

**MINNESOTA PPG MAX WORKPLAN FFY 2013-2016
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM (Sec. 105)**

FFY 2013 Report with FFY 2014 Workplan Revisions (if applicable)

Strategic Goal: 1 – Taking Action on Climate Change and Improving Air Quality¹			
Objective 1.1: Address Climate Change. Reduce the threats posed by climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and taking actions that help communities and ecosystems become more resilient to the effects of climate change.			
2011- 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) - Address Climate Change²			
Air Toxics – Toxics and Global Atmosphere			
Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates & Contact	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
Work collaboratively to address climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions through partnership programs, outreach and other activities.	Ongoing until Project End Date McDonald/ Sierks/ Patraw	Promote EPA voluntary programs including Energy Star, WaterSense, and other programs as appropriate.	<p>FFY 2013 Report:</p> <p>Energy Star exhibit The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and the Minnesota Department of Commerce created an ENERGY STAR appliance display at the 2013 Eco Experience, an exhibit at the Minnesota State Fair which draws 250,000 visitors annually. The display included example appliances, interpretive signs, and ENERGY STAR Appliance brochures. The display was staffed by knowledgeable Commerce and EPA staff. During the event 366 ENERGY STAR pledges were collected.</p> <p>Fix-a-Leak campaign The MPCA kicked-off a 3-month residential water-conservation campaign during EPA’s Fix-a-Leak week (a WaterSense event) in March 2013 that was focused on building public awareness and action regarding silent toilet leaks. The Fix-a-Leak campaign provided interested residents with free toilet leak-detection tablets, an informational card, and a business return card for providing leak results. Advertisements promoting the availability</p>

¹ EPA Strategic Goals are located at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>

² EPA Measures are from National Program Guidance at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>, 40 CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>, and EPA Regional Priorities.

			<p>of the leak detection tablets ran statewide in newspapers, online news sites, Facebook, a Twin Cities radio station, Twin Cities Chinook Book, and on-screen in two local movie theaters.</p> <p>In total, over 5,300 leak-detection cards and tablets were distributed. Over 600 people ordering tablets also provided their email addresses for contact regarding future water-conservation opportunities. Of the > 300 people that returned their business reply cards by 6/30, approximately 25% reported finding and, in most cases, fixing one or more leaks.</p> <p>For the second year in a row, the MPCA created and displayed an educational exhibit on residential water conservation at the 2013 Eco Experience at the State Fair. Nearly 3,500 dye tablets and cards were distributed to event visitors along with 6,000 WaterSense-labeled, low-flow faucet aerators.</p> <p><i>Recreational Fires campaign</i> The Recreational Fires advertising campaign was launched in the spring of 2013 to increase public awareness of and consideration for the environmental and health effects of recreational burning. The primary messages of the ad were to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Avoid burning on air pollution alert days or on windy days 2) Be considerate of those living nearby who may be sensitive to the smoke from fires 3) Only burn dry, seasoned wood <p>The ads ran statewide in multiple newspapers, online, in Chinook Book, and on-screen in 2 Twin-Cities movie theaters. The ads resulted in increased activity on the MPCA's wood smoke informational page, with 1,200 of the year's 1,800 total page views occurring during the campaign's May-June advertising period.</p> <p><i>Living Green 365 e-newsletter</i> Between Sept 2012 and Sept 2013 the MPCA published 4 Living Green 365 e-newsletters (sent to 12,000) that promoted these EPA voluntary programs:</p>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refrigerators (ENERGY STAR): http://content.govdelivery.com/bulletins/gd/MNPCA-615c08 Lawn and garden watering (WaterSense): http://content.govdelivery.com/bulletins/gd/MNPCA-7a24d3 Leaks (Fix-a-leak Week): http://content.govdelivery.com/bulletins/gd/MNPCA-70ae79 Wood burning (BurnWise): http://content.govdelivery.com/bulletins/gd/MNPCA-5299da <p>EPA Comment: MPCA continues to provide a wide variety of GHG reduction resources to the public, but especially through the Eco Experience at the state fair.</p>
--	--	--	---

Objective 1.2: Improve Air Quality. Achieve and maintain health-based air pollution standards and reduce risk from toxic air pollutants and indoor air contaminants.

2011 – 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) - Reduce Criteria Pollutants and Regional Haze

Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification – Control Strategies (mobile source)

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
1) Work with transportation agencies as appropriate to update mobile SIP budgets in response to changing needs such as updates to the mobile model MOVES or other changes.	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	MPCA will monitor motor vehicle emission budgets based on MOVES as necessary to support maintenance plans in Minnesota.	FFY 2013 Report: On November 8, 2010, the EPA approved a limited maintenance plan request for the Twin Cities maintenance area. Under a limited maintenance plan, the EPA has determined that there is no requirement to project emissions over the maintenance period and that "an emission budget may be treated as essentially not constraining for the length of the maintenance period. The reason is that it is unreasonable to expect that our maintenance area will experience so much growth within this period that a violation of CO NAAQS would result." Therefore, no regional modeling analysis for the long range transportation plan and Transportation Improvement Plan is required; however federally funded and state funded projects are still subject to

			"hot-spot" analysis requirements which were completed for FFY 2013 project reviews. The limited maintenance plan adopted in 2010 determined that the level of CO emissions and resulting ambient concentrations will continue to demonstrate attainment of the CO NAAQS.
2) Update out-of-date conformity SIPs to allow the state to utilize more recent flexibilities in the federal rule.	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	MPCA will continue work with MNDOT and others to update transportation conformity SIP addressing both CO and potentially PM _{2.5} . PM _{2.5} standard finalization expected in December 2012 will trigger a focused effort to complete the SIP. <u>MPCA response:</u> MPCA cannot complete this task until EPA completes two tasks: 1) finalize the PM _{2.5} NAAQS revision proposed in June 2012; and 2) Issue final guidance for the revised PM _{2.5} NAAQS. Also, please see revision above.	<u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> In September 2013, the MPCA completed the draft of the Minnesota conformity SIP and forwarded to MnDOT, Metro Council, St. Cloud and Duluth-Superior's MPOs legal staff for their review and comment. Any comments received will be addressed before sending the final draft and the accompanying signature pages to all parties for their signatures. The complete package will be sent to EPA after a 30-day public notice, possibly in early 2014. The current draft addresses only CO since Minnesota is an attainment area for PM _{2.5} based on the final guidance for the revised PM _{2.5} NAAQS that was issued by the EPA in 2012.

NAAQS Ambient Air Monitoring

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
1) Operate monitors for other NAAQS pollutants, NCore, and PAMS according to 40 CFR Part 58, approved monitoring plans, and/or grant agreements including QMPs and QAPPs.	Ongoing until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Strassman	MPCA will operate the ozone network from <u>April 1</u> through <u>October 31</u> in accordance with requirements listed in Table D-3 to Appendix D of 40 CFR Part 58.	<u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA operated the statewide ozone monitoring network from April 1, 2013 through October 31, 2013 in accordance with regulations.
2) All state/local primary quality assurance organizations submit NAAQS pollutant data, PAMS, and QA data to AQS directly or indirectly through another organization according to schedule in 40 CFR Part 58.	Ongoing until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Strassman	MPCA will submit NAAQS pollutant and QA data directly to the AQS within 90 days of the end of a calendar quarter.	<u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> NAAQS pollutant and QA was submitted directly to the AQS within 90 days of the end of a calendar quarter during FFY13. <u>EPA Comment:</u> MPCA operates ~115 monitors. Data completeness for FY 2013 is overall good. Reporting of QA/QC data continues to improve but there are still issues.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ü Data not meeting completeness requirements ü Not all QA/QC data being reported to AQS. (Precision checks for gaseous, etc.) ü In addition, collocation data for PM2.5 continuous FEM data (FEM vs FEM) not being reported to AQS. This is an important issue because the majority of the MPCA PM2.5 network is FEM as opposed to filter-based FRM; and although we know they do meet this requirement, this should be addressed (see screen capture at bottom of email). ü No PEP audits being conducted on PM2.5 FEM network (we mentioned this to Scott, and he has already scheduled some PEP audits for the MPCA FEM). <p>We will be able to better assess the quality of the data in April 2014 when all of calendar year 2013 data is due to AQS. Air monitoring QA data is assessed by calendar year, so looking at fiscal year only tells part of the story.</p> <p><i>In summary: MPCA reports data to AQS as required by 40 CFR Part 58, there are some issues regarding data completeness and the reporting of QA/QC data that they are currently trying to correct.</i></p> <p>All of these issues were mentioned during our FY 2013 TSA on MPCA (the report has not been sent out yet).</p> <p><u>MPCA Response: (Strassman)</u> As mentioned above all of these issues were brought to our attention during the August 20-23, 2013, Technical Systems Audit conducted by EPA Quality Assurance staff. The MPCA addressed these issues and informed EPA of the correction actions taken in a February 21, 2014, letter to Ms. Loretta Lehrman. The MPCA appreciates the steps taken by EPA to schedule PEP audits on the PM2.5 FEM network.</p>
--	--	--	--

3) Certify 2012 NAAQS pollutant data in AQS and provide supporting documentation by May 1, 2013, including exceptional event flags.	By May 1, 2013 Kohlasch/ Strassman	MPCA will certify 2012 NAAQS pollutant data in AQS by May 1, 2013.	FFY 2013 Report: 2012 NAAQS pollutant data was certified effective May 3, 2013.
4) Submit XML-formatted AQS data by the end of 2012 or at the latest the end of 2013.	By the end of 2013 Kohlasch/ Palmer	EPA has developed a work-around through the Exchange Network Services Center (ENSC) that allows us to continue to submit 80 character format data to AQS. While this will be available for the foreseeable future, we understand that new upgrades to AQS will not support the 80 character format. We are currently working on an approved project to investigate potential upgrades to our LIMs system. This upgrade would likely include the ability to submit XML-formatted data to AQS through the Exchange Network Node. It is uncertain if this project would be complete by the end of 2013.	FFY 2013 Report: EPA has developed a work-around through the Exchange Network Services Center (ENSC) that allows us to continue to submit 80 character format data to AQS. While this will be available for the foreseeable future, we understand that new upgrades to AQS will not support the 80 character format. We are currently working on an approved project to upgrade or replace our LIMs system. This upgrade would likely include the ability to submit XML-formatted data to AQS through the Exchange Network Node. We hope to have this implemented by the end of 2014. If we implement the upgrade to XML-formatted submittal in the current system it would have to be redone when a new LIMS system is in place.
5) Submit 2014 annual network plan required by 40 CFR § 58.10, by July 1, 2013, unless another schedule has been approved.	July 1, 2013 Kohlasch/ Strassman	MPCA will submit the 2014 annual monitoring network plan to EPA Region 5 by July 1, 2013.	FFY 2013 Report: The 2104 Annual Air Monitoring Network Plan was open for public review and comment from June 7 through July 8, 2013. The plan was submitted to EPA Region 5 on July 31, 2013, and approved by EPA Region 5 on October 23, 2013.
6) Ensure adequate, independent QA audits of NAAQS monitors, including PEP and NPAP or equivalent.	Ongoing until Project End Date Strassman/ Charpentier (Scruton)	MPCA will continue to fully participate in the Pb PEP and NPAP QA programs.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA participated in the Pb PEP and NPAP programs during FFY13.
7) Report real time ozone and PM _{2.5} data to AirNOW for cities required to report the AQI (state/local only).	Ongoing until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Strassman	MPCA will continue to report hourly ozone and PM _{2.5} data to AirNow in support of air quality forecasting and national pollutant mapping.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA submitted hourly ozone and PM _{2.5} concentrations to AirNow in support AQI forecasting and national pollutant mapping during FFY13.

<p>8) Attend the annual Region 5 State/Local/Tribal Air Monitoring Contacts meeting, Participate in the monthly S/L/Tribal monitoring calls. Attend the Triennial National Monitoring conference, the annual AQS conference and the annual QA conference if they are held.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Strassman</p>	<p>Will commit to monthly calls. However, travel is subject to agency budget and administrative restrictions.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA participates on monthly R5 calls and travels to meetings as budgets allow.</p>
<p>NAAQS - Attainment Planning and Maintenance</p>			
<p>Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)</p>	<p>Progress Target Dates</p>	<p>State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)</p>	<p>Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3</p>
<p>1) Work with local Metropolitan Planning Organizations, EPA, and state and federal transportation agencies in future conformity determinations, as needed.</p>	<p>As yet-to-be-finalized implementation guidance dictates.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Work with EPA to address any monitored violations of the NAAQS. Address through approved maintenance plans if applicable.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: There has been no monitored violation of any NAAQS in FFY 2013. MPCA will continue to work with EPA and other partner agencies through the following existing programs to minimize the potential for violations of the NAAQS: Ongoing implementation of an oxygenated gasoline program as reflected in the modeling assumptions used in the SIP; A regional commitment to continue capital investments to maintain and improve the operational efficiencies of highway and transit systems; Adoption of a regional long-term 2030 Regional Development Framework that supports land use patterns that efficiently connect housing, jobs, retail centers, and transit oriented development along transit corridors; The continued involvement of local government units in the regional 3C transportation planning process that allows the region to address local congestion, effectively manage available capacities in the transportation system, and promoting transit supportive land uses as part of a coordinated regional growth management strategy.</p>

<p>2) Review air quality reports and take appropriate actions dealing with new violating attainment areas with any of the NAAQS.</p>	<p>As agreed upon in approved maintenance plans if applicable.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>The MPCA submits the biennial Air Quality Report to the Legislature, reviews and analyzes air monitoring data on a continuous basis for MN to identify appropriate actions.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted the 2013 Air Quality Report to the Legislature in January 2013. The report contains analysis and interpretation of the MPCA's monitoring data and identifies actions the MPCA and others are undertaking to improve air quality.</p>
<p>3) As appropriate, submit redesignation requests including maintenance plans for areas with clean air quality data.</p>	<p>At state's discretion.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Next expected would be redesignation for lead nonattainment area (2015).</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> No work completed in FFY13. Minnesota's only NAAQS nonattainment area is the lead nonattainment area in Dakota County. Upon demonstration of three years of NAAQS compliant monitoring data (expected in FFY14), MPCA will evaluate redesignation and maintenance plan options.</p>
<p>4) Prepare recommendations on designations for revised NAAQS.</p>	<p>One year after promulgation of revised NAAQS.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Next expected would be for revised PM_{2.5} NAAQS – likely December 2013.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA is preparing and expects to submit a designation recommendation for the revised (2012) PM_{2.5} standard to EPA by December 13, 2013.</p>
<p>5) Facilitate implementation of NOx and SO2 Requirements under Transport Rule.</p>	<p>As required by Transport Rule.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed rule language; • Review proposed allocations for Minnesota; • Talk to affected facilities covered by rules. 	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA continued working with EPA and potentially affected facilities throughout FFY13 to quality-assure technical data for rule development, and will continue to do so. MPCA will work to facilitate implementation of Transport Rule requirements upon rule promulgation.</p>
<p>6) Consult with EPA, as necessary, to finalize area designations for SO₂ primary NAAQS.</p>	<p>Before and during EPA's 120-day process for SO₂.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>After EPA provides final direction on how to proceed, work with EPA to determine designations for SO₂ primary NAAQS.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> No work completed in FFY13. Minnesota has no areas designated for the 2010 SO₂ primary NAAQS. EPA intends to address areas not designated in 2013 in a separate future action. Waiting for release of further action from EPA. MPCA will work with EPA at that time to determine designations for SO₂.</p>

<p>7) Work with stakeholders and EPA through Ozone Advance process to develop and implement local ozone reduction programs to help ensure attainment of 8-hour ozone NAAQS.</p>	<p>Plan due in June 2013</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Work with Clean Air Dialogue process to produce recommendations.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA requested participation in Ozone Advance on May 22, 2012 and PM Advance on March 11, 2013. Between March 2012 and February 2013, the MPCA worked with the Clean Air Dialogue organizer (Environmental Initiative) and participants to produce 24 recommendations in 6 categories detailed in an April 2013 report. Since the report's release, the MPCA, Environmental Initiative and many of the leaders who participated in Minnesota's Clean Air Dialogue have been working to initiate implementation of a number of high-priority emission reduction activities. Future efforts to set priorities for action, request and gather financial resources, and develop plans for implementation of recommended actions will be supported by Clean Air Minnesota and facilitated by Environmental Initiative, working closely with MPCA.</p>
<p>8) Submit SIPs for the §110(a) (2) infrastructure.</p>	<p>Due three years after standard promulgation</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>MPCA will submit these SIPs based on availability of EPA guidance, which is currently pending (August 2012). Ozone – Due March 2011 NO₂ – Due January 2012 SO₂ – Due June 2012</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: MPCA is currently developing an infrastructure SIP submittal addressing ozone, NO₂, SO₂, and PM_{2.5} based upon EPA's September 2013 guidance and has shared an informal draft with EPA for comment. MPCA anticipates submittal to EPA in March 2014.</p>
<p>9) Submit SIPs for the lead NAAQS.</p>	<p>Due June 2013</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Minnesota does not have any areas that were designated nonattainment in the second round of lead designations.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: MPCA completed its only required lead attainment demonstration in FFY 2012. Revisions to the SIP will be completed and submitted to EPA as needed.</p>
<p>10) Conduct public notification and education efforts, including reporting air quality forecasts and current conditions for ozone and particle pollution.</p>	<p>As necessary on forecasted high pollution days.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Strassman</p>	<p>MPCA will continue to publish hourly AQI values and issue same day, next day and 5-day AQI forecasts and issue advisories and alerts for the State of Minnesota.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA launched a redesigned AQI website in Spring 2013, and continues to publish hourly AQI values and issue same day, next day and 5-day AQI forecasts and issue advisories and alerts for the State of Minnesota. EPA Comment: In addition to MPCA's current public notification and education efforts, MPCA may want to consider developing a strategy to increase the number of Enviroflash subscribers that receive AQI forecasts and air quality information. Currently, there are approximately 4,000 Enviroflash subscribers in Minnesota.</p>

			<p><u>MPCA Response: (Kohlasch)</u> The MPCA has dedicated state funding to identify opportunities to enhance the utility of the Air Quality Index (AQI) system. The use of the funding is being guided by stakeholders through the Clean Air Minnesota effort. In 2013, the MPCA launched an updated AQI website and made a Minnesota specific app available for iOS, Android and Windows mobile platforms.</p>
11) Work with EPA to recognize and address environmental justice issues that can be addressed in SIPs.	<p>As opportunities arise.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>As the MPCA develops SIPs, the MPCA will consult with EPA to identify opportunities to address environmental justice issues within those documents, as appropriate.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA kept EPA apprised of SIP development activities through its bi-monthly calls and did not identify specific environmental justice opportunities to be addressed. Integration of environmental justice principals into agency programs is ongoing.</p>
12) Explore feasibility of Implementing strategies for controlling emissions from wood smoke, including woodstove changeout and Burnwise education campaigns. Work with local area stakeholders to support innovative, voluntary, early action initiatives such wood smoke reduction programs.	<p>As available.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p> <p>NOTE: This work is now assigned to Rick Patraw and Brian Timerson. Change ownership.</p>	<p>Work with Clean Air Dialogue to develop recommendations.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The CAD recommendations were released in an April 2013 report. Since the release, the MPCA received \$1.4 million over a two year period to implement non-point reductions and has begun these activities: 1) Clean Diesel: develop model contract for state agencies/LGUs to require clean diesel for construction projects and continue loan/ grant program for Class 6 and larger on-road units. 2) Wood Smoke: develop an outdoor wood boiler model ordinance for LGUs and develop new outreach materials on recreational burning. 3) VOC reduction initiative: joint project with MN Technical Assistance Program to target assistance to high VOC usage sectors and develop RFP process for companies to request grant funding for VOC reduction projects. 4) Other efforts under investigation: examples: Air alert partner program with businesses/ organizations. Green Corps Expansion</p>
13) Convert, where desired, CSAPR FIP into a SIP.	<p>At state's discretion.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>N/A for FFY2013 (CSAPR vacated & EPA's appealing)</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Not applicable for FFY 2013.</p>
14) Implement strategies to attain the 2008 lead NAAQS.	<p>Ongoing throughout grant cycle.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>The MPCA will ensure that Gopher Resources SIP required actions are implemented.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA continues to work with Gopher Resources to ensure they meet the obligations of the Administrative Order (AO) implementing control strategies and conditions of the lead attainment demonstration. MPCA is currently working to develop minor supplements to the lead attainment demonstration SIP and</p>

			associated AO, detailing proposed changes to the facility (Gopher Resources). The changes will not affect the state's ability to attain and maintain the lead NAAQS by the attainment deadline in 2015.
15) Develop attainment demonstrations for SO ₂ nonattainment areas and conduct other SO ₂ air quality planning in accordance with EPA guidance.	On schedule set out by EPA Kohlasch/ Fenske	Minnesota likely will not have nonattainment areas for SO ₂ . Unclassifiable areas will be dealt with according to EPA's guidance or implementation rulemaking.	FFY 2013 Report: Minnesota has no areas designated nonattainment for SO ₂ . MPCA continues to work with facilities included in the SO ₂ maintenance areas for the previous SO ₂ NAAQS to ensure continued NAAQS attainment. MPCA is currently working to develop site-specific SIP revisions for facilities in the Twin Cities SO ₂ maintenance area that have removed/decommissioned SO ₂ -emitting units. MPCA conducted modeling exercises for the 1-hour SO ₂ standard as a part of its Regional Haze SIP to identify facilities that may contribute to an exceedance of the NAAQS. MPCA will work with facilities to develop necessary controls to ensure NAAQS compliance.
16) Complete remaining 10 year maintenance plan SIPs for areas that were previously in nonattainment with the SO ₂ or PM ₁₀ standard, using a process to be developed in collaboration with EPA Region 5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rochester SO₂ maintenance plan SIP • Twin Cities and Rochester PM₁₀ • Twin Cities and Pine Bend SO₂ 	Ongoing, timing based on EPA discussions.	Complete remaining 10 year maintenance plan SIPs for areas that were previously in nonattainment with the SO ₂ or PM ₁₀ standard, using a process to be developed in collaboration with EPA Region 5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rochester SO₂ maintenance plan SIP • Twin Cities and Rochester PM₁₀ • Twin Cities and Pine Bend SO₂ 	FFY 2013 Report: No action on this task in FFY13. SIP resources in the unit were limited due to reassignment of MPCA's SIP coordinator in January 2013 to another position. This SIP task was deemed a lower priority compared to other tasks. The MPCA will consult with EPA early in FFY14 about the priority of this SIP work relative to other work. As of September 2013, the MPCA hired two new staff with a portion of their responsibilities assigned to SIP work. EPA Comment: MPCA is encouraged to work with EPA to collaborate on a process to complete the remaining maintenance plan SIPs for the Rochester and Twin Cities areas. There are still Clean Air Act requirements despite not being the highest priorities and in light of stretched resources. MPCA Response: (Fenske) MPCA will commit to discussing the status of existing maintenance plans with EPA.

17) Revise ambient air quality standards in Minnesota rules, along with significant harm levels as needed (PM2.5, ozone, lead).	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	Rule revision kicking off in Summer 2012. As we are able to revise the rules in conjunction with 40 CFR Part 51.150, we will do so.	FFY 2013 Report: Suggested changes to Minn. R. ch. 7009 to align with updated federal standards have been prepared as part of the "Omnibus" rulemaking and will be shared with EPA prior to informal comment on the draft rules by stakeholders scheduled for winter 2014.
Regional Haze – Attainment Planning and Maintenance			
Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments – Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
1) Continue to work with EPA, Region 5 on issues related to submitted regional haze SIPs.	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	At bimonthly call with EPA Region V identify regional haze SIP issues that require joint effort.	FFY 2013 Report: EPA approved portions of Minnesota's submitted regional haze SIP while deferring action on RAVI requirements for the Sherco facility in July 2012, finalized a FIP for taconite BART in February 2013, and finalized disapproval of Minnesota's taconite industry BART determination effective October 30, 2013. MPCA continues to work with EPA, through its bimonthly calls, and additional consultation as needed to implement the approved portions of the regional haze SIP, and begin planning for the development of required 2018 SIP revisions.
2) Implement BART requirements.	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	The MPCA will implement the BART requirements for subject to BART electric generating units (EGUs) in Minnesota, as provided in the enforceable documents included in Minnesota's Regional Haze SIP. The MPCA will determine whether a SIP amendment is needed to address the legal standing of the Cross State Air Pollution Rule. If EPA approves the BART determinations for Minnesota's subject to BART taconite facilities, then the MPCA will implement the BART conditions provided in the administrative orders.	FFY 2013 Report: EGU BART - MPCA had determined in its Regional Haze SIP supplement (dated May 8, 2012) that CSAPR = BART for subject-to-BART EGUs in MN. EPA approved this strategy effective July 12, 2012. CSAPR was subsequently vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals (DC Circuit) on August 21, 2012, and is awaiting Supreme Court review. MPCA will revisit BART for EGUs with EPA as necessary, pending resolution of CSAPR litigation. Taconite BART - EPA finalized disapproval of Minnesota's BART determinations for subject-to-BART taconite facilities effective October 30, 2013. EPA finalized the FIP for Minnesota's taconite BART determinations effective March 8, 2013. The FIP was stayed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 8 th Circuit on June 14, 2013, pending resolution of litigation (to which MPCA is not a party).

		If EPA disapproves Minnesota's BART determinations for subject to BART taconite facilities in Minnesota, then EPA Region 5 will be responsible for implementation of taconite BART requirements in Minnesota.	
3) Implement Long-Term Strategy of taconite 1-hour SO2 and NO2 NAAQS modeling.	Modeling complete by end of 2012. Compliance by 2017. Kohlasch/ Fenske	MPCA amended response: Implement Long-Term Strategy of taconite NAAQS modeling – as part of Minnesota's Regional Haze SIP and State Administrative orders. If EPA needs further clarification, please contact Mary Jean Fenske/Frank Kohlasch.	FFY 2013 Report: MPCA modified the Administrative Orders' modeling provisions in December 2012, requiring the taconite facilities to submit to MPCA facility-specific SO ₂ and NO ₂ modeling (and associated emissions inputs) by January 2013. Using this data, MPCA then conducted a cumulative modeling exercise to identify sources culpable for modeled 1-hour NAAQS exceedances. MPCA has been working with the taconite industry to finalize details associated with this modeling and will continue to work with the taconite industry to develop controls to ensure NAAQS compliance for the purpose of evolving controls at the taconite indurating furnaces.
4) Submit interim progress report SIP due 5 years after the submittal of the initial Regional Haze SIP as required under 51.308(g).	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	MPCA will work with EPA Region 5 and LADCO to coordinate the submission of the 5-year progress reports on its Regional Haze SIP by December, 2014.	FFY 2013 Report: MPCA is currently developing its regional haze interim progress report, and anticipates it will submit the report on time, by December 2014. MPCA continues to work with EPA Region 5 and LADCO on the development of the interim progress report, and expects to have drafts available for preliminary review in the Spring of 2014.
Permitting			
Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments – Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
(The following measures are funded with EPA Clean Air Act funding.)			
1) Issue construction permits compliant with Greenhouse Gas BACT.	Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith	Issue construction permits compliant with Greenhouse Gas BACT.	FFY 2013 Report: One PSD permit application that was major for GHGs was received during FFY2012 and another during FFY2013. Both permits were reviewed by R5 and issued with GHG BACT conditions.

<p>2) Issue 78 % of major PSD/NSR permits within one year of receiving a complete permit application.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Don Smith</p>	<p>Issue 78 % of major PSD/NSR permits within one year of receiving a complete permit application.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: Three of three PSD permit applications received during FFY2012 were issued within 365 days of receiving permit application. One of three PSD permit applications received during FFY2013 was issued within 365 days of receiving permit application. (The earlier of the remaining two was received in late February 2013, so the permits have been in house less than 365 days.)</p> <p>There are a number of outstanding PSD permit applications that pre-date FFY2012. The companies awaiting these permit applications do not need them to initiate construction. The desired permit actions are primarily changes to BACT limits/conditions.</p>
<p>3) Issue NSR permits consistent with CAA requirements and enter BACT/LAER determinations in the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse (RBLC).</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Don Smith</p>	<p>Issue NSR permits consistent with CAA requirements and enter BACT/LAER determinations in the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse (RBLC).</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The four PSD permits issued in FFY2013 were submitted to R5 for review to ensure consistency with CAA requirements.</p> <p>MPCA entered the BACT determinations for a PSD permit issued for an applications received during FFY2012 into the RBLC. An additional set of BACT determinations was submitted to the RBLC but is not yet published. The other two BACT determinations will soon be submitted to the RBLC soon via the RBLC Standalone Editor. (Delayed since a change in operating system led to deletion of RBLC Editor software.)</p>
<p>4) Provide timeliness data on NSR permits issued for new major sources and major modifications by entering data including "the application accepted date" and "the permit issuance date" in to the RBLC national database.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Don Smith</p>	<p>Provide timeliness data on NSR permits issued for new major sources and major modifications by entering data including "the application accepted date" and "the permit issuance date" in to the RBLC national database.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The one BACT determination from FFY2012-2013 that is currently available in the RBLC contains this information. It is included in other submittals to the RBLC.</p>
<p>5) Coordinate with EPA to ensure that Endangered Species Act consultations are handled in a timely manner.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Don Smith</p>	<p>Coordinate with EPA to ensure that Endangered Species Act consultations are handled in a timely manner.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: Project proposers are required to contact EPA directly with ESA information. For the four PSD projects completed in FFY2013, ESA consultations were completed prior to permit issuance.</p>

6) Provide PSD/NSR permit applications to EPA prior to the start of the public comment period.	Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith	Provide PSD/NSR permit applications to EPA prior to the start of the public comment period.	FFY 2013 Report: No report kept. Project proposers are required to submit applications to EPA directly.
7) Assist with outreach and capacity building for minority, low-income and indigenous communities to improve understanding of and engagement in regulatory and permitting processes.	As necessary until Project End Date Neuschler	MPCA is refreshing its policy for “environmental equity”. Activities for permitting will be identified through this effort by September 20, 2013.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCAs EJ coordinator participated in community meetings about air permits and met with community members individually to discuss permitting activities and concerns about environmental justice. In addition, the MPCA’s Environmental Justice Steering Team and EJ Community members met multiple times in FFY 2013 to share information and views, including assisting community members in understanding the permitting and review process.

2011-2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) – Reduce Air Toxics

Air Toxics

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments – Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
1) Emission Inventory: (1) Develop Criteria Pollutant emission inventories and submit it to EPA’s National Emissions Inventory (NEI) database; (2) also, develop and submit data for the integrated HAP emissions inventory to NEI; (3) Quality assure, validate, and revise NEI data using EIS; and (4) Participate in Regional emission inventory workgroup conference calls.	Dec. 31, 2012- CAP 2011 inventory Mar. 31, 2013 HAP 2011 inventory Dec. 31, 2015 CAP & HAP 2014 inventory Kohlasch/ Palmer	The MPCA will submit 2011 CAP emissions data to NEI by December 31, 2012. We are requesting to submit the 2011 HAP inventory in March 2013 in order to provide EPA more complete and quality assured data and to minimize future updates to the HAP data. This extension is needed due to the extra time required for faculties and staff to work through the first emissions reporting year using our new CEDR system. Future inventories should not be delayed. The MPCA will quality assure, validate and revise NEI data using EIS and will continue to participate in regional emission inventory workgroup conference calls.	FFY 2013 Report: MPCA has submitted 2011 CAP and HAP emissions to EPA. MPCA expects to meet the EPA deadline of January 10, 2014 to submit 2012 CAP facility and point emissions. MPCA will also submit comments and corrections to the 2011 v1 Point, Nonpoint, Onroad/Nonroad to the EIS QA Environment by EPA’s deadline of March 31, 2014. The MPCA will quality assure, validate and revise future NEI data using EIS and will continue to participate in regional emission inventory workgroup conference calls. EPA Comment: USEPA appreciates MPCA’s inventory work that MPCA has submitted by the deadlines. We also encourage MPCA to review 2011 HAP inventory data that is part of the high risk facility list in the 2011 NATA review.

			<p>MPCA Response: (K. Palmer) Emissions inventory staff has reviewed the high risk facility list, reviewed emission calculations and contacted facilities for corrected emission estimates as appropriate. Updated 2011 emissions will be submitted to EPA prior to the March 31, 2014 deadline.</p>
2) Implement delegated or approved section 112 (MACT and Residual Risk), 111(d) and 129 standards, as appropriate, for major sources residual risk, and area sources.	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>The MPCA will adopt federal NSPS and major source NESHAP regulations and implement delegated NESHAP and NSPS through its approved Title V operating permit program. The MPCA does not implement area source NESHAP unless the affected area source is located at a major Title V source.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The draft mercury reduction rules will go on public notice on December 2, 2013 and will propose adoption of these standards into state rules: 40 CFR pt. 63 subp. UUUUU, 40 CFR pt. 60 subps. CCCC, DDDD, LLLL, MMMM, AAAA, Eb, Ec, EEEE.</p> <p>The draft Omnibus rulemaking scheduled for notice later in 2014 will adopt additional NSPS and major source NESHAP as identified.</p> <p>EPA Comment: Everything seems to be on track for the rulemaking. Under the draft mercury reduction rules, MPCA will also be incorporating by reference into their state rules, 2 additional CAA Section 112 NESHAPs: Subpart DDDDD and JJJJ, the major and area source rules for boilers.</p>
3) Participate in the quarterly State/Region 5 risk assessment conference calls. Participate in annual State/Region 5 air toxics meeting.	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Sh. Burman</p>	<p>Will commit to quarterly calls. However, travel is subject to agency budget and administrative restrictions.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA continues to participate on the quarterly risk assessment conference calls as well as send 1-2 participants to the annual air toxics meetings.</p>
4) Participate in research projects, policy issues and task forces that address identification and reduction of persistent bio-accumulative air toxic pollutants.	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Sh. Burman</p>	<p>As MPCA priorities and resources allow.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA's primary focus for persistent bio-accumulative air toxic pollutants is on execution of the PAH monitoring grant that is outside the scope of the EnPPA. The MPCA is also conducting a review of MNRiskS results for dioxin emitters in the state to determine if emission estimation improvements are needed.</p>

<p>5) As resources allow, work with communities to develop and implement voluntary air toxics programs that address outdoor, indoor, and mobile sources with emphasis on areas with potential environmental justice concerns.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Patraw/ Maurice/ Timerson</p>	<p>Continue, as resources allow, air toxics reduction efforts as part of the MPCA's improving Ambient Air Focus Area. The MPCA will focus on using monitoring and modeling tools to analyze for communities with environmental justice concerns in Minnesota impacted by outdoor air pollution. The MPCA will seek to build capacity in communities with environmental justice concerns to understand the air related risks to their community and seek opportunities for emission reductions in their community.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA received state funding for Nonpoint Air reduction work that includes funding for voluntary air toxics reduction efforts through the Minnesota Technical Assistance Program (MNTAP) and our diesel emissions program. The work of MNTAP and the MPCA will focus on VOC reductions from small and medium sized businesses. Both organizations are exploring ways to target portions of the funding and effort to areas with potential environmental justice concerns.</p>
<p>6) Look for a) opportunities to reduce risk from air toxics and PM^{2.5} through voluntary and cooperative programs; and b) opportunities to integrate indoor air programs such as Tools for Schools, Asthma-ETS. Continue efforts. c) focused on monitoring and reduction activities related to sources that emit mercury and products that contain mercury and implement the necessary tools to reduce and/or eliminate the use and/or release of mercury to the environment.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Patraw/ Giddings</p>	<p>b) This is under MN Dept. of Health jurisdiction; c) <u>Mercury</u>: We will continue to seek mercury reduction through Mercury TMDL Implementation Plan, including reduction in mercury emission from air sources.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA is part of the Fine Particle Advance program to seek emission reductions in direct fine particles and precursors. The primary efforts are focused on NOx reductions and direct fine particle reductions from woodsmoke. These efforts are being coordinated through the reestablished Clean Air Minnesota effort.</p> <p>b) Not applicable to the MPCA.</p> <p>c) The MPCA's mercury reduction efforts are coordinated through the Mercury TMDL Implementation plan discussed in item 7, below.</p>

<p>7) Great Lakes Air Deposition Program (GLAD): Address the deposition of persistent bioaccumulative toxics (PBTs) in the waterways of the Great Lakes Region. This effort includes, but is not limited to, PBT air monitoring, source characterization, source allocation, and source reduction efforts.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Kohlasch</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Implement strategies to realize mercury emission reductions by timelines established in Mercury TMDL. 2) Promulgate mercury emission inventory rule to support implementation of the Mercury TMDL, expanded to include reduction plan submittal from existing sources. 3) Prepare State of Knowledge Report summarizing information on mercury releases and environmental response indicators. 4) Participate, <i>as state resources allow</i>, in implementation workgroups for Great Lakes Regional Collaboration regional mercury reduction strategies. <p>Projects supported by GLAD allocation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Electronic Rain Gauges at Mercury Deposition Network Sites 2) Mercury Filling Study 3) Mercury Removal from Metal Scrap Operations Training Event 	<p>FFY 2013 Report:</p> <p>1) The MPCA continues to seek reduction through the Mercury TMDL Implementation Plan. Notable reductions that are in the works include controls at EGUs or fuel switches at EGUs which will lead to significant reductions by 2016. Minnesota's taconite facilities continue to research mercury control technologies appropriate for their furnaces. The MPCA also continues to improve the state's mercury emission inventory to better understand priority sources.</p> <p>2) Minnesota's Mercury Emission Reduction Rule was published in the State Register on December 2, 2013. Hearings for the rule, if needed, are scheduled for early 2014. The MPCA anticipates the rule will be adopted by the fall of 2014.</p> <p>3) MPCA scientists created a Power Point presentation for the 2013 state of the knowledge report. The presentation was given to the Mercury TMDL Oversight Group and is available upon request.</p> <p>4) The MPCA continues to participate in the work of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration to seek regional mercury emission reductions.</p> <p>GLAD Allocation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Electronic rain gauges at Mercury Deposition sites were purchased and deployed to four sites in summer 2013. 2) The contract with the University of Minnesota for the mercury filling study was signed in September of 2013. 3) A workshop for metal scrap operations on the removal of mercury was conducted in April of 2013.
---	---	---	--

Strategic Goal 5: Enforcing Environmental Laws

Objective 5.1: Enforcement Environmental Laws. Pursue vigorous civil and criminal enforcement that targets the most serious water, air, and chemical hazards in communities. Assure strong, consistent, and effective enforcement of federal environmental laws nationwide.

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
<p>1) Submit draft Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS) plan for review, negotiation and approval by EPA.</p> <p>Implementation of the final CMS plan will begin the upcoming federal fiscal year, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. CMS plan should meet EPA's 2010 CAA Stationary Source CMS policy.</p> <p>CMS plan source category and frequency flags in AFS will be completed for the non-Title V source universe by December 1, 2013.</p> <p>EPA shall submit written correspondence to the State accepting or not accepting the CMS plan submitted.</p>	<p>August 31st of each year through 2016</p> <p>October 1st of each year through 2016</p> <p>December 1st of each year through 2016</p> <p>January 1st of each year through 2016</p> <p>Kilgriff/ Morrill (MPCA) Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>Submit draft Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS) plan for review, negotiation and approval by EPA.</p> <p>Implementation of the final CMS plan will begin the upcoming federal fiscal year, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. CMS plan should meet EPA's 2010 CAA Stationary Source CMS policy.</p> <p>CMS plan source category and frequency flags in AFS will be completed for the non-Title V source universe by December 1, 2013.</p> <p>EPA shall submit written correspondence to the State accepting or not accepting the CMS plan submitted.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: Draft 2013 CMS plan was submitted to the EPA and was approved. The plan was fully implemented and 100% of the EPA inspection commitment was met for both major and SM80 sources by 9/30/13.</p>

<p>2) Respond to citizen complaints, including those referred by EPA, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. Inspect as necessary.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Koelfgen/ Kilgriff/</p>	<p>MPCA staff have been responsive to complaints forwarded by EPA, and inspected as necessary and provided summary of outcomes to EPA. Kilgriff</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA has been responsive to complaints forwarded by the EPA and has followed up as necessary and provided a summary of the outcomes to the EPA.</p>
<p>3) Sources/landfills subject to the asbestos NESHAP regulations will be inspected in accordance with EPA's 1988. Implementation Strategy for Revised Asbestos NESHAP guidance.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Koelfgen/ Elling</p>	<p>Inspections will also be conducted by MPCA Solid Waste Program staff at landfills, focusing upon authorization to handle asbestos waste, manifesting and records and location information within the landfill for the disposal. Some complaint follow-up and phone response is also provided. Elling</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA Solid Waste staff inspected a total of 8 landfills this FFY.</p>
<p>4) Track and update EPA on recommendations made during the State Review Framework until completion, as it pertains to non-Title V sources.</p>	<p>Quarterly Koelfgen/ Kilgriff (MPCA) Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>MPCA will track and update EPA on recommendations made during the State Review Framework until completion, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. Kilgriff</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> SRF recommendations are discussed with the Air quality C and E staff to assist in insuring that the recommendations are noted and implemented as appropriate.</p>
<p>5) Require installation, operation and reporting of COMS and/or CEMS on all sources subject to requirements under State or Federal, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. Review and track quarterly COMS/CEMS excess emission reports (EERs) that are submitted by subject sources.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Quarterly Koelfgen/ Kilgriff (MPCA) Vuilleumier (EPA)</p>	<p>Require installation, operation and reporting of COMS and/or CEMS on all sources subject to requirements under State or Federal, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. Review and track quarterly COMS/CEMS excess emission reports (EERs) that are submitted by subject sources.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA reviews and tracks all CEMS and COMS reports for compliance and takes appropriate enforcement when violations are identified. Facility permits require installation of CEMS and COMS when applicable.</p>

FY 2013-2016 Reporting

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
<p>1) Submit compliance and enforcement information to meet EPA's Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) within the sixty (60) day standard required for reporting by the current Air Facility System (AFS) Information Collection Request (ICR), 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, 1986 Guidance on Federal Reportable Violations (FRVs) for Stationary Sources, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. Ensure data is complete, accurate and timely consistent with EPA policies and ICR. Such language should be included in the written agreement between the State and EPA.</p>	<p>60 day reporting as required by ICR</p> <p>Morrill/ Kilgriff</p>	<p>Submit compliance and enforcement information to meet EPA's Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) within the sixty (60) day standard required for reporting by the current Air Facility System (AFS) Information Collection Request (ICR), 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, 1986 Guidance on Federal Reportable Violations (FRVs) for Stationary Sources, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. Ensure data is complete, accurate and timely consistent with EPA policies and ICR. Such language should be included in the written agreement between the State and EPA.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA submits compliance information that meets the EPA's minimum Data Requirements and strives to ensure that data is complete, accurate, timely and consistent with EPA policies and ICR.</p>

<p>2) Sources/landfills subject to the asbestos NESHAP regulations will be inspected in accordance with EPA's 1988 Implementation Strategy for Revised Asbestos NESHAP guidance.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Koelfgen/ Elling (MPCA) Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>Inspections will also be conducted by MPCA Solid Waste Program staff at landfills, focusing upon authorization to handle asbestos waste, manifesting and records and location information within the landfill for the disposal. Some complaint follow-up and phone response is also provided. Kilgriff</p> <p>State will report asbestos demo/reno notification information, compliance evaluations and enforcement activities alphabetically by owner or operator to EPA", annually. Elling</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: A Summary report will be Sent to EPA. Below is a brief summary for the FFY.</p> <p>Inspections Complaints: 38 Routine: 27 Landfills: 8 File Review: 3 Total: 76 plus Kit's</p> <p>Enforcement: LOW – 2 NOV- 2 APO -32 STIPS -4</p>
<p>FY 2013-2016 – Enforcement</p>			
<p>Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)</p>	<p>Progress Target Dates</p>	<p>State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)</p>	<p>Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3</p>
<p>1) State will conduct monthly conference calls with EPA to discuss their efforts to resolve known violators. During these conference calls, newly discovered violators will be identified and discussions on the date, case lead, evidence, timeline for resolution and status of case, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. For State lead HPV cases unaddressed over the 270 day timeframe, EPA and State will determine which agency is best suited to take or maintain the lead for the case and what will be the best method of returning the source back into compliance. In addition, data management,</p>	<p>Monthly</p> <p>Koelfgen/ Kilgriff/ Morrill (MPCA) Dickens/ Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>Monthly conference calls held between our agencies to discuss cases. This activity is on target, and has been very productive in insuring timeliness by MPCA and EPA in following up on HPV cases. Kilgriff</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: This measure is fully met by the MPCA.</p> <p>EPA Comment: MPCA Data Privacy statute prohibits Minnesota to submit their enforcement data in a timely manner per the Information Collection Request for MDRs. The statute requires the information to be disclosed once the case is resolved or closed. However, MPCA provides updates when requested on enforcement cases during the monthly conference calls.</p>

reporting and any data related issues will be discussed during the conference calls, as it pertains to non-Title V sources.			
2) State will provide to EPA the status code and explanation for HPV sources listed on Headquarters Watch List, as it pertains to non-Title V sources. The Watch List ensures timely and appropriate response to significant non-compliers or longstanding violators through better data analysis and routine discussions between EPA HQs OECA, EPA Region 5, and State.	Quarterly, Koelfgen/ Kilgriff/ Morrill	MPCA provides the required status codes and explanations needed to EPA for sources listed on EPA HQs Watch List on a quarterly basis. Kilgriff	FFY 2013 Report: MPCA provides the required status codes to the EPA for sources that are on the watch list. The MPCA seldom has cases that are listed on the watch list, which demonstrates the Agency's ability to resolve cases in a timely fashion.
3) State will conduct its enforcement activities in accordance with EPA 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, the 1991 Clean Air Act Stationary Source Civil Penalty policy and the 1988 Revised Asbestos NESHAP Strategy, as it pertains to non-Title V sources.	Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Koelfgen/ Kilgriff	State will conduct its enforcement activities in accordance with EPA 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, the 1991 Clean Air Act Stationary Source Civil Penalty policy.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA follows the timely and appropriate enforcement response to high priority violations policy. Each Compliance and Enforcement staff person has a copy of the June 23, 1999 policy workbook and is required to follow the processes contained therein. EPA Comment: MPCA reports the other MDRs (full compliance evaluations, stack test reviews, Title V annual certification reviews) in a timely manner.
4) Where it has delegation, the State will copy Region 5 Air Enforcement and Air Permitting on all Part 61 or 63 applicability determinations that it issues at the time of issuance.	Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Koelfgen/ Kilgriff	Where it has delegation, the State will copy Region 5 Air Enforcement and Air Permitting on all Part 61 or 63 applicability determinations that it issues at the time of issuance.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA copies Region 5 Air staff on all party 61 or 63 formal applicability determinations.

APPENDIX A – Title V Outputs/Measures

It is **recommended** to include Title V outputs/measures either here or in the Executive Summary portion of this document, even though Title V activities are not a part of the State Air Pollution Control Program funded with EPA Clean Air Act funding.

Goal: 1 - Clean Air & Global Climate Change³			
Objective 1.2: Improve Air Quality. Achieve and maintain health-based air pollution standards and reduce risk from toxic air pollutants and indoor air contaminants.			
2011 – 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) - Reduce Criteria Pollutants and Regional Haze			
Permitting			
Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
1) Issue a target of 4 significant power plant and refinery Title V permits in CY 2012.	Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith	Virginia & Hibbing will be issued by Oct. 1, 2011 Flint Hills by Oct 2012 Marathon by Dec 2012	FFY 2013 Report: The following were issued: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hibbing Public Utilities Commission – 1/18/12 • Virginia Department of Public Utilities – 1/18/12 • Flint Hills Resources – 1/19/13 • St. Paul Park Refining (Marathon) – 4/10/13 • Xcel Energy-Allen S King – 6/20/13
2) Title V renewal backlog issue.	Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith	Issue 25 permit amendments for modifications that contain new or updated operating conditions to existing Title V facility permits.	FFY 2013 Report: 21 major amendments including updated operating conditions, were issued to Title V sources in FFY 2013. An additional 31 major amendment applications, 21 administrative amendment applications, and 63 reopenings were closed out by incorporating the required updated operating conditions in one of the 21 major amendment actions or 38 Title V permits issued during FFY 2013.
3) Provide timeliness data on new title V permits and significant permit modifications to EPA Regional offices for entry into TOPS.	Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith	Provide timeliness data on new title V permits and significant permit modifications to EPA Regional offices for entry into TOPS.	FFY 2013 Report: TOPS report was submitted January 2013 and July 2013.

³ EPA Measures are from National Program Guidance at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>, 40 CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>, and EPA Regional Priorities.

<p>4) Issue initial permits, significant modifications and renewal Title V permits and reduce backlog of renewal permits.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith</p>	<p>Issue initial permits, significant modifications and renewal Title V permits and reduce backlog of renewal permits.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA issued 38 Title V permits (includes initial permits and reissuances) and 21 separate major amendments during FFY 2013. These 59 permit actions closed out 52 applications for major amendments and 41 applications for renewed or initial Title V permits (93 permit applications closed out). During FFY 2013 we accepted 36 applications for initial permits and renewal Title V permits, and 34 applications for major amendments to Title V permits (70 permit applications received). Thus there has been an overall decrease in the backlog of initial Title V permit applications, renewal Title V permit applications, and significant modification applications.</p>
<p>5) Participate with EPA in Title V permit program evaluations, set target to respond to EPA's evaluation report and implement recommendations.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith</p>	<p>Participate with EPA in Title V permit program evaluations, set target to respond to EPA's evaluation report and implement recommendations.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> EPA program evaluation is scheduled to take place November 5-6, 2013.</p>
<p>6) Issue new Title V permits and significant permit modifications within 18 months of application completeness determined by permitting authority.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date Don Smith</p>	<p>Issue new Title V permits and significant permit modifications within 18 months of application completeness determined by permitting authority.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Of the 52 major amendment applications closed out in FFY 2013, 39 (77%) were issued within 18 months of the date of application receipt; 50 (96%) were issued within 18 months of the date that all needed information was received and the application package was "complete." Of the 41 applications for new or renewed Title V permits that were closed out in FFY 2013, 18 (44%) were issued within 18 months of the date of application receipt; 40 (97%) were issued within 18 months of the date that all needed information was received and the application package was "complete."</p>

Strategic Goal 5: Enforcing Environmental Laws

Objective 5.1: Enforcement Environmental Laws. Pursue vigorous civil and criminal enforcement that targets the most serious water, air, and chemical hazards in communities. Assure strong, consistent, and effective enforcement of federal environmental laws nationwide.

2011-2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) - Maintain Enforcement Presence⁴

FY 2013-2016 Enforcement – Monitoring

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
<p>1) Submit draft Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS) plan for review, negotiation and approval by EPA.</p> <p>Implementation of the final CMS plan will begin the upcoming federal fiscal year. CMS plan should meet EPA's 2010 CAA Stationary Source CMS policy.</p> <p>CMS plan source category and frequency flags in AFS will be completed for the non-Title V source universe by December 1, 2013.</p> <p>EPA shall submit written correspondence to the State accepting or not accepting the CMS plan submitted.</p>	<p>August 31st of each year through 2016</p> <p>October 1st of each year through 2016</p> <p>December 1st of each year through 2016</p> <p>January 1st of each year through 2016</p> <p>Kilgriff/ Morrill Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>Submit draft Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS) plan for review, negotiation and approval by EPA.</p> <p>Implementation of the final CMS plan will begin the upcoming federal fiscal year. CMS plan should meet EPA's 2010 CAA Stationary Source CMS policy.</p> <p>CMS plan source category and frequency flags in AFS will be completed for the non-Title V source universe by December 1, 2013.</p> <p>EPA shall submit written correspondence to the State accepting or not accepting the CMS plan submitted.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Draft 2013 CMS plan was submitted to the EPA and was approved. The plan was fully implemented and 100% of the EPA inspection commitment was met for both major and SM80 sources by 9/30/13.</p>

⁴ The Compliance and Enforcement Guidance is located at: (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/pdfs/strategic_plan_change_document_9-30-08.pdf)

2) Respond to citizen complaints, including those referred by EPA. Inspect as necessary.	Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Kilgriff/ Morrill	MPCA staff have been responsive to complaints forwarded by EPA, and inspected as necessary and provided summary of outcomes to EPA. Kilgriff	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA has been responsive to complaints forwarded by the EPA and has followed up as necessary and provided a summary of the outcomes to the EPA.
3) Track and update EPA on recommendations made during the State Review Framework until completion.	Quarterly, Kilgriff/ Morrill (MPCA) Marceillars (EPA)	MPCA staff are reminded periodically of key findings of the SRF, regarding recommended changes. Kilgriff	FFY 2013 Report: SRF recommendations are discussed with the Air quality C and E staff to assist in insuring that the recommendations are noted and implemented as appropriate.
4) Require installation, operation and reporting of COMS and/or CEMS on all sources subject to requirements under State or Federal. Review, track and report quarterly COMS/CEMS excess emission reports (EERs) that are submitted by subject sources.	Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Quarterly Kilgriff/ Morrill (MPCA) Vuilleumier (EPA)	Require installation, operation and reporting of COMS and/or CEMS on all sources subject to requirements under State or Federal. Review and track quarterly COMS/CEMS excess emission reports (EERs) that are submitted by subject sources.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA reviews and tracks all CEMS and COMS reports for compliance and takes appropriate enforcement when violations are identified. Facility permits require installation of CEMS and COMS when applicable.

FY 2013-2016 Enforcement – Reporting

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
1) Submit compliance and enforcement information to meet EPA's Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) within the sixty (60) day standard required for reporting by the 2012 Air Facility System (AFS) Information	60 day reporting as required by ICR Morrill/ Kilgriff	Submit compliance and enforcement information to meet EPA's Minimum Data Requirements (MDRs) within the sixty (60) day standard required for reporting by the 2012 Air Facility System (AFS) Information Collection Request (ICR), 1998 Timely and	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA submits compliance information that meets the EPA's minimum Data Requirements and strives to ensure that data is complete, accurate, timely and consistent with EPA policies and ICR.

<p>Collection Request (ICR), 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, 1986 Guidance on Federal Reportable Violations (FRVs) for Stationary Sources. Ensure data is complete, accurate and timely consistent with EPA policies and ICR. Such language should be included in the written agreement between the State and EPA.</p>		<p>Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, 1986 Guidance on Federal Reportable Violations (FRVs) for Stationary Sources. Ensure data is complete, accurate and timely consistent with EPA policies and ICR. Such language should be included in the written agreement between the State and EPA.</p>	
<p>FY 2013-2016 – Enforcement</p>			
<p>Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)</p>	<p>Progress Target Dates</p>	<p>State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)</p>	<p>Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3</p>
<p>1) State will conduct monthly conference calls with EPA to discuss their efforts to resolve known violators. During these conference calls, newly discovered violators will be identified and discussions on the date, case lead, evidence, timeline for resolution and status of case. For State lead HPV cases unaddressed over the 270 day timeframe, EPA and State will determine which agency is best suited to take or maintain the lead for the case and what will be the best method of returning the source back into compliance. In addition, data management, reporting and any data related issues will be discussed during the conference calls.</p>	<p>Monthly Koelfgen/ Kilgriff/ Morrill (MPCA) Dickens/ Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>Monthly conference calls held between our agencies to discuss cases. This activity is on target, and has been very productive in insuring timeliness by MPCA and EPA in following up on HPV cases. Kilgriff</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> This measure is fully met by the MPCA.</p>

<p>2) State will provide to EPA the status code and explanation for HPV sources listed on Headquarters Watch List, as it pertains to Title V sources. The Watch List ensures timely and appropriate response to significant non-compliers or longstanding violators through better data analysis and routine discussions between EPA HQs OECA, EPA Region 5 and State.</p>	<p>Quarterly Koelfgen/ Kilgriff/ Morrill</p>	<p>MPCA provides the required status codes and explanations needed to EPA for sources listed on HQs Watch List on a quarterly basis. Kilgriff</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA provides status codes for watch list facilities and fully meets these requirements.</p>
<p>3) State will conduct its enforcement activities in accordance with EPA 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, the 1991 Clean Air Act Stationary Source Civil Penalty policy and the 1988 Revised Asbestos NESHAP Strategy.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Koelfgen/ Kilgriff</p>	<p>State will conduct its enforcement activities in accordance with EPA 1998 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, the 1991 Clean Air Act Stationary Source Civil Penalty policy.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA follows the timely and appropriate enforcement response to high priority violations policy. Each Compliance and Enforcement staff person has a copy of the June 23, 1999 policy workbook and is required to follow the processes contained therein.</p>
<p>4) Where it has delegation, the State will copy Region 5 Air Enforcement and Air Permitting on all Part 61 or 63 applicability determinations that it issues at the time of issuance."</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Koelfgen/ Kilgriff</p>	<p>Where it has delegation, the State will copy Region 5 Air Enforcement and Air Permitting on all Part 61 or 63 applicability determinations that it issues at the time of issuance."</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA copies Region 5 Air on all formal part 61 and 63 applicability determinations.</p>

MINNESOTA PPG MAX WORKPLAN FFY 2013-2016
WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM (Sec. 106 & Sec. 319)
FFY 2013 Report with FFY 2014 Workplan Revisions (if applicable)

Strategic Goal: 2 – Protecting America’s Waters⁵				
Objective 2.2: Protect and Restore Watersheds and Aquatic Ecosystems: Protect the quality of rivers, lakes, streams, and wetlands on a watershed basis, and protect urban, coastal, and ocean waters.				
2011- 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) – Improve Water Quality on a Watershed Basis⁶				
Water Pollution Control (sec 106)				
Code	Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates & Contact	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
WQ-SP10.N11	Number of waterbodies identified in 2002 as not attaining water quality standards where standards are now fully attained (cumulative)	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill	Number will be updated at the end of FFY13.	FFY2013 Report: A cumulative total of 33 impaired waters were restored due to corrective actions in the watershed (versus new monitoring data) as of the 2014 303(d) list. <u>More information can be found at :</u> http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627 ; map can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15339
WQ-SP11	Remove the specific causes of waterbody impairment identified by states in 2002. (cumulative)	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill	Number will be updated at the end of FFY13.	FFY2013 Report: Waterbody impairments/pollutants can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627

⁵ EPA Strategic Goals are located at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>

⁶ EPA Measures are from National Program Guidance at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>, 40 CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>, and EPA Regional Priorities.

WQ-10 SP12. N11	Improve water quality conditions in impaired watersheds nationwide using the watershed approach. (cumulative)	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill	Success Stories submitted annually in Watershed Achievements Report.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> In their review of the final 2012 Watershed Achievements Report, US EPA Region 5 identified three connected Section 319 projects leading to water quality improvements in two waterbodies in the Heron Lake Watershed. These projects were implemented by the Heron Lake Watershed District and include the following: <i>BMP Program for Alba Township, Conservation Tillage Demonstration Plot and the Fulda Lakes BMP Project</i>. MPCA drafted a "Type 2" Success Story using the newly developed template on June 5, 2013. The success story was later approved by US EPA Headquarters and is awaiting publication to the web. [MPCA concurs with EPA language change here]</p>
WQ-01a	Number of numeric water quality standards for total nitrogen and for total phosphorus adopted by States and Territories and approved by EPA, or promulgated by EPA, for all waters within the State or Territory for each of the following waterbody types: lake/reservoirs, rivers/streams, and estuaries.	Katrina Kessler/ Mark Tomasek	The MPCA has already adopted numeric eutrophication water quality standards for lakes, and is in the process of doing so for rivers/streams. The stream eutrophication criteria will be formally proposed and hearings completed by the end of FFY13.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> Draft River Eutrophication Standards have begun moving through the rulemaking process and will be formally public noticed for 51 days on November 18, 2013. Administrative hearings for the draft standards are scheduled for January 8, 2014. MPCA anticipates final adoption of the standards in July 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> EPA supports MPCA's pursuit of nitrate criteria to protect aquatic life, but it is unclear how the development of a nitrate criterion will protect against eutrophication effects from nitrogen pollution.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response:</u> The basis of MPCA's adoption of a nitrate WQS is for aquatic life protection. It is expected that controlling phosphorus will protect state surface waters from eutrophication impacts.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (4/2014)</u> Measure WQ-1a includes eutrophication effects only. Therefore, it makes sense to move the text on MPCA's nitrate aquatic life WQS from WQ-1a to WQ-3 since the WQS is about protecting aquatic life from the toxic effects of nitrate and not eutrophication impacts.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (4/2014):</u> Agree. We moved both paragraphs under "Commitment" and "Report" from this section to WQ-03, per EPA suggestion.</p>

WQ-03a	Number, and national percent, of States and Territories that within the preceding three year period, submitted new or revised water quality criteria acceptable to EPA that reflect new scientific information from EPA or other resources not considered in the previous standards.	Katrina Kessler/ Mark Tomasek	<p>The MPCA is in the process of re-designing the "triennial review" process to allow for more regular review and prioritization of water quality criteria development/revision needs, and to recognize that some criteria development or revision take longer to accomplish than others. The MPCA will solicit EPA input on this process improvement, and will complete the process improvement effort by the end of FFY13.</p> <p>The MPCA is adopting stream eutrophication criteria and additional aquatic life criteria that will be formally proposed and hearings completed by the end of FFY13. Additionally, the MPCA is working on a number of site specific standards and will seek EPA approval prior to regulatory implementation.</p> <p>The MPCA is also developing an aquatic life toxicity-based numeric water quality standard for nitrate. The draft Technical Support Document for the nitrate standard development will be revised by the end of FFY13 to reflect studies currently underway by the state of Illinois and EPA. <i>(This paragraph was moved from WQ-01a, per EPA suggestion.)</i></p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> The MPCA has communicated the redesign of the triennial review with EPA Region 5 (August 8, 2013 presentation) and external stakeholders (September 4, 2013 webinar). The MPCA plans to solicit input on water quality standard priorities in November 2013 and hold hearings to receive external input in later 2013 or early 2014.</p> <p>MPCA is waiting on receipt of additional nitrate toxicity data from EPA Region 5. Once all of the data is available it is anticipated that the administration rule making process for adoption of aquatic life nitrate standards will take approximately another two years. <i>(This paragraph was moved from WQ-01a, per EPA suggestion.)</i></p> <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> Minnesota continues to meet this national performance measure with receipt of the Lake Nokomis Nutrient site-specific standard on August 8, 2013. Region 5 provided a response to the MPCA on December 10, 2013, acknowledging that the new TSR process meets CWA public participation requirements. In addition, EPA input on specific TSR priorities will be sent by the end of the public comment period.</p>
WQ-04a	Percentage of submissions of new or revised water quality standards from States and Territories that are approved by EPA.	Katrina Kessler/ Mark Tomasek	MPCA will continue to provide Technical Support Documents and other technical information to EPA Region 5 prior to rule adoption for discussion and common	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> Discussions with EPA Region 5 staff on draft rule revisions have been ongoing. Specifically, discussions are on river eutrophication, human health methods, use class changes and antidegradation revisions.</p>

			understanding. Include EPA in triennial review discussions and priority setting to assist in generating workload expectations. This measure's final determination and reporting is done at the national level.	<p>EPA Comment: The Region continues to collaborate and provide technical assistance where needed on Minnesota rules under development and proposed. More specifically, during FFY 2013, the Region has provided written input to MPCA on chlorides, MN new triennial review process, MN's proposed variance rule, and MN's proposed stream eutrophication standards. EPA received and approved two site specific nutrient criteria for reservoirs (Hiawatha and Nokomis) and a variance (Mesabi Nugget) within its 60 day statutory deadlines.</p>
WQ-05	Number of States and Territories that have adopted and are implementing their monitoring strategies in keeping with established schedules.	Glenn Skuta/ Katrina Kessler	<p>Continue to implement the 2011 Minnesota Monitoring Strategy: Intensively monitor an average of 8 watersheds each year (IWM). This includes biological, physical and chemical monitoring of streams; flow and chemistry monitoring at the outlets of each watershed; monitoring 80-100 lakes each year (focusing on lakes >500 acres); and supporting citizen and local monitoring. This level of effort depends on continued state funding at the same level as the SFY2012-2013 biennium; if that funding is not continued, the planned accomplishments will need to be adjusted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to actively participate in the national probabilistic monitoring efforts (lakes, streams, wetlands, coastal waters), and conduct state-level probabilistic monitoring either as an add-on to the national studies or through a parallel state monitoring effort (example: state wetland WQ monitoring). 	<p>FFY2013 Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of the Intensive Watershed Monitoring 10-year cycle is on track. Through FFY13, monitoring has been performed in 60% of the state's watersheds. Wetland assessments using a combination of desktop evaluations and extrapolations from random wetland survey data were included in the watershed reports for the Twin Cities, Granite Falls, and Crow Wing watersheds in 2013. Watershed monitoring and assessment reports were completed and webposted for an additional 7 major watersheds in FFY2013. Operation of the Watershed Pollutant Load Monitoring Network and expansion of the network to the subwatershed level are proceeding well. 20 installations of subwatershed gages were completed in 2013, bringing the tally to 83 of the 124 to be installed by the end of 2015, on pace to meet that goal. A webpage with data output maps for watershed loads, flow weighted mean concentrations, and yields went live this year: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-types-and-programs/surface-water/streams-and-rivers/watershed-pollutant-load-monitoring-network.html#products-data No NARS field work was performed in 2013. The report "Pharmaceuticals and Endocrine Active Chemicals in Minnesota Lakes" was released this year. By the end of 2014, ambient groundwater network will include > 270 wells. As of August 2013 the network

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct wetland sampling in IWM watersheds. • Continue to monitor ambient ground water quality in accordance with the state's integrated ground water quality monitoring system. In this inter-agency approach, the MPCA monitors about 100 wells per year, focusing on non-agricultural chemicals in urban and natural areas. • Actively participate in and attend the R5 hosted webinars and bio-assessment meetings. • Transfer water quality data to EPA's STORET Warehouse from EQuIS during 2013 (ongoing). • Communicate with external stakeholders about the purpose and expectations of TALU. • Continue to sample to support TALU classification system, and complete data analysis needed for TALU development. 	<p>includes 210 wells. The network is sampled yearly for > 100 chemicals, including nitrate, phosphorus, sulfate, chloride, trace metals such as arsenic and manganese, and a suite of 68 volatile organic compounds (VOCs). In 2013, the network also was sampled to determine perfluorochemical (PFC) concentrations. Each year about twenty percent of the network (40 wells per year) is sampled for a suite of over 100 contaminants of new or emerging concern (CECs) to better understand presence and extent of these chemicals and inform future monitoring and management efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In spring of 2013 MPCA's EQuIS Database exceeded the storage milestone of 10 million results. The database is growing quickly and MPCA foresees the database exceeding 15 million results within the 2013 calendar year. Data continues to flow to STORET. <p>EPA Comment: EPA appreciates the extensive work and investment MPCA has placed on improving and maintaining the State's monitoring program and implementing its monitoring strategy. On a side-note, EPA appreciates MPCA's work to assess Lake Superior beaches for E. coli, and we look forward to continuing to discuss sampling fecal contaminants on TwinCities inland lake beaches.</p>
WQ-07	Number of States and Territories that provide electronic information using the Assessment Database version 2 or later (or compatible system) and geo-reference the information to facilitate the integrated reporting of assessment data.	Katrina Kessler	Complete necessary efforts in FY13 to submit Integrated Report assessment information using the Assessment Database along with geo-referencing information in 2014. If changes are made to the 303(d) list after ADB submission, the state will revise the ADB and geo-referencing files as needed and resubmit to EPA. During 2013, begin preparations for reporting and begin entering assessment information into ADB. MPCA will continue efforts with MDH and Reg. 5 to explore/refine assessment methodology for water	<p>FFY2013 Report: The MPCA anticipates submitted the integrated report and assessment information in 2014. In the meantime the MPCA is working with Region 5 to clarify the expectations and to maximize the utility of the submittal for both MPCA and Region 5.</p>

			use assessment determinations for waterbodies with Public Water Supply intakes. MPCA will also work to ensure that Integrated Report (303(d) and 305(b)) determinations are accurately and consistently reflected in the ADB.	
WQ-08b	Number, and national percent, of approved TMDLs, that are established by States and approved by EPA [State TMDLs] on a schedule consistent with national policy. Note: A TMDL is a technical plan for reducing pollutants in order to attain water quality standards. The terms 'approved' and 'established' refer to the completion and approval of the TMDL itself.	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill	FFY commitment is 50 TMDLs.	FFY2013 Report: EPA approved 9 TMDL projects addressing 51 impairments in FFY2013. EPA has indicated that the goal for FFY2014 is 50.
WQ-10	Number of waterbodies identified by States (in 1998/2000 or subsequent years) as being primarily nonpoint source (NPS)-impaired that are partially or fully restored. (cumulative)	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill	Water bodies that meet Success Stories Criteria will be submitted annually in Watershed Achievements Report and MPCA will work with EPA to develop complete WQ-10 write-ups for publication on EPA's web page.	FFY2013 Report: The draft 2013 Watershed Achievements Report (WAR) includes information on: intensive watershed monitoring, impaired waters, approved TMDLs and the Minnesota load Monitoring Network as well as previous impairments now meeting water quality standards. In addition, included are descriptions of completed, active and newly awarded nonpoint source projects and predicted pollutant reduction data from 1997-2013. The draft 2013 WAR was submitted to US EPA Region 5 on August 30, 2013. Comments were received on September 30, 2013 and revisions are underway.

<p>WQ-12a</p>	<p>Percent of facilities covered by NPDES permits that are considered current. [Note: Measure will still set target and commitment and report results in both % and #.]</p>	<p>Aaron Luckstein</p>	<p>The MPCA will ensure that 100 % of wastewater general NPDES permits are considered current and 90% of facilities covered under wastewater general permits have current notices of coverage. The MPCA will also ensure that 90 % of wastewater NPDES individual permits will be considered current. Currently, the MPCA has 1158 wastewater NPDES permitted facilities, 699 facilities covered under individual wastewater permits and 459 facilities covered under general permits. <u>EPA:</u> Based on ICIS data and information from State for CAFOs, for FY'12 EOY, we have reported, there are 737 individual NPDES permits and 1625 facilities covered by non-SW GPs (which includes 1253 facilities covered by a GP for CAFOs). <u>MPCA response:</u> WQ-13d below covers CAFOs and there are different State Commitments associated with it. MPCA is proposing that WQ-12a only includes non-CAFO wastewater permits and WQ-13d addresses CAFOs to reduce confusion going forward.</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> As of the end of 9/30/2013, 70% (1240/1788) of permits were considered current with 67% of our total major permits considered current. This total includes both individual and general permits. 324 of the expired permits are for the MNG30 Ballast Water permit which was final issued on October 11, 2013 and 43 are permittees with coverage under the MNG25 and MNG255 permits which is currently being negotiated with EPA R5 staff. Once Notice of Coverages are issued for the 324 permittees under the MNG30 general permit our current permit percentage will be at 88%.</p> <p>For FFY2013 we anticipate similar performance level due to the difficulty of permits getting issued associated with impaired waters. We're also concentrating on watershed permitting.</p> <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> It appears that MPCA is not on track to meet the commitment. We request that MPCA provide more specificity as to the permits or class of permits for which you are experiencing difficulty in issuing and the permit conditions which are problematic.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response:</u> The driver behind many of the delays is specific to new limits and the work that goes into determining those new limits and perhaps more importantly the negotiation of compliance construction schedules, and discussing the rules, regulations, and science behind the new limits with permit holders and public interest groups.</p> <p>The effluent limit review process has become more complex and time consuming during recent years because of several new water quality parameters as discussed below. In general, facilities are not targeted because of their size or class, but rather their location within a drainage network or, in some cases, the dilution capacity of the receiving water. When new water quality parameters interests are identified, an increase in the need for in-depth analytical work is expected during the first five years following the adoption of the standard or the subsequent collection of data.</p>
---------------	--	------------------------	---	--

				<p>Lake Eutrophication Lake eutrophication standards (LES) were adopted in 2008. MPCA began implementing limits to address these standards in early 2010. Currently we are in the first five year permit cycle following the adoption of LES. Most of the State's NPDES dischargers are upstream of a lake impaired for eutrophication. Given that RES are dependent on both a cause and a response variable, the process for developing phosphorus limits involves the development and interpretation of water quality models. This can be quite time consuming but provides a site-specific answer that takes into account localized conditions and which will be compatible with TMDL studies as they are completed in the future.</p> <p>River Eutrophication River eutrophication standards (RES) are scheduled to be adopted in the summer of 2014. In consideration of these draft standards, all permits are currently being evaluated to determine whether existing conditions are sufficient to support the existing narrative river eutrophication standard.</p> <p>Sulfate and Wild Rice Where applicable, permits are also being examined to determine the need for a more restrictive sulfate limits to support downstream wild rice waters. This standard is currently being re-evaluated, so limit determinations can be complex.</p> <p>Salty Discharge Parameters In recent years, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff became aware of issues associated with "salty discharges" from industrial and municipal facilities. As a result, MPCA staff began to request additional monitoring for these facilities and also began assigning effluent limits to facilities that already have data which shows a reasonable potential to exceed a water quality standard. More monitoring data are now available upon review, and as such, limit determinations are now more frequently being made during permit reviews. The need for limits and/or monitoring is not based solely upon facility size, but rather, the dilution capacity of the receiving water and the occurrence of high ionic strength industrial waste streams.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Once new limits are determined, the MPCA then becomes involved in several discussions with permit holders regarding those limits and determining if they can meet the limit without going through construction. If it is determined that construction is needed, the long process of determining what is as soon as possible (following the May 10, 2007 Compliance Schedules for Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations in NPDES Permits Memo from James A. Hanlon) for the permit holder to meet the limit and what compliance schedule steps need to be placed in permit to ensure compliance. This is a very time consuming process.</p> <p><u>EPA Comment (4/2014):</u> We would like to bring it to MPCA's attention regarding backlog #s as of EOY FFY'13: MN's major permits current was 76% and overall permits current was 90%. We have not counted facilities covered under the general permit # MNG30 for Ballast waters towards backlog.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (4/2014):</u> Duly noted.</p>
WQ-13a	Number, and national percent, of facilities covered under either an individual or general MS-4 permit.	Marni Karnowski	The MPCA will reissue the general stormwater permit for small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). Once issued, all phase II small MS4s will receive coverage under the general permit or individual permits, as necessary. The current regulated universe consists of 233 phase II small MS4s and 2 phase 1 large MS4s. The MPCA will reissue the 2 phase 1 large MS4 individual permits as they come due for reissuance.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> The General Stormwater Permit for Small MS4s became effective August 1, 2013. Permittees are required to submit SWPPP Documents (part two of the application process) during the months of October, November, and December 2013. The goal is to issue coverage for all MS4s within 150 days of SWPPP Document (permit application) receipt from each MS4.</p>
	Number of MS4 audits or inspections conducted (National Goal is to have audits or inspections conducted at each small MS4 once every 7 years)	Marni Karnowski	The MPCA will continue with process improvement efforts to improve the MS4 audit and inspection processes in order to meet the national goal. The MPCA will meet targets in state-specific Compliance Monitoring Strategy, as negotiated on an annual basis.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> The MPCA is in the process of implementing a new MS4 Audit process, which resulted from a continuous improvement project. MPCA conducted 17 Audits of Small MS4s in FFY 2013. MPCA will continue to work to meet National Goals for Audit numbers.</p>

WQ-13b	Number, and national percent, of facilities covered under either an individual or general industrial storm water permit.	Marni Karnowski/ Ken Moon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MNR050000. A general NPDES permit was issued April 2010 and expires in April 2015. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of permitted facilities covered by this permit:1,521 (including No Exposure sites that must register in the program: 3,560) • There are 140 individual NPDES point source permits, with stormwater coverage included. <p><u>FFY 3rd quarter of 2013 :</u> Begin permit readiness and updates for 2014 reissuance.</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MNR050000. A general NPDES permit was issued April 2010 and expires in April 2015. Reissuance work for permit is underway. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of permitted facilities covered by this permit:1,521 (including No Exposure sites that must register in the program: 3,560) • There are 140 individual NPDES point source permits, with stormwater coverage included.
WQ-13c	Number of facilities covered under either an individual or general construction storm water site permit.	Marni Karnowski/ Brian Livingston	The MPCA will reissue the Construction Stormwater General permit and ensure that the Federal Construction & Development rule requirements are incorporated. Sites over 1 acre will be covered by permit and those entities taking on a portion of a permitted site will be issue coverage under the Permit Transfer Form. Permit data will be transparent- updated daily- on the MPCA's website.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General permit reissued Aug. 1, 2013 which incorporated the 2009 fed. C&D rule • 1643 sites issued coverage under the general permit Oct. 1 2012-Sept. 20, 2013 • 359* portions of existing permitted sites transferred coverage between Oct. 1 2012-Sept. 20, 2013 (*2.5 mo. data entering backlog; number will be higher) • General permit and all individual site permitting data available on website and uploaded from database every 24 hours.
WQ-13d	Number of facilities covered under either an individual or general CAFO permit.	Randy Hukriede	95% of all CAFOs required by EPA to have an NPDES permit, and facilities with 1000 or more animal units, are covered by a current NPDES or SDS permit.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u></p> <p>As of October 1st 2013, 99% of all CAFOs required by EPA to have an NPDES permit, and facilities with 1000 or more animal units, are covered by a current NPDES or SDS permit.</p>

WQ-14a	Number, and national percent, of Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) that are discharging to POTWs with Pretreatment Programs that have control mechanisms in place that implement applicable pretreatment requirements.	Paul Scheirer	Report Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) in delegated pretreatment POTWs with current unexpired control mechanisms: # with, # without, and % with. For FFY13 Report twice a year as follows: MY of current FY (by March 31) End of FY (by September 30)	FFY2013 Report: # of SIUs with Control Measures: 407 # of SIUs: 407 % of SIU Permits Current: 100%
WQ-14b	Number of Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs) in non-delegated pretreatment POTWs with MPCA permits: # with, # without, and % with.	Paul Scheirer	Report known Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs) in non-delegated pretreatment POTWs with MPCA permits: # with, # without, and % with. For FFY13 Report twice a year as follows: MY of current FY (by March 31) End of FY (by September 30)	FFY2013 Report: # of Non-Pretreatment CIUs with Control Measures: 57 Total# of Non-Pretreatment CIUs: 57 % of CIU Permits Current: 100%
WQ-15a	Percent of major dischargers in Significant Noncompliance (SNC) at any time during the fiscal year.	Paul Scheirer & Ken Moon	The MPCA will report the annual percentage of Major Facilities in Significant Noncompliance. End of FFY 2013 (Sept., 2013) Run reporting in December, 2013	FFY2013 Report: The MPCA's FFY13 SNC rate was 5% which exceeds the goal of 13%.
WQ-19a	Number of high priority state NPDES permits that are issued in the fiscal year.	Aaron Luckstein	The MPCA will issue at least 80% of its high priority NPDES permits as scheduled. The MPCA maintains a 2 year priority permit schedule, which often fluctuates due to factors such as changes to water quality standards or effluent limit guidelines, potential to impact impaired waters, changes to national priorities, etc. The MPCA will select 20% of the facilities on the candidate list as priority and then	FFY2013 Report: MPCA committed to reissuing 20% of the FY13 full list of priority permits or 13 permits. We identified 13 permits that MPCA would attempt to reissue in FY13. EPA's goal is that 80% of the 13 permits be reissued in FY13. 80% of 13 permits is 11 permits. MPCA reissued 8 or 62% of the 13 permits. A table of the permits that were issued and the dates of reissuance and the permits that were not reissued and the reasons for delay in reissuance is attached.

		<p>issue 80% of the permits associated with those Facilities.</p> <p><u>EPA</u>: Consistent with the joint priority to address expired mining permits MPCA will modernize and public notice all of these permits prior to mid-year federal FY14.</p> <p><u>MPCA response</u>: The MPCA is not aware of any discussions regarding the joint priority to address expired mining permits mentioned above. All mining permits expired >2 years are included in the priority permit schedule and therefore already being considered within the evaluation of selecting the facilities on the candidate list as priority. The MPCA is proposing no changes to the original State Commitment language which was mandated by EPA R5 in September 2012.</p> <p>Since the comments above, a Mining Joint Priority has been agreed upon by EPA and MPCA with specific commitments & timeframes (Kristen Faulhaber & Leigh Jorento).</p>	<p>While MPCA did not meet its FY13 priority permit commitment regarding the 13 selected permits, we did in fact reissue 8 permits that were on the original FY13 full list of priority permits (list as follows at bottom of email). In essence, MPCA reissued 14 or more than 20% of the FY13 full list of priority permits, thus achieving the main goal of priority permit reissuance.</p> <p>MPCA hopes that in the future, EPA will only require that states commit to reissuance a percentage or number of permits rather than specifically listing each permit to be reissued. By allowing this flexibility, EPA would find that most states can meet their commitments.</p> <p><i>ATTACH SPREADSHEET: FY13 Priority Permits Issued and Not Reissued.xlsx</i></p> <p><u>EPA Comment</u>: We request that MPCA provide more specificity as to the nature of the comments that have held up issuance of the permits and the source of the comments. EPA notes that several of the unissued permits are for power plant that could have a significant impact on the receiving streams.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u>: The following is a list of the Priority permits that missed the 9/30/13 deadline and reason for delay:</p> <p><u>Xcel Energy – Allen S King Generating Plant MN0000825</u> Reason for delay: The draft permit was on public notice from August 14, 2013 through September 13, 2013. Comments regarding technology-based effluent limitations for bottom ash transport water in light of proposed EPA rulemaking were received from the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy and the Sierra Club jointly. These groups requested the following actions regarding the draft permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include within the Plant’s permit BAT limits for discharge of bottom ash handling water based on zero liquid discharge, including a requirement that the Plant switch to dry bottom ash handling, or to completely recycle its
--	--	---	--

				<p>bottom ash handling water back into the ash handling system;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include a thermal discharge limitation that prohibits Plant discharges greater than 3 °F above the natural temperature of the receiving water, in compliance with Minn. R. 7050.0222, Subp. 3; • determine whether or not the substantially hotter discharges recently measured at the Plant violate state law; • require disclosure of mercury loadings for the past three years at all locations tested to confirm that the rehabilitation project resulted in a long-term reduction in mercury discharges, and require quarterly testing to ensure that monitoring data is sufficient to confirm ongoing compliance with the Plant’s Mercury Minimization Plan; • include a final limit for phosphorus in the effluent limitation section of the permit, and if the facility cannot immediately achieve this limit, incorporate it as a “final limit” and impose a compliance schedule; • require compliance with the PMP within three years of permit issuance; and • establish discharge limitations for total suspended solids and BAT-based effluent limits for toxic pollutants for the spring water flow from the coal pile; if PCA does not currently have data to support development of BAT standards, it should require that the spring water flow be measured and tested on a regular basis for pollutants known to be present in coal pile discharges to determine if this flow is polluted. <p>Final issuance of the permit was delayed due to the comments received. MPCA staff are in the process of responding to these comments. Significant changes to the permit may require another public notice period and possible MPCA Citizen’s Board decision.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Xcel – Minnesota Valley Plant MN0000906 Reason for delay: Public notice period ended 10/7/2013. Start of public notice period delayed due to resolving permittee comments regarding facility closure reporting.</p> <p>Xcel – Red Wing Generating Plant MN0000850 Reason for delay: Public notice period ended 10/7/2013. Start of public notice period delayed due to resolving permittee comments on impact of electronic reporting requirements on preliminary draft permit.</p> <p>Xcel – Wilmarth Generating Plant MN0000914 Reason for delay: Public notice period ended 10/3/2013. Start of public notice period delayed due to resolving permittee comments on impact of electronic reporting requirements on preliminary draft permit.</p> <p>Xcel Energy – Prairie Island Nuclear MN0004006 Reason for delay: Public notice period ended 9/18/2013. Final reissuance delayed due to comments received during public notice period from Prairie Island Indian Community. Those comments focused on the continuation of ecological monitoring and the facility’s interaction with the Indian Community.</p> <p>Seneca Foods Corp – Arlington MN0000264 Reason for delay: Drafting of the permit was delayed due to resolution of thermal limits and sweet corn silage issues at another Seneca facility (Rochester). Since both facilities are similar, creating a consistent approach to address the issues is needed. In addition, the Industrial By-Products (IBP) General Permit was in the process of being revised and reissued. Many of the requirements in the Seneca - Arlington individual permit are consistent with those in the IBP general permit, so the decision was made to wait for the revised IBP general permit. The IBP general permit was reissued on December 20, 2013 and the Seneca – Arlington permit is currently being drafted.</p> <p>The MPCA would like to reiterate that while we did not meet the FY13 priority permit commitment regarding the 13 selected</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>permits, we did in fact reissue 8 permits that were on the original FY13 full list of priority permits (list as follows at bottom of email). In essence, MPCA reissued 14 or more than 20% of the FY13 full list of priority permits, thus achieving the main goal of priority permit reissuance.</p> <p>MPCA hopes that in the future, EPA will revert back to only requiring that states commit to reissuance a percentage or number of permits rather than specifically listing each permit to be reissued. By allowing this flexibility, EPA would find that most states can meet their commitments and the intent of the priority permits program is met.</p>
WQ-20	Number of facilities that have traded at least once plus all facilities covered by an overlay permit that incorporates trading provisions with an enforceable cap.	Gene Soderbeck	<p>FFY13 Commitment: 23 facilities have traded at least once. There are also 44 facilities currently covered under the Minnesota River Basin General Phosphorus Permit with enforceable caps. These numbers are our baseline and will increase in each year to reflect Pre-TMDL trades for new dischargers upstream of impaired waters or within and the Minnesota River Basin. MPCA will maintain this same work level in subsequent years, FY2014, FY2015 & FY2016.</p>	<p>FFY2013 Report: 17 facilities have traded at least once. There are also 44 facilities currently covered under the Minnesota River Basin General Phosphorus Permit with enforceable caps. These numbers are our baseline and will increase in each year to reflect Pre-TMDL trades for new dischargers upstream of impaired waters or within and the Minnesota River Basin. MPCA will maintain this same work level in subsequent years, FY2014, FY2015 & FY2016.</p>
WQ-26	Number of states and territories implementing nutrient reduction strategies by (1) setting priorities on a watershed or state-wide basis, (2) establishing nutrient reduction targets, and (3) continuing to make progress (and provide performance milestone information to EPA) on	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill/ Wayne Anderson	<p>New measure 2.1 <i>loadings from source sectors and/or watersheds</i> – We have completed the N and P source evaluations by sector and we have completed the watershed targeting through both monitoring and modeling. Additionally, over the next year MN will evaluate what level of implementation and associated cost is needed to achieve various reductions levels from a baseline (i.e.</p>	<p>FFY2013 Report: A draft Minnesota State Nutrient Reduction Strategy has been completed and is open for public and stakeholder review until Dec 18, 2013. The strategy includes geographic priorities and sources, goals and baselines for reduction efforts and identifies needed reductions to meet milestone goals and programs to help implement those reductions in the states three major drainage basins. It also sets targets for reduction planning at the HUC8 level. The strategy reports that the state is on target to have River Eutrophication Standards by 2015 and calls for continued action on a nitrogen toxicity standard for rivers. The draft strategy is available on the MPCA external website.</p>

	<p>adoption of numeric nutrient criteria for at least one class of waters by no later than 2016. (cumulative)</p>	<p>15%, 25%, 35% and 45% load reductions at the HUC8 and greater watershed scale). The level of needed BMP implementation will be assessed at the HUC8 level, with assumed BMP performance based on previous monitoring and modeling applications within Minnesota, the scientific literature, and best professional judgment.</p> <p><i>2.2 numeric goals for loading reductions for each targeted watershed or source sector</i> – Over the next year, the MPCA will be working with an Interagency Coordination Team and Tetra Tech to propose appropriate interim target reduction levels for watersheds and sectors. These reduction targets are expected to be included in Minnesota’s State Level Nutrient Reduction Strategy for consideration by HUC8 and finer level watersheds as they develop their own specific watershed nutrient reduction strategies.</p> <p>2.3 MPCA will provide an update on progress towards nutrient criteria milestones with reasons for missed milestones by Sept 2013. (added, after epa comment)</p>	<p>http://www.pca.state.mn.us/zihy1146</p> <p>EPA Comment: This language implies that nitrate criteria would suffice for nitrogen-nutrient criteria. EPA gives MN full credit on Part 3 of WQ-26 because MPCA concluded that, at this point, nitrogen criteria cannot be developed because MN waters are TP limited. Consider the following added language (in blue below):</p> <p>MPCA: The strategy reports that the state is on target to have River Eutrophication Standards for total phosphorus by 2015 and that, at this point, eutrophication criteria for nitrogen cannot be developed because MN waters are TP limited. In addition, the strategy calls for continued action on a nitrogen toxicity standard for rivers. [MPCA added this paragraph per EPA suggestion]</p> <p>Hearings were held in January 2014 for the adoption of river eutrophication standards. The Administrative Law Judge report is anticipated March 24, 2014. Upon receipt the MPCA expects to bring adoption to the April 2014 MPCA Citizens Board for approval with subsequent transmittal to EPA with final EPA approval by late summer 2014.</p> <p>We’re fine with what was added for WQ-26</p>
--	---	---	---

SS-1	<p>Number and national percent, using a constant denominator, of Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) permits with a schedule incorporated into an appropriate enforceable mechanism, including a permit or enforcement order, with specific dates and milestones, including a completion date consistent with Agency guidance, which requires:</p> <p>1) Implementation of a Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) which will result in compliance with the technology and water quality-based requirements of the Clean Water Act; or 2) implementation of any other acceptable CSO control measures consistent with the 1994 CSO Control Policy; or 3) completion of separation after the baseline date. (cumulative)</p>	Bill Priebe	<p>FFY 2013: The St. Paul and Minneapolis CSO Permits have expired. St. Paul is 100 separated. Minneapolis has completed all identified significant sewer separation work and we have no documentation regarding overflow events from these permitted sites in 2011. Next step options for these CSO permits are still under negotiation with the permittees. Potential permit options include termination or reissuance with enforcement mechanisms and/or compliance schedules to address overflows.</p>	<p>FFY2013 Report: The MPCA continued to work with the Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis as well as the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services to either terminate or acceptably reissue these permits. There is not concurrence between all three partners. Our goal is to manage these expired CSO permits, one at a time, over the next two years.</p>
------	---	-------------	--	---

	<p>Number of type of compliance monitoring actions performed at point sources, indirect dischargers, and biosolid generators or users</p>	<p>Paul Scheirer & Ken Moon</p>	<p>Meet targets in, state-specific Compliance Monitoring Strategy, as negotiated on an annual basis.</p> <p>Negotiating FFY 13 CMS currently.</p> <p><u>EPA:</u> In light of MPCA's current resource challenges and the associated reductions in majors coverage, EPA and MPCA will re-evaluate progress on majors coverage at midyear FY13. Projections for coverage over the long-term (i.e., the life of the PPG) should be discussed regularly between the agencies to ensure that resources are adequate for ensuring compliance.</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> See attached EOY spreadsheet</p> <p>Negotiating FFY 13/14 CMS currently.</p>
<p>New item 1)</p>	<p>Joint State/EPA Clean Water Act Action Plan Permitting and Enforcement Work Plan</p>	<p>Wendy Turri/Jeff Stollenwerk</p>	<p>Working together, U.S. EPA and MPCA will annually conduct a CWA planning process to identify national, regional and state priorities consistent with the CWA Action Plan guidance. The resulting collaborative annual Joint Work Plan will use all available mechanisms to accomplish its stated goals including federal and state work sharing, innovative approaches to monitoring facilities or addressing violations, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperate in the development and implementation of the annual Joint State/ U.S. EPA R5 CWA Enforcement and Permitting Work Plan. 	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> We worked together to develop the permitting and compliance work plan. MPCA staff attended monthly Compliance and Permitting meetings with EPA to assure that the work plan commitments are being addressed. Additionally, all leadership wastewater staff attended meetings with EPA. These were intended to be monthly but scheduling has been difficult. Re-establishing these meetings as monthly is a priority.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Participate in annual planning meetings to develop collaborative annual Joint Work Plans. o Participate in regular quarterly meetings to discuss progress towards meeting annual permitting and enforcement priorities outlined in the Work Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track established priorities for each FFY. 	
--	--	--	---	--

Water – Non-point Source (sec 319)

SP-10	Number of waterbodies identified by States (in 1998/2000 or subsequent years) as being primarily nonpoint source (NPS) - impaired that are partially or fully restored. (cumulative)	Doug Wetzstein/ Terry McDill & Juline Holleran	<p>MPCA staff funded through state match and Section 319 funding provide program direction, supervision, project management, technical assistance (water quality monitoring and modeling, stressor ID, data analysis and management, and GIS), program support (civic engagement, public information, computer, and administrative) for nonpoint source water quality projects and programs, including the Minnesota Clean Water Partnership and the federal Section 319 grant program.</p> <p>http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-publications/index.html</p> <p>Activities that document the improvement in the water quality of Minnesota lakes and rivers include the annual Watershed Achievements Report, which highlights the achievements of active and recently completed nonpoint source water quality projects; provide Section 319 grant program progress into EPA's Grants Reporting and Tracking System (GRTS) on a semiannual basis</p>	<p>FFY2013 Report: The draft 2013 Watershed Achievements Report (WAR) includes information on: intensive watershed monitoring, impaired waters, approved TMDLs and the Minnesota Load Monitoring Network as well as previous impairments now meeting water quality standards. In addition, included are descriptions of completed, active and newly awarded nonpoint source projects and predicted pollutant reduction data from 1997-2013. The draft 2013 WAR was submitted to US EPA Region 5 on August 30, 2013. Comments were received on September 30, 2013 and revisions are underway.</p> <p>GRTS reporting, including project reporting and pollution reductions, was completed by February 15, 2013 and September 15, 2013. A Webinar on proposed changes to the GRTS system was attended in August, 2013.</p> <p>EPA Comment: US EPA Region 5 identified three connected Section 319 projects leading to water quality improvements in two waterbodies in their review of the final 2012 Watershed Achievements Report. [MPCA concurs with EPA language change here]</p>
-------	--	---	--	--

		<p>(March 15 and September 15) GRTS will also be updated by MPCA to reflect any changes to grants or related projects those changes should be reflected in GRTS upon EPA approval of proposed changes); and develop individual nonpoint source water quality success stories for local and national presentation.</p> <p>http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-types-and-programs/water-nonpoint-source-issues/clean-water-partnership/financial-assistance-for-nonpoint-source-water-pollution-projects-clean-water-partnership-and-section-319-programs.html</p> <p>EPA conferences and meetings will be attended as resources are available.</p>	<p>EPA conferences and meetings attended were the National Listing and TMDL Workshop held on April 2 through April 4 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia and the Region V Nonpoint Source Program Meeting held in Chicago on July 16-17, 2013.</p>
--	--	---	--

MINNESOTA PPG MAX WORKPLAN FFY 2013-2016 LAND POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

FFY 2013 Report with FFY 2014 Workplan Revisions (if applicable)

Strategic Goal: 3 – Cleaning Up Communities and Advancing Sustainable Development⁷				
Objective 3.2: Preserve Land: Conserve resources and prevent land contamination by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and ensuring proper management of waste and petroleum products.				
2011- 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) – Minimize releases of hazardous waste and petroleum products⁸				
Land Pollution Control				
Code	Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates & Contact	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
HW3	HW0 - Number of hazardous waste facilities with new or updated controls.	Ainars Silis/Gary Victorine/Mary Setnicar EPA	<p>FFY 2013 Permit Reissuance Commitments: BAE, Siemens Industry, Federal Cartridge, New Page.</p> <p>FFY 2014 Permit Reissuance Commitments: Gopher Resources, Nexeo Solutions, Federal Cartridge and New Page.</p> <p>FFY 2015 Permit Reissuance Commitments: SPX.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Permit Reissuance Commitments: Safety-Kleen Eagan, Safety-Kleen Blaine, Xcel, Alliant Proving Grounds.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: BAE reissued 1/22/13 Siemens Industry reissued 6/18/13</p>

⁷ EPA Strategic Goals are located at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>

⁸ EPA Measures are from National Program Guidance at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>, 40 CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>, and EPA Regional Priorities.

Objective 3.3: Restore Land: Prepare for and respond to accidental or intentional releases of contaminants and clean up and restore polluted sites.

2011- 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) – Cleanup Contaminated Land⁹

CA1	Number of RCRA facilities with human exposures under control.	Crague Biglow/ Jose Cisneros - EPA	<p>FFY 2013 Commitments: Achieve Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p>FFY 2014 Commitments: No change. Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: Achieved Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p>
CA2	Number of RCRA facilities with release to groundwater under control (CA750).	Crague Biglow/ Jose Cisneros - EPA	<p>FFY 2013 Commitments: Achieve Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p>FFY 2014 Commitments: No change. Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: Achieved Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p>
CA5	Number of RCRA facilities with final remedies constructed.	Crague Biglow/ Jose Cisneros - EPA	<p>FFY 2013 Commitments: Achieve Remedies constructed (CA550) at 91% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p> <p>FFY 2014 Commitments: Achieve Remedies constructed (CA550) at 93% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: Achieved Remedies constructed (CA550) at 92% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p>

⁹ EPA Measures are from National Program Guidance at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>, 40 CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>, and EPA Regional Priorities.

Strategic Goal: 5 – Enforcing environmental Laws¹⁰

Objective 5.1: Enforce environmental Laws: Pursue vigorous civil and criminal enforcement that targets the most serious water, air, and chemical hazards in communities. Assure strong, consistent, and effective enforcement of federal environmental laws nationwide.

2011- 2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) – Support Ensuring the Safety of Chemicals and Preventing Pollution¹¹

Land Pollution Control

<p>Hazardous Waste Compliance and Enforcement</p>	<p>Katie Koelfgen & John Elling/ Gary Victorine - EPA</p>	<p>The MPCA will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with EPA, inspect all operating TSDs every 2 years; • with EPA and JPA Counties, inspect LQGs every 5 years unless operating under a flexibility plan; • address violations in accordance with the MPCA Enforcement Response Plan; • collect data and ensure data is entered into appropriate national database systems in a timely manner; and • research, develop, test and implement efforts to increase pollution prevention practices, innovate regulatory programs and increase environmental performance. <p>FFY 2013 Commitment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, the MPCA and EPA will conduct CEIs at all TSD facilities in the operating universe. For FFY 2013, the MPCA and EPA have determined the universe of operating TSDFs in Minnesota is 14. During FFY 2013, the MPCA has agreed to conduct four TSDF CEIs at operating facilities and EPA will conduct three TSDF CEIs at operating facilities. • During FFY 2013, the MPCA, Hennepin County, and EPA will conduct CEIs at 20% of the LQG universe. For FFY 2013, the MPCA 	<p>FFY 2013 Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MPCA conducted 6 CEIs at operating or full enforcement TSDFs, which met the PPA commitment for FFY 2013. • The MPCA conducted 41 LQG CEIs and Hennepin County conducted 23 CEIs for a total of 64 LQG CEIs, which exceeded the PPA commitment of 63 for FFY 2013. • The MPCA conducted 122 RCRA CEIs during FFY 2013 and identified 17 Significant Non-compliers (SNC), a compliance monitoring SNC rate of 13.9%, and returned 15 SNCs to compliance (SNN).
---	---	---	---

¹⁰ EPA Strategic Goals are located at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/plan.htm>

¹¹ EPA Measures are from National Program Guidance at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/npmguidance/index.htm>, 40 CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>, and EPA Regional Priorities.

		<p>and EPA have determined the universe of RCRA LQGs in Minnesota is 393. For FFY 2013, the MPCA and Hennepin County have agreed to conduct CEIs at 63 LQGs and EPA Region 5 has agreed to conduct CEIs at 16 LQGs in order to meet the 20% goal of 79.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, the MPCA will conduct additional inspections as required, at generators other than LQGs (e.g. small quantity generators [SQGs], conditionally-exempt small quantity generators [CESQGs], generators with no status and non-notifiers). • The MPCA will also conduct "other" inspections as required including sampling inspections, citizen complaint investigations, follow-up inspections, case development inspections, non-financial record reviews, etc. • All violations discovered by the MPCA will be addressed in accordance with MPCA's <i>Enforcement Response Plan</i>, including the "RCRA (Hazardous Waste) Standard Guidance" section. • The MPCA will translate Compliance, Monitoring and Enforcement (CM&E) data into the RCRAInfo database on, at minimum, a monthly basis and more often as required. In addition, MPCA will differentiate inspections conducted by Hennepin County inspectors from those conducted by MPCA inspectors in the RCRAInfo database. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MPCA executed 1 Stipulation Agreements and issued 2 Non-forgivable Administrative Penalty Orders (APOs), 14 Combination APOs, 27 Notices of Violation, 11 Letters of Warning, and 18 Referrals to Local Units of Government.
--	--	---	--

	RCRA Authorization	Katie Koelfgen & John Elling/Gary Victorine - EPA	<p><u>FFY 2013 Commitments:</u> June 23, 2011, final EPA approval of the MPCA's hazardous waste program authorization revision application (ARA 10). The MPCA is tracking possible rule amendments to include in a future ARA 11. Some EPA RCRA rules are now incorporated into MN Rules by reference.</p> <p>The MPCA commits to conducting meetings with the EPA to discuss EPA's RCRA authorization priorities by June 2013.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA is conducting "housekeeping" rule changes for RCRA/MN 7045 rules in the next couple of months. MPCA is also looking into future RCRA authorization with EPA.</p>
	RCRA Info	Leslie Goldsmith/ Steve Gorg/ Darnell Wilson – EPA	<p>MPCA will ensure the timely entry of all RCRAInfo data fields for which it is the State implementer of record (IOR). Data entry is required within one month of the completion of any recordable RCRA program activity, <i>subject to the availability of RCRAInfo and timely notice of changes to its structure and requirements</i>. Entry of certain non-final compliance monitoring, evaluation and enforcement activities may be delayed until the requirements of the Minnesota Data Practices Act relating to not-public data are satisfied. MPCA will also submit biennial report files in accordance with future timeframes established by EPA's Office of Solid Waste.</p> <p><u>FFY 2013 Commitments:</u> Minnesota will continue to work on automated data transfer solutions utilizing the exchange network. During this process, Minnesota will continue to satisfy data sharing commitments with a combination of automated and manual data management. Minnesota is prepared to complete the Biennial Reporting activities that occur during this year.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> During FFY2013 the MPCA chartered and launched a RCRA Automated Data Flow Project to further develop automated data transfer solutions through the Exchange Network. All known code issues have been resolved and files are successfully able to be submitted yet additional data fixes continue to be worked on to resolve EPA error messages; EPA's CDX production and test environment were not available due to the federal government shutdown. Throughout this process, MPCA satisfied data management commitments while participating in the monthly conference call.</p>

			MPCA will meet monthly on a conference call with regional representatives to discuss progress on biennial report and any problems that may arise. We will also discuss progress on the extract flag for the handler module and the updated RCRAInfo structural change when this takes place this is dependent on ORCR. Regional representatives are committed to a successful BR13 load for every state.	
--	--	--	--	--

Strategic Goal 5: Enforcing Environmental Laws

Objective 5.1: Enforcement Environmental Laws. Pursue vigorous civil and criminal enforcement that targets the most serious water, air, and chemical hazards in communities. Assure strong, consistent, and effective enforcement of federal environmental laws nationwide.

2011-2015 Strategic Measures (Outcomes) - Maintain Enforcement Presence¹²

Categorical Grant: Toxic Substances Compliance – Lead, PCBs & Asbestos

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)		Progress Target Dates	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Reporting for Final Report or Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
TSC-G01	Total number of PCB inspections conducted by state. (PCB permitted facilities need to be inspected once every 3 years)	Katie Koelfgen & John Elling/Mardi Klevs - EPA	FFY 2013 Commitments: 20 PCB inspections per year for each of the EnPPA year at current funding level. *Of these 20 PCB inspections, there are two Approved PCB Commercial Storage facilities in Minnesota, which need to be inspected every three years - therefore, we will do one of these facilities in two out of every three years – John Elling.	FFY 2013 Report: The MPCA completed 20 PCB inspections; included in the 20 inspections the MPCA conducted 1 PCB storage facility (Xcel). EPA Comment: Of the 20 inspections completed by MPCA inspectors, 16 were conducted at natural gas pipeline facilities. Condensate sampling was performed at two of these facilities.

¹² The Compliance and Enforcement Guidance is located at: (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/pdfs/strategic_plan_change_document_9-30-08.pdf)

**MINNESOTA PPG MAX WORKPLAN FFY 2013-2016
CROSS MEDIA ITEMS**

FFY 2013 Report with FFY 2014 Workplan Revisions (if applicable)

Outputs/Measures (identified from EPA National Program Guidance, Regulations, or Policy)	Progress Target Dates & Contact	State Commitments - Outputs/Measures and Outcomes – (should relate to the Output/Measure in column 1)	Annual Performance Report of Progress Made in Meeting Commitments (Outputs and/or Outcomes) in columns 1 and 3
<p>1) For States that administer authorized programs under Title 40 and receive or wish to receive reports or documents electronically, under those authorized programs, as it pertains to non-Title V sources, must ensure the designated program system meet and comply with the Cross-Media Electronic Reporting Regulation (CROMERR), Part 3, Title 40 effective 01/11/06. In accordance with the CROMERR regulation, before the implementation the designated State program system must be approved by EPA.</p>	<p>Ongoing Leslie Goldsmith/Steve Gorg</p>	<p>MPCA does have EPA approval under CROMERR (to do electronic reporting across all media) – approval letter dated 10/8/2009 from EPA D.C. Office of Information Collection.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA receives Water Quality eDMR and Sample Values as well as Air Emission Inventory submittals through our CROMERR Priority Submittal-Compliant portal. The MPCA continues to investigate expanding our technical capacity for additional, approved online submittals.</p>