

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, 12100 Park 35 Circle, Austin, Texas 78753.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joe Kordzi, Air Planning Section (6PD-L), EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202-2733, telephone (214) 665-7186.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Throughout this document “we,” “us,” and “our” means EPA.

**Table of Contents**

- I. What is the background for this action?
- II. What did the State submit and how did we evaluate it?
  - A. Modeling.
  - B. CO motor vehicle emissions budget.
  - C. Contingency measures.
  - D. Has the EPA approved other parts of the SIP before now?
  - E. How close is El Paso to attainment of the CO standard?
- III. What is our final action?
- IV. Why is this a “final action?”
- V. Regulatory Assessment Requirements.

**I. What Is the Background for This Action?**

El Paso, Texas, was designated nonattainment for CO and classified as moderate under sections 107(d)(4)(A) and 186(a) of the CAA. The El Paso CO nonattainment area is restricted to a narrow strip along the Rio Grande, adjacent to Ciudad Juarez, Mexico.

The CAA requires that CO nonattainment areas designated moderate and above demonstrate attainment through air quality modeling or any other analytical method determined by the Administrator to be at least as effective. Section 179B of the CAA contains special provisions for nonattainment areas that are affected by emissions emanating from outside the United States. Under section 179B, the EPA will approve a SIP if the area meets all other CAA requirements, and establishes that implementation of the plan would achieve attainment of the CO standard by the CAA statutory deadline “but for emissions emanating from outside the United States.” This is the type of demonstration that the State of Texas has made.

**II. What Did the State Submit and How Did We Evaluate It?**

**A. Modeling**

The Governor of the State of Texas submitted a revision to the Texas SIP for the El Paso CO moderate nonattainment area via a letter dated September 27, 1995, which was supplemented in February 1998. This included air quality modeling, under section 179B of the CAA, that demonstrates that El Paso would attain the CO NAAQS, but for

emissions emanating from outside of the United States.

El Paso and Juarez, Mexico, share an air-shed. However, emission inventory data was not available for Juarez, so modeling of the entire air-shed was not possible. In such an instance, section 179B allows an area such as El Paso to perform modeling using only U.S. pollutant emission data in performing the attainment demonstration.

In its demonstration, Texas used two models, RAM, and CAL3QHC. RAM modeling was used to estimate background CO concentrations, and CAL3QHC was used to estimate hot-spot concentrations, or those areas that are the most likely to produce the highest concentrations of CO. Using RAM modeling, Texas identified the worst-case meteorological episode conducive for CO concentration. This was subsequently used in the CAL3QHC modeling to determine CO concentrations at six selected intersections. These concentrations were then combined with hourly variables in the 8-hour period with the highest RAM-determined background CO concentration. The modeling results for El Paso indicate that the area would attain the CO standard but for emissions emanating from outside the United States. Texas performed its CO modeling analyses for El Paso, according to EPA guidance, using conservative inputs to EPA guideline models.

**B. CO Motor Vehicles Emissions Budget**

The Governor of Texas submitted the 1996 CO motor vehicle emissions budget of 96.90 tons/day on September 27, 1995. The finding that the budget of the El Paso CO attainment plan was adequate was made in a letter on September 1, 1999.<sup>1</sup> It is EPA’s conclusion that the SIP demonstrates attainment with the budget and contains the measures necessary to support the budget. Today, we are approving this budget, under section 176(c) of the CAA.

**C. Contingency Measures**

Nonattainment areas must adopt contingency measures that are implemented in the event the area does not attain the standard by the attainment date. Under section 187(a)(4) of the CAA’s CO requirements, El Paso must have at least a basic Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) program. However, El Paso was also bound to the CAA’s ozone requirements for serious

areas, which under section 182(c)(3), requires an enhanced program. These two programs yield different levels of CO reductions. The difference in emissions reductions could be called incremental credit. That is, incremental reductions in CO are reductions produced by a control program more stringent than required by CO provisions in the CAA.

The El Paso area is not subject to the section 187(a)(2)(A) Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) forecasts and the section 187(a)(3) contingency measures requirements, because its design value was below 12.7 ppm. It is, however, subject to the section 172(c)(9) contingency measures requirement. The CAA does not specify how many contingency measures are needed or the magnitude of the emission reductions (or VMT reductions) they must provide. In the EPA’s General Preamble,<sup>2</sup> EPA provides its belief that for moderate areas that fail to attain by the attainment date, States may select contingency measures for the reduction of CO emissions. EPA believes that one appropriate choice of contingency measures would be to provide for the implementation of sufficient VMT reductions or emissions reductions to counteract the effect of 1 year’s growth in VMT. The State used this approach to calculate the magnitude of emission reductions it must provide, which is approximately 10.4 tons per day of CO reductions in El Paso. A basic I/M program would produce 43 tons per day of CO reductions. The low-enhanced I/M program approved for El Paso was credited in the SIP for 89 tons per day of CO reductions, which is 46 tons per day of CO reductions beyond the reductions obtained from a basic program. This is well above the 10.4 tons per day the State calculated was required to meet the contingency requirements. The more stringent requirements of the low-enhanced program generate these incremental reductions in CO, thus fulfilling the requirement. The EPA is approving all of the incremental credit of 46 tons per day into the SIP as meeting the CO contingency measures requirement.

**D. Has the EPA Approved Other Parts of the SIP Before Now?**

All CO nonattainment areas must adopt SIPs that contain the following core elements:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> EPA has issued a “General Preamble” describing EPA’s preliminary views on how EPA intends to review SIPs and SIP revisions submitted under title I of the Act (57 FR 13498, April 16, 1992, and 57 FR 18070, April 28, 1992).

<sup>3</sup> As outlined in section 187 of the CAA, additional requirements pertain to moderate

<sup>1</sup> EPA later determined that this motor vehicle emission budget was adequate for transportation conformity purposes (see 64 FR 55911, October 15, 1999).