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**Suite 300, 777 North Capitol Street, N.E.** **Washington, DC 20002-4239** **(202) 962-3360**  **Fax:** **(202) 962-3203**
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The Air and Climate Public Advisory Committee (AQPAC) is an advisory body to the

Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) and the

Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC)

Draft Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 14, 2010

Room 1

5:30 P.M.-7:30 P.M.

**ACPAC members:** DeronLovaas, Chair; Caroline Petti; Bill Butler; Beverly Fourier; Sally Kane, Linda Murphy, Rick Reiss, Julie Van Fleet, Larry Zaragoza

**Staff:** Joan Rohlfs, Anne Mariani, Sunil Kumar, Jeannine Altavilla

**1. Call to Order, Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes**

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 pm by Joan Rohlfs. Bill Butler moved for the minutes to be adopted. The agenda and the minutes of April 19, 2010 were approved with no changes.

**2. Monitors in Fairfax County, Virginia**

Dr. Larry Zaragoza gave a report on the air quality monitoring network review in Virginia based upon a verbal report from Chuck Turner, Virginia DEQ. The revision for NO2 monitoring is underway and will begin soon for SO2. The review process doesn’t include a public consultation phase.  Property ownership and access are considerations. The public will be notified of the monitor positions once the process is completed.  A response to ACPAC’s letter about VDEQ proposal to shut down four monitors out of five in Fairfax County was received from Chuck Turner, the Director of AQ monitoring for VDEQ.  Joan will circulate the response letter, which explains that statistical tests show no significant difference between several monitors (especially Lee Park and Mount Vernon), and thus DEQ's conclusion is that there’s no reason to keep all of them.  Caroline asked if EPA Region 3 was cooperating.  Larry said that they support the state. He thinks DEQ analysis is flawed because they used the wrong statistical test.

Larry noted several points about closing the Mt. Vernon monitor including:  1) the Mount Vernon monitor has been designated as the design value monitor for years for Northern Virginia because it has reported the highest design values for Northern Virginia.   2) while DEQ may conclude that they cannot continue to support the number of monitors that the region has historically operated, closing down the monitor with the highest reported values runs counter to the monitoring requirements, especially for a nonattainment area.   3) Mr. Turner from DEQ reported that closing the Mount Vernon monitor was the decision of Fairfax County.  While DEQ has accepted data from the Mt. Vernon monitor for years and designated the Mt. Vernon monitor as the design value monitor, they did not contact Fairfax County to explore how they might keep the Mt. Vernon monitor operating.

**3. Energy Outreach Program**

Anne Mariani presented the concept of a pilot energy outreach program. She discussed the type of platform that will be used, and the timeline (see timeline handout). The program would involve an online platform, community outreach, and a rewards program with a possible competition element. A printout of Earth Aid’s website for Richmond, VA was used to illustrate the potential tools that will be available. Jeannine Altavilla presented the proposed criteria for selecting the pilot communities, as well as a comparison of proposed communities among these parameters (see pilot communities criteria handout).

Bahri Aliriza was concerned about Earth Aid’s comparison with historical energy use considering the possibility of different conditions: number of people in the household may have changed, an addition may have been built, etc. Others present agreed. Staff responded that there are definitely some issues with Earth Aid’s measuring capabilities, and that the organization has said they would work on those deficiencies with us. Members were also worried about how many residents do not have web access, or who would need substantial help to be able to access a program like this. They feel that it may only be people who already care who would participate. There was a suggestion to change the goal from 100 households per community to 50 households per community, and to consider means of communication within a community as a selection criterion.

Responses from multiple attendees gave suggestions for qualities to look for in the “energy leaders” that will help MWCOG promote the program to residents. : they should be residents of the community, well-plugged in with what is going on in the community and trustworthy, already committed to environmental issues, don’t have to be an expert, should receive support from central program, maybe retired so that they have time. ACPAC members also feel that this job may be very large and wonder if it may be too much to expect of one leader in the community. Possible coordination with University volunteers could help, however the main thrust should be from a trusted leader within the community. Maybe the leader could receive a stipend, possibly $1000 a month, and receive distribution materials from COG. Members were excited about possible input and publicity from utilities. They also felt that input from an Energy Manager could help to run aspects of the program. Members thought a weekly tip would be helpful, probably most helpful coming from the energy leader. Beverly had a leader suggestion for Greenbelt. Members also hoped that public agencies would be active in supporting the program. Suggestions for the rewards program also included a special reward for the biggest savers, and public recognition for their efforts.

**4. Ozone Season Status Report**

Sunil Kumar presented the committee with the Ozone calendar from May through the present. There have been 14 Code Yellow days so far this year for Ozone, and 5 Code Orange days. There have been 5 Code Yellow days for particle concentration. The EPA is considering new standards for Ozone Concentration and will release these at the end of August. This is an update of the regulation that is done every 5 years. The EPA has said that the new standards will probably be between 60 and 70 ppb, currently they are at 75 ppb. Barry asked if the standard always becomes more stringent. Sunil responded that the standard isn’t always changed, but it has always been a stricter standard when it is changed at the 5 year review. Joan said that because the standard is now an 8 hour average there are fewer Code Red days.

The AQI that is presented to the public takes the worst parameter (between ozone and particulate matters) to determine the color code for the day. Sally asked what the potential risks are if both measures are elevated as opposed to just one. She also asked what potential risks could develop if there is a series of attainment days instead of just sporadic ones. Sunil responded that the particle concentrations usually pose greater risks for respiratory systems. Sally suggested that there could be a presentation from a health expert on the effects of the various levels of ozone and particle concentrations.

There was a discussion about whether or not the health risks for various groups are being communicated properly, and whether more can be done to publicize the projections as part of daily weather reports. **Sally and Beverly will draft a letter from ACPAC**, to be reviewed at the next meeting, to present to all local media outlets and forecasters to encourage them to broadcast the information to their audiences on a more frequent basis. They also want to send a request to Accuweather to increase awareness about these standards. Bill noted that some don’t report below Code Orange, so it’s hard to tell who is looking at the ratings on a regular basis. Bahri wonders if the oil burning in the Gulf will affect our air quality this summer. Sunil responded that due to the Easterly Winds it is more likely to affect Texas. Bill asked if Clean Air Partners still runs workshops for forecasters. Joan responded that there have been individual meeting requests, but no organized workshops.

**5. SO2 Standards**

Sunil presented a fact sheet describing the new SO2 standards released by the EPA. The new standards will require a 3 hour average below 75 ppb. Monitoring and modeling will be used to determine non-attainment areas. He also reviewed the timeline for standards attainment (see handout). Members questioned what would happen if an area was in non-attainment. Sunil responded that it would present a great financial burden so it is in an area’s best interest to achieve attainment as quickly as possible. Under current monitoring our area is well within attainment, but we have to wait until the new monitoring system is in place to ensure that this is accurate. Bahri asked what the biggest problem in the area is, and Sunil responded that it is nitrogen oxides.

**6. CEEPC and MWAQC reports**

CEEPC’s last meeting reviewed and approved the outreach pilot program. Ron Kirby, Director of the TPB presented the What Would It Take scenario. Their next meeting is July 21. They will be looking at Carbon Offset. Climate Trust has been hired by DC government to conduct a pre-feasibility study on a carbon offset or carbon benefit fund. They’ll present it to CEEPC. One of the key- findings is that this project would have better chance to work if it were regional, instead of DC only. The

MWAQC will be meeting in July to review the new CAIR rules.

**6. New Business**

**DC Green Map**

The DC Green Map was presented at the recent IGBG meeting. It shows various green resources across the District, including: LEED buildings, green roofs, car shares, farmers markets, etc. The online version can be accessed at: [green.dc.gov](http://www.green.dc.gov). A link to the map is in the upper right-hand corner.

**Murkowski Resolution**

This topic was suggested by Deron as an addition to tonight’s agenda. Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK)’s bill to prevent the EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions was defeated last Thursday by a vote of 47-53. All Republicans and a few Democrats voted for the bill. United Auto Workers was against the bill. They wanted to ensure that the national standards for vehicle emissions that were recently enacted stayed in place.

**BP Oil Spill**

Obama will be giving an Oval Office speech on Tuesday 6/15 about the BP Oil spill, and will also urge for Congress to pass a comprehensive energy bill. Members discussed whether the continued use of dispersants was legal based on EPA codes. Bill suggested that some dispersants are legal, but not the dispersant that is being used. A turn-off valve is also required in every other country in the world, and could have prevented this explosion. Sally and Bahri wondered if ACPAC should take a position on the extended liability of BP, due to the potential tax payer burden for all of the US. The general response was that members privately supported this move, but that it was outside of ACPAC’s goals.

**Topics for next meetings**

**Discuss opportunity of ACPAC taking position on BP Oil Spill?**

**DC Green maps presentation** (by COG staff)

Climate Trust presentation, if possible

**Respiratory specialist presentation along with an AQ forecaster presentation**

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30pm.

**Next meeting: July 19 – 5:30pm – Room 1**