

**PRB Interagency Air Quality Task Group Notes:
March 14, 2005**

Attendance:

Dave Klemp - MDEQ (leader)	Joe Delwiche – EPA Region 8
Elton Erp – MDEQ	Dee Rothery – EPA Region 8
John Coefield – MDEQ	Jay Littlewolf - NCT
Liana Reilly – NPS	Mike Philbin– MTBLM
Derek Milner – USFS	Darla Potter – WYDEQ
Susan Caplan – WYBLM	Robert Mitchell – MT BLM
Paul Beels – WYBLM	Ken Disler – EPA Region 8

This call was focused on the monitoring that may be necessary in the affected area. Also, the group began discussing the other tasks outlined in the work plan.

Old business and Misc

Last meeting minutes approved.

Wyoming let us know that additional maps are being worked on. There is not a definitive date for when they will be done.

Wyoming notes that the maps that team members have include only ACTIVE sites. There was too much information to compile to include all of the sites that ever existed.

A brief discussion ensued about the technical difficulties of getting onto last call. Thanks to Paul for securing this line and starting the call.

Summation of last call. We discussed monitoring recommendations, including the goals, objectives and priorities the group has with regards to monitoring.

Most group members (exceptions being MT DEQ and MT BLM) felt that existing monitoring is good enough for now....pending a review of the maximum concentrations for specific pollutants that Susan Caplan created maps for (to be assessed on today's call) to ensure that monitoring is in places where maximum concentrations are predicted to occur. The preliminary recommendation is that additional monitoring may be needed in the Birney area.

New business

Wyoming DEQ's stance on monitoring recommendations.

FYI, DEQ may be conducting a significant expansion of its monitoring network statewide. Monitoring may be focused on areas of energy development specifically in Northeast Wyoming. The monitors may be put in place to characterize the general, local air quality in the regions. Additional reference method monitoring may be done including monitoring for NO_x and ozone as well as meteorological monitoring. Areas being looked at for potential monitors include Sheriden, Arvada, Gillete, the area near

Millcreek Junction (WY-SD border). The locations have not yet been identified. The State will determine the monitor locations as per the need it has perceived. No input from the group is necessary.

Questions were raised regarding the selection of the sites. Sites were chosen due to expansion of energy development. As for the monitor being looked at for the WY-SD border, it is unclear what all of the reasons behind that one is, but as it is in trajectory downwind for air passing from WY to SD, WY would like to know its contribution to SD air quality. This is especially important as there are currently a number of regulatory matters raising interest in what that contribution to SD may be.

Questions were also raised regarding the timeframe of the monitors being placed. The timeframe is unclear at the moment. The funding was secured from last year's legislative session and was available on July 1, 2004. It takes awhile for RFPs etc. to go through, but the monitors are expected to be placed as soon as possible.

Northern Cheyenne's stance on monitoring recommendations.

Northern Cheyenne feels that we need more monitoring. Monitoring is needed in the SW part of the reservation. The area to the SE of the reservation is devoid of monitoring. It would be helpful to have monitors there-especially in the Birney area (similar view to MT DEQ and MT BLM). (Last year, the tribe attempted to move a monitor from a current location to SW corner but didn't get tribal council approval.) The additional monitor would be especially helpful for quality assurance.

Quality Assurance discussion

EPA raised the fact that the group (perhaps at a later time) should discuss how to do quality assurance (QA). Should the group be assessing the data quality as well as the quantity/location of monitoring? In the report given to the interagency work group, we may want to address quality assurance. The WARMS network and PSD monitoring on Northern Cheyenne Reservation may benefit from QA. For future sites, the group could check for quality when putting monitors in. This idea is prompted partly because BLM has brought up quality issues in the past (i.e. BLM has noted that the 1999 WARMS data may be suspect). Thus, it might be good for existing monitoring to consider QA. The problem is that QA costs money.

EPA feels (with general consensus from the group) that it would be helpful to compare networks, as it seems that we have little information on how information is being gathered across the monitoring stations. All networks have their QA-but question is how comparable are they? If we can identify the level of QA that existed for the existing monitors and look at what is done when monitors are put in today, we can make recommendations on changes that might be needed. The bottom line is that at a minimum, a systems audit is recommended to see how comparable all monitors in the PRB network are. EPA's suggestion is to build this into the recommendations. This information could also be helpful for the folks who are responsible for the monitoring in the report.

Potential future action items for this idea include-creating a line item for QA-performance audits, calibrations, periodic QA/QC checks and performing an analysis of what percentage of the overall operating costs of networks is for QA/QC. For the latter, it is unsure how readily that info could be obtained. One member warned that it may be

difficult to get these numbers (breakdown of prices etc). There is a recommendation from the group that it would be beneficial if the group could at least estimate these numbers. The information for the QA/QC for new sites should be easier to come by.

Discussion of the maps that Susan Caplan made regarding monitoring results.

BLM notes that analysis is only for far field. What is missing is visibility and SO₂ as these were not in the files that Susan had available. Those data are available but are not included on the map. The maximum impact for Visibility is on the Northern Cheyenne reservation though BLM was unsure of the exact location within the reservation. There is a visibility monitoring station on the reservation. There are two PM₁₀ monitors because one is measuring one hour, the second is for the 8 hour. It seems unlikely that we would need to consider the monitor at Fort Belknap as the most likely place for PM₁₀ impacts will be in the PRB and be near field impacts, which we do not see on this map. PM₁₀ monitors may not be such a big issue, especially as WY is closely monitoring the area near the development. What would be helpful would be an emissions inventory grid, however, we are unsure if the data is available in a way conducive for doing that. Susan Caplan will check on this. There is interest in looking at PM₁₀ receptors, the top 10 (highest emissions) in the far field? However, an emissions grid would be preferred.

Monitoring Recommendation Suggestions

The group decided that it is time to start drafting monitoring recommendations. Montana DEQ offered to draft recommendations (Elton Erp). Recommendations will note that the group recommends that additional NO_x, O₃ and continuous PM_{2.5} monitoring be done at Birney and that PM₁₀ be monitored closer to current activity. The recommendations will also include information on WY new monitoring stations (Elton and Darla to coordinate on this). The draft will be circulated (via email) prior to the next call.

The group decided to move on.

Working definitions of other tasks

A2-emission inventories

A3-cumulative impacts for CI and CII areas

A4-modeling

A5-BACT

Priorities of other tasks

NPS feels that the next priority should be A3-cumulative impacts. All still on the call agreed that this should be the groups priority especially after WY noted that for task A2-emission inventories-that work being done by WESTAR and EPA may overlap. A suggestion was made to see what these individuals are doing. It was suggested that the next call include a discussion regarding what WESTAR and EPA are doing with regards to emission inventories. A discussion of the PSD modeling that has been happening around the reservation was also suggested. It is suggested that Dave speak on the former and that Jay and Dave talk about relevant information for the later.

For the next call

Discuss monitoring recommendation (as composed by Elton).

Discuss the overall approach the group will take with the remaining tasks. It is suggested that while the group should focus primarily on one task, that the group also address other tasks that results that must be waited on (i.e. address tasks early that have long lag times). Concerns raised include keeping people focused on the tasks and having people overwhelmed with tasks. It was noted that this wouldn't be multi-tasking so much as keeping an eye on the other tasks more as we move on. All seemed to agree with this.

Overlap discussion-WESTAR and PSD modeling.

Discuss the work plan. Joe will send the work plan to everyone. Everyone is tasked to reread the work plan and put mind to what you think it means-trying to accomplish the task. Do the tasks need to be redefined or does a specific action need to be taken now to define task so we can figure out what it really means and move towards accomplishing it.

Make a concerted effort to move forward.

Action Items-to report back by next call.

Susan look into PM10 monitoring data.

Elton start write up on monitoring recommendation-include WY best as possible. To be circulated via email before next call.

Darla-check status of network review/monitoring.

Darla-call Dave Klemp to discuss overlap-Dave will report back on WESTAR PSD group with regards to how their work links into task A2 and how it impacts the PRB emission inventories. Expect an update from Dave on the next call.

Joe-send out work plan to everyone.

Everyone look at work plan.

Everyone review monitoring suggestions.

Paul Beels-check availability for bridge

Jay Little-Speak on next call re: roundup inventory work/analysis. (and Dave) Joe to check with Kevin Golden (EPA modeler) about this.

Times for next call

Suggested times for the next call: Tuesday April 5 from 1:30-3:30; alternate April 7 1:30-3:30. Dependent on others and bridge availability.