

Minutes
Alamo Area Council of Governments
Air Improvement Resources Technical Committee Meeting
Monday, January 11, 2010, 1:30 p.m.
Al J. Notzon III Board Room
8700 Tesoro Drive, Suite 100
San Antonio, TX 78217-6228

Members Present

Renee Green, Chair, Bexar County
Kristen Lagow Bettis, SAMHP
William Barker, COSA
Doris Cooksey, CPS
Ken Zigrang, TxDOT
Forrest Mims, Guadalupe County
Peter Bella, AACOG
Nick Page, MPO
Christina Castano, VIA Metro Transit

Guests Present

Brett Davis, Zephyr Env.
Chaz Gallagher, Alamo Cement
Lee Garrett, Terracon
Joe A. Lambert, Terracon
Bill Telford, Aviation Department COSA
Debra Engler, SAWS
Dean Word III, Dean Word Co. Ltd.
Paul Detterline, Capitol Aggregates, Ltd
Mike Montemeyor, COSA PCEH

Staff Present

Brenda Williams, Outreach Manager
Steven Smeltzer, Environmental Manager
Annette Prosterman, Outreach Coordinator
Parviz Nazem, Transportation Specialist
Berti Vaughan, Administrative Assistant

Minutes

1. Meeting Called to Order

Chair Renee Green called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call

The Chair called roll and declared a quorum.

3. Citizens to be Heard

There were no citizens signed up to be heard.

4. Approval of AIR Technical Committee Meeting Minutes for November 9, 2009

Chair Green asked the committee for consideration of the November 9, 2009 AIR Technical Committee minutes and requested a motion to approve. Steve Smeltzer and Forrest Mims asked for clarification on certain comments.

- Mr. Smeltzer asked for the following amended remark to the November 9 minutes. “He said developing a second episode will be required (change to) *is strongly recommended* by EPA when the new standard is established.”
- Mr. Mims remarked that the intent of his comments reflected the following. “Mr. Mims stated that the only recourse left to San Antonio was a suit based on the lack of health study activity.” (change to) “Mr. Mims stated that the only recourse left to San Antonio was a suit based on the lack of a study showing an impact to human health.”

Chair Green asked for a motion to approve minutes and that clarification be made in these minutes. Forrest Mims made the motion to approve the minutes with the clarification. Ken Zigrang seconded the motion. The Chair called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Ozone & Particulate Matter Report Update

A. **Action Item:** Request for expedited 2009 ozone monitoring data quality verification by TCEQ.

Peter Bella updated the committee using data in the ozone report hand out. He pointed to the first table on the ozone report showing compliance with the eight-hour ozone standard, for the San Antonio Region thru January 10, 2010. He said he anticipated that designations would be made using the three-year average set (2008, 2009 and 2010) regardless of how the actual standard is revised by EPA. Mr. Bella explained that the center table contained draft compliance acknowledging variability in the standard by the time the 2011 designation was made. He said in all likelihood, the EPA is looking at a design value requirement for either 60 parts per billion (ppb), 65 ppb or 70 ppb. In conclusion, Mr. Bella explained a bottom table listing values from 2007-2009 for comparison.

Chair Green requested a report on trends indicating a decline in their eight-hour ozone averages comparatively from Texas cities in non-attainment. Mr. Smeltzer said he would provide one.

Mr. Bella said there was nothing new to report on particulate matter as the numbers remained well within the standard.

Mr. Bella presented a letter requesting that TCEQ expedite verification of 2009 ozone monitoring data quality. The letter had been approved and signed by Chairman Millikin and Judge Wolff. He explained that the letter had been sent to the TCEQ on January 4, 2010 in order to expedite the request. On January 6, the EPA reserved the right to extend making those designations based on the existing standards until March 2011. Mrs. Green recommended that another letter be drawn up more reflective of what the EPA announced on January 6, 2010. Mrs. Green suggested several changes to the draft letter.

Chair Green asked for a motion that would approve a draft letter going to the AIR Executive Committee for approval with the changes discussed and that Mr. Bella make the changes and then e-mail a copy to the committee for their review. Bill Barker so moved. Forrest Mims seconded the motion. The Chair called for the vote. The motion passed.

6. Update: Region, State, Federal Actions.

A. Ongoing review of NAAQS for Criteria Pollutants

Mr. Peter presented information on criteria pollutants. He reported that lead standards were changed in October 2008 therefore reducing the level permissible by the EPA. He would keep the committee posted on the changes in the standards.

B. EPA's Proposed Revisions of the federal 8-hour average Ozone Standard

Mr. Bella reported that on January 6, 2010, the EPA proposed to strengthen the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone, the main component of smog. He presented the following information.

- EPA is proposing to strengthen the 8-hour "primary" ozone standard, designed to protect public health, to a level within the range of 0.060-0.070 parts per million (ppm).
- EPA is also proposing to establish a distinct cumulative, seasonal "secondary" standard, designed to protect sensitive vegetation and ecosystems, including forests, parks, wildlife refuges and wilderness areas. EPA is proposing to set the level of the secondary standard within the range of 7-15 ppm-hours.
- EPA will take public comment for 60 days following publication of the proposal in the Federal Register. The agency also will hold public hearings on the proposal in the following three locations:
 - February 2, 2010, Arlington, Va., and in Houston, Texas
- EPA will issue final standards by August 31, 2010.

a. Review of Nonattainment Planning process

In addition, Mr. Bella presented and explained the chronology of the following table. Discussion was held on the proposed deadlines and the need to respond with the region's comments in a resolution.

Propose Standards	January 6, 2010 (signature date)
Proposed Rule appears in <i>Federal Register</i> *	~ January 20, 2010 (about two weeks after FR publication)
States Comment on Review	120 days after FR publication
Propose Implementation Rule*	March 2010
Final Standards Signed	August 31, 2010
Final Implementation Rule Signed	November 2010
State Designation Recommendations to EPA	January 2011
Propose Designations*	April 2011
Final Designations and Classifications	Effective no later than August 2011
State Implementation Plans	Due December 2013
Attainment Dates	2014-2031 (depends on severity of problem)

*Opportunity for Public Comment; 60 days for proposed rule comments.

*The EPA will NOT reconsider early Action Compacts as a planning option.

*The EPA is NOT requesting comments on whether to retain the current 75 ppb limit.

- b. **Action Item:** Discussion; first consideration and possible approval of comments in response to proposed revision

Discussion was held on amending several of the proposed comments on the draft resolution.

Chair Green asked for a motion to approve a draft resolution with the changes to include striking paragraph three if in fact the health department can't support it, adding the additional whereas we disagreed with the lowering of the standard to begin with, and making the change on the now therefore be it resolved by striking # 2 and revising #1 to .075 parts per billion. Nick Page made the motion. Peter Bella seconded the motion. The Chair asked for the vote. The motion passed.

Mr. Smeltzer presented a cost analysis using a power point presentation using scenarios under the proposed EPA revisions. The following information was discussed.

EPA's Cost Estimates of the Proposed Revision

- EPA estimates the value of health benefits of reducing ozone to 0.070 ppm would range from about \$13 billion to \$37 billion per year in 2020.
- The costs of reducing ozone to 0.070 ppm would range from an estimated \$19 billion to \$25 billion per year in 2020.
- For a standard of 0.060 ppm, the value of benefits would range from about \$35 billion to \$100 billion per year in 2020.
- For a standard of 0.060 ppm, the costs would range from \$52 billion to \$90 billion.

June 2006 Photochemical Modeling

- A projected 2013 emission inventory was developed for the June 2006 Photochemical Modeling Episode
- Predicted 2013 Design Values at regulatory monitors exceeding the proposed standard*:
 - CAMS 23 - 69.2 ppb
 - CAMS 58 - 69.9 ppb
- Photochemical Modeling results indicate that San Antonio could meet a 70 ppb 8-hour ozone standard in 2013 without additional control strategy implementation
- Only NOx reductions were considered in the cost analysis for a possible 65 ppb and 60 ppb standards
- The 2013 projection is not sensitive to VOC reductions

NOx Reduction Costs

- Cost per ton is based on the average cost for TERP projects: \$8,592 per ton of NOx
- Annual Bexar County Anthropogenic NOx Emissions = 60,244 tons in 2013
- To achieve the 65 ppb standard, the cost of reducing NOx is \$215 million (60,244 tons of NOx X 42% X \$8,592)
- To achieve the 60 ppb standard, the cost of reducing NOx is \$389 million (60,244 tons of NOx X 75% X \$8,592)

Mr. Bella commented that these values were not at all representative of the anticipated costs across all sectors.

Conclusion

- Cost estimates do not include Health Benefits
- Will costs per ton be more expensive once the “low hanging fruit” is gone?
- Will point source NOx reductions be more or less expensive than TERP projects?

C. Update: TCEQ's actions in response EPA's review of the Texas Air Permit Program.

Mr. Bella reported that there was one item before the EPA from the Air Permitting process that might have been something to cause a federal sanctions clock to start if TCEQ did not address it. TCEQ has begun addressing this, and has set up public hearings.

7. Next Meeting Date: Monday, February 8, 2010

Chair Green reminded the Committee that the next meeting of the AIR Technical Committee was scheduled on Monday, February 8, 2010.

8. Adjournment

With no further action to be discussed. The meeting was adjourned.