

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes
April 16, 2020

Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) Members Present (joined via WebEx)

Patrick O'Neill	John Walliser
Gary Merritt	John Shimshock
Robert Altenburg	Michael Winek
Josie Gaskey	Kevin Stewart
John Tissue	Joseph Guzek
Joseph Duckett	John Slade
Jayne Graham	Kimberly Coy
Michael Fiorentino	Michelle Homan
Charles McPhedran	Richard Shaffer

Department Staff Present (joined the WebEx):

Kirit Dalal	Allen Landis
John Krueger	Hitesh Suri
Lucas Hershey	Viren Trivedi
Sean Wenrich	Bo Reiley
Jesse Walker	Nancy Herb
Jennie Demjanick	Susan Hoyle
Jim Rebarchak	Charles Boritz
Thomas Weissinger	Mark Houser
Hayley Book	Susan Foster
Naishadh Bhatt	Darek Jagiela

Others Present (Individuals who joined the WebEx):

Robert Ruth – Clean Air Council	Emily Nuding
Tom Schuster – Sierra Club	David Stucker
Elizabeth Marx – Pa Utility Law Project	Rachel Gleason
Teresa McCurdy – TD connections	David Stucker
Andy Woerner	Chad Eisenman
Mark Huncik	Christina Theodoridi
Marna McDermott	Josh Ennis
Nick Leone - All4 Inc.	Lisa Beal
Robert Barkanic	

CALL TO ORDER

Patrick O'Neill, AQTAC Chair, called the April 16, 2020 meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. through WebEx.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Patrick O'Neill made a roll call for the AQTAC committee members. Due to the technical issues with the audio systems, some members responded to roll call by the chat function and most of them were able to use the audio.

Approval of Minutes

The discussion of the February 13, 2020, meeting minutes was postponed by the AQTAC members until a face to face meeting at a later time.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Draft Proposed CO₂ Budget Trading Program Rulemaking

Hayley Book provided a brief update of the CO₂ Budget Trading Program.

Patrick O'Neill reminded the committee members about a special informational meeting on the CO₂ Budget Trading Program to be held on April 23, 2020. He recommended that committee members send any questions in advance to get the appropriate answers.

John Tissue indicated that there were some questions sent by an e-mail and asked if DEP could provide the answers to them in a timely manner prior to voting on the CO₂ Budget Trading Program Rulemaking. Mr. Tissue indicated that this program is wide reaching and may have a significant impact and that the committee would like to understand the program before voting.

Patrick O' Neill asked Ms. Book if the questions Mr. Tissue referenced above and the ones sent by Kevin Stewart were received. Hayley Book responded that there were several e-mails received from the committee members and DEP will compile all the questions.

Patrick O'Neill asked if any committee members had any further questions for Ms. Book.

No further questions were presented.

Charles McPhedran asked for confirmation about the May 7th AQTAC meeting and asked for the time of the meeting. Patrick O' Neill took the roll call of committee members for their availability for May 7th meeting. All the members present agreed with the date and time of the meeting.

Allen Landis informed that going forward, the DEP will put together the detailed instructions of the WebEx meetings for all the committees.

Patrick O'Neill suggested to the committee members that any questions should be forward to DEP via an e-mail in advance of April 23rd and May 7th meetings.

John Shimshock asked if the invite for the April 23rd meeting went out to the committee members.

Patrick O'Neill suggested to send the notice and an invite to the committee members for the May 7th meeting as soon as possible. Mr. O'Neill asked if there were any further questions or comments from the committee members.

No further questions or comments were presented.

Charles McPhedran asked about the number of people from the committee who were on the call. Patrick O'Neill mentioned that 15 of the 19 members are able to be heard by others and speak at this time. One member, Kevin Stewart, was able to hear the conversation but was not able to be heard by others. Three members, including: Joseph Guzek, Michelle Homan and Judy Katz, were not on the call. According to a chat through WebEx, Michelle Homan and Joseph Guzek were also on the call. Joseph Guzek was able to hear the conversations but not able to be heard by others same as Mr. Stewart due to technical difficulties.

Joseph Duckett recommended to hold off on action items until the next meeting due to the technical difficulties at this time.

Patrick O'Neill agreed with Mr. Duckett not to vote on the RACT III as an action item and proceed with the presentation. Mr. O'Neill asked DEP of any consequences due to postponing the vote on the action items. John Kreuger acknowledged committee members concern and reminded the committee that there will be two significant action items on May 7th including RGGI and the RACT III. It would be an extensive meeting, but if the committee decided to postpone the vote, it was acceptable to DEP.

Charles McPhedran suggested to proceed with the presentations and public comments. Mr. McPhedran also suggested to continue with any remaining discussion and vote on the rulemaking during the May 7th meeting.

Patrick O'Neill indicated that the meeting would proceed with the presentation on RACT III including public comments. Mr. O'Neill suggested a brief presentation on May 7th with further discussion, including comments from the committee, and vote on the rulemaking. Mr. O'Neill asked if there were any committee members opposed to this approach.

Mr. O'Neill confirmed if any committee member felt strongly to vote on the RACT III rulemaking today instead of May 7th, 2020.

It was decided to proceed with the presentation and postpone voting on the RACT III rulemaking until May 7th, 2020.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Draft Proposed RACT III Rulemaking

Sean Wenrich provided a PowerPoint presentation on the draft proposed RACT III Rulemaking.

Michael Winek asked if the limits shown for the cement kilns in the presentation will apply to all the cement kilns across the Commonwealth of PA. Sean Wenrich responded that is correct.

Mr. Winek asked for clarification since there are two limits shown in the presentation. Mr. Wenrich mentioned that the limit depends on the type of kiln and it is clarified in the regulatory language.

Mr. Winek asked about the rationale of the changes to these limits. Mr. Wenrich clarified that DEP was to include limits from the consent decrees from the Evansville and Nazareth plants; however, they were overlooked while preparing the original documentation.

Mr. Winek mentioned that the intent was to impose new stringent limits to all the cement kilns in the Commonwealth. Mr. Wenrich responded that is correct.

Mr. Winek asked if these new RACT III limits apply to all engines and turbines as well as to cement kilns. He further requested DEP to share the technical and economic analysis with the committee to support these limit changes. Mr. Wenrich responded that DEP is preparing a technical support document which will be part of the rulemaking package presented to Environmental Quality Board when this rule is proposed. All of this information will be available in the technical support document.

Joseph Duckett asked if the Department had a chance to review the comments made by Sierra Club on AECOM's report on SCR. Sean Wenrich responded that he has not looked at it yet, but DEP will make sure to consider those comments.

Patrick O'Neill asked if Sean Wenrich has seen the AECOM report before and Mr. Wenrich responded no he has not seen this report.

John Shimshock commented on the issue by mentioning that the AECOM report more a sales brochure than a technical report. Mr. Shimshock indicated that there is link to the presentation which was given at a conference back in 2016 which included this particular application.

Joseph Duckett stated that a facility may have a risk of ammonia slip if they increase ammonia injection rate. Mr. Duckett added that there would be some kind of tradeoff, at least implied if not actual, and asked if DEP has looked at if there is a good tradeoff or not.

Michael Fiorentino indicated that he also looked into the issue with the AECOM report in the regulation and the proposal. Mr. Fiorentino stated he believes that when operating SCR, the existing EGU units in PA are able to perform well below the 0.10 standard. He further mentioned that when someone compares those capabilities against the proposed presumptive RACT of 0.35

and 0.40 that's an extremely relaxed standard. Therefore, it appears that a facility can use this standard in the circumstances when operating below 600°F.

Mr. Fiorentino asked if the DEP performed an analysis to propose this option and made a determination of how often a properly run catalytic reduction unit would encounter below 600°F operating conditions. Sean Wenrich responded that DEP performed an analysis on how the units in PA are running as well as analyzed the temperature data. Mr. Wenrich mentioned that in recent time, there seems to be a lot of cycling; therefore, when the unit falls below approximately 60-65% capacity, it does not hold temperature. In that case, the ammonia does not reduce NOx. Mr. Wenrich clarified that it is not a matter of these units intending to run at the higher temperatures, but it is just a matter of the electricity market right now. Mr. Wenrich assured the committee that DEP has the data and it will be part of the technical support document.

Mr. Fiorentino further asked if DEP has given any consideration of a temperature threshold somewhat lower than the proposed and also limit the amount of frequency which is much higher than that implied. For an example, 500°F or 550°F and asked if there is a reason for which DEP could not have a threshold at that level. Mr. Wenrich responded that DEP looked into the threshold which was lower than 500°F or 550°F and had several discussions with the operators. Also, DEP evaluated the literature from EPA and some of the manufacturers. Mr. Wenrich stated that DEP is confident that injecting ammonia below 600°F, the effectiveness of reducing NOx to a point where DEP really does not believe that it's very feasible.

Mr. Fiorentino asked about the basis of selecting 0.10 and indicated that a lower number appears to be more justifiable with the compliance reporting from many of the coal fired EGU units in PA. Mr. Wenrich responded that DEP looked into the actual data from the recent operation and performed some statistical analysis which will be part of the technical support document. The limit of 0.10 is based on actual operating data.

John Tissue mentioned that a unit is subject to a 30-day rolling average and during the ozone season it's subject to daily average at the same value. Mr. Tissue mentioned that he reviewed the Annex and asked if DEP is confident about their analysis with all the cycling going on right now. He also questioned if the unit will be able to comply with daily average and at the same time comply with the same value for a 30-day rolling average; which, he believes may be a struggle or not even possible. Sean Wenrich responded that DEP believe it's possible and when you are saying same average, the 0.35 and 0.4 are the same numbers. The 30 days year-round is 0.1 and daily average is 0.12 during the ozone season which is above 600°F. Mr. Tissue asked further if there is still some room accommodating the cycling. Mr. Wenrich responded yes.

Mr. Tissue indicated that he did not see the presumptive limits in the draft Annex and asked for confirmation if there are sufficient numbers of facilities which may be effective with the presumptive RACT limits. Sean Wenrich responded that DEP evaluated based on the source type including the variety of data and came to the conclusion that it will not be appropriate to establish a presumptive limit.

Kim Coy indicated that she is not sure if she completely understands the requirements of aggregate fugitive sources of VOCs at natural gas compression and transmission facilities with an associated stationary source and asked for an example. Sean Wenrich responded that it came up in RACT II in cases particularly for the transmission stations which are major for VOCs and where there are valves and flanges. The fugitive sources are subject to LDAR requirements and the question was to determine the type sources for 1.0 or 2.7 ton of threshold. Was it evaluated if there is an individual flange or is it all fugitive sources at the facility? Mr. Wenrich explained that through some guidance for RACT II, DEP decided, in order to account for those fugitive leaking sources, one would take those emissions and put it together near to the stationary source which may be a dehydrator or the engines etc. It needs to be determined if the aggregate falls under the 1 tons/year threshold which is exempt from RACT or falls under the 2.7 tons per year that would be subject to RACT in accordance with good operation practices with the manufacturer specification. Mr. Wenrich further clarified that it is not the facility aggregation for the major source status, but it is just to determine what those sources are with that particular threshold.

Ms. Coy mentioned that when facilities group stationary sources together in the Title V permit, sometimes fugitive emissions and the equipment leak are its own source. Ms. Coy asked if DEP wanted facilities to allocate the equipment associated with the engine or the equipment associated with the dehydrator as part of that source. Mr. Wenrich responded yes, it's true for the RACT purpose but not the entire permit.

Ms. Coy verified that it is only for oil and gas and not for other industries. Mr. Wenrich responded yes. DEP did not see this issue with any industry other than transmission stations. Mr. Wenrich clarified that most of the oil and gas sector, particularly those that can use GP5 and GP5A, must be minor for VOCs. Mr. Wenrich mentioned that these are the select sources and included in the guidance for RACT II. DEP is proposing this in the regulatory language to be clearer for RACT III.

Ms. Coy further clarified that it's not applied for the pipeline and other connectors with fugitive emission sources and asked how the Department determines the allocation of the source. Mr. Wenrich responded that if the fugitive VOC emissions are at a major facility then the emission should be assigned to the nearest stationary source. Mr. Wenrich explained that there are variety of ways and flexibility for a facility to determine that and which can be reviewed by the Department. Mr. Wenrich indicated the basic idea is that all the fugitive emissions components are accounted for at a major VOCs facility. Ms. Coy further asked that DEP does not want to be looked at the emission source seeing the group of equipment. Sean Wenrich explained that was something DEP looked at in RACT II, and, for consistency, the guidance we came up with what is mirrored in the RACT III proposed rulemaking.

John Shimshock mentioned RACT II requirements are already adopted in Title V permits and asked if DEP is requiring facilities to resubmit the same information again to comply with the RACT III requirements. Mr. Wenrich responded yes; DEP is requiring the notification for the sake of completeness.

Mr. Shimshock made a comment that most of the coal fired SCR units are cycling now, based on the data. Mr. Shimshock stated that the cycling is not preferred for the boilers, and units are designed to run efficiently on a full load. Therefore, the operators would want to operate in such a way as to avoid injecting ammonia to keep their flue gas temperature below 600°F, which is better for the unit and much easier for the operator.

Gary Merritt noticed the averaging period and mentioned that some of the emissions rates are tied to lbs./MMBtu per heat input. Mr. Merritt asked if the averaging period is an hourly or a 30-day basis for the coal units. Sean Wenrich responded that for most of the combustion units, if monitored by a CEMS, the proposed averaging period is on a calendar day. Mr. Merritt asked what about the CFP. Mr. Wenrich responded the CFP will fall under the daily average and clarified it is a 24-hour calendar day basis, not 24-hour rolling average.

Mr. Merritt indicated that the presentation had no discussion on the ammonia slip and injection of too much ammonia causes malodor coming from the plant. Mr. Merritt explained the malodor is specially tied to ash from the waste coal and most of the coal plants have an ammonia slip requirement in many cases.

Charles McPhedran asked about reviewing the technical support document (TSD) before making a decision. Patrick O'Neill verified the usual process and asked for clarification on if the committee makes the decision on the regulation based on the presentation and Annex with developing the TSD later by the Department. Sean Wenrich responded that a TSD is not normally prepared for a regulation, and it is normally provided in the Regulatory Analysis Form. Mr. Wenrich clarified that TSD is not usually available by the time the committee votes and in general, the committee will vote based on the presentation and the proposed Annex.

Mr. McPhedran confirmed further that Department is preparing a TSD separate from the RAF (Regulatory Analysis Form). Mr. Wenrich responded that is correct and it is not typical to prepare a TSD for a regulation: but DEP is preparing one for the RACT III in order to determine how DEP came up with the requirements.

Patrick O'Neill asked that some of this information can be included in the comment response document which comes after the written comments are received by the Department. Sean responded yes that is how the information was assimilated in RACT II.

John Slade made a comment, in order to avoid confusion, DEP should include language in the rulemaking that existing facilities, or the ones recently permitted with newly installed emission units, are not subject to RACT III requirements if they already implemented BAT prior to the trigger date of RACT. Mr. Slade also indicated that for the case-by-case RACT III, a six-month submittal period may not be feasible, as was experienced in RACT II, especially when a real quotation is required for the cost analysis for the facilities.

Mr. Slade commented on the monitoring provisions for the cement kilns. He indicated that the requirements for daily determination of firing rate for the clinker production is really difficult to discern. He referenced 40 CFR Part 63 Subpart LLL.

Patrick O'Neill asked if anyone from the committee had any further questions. There were no further questions. Mr. O'Neill explained the process for the public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Elizabeth R. Marx, Executive Director, Pennsylvania Utility Law Project (PULP). (Submitted written comments.)

Ms. Marx represents low income utility consumers in PA who she stated already bear the brunt of the health impacts associated with climate change, and cannot bear the economic burden, in light of COVID-19 crisis. Ms. Marx stated that the DEP's proposed CO₂ Budget Trading Program offers a distinct opportunity and potential to address both the impacts of climate change and the economic inequities that often result from climate change solutions.

Specifically, PULP urges this committee and the Department to consider revisions to the proposed rulemaking to include an annual environmental justice analysis. This analysis should (1) assess potential environmental and economic impacts on local Pennsylvania communities, (2) develop recommendations to mitigate identified impacts, and (3) provide for ongoing monitoring. Impacted communities should be included in this process to ensure they have a voice in the solution. She also mentioned that it is critical for this committee and the Department to begin identifying how the dollars generated from the program will be reinvested into Pennsylvania's communities.

Ms. Marx indicated she and PULP look forward to working with the Department on this in the future

Robert Routh, Attorney for Clean Air Council (CAC) (Submitted written comments.)

Mr. Routh thanked Hayley Book for the RGGI update and expressed anticipation for the next virtual informational meeting on the CO₂ budget allowances and modeling results. Mr. Routh stated that the Council urges DEP to establish an ambitious emissions cap sufficient to drive significant reductions in carbon pollution. He stated that the Pennsylvania emissions budget in the final rule should be no higher than the current emissions, taking into account plants that have recently closed, or will close in the near future. He mentioned that Energy Harbor announced that it has rescinded its deactivation notices for the Beaver Valley nuclear power plant and will now keep the plant open past 2021.

Mr. Routh stated that the Council urges DEP to provide for a mechanism to adjust the base budget for 2022 or 2023 if actual emissions are lower than currently projected and the budget should decline annually by at least 3% in order to meet the climate goals in the executive order. Mr. Routh stated that the Council urges DEP to adopt a voluntary renewable set-aside account in the proposed rule where the emissions can be retired. Mr. Routh said this benefit renewable energy producers.

Tom Shuster, Clean Energy Program Director, PA chapter of the Sierra Club (Submitted written comments.)

Mr. Shuster opted not to read his written testimony but stated he would provide additional commentary on the temperature input threshold. He stated that the various provisions for coal-fired EGUs together allow for too much leeway for NO_x emissions. Mr. Shuster expressed his belief that the daily and 30-day average are higher than they need to be, and those of other states. He provided the example that Maryland had a daily average of 0.08 lbs./MMBtu limit and no other state has an inlet temperature threshold. Mr. Shuster expressed support for the 0.12 lbs./MMBtu daily average and 0.1 lbs./MMBtu 30-day average.

Also, Mr. Shuster acknowledged challenges operating SCR at low inlet temperatures; however, he expressed concern that under 600 degrees F the requirement to operate SCR is not in effect. He offered Sierra Club's assistance in providing more information on these issues.

He also expressed support for the previous comments on RGGI by the CAC.

Concepts for Phasedown of Hydrofluorocarbons (HFC)

Lucas Hershey provided a PowerPoint presentation on concepts for phasedown of HFC.

Joseph Duckett pointed out that 20 years ago HFCs were promoted as the replacements for CFCs and HCFCs and asked whether HFC replacements will present any problems of their own due to their characteristics. Mr. Hershey indicated that the problem with HFCs is their higher global warming potential, which was not considered with CFCs for decades. DEP will be evaluating information available about HFC replacements during the development of the rulemaking. Mr. Hershey clarified that there are different alternatives available, some of which were mentioned in the presentation, including a number of different hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs). HFOs have a significantly lower global warming potential of ten or less, whereas most HFCs have a global warming potential in the hundreds or thousands.

Mr. Duckett asked whether HFCs contribute to ozone formation and whether there is any downside to these chemicals that one should be aware of 20 years from now. Mr. Hershey responded that DEP is evaluating the information available while drafting the rule and reiterated that these compounds do not have the ozone depletion issues associated with CFCs and HCFCs.

Charles McPhedran pointed to slide # 13 about the model rule and asked DEP to provide three or four bullet points about the model rule requirements. Mr. McPhedran mentioned the idea to reduce the content of undesired substances in existing uses, industrial processes etc. Mr. McPhedran further clarified that trying to reduce VOCs is a target of multi-state model rules. Lucas Hershey responded that the model rule is a framework for states to use as they develop their own rules. DEP will be able to provide more detailed information on the requirements as the draft proposal is developed.

Patrick O' Neill added that this is an area that has generally been regulated at the federal level. Mr. O'Neill indicated, as mentioned by Mr. Hershey, that during the last administration, EPA issued national rules under the SNAP program to phase down HFCs. Although those rules are not being implemented due to the court decision, Mr. O'Neill asked about industries' general position on state rules to phase down HFCs. Lucas Hershey responded that, in general, industry has been supportive.

Mr. Hershey mentioned that legislation to phase down HFCs has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives (American Innovation and Manufacturing Leadership Act of 2020) and in the U.S. Senate (American Innovation and Manufacturing Act of 2019). Mr. O'Neill asked about the substance of the legislative bills. Mr. Hershey explained that the legislation would direct EPA to establish a trading program that would phase down HFCs over time. It would be significantly different from the US Climate Alliance model framework which focuses on end uses of these compounds.

Mr. O'Neill asked if this rule will require replacement of older residential and automobile air conditioning systems. Nancy Herb responded that existing home and automobile air conditioning systems will not be affected. These would continue to be serviced with the present refrigerant, but if someone purchased a new air conditioner, the manufacturer will be required to sell units that use compliant refrigerants, in accordance with the rule.

John Slade commented that it may be similar to the past where old equipment became very expensive to charge or service.

Report on Rulemakings/State Implementation Plan Revisions

Kirit Dalal provided a report on Rulemakings/State Implementation Plan Revisions.

Patrick O' Neill asked about when the next EQB meeting will be and clarified if it will be a WebEx meeting. John Kreuger responded that he checked the EQB website and their regular meeting was scheduled and not sure if they still plan on holding it.

Mr. O'Neill mentioned that they would have a busy schedule and listed the pending rulemakings which needed to go to EQB and if it is correct. John Krueger indicated that list is correct, and March and April EQB meetings were cancelled, and all the programs are backed not only the air-quality.

Mr. O'Neill asked committee if there were any further questions or comments.

Josie Gaskey asked about the plan for the public comments for the next two meetings. Mr. O'Neill mentioned that on the May 7th AQTAC meeting will be similar to today's meeting. We would ask the people to provide the comments in advance as it was done today. Also, people will be able to sign on last minute. People could make questions on the chat.

Patrick O'Neill mentioned the informational meeting on April 23rd and asked if there will be any public comment period. Alan Landis responded that for April 23rd is an informational meeting and public comments will be on the May 7 for AQTAC.

Patrick O'Neill clarified to the public listening to the call that next opportunity to make official public comments on the regulation which DEP is making will be open once the regulation is published in the *PA Bulletin*. Mr. O' Neill also assured that the comment made by public are taken into consideration by both AQTAC Committee as well as by PA DEP. Mr. O'Neill explained the public comment period of 30 days to the public.

John Kreuger agreed with Mr. O'Neill's explanation of 30-days comment period and reiterated that PA DEP make any necessary changes if needed based on public comments provided outside of 30-days official comment period.

Patrick O'Neill asked if anyone on the call wanted to make any public comments.

John Kreuger stated that he reviewed the chat screen and did not see anyone who would like to make any further comments.

Patrick O' Neill indicated that the only person on the chat he saw is Lisa Beal who asked if Department can share the aggregation guidance document on T and S sector for RACT III. Mr. Kreuger acknowledged Ms. Beal request and mentioned that Department will follow up on her request.

Patrick O'Neill confirmed that he did not see anyone for further comments and indicated that vote will be taken at May 7th, meeting and comments can be made prior to the vote if anyone would like to make any.

OTHER AQTAC BUSINESS / OPEN DISCUSSION

Patrick O'Neill open the meeting for the other AQTAC business/open discussion.

Michael Fiorentino asked about the compliance and the enforcement report during the shutdown.

Patrick O'Neill about DEP operations during the shutdown.

John Kreuger responded that DEP is operating remotely and assured that Department is not pulling back in any way which will have any impact on the public health. Mr. Kreuger further explained the complete DEP operation during the shutdown including: the operation of all continuous emission monitors, ambient air monitors and operation of regional offices with issuing/reviewing the permits, emission inventories and conducting the inspections. Only consideration and flexibility Department has is if a facility is unable to conduct a testing with third party who is unreachable due to illnesses or the shortage of staff due to COVID 19.

Patrick O' Neill added that Philadelphia Air Management Services (AMS) is also operating in a similar way as PA DEP.

Mr. O'Neill asked Jayme Graham if she can explain the operation of Allegheny County. Ms. Graham explained the operation of Allegheny County as well, including monitoring, testing and the enforcement.

Mr. O'Neill asked John Tissue to discuss his concern. Mr. Tissue indicated that he sent an e-mail request about the CO₂ budget trading program in regard to the public comments made by Ms. Elizabeth Marx.

John Kreuger assured the committee that Mr. Tissue's concern will be addressed in the April 23rd informational meeting next week.

Next Meeting: The next AQTAC meeting is scheduled for 9:15 a.m. on Thursday, May 7, 2020, through a WebEx.

Adjournment: John Tissue made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Josie Gaskey. With no further business before AQTAC, Patrick O'Neill adjourned the meeting at 12:30 PM.

Patrick O' Neill thanked everyone in attendance including AQTAC Committee Members, DEP and public.

Minutes prepared by Hitesh Suri, Air Quality Program Specialist (AQPS). For additional information about AQTAC, please contact Kirit Dalal at kdalal@pa.gov or (717) 772-3436. For any minutes related questions contact Hitesh Suri at hsuri@pa.gov or (717) 772-3963 or by visiting the AQTAC Web page at:

<http://www.dep.pa.gov/Business/Air/BAQ/AdvisoryGroups/Air-Quality-Technical-Advisory-Committee/Pages/default.aspx>