

TO: Western North Carolina Regional Air Quality Agency Board of Directors  
FROM: Betsy Brown, Air Quality Supervisor  
SUBJECT: July 10, 2017  
DATE: August 31, 2017

---

Please find attached a copy of the **MINUTES** from the Monday, July 10, 2017 Board Meeting. The next meeting of the WNCRAQA Board is scheduled **Monday, September 11, 2017**, in the Buncombe County Planning and Development Board Room at 30 Valley Street, Asheville, N.C. 28801.

The Western North Carolina Regional Air Quality Agency Board of Directors met on Monday, July 10, 2017, at the Buncombe County Planning and Development Board Room, located at 30 Valley Street, Asheville, N.C.

The attendance of the Board members was as follows:

Members Present:

*Britt Lovin  
Dean Kahl  
Vonna Cloninger  
Karl Koon  
Joel Storrow*

Members Absent:

Staff Present: *David Brigman, Director; Ashley Featherstone, Air Quality Permitting Program Manager; Kevin Lance, Field Services Program Manager; Betsy Brown, AQ Supervisor; Mike Matthews, Senior AQ Specialist; James Raiford, Senior AQ Specialist*

Others Present: *Brandon Freeman, Board Attorney; Keith Bamberger, NCDEQ DAQ; David Nash, Gene Bell, Jayden Gurney, Pat Hammond, and Vanessa Jones, Asheville Housing Authority; and Samantha Bowers, The American Chestnut Society*

Mr. Lovin called the meeting of the Western North Carolina Regional Air Quality Agency Board of Directors to order on July 10, 2017 at approximately 4:00 PM

The order of business was as follows:

**I. Public Comment Protocol Announcement**

Mr. Lovin started the meeting by reading the announcement about the public comment protocol.

**II. Adjustment and approval of agenda**

Mr. Koon made a motion to approve the agenda. Ms. Cloninger seconded. Motion passed, 5-0.

**III. Special Presentations**

**A. Clean Air Excellence Awards**

**Asheville Housing Authority**

Since 2004, the Western North Carolina Regional Air Quality Agency (WNCRAQA) has been giving special recognition to local businesses and other organizations that have gone above and beyond air quality rules and regulations to implement voluntary, innovative programs that reduce air pollution in our region. In 2012, with the assistance of the Agency's Advisory Committee, the awards program was updated and expanded to include more detailed guidelines and generate more interest from the local community. Keith Bamberger from the NC DAQ is here today representing the committee. This year, WNCRAQA is presenting a Clean Air Excellence Award to Asheville Housing Authority.

The Asheville Housing Authority was certified for accreditation by the Sustainable Performance Institute ([www.sustainable-performance.org](http://www.sustainable-performance.org)) as a sustainable affordable housing provider in 2013. The Institute partnered with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to create a customized accreditation program for public housing authorities and other grantees. Asheville Housing Authority was one of 40 agencies and companies from around the United States that went through the voluntary process of achieving this unique recognition,

which provided support to internalize best practices and then validated that the applicant has institutionalized the systems, processes and program management to deliver best practices in green building, and realize portfolio-wide improvements over time.

The Asheville Housing Authority (AHA) was accredited in part based on the significant commitment it has made over the last several years to energy efficiency. The implementation of an energy performance contract with Siemens has reduced baseline energy and water consumption significantly, with electricity down 16%, natural gas down 24%, and water consumption down 50%. Please see press release enclosed in package for more details.

Dr. Kahl presented the award to David Nash- COO. Also present for the award ceremony were Gene Bell- AHA Chief Executive Director, Jayden Gurney- AHA Property Management, Pat Hammond- AHA Co-Director Property Management, Vanessa Jones- AHA Executive Assistant who tracked utility usage, and Samantha Bowers, a former project manager with AHA, who nominated the Asheville Housing Authority- she is now with The American Chestnut Foundation.

Appreciation was given to Buncombe County TV for coming out to cover the awards program.

#### **IV. Consent Agenda:**

##### **A. Approval of minutes from May 8, 2017.**

Mr. Koon made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Storrow seconded. Motion passed, 5-0.

#### **V. Director's Report:**

##### **A. Ambient Monitoring Update**

Ozone monitoring going well, no problems. Duke's SO<sub>2</sub> monitor is operating without a problem. NCDAQ did not take 105 Grant funds in 2016; we received \$64,000 of those funds to purchase monitoring equipment. We have ordered 2 new Federal Reference Method monitors (FRMs) and have a BAM on order (PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitors). We will replace the older FRMs ( ) on the Board of Education building, this will require a crane. We will have redundancy on the BAM and all new equipment. Typically the monitors last about 12 years.

##### **B. Duke Energy Progress Title V Petition Update**

Ashley Featherstone explained that when an agency issues a TV permit, a citizen or organization can file a petition with EPA to object to the permit within 45 or 60 days. As reported to the Board last year, Sierra Club filed the petition last year requesting a more stringent SO<sub>2</sub> limit to address the 2010 SO<sub>2</sub> standard in the permit. They also filed a similar petition for the NCDAQ permit for Roxboro. In our response to comments we explained that we were following the EPA Data Requirements Rule which meant we were doing modeling or monitoring to characterize the air quality around the facility just like what is being done throughout the nation. The EPA did grant on one part of the petition pertaining to two broad rules. Chapter 4.0401 and Chapter 4.0501 of our rules, says that you cannot allow a facility to exceed emissions standards. We responded that these were broad rules and that the SO<sub>2</sub> data requirements rule was more specific and applicable. EPA said we did not explain our position adequately in our response to comments. This was also the comment that the EPA made to DAQ on Roxboro. We talked to North Carolina about it. We both found this surprising. We had never heard of the EPA granting a petition and requiring an Agency to amend a permit record while not requiring changes to the permit. We asked the EPA about this, and they referred to one document signed by the current EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt which only required that the permitting authority go back and add language to the permit record. They want us to explain our interpretation of the rules and our rationale as to why we did not add more stringent limits for

these particular rules. We will probably file a similar response as NC. The Sierra Club made several comments which we responded to before we issued the permit. In response to comment, we did lower the SO<sub>2</sub> emission rate to a more stringent limit in the permit. We plan to respond to EPA before the deadline. The EPA may be trying to prevent a lawsuit. We will have a call with NC. We will coordinate with NC on our response and plan to respond before the deadline, 60 or 90 days from June 30<sup>th</sup>.

**C. EPA State Review Framework File Review**

A table was added to the Board packet from the State Review Framework review of the Agency. The EPA conducts audits to check the implementation of federally enforceable requirements. We have about 70 permitted facilities, but the EPA was only looking at the ones with federally enforceable programs; the Title V (TV) and Synthetic Minor facilities. We have six TV and ten Synthetic Minor facilities. These are facilities with whom we have a Compliance Monitoring Strategy with the EPA; we are required to report certain data about these facilities into the national database of record. For the facility, it is what programs and standards the facility is subject to, source test evaluations, full compliance evaluations, and other criteria determining compliance. The EPA wanted to see all of our files for these 16 facilities which included looking at inspection reports, permits, and high priority violations (HPV). They look at the database of record and look to see if we have entered everything correctly. We had one HPV that they did review. Overall we did very well. We were missing a few programs in the federal database, AFS. Some of the issues they noted were incorrect and we have given comments to the EPA to that effect. So we believe that our score will come up, and we feel pretty good about our evaluation. For the HPV, the EPA stressed that under the MDR data, we needed to improve the explanation of economic benefit of the violation. This was a situation where a facility did not keep adequate records, and we determined that there was no economic benefit. They will be getting back to us with a more detailed report; this report was just preliminary. All the other agencies are going through these reviews as well.

**D. Facility Operating Permits (Renewals)**

| <b>Facility Name</b>             | <b>Type of Facility</b>           | <b>Facility Classification</b> | <b>Location</b>          | <b>Changes from Existing Permit</b>           |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| Buncombe County Detention Center | Correctional Facility             | Small                          | Valley Street, Asheville | None  |
| Mill Tek Toll Grinders, LLC      | Mineral Product Grinding Facility | Small                          | Spiral Road, Arden       | Remove permit conditions for NSPS Subpart OOO |

Mr. Koon made a motion to approve the permit renewals. Ms. Cloninger seconded. The motion passed, 5 -0.

**E. Facility Permit Modifications**

| <b>Facility Name</b>        | <b>Type of Facility</b>                                     | <b>Facility Classification</b> | <b>Location</b>            | <b>Changes from Existing Permit</b>                  |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Aprotech Powertrain, LLC    | Automotive Components Mfg. Facility                         | Title V                        | Bingham Road, Asheville    | Change facility classification from Title V to Small |
| Asheville Landfill Gas, LLC | Landfill Gas Collection, Control, and Distribution Facility | Small                          | Riverside Drive, Asheville | Name and ownership change                            |

|                                      |                                       |                 |                          |  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|
| New Belgium Brewing Company, Inc.    | Beer Brewing Facility                 | Synthetic Minor | Craven Street, Asheville | Update boiler and generator capacities to equipment installed. Add process waste treatment plant and flare to permit |
| Oldcastle APG South, Inc., dba Adams | Concrete Block Manufacturing Facility | Small           | Meadow Road, Asheville   | Correct silo designation in permit   |

Ms. Cloninger made a motion to approve the permit modifications. Mr. Storrow seconded. The motion passed, 5-0.

**VI. New Business:**

**A. Legal Counsel Report- Brandon Freeman**

There is nothing to report. Mr. Frue sends his regrets.

**VII. Other Business:**

**A. Advisory Committee Report – Dean Kahl**

The Committee has done its work for the year. Keith Bamberger is here today. We sent the press release to our media contact list for the Clean Air Excellence award. Mountain Express usually puts it on their webpage. We had three applications this year. Mr. Storrow asked what is done to promote this award. We generally start in January requesting nominations or applications. We are open to suggestions on how to expand this. Last year there were no nominations. We have had as many as four applicants or nominations. We started out with just offering this to permitted facilities. There are different categories, by laws and guidelines. Guidelines are pretty tight now. For instance, permitted facilities have to document emissions reductions. Having the committee review is better, this process can put pressure or be awkward for staff. Some places, like Luella’s have installed solar panels; they are not a permitted facility so they do not have to submit emissions reductions. One issue in the past is that permitted facilities would apply, but what they were doing was just complying with their permit requirements.

**B. Calendar**

Next regular scheduled meeting is September 11, 2017 at 4:00PM.

**C. Announcements**

None

**VIII. Public Comment**

None

**IX. Adjournment**

Mr. Karl made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Cloninger seconded. The motion passed, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 3:54PM.