Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Areas Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
December 20, 2006
10:00 to 11:30 am EST

Attendees:
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
- Andy Heltibridle of Maryland
- Nancy Herb or Pennsylvania
- Ray Papalski of New Jersey
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Susan Wierman, Pat Davis, and Angela Crenshaw of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was scheduling and planning. We need to keep in mind that the MANE-VU Commissioners meeting is March 1, 2007, the Air Director’s Meeting is in late January or early February and we need to get deliverables out two weeks before the Commissioners meeting. According to MACTEC’s schedule the methodology and control measures deliverable should be available by then. The focus of the March meeting will be sulfur control measures (CAIR+, ICI boilers, home heating/fuel oil, wood burning, etc.) Thus we need to develop as much as possible before then.

Residential Wood Combustion (RWC): There are three categories of RWC: fireplaces, wood burning stoves and outdoor wood boilers (OWBs). The recent increase in interest in OWBs was discussed. It was suggested that the northeastern states propose standards similar to those in Washington and Oregon. It was also suggested that a change-out program should be discussed at the MANE-VU Air Director’s meeting.

Individual Sources and Source Categories: Modeling shows that sulfate has the highest impact on Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic Class I areas; thus in preparation individual sources and source categories should be primarily based on sulfate. CALPUFF runs were discussed. It was emphasized that entire sources be examined because the use of SCCs would split the sources giving them the appearance that they contribute less, thus we need to look at entire sources. It was stated that we need to input on picking the top 30 sources. It was suggested that we do the top sulfate emitting sources. It was also suggested that the
ranking should be based on impact on Class I areas, not emission totals. It was also suggested that Shenandoah and Dolly Sods should be in the analysis as well.

Update on the Activities of other RPOs: LADCO is considering CAIR+ and state collaborative work in their analysis. They are only looking at sources affecting their Class I areas and those states consider this to be the first cut at the analysis. LADCO invited other RPOs to sit in on their calls and they are trying to run an open process. MARAMA is supportive of getting other states involved. Since neither VISTAS nor LADCO are looking outside their region, that we need to look outside our region to assess impacts on nearby Class I areas. It was stated that LADCO added visibility improvement to their analysis and that this may be a topic for further discussion.

Reasonable Progress Workgroup: It was suggested that this group (in addition to Jeff Underhill of New Hampshire who was unable to be on this call) should be the Reasonable Progress Workgroup. It was also suggested that the workgroup needs to look at a more long-term outlook (wider than the scope of what MACTEC is analyzing), for example, considering which additional controls could be put into the 2018 inventory. Other attendees expressed agreement with this idea. The Commissioners approved looking at 500 ppb sulfur in fuels. The more time and notice that industry is given, the more cost effective the controls will be. The 2018 BOTW inventory currently does not include the sulfur controls ok’d by the Commissioners. Other controls such as high efficiency furnaces, low sulfur fuel oil, and scrubbers should be evaluated.

Modeling: It was stated that the modeling should be done soon. However, New Jersey is concerned that Brigantine will fall short of uniform progress targets. It was agreed that NESCAUM will do a CMAQ run and then do REMSAD tagging.

Next steps: The Reasonable Progress Project Kick-off Call with MACTEC was scheduled for Friday, January 5, 2007 at 11am. The next Workgroup call was scheduled for Friday, January 12, 2007 at 11am.

Wishinski and Davis will continue working on the modeling and modeling inputs so that individual sources with the most impact on Class I areas can be chosen.

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

It was also stated that a meeting between NESCAUM and the fuel oil industry was in the works.
Attendees:

- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Tom Downs of Maine
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
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- Anna Garcia of OTC
- Ann Acheson of USFS
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Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was reviewing the charge to the Reasonable Progress Workgroup Committee, reviewing the schedule for the Reasonable Progress Goals Project, discussing the way in which key sources and sources categories will be determined, and reviewing the modeling proposed approach including which control scenarios will be evaluated.

Draft Charge to the Reasonable Progress Goals Workgroup: Wierman noted that the MANE-VU Air Directors agreed to the idea of having a Reasonable Progress Workgroup. Wierman reviewed the Draft Charge to the Reasonable Progress Goals Workgroup document and inquired about EPA finalizing their guidance document. The guidance document had not been finalized but MANE-VU intended to follow the draft. Wierman stated that MACTEC was hired as the contractor for assessing the four statutory factors. Then the schedule for the project was reviewed and emphasis was placed on the need for a timely review of draft work products so that comments can be submitted to
MACTEC on time and the project could stay on track. For clarification Kleiman stated that the analysis should give information about important measures for improving visibility and there is no need to repeat work that has already been completed.

**Determining Key Sources and Sources Categories:** Davis described the list of Draft Top SO\textsubscript{2} Emitters list that was sent out saying that it is the top emitters based on processes (parts of units) not summed up facility totals. It was stated that Sipple, Davis, and Wishinski would work together to compile a more complete source list. MACTEC needs to document and cite the work that has already been done and then figure out the costs and other factors that go along with control measures.

It was clarified that 2002 is the baseline year. Sabo of MACTEC inquired about what should be done with sources that have put on significant controls since 2002 (such as Motiva). Koerber stated that LADCO eliminated all facilities subject to BART and all EGUs and non-EGUs that have consent agreements, this cut their list of specific sources to analyze to 10 sources. Wierman inquired if this approach was reasonable for MANE-VU. Workgroup members stated that it was reasonable.

It was stated that LADCO has a longer list of source categories compared to MANE-VU. MACTEC was tasked to look at the list of sources VISTAS and LADCO are analyzing and see if MANE-VU needs to add any additional sources to its list. Sipple stated that primary metal production should be added as a source because there is a large source located in Missouri that impacts MANE-VU. Davis stated that he would check the inventory for the source and contact CENRAP to see if it has any controls in place.

It was also agreed that ICI boilers will be broken down to individual groups (industrial, commercial, and home) for the analysis. It was stated that Bodnarik of New Hampshire would be a good source of information of MACTEC in this category.

The process for gathering information was discussed and Koerber recommended that if information is needed about a source outside MANE-VU, begin with contacting the state Air Director and that MACTEC can work with LADCO. Wierman agreed with the idea of a multi-pronged effort and that once a source list is agreed upon, MARAMA will send information to LADCO and the Air Directors and then MACTEC can contact the Air Directors directly.

**Key Pollutants:** Koerber stated that LADCO is looking at ammonia and asked if MANE-VU should as well. Wierman said sulfate, organic carbon, and wood smoke are significant sources according to the MANE-VU contribution assessment. It was stated that Class I areas in rural areas were the most impacted by wood smoke from residential wood combustion. It was agreed that since the contribution assessment said the dominant visibility impairing pollutants in the region are sulfate, organic carbon, and wood smoke, and organic carbon was believe to be dominated by natural sources, MANE-VU would stick with analyzing sulfate sources and wood smoke.
Control Measures: Wierman asked if any source controls not considered by OTC should be highlighted. It was agreed that a cost analysis of decreasing sulfur fuels to 15 and 500 ppm is vital to the project.

Outdoor wood boilers in the MANE-VU region were brought up and Sabo stated that he had information on the topic and NESCAUM is currently working on a model rules for outdoor wood boilers. Papalski stated that Washington and Oregon have a lower standard for fireplace inserts and woodstoves than EPA and as a group we should look into wood stove change-out programs. Papalski suggested that at a minimum, we should be looking at fireplace inserts and woodstoves in the reasonable progress analysis under the category residential wood combustion and open burning.

Modeling: Wishinski gave a review of the modeling work that has been done. There seemed to be some confusion about what sources were included so it was agreed that a short explanation document about the modeling that was done will be written along with a revised version of the top 100 sources.

NESCAUM is working on a 2018 run and a supplement BOTW-2 run which includes additional SO2 reductions. It was stated that Kleiman will discuss the modeling proposal with the TSC. The list of which states have limits on heating oils varies, but NESCAUM has a list which will be circulated. Some states said that if it’s a regional agreement they will agree to the changes as well.

Papalski stated that an analysis of the latest IPM run is needed along with a list of additional control measures. Kleiman agreed and stated that unit cost and other information is needed as well.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call is scheduled for Friday, January 12, 2007 at 11am and it is agreed that one MACTEC representative will be on the call.

Wishinski, Sipple, and Davis will continue working on the modeling and modeling inputs so that individual sources with the most impact on Class I areas can be chosen. Davis will also do a short write-up regarding how the sources were chosen and what modeling was used.

Davis stated that he would check the inventory for the large Missouri primary metal production source and contact CENRAP to see if it has any controls in place.

MACTEC was tasked to look at the list of sources VISTAS and LADCO are analyzing and see if MANE-VU needs to add any other sources to its list.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website. Crenshaw will also contact NESCAUM for a list of state heating oil limits.
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 Herculaneum 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 SO\textsubscript{2} 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\textsubscript{x}, off road NO\textsubscript{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.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Areas Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
January 18, 2007
2:00 pm to 3:15pm EST

Attendees:
- Rob Sliwinski 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
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Ann Acheson of USFS
- Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Wick Havens of Pennsylvania
- Kurt Kebschull of Connecticut
- Dave Wackter of Connecticut
- Steve Dennis of Massachusetts
- Tom Downs of Maine
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Bob Kelly of EPA Region II
- Dennis Lohman of EPA Region III
- Pat Brewer of VISTAS
- Bill Thompson of the Penobscot Nation
- 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 individual sources that MACTEC will analyze. MACTEC needs this information soon in order not to fall behind schedule.

Determining Key Sources: The Workgroup reviewed the revised list of Top 30 ICI boiler, cement kiln, and lime kiln sources that impact MANE-VU Class I areas. The Workgroup agreed that the list of key sources to analyze would include the top 16 ICI boiler, cement kiln, and lime kiln sources on the revised list (see attached). Nine sources are in the MANE-VU Region and seven sources are outside the Region. For the sources that are outside MANE-VU Wierman will send a letter to the state air director initiating contact and requesting information and MACTEC can take it from there.

The Workgroup agreed to keep BART-eligible sources on the list of sources to be analyzed by MACTEC. Brewer stated that if a source is BART-eligible it may not be the entire facility, but only part of it.

The group agreed that both specific EGUs and specific non-EGUs should be analyzed as envisioned in the RFP for the MACTEC contract.
Wishinski stated that he would compile a list of top EGU sources that impact MANE-VU Class I areas, using a similar method as was used for the ICI boilers, cement kilns, and lime kilns list. This list would be available next week.

**Status of Contract Deliverables:** Hodan stated that MACTEC was on schedule to deliver the draft Work Plan by the deadline of January 19th. However, MACTEC may need extra time to complete the Control Scenarios Technical Memorandum.

**Consultation:** Papalski stated that the Commissioner of New Jersey signed a letter regarding consultation on Reasonable Progress goals and it was mailed today. The letter was sent to all MANE-VU States and all the States east of the Mississippi River. Questions were raised by the other RPOs as to what was expected. This needs to be clarified but it’s basically an opportunity to comment on the Reasonable Progress Goals to be set by the state.

**Next steps:** The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Thursday, January 25, 2007 at 9 am.

Wishinski will compile a list of the top EGUs that impact MANE-VU Class I Areas.

Davis will finalize the list of Top 16 ICI boilers, cement kilns, and lime kilns that impact MANE-VU Class I Areas and Crenshaw will send it to MACTEC.

MARAMA will draft and send a letter to non MANE-VU states with sources on the above list requesting that they provide information to MACTEC.

Prettyman will continue to do modeling to create a list of the top 200 annual, SO2 emitting, non-EGU units and facilities.

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

Attachment: “Top 16 ICI boilers and kilns affecting MANE-VU Class I Areas Average Daily Sulfate Concentration” (MS Excel file)
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Areas Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
January 25, 2007
9:00 am to 10:30 am EST

Attendees:
- Rob Sliwinski of New York
- Matt Reis of New York
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Ray Papalski of New Jersey
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
- Mark Prettyman of Delaware
- Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
- Andy Heltibride of Maryland
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Ann Mebane of USFS
- Ann Acheson of USFS
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Wick Havens of Pennsylvania
- Kurt Kebschull of Connecticut
- Steve Dennis of Massachusetts
- Tom Downs of Maine
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Pat Brewer of VISTAS
- Arthur Werner and William Hodan of MACTEC
- Susan Wierman of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The agenda for this call included a brief discussion of the MANE-VU Air Director’s Meeting, review Wishinski’s list of EGU sources that impact MANE-VU Class I areas, MACTEC discussing the deliverables that have been submitted (the Work Plan and Control Scenarios Technical Memorandum #1), and MACTEC giving the Workgroup an update of their current status.

MANE-VU Air Director’s Meeting: Wierman began the call with a brief recap of the MANE-VU Air Director’s Meeting which was held January 23rd through 24th. It was stated that it is very important that the project schedule be kept so that information about the 4-factor analysis be available by the March Air Director and Consultation meetings. It was also requested that the Workgroup recommend criteria for what is reasonable i.e., how to use information from the MACTEC report.

List of EGUs impacting MANE-VU: Wishinski explained the list of EGUs impacting MANE-VU Class I areas via a PowerPoint presentation and a spreadsheet entitled “15 Top EGUs.” Wishinski ranked the top EGUs using 2002 emissions and maximum 24 hour impact at each Class I area. Many of the EGUs in MANE-VU are subject to BART and many in the southern tier are also affected by CAIR. Wishinski explained that in spreadsheet, certain rows had “SHEN” in the final column, which identified sources outside MANE-VU that only affected Shenandoah. It was agreed that these sources would not be included in the report, which leaves 30 EGUs to be analyzed by MACTEC.
Brewer inquired why sources in the southeast affect Maine but not Shenandoah? A member of the Workgroup stated that his was because the EGU analysis is based on a single 24 hour maximum impact, a distant source could end up listed due to an impact on a single day. It was noted that when the top 100 sources affecting each Class I area are analyzed there is more consistency; however, when the top 15 sources are viewed there are idiosyncrasies.

Wishinski stated that a huge amount of emissions come from a small number of sources and a huge reduction in emissions could result if these sources are controlled by CAIR for example.

The Workgroup agreed that the list of 30 EGUs would be analyzed by MACTEC. Wierman inquired if it was ok to ask MACTEC to determine whether plants will be controlled by 2018 and there were no objections.

Wishinski stated that there are probably more sources that he would like to include on the list and this was just one method to get a quick list of sources. He stated that he would like to look at the 20% worst days and look at impacts from all sources and then rank them, he expects to do this for Lye Brook before SIPs are due.

Brewer asked about what is required to believe there will be a control in place by 2018. It was stated that SIPs are based on a prediction of the estimated effect of a program, and if the program does not have the desired effect, then a state must revise the plan.

**Review of Deliverables:** MACTEC discussed the draft Work Plan and there were no significant comments. It was stated that comments about the Work Plan should be sent to MARAMA by noon on January 26th.

MACTEC discussed the Control Scenarios Technical Memorandum and stated that they expect to incorporate information from LADCO work in the revised Technical Memorandum. MACTEC requested that the Workgroup clarify what is needed in the useful life category.

MACTEC also inquired about what specific sources should be on the list. A member of the Workgroup stated that the top facilities that emit sulfate and impact the listed consultation states should be included. MACTEC requested the final additions to the list as soon as possible.

A member of the Workgroup stated that the cost range for control measures is so broad as to be meaningless. MACTEC stated that they will try to narrow the range down based on the available data. It was suggested that source categories be divided by category or size.

A member of the Workgroup inquired about fuel cleaning, which gets 20-25% of sulfur removal for coal fired ICI boilers. MACTEC stated that is correct and it may apply more to EGUs.
It was suggested that MACTEC use the MARAMA refinery report to get information for source controls and costs.

It was stated that comments about the Control Scenarios Technical Memorandum should be sent to MARAMA by noon on January 26th.

**Status of Contract Deliverables:** The Summary of Source Selection Technical Memorandum was discussed, and Wierman stated that more detail is needed. MACTEC agreed and stated that the document was completed quickly to meet the deadline.

The Workgroup discussed whether other source categories should be added to the analysis and it was agreed that the current categories were adequate. The Workgroup discussed whether other individual sources should be added to the analysis and it was agreed that Wishinski and Sipple would follow up after the call. Sipple stated that there may be sources in Michigan and other source categories besides ICI boilers and kilns.

**Next steps:** The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 2007 at 11 am.

Austin will send the Control Measures for ICI boilers document to MACTEC.

After the call Wishinski and Sipple will discuss the new modeling runs that need to be completed and the list of other sources. Crenshaw will follow-up with Wishinski and Sipple about the new modeling.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Areas Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
February 1, 2007
11:00 am to 12:20 pm EST

Attendees:
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Ray Papalski of New Jersey
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
- Mark Prettyman of Delaware
- Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
- Andy Heltibridle of Maryland
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Jude Catalano of Connecticut
- Kurt Kebschull of Connecticut
- Dave Wackter of Connecticut
- Tom Downs of Maine
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Denis Lohman of EPA Region III
- Neil Bigioni of EPA Region III
- Bill Thompson of the Penobscot Nation
- William Hodan, Lori Cress, and Walt Gray of MACTEC
- Pat Brewer of VISTAS
- Gary Kleiman of NESCAUM
- Susan Wierman and Angela Crenshaw of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The agenda for this call included a brief update on LADCO’s Reasonable Progress Project, a discussion of the revised list of sources by Wishinski, a discussion of the Methods for Evaluation Technical Memorandum #2 by MACTEC, an update on the current status of the project by MACTEC, and a discussion about what criteria will be used for deciding what is reasonable with respect to the 4-factors.

Update on LADCO’s Reasonable Progress Project: Crenshaw gave a quick update on the status of LADCO’s Reasonable Progress Project stating that the methodology memo and the list of individual facilities were finalized and sent to the Workgroup. The list of source sectors and priority control measures were reviewed and it was noted that LADCO is including biodiesel as a control measure. A member of the Workgroup had previously suggested including biodiesel in our analysis, however Cress stated that biodiesels are used to control NOx from mobile sources and MACTEC’s project does not include mobile sources.

Revised list of sources: Wishinski reviewed the revised list of individual sources using a PowerPoint presentation. It was agreed that five Massachusetts sources had been included in the revised list by mistake and would be removed from the next round of modeling analysis along with all EGUs, which have been modeled separately. A member of the Workgroup stated that the MACTEC analysis should focus on EGUs since they are the largest contributors to regional haze. If CAIR works ideally and the major EGUs are controlled, then visibility would increase in Class I areas. It was stated that only non-EGUs that have impacts comparable to EGUs should be analyzed.
If additional specific sources were to be added to the list of sources to analyze, Wishinski recommended adding MeadWestvaco in Virginia, Holcim Inc. in Michigan, Hercules in Pennsylvania, Sunoco Inc. in Pennsylvania, Citgo in Illinois, and LaFarge in Michigan.

Wishinski stated that a decision needs to be made about whether to use the annual ranking or the maximum 24-hour ranking. The maximum 24-hour ranking allows a rough comparison to the EGU list in the Contribution Assessment rankings and the annual impact ranking allows for the analysis of cumulative impacts from multiple sources.

Wierman stated that based on the previous analysis EGUs are the most important sources and those with the largest impacts need to be analyzed to see if they will be controlled by CAIR. According to the Air Directors a lot of controls are currently being put on EGUs. She asked MACTEC to focus first on EGUs, while further work was done to refine the list of other sources.

Review of Methods for Evaluation TM #2: MACTEC discussed the draft Methods for Evaluation Technical Memorandum #2 that is currently out for review. It was stated that part of the work would be based on previous work in developing BART documents for MRPO.

Papalski’s comment regarding the TM was discussed. The comment was in reference to the remaining useful life of sources category. In the TM MACTEC had indicated that this factor was not applicable to the source category analysis. Papalski stated that this is true for most SO2 source categories but not for residential wood combustion (fireplace inserts and wood stoves) and perhaps home heating oil. He stated that the other three factors should be relied upon to determine if this is important and recognize that we need to address it in some fashion for the source categories because it is still a requirement to address in the rule. Papalski also stated that if remaining useful life is not included in the analysis then there needs to be a statement about why it was omitted. MACTEC agreed with the statement.

Wierman recommended that MACTEC look at LADCO’s Methodology Memo to see how the time necessary for compliance category was addressed and consider identifying methods for categories and individual sources separately.

Wishinski inquired about states being held responsible for a control that was not implemented. Herb stated that reasonable progress goals are not enforceable but are used to determine the approvability of SIPs. Kleiman stated that reasonable progress goals are a tool for consultation, but what is included in a SIP is enforceable if it is backed up by technical information.

Wierman inquired about what the Workgroup wants to come out of this project i.e. how an analysis of individual facilities will fit into reasonable progress goals. It was agreed that the states were looking for general information about the cost of controls for source categories and individual sources and information about what sources will be controlled.
MACTEC stated that they have already spoken with MANE-VU and non-MANE-VU states about what controls are being installed and this will be addressed in the deliverables.

It was stated that comments about the Methods for Evaluation TM should be sent to MARAMA by noon on February 2nd.

Status of Contract and other Deliverables: MACTEC stated that the Control Scenarios TM had be revised and sent to MARAMA before today’s call. MACTEC stated that all the loose ends within the Technical Memoranda will be tied up in the Final Report.

Criteria for Determining what is Reasonable: Wierman introduced the topic of deciding on criteria for what is reasonable with respect to the 4-factors. A previous suggestion was to use criteria similar to those used with respect to the BART 5-factor analysis, which placed control costs into the categories of low, medium, and high cost (found in Appendix A of the NESCAUM BART 5-Factor Analysis document). Crawford stated that this was a good starting point. Kleiman stated the criteria were also available in the NESCAUM 2005 BART report.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Thursday, February 8, 2007 at 11 am.

Wishinski will re-evaluate the list of individual sources based on maximum 24-hour or annual ranking.

Wierman and Crenshaw will write a short description of the process used to select specific sources for analysis as part of the MANE-VU Reasonable Progress Project and send it to Wishinski, Sipple, and Prettyman for review before sending it to MACTEC.

Kleiman sent the previous BART report and will send the BART 5-Factor document to MACTEC next week after the states are allowed to provide comments on it.

After comments are received on the Methods for Evaluation Technical Memorandum MACTEC will finalize the document.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Areas Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
February 8, 2007
11:00 am to 11:50 am EST

Attendees:
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Matt Reis of New York
- Rob Sliwinski of New York
- Ray Papalski of New Jersey
- Tom Downs of Maine
- Stephen Dennis of Massachusetts
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Ron Amirikian of Delaware
- Mark Prettyman of Delaware
- Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
- Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
- Andy Heltibridle of Maryland
- Jude Catalano of Connecticut
- Kurt Kebschull of Connecticut
- Tom Downs of Maine
- Ann Mebane of the USFS
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Denis Lohman of EPA Region III
- Bill Thompson of the Penobscot Nation
- Lori Cress and Art Werner of MACTEC
- Pat Brewer of VISTAS
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Anna Garcia of OTC
- Susan Wierman and Angela Crenshaw of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The agenda for this call included a discussion of the revised list of sources by Wishinski and an update on the current status of the project by MACTEC.

Revised list of sources: Wishinski reviewed the revised list of the largest individual non-EGU sulfur dioxide emitting sources using a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that the Massachusetts sources that had been included in the revised list by mistake were removed from this round of modeling along with all EGUs, which were already previously modeled. Wishinski stated that there were 180 sources total and he took the top 30 sources and modeled the maximum 24-hour average sulfate ion impact and the annual average impacts at each Class I area. Then the top 30 non-EGU sulfur dioxide emitting sources impacting each of the MANE-VU Class I areas were identified for each area. This modeling resulted in ten new sources that were not on the previous list. To keep to the agreed upon limit of 50 individual sources the Workgroup agreed to add 4 new sources, which are: LaFarge in Michigan, MeadWestvaco in Virginia, Sunoco Inc. in Pennsylvania, and Valero in New Jersey. MACTEC stated that adding new sources at this point would make it difficult to keep to the schedule. The Workgroup agreed that MACTEC would use the previously agreed upon list and then add the additional sources to the final report.

Update on the Reasonable Progress Project: MACTEC stated that they are working on the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum, the draft of which is due on February 15th.
MACTEC stated that if they cannot get information from West Virginia and Ohio, they would not be included in the draft technical memorandum.

Wierman reminded the Workgroup that it is important to continue reviewing all of the Technical Memoranda. She stated that each document is a draft of a chapter of the final report and comments on the final versions of the technical memoranda would help MACTEC prepare a better draft of the final report.

**Next steps:** The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Friday, February 16, 2007 at 2 pm and the main focus will be reviewing the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3.

Austin, Garcia, and Wierman will discuss the possibility of MACTEC attending the March 1st meeting.

Crenshaw will revise the list of individual non-EGU sulfur dioxide emitting sources that will be analyzed by MACTEC and send it out to the Workgroup to ok, before sending it on to MACTEC.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Area Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
February 16, 2007
2:00 pm to 3:00 pm EST

Attendees:
• Diana Rivenburgh of New York
• Kurt Kebschull of Connecticut
• Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
• Jeff Crawford of Maine
• Steve Dennis of Massachusetts
• Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
• Ray Papalski of New Jersey
• Ann Acheson of USFS
• Dennis Lohman of EPA Region III
• Bob Kelly of EPA Region II
• Doug Austin of OTC
• Anna Garcia of OTC
• Art Werner, William Hodan, and Lori Cress of MACTEC
• Pat Brewer of VISTAS
• Gary Kleiman of NESCAUM
• Susan Wierman and Julie McDill of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was reviewing the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 and discussing the criteria for what is reasonable.

MACTEC description of the Statutory Factors TM #3: MACTEC stated that for each source category analyzed there are three sections in the TM; a description of the sources, a description of the control options, and a description of the four factors (which include the cost of control options, time necessary for compliance, energy and non-air impacts, and the remaining useful life of sources). The TM discusses the six source categories, EGUs, ICI boilers, residential wood, residential heating oil, open burning, and cement kilns.

The Workgroup discussed the possibility of announcing that the draft TMs were available for public review. It was agreed that public review should wait until the draft final report is available.

Criteria for what is Reasonable: The Workgroup discussed criteria for what is reasonable with regards to controls. On a previous call it was suggested that the criteria that was used in the NESCAUM’s BART reports be used to classify costs as high, medium, or low. In the BART reports there was no judgment about whether a certain control was reasonable or not. Kleiman suggested ranking the options using dollars per ton and McDill agreed with this suggestion. Werner suggested that EPA may have criteria for NSPS. (However after the call he called to say there was no available guidance.) McDill stated that the BACT Clearinghouse has information on dollar per ton controls, and that there was some information in a NAS report on the NSR issue.
**Next steps:** The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call is scheduled for Friday, February 23, 2007 at 11am.

The next step in the Reasonable Progress Project will be a revised draft of the Statutory Factor Technical Memorandum, which is due on February 27\textsuperscript{th}.

Wierman will again request contact information from Bob Hodenbosi, Ohio’s Air Director.

MACTEC stated that they would like to discuss how to summarize the four-factor TM with MARAMA.

Comments on the draft Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum are due to Crenshaw by Thursday, February 22\textsuperscript{nd} before noon.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Area Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
February 23, 2007
11:00 am to 12:00 pm EST

Attendees:
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Kurt Kebschull of Connecticut
- Wick Havens of Pennsylvania
- Jeff Crawford of Maine
- Steve Dennis of Massachusetts
- Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
- Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
- Ray Papalski of New Jersey
- Ann Acheson of USFS
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Andy Heltibridle of Maryland
- Mark Prettyman of Delaware
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Pat Brewer of VISTAS
- Mike Koerber of LADCO
- Gary Kleiman and Praveen Amar of NESCAUM
- Art Werner and Lori Cress of MACTEC
- Susan Wierman, Angela Crenshaw, and Julie McDill of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was reviewing the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 comments, the Four Factor Analysis presentation that will be given at the March 1st MANE-VU Consultation meeting, and a discussion of what is reasonable with regards to controls.

Discussion of Statutory Factors TM #3 Comments: A member of the Workgroup stated that they would like to see more information about ICI boilers. It was stated that Praveen Amar and Addison Fowler of NESCAUM should be contacted regarding information about ICI boilers. A member of the Workgroup suggested that MACTEC could look at the Clearinghouse for MACT, BACT, and LAER to find information about controls. A member of the Workgroup also stated that it is important to focus on fuel switching, from high sulfur fuels to low sulfur fuels. A member of the Workgroup stated that data from 2000 about flue gas desulfurization (FGD) is too old and it was suggested that newer data should be used.

Papalski stated that under the time for compliance sections, the TM needs to include information about the industry timeframe as opposed to the state or federal timeframe. Wierman said both were important. Papalski also stated that a longer timeframe of 5-10 years may be needed for applying control measures. It was also stated that the Haze Rule says that if 5 years after the SIP submittal, the state has not reached reasonable rate of progress then the SIP may need to be revised.
In regards to kilns, Havens stated that there is a lot of turnover and they are complicated because controls that work at one kiln, may not work at another. He gave Terry Black as a contact for additional information about kilns.

Wierman stated that there was a lot of interest in more controls for outdoor wood boilers. Papalski stated that he would like to see a model rule addressing wood burning and new stove inserts and a regional strategy. McDill stated that Pennsylvania has a wood stove change-out program up and running.

Amar gave a brief update on the ICI project NESCAUM is working on. The project will look at NOx, SOx, and PM controls on ICI boilers and will incorporate Bodnarik’s work and include information about emerging technologies. This report will focus on costs not recommendations. NESCAUM expects to have a contract signed by March 1st and the final report by December.

Koerber stated that LADCO is working with Jim Stout to study RACT and review ICI boiler recommendations.

Discussion of the Four Factor Analysis Presentation at the MANE-VU Consultation Meeting: A member of the Workgroup stated that MACTEC should provide as much information as possible about switching from high sulfur fuels to low sulfur fuels, especially availability and costs. It was stated that it is important to show the cost of low sulfur fuel oil in dollars per ton so that it can be compared to the cost of other control measures. It was also stated that it is important to use the wholesale sulfur prices that do not contain taxes, as opposed to the retail prices that do include taxes.

Austin stated that he is working on one-page documents about Regional Haze reduction strategies for low sulfur fuel, CAIR+, BART, residential wood combustion, the OTC SO2 control measures, and ICI boilers by state for the meeting. He wanted to make sure that MACTEC and OTC were collaborating and using the same information. Wierman asked MACTEC to be sure to document the sources of information in the report.

A member of the Workgroup stated that the ranges on the ICI boiler controls are too large and need to be made smaller. It was suggested that medians are used as opposed to arithmetic averages, which may be influenced by an outlier.

What is reasonable with regards to controls: Wierman stated that if any member of the Workgroup had any comments on what is reasonable with regards to control, they should be sent to MARAMA because information about what is reasonable needs to be presented soon.

MACTEC update: MACTEC stated that they were working on the presentation for the MANE-VU Consultation Meeting and addressing comments to the Statutory Factors TM.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Wednesday, March 14, 2007 at 11am.
The next step in the Reasonable Progress Project will be a revised final version of the Statutory Factor Technical Memorandum, which is due on March 8th.

Crenshaw will type up a summary and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Area Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
March 14, 2007
11:00 am to 12:35 pm EST

Attendees:
• Diana Rivenburgh of New York
• Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
• Steve Dennis of Massachusetts
• Liz Nixon of New Hampshire
• Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
• Ray Papalski of New Jersey
• Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
• Bob Kelly of EPA Region II
• Andy Heltibridle of Maryland
• Jude Catalano of Connecticut

• Bill Thompson of the Penobscot Nation
• Doug Austin of OTC
• Anna Garcia of OTC
• Seth Barna of OTC
• Pat Brewer of VISTAS
• William Hodan, Walter Gray, Art Werner and Lori Cress of MACTEC
• Susan Wierman, Angela Crenshaw, and Julie McDill of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was reviewing the changes that were made to the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 dated March 8th in regards to the Workgroup’s comments on the draft of Technical Memorandum #3 dated February 16th. The Workgroup also discussed with MACTEC any new comments on the revised Technical Memorandum #3 dated March 8th. Also discussed on this call was the schedule of deliverables for the reasonable progress project.

Discussion of the Revisions to the Statutory Factors TM #3: MACTEC stated that the revised Technical Memorandum #3 addressed most of the Workgroup’s previous comments. However, there was still some duplication and a few inconsistencies in the document that they will fix. MACTEC stated that they still need to work on the compliance timeframe for EGUs and kilns. Changes were made to the timeframe to compliance section so that it addresses time for industry compliance, as previously requested. MACTEC also re-worked the fuel oil costs section and added dry sorbent injection for ICI boilers.

TM# 3 dated March 8th Comments: The Workgroup requested that the tables in the document include references of the organization and date the information was provided. The Workgroup also requested that information in tables be attributed to a source in a reference section that includes the name and contact information of the individual that provided the information, along with the date.

McDill will discuss her specific comments about the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 with MACTEC in a separate call.
The Workgroup requested that other revisions be made and these are summarized in the document titled, “Summary of Member Comments on the Reasonable Progress Draft Revised Final Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 Dated March 8, 2007.” This document will be made available to the Workgroup and be posted on the MARAMA website.

It was recommended that MARAMA send the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 dated March 8th out for public review and request comments by March 30th. MARAMA will also provide a summary of comments to date on the draft.

Schedule of Deliverables: The due dates for the next deliverables were revised as follows: comments on the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 (dated March 8) are due to MARAMA on March 30th, the draft report is due on April 13th, comments on the draft final report are due to MARAMA on May 10th, and the revised draft of the report is due on May 25th. The revised schedule is available on MARAMA’s website.

MACTEC update: MACTEC stated that they were working on the draft report.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Wednesday, April 4, 2007 at 10 am.

McDill will discuss her specific comments about the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 with MACTEC.

MARAMA gave MACTEC the contact information for Laura Crowder of PPG. If MACTEC cannot get in contact with her, Wierman will call her.

Comments are due on the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 dated March 8th by March 30th.

The next step in the Reasonable Progress Project will be a draft version of the report, which is due on April 13th.

MACTEC will provide MARAMA with a copy of the Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 in MS Word format.

Crenshaw will type up a summary of the call and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Area Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
April 4, 2007
10:00 am to 11:00 pm EST

Attendees:
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Richard Fields of Massachusetts
- Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
- Andy Heltbriddle of Maryland
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Doris McLeod of Virginia
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
- Deirdre Elvis-Peterson of D.C.
- Wendy Jacobs of Connecticut
- Bill Thompson of the Penobscot Nation
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Anne Mebane of USFS
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Anna Garcia of OTC
- Gary Kleiman of NESCAUM
- William Hodan and Art Werner of MACTEC
- Susan Wierman, Angela Crenshaw, and Julie McDill of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was reviewing the comments that were received regarding the revised draft final Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 dated March 8th which was sent out for external review on March 19th.

Discussion of the Comments received regarding the revised draft final Statutory Factors TM #3: MACTEC reviewed the summary of external comments document with the Workgroup and the Workgroup provided advise as to how to address the comments in preparing the draft final report document. These comments are summarized in the document titled, “Summary of External Review Comments on the Reasonable Progress Draft Revised Final Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3,” located on MARAMA’s website.

Project update: The next deliverable in the Reasonable Progress Goals project is the draft final report, which is due on April 13th. Wierman stated that the EPA 21 day review will occur on this document and MANE-VU would greatly appreciate a review of the document that is quicker than 21 days so that the project can be kept on schedule.

Wierman stated that there is a MANE-VU meeting scheduled for June 7th in Providence, Rhode Island and that Werner of MACTEC will attend this meeting to discuss the Reasonable Progress Goals project.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Monday, May 7, 2007 at 10 am.
Wierman requested that any comments regarding the revised draft final Statutory Factors TM #3 be sent to Crenshaw as soon as possible.

Sipple stated that he would meet with Prettyman and send MACTEC an explanation of the information and data that went into the modeling that produced the list of individual sources.

Wishinski stated that he would send MACTEC an explanation about how he completed the modeling for the individual sources, including his MS PowerPoint presentations about the specific EGU and non-EGU lists.

Wierman and McDill will provide a rationale for addressing residential wood combustion and open burning in the report.

Crenshaw will type up a summary of the call and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Area Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
May 7, 2007
10:00 am to 11:45 pm EST

Attendees:
• Diana Rivenburgh of New York
• Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
• Stephen Dennis of Massachusetts
• Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
• Brian Hug of Maryland
• Paul Wishinski of Vermont
• Tom Downs of Maine
• Karen Slattery of Rhode Island
• Jack Sipple and Mark Prettyman of Delaware
• Deirdre Elvis-Peterson of D.C.
• David Wackter of Connecticut
• Ray Papalski of New Jersey
• Doris McLeod of Virginia
• Pat Brewer of VISTAS
• Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
• Doug Austin and Seth Barna of OTC
• Susan Wierman, Angela Crenshaw, and Julie McDill of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was to review the purpose of the Reasonable Progress Draft final report and decide if the document accomplishes the intended purpose. Also up for discussion was the inclusion or removal of the open burning section (chapter 10) of the report and whether or not the scope of the project needed to be expanded.

Purpose of the report: Wierman began the call by stating that the purpose of this report is to document the technical background for the reasonable progress goals (the key pollutants, the sources of those pollutants, control measures, and the four factor analysis). Then the source categories on page viii were reviewed by the Workgroup and no one suggested any additions or removals.

The Open Burning Section (Chapter 10): Wierman posed the question of whether or not the open burning section of the report could removed from the final report. The EPA representative stated that as far as the Reasonable Progress Goals report it could be removed, but it needed to be included in the Long Term Strategy and addressed in the Smoke Management Plan. It was stated that smoke management must be mentioned in the SIP. It was decided that the open burning section will stay in the report, but it needs to be revised, possibly splitting prescribed and agricultural burning into two chapters.

The Scope of the Project: Wierman asked whether the states wanted the scope of the project to be expanded to include more specific EGUs. Wishinski supported this idea because Vermont is concerned that unless specific EGUs are controlled, the expected benefits of CAIR will not be achieved. It was suggested that the expanded list of EGUs
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Mid-Atlantic and Northeastern Class I Area Consultation

Reasonable Progress Workgroup Conference Call
Draft Minutes
April 4, 2007
10:00 am to 11:00 pm EST

Attendees:
- Diana Rivenburgh of New York
- Nancy Herb of Pennsylvania
- Richard Fields of Massachusetts
- Andy Bodnarik of New Hampshire
- Andy Heltbridle of Maryland
- Paul Wishinski of Vermont
- Doris McLeod of Virginia
- Jack Sipple of Delaware
- Deirdre Elvis-Peterson of D.C.
- Wendy Jacobs of Connecticut
- Bill Thompson of the Penobscot Nation
- Anne McWilliams of EPA Region I
- Anne Mebane of USFS
- Doug Austin of OTC
- Anna Garcia of OTC
- Gary Kleiman of NESCAUM
- William Hodan and Art Werner of MACTEC
- Susan Wierman, Angela Crenshaw, and Julie McDill of MARAMA

Agenda Items

General Overview: The main focus of this call was reviewing the comments that were received regarding the revised draft final Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3 dated March 8th which was sent out for external review on March 19th.

Discussion of the Comments received regarding the revised draft final Statutory Factors TM #3: MACTEC reviewed the summary of external comments document with the Workgroup and the Workgroup provided advise as to how to address the comments in preparing the draft final report document. These comments are summarized in the document titled, “Summary of External Review Comments on the Reasonable Progress Draft Revised Final Statutory Factors Technical Memorandum #3,” located on MARAMA’s website.

Project update: The next deliverable in the Reasonable Progress Goals project is the draft final report, which is due on April 13th. Wierman stated that the EPA 21 day review will occur on this document and MANE-VU would greatly appreciate a review of the document that is quicker than 21 days so that the project can be kept on schedule.

Wierman stated that there is a MANE-VU meeting scheduled for June 7th in Providence, Rhode Island and that Werner of MACTEC will attend this meeting to discuss the Reasonable Progress Goals project.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was scheduled for Monday, May 7, 2007 at 10 am.
Wierman requested that any comments regarding the revised draft final Statutory Factors TM #3 be sent to Crenshaw as soon as possible.

Sipple stated that he would meet with Prettyman and send MACTEC an explanation of the information and data that went into the modeling that produced the list of individual sources.

Wishinski stated that he would send MACTEC an explanation about how he completed the modeling for the individual sources, including his MS PowerPoint presentations about the specific EGU and non-EGU lists.

Wierman and McDill will provide a rationale for addressing residential wood combustion and open burning in the report.

Crenshaw will type up a summary of the call and circulate it before it is posted on the MARAMA website.
include the top 100 EGUs (including all the units at the selected facilities) with impacts on MANE-VU Class I areas. The data that would result from the expanded list of EGUs would be presented in a form similar to Table 3.2 on page 3-7. Brewer stated that a lot of this analysis was done for VISTAS by Bill Barnard and Ed Sabo of MACTEC in the summer of 2006.

It was also suggested that a comparison table of CAIR and CAIR+ be included in the report.

Next steps: The next Reasonable Progress Workgroup Call was not scheduled. MARAMA will have a conference call with MACTEC to discuss a project extension and the comments regarding the draft final report. Further discussion will occur on the May TSC call.

Wierman requested that any comments regarding the draft final report, especially the open burning section, should be sent to Crenshaw as soon as possible.

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