
Agenda item: Review of 2005 EI, Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy

Discussion:

Dave- Need an updateable database.

Sarah- Did not get database from past consultant. What we scoped and contracted for was not able to be delivered within the allotted budget.

Stephanie- Getting a database should be an integral part of next EI

Cindy- Issue is cost, steering committee must evaluate usage and what value will we get out of it.

Sue- Database is important, may have to scope in or out depending on the cost.

Tina- Last process was labor intensive and complicated. Is there a way to do the update in a manner that is simpler?... should be easier the second time around.

Stephanie- Areal boundary may influence the simplicity/complexity

Tina- Last time was pretty successful, good job of keeping industry partners involved, communication was good.

Mike- Had American Lung Association support the first time. We did not have any scoping issues last time, the process was good.

Stephanie- What worked well last time was how comprehensive we were in our approach, the second time around we should look hard at what has been useful, maybe we do not need to do the entire airshed again.

Sue- We want a consultant proposal that is scalable based on budget.

Conclusions:

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

Agenda item: Involvement of New Partners, Washington Dept. of Ecology, UPRR, Port of Olympia

Discussion:

Mike- Nice to have American Lung Association as an NGO.

Dave- ALA went through a changing of leadership

Cindy- Approached Ecology, who is still considering their ability to contribute. Asked UP to consider contribution, will contribute in-kind and data.

Stephanie- Some groups do not consider ALA an environmental association, other groups have become involved in air issues and other groups may want to have a bigger role

Sue- Tool for Ports and regulatory agencies, we need to be able to drive how it goes.

Sarah- We can open for public comment period instead of meeting format to get input from other groups.

Stephanie- Key is to give NGO's a forum to comment

Conclusions: Steering committee will be made up of those who provide money and data. In addition, organize a forum including those NGO's and other stakeholders for input and suggestions

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Contact Dave DeBryan (ALA)	Frank Van Haren	
✓ Find out who is the head of ALA now	Dave Kircher	
✓ Contact Port of Olympia	Sue Mauermann	

✓

Agenda item: EI budget

Discussion:

Dave- PSCAA put money in budget for next fiscal year, needs to be approved by Board of Directors

Sue- POT and POS will give 75K a piece pending approval from Commissions

Tina- Take budget to board and see what they think

Sarah- Asked other Ports around North America what their updates costs; each said updates cost 200K just for their port. Suspect Seattle and Tacoma ports would cost 200K each to do their own inventory.

Sue- Are there any funding sources available.

Sarah- Grants are no longer aimed at studies, primarily aimed at technology advancement for equipment that reduces emissions.

Dave- What is the possibility of getting EPA money, we should ask EPA Region 10

Conclusions:

Action items

Person responsible

Deadline

- | | | |
|---|----------------|--|
| ✓ Investigate EPA grant money availability | Dave Kircher | |
| ✓ PSCAA Board of Director Budget Approval | Dave Kircher | |
| ✓ Port Commissions Budget Approval | Sue/ Stephanie | |
| ✓ Holland America and Cruise Association Budget Approval??? | Tina Stotz | |
| ✓ Seek organizational funding and confirm with POT | All others | |

Agenda item: Develop Methodology Section in 2010 before data collection starts in 2011

Discussion:

Sue- Lets start now so we can be ready in 2011. May be able to tailor the consultant process and do data collection ourselves to reduce consultant costs.

Stephanie- It will be more difficult to update model and data because relationships have changed. Should we select a consultant sooner to figure out the need?

Sue- Invite other Ports to ask what they have done at the next meeting.

Sue- Use RFI process to poll consultants for changes in methodology.

Conclusions:

Action items

Person responsible

Deadline

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|--|
| ✓ Produce RFI and explore methodology | Ron Stuart | |
| ✓ | | |
| ✓ | | |
| ✓ | | |

Agenda item: Criteria Pollutants + Greenhouse gases

Discussion:

Sue- Last time did a full range of pollutants plus greenhouse gases

Sarah- We should repeat the same greenhouse gas inventory we did before.

Ron – Noted that GHG calculations and Emission Boundaries used for the Climate Registry differ from those used

in emission inventories. Results may be comparable to the 2005 Puget Sound inventory but not other regional, state or federal GHG only inventories completed since 2005.

Conclusions: Measure same pollutants so that it is comparable to the last study done

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

Agenda item: Areal Boundary of Inventory

Discussion:

Stephanie: What is the cost of doing this?

Sue- Significance would be other ports, ferries, and recreational, this is a cost vs. scope vs. benefit issue.

Dave- more straightforward methodology of non-port aspects, scaling in a meaningful way.

Mike- Can get specific data that is available for review.

Stephanie-Does anyone feel strongly that we need to do this again

Dave- Depends on where you live, some people feel very strongly about certain areas being left out

Tina- Scope of work feels potentially different. Are we looking for a tool that the ports can use to gather data and update the emission inventory at different points in time when change happens. Maybe we should be looking to purchase the tool that allows us to do the work to better understand the issue. Maybe the database is more important.

Sue- We are not quite there yet but we will need to make a decision eventually

Dave- The methodology changing is the biggest issue. We need to be able to compare '05 and '11 changes.

Sarah- Reason we are looking for outside consultant is so that we are not viewed or perceived as a bias look at our own emissions.

Conclusions: Areal boundary may remain the same, but measured sources may depend on cost

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓		
✓		
✓		
✓		

Agenda item: General Discussion and Next Steps

Discussion:

-Think about consultants

-Ask about financing for steering committee participation

-Next meeting tentative for the end of April

-Think about stakeholder process

Conclusions:

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------

✓ Schedule next meeting

Matoya Darby

✓