

**VISTAS Data Workgroup Meeting**  
**June 18, 2001 – Asheville, North Carolina**

Present:

Dotty Diltz, Florida DEP  
Errin Pichard, Florida DEP  
Tammy Eagan, Florida DEP  
John Calcagni, US EPA  
Jim Brenner, FL Division of Forestry  
Richard Guillot, US EPA  
John Jansen, Southern Company  
Maria Whitmer-Rich, Midwest Ozone Group  
Tim Carroll, West Virginia  
Steve Ewald, Georgia Power  
Bob Carson, Mammoth Cave National Park  
Roger Tanner, Tennessee Valley Authority

Teleconferencing:

Bill Murphey, Georgia EPD  
Kristi Morris, US Fish & Wildlife Service  
Larry Garrison, Kentucky DAQ  
Jerry Beasley, Mississippi DEQ  
Pat DalPorto, American Electric Power  
Kevin Covington, Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group  
Tom Stecker, South Carolina DEHC  
Eldewins Haynes, Duke Power  
Tom Jennings, Virginia  
Neal Stevens, CF Industries (phosphate)  
Kevin Washington, Florida Power & Light  
Jackie Waynick, Tennessee  
Wilfred Whitcraft, DuPont  
Jim Renfro, National Park Service  
John Glass, South Carolina DHEC  
Dave Wergowske, US Forest Service

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. and was followed by a roll call and introductions by work group members.

**VISTAS Workgroup Guidelines**

The first item on the agenda was discussion and comments on the draft VISTAS workgroup guidelines. Dotty went over a few key points in the guidelines, most notably the consensus basis by which the workgroups resolve issues. When a consensus cannot be reached, the state, tribal and local program representatives will vote. Other members of the workgroup do not have voting privileges.

John Jansen (Southern Company) asked how the opinions of the stakeholders would be considered in the process. Dotty assured him that everyone's opinion will be included in any decision-making process, but with contentious issues we must fall back on the workgroup guidelines.

Maria Whitmer-Rich (Midwest Ozone Group) asked if there would be any sort of orientation session for new members of the workgroups. Dotty stated that the earlier meetings in Asheville and Tampa were for this purpose, but complete information can be found on the temporary VISTAS web site ([www.daq.state.nc.us/VISTAS1](http://www.daq.state.nc.us/VISTAS1)).

### VISTAS Timeline

The next agenda item was a discussion of the current VISTAS workgroup timeline. John Jansen (Southern Company) noted that comments regarding the Planning workgroup's timeline were due to that group today (6/18/2001). In his opinion, the timeline is too short to do the technical work. Should we utilize the full 2000-2004 time span to select episodes for modeling? If so, new data needs to be collected by January 1 to proceed with the technical work. He further stated that the timelines for the Data Workgroup and the Technical Analysis Workgroup don't seem consistent.

Dotty pointed out that each state has a deadline to submit its regional haze SIP by 2008. This will involve rulemaking, which can take considerable time, so time is very limited to accomplish everything that needs to be done.

John Jansen recommended we add another year to the Technical Analysis Workgroup schedule.

John Calcagni (US EPA) recommended we get the contractor on board first, and then worry about modeling after the data is reviewed to see what the episodes are like. The contractor can make recommendations in the data analysis report to the workgroup.

Steve Ewald (Georgia Power) reminded the workgroup that we only have \$500,000 this year; however, we need to consider how much it will take to do the job. If necessary, we should ask for more.

John Jansen asked Dotty about the schedule, if any, for changing the workgroup timeline. Dotty stated that the document is a projection based on our best time estimates. However, it is dynamic and will probably change many times over the course of the project.

### Draft Scope of Work

The next agenda item was a discussion of the draft scope of work for data collection and analysis. Dotty gave the workgroup a general background of the development of the draft scope of work.

Tom Jennings (Virginia) asked about the purpose of having the contractor report locations where the annual concentration exceeds  $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . John Calcagni said that the value would act as a screen, since the standard is  $15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . He went on to say that the contractors should be able to bid on one or both parts of the scope of work, since there may be different contractors who are better suited for each of the two parts.

John Jansen stated that there seemed to be too much content for one scope of work, and the part dealing with determination of natural conditions needs more direction and focus. After much discussion, the workgroup decided to break out the determination of natural conditions into its own element that will be bid out separately.

Dotty said that she wanted to form a subcommittee to draft a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the first element of the scope of work – Collection and Analysis of Existing PM2.5 and Regional Haze Data. After a few of the possible contractors were discussed, the issue of contracting with a university was raised. The general consensus was that, due to budget and time constraints, they may be better suited to bid on the second element of the scope of work.

Larry Garrison pointed out that we need to provide the evaluation criteria to use in the contract evaluations. Dotty informed the workgroup that the SAMI contract spells out necessary qualifications on page 21, “other requirements” on page 23, and criteria on page 24. These portions of the SAMI RFP will be a good start for the development of ours. The subcommittee will draft an RFP, including contractor qualifications and evaluation criteria, and submit it to the workgroup for review. John Calcagni said that we might want to keep evaluation criteria out of the RFP.

The workgroup decided to form one subcommittee to draft the RFP for the first element of the scope of work (data collection and analysis), and a second subcommittee to review the contractor proposals. The following workgroup members volunteered to serve on the subcommittees:

RFP Drafting

John Calcagni (US EPA) - Chairman  
Jerry Beasley (Mississippi DEQ)  
Tim Carroll (West Virginia)  
John Jansen (Southern Company)  
Roger Tanner (Tennessee Valley Authority)  
Bob Carson (National Park Service)

Proposal Review

Larry Garrison (Kentucky) – Co-chairman  
Jim Brenner (Florida Division of Forestry) – Co-chairman  
John Jansen (Southern Company)  
Kristi Morris (US Fish & Wildlife Service)  
Neal Stevens (CF Industries/Florida Phosphate Council)  
Dave Wergowske (US Forest Service)  
Kevin Washington (Florida Power & Light)  
Maria Whitmer-Rich (Midwest Ozone Group)

A concern was expressed about the appropriateness of members serving on both committees, but since only one member was interested in taking this double workload, it was not considered to be a problem. Efforts were made to balance the makeup of each subcommittee to assure equitable representation.

It was suggested that we put the RFP on the NESCAUM and MARAMA web sites, as well as Commerce Business Daily. A concern was expressed over the length of time it would take to

publish and the potential of drawing proposals from unqualified reviewers, but no decision was reached on the use of the Commerce Business Daily. We should also see what contractors SAMI sent their RFPs to. Dotty asked if we wanted to broadcast the RFP or send it to a few well-known contractors with regional haze experience. The general agreement seemed to be that it would probably be best to limit the number of RFPs sent out, but it needs to be posted in a public forum of some sort. Also, based on the requirements set forth in the scope of work, we may not get many responses anyway.

John Jansen said that it would be useful to see what kind of guidance we can get from EPA and STAD regarding RFP review requirements. Jim Brenner (Florida Division of Forestry) agreed with this comment, noting that review requirements were necessary to eliminate delays. Since there are currently no specific contractor solicitation procedures in place, the drafting subcommittee was asked to review other governmental solicitation processes and draft a recommended procedure for the approval of the full workgroup that we could use. Since this contract will be the first VISTAS contract executed, the procedures approved by the workgroup will be submitted to the VISTAS Coordinating Committee for concurrence. Dotty will continue to work with EPA and Phil Brantley to obtain their recommendations on a solicitation process.

The general consensus among the workgroup was that more thought needs to be given to the second element of the scope of work - Long Term Collection of Data in Class I Areas. Also, it was agreed that the determination of natural background conditions should be a third element. Tammy Eagan (Florida DEP) will draft this third element of the scope of work since she is the only representative from our RPO states serving on the national workgroup developing the guidance for determining background conditions. Each element of the scope of work will be contracted separately.

John Calcagni asked that RFP Drafting subcommittee members submit their comment on Part I of the scope of work as soon as possible, but no later than June 22. The Technical Analysis workgroup will also be encouraged to submit comments directly to John by June 22.

#### Next Meeting/Teleconference

The next meeting/teleconference will be scheduled to take place after the draft RFP is completed and reviewed by the workgroup. We will aim for the end of July or early August, possibly in Charleston or Atlanta. Those who cannot attend this meeting may teleconference. John Jansen suggested we avoid dates that would conflict with SAMI activities – July 25 and August 7-9.

NOTE: Hopefully the poor sound quality of the teleconference will be improved for the next workgroup meeting.

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.