



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

George Washington & Jefferson
National Forests

5162 Valleypointe Parkway
Roanoke, VA 24019-3050
540/265-5100

File Code: 2580-2

Date: January 25, 2008

Mr. Martin Luther
Kentucky Division of Air Quality
803 Schenkel Lane
Frankfort, KY 40601

Dear Mr. Luther:

On December 17, 2007, the State of Kentucky submitted a draft implementation plan describing your proposal to improve air quality regional haze impacts at mandatory Class I areas across your region. As the Federal Land Manager of a Class I area in an adjacent state we appreciate the opportunity to work closely with Kentucky through the initial evaluation, development, and, now, subsequent review of this plan. Cooperative efforts such as these ensure that, together, we will continue to make progress toward the Clean Air Act's goal of natural visibility conditions at our Class I wilderness areas and parks.

This letter acknowledges that the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service has received and conducted a substantive review of your proposed Regional Haze Rule implementation plan. Please note, however, that only the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can make a final determination about the document's completeness, and therefore, only the EPA has the ability to approve the document. The Forest Service's participation in the State of Kentucky's administrative process does not waive any legal defenses or sovereignty rights it may have under the laws of the United States, including the Clean Air Act and its implementing regulations.

As outlined in a letter to your State in October 2006, our review focused on eight basic content areas. The content areas reflect priorities for the Federal Land Manager agencies, and we have attached comments to this letter associated with these priorities. We look forward to your response required by 40 CFR 51.308(i)(3). For further information, please contact Cindy Huber at (540) 265-5156 or Scott Copeland at (307) 332-9737.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to work closely with the State of Kentucky. The Forest Service compliments you on your hard work and dedication to significant improvement in our nation's air quality values and visibility.

Sincerely,

/s/Henry B. Hickerson
HENRY B. HICKERSON
Deputy Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Michele Notarianni - EPA Region 4
Forest Supervisor - Daniel Boone National Forest



January 25, 2008

Enclosure

Forest Service Technical Comments on Kentucky Division for Air Quality's Pre-Hearing Draft Regional Haze State Implementation Plan

Overall Comments

As stated in our letter, we feel that your agency has addressed each of the priority content areas with which the Federal Land Managers (FLMs) are concerned in the draft Regional Haze Regulations State Implementation Plan (SIP), and we appreciate the clarity of the document.

As part of its long-term strategy, we expect that the State will rely in great part on the new source review (NSR) and prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) programs to assure that new sources do not unduly impair the expected progress toward natural conditions. The December 2008 draft speaks to emissions reductions of ongoing programs but does not include a discussion of the interaction between the existing new source review program and progress on the regional haze plan. Given the uncertainty in the new source growth estimates used to develop the 2018 emissions inventory, and ultimately the 2018 visibility projections, we feel it would be appropriate for the state to discuss the relationship between the Regional Haze Plan and requirements of the NSR and PSD programs within the SIP. Specifically, how does the State anticipate addressing new sources of air pollution in the PSD process in regards to its reasonable progress goals and long term strategy; and, how will it analyze the affect of new emissions from these new sources on progress toward the interim visibility goals established under this SIP, as well as the ultimate goal of natural background visibility by 2064?

Finally, we recognize that the Regional Planning Organizations have provided significant resources to the states throughout the Regional Haze planning process, and that it will be detrimental to the state agencies if these resources are no longer available for subsequent planning and periodic SIP reviews. We will strongly encourage the EPA to maintain support for the Regional Planning Organizations and the integrated technical analyses that will be necessary as we begin tracking reasonable progress for the Class I areas under the Regional Haze State Implementation Plans.

Specific Comments

Section 2:

Page 13, second paragraph – Consider changing the second sentence to “Sources include *agricultural and wildland (wildfire, wildland fire use and prescribed fire) burning*, and incomplete combustion of fossil fuels.” This more accurately characterizes the types of wildland fire that occur.

January 25, 2008

Page 14, second paragraph – I did not find the CART analyses in Appendix B. Please identify the correct Appendix for this information.

Section 4.1: Baseline Emissions Inventory

Page 18, 4.1.2, 3rd paragraph – The statement, “Thus, fire emissions remain the same for air quality modeling in both the base and any future years” is misleading and should be corrected. I believe the intent may have been to say that the fire locations remained the same. In fact fire emissions for 2009 and 2018 were increased in all states except Florida to reflect anticipated increases in the use of prescribed fire as a management tool on federal lands. This is discussed in section 4.1.7 on page 20 of the draft SIP.

Page 20, Table 4.1.6-1 – It would be helpful to show values for the EGU and non-EGU point sources instead of lumping them into a single category, because they are often referred to as EGU and non-EGU throughout the document.

Section 7.9: Additional Emissions Controls Considered

Page 77 – We agree with your conclusion that that elemental carbon from agricultural and wildland fire sources is a relatively minor contributor to visibility impairment. This is consistent with VISTAS’ finding for Mammoth Cave National Park, as well as Class I areas in adjacent states. It is our opinion that this section adequately addresses the requirements of Section 51.308(d) (3) (v) of the Regional Haze Rule. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with the state to manage smoke from wildland fires and protect human health.

Section 11: Comprehensive Periodic Implementation Plan Revisions

While large sulfur dioxide emissions reductions are anticipated under CAIR, EGU emissions are expected to remain a significant contributor to regional haze in 2018 even after implementation of this Federal Rule. Given that additional EGU reductions will still be necessary after 2018, and that there is a fair amount of uncertainty surrounding the modeling analyses conducted for future year projections as well as what is actually going to occur under CAIR, the tracking and review periods under the Regional Haze Regulations become increasingly important from the FLMs perspective. We are pleased to see KY DAQ’s commitment to completing the reasonable progress reports every five years, as well as comprehensive SIP revisions in subsequent planning periods, in accordance with the Regional Haze Regulations.

We are also pleased to see that KY DAQ has included measures for ongoing consultation with the FLMs on page 84 and included annual discussions of the implementation process and the most recent IMPROVE monitoring data. We recommend adding the following sentence to clearly define “ongoing consultation” for future planning periods. “*Consultation between KY DAQ and the FLMs will include early involvement of FLMs in*

January 25, 2008

the periodic review process and FLMs will receive copies of revised regional haze SIPs for comment prior to finalization.” We feel that clearly establishing the process for FLM consultation in the SIP document may eliminate any confusion as to what “ongoing consultation” requires in future years.