13.2.1 Paved Roads

13.2.1.1 General

Particulate emissions occur whenever vehicles travel over a paved surface such as a road or parking lot. Particulate emissions from paved roads are due to direct emissions from vehicles in the form of exhaust, brake wear and tire wear emissions and resuspension of loose material on the road surface. In general terms, resuspended particulate emissions from paved roads originate from, and result in the depletion of, the loose material present on the surface (i.e., the surface loading). In turn, that surface loading is continuously replenished by other sources. At industrial sites, surface loading is replenished by spillage of material and trackout from unpaved roads and staging areas. Figure 13.2.1-1 illustrates several transfer processes occurring on public streets.

Various field studies have found that public streets and highways, as well as roadways at industrial facilities, can be major sources of the atmospheric particulate matter within an area.[1-9] Of particular interest in many parts of the United States are the increased levels of emissions from public paved roads when the equilibrium between deposition and removal processes is upset. This situation can occur for various reasons, including application of granular materials for snow and ice control, mud/dirt carryout from construction activities in the area, and deposition from wind and/or water erosion of surrounding unstabilized areas. In the absence of continuous addition of fresh material (through localized track out or application of antiskid material), paved road surface loading should reach an equilibrium value in which the amount of material resuspended matches the amount replenished. The equilibrium surface loading value depends upon numerous factors. It is believed that the most important factors are: mean speed of vehicles traveling the road; the average daily traffic (ADT); the number of lanes and ADT per lane; the fraction of heavy vehicles (buses and trucks); and the presence/absence of curbs, storm sewers and parking lanes.[10]

The particulate emission factors presented in a previous version of this section of AP-42, dated October 2002, implicitly included the emissions from vehicles in the form of exhaust, brake wear, and tire wear as well as resuspended road surface material. EPA included these sources in the emission factor equation for paved roads since the field testing data used to develop the equation included both the direct emissions from vehicles and emissions from resuspension of road dust.

This version of the paved road emission factor equation only estimates particulate emissions from resuspended road surface material[28]. The particulate emissions from vehicle exhaust, brake wear, and tire wear are now estimated separately using EPA's MOVES[29] model. This approach eliminates the possibility of double counting emissions. Double counting results when employing the previous version of the emission factor equation in this section and MOVES to estimate particulate emissions from vehicle traffic on paved roads. It also incorporates the decrease in exhaust emissions that has occurred since the paved road emission factor equation was developed. Earlier versions of the paved road emission factor equation includes estimates of emissions from exhaust, brake wear, and tire wear based on emission rates for vehicles in the 1980 calendar year fleet. The amount of PM released from vehicle exhaust has decreased since 1980 due to lower new vehicle emission standards and changes in fuel characteristics.

13.2.1.2 Emissions And Correction Parameters

Dust emissions from paved roads have been found to vary with what is termed the "silt loading" present on the road surface. In addition, the average weight and speed of vehicles traveling the road influence road dust emissions. The term silt loading (sL) refers to the mass of silt-size material (equal to or less than 75 micrometers [µm] in physical diameter) per unit area of the travel surface. The total road surface dust loading consists of loose material that can be collected by broom sweeping and vacuuming of the traveled portion of the paved road. The silt fraction is determined by measuring the proportion of the loose dry surface dust that passes through a 200-mesh screen, using the ASTM-C-136 method. Silt loading is the product of the silt fraction and the total loading, and is abbreviated "sL". Additional details on the sampling and analysis of such material are provided in AP-42 Appendices C.1 and C.2.

The surface sL provides a reasonable means of characterizing seasonal variability in a paved road emission inventory. In many areas of the country, road surface loadings [11-21] are heaviest during the late winter and early spring months when the residual loading from snow/ice controls is greatest. As noted earlier, once replenishment of fresh material is eliminated, the road surface loading can be expected to reach an equilibrium value, which is substantially lower than the late winter/early spring values.

DEPOSITION
1. PAVEMENT WEAR AND DECOMPOSITION
2. VEHICLE-RELATED DEPOSITION
3. DUSTFALL
4. LITTER
5. MUD AND DIRT CARRYOUT
6. EROSION FROM ADJACENT AREAS
7. SPILLS
8. BIOLOGICAL DEBRIS
9. ICE CONTROL COMPOUNDS

REMOVAL
1. REENTRAINMENT
2. WIND EROSION
3. DISPLACEMENT
4. RAINFALL RUNOFF TO CATCH BASIN
5. STREET SWEEPING

Figure 13.2.1-1. Deposition and removal processes.

13.2.1.3 Predictive Emission Factor Equations[10,29]

The quantity of particulate emissions from resuspension of loose material on the road surface due to vehicle travel on a dry paved road may be estimated using the following empirical expression:

$$E = k\ (sL)^{0.91} \times (W)^{1.02} \qquad\qquad (1)$$

where: E = particulate emission factor (having units matching the units of k),

  k = particle size multiplier for particle size range and units of interest (see below),

  sL = road surface silt loading (grams per square meter) (g/m^2), and

  W = average weight (tons) of the vehicles traveling the road.

It is important to note that Equation 1 calls for the average weight of all vehicles traveling the road. For example, if 99 percent of traffic on the road are 2 ton cars/trucks while the remaining 1 percent consists of 20 ton trucks, then the mean weight "W" is 2.2 tons. More specifically, Equation 1 is *not* intended to be used to calculate a separate emission factor for each vehicle weight class. Instead, only one emission factor should be calculated to represent the "fleet" average weight of all vehicles traveling the road.

The particle size multiplier (k) above varies with aerodynamic size range as shown in Table 13.2.1-1. To determine particulate emissions for a specific particle size range, use the appropriate value of k shown in Table 13.2.1-1.

To obtain the total emissions factor, the emissions factors for the exhaust, brake wear and tire wear obtained from either EPA's MOBILE6.2 [27] or most recent MOVES [29] software model should be added to the emissions factor calculated from the empirical equation.

Table 13.2.1-1. PARTICLE SIZE MULTIPLIERS FOR PAVED ROAD EQUATION

Size range[a]	Particle Size Multiplier k[b]		
	g/VKT	g/VMT	lb/VMT
PM-2.5[c]	0.15	0.25	0.00054
PM-10	0.62	1.00	0.0022
PM-15	0.77	1.23	0.0027
PM-30[d]	3.23	5.24	0.011

[a] Refers to airborne particulate matter (PM-x) with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than x micrometers.

[b] Units shown are grams per vehicle kilometer traveled (g/VKT), grams per vehicle mile traveled (g/VMT), and pounds per vehicle mile traveled (lb/VMT). The multiplier k includes unit conversions to produce emission factors in the units shown for the indicated size range from the mixed units required in Equation 1.

[c] The k-factors for PM$_{2.5}$ were based on the average PM$_{2.5}$:PM$_{10}$ ratio of test runs in Reference 30.

[d] PM-30 is sometimes termed "suspendable particulate" (SP) and is often used as a surrogate for TSP.

Equation 1 is based on a regression analysis of 83 tests for PM-10.[3, 5-6, 8, 27-29, 31-36] Sources tested include public paved roads, as well as controlled and uncontrolled industrial paved roads. The majority of tests involved freely flowing vehicles traveling at constant speed on relatively level roads. However, 22 tests of slow moving or "stop-and-go" traffic or vehicles under load were available for inclusion in the data base.[32-36] Engine exhaust, tire wear and break wear were subtracted from the emissions measured in the test programs prior to stepwise regression to determine Equation 1.[37, 39] The equations retain the quality rating of A (D for PM-2.5), if applied within the range of source conditions that were tested in developing the equation as follows:

Silt loading: $0.03 - 400$ g/m^2
$0.04 - 570$ grains/square foot (ft^2)

Mean vehicle weight: $1.8 - 38$ megagrams (Mg)
$2.0 - 42$ tons

Mean vehicle speed: $1 - 88$ kilometers per hour (kph)
$1 - 55$ miles per hour (mph)

The upper and lower 95% confidence levels of equation 1 for PM$_{10}$ is best described with equations using an exponents of 1.14 and 0.677 for silt loading and an exponents of 1.19 and 0.85 for weight. Users are cautioned that application of equation 1 outside of the range of variables and operating conditions specified above, e.g., application to roadways or road networks with speeds above 55 mph and average vehicle weights of 42 tons, will result in emission estimates with a higher level of uncertainty. In these situations, users are encouraged to consider an assessment of the impacts of the influence of extrapolation to the overall emissions and alternative methods that are equally or more plausible in light of local emissions data and/or ambient concentration or compositional data.

To retain the quality rating for the emission factor equation when it is applied to a specific paved road, it is necessary that reliable correction parameter values for the specific road in question be determined. With the exception of limited access roadways, which are difficult to sample, the collection and use of site-specific silt loading (sL) data for public paved road emission inventories are strongly recommended. The field and laboratory procedures for determining surface material silt content and surface dust loading are summarized in Appendices C.1 and C.2. In the event that site-specific values cannot be obtained, an appropriate value for a paved public road may be selected from the values in Table 13.2.1-2, but the quality rating of the equation should be reduced by 2 levels.

Equation 1 may be extrapolated to average uncontrolled conditions (but including natural mitigation) under the simplifying assumption that annual (or other long-term) average emissions are inversely proportional to the frequency of measurable (> 0.254 mm [0.01 inch]) precipitation by application of a precipitation correction term. The precipitation correction term can be applied on a daily or an hourly basis [26, 38].

For the daily basis, Equation 1 becomes:

$$E_{ext} = [\ k\ (sL)^{0.91} \times (W)^{1.02}\ ]\ (1 - P/4N) \qquad (2)$$

where k, sL, W, and S are as defined in Equation 1 and

E_{ext} = annual or other long-term average emission factor in the same units as k,

P = number of "wet" days with at least 0.254 mm (0.01 in) of precipitation during the averaging period, and

N = number of days in the averaging period (e.g., 365 for annual, 91 for seasonal, 30 for monthly).

Note that the assumption leading to Equation 2 is based on analogy with the approach used to develop long-term average unpaved road emission factors in Section 13.2.2. However, Equation 2 above incorporates an additional factor of "4" in the denominator to account for the fact that paved roads dry more quickly than unpaved roads and that the precipitation may not occur over the complete 24-hour day.

For the hourly basis, equation 1 becomes:

$$E_{ext} = [\ k\ (sL)^{0.91} \times (W)^{1.02}\ ]\ (1 - 1.2P/N) \qquad (3)$$

where k, sL, W, and S are as defined in Equation 1 and

E_{ext} = annual or other long-term average emission factor in the same units as k,

P = number of hours with at least 0.254 mm (0.01 in) of precipitation during the averaging period, and

N = number of hours in the averaging period (e.g., 8760 for annual, 2124 for season 720 for monthly)

Note: In the hourly moisture correction term $(1-1.2P/N)$ for equation 3, the 1.2 multiplier is applied to account for the residual mitigative effect of moisture. For most applications, this equation will produce satisfactory results. Users should select a time interval to include sufficient "dry" hours such that a reasonable emissions averaging period is evaluated. For the special case where this equation is used to calculate emissions on an hour by hour basis, such as would be done in some emissions modeling situations, the moisture correction term should be modified so that the moisture correction "credit" is applied to the first hours following cessation of precipitation. In this special case, it is suggested that this 20% "credit" be applied on a basis of one hour credit for each hour of precipitation up to a maximum of 12 hours.

Note that the assumption leading to Equation 3 is based on analogy with the approach used to develop long-term average unpaved road emission factors in Section 13.2.2.

Figure 13.2.1-2 presents the geographical distribution of "wet" days on an annual basis for the United States. Maps showing this information on a monthly basis are available in the *Climatic Atlas of the United States*[23] . Alternative sources include other Department of Commerce publications (such as local climatological data summaries). The National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) offers several products that provide hourly precipitation data. In particular, NCDC offers *Solar and Meteorological Surface Observation Network 1961-1990* (SAMSON) CD-ROM, which contains 30 years worth of hourly meteorological data for first-order National Weather Service locations. Whatever meteorological data are used, the source of that data and the averaging period should be clearly specified.

It is emphasized that the simple assumption underlying Equations 2 and 3 has not been verified in any rigorous manner. For that reason, the quality ratings for Equations 2 and 3 should be downgraded one letter from the rating that would be applied to Equation 1.

Figure 13.2.1-2. Mean number of days with 0.01 inch or more of precipitation in the United States.

Table 13.2.1-2 presents recommended default silt loadings for normal baseline conditions and for wintertime baseline conditions in areas that experience frozen precipitation with periodic application of antiskid material[24]. The winter baseline is represented as a multiple of the non-winter baseline, depending on the ADT value for the road in question. As shown, a multiplier of 4 is applied for low volume roads (< 500 ADT) to obtain a wintertime baseline silt loading of 4 X 0.6 = 2.4 g/m^2.

Table 13.2.1-2. Ubiquitous Silt Loading Default Values with Hot Spot
Contributions from Anti-Skid Abrasives (g/m^2)

ADT Category	< 500	500-5,000	5,000-10,000	> 10,000
Ubiquitous Baseline g/m^2	0.6	0.2	0.06	0.03 0.015 limited access
Ubiquitous Winter Baseline Multiplier during months with frozen precipitation	X4	X3	X2	X1
Initial peak additive contribution from application of antiskid abrasive (g/m^2)	2	2	2	2
Days to return to baseline conditions (assume linear decay)	7	3	1	0.5

It is suggested that an additional (but temporary) silt loading contribution of 2 g/m^2 occurs with each application of antiskid abrasive for snow/ice control. This was determined based on a typical application rate of 500 lb per lane mile and an initial silt content of 1 % silt content. Ordinary rock salt and other chemical deicers add little to the silt loading, because most of the chemical dissolves during the snow/ice melting process.

To adjust the baseline silt loadings for mud/dirt trackout, the number of trackout points is required. It is recommended that in calculating PM$_{10}$ emissions, six additional miles of road be added for each active trackout point from an active construction site, to the paved road mileage of the specified category within the county. In calculating PM$_{2.5}$ emissions, it is recommended that three additional miles of road be added for each trackout point from an active construction site.

It is suggested the number of trackout points for activities other than road and building construction areas be related to land use. For example, in rural farming areas, each mile of paved road would have a specified number of trackout points at intersections with unpaved roads. This value could be estimated from the unpaved road density (mi/sq. mi.).

The use of a default value from Table 13.2.1-2 should be expected to yield only an order-of-magnitude estimate of the emission factor. Public paved road silt loadings are dependent

upon: traffic characteristics (speed, ADT, and fraction of heavy vehicles); road characteristics (curbs, number of lanes, parking lanes); local land use (agriculture, new residential construction) and regional/seasonal factors (snow/ice controls, wind blown dust). As a result, the collection and use of site-specific silt loading data is highly recommended. In the event that default silt loading values are used, the quality ratings for the equation should be downgraded 2 levels.

Limited access roadways pose severe logistical difficulties in terms of surface sampling, and few silt loading data are available for such roads. Nevertheless, the available data do not suggest great variation in silt loading for limited access roadways from one part of the country to another. For annual conditions, a default value of 0.015 g/m^2 is recommended for limited access roadways.[9,22] Even fewer of the available data correspond to worst-case situations, and elevated loadings are observed to be quickly depleted because of high traffic speeds and high ADT rates. A default value of 0.2 g/m^2 is recommended for short periods of time following application of snow/ice controls to limited access roads.[22]

The limited data on silt loading values for industrial roads have shown as much variability as public roads. Because of the variations of traffic conditions and the use of preventive mitigative controls, the data probably do not reflect the full extent of the potential variation in silt loading on industrial roads. However, the collection of site specific silt loading data from industrial roads is easier and safer than for public roads. Therefore, the collection and use of site-specific silt loading data is preferred and is highly recommended. In the event that site-specific values cannot be obtained, an appropriate value for an industrial road may be selected from the mean values given in Table 13.2.1-3, but the quality rating of the equation should be reduced by 2 levels.

The predictive accuracy of Equation 1 requires thorough on-site characterization of road silt loading. Road surface sampling is time-consuming and potentially hazardous because of the need to block traffic lanes. In addition, large number of samples is required to represent spatial and temporal variations across roadway networks. Mobile monitoring is a new alternative silt loading or road dust emission characterization method for either paved or unpaved roads. It utilizes a test vehicle that generates and monitors its own dust plume concentration (mass basis) at a fixed sampling probe location. A calibration factor is needed for each mobile monitoring configuration (test vehicle and sampling system), to convert the relative dust emission intensity to an equivalent silt loading or emission factor. Typically, portable continuous particle concentration monitors do not comply with Federal Reference Method (FRM) standards. Therefore, a controlled study must be performed to correlate the portable monitor response to the road silt loading or size specific particle concentration measured with an approved FRM sampling system. In the calibration tests, multiple test conditions should be performed to provide an average correlation with known precision and to accommodate variations in road silt loading, vehicle speed, road dust characteristics and other road conditions that may influence mobile monitoring measurements or emissions characteristics. Because the paved road dust emissions are also dependent on the average vehicle weight for the road segment, it is important that the weight of the test vehicle correspond closely to the average vehicle weight for the road segment or be adjusted using the average vehicle weight relationship in Equation 1. In summary, it is believed that the Mobile Monitoring Method will provide improved capabilities to provide reliable temporally and spatially resolved silt loading or emissions factors with increased coverage, improved safety, reduced traffic interference and decreased cost.[40, 41, 42]

Table 13.2.1-3 (Metric And English Units). TYPICAL SILT CONTENT AND LOADING VALUES FOR PAVED ROADS AT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES [a]

Industry	No. of Sites	No. Of Samples	Silt Content (%)		No. of Travel Lanes	Total Loading x 10^{-3}			Silt Loading (g/m^2)	
			Range	Mean		Range	Mean	Units[b]	Range	Mean
Copper smelting	1	3	15.4-21.7	19.0	2	12.9 - 19.5	15.9	kg/km	188-400	292
						45.8 - 69.2	55.4	lb/mi		
Iron and steel production	9	48	1.1-35.7	12.5	2	0.006 - 4.77	0.495	kg/km	0.09-79	9.7
						0.020 -16.9	1.75	lb/mi		
Asphalt batching	1	3	2.6 - 4.6	3.3	1	12.1 - 18.0	14.9	kg/km	76-193	120
						43.0 - 64.0	52.8	lb/mi		
Concrete batching	1	3	5.2 - 6.0	5.5	2	1.4 - 1.8	1.7	kg/km	11-12	12
						5.0 - 6.4	5.9	lb/mi		
Sand and gravel processing	1	3	6.4 - 7.9	7.1	1	2.8 - 5.5	3.8	kg/km	53-95	70
						9.9 - 19.4	13.3	lb/mi		
Municipal solid waste landfill	2	7		-	2	-			1.1-32.0	7.4
Quarry	1	6		-	2	-			2.4-14	8.2
Corn wet mills	3	15		-	2	-			0.05 – 2.9	1.1

[a] References 1-2,5-6,11-13. Values represent samples collected from *industrial* roads. Public road silt loading values are presented in Table-13.2.1-2. Dashes indicate information not available.[b] Multiply entries by 1000 to obtain stated units; kilograms per kilometer (kg/km) and pounds per mile (lb/mi).

13.2.1.4 Controls[6,25]

Because of the importance of the silt loading, control techniques for paved roads attempt either to prevent material from being deposited onto the surface (preventive controls) or to remove from the travel lanes any material that has been deposited (mitigative controls). Covering of loads in trucks, and the paving of access areas to unpaved lots or construction sites, are examples of preventive measures. Examples of mitigative controls include vacuum sweeping, water flushing, and broom sweeping and flushing. Actual control efficiencies for any - of these techniques can be highly variable. Locally measured silt loadings before and after the application of controls is the preferred method to evaluate controls. It is particularly important to note that street sweeping of gutters and curb areas may actually increase the silt loading on the traveled portion of the road. Redistribution of loose material onto the travel lanes will actually produce a short-term increase in the emissions.

In general, preventive controls are usually more cost effective than mitigative controls. The cost-effectiveness of mitigative controls falls off dramatically as the size of an area to be treated increases. The cost-effectiveness of mitigative measures is also unfavorable if only a short period of time is required for the road to return to equilibrium silt loading condition. That is to say, the number and length of public roads within most areas of interest preclude any widespread and routine use of mitigative controls. On the other hand, because of the more limited scope of roads at an industrial site, mitigative measures may be used quite successfully (especially in situations where truck spillage occurs). Note, however, that public agencies could make effective use of mitigative controls to remove sand/salt from roads after the winter ends.

Because available controls will affect the silt loading, controlled emission factors may be obtained by substituting controlled silt loading values into the equation. (Emission factors from controlled industrial roads were used in the development of the equation.) The collection of surface loading samples from treated, as well as baseline (untreated), roads provides a means to track effectiveness of the controls over time. The use of Mobile Monitoring Methodologies provide an improved means to track progress in controlling silt loading values.

13.2.1.5 Changes since Fifth Edition

The following changes were made since the publication of the Fifth Edition of AP-42:

October 2002

1) The particle size multiplier for $PM_{2.5}$ was revised to 25% of PM_{10}. The approximately 55% reduction was a result of emission testing using FRM monitors. The monitoring was specifically intended to evaluate the PM-2.5 component of the emissions.

2) Default silt loading values were included in Table 13.2.1-2 replacing the Tables and Figures containing silt loading statistical information.

3) Editorial changes within the text were made indicating the possible causes of variations in the silt loading between roads within and among different locations. The uncertainty of using the default silt loading value was discussed.

4) Section 13.2.1.1 was revised to clarify the role of dust loading in resuspension. Additional minor text changes were made.

5) Equations 2 and 3, Figure 13.2.1-2, and text were added to incorporate natural mitigation into annual or other long-term average emission factors.

December 2003

1) The emission factor equation was adjusted to remove the component of particulate emissions- from exhaust, brake wear, and tire wear. A parameter C representing these emissions was included in the predictive equation. The parameter C varied with aerodynamic size range of the particulate matter. Table 13.2.1-2 was added to present the new coefficients.

2) The default silt loading values in Table 13.2.1-3 were revised to incorporate the results from a recent analysis of silt loading data.

November 2006

1) The $PM_{2.5}$ particle size multiplier was revised to 15% of PM_{10} as the result of wind tunnel studies of a variety of dust emitting surface materials.

2) References were rearranged and renumbered.

January 2011

1) The empirical predictive equation was revised. The revision is based upon stepwise regression of 83 profile emissions tests and an adjustment of individual test data for the exhaust; break wear and tire wear emissions prior to regression of the data.

2) The C term is removed from the empirical predictive equation and Table 13.2.1-2 with the C term values is removed since the exhaust; break wear and tire wear emissions were no longer part of the regressed data.

3) The $PM_{2.5}$ particle size multiplier was revised to 25% of PM_{10} since the PM_{10} test data used to develop the equation did not meet the necessary PM_{10} concentrations for a ratio of 15%.

4) The lower speed of the vehicle speed range supported by the empirical predictive equation was revised to 1 mph.

5) Information was added on an improved methodology to develop spatially and temporally resolved silt loadings or emissions factors by Mobile Monitoring Methodologies.

References For Section 13.2.1

1.   D. R. Dunbar, *Resuspension Of Particulate Matter,* EPA-450/2-76-031, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, March 1976.

2.   R. Bohn, *et al., Fugitive Emissions From Integrated Iron And Steel Plants,* EPA-600/2-78-050, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, March 1978.

3. C. Cowherd, Jr., *et al., Iron And Steel Plant Open Dust Source Fugitive Emission Evaluation,* EPA-600/2-79-103, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, May 1979.

4. C. Cowherd, Jr., *et al., Quantification Of Dust Entrainment From Paved Roadways,* EPA-450/3-77-027, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, July 1977.

5. *Size Specific Particulate Emission Factors For Uncontrolled Industrial And Rural Roads,* EPA Contract No. 68-02-3158, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, September 1983.

6. T. Cuscino, Jr., *et al., Iron And Steel Plant Open Source Fugitive Emission Control Evaluation,* EPA-600/2-83-110, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, October 1983.

7. J. P. Reider, *Size-specific Particulate Emission Factors For Uncontrolled Industrial And Rural Roads,* EPA Contract 68-02-3158, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, September 1983.

8. C. Cowherd, Jr., and P. J. Englehart, *Paved Road Particulate Emissions,* EPA-600/7-84-077, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, July 1984.

9. C. Cowherd, Jr., and P. J. Englehart, *Size Specific Particulate Emission Factors For Industrial And Rural Roads,* EPA-600/7-85-051, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH, October 1985.

10. *Emission Factor Documentation For AP-42, Sections 11.2.5 and 11.2.6 — Paved Roads,* EPA Contract No. 68-D0-0123, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, March 1993.

11. *Evaluation Of Open Dust Sources In The Vicinity Of Buffalo, New York,* EPA Contract No. 68-02-2545, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, March 1979.

12. *PM-10 Emission Inventory Of Landfills In The Lake Calumet Area,* EPA Contract No. 68-02-3891, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, September 1987.

13. *Chicago Area Particulate Matter Emission Inventory — Sampling And Analysis,* Contract No. 68-02-4395, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, May 1988.

14. *Montana Street Sampling Data,* Montana Department Of Health And Environmental Sciences, Helena, MT, July 1992.

15. *Street Sanding Emissions And Control Study,* PEI Associates, Inc., Cincinnati, OH, October 1989.

16. *Evaluation Of PM-10 Emission Factors For Paved Streets,* Harding Lawson Associates, Denver, CO, October 1991.

17. *Street Sanding Emissions And Control Study,* RTP Environmental Associates, Inc., Denver, CO, July 1990.

18. *Post-storm Measurement Results — Salt Lake County Road Dust Silt Loading Winter 1991/92 Measurement Program,* Aerovironment, Inc., Monrovia, CA, June 1992.

19. Written communication from Harold Glasser, Department of Health, Clark County (NV).

20. *PM-10 Emissions Inventory Data For The Maricopa And Pima Planning Areas,* EPA Contract No. 68-02-3888, Engineering-Science, Pasadena, CA, January 1987.

21. *Characterization Of PM-10 Emissions From Antiskid Materials Applied To Ice- And Snow-Covered Roadways,* EPA Contract No. 68-D0-0137, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, October 1992.

22. C. Cowherd, *Background Document for Revisions to Fine Fraction Ratios Used for AP-42 Fugitive Dust Emission Factors.* Prepared by Midwest Research Institute for Western Governors Association, Western Regional Air Partnership, Denver, CO, February 1, 2006.

23. *Climatic Atlas Of The United States, U.S.* Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C., June 1968.

24. C. Cowherd, Jr., *et al., Improved Activity Levels for National Emission Inventories of Fugitive Dust from Paved and Unpaved Roads,* Presented at the 11th International Emission Inventory Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, April 2002.

25. C. Cowherd, Jr., *et al., Control Of Open Fugitive Dust Sources,* EPA-450/3-88-008, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, September 1988.

26. Written communication (Technical Memorandum) from G. Muleski, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, MO, to B. Kuykendal, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, September 27, 2001.

27. EPA, 2002b. MOBILE6 User Guide, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA420-R-02-028, October 2002.

28. Written communication (Technical Memorandum) from P. Hemmer, E.H. Pechan & Associates, Inc., Durham, NC to B. Kuykendal, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, August, 21, 2003.

29. EPA, 2009, MOVES2010 User Guide, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA420B-09-041, December 2009.

30. *Fugitive Particulate Matter Emissions,* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC, Midwest Research Institute Project No. 4604-06, April 15, 1997.

31. Midwest Research Institute, *Roadway Emissions Field Tests at U.S. Steel's Fairless Works*, U.S. Steel Corporation, Fairless Hills, PA, USX Purchase Order No. 146-0001191-0068, May 1990.

32. *Paved Road Modifications to AP-42, Background Documentation For Corn Refiners Association, Inc. Washington, DC 20006*, Midwest Research Institute Project No. 310842, May 20, 2008.

33. *Emission Tests of Paved Road Traffic at Minnesota Corn Processors Marshall, Minnesota Facility*, McVehil-Monnett Associates, Midwest Research Institute Project No. 310212.1.001, July 6, 2001.

34. *Emission Tests of Paved Road Traffic at Minnesota Corn Processors Columbus, Nebraska Facility*, McVehil-Monnett Associates, Midwest Research Institute Project No. 310212.1.002. July 13, 2001.

35. *Emission Tests of Paved Road Traffic at Cargill Sweeteners North America Blair, Nebraska Facility*, McVehil-Monnett Associates, Midwest Research Institute Project No. 310395.1.001. November 27, 2002.

36. *Emission Tests of Paved Road Traffic at ADM's Marshall, Minnesota Facility*, McVehil-Monnett Associates, Midwest Research Institute Project No. 310479.1.001. December 5, 2003.

37. E-mail communication between Ron Myers of EPA/OAQPS/SPPD/MPG, RTP, NC and Prashanth Gururaja and Ed Glover of EPA/OTAQ/ASD/HDOC re. *Diesel exhaust, tire and brake wear for low speed stop and go traffic*; January 2009 through May 2009.

38. Technical Memorandum from William B. Kuykendal to File, Subject: *Decisions on Final AP-42 Section 13.2.1 "Paved Roads"*, October 10, 2002.

39. E-mail communication between Ron Myers of EPA/OAQPS/SPPD/MPG, RTP, NC and Gary Dolce and Rudolph Kapichak of EPA/OTAQ/ASD/HDOC re. *Paved Road Test Data*; October 12, 2010 through December 16, 2010.

40. C. Cowherd, *Mobile Monitoring Method Specifications*, Prepared by Midwest Research Institute for Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management, Las Vegas, NV, February 6, 2009.

41. C. Cowherd, *Technical Support Document for Mobile Monitoring Technologies*, Prepared by Midwest Research Institute for Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management, Las Vegas, NV, January 9, 2009.

42. R. Langston, R. S. Merle Jr., *et al.,Clark County (Nevada) Paved Road Dust Emission Studies in Support of Mobile Monitoring Technologies*, Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management, Las Vegas, NV, December 22, 2008.

43. Midwest Research Institute; Analysis of the Fine Fraction of Particulate Matter in Fugitive Dust; Western Governors' Association - Western Regional Air Partnership (WRAP); October 12, 2005.