



Missouri
Department of
Natural Resources

St. Louis Ozone Designation Process Meeting Summary
Powder Valley Conservation Center
Kirkwood, MO
June 10, 2008
10 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Staff Present:

Aaron Basham
David Lamb
Jeff Bennett
Jim Kavanaugh
Joe Winkelmann
John Rustige
Rebecca Birke
Tom Markowski, SLRO

Others Present by Attendance Record:

David Grimes, Southeast Missouri Regional Planning Commission
Albert Fults, Ste. Genevieve County Commission
Schuyler Johnson, Chemical Lime Co
Steve Brune, Boonslick RPC
Rob Kaleel, Illinois EPA
Jim Ross, Illinois EPA
Mike Henderson, MoDOT
Vicky Huesemann, St. Charles County Government
Roy C. Hengerson, Sierra Club
Scott D. Lemmons, ENVIRON Corp
Chad Howell, St. Louis Development Corp
Tyler Harris, City of St. Louis - Air Pollution Control
Roger Walker, REGFORM
Kimberly Lagomarsino, Mississippi Lime Co
Tom Siedhoff, Mississippi Lime Co
Ken Anderson, Ameren
David Shanks, Boeing
Mike Coulson, East West Gateway Council of Governments
Susannah Fuchs, American Lung Association
Michael Zlatic, Saint Louis County Health Department
Chad Fisher, Anheuser-Busch Inc.
Tim Embree, Mayor Francis Slay's Office
Dean Pusch, Anheuser-Busch Inc.

Opening Remarks:

Jim Kavanaugh, Director of the Air Pollution Control Program –Mr. Kavanaugh thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He explained that this is the first of a series of meetings that will be held by the department. This meeting will serve to get everyone on the same page about the ozone designation process. This will be mostly informational, with future meetings being more technical. There will be plenty of opportunities to provide input and make comments.

He went on to explain that many people have questions about what nonattainment means. ie: What controls will be necessary? Who decides the controls? We don't have all of those answers, yet. EPA will be providing more information to that regard once our recommendation is completed. For now we want to discuss what our process is and how we get to a recommendation.

He then asked attendees to go around the room and introduce themselves. He then turned it over to Jeff Bennett and John Rustige, both Environmental Engineers with the Department of Natural Resources' Air Pollution Control Program.

Jeff Bennett – Jeff discussed the agenda. He explained that this is not an optional process. The process itself is much the same as it was in the past. We are required by the federal government to do this. He will lead the discussion about what the designation process will be. He encouraged people to ask questions along the way and to let him know what they wanted to hear more about.

John Rustige – John discussed the previous 1997 ozone standard. He explains how you arrive at a design value. An average of the fourth highest value at each monitor over a three year period is how they are derived and rounding was an option then.

The new standard is lower or tightened now and rounding is not allowed. We did a lot of work to achieve air quality standard in St. Louis. He discussed the Inspection and Maintenance program and its approval into the SIP. The I/M program is a key component of the ongoing effort to improve air quality in the St. Louis area.

History of ozone planning in the St. Louis area – slide highlights the major rules that have helped St. Louis meet federal standards (see presentation). He wanted to give everyone a sense of how much effort has gone into controlling ozone in the area.

The mobile source controls are an important part of this effort. They include I/M, Stage II Vapor Recovery, and Reformulated Gasoline. All still in place and all still good control mechanisms.

New standard is 75 ppb. Area meets the new standard at 75ppb, no rounding is allowed.

Slide shows map of the current ozone design values. All but two of these are above the new ozone standard. These are using 2005-2007 data. 2008 data may be pulled into this analysis once it is quality assured.

John discusses the timeline and when our recommendation needs to be completed. EPA has the final authority to make this decision and they will share this with the state. March 2009 will be the expected date of final designations.

Question: Can data outside of the 2007 timeline be used for the recommendation?

Answer: This data will need to be quality assured, so the initial timeline does not allow for this. However, we will submit an addendum with the latest ozone information so that 2008 data can be included in EPA's review of our recommendation. EPA will likely base their recommendation on 2006-2008 ozone data, so it will be included in a later submittal.

Question: What if 2005-2007 shows better numbers than the 2006-2008 data? Would we have to use this data if it "hurts us"?

Answer: We have to use the most recent data no matter what the numbers show. It would be difficult to base a recommendation on older data. The 2006-2008 data has to be submitted regardless. EPA will be looking at it no matter what it shows.

Question: The State Implementation Plan is not due until the summer of 2013. How can anyone practically reach attainment by the 2013 deadline?

Answer: Because St. Louis is a moderate nonattainment area, there is a lot of variability in how long they give you to reach the standard. So, bottom line, because they have more of an ozone problem, they will have more time to implement the necessary controls.

Jeff Bennett – Jeff explained that EPA's guidance for making designations is expected in late 2008. His suspicion is that we will be talking about slight modifications to the recommendation based on any new guidance that we may receive. The fact that we won't have "new guidance" will not stop us from getting through this process. We basically have to use the criteria that we used in the past until further notice.

To determine whether an area is going to be designated as a nonattainment area you have to do a "test". Ask yourself: Does a monitor in your area/county show monitored violations of the standard? If the answer is "yes" - nonattainment is probable – you don't get to choose.

A second "test" –Does any other county contribute to the ozone that causes those monitors to violate the standard? If it is clear that they contribute, they're in nonattainment.

Why is the MSA important? It is the default boundary. When EPA begins their review of the data, the MSA is their starting point for the boundary. Missouri and Illinois suggested in the past that this is not the appropriate boundary and had to make a case to support this. We have to make a case to show them who is really contributing and who is not. That is the starting point for the boundary, but not the ending point. They could pull in or add more than just those counties that make up the MSA if they see that it is necessary.

Question: Ste. Genevieve – Will it be included in the St. Louis nonattainment area?

Answer: We are still looking at this, the decision is not made. It is violating, but will it be its own nonattainment area and not part of the St. Louis nonattainment area, that we don't know yet.

Note: Even if a county doesn't have a monitor, it still may be included because it is contributing to other areas that have monitors violating. We have to prove its level of contribution, but it is a possibility.

Question: How we will determine what a significant contribution to a violating monitor is?

Answer: It is part of the evaluation process. There is not a certain number or limit rule that tells us this answer. There is no federal guidance on this issue. It isn't that easy, we look to common sense. How that geographical area compares to another geographic area helps us to get our answer. If there is an obvious source or clear contribution, that makes it easier. But sometime it is just not that clear. Once we come to a decision, we have to make the case and support that decision.

Transport should be accounted for and this should also come will also come into our evaluation. It is not anyone criteria of the 11, they all have to be looked at collectively. It is relative to each area. We will be as transparent as possible on this. The concept is difficult.

Question: Even though you haven't received the new criteria, you are moving forward? Why?

Answer: Yes we are moving forward. We have a rigorous timeline for this process. Also, EPA recommended that we use criteria from the previous designation to get started.

Four Concepts to remember in the designation criteria: violating monitors, emission contributions, and traffic and commuting patterns – you have to establish connectivity with the upwind or downwind metropolitan area, and growth – population, census data, employment growth. Meteorological data plays a roll in this as well. What pattern is there that shows us how the ozone is moving. How much does each of these criteria support inclusion? This is a part of it.

Question: Will you take the new engine rules coming down from the federal government into account as controls for ozone?

Answer: To the extent that we can we will, but we don't generally have specific enough information about what these reductions will be. We don't turn a blind eye to these; however, it is just an estimate. There is uncertainty about the impact of national controls.

Question: Have DNR or EPA thought about what impact GHG emission reductions will have on ozone reductions?

Answer: It may have been thought about, but it has not come up yet, however there is correlation. We will start looking at all pollutants collectively in the Air Quality Management Plan for St. Louis, but we can't do anything stricter than the feds at this point.

County boundaries are our natural boundaries. Making the case to break up a county in the past, was not well-received by EPA. So, we usually don't attempt to break them up.

The nonattainment area in downtown St. Louis has done a lot to try to meet the standard. We don't have a lot of flexibility when it comes to when a county shows violations at monitoring sites.

Monitored Violation Area – see slide. These areas have high ozone levels, but are outside of the current control window. We are only at the point of deciding who is in or out. We are not discussing, yet, what that county is required to do.

Question: How many potential nonattainment areas will there be in the state?

Answer: Three to five depending on how they are grouped. We are talking to EPA about the possibilities.

Question: How will we handle larger areas of the state that do not have monitors?

Answer: Extrapolation of data between two monitoring sites could give us this information. This is different than the contribution factor, though. Or if there is no data, you don't have anything to stand on. We may have to classify those areas as with an "unclassifiable" designation. EPA will also be proposing a new monitoring rule that could help us with this. Yes, there are counties that are unclassifiable, but EPA may give us guidance on how to deal with these areas. We may also be shifting and adding monitors to help with this.

You can not designate an area without data to back it up. Ozone monitors – we are looking at moving some from the St. Louis area.

Question: What is the timeline for moving those monitors?

Answer: The process requires us to go through a network review, which we are doing now. We then evaluate where we need to put additional monitors. The timeline for this decision is not yet clear.

Question: Do you plan to look at the Meteorological data that facilities had to provide for their permits to assist with this process?

Answer: We probably won't do this by default. This met data is too specific; we need to look at the larger picture on weather patterns. It is more of a regional issue and requires a broader approach.

Question: What is background and how does it play into this decision-making process?

Answer: It does not have a lot to do with setting the standard. Background allows us to look at the precursors for ozone and where they come from. All the emissions that are coming in that are carried along, the background monitors allow us to get a picture of where these pollutants are coming from. Background is everything that is coming in that we do not have any control over. CAIR helps us with this issues and the NOx SIP call helped us to address this. Cars are also getting cleaner so that will help us. Think of background as what is being developed somewhere else that is coming into the area.

Question: What are our background monitors?

Answer: The definition of a monitor can change based on weather patterns. Depending on the wind any monitor can, at one point or another, be a background monitor for determining contribution from other areas.

Question: Does the Clean Air Act need some retooling? Is that politically possible?

Answer: The CAA establishes the requirement for reassessing the NAAQS every five years. The last implementation took seven years, you decide.

Question: Are there any significant natural sources of NO_x?

Answer: Corn does contribute, but most NO_x sources are not biogenic. NO_x is mostly emitted by utilities and mobile sources, but controls on each have been getting better.

Question: What controls that are on the way will help us?

Answer: CAIR, Vehicle Miles Traveled are lowering, and cleaner cars will be major players in this. Mobile sources have always been predominant driver of ozone issues, and the more we can do to control them the more we protect air quality.

Question: Will EPA suggest statewide I/M?

Answer: We don't know what EPA will do. That is a major under-taking.

Opportunity for Input:

We are looking at the criteria, and in general we are looking at emissions inventory data and transportation and commuting patterns. We need quality-assured local information that is more accurate than the national averages that we have access to. Local, more refined data will assist us in this process. Population and economic growth and commuting patterns that you can provide to us will also be helpful.

See the old recommendation to help get in touch with how this process worked in the past. It can be found on the Web site.

The Web page allows you to submit appropriate information directly to us. If you have given some thought about the designation process and you can argue a case either way about why an area should or should not be included, please let us know. If you can support an argument please share those with us. Fresh ideas always help us get a handle on each area's specific situation.

There will be plenty of opportunities for input on this process. If this is anything like the last time, we did not agree with EPA and we needed all the facts to support our recommendation and position on this process.

Discussion of next meetings: Next "technical" meeting is expected in late July. Last meeting will be sometime in September.

See timeline slide – this is why we are in a hurry on this. The schedule is rigorous. Public hearing will have to take place in early December at the MACC meeting.

Thanks everyone.