

Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Areas Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call

Draft Minutes

January 12, 2007

11:00 to 12:20 pm EST

Attendees:

- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
- Mark Prettyman of Delaware
- Andy Heltibridle of Maryland
- Ray Papalski of New Jersey
- Anna Garcia of OTC
- Ann Acheson of USFS
- Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
- Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Wick Havens of Pennsylvania
- Gary Kleiman of NESCAUM
- Bob Kelly of EPA Region II
- Mike Koerber of LADCO
- Pat Brewer of VISTAS
- Arthur Werner and William Hodan of MACTEC
- Susan Wierman, Pat Davis, and Angela Crenshaw of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was to discuss the way in which key sources and sources categories will be determined.

Determining Key Sources: Wierman spoke about the various reasons why the workgroup is interested in the top sources that affect MANE-VU. Then the revised version of the top source list was reviewed. A discussion began about whether or not to include BART sources and other sources that have begun or will begin installing control measures. Koerber stated that LADCO had excluded all non-EGU BART sources from their analysis of specific sources. It was stated that Motiva has a consent order and Westvaco is in the process of putting on scrubbers. It was also stated that part of the P.H. Glatfelter plant is controlled under BART. As a follow-up from the previous call Lee Warden of the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality was contacted about the large primary metal source in Missouri and it was discovered that the Doe Run Herculanum smelter is still active, but the Doe Run Glover smelter has been shut down (Oklahoma DEQ has the smelter as active in 2002 but shut down from 2009 onwards). Wishinski stated that there is no need to re-invent the wheel and if information and data about sources that could possibly put on controls exists we should use it. In the case of Motiva it was stated that MACTEC could put the control measure information in a summary in the four factors report.

Koerber stated that LADCO used three criteria to choose specific sources to analyze: emissions, Q/d, and input modeling. He also stated that they are only analyzing facilities

in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. LADCO is looking at ten EGUs and ten non-EGUs (including cement, glass, ICI boilers, refineries, and lime kilns).

Wishinski stated that he thinks the analysis should look at the top sources, excluding BART controlled sources, with an impact on MANE-VU Class I areas and added that many of these sources have an affect on Shenandoah as well. The top ten facilities that affect MANE-VU Class I areas are LaFarge, Kodak, Motiva, Westvaco, St. Lawrence, NRG Energy, P.H. Glatfelter, Sappi-Somerset, UGI Development Co/Hunlock Power Station, and Great Northern. Wishinski also recommended including any source outside the MANE-VU region which emitted more than 10,000 tons of SO₂ in 2002 and cross-reference this to the top thirty list. That might mean expanding these ten by adding four more sources that are outside of MANE-VU including MW Custom Papers, PPG Industries, Eastman Chemical Company, and Williams Ethanol Services.

Papalski inquired about looking at sources outside of MANE-VU. Wierman stated that the analysis should look at sources outside of MANE-VU that affect MANE-VU class I areas, but the analysis for Shenandoah should only include sources within MANE-VU.

Herb was concerned that the methodology of using the SCC level emissions data may have resulted in the omission of units with higher emissions than units included in the list. For example, the list of sources only contained one boiler for the Weyerhaeuser/Johnsonburg Mill facility but there are two and there is also a second Pennsylvania facility on the list where this is the case. If there are at least two facilities in Pennsylvania, then there are probably some in other states. Wierman asked the workgroup if more information is needed or if the project can move on with the current information. It was agreed that more modeling needs to be completed before the specific source list can be determined.

Determining Key Sources Categories: Koerber said LADCO is not quite finished with their list of categories to analyze, but that it presently includes EGUs, ICI boilers, on-road NO_x, off road NO_x, agricultural ammonia, and prescribed burning. Wierman noted that MANE-VU's list so far does not include glass and refineries.

VISTAS update: Brewer stated that the VISTAS states are having discussions that are similar to what was discussed on the call today. The VISTAS states are doing analysis that includes Brigantine and CENRAP states. Regarding whether to include BART sources, she noted that only under reasonable progress will you review impacts of entire facilities- BART analysis looks at individual units. She recommended that if a source outside MANE-VU is chosen for analysis, the first step would be to contact the specific state first, to see if they are doing a 4-factor analysis of that source and if collaboration is possible. Brewer also stated that she would like to participate as much as possible with the MANE-VU reasonable progress project so that the MANE-VU and VISTAS projects run parallel.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was tentatively scheduled for Thursday, January 18, 2007 at 2pm.

Wishinski, Sipple, Prettyman, and Davis will continue working on the modeling and modeling inputs so that facilities with the greatest impact on Class I areas can be chosen.

After the call, Sipple, Prettyman, Davis, and Crenshaw will discuss what additional modeling needs to be completed.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.

Wierman, Crenshaw, and Davis will prepare a proposed option for discussion on the next call.