

**UGRB Air Quality Citizens Advisory Task Force
Meeting Summary
May 30, 2012
5:00 – 8:30pm
Rendezvous Point Senior Center, Pinedale, WY**

<input type="checkbox"/> Draft for Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved
Task Force Members Present:	
<p>John Anderson, Sublette County Resident Craig Brown, QEP Resources Kent Connelly, Lincoln County John Corra, WY Dept. of Environmental Quality Elaine Crumpley, Sublette County Resident Shane Deforest, Bureau of Land Management Steve Dietrich, WY Dept. of Environmental Quality Wally Johnson, Sweetwater County Commissioner Thomas Johnston, Sublette County Carmel Kail, Sublette, County Resident Cally McKee, Ultra Petroleum Tom Monahan, Exxon Mobil Cortnie Morrell, Williams Andy Nelson, Sublette County Bruce Pendery, Wyoming Outdoor Council</p>	<p>Jeremiah Rieman, Governor’s Office Rod Rozier, Sublette County Resident Isabel Ruckers, Sublette County Resident Mike Shaffron, Encana Oil and Gas Terry Svalberg, US Forest Service</p> <p><i>Alternates:</i> Steve Jones, The Wilderness Society Hyun Kim, City of Pinedale Ted Porwoll, US Forest Service</p> <p><i>Facilitators:</i> Steve Smutko, UW Ruckelshaus Institute Elizabeth Spaulding, UW Ruckelshaus Institute</p>
Agenda:	Handouts:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome & Announcements 2. Agenda, Procedures, Outreach 3. Presentation of the Joint Fact Finding Document 4. Review of the Recommendation Process 5. Option Generation - Brainstorming 6. Option Ranking 7. Next Steps 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint Fact Finding Document 2. UGRB Air Quality Task Force Objectives 3. UGRB Air Quality Task Force Option Ideas 4. UGRB Air Quality Task Force Interests 5. UGRB Air Quality Task Force Decision Context Diagrams 6. Recommendations for Controlling Ozone in the Upper Green River Basin – Bruce Pendery 7. Recommendations from Steph Kessler 8. Recommendations from Deforest, Kail, Hohl, Anderson, and Zivkovich
Presentations Given:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical Subcommittee presentation of the Joint Fact Finding Document 	
Action Items:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rank generated options into categories of potential for effectiveness and acceptability. 	

Meeting Summary

I. Welcome & Announcements

- A. John Corra opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing the alternates in attendance.

II. Agenda, Procedures, Outreach

- A. Elizabeth Spaulding reviewed the agenda for the evening and asked for any questions.
- B. Elizabeth asked Task Force participants to share how they have been communicating Task Force activities and discussions with their constituents. One participant stated that she held a conference call with her company. Another participant expressed that community members had asked to be kept better informed. There was a brief discussion about the potential of setting up a communication strategy plan to help inform constituents of Task Force activities.

III. Presentation of the Joint Fact Finding Document

- A. Rod Rozier presented the most recent version of the Joint Fact Finding Document and reviewed the summary points that were drawn by the technical subcommittee. One participant requested the JFF document contain more information about the role of the regulatory agencies. Members of the technical subcommittee responded by stating that while it is possible to add information about the roles and timelines of the various agencies, implementation rules are still forthcoming. There was also agreement that including an explanation of what the Ozone Advancement program is would be helpful. There was discussion on what the proper format of the document should be, as it is intended to be a tool for the public. One participant requested further information on monitoring.

IV. Review of the Recommendation Process

- A. Steve Smutko reviewed the Decision Context diagrams that were created at the previous meeting, and checked with participants that his interpretation of them was correct. Task Force members agreed that it was.
- B. Steve then reviewed the list of interests that was generated through the Decision Worksheet homework completed for the previous meeting. He explained the necessity of gaining clarity and understanding on each of the interests, as they would later be used to evaluate the strength of individual recommendations. Steve then went through each priority level of interests, asking if there were any questions or necessary clarifications.
- C. One participant expressed a concern that not everyone had voiced interests and that the list was not fully comprehensive. Several participants asked for some elaboration on listed interests, and the authors of the interests provided further understanding. Several members requested clarification on interests that did not appear to have an author present. These interests were marked for later discussion. One participant stated that he did not believe the listed interests encompassed Sweetwater and Lincoln counties' interests, and that those should also be considered, particularly the air quality and economic strength of those communities. This led to a discussion clarifying how the non-attainment boundary was determined, so as to provide insight as to why representatives of Sweetwater and Lincoln county were included in the Task Force. Several interests that were added to the list included an increased sense of urgency to the process and a developed methodology that explains the differentiated VOC and NOx equation.

This list of interests can be found at the Ruckelshaus Institute's website at <http://www.uwyo.edu/enr/ruckelshaus-institute/collaborative-decision-making/ugrb-air-quality-task-force.html>.

V. Option Generation

- A. Elizabeth asked task force participants to review the options that had been proposed to the group via email, as well as through the objective identification exercise at the previous meeting. She then had them break into self-selecting small groups and brainstorm further options that would meet the Task Force's interests and objectives.
- B. Each small group identified new options and posted them on the Sticky Wall. Once all new options were posted, Elizabeth read them aloud to the Task Force, allowing time for questions of clarification for each. The list of new generated options is as follows:
1. Phasing retrofits (of grandfathered facilities) percentages per year. Start big sources and work to small. (We have interpreted this to mean that retrofits on grandfathered facilities should be phased in based on tonnage of emissions, targeting high emitters first and working toward smaller emitters.)
 2. DEQ should announce rulemakings by Fall to create incentives for voluntary reductions, such as pneumatics.
 3. Upgrade P-BACT to eliminate routine venting and other upgrades. Then apply as RACT rule to grandfathered facilities.
 4. Area wide cap of emissions.
 5. Monitor liquids gathering system for leaks. Provide for a way to back track to find leaks (multiple meters).
 6. Hire another DEQ personnel solely to manage the UGRB air quality issues, perhaps for five years.
 7. "Programmatic" offset policies and solutions need to be considered along with specific emissions control measures.
 8. Implement a staged development plan.
 9. Aggregate all minor (permitted and unpermitted mobile) sources within the UGRB.
 10. DEQ should develop and enforce minimum emission and operation standards for exposed produced and drilling water ponds.
 11. Retire all pre-March 2011 VOC/NOx "credits."
 12. Shift to pit-less operations.
 13. DEQ should present to the Task Force rough estimates for equipment changes and cost per ton of NOx and VOC reductions in 10% increments. The Task Force can then examine and evaluate these for reasonableness.

14. Use increased monitoring to target and inform actions designed to reduce NOx and VOC emissions.

VI. Option Ranking

- A. Elizabeth instructed Task Force participants to begin ranking the generated options into two categories based on how they viewed the acceptability and effectiveness of the option in meeting their interests and objectives. They were encouraged to work within their small groups, but that consensus within the group was not necessary for the ranking.
- B. Due to a lack of time, Task Force participants were unable to review and rank all of the options generated. Several participants requested that the options be compiled into a single document, with redundant options removed. Elizabeth agreed that Ruckelshaus Institute will do this. Elizabeth explained to the Task Force that the Ruckelshaus Institute will soon be sending out a poll that will allow Task Force participants to individually rank all of the options into categories that reflect the options' effectiveness and acceptability.

VII. Next Steps

- A. Ruckelshaus Institute staff will review and condense the options generated by both email and through the brainstorming exercise into one document. They will then send out the list of options to the Task Force with a survey that will allow Task Force participants to rank the options according to how acceptable and effective they believe them to be.
- B. A doodle poll will be sent out to the Task Force to explore possible dates for the next meeting.

Next Meeting

Date: TBD

Time: 5:00 – 8:30 pm

Location: Pinedale, Wyoming

Draft Agenda:

- 1. Begin to evaluate options.