

**CLEAN AIR CONSORTIUM WORKING GROUP**  
**JUNE 24, 2004**  
**OKI BOARD ROOM**

Attendees:

|               |                                  |
|---------------|----------------------------------|
| Lona Brewer   | Kentucky Division of Air Quality |
| Cory Chadwick | Hamilton County DOES             |
| Bob Driehaus  | Cincinnati Post                  |
| Rick Geise    | Griffin Industries               |
| Candice Klein | NKY Chamber                      |
| John Lyons    | Kentucky Division of Air Quality |
| Doug Moorman  | Greater Cincinnati Chamber       |
| Tom Niehaus   | Ohio State Representative        |
| Bill Spires   | OEPA                             |
| Steve Stevens | NKY Chamber                      |

OKI Staff:

Charmaine Davis  
Allen Freeman  
Summer Jones  
Fran Malone  
Mark Policinski  
Andy Reser  
LaTania Thomas  
Sarah Woller

**PURPOSE AND MISSION OF WORKING GROUP**

Mr. Steve Stevens welcomed all to the meeting and encouraged everyone to stay connected as the very important work of improving the air quality for the region. Everyone introduced themselves.

**GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The main goal of this group is to help the region reach attainment standards in 2005, both Ozone and PM 2.5. To develop a plan that is approvable by the USEPA. To provide recommendations and options that we have now as well as those that we would put in place that may not be presently performed to help us attain a new 8-hour standard for Ozone.

Mr. Cory Chadwick stated that we may be looking for voluntary programs that will give us credit on this plan which is the state implementation plan.

The dates necessary to develop this plan will be established and communicated to the group.

Mr. Policinski suggested that the group send out a joint letter from the Chambers to state the purpose of this group, not seeking ownership but rather joint solutions from all the stakeholders in this region.

We must keep current on all the PM2.5 issues and keep ourselves educated on these PM2.5 options. To weigh the cost of each idea for economical and environmental impacts.

### **HISTORY AND REGIONAL OZONE ACTIVITIES**

Mr. Steve Stevens and Ms. Sarah Woller gave a review of the efforts of the Regional Ozone Committee and the work for Cleaner Air that has been a part of their activities both mandatory and voluntary. In the late 80's there were 57 exceedences because of the terrible summer we had that year, with hot air and stagnant movement.

The stated goals of the Regional Ozone Coalition are to: Raise public awareness; Present possible solutions; and Implement voluntary ozone reduction plans for business and local residents. There was great buy-in from citizens, businesses, environmental and government organizations.

The SMOG Alert program was established by this group. The notification system covered thousands of business and organizations. There were guidelines established for voluntary actions that could be utilized by everyone to improve the air quality. Through education the of the general public, outdoor advertising, transit advertising and bike giveaways, Family Fun Fest, The Calendar Contest the word was spread about voluntary actions easily attainable by everyone.

The Clean Air Coalition did gas cap testing and joined efforts with the Tri-State Alternative Fuels Coalition to spread the word and educate the public. Through all the efforts the Regional Ozone Coalition received an award for outstanding achievement in pollution prevention.

There has been a newer standard that has been established for us. There is a new 8-hour standard in effect currently. These numbers will some day need to look like the chart for the 1-hour standard.

### **OZONE DESIGNATION AND WHAT THEY MEAN**

Mr. Cory Chadwick and Ms. Lona Brewer gave guidelines on what the designation means and the story of PM 2.5.

The current status is in attainment except for the 1-hour ozone. We as an area have not violated the standard for over five years, but do to a technical deficiency in the state implementation plan USEPA was sued in Federal Court by the Sierra Club for a deficiency in the SIP that involves RACT Rules. That suit was won by Sierra and we still have not violated the 1-hour standard, but we are not in attainment for the 8-hour standard for ozone and PM2.5 standard.

Ozone comes from a mixture of volatile organic compounds (VOC's), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), high temperatures and sunlight. The VOC's come from petroleum, inks that are solvent based, paints, fossil fuel combustion and plants and trees. The NOx sources are coal burning power plants, industrial sources and transportation sources. There are several potential control for existing sources. These plans have to be in place by 2009 as directed by the OEPA. The plan will include inventory of emission sources; identifying control measures; computer modeling to determine what reductions are necessary and adopting rules and regulations. The implementation of these requirements will be both voluntary and mandated by USEPA. The fuels are becoming cleaner as are the cars that are being produced today. The only affect that is currently being felt is the permitting that is being issued currently.

PM2.5 is made of sulfates from coal burning, nitrates from coal burning, crystals from salt and water on the road, organic compounds due to speciation possibly from automobiles.

Ms. Lona Brewer gave an overview of the National Fine Particulate Standard. The timeline is similar for PM2.5 as it is for Ozone. PM2.5 is a whole new pollutant that has only been monitored for since 1999. It is a complex mixture of extremely small particles and liquid droplets. It is not visible by the naked eye and cannot be expelled by the lungs like most other particles. The people with heart or lung disease, older adults, or children are more vulnerable to PM2.5 as the Ozone groups. PM2.5 is linked to premature deaths from heart and lung disease, aggravation of heart and lung diseases, and possibly linked to lung cancer deaths; infant mortality; developmental problems; and decrease in lung capacity as people mature.

There are a few ways to monitor for PM2.5. The Federal Reference Method used currently; TOEM – Tapered Element Oscillating Microbalance which will be used for forecasting; and Speciation Monitors which are used to determine the constituency of the samples.

PM2.5 is a year round standard, no longer seasonal. PM2.5 contributes to significant health and environmental effects. EPA intends to finalize the designations for the fine particles standard in November 2004. SIP's will be final January 2008.

#### **SUBGROUP FORMATION AND SUBGROUP FORMATION**

Mr. Stevens proposed the development of sub groups. One being focused on ozone and one on PM2.5, because we have experts to hopefully add to the committee to focus on these two components. Two chairs will be established in the future to report what they discover and develop.

The working phase will investigate what our real options are for resolving the issues of the control issues. These groups will look at both the environmental and business controls and what is the cost. They will be called upon to look at more detailed potential controls and seek best practices, as opposed to reinventing the wheel with what has already been laid down as a base work with ozone. The EPA will give us updates and

continue with group ideas. The ideas will all be investigated and encouraged all the stakeholders to come together to reach attainment.

The timeline will have to be modified for both states because the timeline cannot be projected for the three state area due to difference in government styles. The area by area plans will need to be looked at as soon as end of year 2004.

#### **OTHER DISCUSSION**

Representative Niehaus questioned the fact that the OKI region is in two federal regions for air quality, how that affected the consistency and success. The analysis is done on a nationwide basis and the first control strategies will be published at the same time. There is a data control protocol that ensures that the OEPA can pass the inventories around so that all the air quality programs are based on the same model. From that standpoint there is a standard whether CMAQ or KYMAQ. The solutions that come about can be different because the states are autonomous.

Mr. Stevens reiterated that because this is a region, the solution will be regional and good for all the counties involved.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further discussion the meeting was adjourned at 11:20am.