

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Board of Directors Regular Meeting
Wednesday, May 4, 2011
9:45 a.m.

APPROVED MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Tom Bates called the Regular Meeting to order at 9:48 a.m.

Pledge of Allegiance: Chairperson Bates led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call:

Present: Chairperson Tom Bates; Vice Chair John Gioia; and Directors Susan Gorin, Carole Groom, Jennifer Hosterman, David Hudson, Carol Klatt, Nate Miley, Mark Ross, James Spring, Gayle B. Uilkema, Brad Wagenknecht and Ken Yeager. Directors John Avalos, Susan Garner, and Eric Mar and arrived after the roll call was taken.

Absent: Secretary Ash Kalra; and Directors Harold Brown, Scott Haggerty, Liz Kniss, Johanna Partin and Shirlee Zane.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA MATTERS: Chairperson Bates opened the public comment period and seeing no one came forward to speak, he closed the public comment period at 9:50 a.m.

Chairperson Bates stated that Agenda Item 12, the presentation titled “Legal Framework for the Air District – How Do We Clean the Air?” will be postponed to a later date.

CONSENT CALENDAR (Items 1-6):

- 1. Minutes of the April 6, 2011 Regular Meeting.**
- 2. Board Communications Received from April 6, 2011 through May 3, 2011.**
- 3. District Personnel on Out-of-State Business Travel.**
- 4. Quarterly Report of California Air Resources Board Representative – Honorable Ken Yeager.**
- 5. Set Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Regulation 11, Rule 17; Limited Use Stationary Compression Ignition (Diesel) engines in Agricultural Use; and Certification of a CEQA Environmental Impact Report.**
- 6. Amend Executive Officer / APCO Employment Agreement.**

Board Action: Director Wagenknecht made a motion to approve Consent Calendar Items 1 through 6; Vice Chair Gioia seconded the motion; which carried unanimously without objection.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7. Report of the Executive Committee Meeting of April 11, 2011

Chair: Tom Bates

Chairperson Bates reported that the Executive Committee met on Monday, April 11, 2011 and approved the minutes of November 22, 2011.

The Committee received a Quarterly Report from Hearing Board Chair, Tom Dailey, for the fourth quarter of calendar year 2010, and the first quarter of calendar year 2011.

The Committee also received an update from the Joint Policy Committee presented by Ted Droettboom, which reviewed the history and the future direction of the Joint Policy Committee. The Committee recognized Mr. Droettboom's work with the Joint Policy Committee and his upcoming retirement.

The Committee received an update on the Implementation of the Air District's California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and Community Risk Reduction Plans. Staff outlined the Air District's work with local governments and developers, and the development of standardized mitigation measures. The Committee also received a presentation from the San Francisco Planning Department and discussed San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy and Community Risk Reduction Plan.

The Committee heard an update regarding the Air District's Production System Project. Staff and industry training has begun and the Board of Directors will see a demonstration of the technology in the summer. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held at the Call of the Chair.

Board Action: Chairperson Bates made a motion to approve the report of the Executive Committee; Director Wagenknecht seconded the motion; which carried unanimously without objection.

8. Report of the Budget and Finance Committee Meeting of April 28, 2011

Chair: Carole Groom

Director Groom reported that the Budget and Finance Committee met on April 28, 2011 without a quorum. The approval of the meeting minutes of March 23, 2011 was delayed until the next meeting.

The Committee received the following three reports:

- A) Third Quarter Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ending (FYE) 2011
- B) Update on Proposed Fee Amendments for FYE 2012
- C) Continued Discussion of FYE 2012 Proposed Air District Budget and Consideration to Recommend Adoption

The Committee discussed the Third Quarter Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ending 2011 including third quarter revenues, expenses, investments and projected year-end fund balances with staff.

The Committee received the update for the Proposed Fee Amendments for Fiscal Year Ending 2012, which was a follow up on a report given at the March 23, 2011 meeting. The proposed fee schedule amendments would increase the fee schedule by 10% and the budgeted fee revenue by 5%.

The Committee discussed the Fiscal Year Ending 2012 Proposed Air District Budget. The Budget document was reviewed, Committee members asked questions, and staff emphasized the Air District's pro-active, balanced, multi-faceted and multi-year approach in responding to budget constraints with personnel costs, expenditures, fees, and reserves. The consensus of the Committee Members present was to recommend the Fiscal Year Ending 2012 Proposed Air District Budget for approval by the Board of Directors.

The next meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, May 25, 2011 at 1:00 p.m.

Board Action: Director Groom made a motion to approve the report and the consensus recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee Members present at the April 28, 2011 meeting; Director Hudson seconded the motion; which carried unanimously without objection.

9. Report of the Mobile Source Committee Meeting of May 2, 2011

Chair: Scott Haggerty

Director Groom reported that the Mobile Source Committee met on Monday, May 2, 2011 and approved the minutes of March 24, 2011.

The Committee discussed Carl Moyer projects with grant awards over \$100,000, which included 18 projects to replace 41 pieces of off-road equipment and 11 marine engines, with \$3,138,251 in total awards and 33 tons per year of criteria pollutant emissions reductions. The Committee recommends the Board of Directors approve Carl Moyer Program projects with proposed grant awards over \$100,000; and authorize the Executive Officer/APCO to enter into agreements for the recommended projects.

The Committee discussed consideration of approximately \$20 million in California Goods Movement Bond Funding for Bay Area Ports. The Air District has received two applications for shore power projects at ten berths at the Port of Oakland, with two additional berths listed as alternates. Upon approval of the Board of Directors, funded projects will have to comply with a number of requirements during the project implementation period. The Air District receives funding for the administration of these grants through the I-Bond program. The Committee recommends the Board of Directors approve the proposed and alternate I-Bond shore power projects; and authorize the Executive Officer/APCO to enter into agreements for the projects.

The Committee discussed the Air District's participation in the Lawn and Garden Equipment Replacement Project. This program would be similar to the vehicle buyback program. Participants would turn in used gas operated lawn mowers and receive discount vouchers to purchase cordless electric lawn mowers. Staff will issue an RFP to find one or more vendors to implement the program. Approximately 2,000 lawnmowers are expected to be retired through the program.

The Committee recommends the Board of Directors adopt a resolution authorizing the Executive Officer/APCO to accept a grant from the California Air Resources Board of up to \$182,025 and commit the Air District to comply with the program requirements, and to allocate up to \$182,025 in Mobile Source Incentive Funding as matching funds; and to authorize the Executive Officer/APCO to execute all necessary agreements with the California Air Resources Board relating to the Air District's receipt of Lawn and Garden Replacement Project funds for fiscal year ending 2011.

The Committee discussed the allocation of Transportation Fund for Clean Air County Program Manager Expenditures Plans. The Air District received applications from all nine Program Managers.

The Committee also discussed allocation of the remaining fiscal year ending 2008 funds for Napa County. There are now sufficient projects to expend this funding.

The Committee recommends the Board of Directors approve the allocation of 2012 Program Manager funds as identified in the staff memo, authorize the Executive Officer/APCO to enter into funding agreements with the County Program Managers for the total funds to be expended in fiscal year ending 2012; and approve the allocation of \$68,020.50 in remaining fiscal year ending 2008 funds to the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency, and authorize the Executive Officer/APCO to amend the funding agreement with the agency to include the additional allocation.

The next meeting of the Mobile Source Committee will be held at the call of the Chair.

Board Action: Director Groom made a motion to approve the report and recommendations of the Mobile Source Committee; Director Wagenknecht seconded the motion; which carried unanimously without objection.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

10. Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of Proposed Amendments to Air District Regulation 3: Fees, and Approval of Notice of Exemption from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Brian Bateman, Director of Engineering, presented the staff report. Mr. Bateman explained that fees are amended as part of annual budget preparation. The Air District's fees are regulatory, and the Air District has the authority to assess fees to recover the reasonable costs of regulating stationary sources. The Air District's fee revenue falls short of 100% cost recovery according to the 2011 Cost Recovery and Containment Study prepared by Matrix Consulting Group. For fiscal year ending 2010, fee revenue recovered 62% of costs. The cost recovery gap is filled by county tax revenue. Best Management Practices and other cost cutting measures have helped with the gap. Fees are the largest source of revenue, and property tax is second. In the current fiscal year we will be drawing on reserves to fill the gap. The State subvention of \$1.7 million is currently in the Governor's budget, but that may change before the State budget is finalized.

New regulations and responsibilities present a challenge for the Air District. There are new and more complex federal, state, and District air quality requirements, including measurement of ozone, greenhouse gases, and creation of climate protection programs.

There is a decrease in the revenue expected to come from fees, fines and penalties, grant program and interest.

To address the decrease in revenue streams, the Air District has taken several cost cutting measures including: Reduction in personnel costs due to a vacancy rate of over 10%, and not filling vacant positions; reducing expenditures in all areas, especially capital and service/supplies; and increasing efficiency with use of our new production system. Reserves are needed to fill the gap, and without an increase in fees, reserves will continue to be used. After an initial decrease in 2012, reserves will increase in 2013 and beyond. Fee increases will maintain reserves at the milestone level set by the Board of Directors.

The percentages of fee increases do not yield an equivalent percentage of increases in cost recovery. The proposed fee increases are designed to increase budgeted fee revenue by 5% (\$1.5 million) from FYE 2011 to FYE 2012. There is a shortfall between FYE 2011 budgeted and actual fee revenue. Fees related to levels of business activity or emissions are decreasing. Less permit applications have been received. Permit revenues are dependent on permits from big energy plants and no permits are expected this coming year. Decreases in emissions based fees are considered to be permanent reductions.

Actual revenue is tracking 4% lower than projected revenue to date, there is a \$1.2 million shortfall projected by end of this fiscal year. Assuming that business activity in FYE 2012 will be the same as it is currently, fee rates will need to be increased by an average of 10% in order to meet budget revenue targets.

The proposed fee increases are not across the board, but have been tailored to look at each fee schedule and the rate of cost recovery for each category. Fee categories with a cost recovery greater than 89% were not changed. There is a 10, 12 or 14% increase on other schedules based on cost recovery.

The proposed fee increases are as follows:

- No change for Schedule M: Major Stationary Source Fees
- 2% increase for Schedule R: Equipment Registration Fees
- New one-time fee of \$129 in Schedule R for low-use agricultural diesel engines with an Alternative Compliance Plan (ACP)
- 10% increase in permit application filing fees and permit renewal processing fees
- 10% increase in fees for ACP's that use Interchangeable Emission Reduction Credits (IERCs)
- For Schedule K: Solid Waste Disposal Sites, create separate fees for waste decomposition and material handling processes (fee neutral)

Typical increases will be approximately \$52 for a dry cleaner, \$ 46 for an auto shop, and \$33 for a backup generator.

The typical increase for a gas station will be \$231. The cost recovery for gas stations is 43%. The emissions potential is very large for gas stations and there is a great deal of staff time spent on gas stations. The Air District has 10 full time field inspectors exclusively assigned to gas stations.

For Title V Federal operating permits, the estimated FYE 2012 renewal fee increases are 4.4 to 7% for the five Bay Area petroleum refineries, with an average of 5.7%. Other Title V facilities have a proposed increase of 0.8 to 13.8%, with an average of 8.9%.

When compared with the South Coast Air District fees, the BAAQMD fee schedule is lower. The South Coast Air District has a cost recovery of 90%.

The process and schedule staff has implemented for the fee increases is as follows:

- February 18, 2011 - Draft fee proposal issued
- March 14, 2011 - Public workshop held

- March 23 and April 28, 2011 - Budget & Finance Committee briefings
- May 4, 2011 - Public hearing to consider adoption, except for fees for non-permitted sources
- June 15, 2011 - Public hearing to consider adoption of fees for non-permitted sources
- July 1, 2011 - Proposed effective date of fee amendments

Mr. Bateman reported that 8 written and 6 verbal public comments were received regarding the proposed fee increases. Almost all comments indicated opposition to the fee increases, mentioning economic downturn and past fee increases and/or compliance costs.

The California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB) also provided written comments. CCEEB echoed that double-digit fee increases are difficult to accept during this economic downturn; recommended establishment of a process to review and implement appropriate cost containment measures from 2011 study; suggested that the Air District review value of discretionary activities and clarify conformance with Proposition 26 requirements. Staff will be meeting with the CCEEB to discuss their recommendations and comments.

Staff recommends that the Board of Directors adopt the proposed amendments to the fee schedule.

Public Comments: Chair Bates opened the public hearing at 10:33 a.m. Janet Whittick, representing CCEEB, stated that they were looking forward to working with the Air District on this issue.

Board Comments:

Director Hosterman was concerned about implementing double-digit increases in this economy; preferred a phase-in approach.

Mr. Broadbent replied that the Air District understands that the economy is sputtering. This set of recommendations is the result of the cost recovery study. Time was tracked, and there are areas where we do not come close to recovering costs. We also have been cutting our spending. Fee increases are part of a larger plan. Vacancies have not been filled, and staff will continue to look at programs and make efforts to contain costs. We reluctantly make this recommendation to increase fees, but we have a shortfall. We need to create certainty for those we regulate. What is a reasonable expectation for cost recovery? Many of our fees are in 40, 50, 60% range, and we need to correct this.

Director Hosterman asked if staff had looked into keeping the increases under double - digits.

Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer Jeff McKay responded that the fee increases realize a net revenue increase of 5%. This recommendation is part of a multi-year approach. Presentations have been given to the Budget and Finance Committee and we are using every tool to keep costs down.

Director Ross stated that businesses need certainty. While no one wants to increase fees, we keep falling behind. We have to set a policy, and have a goal so businesses know what to expect in the future. There is currently no proposed increase for Schedule M fees. So we should consider a one to two percent increase for this schedule. He expressed a desire to give small gas service station owners a break.

Mr. Bateman stated while there is no proposed increase on refineries this year, fees were increased 5% last year, and 15% the year before. We have been aggressive in the past on that fee schedule.

Director Sperring was concerned about a double digit increase and asked what the target percentage for cost recovery is. Small businesses will see cumulative impact of fee increases, there is tremendous costs for these businesses to comply. The phased approach is beneficial as it has the ability to adjust as things change.

Mr. Broadbent stated that it was appropriate to include comments and concerns as part of the budget discussion. The cost containment study has over 50 recommendations that have value and will produce savings, and those will be discussed with the Budget and Finance Committee. Results will take some time.

Director Wagenknecht reinforced the idea of robustness while going through cost containment methods. CCEEB has offered to help and that will be a good resource.

Director Gorin asked how fees have increased in the past and suggested that small regular fee increases be built in, to avoid huge increases in any one year. All agencies are looking at cost recovery issues.

Director Hudson commented on the presentation slide which showed cost recovery increasing from 62% to 67%, and felt that was an important indicator. He wants to focus on the service the Air District provides, cleaning up the air. He did not feel 14% was excessive, and felt that the Board has to make decisions of the direction the cost recovery should go. Cost recovery is needed.

Director Groom noted that she is the Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, and she and the Committee have looked at the cost recovery issues at several meetings. The Air District is not filling vacancies, including vacancies in Enforcement. The Committee has reviewed these increases, and discussed the burdens to businesses at length. The Committee has made this recommendation because the overall fiscal health of this agency is at risk. We have a long term plan and this is just one piece of it. The Committee struggled with the fact that small businesses are being asked to pay more.

Director Garner supported the comments of the other Board members. She wanted a minimal fee increase, up to 2%, to be considered for refineries, that may off-set the burden to smaller businesses. She supports the Air District being fiscally solvent.

Director Uilkema acknowledged that California Unified Program Agency (CUPA) fees have gone up, and businesses are also impacted by those rising costs. Contra Costa County has a number of refineries that are greatly impacted by the fee increases from all sources. One complaint is that increases are unpredictable. It is preferred to have staged increases, set for several years in advance, to assist businesses plan for the future. The Executive Committee should look at this, in addition to the Budget and Finance Committee. Director Uilkema would like this referred to both Committees. She suggested that the Board create a defined goal regarding the cost recovery rate and to use a careful approach in how this is done.

Director Avalos noted that the Air District has a mission to carry out its functions to protect public health. Director Avalos asked about the trend of property tax revenues, since 34% of Air District revenues are coming from this source, and asked about the Air District's reserve policy

Mr. McKay responded that property tax remains flat and Staff has not projected any change in that.

Mr. Broadbent stated that the increases would help stabilize the organization. The Air District is dependent on EPA and State money that can be pulled; we are never really certain about these funds. If those funds do get pulled Staff will go back to Committee. Without this plan of proposed increases, severe cuts would occur and impact our mission; as well as cutting into reserves.

Director Avalos supports the Staff recommendation and acknowledged the impacts that fee increases have on small business.

Director Yeager inquired about penalties if the Air District fails to meet federally mandated regulations because of cuts in personnel and budget; are they financial penalties and who pays those fines.

Mr. Broadbent responded that penalties that are imposed by the EPA are complex. There are many requirements as we are the implementing agency for the Clean Air Act.

District Counsel Brian Bunger answered that if the Air District fails to meet the federal requirements, federal funding is not available. Highway funds can be frozen and there are examples of where this has happened.

Director Yeager wants the Board to remember why we do this, that no one like to increase fees, but the Air District is charged with certain responsibilities and those requirements are greater.

Board Action: Director Wagenknecht moved to adopt the proposed Amendments to Air District Regulation 3: Fees, and to approve the Notice of Exemption from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); additionally he moved that cost recovery goals, a phasing plan for future fee increases, and cost containment implementation be discussed by both the Budget and Finance Committee and the Executive Committee. The motion was seconded by Director Uilkema.

Board comments continued with the motion on the floor. Director Gorin supported the wording added to the motion that addressed the comments made by the Board today.

Director Ross stated that he supported the staff recommendation, with the exception of a zero increase in Schedule M fees. We put in a production system this year to help the people we serve.

Mr. Broadbent stated that the refineries do not get off without fee increases. There is integrity involved in the cost recovery process. The Board can later direct Staff to pursue full cost recovery for refineries and that is a reasonable goal.

Director Gioia commented on the staff report, stating that fees are going up using methodology that is based on cost recovery. These fee increases are not across the board; there are greater fee increases for categories where cost recovery is lower. The total effect of all the fee increases is a 5% increase in revenue. There are a lot of repercussions if we cannot implement our programs. The fee comparison between BAAQMD and the South Coast Air District was good, we want to stay lower.

Chair Bates said there had been no opposition and there has been very little public response.

Chair Bates stated that there was a motion on the floor that had been moved and second, and called for a roll call vote.

Ayes: Gioia, Avalos, Garner, Gorin, Groom, Hosterman, Hudson, Klatt, Mar, Miley, Ross, Uilkema, Wagenknecht, Yeager, Bates

Noes: Spering

Absent: Kalra, Brown, Haggerty, Kniss, Partin, Zane

The motion passed with a majority vote.

11. Public Hearing to Consider Adoption of Proposed Amendments to Regulation 9, Rule 7: Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and Carbon Monoxide from Industrial, Institutional and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators; and to Regulation 1: General Provisions and Definitions; and to Consider Approval of an Addendum to the 2008 CEQA Negative Declaration for Regulation 9 – 7.

Julian Elliot, Senior Air Quality Engineer presented the staff report.

Mr. Elliot gave background information about Regulation 9-7, which generally applies to boilers, steam generators and process heaters. Slides showing different size boilers were shown to the Board.

Small heaters such as residential water heaters are not subject to this rule, and neither are refinery heaters or power plant boilers that have more specific regulations. Regulation 9-7 applies to both existing and new devices.

The 2008 Amendments to Regulation 9-7 updated NOx limits for new and existing heaters subject to the rule and added new NOx limits for new and existing, natural gas-fired heaters rated >2 to <10 MM BTU/hr. There were added energy efficiency measures to reduce GHG emissions (insulation, stack gas temperature limits). The result was significant. NOx emissions were reduced by 3.2 ton/day. Operator registration and manufacturer certification programs were created for natural gas-fired devices rated >2 to <10 MM BTU/hr. Equipment registration has provided a low-cost mechanism for managing data on heater operators. Certification partially shifts burden of complying with new NOx standards from operators to manufacturers beginning 1/1/2011.

All these regulations are going now into effect. However, consumers are not able to buy a compliant device as manufacturers have not certified. Operators have been unable to find compliant equipment.

Compliance Dates for Small, Natural Gas-Fired Heaters (NO_x limits for All Devices, Certification for New Devices)			
Heat Input (MM BTU/hr)	2008 Amendment Effective Dates	2011 Proposal	
		Certification (New Devices)	NO_x Limits (All Devices)
>2 to 5	1/1/2011	1/1/2012	1/1/2013
>5 to <10	1/1/2012	1/1/2012	1/1/2013

Above are the dates initially scheduled for compliance and the proposed dates that allow more time to accomplish compliance with the Regulation. Staff proposes to simplify Regulation 9-7 certification process and allow more methods to establish compliance for certification; and to simplify the certification application. There are some minor corrections and clarifications needed on Regulation 9-7. Language regarding registration for non-permitted devices would be amended on Regulation 1 to be more precise.

Staff has participated in manufacturer training sessions, met with municipal engineering staff, and participated in other forums to explain the new requirements. Staff mailed compliance advisories and requested comments on draft rule from heater operators, manufacturers, industry groups and others. Staff has undertaken an extensive inspection and outreach program to evaluate compliance with rule and to ensure that rule is understood by operators and manufacturers.

Twelve comments were received regarding the draft rule, and are listed in the staff report. Comments were incorporated as appropriate. The final proposal was published on April 4, 2011, and included the proposed amendments to Regulation 9-7, Regulation 1, the 2011 Addendum to 2008 CEQA Negative Declaration and the 2011 Addendum to 2008 Socioeconomic Analysis. No comments have been received.

Public Comments: Chair Bates opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gordon Judd, from NRG Energy Center SF spoke to the Board about his operation. His company operates large boilers, and a steam plant at 5th & Market. He noted that the low fuel usage exemption has been removed from the Regulation, and would like the Regulation to allow the low fuel exemption boilers to qualify as a retrofit.

Mr. James Gotterba, of Alzeta Corporation, commented that a majority of boilers will be retrofit, and burner manufacturers will be gearing up to comply. He would like to see the Air District proceed with the original compliance schedule.

Mr. Elliott responded to Mr. Judd's comments stating that the altered final draft did show the low fuel exemption is allowed, and that those pieces of equipment will be counted as compliant devices.

\Mr. Broadbent responded to Mr. Gotterba's comments stating that the Staff carefully considered the changes to the Regulation and that the extension was practical and fair. The schedule is as aggressive as it can be. We recognize that Alzeta is a leader in this area and they have available equipment to comply now, however, we still need to allow more time.

Director Wagenknecht complimented Staff's work on this Regulation.

Board Action: Director Wagenknecht moved to adopt the Proposed Amendments to Regulation 9, Rule 7: Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and Carbon Monoxide from Industrial, Institutional and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators; and to Regulation 1: General Provisions and Definitions; and to Approve an Addendum to the 2008 CEQA Negative Declaration for Regulation 9 – 7. The motion was seconded by Director Uilkema and passed unanimously without objection.

CLOSED SESSION

13. Conference with Labor Negotiators

Chair Bates adjourned the meeting into a closed session at 11:45 a.m.

OPEN SESSION

The meeting was reconvened at 11:55 a.m. There was no reportable action from the Closed Session.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA MATTERS

There was no public comment.

BOARD MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Director Uilkema stated that tomorrow is the Stationary Source Committee meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

14. Report of the Executive Officer/APCO

Mr. Broadbent reported that the Spare the Air season began on May 1, 2011. He also stated that he will have more information to share with the Board about the Air District's proposed relocation at the next meeting.

15. Chairperson's Report

The Legislative Committee Meeting scheduled for May 9, 2011 and the Mobile Source Committee Meeting scheduled for May 26, 2011 have been cancelled.

The Air District received the 2011 Clean Air Award for Public Health from Breathe California.

16. Time and Place of Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 18, 2011, 9:45 a.m. at 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

17. Adjournment: Chair Bates adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m.

15/ Kris Perez Krow

Kris Perez Krow
Clerk of the Boards