



SPOKANE COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
BOARD MEETING MINUTES

August 3, 2006 9:30 a.m.
SPOKANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING
LOWER LEVEL HEARING ROOM

PRESENT WERE:

Matthew Pederson
Michele Pope
Jeff Corkill
Mike DeVleming

STAFF:

William Dameworth, Director
Barbara Nelson, Finance & Personnel Admin.
Ron Edgar, Chief of Technical Services
Matt Holmquist, Compliance Administrator
Chuck Studer, Air Quality Engineer I
Mary McDermott, Secretary II

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

1. Registration Fee Update – Matt Holmquist

Matt Holmquist updated the Board on the proposed rulemaking to achieve full-cost recovery in the first year of implementation with annual review and adjustments being made thereafter as necessary to maintain the full-cost recovery discussed at the last board meeting. The flat facility fee would be about \$165 and then the remaining facility fees would be assigned to the emission fee per ton category. This will simplify the fee schedule. The Board will be provided with an updated staff report accompanied with a brief presentation at the September 7th board meeting. With the Board's concurrence, there will be a third more formal public comment period in October followed by a public hearing at the November board meeting. Immediately following the public hearing, the Board may adopt the proposed fee amendments which would become effective in December.

BOARD MEETING: The board meeting was called to order at 9:47 a.m.

1. Registration of Coffee Roasting

- a. **Administrative Policy for Roasters < 10 lbs.**
- b. **Amend Regulation regarding Small Roasters**

Joe Southwell gave a brief summary of the two proposals/options for small coffee roasters that the Board Members were interested in hearing more about. Option 2 would

continue to require registration and permits for all coffee roasters and no emission controls on roasters under a maximum 10 pound batch size unless odor/nuisance problems are documented. This policy option can be implemented with a Board approved policy. Option 3 would exempt small 10 pound or less roasters from registering, permitting and control requirements, but have a contingency that if odor/nuisance problems are documented, they are then required to register, get permits and controls. This option would require some amendments and revisions to SCAPCA's current regulations. SCAPCA has also drafted procedures for documenting odor/nuisance problems. SCAPCA receives a complaint; investigates the complaint and verifies off-site odors and determines if the roaster was operating normally; informs the roaster of the complaint and off-site odors and asks the owner to address the problem; and if this occurs twice in a 12-month period, the roaster will be required to install an afterburner within 10 days after being notified of the second occurrence.

Bill Dameworth asked Joe to tell the Board a little bit about Puget Sound's policy on what happens when they document a complaint, because they exempt these roasters right now from permits but they have a policy or procedure for dealing with them if they do cause a complaint. Joe stated that Puget Sound has built within their regulations a provision for exempting various identified sources from permitting, but they do register them. Built within the regulation they also have a process for voiding that exemption if they find odor/nuisance complaints. Recent coffee roasters of Puget Sound went through a regulation revision about three months ago where they exempted coffee roasters under 10 pounds maximum batch capacity from the permitting requirements. They do require a notification and registration and are in the process of seeing how this goes. Right now they have received one complaint from a smaller roaster and are in the process of reviewing whether the exemption from the permitting and control requirements is warranted for the coffee roaster that generated the complaint.

Michelle Pope asked if SCAPCA could provide a flyer for businesses when they apply for a business license. She thinks that if there is a problem with a complaint, then SCAPCA can work with the business to fix the problem. Otherwise it is like treating all roasters as a problem when the problem roasters are very minuscule. She thinks SCAPCA should deal with them when it happens, it is only odors, it is under 10 pounds, and it's not that big of a deal. Mike DeVleming stated that you will always have somebody who will say they never heard of the requirements. He thinks any business owner is under the assumption that if there's a problem with their business they are going to have to deal with it. He believes that if Lisa continues to inform the public the way she does and possibly throw a blurb in the chamber news letter that maybe these people have joined, that might be a heads-up, something on the web page is another heads-up, but he believes that SCAPCA will have to deal with them as they come. Matthew Pederson and Jeff Corkill agreed that if the permit was required at either no cost or a very low cost the small coffee roaster would know all of the regulations and requirements before construction without having the extreme expense of the afterburner units. That is the main complaint from the businesses, the high expense of the afterburner units. He thinks that it will avoid a lot of confusion on the owner's part if they did have a complaint against their operation and then they would know up front that the technology they have in place may not be efficient enough to contain the odors or toxins, and additional equipment may be required. He doesn't think it will come to that point but if SCAPCA lets them know up front, it's not a surprise to them once they have a complaint, then this would save a lot of trouble for the agency and the business owner. Jeff Corkill would like to have registration required in Option 3 at a low cost.

Bill Dameworth stated that registration for coffee roasters would be close to \$165 and he doesn't think that the people will object to the fees, the issue is whether you spend \$8,000 to \$10,000 on the air pollution control equipment. There has been a lot of discussion about this that if you look up the economics of it and you want to buy one of these things to roast a small amount of coffee, it would be tough to make an economic case for it. On the other hand it's possible if they locate in a high density area and don't vent the roaster properly it could be a source of odor complaints. Our experience with odor complaints, odor regulations and enforcing them and getting something done with them is marginal at best. So if you have some other way of dealing with these roasters other than trying to enforce the odor regulation, it would work a lot faster and more efficiently.

There were no public comments on this subject.

Mike DeVleming moved to select Option 3 with the revision of changing line three to require registration and Jeff Corkill seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Public Information/Education Update – Lisa Woodard

Lisa Woodard gave a brief update on public information and education. This summer SCAPCA is a sponsor at the Indians Baseball Games with a display and trivia game. The asbestos display has been moved to the Habitat Home Builder's Surplus Store. The "Air World Kiosk" moves from location to location and is booked for the next couple of years. SCAPCA will be at "Kid's Day" in Riverfront Park in August with a "Kid's Club" event and other display items. A couple of print items and the web site were updated. The "Compliance Assistance Update" newsletter was produced and mailed out. The summer outreach "It All Adds Up to Cleaner Air" campaign is under way and SCAPCA teams up with Black and Decker and Neuton to give away electric lawn equipment. SCAPCA partners with gas stations and provides pump toppers, brochures, sets up a display and hands out tire pressure gauges. We are gearing up for the outdoor burning phase-out that occurs January 1st, 2007. Outdoor burning will not be allowed in the urban growth areas and cities that have 5,000 or more population in Spokane County. Letters have been sent to the Mayors and Fire Districts. SCAPCA continues to implement its Wood Stove Replacement Program. SCAPCA did an interview regarding Baker Commodities odor issues on KXLY and segments on ozone with KHQ.

Several air pollution agencies in Washington have gone from a "Control Authority" to a "Clean Air Agency" and they have all had good public and business response. If the Board is in favor of changing SCAPCA's name, it would also like to change its logo at the same time. There are pros and cons of changing SCAPCA's name but overall it would be fairly inexpensive. Bill Dameworth added that what SCAPCA could do is approach the Graphic Arts Departments at high schools and colleges and see what kind of interest they would have and this could generate some community interest having a contest with the schools. Jeff Corkill stated that he has always thought that the name "Authority" was a bit heavy handed. Matthew Pederson also agrees with Jeff and thinks that rather than Spokane County, it should be Spokane Regional. Bill agreed because people think that SCAPCA is part of the county government and it isn't. Matthew also added that he would like the public and businesses to think of SCAPCA as more than just regulators that set restrictions on individuals and businesses. SCAPCA wants to promote and encourage clean air and not be known as the "Air Police".

3. Activity Report for June 2006 – Ron Edgar

Ron Edgar gave a summary of the activity report. Dust, open burning and odor complaints are the primary complaints in the summer time. There is nothing unusual for enforcement activities, inspections and new source permits and construction. SCAPCA had a meeting with the DOE and went over, with the Waste to Energy Facility, some possible changes in their Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit that they were originally issued. There have been some problems with it and they would like to correct it. It would be a slight increase in their allowable emissions, but overall a very minor impact. At the same time it would also allow them to tune down their ammonia injection and SCAPCA has been seeing a lot of ammonia slip from the facility. SCAPCA is trying to balance out how much ammonia is emitted into the air versus how much NO_x they might increase. Ammonia emissions contribute to fine particulate in the air so it would be better if they used less. Air quality in general has been good so far this summer.

Action Items:

4. Approval of Minutes of the May 22, 2006 Special Board Meeting

Michele Pope moved to approve the May 22, 2006, special board meeting minutes and Jeff Corkill seconded it. Motion passed with Mike DeVleming abstaining because he was not present for these meetings.

5. Approval of Minutes of the June 23, 2006 Special Board Meeting

Michele Pope moved to approve the June 23, 2006, special board meeting minutes and Jeff Corkill seconded it. Motion passed with Mike DeVleming abstaining because he was not present for the meeting.

6. Approval of Minutes of the July 13, 2006, Board Meeting

Jeff Corkill moved to approve the July 13, 2006, board meeting minutes and Mike DeVleming seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Income/Expense Statement for June 2006 – Barbara Nelson

Barbara Nelson stated that this statement is to June 29th which is just short of the completion for the FY-06 year and the final billing payments will be processed as June 30th. There is nothing unusual or out of the ordinary for this statement, SCAPCA is on track and will be moving forward with closing the year in the next couple of weeks. Mike DeVleming asked about the increases in the PERS, legal costs and advertising. The PERS is SCAPCA's state retirement and at budget time, SCAPCA was unaware of a legislative change increase in the contributions made. The legal costs were significantly more because SCAPCA was involved in litigation compliance issues in this period. Advertising was higher because of the director position advertisement. Jeff Corkill asked about the audit that was performed. Barbara replied that SCAPCA's audit is still not complete. After several weeks of the auditor being in the office

and on-site, it was determined that SCAPCA's financial statements will be sent to Olympia for review based on the fact that it was the first audit for SCAPCA's GASBY 34 reporting requirement. That is their policy and the auditor that had been doing the audit was unfamiliar with those reporting requirements. SCAPCA received an answer back from Olympia and they suggested that additional information be added to the management analysis statement and some additional comments and graphs added to the notes of the report. The statements themselves had no issues or corrections necessary. The auditor will schedule an exit interview when they do have it completed and SCAPCA will be asking Board members to attend. Michele Pope thanked Barb for outlining things so clearly for the Board.

8. Voucher Approval for July 2006 – \$155,899.72

Mike DeVleming moved to approve the July 2006, vouchers and Michele Pope seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

Bill Dameworth mentioned that SCAPCA has joined the Spokane Chamber of Commerce and intends to participate actively with them.

9. Resolution 06-10 – Amendment to Regulation 1, Article II – Public Hearing

Chuck Studer gave an overview of the changes to Regulation 1, Article II. SCAPCA revised this section so that it reflected the comments made by Beth Hodgson of Spring Environmental and she was pleased with the changes to the regulation. This section is an informational section that tells which sections of the State WACs SCAPCA enforce and which sections of the WACs SCAPCA does not enforce and why it doesn't enforce those. The only WAC SCAPCA has exceptions with are Chapter 173.400. There were no comments from the public.

Michele Pope moved to approve Resolution 06-10 and Jeff Corkill seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

10. Resolution 06-11 – Approval of the CY-06 PM_{2.5} Monitor Grant Budget

Barbara Nelson gave an overview of Resolutions 06-11 and 06-12. These are house keeping resolutions to establish the budget for grant money that SCAPCA has already received and has been spending. These resolutions establish the budget and approval for appropriation of these funds.

Jeff Corkill moved to approve Resolution 06-11 and Mike DeVleming seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

11. Resolution 06-12 – Approval of the Fiscal 06-07 Wood Stove Grant Budget

Mike DeVleming moved to approve Resolution 06-12 and Michele Pope seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

12. Resolution 06-13 – Appointment of Advisory Council Member

Jeff Corkill moved to approve Resolution 06-13 and Mike DeVleming seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

13. Resolution 06-14 – Extension of Professional Services Contract for School Bus Retrofit Program

Jeff Corkill moved to approve Resolution 06-14 and Mike DeVleming seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

14. Executive Session

a. Personnel Issues:

Matthew Pederson stated that the Board would be in executive session for approximately 15 minutes at 10:41 a.m. The Board reconvened at 10:58 a.m.

15. Board Concerns: Jeff Corkill asked if SCAPCA could review who does what between SCAPCA and Ecology in regards to monitoring the Waste to Energy Plant and its emission trends. Mike DeVleming asked if the Board was interested in or if it was possible to move these board meetings around occasionally. There is a facility out in the Valley with the same set-up electronically and free parking. This is something to think about because there are quite a few businesses in the Valley that are affected by decisions and policies made by this Board.

16. Public Forum: There were no public concerns at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 11:01 a.m.

The next Board Meeting will be September 7, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. in the lower level of the Public Works Building.

MATTHEW PEDERSON, CHAIR

WILLIAM DAMEWORTH, SECRETARY