

NOACA Air Quality Public Advisory Task Force
Meeting Summary
July 25, 2005

The second meeting of the NOACA Air Quality Public Advisory Task Force was called to order by the Chair, Dr. Nora Nock, at 5:00 p.m. on July 25, 2005. (See attached sign-in sheet.)

Dr. Nock explained that the agenda would be long and that the Monitoring presentations would begin immediately, so as to allow time for question-and-answer.

Richard Nemeth, Commissioner, City of Cleveland Division of Air Quality, gave the first talk on PM_{2.5} monitoring for Cuyahoga County. An actual collection device was passed around the room, accompanied by an explanation of how the monitor worked and what the U.S. EPA Guidelines were under which the monitors were operated. Mr. Nemeth noted the difference between continuous and intermittent monitors because only intermittent monitors are Federal Reference Method (FRM) monitors from which U.S. EPA gleans its data for Northeast Ohio. The continuous monitors are used to provide real-time PM_{2.5} data on an hourly basis. Mr. Nemeth was able to give the cost of the equipment, the cost of operating the program, and the method by which the data was collected.

Bert Mechenbier, Air Pollution Control Supervisor, Lake County General Health District, then gave a presentation on ozone monitoring in Lake and Geauga Counties. An actual ozone monitor was plugged in and operated for the audience, accompanied by an explanation of how the data was collected and how its quality was assured. A further explanation of NOx scavenging was given, along with the discussion of how ozone monitor locations were chosen by the U.S. EPA.

Bill Spires, Manager, State Implementation Plan Section, Division of Air Pollution Control, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, then spoke on airshed modeling. He explained the method by which photochemical grid modeling was accomplished for a large region, such as Northeast Ohio. He reiterated the fact that existing federal regulatory programs, although highly valuable for the future, would not bring Northeast Ohio into attainment for either ozone or PM_{2.5} by the year 2010. Other statewide or local measures would certainly be needed. Mr. Spires explained that model runs, being time-consuming, complex, and expensive, were usually performed not for single control measures but for "batches" of control measures. Ohio's modeling runs are being performed partly in-house, partly by Ohio University, and partly by the Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium.

Amy Wainright, Air Quality Planner, NOACA, went over the data from 2002 for point, area, and mobile sources. The point was made that each sector would have to contribute part of the solution if Northeast Ohio were to achieve clean air. Sources that showed strong importance included cars, trucks, buses, coal-fired power plants, 4-stroke and 2-stroke gasoline engines, solvents, paints, locomotives, and marine vessels. It was made clear that the data for area and mobile sources were estimates made by U.S. EPA. The estimates for pleasure craft and for marine vessels were challenged.

Ms. Wainright then began the discussion of the various control measures that were possible. The Task Force began to enumerate selection criteria by which the measures could be evaluated and ranked. The criteria included:

- Feasibility
- “Bang for the buck” (efficacy of the measure)
- Cost per ton of pollutant removed
- Ease of regulation
- Short-term benefits
- Long-term benefits
- Combined pollutant benefits
- Side effects and side benefits
- Economics and job impacts
- Timing – ability to meet the U.S. EPA deadline
- Health impacts
- Elimination of additional toxic pollutants
- Successes in other states or other nonattainment areas
- Measurability
- Enforceability
- Ease of public education
- Relationship to land use planning and other larger goals

The Task Force paid special attention to school bus retrofits, including the benefit of such programs and their cost. The Task Force was informed that Ohio EPA would be setting aside 20% of fines collected for school bus retrofit programs.

The Task Force also discussed anti-idling rules for diesel engines, employer trip reduction programs, reduced speed limits, urban trees, rooftop gardening, biodiesel for motor vehicles and for residential fuel combustion, rotaries (traffic circles), E-check, gas cans, autobody paint sprayers, cold-cleaning degreasers, hot water heaters, marine vessels, locomotives, modal shifts between types of carriers, and “live-and-work” zoning for housing.

A Mobile Source Workgroup was suggested so that the list of possible control measures for mobile sources could be narrowed before the September meeting. The Task Force was informed that Cincinnati and Dayton had already selected, for a summertime fuel, gasoline with a Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP) of 7.8 psi. It was noted that the Task Force would consider all types of fuels, including low-RVP fuels as well as reformulated gasoline (RFG), which might include ethanol and other oxygenates.

The Task Force agreed that it would meet again at 1:00 p.m. on September 28, 2005, assuming that the Mobile Source Workgroup would meet during August.

No discussion was had on planning for a public Health Forum, due to lack of time.

There being no comment from members of the public, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m., letting the members know that the presentations and hand-outs would be posted at: www.noaca.org/siplan.html.