

Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee
Suite 300, 777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002-4239
(202) 962-3358 Fax (202) 962-3203

DRAFT MINUTES OF February 22, 2006 MEETING

Attendance:

Members and Alternates

Hon. Sharon Bulova, Fairfax County
Hon. Will Campos, Prince George's County
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Hon. Redella S. Del Pepper, Alexandria
Deirdre Elvis-Peterson, District of Columbia Department of Health
Jill Engel-Cox, JCET/AQPAC
Hon. Andrew Fellows, College Park
Hon. Nancy Floreen, Montgomery County
Victoria Greenfield, Charles County
Diane Franks, Maryland Department of the Environment
Hon. Phil Mendelson, District of Columbia City Council, MWAQC Chair
Howard Simons, Maryland Department of Transportation
Hon. Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
Hon. David Snyder, Falls Church
Joanne Sorenson, Virginia Department of Transportation
Jim Sydnor, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Hon. Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax

Others Present:

Randy Carroll, Maryland Department of the Environment
Julie Crenshaw, AQPAC
Terry Darton, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Mike Dowd, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Barbara Hardy, Fairfax County
Beth Major, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Brad Heavner, MaryPIRG
Doris McLeod, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Mary Richmond, Montgomery County
Bill Skrabak, City of Alexandria
Kanathur Srikanth, Virginia Department of Transportation
Didian Tsongwain, Prince George's County
Lawrence Nwankwo, District of Columbia Department of Transportation
Harriet West, Clean Air Partners

Staff:

Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP	Jennifer Desimone, COG/DEP
Jeff King, COG/DEP	Mike Clifford, COG/TPB
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP	Leah Boggs, COG/DEP
Ron Kirby, COG/DTP	

1. Call to Order, Public Comment Period

Chairman Mendelson called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m. No speakers were present for the public comment period.

2. Approval of Minutes, Announcements

Mr. Mendelson called for a motion to approve the draft minutes of the December 14, 2005 meeting. A motion was made and seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Mr. Mendelson announced several newly-appointed members: Geri Edens, Gaithersburg City Council; Will Campos, Prince George's County Council; and J. Steven Randolph, City of Manassas. He said that Elizabeth Berry and Marie Sansone from the D.C. Department of Environment were unable to attend today. He said that Mayor Williams recently appointed Elizabeth Berry to be the Acting Director for the District's new Department of Environment.

Mr. Mendelson said that in January the Interstate Air Quality Council (IAQC) sent an annual letter to MWAQC reporting on its activities to reduce transported pollution into the Washington Region. The IAQC also sent a list of analyses and reports that are needed this year and a schedule for the 8-hour ozone and fine particle planning processes.

There is an MWAQC newsletter, "Air Currents," that is available online (COG website) and in hardcopy. The newsletter is the winter edition as there was no MWAQC meeting in January.

Next week on February 28, COG is hosting EPA's Mid-Atlantic Diesel Collaborative meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to identify opportunities for mitigating diesel emissions in the Mid-Atlantic region.

This is the legislative season in Virginia and Maryland. Today's agenda focuses on the air quality initiatives in both states. There will be a panel to discuss the different proposals and the status of those proposals.

3. Committee Reports

A. Report of the Technical Advisory Committee

Mr. Sydnor reported on the activities of the TAC. The TAC Emission Inventory Subcommittee recently met to continue development of 2002 and 2009 inventories for modeling and for the SIP. Within the next two months, the TAC will begin to complete work on developing the draft control strategy for the SIP. Staff are working to hire a consultant to handle a survey of non-road diesel equipment to assess the potential for emission reduction from that source category. The TAC has formed a new subcommittee to focus on local government initiatives. The goal will be to develop voluntary measures for inclusion in the SIP. Mary Richmond from Montgomery County will chair the Local Government Initiatives Subcommittee in 2006.

B. Report of the Air Quality Public Advisory Committee

Ms. Engel-Cox, Chair of the Air Quality Public Advisory Committee (AQPAC), reported. She reported that AQPAC held an election for new officers in December. Jill Engel-Cox was elected chair and Brian Holmes vice chair. Ms. Engel-Cox said that she has served on AQPAC for five

years and on AQPAC she represents the University of Maryland Baltimore County's Joint Center for Earth Systems. Brian Holmes represents the Maryland Highway Contractors Association. She said that AQPAC is tracking the Clean Power Rule and Healthy Air Act in Maryland. The committee has reviewed and discussed provisions contained in these initiatives, and is supportive of the inclusion of ozone, particulate matter, and mercury. The committee sent questions to Nancy Floreen who is a member of Maryland's Air Quality Control Advisory Council (AQCAC) regarding penalties and industry response. The committee discussed AQPAC member participation in the Technical Advisory Committee and will be sending a letter with questions. The committee also discussed plans for the year. In addition to tracking state legislation, AQPAC intends to invite guest speakers to address a variety of topics. AQPAC also is willing to assist MWAQC by reviewing documents or analysis and providing comments in advance of release to the public.

C. Report of the Clean Air Partners

Ms. West, Clean Air Partners (CAP) managing director, reported. Ms. West attended an EPA conference on air quality where she was introduced to several new potential air quality improvement programs. She will work with the CAP Board of Directors to explore anti-idling programs at schools, driver education programs to reduce VMT, and lawn maintenance and care programs for the Baltimore and Washington regions. She also said that CAP is hosting focus groups with participants of the Air Quality Action Day (AQAD) program. The purpose is to assess the level of activity and understand the effect of EPA's new standards on levels of participation. The groups are also considering various options related to what criteria are used to call an Air Quality Action day, including calling AQADs on days that are forecasted to be code orange. CAP is also working to survey the printing industry in Virginia to assess support for a voluntary episodic program to reduce emissions from this source sector. CAP will participate in a Printing Industry of Northern Virginia (PIVA) conference in Fairfax on March 7. CAP also submitted a grant application to EPA to continue work with this industry sector in 2006. CAP is also working with a consultant on a draft air quality education curriculum initiative which may be pilot tested in Northern Virginia throughout the remainder of the year.

D. Report of the Interstate Air Quality Council

Ms. Franks, Maryland Department of the Environment, reported. The IAQC sent its annual letter to MWAQC. The letter lists the accomplishments of IAQC and MWAQC during 2005 and provides a schedule for important tasks and reports for 2006. The schedule calls for a draft SIP document by end of year. Modeling results will be presented throughout the year. The letter does not address the MWAQC budget because the budget is still being deliberated. The IAQC is also addressing transport of pollution. The IAQC is involved with large-scale regional efforts through the Ozone Transport Commission (OTC). Because EPA's Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) may not be sufficient to eradicate all areas of nonattainment in the Ozone Transport Region (OTR), one major initiative being considered is a CAIR-plus strategy which could involve a more stringent cap on emissions. The IAQC is also pursuing a more localized upwind county initiative aimed at expanding programs already adopted in the Washington region to areas upwind of the region. This upwind effort focuses on reducing the pollution brought into the area via the low level jet (a low level nighttime air current that funnels pollution from areas to the south and west of the Washington region along the east side of the Appalachian mountains). The goal is to try to control area and mobile sources across a wider region, potentially including areas that are in attainment of the ozone standard.

4. Potomac River Power Plant: Update

Mike Dowd, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, provided an update on the status of the Potomac River Power Plant. Pursuant to an Order from the U.S. Department of Energy issued in December 2005, the plant is operating 2 units on a full time basis as specified under non-emergency situation Option A. TRONA is being injected to control emissions of SO₂. Virginia DEQ is satisfied that the plant is currently operating in full compliance with the NAAQS. The DOE has also ordered that the plant be run at full capacity if the major transmission lines servicing the DC region are taken out of operation for maintenance, as occurred in January. Modeling for this scenario has indicated the potential for NAAQS exceedances.

DEQ is in the process of applying for a rehearing on the DOE order, a matter which is still pending. DEQ has also commenced a permit process, including a public review and comment period, to ensure that a new State Operating Permit for the plant ensures compliance with the NAAQS. Mr. Dowd said that FERC has ordered PJM and PEPCO to develop a reliability plan that does not involve reliance on the Potomac River Power Plant. In spring 2007, new transmission line capacity into the area may render the plant a not-must-run facility.

Phil Mendelson asked whether Virginia's position is to not close the plant but only ensure the NAAQSs are met. Mike Dowd said that Virginia has no authority to close the plant. Virginia's authority is derived from the Clean Air Act and the State Air Pollution Control Law, which requires the plant to demonstrate that it meets the relevant environmental requirements, most importantly the NAAQS. Mike Dowd confirmed that under Option A, the plant operates one of its large baseload units, and one of the smaller swing units. In response to another question from Phil Mendelson, Mike Dowd said that the plant is going through a re-permitting process. Nancy Floreen asked whether Mirant's compliance involved acquisition of credits. Mike Dowd said that the air quality modeling assumes no trading of emission allowances. The plant must meet the NAAQS regardless of the allowance allocations under CAIR. In response to a question from Nancy Floreen, Mike Dowd confirmed that FERC and PEPCO represented to DEQ that in Spring of 2007 the plant would no longer be required from a reliability perspective, assuming the new transmission capacity was operational.

In response to a question from Phil Mendelson regarding the District of Columbia Public Service Commission's filing, Mike Dowd said that the filing led to the DOE order. Virginia DEQ, the Public Service Commission, and the City of Alexandria have all appealed the order, for different reasons.

Del Pepper said that the plant has a long history as a nuisance to the City and poses health hazard to Alexandria residents. She said that in August, when the plant was closed, there was a noticeable improvement in air quality. She said that Mirant is proposing to get approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to raise the height of the stacks. She said that the City of Alexandria has tried to withdraw the special use permit but Mirant sued in court and won. Alexandria is appealing that decision.

Andrew Fellows asked how the Commonwealth of Virginia is working with the local governments on this issue. Mike Dowd said that Virginia DEQ communicates closely with Bill

Skrabak from the City of Alexandria as well as a Citizen Advisory Committee chaired by Del Pepper. Bill Skrabak said that Alexandria and DEQ coordinate review of the air quality modeling results and DEQ attends the Citizen Advisory Committee. He also said that the city is concerned about potential PM_{2.5} impacts, which have not been the subject of modeling analysis. He also suggested that more work is needed to understand the environmental impacts of TRONA injection. Andrew Fellows asked whether the proposed Virginia Clean Smokestacks legislation would impact the situation with the Potomac River Power Plant. Mike Dowd said that the downwash concerns related to the modeled NAAQS exceedances do not relate directly to the state emission budgets for utilities. The Commonwealth already has the authority to require the plant to redress any localized air quality exceedances. Mr. Fellows asked if the goal of the NAAQS is to set minimal standards. Mike Dowd said that the NAAQS are EPA standards and are meant to protect public health with a margin of safety. He also said that DEQ's responsibility is to ensure that there are no modeled exceedances of the NAAQS.

5. Air Quality Initiatives: Panel

Joan Rohlfs provided background on the panel discussion. The EPA Clean Air Interstate Rule affects 28 states in the Eastern U.S., providing states with emission budgets that are provided to affected utilities through issuance of allowances. Companies can trade allowances to meet the cap. CAIR will be implemented in phases. The phase I cap for NO_x is 2009 and for SO₂ is 2010. Phase II for both pollutants in 2015. EPA's modeling indicates that CAIR will bring most of the states into compliance with the PM_{2.5} standard by 2010. The modeling also indicates that the rule will not bring the areas into compliance with the ozone standard until 2015.

EPA provides two options for implementation of CAIR. States can elect to participate in EPA's cap and trade system, or can develop state-specific regulations, as long as they meet the required emission budgets. If a state does not adopt the required implementation rule by September 2006, the EPA will impose a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP). The FIP will be withdrawn if the states develop the required plan by 2007. The states are responsible for preparation of the CAIR SIP. MWAQC does not have a direct role in preparing the CAIR SIPs.

Joan Rohlfs discussed the advantages and disadvantages of a cap and trade system. One advantage is that it allows companies to trade allowances, which can enhance profitability. Plants that can make early and inexpensive reductions can sell allowances to facilities where it may be more expensive to install controls. One disadvantage is that because the trading system involves a very large region of 28 states, emission reductions needed to address local air quality concerns may not occur in an area that has significant influence.

Ms. Rohlfs introduced the panel of speakers. Diane Franks will discuss the Clean Power Rule in Maryland. Brad Heavner will discuss the Maryland Healthy Air Act. Beth Major will discuss the Virginia CAIR rule proposal. Chris Miller was unable to attend.

Diane Franks discussed the Clean Power Rule and MDE's proposed amendments to the Health Air Act. She said that either the rule or the legislation is needed in order for all regions of Maryland to be able to comply with federal clean air standards. The Clean Power Rule addresses a major component of the local contribution to air quality concerns in Maryland. MDE believes that approximately 50 to 75 percent of the air pollution problems in Maryland are from

transported pollution from outside the region. The NO_x SIP call did have an effect on reducing transported pollution, as was observed in 2005, but additional reductions are needed for attainment of the new standards. The rule will drive compliance with both the ozone and fine particle standard. She reiterated the point that EPA's modeling indicates that the region will not attain the ozone standard by 2010 under the current CAIR requirements. This proposed state rule will complement and strengthen the federal CAIR requirements. Reductions resulting from either of these programs will provide the greatest level of emission reductions in Maryland compared to all other programs implemented to date.

The rule covers three pollutants - SO₂, NO_x, and mercury - and applies to the six largest electric generating plants in Maryland. These six plants represent more than 90 percent of power plant emission in Maryland. Companies will not be permitted to purchase allowances that would allow them to emit above the specified rates, so all reductions must occur in Maryland. Averaging is allowed within the power plant systems for each company (e.g., Mirant, Constellation). Continuous emission monitoring will be required. The nitrogen oxide requirements are implemented in two phases. Companies must meet a system-wide NO_x emission rate of 0.125 pounds per million Btu (lbs/MMBtu) of energy produced by 2009 on an ozone-season and year-round basis. This is equivalent to an 80-85 percent reduction in emissions from the 1990 baseline. This rate is reduced to 0.100 lbs/MMBtu in 2012 if Maryland's monitors do not show attainment of the ozone standard by 2010. This requirement is expected to drive the installation of Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) technology at most covered units. The nitrogen reductions will also help Maryland meet its commitment to reduce nitrogen deposition to the Chesapeake Bay. For sulfur dioxide, companies must meet a system-wide SO₂ emission rate of 0.225 lbs/MMBtu by 2010 year-round, an 85 percent reduction. This requirement is expected to drive the installation of scrubbers at all larger units. This will be important for achieving the fine particle standard and for improving visibility. MDE estimates that 40-45 percent of the fine particle problem is a result of sulfates based on monitored speciation data.

The rule does offer flexibility to smaller units for meeting the SO₂ requirements given engineering design issues associated with installation of large scrubber units. The R. Paul Smith Station is a very small facility, representing less than 2 percent of statewide emissions. This facility is important for electricity reliability and was forecast by EPA to shut down if forced to install controls. The rule proposes to exempt this facility from the control requirements.

For mercury, a company's system must reduce emissions by 80 percent by 2010 and 90 percent by 2015. The first phase of mercury reductions will be driven by co-benefits from controls on NO_x and SO₂. Unlike the Healthy Air Act, the Clean Power Rule does not have provisions for control of CO₂ emissions.

Diane Franks also covered the differences between the proposed rule and the Healthy Air Act legislation. MDE has provided proposed amendments to the legislation to bring the requirements more in-line with the proposed rule, in terms of pollutants covered, level of reductions, and timing of emission reductions.

Diane Franks said that EPA has estimated the costs and timeline of installing controls to meet CAIR requirements. EPA has indicated that the controls can be installed at all facilities by 2009.

In fact, EPA has predicted that all of the large Maryland facilities will install controls rather than purchase allowances.

Brad Heavner, MaryPIRG, supports MDE's efforts to meet the Clean Air Act compliance deadlines. MaryPIRG prefers amendments that bring the Clean Power Rule in-line with the Healthy Air Act. He said legislation would be preferable to a regulation due to potential for litigation of the rule. He said that because the power plants in Maryland are relatively old and uncontrolled, emission reductions are considered to be cost effective. He does not believe the smaller facilities should be exempted from the requirements. MaryPIRG does support the inclusion of restrictions on trading to lock in the reductions predicted by EPA under the CAIR rule. Mr. Heavner also supports the two-phased approach to mercury reductions, but believes the second phase of reductions should begin in 2012. He said that it is important to consider planning for reducing emissions of all pollutants during a time when substantial investments are being made at these older power-generating stations. He believes that it would be relatively straightforward for Maryland to participate in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) process in the Northeast. He encouraged MWAQC to comment on the proposals, especially regarding potential amendments to timing and magnitude of reductions.

Beth Major, Virginia DEQ, said that the Clean Air Interstate Rule is a broad regional interstate program and is not designed to address local attainment issues. Virginia's Air Pollution Control Board acted on a proposed CAIR implementation rule in December 2005. The legislature is now codifying the key provisions of the proposed implementation rule.

In Virginia, CAIR will be implemented as three separate allocations programs: SO₂ annual, NO_x annual, and NO_x seasonal. The Virginia regulation also included a new source set-aside and a voluntary public health set-aside. Also, to ensure reductions are made locally, only the allowances issued by the Air Pollution Control Board can be used for compliance purposes by facilities in the nonattainment areas. The rule and legislation requires reductions in the statewide cap in 2009 and again in 2014. EPA will track all of the allowances and will verify compliance using continuous emissions monitoring. Virginia is also including provisions for early emission reduction credits for facilities that make reductions prior to 2009. EPA issues the allowances for SO₂ under Title IV of the Clean Air Act. Virginia is also including non-EGUs in the seasonal budget program and is creating a renewable energy new source set aside. She provided details on the proposed budgets for each of the programs. Virginia DEQ is confident that the budgets presented will be codified.

Chris Miller from the Piedmont Environmental Council was unable to attend. Beth Major briefly commented on the proposed Clean Smokestacks Bill. She said that the bill contains several compromises to address issues such as trading and that the final legislation will likely be similar to the requirements of the CAIR implementation rule presented today. Jim Sydnor said that the bill is being voted on today and that there may be a provision to conduct a study on the potential to reduce CO₂ as part of the compromise.

In response to a question from Phil Mendelson, Beth Major said that part of the legislative compromise may be to codify the proposed magnitude and timing of the required emission reductions, at least for NO_x and SO₂.

Mr. Mendelson asked Diane Franks about the status of legislative approval of the proposed rule. Diane Franks said that the rule is being deliberated by the Air Quality Control Advisory Council (AQCAC), comprised of academia, power sector, manufacturing sector, and local representatives. AQCAC will then recommend the rule for release to a joint Administrative, Executive, and Legislative Review (AELR) committee of the Maryland legislature. The joint committee reviews the recommendations and may decide to recommend announcing the proposal in the Maryland register. The AELR could also decide to hold the rule, in which case the process would have to be reinitiated. Mr. Mendelson asked if the process was far enough along such that MDE is confident the rule will be adopted. Diane Franks said that if the AQCAC recommends the rule, MDE is hoping the rule could be officially proposed by early summer.

Nancy Floreen asked if there was a side-by-side comparison of the Virginia and Maryland proposals. Beth Major said that she is not aware of a detailed comparison. Ms. Floreen asked if the Virginia legislation and rule basically codify the EPA CAIR requirements. Beth Major said that the initial proposal was more stringent than the EPA program, but that the key components of the EPA program will be codified. One of the most important aspects of the compromise legislation may be the restriction of allowance trading in the nonattainment areas. Ms. Floreen asked about the status of the mercury proposals. Beth Major said that the legislature is currently debating the provisions of a mercury program. In response to a question from Ms. Floreen, Beth Major said that the legislation is not final, but currently there is a proposal to study the potential for CO₂ control.

Linda Smyth asked about the handling of waste from the pollution control devices, including mercury. Beth Major said that resultant ash from baghouse or capture control strategy will be landfilled in a way to protect against water contamination and bioaccumulation concerns.

Victoria Greenfield asked about AQCAC representation. Diane Franks said that it is a multidisciplinary body, and includes representation from the power sector, academia, children's health organizations, and manufacturing. Nancy Floreen is a member representing MWAQC.

Andrew Fellows asked if the Administration prefers a rule to legislation. Diane Franks said that MDE initiated the rulemaking to ensure that a program is in place to meet the federal requirements and does not currently need additional legislative authority to move forward. If legislation is passed, the rule may have to be amended. Mr. Fellows asked both Maryland and Virginia about the industry response. Beth Major said that the industry told Virginia DEQ that they support the EPA model rule. Diane Franks agreed. She also said that it will be difficult for the firms to manage the installation of all the necessary controls within the short timeline. Industry is also concerned about the costs of compliance and recovery of costs in a state such as Maryland where utilities have been deregulated.

Jill Engel-Cox commented that she is pleased with the provision of continuous emission monitors. AQPAC members also asked about whether it is possible, given the Clean Power Rule sets allowable emission rates but not an emission cap, that the overall emissions could increase over time as new facilities are sited. Diane Franks said any new plants would have to meet the same rates, and the New Source Review program would require that the company purchase emission offsets, which could be purchased from any other moderate nonattainment area in the country. Brad Heavner added that the same concern could be raised for expansion of generation

at the existing facilities. Jill Engel-Cox said that AQPAC members are generally interested in encouraging clean energy through either caps or rates.

David Snyder asked whether MWAQC members would support authorizing the Executive Committee to take action on any formal comment letters on the legislative proposals if required, given issues with timing of the legislative session. Phil Mendelson and members agreed.

6. Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI)

Jeff King, COG DEP, said that greenhouse gases, most notably carbon dioxide from fuel combustion, are believed to be increasing in concentration in our atmosphere, and may be leading to a phenomenon known as global warming, or climate change. One group of states is involved with an initiative is known as the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) to develop an regional approach to contributing to a solution to the issue.

The RGGI program, once in force, will cap and then reduce carbon dioxide emissions from power plants in the participating states. The cap will cover the entire region. All participating states will be allocated a CO₂ budget. States will then provide utilities with emission allowances. To meet the cap, utilities can either reduce emissions, trade allowances, or purchase emissions offsets. This program was originally envisioned in 2001 by states in the Northeast. New York initially took the lead and invited other states to the table. Through the negotiations, the following states were involved: New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, New Jersey, and Delaware. In addition, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the District were invited as observers. At the end of the framework negotiation, Massachusetts and Rhode Island opted out of the initiative, so the seven signatory states as of December 2005 were New York, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, New Jersey, and Delaware.

The program caps CO₂ emissions across the region with states receiving their own budgets. The cap will be implemented through adoption of a model rule. In December 2005, the states agreed to proceed with development of a model rule, which is expected to be completed next Month. As currently planned, the cap will take effect in 2009 and then, beginning in 2015, the cap will be reduced by 10 percent by 2108.

The program endeavors to achieve all emission reductions from within the region, however, depending on the cost of allowances under the trading program, companies may be allowed to purchase offsets from outside the region. The threshold is proposed to at \$7/ton.

Another interesting aspect of this program is that the group may set aside 25 percent of the allowances for public benefit. These allowances will be auctioned off to the highest bidder, and all revenues would be earmarked for energy efficiency, renewable energy, innovative energy technologies, or consumer rebates.

Advantages of the program are that it may encourage a domestic approach to reducing CO₂ emissions, and may encourage innovation, both within and outside the utility sector. There are concerns about the program as well. Massachusetts and Rhode Island declined to participate, citing concerns about a lack of a mechanism to protect consumers and utilities from unduly high compliance costs. Another concern is that utilities are not the only source of CO₂ and other

greenhouse gas emissions, yet this program only caps utility sector emissions. Also, climate change is a global problem requiring national and international leadership.

In response to question from Andrew Fellows, Jim Sydnor said that Virginia was not invited to participate in the RGGI process. In response to a question from Phil Mendelson, Jeff King said that the District has participated in the process as an observer.

7. Air Agency Report

Diane Franks said that Tad Aburn was recently appointed Air Director for Maryland. She offered a summary of the Clean Power Rule and Healthy Air Act proposals.

Virginia and the District had nothing to report.

8. Date for Next Meeting and Adjourn

Mr. Mendelson recognized Julie Crenshaw, a member of the Air Quality Public Advisory Committee, for her service to MWAQC and to improving air quality. Mr. Kauffman, Supervisor, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, was not present and will be recognized next month.

The next meeting will take place on March 22. The meeting was adjourned at 2 pm.