United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 23, 2010

The Honorable Lisa Jackson
Administrator
U.S Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Administrator Jackson,

We write to convey our continued concerns regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) latest actions in its review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) as required every five years under the Clean Air Act. The Second Draft Policy Assessment (PA) for Particulate Matter (PM) released on July 8, 2010 in the Federal Register, if approved, would establish the most stringent and unparalleled regulation of dust in our nation's history.

According to the PA for Particulate Matter, EPA would be justified in either retaining the current levels of 150 $\mu g/m^3$ for regulating coarse PM or in revising it to levels as low as 65-85 $\mu g/m^3$, depending on the emphasis placed on the evidence and uncertainties. A coarse PM NAAQS of 65-85 $\mu g/m^3$ would be twice as stringent as the current standard. The current standards have been difficult if not impossible for industries in the Western portion of the country to attain, including agricultural operations.

We respect efforts for a clean and healthy environment, but not at the expense of common sense. These identified levels will be extremely burdensome for farmers and livestock producers to attain. Whether its livestock kicking up dust, soybeans being combined on a dry day in the fall, or driving a car down the gravel road, dust is a naturally occurring event.

Producers could potentially be fined for not meeting the PM standards while still practicing good management practices on their soils. Considering the Administration's focus on rural America and rural economic development, a proposal such as this could have a negative effect on those very goals. If the EPA publishes a rule that regulates dust at these low levels, excessive dust control measures could be imposed which could slow economic development and impose significant costs to farmers and businesses. Since EPA would be justified in retaining the current standard, then the current standard should be retained.

When the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee's (CASAC) meets on July 26, 2010 to review this PA and consider revising the current PM standards, we encourage you to consider maintaining the primary and secondary standards or, in the alternative, consider different PM

indicators. In particular, we ask that CASAC focus attention on EPA's choice to not adopt a PM10-2.5 standard. Common sense requires the EPA to acknowledge that the wind blows, and so does dust.

Sincerely,

Chuck Grassley

Jim Johnson

Pat Roberts

Sam Brownback

Jim Bunning

George V. Voinovich

John Cornyn

Thad Cochran

Mike Crapo

John Barrasso

Blanche L. Lincoln

Tom McClintock

E. Benjamin Nelson

Saxby Chambliss

Tom Cohen

[illegible]

Kit Bond

Michael B. Enzi

Jim Risch

John Thune

Mike Johanns