

SUMMARY MINUTES FOR THE:

**AIR QUALITY TASK GROUP MEETING
(PINEDALE AREA WORKING GROUP)
PINEDALE, BLM OFFICE, PINEDALE, WYOMING
JUNE 4, 2009**

ATTENDING:

- LAUREN MCKEEVER, (FACILITATOR & LIAISON), BLM
- DENNIS KUHNEL, BLM
- *CRAIG BROWN (CURRENT TASK GROUP MEMBER), QUESTAR
- *STEPHANIE KESSLER, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY
- LINCOLN SHERMAN, CONSULTANT WITH AIR RESOURCES
- *JONATHAN RATNER, (CURRENT TASK GROUP MEMBER), WESTERN WATERSHEDS PROJECT.
- *TERRY SVALBERG, USFS, AIR QUALITY SPECIALIST
- JEFF SOLTZ, UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
- *CHUCK BRAGG, LOCAL ATTORNEY
- TONY GOSER, LOCAL RESIDENT
- JENNIFER FRAZIER, DEQ
- KELLY BOTT, DEQ
- *TOM HAKONSON, LOCAL RESIDENT
- MEGHANN DURBROW, SUBLETTE COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT

*Task group member

SYNOPSIS:

The June 4, 2009 PAWG Air Quality Task Group Meeting addressed a variety of topics. The issues most discussed included: 1) the advantages and disadvantages of the process that created the 2005 PAWG Air Quality Report; 2) the significance and public worthiness of the 2005 PAWG Air Quality Report; 3) the funding and focus of the next proposed PAWG Air Quality Report and 4) the content, date and time of the next PAWG Air Quality meeting.

SUMMARY MINUTES:

After introductions, **Lauren McKeever** shared that **Jonathan Ratner** had asked beforehand about the “review for southwest networking.” **Kelly Bott** responded that she could field questions on the subject by phone or email.

Craig Brown asked if the ozone season data had been posted to the internet. **Kelly Bott**

responded that the database was expected to be finished this week and made for public access and review immediately in the next couple weeks.

Lauren McKeever brought up the topic of what ought to be the operating guidelines for PAWG.

Stephanie Kessler said that the document in May laid out the role of PAWG; including its process and duties. **Kessler** would like to see the next report from the Task Group specifically layout more guidelines for the group and its future reports.

Lauren McKeever shared that an annual report from the Task Group was due September 10th, 2009. **McKeever** said that she felt this deadline would not permit the group enough time to produce a report. **McKeever** suggested that the Task Group come up with an alternate deadline for the report. The group had discussion about potential resources to fund updating the task group's last report (2005).

Chuck Bragg asked what resources were available to the Task Group to update its report.

Terry Svalberg replied that many of the data sets from 2005 were obsolete. For **Svalberg**, the issue of the report could be handled in a number of ways. The Task Group could either 1) Redo all of the 2005 report 2) Create a supplemental report to accompany the original 2005 document that would contain updated information or 3) Present the 2005 report with an annotated bibliography with links and directional information for the reader to new data sets and information.

Stephanie Kessler in response to **Terry Svalberg** expressed concern that the guidelines she had previously mentioned forbade any mention from data that was older than one year.

Kessler said that PAWG should not be interested in 2005 and instead seek out funding for more

Comment [kb1]: UGWOS 2009 data has been posted and the data from the permanent stations (Boulder, Daniel, South Pass, etc.) is included in that database.

current data.

Lauren McKeever clarified the issue by saying that the PAWG had simply chosen to grandfather older guidelines for reports and that the Task Group had the authority to decide upon what structure it preferred.

Kelly Bott agreed with **McKeever** in principle, but added that the older guidelines provided a valuable framework for the Task Group's purpose.

Stephanie Kessler stated that she agreed with **McKeever** that the September deadline was impractical and too "quick." **Kessler** added that the Task Group was tied to the Anticline and ROD (Record of Decision) which, in effect, made it necessary for the report to be delayed past September as the Task Group would need time to analyze and disseminate information.

Kessler suggested October as an alternate due date.

Terry Svalberg wondered why delaying the Task Group's report past September was necessary.

Stephanie Kessler elaborated upon the need for a delayed due date by saying that the Visibility Impacts needed more time to be analyzed.

There was discussion about what specifically was due September 12, 2009. **Kelly Bott** noted the emissions inventory was due July 1, 2009 and that would determine whether or not companies had met visibility thresholds. **Bott** also shared that ozone modeling was due by September 12 along with reports on liquid gathering systems. **Bott** related that non-compliance with offset credits would result in certain consequences for involved parties.

Chuck Bragg asked when reports due September 12, 2009 would become publicly available.

Kelly Bott shared that she believed the reports submitted to the BLM would be available

immediately or, at least, by the third week of September. **Bott** said the reports would primarily be technical data, whereupon several Task Group participants suggested that the reports be required to contain a cover memo that synthesized the technical data.

Stephanie Kessler asked who is responsible for visibility milestones?

Kelly Bott answered that operators have to show to the BLM and other federal agencies that they met visibility milestones stated in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Stephanie Kessler asked if the PAWG had requirements not stated in the ROD?

Kelly Bott responded that they were in the TSD, page 37, Table 4:1.

Lauren McKeever stated that it would probably be beneficial if DEQ asked for a summary cover letter for reports and communications.

Kelly Bott agreed and stated she would be happy proposing a summary page.

Lauren McKeever asked if the Task Group was on board with asking for a summary cover page. No one present dissented.

Kelly Bott related that the emissions inventory were due July and August 1, 2009.

Chuck Bragg asked what the time frame was for the PAWG report with this information now on the table. **Bragg** suggested maybe November or December would be more sensible deadlines than September.

Lauren McKeever stated that suggested PAWG report deadlines could be met by some groups, but was unsure about the timeline for recommendations.

Stephanie Kessler followed up McKeever's comment by saying that she thought time was definitely needed past September for reflection and communication with PAWG.

Terry Svalberg pointed out at this time that the original report had taken six months.

Chuck Bragg, upon hearing this, suggested January 2010 as a deadline.

Lauren McKeever restated that different tasks could possibly have different deadlines.

Stephanie Kessler then asked whether or not DEQ was responsible for some of these actions?

Kelly Bott responded that the DEQ would provide data but leave interpretation out of it.

Tom Hakonson asked why the PAWG was looking at this data and who was the intended customer for the PAWG report.

Kelly Bott said that the group will look at the available data for Pinedale, the Anticline and many other locations and bring them together into one source, providing an important convenience for public access and information-gathering.

Terry Svalberg added that by bringing this information together too it makes it possible to notice important commonalities and trends in the data.

Stephanie Kessler interjected and said that she wanted PAWG to do more than what was being described and that was done in the 2005 report.

Kelly Bott asked what steps were necessary for PAWG to request money for projects.

Jennifer Frazier said the Jonah Interagency Office was entertaining proposals for projects.

Kelly Bott asked who was responsible for filing applications for funds. June 12 was one deadline for JIO proposals, but then another would follow that.

Stephanie Kessler suggested that PAWG be a clearinghouse for air monitoring information and an interface between the public and the plan. Most importantly, Stephanie said, the PAWG should tell the public whether or not air quality standards are being met.

Chuck Bragg claimed that the goal of the PAWG was to give the BLM ideas to reduce air pollution.

Terry Svalberg followed this up by noting that the PAWG was in a regulatory mode.

Jennifer Frazier said in response to everyone that in her opinion there was still room for ideas for mitigating air pollution.

Stephanie Kessler asked what would happen if analysis showed benchmarks would not be met? She wondered if the result of that would only be that the PAWG would ask them to model again.

Lauren McKeever suggested that the PAWG could summarize all monitoring activities and whether or not goals were being met, and to inform the public about where more information on the subject could be found.

Jennifer Frazier said that one of the strong points of the first report was that it did what Lauren described and that is why it was so successful.

Jonathan Ratner said that in his opinion also the 2005 report was good and should just be updated with current data.

Stephanie Kessler followed by saying that what really mattered was that this report does not just get simply filed. From the BLM perspective Stephanie thought, the 2005 report was simply filed away and forgotten.

Lauren McKeever in response to this said that she would do her best to try and make sure the next report is not forgotten.

Stephanie Kessler pointed out that besides from the monitoring and mitigation- the PAWG was also to work with the Pinedale Anticline Project Office (PAPO).

Lauren McKeever said that this group could assist with monitoring information and proposals for (adaptive) management.

Terry Svalberg added that the group's recommendations ought to be a collaborative effort.

Tony Gosar described the issue of air quality as having many different components; sampling was important and see what is being helpful and what isn't. In other words, air quality is not something that possesses a selective data set.

Jonathan Ratner said that in 2005 he suggested there be a 3 page report that summarized for the public the findings of the report. That didn't happen, instead the final report was 86 pages long.

Stephanie Kessler said that we need to redo the original 2005 report because there is so much more data and issues at hand. Also, she thinks that it would be better to make recommendations and have links to raw data than simply make the report raw data itself.

Jennifer Frazier said that she thinks the report needs to be more user friendly. **Frazier** also added that she thinks it is the purpose of the Data Analyst job to make recommendations and interpret the data (to the PAPO). She noted that there was currently a hiring restriction that could slow down the hiring.

Lauren McKeever confirmed with Jennifer that the new Data Analyst position could possibly be filled in August or September.

Terry Svalberg said that if we do a report we should definitely hire a contractor to compile and write it.

Jennifer Frazier was not sure whether or not a contractor hire would meet mitigation requirements (with PAPO funding).

Terry Svalberg said that a summary should be written and added to the 2005 report.

Stephanie Kessler said the 2005 report was not useful to the public at this point and should not be duplicated in any way.

Jonathan Ratner followed by saying what was needed was:

- 1) A detailed report for decision-makers
- 2) A second document for the lay public
- 3) Time should be allowed for the group to edit and examine the material in each section of the report. It is key Jonathan said that contractor not be allowed to do this step.

Lauren McKeever asked if there was consensus for a technical report with 1) summary and reference guide and 2) a separate document that lists all that is going on and states trends.

Jennifer Frazier disagreed and said that it was not the business of this group to do trend data analysis.

Lauren McKeever clarified and said she meant a report on analysis of trends and not original trend analysis.

Jonathan Ratner said he sees no benefit in providing links for the public in a document. In his opinion, you have to tell the people what the bottom line is.

Kelly Bott said that trend data was not a problem in her opinion if the report did not draw conclusions from data trending one way or another.

Chuck Bragg interjected and said that we are just creating a synopsis. In response to the thought that the report should only be 2-3 pages long, **Lauren McKeever** stated that in reality it would have to be much longer.

Stephanie Kessler said that the report could maybe be 10 pages, but in no circumstance could it be 200 pages long.

Jonathan Ratner said that 10 pages was much too long.

Lauren McKeever suggested that there possibly be a 10 page and a 3 page report.

Jonathan Ratner said that we should do a full report and then do a 3 page summary of the full report. Any other alternative method would be “putting the cart before the horse.”

Craig Brown said that he agreed with the goal of a portion of the report being designed for public consumption

Lauren McKeever said that the group will have to agree what language to use for the application. Most importantly, **McKeever** suggested, the group must decide exactly what the contractor is to do for their work assignment.

Jonathan Ratner said that he preferably wanted a writer with Air Quality experience.

Lincoln Sherman suggested that they could call it “A Citizen’s Guide to Air Quality in Sublette County.”

Terry Svalberg suggested that the group could make one application for one report and another application for another report later.

Jennifer Frazier reminded the group that if they had any ideas to reduce emissions they could apply for funding to the PAPO office. She also said that if the group did this they could qualify for more than \$15,000 in funding. **Frazier** said that this opportunity is something the group should consider, because agencies understand pollution sources so the real issue is ideas about how to mitigate that pollution.

Meghann Durbrow suggested that each rig use wind turbines.

Jonathan Ratner agreed saying that 99% of the problem is caused by one entity, so it makes sense to try and mitigate the problem at the scene.

Jennifer Frazier clarified that the money was not for operators. PAPO funds are for

mitigation, but not on the rigs. **Frazier** said that she thinks the mitigation would allow for a host of projects that could reduce emissions.

Frazier added the group should refer to the ROD for funding guidelines. **Frazier** advised that if the group used the ROD to inform their application it would be easier to tie their objectives to mitigation standards. The PAPO has an application.

Stephanie Kessler said that the PAWG should provide the “big picture” for the public.

Tom Hakonson said that the real risk of the report would be to try and interpret long term data; a task he does not think the group is qualified to do.

Terry Svalberg said the group should interpret the data that the BLM and other agencies do not do.

Lauren McKeever suggested that the report be made available through the PAWG website.

Kelly Bott pointed out that the ROD’s second paragraph of page 17, 2.9 clearly says that money can be used for research that is made publically available.

Stephanie Kessler quoted similarly from page 25 of the ROD.

Kelly Bott shared that the PAPO is developing a website where we could make all this information more transparent, and that transparency has strong support from BLM’s Chuck Otto. **Bott** also said that the PAWG could ask for contract funding (for a contractor to do the air quality report).

Chuck Bragg asked Kelly Bott what kind of contractor would she recommend hiring?

Kelly Bott recommended an air quality person, at least, just to compile the data.

Craig Brown expressed reservations about paying someone to analyze data when, he

suggested, maybe many of these reports were already doing this as part of the report. That said, he thinks it is good we understand the different monitoring efforts.

Kelly Bott said that she agreed with Craig Brown; but some statistics weren't transparent and needed to be made available for public comment and perusal.

Stephanie Kessler said that she does not want to monitor the raw data; thinks that we should only make something available for the public.

Kelly Bott agreed that to put all studies in the spotlight would be helpful

Lauren McKeever asked who should make the application to PAPO for funding?

Stephanie Kessler said the issue is what should be the scope of contributor's work . . . should they summarize or recommend more monitoring?

Jonathan Ratner said that long term monitors could be part of nation-wide systems.

Terry Svalberg talked about the differences in monitoring, for example the Forest Service monitors contents of lakes to determine pollution in region.

Lauren McKeever asked if there was consensus for a summary report; or an application to the PAPO?

Stephanie Kessler and **Jennifer Frazier** volunteered to write grant application for report.

Stephanie Kessler asked if the group thought do we need an Air Quality expert or just a technical writer?

Terry Svalberg said that he believed someone with a background in Air Quality would be helpful.

Lincoln Sherman predicted that a ballpark cost estimate for a summary document would

be less than a request for data collection.

Jennifer Frazier said that she thought the future Data Analyst could do much of the work that was being described.

Lincoln Sherman estimated that the report for Pinedale and the Anticline would cost \$5-15,000.

Lauren McKeever suggested that Terry Svalberg could help with the estimate of hours of work necessary for the report; Lincoln could come up with a cost estimate and Jennifer could report on the status of the Data Analyst.

Terry Svalberg said that it would take 3 months or less to compile and write the report that had been discussed

*

Lauren McKeever asked what the next step for the group should be? **McKeever** said she would send emails to make sure the appropriate language was used to meet guidelines for applications.

Stephanie Kessler reiterated that she was going to make an application for a new and updated Air Quality report.

Terry Svalberg asked if the group should break up the application and report process into two different projects.

Stephanie Kessler said that it was necessary to update the information into one report.

Chuck Bragg asked how many different sources were out there in terms of data?

Lincoln estimated that there were likely 7-9 sources, maximum 12 that could be used.

Stephanie Kessler said that there should be a "State of the Air" report.

Chuck Bragg thought that "Citizen's Report" sounded easier and better.

Jennifer Frazier said that the issue will be brought up at the next meeting (for PAPO).

Stephanie Kessler said that would be helpful because the task group should get more feedback.

Lauren McKeever asked if someone could volunteer to report on the group's progress to the PAWG's next meeting on July 23, 2009.

Jonathan Ratner asked where the network assessment was in terms of its progress?

Kelly Bott said that the final report would be on the DEQ website for review. **Bott** also shared that the network assessment is to review DEQ monitoring networks and any shortcomings it may have and suggest new parameters. NE, NW, SW Wyoming still need to be done.

*

Stephanie Kessler asked whether the ozone findings and recordings had been validated?

Kessler was worried because she knew people on the Lander Nordic Ski Team which train near where high ozone readings have been taken (South Pass area).

Kelly Bott reported to the group that the ozone findings had not been validated.

Jonathan Ratner said that he believed the studies may be followed up in January.

Chuck Bragg said that the validation should not take a huge amount of time.

Stephanie Kessler asked what are the experts saying about the trends? She also shared that she would rather only write one application for one report that covers everything instead of two smaller reports.

Jonathan Ratner shared that visibility analysis of information was time consuming.

Chuck Bragg thought, on the other hand, that visibility data could be quickly attained.

Lincoln Sherman confirmed that it is easier now than it had been in the past.

Terry Svalberg said that air quality is not a contained deposition. You have to identify

Comment [kb2]: The Air Quality Division is still investigating the high ozone events that took place at the South Pass monitor, but at this time, believe the events were due to stratospheric intrusion.

the information to gather, decide what you are going to do and tell the public and etc?

Tom Hakonson asked how graphs and data would be interpreted?

Terry Svalberg answered that graphs help reveal trends that, for example, may show links to spikes in oil and gas development. **Terry Svalberg** shared that the National Forest Service does not seek out to blame any single group for changes in trends and etc.

Chuck said that the group should identify 1) data gaps 2) objective for task group (keeping it very limited) and 3) how you go about answering for significant data gaps. Chuck said that the group should focus on what to identify and recommend to groups how to fix it. Keep the scope small, for example, make it the opposite from the 2005 report because the public will not get a lot out of it.

Terry Svalberg suggested that maybe the group in that case then could just focus on mitigation for air quality, as Jennifer had suggested.

Lauren McKeever posed the questions of whether or not mitigation could be directed towards activities in the gas patch. The group did not seem sure what the answer was to this question.

Tom Hakonson asked the group, “Where are we?” And whether or not the 2005 data, since it came before the high ozone levels, had any value at all to the group.

Kelly Bott and **Jennifer Frazier** (with DEQ) were not entirely sure what the data analyst position would encompass, but Cara Keslar should be consulted.

Tom Hakonson asked if the application for funding needed to request a complete analysis of the situation?

Stephanie Kessler requested that the application ask for “comprehensive analysis” and have lots of information for public consumption in it.

Lincoln Sherman said we need to understand the data before we proceed with ideas about mitigation, programs and other opportunities

Chuck thought that there was consensus on Lincoln's point on this matter.

Lauren McKeever suggested that included in the application should be a request for a website that contained the report and data.

The present members of the PAWG all agreed enthusiastically with Lauren McKeever's idea.

Jennifer Frazier and Stephanie Kessler agreed to work on the application for funding in the next week.

Lauren McKeever raised the topic of when the next meeting time should be.

Stephanie Kessler suggested that the group invite another group to come and give a presentation at the next meeting.

Kelly Bott volunteered to make sure the right people came to the next meeting to update the group on Air Quality trends.

It was decided the next meeting would be by July 16, 2009 from 4-6 P.M. (for better public access)

Kelly Bott said her group would have to make it regardless of if it went past 5 P.M.

Meghann Durbrow suggested that more people will come if you publicize it and let people know that it will be majority informational.

Chuck Bragg asked whether or not 2 hours was enough?

Kelly Bott said she will have to talk to Cara (Kessler-DEQ) about that.

Lauren McKeever suggested that they make it a layman's meeting from start to finish.

Lincoln Sherman said that there should be a Q & A session at the next meeting after the presentation.

MEETING OVER: 3:15 P.M. TIME ELAPSED: 2 Hours and 15 Minutes.