

## **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 be 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

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.