

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

FFY 2016 Report

p-part1-13b

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><i>Energy Star exhibit</i> 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><i>Fix-a-Leak campaign</i> 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 of the leak detection tablets ran statewide in newspapers, online news sites, Facebook, a</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>, 40CFR 35 at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/>
In addition, EPA Regional Priorities.

			<p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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><u>EPA Comments:</u> 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>
--	--	--	---

FFY 2014 Report:

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency creates and coordinates an environmental exhibit at the Minnesota State Fair called the Eco Experience. During 12 days in August 2014, it drew 262,000 visitors. In 2014, the exhibit included three areas that promoted EPA voluntary programs.

ENERGYSTAR exhibit

The MPCA and the Minnesota Department of Commerce created an ENERGY STAR laundry room display, which included appliances, interpretive signs, ENERGY STAR brochures, and the ENERGY STAR pledge (150 ENERGY STAR pledges were collected). Additionally, the Commerce energy area provided a full suite of demonstrations and hands-on models to teach about home insulation, energy upgrades, lighting, and HVAC. All promoted ENERGY STAR programs and resources throughout.

https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B4MLOpFm8nQPpHUxUnBBWW1WaGc/edit?usp=drive_web

Household outdoor water conservation exhibit

The Eco Experience also included an exhibit piece about lawn and garden water use, including EPA's WaterSense graphics and 10 ways to save water at home.

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/mpcaphotos/14850428108/in/set-72157646447353349>

Wood smoke exhibit

The EPA's Wet Wood is a Waste brochure came to life as a wood shed and moisture meter interactive activity. Awareness was also raised regarding potential health and environmental impacts of smoke from backyard fires. Other handouts included How to Build a Wood Shed, and Burn Wise Tip Sheets (in English and Spanish).

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/mpcaphotos/15050570621/in/set-72157646447353349>

Living Green 365 e-newsletter

Between Sept 2013 and Sept 2014 the MPCA published 3 Living Green 365 e-newsletters that promoted EPA voluntary programs, air quality and/or CO2 emissions reduction strategies (sent to 16,000):

- Buying a cleaner car:
<http://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/MNPCA/bulletins/a532b7>
- Minnesota air quality:
<http://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/MNPCA/bulletins/9c6b18>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water (including WaterSense program promotion): http://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/MNPCA/bulletins/a95028 <p><i>Fix-a-Leak campaign</i> During the 2014, EPA WaterSense Fix-a-Leak week, the MPCA celebrated by partnering with a local nonprofit, H2O for Life. The project sent home over 600 fix-a-leak kits to 5th grade students in five White Bear Lake-area public schools and one Mahtomedi-area public school. These communities are experiencing low ground water levels and water conservation is a hot topic in their area. Educational materials from the EPA were included in the kits, including a "Filter Out Bad Water Habits" student and family pledge form. Participating students from the classroom(s) with the highest rate returned student worksheets and student / family pledges to reduce water use received reusable water bottles as a prize for their achievement.</p> <p>MPCA also attended two community events with a fix-a-leak message: The Bloomington Home Improvement Fair and the North Metro Home & Garden Show in Blaine (Nat'l Sports Center). The events were a good opportunity to interact with the public and distribute water conservation information. Several hundred-leak detection kits were given out at both events.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> <i>Climate, Energy, and Community traveling exhibit</i> In partnership with the Minnesota Department of Commerce, the MPCA created a traveling exhibit called, "Climate, energy and community: What we can do." Content covers climate changes occurring in Minnesota, energy conservation, renewable energy technologies, individual actions for greenhouse gas reduction, and community adaptation. The exhibit displayed from January 31-June 8, 2015 at the Headwaters Science Center in Bemidji, Minnesota. Over 3,000 adults and 5,000 children visited the museum during this time. It is currently displayed (beginning November 5, 2015) at Cascade Meadow visitor center in Rochester, Minnesota.</p> <p><i>Eco Experience at the Minnesota State Fair</i> The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency creates and coordinates an environmental exhibit at the Minnesota State Fair called the Eco Experience. During 12 days in August 2015, it drew 254,000 visitors. In 2015, the exhibit included three areas that promoted EPA voluntary programs.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><i>ENERGY STAR exhibit</i> The MPCA and the Minnesota Department of Commerce created an ENERGY STAR appliances display, which included appliances, interpretive signs, ENERGY STAR brochures, and the ENERGY STAR pledge (243 ENERGY STAR pledges were collected). Additionally, the Commerce energy area provided a full suite of demonstrations and hands-on models to teach about home insulation, energy upgrades, lighting, and HVAC. All promoted ENERGY STAR programs and resources throughout. https://www.flickr.com/photos/mpcaphotos/sets/72157658215368958/page2</p> <p><i>Wood smoke exhibit</i> The exhibit was entitled “Learn before you burn” with a focus on five appliances: a backyard fire pit, an old fashioned wood-burning stove without any emission control equipment, newer wood-burning stove with some emissions control devices built in, the newest wood-burning stove with a variety of emissions control devices built in, and a natural gas fireplace. Different sizes of plumes of smoke with each unit illustrated the particulate matter pollution from each. An activity for measuring wood moisture highlighted the EPA’s “Wet Wood is a Waste” brochure. Other handouts included How to Build a Wood Shed, and Burn Wise Tip Sheets (in English and Spanish).</p> <p><i>Water Conservation exhibit</i> This interactive exhibit focused on the embedded or “hidden” water that exists in the products and materials we use on a daily basis. The exhibit introduced visitors to the concept of indirect water use, which includes the water used to grow, manufacture, and transport products. The exhibit also included signage encouraging visitors to tackle common water wasters in their homes, such as household leaks, over-watering of lawns and gardens, and water-wasting fixtures and appliances. The signage encouraged visitors to replace water-inefficient fixtures and appliances with efficient EPA WaterSense and ENERGY STAR labeled products.</p> <p><i>Living Green 365 e-newsletter</i> The March edition of the MPCA’s Living Green 365 e-newsletter (distribution 17,000+) addressed climate adaptation for homes and other residences: http://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/MNPCA/bulletins/f20b9dz. Readers were encouraged to reduce CO2 emissions, energy and water by replacing old, inefficient appliances and fixtures with EnergyStar and WaterSense labeled new ones.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Chinook Book <i>Chinook Book</i> is a print coupon book and mobile app featuring hundreds of green businesses in the Twin Cities area. The MPCA has been a long-time supporter of the publication, which many thousands of metro residents purchase and use each year. In the 2016 <i>Chinook Book</i> print version (which covers the period of September 2015-October 2016), the MPCA included an informational ad—provided to WaterSense partners by the EPA—promoting home leak detection and correction. The ad directs readers to the EPA WaterSense website for resources and additional information. Most of the effort involved in securing the ad’s inclusion in the 2016 <i>Chinook Book</i> occurred in FFY 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> MPCA continues to provide a wide variety of GHG reduction resources to the public and exceed its commitments in this area.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> <i>Climate, Energy, and Community traveling exhibit</i> In partnership with the Minnesota Department of Commerce, the MPCA created a traveling exhibit called, “Climate, energy and community: What we can do.” Content covers climate changes occurring in Minnesota, energy conservation, renewable energy technologies, individual actions for greenhouse gas reduction, and community adaptation. The exhibit displayed from November 5, 2015-April 12, 2016 at Cascade Meadow visitor center in Rochester, MN. Over 3,000 adults and 5,000 children visited the center during this time. It is currently displayed (beginning September 12, 2016) at Mississippi Watershed Management Organization visitor center in Minneapolis, MN.</p> <p><i>Energy Star exhibit</i> The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and the Minnesota Department of Commerce incorporated ENERGY STAR appliances into the 2016 Eco Experience, an exhibit at the Minnesota State Fair, which drew 262,000 visitors. The display included example appliances, and interpretive signs. The display was staffed by knowledgeable Commerce and Best Buy Corporation staff.</p> <p><i>Chinook Book Mobile Ads</i> During FFY 2016, the MPCA continued its long time partnership with Chinook Book, a print coupon book and mobile app featuring hundreds of green businesses in the Twin Cities area. Among the mobile resource ads that the MPCA featured was an informational ad on wood smoke that, when tapped, connected viewers with MPCA and EPA information and resources on wood smoke, including best practices and health impacts. The ad received 15,478 views during its September-December, 2015 run.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>Interagency partnership to promote water conservation</i></p> <p>The MPCA partnered with another state agency, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), in spring 2016 to distribute bulk quantities of fix-a-leak kits to Minnesota cities participating in DNR-sponsored water-supply planning workshops. Cities distributed the kits, containing toilet leak-detection education/information cards and leak detection tablets, to residents via onsite visits, community events, and other means. In all, over 3,000 cards and tablets were distributed to cities. The kits, which contain EPA WaterSense program information and messaging, also encourage consumers to look for WaterSense labeled products when shopping for plumbing fixtures.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017):</u> MPCA continues to creatively provide the public with information on climate change and reducing GHG emissions and meets its commitments in this area.</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.	<u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.

			<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Federally funded and state funded projects subject to "hot-spot" analysis requirements were completed for FFY 2014 project reviews. All plans, TIPS, and subsequent amendments submitted in FFY 14 were in conformance with the limited maintenance plan adopted in 2010.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Federally and state funded projects subject to conformity requirements were completed for FFY 2015 project reviews. All plans, Transportation Improvement Plans, and subsequent amendments submitted in FFY 15 were in conformance with the limited maintenance plan adopted in 2010.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Federally and state funded projects subject to conformity requirements were completed for FFY 2016 project reviews. All plans, transportation improvement programs (TIPs), and subsequent TIP amendments submitted in FFY 2016 were in conformance with the Limited Maintenance Plan adopted in 2010.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>2) Update out-of-date conformity SIPs to allow the state to utilize more recent flexibilities in the federal rule.</p>	<p>As necessary until Project End Date</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>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.</p> <p><u>MPCA response:</u> MPCA cannot complete this task until EPA completes two tasks: 1) finalize the PM_{2.5}</p>	<p><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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The Minnesota conformity SIP has been completed and signed by participating agencies including: MnDOT, Metro Council, MPCA, FTA, FHWA, and Duluth-Superior's MPO. The document was published in the State Register for a 30-day public notice period on November 10, 2014. If there is no request for a public meeting, the conformity SIP package</p>

		<p>NAAQS revision proposed in June 2012; and 2) Issue final guidance for the revised PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Also, please see revision above.</p>	<p>would be sent to EPA for its review, signature, approval and publication in the Federal Register. The entire approval process should be completed in early 2015. The current document 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.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The Minnesota conformity SIP was completed and signed by all participating agencies including: MnDOT, Metro Council, MPCA, FTA, FHWA, Duluth-Superior’s MPO, and EPA. The signed document was submitted to EPA for publication in the Federal Register. The current document 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.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA met the commitment for the conformity SIP. EPA approved the conformity SIP on December 11, 2015(80FR 76863). It became effective on February 9, 2016.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The EPA approved Minnesota’s conformity SIP on December 11, 2015 (80FR76863). It became effective on February 9, 2016. The MPCA is continuing to implement this Plan as stipulated in the SIP document.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA’s progress and concurs with MPCA’s report.</p>
--	--	---	---

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	Ongoing until Project End Date Kohlasch/	MPCA will operate the ozone network from <u>April 1</u> through <u>October 31</u> in accordance with requirements listed in Table	<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.

<p>CFR Part 58, approved monitoring plans, and/or grant agreements including QMPs and QAPPs.</p>	<p>Strassman</p>	<p>D-3 to Appendix D of 40 CFR Part 58.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA operated the statewide ozone-monitoring network from April 1, 2014 through October 31, 2014 in accordance with regulations.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA operated the statewide ozone-monitoring network from April 1, 2015 through October 31, 2015 in accordance with regulations.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA operated the statewide ozone-monitoring network from April 1, 2016 through October 31, 2016 in accordance with regulations. Ozone is monitored year-round at three sites, including NCore to meet regulations and provide data for special studies. Planning is underway to begin the ozone season on March 1, 2017 to meet new regulations.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Strassman</p>	<p>MPCA will submit NAAQS pollutant and QA data directly to the AQS within 90 days of the end of a calendar quarter.</p>	<p><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.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</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.</p> <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>In summary: <i>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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted all pollutant and quality assurance data to the AQS according to schedule in 40 CFR Part 58.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA reports data to AQS as required by 40 CFR Part 58. AMAS reviews MPCA AQS data submissions throughout the year. Some issues remain regarding quality assurance data completeness issues as a result of late submission of data to AQS, but we anticipate these will be resolved by May 01, 2015 when final data certification is due.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response:</u> MPCA discussed these issues with Region 5 on February 25, 2015. All issues raised will be resolved by May 1, 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted all pollutant and quality assurance data to the AQS according to schedule in 40 CFR Part 58.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA discussed data completeness with MPCA during our December 2015 quarterly call, and in particular, one site undergoing re-roofing that caused an unavoidable monitor shut down. No other issues anticipated prior to final data certification on May 1, 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted all pollutant and quality assurance data to the AQS according to schedule in 40 CFR Part 58. Issues related to data submittal raised during the June 2016 Technical System Audit are currently being addressed in consultation with Region 5.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>3) Certify 2012 NAAQS pollutant data in AQS and provide supporting documentation by May 1, 2013, including exceptional event flags.</p>	<p>By May 1, 2013 Kohlasch/ Strassman</p>	<p>MPCA will certify 2012 NAAQS pollutant data in AQS by May 1, 2013.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 2012 NAAQS pollutant data was certified effective May 3, 2013.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 2013 NAAQS pollutant data was certified effective April 2014. Upon EPA's request, changes were made and data resubmitted to the AQS resulting in a revised certification effective August 1, 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> CY2014 NAAQS pollutant data was certified effective May 1, 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> CY2015 NAAQS criteria pollutant data was certified effective April 29, 2016. Data collection and processing through September 30, 2016 on track to meet CY2016 data certification deadlines.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>

<p>4) Submit XML-formatted AQS data by the end of 2012 or at the latest the end of 2013.</p>	<p>By the end of 2013 Kohlasch/ Palmer</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> We have completed the gap analysis for the upgrade of our current LIMs system. The process has taken longer than expected and we now plan to have the system implemented by the end of 2015. We plan to upgrade to the XML-formatted when the new system is in place.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA no longer uses the 80-character format to submit to AQS. We are now submitting using a pipe delimited text file through the ENSC. We have completed the gap analysis for the upgrade of our current LIMs system. The process has taken longer than expected and we now plan to start work on the system spring/summer of 2016 and have the system implemented by the end of 2017. We may upgrade to the XML-format to submit data through the Exchange Network Node when the new system is in place.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA is currently working to develop the capability to electronically submit data to AQS through the Exchange Network Node. We have made substantial progress on developing this for the continuous data that we currently store using Agilaire's AirVision system. Development has been completed for the software necessary to submit data compatible with AQS version 3.0. Several test submissions have been made but are currently receiving errors from that process. We hope to be able to complete a successful submission of data in December.</p> <p>MPCA is also working to submit non-continuous data to the Exchange Network. MPCA has begun efforts to replace the current obsolete LIMS with a new system. However, that process is not expected to be completed until late spring of 2017. Once that is complete</p>
--	---	--	---

			<p>and in place, MPCA will complete its efforts to develop the electronic submittal process to the Exchange Network node. We hope to be able to begin submitting non-continuous data through the Exchange Network in June 2017.</p> <p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>5) Submit 2014 annual network plan required by 40 CFR § 58.10, by July 1, 2013, unless another schedule has been approved.</p>	<p>July 1, 2013</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Strassman</p>	<p>MPCA will submit the 2014 annual monitoring network plan to EPA Region 5 by July 1, 2013.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The 2105 Annual Air Monitoring Network Plan was open for public review and comment from June 2 through June 30, 2014. The comment period was extended through August 1, 2104, at the request of several citizens asking for more time to review and comment on the plan. The plan was submitted to EPA Region 5 in September 2104, and approved by EPA Region 5 on October 31, 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA was made aware of the comment review extension in a timely manner, and always appreciated the effort that MPCA puts into producing a high quality Network plan.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The 2016 Annual Air Monitoring Network Plan was available for public inspection from July 10 through August 14, 2015. The plan was submitted to EPA Region 5 on September 11, 2015. Subsequent revisions and an Appendix B were added in response to EPA's comments. The 2016 Plan was approved by EPA Region 5 on October 29, 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA was timely informed of the MPCA's delay in submitting the annual network plan. This delay was impacted by EPA's IMPROVE site defunding decisions, a new MPCA site install, and MPCA litigation over the operation of special purpose monitoring sites.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The 2017 Annual Air Monitoring Network Plan was available for public inspection from June 10 through July 13, 2015. The plan was submitted to EPA Region 5 on September 26, 2016 and approved by Region 5 on October 31, 2016.</p>

			<p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
6) Ensure adequate, independent QA audits of NAAQS monitors, including PEP and NPAP or equivalent.	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Strassman</p>	<p>MPCA will continue to fully participate in the Pb PEP and NPAP QA programs.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA participated in the Pb PEP and NPAP programs during FFY13.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA participated in the Pb PEP and NPAP programs during FFY14.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA participated in the Pb PEP and NPAP programs during FFY15.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA participated in the Pb PEP and NPAP programs during FFY16 and plans to continue participation in FFY17.</p> <p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
7) Report real time ozone and PM _{2.5} data to AirNOW for cities required to report the AQI (state/local only).	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Strassman</p>	<p>MPCA will continue to report hourly ozone and PM_{2.5} data to AirNow in support of air quality forecasting and national pollutant mapping.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted hourly ozone and PM_{2.5} concentrations to AirNow in support AQI forecasting and national pollutant mapping during FFY13.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted hourly ozone and PM_{2.5} concentrations to AirNow in support AQI forecasting and national pollutant mapping during FFY14.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted hourly ozone and PM2.5 concentrations to AirNow in support AQI forecasting and national pollutant mapping during FFY15.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted hourly criteria pollutant concentrations to AirNow Tech to meet grant obligations, support AQI forecasting, and national pollutant mapping during FFY16.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA participates on monthly R5 calls and travels to meetings as budgets allow.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA participates on monthly R5 calls and travels to meetings as budgets allow. Three staff attended the 2104 National Air Monitoring Conferences in Atlanta.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA appreciates MPCAs commitment to participating in the monthly calls and maintaining open communication and information sharing.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA participates on monthly R5 calls and travels to meetings as budgets allow.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> In addition, MPCA is also providing valuable feedback during newly instituted quarterly calls.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA participates on scheduled R5 calls and travels to meetings as budgets allow. Three staff attended the National Ambient Air Monitoring Conference in St. Louis in August 2016.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>

NAAQS - 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) Work with local Metropolitan Planning Organizations, EPA, and state and federal transportation agencies in future conformity determinations, as needed.	As yet-to-be-finalized implementation, guidance dictates. Kohlasch/ Fenske	Work with EPA to address any monitored violations of the NAAQS. Address through approved maintenance plans if applicable.	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> There has been no monitored violation of any NAAQS in FFY 2014. 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; Continue to maintain all the transportation control measures approved 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 2040 Regional Development Plan (Thrive MSP 2040) that supports land use patterns that efficiently connect housing, jobs, retail centers, and transit oriented development along transit corridors; Adoption of 2040 Transportation Policy Plan; 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><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> There has been no monitored violation of any NAAQS in FFY 2015. 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; Continue to maintain all the transportation control measures approved in the SIP; A regional commitment to continue capital investments to maintain and improve the operational efficiencies of highway and transit systems; Continue implementation of our regional long-term 2040 Regional Development Plan (Thrive MSP 2040) that supports land use patterns that efficiently connect housing, jobs, retail centers, and transit oriented development along transit corridors; Continue implementation of 2040 Transportation Policy Plan; 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><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> There has been no monitored violation of any NAAQS in FFY 2016. 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; Continue to maintain all the transportation control measures approved in the SIP; A regional commitment to continue capital investments to maintain and improve the operational efficiencies of highway and transit systems; Continue implementation of our regional long-term 2040 Regional Development Plan (Thrive MSP 2040) that supports land use patterns that efficiently connect housing, jobs, retail centers, and transit oriented development along transit corridors; Continue implementation of 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (2040 Transportation Policy Plan will be updated in 2017); 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><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA is preparing the 2015 Air Quality Report to the Legislature to be submitted on time in January 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted the 2015 Air Quality Report to the Legislature in January 2015. 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. Work on the 2017 Report will occur throughout 2016.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting their commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA has drafted the 2017 Air Quality Report for the Legislature containing analysis and interpretation of monitoring data. In addition, it describes actions being taken to improve air quality and health outcomes, with a focus this year on nonpoint sources and environmental justice. It will be submitted in early January 2017.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> In accordance with discussions with EPA, work has begun on a redesignation request and maintenance plan for the Dakota County lead nonattainment area. Final, quality assured data demonstrating three calendar years of NAAQS compliance is expected in FFY15. Submittal of redesignation request and maintenance plan expected for FFY15.</p>

			<p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA submitted final, quality-assured data demonstrating three calendar years of NAAQS compliance in the Dakota County lead nonattainment area. EPA finalized a clean data determination on 10/23/15. This determination of attainment of the 2008 lead NAAQS suspends SIP planning requirements for the area. As agreed with EPA, MPCA submitted a letter formally withdrawing our June 2012 attainment demonstration SIP submittal. The MPCA will submit a redesignation request and maintenance plan at a future time when Gopher Resource’s permit is next opened.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA will submit a redesignation request and maintenance plan at a future time when Gopher Resource’s permit is next opened. (See FFY 2015 report)</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA’s progress and concurs with MPCA’s report.</p>
4) Prepare recommendations on designations for revised NAAQS.	One year after promulgation of revised NAAQS. Kohlasch/ Fenske	Next expected would be for revised PM _{2.5} NAAQS – likely December 2013.	<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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> MPCA prepared and submitted a designation recommendation for the revised 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS to EPA on December 6, 2013.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Other than for SO₂, no actions necessary. For SO₂, Minnesota had no areas required for 2016 designation (per final EPA Consent Decree obligations), but consulted with both EPA and South Dakota regarding any data needed to assess Big Stone plant in SD. Minnesota has compiled its list of sources subject to the final Data Requirements Rule (published 8/21/2015), has consulted with EPA on early submittals/review of available modeling data, and has begun discussions with affected sources regarding preferred designation pathways.</p>

			<p>The MPCA will submit designation recommendations for the 2015 ozone standard by the October 1, 2016 deadline.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA submitted its designation recommendation for the 2015 ozone standard on September 28, 2016. The MPCA recommended that all counties in Minnesota be designated attainment for this standard.</p> <p>Minnesota submitted its list of sources (6) for Data Requirements Rule mandated air quality characterization by the required date of January 15, 2016. By July 1, Minnesota identified to EPA the air quality characterization pathway and submitted modeling protocols for four of the sources. Minnesota also requested (and EPA subsequently approved) two of the sources be removed from the list because of new information that showed they did not meet the criteria for designation assessment. Minnesota will be submitting its statewide designation request to EPA along with modeling analyses for the Data Requirements Rule-subject sources by January 13, 2017.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>5) Facilitate implementation of NOx and SO2 Requirements under Transport Rule.</p>	<p>As required by Transport Rule. 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> No work completed in FFY2014, due to the continuing litigation (and associated stay by courts) of the Transport Rule.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA Permits Section is implementing U.S. EPA's May 13, 2015 memorandum titled "Title V Permit Guidance and Template for the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule". No further direction beyond this memo has been provided by EPA that resulted in implementation work for the Air Policy Unit.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> CSAPR (the Transport Rule) is an applicable requirement in affected sources' title V permits. Minnesota continues to use EPA's May 2015 guidance to ensure that subject facilities fully comply with CSAPR requirements.</p>

			<p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> No work completed in FFY14. Minnesota has no areas designated for the 2010 SO₂ primary NAAQS, and awaits final rulemaking in 2015 to address areas not yet designated. MPCA will work with EPA at that time to determine designations.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Minnesota had no areas required for 2016 designation (per final EPA Consent Decree obligations), but consulted with both EPA and South Dakota regarding any data needed to assess Big Stone plant in SD. Minnesota has compiled its list of sources subject to the final Data Requirements Rule (published August 21, 2015), has consulted with EPA on early submittals/review of available modeling data, and has begun discussions with affected sources regarding preferred designation pathways.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Minnesota submitted its list of sources (6) for Data Requirements Rule mandated air quality characterization by the required date of January 15, 2016. By July 1, Minnesota identified to EPA the air quality characterization pathway and submitted modeling protocols for four of the sources. Minnesota also requested (and EPA subsequently approved) two of the sources be removed from the list because of new information that showed they did not meet the criteria for designation assessment. Minnesota will be submitting its statewide designation request to EPA along with modeling analyses for the Data Requirements Rule-subject sources by January 13, 2017. The MPCA consulted frequently with EPA Region V during this process.</p> <p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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 Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Work with Clean Air Dialogue process to produce recommendations.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p>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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to collaborate with its Clean Air Minnesota partners to tackle the work laid out in the Clean Air Dialogue Final Report, which was submitted to EPA as our plan forward for PM and Ozone Advance. Highlights from the past year included work on clean diesel projects, grants to small businesses for VOC reduction, and instillation of electric vehicle charging stations.</p> <p>The MPCA submitted our Advance update letter to EPA on June 6, 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to collaborate with its Clean Air Minnesota partners to perform the work laid out in the Clean Air Dialogue Final Report, which was submitted to EPA as our path forward for PM and Ozone Advance. Highlights from the past year included launch of new BeAirAwareMN.org website, continued work on clean diesel projects, grants to small businesses for VOC reduction, and a gas can exchange program.</p> <p>The Clean Air Minnesota convener (Environmental Initiative) is currently developing a report on data collected over the last two years of Clean Air Minnesota work. As agreed with EPA, the MPCA's annual update has been on hold until this report is completed and can be submitted along with the update. The MPCA expects to submit this report in December 2015.</p>
---	--	---	---

			<p>The MPCA received continued funding from the legislature for the next biennium to continue work with Clean Air Minnesota. Contract negotiations are complete with convener Environmental Initiative for the next biennium.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted its 2015 Advance update letter on December 29, 2015.</p> <p>The MPCA continues to collaborate with its Clean Air Minnesota partners to perform the work laid out in the Clean Air Dialogue Final Report, which was submitted to EPA as our path forward for PM and Ozone Advance. Highlights from the past year included promotion of the BeAirAwareMN.org website, continued work on clean diesel projects, and grants to small businesses for VOC reduction.</p> <p>The MPCA is preparing its annual Advance update letter and expects to submit that to EPA in December 2016.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
8) Submit SIPs for the §110(a) (2) infrastructure.	Due three years after standard promulgation Kohlasch/ Fenske	MPCA will submit these SIPs based on availability of EPA guidance, which is currently pending (August 2012). Ozone – Due March 2011 NO ₂ – Due January 2012 SO ₂ – Due June 2012	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA developed and submitted an Infrastructure SIP for ozone, NO₂, SO₂, and PM_{2.5} on June 12, 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> As requested by EPA, the MPCA submitted a supplemental letter to EPA on February 3, 2015 outlining the on-the-books rules and permits that help MN continue to comply with the ozone, NO₂, SO₂, and PM_{2.5} NAAQS.</p> <p>EPA published its final rule responding to MN's Infrastructure SIP on October 20, 2015. MPCA is working with EPA to submit the remaining "good neighbor" requirements for ozone and the section 128 and 110(a) (2) (E) (ii) state board requirements in 2016.</p>

			<p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA submitted an infrastructure SIP update addressing its section 110(a)(2)(D) "good neighbor" requirements for the 2008 ozone NAAQS and the section 128 and 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) state board requirements on May 26, 2016.</p> <p>MPCA submitted a proposed SIP revision to incorporate its PSD rule into Minnesota's SIP on October 4, 2016. This submittal also addressed Minnesota's infrastructure SIP obligations for sections 110(a)(2)(C), 110(a)(2)(D)(i)(II), 110(a)(2)(D)(ii), and 110(a)(2)(J) for all current NAAQS.</p> <p>MPCA submitted an infrastructure SIP update in response to the Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction SIP call on November 22, 2016. MPCA will submit an update letter in December 2016 to provide the final publication (December 19) and effective dates (December 27) for this rule which will be finalized as part of our Omnibus Air Rulemaking.</p> <p>On November 21, 2016, MPCA put on public notice a proposed infrastructure SIP revision to address its section 110(a)(2)(D) "good neighbor" requirements for the 2012 PM2.5 NAAQS. Minnesota expects to submit this SIP to EPA in January of 2017.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
9) Submit SIPs for the lead NAAQS.	Due June 2013 Kohlasch/ Fenske	Minnesota does not have any areas that were designated nonattainment in the second round of lead designations.	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> No additional work necessary as MPCA completed its only required lead attainment demonstration in FFY 2012. (As mentioned in #3 and # 16, in accordance with discussions with EPA, work has begun on a redesignation request and maintenance plan for the Dakota County lead nonattainment area.)</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA submitted final, quality-assured data demonstrating three calendar years of NAAQS compliance in the Dakota County lead nonattainment area. EPA finalized a clean data determination on 10/23/15. This determination of attainment of the 2008 lead NAAQS suspends SIP planning requirements for the area. As agreed with EPA, MPCA submitted a letter formally withdrawing our June 2012 attainment demonstration SIP submittal. The MPCA will submit a redesignation request and maintenance plan at a future time when Gopher Resource’s permit is next opened.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA will submit a redesignation request and maintenance plan at a future time when Gopher Resource’s permit is next opened. (See FFY 2015 report)</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA’s progress and concurs with MPCA’s report.</p>
10) Conduct public notification and education efforts, including reporting air quality forecasts and current conditions for ozone and particle pollution.	As necessary on forecasted high pollution days. Kohlasch/ Fenske	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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> As part of the Clean Air Minnesota effort, a statewide air alert communications plan has been created with the purpose of increasing the number of people receiving and acting</p>

			<p>upon the air alerts and to educate and encourage more organizations to voluntarily implement various emissions-reduction best management practices. There are two broad elements of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A strategy to communicate to the general population when air quality will be/is poor, and actions they should take to protect their health, as well as steps they can take to address poor air quality. b) A strategy to engage partner organizations to communicate about air alerts and encourage year-round emissions-reduction BMPs, at two levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. During air alert situations, to ensure that partner organization's employees become aware of the alert ii. Steps that the organization and employees can take during alerts, and on a continual basis, to reduce emissions. <p>The MPCA worked with the Minnesota Department of Transportation to orchestrate the display of air alert messages on electronic changeable road signs. In an effort to better inform the traveling public on air quality alert days, The Minnesota Department of Transportation will use its electronic changeable signage boards to relay public service announcements regarding the advisory status, such as "Air advisory today: avoid idling."</p> <p>The MPCA worked with KARE 11 News Organization to plan to turn off their natural gas outdoor fireplace on air alert days. During the last air advisory on December 11, 2014 KARE 11 told the viewing audience that their fire was not lit due to the Air Quality Advisory pointing out the wood fires add to fine particle pollution.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The results from the 2013 – 2015 Clean Air MN efforts were an average of 900,000 people per day driving under the MNDOT road signs alerting them of the air advisory for the 4 days the advisory ran in December 2014. The road signs were used a second time in July of 2015 to raise awareness of an air alert over the Fourth of July Holiday weekend from Canadian wild fire smoke.</p> <p>The Be Air Aware Employer outreach resulted in an increase of 35,000 employees who will receive notice of a "bad air" days from the 17 partnering employers. We continue these efforts to build an Employer partnership under our Be An Air Aware Employer Campaign.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and the Minnesota Department of Health have launched a website called www.BeAirAwareMN.org . The website promotes awareness of Air Quality and Health, provides data in an easily accessible format and provides tips and links to how you can protect yourself and your family from poor air quality as well as reduce air pollution.</p> <p>Sign-ups for Air Quality Alerts through EnviroFlash decreased in the beginning of the biennium and then increased for an average of around 4000 individuals, which is stable to previous years' averages.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA is working to build the structure to support internal AQI forecasting in MN for State FY 2017. MPCA will no longer contract with Sonoma Technologies, Inc. to forecast AQI for two cities in MN after June 30, 2017, (although will continue to contract with the company for web-services.) The forecast will be expanded to include several more cities creating statewide AQI coverage.</p> <p>There continues to be two types of outreach for air quality alerts and education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a.) General population outreach: MPCA has partnered with Minnesota Department of Health and Minnesota Department of Transportation to ensure all avenues are being explored and utilized to connect with the public when air is unhealthy. This includes continued outreach on the joint MPCA/ MDH website called www.BeAirAwareMN.org containing tips on reducing exposure and pollutants in both indoor and outdoor air. b.) Businesses in MN: the focus this past year has been to ensure all state departments in MN are communicating with their employees on bad air days. Employees are also encouraged to sign up for their own notifications through EnviroFlash. Efforts continue to include private companies in an Air Aware Employer Partnership. The partnership is being evaluated by a communications team to be more inclusive and collaborate resources with Clean Air MN to expand the reach of the partnership. <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>11) Work with EPA to recognize and address environmental justice issues that can be addressed in SIPs.</p>	<p>As opportunities, arise. 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 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> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 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> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 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> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>12) Explore feasibility of Implementing strategies for controlling emissions from wood smoke, including woodstove change out and Burnwise</p>	<p>As available. Patraw/ Timerson</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</p>

<p>education campaigns. Work with local area stakeholders to support innovative, voluntary, early action initiatives such wood smoke reduction programs</p>			<p>grant funding for VOC reduction projects. 4) Other efforts under investigation: examples: Air alert partner program with businesses/ organizations. Green Corps Expansion.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> (Delete #12 here and include measures in Reduce Air Toxics #5)</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA may revise commitment as suggested.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response:</u> Per EPA approval, MPCA will combine the reporting of this measure with Measure #5 under Air Toxics section for the remaining fiscal year reports of this grant cycle.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report (N/A)</u></p>
<p>13) Convert, where desired, CSAPR FIP into a SIP.</p>	<p>At state's discretion. 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Not applicable for FFY 2014, due to the continued litigation (and associated stay by courts) of CSAPR.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> No changes to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Minnesota is under a FIP for EGUs for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standard, subject to CSAPR's annual NOX and SO2 trading program. (FIP is at 40 CFR 51.1240 and 1241) CSAPR is an applicable requirement in affected sources' title V permits, and Minnesota is using EPA's May 2015 guidance to ensure that subject facilities fully comply with CSAPR requirements. For the foreseeable future, Minnesota does not anticipate converting this FIP into a SIP.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>14) Implement strategies to attain the 2008 lead NAAQS.</p>	<p>Ongoing throughout grant cycle.</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</p>

	Kohlasch/ Fenske		<p>the lead attainment demonstration SIP and 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> In accordance with discussions with EPA, work has begun on a re-designation request and maintenance plan for the Dakota County lead nonattainment area. Final, quality assured data demonstrating three calendar years of NAAQS compliance is expected in FFY15. Submittal of re-designation request and maintenance plan expected for FFY15. The re-designation request and maintenance plan will include proposed changes to the facility that were not addressed in the attainment demonstration SIP submitted in 2012. Such changes are not expected to interfere with continued maintenance of the lead NAAQS. MPCA continues to work with Gopher Resources to ensure they meet obligations of the AO and permit, which contain control strategies ensuring attainment of the lead NAAQS.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA submitted final, quality-assured data demonstrating three calendar years of NAAQS compliance in the Dakota County lead nonattainment area. EPA finalized a clean data determination on 10/23/15. This determination of attainment of the 2008 lead NAAQS suspends SIP planning requirements for the area. As agreed with EPA, MPCA submitted a letter formally withdrawing our June 2012 attainment demonstration SIP submittal. The MPCA will submit a redesignation request and maintenance plan at a future time when Gopher Resource's permit is next opened.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA will submit a redesignation request and maintenance plan at a future time when Gopher Resource's permit is next opened. (See FFY 2015 report)</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
15) Develop attainment demonstrations for SO2 nonattainment	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	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Minnesota has no areas designated nonattainment for SO₂. MPCA continues to work with facilities included in the SO₂ maintenance areas for the previous SO₂ NAAQS to ensure continued NAAQS attainment. MPCA is currently working to develop site-specific SIP revisions for facilities in the Twin Cities SO₂ maintenance area that have</p>

<p>areas and conduct other SO₂ air quality planning in accordance with EPA guidance.</p>		<p>guidance or implementation rulemaking.</p>	<p>removed/decommissioned SO₂-emitting units. MPCA conducted modeling exercises for the 1-hour SO₂ 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Minnesota has no areas currently designated nonattainment for SO₂. MPCA continues to work with facilities included in the SO₂ maintenance areas for the previous SO₂ NAAQS to ensure continued NAAQS attainment. MPCA is currently working to develop site-specific SIP revisions for facilities in the Twin Cities SO₂ maintenance area that have removed/decommissioned SO₂-emitting units. MPCA will comply with requirements of the EPA's Data Requirements Rule for SO₂ (upon finalization), addressing designations and associated air quality analyses for the SO₂ NAAQS.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Minnesota has no areas currently designated nonattainment for SO₂. MPCA continues to work with facilities included in the SO₂ maintenance areas for the previous SO₂ NAAQS to ensure continued NAAQS attainment, updating the SIP as needed for permit amendments by subject facilities. MPCA is currently working to develop a final SIP revision for facilities in the Rochester SO₂ maintenance area to reduce legacy SIP requirements for sources with minimal SO₂ emissions. MPCA will comply with requirements of the EPA's Data Requirements Rule for SO₂, addressing designations and associated air quality analyses for the SO₂ NAAQS.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Minnesota has no areas currently designated nonattainment for SO₂. MPCA continues to work with facilities included in the SO₂ maintenance areas for the previous SO₂ NAAQS to ensure continued NAAQS attainment, updating the SIP as needed for permit amendments by subject facilities. On December 11, 2015, MPCA submitted a final SIP revision for facilities in the Rochester SO₂ maintenance area to reduce legacy SIP requirements for sources with minimal SO₂ emissions. MPCA will comply with requirements of the EPA's Data Requirements Rule for SO₂, addressing designations and associated air quality analyses for the SO₂ NAAQS.</p>
---	--	---	--

			<p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>16) Complete remaining 10-year maintenance plan SIPs for areas that were previously in nonattainment with the SO₂ or PM₁₀ standard, using a process to be developed in collaboration with EPA Region 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Rochester SO₂ maintenance plan SIP · Twin Cities and Rochester PM₁₀ · Twin Cities and Pine Bend SO₂ 	<p>Ongoing, timing based on EPA discussions.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>Complete remaining 10-year maintenance plan SIPs for areas that were previously in nonattainment with the SO₂ or PM₁₀ standard, using a process to be developed in collaboration with EPA Region 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Rochester SO₂ maintenance plan SIP · Twin Cities and Rochester PM₁₀ · Twin Cities and Pine Bend SO₂ 	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response:</u> MPCA will commit to discussing the status of existing maintenance plans with EPA.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> In FFY 2014, MPCA and EPA discussed plans for submitting maintenance plans with EPA. It has been agreed that the lead redesignation request and maintenance plan will be submitted in FY15, and work has already begun on preparing this submittal. It was also agreed that the Rochester SO₂ and St. Paul PM₁₀ maintenance plans were low-priorities and would be submitted as time allows. The remaining maintenance plans were dropped from discussion due to the expiration of the 20-year maintenance period (area was redesignated to attainment of SO₂ NAAQS in 1995) approaching in 2015 and the existing maintenance plan has ensured attainment throughout that time.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> In FFY 2014, MPCA and EPA discussed plans for submitting maintenance plans with EPA. It was agreed that the Rochester SO₂ and St. Paul PM₁₀ maintenance plans were low-priorities and would be submitted as time allows. The remaining maintenance plans were dropped from discussion due to the expiration of the 20-year maintenance period (area was redesignated to attainment of SO₂ NAAQS in 1995) in 2015 and the existing maintenance plan has ensured attainment throughout that time. MPCA has public noticed a SIP revision for facilities in the Rochester SO₂ maintenance area to reduce legacy SIP</p>

			<p>requirements for sources with minimal SO₂ emissions. No comments were received. Though not a “maintenance plan update,” this SIP action will simplify SIP requirements in Rochester, and should simplify completion of a future maintenance plan SIP revision. The MPCA expect to submit this SIP revision to EPA for approval in December 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Minnesota submitted its SIP revision for the Rochester area legacy SO₂ SIP on December 11, 2015. (No other updates from the FFY 2015 report.)</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA’s progress and concurs with MPCA’s report.</p>
<p>17) Revise ambient air quality standards in Minnesota rules, along with significant harm levels as needed (PM_{2.5}, ozone, lead).</p>	<p>As necessary until Project End Date</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> In FFY 2014, the MPCA shared preliminary draft rule language containing the proposed updated ambient standards with EPA. The preliminary draft rule language was shared with external stakeholders on September 10. The rulemaking is expected to be final by the end of FFY15.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> In FFY 2015, the MPCA shared updated draft rule language containing the proposed updated ambient standards with EPA and made changes to the language to address EPA’s comments. Since summer of 2015, the draft rule language and Statement of Need and Reasonableness has been undergoing legal review. The proposed rulemaking is expected to be on public notice in January 2016 and final in late spring of FFY15.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> On February 29 2016, the MPCA published draft rules (“Omnibus rulemaking”) for public comment. These rules will be effective on December 27, 2016 and align the Minnesota ambient air quality standards with the national ambient air quality standards as well as include new language that incorporates by reference the national ambient air quality standards.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA’s progress and concurs with MPCA’s report.</p>
--	--	--	--

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.	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p>On August 11, the MPCA submitted comments on EPA’s July notice of the proposed consent decree to address the Clean Air Act citizen suit filed with regards to EPA’s failure to complete an analysis to determine if RAVI could be attributed to Sherco units 1 and 2. Following the comment period, the MPCA provided data and input on EPA’s approach as well as comment on a draft modeling protocol.</p>

			<p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> 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. Minnesota provided comment to EPA in support of its proposed settlement agreement resolving Sherco Power Plant Reasonably Attributable Visibility Impairment litigation.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> 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. During FFY 2016, Minnesota provided comment to EPA on its proposed updates to its regional haze rules as well as its regional haze guidance.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
2) Implement BART requirements.	As necessary until Project End Date Kohlasch/ Fenske	<p>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.</p> <p>If EPA approves the BART determinations for Minnesota's subject to BART taconite facilities, then the</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p>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 8th Circuit on June 14, 2013, pending resolution of litigation (to which MPCA is not a party).</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> No work completed in FFY 2014, pending resolution of litigation (and associated stays) for both CSAPR and the taconite BART FIP. The U.S. Supreme Court upheld CSAPR in April</p>

		<p>MPCA will implement the BART conditions provided in the administrative orders.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>2014, and in October 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals (DC Circuit) lifted the stay of the rule, and MPCA will assess implementation requirements in FFY2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> CSAPR is an applicable requirement in affected sources' title V permits, and Minnesota is reviewing EPA's May 2015 guidance to ensure that subject facilities fully comply with CSAPR requirements.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> EGU BART - CSAPR is an applicable requirement in affected sources' title V permits, and Minnesota is using EPA's May 2015 guidance to ensure that subject facilities fully comply with CSAPR requirements. Taconite BART - The MPCA continues to track EPA's implementation of its FIP. EPA finalized the FIP on April 12, 2016 for the Cliffs/ Arcelor facilities and received petitions for review of the NOx emissions limit determination method. An updated FIP is expected to be published in early 2017. EPA continues to work with US Steel facilities and the courts to finalize their FIP.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>3) Implement Long-Term Strategy of taconite 1-hour SO2 and NO2 NAAQS modeling.</p>	<p>Modeling complete by end of 2012.</p> <p>Compliance by 2017.</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p><u>MPCA amended response:</u> 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 MaryJean Fenske/Frank Kohlasch.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA modified the Administrative Orders' modeling provisions in December 2012, requiring the taconite facilities to submit to MPCA facility-specific SO₂ and NO₂ 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> MPCA worked closely throughout FFY 2014 with taconite facilities, the EPA, federal land managers, and tribal representatives, to reassess cumulative modeling requirements under the Regional Haze SIP and associated Administrative Orders (AOs). The process resulted in</p>

			<p>draft final Amendments to the AOs that would require a new round of cumulative modeling for the one-hour SO₂ and NO₂ NAAQS be conducted in support of the Long Term Strategy. Prior to finalization of the Amendments to the AO, the MPCA became aware that the EPA was engaged in active negotiations with the taconite facilities related to the taconite BART FIP. Controls/emissions rates that may result from such negotiations and any potential settlement could significantly impact cumulative modeling results. As a result, the MPCA has temporarily paused the AO modeling work, but will reassess progress in early 2015 and proceed as necessary to ensure implementation of its Long Term Strategy.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Minnesota continues to monitor the progress of settlements and FIP actions pertaining to taconite BART, and its efforts to update and implement long-term strategy AOs have been suspended pending final resolution of taconite BART limits. Implementation of a separate but related set of regulatory requirements could interfere with federal efforts to finalize BART, and Minnesota believes that its AOs serve as a useful backstop to further settlement delays. Upon finalization of taconite BART limits, Minnesota will revoke long-term strategy AOs; should the EPA be unable to finalize BART limits in current settlement discussions, Minnesota will consider further action on its long-term strategy AOs.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Minnesota continues to track the progress of settlements and FIP actions pertaining to taconite BART, and its efforts to update and implement long-term strategy AOs have been suspended pending final resolution of taconite BART limits. Implementation of a separate but related set of regulatory requirements could interfere with federal efforts to finalize BART, and Minnesota believes that its AOs serve as a useful backstop to further settlement delays. Upon finalization of taconite BART limits in the FIP, Minnesota will terminate the long-term strategy AOs; should the EPA be unable to finalize BART limits on a FIP, Minnesota will consider further action on its long-term strategy AOs.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>4) Submit interim progress report SIP due 5 years after the submittal of the initial Regional Haze SIP as required under 51.308(g).</p>	<p>As necessary until Project End Date</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Fenske</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Minnesota developed and public noticed its Regional Haze SIP Five-Year Progress Report in FFY2014. The MPCA is finalizing the Five-Year Progress Report, and will submit to EPA on schedule, no later than December 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Minnesota submitted its Five-Year Progress Report in December 2014, in accordance with its federally required deadline. Minnesota awaits EPA action on its submittal.</p> <p><u>EA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> No action by Minnesota required in FFY 2016. Awaiting action by EPA on its submittal.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA is currently reviewing MPCA's Five-Year Progress Report.</p>
--	--	--	--

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 Smith D./Volkmeier	Issue construction permits compliant with Greenhouse Gas BACT	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> One permit action that was major for GHGs was received during FFY2013 and another during FFY014. As noted above, the permit action from FFY2013 was reviewed by R5 and issued with GHG BACT conditions. The permit action from FFY2014 (a major modification for another PSD pollutant) is still being prepared. It will be sent to R5 for its review.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> One permit action that was major for GHGs (for an anyway modification) was received during 2015. This permit was reviewed by R5 and issued with GHG BACT conditions.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> During FFY 2016, the MPCA received one PSD permit application that was major for GHGs (for an anyway modification). This permit was reviewed by R5 and issued with GHG BACT conditions.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
2) Issue 78 % of major PSD/NSR permits within one year of receiving a	Ongoing until Project End Date	Issue 78 % of major PSD/NSR permits within one year of receiving a complete permit application.	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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</p>

complete permit application.	Smith D./Volkmeier		<p>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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Three of three PSD permit applications received during FFY2013 were issued within 365 days of receiving permit application. None of the six PSD permit applications received during FFY2014 was issued within 365 days of receiving permit application. (Two of the PSD permit t applications have been withdrawn. The remaining four have been in house less than 365 days.)</p> <p>There are a number of outstanding PSD permit applications that pre-date FFY2013. 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><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Both of the PSD applications received during FFY2014 were issued within 365 days of receiving the permit application. One of the PSD permit applications received during FFY2015 was issued within 365 days of receiving the permit application. A second FFY2015 PSD permit application was received less than three months ago (August 17, 2015). A number of outstanding PSD permit applications that pre-date FFY2013 remain. This category now includes a permit application from FFY2013. 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><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA received two PSD applications during FFY2016. One of the permits was issued within 365 days of receiving the permit application, while the other was received about nine months ago (February 12, 2016) and has not yet been issued. The application for the other permit issued in FFY 2016 was submitted in FFY 2012. A number of outstanding PSD permit applications that pre-date FFY2016 remain. Many of the desired permit actions are changes to BACT limits/conditions.</p>
------------------------------	--------------------	--	--

			<p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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 Smith D./Volkmeier</p>	<p>Issue NSR permits consistent with CAA requirements and enter BACT/LAER determinations in the RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse (RBLC).</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The four PSD permits issued in FFY2013 were submitted to R5 for review to ensure consistency with CAA requirements. 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Four PSD permits were issued in FFY2014. They were submitted to R5 for review to ensure consistency with CAA requirements. MPCA entered the BACT determination for two applications issued during FFY2014. The remaining two PSD applications were for changes to BACT limits. The BACT determination for one of these changes to a BACT limit is in progress. The other BACT determination affirmed the original BACT determination.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Three PSD permits were issued in FFY2015. They were submitted to R5 for review to ensure consistency with CAA requirements. MPCA entered the BACT determination for the three PSD permits. These determinations have not yet been published in the RBLC.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA issued two PSD permits in FFY2016. The permits were submitted to R5 for review to ensure consistency with CAA requirements. MPCA also submitted the BACT determination for the PSD permits to the RBLC, but these determinations have not been yet published there.</p> <p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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>Smith D./Volkmeier</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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The one BACT determination from FFY2013-2014 that is currently available in the RBLC contains this information. It was also included in the other submittals to the RBLC.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> None of the BACT determinations from FFY2015 are available in the RBLC. (See Item 3 above.)</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> None of the BACT determinations from FFY2016 is available in the RBLC. (See Item 3 above.)</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>Smith D./Volkmeier</p>	<p>Coordinate with EPA to ensure that Endangered Species Act consultations are handled in a timely manner.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Project proposers are required to contact EPA directly with ESA information. For the four PSD projects completed in FFY2014, ESA consultations were completed prior to permit issuance.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Project proposers are required to contact EPA directly with ESA information. For the three PSD projects completed in FFY2015, ESA (and NHPA) consultations were completed prior to permit issuance.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Project proposers are required to contact EPA directly with ESA information. For the two PSD projects completed in FFY2016, ESA and NHPA consultations were completed prior to permit issuance.</p>

			<p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
6) Provide PSD/NSR permit applications to EPA prior to the start of the public comment period.	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Smith D./Volkmeier</p>	<p>Provide PSD/NSR permit applications to EPA prior to the start of the public comment period.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> No report kept. Project proposers are required to submit applications to EPA directly.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> No report kept. Project proposers are required to submit applications to EPA directly.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> No report kept. Project proposers are required to submit applications to EPA directly.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> No report kept. Project proposers are required to submit applications to EPA directly.</p>
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.	<p>As necessary until Project End Date</p> <p>Kuskie/Brooks</p>	<p>MPCA is refreshing its policy for "environmental justice". Activities for permitting will be identified through this effort by September 20, 2013.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA's 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA's EJ coordinator continued to meet with community members. In addition, the MPCA convened several sub teams to develop policies and procedures that will be combined to create the MPCA's EJ Framework. The sub teams were: EJ Area Analysis, Regulatory Services, Consideration of Cumulative Impacts, and Enhance Outreach. The intent is to have an EJ Framework laid out, including actions taken under these four areas to improve engagement in regulatory and permitting processes, by early CY2015. The MPCA also began work on a project to improve air quality around several emitters where the community has expressed concerns. Beginning early in CY2015, we anticipate one additional FTE focused on the implementation of EJ in air permitting and regulatory work.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> With extensive community input, the MPCA developed procedures for public participation in areas of concern for environmental justice during our regulatory and permitting processes. This also includes longer-term community engagement practices to build trust and establish relationships to improve effectiveness during regulatory actions.</p>

			<p>In FFY15 the MPCA established a new position of EJ Analyst to assist with integrate environmental justice into our permitting and regulatory work.</p> <p>Fostering participation and engagement of low-income residents and people of color in our regulatory processes is one of several key objectives of our draft environmental justice framework, our vision and strategies for integrating EJ principles across the work of the MPCA. This framework will be completed in FFY16.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Report: Our Environmental Justice Framework, complete in December of 2015 emphasizes outreach and engagement in low-income communities and communities of color around permitting and other regulatory actions. In FFY 16, the MPCA announced plans to reissue an expired permit at a facility in an area of concern for environmental justice and initiated enhanced community engagement. In addition, communication with community members about ambient monitoring exceedances and legal action involving another facility included extensive civic engagement work.</p> <p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
--	--	--	---

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
<p>1) Emission Inventory: (1) Develop Criteria Pollutant emission inventories and submit it to EPA's National Emissions Inventory (NEI) database; (2) also,</p>	<p>Dec. 31, 2012- CAP 2011 inventory</p> <p>Mar. 31, 2013 HAP 2011 inventory</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>MPCA will also submit comments and corrections to the 2011 v1 Point, Nonpoint, Onroad/Nonroad to the EISQA Environment by EPA's deadline of March 31, 2014</p> <p>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.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Dec. 31, 2015 CAP & HAP 2014 inventory</p> <p>Kohlasch/ Palmer</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The MPCA will quality assure, validate and revise NEI data using EIS and will continue to participate in regional emission inventory workgroup conference calls.</p>	<p><u>EPA Comments:</u> 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> <p><u>MPCA Response:</u> (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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA reviewed and submitted comments on version 1 and version 2 of the 2011 CAP and HAP NEI other than mobile sources. We will plan to review the version 2 2011 mobile source emissions when they are available. MPCA is prepared to submit 2013 CAP point source emissions by the January deadline</p> <p>MPCA has reviewed the schedule for the 2014 CAP and HAP inventory submissions and plans to meet the 2015 and 2016 calendar year schedules. We continue to participate on the regional conference calls and discussions.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA has reviewed the schedule for the 2014 CAP and HAP inventory submissions and plans to meet the 2015 and 2016 calendar year schedules. We continue to participate on the regional conference calls and discussions.</p> <p>We have submitted MOVES inputs for the 2014 inventory and plan to meet the 1/15/16 deadline for submitting point source CAP and HAP inventory submissions. We are also on track to meet the new deadline of 2/19/16 to submit data to the 2014 NEI v1 for nonpoint sources for CAPS and HAPS. For some nonpoint sectors, we may accept the EPA v1 estimates and reserve comment for the v2 estimates since some EPA non-point tools have been delayed.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> Region 5 appreciates MPCA's timely submittal of the 2014 emission inventory.</p>
---	---	---	---

			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA submitted the 2014 CAP and HAP facility inventories and nonpoint data. We are on track to submit 2015 CAP facility emissions in Dec 2016. We reviewed EPA QA of our data and submitted changes for 2014 data. We are also reviewing 2014 facility emissions highlighted during EPA's NATA review and will meet the May 2017 deadline for submitting changes and comments.</p> <p>We continue to participate on regional conference calls and discussions and have been an active state member working on EPA's Consolidated Air Emissions Repository Project (CAER).</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA appreciates MPCA's timely submittals of emission inventory data. We also especially appreciate MPCA's review of HAP inventory data for point sources for the 2014 NATA review and the commitment to meet the May 1st deadline for changes and comments.</p>
<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>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016. 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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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. The draft Omnibus rulemaking scheduled for notice later in 2014 will adopt additional NSPS and major source NESHAP as identified.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> 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 JJJJJ, the major and area source rules for boilers.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The mercury reduction rule was adopted by State of Minnesota on September 22, 2014. With this adoption, the MPCA will assume delegation of the major source NESHAPs (MATS and DDDDD). The area source NESHAP JJJJJ was also incorporated by reference into states rule but the MPCA will not seek delegation of this standard.</p> <p>The rule also now allows the MPCA to complete its 111(d) plan for existing CISWI, SSI, and other solid waste incinerators. This process will likely conclude in late 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA has communicated with EPA Region V that it will accept the federal plan for Sewage Sludge Incinerators and Commercial/Industrial Solid Waste Incinerators. The MPCA will file a letter of negative declaration for the “other solid waste incinerator” category in FFY 2016.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA is disappointed that MPCA will not be submitting a State Plan for the SSI and CISWI after incorporating the guidelines in their mercury reduction rule. EPA looks forward to receiving the Negative Declaration for the OSWI and will process it promptly.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA has completed the “Omnibus” rulemaking (see FY13 report) to complete adoption of the listed NESHAP and NSPS and it will be effective on December 27, 2016.</p> <p>40 CFR Subp QQQQ was promulgated in 2015. The MPCA is working with EPA Region V to promote compliance with this standard that controls emissions from wood-fired central heaters, a significant contributor to MPCA’s PM2.5 inventory. The MPCA very much appreciates EPA Region V’s support and involvement in implementing 40 CFR Subp QQQQ. The MPCA looks forward to continuing this partnership to successfully implement this standard in Minnesota as well as nationally.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA looks forward to working with MPCA on CISWI.</p> <p>Regarding all NESHAPs incorporated into Minnesota State rules, EPA request that MPCA formally request delegation according to the procedures outlined in the Delegation MOA with EPA. In Section III.A (3), “MPCA shall submit a letter to EPA with proof of incorporation by reference, including the date of the action. This will ensure all implementation authority.” Next, in accordance with Section III.B.(3), “EPA shall respond to the MPCA’s written announcement of completing its rulemaking to incorporate the standards by reference with a letter delegating enforcement authority to the MPCA with respect to the standard or standards.”</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> The MPCA will submit a letter to request delegation for specific NESHAPs in accordance in accordance with the Delegation MOA.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>3) Participate in the quarterly State/Region 5 risk assessment conference calls. Participate in annual State/Region 5 air toxics meeting.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016.</p> <p>Kohlasch/Roberson</p>	<p>Will commit to quarterly calls. However, travel is subject to agency budget and administrative restrictions.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to participate on the quarterly risk assessment conference calls. One staff person was physically at the Reg 5 States AT meeting, several staff participated electronically as well as presenting presentations on our PAH Monitoring Study (Community Air Toxics Grant) and EJ Projects & Integration at the MPCA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to participate on the quarterly risk assessment conference calls. Two MPCA personnel attended at the Reg 5 States AT meeting and gave a presentation, several staff participated electronically.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA appreciates MPCAs continued participation in the quarterly state risk assessment calls and annual meetings.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to participate on the quarterly risk assessment conference calls. The air risk assessor supervisor and a staff risk assessor attended the Reg 5 States AT meeting; MN air risk assessors gave multiple presentations both in person and electronically. Several staff participated electronically.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA continues to appreciate MPCA's continued participation in the quarterly state risk assessment calls and annual meetings. EPA greatly appreciated the multiple presentations MPCA prepared and presented at the annual meeting.</p>
<p>4) Participate in research projects, policy issues and task forces that address</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p>	<p>As MPCA priorities and resources allow.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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>identification and reduction of persistent bio-accumulative air toxic pollutants.</p>	<p>Kohlasch/ Roberson</p>		<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Work on the PAH in Urban Air Community Air Toxic grant continues. Quarterly status reports are provided to EPA. Work continues as resources allow on MNRiskS - we are using MNRiskS 2008 and will be preparing for MNRiskS 2011 with the finalization of the 2011 Emission inventory.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Work on the PAH in Urban Air Community Air Toxic grant is wrapping up. Quarterly status reports are provided to EPA. Development of a Community air toxics report is in progress and submittal to EPA is expected June 2016. Work continues as resources allow on MNRiskS - MNRiskS 2011 has been delivered and is in beta testing. Development of MNRiskS 2014 will commence with the finalization of the 2014 Emission inventory.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> PAH in Urban Air Community Air Toxic grant has wrapped up. Final report was submitted to EPA June 30, 2016. Multiple posters and a presentation at SETAC resulted from the study. Manuscripts for submittal to peer review journals are currently in development.</p> <p>Planning and development of MNRiskS 2014 is underway. The MNRiskS team participated in an CI process mapping session from which an updated MNRiskS Technical Support Document (TSD) was produced and is currently in publications for formatting and subsequent posting to the MPCA Air Risk Assessment webpages.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
<p>5) As resources allow, work with communities to develop and implement voluntary air toxics programs that</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Patraw/ 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</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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</p>

<p>address outdoor, indoor, and mobile sources with emphasis on areas with potential environmental justice concerns.</p>		<p>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>exploring ways to target portions of the funding and effort to areas with potential environmental justice concerns.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA received \$1.4 in state funding for Nonpoint Air reduction work that includes funding for voluntary air toxics reduction efforts to be implemented in FY14-FY15. Working in cooperation with Clean Air Minnesota, a public/private partnership, the MPCA is implementing non-point air pollution reduction efforts 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 way, an Air alert partner program with businesses/ organizations and an expansion of our Green Corps Program that places post graduate students at host communicates throughout Minnesota. Also, we have undertaken additional air monitoring in the metro area to access air toxics. These efforts all consider exploring ways to target portions of the funding to areas with potential environmental justice concerns.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> In June of 2015, the MPCA completed the first phase of a two year, \$1,400,000 effort to reduce Nonpoint Air emissions focused on voluntary air toxics reductions to be implemented in FY14-FY15. Working in cooperation with Clean Air Minnesota, a public/private partnership, the MPCA implemented these non-point air pollution reduction activities:</p> <p>1) (a) Clean Diesel: we developed a model contract for state agencies and LGUs requiring them to use clean diesel equipment if awarded a state or local contract. 1 (b) The MPCA continued awarding clean diesel grants (\$150,000) as part of our ongoing DERA funding from EPA.</p> <p>2) Wood Smoke: we developed an Outdoor Wood Boiler Model Ordinance for LGUs to use. We worked with CAM partners in developing new outreach materials on recreational</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>burning which were advertised via billboards and the internet. We hope to build on this pilot in 2016.</p> <p>3) VOC reduction initiative: we undertook a joint project with MN Technical Assistance Program to target assistance to high VOC usage sectors and develop an RFP process for companies to request grant funding for VOC reduction projects.</p> <p>4) Air Alert Outreach Program: we initiated an air alert program aimed at getting CAM partners to encourage their employees to sign-up and take actions when receiving an air alert triggered by poor air quality days. We plan to increase the number of people getting air alerts so they can take actions during these times to reduce emissions and reduce health impacts.</p> <p>5) MN GreenCorps Program: was expanded by 5 members to focus on reducing energy. GreenCorps places post graduate students at host communities throughout Minnesota.</p> <p>6) Gas Can Exchange: 1,500 old "high emitting" gas cans were exchanged for new non-vented spill-proof cans.</p> <p>7) Community Forestry: a health impact analysis related to community forestry issues was completed and several projects were implemented to replace trees destroyed by emerald ash borer.</p> <p>8) Air Monitoring: we started new air monitoring in the metro area to assess air toxics.</p> <p>9) Environmental Justice (EJ) and Human Health: All projects implemented included an analysis of EJ opportunities and human health impacts.</p> <p><u>The estimated and projected emissions reductions were:</u> Volatile Organic Compounds: 2-yr: 297 tons; 10-yr: 1,500 tons Nitrogen Oxides: 2-yr: 38 tons; 10-yr: 192 tons Fine Particle Matter (PM 2.5): 2-yr: 155 tons; 10-yr: 905 tons</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA received \$1.4 in state funding for Nonpoint Air reduction work that includes funding for voluntary air toxics reduction efforts to be implemented in FY16-FY17. Working in cooperation with Clean Air Minnesota (CAM), a public/private partnership, the MPCA is implementing non-point air pollution reduction effort and has begun the following activities: 1) Clean Diesel: Utilize \$240K of the state funding to supplement our Diesel Emission Reduction Act (DERA) grant program for Class 5 and larger on-road and heavy duty off-road vehicles. 2) Wood Smoke: Project Stove Swap is being implemented through Environmental Initiative, a CAM partner to swap out old high emitting wood stoves and boilers with new cleaner burning equipment. 3) Business VOC reduction initiative to target assistance to high VOC usage sectors and develop RFP process for companies to request grant funding for VOC reduction projects. Included in this is an innovative pilot project working with a parts washer vendor to provide rebates to change from a solvent-based parts washer to a low VOC water based system. 4) High emitting vehicle project: we are working with our CAM partners on a pilot repair project to work with non-profit garages to repair high emitting vehicles owned by low-income residents. Other efforts under way are an Air Alert partner program with businesses/organizations to inform the public of days where air quality is harmful, and an expansion of our Green Corps Program that places post graduate students at host communicates throughout Minnesota. Also, we have undertaken additional air monitoring in the metro area to access air toxics. These efforts all consider exploring ways to target portions of the funding to areas with potential environmental justice concerns.</p> <p>We are also starting to implement the Minnesota portion of the Volkswagen Consent Decree, which will provide significant funding to reduce NOx emissions intended to offset emissions from vehicles that had factory altered emission controls.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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	Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Kohlasch/ Patraw/ Giddings	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.	<u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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 wood smoke. These efforts are being coordinated through the reestablished Clean Air Minnesota effort. b) Not applicable to the MPCA c)The MPCA's mercury reduction efforts are coordinated through the Mercury TMDL Implementation plan discussed in item 7, below.

<p>integrate indoor air programs such as Tools for Schools, Asthma-ETS. Continue efforts</p> <p>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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <p>a) See report for item 5) above for voluntary reduction programs.</p> <p>b) Not applicable to the MPCA</p> <p>c) See report for item 7) below for mercury reduction work. In addition, the MPCA adopted a mercury emission reduction rule in September 2014 requiring emission reduction plans from certain facilities and requiring annual mercury emission reporting for facilities releasing 3 pounds or more of mercury each year.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u></p> <p>a) See report for item 5) above for voluntary reduction programs.</p> <p>b) Not applicable to the MPCA</p> <p>c) Mercury reduction work is shifting to a focus on mercury use in products and mercury in the waste stream. The MPCA mercury emission reduction rule, adopted in September 2014, anticipated emission reduction plans from 18 facilities. Of the 18 anticipated plans, 12 facilities submitted updated emissions data to show their emissions were low enough that they did not have to submit a plan; 3 facilities accepted permit limits to reduce their mercury emissions; and one facility was regulated under a federal emissions rule. The remaining 2 facilities submitted plans to the MPCA for review. The MPCA will continue to review the plans and make any necessary permit changes to adopt the plan conditions.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Work on reducing the use of mercury in products and wastes includes: administering a voluntary mercury amalgam separator program; compliance, enforcement and education regarding mercury in skin lighteners; studying the prevalence of mercury-catalyzed polyurethane floors; education regarding Minnesota's 2014 statute banning mercury wheel weights; and continued monitoring of the collection and proper recycling of mercury thermostats, switches, and thermometers.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA is meeting its commitments. Minnesota's mercury reduction programs continue to be among the nations strongest.</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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u></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. <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <p>The MPCA used the FFY2014 GLAD funding to complete the purchase of new precipitation monitors for the atmospheric deposition monitoring sites in Minnesota. The host state for these monitors is required to maintain and upgrade the equipment at each site to continue participation in the national program. Through the use of state funds and GLAD funds, the MPCA has maintained all of its atmospheric deposition monitors and no site closures are currently planned.</p> <p>The MPCA also used GLAD funds to supplement analytical laboratory costs from the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) to support the MPCA's PAH monitoring project. The additional GLAD funding allowed the MPCA and MDH to conduct additional PAH</p>
---	---	---	---

		<p>FFY2014 Projects supported by GLAD allocation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Complete purchase of new precipitation monitors for the remainder of Minnesota's atmospheric deposition monitoring sites. 2) Provide supplemental analytical support to the PAH monitoring effort to understand the ambient levels of this important class of compounds. <p>FFY2015 Projects supported by GLAD allocation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Conducting a Residential Fuel Wood Survey to support the 2014 NEI for dioxin and PAH emissions from wood burning. 2) Appliance recycler training to reduce mercury releases 3) Study of mercury-catalyzed polyurethane floors 4) Sulfate mercury methylation study <p>FFY2016 Projects supported by GLAD allocation:</p>	<p>analysis to identify potential PAH markers for diesel emissions and address interference issues with certain overlapping PAH peaks.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The Mercury Filling Study with the University of Minnesota was completed in FFy2015. The study developed a method to better quantify the potential mercury emissions from cremation in Minnesota. The study indicated that previous estimates may have been high. The study also highlighted the challenges of visual acknowledgement or removal of mercury containing dental treatments at the time of cremation. It is anticipated that the methodology developed can be used in future studies of age and geographic cohorts to improve regional and national estimates.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Residential Fuel Wood Survey was conducted FFY2015. The results are being assembled and analyzed at this time and will be provided to EPA when the data QA and analysis are complete. 2) The appliance recycler training was not conducted in FFY2015 due to staff resource limitations. The training will occur in FFY2016 and results of the outreach will be provided to EPA. 3) The FFY2015 study of mercury-catalyzed polyurethane (MCP) floors yielded a small population of potential schools of concern. 140 schools in Minnesota were surveyed for the presence of MCP floors. The survey found one MCP floor that had been covered with a synthetic floor and air monitoring showed very low mercury levels. A review of additional schools found three additional uncovered MCP floors. These suspected floors sampled for mercury emissions and physically sampled for mercury content. Air monitoring results showed that the emissions are not large enough to add to the state's emission inventory and with proper ventilation, occupants are not at risk. When one floor was analyzed for leachable mercury, mercury levels were high for the material to be considered hazardous waste. The MPCA also provided outreach and expertise to school districts in Minnesota with concerns from potentially problematic floor materials. 4) Sampling and analysis for the sulfate mercury methylation study was conducted in FFY2015. The results will be reviewed and analyzed in FFY2016. The study findings will be provided to EPA in FFY2016, when the study is completed.
--	--	---	--

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Contracting funds for the update of the MNRiskS tool with 2011 NEI emissions data. This update will provide additional data for the risks from emissions of chemicals with deposition characteristics, such as PAHs, mercury, and dioxins. 2) Contracting funds to cover analytical costs for mercury deposition monitors in Minnesota. 	<p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the GLAD commitments to date. EPA would like to work with MPCA in 2016 to ensure the results of these reports are shared with other interested Great Lakes States.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Residential Fuel Wood Survey report was completed in May 2016 and results shared with EPA, Region V states, and Clean Air Minnesota. It is available on the MPCA's wood smoke website. 2) Due to staff resource limitations, the money for appliance recycler training was directed toward the residential wood smoke project. 3) The mercury-catalyzed polyurethane (MCP) floors project to determine the quantity of these floors in Minnesota's schools and estimate how much mercury is volatilizing is complete. Results are being compiled although it was determined that there are not as many floors as the MPCA previously thought and the amount released will not trigger a three lbs./year threshold. The Minnesota Department of Health has developed guidance for schools on proper ventilation of field houses and gymnasiums containing these floors. 4) Sampling and analysis for the sulfate mercury methylation study was conducted in FFY2015 and the results are currently being reviewed and analyzed. The study findings will be provided to EPA in FFY2016 when the study is complete. <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting its commitment in this area.</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.

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</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>Boeck & Kilgriff/Morrill</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><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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> A Draft 2014 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 9/30/14.</p> <p>An alternative CMS plan was submitted for 2015 and was approved by the EPA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The alternative CMS plan reviewed and approved by EPA for 2015 requires that the results of 2015 be used to determine the CMS plan for 2016. The 2015 commitment was not due to be completed until 9/30/15, thus supplying a 2016 commitment by 8/31/15 was not possible. 2016 implementation is scheduled to begin once 2015 results are tabulated (after 9/30/15) and a 2016 list is generated and submitted. The anticipated implementation date is no later than 10/31/15</p>

<p>completed for the non-Title V source universe by December 1, 2013.</p>	<p>(MPCA)/ Marceillars (EPA)</p>		<p><u>EPA Response:</u> Draft CMS plans are due to region 8/31, final 9/30 and implementation of plan begins 10/1. MPCA provides a mid-year progress report to EPA. At that time, MPCA should review facilities for generating a new list for the next fiscal year or at least begin the review process. MPCA stated they will try to start making a list earlier; however, the list cannot be finalized until after the end of the federal fiscal year.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (February 2016): The MPCA will begin its review process prior to the end of the Federal Fiscal year (FFY) and will provide a preliminary/partial list to the EPA prior to the end of the FFY.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> No comments</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The draft 2016 alternative CMS plan was submitted to the EPA and was approved. The alternative CMS Plan was fully completed by 9/30/16.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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 Boeck & Kilgriff (MPCA)/ Dickens (EPA)</p>	<p>MPCA staff has been responsive to complaints forwarded by EPA, and inspected as necessary and provided summary of outcomes to EPA.</p> <p><u>MPCA note regarding responsible party names:</u> Ms. Koelfgen is the manager of this program who would like to view Ms. Kilgriff's reports so we need to keep her name on all C&E measures –thank you.</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><u>FFY 2014 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><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA has been responsive to complaints both internally and also forwarded by the EPA, and has followed up as necessary and provided a summary of the outcomes to the EPA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA responds to all complaints, including those that are referred by the EPA. The MPCA will continue to provide the EPA with updated on referred complaints.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p>
<p>3) Sources/landfills subject to the asbestos NESHAP regulations will be inspected in accordance with EPA's 1988.</p> <p>Implementation Strategy for Revised Asbestos NESHAP guidance.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Giddings/Kroening (MPCA)/ Dickens (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.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> MPCA Solid Waste staff inspected a total of 8 landfills this FFY.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> MPCA Solid Waste staff inspected a total of 41 landfills this FFY.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA Solid Waste staff inspected a total of 27 landfills this FFY.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA Solid Waste staff inspected a total of 26 landfills this FFY.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</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</p> <p>Boeck & 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.</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><u>FFY 2014 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><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2015 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><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA and MPCA will discuss SRF follow-up action items at the next monthly conference call scheduled for January 26th.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (February 2016): The MPCA provided training to staff on Feb 23rd to address a number of EPA recommendations. The MPCA will continue to work with EPA until completion</p> <p>SRF 2015 MN data was submitted to EPA on February 19, 2016</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> EPA and MPCA continue to discuss and work together on the SRF recommendations.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 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><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> The final MPCA Round 3 SRF report was submitted to MPCA January 12, 2017. EPA will be tracking the recommendations during FFY 2017.</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</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Boeck & 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.</p> <p>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> <p><u>FFY 2014 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> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p>

<p>excess emission reports (EERs) that are submitted by subject sources.</p>			<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA reviews and tracks all CEMS and COMS reports for compliance and takes appropriate enforcement when violations are identified and such action is warranted. Facility permits require installation of CEMS and COMS when applicable.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> The Output/Measure requires MPCA to review and track source EERs, which they are doing. EPA would prefer that MPCA provide those EERs to EPA, but MPCA claims it does not have the resources to do so.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (February 2016):</u> Copies of any EER the EPA wishes to see are available by request</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> No comments</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA reviews and tracks all CEMS and COMS reports for compliance and takes appropriate enforcement when violations are identified and such action is warranted. Facility permits require installation of CEMS and COMS when applicable.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</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 2015 ICIS-Air Information Collection Request (ICR), 2014 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, 2014 Guidance on Federal Reportable Violations (FRVs) for Stationary Sources, as it pertains to non-Title V sources.</p>	<p>60-day reporting as required by ICR</p> <p>Boeck & Kilgriff/ Gorg (MPCA) Marceillars/ (EPA)</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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 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><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA has made every attempt to submit 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. The MPCA has been transitioning to a new data system, which has presented some difficulty, however we believe we have been meeting the requirements.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA has been directly entering the MDRs in ICIS-Air until an electronic transfer program is developed. Any data issues or deficiencies are identified in the monthly calls and corrected by MPCA data steward.</p> <p><u>MPCA Comments</u> (February 2016): MPCA receives ICIS Air C&E data reports from EPA prior to each monthly call. MPCA then compares this data with corresponding data from our TEMPO database (excel spreadsheet for stack tests) and adds/edits/deletes ICIS Air data as necessary.</p>

<p>Ensure data is complete, accurate and timely consistent with EPA policies and ICR.</p>			<p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> During the monthly call in March, MPCA realized there needs to be a strategy developed between MPCA enforcement and data program offices for reporting their data in a complete, accurate and timely manner to ICIS-Air.</p> <p><u>MPCA Comments (April 2016):</u> The MPCA continues to diligently work on automated data submittal. In light of the recent conversion to the Tempo, database system automated transfer is not yet possible; however, the MPCA data steward manually enters data and verifies its accuracy.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA began flowing data from TEMPO to ICIS-Air in October. The MPCA continues to further develop and maintain submittal information to meet the EPA's minimum Data Requirements.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is currently submitting its compliance and enforcement data to ICIS-Air test. Once MPCA receives a 95% or higher data transfer rate in ICIS-Air test, they can then transfer their data into ICIS-Air production. EPA will continue to monitor MPCA's progress.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> MPCA is submitting minimum data requirements to ICIS-Air production. The MPCA continues to further develop and maintain submittal information to meet the EPA's minimum Data Requirements. The MPCA continues to request read access to the relevant EPA data tables for QA/QC purposes.</p>
<p>2) State will report asbestos demo/reno notification information, compliance evaluations and enforcement activities, including penalties assessed, alphabetically by owner/operator to EPA, annually.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Kroening (MPCA)/ Marceillars (EPA)</p>	<p>State will report asbestos demo/reno notification information, compliance evaluations and enforcement activities alphabetically by owner or operator to EPA, annually.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> <u>A Summary report will be Sent to EPA. Below is a brief summary for the FFY.</u></p> <p>Inspections Complaints: 38 Routine: 27 Landfills: 8 File Review: 3 Total: 76 Enforcement: LOW – 2 NOV- 2 APO -32 STIPS -4</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Intent to Demo notifications submitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. 1,000 (2,073 includes amendments) <p>Asbestos-related work (renovation) notifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. 900 (3000+ w/amendments) <p>(**note** MDH = 1,400 original including residential abatement)</p> <p>Inspections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints –Demolition – 34 • Complaints – Renovations - 6 • Complaint – Disposal – 6 • Complaint – Landfill - 1 • Routine Demo – 6 • Routine Reno – 0 • Routine Landfill - 41 <p>Total = 97</p> <p>Enforcement Actions</p> <p>LOW – 1</p> <p>NOV – 3</p> <p>APO (issued) – 26 (total penalty amt = \$58, 200)</p> <p>Stipulation – 1 (pending) (proposed penalty \$25,000)</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> <u>Number of Inspections Associated with Asbestos NESHAP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints –Demolition of Regulated Structures (or reported as a NESHAP regulated) = 33 • Complaints – Renovations (as regulated) = 5 • Complaint – Disposal of regulated ACM = 1 • Complaint – Landfill = 0 • Routine Demolition of Regulated Structure = 11 • Routine Renovation of Regulated Structure = 1 • Routine Landfill (NESHAP regulated) = 27 <p>Total Inspections: 78</p> <p><u>Enforcement Actions (w/NESHAP violations)</u></p> <p>LOW = 4</p> <p>NOV = 3</p> <p>APO (issued) = 16</p> <p>Total penalty amount = \$17,650 (NESHAP only portion of the total penalty)</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Stipulation Agreement = 1 Total penalty amount = \$5,000 Total enforcement actions = 24 Total penalty = \$22,900 Original/initial Demolition Notification = 1,429 Original/initial Renovation Notification (Asbestos Related Work) = 768 (MPCA only)</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> <u>Number of Inspections Associated with Asbestos NESHAP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaints –Demolition of Regulated Structures (or reported as a regulated) = 25 • Complaints – Renovations (as regulated) = 4 • Complaint – Disposal of regulated ACM = 15 • Complaint – Landfill = 2 • Routine Demolition of Regulated Structure = 2 • Routine Renovation of Regulated Structure = 1 • Routine Landfill (that accepts ACM) = 26 <p><u>Enforcement Actions (w/NESHAP violations)</u> LOW = 6 NOV = 1 APO (issued) = 8 Total penalty amount = \$24,565.51 Stipulation - 1 Total penalty amount = \$4,000</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p>
--	--	--	---

FY 2013-2016 – Enforcement

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) 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 180-day timeframe, EPA and State will determine which agency is best suited to take or</p>	<p>Monthly Boeck & Kilgriff/ Gorg (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><u>EPA Comments:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 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 on enforcement cases during each of the monthly conference calls with the EPA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> 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 on enforcement cases during each of the monthly conference calls with the EPA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA provides updates on enforcement cases during the monthly conference calls.</p>

<p>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, as it pertains to non-Title V sources.</p>			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> 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 on enforcement cases during each of the monthly conference calls with the EPA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA provides updates on enforcement cases and HPVs during the regularly scheduled monthly conference calls.</p>
<p>2) State will conduct its enforcement activities in accordance with EPA 2014 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.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Boeck & Kilgriff (MPCA)/ Dickens (EPA)</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><u>EPA Comments:</u> MPCA reports the other MDRs (full compliance evaluations, stack test reviews, Title V annual certification reviews) in a timely manner.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 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 newly updated policy and is required to follow the processes contained therein. Staff will attend upcoming training on the newly modified policy, as it is available.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments to date.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 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 newly</p>

			<p>updated policy and is required to follow the processes contained therein. Staff will attend upcoming training on the newly modified policy, as it is available.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is following the HPV policy and Asbestos strategy, but is not currently calculating penalties in conformance with the 1991 CAA Stationary Source civil penalty policy.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (February 2016): The MPCA is working with the EPA to resolve discrepancies in its application of the CAA penalty policy</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA multimedia program managers and staff will meet by end of April to discuss the implementation of a penalty matrix similar to one that was used in the past. MPCA is looking to begin implementing by mid-May. Both agencies will evaluate the effectiveness of the matrix and determine if it resolves the penalty, issue identified in the SRF.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 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 newly updated policy and is required to follow the processes to ensure that data is sent to ICIS when it becomes available (when the case is closed).</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting its commitments except for the 1991 CAA Stationary Source Civil Penalty Policy. This issue was identified during the State Review Framework. MPCA is currently reviewing its penalty matrix previously used in order to provide modifications. Once completed, MPCA will submit a draft to EPA for review before implementation.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> The MPCA sent EPA the revised penalty matrix on February 28, 2017. EPA comments are being integrated into the guidance and the final version will be completed by April 15, 2017.</p>
--	--	--	--

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 Smith D./Volkmeier	Virginia & Hibbing will be issued by Oct. 1, 2011 Flint Hills by Oct 2012 Marathon by Dec 2012	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u></p> <p>The following were issued:</p> <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 <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <p>This action was completed last year. In addition to the permits that originally fulfilled this requirement, in FFY 2014, 11 additional Part 70 permits were reissued for power generating facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xcel Energy – Monticello Generating – 11/15/13 • Mankato Energy Center – 2/14/14 • Broadway Generation Plant – 2/28/14 • Benson Municipal Utilities – 3/10/14 • Hutchinson Utilities Plant 1 – 3/27/14 • Xcel Energy Black Dog – 4/1/14

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/>, IN ADDITION, EPA Regional Priorities.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worthington Diesel Generating Plant – 4/11/14 • Redwood Falls Public Utilities – 5/6/14 • New Ulm Public Utilities – 7/2/14 • Xcel Energy Inver Hills – 7/16/14 • MN Power Laskin Energy Center – 8/18/14 <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> This action was completed in FFY 2013. In addition to the permits that originally fulfilled this requirement, and the permits issued in FFY 2014, the following Part 70 permits were reissued for power generating facilities in FFY 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Otter Tail Power Co – Solway (3/25/15) • Xcel Energy – High Bridge (4/24/15) • Great River Energy – Pleasant Valley (6/26/15) • Great River Energy – Maple Lake (6/26/15) • Great River Energy – Rock Lake (6/26/15) • Great River Energy - Cambridge (6/26/15) • Blue Earth Light & Water (7/1/15) • Rochester Public Utilities – Cascade Creek (9/23/15) <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> This action was completed in FFY 2013. In addition to the permits that originally fulfilled this requirement, and the permits issued in FFY 2014 and FFY2015, the following Part 70 permits were reissued for power generating facilities in FFY 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duluth Energy Systems/Ever-Green Energy (10/28/15) • Koda Energy (12/24/15) • St. James Diesel Generating Plant (6/3/16) • Centennial Generating Station (6/29/16) • Xcel Energy – Wescott LNG Plant (8/29/16) • Minnesota Power – Tac Harbor Energy Center (9/1/16) • SMMPA Methane Energy Facility (9/12/16) <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA’s progress and concurs with MPCA’s report.</p>
2) Title V renewal backlog issue.	Ongoing until Project End Date	Issue 25 permit amendments for modifications that contain new or updated operating	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 21 major amendments including updated operating conditions were issued to Title V sources in FFY 2013.</p>

	Smith D./Volkmeier	conditions to existing Title V facility permits.	<p>An additional 31 major amendment applications, 21 administrative amendment applications, and 63 reopening's 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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 21 permit amendments including updated operating conditions were issued to Title V sources in FFY 2014. An additional 84 permit amendment applications and mandatory reopening's were closed out by incorporating the required updated operating conditions in one of the 21 permit amendments or 24 Title V permits issued during FFY 2014.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> 23 permit amendments including updated operating conditions were issued to Title V sources in FFY 2015. An additional 62 permit amendment applications (35 administrative, 20 major, 5 minor, and 2 moderate) and 55 mandatory reopening's were closed out by incorporating the required updated operating conditions in one of the 23 permit amendments or 52 Title V permits issued during FFY 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> 11 permit amendments including updated operating conditions were issued to Title V sources in FFY 2016. An additional 26 permit amendment applications (9 administrative, 11 major, 6 minor) and 8 mandatory reopening's were closed out by incorporating the required updated operating conditions in one of the 11 permit amendments or 26 Title V permits issued during FFY 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
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 Smith D./Volkmeier	Provide timeliness data on new title V permits and significant permit modifications to EPA Regional offices for entry into TOPS.	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> TOPS report was submitted January 2013 and July 2013.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> TOPS report was submitted February 2014 and August 2014.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> TOPS report was submitted February 2015 and July 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is meeting the commitments to date.</p>

			<p>FFY 2016 Report: TOPS report was submitted January 2016 and July 2016.</p> <p>EPA Response (January 2017) EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
4) Issue initial permits, significant modifications and renewal Title V permits and reduce backlog of renewal permits.	<p>Ongoing until Project End Date</p> <p>Smith D./Volkmeier</p>	<p>Issue initial permits, significant modifications and renewal Title V permits and reduce backlog of renewal permits.</p>	<p>FFY 2013 Report: 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).</p> <p>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>FFY 2014 Report: The MPCA issued 24 Title V permits (includes initial permits and reissuances) and 17 separate major amendments during FFY 2014. These 41 permit actions closed out 24 applications for major amendments and 24 applications for renewed or initial Title V permits (48 permit applications closed out).</p> <p>During FFY 2014, we accepted 35 applications for initial permits and renewal Title V permits, and 26 applications for major amendments to Title V permits (61 permit applications received). Thus, there has been an overall increase in the backlog of initial Title V permit applications, renewal Title V permit applications, and significant modification applications.</p> <p>FFY 2015 Report: The MPCA issued 52 Title V permits (includes initial permits and reissuances) and 23 separate significant (non-administrative) amendments during FFY 2015. These 75 permit actions closed out 49 applications for significant amendments and 52 applications for renewed or initial Title V permits (101 permit applications closed out).</p> <p>During FFY 2015, we accepted 39 applications for initial permits and renewal Title V permits, and 67 applications for significant (non-administrative) amendments to Title V permits (106 permit applications received). Thus over the FFY2015, there has been a decrease in the backlog of initial Title V permit applications and renewal Title V permit applications, and a slight increase in the backlog of applications for significant modifications.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA issued 26 Title V permits (includes initial permits and reissuances) and 11 separate significant (non-administrative) amendments during FFY 2016. These 37 permit actions closed out 28 applications for significant amendments and 26 applications for renewed or initial Title V permits (54 permit applications closed out). During FFY 2016, we accepted 36 applications for initial permits and renewal Title V permits, and 32 applications for significant (non-administrative) amendments to Title V permits (68 permit applications received). Thus over the FFY2016, there has been an increase in the backlog of initial Title V permit applications and renewal Title V permit and in the backlog of applications for significant modifications.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
5) Participate with EPA in Title V permit program evaluations, set target to respond to EPA's evaluation report and implement recommendations.	Ongoing until Project End Date Smith D./Volkmeier	Participate with EPA in Title V permit program evaluations, set target to respond to EPA's evaluation report and implement recommendations.	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> EPA program evaluation is scheduled to take place November 5-6, 2013.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> An EPA program evaluation took place on November 5-6, 2013. The draft report was provided to MPCA on 8/5/14, and MPCA's response was given to EPA on 9/9/14.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> No EPA program evaluation took place in FFY 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> No EPA program evaluation took place in FFY 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
6) Issue new Title V permits and significant permit modifications within 18 months of application completeness determined by permitting authority.	Ongoing until Project End Date Smith D./Volkmeier	Issue new Title V permits and significant permit modifications within 18 months of application completeness determined by permitting authority.	<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."</p> <p>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>

			<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Of the 24 major amendment applications closed out in FFY 2014, 19 (79%) were issued within 18 months of the initial date of application receipt; 23 (96%) were issued within 18 months of the date that all needed information was received and the application package was "complete." Of the 24 applications for new or renewed Title V permits that were closed out in FFY 2014, 11 (46%) were issued within 18 months of the initial date of application receipt; 22 (92%) were issued within 18 months of the date that all needed information was received and the application package was "complete."</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Of the 58 significant amendment and new Title V permit applications closed out in FFY 2015, 46 (79%) were issued within 18 months of the initial date of application receipt; 55 (95%) were issued within 18 months of the date that all needed information was received.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Of the 54 significant amendment and new Title V permit applications closed out in FFY 2016, 30 (55%) were issued within 18 months of the initial date of application receipt.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</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 Presence ⁴			
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 2014 CAA Stationary Source CMS policy.</p> <p>CMS plan source category and frequency flags in AFS will be</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</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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Draft 2014 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 9/30/14.</p> <p>An alternative CMS plan was submitted and approved for 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The alternative CMS plan reviewed and approved by EPA for 2015 requires that the results of 2015 be used to determine the CMS plan for 2016. The 2015 commitment was not due to be completed until 9/30/15, thus supplying a 2016 commitment by 8/31/15 was not possible. 2016 implementation is scheduled to begin once 2015 results are tabulated (after 9/30/15) and a 2016 list is generated and submitted. The anticipated implementation date is no later than 10/31/15.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> Draft CMS plans are due to the region on 8/31, final 9/30 and implementation of plans begins 10/1. MPCA provides a mid-year progress report to EPA. At that time, MPCA should review facilities for generating a new list for the next fiscal year or at least begin</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)

<p>completed for the non-Title V source universe by December 1, 2013.</p>	<p>through 2016 Boeck & Kilgriff/ Gorg (MPCA)/ Marceillars (EPA)</p>		<p>the review process. MPCA stated they will sure try to start making a list earlier, however, the list cannot be finalized until after the end of the Federal Fiscal Year.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (February 2016): The MPCA will begin its review process prior to the end of the Federal Fiscal year (FFY) and will provide a preliminary/partial list to the EPA prior to the end of the FFY.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> No comments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The alternative draft CMS plan for FFY17 was submitted on October 17, 2016. The MPCA will provide a list of "due" inspections by 8/31/17; however it will not be a complete list because enforcement points are not known until all inspections are completed.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA and MPCA have agreed and incorporated in the FFY17-FFY20 PPA the draft alternative CMS plan, which will include a partial list of FCE commitments with the understanding that the remaining list is to be completed and submitted by MPCA by October 14, 2017 for review, negotiation and approval by EPA. The other commitments and source universes will be similar to the previous FFY.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> The complete FCE commitment list was sent to the EPA on October 13, 2017.</p>
<p>2) Respond to citizen complaints, including those referred by EPA. Inspect as necessary.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016 Boeck & Kilgriff (MPCA)/ Dickens (EPA)</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><u>FFY 2014 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><u>FFY 2015 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><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p>

			<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to be responsive to complaints forwarded by the EPA and follows up as necessary and provides a summary of the outcomes to the EPA.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p>
3) Track and update EPA on recommendations made during the State Review Framework until completion.	Quarterly, Boeck & Kilgriff/Gorg MPCA Marceillars EPA	MPCA staff are reminded periodically of key findings of the SRF, regarding recommended changes. Kilgriff	<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><u>FFY 2014 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><u>FFY 2015 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><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA and MPCA will discuss SRF follow-up action items at the next monthly conference call scheduled for January 26.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (February 2016):</u> Staff was trained on Feb 23 to address a number of EPA's recommendations. The MPCA will continue to work with the EPA to address any other concerns.</p> <p>SRF 2015 MN data was submitted to EPA on February 19, 2016.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> EPA and MPCA continue to discuss and work together on the SRF recommendations.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 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><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> The final MPCA Round 3 SRF report was submitted to MPCA January 12, 2017. EPA will be tracking the recommendation during the FFY 2017.</p>

<p>4) Require installation, operation and reporting of COMS and/or CEMS on all sources subject to requirements under State or Federal.</p> <p>Review, track and report quarterly COMS/CEMS excess emission reports (EERs) that are submitted by subject sources.</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>Boeck & 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.</p> <p>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> <p><u>FFY 2014 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> <p><u>FFY 2015 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> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA does not have the resources or tracking ability in a database to provide quarterly COMS/CEMS EERs to EPA.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (February 2016): Any EER the EPA wishes to see is available by request.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> No comments.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 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> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> EPA has reviewed MPCA's progress and concurs with MPCA's report.</p>
--	--	---	---

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
<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 2015 Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS-Air) Information Collection Request (ICR), 2014 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, 2014 Guidance on Federal Reportable Violations (FRVs) for Stationary Sources. Ensure data is complete, accurate and</p>	<p>60-day reporting as required by ICR</p> <p>Boeck & Kilgriff/Gorg (MPCA)</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 2012 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. 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><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> 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. The MPCA is in transition to a new data system, which has presented some issues with data transfer</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA has been directly entering the MDRs in ICIS-Air until an electronic transfer program is developed. Any data issues or deficiencies are identified in the monthly calls and corrected by MPCA data steward.</p> <p><u>MPCA Comments</u> (February 2016): MPCA receives ICIS Air C&E data reports from EPA prior to each monthly call. MPCA then compares this data with corresponding data from our TEMPO database (excel spreadsheet for stack tests) and adds/edits/deletes ICIS Air data as necessary.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> During the monthly call in March, MPCA realized there needs to be a strategy developed between MPCA enforcement and data program offices for reporting their data in a complete, accurate and timely manner to ICIS-Air.</p>

<p>timely consistent with EPA policies and ICR.</p>			<p><u>MPCA Comments (April 2016):</u> The MPCA continues to diligently work on automated data submittal. In light of the recent conversion to the Tempo database system automated transfer is not yet possible; however, the MPCA data steward manually enters data and verifies its accuracy.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA implemented the ICIS-Air data flow in October. The MPCA continues to further develop and maintain submittal information to meet the EPA's minimum Data Requirements.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is currently submitting its compliance and enforcement data to ICIS-Air test. Once MPCA receives a 95% or higher data transfer rate in ICIS-Air test, they can then transfer their data into ICIS-Air production. EPA will continue to monitor MPCA's progress.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> MPCA is submitting minimum data requirements to ICIS-Air production. The MPCA continues to further develop and maintain submittal information to meet the EPA's minimum Data Requirements. The MPCA continues to request read access to the relevant EPA data tables for QA/QC purposes.</p>
---	--	--	--

FY 2013-2016 – Enforcement

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) State will conduct monthly conference calls with EPA to discuss their efforts to resolve known violators. During these conference calls, newly discovered</p>	<p>Monthly Boeck & Kilgriff/Gorg (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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA and EPA hold monthly conference calls.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA and EPA hold monthly conference calls.</p>

<p>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 180-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><u>EPA Response (March 2016):</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA and EPA hold monthly conference calls.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting the commitment.</p>
<p>2) State will conduct its enforcement activities in accordance with EPA 2014 Timely and Appropriate Enforcement Response to High</p>	<p>Ongoing through September 30, 2016</p> <p>Boeck & Kilgriff/ (MPCA) Dickens</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><u>FFY 2014 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 newly</p>

<p>Priority Violations (HPVs) policy, the 1991 Clean Air Act Stationary Source Civil Penalty policy and the 1988 Revised Asbestos NESHAP Strategy.</p>	<p>(EPA)</p>		<p>updated HPV policy and is required to follow the processes contained therein. Staff will attend training when it is available.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 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 newly updated HPV policy and is required to follow the processes contained therein. Staff will attend training when it is available.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> MPCA is following the HPV policy and Asbestos strategy, but is not currently calculating penalties in conformance with the 1991 CAA Stationary Source civil penalty policy.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (February 2016): The MPCA continues to work with the EPA to resolve the issues surrounding the CAA penalty policy.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (March 2016)</u> MPCA multimedia program managers and staff will meet by end of April to discuss the implementation of a penalty matrix similar to one that was used in the past. MPCA is looking to begin implementing by mid-May. Both agencies will evaluate the effectiveness of the matrix and determine if it resolves the penalty, issue identified in the SRF.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 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 newly updated policy and is required to follow the processes to ensure that data is sent to ICIS when it becomes available (when the case is closed). The MPCA is in the final stages of amending its penalty policy. Once complete, the EPA will be provided a copy for review.</p> <p><u>EPA Response (January 2017)</u> MPCA is meeting its commitment except for the 1991 CAA Stationary Source Civil Penalty Policy. This issue was identified during the State Review Framework. MPCA is currently reviewing its penalty matrix previously used in order to provide modifications. Once completed, MPCA will submit a draft to EPA for review before implementation.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> The MPCA sent EPA the revised penalty matrix on February 28, 2017. EPA comments are being integrated into the guidance and the final version will be completed by April 15, 2017.</p>
--	--------------	--	---

MINNESOTA PPG MAX WORKPLAN FFY 2013-2016
WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM (Sec. 106 & Sec. 319)
FFY 2016 Report

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 Basis ⁶				
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)	Terry McDill	Number will be updated at the end of FFY13	<p>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</p> <p>FFY 2014 Report: A cumulative total of 35 impaired waters were restored due to corrective actions in the watershed (versus new monitoring data) as of the 2014 303(d) list. More information can be found at: 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</p>

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.

				<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> A cumulative total of 35 impaired waters were restored due to corrective actions in the watershed (versus new monitoring data) as of the 2014 303(d) list. MPCA has identified one additional restored waterbody as a result of the 2014 and 2015 assessments and there may be more identified as the assessments are completed. Newly identified restored waterbodies will be included in the 2016 303(d) list when it is available in the spring of 2016. Information about delisting decisions can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627 The Restored Waters map can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15339</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Waterbody impairments/pollutants can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627</p> <p><u>EPA Comment: (January 2017)</u> We had discussions with the State that their cumulative numbers for SP10 do not match with EPA calculated and reported FY numbers. As EPA calculates and reports on these measures from state 303d lists, recommend deleting and using the added language. [Matthew Gluckman]</p>
WQ-SP11	Remove the specific causes of waterbody impairment identified by states in 2002. (cumulative)	Terry McDill	Number will be updated at the end of FFY13	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> Waterbody impairments/pollutants can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Waterbody impairments/pollutants can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Waterbody impairments/pollutants can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Waterbody impairments/pollutants can be found at: http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/view-document.html?gid=15627</p>

				<p><u>EPA Comment: (January 2017)</u> We had discussions with the State that their cumulative numbers for SP10 do not match with EPA calculated and reported FY numbers. As EPA calculates and reports on these measures from state 303d lists, recommend deleting and using the added language. [Matthew Gluckman]</p>
WQ-SP12.N11	Improve water quality conditions in impaired watersheds nationwide using the watershed approach. (cumulative)	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</i> and the <i>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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The 2014 Report highlighted a project of statewide significance to evaluate Artificial Drainage in Altering Hydrology (page 21). The purpose of the project was to verify and clarify the drivers of increased stream flow in a suite of 21 agricultural watersheds and determine if these hydrologic changes triggered an increase in erosion of near channel sediment sources.</p> <p>Using the first 35 years of a dataset (1940-1974) to calibrate the relationship between water yield and precipitation, it was found that climate and crop conversion could explain less than half of the observed increased in river flow that occurred in the second period (1975-2009). Artificial drainage was identified as the largest driver of increased flow.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> The project discussed above does not meet the requirements for a success story or a "type 2" success story. While no success stories were reported in the 2014 WAR, MPCA completed one success story write up for publication on EPA's webpage. The story covered four lakes (Beaver, Keller, Battle Creek and Carver Lakes) located in the Ramsey Metro Washington Watershed District.</p>

				<p>FFY 2015 Report: 2015 Watershed Achievements Report (WAR) Watershed program accomplishments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minnesota’s clean water roadmap. Minnesota state agencies with responsibilities for water resources developed a set of goals for protecting and restoring Minnesota’s water resources during the 25-year life of the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment. This first edition lays out goals for four high-level indicators that describe surface water quality, groundwater quantity and groundwater quality. • Minnesota’s statewide buffer initiative. In 2015, the Minnesota Legislature passed a statewide buffer initiative. It requires most farmers to install 50-foot buffers along public lakes and rivers, with smaller strips along ditches. • Swimmable, Fishable, Fixable? A new report by the MPCA provides additional evidence that agricultural and urban runoff is contributing significantly to the impairment of Minnesota’s lakes, rivers and streams. This new study takes an in-depth look at the lakes and streams in the state’s major drainage areas. <p>Minnesota’s success stories submitted for EPA’s Section 319 success story webpage are the Lower Twin and Ryan Lakes in the Shingle Creek Watershed in the northwestern Twin Cities metropolitan area. This is a “Type 1” NPS Success Story, which means the lakes have a TMDL and they been restored to water quality standards. The lakes are part of the Twin Lake chain of lakes, which flows into Shingle Creek and ultimately the Mississippi River. The Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission is the local entity responsible for protecting the lakes, streams, and wetlands in the watershed.</p> <p>The Lower Twin and Ryan Lake subwatersheds are fully developed with single and multi-family residential land uses. Together, the lakes drain more than eight-square miles of land within the watershed. The lakes are regularly used for recreational activities such as canoeing and fishing. The MPCA added these two lakes to the state’s Clean Water Act (CWA) section 303(d) list of impaired waters in 2002 for excess nutrients/eutrophication.</p> <p>Recent monitoring data indicates that water quality has improved in both lakes. Lower Twin Lake has consistently met water quality standards since 2003. Ryan Lake has been meeting water quality standards since 2008. As a result, MPCA removed Lower Twin and Ryan Lakes from the impaired waters list in 2014. The improvement in water quality of these lakes has likely occurred as a result of best management</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>practices and stricter stormwater treatment standards. These actions have decreased phosphorus loading to these lakes, which has led to improved water clarity and decreased chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentrations.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Report: Success Story: 41-0089-00 Lake Shaokatan was delisted on the Draft 2016 303(d) list. https://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/minnesotas-impaired-waters-list Efforts included rehabilitation of three animal feedlots, four wetland areas, and shoreline septic systems. These actions resulted in a 58 percent reduction in phosphorus loading into the lake. Phosphorus levels in the lake dropped significantly, with concentrations near the state standard of 90 parts per billion, down from 200 to 350 parts per billion in previous summers. This decrease resulted in reductions in the frequency and severity of nuisance algal blooms. Follow the following link for further information: https://www.pca.state.mn.us/news/lake-shaokatan-prairie-lake-improving-water-quality A wide range of key stakeholders were involved in the restoration of Lake Shaokatan: MPCA: Provided state grant and loan funds. EPA: Provided federal 319 funds. Yellow Medicine Watershed District: Grant Administration, monitoring, reporting, tracking, securing easements, and technical support. Lincoln County SWCD: BMP Implementation and technical support. Lincoln County Environmental Office: Grant and Loan Administration, reporting, septic system upgrades, feedlot upgrades and technical support. Lake Shaokatan Sportsman’s Club: Provided funds for: Monitoring, BMP implementation, and overall project support. US Fish & Wildlife Service: Provided funds and technical support for: Wetland restorations, securing easements, and land acquisition. Lake Shaokatan Association: Provided funds for monitoring and support for citizen monitoring. BWSR: Provided state cost share funding. MN DNR: Technical support. Landowners: BMP Implementation.</p>
WQ-01a	Number of numeric water quality standards	Catherine Neuschler	The MPCA has already adopted numeric eutrophication water	<p>FFY2013 Report: Draft River Eutrophication Standards have begun moving through the rulemaking process and will be formally public noticed for 51 days on November 18, 2013.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>(New language – for FFY’16 target)</p> <p>Number of numeric water quality standards adopted or planned within 3 years for total nitrogen or total phosphorus for all waters within the State or Territory for each of the following waterbody types: lakes/reservoirs, rivers/streams, and estuaries.</p>			<p>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>	<p>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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> River eutrophication standards have been adopted through the state Administrative Act process and sent to EPA for final approval.</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA issued its approval on 1/23/15.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Nothing new to report, as noted in center column MN now has comprehensive numeric nutrient criteria covering flowing systems as well as lakes and reservoirs.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Nothing new to report, as noted in center column MN now has comprehensive numeric nutrient criteria covering flowing systems as well as lakes and reservoirs.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>WQ-03a</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Catherine Neuschler</p>	<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</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 Response:</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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Redesign of the triennial review process is completed. The triennial review has been conducted. A small number of site-specific standards have been approved by EPA and work continues on a few additional. Final nitrate toxicity tests are being completed by EPA contractor. MPCA will revise the draft nitrate aquatic life technical support document and move into formal rulemaking upon receipt of final test results.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> In January 2015, EPA approved the MN river eutrophication standards. EPA review of new methods to develop human health water quality standards continues as of 11/10/2015. Formal rulemaking continues on revised variance and antidegradation water quality standards and MPCA anticipates adoption of these standards in 2016. MPCA put out an initial request for comments on proposed changes to the existing wild rice sulfate water quality standards in October 2015 and expects to do the same for Class 3 and 4 water quality standards in November 2015. Other ongoing water quality standards activities work includes pre-rulemaking activities for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiered aquatic life uses • Nitrate (waiting for final toxicity tests)
---------------	---	----------------------------	---	--

			<p>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ammonia • Class 1 (Domestic Consumption) • Specific human health based WQS (considering selected algal toxins, PCBs; dioxins/furans, PFOS) (waiting for EPA approval of methods to develop human health WQS) • Recreational WQS for human health protection from surface water pathogens (i.e., E. coli) based on 2012 304(a) criteria <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> EPA issued its approval of the revised HH method on 11/5/15. EPA provided comments on MN's proposed revisions to MN's variance rules on 12/29/15. EPA provided comments on MN's notice of the proposed changes to the wild rice rules on 12/17/15. EPA understands that MPCA continues to work on a number of site-specific eutrophication criteria for lakes. EPA continues to provide technical support to MPCA on ongoing WQS work.</p> <p>Regarding ammonia, EPA appreciates the information provided by MPCA on its work toward updating its ammonia criteria to be consistent with EPA's 2013 criteria update. EPA request that MPCA provide additional details on this process, including but not limited to: (1) whether criteria necessary to protect mussels will be applied statewide, (2) whether analyses have been conducted to identify if dischargers may have difficulty meeting the new criteria, (3) availability of technologies that may be implemented to meet the new criteria, and (4) a timeline for further work on ammonia water quality criteria adoption (we are aware that MPCA awaits additional information on nitrate toxicity prior to moving forward with the ammonia rulemaking). A conference call or other communication regarding this matter would be helpful to ensure coordination among the agencies and could also identify areas where early input and/or technical assistance may be warranted.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (Mar 2016):</u> MPCA will contact EPA to schedule a conference call to discuss the adoption of ammonia and nitrate criteria with specific emphasis on protection of mussels, potential wastewater treatment discharge limits, wastewater treatment options, and a timeline for the adoption.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA is continuing to work actively to move into formal rulemaking to adopt Tiered Aquatic Life Uses, and is preparing for the Triennial Standards Review, both expected for FFY2017. The TSR will guide priorities for future WQS adoption.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p><u>EPA response:</u> Minnesota continues to meet this national performance measure with EPA approval of the Spring Lake nutrient site-specific standard on July 19, 2016. EPA will provide input on national priorities as the MPCA begins the next Triennial Standards Review.</p>
WQ-04a	Percentage of submissions of new or revised water quality standards from States and Territories that are approved by EPA.	Catherine Neuschler	MPCA will continue to provide Technical Support Documents and other technical information to EPA Region 5 prior to rule adoption for discussion and common 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><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> <p><u>EPA response:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Eutrophication standards for rivers and streams were adopted and submitted to EPA for review. Human health methods revisions are in the formal rulemaking process. Anti-degradation rule revisions and adoption of TALU are being finalized and moved into the formal rulemaking process in the next months. All have been discussed with EPA water quality standards staff. Additional standards rule revision priorities and timelines are detailed in the triennial standards review documents. The other standards submitted to EPA were site-specific nutrient standards (one in FY 2014 and two in FY 2013) were all approved by EPA. (<i>EPA edits in blue</i>)</p> <p><u>EPA Response:</u> EPA's approval of the Mesabi Nugget variance was litigated and the approval was remanded by the court to EPA for reconsideration. EPA subsequently disapproved the variance on July 2, 2014.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Eutrophication standards were approved by EPA in January 2015. Human health methods revisions were adopted and submitted to EPA for review. Antidegradation rule revisions and variances are in formal rulemaking with hearings scheduled for early 2016. Proposed changes to the wild rice sulfate water quality standards and</p>

				<p>other standards to protect industrial use (Class 3) and agricultural irrigation and wild life uses (Class 4) are expected to be in formal rulemaking before the end of 2015. The TALU rule is in formal rule making with the formal comment period and possible hearings planned for Winter Spring 2016. A package of Class 2A and 2B changes along with changes to how the MPCA designates Class 2A waters is expect to start formal rulemaking in Spring/Summer 2016.</p> <p>All have been discussed with EPA water quality standards staff. Additional standards rule revision priorities and timelines are detailed in the triennial standards review documents. The other standards submitted to EPA were site-specific nutrient standards (one in FY 2014 and two in FY 2013) were all approved by EPA. One site-specific standard was submitted to EPA in FY2014 and subsequently approved in FY2015. MPCA expects to submit at least two more site-specific standards in FY 2015.</p> <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> Please see EPA response for WQ3a for information on EPA WQS actions during 2015. EPA's understanding is that the anti-degradation, class 3 & 4, and TALU rules have not yet been public noticed. EPA received one site-specific nutrient criterion for Spring Lake on 1/5/16; this submittal is currently under review.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (Mar 2016):</u> The antidegradation rules and statement of need and reasonableness (SONAR) were public noticed on February 1, 2016. The MPCA will hold two administrative law judge hearings on the proposed rules March 31, at 9 a.m. and 6 p.m., at the MPCA St. Paul office, with videoconference links also available at the MPCA Duluth and Mankato offices. MPCA announced the start of rulemaking for the wild rice sulfate standard and the Class 3 and 4 standards in December 2015 and January 2016, respectively.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Antidegradation rule revisions and variances completed most of the formal rulemaking process and are expected to be finalized early in FFY17. Proposed changes to the wild rice sulfate water quality standards, other standards to protect industrial use (Class 3) and agricultural irrigation and wild life uses (Class 4), and the TALU rule are all expected to be in formal rulemaking in FFY2017.</p> <p>All have been discussed with EPA water quality standards staff. Additional standards rule revision priorities and timelines will be detailed in the triennial standards review documents.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>EPA response: EPA continues to collaborate and provide technical assistance, where needed, on Minnesota rules. More specifically, during FFY 2016, Region 5 provided verbal and written input to MPCA on variance rules, antidegradation revisions, Class 3/4 revisions, TALU/Biocriteria, and wild rice/sulfate. Region 5 received the official submittal for both the variance and antidegradation rulemakings at the end of the year and both submittals are currently under review.</p>
WQ-05	Number of States and Territories that have adopted and are implementing their monitoring strategies in keeping with established schedules.	Dana Vanderbosch	<p>Continue to implement the 2011 Minnesota Monitoring Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 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. · Continue to actively participate in the national probabilistic monitoring efforts (lakes, streams, wetlands, coastal waters), 	<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 web posted for an additional seven 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 fieldwork 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 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. · 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

		<p>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> <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>exceeding 15 million results within the 2013 calendar year. Data continues to flow to STORET.</p> <p>EPA Response: 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 <i>E. coli</i>, and we look forward to continuing to discuss sampling fecal contaminants on Twin Cities inland lake beaches.</p> <p>FFY 2014 Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Intensive Watershed Monitoring 10-year cycle is on track. Through FFY14, monitoring has been performed in 72% of the state's watersheds. Watershed monitoring and assessment reports were completed and web posted for an additional 11 major watersheds in FFY2014, including wetlands components. • Expansion of the Watershed Pollutant Load Monitoring Network to the subwatershed level is proceeding well, on track for all gages to be installed by the end of calendar 2015. • NARS NRSA recon began at the end of FFY14. Recon included grab sampling for CECs. • Citizen Monitoring programs continue to operate and produce a large amount of data. • The MPCA continues to expand the Surficial Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Network to identify and track water quality trends in vulnerable aquifers and determine how quality varies with land use. By the end of 2014, the network will include 270 monitoring wells that will provide the necessary information to evaluate and refine groundwater management decisions. Each year the existing well network is sampled for over 100 chemicals, including nitrate, phosphorus, sulfate, chloride, trace metals such as arsenic and manganese, and a suite of 68 volatile organic compounds (VOCs). 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. The results of this effort from 2009 – 2012 are available in a report developed jointly by USGS and MPCA at http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2014/5096/pdf/sir2014-5096.pdf. Ambient groundwater data are available to the public via the agency's web-based Environmental Data Access system.
--	--	---	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of TALU is still ongoing. Efforts over the last year have been focused finalizing draft rule language, supporting documents as well, and the framework for implementing TALU into MPCA's existing water quality assessments, stressor identification, impaired waters listings, permitting, and other water quality management work. In parallel to the 2014 water quality assessments MPCA staff plan to pilot the proposed TALU system. MPCA continues to keep EPA Region 5 apprised of the development and schedule of TALU. The current estimate is that TALU will be adopted into rule in January 2016. <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensive watershed monitoring remained on track. Through FFY15, monitoring has been performed in 85% of the state's watersheds. Watershed monitoring and assessment reports scheduled to be completed in FFY15 were not finished due to delays in the development of IT applications for producing waterbody assessments. These seven reports will be completed and web posted by mid-FFY16. Reports scheduled for FFY16 will be completed on time. MPCA received a Level 4 designation from EPA for its bio- assessment program. Expansion of the Watershed Pollutant Load Monitoring Network to the subwatershed level was completed, on schedule. Water quality trends will be developed in FFY16 for a subset of the sites in the network that have a sufficient period of record. Monitoring for the National Rivers and Streams Assessment was performed. Three new reports from the National Lakes Assessment were web posted at http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/water/water-types-and-programs/surface-water/lakes/national-lakes-assessment-project-nlap.html Citizen Monitoring programs continue to operate and produce a large amount of data, including statistically valid trend assessments on lakes (and some streams) across Minnesota. The MPCA's build out of the Surficial Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Network continues. As of October 2015, the network includes more than 240 wells to identify and track water quality trends in vulnerable aquifers and determine how quality varies with land use. Over the next several years, the network will expand to 268 monitoring wells that will provide the necessary information to evaluate and refine groundwater management decisions. Annual sampling of the network continues for over 100 chemicals, including nitrate, phosphorus, sulfate, chloride, trace metals such as arsenic and manganese, and a suite of 68 VOCs. Each year 40 wells are sampled for a suite of over 100 contaminants of new or emerging
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>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"> • TALU development continues. The draft rule language is essentially complete along with the supporting documents. The schedule for TALU adoption and formal implementation has been pushed back more than once because of a combination of lack of legal and rulemaking resources and most recently because of the need to conduct additional stakeholder outreach. The political climate for new and revised water quality standards in Minnesota is extremely difficult. The MPCA remains committed to TALU adoption but recognizes that the schedule is somewhat dependent on external forces beyond our control. In the meantime, the MPCA continues to pilot the draft TALU framework for water quality assessments and is working closely with MPCA staff responsible for stressor identification, impaired waters listings, and permitting, and other water quality management work. MPCA will keep EPA Region 5 apprised of the development and schedule of TALU. • Minnesota and Wisconsin continued to plan a monitoring pilot for calendar 2016 of the UMRBA monitoring strategy for the Mississippi River from St. Anthony Falls to the Iowa border. The MPCA continues participating in the workgroup developing a companion assessment methodology. • Large River Intensive Monitoring was completed on the Minnesota River. The data is being analyzed and the river will be assessed in FFY2016. Large River Intensive Monitoring was initiated on the Red River, and will be completed in FFY16. Site selection and recon for the Rainy River got underway, with sampling to occur in calendar 2016. The Upper Mississippi River monitoring and assessment report will be out in FFY16. • Approximately 60 long term biological monitoring stations were established at least-impacted reference sites around the state, to help understand wide scale changes in river and stream condition from ubiquitous stressors like climate change. All of the sites are sampled every two years (approximately ½ of the sites are sampled in any given year) for biology, habitat, flow and water chemistry. • Lake IBI development and piloting continued jointly by the MPCA and the MDNR. Assessments using Lake IBIs were produced for 81 lakes in 4 major watersheds, and will be included in watershed monitoring and assessment reports in FFY16. <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> EPA requests that MPCA indicate that lake IBIs are already being used to do some assessments --- this is already stated above; have now specified that this was done for 81 lakes in 4 watersheds --- and would appreciate more information</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>documenting these lake IBIs --- as stated above, watershed reports including these assessments will be produced in 2016 and thus will be reflected in this update next year ---. EPA is aware that these metrics were under development but has not seen specifics. We have now emailed more detailed info and provided contact info to EPA separately on this.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensive watershed monitoring remains on track. Through FFY16, monitoring has been performed in 93% of the state's watersheds. Very high stream and river flows due to rain made fish sampling for ambient condition very difficult. Though the vast majority of fish sampling was accomplished, it was suspended on some sites. They will be monitored next year. Since water quality sampling is conducted over two summers before assessment occurs, the delay of biological monitoring for these sites will not delay assessment. Watershed monitoring and assessment reports scheduled to be completed in FFY15 were not finished last year due to delays in the development of IT applications that produce assessment results and portray those results in tables and maps. These seven reports have now been completed and are being formatted in preparation to being posted to our watershed web pages. Reports scheduled for FFY16 are in development, but they are behind schedule. We anticipate they will be completed by the end of the 2016 calendar year. • We have completed the fourth year of monitoring large rivers for water quality and biology. This work is akin to the intensive watershed monitoring in design, but is focused on the large rivers in Minnesota: Upper Mississippi River (from headwaters to the Twin Cities), the Minnesota River, the Red River, the Rainy River, the Lower Mississippi River (Twin Cities to Iowa border), and the St. Croix River. In past years, we sampled the Minnesota, Red, and Upper Mississippi Rivers. This year, sampling was conducted on the Rainy River. • Minnesota and Wisconsin completed the planned monitoring pilot for the Lower Mississippi River this past summer/fall. The MPCA continues participating in the UMRBA workgroup to develop an assessment methodology for the data collected. • Approximately 60 long-term biological monitoring stations were established at least-impacted reference sites around the state, to help understand wide scale changes in river and stream condition from ubiquitous stressors like climate change. All of the sites are sampled every two years (approximately ½ of the sites are sampled in any given year) for biology, habitat, flow and water chemistry.
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring the Watershed Pollutant Load Monitoring Network continues on the whole network of 199 major watershed and subwatershed load sites. We have draft water quality trends for a subset of the sites in the network that have a sufficient period of record. A report of these trends is in development. • MPCA has continued to participate and provide technical expertise for the NARS steering committees, most notably in the past year the upcoming National Lake Assessment survey. MPCA has applied for, and received, the funds for the basic survey, as well as additional funds that will allow us to intensify our effort to sample 150 lakes across the state. Analyses will include basic water chemistry and a number of additional parameters that are part of the survey design. Algal toxins (microcystin and anatoxin-a), phytoplankton identification and enumeration, glyphosate monitoring, and zooplankton identification and enumeration will occur on all lakes. Additional work, such as shoreline habitat, and sampling and analyses for pesticides and a panel of contaminants of emerging concern will be supported using state funding. • MPCA completed the National Wetland Assessment survey monitoring this past summer, and submitted a grant amendment to shift funding for certain activities. Work has begun to determine field logistics needed to support the wetland depression monitoring to be conducted in 2017 that will expand on the national survey. • Citizen Monitoring programs continue to operate and produce a large amount of data, including statistically valid trend assessments on lakes (and some streams) across Minnesota. • The MPCA continues to operate its Ambient Groundwater Monitoring Network. The network includes 266 wells to identify and track water quality trends in vulnerable aquifers and determine how quality varies with land use. These data are critical for providing a basis on which to evaluate and refine groundwater management decisions. • Lake water quality and biological is being jointly sampled by MPCA and the DNR. Together, we conduct aquatic life use assessments for the sampled lakes. The lake IBI tool used to assess data can only be applied to data from certain lake classes – it does not represent lakes in the northeast part of the state, those that experience winterkill or those greater than 10,000 acres in size. Even so, the lake IBI tool is suitable to assess biological data for a large portion of Minnesota lakes. Approximately 140 lakes have been assessed to date, most of which show aquatic life support. Eight lake aquatic life impairments were identified during the 2015 assessments and are included on the 2016 draft impaired waters list. Eighteen more lake biological impairments were identified during the 2016
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>assessment and will be included on the 2018 draft impaired waters list. More lake aquatic life assessments will be conducted in 2017. The assessment decisions are being included in our watershed monitoring and assessment reports. Once assessment has been conducted, DNR staff conducts stressor identification using EPA's CADDIS methodology for those lakes not supporting aquatic life uses. The information is shared with MPCA stressor identification staff for inclusion in the report and ultimately the Watershed Restoration and Protection Strategy documents document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TALU development continues. The technical work and rule documents that support the Tiered Aquatic Life Uses framework are completed. The documentation for the rule, including technical support documents and draft rule language, is available at the TALU framework website (https://www.pca.state.mn.us/talu). The rule is currently working its way through Minnesota's administrative process and a 45-day comment period is expected to start in November or December. At the start of the comment period, the Statement of Need and Reasonableness (SONAR) will be made available. Final adoption of the TALU framework is expected in Winter/Spring 2017. In the meantime, the MPCA continues to pilot the draft TALU framework for water quality assessments and is working closely with MPCA staff responsible for stressor identification, impaired waters listings, and permitting, and other water quality management work. MPCA will keep EPA Region 5 apprised of the development and schedule of TALU. <p>The draft 2016 impaired waters list was open for public comment August 1 – September 30, 2016. The list is expected to be submitted to EPA by the end of 2016. It will not include wild rice waters. The submittal of the draft 2016 impaired waters list to EPA has been delayed due to continued work on the assessments IT infrastructure. The draft list reflects only two restored waters. 2016 is the first year in which impairments are listed based on Minnesota's new TSS and river nutrient standards. We had over 500 new impairments, over half for biology (fish and macroinvertebrates).</p>
WQ-07	Number of States and Territories that provide electronic information using the Assessment Database version 2 or later (or	Catherine Neuschler	Complete necessary efforts in FY13 to submit Integrated Report assessment information using the Assessment Database along with geo-referencing information in	<p>FFY2013 Report: The MPCA anticipatessubmitted 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>

	compatible system) and geo-reference the information to facilitate the integrated reporting of assessment data.		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 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.	<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA submitted the 2014 integrated report and draft 2014 303(d) list to EPA in April 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> The 303(d)/305(b) package MPCA submitted to EPA in April 2014 was complete except that it lacked an assessment of wild rice waters for possible sulfate impairment. EPA and MPCA are discussing how to address these remaining waters.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The draft 2014 impaired waters list was submitted to EPA in April 2014. The 2014 are complete and 2015 assessments continue as of November 2015. As noted above the draft 2014 list did not include wild rice waters. On June 30, 2015 MPCA sent an email to EPA requesting that they consider the April 2014 draft list complete in lights of 2015 Minnesota Session Law that prohibits the MPCA from listing waters as impaired under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The proposed 2016 impaired waters list went on public notice in July 2016 and is planned to be submitted to EPA by the end of CY2016. As with the 2014 list, the proposed 2016 list will not include wild rice waters. The 2014 list is not yet approved.</p>
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	Terry McDill	FFY commitment is 50 TMDLs	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> EPA approved 9 TMDL projects addressing 51 impairments in FFY2013. EPA has indicated that the goal for FFY2014 is 50.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> EPA approved 14 TMDL projects addressing 131 impairments in FFY2014. EPA no longer has numerical goals for TMDLs and is working with MPCA on a new prioritization process for priority areas with TMDLs. New measures WQ-27 and 28 are now in place, and reporting on those measures will begin in FY16. (EPA revisions)</p>

	in order to attain water quality standards. The terms 'approved' and 'established' refer to the completion and approval of the TMDL itself.			<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> EPA no longer has numerical goals for TMDLs and has worked with MPCA on a new prioritization process for priority areas with TMDLs. This report, "Prioritization Plan for Minnesota 303(d) Listings to Total Maximum Daily Loads," dated September 2015, was approved by US EPA in October 2015. New measure WQ-27 is now in place, and reporting on those measures will begin in FY16.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> This measure is no longer being used. Please see WQ-27.</p>
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)	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.	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The draft 2014 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 1997-2014. The draft 2014 WAR was submitted to US EPA Region 5 on August 28, 2014. No comments have been received as of November 3, 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> EPA provided comments on the WAR to MPCA in December 2014. While no success stories were reported in the 2014 WAR, MPCA completed one success story write up for publication on EPA's web page. The success story covered four lakes (Beaver, Keller, Battle Creek and Carver Lakes) located in the Ramsey Metro Washington Watershed District.</p>

				<p>FFY 2015 Report: The 2015 Watershed Achievements Report (WAR) includes information on: intensive watershed monitoring, WRAPS progress, impaired waters, approved TMDLs and the Minnesota Load Monitoring Network as well as previous impairments now meeting water quality standards. Also included are descriptions of completed, active and newly awarded nonpoint source projects and predicted pollutant reduction data from 1997-2015. EPA approved the 2015 WAR on November 12, 2015.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Report: In reviewing the 2002 303(d) list for waterbodies that were primarily non-point source impaired and that were partially or fully restored, our records show thirteen (13) water bodies total (ListWQ-10 2016.xlsx)</p>
WQ-12a	Percent of facilities covered by NPDES permits that are considered current. [Note: Measure will still set target, commitment, and report results in both % and #.]	Nicole Blasing	<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.</p> <p><u>EPA:</u> Based on ICIS data and information from State for CAFOs, for FY'12 EOY, we have reported, there</p>	<p>FFY2013 Report: 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, 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 are also concentrating on watershed permitting.</p> <p>EPA comment: 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>MPCA Response: 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>are 737 individual NPDES permits and 1625 facilities covered by non-SW GPs (which includes 1253 facilities covered by a GP for CAFOs).</p> <p><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>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</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>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: Minnesota'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> noted.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> For Federal Fiscal Year 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of wastewater general NPDES permits were considered current and 99.2% of the facilities covered under those generals had current notice of coverage. • 94.9% of all NPDES permits were current. • 75.0% of our total EPA major permits were current. • 85.8% of our total minor permits were current. <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> For Federal Fiscal Year 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% of our wastewater general permits are current. 100% of the facilities covered under those generals had current notice of coverage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Our MNG58 Stabilization Pond General Permit expired on 8/31/2015 and was not reissued in time. This delay was the direct result of the development of our RES implementation procedures. Work on the permit has resumed now that the procedures are complete but it will take several months to complete of the required total phosphorus watershed reviews. • 75.9% of all NPDES permits were current. This is the result of the MNG58 permit
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>expiring. There are 189 facilities covered under MNG58.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60.0% of our total EPA major permits were current. Primary reason for delay is specific to new limits and the work that goes into determining those new limits. 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. 77.0% of our total minor permits were current. This is the result of MNG58 expiring. <p>FFY 2016 Report: For Federal Fiscal Year 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90% of our wastewater general permits are current. 100% of the facilities covered under those generals have current notice of coverages. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our MNG58 Stabilization Pond General Permit expired on 8/31/2015 and has not been reissued yet. This delay was the direct result of the development of our RES implementation procedures. Work on completion of the watershed reviews to develop total phosphorus limits is ongoing but it will take several months to complete all of the required total phosphorus watershed reviews to be able to reissue the permit. MPCA is discussion all possible options for moving forward with reissuing the permit prior to completion of the total phosphorus watershed reviews. 60% of all NPDES permits were current. The primary reasons are the MNG58 permit expiring (189 Permittees), a slowdown of permitting production due to a transition into a new permitting database, and challenges encountered due to implementation of the river eutrophication standards. 50% of our total EPA major permits were current. Primary reason for delay includes the development of new limits and WQS, a transition into a new permitting database, and challenges encountered due to implementation of the river eutrophication standards. 61% of our total minor permits were current. The primary reasons are the MNG58 permit expiring (189 Permittees), a slowdown of permitting production due to a transition into a new permitting database, and challenges encountered due to implementation of the river eutrophication standards.
WQ-13a	Number, and national percent, of facilities covered under either an	Marni Karnowski/ Duane Duncanson	The MPCA will reissue the general stormwater permit for small municipal separate storm sewer	<p>FFY2013 Report: 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</p>

individual or general MS-4 permit.			<p>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>	<p>to issue coverage for all MS4s within 150 days of SWPPP Document (permit application) receipt from each MS4.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> During FFY 2014, the MPCA reissued coverage to 233 of 233 Small MS4s under the general stormwater permit that became effective August 1, 2013.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> During FFY 2015, the MPCA identified 25 small MS4s required to obtain coverage under the general stormwater permit based on the 2010 decennial census and other MN. Rule criteria. Part 1 of the application process was initiated on February 25, 2015. The application process will be completed with the submittal of Part 2 (SWPPP document) of the application by October 25, 2016.</p> <p>Minnesota’s Phase I MS4 permits (Minneapolis and St. Paul) expire on January 21, 2016. The MPCA initiated the reissuance process in November 2014 with the intent to complete reissuance by the expiration dates.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> <u>Phase II MS4s</u> The current general MS4 permit expires August 1, 2018. A complete application is due by October 25, 2016 for the 25 “new” MS4s coming into the program. The MPCA expects to have them under permit coverage by February of 2017. <u>Phase I MS4s</u> The two individual permits expired on January 21, 2016. The MPCA is working to reissue both permits during FFY2017.</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/ Duane Duncanson		<p>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>	<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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA continued the implementation of a revised audit/inspection process. In FFY 2014, the MPCA continued to enhance the process and completed 14 audits/inspections of Small MS4s.</p>

				<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Please see attached End of Year report.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA continued the implementation of a revised audit/inspection process. In FFY 2016, the MPCA continued to enhance the process and completed 30 audits/inspections of Small MS4s.</p>
WQ-13b	Number, and national percent, of facilities covered under either an individual or general industrial storm water permit.	Jeff Stollenwerk/ Aaron Luckstein	<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>Updates for FFY' 15:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MNR050000. A general NPDES permit was last 	<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. <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MNR050000. A general NPDES permit was approved in July 2014. The new permit coverage starts April 5, 2015 and expires in April 2020. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently permitted and NE facilities are seeking coverage (NOI) under this permit: 2,743 (This represents both Permitted and No Exposure sites) • There are 140 individual NPDES point source permits, with stormwater coverage included. <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Efforts range from permittee training opportunities, compliance inspections and several communication campaigns. Parts of Tempo have not been built to accommodate sampling data or annual reports and efforts will be made for these developments.</p> <p>General permit data are available on external website and uploaded from database every 24 hours, with the goal of sampling data to again be viewable on the web.</p>

			<p>issued April 2015 and expires April 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of permitted facilities covered by this permit: 3,236. 1,521 have full permit coverage and 1902 have certified for No Exposure · There are 150 individual NPDES point source permits, with stormwater coverage included. <p><u>Updates for FFY'16:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · MNR050000. A general NPDES permit was last issued April 2015 and expires April 2020. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of permitted facilities covered by this permit: 3,416. 1,449 have full permit coverage and 1967 have certified for No Exposure · There are approximately 150 individual NPDES point source permits, with stormwater coverage included. 	<p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Efforts range from a minimum of 4 ISW specific training opportunities, compliance inspections and several communication campaigns. Parts of Tempo still have not been built to accommodate sampling data or annual reports and efforts will be made for these developments. Our goal is to have this complete in FFY17. Data is still being collected and stored in WQ Delta.</p> <p>General permit data are available on external website and uploaded from database every 24 hours, with the goal of sampling data to again be viewable on the web.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

WQ-13c	Number of facilities covered under either an individual or general construction storm water site permit.	Marni Karnowski/ Tanya Maurice	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 issued 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. <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1435 sites issued coverage under the general permit Oct. 1 2012-Sept. 30, 2013 • 358 portions of existing permitted sites transferred coverage between Oct. 1 2013-Sept. 30, 2014 • General permit and all individual site permitting data available on website and uploaded from database every 24 hours. <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1766 sites issued coverage under the general permit Oct. 1 2014-Sept. 30, 2015 • 640 portions of existing permitted sites transferred coverage between Oct. 1 2014-Sept. 30, 2015 • General permit and all individual site permitting data available on website and uploaded from database every 24 hours. <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2013 sites issued coverage under the general permit Oct. 1 2015-Sept. 30, 2016 • 1115 portions of existing permitted sites transferred coverage between Oct. 1 2015-Sept. 30, 2016
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> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> As of October 1st 2014, 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>

				<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> As of October 1st 2015, 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> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> As of October 1st 2016, 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	<p>Report Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) in delegated pretreatment POTWs with current unexpired control mechanisms: # with, # without, and % with.</p> <p>For FFY16 Report twice a year as follows:</p> <p>MY of current FY (by March 31) End of FY (by September 30)</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> # of SIUs with Control Measures: 407 # of SIUs: 407 % of SIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> # of SIUs with Control Measures: 375 # of SIUs: 375 % of SIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> # of SIUs with Control Measures: 375 # of SIUs: 375 % of SIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> # of SIUs with Control Measures: 367 # of SIUs: 367 % of SIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p>a. MPCA Comment for EPA: Each year EPA staff ask for the data in WQ 14a and 14b by two different EPA staff/programs that MPCA respond to. EPA Pretreatment staff and PPG staff should coordinate so MPCA staff are not double reporting the same data each year.</p>

				<p><u>EPA Comment:</u> MPCA may report SIU numbers to Sreedevi Yedavalli and she will disseminate to Region 5 staff as needed.</p>
WQ-14b	Number of Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs) in non-delegated pretreatment POTWs with MPCA permits: # with, # without, and % with.	Paul Scheirer	<p>Report known Categorical Industrial Users (CIUs) in non-delegated pretreatment POTWs with MPCA permits: # with, # without, and % with.</p> <p>For FFY16 Report twice a year as follows:</p> <p>MY of current FY (by March 31) End of FY (by September 30)</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> # of Non-Pretreatment CIUs with Control Measures: 57 1. Total# of Non-Pretreatment CIUs: 57 % of CIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> # of Non-Pretreatment CIUs with Control Measures: 51 Total# of Non-Pretreatment CIUs: 51 % of CIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> # of Non-Pretreatment CIUs with Control Measures: 45 Total# of Non-Pretreatment CIUs: 45 % of CIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> # of Non-Pretreatment CIUs with Control Measures: 48 Total# of Non-Pretreatment CIUs: 48 % of CIU Permits Current: 100%</p> <p>MPCA Comment for EPA: Each year EPA staff ask for the data in WQ 14a and 14b by 2 different EPA staff/programs that MPCA respond to. EPA Pretreatment staff and PPG staff should coordinate so MPCA staff are not double reporting the same data each year.</p>

				<p><u>EPA Comment:</u> MPCA may report SIU numbers to Sreedevi Yedavalli and she will disseminate to Region 5 staff as needed.</p>
WQ-15a	Percent of major dischargers in Significant Noncompliance (SNC) at any time during the fiscal year.	Paul Scheirer & Tanya Maurice	<p>The MPCA will report the annual percentage of Major Facilities in Significant Noncompliance</p> <p>End of FFY 2016 (Sept., 2016) Run reporting in December, 2016</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> The MPCA's FFY13 SNC rate was 5%, which exceeds the goal of 13%.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA's FFY14 SNC rate was 4%, which exceeds the goal of 13%.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCAs FFY15 SNC rate is 4%, which again exceeds the goal of 13%.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCAs FFY16 SNC rate is 1%, which again exceeds the national goal of 13%.</p>
WQ-19a	Number of high priority state NPDES permits that are issued in the fiscal year.	Nicole Blasing	<p>The MPCA will issue at least 80% of its high priority NPDES permits as scheduled. The MPCA maintains a two-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 issue 80% of the permits associated with those Facilities.</p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> 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. Eighty percent 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, the permits that were not reissued, and the reasons for delay in reissuance is attached.</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><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>ATTACH SPREADSHEET: <i>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 bottom ash handling water back into the ash handling system; • 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
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>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> <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><u>Xcel – Minnesota Valley Plant MN0000906</u> 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><u>Xcel – Red Wing Generating Plant MN0000850</u> 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><u>Xcel – Wilmarth Generating Plant MN0000914</u> 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><u>Xcel Energy – Prairie Island Nuclear MN0004006</u> 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><u>Seneca Foods Corp – Arlington MN0000264</u> 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 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> MPCA committed to reissuing 20% of the FFY14 full list of priority permits or 9 permits. The MPCA fulfilled this commitment.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA committed to reissuing 10 permits. The MPCA fulfilled this commitment.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA committed to a list, which included 20% of the FFY16 full list of priority permits or 15 permits. EPA's goal is that 80% of the 15 permits be reissued in FFY16. 80% of the 15 permits is 12 permits. MPCA reissued 7 of the 15 permits.</p> <p>MPCA and EPA have already committed to meeting quarterly throughout FFY17 to work together towards achieving the goal in FFY17.</p> <p>Included below are some of the reasons for the slowdown in MPCA's permitting efficiency:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MPCA transitioned into a new database (TEMPO) in October 2015. As a result, permit writers spent a significant amount of time in trainings and learning the new database. Permit writers had to write permits with little to no instruction and at times had to write permits multiple times until the permit could be appropriately locked and issued. 2. With the implementation of river eutrophication standards (RES) there has been a significant slowdown in the time it takes for an effluent limits review to be completed, to negotiate the new limit and compliance schedule with the permittee, and to get the permit through the public process. MPCA staff have
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>had to respond to a number of comment letters and petitions submitted during the public notice period and after the permit is final issued. Completing the watershed reviews and responding to comments and petitions has taken a considerable amount of staff time and has significantly slowed down the permitting process.</p> <p>3. As part of the implementation of the RES, EPA has been completing a focused phosphorous reviews for all permits that include a phosphorous limit prior to public noticing. This adds an additional 30 days to the permit writing process. Which at times becomes longer than 30 days if EPA has questions or comments that need to be resolved.</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.	Nicole Blasing	<p><u>FFY13 Commitment:</u> 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><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> 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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> 16 facilities have traded at least once. There are an additional 33 facilities under the Minnesota River Basin General Phosphorus Permit, which are authorized to trade within enforceable caps.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> 16 facilities have traded at least once. There are an additional 33 facilities under the Minnesota River Basin General Phosphorus Permit, which are authorized to trade within enforceable caps.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> 30 Permittees have traded at least once. There are 3 active NPDES permits that include a point to non-point source trade and 1 active point-to-point source trade. There are 45 Permittees included in the Minnesota River Basin General Phosphorus Permit, which are authorized to trade within enforceable caps.</p>
WQ-26	Number of states and territories implementing	Terry McDill/ Wayne Anderson	<p>New measure 2.1 <i>loadings from source sectors and/or watersheds</i></p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> 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</p>

<p>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 adoption of numeric nutrient criteria for at least one class of waters by no later than 2016. (cumulative)</p>			<p>– 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. 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</p>	<p>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. http://www.pca.state.mn.us/zihy1146</p> <p>EPA response: 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>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 Minnesota 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 are fine with what was added for WQ-26.</p> <p>FFY 2014 Report: The Minnesota State Nutrient Reduction Strategy (NRS) has been completed and is accessible at www.pca.state.mn.us/nutrientreduction . A companion Nutrient Planning Portal, that provides Nutrient Strategy information and planning tools for the HUC 8 Watershed Planning has been completed concurrently with the NRS and is available at http://mrbdc.mnsu.edu/mnnutrients/ The NRS 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</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>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>state is on target to have River Eutrophication Standards by 2015 and calls for continued action on a nitrogen toxicity standard for rivers.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The Minnesota State Nutrient Reduction Strategy (NRS) is accessible at www.pca.state.mn.us/nutrientreduction. The strategy has been presented at many meetings, forums and webinars both within Minnesota and regionally, and has been shared with the members of the Hypoxia Task Force to help guide Mississippi Basin progress. The NRS is guiding policy and program actions such as the newly passed Mandatory Buffer Initiative by the MN Legislature in 2015 and signed into law by Governor Dayton.</p> <p>Minnesota added to the NRS' companion planning portal http://mrbdc.mnsu.edu/mnnutrients/ by completing pilot nutrient guides in selected sub-watersheds of three priority watersheds (the Le Sueur, Cannon and Root Watersheds) during FFY2015 and these guides will be added to the portal as examples for watersheds as they are incorporating the principles and strategies of the NRS. River Eutrophication Standards were established and approved by USEPA in FFY2015. Work is continuing on a nitrogen toxicity standard for rivers. Major wastewater facilities are being required to monitor nitrogen and phosphorus influent and effluent.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> This is the final year for this measure. Efforts launched across Minnesota are reducing nutrients from both point source and nonpoint source. The Minnesota Nutrient Reduction Strategy (NRS) laid out a strategy to achieve a 45% reduction in total P loads to the Mississippi and a 20% milestone reduction of total N to the Mississippi River by 2025 with a future reduction of Total N of 45% by 2040. Minnesota continues to provide a comprehensive water quality monitoring, watershed assessment program, along with locally led planning, implementation programs to create the capacity to support a significant watershed restoration, and protection program in the 80 HUC-8 watersheds in Minnesota. For nonpoint source nutrients, Minnesota has a number of programs identified in the NRS to facilitate the planning and implementation of nutrient management BMPs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandatory riparian buffer initiative passed by Minnesota Legislature: Governor Dayton's initiative for clean water was passed by the legislature, signed into law
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>in the 2015 legislative session, and then passed again with clarifications in the 2016 session. Deadlines for establishment of buffers on public waters and public ditches is 2017 and 2018 respectively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nitrogen fertilizer rule development is underway for priority groundwater areas that include fall fertilizer restrictions and required BMPs. Drinking water wells in vulnerable aquifers are being threatened and, in many cases, impaired for use as drinking water in private and community water supplies. This rule is being developed following updating of the state’s plan for nitrogen fertilizer management and will include monitoring, restrictions on the use of fertilizer, and promotion and in some cases requirements for Best Management Practices. • Incentives for BMPs include the certification of farms for water quality protection. Minnesota along with US-EPA and USDA initiated this program for providing certainty for farms certified to meet water quality protections. In 2016 Land O Lakes became a partner in promotion of this program through its Cooperative Division that assists farmers on nutrient management. Recent progress reported at the end of Sept 2016 shows 350 additional active applicants in process, while already having certified 264 farms representing 147,957 acres with the following results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 487 new Best Management Practices ○ 4,516 tons TSS reduced per year ○ 6,668 tons of soil saved yearly ○ 5,654 lbs. P reduced per year ○ N loss reduction of up to 49% on acres treated with new practices • Governor Mark Dayton convened a Clean Water Summit in 2016 to further water restoration and protection strategies including strategies aimed at reducing nutrient loading to surface and groundwater and stepping up the pace of progress. One of the themes of the Summit was “increasing living cover on the landscape”. • Drainage manual revisions include adding BMP chapter: Minnesota has had a drainage manual since 1991. In 2016, the manual is being updated, in part to emphasize greater consideration of the water quality impacts of drainage and inclusion of a chapter on Best Management Practices. • Cover Crop and living cover research by the University of Minnesota Forever Green Initiative (Legislature added \$1M in 2016) is creating an aggressive
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>research base for establishment of new crops and markets for perennial based vegetation.</p> <p>Water Education: Minnesota Humanities Center and the Smithsonian Institute presents a new exhibit, <i>Water/Ways</i>, a free traveling exhibit that focuses on the relationships between people and water—how water connects story, history, faith, ethics, the arts, and science. As part of the <i>Water/Ways</i> exhibit, a companion exhibit, <i>we are Water Minnesota</i>, has been developed to tell the Minnesota story and will accompany the traveling exhibit. The exhibit raises awareness about the quantity and quality of Minnesota’s water, connecting exhibit-goers to active water solutions. Information on the Exhibit: mnhum.org/waterways</p>
WQ-27 (New Measure)	Extent of priority areas identified by each state that are addressed by EPA-approved TMDLs or alternative restoration approaches for impaired waters that will achieve water quality standards. These areas may also include protection approaches for unimpaired waters to maintain water quality standards.	Terry McDill & Catherine Neuschler (only Assessment)	<p>New Measure – Replaced WQ-08a&b</p> <p>HQ recognizes this is a measure under development, and the expectation is that while nationally a few states may be able to provide commitments for FY15; most will not be ready to have commitments in place until FY16. Some R5 states have a fair idea of how they plan to establish priorities, but even those are not far enough along to be able to provide either a regional or state-specific number for this measure, which would represent a percentage of state priority areas to be covered by TMDLs or alternatives.</p>	<p><u>MPCA comments – if appropriate:</u> Under further discussion with EPA</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The report, “Prioritization Plan for Minnesota 303(d) Listings to Total Maximum Daily Loads,” dated September 2015, was approved by US EPA in October 2015. New measure WQ-27 is now in place. Preliminary numbers are as follows: The “universe” of Section 303(d) listed waters that will be addressed with a TMDL by 2022 is 6,573, 576 acres. The “baseline,” or all waters having approved TMDLs already is 600,751 acres. FFY16 commitments are 899,564 acres and this includes the baseline of 600,751 acres. Reporting on those measures will begin in FY16.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> For FFY2016, the goal for segments addressed by TMDLs were 899,564 (which include the baseline of 600,751 acres). The actual results were 845,696 acres, or 94% of the goal. We are currently analyzing the data to determine where and why the shortfall occurred.</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: 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</p>	Bill Priebe	<p><u>FFY 2013:</u> 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><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA continued to work with the Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis as well as the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) to either terminate or acceptably reissue these two remaining CSO permits in Minnesota. There continues to be a lack of concurrence between all partners. Agreements were made between the City of St. Paul and MCES such that we expect to have termination of this joint CSO permit in early FFY15. Our goal is to then manage the remaining expired CSO permit in FFY16.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The joint CSO permit including the City of St. Paul and the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) was terminated in FFY2015. Only one CSO permit remains in Minnesota. The MPCA continues to work with the City of Minneapolis as well as MCES to either terminate or acceptably reissue this remaining CSO permit. There continues to be a lack of concurrence between all partners. Our goal is to manage the remaining expired CSO permit in FFY16.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Only one CSO permit remains in Minnesota. The MPCA continues to work with the City of Minneapolis as well as MCES to either terminate or acceptably reissue this remaining CSO permit. There continues to be a lack of concurrence between all partners. Our goal is to manage the remaining expired CSO permit in FFY17. Note that there have been no reported overflows from this CSO for over six years.</p>
------	--	-------------	---	--

	1994 CSO Control Policy; or 3) completion of separation after the baseline date. (cumulative)			
	Number of type of compliance monitoring actions performed at point sources, indirect dischargers, and biosolid generators or users	Paul Scheirer & Tanya Maurice	<p>Meet targets in, state-specific Compliance Monitoring Strategy, as negotiated on an annual basis.</p> <p>FFY 16 CMS currently in review by EPA. <u>EPA:</u></p>	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u></p> <p><u>See attached EOY spreadsheet</u></p> <p>Negotiating FFY 13/14 CMS currently.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <p><u>X:\Agency_Files\EnPPA_PPG – CMS\Compliance Monitoring Strategies\FY14 CMS</u></p> <p>See FY14 EOY Report (spreadsheet)</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u></p> <p><u>X:\Agency_Files\EnPPA_PPG – CMS\Compliance Monitoring Strategies\FY15 CMS</u> see FY15 EOY spreadsheet</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u></p> <p>The Compliance Monitoring Strategies spreadsheet will be sent as a separate file/attachment. Please see 2016 Final CMS.</p>
New item 1)	Joint State/EPA Clean Water Act Action Plan Permitting and Enforcement Work Plan	Wendy Turri/Jeff Stollenwerk	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	<p><u>FFY2013 Report:</u></p> <p>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>

			<p>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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in annual planning meetings to develop collaborative annual Joint Work Plans. ○ Participate in regular quarterly meetings to discuss progress towards meeting annual permitting and enforcement priorities outlined in the Work Plan. • Track established priorities for each FFY. 	<p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> MPCA and EPA staffs routinely negotiate priority permits and a permit review list. MPCA staff participates in the bi-monthly meetings with EPA-R5 and other Region 5 states. MPCA leadership is actively involved in EPA’s New Enforcement Framework development workgroup. The scheduling of routine meetings between MPCA wastewater program leadership and EPA-R5 leadership has ceased. In FFY2015, we need to determine whether re-establishing these meetings would be useful.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> MPCA and EPA staffs routinely negotiate priority permits and a permit review list. MPCA staff participates in the bi-monthly meetings with EPA-R5 and other Region 5 states. MPCA leadership actively participated in EPA’s New Enforcement Framework development workgroup. The scheduling of meetings between MPCA wastewater program leadership and EPA-R5 leadership continue on an “as needed” basis.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> MPCA and EPA staffs routinely negotiate priority permits and a permit review list. MPCA staff participates in the bi-monthly meetings with EPA-R5 and other Region 5 states. MPCA leadership actively participated in EPA’s New Enforcement Framework development workgroup. The scheduling of meetings between MPCA wastewater program leadership and EPA-R5 leadership have been upgraded to quarterly basis. The next scheduled meeting is in November 2016.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Water – Non-point Source (sec 319)

SP-10	<p>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)</p>	<p>Terry McDill & Juline Holleran</p>	<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><u>FFY2013 Report:</u> 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>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>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> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The draft 2014 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 1997-2014. The draft 2014 WAR was submitted to US EPA Region 5 on August 28, 2014. No comments have been received as of November 3, 2014.</p> <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> EPA provided comments in December 2014.</p> <p>GRTS reporting, including project reporting and pollution reductions, was completed by February 15, 2014 and September 15, 2014.</p>
-------	---	---	--	---

		<p>Section 319 grant program progress into EPA's Grants Reporting and Tracking System (GRTS) on a semiannual basis (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>US EPA conference and/or meeting attended was the 2014 National Training Workshop on CWA 303(d) Listing and TMDLs held Tuesday, May 6 through Thursday, May 8, 2014 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The 2015 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 1997-2014. The 2015 WAR was approved by EPA on November 12, 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The 2016 Watershed Achievements Report (WAR) includes descriptions of completed, active and newly awarded nonpoint source projects and predicted pollutant reduction data. It was to EPA on September 15, 2016, and was approved by EPA on November 8, 2016. The report is being prepared for posting on the MPCA website, at which point it can be found through the website search.</p> <p>GRTS reporting, including project reporting and pollution reductions, was completed by February 12, 2016 and September 15, 2016.</p> <p>US EPA conference and/or meeting attended was the 2016 National Training Workshop on CWA 303(d) Listing and TMDLs held June 1 through June 3, 2016 in Shepherdstown, West Virginia. Brian Livingston, Supervisor of the East Central Watershed Unit, attended.</p>
--	--	--	---

MINNESOTA PPG MAX WORKPLAN FFY 2013-2016

LAND POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

FFY 2016 Report

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.	Sarah Kilgriff & Ainars Silis/Regina Small - MPCA/ 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:</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> BAE reissued 1/22/13 Siemens Industry reissued 6/18/13</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Gopher Resources reissued 9/10/14 Nexeo reissued 9/2/14 IBM Corrective Action Document 6/20/2014</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> No permits were reissued in FFY 2015.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Safety-Kleen Systems Inc. - Eagan 9/29/16 Safety-Kleen Systems Inc. – Blaine 8/30/16 U of M – FTCEM – minor modification 9/9/16</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.

			Safety-Kleen Eagan, Safety-Kleen Blaine, Xcel, Alliant Proving Grounds, Federal Cartridge, Verso Paper (New Page).	
--	--	--	--	--

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.	Candace Sykora/ Jose Cisneros - EPA	<p><u>FFY 2013 Commitments:</u> Achieve Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRa baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Commitments:</u> No change. Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRa baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Commitments:</u> Achieve Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 97% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRa baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Commitments:</u> Achieve Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 98% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRa baseline list.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Achieved Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRa baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Achieved Human exposures controlled (CA725) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRa baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Achieved Human exposures at 97% meeting Minnesota's 2020GPRa goals.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Achieved Human exposures at 98% meeting Minnesota's 2020 GPRa goals.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> Please update FFY2016 Commitments to reflect exposures controlled (CA725) at 98% in column 3 versus 97%.</p> <p><u>MPCA response:</u> <u>Duly noted. MPCA made the correction.</u></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.

CA2	Number of RCRA facilities with release to groundwater under control (CA750).	Candace Sykora / Jose Cisneros - EPA	<p><u>FFY 2013 Commitments:</u> Achieve Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Commitments:</u> No change. Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Commitments:</u> Achieve Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 95% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Commitments:</u> Achieve Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Achieved Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Achieved Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline list.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Achieved Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities, meeting Minnesota's 2020GPRA goals.</p> <p><u>EPA Comment:</u> In FY15, one CA750 was completed (750 achieved for 86 of 90 facilities or 95.55%. This percentage is presented as 96%)</p> <p>FY16, no additional CA750 are proposed. The percentage needs to be changed to 96% (same as FY15 report)</p> <p><u>MPCA Response</u> (Mar 2016): Changes made per EPA's request.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> Achieved Migration of Groundwater Contamination controlled (CA750) at 96%</p>
CA5	Number of RCRA facilities with final remedies constructed.	Candace Sykora/ Jose Cisneros - EPA	<p><u>FFY 2013 Commitments:</u> Achieve Remedies constructed (CA550) at 91% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Commitments:</u> Achieve Remedies constructed (CA550) at 93% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> Achieved Remedies constructed (CA550) at 92% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> Achieved Remedies constructed (CA550) at 94% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> Achieved Remedies constructed (CA550) at 96% of Minnesota's facilities-meeting Minnesota's 2020GPRA goals</p>

			<p>FFY 2015 Commitments: Achieve Remedies constructed (CA550) at 95% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Commitments: Achieve Remedies constructed (CA550) at 97% of Minnesota's facilities on the 2020 GPRA baseline.</p>	<p>EPA Comment: In FY15, one CA550 was completed (550 achieved for 86 of 90 facilities or 95.55%. For consistency, this percentage needs to be changed to 96%)</p> <p>For FY16, one CA550 is proposed (550 expected for 87 of 90 facilities or 96.66%. For consistency, this percentage needs to be changed to 97%</p> <p>MPCA Response (Mar 2016): Changes made per EPA's request.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Report: Achieved Remedies constructed (A55) at 97% of Minnesota's facilities; meeting Minnesota's 2020 GPRA goals.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

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

Hazardous Waste Compliance and Enforcement	Sarah Kilgriff & John Elling/ Gary Victorine - EPA	<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 	<p>FFY 2013 Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPCA conducted six 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). The MPCA executed one 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.
--	--	--	---

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.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> research, develop, test and implement efforts to increase pollution prevention practices, innovate regulatory programs and increase environmental performance. <p><u>FFY 2013 Commitment:</u></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 TSDs in Minnesota is 14. During FFY 2013, the MPCA has agreed to conduct four TSD CEIs at operating facilities and EPA will conduct three TSD 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 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><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPCA conducted five CEIs at operating or full enforcement TSDs, which met the PPA commitment for FFY 2014. The MPCA conducted 25 LQG CEIs and Hennepin County conducted 22 CEIs for a total of 47 LQG CEIs, which met the PPA commitment of 47 for FFY 2014. The MPCA conducted 78 RCRA CEIs during FFY 2014 and identified six Significant Non-compliers (SNC), a compliance monitoring SNC rate of 7.7%, and returned nine SNCs to compliance (SNN). The MPCA executed 3 Stipulation Agreements and issued 1 Non-forgivable Administrative Penalty Orders (APOs), 5 Combination APOs, 7 Notices of Violation, 5 Letters of Warning, and 11 Referrals to Local Units of Government. <p><u>EPA Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPCA conducted five CEIs at operating or full enforcement TSDs. MPCA met the two-year TSD CEI PPA commitment with EPA assistance. The MPCA conducted 28 LQG CEIs and Hennepin County conducted 22 CEIs for a total of 50 LQG CEIs. MPCA exceeded the 20% LQG CEI universe commitment with EPA and Hennepin County assistance. The MPCA conducted 77 RCRA CEIs during FFY 2014 and identified six Significant Non-compliers (SNC), a compliance monitoring SNC rate of 7.7%, and returned nine SNCs to compliance (SNN). The MPCA executed 3 Stipulation Agreements; and issued 1 Non-forgivable Administrative Penalty Order (APO), 5 Combination APOs, 8 Notices of Violation, 6 Letters of Warning, 11 Referrals to Local Units of Government, 2 verbal informal actions, and 5 information requests. <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPCA conducted six CEIs at operating or full enforcement TSDs, which met the PPA commitment for FFY 2015. The MPCA conducted 33 LQG CEIs and Hennepin County conducted 22 CEIs for a total of 55 LQG CEIs, which met the PPA commitment of 50 for FFY 2015.
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, the MPCA will conduct additional inspections as required, at generators other than LOGs (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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPCA conducted 88 RCRA CEIs during FFY 2015 and identified eight Significant Non-compliers (SNC), a compliance monitoring SNC rate of 9%, and returned three SNCs to compliance (SNN). The MPCA executed two Stipulation Agreements and issued 1 Non-forgivable Administrative Penalty Order (APO), 2 Combination APOs, 10 Notices of Violation, 4 Letters of Warning, and 12 Referrals to Local Units of Government. <p><u>EPA Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPCA collected \$51,425 in penalties. EPA conducted 10 LOG CEIs and 1 SQG CEI in Minnesota. EPA conducted four TSDf CEIs in Minnesota (2 state/local TSDFs, 2 commercial TSDFs). EPA issued 18 Notice of Violation Letters to facilities in Minnesota. EPA designated one SNC in Minnesota. <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MPCA conducted five CEIs at operating or full enforcement TSDFs, which met the PPA commitment. The MPCA conducted 21 LOG CEIs and Hennepin County conducted 23 LOG CEIs for a total of 44 LOG CEIs, which combined with the 21 Flexibility Plan SQG CEIs, met the PPA commitment of 64. The MPCA conducted 89 RCRA CEIs during FFY 2016 and identified eight Significant Non-compliers (SNC), a compliance monitoring SNC rate of 9%, and returned 12 SNCs to compliance (SNN). The MPCA executed three Stipulation Agreements and one Schedule of Compliance. The MPCA issued 1 Administrative Order, 2 Non-forgivable Administrative Penalty Order (APO), 9 Combination APOs, 14 Notices of Violation, and 11 Letters of Warning. The MPCA referred violations to Hennepin County for low-level enforcement on 12 occasions. <p><u>EPA Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPCA collected \$302,610 in penalties. EPA collected \$25,000 in penalties. EPA conducted eight LOG, two SQG, and two VSQG CEIs in Minnesota. EPA conducted four TSDf CEIs in Minnesota (2 state/local TSDFs, 2 commercial TSDFs). EPA issued nine NOV's to facilities in Minnesota.
--	--	--	---

			inspectors in the RCRAInfo database.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA issued one complaint and compliance order (CAFO) in Minnesota, and referred one facility to Superfund.
RCRA Authorization	Sarah Kilgriff & John Elling/Gary Victorine - EPA	<p>FFY 2013 Commitments: 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>FFY 2013 Report: 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> <p>FFY 2014 Report: MPCA is conducting "housekeeping" rule changes for RCRA/MN 7045 rules in the next couple of months. MPCA is still looking into future RCRA authorization with EPA.</p> <p>FFY 2015 Report: MPCA is conducting "housekeeping" rule changes for RCRA/MN 7045 rules in the next couple of months. MPCA is still looking into future RCRA authorization with EPA.</p> <p>FFY 2016 Report: MPCA is conducting "housekeeping" rule changes for RCRA/MN 7045 rules in the next couple of months. MPCA is still looking into future RCRA authorization with EPA.</p> <p>Update 3/23/17: We continue to work on rule authorization changes, including new and emerging federal changes as they get promulgated. We have been adding to the rule update package as we move along in the process, which in part has caused some of the delay. We continue to progress on our rule updates, but I would like to reiterate that Minnesota has a different rule base structure than EPA, and therefore in most cases we are currently as stringent if not more stringent than EPA. An example where we are more stringent is regulating smaller generators that are federally exempt, we also regulate industry sectors that EPA typically does not, like pharmaceuticals that fall under Minnesota lethality. We will continue to work on the rule update/authorization package with a goal of public noticing the rule package in early fall of 2017.</p>	
RCRA Info	Steve Gorg/ Darnell Wilson – EPA	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	<p>FFY 2013 Report: 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.</p>	

		<p>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>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</p>	<p>Throughout this process, MPCA satisfied data management commitments while participating in the monthly conference call.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> During FFY2014, the MPCA further developed automated data transfer solutions through the Exchange Network. Throughout this process, MPCA satisfied data management commitments while participating in the monthly conference call. The MPCA applied for a 2015 NEIEN Grant (Grants.gov Tracking Number GRANT11787390) to acquire funding to assist in the streamlining and modernization of the management of MPCA's electronic submissions for the RCRA Biennial Report.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> During FFY2015, the MPCA participated in monthly conference calls and further developed automated data transfer solutions through the Exchange Network while satisfying data management commitments.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> MPCA will transfer to an automatic flow from their state data system to RCRAInfo through the exchange network. The state will start translating handler and CME data. The date the automatic flow will occur is February 15, 2016. MPCA decided not to bid on a grant for a new BR system for the FY15 cycle. MPCA decided to use the Florida Biennial Report Software (BRS) for the upcoming cycle. Data verification State Review Framework (SRF) will be completed in the timeline allowed.</p> <p><u>MPCA Comments/Rebuttals</u> (February 2016): The MPCA is scheduled to start automated flow of handler and CME data. The automatic data transfer of the state's Hazardous Waste data is currently scheduled to occur in 2016.</p> <p>MPCA's proposal for the 2015 NEIEN Grant (Grants.gov Tracking Number GRANT11787390) to acquire funding to assist in the streamlining and modernization of the management of MPCA's electronic submissions for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Biennial Report was denied, the EPA adopted the proposal and will be completing the proposed efforts. Until those efforts are completed, the MPCA will continue to use the Florida Biennial Report Software (BRS).</p>
--	--	--	---

			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.	Data verification for State Review Framework (SRF) purposes was completed in the timeline allowed. <u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> During FFY2016, the MPCA participated in monthly conference calls and further developed automated data transfer solutions through the MPCA's RCRAInfo Data flow while satisfying data management commitments. <u>MPCA (March 2017)</u> The MPCA continues to further develop and maintain submittal information to meet the EPA's minimum Data Requirements. The MPCA continues to request read access to the relevant EPA data tables for QA/QC purposes.
--	--	--	--	---

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 Presence ¹²				
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 three years)	Sarah Kilgriff & John Elling/Mardi Klevs - EPA	<u>FFY 2013 Commitments:</u> 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 -	<u>FFY 2013 Report:</u> The MPCA completed 20 PCB inspections; included in the 20 inspections the MPCA conducted 1 PCB storage facility (Xcel). <u>EPA Comments:</u>	

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

			<p>therefore, we will do one of these facilities in two out of every three years – John Elling.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p><u>FFY 2014 Report:</u> The MPCA completed 10 PCB inspections; 1 pipeline; 9 electrical utilities.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> During FFY 2014, MPCA trained a new field inspector on PCB inspections, including on-the-job field training during the PCB inspections completed by MPCA. These activities were in accordance with EPA Order 3500.1 and the Guidance for Credentialing State and Tribal Inspectors.</p> <p>MPCA has been fully funded out to September 30, 2016, under the TSCA cooperative agreement for the current PPG. MPCA should continue to complete their minimum commitment of 20 inspections per fiscal year, as established in the work plan. Additionally, during the remainder of the current PPG, MPCA must also complete the 10 inspections that were not performed in FY 2014.</p> <p>The collection of environmental samples at investigation sites continued to be accomplished when appropriate. This activity must continue, as it adds to the evidence for any non-compliance by operators of facilities handling PCB containing equipment, materials, and/or waste.</p> <p><u>MPCA response:</u> Comments duly noted.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u> The MPCA conducted 20 inspections for FFY2015, (19 Electrical utilities and 1 Natural Gas utilities)</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> During the year, the new PCB inspector independently completed 10 of the 20 inspections the Agency committed to accomplish. For FY15, the MPCA inspections uncovered 5 facilities not in compliance with the PCB Rule. Those cases will be reviewed for further enforcement action. There were two enforcement cases developed in FY15 from the previous FY fieldwork. One of these cases resulted in a Consent Agreement and Final Order. The second matter is currently in settlement negotiations. The revised PCB sampling QAPP for MPCA was reviewed by EPA and final approval was completed during the FY. The MPCA independently developed a comprehensive mapping system for</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>municipal utilities and electric cooperative, the major source of PCB containing equipment in Minnesota.</p> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA conducted 20 inspections for FFY2016, (17 Electrical utilities and 3 Natural Gas utilities). 2 potential enforcement referrals.</p> <p><u>EPA Comments:</u> The MPCA used their mapping system for municipal utilities and cooperatives to send out a questionnaire about the facilities PCB free status. Those that claimed to be PCB free were asked to submit data on their equipment inventories. The MPCA will analyze this data in 2017 as part of the goal to have PCB free utilities and coops. MPCA has been asked and agreed to take samples for demonstration of compliance, as needed.</p> <p><u>MPCA Response (March 2017)</u> Duly noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

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

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 Steve Gorg (MPCA)</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> <p><u>FFY 2014 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. In conjunction with the development and implementation of a new enterprise system, the MPCA submitted an application for revision of the state’s existing CROMERR approval.</p> <p><u>FFY 2015 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> <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u> The MPCA continues to receive 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>

<p>2) QA/QC New Item (starting in FFY2015): annual report on major Quality Assurance activities</p>	<p>On going Luke Charpentier/ Sandy McDonald (MPCA)/ Kevin Bolger (EPA)</p>	<p>MPCA will report on self-approved Quality Assurance Project Plans, training events, audits performed throughout the State, and changes proposed to the Quality Management Plan for the reported fiscal year.</p>	<p><u>FFY 2015 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MPCA self-approved the following number of Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) or Sampling and Analysis Plans (SAPs) for the listed programs; 10 for Remediation (which includes Superfund, Resource Conservation Recovery Act and Brownfields), five for GLNPO and none (three submitted in early 2016) for Air. • The MPCA is hiring three positions into the Environmental Data Quality unit following retirements and staff moves, the Water Quality Assurance Coordinator, an Air Quality Assurance Coordinator, and an EQUIS Data System Analyst. • A PEP audit was performed by an USEPA contractor in September. The results met specifications. A TTP (through the probe) audit was performed in October by a EPA contractor and the MPCA met QA specifications. • MPCA audited 17 wastewater laboratories (meeting the goal of 17) in FY15 and anticipates auditing 17 in FY16 for certification. • MPCA performed two contractual audits for Remediation and anticipates seven more audits in FY16. • The MPCA Quality Management Plan (QMP) was written in 2012 and approved in 2013 by EPA. The following changes to the quality system at MPCA are noted over the last two years. The MPCA anticipates the updated QMP will be posted on the MPCA QA Webpage in May. EPA will be informed when the new document is posted. The modifications to the QMP are listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Figure 2 will be removed as the current link to the MPCA Organization chart is supplied in Section 1.7. ○ Table 3 will be edited to show current staffing changes. ○ Consistency in naming the Quality Assurance Coordinators as QACs not QCCs is being changed throughout the document. ○ References throughout the document to figures are being corrected and links to external websites checked and fixed when found to be outdated. ○ Section 5.2 will be edited to include information on the OnBase system used by MPCA for records management. Information on TEMPO (the new permitting system at MPCA) will be discussed.
---	---	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 6.4 the EQUIS and Delta database sections will be updated to include current information. MPCA is currently replacing Delta (used for permitting of facilities) with a new system called Tempo (which is being implemented). ○ Section 10 will be updated with new MPCA Continuous Improvement (CI) work. <p><u>FFY 2016 Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The MPCA self-approved the following Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 14 for Remediation (which includes Superfund, Resource Conservation Recovery Act and Brownfields) ○ one for the Municipal Division ○ one for the Environmental Analysis and Outcomes Division ○ two for GLNPO as part of the ongoing State AOAC work ○ two for Air, Air Criteria Pollutants and Air Toxics · The MPCA hired an Air Quality Assurance Coordinator into the Environmental Data Quality unit in March. · EPA Region 5 performed a Technical Systems Audit (TSA) in August. The Air Unit is still in the process of responding to some of the findings but will have this wrapped up by early 2017. · A Through the Probe (TTP) audit was performed in October by a USEPA contractor and the MPCA met QA specifications. · MPCA audited 14 certified wastewater laboratories in FY16 and anticipates auditing 19 in FY17. This will complete the first three-year audit cycle for the program. One new laboratory joined the program in 2016 and another will be joining in January of 2017.
--	--	--	--