

Northern Class I Areas Consultation

Minutes

February 15, 2007

1 - 2 pm CDT

Attendees	State	Attendees
	Minnesota	Gordon Andersson, Mary Jean Fenske, Anne Jackson, Margaret McCourtney, Catherine Neuschler, John Seltz
	Michigan	Cindy Hodges, Teresa Walker
	Iowa	Matthew Johnson, Wendy Rains
	North Dakota	Tom Bachman, Dana Mount
	Wisconsin	Larry Bruss, Bob Lopez
	Missouri	Terry Rowles
	Tribes	Brandy Toft, Leech Lake
	FLMs	Chris Holbeck - Voyageurs Bruce Polkowsky - NPS Chuck Sams Trent Wickman – USFS – Superior
	RPOs	Mike Koerber – LADCO/MRPO Jeff Peltola – CENRAP
	EPA	Matt Rau

Agenda Items

Agenda, Minutes from Previous Call

The minutes from the last call (January 9) are approved and can be posted.

Review of Minnesota's January 31 Stakeholder Meeting

Thanks to all who presented or attended. The meeting went well. Presentations from the meeting are available online at <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/air/regionalhaze.html>. The meeting was focused on technical information sharing, but Minnesota did state that they were leaning towards deciding that CAIR=BART for EGUs, and no concerns about that decision have been raised.

Decision Points Document

Items from the decision points document were discussed. Item 1.4 was discussed in January, and cannot be completed until we have information from the CENRAP PSAT modeling. Item 1.5, on the meteorological conditions was discussed. It was agreed that, as noted in the Technical Summary on page 3, the worst visibility days are associated with transport from the south, while good visibility days are associated with more northerly transport. Bad visibility days occur throughout the year.

Item 2.2 will be discussed on the next call. Some monitoring days with poor visibility were thrown out, despite having monitored data for the pollutants we are most concerned about. Adding these days back changes baseline visibility conditions. Similar missing data or data substitution issues are occurring in WRAP and VISTAS. Information on this change will be distributed and 2.2 will be discussed on the next call.

Accuracy of IPM Runs

If EPA's IPM runs for 2018 do not account for all known projects and emission reductions, we need to decide what information on future emissions will be used. Information from IPM runs could be adjusted, new IPM runs could be done, or a completely different inventory could be used. MN in particular believes that the IPM data (from IPM-VISTAS run) will have to be adjusted, as it does not include some known projects. MN is going through and adjusting some emissions to account for known projects or areas where projections seem unrealistic (e.g. A tripling of emissions from a plant operating near capacity) and is offering the other states (particularly IL, IA, ND, and WI) the chance to adjust their future inventories to be used in developing the adjusted IPM scenario. MN intends to apply control strategies to the adjusted scenario. WI raised concerns about which projects are included, since announcements of emission reductions are not enforceable. Iowa noted that they have units that have applied for permits for pollution reduction projects that are not included in IPM, as well as some plants that show strange emission rates. Mike Koerber states that alternate scenarios are probably a better solution than just tweaking an IPM run, because emissions lowered in one area are likely to pop up in another. WI suggested that we need multiple future scenarios: including an IPM scenario and a hopeful/best guess. CENRAP is going to do something similar with a high, low, best guess, and IPM scenario. Although it is difficult for some states and MRPO to support Minnesota's schedule due to the timing of haze and attainment SIPs, it was agreed that Minnesota would prepare a report that other states could check. This group could further discuss what are appropriate future scenarios.

ECR Update

ECR has submitted some plans – documented in their methodology document and list of chosen sectors on the LADCO website, and in the document listing individual sources that has been sent to the states. Yesterday they presented a summary of the four factor analysis for ORB controls, and then the four factor analysis for one strategy for one sector as an example analysis. These analyses were not complete. A call will be held on March 5, at which time it will hopefully be more clear what results can be obtained from the four factor analysis. Bill Battye of ECR will speak at the LADCO meeting in March, focusing on results from EGU and ICI boiler sectors. Now expecting full report by end of April.

Upcoming Meetings/Next Call

LADCO is having a meeting on March 21 and 22. The 22nd is focused on haze.

Next call is Monday, March 12 at 1 central/2 eastern.

(Remember Daylight Savings Time starts March 11 this year, so check electronic calendars carefully!)