

DRAFT  
**Meeting Notes**  
**IWG Conference Call**  
**December 21, 2006**

**Participants:**

Wienke Tax EPA-9	Eleanor Kaplan EPA-9	John Kelly EPA-9
Dana Mount ND	Alice Edwards AK	Frank Forsgren NV
Lori Campbell NV	Jan Miller UT	Rita Trujillo NM
Rosanne Sanchez NM	Bud Rolofson USDA FS	Tom Moore WGA
Bob Lebens WESTAR	Rick Boddicker SD	Patrick Cummins WGA
Corky Martinkovic AZ	Lisa Tomczak AZ	Ray Mohr CO
Don Arkell WESTAR	Kieth Rose EPA-10	

**Major discussion items:**

Affirmed **action items from the December meeting**, with clarifications as follows:

- 1.) Send e-mail to IWG-reminder to send projected SIP planning timetable to Lewis McLeod, [lmcleod@ntec.org](mailto:lmcleod@ntec.org) and FLMS on planning schedules. *Done. Email sent-need letters from states*
- 2.) Summarize State responses to BART and SIP planning questions and post *–Done. Meeting notes with Appendix and BART table. Table will be updated as schedule changes occur-*
- 3.) Summarize issues for air managers/state directors-recommendations – *No recommendations as yet. AMC issues pending WRAP staff retreat.*
- 4.) Several states agree to using Lee’s reasonable progress approach on at least one example Class I area and be ready to share their experiences with others. AZ, NM, WY, CO, ID, NV – *States affirmed their earlier agreements. This can be incorporated into the training schedule, item 5, and where appropriate use the updated 2018 visibility projections from items 6 and 7.*
- 5.) IWG Finalize TSS training needs and develop a training schedule – *Affirm timing and content of TSS training. Current thinking: First, in January-February, intro to TSS tool capabilities-(how to drive), followed in early March, with walk-through, using case studies selected by each state. Prior to the March session, states will be asked as homework to apply TSS tools to Class I areas they want to use as case studies, (see item 4) and to identify specific planning issues relative to individual class I area. Sessions will use WebEx format of 60-90 minutes.*
- 6.) WRAP staff re-issue the 2018 emission scenarios including all that is known about 2018. States will review and revise 2018 emissions projections as appropriate. – *To be sent in a week or two. Emission scenarios will include new projections for O&G, EGU’s California, and any firmed-up BART determinations. States will be asked for reality check on specific projections. This request may also ask for comments or projections for several selected non-BART control measures. Schedule a*

**March phone call to review as a group. Goal is to incorporate results as case-studies for training, (see item 4.) Also should include this as agenda item for April IWG meeting.**

7.) In March, projection scenarios from states will be prepared for another 2018 regional analysis. States can use this for RFP demonstration if it is sufficient for their RFP demonstrations. - **Goal is to include this as agenda item for April IWG meeting. Results from Item 6 to be reviewed at the April IWG meeting, Also may be used is training (see item 4)**

8.) If states wish to identify additional control measures for reasonable progress, limited modeling may be available for further 2018 analysis – **Pending**

9.) EPA attendance at IWG meetings will be encouraged – **Done**

On Oregon SIP template:

- Oregon is not submitting a revised 309 SIP, and is planning to submit a 308 SIP;
- The 308 template development has morphed into the draft Oregon SIP;
- Elements of the template are available for anyone to use as appropriate;
- The species-specific methodology appears to be a workable approach in Oregon.

On 2018 visibility projections, BART and non-BART control measures:

- Tom will re-issue 2018 base-case emission projections including BART controls (for states that have made those determinations), Rules on the books since 12/04, O&G, population, area sources, CA emission controls, other non-regional haze controls.
- Time should be factored into schedule for state evaluation of 2018 projections;
- States review revised base-case and decide what, if any BART assumptions should be included.
- 3 or 4 non-BART sources may also be looked at depending on what is obvious and what states determine they want analyzed;
- Some states expressed reluctance to separate BART and non-BART regional visibility projections for reasonable progress demonstrations;
- Separate sensitivity modeling may be run for BART?
- Regional modeling should not be the tool of choice to evaluate visibility impacts from BART sources or other stationary sources in particular Class I areas. States should anticipate using other more appropriate modeling methods in such cases.

On TSS training (see action item 4, above):

- TSS Training should be scheduled within the next several months, to include full TSS capability (How to drive), and practical application of the TSS tools to specific Class I areas.
- Participants will be expected to think about how to apply the TSS tools in their respective areas, and complete some homework preparations prior to the training session;

On form of TSS:

- TSS will continue to be a web-based portal to support SIPs. It is not expected that a hard-copy TSD will be produced by WRAP. States may develop hard-copy for submittal and public information purposes;

On EPA and FLM participation and “pre-approval” of SIP strategies:

- EPA and FLM’s cannot provide prior evaluations of candidate control measures, formats, demonstrations or explanations;
- Nonetheless, the collaborative process among states, tribes, federal agencies and stakeholders is very transparent, designed to achieve a “no surprises” environment and to provide some level of confidence that SIPs can be approved. All participants should work toward this goal;
- EPA was unable to conference on questions asked about “committal SIPs” during the December IWG meeting.

On species-specific approach for reasonable progress demonstrations:

- As above, EPA cannot endorse this approach, however it may help screen out non-controllable from controllable source categories and help support reasonable progress demonstrations where the overall visibility reductions do not meet the Uniform Rate of Progress;
- SIPs must provide good justification and explanations for why certain species of pollutants or source categories are not controllable, or are unreasonable to attempt to control. Reasoning may be based on technical, jurisdiction issues;

On questions for air managers:

- Issues should be better defined following assessment of 2018 modeling results;
- WRAP staff will retreat in February, look at what assistance may be needed from AMC;

On WRAP staff changes:

- Lee Alter will be leaving the WRAP on January 31.
- Lee Gribovicz will be joining the WRAP in mid-January.

DRAFT