



SPOKANE COUNTY
AIR POLLUTION
CONTROL AUTHORITY

WEST 1101 COLLEGE AVE, SUITE 403 ♦ SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99201 ♦ (509) 477-4727 ♦ FAX (509) 477-6828

SPOKANE COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

June 1, 2006 9:30 a.m.

SPOKANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING
LOWER LEVEL HEARING ROOM

PRESENT WERE:

Matthew Pederson
Jeff Corkill
Michele Pope
Commissioner Harris

STAFF:

Ron Edgar, Interim Director
Barbara Nelson, Finance & Personnel Admin.
Mary McDermott, Secretary II
Lisa Woodard, PI Officer
April Westby, Air Quality Engineer II
Crystal Alford, Air Quality Specialist II

WORK SESSION: The work session of the board meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m.

1. Air Operating Permit Fee Rule – April Westby

April Westby gave an overview of the Air Operating Permit (AOP) Program. It is a federally mandated program in Title V of the Clean Air Act (CAA) and it is delegated to SCAPCA for implementation in Spokane County. The program commenced in 1994 and is only applicable to the large emitting sources in the County. The AOP issued to these sources contains all federal, state and local air quality requirements for the facility in one document. Over the past five years there have been between 10 and 13 AOP sources subject to this program.

There are numerous activities SCAPCA performs for the sources subject to the AOP program, including permit writing and revisions. Each permit is good for a term of five years, although a number of sources have had to have their permits revised because they've had new requirements that have become applicable during the permit term. Notice of Construction (NOC) reviews are performed when a source installs new equipment or modifies existing equipment. Sources that are subject to this federal program are required to submit numerous reports to SCAPCA which are all reviewed. SCAPCA also performs annual inspections and responds to complaints. Time is spent on technical assistance, enforcement actions, training and management of the program.

The Federal and State CAAs require that the AOP program be at full-cost recovery, where the costs are fully recovered by the fees paid by the sources. The program cost for each year has been approximately \$100,000. Over the life of the program it is at 97.9% cost recovery. The deficit has

been taken from SCAPCA's General Fund. Although this program has been running at a high level of cost recovery, we're expecting our cumulative deficit for the last 12 years to be about \$40,000 by the end of this current fiscal year.

SCAPCA's AOP program was recently audited by EPA and the only significant finding that they have from the audit is that the program does not have sufficient funding. EPA told SCAPCA they would issue a formal Notice of Deficiency to SCAPCA, which would give SCAPCA 18 months to fix the funding deficiency problem. This has not happened but EPA has communicated that this is something that will probably happen. EPA also requires the recovery of the past program deficit. In order to get to full-cost recovery, SCAPCA is looking at revising the fee structure, reducing costs and increasing efficiency as much as possible.

SCAPCA's current AOP fee structure that is contained in its regulations includes an annual AOP fee that was last revised in 2001. It has a \$3,000 base fee and the emissions fee is \$31.11 per ton of pollutants and there is also an Ecology oversight fee which is charged to the sources and that money is sent back to Ecology. The sources also pay NOC fees when they go through the process for installing new or modified equipment. The problem with the current fee structure is that the annual fees are directly tied to the number of sources and annual emissions and they are not correlated to SCAPCA's time spent. A couple of sources have dramatically reduced their emissions over the past years, which is a positive thing, but it has also cut the AOP program revenue. Even though the emissions have been reduced, a level of oversight in the workload has to remain the same.

Statewide fee comparison shows that SCAPCA's fees are the lowest in the state. Michele Pope asked what the DOE does for their fee. April replied that the Ecology oversight fee is for Ecology writing, revising and maintaining the rules; dealing with EPA; furnishing training; and providing an audit once a year. This fee is what Ecology would charge their sources and it is only charged to the local sources. Jeff Corkill added that this is for the sources that don't have air pollution control agencies. April Westby added that last year the annual fees ranged from \$3,000 for the smallest source to \$20,000 for the source with the highest emissions in the County.

To recover the future program costs, SCAPCA is proposing to implement a revised AOP fee structure for the annual fee. The revised annual fee will be comprised of three parts. SCAPCA would keep the current base fee and emission fee and the third part of the fee would be a SCAPCA time fee. This time fee would be determined by utilizing the detailed time accounting records that are kept to calculate the number of hours spent on each source by SCAPCA employees. The remaining program costs that are not covered by the base and emission fees would be apportioned out to the sources based on the number of hours spent on each source. SCAPCA would also keep the Ecology oversight fee and a shortfall recovery fee.

To recover the \$40,000 dollar past program deficit, SCAPCA is proposing to institute a shortfall recovery fee. Since it took about 10 years to accrue the current deficit, SCAPCA is proposing to take 10 years to recover the money at a rate of \$5,000 per year. This money will be placed back into SCAPCA's general fund. The \$5,000 will be equally dispersed among the sources subject to the program; each will pay about \$400 extra per year. SCAPCA is proposing to eliminate the NOC fees that are currently charged and role this activity into the annual AOP fee. This will simplify the fiscal part and time spent on doing NOC reviews will be time spent on other activities such as inspections, report reviews, etc.

There are several advantages to the three-part AOP fee structure and the most important one is that the annual revenue will recover the annual program costs so that the program will be at full-cost recovery. SCAPCA favors the fees based partly on emissions because this is in line with EPA's guidance and it also encourages emission reductions. The three-part fee also accounts for SCAPCA time spent working on each source. So if one source has a major action or if SCAPCA spends a lot of time writing a permit, the fees for that source will reflect the time spent during that year. In addition to changing the fees, SCAPCA is committed to keeping its costs low and increasing the program efficiency when possible. There are minimum activities that must be performed under the program which cannot be eliminated. In addition, several of our AOP sources do not have dedicated environmental personnel on staff and they rely on SCAPCA as their primary source of information and assistance. There will be complete documentation for the hours spent on each source that will be available for review upon request. SCAPCA will make every effort to keep the program costs in the range that they have been in the past.

SCAPCA sent out the proposed fee revisions and fact sheet to all the affected AOP sources for a 30-day comment period a couple of months ago. An individual letter was sent to each source with information on what the revised fees would be for that facility. There were no negative comments received during the comment period. There was a comment received from a source that has a facility on the other side of the state and all they said was that SCAPCA's fees are so low that they don't have a problem with the revised fees. The next step in the process would be to initiate the formal rulemaking process and hold a public hearing.

Jeff Corkill asked if the shortfall recovery fee could be pro-rated by the sources emissions. April replied that SCAPCA's feeling was to keep it simple and divide it equally among the sources which turn out to be approximately \$450 per source, but pro-rating it by emissions could be done. Michele Pope added that the sources vary in size so \$450 to one source would mean something different to a smaller one. Michele also applauded April for looking at ways to reduce the cost and increase the programs efficiency.

Ron Edgar stated that he would proceed to put this into public comment period. The changes will be made that were suggested and then it will be filed with the State Code Reviser's Office. After that SCAPCA will get a date and notify the Board of the Public Hearing, which will probably be in September.

2. Amendments to SCAPCA Regulation I, Article II, General Provisions – Chuck Studer

Ron Edgar explained that this is a general housekeeping issue. There are a lot of rules and regulations that SCAPCA is delegated or to accept delegation of that SCAPCA enforces from the State and EPA. This is to clarify in the rules the current status of those delegations. These amendments are out for public comment at this time.

Chuck Studer stated that in Section 2.12 the title "Restraining Orders-Injunctions" was added to clarify the purpose of the section. In Section 2.13, SCAPCA is getting its effective date for the rules and regulations up from March 4, 2004 to July 1, 2006. This allows SCAPCA staff to implement and enforce the most recent version of the federal rules and regulations. Section 2.14 is mostly for information purposes to allow the public to know which WACs SCAPCA implements and enforces

and which Sections that SCAPCA does not implement and enforce. The reason SCAPCA has done this is in the last revision to the State's Regulation of Chapter 173-400 WAC; they put a provision in that says this section applies statewide except where an authority has its own rule and regulation for such sources. This Chapter also has to do with the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Sources (PSD) and Ecology has oversight of that, they write the permits, etc. and SCAPCA implements the enforcement section.

Matthew Pederson stated that it would be fine for SCAPCA to schedule this for public hearing and a decision by the Board, for the month of July.

BOARD MEETING: The board meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Administrative Items:

1. Advisory Council Report – Ron Edgar

Ron Edgar stated that the Advisory Council was given an overview of the rules and regulation changes, the asbestos fees, AOP fees and registration rule making processes. The discussion from the Advisory Council is that they are supportive of getting full-cost recovery on the programs where fees are charged. They stated that the increases in general across the board are fair. The recommendation from the Council for the new member on the council was Ray Kelleher.

2. Public Information/Education Update – Lisa Woodard

Lisa Woodard gave an overview of the months of April and May events. About 8% of SCAPCA's education budget is earmarked for its youth audience. During this time period, SCAPCA had air quality booths with staff and materials at the Home and Garden Show, Paint a Helmet Event, Kid's Run, Earth Day and Clean Transportation Fair. SCAPCA presents to classrooms on request and joined with other environmental agencies and hosted its Annual Youth Conference. May was "Clean Air Month" and a number of activities were going on at Mobius Children's Museum every Saturday in May, except the last Saturday a clean air team was working with the Children at the Museum.

The compliance assistance program focused on asbestos and updated the "Things Your Business Should Know" guidebook. Outdoor burning events consisted of the chipping and composting event at the north Spokane County Fire Station where 18 cubic yards of chipped debris and 15 cubic yards of natural vegetation along with 5 burn barrels being turned in. "It All Adds Up to Cleaner Air" campaign made presentations to ETCs on the upcoming summer clean air events. Media activities included news releases on the chipping and composting event, yard and garden season and a car care fair in May at SCC.

3. Activity Report for April 2006 – Ron Edgar

Ron Edgar gave a summary of the activity report. There were 42 open burning complaints during the yard and garden burning season. Air quality remained good throughout the period. Jeff Corkill stated that he has noticed in the last week the main culprit in air quality is ozone, is that typical for this time of year. Ron replied that as soon as SCAPCA turns on the ozone monitors, the first day of

May, half of the time ozone is the predominant air pollutant, especially when the days are hot. Also during rainy periods which bring the particulate pollutants down, ozone still is generated if we have enough sunshine.

4. Income/Expense Statement for April 2006 – Ron Edgar, Barbara Nelson

Ron Edgar stated that SCAPCA is on track for both the income revenue and expenditures. Advertising for the director search was not in the current budget so that item will have to be adjusted.

Action Items:

5. Approval of Minutes of the May 4, 2006 Board Meeting

Michelle Pope moved to approve the May 4, 2006, board meeting minutes and Jeff Corkill seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Voucher Approval for May 2006 – \$128,094.57

Michele Pope moved to approve the May 2006, vouchers and Commissioner Harris seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Resolution 06-04 – Appointment of the Business Community Representative to the Advisory Council

Michele Pope moved to approve Resolution 06-04 with Raymond L. Kelleher as the Business Community Representative and Commissioner Harris seconded it. Motion passed unanimously. The Board would also like to meet Mr. Kelleher at some point in time.

8. Resolution 06-06 – FY-2007 Budget – Public Hearing

a. Staff Presentation – Barbara Nelson

Barbara Nelson gave a quick overview of May's workshop presentation to the Board for the FY-2007 Budget for the period of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. The FY-07 2% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) has been included for all staff at \$20,545. As a flat rate COLA, each employee would receive \$1,081.32 for an annual COLA and this increase ranges from 1.4% to 3.24% from top to bottom. This is included in the resolution as a separate item where the Board can make their selection as they approve the resolution later. Michele Pope asked if in regards to the pay increase, there is a cost of living and there is the step increases and for a lot of these employees, they are already at the highest level of their step increase so the COLA is their only increase. Barbara replied that is correct. Michele asked how many of the employees out of the 19 is that the case for? Barbara replied there are four employees that are not at the top of the step scale. The employees pay a portion of their dependent medical and dental care and SCAPCA uses the County figures and there is an increase of \$5 per month for every employee.

The end of the year reserved fund balance will be \$2,200. The unreserved designated fund balance in the project account is \$366,394 and the equipment/vehicle reserve account is \$148,581. The

unreserved undesignated fund balance is available for appropriation and SCAPCA plans to use \$351,540 to balance the budget for FY-07; the FY-07 fund balance is expected to be \$578,280 noting that without the fee changes that SCAPCA is working on, there will be a deficit in FY-09 of \$110,944.

Jeff Corkill asked about the condition of the air pollution equipment and how it looks in the long range future. Ron Edgar stated that the equipment is fairly up-to-date and the standard is going through some changes so he does not want to replace anything at this point. There are certain upkeep items that get replaced on some of the equipment but in general, all of the equipment is in fair condition.

b. Public Comment: There were no public comments.

c. Board Action:

Jeff Corkill stated that it is his feelings to give the 2% COLA rather than the flat fee. He thinks that people coming to SCAPCA invested time and effort into training which gives them different levels of jobs and he thinks that that should be rewarded in a way by giving a 2% COLA rather than a flat COLA. Michele Pope stated that she agrees with Jeff on that, that everybody has had different levels of education, experience and time and that should reflect in the COLA.

Jeff Corkill moved to approve Resolution 06-06 with a 2% Cost-of-Living-Adjustment (COLA) and Michele Pope seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

9. Resolution 06-07 – Setting the Budget for Huntwood SEP – Public Hearing

a. Staff Presentation – Crystal Alford

Crystal Alford gave a presentation on the residential woodstove change-out program. This program was funded with the Huntwood Industries violation monies and NW Hearth, Patio & BBQ Association. Seasonal and 24 hour trends suggest that residential wood smoke is a contributor to elevated levels of PM_{2.5} which is fine particulate matter. Wood smoke and PM emissions are approximately 6% of the total amount of PM emitted every year in the US. In Washington, the numbers are higher (13%) because there is more use of wood heating devices. Nationally, residential wood smoke contributes about 22% of all seven carcinogenic Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) emissions. Wood smoke contains benzene, toluene, aldehyde gases, polycyclic organics, dioxin, carbon monoxide and oxides of both nitrogen and sulfur. Solutions that have been looked at nationally to address emissions from wood stoves and other wood heating devices include curtailment programs, outreach on how to burn cleanly and wood stove change-out programs. Change-outs are a good idea because they provide an incentive to people to change their practices or habits; provides all parties an opportunity to contribute or benefit such as the hearth industries, homeowners, neighborhoods and air sheds; and it helps areas to avoid non-attainment. Old non-certified stoves overall efficiency is 40 to 60% and EPA certified stoves are 60 to 80% efficiency. In one hour the particulate emissions from a non-certified stove would put out 30 to 50 grams of emissions and a certified stove would put out 2 to 7 grams of emissions. The total cost of change-outs range from \$1,500 to \$3,000 per stove. In this program, settlement money from enforcement matters with Huntwood Industries totaling \$25,000 was marked for use with this program. SCAPCA partnered with Northwest Hearth, Patio and BBQ Association and they put up \$1,500 through a grant to go towards

this. SNAP did not provide any funding but they provided a tool for us to be able to utilize their services for identifying low and fixed income homeowners.

In the program, SCAPCA secured partners and device quotes and set a price cap for each device. In the qualification process, we looked at primary heat source in these homes as being uncertified wood heating devices, the homeowner lives in the Smoke Control Zone and are low or fixed income which would be verified by SNAP. When the homeowner was qualified, they were sent a list of retailers to obtain two bids and the job was awarded to the lowest bidder. The four participating retailers are Spokane Fireplace with three bids, The Fireplace Center with two bids, Auto Rain Sprinkler and Stoves with four bids and Falco's received two bids.

The results of the program were 11 uncertified devices were replaced with six EPA certified wood stoves and five natural gas appliances. The average cost of replacements was \$2,375. SCAPCA estimated that on an annual basis PM emissions were reduced by 1.3 tons and over an eight-year "lifespan" of devices, 10.1 tons of PM were reduced. The cost per ton of emissions reduced is \$2,500.

b. Public Comment: There were no public comments.

c. Board Action:

Commissioner Harris moved to approve Resolution 06-07 and Michele Pope seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

10. Report on the Executive Director Search – Matthew Pederson

The Board has met twice since the interview process narrowed down the candidates to three. Both special meetings immediately went into executive session to evaluate the qualifications of the three candidates. At this time, the candidates are all well rounded, experienced individuals. Backgrounds are being checked on each individuals and a new date will be set to reconvene into executive session to further process and hopefully make a decision. The Board set the continuing meeting date for the executive session for June 7th at 2:00 p.m. in the Commissioner's Conference Room.

11. Board Concerns:

Matthew Pederson introduced Council Member Michael DeVleming who will be joining the SCAPCA Board at its July meeting.

Commissioner Harris stated that he had a concern about a coffee roaster that's minuscule in its operation, roasting two pounds of coffee. The other state regulations are not as strict as SCAPCA's.

12. Public Forum:

Ryan Skinner of Humble Earth Natural Market stated that Puget Sound Clean Air Agency has a rule that if a coffee roaster roasted ten pound batches or smaller, they do not have to apply for a NOC and do not have to pay engineering fees, etc. There is a coffee roaster notification application that a coffee roaster does have to fill out which is a \$100 fee and a \$110 annual registration fee. They are

outside of the registration and regulations regarding large coffee roasters which in Spokane County, everyone is viewed the same.

We had a complaint filed against us from one of our tenants in our building. We stopped roasting in the area of the building that we are in, finding out that the way our building was structured, we share a wall with one of the tenants and the ceilings are combined. We shut down the roasting operations, brought in a different five pound roaster that is electric, tore out the ceiling and taped up all of the corresponding walls that Pizza Pipe Line's ventilation was caused from and brought in a HVAC guy who used the exhaust situation and got it plumbed out of the building appropriately. To date, they have not filed any other complaints. I talked with their corporate offices a number of times and talked with their management at that Pizza Pipe Line location and nobody has filed any complaints. With that and knowing that the regulations in western Washington, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, total about \$210 annually, the problem with Spokane County is that the current regulations require any size of roaster, even if it is a one pound roaster, technically you are required to install an after burner which is about \$10,000 and then you must have natural gas lines and pay the permitting, licensing and engineering fees that estimate to be \$15,000. We are just over a year old and we don't have \$15,000. We didn't understand why an agency in western Washington would be more lenient in its regulations and the ability for a small business to keep going and if we got to the point where we were at a 15 to 20 pound roaster, then yes we would need to install an afterburner. No neighbors have complained outside of the actual physical structure of our building and it really is not as unpleasant of a smell as everybody says it is. It also must be noted that the exhaust is non-toxic.

As of yesterday, the 31st was our last extension from SCAPCA, so we stopped coffee roasting yesterday and we cannot operate today because of the Notice of Violation (NOV) that was issued May 1st. We have taken the steps knowing that yes we could possibly get this approved in our favor, but at the same time knowing that if it doesn't go in our favor, we will have to disband and break everything up. I have been searching for employment and have looked for somebody who would buy the concept of the store.

Michele Pope thanked Ryan for his document and presentation. Matthew Pederson asked Ron Edgar if he was aware of the situation. Ron stated yes, he was aware of it and SCAPCA is looking at it. He is not opposed to putting a deminimus level on coffee roasters. The way SCAPCA's rules currently read, it has no deminimus level for coffee roasters. He pointed out that while this coffee roaster has had one complaint and no further ones, SCAPCA has had troubles with coffee roasters off and on depending on where they are located. Small coffee roasters can be located in small shops in residential neighborhoods and for a while the odors may seem pleasant, after a while people get tired of the smell of coffee; and there can be those kinds of problems and nuisances. He understands this business's problem with that and small coffee roasters are extremely expensive and Ryan is correct with the prices quoted. As far as visible emissions, he doesn't think that they should be excused; Ryan talked about white smoke, Ron thinks that most of them can operate with a minimal amount of smoke in most cases. Puget Sound did talk about an option of if a source under a 10 pound roaster started to have odor and nuisance complaints, they could be required to install some type of control. Control does not have to be an afterburner but it is the most effective at controlling smoke and odors. Puget Sound set a policy of not requiring registration and then went into rule making. If that is what the Board would like, SCAPCA could go into a rule making process to exclude small roasters and in the meantime, the smaller roasters would not be required to do anything. Under SCAPCA's registration rules, they would pay an annual fee, be a registered source that would be checked on once a year or

every couple of years to make sure they are operating properly and there would be no requirement for them to file a NOC and no additional controls would be required unless we start having problems with them.

Michel Pope stated that she is in favor of something like that because we need to look out for the small coffee roasters that only roast a few pounds because it seems heavy handed. Commissioner Harris asked who set the standards or rules to have an afterburner and what does the standard say? Ron replied that SCAPCA doesn't have one; other agencies have a rule that says they have to control the smoke and odor. It has been found that what is most effective is an afterburner. He disagrees that the emissions are not toxic; there are some toxic compounds in the emissions from coffee roasting especially when you look at the darker roasts. The rule would be set by each local agency. Commissioner Harris stated that rules can be ambiguous or indefinable. If you're saying that you don't have a rule, then what he is hearing is if you've got a roaster and you can control the smoke and the smell, that's all you want them to do to comply. The rules that we are issuing these NOV's under don't meet the test. Ron replied we have regulated all coffee roasters and the NOV was based on the fact that there was an odor and he didn't file a NOC and Application for Approval or register with SCAPCA that he has this under control. The actual control method is individual to each source but there is the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) that we are required to have and it becomes a default that ends up being out there that we have to look at as far as good engineering practice. Commissioner Harris asked Ron if he was familiar with the new source review program under RCW's. Ron replied yes. Commissioner Harris stated that there are certain rights that people have to move forward with business unmolested by government, unless you can show that their rights to exercise or run their business overrules the rights of others. Complaints are very serious things, but there is a degree of complaints.

Commissioner Harris made a motion to set aside the NOV until such time that the Board has a chance, as a Board, to look into this and decide what is and what isn't in roasters, because it is ambiguous. There could be a 50 pound a day roaster and if nobody complains and they have a NOC permit, where does it say that a 50 pound roaster has to have an afterburner on it. The problem is he can't find anything in SCAPCA's regulations that a reasonable person could review and understand what their expectations are and once they do something they are going to get a NOV. This agency was set up as an educational agency to educate people in how to do things correctly. Now it seems to have become an enforcement agency. SCAPCA still has a responsibility, especially with this Board to set rules that are reasonable and enforceable and meet the tests of reason. The laws and federal government that SCAPCA operates under still has another side called practical operation and day-to-day operation. We went through this before and the guy got so frustrated he shut down his business because it was unreasonable; he was only roasting two pounds a day.

Michele Pope asked if that addresses Ryan Skinner's ability to continue to do business if SCAPCA does that. Ron replied that he thinks that is the intent of Commissioner Harris' motion, so he will take it as that. Matthew Pederson agrees, he would like to stop the order of the NOV and move into the rule making process, sounds like we have some education to go through and find out what all is entailed in these emissions from the roasting process, good, bad and indifferent. What is the BACT to use in the small operations versus a large operation and apparently it has been successful in other regions in the state and he would like to see what kind of information we could get from the Puget Sound Authority. Ron stated that he would bring back a staff report for the Board to review at the July meeting with several options. There is no problem with setting a de minimus level as long as SCAPCA

still has some authority to at least suggest changes in how they vent smaller source. To not control a nuisance problem will also lead to problems with associated businesses and things like that. Matthew Pederson agrees with that and he would like to see that the individuals notify SCAPCA that they are putting in such equipment and then have SCAPCA inform and educate them on the BACT for smoke and odors.

Commissioner Harris wanted the staff to know that he wasn't fussing at them because they are operating under the rules that SCAPCA has been operating under, he is just finding fault with the rules. The problem we are having is the stuff that seems logical becomes illogical. So the NOV is because the coffee roaster wasn't properly permitted to start with. Michele Pope thanked Mr. Skinner for coming before the Board and making them aware of this situation they need to hear from the business owners and if they don't, the Board would be out of touch. Matthew Pederson added that he would like to support SCAPCA staff, there might be some deficiency in its regulations but they have to work within the confines of those regulations and they do not have the authority to go outside the bounds of those confines that are set by the Board. They do a fairly good job working with people and he would like to see that continue. Hopefully we can make the repairs to any problems that were made or may arise as we go; the staff was just trying to do their jobs.

Matthew Pederson called for questions, there is a motion by Commissioner Harris and it is seconded by Michele Pope. Motion passes unanimously.

Michele Pope wanted to recognize and thank Commissioner Harris for his nine years of service sitting on the SCAPCA Board and that his input and guidance will be greatly missed.

Commissioner Harris stated he is going to miss everyone, the people he worked with and the people who have come and gone, but he is not going to miss the obnoxious attitude that the federal government has forced this agency to be involved in. He supports clean air and clean water and will miss all of the Board and SCAPCA staff and he thanked everyone for putting up with him through the years and who knows, he might be back you never know.

The meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.

The next Board Meeting will be July 6, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. in the lower level of the Public Works Building.

MATTHEW PEDERSON, CHAIR

WILLIAM DAMEWORTH, SECRETARY