

EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group  
Draft Meeting Summary  
January 21, 2004

Members attending: Rev. Marvin Smith, Emily Lee, George Baker, Tim Nieberding, Richard Connelly, Stu Greenberg, Richard King, Elvin Vauss, Bill Davis, Frances Henderson, Tom McLeary, Bob Leidich, Mary Pat Tyson, Hollie Dellisanti, Herbert Mausser, Bill Skowronski, Dennis Finn, Richard King, Chris Kious, ,

Absent: Marty Gelfand, Joe Calabrese, Laura Hobson, Eleanor Bykoski, Colleen Lindsey, Ed Resnick, Colleen Moynihan

EPA: Lyn Luttner, Anne Marie Vincent, George Coder, Cher Salley, Barbara Driscoll

Guest: Regi Oommen, Andrew Shroads

Facilitators: Sanda Kaufman, Linda Kimble.

The Ohio Air Toxics Group convened for the eighteenth time at the Sewer District.

August MEETING SUMMARY – approved.

Barbara Driscoll presentation on the Local Inventory

Finding out smaller sources that would not be found in the national inventory. Inventory finished last September. Brochures are about what an inventory is, with two fact sheets for the 2 neighborhoods with information specific to the actual kinds of facilities in the two neighborhoods (for those zip codes).

A local inventory provides more accurate emission information than the national one. State data are considered the most reliable. It is compiled with EPA and TRI data. County information is not accurate because it is really based on national averages and has no information about smaller sources. Developing a local inventory helps determine what comes from local sources and helps define a baseline for assessing progress. Local inventories are also useful for locating monitoring devices and risk exposure modeling.

Andrew Shroads (City Health Department), Bill Davis (NOACA), Linda Kimmy (CSU), Tim Nieberding and Rev. Smith, Eleanor Bykowski helped with the inventory.

For the resources available the focus was primarily on stationary sources. Actual facilities (electroplaters and drycleaners) were identified to specifically address neighborhood concerns.

Three major large emission source categories (see report):

- point sources (larger facilities and individual processes –specific location that is known – information good for modeling);
- nonpoint sources (smaller – dry cleaner, gas stations – no exact location so the emissions are calculate for the whole county more or less averaged across it)
- mobile (on-road—cars, trucks, motorcycles, and non-road – trains, lawn mowers, other equipment)

1999: under the Clean Air Act EPA had to devise a strategy to address air toxics. 30 hazardous air pollution toxics were identified that presented the largest problems in urban areas. 3 more were considered important and added for the 33 most toxic HAPs considered in this inventory.

Results: 60% from mobile sources; 22% from non-point sources) and 14% (point sources) for the 33 HAPs.

Main air toxics emissions: primarily volatile organics. Other metropolitan areas are similar to Cleveland for the same types of facilities. Straight emissions by pound or ton went into the inventory (not weighted by toxicity).

Primary findings: mobile sources (primarily on-road) contribute the most emissions. Point sources contribute the smallest percentage (for the 33 HAPs, based on the permitting data). If they are emitting something else, it is not included. Metallurgical, wood product, chemical, auto and waste disposal. For nonpoint, solvent-using and small-combustion sources were the most polluting. The top emitting facilities (33 HAPs) for the whole county (see report).

Limitations: we look at the quantity of a pollutant and the activity producing it and to estimate the quantity that might be emitted in the county (no exact numbers for emissions). It is a best guess. More HAPs could be considered. There was limited information on non-permitted facilities. All the facilities were not contacted and some may have closed between 200 and 2002 when the inventory was produced. Actual mobile emissions on the interstates could not be located without more resources.

The inventory can be expanded beyond the 33 HAPs, adding more local data, using it as a baseline to measure progress.

It was difficult to identify specific zip codes and match them to the pollutant emissions. The point source emissions for the neighborhoods is the most accurate of the three types.

Qs and As

- Is this profile typical of urban areas? Yes.
- Does the season make a difference? No, it is year-around as opposed to lawn and gardening equipment, which increases in summer. They equal the mobile source emissions. (information based on the national inventory taking into account the number of households in Cleveland.)

- Future actions estimating exposure and risk: EPA has software for calculating TRI exposure and risk – could this be done for this inventory? Currently it can only be used with TRI data but it may be expanded in the future. Other models can be used for local problems. We used the Aspen model which is regional and does not give accurate results for local problems but it was the best available at the time.
- Mercury and lead stand out and are real concerns for the St. Clair neighborhood (children with the highest level of lead in Cleveland). A: there may be multiple sources of a specific pollutant causing the problems.
- Could you help us make this available to neighborhoods by adding the toxicity levels? This information is not weighted but there is information available and could be attached to the result sheets.

Bill Skowronski video about mercury (will bring several copies to the next meeting.)

Implementation team updates:

- Indoor air and schools:
- Indoor: tools for schools incentive pledge (48 schools are participating, 5 are on the way).
- Brochure: 4th revision, ready in February (2500 will be printed).
- HHW collection: 2 sites (East and West Side)– combined 171 cars (last year 80, so the numbers doubled at 2 locations). The City will do this in the Fall and Lorain County will do it twice this year
- Smoke-free home pledge: need for measurements

Q&A:

- What was the difference between two locations that did very differently (one very well and one not very well)? Unclear – the only difference was staffing.
- Are there names and addresses for those who made pledges? Only names. In the future we should collect addresses too for follow-up. We only have addresses for the second but not the first round.
- Could it be advisable to get people to agree to a follow-up before they pledge? Yes.
- Electroplaters:
- Description of arrangements ; they were not sure how much buy-in the area's facilities would have with the initial approach so other options were examined. Taking a look at catastrophic releases that can affect air quality: that would interest the facilities more because of the financial consequences and the bad publicity following such releases. The consultant agreed. Then a best-practices document will be put together and shared with electroplating facilities in the areas that could examine their own potential for catastrophic releases. That could get a better buy-in so we are asking for permission to change the project in that

direction. The consultant had provided a tool for electroplater self-assessment to make the best use of the consultant's time.

Q&A:

- Would there be a consequence for the project funding? No.
- Good idea to combine pollution prevention with accident prevention. The participants would co-sponsor a seminar. Part of the product could be a response plan, which is of value to these shops and could increase buy-in.
- Would there be any modeling of what happens if an accidental release occurs? No plans for that but if there are funds left over we could take a look at that.
- No objection to the course change. Decision on additional funding for modeling should be held off until the next decision is discussed (about how to spend funds left over from all projects.)

Second convening report highlights

Comment: the CCACC should go on and become sustainable.

Project Report (Richard King)

Decision among Options A (leaving money as in the initial allocation of EPA funds); and B (\$46K will be reallocated according to the WG decision and carried over for another year) with an EPA cost extension (some additional ALA funds not spent will be added).

Richard: Option B appears the only one viable.

Lori: a projected budget should be submitted with the request for the no-cost extension.

Richard: the Planning Committee should work on this during the upcoming meetings.

Q&A:

Seed money: how can it be invoiced to EPA? Gund example: we present a project and we show the full project budget as well as our seed money (through the cooperative agreement with EPA). Therefore it can be invoiced as well as used as seed money.

In-kind contributions: volunteer efforts count for obtaining matching funds.

Option B was approved by consensus.

CCACC Phase II:

Proposed new structure with Planning Committee meeting more often and the WG meeting quarterly.

Convening model: same as before, but now the focus is in the implementation teams. The WG functions as a full unit but the hard work is in the implementation teams. Notice the teams that had the most members got the most done. Changing from a planning phase to a doing phase, we expanded the previous model. Implementation teams need to meet more often so the contact time will remain the same.

Comments:

In the heavy-duty retrofit team, if we come up with additional money it will be important for the WG to get together and think about how to spend the money and get new members for that implementation team. The only way to reallocate and make decisions is through the WG meeting. Now we are in a lull in terms of funding but if we do receive funding that activity will pick up again. So we can always go back to that mode if need be.

Who is the planning committee? (Bob Leidich, Richard King, Rev. Smith, Lyn Luttner, Emily Lee, Lori Kondas, Linda Kimble, Sandra Kaufman) We want to compliment them on the work they have done.

What can I do as a neighborhood rep to appraise my community? Take the meeting materials and talk about them at your meetings. We will let them know when we need volunteers and they are welcome to our meetings. You can also participate in specific implementation groups (especially as not everyone in the implementation groups is a member of the WG).

Could an implementation team meet in the neighborhood and invite community members?  
Yes.

The direct connections between neighborhoods and agencies is very unique and developed from this project. The more that happens the better.

Send a new distribution list to all WG members.

Announcements

Funding for some projects will come from SEP funds. As a result of working group with environmental groups and neighborhoods, meeting monthly for about years, one of the goals related to compliance. Cleveland wound up inspecting upon neighborhood requests, and several of the inspections yielded significant violations with penalties. Two electroplaters settled by agreeing to \$55K combined going into SEPs for the Cleveland school bus retrofit program. A press release or conference is planned to highlight companies' compliance (the real goal). This outcome is very unique. We are trying the same strategy in Lee-Miles Seville. The press release will recognize the CCACC for the school bus program.

Comments:

This is an excellent opportunity to get the word out about this project.

People are concerned about the compliance end of it. The message is that there is an alternative that is viable, a positive outcome. We need more publicity. This is a nice, big, unique thing.

The money is going right back into the neighborhood that was affected.

The community activism acted as seed money.

There should be no implication that the group lobbied for the money. The agency can stress how important such groups are. Then there will be more involvement in our campaign.

This model (neighborhoods working with agencies) is good for community groups to use.

This is a big EPA initiative to get money into school bus retrofits. This will also be easier to quantify in terms of impacts.

In favor of enforcement: enforcement is good!

We did the inspections as a result of working with the neighborhoods. We did not target businesses. This SEP arrangement is the first of its kind.

Critical: when you have the opportunity of a settlement and are ready to put the money back in the community, you need an accountable organization as was the case here. Compliance can also be achieved through education. This group could help. It might be more acceptable to businesses if it came from a group like this.

Request for permission to include CCACC in any press release. Granted.

Proposed: electronic review by the planning committee. (Concerns with confidentiality.)

Suggestion for the Planning Committee: issue a press release mirroring the EPA press release.

Consider that the CCACC provided 140K and EPA added \$250K, and now the SEPs added 55K (almost \$5million!), meaning major emission reductions from those school buses in the neighborhoods.

Announcements (continued):

The slogan for CCACC was approved electronically and added to the logo.

Cleveland City Council Development Committee met and discussed sustainability. Linda was part of the presentation. The environmental groups have pledged to raise money to fund a sustainability coordinator in the mayor's office (through Gund Foundation).

METING ADJOURNED AT 9:00

Next meeting: