

**Air Quality Advisory Council  
Draft Minutes – July 7, 2009**

**Members / Alternates Present:** Jan Hoem, Patricia Hogan, Jason Boeckel, John Garberson, Dan Cottrell, Tova Sardot, Garon Smith,

**Staff Present:** Mamie Colburn, Ben Schmidt

**Public Present:** Mary McNamara, Mark Herrington, Mark (from Axmen Propane)

- 1. John Garberson called the meeting to order.**
- 2. Excused Absences Recognized:** Beth Berlin, Bert Chessin, Bill Flannery, Sue Spanke
- 3. Agenda was approved with the addition of an article report by Patricia Hogan.**
- 4. April minutes were approved with a few grammatical amendments.**
- 5. No public comment on non agenda items.**

**6. Patricia Hogan: Article Presentation.** “Wood Smoke is a Severe Health Hazard” newsletter, Group Against Smog and Pollution, Inc. Spring 2008. This newsletter article reviews woodstoves as a source of PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollution. It collected data from various studies and interviews with two doctors who pointed out the connection between PM<sub>2.5</sub> and woodstove smoke. The article reviewed the other pollutants from wood smoke such as Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons with include known carcinogens such as benzo(a)pyrene. Some of the pollutants are similar to what is found in second hand cigarette smoke.

**7. Ben Schmidt: Woodstoves In the Air Stagnation Zone.** It was estimated in the year 2000 that there were 1300 woodstoves in the Air Stagnation Zone. Based on attrition levels, approximately 150 of these stoves should have been removed since then. Ben attempted to roughly estimate emission reductions that would come from replacing these remaining stoves with newer more clean burning stoves. He used emission factors from the AP42 method. In this method, Phase 2 stoves emit half the emissions of a non-phase 2 device. Potential emission reductions could be around 50% per stove given ideal conditions, if all stove use stayed the same from new to old stoves.

The department has the following concerns with changing out woodstoves in the Air Stagnation Zone for newer wood burning stoves:

- As property changes ownership, older stoves already need to be removed. With the growing valley population, would it be responsible or fair to allow the installation of new woodstoves to a few people in the urban area while telling everyone else no?
- If people do install a shiny new stove, would they burn more wood and so produce more emissions than if the old stove had remained?

- Tracking and enforcement of a woodstove for woodstove change out program would be very difficult or impossible with the resources available. It would be very easy for people who have not sold their property since 1994 but have no woodstove to circumvent the rule and install a woodstove.
- It has been proposed that if a woodstove for woodstove change out program was done in the Air Stagnation Zone, the new stove would still need to be removed when the property changed ownership. One problem with this is that resistance to removing a nice efficient new stove from a property would be inevitable. Also, the use of direct monetary payments from the government or tax rebates for woodstoves that would need to be removed in the future would not be a good or appropriate use of public money. A better use of public money would be to encourage installation of devices that could remain when a property changes ownership. That would mean approved pellet stoves in the Air Stagnation Zone and many types of wood burning devices outside the Air Stagnation Zone in the County.
- Frequently, woodstoves are operated differently in people's homes and shops than how they are tested in a laboratory. Emissions for woodstoves are higher outside of the laboratory setting. So when people show a woodstove with an emission rating similar to a pellet stove, real world emissions for the woodstove would most likely be higher than the pellet stove which has a more controlled fuel and combustion process.

Our Airshed has no additional capacity, so risk of increasing has potentially heavy impacts. Garon asked Marcy about her familiarity with the Libby woodstove change out program and asked her to give a copy of the report to the staff. The group discussed the impacts of reducing biomass and our position here in Western MT being surrounded by beetle kill and wildfires. Mamie re-iterated that the health department is not against burning but recognizes the impacts associated with it. Patricia stated from her research that a natural gas or propane furnace emits 0.001 grams/hour of fine particulates, as compared to 2.4 grams/hour for a high efficiency pellet stove, and 30 grams/hour for hardwood burned in a fireplace.

**8. Staff Report.** Staff has been working on responding to comments from the public hearing. Staff will present the Wildfire Smoke Emergency Episode Avoidance Plan to the Air Pollution Control Board this month. Odor complaints and investigations are ongoing.

**9. No Public Comment.**

**10. Announcements.** The council decided not to hold an August meeting. Next meeting will be September 1, 2009. Tova will be out this fall because she is studying abroad in Ireland.

**11. Meeting was adjourned.**