

Springfield – Greene County, Mo Integrated Plan for the Environment



Task Force Meeting Notes June 17, 2014 4:30–6:30

Attendees

Task Force members present were:

Dan Hoy	Kara Tvedt	Clay Dodson
Ken McClure	Emily Denniston	Jason Hainline
Loring Bullard	Matt Pierson	Charley Burwick
King Coltrin	Fred Palmerton	Janet Hicks
Bridget Dierks	Joe Pitts	Jim Peterson
Doug Neidigh	Natasha Longpine	Zach Miller
Bob McCartney	Luke Westerman	Jared Rasmussen

Absent with prior notice: Skip Jansen

Absent: Terry Whaley, Debra Dorshost, Charlyce Ruth, Janet Dankert, Brad Erwin, Jennifer Wilson, Michelle Garand, John Twitty

Technical Committee members present were: Brian Adams (City Environmental Services), Barbara Lucks (City Environmental Services), Carrie Lamb (City Environmental Services), Jan Millington (City Law), Jessica Peebles (City Environmental Services), Tim Davis (Greene County Resources Management), Dave Fraley (City Utilities), Todd Brewer (City Utilities), Todd Wagner (City Public Works), and Daniel Hedrick (City Utilities).

Springfield/Greene County staff present included: Ashley Fears (City Environmental Services), Tim Smith (Greene County), and Kimberly White (City Environmental Services)

Missouri DNR or EPA staff present: Paul Vitzthum (MoDNR-SWRO) and Cindy Davies (MoDNR)

Others present were: David Braun (Springfield Iron & Metal), Mike Pessina, Beverly Pitts, Daniel Shedd (KOLR 10), Eric Dove, Gary Pendergrass, Kimberly White's son, Keith Ray Mackie (30th District-Sen. Bob Dixon), Nii Abrahams (City Public Information Office), and Emily Denniston (Chamber)

Environmental Priorities Task Force Meeting #3

Fred Palmerton welcomed the groups and introduced Senator Dixon's representative, Keith Ray Mackie.

Errin Kemper, Assistant Director Environmental Services, presented information about the Integrated Plan. He reviewed the Integrated Plan phases that were discussed in prior meetings and explained that the task force work fits into the community priorities aspect of the plan. The Integrated Plan is based on sound science, but science can't tell us what's important to our community; that's where the task force comes in.

Mr. Kemper discussed some of the choices available for answering the question, "What should we focus our Air Quality efforts on?" Choices include human health, impact to land and water, and others. These choices are not mutually exclusive and the answer is always changing and hard to quantify. The second question is, "Where should we focus?" Should the focus be locally, regionally, or globally?

Dave Fraley, with City Utilities, spoke on air. Dr. Fraley explained that air may look clean but may still be considered unhealthy by regulators. Air quality is important for human health, local environment, such as plant health and water/land pollution, local economy, and the regional and global environment. It affects our local economy by impacting the types of businesses that can locate here because the "air-shed" may not accommodate their emissions. It can also impact whether we receive transportation funds. Air pollution travels regionally and there are global issues such as climate change.

Dr. Fraley explained that air pollution sources include factories and business, lawn equipment, open burning and mobile sources (vehicles, boats and airplanes), and the evaporation of vapors during fueling. Pollutant emissions are categorized into:

1. Mobile
2. Stationary-power plants, industries big enough to have to report emissions.
3. Area - from many varied sources in cities and agriculture, not one of which is big enough to have to report their emissions but collectively make an impact.
4. Natural - lightning, forest fires

There are six common air pollutants, which include: ground-level ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, and lead. These are also called "criteria pollutants" because they have numeric criteria, also called standards. Ozone and particulate matter are the two biggest concerns. EPA has become more concerned with smaller particles – particles 2.5 micrometers and smaller. Carbon monoxide is the result of partial combustion and has been regulated since the Clean Air Act was passed in 1970. Carbon dioxide is the result of complete combustion and has recently become regulated.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards include primary and secondary standards. Primary standards protect human health and secondary standards protect everything else besides human health. Dr. Fraley stated that both of these need to be met; if not, you go into "non-attainment." All of these standards have been revisited and updated within the last several years. Revisiting/updating is something EPA is required to do under the Clean Air Act.

Primary Air Pollutants in the U.S. are carbon monoxide (38%), particulate matter (36%), volatile organic compounds (9%), nitrogen oxides (9%), and sulfur oxides (8%). The Air Quality Index is published by EPA to let the public know the level of health concern of the current air quality, similar to the pollen count. This

helps the public plan activities based upon health risk, as well as, taking measures to reduce air pollution impacts if the air quality is bad. The annual air quality index for Missouri since 1999 has been higher than U.S. averages, at times.

Springfield industrial air emissions have been decreasing since 2002. These are emissions by industries big enough to report their emissions as required by federal and state regulations. City Utilities emissions have been dropping since 1980, in terms of pounds per net megawatt hour. Ozone in Springfield has been trending down but is still close to being at non-attainment levels because the standard has dropped.

Asthma admission rates at local health care facilities are tracked as an air quality indicator. Greene County is lower than Missouri's state-wide average for children and young adults.

Challenges for air quality management include: regulations are getting more stringent, lack of awareness of the problem, number, and diversity of sources, and it is weather dependent. Dr. Fraley discussed household tips for reducing effects.

Discussion

- The newly proposed greenhouse gas regulations are for existing sources and take effect in 2020. Early predictions for CU indicate we are on track to meet these by focusing our expansion on renewables and will not have to reduce CO2 emissions from our existing power generation.
- Asthma diagnosis has been increasing, which may be due to indoor air quality.
- A decrease in PM 2.5 would be due mostly to improvements in technology
- Brief history of the Ozarks Clean Air Alliance: Born out of nearly being in non-attainment for ozone in 2007. The Alliance provides voluntary assistance and public education on air quality.

Survey Discussion

The Citizen Task Force then discussed the results of the recent survey. The Task Force's charge: "How do we best use our limited resources to protect our air quality?" Sheila Shockey, Shockey Consulting Services, discussed this charge and the survey results. Sheila asked the task force for feedback and discussion on why they answered the recent survey the way they did.

Question #1 – Spend money on programs/projects to address pollution.

- There was a lot of consensus on spending money where it provides the most benefit
- best benefit/cost ratio
- Multiple benefits.

Question #2 – If you had \$100 to spend on environmental protection, how would you allocate it? Public health locally? Environment locally? Others downstream/downwind or our region? Global environment (US and world)?

- The majority responded for 'Environment locally' (40.22%) and 'Public health locally' (39.32%).
- A comment was made that addressing local issues, also in many cases, has positive impact regionally.

Question #3 – Options for investing financial resources.

- The majority of opinions were in favor of 'investing in reducing multiple pollution sources that are easy to eliminate before making large investments in addressing a single source.'

- The second option selected was 'invest in pollution prevention before cleaning up existing pollution.'
- A comment was made that on Pollution Prevention we need to consider cost/benefit of legacy sources that may be causing more harm than new pollution.
 - o However, not investing in pollution prevention now may result in costs later.
- On the "Resource use" option, a comment on neutral vote was that we may not have good data showing what we do currently use. Need to understand the science.

Question #4 – Options regarding water resource policy statements.

- The consensus opinion of the group was 'Working on a watershed basis when taking actions' followed by 'investing in water bodies that people use now.'
- Restoring degraded streams had less strong agreement, but a comment was made that those are often closest to urban areas so they are more accessible for people to enjoy if they were restored. Another comment was made that it's important because it's the law.

Question #5 – Options regarding financial investments.

In order of 'strongly agree' and 'agree' responses received, the group responded with:

- 1) learn more
 - 2) spend existing resources on resolving issues with multiple benefits
 - 3) prioritize base on the ability to pay
 - 4) Reallocate existing funds to solve the most important issues.
- A comment was made that the option to reallocate existing sources makes good common sense and allows flexibility, which is important.

Next, the task force did an exercise to each allocate \$1.00 to prioritize air quality investments. Options included: human health, recreation/enjoyment of the outdoors, impacts to land and water resources, greenhouse gas reduction, aesthetic issues/visibility, protection of food sources, degradation of building materials.

Errin Kemper and Dan Hoy provided closing remarks.

Next meeting will be at the Watershed Center on June 24th, focusing on land resource issues.