

# Arizona Regional Haze Status Report – August 2006

## Response to Questions Posed at 8/29/06 Portland IWG Meeting:

1. ***What is the status of BART in Arizona?***
  - BART-eligible sources have been identified;
  - Emissions data for modeling will be sent to WRAP by mid-September '06;
  - When modeling results are in, letters will be sent to stationary sources; letters will give sources two choices: (1) do BART analysis or (2) do analysis to show us why you are not BART-eligible; and
  - Question: What if the analysis we receive is insufficient or wrong, or they claim they cannot complete the analysis or re-analysis in time for the SIP?
2. ***Any rules or rule revisions planned?*** No; may need to do revisions, but doubt they will be done in time for December 2007 submittal.
3. ***How are stakeholder relations? Major issues?*** Will be meeting with FLMs. Not entirely sure all stakeholders, but stationary sources may not be as on-board as before; first stakeholder meeting planned for this fall; major issues will most likely be: (1) status of 309 and trading program, revised milestones; (2) growth issues, (3) reasonable progress and expectations that all the measure need to be in place now and not along a glidepath, and (4) see No. 4.
4. ***What other air quality issues are confronting state that may interface with haze?*** 110 CAIR SIP (September 2006 or later), 8-hr. Ozone SIP (June 2007; attainment by June 2009), and Maricopa County PM<sub>10</sub> Five Percent SIP (December 2007; every year until we meet attainment). Also, IMPROVE monitors, PM standard/monitoring changes, growth, litigation (e.g., AgBMP litigation in California), and drought, drought and fire, and fire.
5. ***What progress has been made digesting/incorporating WRAP docs/products?*** Have been playing, waiting for updated AoH data as first round not that reliable for Arizona; used for analysis re need for micro-scale modeling of certain AZ CIAs.

## Results of our Visceral Profile for Arizona's 12 Class I areas:

### *Four 309 Class I areas [Grand Canyon, Petrified, Sycamore Canyon, and Mt. Baldy]*

- Natural condition pollutants: PM coarse (all four), elemental carbon, organic carbon (all four save Petrified); sources: disturbed topsoil, dust (all four), wildfires, and vegetation (all four save Petrified)
- Anthropogenic pollutants: vehicles (all four), stationary sources (all four), prescribed fires (all four save Petrified), urban activities (Grand Canyon), land-use change (e.g., grazing, agriculture, industrial growth)
- Fire: all scheduled for burns; all but Petrified prone to local wildfire
- Sufficient and appropriate monitors: yes for all (but)
- Impact of proposed IMPROVE monitor changes: not okay save Sierra Ancha

- Will areas meet default glidepath: no for all four (by a moderate margin); Note: based on early 2006 WRAP data; causes not readily resolvable
- Stationary sources with > 100 typ that are not BART-eligible: yes
- Controls not yet modeled: nitrogen oxides at Sycamore Canyon
- Impacted negatively by growth: Mt. Baldy
- Out of state emissions: California and Nevada (Las Vegas); many controls planned for California will provide reductions (e.g., marine, agriculture); Asian dust, but not controllable

**Tentative approach for 309 CIAs (subject to review and change):** Go with GCVTC controls combined with source-specific NO<sub>x</sub> controls for 100 typ sources where necessary or feasible, further land-use study, capture of in and near activities with local controls, track stationary sources progress under trading program and compliance orders/permits; consultation with California and Nevada if necessary.

*Eight CIAs under Section 309(g) [Chiricahuas (2), Galiuro, Pine Mountain, Sierra Ancha, Mazatzal, Saguaro, Superstitions]*

- For the most part, same as above save specific stationary sources within buffer
- Urban growth impacts: Saguaros (Tucson), Superstitions (Phoenix), Sierra Ancha and Mazatzal (Payson and Gila County), Mt. Baldy (Pinetop/Lakeside, Eagar, Springerville)
- Out of state emissions: Mexico (not readily controllable)
- Meet glidepath: no (Note: based on early 2006 WRAP data)

*What else we discovered:*

- Our maps for stationary sources within parks and within 50K buffer need updating
- Park borders need to be checked; leased land authority
- Tribal source impacts are from tribes that are not members of WRAP
- No new compliance orders or unique permit limits scheduled or unaccounted for
- Our population stats are outdated and new ones have been submitted to WRAP for 2018 projection (35% off compared to original growth projections)
- Growth projections may be tempered by availability of water; can we determine?
- Some 309(g) areas are candidates for clustering: Chiricahuas (2) and Galiuro; Pine Mountain and Mazatzal; NOTE: Saguaro, though listed as one park, will be analyzed independently due to Tucson split
- Micro-scale modeling (4 grid) will be necessary at some CIAs due to unique and local conditions; this is important should source-specific controls prove necessary