



Missouri  
Department of  
Natural Resources

**Springfield Area Ozone Designation Process Meeting Three**  
**The Library Center**  
**The Auditorium**  
**10 a.m. to 12 p.m.**  
**Sept. 26, 2008**

**Staff Members Present**

Carrie Smith (Ombudsmen)  
Cindy Davies, SWRO  
Dave Woolery (Ombudsmen)  
David Lamb  
Jeff Bennett  
Paul Myers  
Paul Vitzthum, SWRO  
Rebecca Birke Scheuler

**Others Present by Attendance Record**

Barbara Lucks, City of Springfield Public Works  
Doug Neidigh, Ozarks Clean Air Alliance  
Randy Lyman, City of Springfield Public Works  
Phil Broyles, City of Springfield Public Works  
Karen Mekinis, Springfield-Greene County Health Department  
Ryan Talken, Joplin Health Department  
Jim Bresee, Christian County  
Dave Fraley, City Utilities of Springfield  
Cassandra Henne, City of Republic  
Steve McKarus, Jasper County Health Department  
Tent Bowers, City of Hollister  
Jeff Seifried, Springfield Chamber of Commerce  
Frank Schoneboom, City of Branson  
Andrew Seiler, MoDOT  
Michelle Garand, Community Partnership  
Joel Kella, Cedar County  
Brian Adams, Springfield Air Quality Control  
Jami Gay, Springfield Air Quality Control  
Sarah West, Bolivar Herald-Free Press  
Natasha Longpine, OTO  
Sara Edwards, OTO  
Bill Barnett, Christian County  
Eric Bernskoetter, MoDOT  
Jim Strafuss

Joel Kella, Green Co Highway  
Chey Goddard, Springfield-Green County Health Department  
Lyndall Fraker, Webster County  
Danny Strahen, Taney County  
Ron Houseman, NACO  
Chuck Kroeger, The Forrester Group  
Dan Watts, Southwest Missouri Council of Governments  
Earl Dotson, Lawrence County  
Bill Dryer, Polk County Commission  
Harold Morgans, Dallas County Commission  
Michael Giles, City of Springfield Public Works  
George Thullesen, Empire  
Paul Ipock, Webster County  
Harold Bengsch, Greene County Commission

### **Opening Remarks**

David Lamb opened the meeting welcoming everyone and asked that everyone go around the room with introductions. He explained the agenda for the meeting and timeframe for the designation recommendation. He explained that this is our initial draft and there would still be an opportunity to comment. He then introduced Jeff Bennett who would be giving the presentation.

Jeff opened the presentation with an encouragement for interaction and questions. We are attempting to make this as transparent as possible. We are going to talk about the draft recommendation, which counties will be included and why. 2006-2008 data is showing that so far this area is in attainment for their two monitors nearing the end of this ozone season. However, that does not mean that it will not change and violations at monitors are still possible. That tells us that our recommendation will have two scenarios based on the data used.

The map tells us that there are two monitors in violation, Eldorado Springs and Hillcrest. Two critical questions need to be asked:

- 1) Does a monitor in the area violate the standard?
- 2) Do VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emission sources in each county contribute to those violating monitors in a nearby area?

### **Draft Recommendation**

#### **Scenario One**

If 2006-2008 data is used – all counties in the region would be recommended for attainment of the 2008 ozone standard.

#### **Scenario Two**

If 2005-2007 data is used – Christian, Greene, Stone, and Taney counties would be designated as nonattainment areas. Cedar County would also receive a special designation as a rural transport nonattainment area because emissions that are causing violations at their monitor are not necessarily originating in that county. That means that their requirements would be very minimal because there are not a significant amount of options for control.

Contribution Summary – see slide. This is an evaluation of all sources.

This map tells us the percentage of VOC, NO<sub>x</sub> and population. This is probably not news to folks; the greatest contributor to ozone in the area is Greene County. The summary does not include met data. Jasper county emissions are higher, but are they nearby enough to the Springfield area or do the winds blow from their direction when the monitors are violating?

**Question:** Why not include Vernon County if you include Cedar County?

**Answer:** Yes, it could be included, but how much do those surrounding counties contribute and is it enough to make the case that they should be included? It can become a slippery slope, it was under consideration, and we evaluated all other aspects to make this determination. We don't like to make assumptions; we like to stick to the facts. Without data to support its inclusion, we will not include Vernon County.

**County by County Evaluation – see slides for complete details.**

**Greene County** – Nonattainment. There are enough emissions to prove that this county contributes to ozone in the area. It has the largest population in the area and largest annual VMT.

**Jasper County** – Attainment. This county was a difficult one to determine. It is an emitter. However, we don't have enough data to support its inclusion at this time, but added monitoring may bring this county in at a later date. A monitor that will be added in Joplin will give us a better picture of air quality here.

**Taney County** – Nonattainment. This county is the second largest emitter of VOC emission in Southwest Missouri. 15 tons per day is a large amount for one county. They also contribute to violating monitors in Springfield. Met data shows contribution to the Hillcrest violating monitor.

**Newton County** – Attainment. This one is similar to Jasper County. They have a little lower emission levels. New monitoring proposed for Joplin will also help us get a better picture of the air quality here.

**Stone County** – Nonattainment. It is the fourth Largest VOC emitter with 10 tons per day. Met data supports its contribution to the violating Hillcrest monitor.

**Christian County** – Nonattainment. This is the most connected county to the Springfield Metropolitan Complex. There is a distinct connection between North-Central Christian County and Greene County. Vehicle Miles Traveled are increased here because of this and those contribute to VOC emissions that contribute to ozone formation.

**Question:** I know that monitors are proposed for St. Joseph, Columbia, Jefferson City and Joplin. Why not in Christian or Taney Counties?

**Answer:** Yes, that would make sense. It is costly and the department has to decide which will give us the most data for the dollars spent. You have to remember that ozone does not form immediately downwind from a source, so monitoring in areas with the highest emissions isn't

always the best approach. These emissions move and “percolate”, if you will, to form ozone. So, we want monitors placed where the ozone is forming.

What are we going to do to address incoming pollution? The short answer is; it is always under consideration. Missouri is not an island. Surrounding states contribute to bad air quality in Missouri and we contribute to their problems, too. This is everyone’s problem to solve. Controls here assist us and others, too.

**Barry County** – Attainment. They have no real connectivity to the Springfield or Joplin Metro areas. Not located in or adjacent to the Springfield MSA. There are low VMT and lower emissions.

**Lawrence County** – Attainment. They have medium VMT. They are somewhat connected to the Springfield Metro area, but not enough to make them large contributors to violating monitors.

**Webster County** – Attainment. This is the next most connected after Christian County. However, based on all the criteria, they are not contributing to downwind Springfield.

**Polk and Dallas Counties** – Attainment. These are not major contributors to violating monitors. These are relatively small.

**McDonald, Barton, and Dade Counties** – Attainment. Their combined emissions are less than 10 tons per day. There is limited connection to the Springfield MSA.

**Cedar County** – Rural Transport Nonattainment. This county is in because of a violating monitor, but they are not contributing to their own problem and the problem of others.

Bad News – 2005-2007 data is showing that there are counties violating the standard.

Good News – 2006-2008 data was better and shows attainment.

More Bad News – This recommendation may be based on 2007-2009 data and that means that bad air quality episodes in 2009 can affect the final designation because EPA will use the most recent, quality-assured data.

More Good News – Ozarks Clean Air Alliance is already working on a Clean Air Action Plan that will help protect air quality in this area. We encourage you to work on your own problems and we support the work that you have already started.

### **Timeline**

We will be submitting our recommendation in March 2009 based on the most recent quality-assured monitoring data. EPA will make final designations on March 2010.

### **Wrap-Up**

Everyone can review the technical support document and the proposed recommendation posted on the Web page.

Please look this over and provide us with any comments through the Web site.

Doug Neidigh then spoke briefly about the Ozarks Clean Air Alliance. He spoke on the development of the Clean Air Action Plan. A workgroup has completed a first draft of this plan of voluntary strategies. We will be sending this out for review and comments. This plan will work if counties throughout the region are on-board with these voluntary strategies that will protect air quality and hopefully save folks some money, too. Regional support is definitely needed. Your input is also very important. We want feasible and easily implemented solutions.

The final document will be posted on Nov. 4, 30 days before the public hearing. The public hearing will be on Dec. 4 in Jefferson City, MO.