, 2004, the EPA designated areas in 32 states and the District of Columbia (474 counties in all) as nonattainment for the 1997 ozone air quality standard.¹¹⁰ The EPA ozone designations, and the implementation rule¹¹¹ that accompanied the designations, have been challenged for being too lenient by several states and various public interest groups, and too restrictive by industry groups. On December 22, 2006, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit vacated the implementation, and remanded the matter to EPA.¹¹² A number of general issues, such as cost and interpretation of boundaries, are expected to be similar for the eight-hour ozone and PM_{2.5} rules, but the EPA deems the CAA requirements regarding PM_{2.5} to be less complicated, relative to ozone requirements. The PM_{2.5} implementation rule is new rather than a transformation of an existing one, as in the case of eight-hour ozone. In addition, fewer areas have been designated as nonattainment for PM_{2.5} than were designated under the eight-hour ozone NAAQS. Nevertheless, implementation of the eight-hour ozone NAAQS and associated challenges or other delays, will likely affect the implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS.

Further complicating the potential impacts of the ozone NAAQS on implementation 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, on March 12, 2008, the EPA Administrator signed revisions to the NAAQS for ozone.¹¹³ The revisions, the result of a multi-year review of the science regarding ozone’s effects on public health and welfare, have raised a number issues. Although the revisions lower the primary (health-based) and

¹⁰⁸ (...continued)

American Trucking Associations v. EPA, 283 F. 3d 355, 369-72 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

¹⁰⁹ 62 *Federal Register* 38652-38760, and 38855-38896, July 18, 1997.

¹¹⁰ 69 *Federal Register* 23857, April 15, 2004.

¹¹¹ 69 *Federal Register* 23951, April 30, 2004. See 8-hour Ground-Level Ozone Designations: Regulatory Actions, an EPA website, at [<http://www.epa.gov/ozone/designations/regs.htm>].

¹¹² *South Coast Air Quality Management v. EPA*, No. 04-1200 (D.C. Cir. December 22, 2006).

¹¹³ 73 *Federal Register* 16435.

secondary (welfare-based) standards, they are weaker than those proposed by the independent CASAC scientific review panel established under the Clean Air Act. This raises some questions as to whether the Administrator's choices for the primary and secondary standards are backed by the available science. Whether the standards should lead to stronger federal controls on the sources of ozone pollution precursors is another likely issue. Whether the current monitoring network is adequate to detect violations of a more stringent ozone standards is another concern.¹¹⁴

Congressional Action Related to Particulates NAAQS Implementation

Concerns regarding the potential impacts of the ozone and particulate standards have led to several attempts by Congress over the years to modify the implementation requirements.¹¹⁵ Attempts in recent years were generally attached to larger pieces of legislation, such as the energy¹¹⁶ and transportation bills, as well the proposed multipollutant (Clear Skies) bills to reduce emissions from coal-fired power plants. Although PM_{2.5} was not one of the primary pollutants¹¹⁷ specified in the multipollutant legislation previously considered, certain provisions of some of the bills could have potentially contributed to reducing PM_{2.5} concentrations. During the 110th Congress, five multipollutant bills have been introduced. The proposed bills, S. 1168, S. 1177, S. 1201, S. 1554, and H.R. 3989, would establish a regulatory program to reduce the quantities of sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), mercury (Hg), and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from the electric generating sector. No action has been scheduled as of this writing.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ See CRS Report RL34057, *Ozone Air Quality Standards: EPA's March 2008 Revision*, by James E. McCarthy.

¹¹⁵ For a historical perspective, see CRS Report RL34057 *Ozone Air Quality Standards: EPA's 2007 Proposed Changes*, by James E. McCarthy; CRS Report RL33552, *Clean Air Act Issues in the 109th Congress*, by James E. McCarthy; and CRS Issue Brief IB10107, *Clean Air Act Issues in the 108th Congress*, by James E. McCarthy (out of print but available from the author).

¹¹⁶ See CRS Report RL32873, *Key Environmental Issues in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-58, H.R. 6)*, by Brent D. Yacobucci.

¹¹⁷ Bills introduced in previous Congresses generally focused on regulating three or four pollutants; three-pollutant bills addressed sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and mercury (Hg) emissions, and the four-pollutant bills added carbon dioxide (CO₂)

¹¹⁸ For additional information and a detailed comparison of legislative proposals, see CRS Report RL34018, *Air Quality: Multi-Pollutant Legislation in the 110th Congress*, by Larry Parker and John Blodgett. For a comparison of bills in the last Congress, including the Clear Skies bill, see CRS Report RL32755, *Air Quality: Multi-Pollutant Legislation in the 109th Congress*, by Larry Parker and John Blodgett.

Implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS: Timeline and Delays

Because of legal challenges, the lack of a national monitoring network, and other factors, implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS has been delayed since it was promulgated. The timeline presented in **Table 2** below reflects the most recent key milestone dates for implementing the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS, including actual completions. These milestones are driven primarily by statutory requirements. It follows an EPA milestone schedule outlined in an April 21, 2003, memorandum to EPA regional administrators that also provided the nonbinding guidance for implementation of the PM_{2.5} area designations.¹¹⁹ Recognizing potential efficiencies associated with states and tribes being able to harmonize future control strategies, the initial PM_{2.5} schedule was intended to be similar to the eight-hour ozone program.

Table 2. Schedule for Implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS

Date	1997 PM _{2.5} NAAQS Milestones
February 2004 (completed)	State-tribal area designation recommendations (based on 2000-2002 monitoring data)
June-July 2004 (completed)	EPA notifies states and tribes regarding modifications to their recommendations
January 5, 2005 (completed) (70 <i>Federal Register</i> 944)	EPA promulgates final area designations (required one year after states and tribes make recommendations)
February 2005 (completed November 1, 2005) (70 <i>Federal Register</i> 65984)	EPA proposes PM _{2.5} implementation rule
April 5, 2006 (one year after the final designation April 5, 2005 effective date)	States with new transportation projects submit conformity determination within one year of the effective date of nonattainment designation
Mid-2007 (completed April 25, 2007)	EPA promulgates final PM _{2.5} implementation rule
April 2008 (3 years after final area designations effective date)	States and tribes submit revised implementation plans (SIPs) to achieve PM _{2.5} compliance in nonattainment areas
April 2010-2015 (5-10 years after final area designations effective date)	NAAQS statutory compliance deadline for attainment

Source: Prepared by the Congressional Research Service based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency fact sheets and guidance documents, and relevant *Federal Register* notices.

The PM_{2.5} NAAQS requirement for three years of monitoring data to determine whether areas were meeting the established limits was one factor responsible for

¹¹⁹ EPA memorandum, April 21, 2003, from the Office of Air and Radiation Assistant Administrator Jeffrey R. Holmstead to EPA Regional Administrators, available at [http://www.epa.gov/ttn/naaqs/pm/pm25_guide.html].

delaying implementation. Comprehensive monitoring data sufficient to make this determination and the attainment designations were not available in 1997. Recognizing this dilemma, in the 1998 Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21; P.L. 105-178, Title VI), Congress revised the statutory deadline requirements for the new NAAQS, predicated on a previously released EPA Interim Implementation Policy. TEA-21 required states to submit designation recommendations within one year after receipt of three years of data meeting defined federal protocols, and required the EPA to promulgate designations within one year after state recommendations are due, but not later than December 31, 2005.

As discussed earlier in this report, operation of the network of monitors was phased in from 1999 through 2000, making three-year monitoring data available at different points, depending on area location. Rather than a staggered designation schedule, which would likely result in hampering cross-coordination of implementation plans, the EPA proposed a single date for state and tribal recommendations and final EPA designations. The deadlines of February 15, 2004, for governors to submit their PM_{2.5} designation recommendations and December 31, 2004, for EPA to promulgate designations for each state, were the result of Congress amending the CAA in the FY2004 omnibus appropriations (P.L.108-199).

In addition to the delay in establishing a monitoring network, the 1997 NAAQS standards were challenged in District Court by the American Trucking Associations, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and several other state and business groups. An initial May 1999 opinion by the District Court partially in favor of the plaintiffs was reversed by the Supreme Court in February 2001.¹²⁰

Conclusion

Implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS is affecting a number of areas, including some that were not previously designated “nonattainment” for a NAAQS. Nonattainment designations are in effect for 39 areas, comprising 208 counties within 20 states (and the District of Columbia) nationwide, with a combined population of almost 90 million. A number of concerns have been raised regarding the potential impacts, and numerous questions have been triggered regarding the specifics of the implementation process for the 1997 standards.

According to EPA projections, federal measures, such as recent auto and truck emission standards and controls on power plants and regional regulations, will be sufficient to demonstrate attainment in a large portion of monitored nonattainment counties by 2015, prior to the development and implementation of local measures.

¹²⁰ United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, argued December 17, 1998; decided May 14, 1999 (No. 97-1440). American Trucking Associations, Inc., et al., Petitioners v. United States Environmental Protection Agency; Whitman v. American Trucking Associations, U.S. Supreme Court, No. 99-1257 and No. 99-1426, February 27, 2001 (121 S. Ct. 903). See CRS Report RS20860, *The Supreme Court Upholds EPA Standard Setting Under the Clean Air Act: Whitman v. American Trucking Associations*, by Robert Meltz and James E. McCarthy.

Some Members of Congress and others questioned the EPA's predictions regarding the relative magnitude of the emission reductions associated with existing and proposed air quality controls. Considerable debate also continues regarding the potential economic consequences associated with nonattainment.

The final form of PM_{2.5} implementation and its effects may not be known for some time. Some states and other stakeholders continue to disagree with the EPA's PM_{2.5} nonattainment area designations and to suggest that fewer counties should have been designated. Other stakeholder groups contend that the EPA should have included additional counties. The agency's final PM_{2.5} implementation rule, published April 25, 2007, has been formally challenged (like many EPA rules). The EPA's first attempt at an implementation plan was among the issues remanded by the Supreme Court in the 2001 decision that addressed a number of issues related to the setting of the PM_{2.5} and the eight-hour ozone standard. Delays in publishing the final rule and guidance have caused concern among state air pollution control agencies and some Members of Congress, given that state SIPs are due to EPA by April 2008.

The EPA's review and October 2006 revisions of the existing particulates NAAQS have also been challenged, which could affect implementation of the 1997 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. In addition to the divergence from recommendations of the scientific advisory committee (CASAC) mandated under the CAA, several elements of the new 2006 particulates standard have been controversial, including the decision not to exclude rural sources from the coarse particle standard. Some also questioned the EPA's strengthening of the standard for *all* fine particles, without distinguishing their source or chemical composition. In late December 2006, several state, industry, agriculture, business, and public advocacy groups petitioned the court to review new 2006 particulates NAAQS.¹²¹ Recommendations to modify the statutory provisions affecting implementation of the particulates (and the ozone) standards are also likely to be advocated.

Given that several key implementation milestones are scheduled to be completed during 2008, PM_{2.5} will likely remain an area of focus for many stakeholders and interest groups, as well as Congress.

¹²¹ The Court has consolidated the cases, *American Farm Bureau Federation v. U.S. EPA*, No. 06-1410 (D.C. Cir. 2006).