Pinal County PM10 Stakeholders Meeting Minutes
8/17/07
1:30 pm

ATTENDEES

Alisa Schroder –Meritage Homes	Leonard Montenegro - ADEQ
Agustin Figueroa – CEMEX	Mark Velasco – Focus Environmental
Andrea Martin – AZ Dept of Agriculture	Mike Billote – United Dairymen of AZ
Barbara Cenalmor – PCAQCD	Philip Bashaw – Arizona Farm Bureau
Charles Blair – Lennar Homes	Rick Lavis – Arizona Cotton Growers Assoc.
David Nail – Frito-Lay	Rodger Arms – Lennar Homes
Diane Arnst - ADEQ	Ron Martin – Frito-Lay
Don Gabrielson – PCAQCD	Scott DiBiase – PCAQCD
Don Keith – Seafab Metals	Shawn Kendall – ADEQ
Drew Neptune – Lennar Homes	Spencer Kamps – Home Builder Assoc.
Jay Knoll – Meritage Homes	Steve Trussell – ARPA
Jerry Hozwardt – Focus Environmental	Steve Peplau – ADEQ
Kale Walch – PCAQCD	Tom Collins – Pulte Homes

Don Gabrielson, Director of Pinal County Air Quality Control District (PCAQCD) opened the meeting with a round of introductions.

As part of the action items from the previous meeting, Mr. Walch explained that one of PCAQCD's inspectors went to check out the airstrip in Stanfield. The inspector found the airstrip well graveled and maintained. The turn area is not used very often, and the soil is not powdery.

Mr. Walch began this meeting's presentation by showing some aerial photographs of the Maricopa site and by asking whether there were any questions from the past presentation on the Stanfield site. There were no questions from the stakeholders.

Mr. Gabrielson summarized the data obtained up to now from the online survey. While Stanfield's and Pinal County Housing (PCH) numbers were very similar, the numbers in the "desert land" and "background transport from out of county" categories were reversed.

Mr. Walch continued with the presentation on the Maricopa site. He showed one of the aerial photographs, updated to indicate already built out areas and vacant areas. He described the Maricopa site as being located behind the fire station, running a TEOM. The stagnation event chosen for discussion at this meeting occurred on Nov. 18, 2006. The 24-hr concentration was 155 ug/m3. Mr. Walch described this day as having very low wind speeds. As shown on the windrose, there were light and variable winds.

Mr. Walch opened the discussion for the stagnation day by mentioning that most public roads in Maricopa are paved, but outside the city limits they are mostly unpaved.

Mr. Gabrielson explained that the biggest difference between Maricopa and other previously discussed sites is the construction activity , so he advised that the discussion

should start with that category. He described the population of Maricopa as about 20-30 thousand people now, and with a lot of new development in the last 10 years.

Mr. Neptune asked about previous exceedances at this site, and whether the concentrations were low.

Mr. Walch explained that the exceedance concentrations were low only if compared to Cowtown, but that all three sites discussed up to now have had about 20 exceedances/year on average for each site.

Mr. Kendall indicated that the air quality profile readings in Stanfield are very similar to Maricopa, with a peak in the morning and a peak in the afternoon.

Mr. Walch added that there was no speciation study conducted for this site because there was no monitor at this site when the study was conducted.

Mr. Gabrielson asked the stakeholders whether any of them had any knowledge of the paving situation in the area. He explained that there is some dirt road development in the Hidden Valley area (west of Maricopa) and a small airport northeast of town.

Mr. Walch, Mr. Kendall and Mr. Gabrielson discussed the impact to the monitor from out of town activities on a stagnation day, and the maximum distances from the monitor which would cause an impact. Mr. Kendall indicated that on a stagnation day, the impact wouldn't be from very far away, and Mr. Gabrielson estimated approximately 3 miles. Some of the stakeholders were concerned that the current construction activity is further out from the monitor than 3 miles.

Mr. Lavis asked if the areas marked as vacant in aerial photo were agricultural areas.

Mr. Walch responded that no, they are mostly sold for development but vacant.

Mr. Lavis indicated that in the photograph, the vacant land to the south of the monitor looks ready for development, as it looks bladed.

Mr. Walch was not sure of any activity occurring on that lot this week, but he believed there was no development going on. He also did not think the lot was a powdery mess or PCAQCD would have received complaints.

Mr. Kendall asked whether PCAQCD had data to measure construction in the area, for example, the number of construction permits.

Mr. Walch responded that he had no current data, but that there are at least 10 large developments in a 5 mile radius from the site. He did not have data on the number of houses.

Mr. Knoll indicated that the profile for the stagnation day shows peaks around 6 am, 9 am and 6 pm, and that seems to correspond with traffic going to work and coming home. The peaks should be related to traffic here more than at other sites.

Mr. Neptune indicated that he was still struggling with the numbers being put together because the peaks shown in the presentation are not during earthmoving activities. An ADOT study for Pinal County shows non-road construction at 7.77%, but all other data always says home construction is always 5% or less.

Mr. Gabrielson explained that the peaks correlate to the times of day that stagnation hurts the most, not necessarily when emissions are at a peak.

The discussion of the numbers appropriate for this site resumed. Mr. Kendall gave a quick run of his estimates, including 5% agriculture to account for the fields on the west side of town.

A stakeholder brought up that there is also burning in this area too.

Mr. Gabrielson indicated that the construction number here shouldn't be lower than in PCH.

Mr. Neptune indicated that he was not agreeing with the 10% assigned to construction at PCH, but he agreed that at this site it should be at least the same or more.

Mr. Knoll asked whether burning takes into account fireplaces since the stagnation day is in November.

Mr. Walch explained that most new houses have gas inserts, and not fireplaces. There may be some illegal burning in the area, but should be little impact.

A stakeholder brought up that the monitor is near the downtown area, where there are older houses with fireplaces, and where older residents live.

Mr. Walch added that in that area most of these homes are trailer homes.

The preliminary numbers agreed to for the Maricopa Stagnation Day were:

Desert Land	0%
Paved Public Roads	15%
Dirt Public Roads	40%
Agriculture – Fields/Field Activity	10%
Agriculture – Dairies/Feedlots	5%
Construction	10%
Burning – all types	5%
Background – transport from out of County	15%
Other – in County Emissions	0%
TOTAL	100%

Mr. Walch began the discussion on the Wind Day, which occurred on April 14. The 24-hour concentration was 330 ug/m3, and the concentration profile shows peaks starting at 3pm through 9 pm. The windrose shows winds were blowing 11.1 m/sec (25 mph) to the NE.

Mr. Trussell asked whether for the previous sites we had looked at wind events which were considered regional or natural events.

Mr. Walch responded that this was a regional "extreme" event so it would be considered a natural event.

Mr. Kendall explained that he did not think this was the best example to use because of the large long range transport. He explained that on a windy day this area will have similar impacts as the Stanfield site. Tilled fields and unpaved roads will be the main impacts, but also some construction contribution will occur in this area but it won't be huge compared with what is coming in from the long range transport. On this day there's more transport from out of County than in the Stanfield and PCH examples. He asked whether there's another Maricopa high wind day that we can use that's not so windy.

Mr. Gabrielson asked the stakeholders what the breakdown numbers would look like for each category at Maricopa, just by looking at the trend of Stanfield and PCH. He had a short discussion with Mr. Kendall about some of these numbers.

Mr. Lavis added that there's not as much Ag. in this area as the other areas.

Mr. Kendall also added that roads are going to be a bigger contribution at this site.

Mr. Gabrielson mentioned that once these areas are built out, the roads are paved and the shoulders are stabilized, but Mr. Kendall reminded him that this area is not completely built out yet.

The preliminary numbers agreed to for the Maricopa Wind Day were:

Desert Land	15%
Paved Public Roads	10%
Dirt Public Roads	30%
Agriculture – Fields/Field Activity	15%
Agriculture – Dairies/Feedlots	0%
Construction	5%
Burning – all types	0%
Background – transport from out of County	25%
Other – in County Emissions	0%
TOTAL	100%

Mr. Gabrielson reminded the stakeholders that even though sources like off road and rock products are not contributing in large numbers, we need to think about them. We also

need to include the Cowtown, even if we don't do the same type of exercise for that monitor.
Mr. Gabrielson continued by explaining that now that we have numbers for all 3 sites for stagnation and wind, we can look at all data and establish what we need to do. We can look at where we need to reduce impacts, and if there is a way to do it. He indicated that the next step in the process is figuring out what we are going to do and who is going to pay for it.

Mr. Kendall suggested we first do a sanity check, by finding a day for Maricopa with a high wind day, not the one discussed here, and calculate for all 3 source categories what the concentration would be according to the percentages. The background concentration should be approximately the same number for all 3 sites, if not, we need to do some refining.

Mr. Neptune asked how the data is going to be put together, including the surveys, the Sierra Research numbers…. He also asked how a reality check will be done.

Mr. Kendall explained that we started with the Sierra Research numbers and that the numbers from this exercises are linked.

Mr. Neptune also inquired as to whether we are going to break the categories into subcategories like the ADOT study. For example: Road construction vs road maintenance.

Mr. Gabrielson explained that there are no resources to come up with site specific data on subcategories. The numbers that have come out of these meetings represent who has a seat at the table once we start discussions on what can be done, but it is not a quantitative analysis.

Mr. Gabrielson added that PCAQCD would do a sanity check on the numbers put together and then invite all to join us and see who the key players are.

Mr. Walch reminded the stakeholders that next time we would be back to morning meetings. There will be a spreadsheet up on the website for voting, and then all the numbers will be put together for the sanity check and for viewing next time.