



Date: August 1, 2006

Subject: Notes from TOC/Forum & Workgroup Co-Chairs conference call of July 7, 2006

Attendance: Dave Jones, Pat Cummins, Kevin Briggs, Ken Cronin, John Veranth, Marc Pitchford, Lewis McLeod, Lee Gribovicz, Alice Edwards, Brock LeBaron, Mark Fitch, Bob Palzer, Colleen Cripps, Tamera Dawes, Dan Redline, John Vimont, Steve Arnold, Doug Latimer, Wayne Leipold, Tom Moore

Upcoming Events: July 11-13 Fire Emissions and Emissions Forums' meetings, July 17-18 Greenhouse Gas Registry meeting, July 25-27 TSS and AoH workgroup meetings, July 26-27, Tribal Data Development WG meeting, Stationary Sources Forum meeting August 16-17. These are posted on the website.

Action: Tom will post the August 29-31 Implementation Work Group meeting notice; also the Dust Forum plans needs to be fleshed out and Tom will find out what their plans were and post any meeting they anticipate.

Budget: Pat C. reviewed the budget situation. About twice the available money has been requested. The 2008 funding is being used to help fund these but the money needed in the future as being shown as 'unfunded requests'. Some funding from the 05 and 06 budgets were juggled to fund the TSS and AoH work. Lee G. asked if the spreadsheet being reviewed was different than the one available in June. Pat confirmed that this is a redistributed budget that is balanced, in a sense. There is a call next Friday with the Planning Team to review this budget.

Potential IMPROVE network cutback and Natural Conditions discussion - Marc P. noted that a recent article in the paper related to an article in Science and links increased wildfires to climate change and made the point that RH is directly linked to this. A number of other newspapers carried the article.

IMPROVE Site Reduction Plan - Marc went through the slide show that will be presented to the RPO Monitoring call next week. Marc noted that the 'notes section' of the slides add a lot of detail. The show we reviewed is not totally complete but reflects the brunt of the material. Budget cuts threaten the existing network. Marc participated in a process to look at a reduced network. Protocol developed to look for reductions by the group to protect that all Class I areas will have representative data. Using existing data evaluate sites to determine if one existing site was representative of another Class I area and could therefore be eliminated. Other criteria were listed in the slides. One wrinkle that came about was when the criteria were applied and a test list was sent out for reductions many reasons were raised as to why those sites should not be eliminated and the reasons fell outside of the selection criteria. Nitrates were used as a more key

indicator of differences or similarities between sites rather than some of the other species as many of the other species are too similar to distinguish one site from another while nitrates appear to truly be different if sites were not similar. An EOF (empirical orthogonal function) analysis was also used to differentiate sites from each other. Slide 6 showed the groupings in a picture. The Regional Metric developed in the first step of the process led to a sub regional analysis of the similarity (or dissimilarity) of sites within the initial grouping. Sifting through the next steps of the process led to more controversy and some wrinkles need to be ironed out. Different approaches were suggested in the next steps and Marc emphasized that other processes of selection could be used. John V. pointed out the selection process targets a great deal of sites in the WRAP area and Marc agreed. John V. felt that other criteria like terrain complexity and the spread of sources is considerably different in the West and this process seemed to ignore those factors. Marc agreed the process did not take this into account. The process did create 'orphaned' Class I areas and the process then froze those sites so adequate representation was provided. Bottom line- the WRAP has 77 monitoring sites that are a 66% representation of the Class I areas in the West. The modified plan drops this to 48% coverage. CENWRAP came out similar to WRAP in the end. The representativeness ratio is covered in the slides. The end process, by happenstance, ended up giving about equal coverage in each Region excluding some areas that had only two monitors to start with.

Natural Conditions - Marc noted nothing new has been done on this in the past month as the focus has been on the IMPROVE network reduction project. The slide show was reviewed. A lot of detail about the process to calculate the new 'natural conditions' number was reviewed. Slide 6 summarized the end result in a picture of the country. Marc said that a few weeks from now he hopes to have a slide based report and a presentation at the 2nd Monday in August and also for the AoH meeting at the end of July. After this, about the end of August, he expects to have this mounted on the WRAP Web site.

Action: Marc will finish these 2 slide shows and prepare a report for the Natural Conditions one, to present for various groups over the next few weeks.

Board Meeting presentation design: Tom reviewed the outline of the presentation for the Board meeting and asked for input into content. Wayne L. asked about several of the slides showing 'State' lines and a discussion followed about why or why not to show these. The bottom line is that States have to use the monitoring data in their RFP process. Focus on emissions and attribution will be the meat of the discussion. Tom expected about a 30 slide presentation in about 45 minutes.

Action: TOC or others can comment to Tom about the outline and slides in the next month. Tom will send a reminder to the TOC members to have them review and comment by a date he will establish.

Technical Status Report (July 2006 edition) - Tom asked that members review the status report and make comments and he will send a reminder on that.

Next call date/time - scheduled for Friday August 4th 1100 AM Mountain