

Air Quality Management Subcommittee
Minutes from Meeting on October 18 - 19, 2005
Catamaran Hotel
3999 Mission Boulevard
San Diego, CA

Attendees:

See san diego attendees.pdf on CAAAC website.

Introduction: – Pat Cummins and Greg Green

The meeting began with attendees introducing themselves and with Greg Green reviewing the agenda. Greg indicated that for the first time the Air Quality Management (AQM) Subcommittee is moving to the heart of its topic. The statement of vision and principles and the “Structure” document for the subcommittee were slow to develop, but there now appears to be agreement on positions which were created over the last six months; the subcommittee can move forward using this work as a foundation. (These documents are available on the CAAAC website respectively as aqm-06-16-05-vision.pdf and organizational structure for AQM subcommittee.pdf). Greg also noted that the “Structure” document is sound, but that it is a work-in-progress and that its ideas can be modified as new issues become evident. He emphasized that Subcommittee members are encouraged to think creatively about air quality management for the environment and public health. They should try to participate at a level above that dictated by individual interests. He noted that an original plan to complete work by the July 2006 appears to be unrealistic and that the expectation now is to complete a subcommittee report and recommendations by November 2006.

Future Air Quality: – John Bachmann

To provide focus for the AQM Subcommittee, John Bachmann (via conference phone) made a presentation on Air Quality Management in the 21st Century. The thrust was future air quality management for the “foreseeable” (10 to 15 year) future. It included the challenges identified by the NAS, quantitative and qualitative scenarios for pollutants and their transport, and links to other major societal issues. Mega-trends he identified that could lead to changes in the air quality management system include: focus on international/global air pollution/climate issues; integration of air quality management into larger societal programs, e.g., smart growth, urban planning, etc.; importance of voluntary/local programs; and tracking results of initiatives.

The presentation was very well received and was frequently referenced by participants during these meetings. There was also strong interest in distributing color copies of the slides to participants; Deb Stackhouse agreed to follow through on this request. Subsequently, it was also agreed to include the addition of “talking points” (along with an integration of the NAS recommendations) into the MS PowerPoint slide presentation; this will provide a basis for problem definition by the subcommittee.

There was specific interest in the extent to which the PM analysis for Birmingham, AL was available for other pollutants and metropolitan areas. John indicated that similar impact analyses are planned to support a regulatory proposal and will likely include cities such as Birmingham, Detroit, Seattle, and other western cities, but only for PM (not O3). Good news in the projected progress was noted, but uncertainties in projections for O3/PM for specific source sectors are worth identifying. Uncertainty also affects the relationship of sources to non-attainment in the future and should be addressed. John agreed that understanding of the overall system may be an issue; he feels very good about sulfur and regional NOx/SOx, but noted there could be issues if we are wrong about such things as diesel particles, treatment of mobile sources, emission factors for non-traditional sources, the impact of proximity on the effects of a source, or biases that occur in treating local versus regional impacts. Also, some source categories may need more specific information, e.g., iron and steel. In response to a question on a Texas topic, John indicated that the lack of counties in Texas with future PM exceedances is due to warm, windy conditions without valley terrain or wood burning; coarse PM exceedances may occur, but not for PM fine.

It was noted by participants that the mega-trend for international/global is important and that integration of air quality management is equivalent to proceeding “back to the future”. In addition there may be even bigger mega-trends to consider. These could include: (1) NAAQS tend to become more restrictive each time they are reconsidered, (2) it becomes easier to control emissions, and (3) it is hard to connect emissions with health effects. Participants should be aware of these underlying issues. The presentation is posted on the CAAAC-AQM website as Bachmann_AQM_san diego.pdf.

Team 1 – The AQM Planning Process -- Work Plan Discussion:

Co-Chairs: Janet McCabe, Lydia Wegman, Don Clay (John Seitz substituted)

Discussion addressed a proposed table of 10 lettered (A – I) topics which organized 18 potential components of the planning process (taken from the “Structure” Document) for consideration by Team 1; the table was included with meeting handouts and the amended version available in its revised version as team 1 workplan 11-05-05.pdf. The table is a product of a conference call on 10/5/05 and was prepared by the co-chairs. Five of the eighteen components are top priorities, but all are of interest. Comments were made on the proposed table by Brock Nicholson, Greg Dana, Lisa Gomez, and Leah Weiss. From today’s meeting, Team 1 hopes to have a plan to move forward on topics identified in the table with volunteers to prepare white papers for each of the topics.

The Team 1 discussion focused on simplification of the table and how to proceed from it, understanding that many topics are interwoven. What is the vision of the AQM program for the future as it is in the table, not just a statement of “38” more recommendations? What happens at the end of this process to make sure it all comes together? Eventually the conversation evolved to an extension of a proposal originally

made by Brock Nicholson and further elaboration of that proposal. There was general agreement that the use of white papers is a good approach for focusing the discussion.

In the general discussion of the table, it was suggested that some issues are precursors and there needs to be staging before going to a final structure of topics. White papers should be done before fully integrating all topics in the table; the white papers should be for broader topics and the total number should be made smaller; have 4 - 5 white papers, not 9 - 10. There should be a more sequential approach with open discussion, not an overly structured set of topics; an open look across all options for an AQM system and emission control programs is needed. If Team 1 tries to pull all the topic pieces together too early, something might be missed. All appropriate options or groups of options should be captured.

It was noted that the CAA has worked well over 35 years and things that can be done within the current CAA shouldn't be missed. Team 1 should think back over the program and identify what has worked, e.g., mobile source programs have been very effective. The bottom line is emission control and what makes the most sense as to sectors that can be effectively controlled, or emissions otherwise reduced, through national or other programs. Traditional versus non-traditional sources should be considered, as well as the use of monitoring to measure tangible results and trends in the effectiveness of controls for categories of sources. Also, Team 1 shouldn't lose sight of the NAS recommendations.

Specific topics in the table were referred to periodically throughout the discussion. It was generally assumed that topic "A -- Problem Definition" is a big picture issue that should be further developed. The amalgamation of topics or "Fundamental Approach to Air Quality Planning" addressed by Brock Nicholson, Greg Dana and others should be considered separately as a large piece that may need to be broken into parts, as needed. However, Team 1 shouldn't recommend specific emission reductions and this white paper should be used in an iterative process. Topics "H -- Coordination" and "I -- Communications" need to be considered as separate process issues.

The team was reminded that much of the above conversation is a repeat of what took place before and during the Ann Arbor meeting. It is time to move on and consider the Bachmann presentation and the AQM vision/principles to which members of the AQM Subcommittee previously agreed. Questions in the "straw proposal" (see AQM straw proposal 8-17-95.pdf) will serve to provoke any further discussion that is needed.

Janet McCabe brought the conversation together by indicating the need to define an audience and to define the problem? The current AQM system has a lot of inertia, so the kind of AQM system that requires support needs to be identified. Much can be accomplished by parallel discussion on the various issues considering NAS recommendations and questions. Brock agreed to take the lead on an issue paper considering the amalgamated topics with 4 or 5 people. They will prepare a bigger outline with sub-options and will propose options within categories; the expanded outline should be completed before additional efforts are begun. Other individuals can look at

other topics. In summary, Janet proposed discrete topics with white papers for each of the four topic areas noted above. The topic areas derived from the original table are: “A”; “B, C, D, E, F” (for which Brock Nicholson will provide an expanded outline); “H”; and “I”.

Team 2 – New and Improved AQM Tools -- Work Plan Discussion:
Co-Chairs: Anna Garcia, Bob Wyman, Debbie Wood

The emphasis for Team 2 is AQM tools. Their process has just been started with a conference call during the previous week. In the discussion today it is necessary to address the final team product, indicate a list of meetings, and develop a work plan. Team 2 is working from the list of 15 items drawn from the “Structure” document and includes a mix of topics. For discussion, example matrices of tools for potential applications/areas based on both scientific tools and on strategies & programs had been distributed. The ensuing discussion involved both big picture topics and how to capture tools as part of matrices or other summary mechanisms.

It was suggested that the audience needs to be defined and should include staff at State/local levels for the next regulatory process. Also, the external AQM audience should be considered.

Team 2 should develop a set of tools, structure tools based on problems being addressed, identify attributes of tools, and indicate environmental benefits. Other attributes might include an accountability scale (local versus regional), cost, lead time, conceptual versus specific attributes, etc. Past approaches and new ones should be included; the next generation of strategies needs to be different, e.g., local orientation. Team 2 needs to follow NAS recommendations for better tools and should identify what is not known, including tools, tracking, growth, and categories that are needed. Since there are a lot of issues for which resources are unavailable, perhaps the team could consider bringing in experts on future tools or asking EPA for a report, e.g. effects of climate on AQM. More specifically, tools associated with non-traditional source issues and the different tools required by different sectors also need to be addressed. Other possible topics are barriers for cap and trade at airports and ports, apportionment of SIP credits, cleaner engines for aircraft, credit for U.S. automakers relative to greenhouse gases, near term ozone reductions, and integration of land use planning, transportation planning, and air quality management.

Information on what has worked for existing programs should be identified. A tool is needed for facilitating the exchange of information among those that have information to share; some information exchange mechanisms are already available, but a technologies website may prove useful.

The use of a matrix of strategies was questioned. Rather, the focus should be on tools, approaches, and options as to what has and has not worked. However, participants are reminded that the matrix approach is just intended to be a summary and not advocate specific approaches.

Finally, it was noted that the 38 Phase I recommendations have already identified tools. Brainstorming is good, but full Team 2 discussion on individual topics based on one or more white papers is desirable; categories already identified should be addressed first. Anna Garcia suggested drafting a work plan with dates; she will do that after the meeting adjourns. She will also pull together a preliminary timeline and some example tools, strategies and needs. The amended team 2 workplan is available on the AQM-CAAAC website as team 2 workplan outline.pdf

Phase 1 Implementation: – Rob Brenner

Rob Brenner, with Carrie Fitzmaurice via conference phone, provided an interim status report on the 38 Phase 1 recommendations. He began by noting the 15th anniversary (in November) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1990. Many good results have been produced, but not everything is done. Open discussion has been very helpful. As the 38 recommendations are implemented, it may be possible to identify and provide a good head start to the next stage in CAA amendments.

Rob plans to provide the next formal update on the 38 recommendations in November and will provide written documentation to participants. The update will provide a basis for determining whether EPA is on schedule, or if changes are needed. The information today is only preliminary, and detailed discussion is expected at the next subcommittee meeting (January/February 2006). At that time it may be desirable to bring in those involved in developing/implementing the recommendations to discuss their status and how they have gotten to where they are. Today the focus is on about 15 recommendations in four categories to provide an example of on-going progress. The four categories are: recommendations that are completed, recommendations with significant progress (some of which may be completed by the next meeting), recommendations for which a different direction has been taken, and recommendations that are ready to be implemented but for which resources need to be found and/or other opportunities for implementation need to be identified. It was noted that there are no increases in FY06 funding anywhere that can be used.

Recommendations that are completed:

- 3.4 Streamline Minor SIP Revisions – EPA Regional Offices have been surveyed and it has been found that States are not asking for additional capabilities. Lists of accomplishments and “letter approvals” have been addressed.
- 3.9 Co-Benefits of Innovative Measures – A website is being established; STAPPA is also developing its own website and will linkup with EPA’s site.
- 3.10 Innovative and Voluntary Measures – Guidance has been issued and a website developed.
- 3.11 SIP Credits for Bundled Innovative Measures – Guidance has been issued.

Recommendations with significant Progress:

2.5 Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines – Work is ongoing.

2.7 Cement Manufacturing, Petroleum Refining, and Pulp and Paper – Evaluation of additional emissions reductions from these sectors, screening level risk assessments, and cost effective emission reductions are being considered.

2.10 Residential Wood Smoke – Demonstration grants, change-outs, and outdoor wood boilers are all being considered.

2.13 Conformity – A PM2.5 settlement is being developed.

4.1 SIPs to Address Multipollutant Impacts – It was noted that a pilot for Detroit involving O3/PM is being considered, as well as specific facilities like steel. Also the anticipated OAQPS reorganization will include an orientation to multipollutant strategies.

Recommendations for which a different direction has been taken:

2.3 Non-Industrial Solvents – Preliminary review indicates that a national rule may not get big reductions and major litigation is a concern. Instead of rulemaking, incentives to manufacturers and public information are possibilities. For example, marketing and labeling approaches, other approaches to encourage manufacturers to improve products, and SIP credits are considerations.

2.4 Architectural Coatings – Regional/State rulemaking may be more stringent than at a national level, thus making a national rulemaking unnecessary.

3.2 Protocol for SIP Development – Regional Office and State interest is lagging on this topic, except for EPA Region 5 and Indiana.

Recommendations that are ready to be implemented, but resources need to be found:

3.3 Clearinghouse of Approved SIPs – A clearinghouse can be started, but funding is needed to continue support.

3.8 Effective Communication with Constituencies – It was noted that EPA communications staff are already swamped and can't take an additional workload. Discussions have been held with State/local agencies, but there have been no volunteers.

4.3 Greenhouse Gas Co-Benefits and Disbenefits – Tools have been developed but funding is needed for support.

A matrix of the recommendations and progress on each will be provided in November, and changes with discussion will be provided at the January 2006 meeting.

Participants generally expressed appreciation for Rob's update. Some concern was expressed that States, as implementers of the CAA, are good sources of information that may not have been fully considered. Their comments should be sought on implementation of the 38 recommendations, particularly to avoid undercutting established State rules and to insure equitable review of SIPs. Preliminary findings on the 38 recommendations may be premature with regard to coatings and solvents; problems with labeling issues for solvents were noted. The need to distinguish between "nutrition" and "star" labeling was also noted. Rob recognized the need to discuss findings with NESCAUM and other State groups; participation in STAPPA conference calls concerning criteria pollutants is anticipated.

A question was asked about the outcome of the reactivity workgroup. It was indicated that a lot was learned through that workgroup; information should be folded into recommendations on solvents/coatings, and guidance should be considered that gives States the right to consider reactivity on their own for SIPs.

One participant indicated that there is input on open burning that could be added from those involved with this topic; additional information has been found on an EPA website that was not previously available. The status of industrial boilers was also sought since this is the largest group of sources and it is important for regional controls; there is a need to complete the development of data that are beginning to be pulled together. Team 2 is also working on this type of information for industrial sectors. Rob indicated that industrial boilers will be tough to control and that flexibility is needed. The challenge is how to work together to get better controls within a fluid market with significant cost issues; there is a need to "think outside the box".

Greg Green closed the conversation by seeking input on the usefulness of this information; an invitation to contact Rob/Carrie for more information was made.

Decision Process: – Pat Cummins and Greg Green

Greg Green began this discussion by noting that there appears to have been agreement among participants in reaching the 38 Phase I short-term recommendations. In getting to those recommendations a "significant consensus" approach was used whereby the majority of participants appeared to agree with the individual recommendations. For the current AQM Subcommittee activity, Greg is suggesting an approach used by the Air Quality Management Working Group in making recommendations. That is, if there is not consensus, those who decline to agree are given a chance to prepare a written statement of their disagreement for inclusion in the final report. It was noted though that this was never really used by the Working Group because issues were eventually reconciled.

It was also noted that only three environmental groups are represented, so that if they disagree with other participants their credibility might be affected. There was also concern about representing the larger environmental community with only these three groups. Nevertheless, they will reach out to others to get the larger environmental community involved in the final process of reviewing recommendations. Tribal representation and positions on issues is another factor to consider with similar concerns.

Other thoughts on the decision process included the fact that everything is open and public; but that there is always a need to be aware of the makeup of the group and “process”. If there is an obvious non-consensus, then it is clear that this should be addressed. The Subcommittee shouldn’t proceed if a whole “sector” of interest disagrees. WESTAR uses the proposed process and has had occasion to use minority reports. CAAAC has rarely had to deal with non-consensus. The majority vote with allowance for dissension appears to be an acceptable approach for this AQM Subcommittee. However, minority reports should not get in the way of working for consensus.

Subcommittee Structure: – Pat Cummins and Greg Green

Greg Green noted that at this time the AQM Subcommittee is operating with a two team structure, each of which has a list of issues to address; Team 1 is focusing on the AQM planning process, whereas Team 2 is addressing new and improved AQM tools. It was noted that at this time the issues are listed with “arrows” and “dots”; there is a need to distinguish between these designators. It was explained that arrows are “priority” issues, but not exclusively, and that dots need further discussion. The teams were also reminded that to-date the discussion has focused on organization and process; however, no “work” has been done yet. The Subcommittee needs to move forward.

Pat Cummins noted that editorial changes have been made to the greenhouse gas issues, emphasizing the need for increased coordination; the changes effect a review and restatement of the NAS recommendation on this subject. The AQM Subcommittee will have to address this, but the statement also implies that the subcommittee recognizes ongoing efforts. Concern was expressed that this final statement doesn’t completely characterize the problem and that it shouldn’t be just assumed that greenhouse gases and climate change are going to happen and that we have to react. Others noted that the AQM mission is not to control greenhouse gases and that climate change and global warming are in fact happening and will continue to happen. However, it was also noted that States are doing climate related work, e.g., CO2. This forum provides an opportunity to integrate such ongoing work. More discussion on this topic will be needed later.

The conversation briefly turned to pollutant concentrations and health effects. Concern was expressed about technical capacity issues expressed in the NAS recommendations, especially ambient levels versus personal exposure. Relationships between what is in the air and the effects on health may not be fully understood, e.g. size characteristics of PM. What tools are needed and which team should address this issue? Also, exposure and risk must be addressed to help control strategies, e.g., those near

roadways. Jeff Underhill and Jeanette Clute will consider preparing a white paper for review by Team 1.

The representative from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) continued the health discussion by noting that California staff regularly consider health studies and has lots of information on PM health effects that do not appear to be widely understood. Briefings on the California experience can be provided, particularly on the relationship between emissions and health. It may not be necessary to really know the last piece in the relationship; controlling “mass” is effective. Another participant noted that there is a need to examine monitoring issues as part of identifying the problem. The Bachmann presentation was helpful in understanding assessment tools. More of this would be helpful to decision makers. Other informative presentations, including a California presentation on health effects, would also be helpful.

The “Structure” document came up again and Deb Stackhouse indicated that this document doesn’t need to be revised every time there is a new idea. Also, it was noted that overlaps and the relationship between Team 1 and Team 2 needs to be discussed and factored into work plans.

Team 1 Work Plan Presentation: – Janet McCabe

Janet McCabe handed out a revised table and a work plan to all participants; the amended version available in its revised version as team 1 workplan 11-05-05.pdf. The lettered table reduces the number of topics from 18 to 10 to 4 main topics; the four topics include Problem Definition, Air Quality Planning Process, AQM Coordinating Function, and Improve Communications/Partnerships. The team should proceed with white papers on the four topics. Volunteers for the white papers were identified during the discussion and are included in an updated version of the table; the inclusion of an EPA person on each topic is important. Others should let Janet know of their interest. Conference calls are scheduled for the 1st Tuesday of the month from 1 to 3pm EST. The first step is to have a more detailed outline prepared by Brock Nicholson by mid-November. Plans, activities, and products need to be shared with Team 2, given important overlaps. Janet noted that guidance is also needed on when a draft report is required for general review and on roles of individuals for the January meeting. Deb Stackhouse indicated that EPA staff will coordinate team calls and that names of those volunteering for the white papers would be e-mailed to participants along with the Bachmann presentation.

Team 2 Work Plan Presentation: – Anna Garcia

Anna Garcia handed out a work plan outline and a schedule of meetings and calls for Team 2 to all participants; the amended team 2 workplan is available on the AQM-CAAAC website as team 2 workplan outline.pdf

. Team 2 will have conference calls on Thursdays at 11 am EST; initial conference calls may be bi-weekly for 1 hour. Brainstorming ideas should be sent to Anna by Team 2 members to be listed and categorized on the first call; a connection with Ben Henneke’s Subcommittee (economic incentives) will be established. Plans are to e-

mail products to Team 2 participants and to cc: Team 1 members and others who are interested.

Wrap-up / Next Steps: – Pat Cummins and Greg Green

Rhetorically, a question was asked about how much lead time and how much massaging of reports is anticipated. What is the final product expected from the two teams? Is October 1, 2006 an acceptable target for complete draft reports? Is there sufficient time for external peer review? It was also noted that there is a need to keep the list of participants updated and to post draft documents on the CAAAC website.

Pat Cummins indicated that the next CAAAC meeting is in November in El Paso, TX; no subcommittee meetings are scheduled. Those attending can get together in available meeting space on November 16. Some members of Team 2 will be in El Paso, so an ad hoc meeting is possible.

Since the two teams need a working session, an AQM Subcommittee meeting, with draft papers available, is tentatively agreed upon for the last week in January, 2006. Specifically, January 24 – 25 is targeted with 2 full days (one day for each team). A southern or central location such as Dallas, Albuquerque, or Atlanta is to be considered.

Teams 1 and 2 should have draft issue papers no later than February 2006. A CAAAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 5 – 6 in Washington; this is a ½ to 2 day meeting so that teams could meet on April 4 for a full day and ½-day on April 5. The discussion could include a distributed draft paper.

Deb Stackhouse requested that teams send products to members of that team and to interested cc's for review of preliminary drafts; a list of potential addressees should be provided to Deb for distribution. Draft products should be circulated to all interested participants. Those products will be placed on the CAAAC website when a close-to-final version is available after comment.

The Brenner report on 38 Phase I recommendations should be made at the April meeting. Also there could be a report from CARB on health effects. Alternately, the health report could be on a special call in December or for the CAAAC meeting in April. This will be coordinated at a later time.

The meeting was concluded with a note that co-chairs for the two teams need to talk on a regular basis.