

UGRB Air Quality Citizens Advisory Task Force

Meeting Summary

March 21, 2012

5:00 – 8:30pm

Sublette County Library, Pinedale, WY

Draft for Review

Approved

Task Force Members Present:

John Anderson, Sublette County Resident
 Craig Brown, QEP Resources
 Kent Connelly, Lincoln County
 John Corra, WY Dept. of Environmental Quality
 Shane Deforest, Bureau of Land Management
 Steve Dietrich, WY Dept. of Environmental Quality
 David Hohl, Town of Pinedale
 Thomas Johnston, Sublette County
 Carmel Kail, Sublette, County Resident
 Stephanie Kessler, Wilderness Society
 Cally McKee, Ultra Petroleum
 Tom Monahan, Exxon Mobil
 Cortnie Morrell, Williams Company
 Andy Nelson, Sublette County

Bruce Pendery, Wyoming Outdoor Council
 Jim Robinson, Town of Marbleton
 Rod Rozier, Sublette County Resident
 Isabel Rucker, Sublette County Resident
 Mike Shaffron, Encana Oil and Gas
 Terry Svalberg, US Forest Service
 Hank Williams, Sublette County Resident
 Angela Zivkovich, Shell Exploration & Production

Alternates:

Mary Lynn Worl, CURED
 Rebekah Fitzgerald, Office of the Governor

Facilitators:

Steve Smutko, UW Ruckelshaus Institute
 Elizabeth Spaulding, UW Ruckelshaus Institute

Agenda:

1. Welcome & Announcements
2. Agenda, Procedures, Outreach
3. Process Roadmap and Discussion
4. Charter Review and Discussion
5. Scientific and Technical Discussion
6. Joint Fact Finding Dialogue
7. Next Steps

Handouts:

1. Upper Green River Basin Air Quality Task Force Joint Fact-Finding Document DRAFT – March 15, 2012
2. Upper Green River Basin Air Quality Citizens Advisory Task Force Charter Draft 2.2

Presentations Given:

1. Ruckelshaus Institute Presentation: Problem-Solving Process and Joint Fact Finding
2. WDEQ Presentation: Air Quality Modeling 101
3. Dr. Rob Field (UW Atmospheric Science) Presentation: Pinedale Anticline Spatial Air Quality Assessment Updated Preliminary Findings and Provisional Result
4. Ruckelshaus Institute Presentation: Problem-Solving Process and Joint Fact Finding

Action Items:

1. A technical subcommittee will be formed to review and complete the JFF document.
2. Ruckelshaus Institute staff will meet with the Steering Committee to reassess the Task Force's timeline and process.

Summary Points:

1. A roadmap was presented for the next two meetings.
2. There was a discussion on the benefits and limitations of modeling, with varying perspectives on how useful modeling will be in creating recommendations.
3. Changes in the Task Force Charter were reviewed.
4. The Task Force narrowed their objectives.

Meeting Summary

I. Welcome & Announcements

- A. John Corra opened the meeting by introducing those Task Force members not in attendance at the first meeting.
- B. John announced that we are nearing the end of “ozone season” and that there were no exceedences this year.

II. Agenda, Procedures, Outreach

- A. Elizabeth Spaulding reviewed the agenda for the evening. No changes to the agenda were requested.
- B. Elizabeth reviewed the ground rules for the meeting.

III. Process Roadmap and Discussion

- A. Steve Smutko discussed the collaborative decision-making process, which includes Joint Fact Finding, identification of issues and interests, option generation, and evaluation of options. He then provided the following roadmap for the Task Force’s first four meetings:
 - Meeting 1 (February): Procedural ground work
 - Meeting 2 (March): Finish procedural work; begin discussion on technical issues
 - Meeting 3: Solidify technical reference; frame issues; specify interests
 - Meeting 4: Generate options
 - Subsequent meetings: evaluate options; reach agreement on recommendations; evaluate progress
- B. Steve asked the Task Force if this was the appropriate process for them. Several participants expressed concern that the process is taking longer than they hoped it would, as they feel they are ready to move into the recommendation phase already. Other participants felt like spending time on Joint Fact Finding was important for the Task Force’s ability to move forward and make educated recommendations. Steve told the Task Force that the Ruckelshaus Institute staff would reconvene the steering committee to discuss how the process may be adjusted in order to help the Task Force move more quickly toward creating recommendations. One Task Force participant stated that we to clarify the task force’s objectives in order to move forward. The Task Force narrowed these objectives to focus on ozone precursors initially, with a focus on industrial sources. One participant emphasized the need to focus on compliance with NAAQS. Further discussion will be necessary to solidify these objectives.
- C. Steve also suggested that a Technical Subcommittee of six to eight members be formed from the Task Force. The purpose and function of the subcommittee would be to:
 - Address comments/recommendations on JFF document from Task Force members
 - Provide guidance to Ruckelshaus staff in development of JFF document
 - Report back to Task Force

The Task Force agreed to this recommendation. A sign-up sheet was circulated to the Task Force for volunteers on the subcommittee. The following Task Force members volunteered to serve on the subcommittee:

1. Craig Brown
2. John Corra

3. Carmel Kail
4. Tom Monahan
5. Rod Rozier
6. Hank Williams

IV. Charter Review and Discussion

- A. Elizabeth reviewed the changes that have been incorporated into the charter based on the discussion at the first meeting, as well as pertinent comments noted in the margins. She then presented Section 9, "Decision Process" to the Task Force, specifically pointing out the new language describing what process would be used if consensus on a decision could not be met. The Task Force asked clarifying questions, but voiced no issues of concern over the section. Ruckelshaus staff will prepare a "clean" draft of the charter for formal adoption at the next meeting.

V. Scientific and Technical Discussion

- A. Steve Dietrich provided a brief presentation on the work DEQ has been doing on modeling. Steve explained that modeling is done to estimate air pollutant concentration at specific locations, as well as estimate impacts from single or multiple sources, in order to help develop strategies for air quality management. However, there is currently no winter ozone model configuration fully developed. The DEQ has a contracted photochemical grid modeling (PGM) analysis and model evaluation of CMAQ and CAMx underway with a target completion date of the end of 2012.
- B. Dr. Robert Field presented an overview of his research, highlighting several important findings:
 - A strong level of agreement was found between UW ambient measures at Boulder South Road and the DEQ emissions inventory for six VOCs in March 2011. While this is a good first step, consideration must still be given to the size of the box model area, the position of the sampling site, and the emission locations.
 - Dr. Field explained that VOCs have different ozone creation potentials when considering their reaction with the hydroxyl radical. When considering this factor along with the mixing ratios, the class of compounds known as BTEX are important.
 - UW identified different areas that have relatively high emissions of BTEX and NOx. The Mesa and a water treatment facility were important for BTEX. For NOx, roads and perhaps compressor stations were important.
- C. C. The power points from these presentations can be found on the Ruckelshaus Institute's website at <http://www.uwyo.edu/enr/ruckelshaus-institute/collaborative-decision-making/ugrb-air-quality-task-force.html> and on the WDEQ's website at <http://deq.state.wy.us/aqd/Ozone>.

VI. Joint Fact Finding Dialogue

- A. Anne Jakle presented Draft 1 of the Joint Fact Finding (JFF) document to the Task Force, providing an explanation of its purpose and how it was created. She also explained how to identify where in the document there are still gaps in information and areas of uncertainty.
- B. Elizabeth broke the task force into four small groups in order to review the JFF document. Each group was asked to respond to four questions:
 1. What information do we need?

2. Who can provide it?
3. When do we need it?
4. What are we going to do with it?

After twenty minutes of discussion, one person from each group presented their group's responses to the rest of the Task Force. Responses were recorded and will be submitted to the Technical Subcommittee for inclusion in the JFF document. Task Force participants were encouraged to send additional comments to Elizabeth, who will in turn provide them to the Technical Subcommittee for consideration and inclusion into the JFF document.

VII. Next Steps

- A. A technical subcommittee will be assembled to review and complete the JFF document.
- B. The technical subcommittee will present the revised JFF document to the Task Force at large for approval.
- C. The Task Force will identify issues to be addressed and stakeholder interests.
- D. The Task Force will begin to generate options that meet these issues and interests.

Next Meeting

Date: TBD

Time:

Location: Sublette County Library, Pinedale, Wyoming

Draft Agenda:

1. Task Force announcements
2. Approve charter
3. Review and discuss the JFF Document
4. Develop and agree on a clear set of issues that will be addressed by the Task Force
5. Identify and specify stakeholder interests
6. Begin to generate options for recommendations