

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

Recommendation	AQMWG Priority Level	TEAM (Lead in bold; Non-EPA in italics)	Status and Timing
<p><b>1.1 Emissions Measurements and Reporting</b> - EPA, in conjunction with S/L/T and affected stakeholders, should pursue improved emissions measurements and reporting to enhance emissions databases for more accurate air quality assessments and tracking of progress.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Conniesue Oldham-OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Modified emission inventory reporting rule to require new state emission reporting and verification to be proposed November 2005. Also conducting a study to identify relevant existing emissions measurement methodologies and protocols, as well as identifying efforts to develop new emissions measurement methodologies and technologies.  <b>Products:</b> Air Emissions Reporting Requirements Rule - Proposal November 2005; Reengineered National Emissions Inventory – Currently Ongoing (2008)                      Study for new emissions measurement methodologies and technologies - December 2005                      Title V Monitoring ANPR - Completed</p>
<p><b>1.2 Emissions Factors and Estimation Methods</b> - Where emissions measurement-based information is impractical to obtain for air quality assessments, or where improved projections are needed, EPA, in conjunction with S/L/T and affected stakeholders, should improve emissions factors and emission estimation methods.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Fred Thompson - OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Working to improve the use and development of emissions factors, as well as projects to review existing source profiles used in source-based modeling and projects designed to help address the reconciliation of emissions inventories with ambient measurements.  <b>Product:</b> Emission factors and monitoring policy applications case study and final report / options paper – Summer 2005 (Completed)                      Electronic Reporting Tool – Summer 2005 (Completed)                      Emissions Factors and Monitoring Resource Tool – Beta Test 2005 (Completed)                      Title V Monitoring ANPR Completion - (Coincides w/ Recommendation 1.1) - 2005 (Completed)                      Monitoring Knowledge Base - Summer 2005 (Completed) Addition of over 2000 profiles to the electronic data base – 2006                      Reconciliation of current emissions inventories with ambient measurements - 2006</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>1.3 Uncertainty in Emissions Inventories and Modeling</b> - EPA, in conjunction with S/L/T and affected stakeholders, should quantify and take actions to reduce uncertainty in emissions inventories and air quality modeling applications, provide guidance for incorporating uncertainty assessments into SIP planning, and improve communication of uncertainty to decision-makers.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Lula Melton / Tyler Fox- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> To begin identification and evaluation of sources of uncertainty in emissions inventories and modeling analyses; identify needed data collection activities (and associated costs) to reduce the most significant emissions uncertainties (NARSTO report); and identify appropriate techniques for characterizing uncertainty in preparing emissions inventories and conducting modeling analyses, EPA will coordinate internal workshops to get background and status on ongoing work concerning developing taxonomy and conducting an influence analysis focusing on benefit end-points. <b>Products:</b> EPA workshop: taxonomy/influence analysis focusing on benefit end-points - Spring 2006, Emission inventory workshop May 2006, EPA internal workshops and inclusion of uncertainty characterization section in PM/Regional Haze SIP modeling guidance (emissions, modeling, monitoring, and ambient data analysis) Spring 2006. Performance evaluation of modeled meteorological data for use in air quality modeling - 2001 data (completed) 2002 data (summer 2006).</p>
<p><b>1.4 Multipollutant Monitoring</b> - EPA, in conjunction with S/L/T and affected stakeholders, should promote and improve integrated, multipollutant monitoring.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Phil Lorang- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> EPA is currently working to finalize its proposed national ambient monitoring strategy. The existing monitoring networks are top-heavy on determining attainment / nonattainment and light on addressing other monitoring objectives, especially control strategy development and tracking progress. <b>Products:</b> Monitoring Rule NPRM - December 2005 (Final 2006) Complete proposal of Monitoring Strategy - 2008; Working with monitoring program leaders in the states and regions to initiate changes required as a result of the new strategy – Ongoing; Scientific Advisory Panel – Ongoing</p>
<p><b>1.5 Framework for Accountability</b> - EPA, in conjunction with atmospheric scientists, health and ecosystem experts, S/L/Ts, and affected stakeholders, should undertake a systematic effort to track air quality achievements and evaluate air program results. This effort should begin by focusing on the progression and associations of air emissions as they interact and ultimately affect human health and the environment. In order to move beyond the current approach of relying predominantly on air quality measurements, we need to further develop and apply the capacity to monitor, assess, and report on how changes in</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>John Bachmann - OAQPS</b> <b>Rich Scheffee - OAQPS</b> <b>James Vickery - ORD</b> <b>James Hemby - OAQPS</b> <b>Rona Birnbaum - OAP</b> <b>Susan Stone - OAQPS</b> <b>Dave Guinnup -</b></p>	<p><b>Health</b> - EPA workshop on health indicators – FY05; <b>NOx assessment report – FY05 (Completed and published);</b> Communication at national conferences: National Air Quality Conference (2/2006), Environmental Public Health Tracking Partners Meeting (Completed) and National Conference (4/2006), and Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists annual meeting (6/2006); Multi-pollutant accountability report – FY06/FY07 (underway); Initial health indicators team report - Feb 06; Four health indicator feasibility studies – Feb 06; Report on retrospective accountability assessment in selected urban areas – FY06; Report on EPA framework for accountability – FY07; Final health indicators team report - FY 07; National accountability workshop (possible) - FY 07/08</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p>emissions impact air quality, atmospheric deposition, exposure, and effects on human health and ecosystems. Emphasis should be placed on developing and enhancing appropriate health and ecosystem indicators, benchmarks, and subsequent analyses within this overarching accountability framework.</p>		<p><b>OAQPS</b>  <b>Tyler Fox - OAQPS</b>  <b>Fred Dimmick – ORD</b>  <b>Dave Schmeltz</b></p>	<p><b>Ecosystems - Draft report on the current state of environmental monitoring at EPA to support evaluation of air policy approaches and program assessment ---2006;</b> Synthesis of information on ecological health indicators responsive to multi-pollutant atmospheric loadings and ambient ozone concentrations -- 2006; Ecological accountability workshop --- 2006; Progress towards designing and implementing a comprehensive mercury multi-media integrated assessment approach ---2006; Regional scale nitrogen case studies to demonstrate the application of a N deposition-driven ecological outcome measure---2007</p>
<p><b>2.1 Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers -</b> EPA should complete as soon as possible a review of the contributions from this category and the technical and economic feasibility of further controls, given the high priority assigned to this sector. EPA should then initiate development of a regional or national emissions control regulation for the category, or take alternative action consistent with the results of its analysis.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Peter Tsirigotis,</b>  <b>OAQPS</b>  <b>Representatives of</b>  <b>Regional Planning</b>  <b>Organizations</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> In coordination with EPA, the Regional Planning Organizations will collect and analyze data concerning industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers to effectively characterize these sources and their environmental impacts. EPA plans to include STAPPA/ALAPCO and other organizations in this comprehensive approach.  <b>Products:</b> The information gathered will help characterize emissions from different source sectors (March 2006); Data inventory and analysis completed by June 2006.</p>
<p><b>2.2 Industrial Surface Coatings -</b> EPA should complete as soon as possible a review of the contributions from this category and the technical and economic feasibility of further controls. EPA should then initiate development of a regional or national emissions control regulation for the category, or take alternative action consistent with the results of its analysis.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Paula Hirtz, OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Approach:</b> Conduct an analysis of the industrial surface coatings category including review of non-attainment contributions from 25 Industrial Surface Coatings source categories, the existing 13 NSPS rules, 25 CTGs and existing ACTs, the 11 outstanding categories listed for regulation under 183(e) and new categories including but not limited to facility maintenance operations and surface coating of miscellaneous wood products. <b>Product:</b> Will be determined based on analysis in FY06.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>2.3 Non-Industrial Solvents (Consumer Products)</b>- EPA should initiate rulemaking efforts to establish minimum performance standards (i.e., national rules) for this category using the volatile organic compound (VOC) content limitations contained in, and regulating the products covered by, the model rule developed by the Ozone Transport Commission.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Bruce Moore, OAQPS Sub Team Leads: Melissa Payne, Anne Pope and David Sanders</b></p>	<p><b>Approach:</b> Discussing several approaches to address this recommendation. Will be meeting with stakeholders and internally to determine best approach to recommendation. <b>Product:</b> Will be determined based on discussions.</p>
<p><b>2.4 Architectural Coatings</b> - EPA should initiate rulemaking efforts to establish minimum performance standards (i.e., national rules) for this category using the VOC content limitations contained in, and regulating the products covered by, the model rule developed by the Ozone Transport Commission.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Bill Johnson - OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Approach:</b> EPA will initiate meetings with stakeholders to determine the best approach to respond to this recommendation. <b>Product:</b> Will be determined based on discussions.</p>
<p><b>2.5 Heavy-Duty Diesel Engines</b> - EPA should reduce emissions from the existing fleet of heavy-duty diesel engines by employing a multi-pronged approach.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Jim Blubaugh - OTAQ</b></p>	<p><b>Actions:</b> EPA is continuing its existing efforts to employ a variety of strategies to monitor and reduce emissions from the in-use HD fleet and to enforce its emission standards. These strategies include <u>compliance program strategies</u>, such as continuing to work with manufacturers to ensure compliance with existing and new emission standards, harmonized nationwide OBD diagnostics for HD vehicles, and development of portable emissions capabilities for diesel PM, and <u>voluntary program strategies</u>, such as encouraging voluntary retrofits, idling reductions, and other emission control strategies, concentrating on the construction, port, freight, and school bus sectors. <b>Products:</b> Continued effective implementation of compliance programs and of voluntary programs aimed at reducing emissions from in-use HD engines.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>2.6 Emissions from Ships, Locomotives, and Aircraft, and Mobile Source Air Toxics</b> - EPA should address emissions from ships, locomotives, and aircraft, and mobile source air toxics through national emissions standards.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Locomotives/marine:</b> <b>Bill Charmley -</b> <b>OTAQ. Aircraft:</b> <b>Glenn Passavant -</b> <b>OTAQ. Air toxics:</b> <b>Kathryn Sargeant -</b> <b>OTAQ.</b></p>	<p><b>Actions:</b> Rulemaking processes underway. Current plans call for an NPRM on locomotive and marine diesel standards in 2006; development of a rule for ocean-going marine engines and their fuels during 2006; a final rule adopting the existing International Civil Aviation Organization NOx standard for aircraft engines in 2005; an NPRM on small gasoline engines by Spring 2006; and an NPRM on air toxics by February 28, 2006 with a final rule by February 9, 2007. <b>Products:</b> Rulemaking products described above.</p>
<p><b>2.7 Cement Manufacturing, Petroleum Refining, and Pulp and Paper</b> - The cement manufacturing, petroleum refining, and pulp and paper industrial source categories are already under substantial regulation, but continue to be significant sources of pollutants and warrant further consideration by EPA. EPA should evaluate potential national or regional emissions reduction strategies for criteria pollutants and air toxics in these categories. This should include improving emissions inventories if necessary and assessing their impacts on nonattainment areas or other sensitive areas. EPA should carefully consider the cost-effectiveness of imposing additional controls as it determines whether additional emissions reductions are justified and should take action consistent with the results of this analysis.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Brenda Shine-</b> <b>OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> EPA has initiated the process of evaluating the potential for additional emissions reductions for these three industrial sectors by completing the three components that were also identified by the AQMWG: first, refining the base and future year inventories, where appropriate; second, evaluating control strategies and identifying measures that would provide greater or more optimal reductions in air toxics and criteria pollutants than the current regulatory framework; third, conducting modeling to assess the impacts of these sectors on risk, nonattainment and/or sensitive areas, and in evaluating the effects of proposed compliance strategies. <b>Products:</b> Pulp and Paper Review; Cement and Petroleum Refineries Review ; <b>Progress:</b> Emission inventories and projections have been updated for cement manufacturing , and pulp and paper (completed); modeling for screening level risk assessments and for effects on the NAAQS for PM2.5 have been conducted for all three sectors (completed); evaluation of emission reduction strategies is ongoing for all three sectors. Plan on completing the reviews for all three sectors by summer 2006.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>2.8 Residential Fossil Fuel Combustion</b> - EPA should evaluate the potential for expanding the Energy Star voluntary program to gain additional criteria pollutant emissions reductions (as well as improve energy efficiency) from the residential fossil fuel sector. As part of this effort, EPA should continue to gather information on the characteristics of residential fossil fuel emissions and their contributions to nonattainment, and the magnitude and cost of potential emissions reductions under a voluntary program and/or expanded use of low-sulfur fuel. EPA should also coordinate with Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) and companies that produce lower-emitting appliances to assess the potential for programs that promote the installation of such technologies.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Julie Rosenberg- OAP</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> EPA is identifying multi-pollutant benefits of Energy Star residential fossil fuel sources. Longer-term, EPA will develop an outreach strategy to further promote energy efficient residential appliances. EPA will use the extensive network within the residential sector and with state and local governments and NGOs to encourage energy efficiency, including use of these products, as a way to help meet air quality goals.</p>
<p><b>2.9 Guidance for Local Control Measures in Key Sectors</b> - EPA, in conjunction with S/L/T and affected stakeholders, should prepare guidance for local (urban-scale) control measures to support the upcoming round of ozone and PM2.5 SIPs, and, if possible, optimize multipollutant control benefits and opportunities for reducing criteria and toxic air pollutants.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Tim Smith- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Identify remaining urban source categories that may be contributing to nonattainment areas. Evaluated inventory information for 41 categories and identified a few that are being investigated further. <b>Products:</b> Actions being taken on two: commercial cooking (evaluating feasibility of voluntary program) and steel mills (pilot project to evaluate emissions and additional controls). Both projects should be completed in 2006. Guidance for remaining categories appears to be available or is under development. For example the WRAP has developed comprehensive guidance for fugitive dust sources. Providing technical input into STAPPA/ALAPCO “menu of options” document which should be completed by early 2006.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>2.10 Residential Wood Smoke</b> - EPA should further develop the Residential Wood Smoke Reduction Initiative that includes working with S/L/T, industry, non-governmental organizations and others to support and facilitate the changeout of dirty, inefficient, “conventional” (pre-New Source Performance Standard or NSPS) woodstoves with new, cleaner, and more efficient heating appliances (e.g., EPA certified woodstoves). Concurrent with the development and implementation of changeout programs, EPA should commence efforts to revise the NSPS.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Karen Blanchard - OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> EPA, the SW Pennsylvania Air Quality Partnership (Partnership) and other partners kicked off an 11 county woodstove changeout campaign on Sept. 29 in Pittsburgh. The EPA awarded a \$100K grant to the Partnership for funding low-income households that changeout their old, dirty inefficient woodstove with clean burning more efficient hearth appliance (e.g., gas, pellet or EPA -Certified woodstove). Allegheny County also contributed \$80K to help low-income households and the hearth industry provided rebates (~10%) for any person that participates in the changeout and turns in their old stove. EPA awarded \$100K woodstove demonstration grant to the Lincoln County Health Dept (Montana) for their ongoing woodstove changeout. EPA has initiated a review of a recent petition from NE states to regulate outdoor wood-fired hydronic heaters with decision expected Spring 2006 on how to address this source category. We are also evaluating information on the woodstove industry.</p> <p><b>Products:</b> Final woodstove changeout SIP guidance (November 2005); Final woodstove changeout “How To” Guide (November 2005); Determine priority for reviewing woodstove NSPS (Dec 2005); Determine outdoor wood boiler federal strategy (Spring 2006)</p>
<p><b>2.11 Open Burning</b> - EPA should work S/L/T to encourage more vigorous control of open burning, especially in, and adjacent to, counties with Class I areas and counties classified as nonattainment for fine particles or ozone.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Laurel Dygowski- R8</b></p>	<p><b>Actions:</b> States participating in the workgroup provided information on their emission inventory and control information. The result has been a determination that most states do not collect open burning inventory information. Subsequently, the group is reviewing some recent work in NEI by EPA concerning open burning inventories and emission factors. This information may serve as the basis for the development of SIP guidance on open burning. Also, the workgroup is on target to have updated control information for states that is in a centralized location by May 2006. If it is determined that a national open burning rule would be beneficial, the response to this portion of the recommendation would be May 2007 or later to allow for development and implementation of such rule. Also, in response to the needs of the workgroup members, the workgroup will be sharing case studies in the implementation of open burning in their state/local/tribe.</p> <p><b>Product:</b> The final response product will be emission factor and inventory information, a SIP guidance document, a model rule, and informational and outreach materials. These materials will be in a centralized location dedicated to open burning. A national rule pertaining to open burning is also a possible product</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>2.12 High-Emitting Gasoline Vehicles</b> - EPA and S/L/T should reduce emissions from high-emitting gasoline vehicles that are believed to contribute a high fraction of mobile source emissions.</p>	<p><b>Variable</b></p>	<p><b>Gene Tierney - OTAQ</b></p>	<p><b>Actions:</b> EPA will use new data to determine the impact of high-emitters on today's inventory, continue to evaluate OBD effectiveness, encourage development of new technologies to detect high-emitters, and support state and local I/M programs designed to repair high-emitters or remove them from the road.  <b>Products:</b> Characterization of the impact of high emitters on today's mobile source vehicle inventory. New mobile model--MOVES2006. Recommendations for changes to further reduce emissions from high-emitting vehicles. The priority is variable, depending on the impact of high-emitters on a local inventory.</p>
<p><b>2.13 Conformity</b> - Conformity should be retained as part of the nation's AQM system.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p><b>Lee Cook - OTAQ</b></p>	<p><b>Actions:</b> Transportation conformity requires that air pollution levels from motor vehicles in a metropolitan area, including emissions from planned transportation projects, be consistent with levels necessary to assure timely attainment and maintenance of NAAQSs. The workgroup recommended that conformity's 20 year transportation planning horizon, and the requirement to revise transportation conformity analyses every three years, be maintained. <b>Products:</b> Retention of the transportation conformity program. Final rule to incorporate PM2.5 precursors to transportation conformity regulations completed in May 2005. Interim guidance on transportation bill changes to the conformity program by the end of the year. The priority is low because there is an effective program in place.</p>
<p><b>3.1 Align SIP Submittal Dates</b> - Because ozone, PM2.5, and regional haze SIPs have similar elements and are likely to contain similar control strategies, EPA, S/L/T and other stakeholders should strive to align the submittal dates of the three SIPs. This recommendation is not intended to suggest changes to any deadlines for attainment or implementation of control strategies, or to imply that a single SIP should be required for ozone, PM2.5, and regional haze. It is further recommended that, in the future, EPA should align designation dates as appropriate to promote multipollutant SIP development.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Barbara Driscoll-OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Language to be included in Ozone and PM implementation rules to encourage integration of SIP control strategies. Initiating group to look at incentives for States to submit PM SIPs early. <b>Products:</b> PM Rule proposed in September 2005. Ozone Rule final by December 2005. PM incentives by Jan. 2005 if determined feasible.</p>



Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>3.2 Protocol for SIP Development</b> - Each State should work with the appropriate EPA Regional Office to develop and implement a protocol for SIP development and processing that would lay out responsibilities, expectations, and timelines for all parties. While a model protocol should be developed, the EPA Regional Office and each State should have the flexibility to design a protocol tailored to their specific needs.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Steve Rosenthal- R5</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Region 5 will work with Indiana to develop a protocol for SIP development and processing that could serve as an example protocol for use by other states.  <b>Products:</b> A SIP Protocol developed with Indiana that will establish guidelines to improve communication between EPA and the State and result in expedited and high quality SIP revisions. This SIP Protocol will include a detailed schedule for Indiana's rule development and EPA's subsequent review and is intended to serve as an example for use by other states. Specific elements of this protocol are the successive stages of the Indiana rulemaking process, the expected communication between Indiana and EPA at the appropriate stages of the State rulemaking process, specific commitments for EPA review in order to avoid late hits, monthly status calls, and detailed rule/SIP development tracking.  <b>Status:</b> EPA has provided Indiana with a list of different types of SIP revisions and corresponding EPA review times. Indiana has incorporated this information in a recently submitted detailed draft joint protocol which addresses the various stages of the State rulemaking process, the communication required by Indiana and EPA at the successive stages of the rulemaking process and commitments for EPA's review. Region 5 and Indiana have targeted a final Protocol to be signed by the Regional Administrator and Indiana's Environmental Commissioner by December 2005.</p>
<p><b>3.3 Clearinghouse of Approved SIPs</b> - EPA should develop a website, similar to the Best Available Control Technology (BACT)/Lowest Achievable Emission Rate (LAER) clearinghouse, containing interpretations of rules and other SIP/TIP approval-related issues. This website could contain both policy and/or technical information depending on how it is developed. Each EPA Regional Office should develop a website, to be updated every 12 months on or about October 1, that identifies and provides links to all statutory and regulatory requirements in the federally approved SIP, including associated State and federal legal citations and effective dates.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>Sean Lakeman- R4; Dawn Roddy- OAR</b></p>	<p>The main portion of this recommendation is underway and will be complete in 6 months including detailed business plans with request for funding in FY06 to develop clearinghouse.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>3.4 Streamline Minor SIP Revisions</b> - For the SIP approval/disapproval phase of the air quality management process, EPA should establish a <i>de minimis</i> level for SIP revisions and streamline the processing of these revisions by the use of “letter approvals” or similar expedited procedures signed by the Regional Administrator. EPA should, in consultation with S/L/T and other stakeholders, develop a listing of the types of SIP actions that are eligible for streamlined processing.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Jerry Stubberfield- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action: Recommendation Addressed:</b> Follow-up discussions with Regions and States have resulted in no new additions to list of eligible SIP actions with qualify for "letter notice approvals". No plans for any additional follow up actions with respect to streamlining minor SIP revisions.</p>
<p><b>3.5 Timely EPA Guidance</b> - EPA guidance should be issued in sufficient time for States to meet their SIP development deadlines. EPA should involve S/L/T and other appropriate parties in its guidance development process. In cases where guidance is delayed, EPA should take into consideration States’ efforts to meet deadlines without the benefit of the appropriate policy guidance.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Barbara Driscoll- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Evaluate timelines for actual guidance/implementation rules being developed to determine where efficiencies can be made <b>Products:</b> Evaluate implementation rules for ozone and PM by December 2005. Develop list of recommendations for improving process based on evaluations by January 2006.</p>
<p><b>3.6 Avoid Unnecessary Public Hearings</b> - EPA should work with States and Tribes to develop a model regulation that would require a public hearing for SIP revisions only if one is requested after public notice. This recommendation is not to restrict public comment in any way; it is meant only to eliminate those hearings that no one attends.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Doug Aburano- R5</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Workgroup will develop alternative public hearing process and conduct a pilot project with Minnesota to identify where public interest is typically low in participation by December 2005. <b>Products:</b> EPA and MPCA have developed a table that describes the types of SIP revisions that: 1) will continue to have automatic public hearings, 2) will not have public hearings unless one is requested, and 3) will have the equivalent of a SIP public hearing. This table will be formalized in a memorandum of agreement between EPA and MPCA. This MOA will then be submitted to EPA as a SIP revision. <b>Status:</b> MPCA and Region 5 have agreed on the types of SIP revisions that do not require automatic public hearings. This will be submitted for parallel processing for approval in the Federal Register. We expect a final approval in the Federal Register by December 2005.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>3.7 Facilitate Redesignation Process for Certain Areas -</b> For those areas that have not pursued and been granted redesignation when initially eligible, and have continued to demonstrate violation-free ambient air quality data for several years, EPA should expedite the redesignation process. EPA should ensure that all Regions and States are aware of the simplified procedures. This recommendation is not intended to change the requirements for redesignation under the CAA.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p><b>Kay Prince- R4</b></p>	<p>1. Workgroup will compile existing guidance. 2. OAQPS will provide a website 3. R4 will work with OGC/OAQPS to complete materials for Regional Offices by November 2005</p>
<p><b>3.8 Effective Communication with Constituencies -</b> EPA, along with S/L/T should develop a menu of options for effective communication to build support with a wide variety of constituencies for clean air plans at the S/L/T level.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>	<p><b>To be Determined</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Looking for State or local lead for team. Have developed a piece requesting participation on this team. Current team members are looking at ways to survey State/local government for communication needs and also to inventory what is available.</p>
<p><b>3.9 Co-Benefits of Innovative Measures -</b> EPA and S/L/T should work collectively to communicate the co-benefits associated with innovative measures.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>David Solomon-OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Recommendation completed August 2005. <b>Products:</b> Incorporated a discussion of co-benefits in EPA's 2005 Air Innovations Conference and in EPA's SIP credit guidance documents (e.g., bundled measures). Guidance documents will include discussions of co-benefits for all pollutants as well as quality of life benefits as known. Included table on website with emerging and voluntary actions and their co-benefits, also as part of bundled SIP guidance (AQM 3.11).</p>
<p><b>3.10 Innovative and Voluntary Measures -</b> EPA should encourage States' and Tribes' efforts to implement innovative measures by providing enhanced flexibility, SIP/TIP credit guidance, technical support, and funding for innovative and voluntary programs.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>David Solomon-OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Recommendation completed <b>Products:</b> 1) Held August 2005 annual Air Innovations Conference; 2) Completed innovations website; 3) issued SIP credit policy and guidance on a) voluntary and emerging measures, b) energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives, and c) reductions in truck and locomotive idling emissions. Additional guidance will be issued as needed.</p>
<p><b>3.11 SIP Credits for Bundled Innovative Measures -</b> EPA should incentivize innovative pollution control strategies by offering SIP/TIP credit for “bundled and discounted” measures.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>David Solomon-OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Completed August 2005. <b>Product:</b> Developed a "bundled measure" SIP/TIP guidance document by August 2005 Air Innovations Conference.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>3.12 Regional Approaches to SIP Planning</b> - For many areas, planning for new SIPs or major revisions to existing SIPs for two or more separate nonattainment areas that are both part of the same regional-scale air quality problem should be coordinated. If requested by a State, EPA should work with the different nonattainment areas, Tribes and combinations of multistate organizations and other stakeholders, as appropriate, to assist in the development of regional approaches to planning. This could include technical assistance such as modeling, national or regional control strategies, model SIPs, and model rules as templates for S/L/T adoption.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Bill Beal- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Develop resources and additional guidance and policy for RPOs, states and tribes to encourage regional and multi-pollutant approaches to the development of SIPs.  <b>Product:</b> Grant guidance, budget strategies and policy documents that encourage regional planning across pollutants to be completed by December 2005.</p>
<p><b>3.13 Federal and State Partnership</b> - EPA should participate with S/L/T in the SIP/TIP development process to identify and pursue emissions reductions from important source categories, especially those that only the federal government has the ability to address, such as federal and international sources. The level of control sought from these sources should be commensurate with their impact on the nonattainment area. As warranted by the nature of the source, control strategy development should be carried out by S/L/T working either directly with EPA or with EPA and other federal agencies. For attainment demonstration purposes, States should be able to take appropriate credit for anticipated reductions from these sources (whether the reductions are from regulatory or incentive programs) so long as the control strategy and its anticipated impact are found to be consistent with EPA regulation and guidance.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Carey Fitzmaurice- OAR</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Continued work with other governments and U.S. government entities on standards and programs. Continued work with States/locals about voluntary measures and programs for reductions at airports and ports.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>3.14 Weight-of-Evidence Demonstrations</b> - In order to move beyond the current approach of relying on air quality modeling, EPA, in conjunction with S/L/T and affected stakeholders, should modify its guidance to promote weight-of-evidence (WOE) demonstrations for both planning and implementation efforts. In particular, these demonstrations should reduce reliance on modeling data as the centerpiece for SIP/TIP planning, and should increase use of monitoring data and analyses of monitoring data, especially for tracking progress.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Tyler Fox- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Released a draft final guidance for 8-hour Ozone SIPs and release the final version in Fall 2005 with the ozone implementation rule. Issue draft guidance for PM 2.5/Regional Haze SIP demonstrations by end of 2005.  <b>Product:</b> Final guidance for 8-hour Ozone SIP--October 2005; Draft guidance for PM 2.5/Regional Haze SIP demonstrations end of 2005 ; Final guidance on PM2.5/Regional Haze SIP demonstrations -- Spring 2006 (integrated document with Ozone also).</p>
<p><b>3.15 Periodic Assessments to Track Progress</b> - S/L/T and EPA should conduct periodic assessments to ensure that areas are on track to meet NAAQS, air toxics, and visibility goals, and make mid-course adjustments, as necessary.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>James Hemby- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Initial efforts underway to expand accountability assessment to include multipollutant impacts.  <b>Product:</b> NOx Assessment - Completed; Multi-pollutant accountability report – FU06/FY07; as well as products resulting from recommendation 1.5 and 3.14</p>
<p><b>3.16 Averaging, Banking and Trading in Gasoline Sulfur Program</b> - EPA should evaluate the averaging, banking, and trading (ABT) provisions included in the Tier II gasoline sulfur regulation to see if they are effective.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>	<p><b>John Holley - OTAQ</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> ABT provisions have not been used in fuel programs since the lead phase-down. This evaluation will be phased to include annual analysis of available information and a complete report when the program has been fully implemented and patterns of credit usage are well-established. <b>Products:</b> Some aspects of the evaluation can be addressed in annual analyses beginning in mid-to-late 2005. The more complete report cannot be developed until late 2007 at the earliest, the first time data on a fully-implemented program will be available.</p>
<p><b>4.1 SIPs to Address Multipollutant Impacts</b> - For the SIPs States are required to submit over the next several years, EPA and S/L/T should promote the consideration of multipollutant impacts, including the impacts of air toxics, and where there is discretion, select regulatory approaches that maximize benefits from controlling key air toxics, as well as ozone, PM2.5, and regional haze.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Amy Vasu - OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Actions:</b> Memo to Regional ADDs with initial guidance for States on including HAP in SIPs - August 2005 - completed <b>Other Products:</b> 1. Assessment of PM2.5 and metals from steel mills -- final report, Jan. 2006 2. Draft of in-depth guidance on process to assist States in SIP development by end of 2005. 3. Detroit Pilot Study - case study on process, data, and tools for developing control strategies for combined SIPs - Summer 2006</p>
<p><b>4.2 Multipollutant Benefits and Disbenefits in Standards Setting</b> - EPA should explicitly outline and quantify multipollutant benefits and disbenefits when setting emissions standards.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Brenda Shine- OAQPS</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Propose to develop a protocol for conducting multipollutant analyses and incorporating this protocol into our standard setting process. <b>Products:</b> Draft for internal EPA review by end of October 2005. Completion of protocol by December 2005 and updated as needed.</p>

Status Summary of AQM Phase 1 Recommendations – November 2005

<p><b>4.3 Greenhouse Gas Co-benefits and Disbenefits - EPA</b> should assist States and localities in quantifying the potential for greenhouse gas co-benefits and disbenefits of emissions reduction measures primarily designed to address ozone, PM2.5, regional haze and air toxics.</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Julie Rosenberg- OAP</b></p>	<p><b>Action:</b> States are encouraged to use the Clean Air Climate Protection Software too, available from STAPPA/ALAPCO. To upgrade the tool, EPA is assessing the best approach to adding the PM2.5, determining whether the tool can be updated with existing data or if new data sets will need to be generated.</p>
<p><b>5.1 Program Review to Improve Ecosystem Protection -</b> EPA should, in parallel with recommended scientific and technical work, begin now to examine current and alternative clean air related policies and programs to develop approaches that would advance protection of ecosystems from the adverse effects of air pollution. Alternatives that should be evaluated include a regional cap-and-trade program, protection of ecosystems based on critical loads, a State-wide planning program for protecting and enhancing air quality in areas that attain the NAAQS (including National Parks and Wilderness Areas).</p>	<p><b>High</b></p>	<p><b>Rick Haeuber- OAP</b></p>	<p><b>Products:</b> Comprehensive review of ecosystem protection successes and limitations under current authorities (draft report 3/2006); EPA- Forest Service IAG to expand NE US critical loads mapping project (1/2006); EPA-USGS IAG for Western U.S. - focused cross-site model comparison workshop (1/2006); Inter-Agency critical loads technical workshop (5/2006); Eastern US - focused technical workshop to compare/evaluate dynamic models for use in developing regional critical loads and characterizing broad regional impacts (Fall 2006)</p>